

THE LAST BATTLE OF THE COLD WAR



AN INSIDE ACCOUNT OF NEGOTIATING THE
INTERMEDIATE RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES TREATY

MAYNARD W. GLITMAN

WITH A FOREWORD BY

MAJOR GENERAL WILLIAM F. BURNS



THE LAST BATTLE
OF
THE COLD WAR

Initiatives in Strategic Studies: Issues and Policies

James J. Wirtz
General Editor

Jeffrey A. Larsen
T.V. Paul
Brad Roberts
James M. Smith
Series Editors

Initiatives in Strategic Studies provides a bridge between the use of force or diplomacy and the achievement of political objectives. This series focuses on the topical and timeless issues relating to strategy, including the nexus of political, diplomatic, psychological, economic, cultural, historic, and military affairs. It provides a link between the scholarly and policy communities by serving as the recognized forum for conceptually sophisticated analyses of timely and important strategic issues.

Nuclear Transformation: The New U.S. Nuclear Doctrine
Edited by James J. Wirtz and Jeffrey A. Larsen

*Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction in the Middle East:
Directions and Policy Options in the New Century*
James A. Russell

*The Last Battle of the Cold War: An Inside Account of Negotiating
the INF Treaty*
Maynard W. Glitman

THE LAST BATTLE
OF
THE COLD WAR

An Inside Account of Negotiating
the Intermediate Range Nuclear
Forces Treaty

Maynard W. Glitman

palgrave
macmillan



THE LAST BATTLE OF THE COLD WAR
© Maynard W. Glitman, 2006.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles or reviews.

First published in 2006 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN™
175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010 and
Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, England RG21 6XS
Companies and representatives throughout the world.

PALGRAVE MACMILLAN is the global academic imprint of the Palgrave Macmillan division of St. Martin's Press, LLC and of Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. Macmillan® is a registered trademark in the United States, United Kingdom and other countries. Palgrave is a registered trademark in the European Union and other countries.

ISBN 1-4039-7281-8

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Glitman, Maynard W.

The last battle of the Cold War : an inside account of negotiating the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty / Maynard W. Glitman.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 1-4039-7281-8

1. Soviet Union. Treaties, etc. United States, 1987 Dec. 8. 2. Nuclear arms control—United States—History. 3. Nuclear arms control—Soviet Union—History. 4. Intermediate-range ballistic missiles. I. Title.

KZ5662.25.G58 2006

327.1'747—dc22

2005053915

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Design by Newgen Imaging Systems (P) Ltd., Chennai, India.

First edition: April 2006

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America.

CONTENTS

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| <i>Foreword</i> | vii |
| <i>Acknowledgments</i> | xi |

Part I

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Setting the Table | 3 |
| 2. Soviet INF: NATO and the United States Mobilize to Counter the Threat | 15 |
| 3. NATO Faces the Soviet Challenge | 41 |
| 4. Taking the First Steps | 53 |
| 5. The End of the Beginning | 65 |
| 6. Life After “The Walk in the Woods”: The Talks Break Down | 81 |

Part II

| | |
|---|-----|
| 7. Picking Up the Pieces: A New Beginning | 103 |
| 8. Peace Movements | 127 |
| 9. Breaking the Back of the Biggest Problems | 145 |
| 10. Shorter-Range INF—Sealing Off the Potential for Circumventing the Treaty | 173 |

Part III

| | |
|---|-----|
| 11. Undertakings: The Story of a Word | 199 |
| 12. Verification: Making Trust Acceptable | 207 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 13. Moving to the Hill: Senate Ratification | 223 |
| 14. Upsides and Downsides | 233 |
| <i>Notes</i> | 237 |
| <i>Index</i> | 251 |

FOREWORD

Research on the causes and implications of the end of the Cold War that dominated the international scene during the latter part of the twentieth century is still in its infancy. Until this research bears fruit, answers to contemporary questions concerning the abrupt collapse of the Soviet Union, the reunion of Germany, and the dissolution of the Warsaw Treaty Organization remain illusory. None of these events was truly predicted, and it is important that their causes be identified and understood, just as it was important that an earlier generation study and understand the circumstances that brought about the rise and fall of Nazism and Fascism in Europe.

Ambassador Glitman's first-person account of a singular process that contributed to the end of the Cold War is important because it sheds light on a bilateral negotiation between the major protagonists of that war which became a test of strength and of wills between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. He is uniquely suited to this task. As a Foreign Service Officer who spent much of his career either in Washington or European capitals dealing with Cold War issues, as a principal negotiator with the Soviet Union concerning reductions in so-called Euro-missiles, and as U.S. Ambassador to Belgium, he was both an observer of and a participant in the careful, tedious, and dangerous process of insuring that the Cold War did not end in nuclear disaster. In particular, his insights as chief of the U.S. Delegation to the Intermediate Nuclear Forces negotiations in Geneva in the mid-1980s paint an accurate and valuable picture of the decision-making process of both sides as they eventually moved to eliminate an entire class of nuclear delivery systems.

The INF negotiations were unusual in that they were conducted at many levels. First, of course, they were a critical negotiation—a lengthy, detailed, and dangerous process of communication—between the two nuclear superpowers. In these negotiations, the United States' task was further complicated as it represented the interests of

its NATO partners, particularly the concerns of those nations that had agreed to accept deployment of U.S. missiles to offset similar Soviet systems. The interests of U.S. Allies in Asia also became important as Soviet negotiating positions developed that could relieve concerns in Europe but expose our Asian Allies to new threats. The needs of public diplomacy became crucial when the Soviet Union attempted to influence political decisions among European NATO Allies through “peace” movements in countries that had agreed to accept U.S. deployments. This was particularly important in West Germany, where the Pershing II missile system was deployed when the first phase of the negotiations proved unsuccessful.

The focal point for all these activities, the diplomatic efforts with Allies as well as negotiations with the Soviet Union, was Geneva and the INF negotiations themselves. Glitman explains the details of these events as a participant, first as deputy to Ambassador Paul Nitze, and later in his own right as chief negotiator. He also describes the difficulties in policy formulation for the United States and for the Soviet Union as new vistas were opened in relations between the two superpowers and they explored new options in nuclear arms reduction opportunities. He identifies unintended consequences of policy decisions, such as the difficulties raised in the INF negotiations when a complicated and vague integration of the intermediate range, space, and strategic nuclear negotiations took place when the sides resumed talks in 1985.

We do not yet know the total impact of the end of the Cold War on future relations among states. Neither do we know the future shape of the North Atlantic Alliance and its relation to the Russian Federation. What is clear, however, is that the INF negotiations in Geneva during most of the 1980s were a crucial part of the final chapter in the demise of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War era. Glitman describes the meticulous attention to detail required in preparing formal statements and the intricate one-on-one conversations between the sides that provided important insights into potential mutually acceptable formulations.

These negotiations also provided the basis to sustain trans-Atlantic cooperation and integrity during those important years and lay the foundation for a continuing formal security alliance for the present century. Mike Glitman’s careful re-creation of these negotiations is a unique contribution to an understanding of how the United States and its Allies managed these events. He stresses the importance of routine and frequent appearances both at NATO headquarters in Brussels and in European capitals to consult, reassure, and gain insights.

As his colleague during the early negotiating years and later as a player in the arms control decision-making process in Washington, I can attest to his professionalism, his comprehension of the issues, and his ability to analyze the detailed negotiating process.

Major General William F. Burns, USA (ret.)
Former Director, U.S. Arms Control and
Disarmament Agency

This page intentionally left blank

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Literally hundreds of people were involved in negotiating this treaty. They included representatives from all the agencies and departments responsible for arms control and defense over a period of many years. This includes also the families of those involved who spent many weeks or months separated as the negotiations went on or who moved back and forth with the team.

Among these particular appreciation goes to Paul and Phyllis Nitze, John and Laura Woodworth, Jeff Ankley, Leo and Athleen Reddy, Don and Frances McConnell, Bill and Peggy Burns, Frank and Kay Partlow, Jim Hurd, Ron Bartek, David and Terry Jones, Susan Kosinski, Alan Foley, Robert Simmons, Roger Harrison, and Steve Ledogar.

The various support teams in Washington who worked tirelessly. At the same time, credit must also be given to our Allies who followed each step of the negotiations and contributed political support toward its completion, as well as to the negotiating team from the Soviet Union.

This book could not have been completed without the continuing help and encouragement of Foreign Service Officer David T. Jones who served as well throughout the negotiating process. In addition, my thanks to Dr. James Smith of the Air Force Institute for National Security Studies, and Dr. Jeffrey Larsen of Larsen Consulting Group, both in Colorado Springs, for their editorial help in the completion of this manuscript and finding a publisher, and to Carol Tank-Day for secretarial support.

The opinions and characterizations in this book are those of the author, and do not necessarily represent official positions of the U.S. Government.

This page intentionally left blank

PART I

This page intentionally left blank

SETTING THE TABLE

It was March 1976. The lights in the Pentagon special conference room were dimmed, and the Defense Department briefer began what had become for him a routine lecture on the status of the Soviet military machine. The audience, however, was anything but routine, consisting of member countries' representatives to the North Atlantic Council (NAC) at NATO headquarters in Brussels. For the first time, America's NATO Allies would be shown the photographic evidence of the massive Soviet military buildup.

Only months before, Donald Rumsfeld had been one of their number, as U.S. representative to the council. Now, as U.S. Secretary of Defense, he had invited his former colleagues to Washington for a firsthand view of the impressive improvements, both quantitative and qualitative, in the Soviet military machine. The United States, in response to the Soviet action, was about to begin a major rebuilding effort of its own. Above all, U.S. forces in Europe needed extensive repair, after years of reductions and neglect as the nation and its resources became increasingly absorbed in Vietnam.

The administration had already begun the effort to enlist congressional support for the rebuilding process. Now, in the summer of 1976, the time had come to engage our NATO Allies. The Pentagon briefing, with its stunning, persuasive photographs, was designed to convince our Allies, as it already had many in the Congress, that a concerted effort to strengthen NATO's military arm was needed to ensure the Alliance's ability to deter and defend against the Soviet threat.

The briefing covered five broad areas: conventional land, air, and sea forces; industrial capabilities; and nuclear forces. As it moved along, one could sense the briefing's impact on the audience. They saw Soviet airfields filled with new fighters and bombers and evidence of a blue-water surface fleet under construction. The pictures of huge depots of tanks and artillery and acres of mobile bridging devices, an

innovation unlike anything in the West's arsenal, deployed in a manner and location that appeared ominously offensive, sparked numerous questions on the equipment's capabilities and the likely intended purpose.

The European ambassadors followed the review of the growth in Soviet strategic nuclear forces with perhaps somewhat less interest than they had accorded the discussion of the conventional forces on their borders. But when the briefer turned to those Soviet nuclear forces aimed directly at Europe, one could hear the shuffling as they straightened up in their chairs.

The commentary began with the known Soviet intermediate-range nuclear force (INF)¹ missiles: the SS-4 and SS-5 liquid-fueled missiles that required time to "gas up" before they could be launched. Some were immobilized in fixed silos and thus subject to easy counter targeting. Others were tied relatively close to their bases and, while movable, were hardly nimble. Although capable of indescribable death and destruction, and thus a source of concern, they had been in the Soviet inventory for many years and had begun to be labeled "obsolescent." Familiarity had not bred complacency, let alone contempt, but it had made these weapons appear a "normal" part of the nuclear landscape in Europe. After a few questions on these systems, the audience was ready for the next topic.²

As the next picture came into focus, the assembled ambassadors saw a newly constructed missile base with the usual barracks and administrative and maintenance buildings. The presence of several large garages with what appeared to be retractable roofs set it apart, however, from previous Soviet missile complexes.

Inside the garages could be seen missiles of a markedly new Soviet type. They were most impressive. Mounted on truck-like vehicles, making them truly mobile and small enough to be transported by rail cars, they would be hard to find once they left their bases. With a range sufficient to reach every capital in Europe, they carried three nuclear warheads and used solid fuel. More easily fired and much deadlier than their predecessors, this new missile system was qualitatively different—a difference more in kind than in degree.

The room was silent as the briefer ran through the description and analysis of the new missile. When he finished, there was a moment of hesitation and silence followed by a flood of questions. How many of these new missiles did the Soviets now have? How many did the American analysts think the Soviets would ultimately produce? What would be the likely targets? Where would they be based? Why were the Soviets deploying this new system? When would more details on

capabilities be available? Would the older systems remain in service or be phased out? How could it be countered? And perhaps most important, what should be done about it?

The briefer did his best to answer, but the questions were too speculative, the information too sensitive, and the gaps in knowledge too great to permit detailed responses. As the Allied ambassadors filed out of the room, snatches of overheard conversation underscored that while they were impressed by what they had seen of Soviet conventional forces, it was the new missile, the SS-20, and its implications for their security that had truly commanded their attention.

Thus in an almost classical way, with the gathering and dissemination of intelligence, began the epic, final Cold War struggle over Europe's political orientation. And thus also began my own unbroken association with this campaign, which was to culminate 12 years and three administrations later with the ratification of the INF Treaty.

Most in that room that day had recognized the importance of the material presented and of the Allied reaction to it. I doubt if any of us foresaw the full implications of what that session had launched or had any inkling that the culminating battle of the Cold War was about to begin.

Indeed, our focus was on the conventional side. The SS-20 had been brought into the briefing because, we would argue, its deployment underscored the need to strengthen the deterrent value of NATO's *conventional* forces. We neither argued nor contemplated that the situation required a dramatic strengthening of American nuclear forces committed to NATO.

This approach, posited on an essential difference in how the United States and its Allies viewed the Soviet threat, was explained in part by a long history of intra-Alliance difficulties and failures in dealing with the role of nuclear weapons in NATO. The issue was quiescent at the moment. The Allies, with the longstanding exception of France, remained relatively content with the character and composition of both America's nuclear commitment to NATO and their own contributions to NATO's nuclear deterrent. This was one sleeping dog that we carefully tiptoed around.

BACKGROUND

At the heart of the problem, and what made it so difficult, lay one of NATO's unspoken internal contradictions, the bridging of which requires constant care and attention. The contradiction, in the view of academic specialists, lay in European concern that U.S. policy,

especially involving nuclear weapons, threatened to lead either to the United States abandoning Europe or to Europeans being entrapped in U.S. initiatives.

In many respects, the problem results from geography, making it all the more difficult to address. Seen in an unvarnished context, it came down to the perception that were deterrence to fail, the Europeans would be relatively better off if a war were fought over their heads with U.S. and Soviet missiles striking each other's home territory. From the American standpoint, however, it would be preferable for a war to be fought, at least in the first instance, in Europe.

Trying to structure a coherent and cooperative Alliance defense posture in this context provided NATO members with a constant challenge to their goodwill and ingenuity. Each new advance in military technology and each new arms control initiative, especially in the nuclear area, affected this issue and required a new effort to overcome the apparent contradiction.

The potential use of America's nuclear arsenal in defense of the Alliance—the “coupling” of NATO's largely U.S. nuclear force in Europe with U.S. strategic nuclear forces—became, and remains, a key part of NATO's deterrent posture. The “coupling” strategy contained an implied threat that the United States would use its nuclear forces in Europe to counter a Soviet attack—conventional or nuclear—on NATO Europe. It also contained an implicit understanding on the part of the United States and its Allies that doing this would risk a Soviet nuclear attack on the United States itself.

The “coupling” strategy thus made clear to the Soviets and to our Allies that U.S. strategic nuclear forces would come to NATO's defense if the Soviets attacked, thereby deterring the Soviets from attacking any NATO member. Moreover, the strategy would greatly diminish Soviet ability to intimidate individual Allied nations. For their part, the Soviets saw it as very much in their interest to undermine the philosophical and material foundations of that deterrence. In NATO's earliest days, the nuclear factor was kept in the background. Our nuclear stockpile was small and viewed as strategic rather than tactical weapons. The emphasis was on developing stronger conventional forces.

The February 1952 Alliance meeting in Lisbon had marked a turning point in the effort. Concerned over Soviet intransigence and fearful that North Korea's invasion of South Korea might be a prelude to a similar move in Europe, the Allies sought to establish a force level that would provide NATO with the ability to defeat a Soviet land grab. With this goal in mind, the NATO Allies agreed to field

50 active divisions and 4,000 aircraft by the end of the year, with further increases to follow. They also endorsed plans for the establishment of a European Defense Community (EDC) to enhance the ability of the European Allies to contribute to the common defense.³

The Lisbon force goals, however, proved overly ambitious. It soon became apparent the levels would not be reached, and something else would be needed to deter and, if necessary, defeat the Red Army. In Washington, meanwhile, Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey was pushing the Eisenhower cabinet to keep down expenses. His arguments that nuclear weapons would provide a “bigger bang for the buck” helped persuade the administration to place more emphasis on the nuclear deterrent.

The Allies’ failure to field the required ground forces, their failure to establish the EDC, and the U.S. administration’s effort to reduce expenditures contributed to the development of two momentous decisions: (1) to rearm West Germany and bring it into the Alliance, a policy formalized in May 1955;⁴ and (2) to express the “firm determination of all member governments to see the Atlantic force equipped with the most modern weapons”; namely, nuclear forces.⁵

While Germany’s rearmament and NATO membership constituted vital steps in reintegrating Germany into Europe, the determination to field “the most modern weapons” eventually moved from euphemism to the open endorsement of nuclear weapons for defense and deterrence, the enduring keystone of NATO’s politico-military policy. The open endorsement of nuclear weapons followed the Soviet invasion of Hungary and the subsequent Soviet “peace offensive” designed to persuade Western publics to forego modernization of NATO’s forces.

In response to this ploy, the Allies reaffirmed they would not accept a situation in which the Soviet Union would have a monopoly of nuclear weapons on the European continent. The NATO Allies proclaimed that the “Atlantic Alliance must be in a position to use all available means to meet any attack which might be launched against it. It is the availability of the most modern weapons of defense which will discourage attempts to launch any such attack on the Alliance.”⁶

At its next ministerial meeting in December 1957, NATO explicitly included intermediate-range ballistic missiles (IRBM) in this context. While not an explicit part of the reasoning, the seeds of “strategic coupling” were evident at this time. The Allies noted that the Soviet leaders were preventing steps toward disarmament while introducing “the most modern and destructive weapons, including missiles of all kinds” and were calling on “all European nations except the USSR to

remove nuclear weapons and missiles.” The Allies went on to state that “As long as the Soviet Union persists in this attitude,” NATO would field the best available weapons, and “to this end, NATO has decided to establish stocks of nuclear warheads, which will be readily available for the defense of the Alliance.” NATO also “decided that intermediate-range ballistic missiles will have to be put at the disposal of the Supreme Allied Commander Europe. . . . Arrangements for their use would conform to NATO defense plans” and be in agreement with the states that would host these systems.⁷

Subsequent communiqués reaffirmed the strategic doctrine underlying these statements. These documents emphasized that NATO’s defense strategy is founded on the concept of a strong deterrent, comprising “the shield, with its conventional and nuclear elements, and the nuclear retaliatory forces.”⁸

All of these communiqué paragraphs placed NATO’s formal imprimatur on the stationing of American nuclear weapons in Europe. They also underscored the strong interest of the European NATO Allies in having the U.S. nuclear deterrent available for NATO on European territory.

Moreover, the Soviet arguments and Allied responses foreshadowed most of the later questions at the heart of the INF issue. Such arguments would surround and form the debate over the purpose of these weapons; the European Allies’ role in determining how, why, and under what circumstances they might be used; and, above all, the legitimacy the United States and its Allies had for deployment of such weapons in Europe. It was also in 1957 that I had my first encounter with the question of the role of American nuclear weapons in Europe. Like many first encounters, it has stayed with me.

In December 1956, newly married and with less than a year in the Foreign Service, I received a draft notice and passed my physical. I signed up for a newly opened program that involved six months of active duty followed by years in the active reserves; I then headed to basic training at Fort Knox, Kentucky.

Basic training provided an important benefit. I gained direct experience with the military. At the end of Basic, I was named “Outstanding Trainee” and assigned, in the summer of 1957, to the Army Intelligence School at Fort Holabird, Maryland, to learn the art of combat intelligence.

The course at Fort Holabird was designed to keep up with the latest developments. Thus, with the revelation in the May 1957 NATO Communiqué that U.S. tactical nuclear weapons would be deployed in Europe, and after the “sputnik” satellite launch had underscored

the growing Soviet technical prowess, the combat intelligence course included lectures on how to discern the likelihood that U.S. and Allied combat forces might come under Soviet nuclear attack. Of equal importance, our analysis of Soviet moves, the strength of their forces, and the odds of their making a war-winning breakthrough on “our front” would play a crucial role in how U.S. commanders would array our forces and decide whether to unleash our own nuclear weapons.

During one of the map exercises, we were asked to make such a judgment. The simulated intelligence information led to the conclusion that our division was about to be overrun and that the entire front would be exposed and could collapse. The way would be open for the enemy to push NATO forces back off of the map, presumably to a “Dunkirk.” After we presented our conclusion, I asked the lecturer how the U.S. command would respond in such a situation. He replied that although he was in intelligence and not in operations, he would guess that, given the strong likelihood of a crushing defeat, our division commander would almost certainly request permission for immediate use of tactical nuclear weapons to stem the attack. I could not but wonder what might be happening on our flanks and what the forward edge of the battle area (FEBA) might look like in such circumstances.

It was obvious that the definitions of tactical versus strategic nuclear strikes depend very much on where one lives. It was equally obvious to American thinkers that NATO’s conventional forces must be kept strong enough to prevent a situation from arising that could leave us with such a Hobson’s choice. The threat of tactical nuclear strikes and the evident will to carry them out would help deter any attack. For example, such a threat by NATO would compel a potential attacker to deploy forces in ways that would improve NATO’s prospects of a successful conventional defense. However, actually having to use the nuclear weapons because our conventional forces were too weak to deter or defeat an attack, even one dispersed to minimize the effects of nuclear weapons, would represent a devastating failure of strategic policy.

I later found that our European Allies did not always or fully share this logic, which led inexorably to the conclusion that NATO must be strong enough to ensure the Soviets would never risk an attack. This meant the Allies had to be equally ready to meet the financial demands of such a strategy. At the same time, the Allies were not fully comfortable with a deterrence doctrine that at its core required that NATO be, and be seen as, credibly prepared to use nuclear weapons on

European soil, including most particularly German territory, to halt an otherwise unstoppable Soviet invasion.⁹ It was simultaneously necessary to defeat aggression as far forward as possible; since trading (German) territory for time to mobilize was not an accepted option either.

On the popular level, this dilemma fed the debate over whether people were “better red than dead.” NATO countered by arguing that this cant phrase did not accurately portray the situation. NATO members could have peace, security, *and* freedom. The need for NATO members to confront and master the dilemma—to be seen as indeed able to have peace, security, and freedom—was even more essential on the official level. NATO’s deterrent policy could not stand without public support. Were the policy to be undermined, the Alliance, and the peace, security, and freedom it provided its members, would be at risk.

Unable to change the geopolitical underpinnings of its nuclear dilemma, NATO’s leaders sought to develop procedural approaches that would help bridge the political and psychological gap present in an alliance between a nuclear but distant America and a Europe on the front line. Ultimately dependent on America’s fulfilling its pledge to come to their assistance with all necessary force, Europeans needed to be convinced that we would make such a sacrifice.

Britain and France, as nuclear powers in their own right, were in a special situation; but both (at least until President de Gaulle withdrew France from NATO’s integrated military command structure in 1967) saw their nuclear forces as part of NATO’s deterrent. NATO’s procedural approaches aimed both to provide the European NATO countries with a participatory role in the Alliance’s nuclear deterrent force and to share with them the responsibility for the use of nuclear weapons.

The effort to give concrete form to the concept of participation in, and sharing of the responsibility for, the use of nuclear weapons took some time to develop. After failing to find a mutually acceptable way to have mixed crews on nuclear-armed vessels, the NATO Allies settled on the following four specific approaches:

- the acceptance by European NATO Allies of the stationing of U.S. nuclear weapons and delivery systems on their territory, as foreseen in the May 3 and December 19, 1957, NAC Communiqués;¹⁰
- the Allies’ provision of delivery systems that would carry U.S. nuclear weapons to their targets;
- the assignment, beginning in 1963, to the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe (SACEUR) of three U.S. Polaris submarines and the United Kingdom’s Vulcan nuclear bomber force;¹¹ and

- a process of nearly continual consultation on the doctrine for the possible use of nuclear weapons and discussions on the nature of specific nuclear weapons systems and their deployment.

This consultative process had its origin in the May 4–6, 1962, NAC ministerial meeting held in Athens. There, the Allies set down what became known as the “Athens Guidelines,” the key elements of which were spelled out in three paragraphs:

The Council noted the progress that has been made in the direction of closer cooperation between member countries in the development of the Alliance’s defense policy. In this respect Ministers welcomed the confirmation by the United States that it will continue to make available for the Alliance the nuclear weapons necessary for NATO defense, concerting with its allies on basic plans and arrangements in regard to these weapons. In addition, both the United Kingdom and the United States Governments have given firm assurances that their strategic forces will continue to provide defense against threats to the Alliance beyond the capacity of NATO-committed forces to deal with.

So that all member states may play their full part in consultation on nuclear defense policy, it has been decided to set up special procedures which will enable all members of the Alliance to exchange information concerning the role of nuclear weapons in NATO defense.

The purpose of NATO is defense and it must be clear that in case of attack it will defend its members by all necessary means. The Council has reviewed the action that would be necessary on the part of member countries, collectively and individually, in the various circumstances in which the Alliance might be compelled to have recourse to its nuclear defenses.¹²

The language of this communiqué underscored the determination of the United States to ensure that its Allies would have and be seen as having an important role in the formulation and execution of NATO nuclear deterrent policy. It is also noteworthy for its robust presentation of that policy. There is no hint whatsoever that the drafters and signers were contemplating a complementary or alternative arms control approach to deterrence. They clearly wanted to stress their determination to resist aggression, hoping that this show of determination would itself deter any attack.

Eventually, the NATO Nuclear Planning Group (NPG), established in 1965, became the formal locus for NATO’s nuclear consultative activity. In addition to regular meetings of action officers at NATO headquarters, the NPG is on call for meetings at the level of

permanent representatives and meets twice a year at the ministerial level.

In addition to NATO's involvement with the military side of nuclear weapons, the Alliance's political side has been and remains a major contributor to the development of nuclear and conventional disarmament policies affecting the Alliance, as it was for the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks (SALT) negotiations. While the SALT negotiations were meant to reduce U.S. and Soviet strategic nuclear weapons, the question of whether and how to include U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear weapons in an agreement emerged as an important element. The Soviets argued that U.S. forward-based systems (FBS), such as FB-111s located in Europe, should be considered strategic because they could reach targets in the Soviet Union. The United States, noting that the Soviet Union had similar forces that could reach targets in NATO Europe, at times suggested that both sides' medium-range systems be left out of the strategic equation; but we had difficulty formulating an approach in concrete terms. In the end, neither U.S. nor Soviet INF systems were included in the final SALT I agreements (which included the ABM Treaty). But the potential for the FBS/intermediate-range nuclear forces issue to create internal political problems in NATO had been uncovered.¹³

This potential was exposed even further during the SALT II negotiations, when the United States agreed to a protocol that would ban deployment of the new cruise missile systems then under development. The ban would have expired before the missiles were ready for deployment. Nevertheless, the willingness of the United States to accept such a ban as part of a package built largely around strategic systems, and which contained no counterpart limitations on Soviet intermediate-range missiles within range of NATO Europe, aroused Allied concerns. They feared their interests might be compromised if the United States were to forgo deployment of cruise missiles in Europe capable of reaching targets in the Soviet Union. They also feared that arms control negotiations could be negatively prejudiced by removing an important bargaining chip for reducing Soviet intermediate-range nuclear systems directly threatening NATO Europe.¹⁴

The difference in perspective between the United States and the Soviet Union on these intermediate-range weapons would become a major element in the INF negotiations. In essence, the Soviets argued that if the United States deployed its intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe to help defend its NATO Allies, the nuclear forces of the British and French Allies should count as part of the U.S. strategic forces and be subject to limitation in any U.S.-Soviet treaty constraining

strategic nuclear weapons. The rationale was that British and French nuclear forces could reach targets inside the Soviet Union. Soviet intermediate-range nuclear forces, on the other hand, should not be counted in the context of such a U.S.-Soviet agreement because they could not reach targets in the United States.

One offshoot of this argument was the Soviets' suggestion that they might be prepared to offset their intermediate-range force against U.K. and French intermediate and strategic forces. This approach, however, would have left Soviet strategic forces outside the Soviet-European equation, despite the Soviets' boast that even a small number of their forces could easily target all of the United Kingdom and France. The underlying effect of the Soviets' proposed approach would have been to leave U.S. Allies, other than the United Kingdom and France (Germany in particular), exposed to the threat of nuclear attack from Soviet strategic, intermediate-range, and tactical nuclear forces without benefit of counterweight U.S. nuclear forces located in Europe, where their coupling with U.S. strategic forces would be magnified.

The fundamental goal of the Soviet approach both in the SALT context and later during the long INF negotiations was to use the geographically built-in differences of perception between the United States and its European Allies to attempt to split the North Atlantic Alliance. As we shall see, almost all of the Soviet tactical and strategic moves during the 12-year period beginning with the Soviet activities reported on at the spring 1976 briefing of the NATO Permanent Representatives (Perm Reps) and ending with the spring 1988 exchange of ratified treaties, had this goal in mind. The stakes were high—nothing less than the ultimate outcome of the Cold War.

This page intentionally left blank

SOVIET INF: NATO AND THE UNITED STATES MOBILIZE TO COUNTER THE THREAT

A NEW ADMINISTRATION TAKES THE HELM

The briefing to the NATO Permanent Representatives in the summer of 1976 was followed by briefings of senior Allied officials in NATO capitals. While the SS-20 was a point of great interest, once again the main thrust of the briefing was to focus on the need for NATO to strengthen its conventional forces to offset the growing and technically improving Soviet forces. The Ford administration hoped to build upon the impact of the briefings of congressional leaders in Washington and of Allied leaders to gain support for a major program to improve NATO's military readiness. But the election of 1976 put Jimmy Carter in the White House. His administration would have to determine whether and to what extent the United States would devote its resources to NATO's "getting well" and how best to deal with the political and military threat posed by the SS-20.

Soon after the new president was sworn in, Vice President Walter Mondale left for a tour of Allied capitals. The purpose of the trip was to underscore the Carter administration's interest in maintaining a strong Alliance and to give the new administration, via Mondale, a first-hand impression of Allied views and concerns. As the senior remaining Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) officer from the previous administration dealing specifically with NATO and European affairs, I was asked to accompany the vice president and provide a Pentagon perspective on the issues. The trip achieved both of its goals and helped set the stage for the Carter administration's efforts to improve NATO's defense capabilities.

Carter and his Defense Secretary Harold Brown would in fact pick up the baton. Soon after the new administration took office, planning began, under the imaginative conceptual and bureaucratically forceful direction of Under Secretary of Defense Robert Komer, for the development of a “Long Term Defense Program” (LTDP). Under Komer’s prodding at their May 1977 summit meeting in London, NATO leaders approved the commissioning of a task force to prepare the plan. In its initial phases, the LTDP focused exclusively on conventional forces. I was concerned that this concentration of effort could create a false impression among our Allies that the United States was deliberately downplaying the nuclear side. Such a conclusion in turn could lead to an impression that the United States, by stressing improvements in NATO’s conventional forces and thus making it more likely that any war would be fought out in Europe by conventional forces, was seeking to limit the linkage of its forces in Europe to the U.S. strategic deterrence, which (if the theory of extended deterrence was correct) would deter any war from breaking out in the first place. The Europeans, however, tended to see the LTDP effort through the other end of the telescope. They had, as the saying went, at the time “no interest in making Europe safe for conventional war.”

There was a risk that our emphasis on the conventional side might lead the Soviets to underestimate America’s will to use nuclear weapons to halt an otherwise unstoppable Soviet attack. Failure to give more weight to the coupling and deterrent role of U.S. nuclear forces in Europe could raise doubts, among our Allies and with our adversaries, about U.S. resolve and motivations, thus actually increasing the risk of war. It was, and remains, all-in-all, a balance so delicate to maintain that long-lasting equilibrium was, and is, not possible.

That these concerns were well founded became more apparent from reports of just such European anxieties. Consequently, I urged that the LTDP include a section on nuclear weapons. A requisite chapter—the final chapter—was added and formally incorporated at the October 12, 1977, meeting of the Nuclear Planning Group.

While NATO defense ministers had been discussing “improvements” in NATO’s nuclear force posture for some years, much of the emphasis had been placed on ensuring that the force could survive an attack and on the ability to command and control that force. When the nuclear chapter was added to the LTDP, we had nothing new in mind beyond moving ahead in these areas and demonstrating that the LTDP would not be limited only to the conventional side. That would soon change, however. Having the nuclear chapter in place did not prevent this politically sensitive issue from displacing the LTDP in

the public's eye or from dominating the overall transatlantic debate. But, it did help create a new forum for dealing with nuclear issues, namely the High-Level Group (HLG) composed of assistant secretary level officials from capitals, in which differences could be resolved and concerted positions developed.

The LTDP was formally presented to NATO defense ministers by Harold Brown at the May 1977 NATO Defense Planning Committee (DPC) meeting. The second paragraph of the "Ministerial Guidance" agreed at that meeting revealed, even to those not adept at reading between the lines, that a disagreement had arisen over where the LTDP should place the fulcrum of balance between NATO's conventional and theater nuclear forces. That paragraph also marked the first time that the SS-20 was mentioned in a NATO Communiqué. However, in the context of that paragraph, the mention was slightly dismissive, and concern over Soviet conventional forces was given pride of place.

The Warsaw Pact forces are increasingly offensive in posture and capable of projecting Soviet power on a global scale. Soviet nuclear forces continue to improve with the appearance of new nuclear missile systems equipped with multiple warheads, including the expected deployment of the SS-20 mobile intermediate-range system capable of striking targets in the whole of Europe and beyond. It is in the conventional field, however, where the growth of the Warsaw Pact capability has been most pronounced. In particular, the Warsaw Pact ground forces have the capabilities to stage a major offensive in Europe without reinforcement. The improved offensive and deep penetration capabilities of the Warsaw Pact tactical air forces now permit the Warsaw Pact to conduct the initial stages of an air attack to a greater extent than hitherto, with in-place forces. The capabilities of the Soviet Union to exercise sea power all around the world have been enhanced by the introduction of new and improved ships, submarines and aircraft."¹

The Ministerial Guidance then proceeded to lay out the foundation for the Alliance to take conventional and nuclear measures to counter the enhanced threat. Viewed from today's perspective, which encompasses the collapse of the Warsaw Pact and the end of the Soviet Union, it is natural to ask whether the concerns expressed in 1977 were valid. At first glance and with 20-20 hindsight, it could seem obvious that the concerns and the remedies for overcoming them were exaggerated.

Here one needs to make a distinction between equipment and the will to use it. While the Soviet equipment was not as technically

proficient as ours, it was plentiful and capable of performing its mission. Anyone who has any doubts would do well to recall the lessons of World War II. Item by item, the German equipment was technically superior to that of the Soviets, but it was not as well adapted to the demands of the Russian winter, nor as plentiful.

Thus I am persuaded that even with their faults, the Soviet and Warsaw Pact armed forces did present a formidable threat, which was made all the more pressing as a result of the drawdown, demoralization, and weakening of the U.S. military as a result of the Vietnam War. We needed to build up our conventional and nuclear forces to ensure that we could deter and if necessary halt and then decisively turn back any Soviet-Warsaw Pact attack. In my view, meeting that goal required an overhaul of NATO's defenses and particularly its conventional forces.

Yet while the ministers placed the nuclear issue in a secondary role at the May meeting, its steady rise to prominence began just a month later at the June 1977 Ottawa meeting of NATO's Nuclear Planning Group attended by some of the same ministers. It was there that European, and especially German, concerns over U.S. nuclear policy became unmistakable.

Key phrases in the June 1977 Nuclear Planning Group (NPG) Communiqué hinted at the major undercurrents of the debate, but did not reveal the developing intensity of the differences:

They [the Ministers] noted the continuing improvements in Soviet nuclear forces over the whole spectrum of capabilities . . . including . . . the SS-20. . . . They also discussed current and potential improvement in NATO nuclear forces. They agreed that the Alliance's nuclear capability as a whole continued to make a vital contribution to deterrence and underlined their determination to maintain essential equivalence between the nuclear capabilities of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. . . . Ministers reviewed the implications for Western security of current developments in cruise missiles, including the relationship to arms control negotiations on these developments. . . . Ministers also reaffirmed the importance of improving NATO conventional forces so as to maintain the credibility of NATO's strategy of forward defense and flexible response.²

NATO Ministerial (and presidential level) Communiqués are often exercises in the arcane with the fine points carefully crafted. Weeks are spent in their preparation; the final version is worked out in an all-night session. Efforts to keep them short and easily understood by the public usually fail as members insist on the inclusion of issues of

particular concern to them, even if those issues would not have been at the top of an objective observer's list. This tendency was understandable, yet if we were not writing for the public, or making our "signals" to the Soviets the top priority in the communiqué drafting process, what audience were we aiming at? I finally concluded that the key audience was ourselves. We were being so careful with the wording of these documents because they established agreed NATO policy and provided the benefit of precedence in any future policy debate on the subject at hand to those whose draft wording had been incorporated in the document.

The June 8-9, 1977, NPG Communiqué cited above is clearer than most, but might still benefit from some interpretation. The United States traditionally provided the intelligence briefings at NPG meetings, and thus it was the U.S. briefing that stimulated the Allies to underscore the growing strength in Soviet nuclear forces and to juxtapose this concern with a reference to "current and potential improvements in NATO nuclear forces" and to "underline their determination" to ensure that NATO improvements kept pace with Soviet developments. The United States, in turn, was careful to add language "reaffirming the importance of improving NATO's conventional forces. . . ." The result was a carefully crafted balance between Allied efforts to focus on the need for NATO to counter the growth of Soviet nuclear forces focused on Western European targets and the U.S. desire to emphasize the need to improve NATO's conventional defenses. The reference to "developments in cruise missiles," however, served both to expose and then obscure the most sensitive part of the discussion.

At the same time as those of us dealing with defense issues were developing approaches for strengthening the U.S. military contribution to NATO and for inducing the Allies to take on a larger share of the defense burden, others were pursuing arms control approaches. Prime among these was the bilateral U.S.-Soviet Strategic Arms Limitations Talks (SALT). Thus while we were briefing the Allies on the capabilities of our new cruise missiles, our colleagues in SALT were engaged in negotiating potential limitations on these same weapons and briefing the Allies on their activities. As the Soviets would have put it, "it was no accident" that the SS-20 and the U.S. cruise missile were mentioned in the same paragraph.

The Allies were beginning to see the cruise missile as the antidote to the SS-20. The fact that this missile was still under development did not slacken their interest in ensuring that it would be available for NATO use or for use as a bargaining chip for obtaining reductions in

Soviet theater nuclear forces facing Europe. Indeed, their enthusiasm for the still-in-development missile led me to dub it the “King Lear” weapon: “I shall do such things, I know not what they may be but they shall be the terrors of the earth.”

The importance the cruise missile had assumed among the Allies was most directly conveyed to Secretary Brown in a bilateral conversation at the Ottawa NPG meeting by Georg Leber, his German counterpart. Leber underscored his concern that U.S. strategic arms control negotiators might, in exchange for Soviet concessions in the strategic area, agree to place limitations on cruise missiles with non-strategic ranges. While he did not offer to deploy such missiles on German soil, his comments, coupled with expressions of concern over the SS-20, could logically be interpreted only in such a context. That seemingly vague sentence in the communiqué of the June 8–9, 1977, NPG Ottawa meeting concerning “current developments in cruise missiles, including the relationship to arms control negotiations on these developments” can be seen as an oblique reference to, and recognition of, Leber’s concerns.

The German position placed us in a dilemma. The U.S. view at this point was that U.S. nuclear forces then assigned to NATO—essentially aircraft, shorter range missiles, and artillery along with the strategic forces backing them up—were sufficient to deter the Soviets and their new SS-20s. Thus we saw no military need to deploy additional nuclear forces in Europe. Also we did not wish to limit our flexibility in SALT. On the other hand, Allied concerns, particularly among the Germans, whose divided country was most exposed to Soviet political pressures as well as to Soviet forces could not be ignored.

The difficulty the United States faced in balancing its interests in obtaining a SALT agreement and in ensuring Allied unity was brought home to me by the impact on the European North Atlantic Council (NAC) members of a 1977 briefing by U.S. SALT negotiators. During their briefing of the council, the U.S. negotiators noted their successful efforts in obtaining Soviet concessions on two weapon systems. One was the Soviet agreement to remove refueling probes from Backfire bombers, rendering them unable to reach targets in the United States. The other was the Soviet agreement to forego deployment of a strategic Soviet missile, the mobile SS-16. While these were of importance to the U.S. strategic situation, the outcome meant that the Backfire bomber force would now be concentrated on closer targets such as NATO Europe. As for the SS-16, it was in effect the direct ancestor of the SS-20. The SS-20, however, could not reach the

United States (except for portions of Alaska) and was clearly aimed at NATO Europe. Moreover, at this point, the SS-20 was not bound by any arms control limitations. The net result of this portion of the briefing was to highlight how their different geographic locations affected United States' and NATO Europe's views of security.

Although the communiqués had been published and carefully studied by those following such matters, the INF issue had not penetrated very far into the consciousness of the broad public. German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt's widely noted October 28, 1977, lecture at the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) in London began the process of placing INF on the front page. In his lecture, Schmidt raised concerns that the deployment of the Soviet SS-20s and the codification, via the SALT Treaties, of an approximate parity in strategic weapons between the United States and the Soviet Union had created a "gray zone" in Europe in which Soviet nuclear weapons were not limited.

As Schmidt put it,

[S]trategic arms limitations confined to the United States and the Soviet Union will inevitably impair the security of the West European members of the Alliance vis-à-vis Soviet military superiority in Europe if we do not succeed in removing the disparities of military power in Europe parallel to the SALT negotiations. So long as this is not the case we must maintain the balance of the full range of deterrence strategy. The Alliance must, therefore, be ready to make available the means to support its present strategy, which is still the right one, and to prevent any developments that could undermine the basis of this strategy.³

Later in his speech, Schmidt suggested the balance could be restored by arms control. However, given the emphasis on developing a NATO nuclear counter (especially via U.S. cruise missiles) to the Soviet buildup, it was understandable that I and other observers tended to see Schmidt's remarks as aimed largely at encouraging and justifying the Alliance's move to field new U.S. intermediate-range nuclear forces in NATO Europe.⁴

"STOP DE NEUTRONEN BOM"

With the need to accommodate those concerns still fresh in our minds and with the implementation of the minister's guidance on the LTDP just getting underway, we found ourselves faced with a completely unexpected problem: a sophisticated, high visibility public attack on a

secondary element of nuclear modernization, the so called neutron bomb. For almost a year, this issue would plague transatlantic security relations and influence Soviet perceptions of the solidity of U.S.-Allied cooperation in the nuclear area. Above all its unfavorable outcome would spur Soviet efforts to manipulate Western public opinion in the furtherance of Soviet policies, especially those aimed at breaking up the North Atlantic Alliance.

While I enjoyed working at the Pentagon as part of both the Rumsfeld and Brown teams, I decided to accept an offer from Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett to take up the post of Deputy United States Representative at NATO. The job would be a natural follow-on to my Pentagon position dealing with the same issues, but it would engage directly on a day-to-day basis with our Allies in what was then arguably our most important overseas mission.

In July 1977, as I was leaving the Pentagon for Brussels, an article appeared in the *Washington Post*. Its author, Walter Pincus, had been carefully researching budget documents dealing with nuclear forces and had come upon an entry that revealed to his well-trained eye that the United States was planning to deploy a new type of tactical nuclear warhead in Europe. The *Post* labeled the warhead the “neutron bomb” and presented this technology as a dangerous development that could jeopardize European security. The nuclear armorers who were planning to deploy the replacement warheads did not, however, see anything particularly unusual about it. For them it was almost a routine improvement, albeit one designed to carry out a very specific and important function in a new way.

Its principle role was to inhibit the Soviets from massing their armored forces for an attack. It would thus provide an effective counter and deterrent to the Soviet advantage in tanks. What would make this weapon a more credible deterrent than existing short-range nuclear weapons was that it would have a reduced blast and “enhanced radiation” to penetrate armor and thus create less “collateral damage.” Because this development would reduce civilian casualties, the Soviets could conclude that it could be used closer than existing weapons to urban areas, where Soviet tanks might otherwise deliberately choose to assemble before launching an attack.

Denying the Soviet attackers this possibility would aid NATO defensive forces by “channeling” Soviet armor into pathways where they could be pummeled by waiting NATO conventional forces. Assuming the Soviets would make the same set of calculations, they would thus be more effectively deterred from launching such an attack in the first place.

The reduced blast was accompanied by an increase in neutron radiation, which could penetrate armor and incapacitate Soviet tank crews. This radiation, however, would be shorter lived than the radioactive fallout from a “normal” blast weapon. Moreover, because of the reduced blast feature, the fallout also would be reduced. Pincus and the headline writers at the *Post* chose to focus on the warhead’s enhanced radiation feature. They were aided in this approach by the weapon’s builders own predilection to refer to it as an “enhanced radiation” weapon as this feature made it particularly lethal to tank crews.

For the better part of a week, the *Post* gave the “neutron bomb” front-page coverage. Underscoring the increased radiation created an especially strong emotional reaction. It seemed to me that many people envisaged their brains or their reproductive organs being fried. In one memorable edition, the headline writers, perhaps in search of an even more shocking label referred to the weapon as a “killer bomb.” One could not avoid asking what the headline writers expected a bomb to do. Were they awaiting the development of a “feather bomb” which would tickle people to death?

Above all the articles gave little credence to the underlying *raison d’être* for the weapon: that it would help deter a war. Unfortunately, when the Pentagon finally reacted to the story, it concentrated on the charge that Pincus was revealing classified information. This approach was bound to be a losing posture since Pincus had used open source unclassified material. More importantly, the Pentagon’s reaction would neither impress a public that might assume the government was trying to hide something nor explain why the U.S. government was proposing to build this weapon. Indeed, the failure to provide an early, clear exposition of why this weapon had been developed and what it was meant to accomplish—deter a Soviet conventional attack—set the stage for an even greater and far more costly failure.

I tried from my post at NATO to regain some of the lost ground by urging that the U.S. government consistently refer to this warhead as the reduced blast weapon and succeeded in getting that label into some documents, for example, the October 11–12, 1977, Nuclear Planning Group Communiqué. However, most of Washington, seemed to have given up any hope of getting the media to drop the inaccurate and unfavorable “neutron bomb” label, and it stuck.

The real battle over the deployment of the new warhead, however, took place in Europe. The European press quickly picked up on the *Post’s* articles. Egon Bahr, a German Socialist Party (SPD) security policy expert, who understood the real purpose of the weapon, provided a quip that would be picked up by NATO opponents, including

Soviet propagandists. It was, Bahr said, the “ultimate capitalist weapon which kills people while sparing property.” Within a short time, a “ban the neutron bomb” movement seemed spontaneously to spring up across Western Europe. Its focal point was in the Netherlands where this movement got off to an early start. I visited there at this time and was impressed by the number of large multicolored “Stop de Neutronen Bom” posters in windows and on walls. All a pro-NATO group could muster were small mimeographed hand-outs urging “Stop de SS-20 Raket.” “Racket” in its modern English meaning was, it seemed to me, entirely appropriate for what was going on. With parts of the Soviet archives now open, the validity of these suspicions is confirmed. While I believe the vast majority of the “anti-neutron bomb” demonstrators sincerely believed in their position, there is little doubt that Moscow played an important role behind the scenes.

As the antideployment campaign gained momentum, Washington, fearing that the Allies might not accept deployment of the new weapons and not wanting to be overly committed to a possible failure, began to back off a bit from its support for fielding the new warheads and sought to place some of the political burden for the deployments on the Allies: We would produce and deploy if they wanted it.

The U.S. government’s initial public response to the “ban the neutron bomb” campaign had been relatively subdued. Washington’s guidance, in the face of the mounting antideployment campaign was to remain reactive in nature and not to draw attention to the issue. Thus, U.S. officials were not to initiate public debates on the subject, were to take a rather neutral position on the deployment of the weapon, and were to underscore the obvious point that the warheads would only be deployed if the Allies wanted them. If pressed further, U.S. officials could add that the new warhead would strengthen deterrence. But there should not be a full court press in public, for example by going into detail on just how the weapon would reduce the risk of war.

In keeping with this approach, President Carter at a March 17, 1978, public forum responded to a critical question concerning the weapon by describing the “neutron bomb” as a “tactical weapon” that “will not change at all the relative balance of strategic nuclear power” and adding that “The Soviets have used the neutron bomb primarily as a propaganda item.” Not a strong endorsement, but certainly a defense of the weapon and far from an expression of reluctance about it.⁵

Yet while the U.S. government was soft-pedaling on the public side, U.S. officials in Washington and, acting under instructions,

abroad were encouraging the Allies at NATO headquarters and at Allied capitals to commit themselves to support deployment. The "ban the neutron bomb" campaign had begun in the Netherlands, but its focal point quite naturally shifted to Germany, which, geography determined, would have to host the majority of the new warheads. Chancellor Schmidt and Foreign Minister Genscher were under growing domestic political pressure to refuse the weapons. Faced with this pressure, and seeking to undercut the appeal of the ban the bomb campaign, the German government began to suggest that non-deployment might be traded off against reductions in Soviet armored forces.

Nevertheless, as the U.S. budget-driven date for deciding whether to ask Congress for funds to produce the warhead drew nearer, the German leaders appeared increasingly likely to give their support providing they had company. On April 4, 1978, Hans-Dietrich Genscher visited Washington and told U.S. officials that Germany would support deployment if other nations in Europe would also do so.⁶

The U.S. Mission at NATO was asked by Washington to request NATO Secretary General Joseph Luns to call a meeting at NATO headquarters at which the Permanent Representatives would formally present their national positions. Before that meeting, however, Luns held an informal private Perm Reps session at which the Allied ambassadors provided informal estimates of their countries' likely formal positions. After that informal meeting, Ambassador Bennett and I reviewed the situation and sent a message to Washington setting forth our conclusions on the likely Allied response.

Essentially, we said there was still an element of uncertainty, particularly as regarded the Norwegian position, that some reference to arms control might be needed to provide diplomatic cover for some of the members, and that the Germans would not accept the new warheads on their soil unless another European NATO country joined them. We noted there were bound to be further bumps along the road to actual deployment. Nevertheless, we concluded that the Allies would agree to move ahead, and NATO would be able to announce a positive response regarding the deployment of the new warhead.

The message noted that Ambassador Bennett and I had scheduled a meeting with Secretary General Luns to work out a game plan with him before the meeting at which the Perm Reps were formally to lay out their governments' positions. Late that night my phone rang. Over the years, I had grown accustomed to Washington ringing up at

the end of its day, which meant after midnight for us. But this call was one to remember.

David Gompert, who had been working on this problem from State, was on the line. He asked me if I was sitting down because he had some very unexpected news. Translating from his subsequent cryptic comments, it became clear that the U.S. position on the new warhead had drastically changed. This could only mean that we were not going ahead with production. I asked him if they had received our cable. He said they had and agreed with our prognosis. Nevertheless, the United States now had a new position. A message explaining all this would be sent to us. We should not meet with Luns until we had read and absorbed it.

Ambassador Bennett and I met the next morning to read the message and to prepare for our meeting with Luns. The news was indeed shocking. It was clear from the Washington message that President Carter had changed his mind and was backing away from the production and deployment of the new warhead.

Despite the effort to appear neutral about deployment of the new warhead, the United States had in effect (at the very least implicitly) been asking its Allies to support it. Certainly there was no other place and no other role for it but in NATO Europe. If there was any doubt about the utility of deploying the weapon there, if we did not think its deployment in Europe was in the U.S. national interest, it would have made no sense whatsoever to design, develop, and produce it. What else could the Allies conclude, therefore, but that we hoped they would accept it? And indeed, Allied leaders, particularly the Germans, facing far more opposition than U.S. leaders had to address, had gone out on a limb with their publics to keep open the prospect of NATO support for deploying the new weapon. Now, just as it seemed we were ready to put the package together, Washington had reversed gears—and the grinding was audible.

Our new position, which the president articulated on April 7, 1978, was to “defer production of weapons with enhanced radiation effects” conditioning ultimate production and deployment on “the degree to which the Soviet Union shows restraint in its conventional and nuclear programs and force deployments affecting the security of the United States and Western Europe.”⁷

With the secretaries of state, defense, and energy, and the national security advisor all deeply involved in the formulation of the U.S. approach on this issue, Ambassador Bennett and I (not to mention others in Washington who were even closer to the decision-making) could not imagine how it could have gone as far as it had without the

president having been on board. Indeed, one senior National Security Council (NSC) official, having no answer to the president's decision, simply refused to respond to calls from Allies. Subsequently, he was told his nonresponse was more eloquent than anything he could have said. However, we had our new guidance and would have to do our best to help moderate the inevitable damage.

Luns was clearly shocked by the new development. But recognizing that we all had to work within the new situation, he also understood the need for damage limitation. Working from our guidance message, Ambassador Bennett and I rehearsed with him the line the ambassador would be taking at the private meeting of Perm Reps, which Luns originally had scheduled to hear the Allies' formal response to our original deployment proposal.

The ambassador would emphasize that the new position deferred, not canceled, production. He would comment that the United States was moving in the direction of the arguments that some of the Allies had made, by noting that final U.S. disposition of this issue would depend on Soviet actions to restrain their forces. (The Allies would naturally interpret this as strongly suggesting the inclusion of an arms control element in our new approach.) At the same time, he would note that the United States would go ahead with the other nonnuclear elements of modernization for the Lance missile and eight-inch artillery weapons, thus underscoring the continued U.S. commitment to Alliance defense.

Most of the Perm Reps had received word of the U.S. position from their capitals, each of which had been informed directly from Washington about the new U.S. position. Almost all expressed astonishment; some voiced anger and others dismay over the unexpected shift in U.S. policy. Nonetheless, after Ambassador Bennett went over our talking points, they recognized that, for the sake of the Alliance, we would all have to put the best face on it and move forward with our other efforts to strengthen NATO.

In explaining his decision to defer production of the weapon, President Carter subsequently said that the "decision to go ahead with the design of the neutron bomb was made before I became President. I didn't know about it until it was published in the newspaper. And at that time I began to assess whether or not we needed to go ahead and produce the neutron weapon itself." The president went on to describe the deterrent value of the weapon vis-à-vis Soviet armored forces and noted that it could save European lives. (Curiously this was just the sort of description that made the best case possible for the weapon and that we had, under instructions, avoided

using in public before the issue came to its abrupt denouement.) The president then commented, "I never had a single European country who told me that if we produced the neutron weapon that they were willing to deploy it. . . . West German leaders said that if other nations in Europe would deploy it, we will. So that's why I terminated any consideration of the production of the neutron weapon for the time being."⁸

The incident almost propels one to speculate on just what had motivated the president. He has commented in his memoirs that Allied leaders such as German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt were happy with what he had done and how he had done it. But this conclusion does not accord with the views we heard at the time and from what has been written about the affair since. One former U.S. official commented to me in the mid-1990s that the president's handwritten comment on the margin of a memo concerning the deployment of the weapon suggested he was concerned that he would be judged negatively by the public if he opted to go forward with deployment. I also wondered at the time whether the fact that the affair occurred around Easter might have reflected deep personal concerns on his part regarding the ethics of deterrence.

Whatever the reasons for the decision, however, the way this issue played out had far-reaching negative consequences for our efforts to strengthen NATO. Allied unity and confidence in American leadership was shaken by what the Allies (and many American officials including cabinet officers) saw as an abrupt about-face. But, as important as was the blow to Allied cohesiveness and confidence in the United States, the impression given to the Soviets that the well-orchestrated "ban the neutron bomb" campaign had forced the United States and NATO to back away from a decision on a nuclear issue was of equal, if not greater, import. The lesson they drew was that this feat could be duplicated and would provide them with the means for derailing NATO's efforts to respond to the buildup of Soviet nuclear forces facing Europe. It was a heavy price to pay for what has to be considered a failure, at the least, of management, at the place in the U.S. government where "the buck stops."

ENTER ARMS CONTROL

Moreover, although the Schmidt government had suggested that NATO offer to forego deployments of the new weapon in exchange for Soviet willingness to negotiate reductions in Soviet weaponry, preferably in the Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions (MBFR)

context. While the United States had floated the idea in early 1978 that it might announce a decision to produce and deploy the new weapon if, after a certain stipulated period, the Soviet Union did not respond with a serious move of its own, President Carter's implicit incorporation in his neutron bomb solution of an arms control element as a part of, or an alternative to, a deployment decision gave the concept an American imprimatur. It practically assured that no new NATO deployment of nuclear weapons in Europe would be possible without the prospect of a parallel arms control element. As such it created an additional obstacle to Allied efforts to deploy new nuclear weaponry; one that the Soviets, under their system of government would not face.⁹

Arms control can provide a complementary method for achieving enhanced security. However, given the realities of the political differences between democratic and totalitarian societies, the approach proffered by the U.S. president (and to some extent the German government) on this occasion gave the Soviets a golden, and one-sided, opportunity to intervene in intra-NATO decision making on matters of vital Allied security.

Indeed, the impact of the neutron bomb affair can be seen from a review of NATO Communiqués. From the earliest mention of U.S. nuclear weapons deployments in Europe in December 1957 until early April 1978, these deployments were treated as an essential part of NATO's deterrent and defense posture: Important for what they alone could accomplish in the preservation of freedom and the maintenance of peace, their deployment was not linked to any other alternative approach.

As we have seen, arms control and disarmament had been mentioned in earlier official NATO documents, but not in the context of implying that they could replace nuclear deterrence. However, in the first NATO Communiqué issued following President Carter's decision to defer deployment, the NATO Nuclear Planning Group meeting at ministerial level on April 18–19, 1978, added to their reaffirmation of support for the policy of deterrence, and of the role of nuclear weapons in deterrence, new language that "equitable and verifiable measures of arms control must remain an important feature of NATO's overall security policy and would contribute to efforts for furthering the process of détente." Henceforth, language to the effect that arms control could substitute for, or complement, deployment would appear regularly in NATO Communiqués.

The communiqué published at the May 30–31, 1978, NAC meeting at the head of government (presidential) level provided another

example; this one approved at the highest level. The Allied leaders endorsed and approved several decisions to strengthen NATO's conventional defense. But, they only "noted with interest" work underway on the nuclear side and "concluded that in the absence of equitable arms control and disarmament agreements, a satisfactory balance in strategic, theater nuclear and conventional arms could only be assured by greater efforts to modernize and strengthen the military capacity of the Alliance."

The language suggests that NATO would try arms control first and only if it failed would it move ahead on deployments. However, in an effort to demonstrate that NATO remained committed to a strong defense, the communiqué went on to state that the Heads of State and Government also "stressed that the maintenance of security is indispensable for the continued freedom, individual liberty and welfare of their societies and for the furthering of détente."¹⁰

It is possible to read between the preceding communiqué lines and see how those of us who were negotiating the communiqué language sought to ensure that the arms deployment approach (under the rubric of "maintenance of security") was given the last word: a task complicated for the U.S. negotiators and other Allies by the U.S. role in the denouement of the "neutron" issue. In any event, while "security" concerns had the last word, this paragraph in effect gave equal weight to maintaining security—that is, deploying new systems and to arms control and disarmament—thus providing further encouragement for Soviet political maneuvering and for "peace" demonstrators in Allied nations to work to delay and derail deployment, even as the Soviet nuclear buildup continued unabated.

Finally, while the Soviets often offered "moratoria" on new deployments after they had deployed a large force of their own, at no point during the Cold War did they offer to negotiate limits on any of their new nuclear weapons before they had actually deployed them. Yet the United States and its NATO Allies found themselves in just such a situation and under attack from within and without. Thus did the neutron bomb fiasco set the stage for what was to follow in INF.

NATO ORGANIZES TO CONSIDER THE POSSIBLE DEPLOYMENT OF NEW U.S. NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN EUROPE

In October 1977, even as the neutron issue was attracting attention and controversy, NATO defense ministers in the NPG established, as

part of the LTDP, a High-Level Group (HLG) consisting of senior defense ministry officials from capitals responsible for the development and implementation of their countries' policies in the nuclear area. Their task was to make recommendations on the modernization of theater nuclear forces. Their *modus operandi* was to approach the issue in an exploratory mode, consider all the options, all the pros and cons, and provide their unfettered advice. Given the key role of the United States in this area, it was agreed, that unlike other NATO committees, this one would be chaired by an American official rather than by the NATO international staff.

In part because of the uncertainties of the SALT negotiations and their relationship, if any, to INF weapons, the United States entered the HLG discussions with an open mind concerning deployment of new U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe. At the same time, and without taking a position on new deployments, we also sought to calm Allied concerns over the newly deployed Soviet theater nuclear forces. The Allies were assured that the existing U.S. nuclear forces in or assigned to NATO were more than sufficient to deter the Soviets from any thought of using their theater nuclear forces against NATO European targets.

The irony is that beginning in 1975, U.S. intelligence reports shared with NATO began to focus on the growth and modernization of Soviet and Warsaw Pact forces and the necessary counteraction. Here again the NATO communiqués serve as a guide to the attention paid to this concern. Thus, after calling attention to the expanding Warsaw Pact military capabilities, the May 2–3, 1975, DPC Communiqué called for the “modernization of both strategic and theater nuclear capabilities” but gave priority to maintaining and improving conventional forces.

Later that month, the NAC, meeting at the presidential level, said, “Serious problems confront the Allies. . . . The armed forces of the Warsaw Pact continue to grow in strength beyond any apparent defensive needs. At the same time, the maintenance of the Allied defense effort at a satisfactory level encounters new difficulties arising from the world-wide economic situation. The Allies are resolved to face such challenges together and with determination.”¹¹

For several years thereafter, almost all NATO communiqués made similar references to the growing Soviet and Warsaw Pact threat. While reviewing all these documents in one sitting creates the sense of a constant drumbeat, as noted above the threat was real, and failure to respond would have put freedom, peace, and security at risk.

Deterrence of War and INF

In any event, our efforts to persuade the Allies that U.S. strategic systems were a sufficient deterrent encountered a good deal of skepticism. The Allies, particularly the British, who played an active role in these deliberations, were concerned that without a modern U.S. intermediate-range nuclear missile on the ground in Europe and providing a clear and direct counter to the SS-20, the Soviets might conclude that a gap had opened in NATO's spectrum of deterrence. They opined that the Soviets might then wrongly believe they could take military and political advantage of this gap to intimidate individual NATO countries. Enormous strain would thereby be placed on Alliance cohesiveness, perhaps enough to break it. This line of argument carried considerable weight. In my view, the SS-20's main purpose was as a weapon of political intimidation—one whose mere presence was meant to have an impact—and which could serve as a lever to pry NATO apart.

In response to Allied concerns, Washington, in 1976, sent a high-level briefing team from both the Departments of Defense and State to NATO. In an extraordinary move, the U.S. briefer laid out relevant portions of the highly classified U.S. Single Integrated Operational Plan (SIOP) that specified the number and type of targets the United States intended to strike should deterrence fail and a nuclear war ensue. The briefing led to the conclusion that the existing U.S. nuclear force, which included the U.S. weapons assigned to NATO, would suffice to deter the Soviet Union even after it had deployed the new SS-20 missiles. The Allies appreciated the briefing, but their questions suggested that they remained persuaded that a modernized U.S. nuclear force on the ground in NATO Europe was still the real antidote to the SS-20 threat. The problem was as much one of psychology as of capabilities and numbers.

It seemed to me that the time had come to lay out before the Allies all the economic, military, and potential political costs that a decision to deploy modern U.S. intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe would entail. I was concerned that unless we did this the Allies, once confronted with these costs, might get cold feet after we had embarked on the enterprise. If this effort failed to persuade the Allies, and if the Germans, in particular, seemed convinced that the United States must deploy new intermediate-range nuclear weapons in order to maintain deterrence across the full spectrum of possible conflict situations, then we needed to face up to the situation and take a more positive position regarding new INF deployments. A cable along these lines was sent to Washington.

Another meeting was arranged at NATO headquarters in which the United States would lay out the full costs of an INF deployment program involving both cruise missiles and the new Pershing II. The Washington delegation, however, arrived with unexpected new guidance. The U.S. policy toward INF deployment had done an about-face. While we would lay out the costs, our ultimate conclusion was now closer to those Europeans who had been urging deployment. I asked Assistant Secretary of Defense David McGiffert, who headed the U.S. delegation to the meeting, what had prompted this shift. He said that the more Washington considered the issue, and especially the European concerns and arguments, the more the United States became persuaded by the European point of view.

Unfortunately, in an even more startling turnabout than the American one, the European NATO Allies, especially the Germans, reacting to the increasing political heat from left-of-center parties began to have second thoughts about deploying new U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe. The result of these shifts meant that the United States had moved from a hesitant supplier of INF missiles to a more active advocate of their deployment, while the Europeans, and in particular the Germans whose role was key to any solution, had moved from ardent pursuer of deployment to a rather hesitant, but still willing host of U.S. INF.

Moreover, the Europeans, especially the Germans, with President Carter's neutron "solution" as a precedent, became more insistent that any deployments of U.S. INF missiles in Europe be accompanied by arms control measures designed to complement the deployments by reducing Soviet forces and setting limits on those of NATO. This stance in effect created the foundation for a "dual-track" approach for countering the deleterious impact of Soviet INF deployments on NATO's deterrent capabilities, and thus on NATO's ability to maintain freedom, peace, and security.

The United States was reluctant at first to accept this approach. As noted earlier, NATO is a coalition of democratically elected governments. Opening an arms control track would give the Soviets a one-sided opportunity to influence both NATO's approach to arms control, and more importantly, to use the arms control track to thwart efforts by NATO to counter the Soviet threat via the deployment track. It added the further complication that without deploying its own INF, NATO would not have any new systems to trade off in a negotiation against the new Soviet SS-20 force.

However, as the political activism of the antideployment forces within NATO countries began to increase, and to gather more press

coverage, it became clear that European NATO governments would need the political cover provided by arms control negotiations to retain public support for deployments, which in turn were essential to the success of NATO's arms control approach. I initiated a message to Washington to this effect.

Accepting the inevitability of an arms control track and determined to make a success of it, the United States moved to establish procedures that would maximize the prospects for a positive outcome for both the deployment and arms control elements of our approach. The key step was the establishment of the Special Group (SG) (later to be renamed the Special Consultative Group, or SCG) in April 1979. The SG's job was to develop an agreed NATO approach to an INF arms control agreement. Given that the INF missiles, which would be subject to an agreement, were U.S. missiles, and the United States would thus be conducting the negotiations that would place limitations on those missiles, it was agreed that in this situation the United States rather than the NATO international staff would chair the SCG, just as it chaired the HLG.¹²

We knew at the outset that the SCG and the HLG would have to proceed, and be seen as proceeding, in a manner that went well beyond traditional consultations. Thus the exchanges of views and papers, in a collegial, seminar-like process led to the development of a common, jointly arrived at position. It was a NATO position, not only an American one, and one which all the Allies could defend as their own.¹³

Over the course of the following nine years, the United States and NATO were fortunate in the selection of those who served as SCG and HLG chairpersons. The particular skills needed to head the committees at just that time were well matched by the qualities of those individuals.

For the SCG, we had the academically inclined Leslie Gelb at the outset when conceptual issues were at the forefront; the superb diplomatic skills of Reginald Bartholomew when coalition building was crucial; the careful and steady hand of the well-connected (and thus confident) Lawrence Eagleburger when the very continuation of the enterprise was at stake because of opposition to it within the new Reagan administration; the media savvy of Richard Burt when the need to prevail on the public diplomacy front played a major role within the overall negotiating process; and the calm approach of Allen Holmes when the talks were in their final high pressure stage.

On the HLG side, David McGiffert led with competence and determination the work of the group from its inception, through the crucial period of developing a deployment policy and program, and to

its acceptance by NATO, on December 12, 1979. Richard Perle assumed the position when the Reagan administration took office. Renowned for his hard-line image, Perle proved to be an adept coalition builder and prepared to compromise when compromise was essential to forward the interests of the United States and NATO.

We were also fortunate that the Allied representatives to both the HLG and SCG were of very high quality. They made significant contributions into what became the Alliance and the U.S. guidelines for the deployments and the negotiations. The enterprise could not have succeeded without them.

It was essential to the success of the enterprise that the United States be, and be seen as being, open and forthright with the Allies. It seemed to me that we could help achieve this result by holding informal gatherings, which would help to develop a strong team spirit among all the HLG and SCG participants. Moreover, the discourse at the formal HLG and SCG meetings could be enhanced if they were preceded by an informal lunch or dinner for the heads of delegation. At these events, the participants could socialize, informally explore alternative approaches, and give one another a "heads up" if they were planning to introduce some new concepts at the formal meeting.

Accordingly, I offered to host such events at our residence. These became a regular part of the group's activities. Later we added a predinner or prelunch social period during which the representatives of the five Allied countries that had agreed to host U.S. cruise missiles and the Pershing II ballistic missile could meet together with the United States to discuss the special problems they were facing. Even with changes in national representatives and the differences in national approaches, both the HLG and the SCG developed a strong esprit de corps.

After I joined the U.S. INF negotiating delegation, first as the deputy chief negotiator under Paul Nitze and then as chief negotiator, I continued my close association with the HLG and SCG and with the NATO Council of Permanent Representatives. The United States was negotiating not only for itself but also for its NATO Allies. I believed it was essential that we, as their agents, had a responsibility to keep the Allies fully and promptly informed about our activities in Geneva. Other U.S. negotiators and I were frequent visitors to NATO headquarters; in my case at least once a month, and on one occasion twice in a week.

All of these consultations were fundamental in resolving differences and developing and maintaining a common NATO position. Moreover, in such an atmosphere it was natural for the participants to

concentrate on the quality of an idea and not on the nationality of the participant who presented it. As a consequence, the NATO position and the positions put forward by the United States later during the negotiations were truly the product of a common Allied effort. The INF consultative arrangements set the standard for real consultation among Allies. Moreover, they provided a bulwark against Soviet efforts to split the Alliance.

NATO Agrees on a Course of Action

The HLG moved forward in a well-planned, step-by-step approach. One of its first major agreements was reached at its February 1978 meeting at Los Alamos, New Mexico. At that meeting, the HLG reached a consensus on the concept that NATO deterrence required an evolutionary upward adjustment of its nuclear forces in Europe capable of reaching the western Soviet Union.¹⁴ This achievement was followed by the ministerial-level endorsement, in the April 18–19 1978, NPG Communiqué, “of the importance of the modernization of NATO’s theater nuclear forces.”¹⁵

With both its broad concept and high-level endorsement in hand, the task of the HLG was then to answer several difficult questions. Should “modernization” take the form of new deployments of U.S. nuclear weapons? Which weapons should be deployed? What should be their ranges? Where should they be deployed? How many weapons should be deployed? The group would spend the next 22 months developing the answers.

The HLG reached agreement on each of these questions in time for presentation to NATO foreign and defense ministers in December 1979.

1. There would be new deployments of U.S. intermediate-range nuclear weapons to help ensure that the Soviets would not be tempted to conclude, even if wrongly, that their SS-20 deployments had, in an era of strategic parity, opened a gap in NATO’s deterrence.
2. There should be a mix of cruise and ballistic missiles, in part to help ensure that the Soviets could not concentrate their defense forces against only one type of attack. The ballistic missile would be a follow-on to the Pershing I missile, 108 of which were already present in Germany. The Pershing II would be equipped with modern electronics, have a highly accurate guidance system, and could carry an earth-penetrating warhead which could put at risk

Soviet command and control bunkers in the Western USSR, but which could not reach targets in Moscow. The cruise missile would be ground launched, and thus visible to Allied populations, rather than air or sea launched. Its range would allow it to reach Moscow, unlike the Pershings. However, because it was relatively slow moving, its longer flight time and the existence of formidable Soviet and Warsaw Pact anti-aircraft capabilities meant it could not be considered a first strike weapon.

3. The new U.S. missiles should be deployed in several countries to make it more difficult for the Soviets to target them, to spread the responsibility for NATO's nuclear deterrent more widely, and above all to prevent Germany from being "singularized" as the only country of deployment.
4. The number of weapons to be deployed should be geared to NATO's deterrence needs, which would require a force both militarily significant and survivable. After much discussion, the Allies agreed to field 572 new single warhead missiles consisting of 108 mobile Pershing II missiles and 464 BGM 109G, ground launched cruise missiles. It was agreed there would be no net increase in nuclear weapons in Europe as a result of the INF deployments. Accordingly, NATO would remove 1,000, admittedly obsolete, warheads from Europe, more than offsetting the number of new warheads on the Pershing II and cruise missiles.

The SCG also moved in a step-by-step manner. Broad negotiating principles were adopted. Among these was the principle of an equal outcome for both sides, and the corollary insistence that negotiations be bilateral between the United States and the Soviet Union. A final number for a negotiated outcome was not chosen, but the "lowest possible" number was generally accepted as a broad goal. The Germans interpreted this as perhaps leading to a "zero-zero" outcome; that is no U.S. or Soviet INF systems.

The likely outcome of the SG and HLG deliberations became increasingly clear as the year advanced. NATO communiqués from late 1978 to November 1979 track the Alliance's movement toward accepting a dual-track approach. Indeed, the November 13–14, 1979, NPG Communiqué set out a complete exegesis of the NATO position on INF. Its formulation of the arguments was used subsequently in many other presentations.

After laying out the many qualitative and quantitative improvements in the Soviet INF arsenal, the communiqué turns to reasons

why deployment was necessary. The key paragraph reads as follows:

Against this background [the Soviet build-up] Ministers considered the urgent requirement for modernizing NATO theatre nuclear forces as part of the Long Term Defense Programme and the parallel need for related arms control measures. In this context, Ministers noted that the modernization of theatre nuclear systems would, by adding highly accurate and survivable, long-range systems based in NATO Europe, enhance NATO's deterrent and strengthen the linkage between NATO's conventional forces and the United States intercontinental strategic systems; and by augmenting NATO long-range theatre nuclear forces, close a gap in the spectrum of escalation and provide increased options for restrained and controlled responses. An upward adjustment in long-range theatre nuclear forces would minimize the risk that the Soviets might believe—however incorrectly—that they could use long-range forces to make or threaten limited strikes against NATO Europe from locations deep in the Soviet Union. Ministers agreed that conventional force requirements should continue to take priority in force planning and that there would be no questions of NATO increasing its reliance on nuclear weapons or of lowering the nuclear threshold.¹⁶

The unprovoked Soviet buildup of intermediate-range nuclear forces, especially the SS-20, had energized the NATO Allies into taking countermeasures to ensure their deterrence would remain credible. Nonetheless, growing opposition to deployments, particularly in the Netherlands, Belgium, and Germany—all prospective basing countries—threatened Allied cohesion. While the Dutch and the Belgian governments agreed to sign on to the decision document under preparation by the SCG and HLG, they both added reservations. The Dutch stated they would decide on full participation in two years' time. The Belgians said they would review their position on deployment in six months.¹⁷

The German government did not ask for any reservations, but the ruling German Social Democratic Party (SPD) was far from unified in support of deployment. With the growing pressure from its left wing threatening the SPD's cohesiveness, an arms control track had become politically essential to the German government's ability to deploy the new U.S. nuclear weapons; which, as we have seen, German political leaders had long been urging.

Most of the opponents were arguing that an arms control approach should be tried before any new U.S. nuclear missiles were deployed. NATO, as we have seen, was already moving toward the inclusion of

an arms control track as part of any deployment decision. In fact it was publicly known that neither the new missiles nor their bases would be ready for deployment before the fall of 1983. Thus, the arms control track could be put into effect well before any INF missiles arrived in Europe. The real question was whether the Soviets would negotiate seriously with the United States before there were new U.S. missiles on the ground in Europe. There was no question, however, that they would view any negotiation as a major battleground in their campaign to undermine and, if possible, split NATO.

The Soviets for their part were trying to undermine support for any decision that included a commitment to deployment. This effort reached a crescendo with the October 6, 1979, speech in East Berlin by Soviet President Brezhnev. It was directed at Western Europeans and specifically at the West Germans. The Soviet leader said that deployment would fundamentally change the strategic situation in Europe, and he promised not to target nuclear weapons at states that did not accept deployments. He said the Soviet Union would agree to reduce its nuclear weapons based in Europe if NATO opted not to deploy, and he announced that the Soviets would unilaterally withdraw 20,000 soldiers and 1,000 tanks from East Germany.¹⁸

Brezhnev's speech was vintage Soviet style, combining bluster and threats with promises of preferred treatment for collaborators. The "fundamental change in the European strategic situation" wording carries with it an implied threat of Soviet counteractions. The arms control offer was also classic. What appeared at first blush a generous offer to reduce Soviet nuclear weapons if NATO did not deploy was actually a proposal for an unequal outcome. It glossed over the already in-process major build-up in Soviet INF weaponry and would have allowed the Soviet Union to retain its INF systems targeted on NATO Europe, while NATO would not be allowed such systems. Its promise not to target states rejecting deployments was meaningless both because it was unverifiable and because prospective basing countries were often already hosts to U.S. nuclear-capable systems. The speech indicated that the Soviets would take a hard line, threatening that negotiations could not take place unless NATO agreed to forego deployments. It also indicated that the Soviets would seek to exploit, and if possible help create, differences among the Allies.

With left-of-center internal opposition to deployments, and Soviet threats and blandishments notwithstanding, NATO moved forward with the preparation of its position. It would deploy modernized INF missiles in Europe and would offer to reduce the number of such missiles in the context of a U.S.-Soviet arms control negotiation.

This page intentionally left blank

NATO FACES THE SOVIET CHALLENGE

NATO DECIDES ON DEPLOYMENT AND ARMS CONTROL: THE DUAL-TRACK DECISION

The work of the High-Level Group (HLG) and the Special Group (SG) came to fruition at an extraordinary special meeting of NATO's foreign and defense ministers held at NATO headquarters on December 12, 1979. The communiqué issued by the ministers following this meeting (popularly known as the "dual-track decision") became the foundation both for the deployment of NATO's new missiles and for the negotiating approach for placing limits on them, and their Soviet counterparts.¹

The document opens with a clear statement of why NATO needed to respond to the growth in Soviet forces. It begins by recalling that NATO governments "resolve to meet the challenges to their security posed by the continuing momentum of the Warsaw Pact military buildup." It notes the continuing growth in numbers and capability of the Warsaw Pact's nuclear forces that "directly threaten Western Europe and have a strategic significance for the Alliance in Europe." "This situation" it continues, "has been especially aggravated over the last few years by Soviet decisions to implement programs modernizing and expanding their long-range nuclear capability substantially. In particular they have deployed the SS-20 missile, which offers significant improvements over previous systems in providing greater accuracy, more mobility and greater range, as well as having multiple warheads, and the Backfire bomber, which has a much better performance than other Soviet aircraft deployed hitherto in a theater role." After citing the enhanced capabilities of the MIRVed SS-20 and the Backfire bomber, the statement goes on to note that NATO capabilities in the INF area had remained static during this period and are

increasing in age and vulnerability. It also notes the modernization, expansion, and improvement of the Soviet tactical nuclear forces. All of this, it continues, “against the background of increasing Soviet inter-continental capabilities and the achievement of parity in inter-continental capability with the United States.”²

The document sums up this section by noting,

These trends have prompted serious concern within the Alliance, because if they were to continue, Soviet superiority in theater nuclear systems could undermine the stability achieved in inter-continental systems and cast doubt on the credibility of the Alliance’s deterrent strategy by highlighting the gap in the spectrum of NATO’s available nuclear response to aggression.

The United States and its Allies all had a hand in the development of these fundamental arguments in favor of deployment. Nevertheless, the influence of German thinking, and especially that of Chancellor Schmidt on NATO’s underlying conceptual approach to the issue, is most evident in this portion of the document.

Moving into its action/implementation/conclusions, the document states,

Ministers noted that these recent developments require concrete actions on the part of the Alliance if NATO’s strategy of flexible response is to remain credible. After intensive consideration, including the merits of alternative approaches, and after taking note of the positions of certain members, Ministers concluded that the overall interest of the Alliance could best be served by pursuing two parallel and complementary approaches of TNF modernization and arms control.³

It is noteworthy that the broad action/implementation/conclusions portion of the dual-track decision was preceded by specific arguments and justifications for deployment, while the argumentation and justification of the arms control element followed the statement of the ministers’ conclusions. This subtle difference simply reflects the political reality that modernization could not be undertaken without a compelling argument in its favor, while, in the eyes of some NATO governments, arms control needed no such justification, and indeed it had become a politically necessary ingredient of a NATO decision to modernize its nuclear weapon force, no matter how compelling the security arguments in favor of this action.

A hint of a potential schism in this regard can be seen in the phrase “after taking note of the positions of certain members,” which

preceded the key "Ministers concluded" sentence. The internal political situations in Greece and Denmark in particular were beginning to limit those governments' ability to give wholehearted support to the deployment of modernized NATO INF weapons, regardless of the extent of the Soviet threat. Fortunately, the two governments did not insist on using NATO's rule of consensus to block the publication of this, or subsequent documents dealing with INF. In the future, however, they would often make public their nonsupport by means of brief footnotes. Denmark would place a "general reservation on parts" of the document. Greece would "recall its position" on "several parts" of the document but would also note its "reservations concerning the deployment of INF in Europe."

The dual-track decision document then lists the specifics of the deployment actions that were developed in the HLG as outlined above. It also states that "the program will not increase NATO's reliance upon nuclear weapons" and that 1,000 U.S. nuclear warheads will be withdrawn from Europe as soon as feasible." The obvious purpose of the reference to the warhead withdrawal program in the document was to highlight to NATO publics that although the Alliance had decided to modernize its nuclear weapons, it was not planning a buildup in their numbers. In recognition of the need to remind NATO publics that the Alliance was not placing greater emphasis on nuclear weapons, the warhead withdrawal program would be mentioned frequently in future NATO communiqués. Those 1,000 had been held for years as part of the Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions' (MBFR) "Option III," which was a proposal to put limited restrictions on U.S. European-based nuclear forces in return for Soviet agreement to strict limits on their conventional forces. Those 1,000 warheads, however, were privately described as "ash and trash" so far as their absence of military utility was concerned.

The document next turns to the specific parameters of the arms control track. It begins this portion by stating that, "Ministers attach great importance to the role of arms control in contributing to a more stable military relationship between East and West and in advancing the process of détente. . . . [" "] Ministers regard arms control as an integral part of the Alliance's efforts to assure the undiminished security of its member states and to make the strategic situation between East and West more stable, more predictable, and more manageable at lower levels of armaments on both sides." They also note SALT II's contribution toward the above objectives.⁴

After making this broad conceptual statement, the document turns to the specific application of arms control to the INF issue. "Ministers

consider that . . . taking account of the expansion of Soviet Long Range Theater Nuclear Forces (LRTNF) capabilities of concern to NATO, arms control efforts to achieve a more stable overall nuclear balance at lower level of nuclear weapons on both sides should therefore now include certain United States and Soviet long-range theater nuclear systems. This would reflect previous Western suggestions to include Soviet and U.S. systems in arms control negotiations and more recent expressions by Soviet President Brezhnev of willingness to do so.”⁵

The document then turns to the specifics of an arms control track. It begins by emphasizing that arms control negotiations, although supported by the Allies, must be bilateral in nature involving only the United States and the Soviet Union. “Ministers fully support the decision taken by the United States following consultations within the Alliance to negotiate arms limitations on LRTNF and to propose to the USSR to begin negotiations as soon as possible along the following lines which have been elaborated in intensive consultations within the Alliance.”⁶

The “intensive consultations” phrase was meant as a clear signal to the Soviets that NATO was unified on how the United States would approach and conduct the negotiations. There were five specific elements to the NATO-developed and -approved negotiating approach that would guide the United States in its approach to the negotiations.

First, “*Any future limitations on U.S. systems principally designed for theatre missions should be accompanied by appropriate limitations on Soviet systems.*”⁷ In other words, the Soviets would not be given a free ride. If they failed to accept appropriate limitations, deployment would proceed without any limitations on either side. Second, “Limitations on U.S. and Soviet long-range theatre nuclear systems should be negotiated bilaterally in the SALT III framework in a step by step approach.”⁸

Once again the United States and NATO underscore the bilateral nature of the negotiations. U.K. and French nuclear forces will not be taken into account. This point would become the major bone of contention during the INF negotiations. With the failure of the U.S. Senate to ratify SALT II, a new forum within which to conduct negotiations was necessary.

“*The immediate objective of these negotiations should be the establishment of agreed limitations on U.S. and Soviet land-based long-range theatre nuclear missile systems.*” Here the United States and NATO yet again underscore the bilateral nature of any negotiation

and limitations. However, this statement is more interesting for what it does not include than for what it does include. For its purpose is to make clear that the only systems that would be subject to limitations would be land-based, long-range theater nuclear missiles. It, therefore, excluded from negotiation and limitations sea-based systems, air-launched missiles, aircraft, and strategic or short-range/tactical systems. This would also be an area of strong differences of opinion and objectives during the negotiations.

*“Any agreed limitations on these systems must be consistent with the principle of equality between the sides. Therefore, the limitations should take the form of de jure equality both in ceilings and in rights.”*⁹ This is the crucial paragraph, the cornerstone of the U.S. and NATO position, and it speaks for itself. Getting the Soviets to accept it absorbed more time than any other issue. It impacts on the question of whether U.K. and French nuclear forces should be included on the U.S. side of the ledger, whether “equality” means an equal outcome, or as the Soviets would attempt to argue, equal reductions. This paragraph impacts whether the Soviets would or would not (as I liked to put it) be accorded “extra credit” for having deployed so many missiles so fast; and it makes clear that what should matter was not which side had how much of what before or during the negotiations but rather where the sides ended as a result of the negotiations. This point also made it clear that for the United States, the final agreed number had to be equal for both parties and only those two parties. Anything less would not be acceptable.

*“Any agreed limitations must be adequately verifiable.”*¹⁰ The Soviets are put on notice that verification considerations will be among the United States and NATO’s major concerns. “Adequately verifiable” is not further defined. However, the nature of the Soviet nuclear systems—mobile and relatively small when compared with strategic nuclear missiles—and the recognition that verification provisions will be carefully scrutinized in the U.S. Senate led to quiet contemplation that some form of on-site inspection may be necessary.

The document makes another key point by something it does not say. The Soviets in describing their approach specified that it would apply only to missiles located in Europe. The dual-track decision document refers to INF missiles without specifying where they might be located. In other words, it implicitly calls for a global approach.

In its closing paragraphs, the document established the NATO Special Consultative Group (SCG), which was to “follow the negotiations on a continuous basis.” It further set out broad justification for adopting a dual-track approach, including to “prevent an arms race in

Europe caused by the Soviet TNF build-up,” while preserving “the viability of NATO’s strategy of deterrence and defense and thus maintain the security of its member states.”¹¹

The final three paragraphs gave a nod to the importance of NATO’s deploying [a] modernized theater nuclear forces (TNF) both to provide a credible deterrent and to “provide the foundation for the pursuit of serious negotiations on TNF” and to how the “success of arms control in constraining the Soviet build-up can enhance Alliance security, modify the scale of NATO’s TNF requirements, and promote stability and détente in Europe.” It concluded by stating that “NATO’s TNF requirements will be examined in the light of concrete results reached through negotiations.”¹²

Although most of the document is aimed primarily at the Soviets, these last three paragraphs are aimed mostly at NATO publics. It sought to demonstrate that NATO’s approach would be balanced. Both those who favor placing emphasis on deployment and those who favor placing emphasis on arms control could support it. Moreover, the decision paper served ably over the next several years of negotiations with the Soviets both as a concise public document and as a guide for the Americans who would be negotiating on behalf of the United States and the NATO Allies.¹³

NATO POISED FOR NEGOTIATION, THE SOVIETS OPT FOR INVASION

On December 14, 1979, two days following the adoption of the dual-track decision, NATO ministers issued a standard North Atlantic Council (NAC) Communiqué in which they listed all of the initiatives the Allies had taken which, if implemented, would open the way to better East–West relations. In addition to the offer to negotiate on INF, the Allies advanced a number of other initiatives in the “fields of confidence-building and arms control designed to improve mutual security and co-operation in Europe.” These initiatives included new proposals for the Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions negotiations, dealing with conventional forces in Europe. They also announced a readiness to examine proposals within the framework of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). The communiqué ended with the ministers saying they “are determined that the 1980s should see a fundamental change for the better in the situation between East and West and will make every effort to bring this about.” They called on Warsaw Pact governments to respond positively to their offer.¹⁴

All these hopes for a better future and for progress in improving East–West relations were soon deflated by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan on December 28, 1979. Looking ahead to the end of the 1980s, however, East–West relations would be dramatically improved beyond even the most optimistic expectations. The resolution of the INF issue would be a major factor in bringing this about.

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the strongly negative Soviet reaction to the offer made by the United States to open negotiations (essentially that the USSR would not negotiate unless NATO publicly renounced its modernization program) put a damper on hopes that there would be quick movement toward diplomatic engagement. Indeed, given the internal political opposition toward deployment in several NATO countries, the Soviets were bound to attempt to undermine the dual-track decision and NATO itself.

But the Soviets miscalculated. The majority of NATO member state governments were in agreement that the strategic and political situation necessitated the deployment of modernized U.S. INF missiles in NATO Europe. They had also offered to conduct arms control negotiations that would place limits on U.S. and Soviet INF missiles. By spurning NATO's offer to negotiate, the Soviets undercut their efforts to persuade Western publics that the USSR was the aggrieved party seeking a nonconfrontational outcome.

For its part, NATO's HLG and SCG continued to work to refine the deployment program and to fine-tune the negotiating posture. The Alliance, having already realized that the outcome of the INF issue would ultimately depend on support from NATO publics, particularly those in the five basing countries, made frequent reference in its public statements to the main elements of the December 1979 decision. Moreover, the NATO Allies also called frequent attention to the continued Soviet buildup, now being undertaken against the backdrop of the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan, and the continued Soviet unwillingness to respond constructively to the December 1979 offer to undertake arms control negotiations.

To maintain the pressure on the Soviets to respond constructively and to underscore the United States seriousness of purpose, the United States and the NATO Allies repeated the offer to negotiate or conduct "preliminary exchanges" on arms control "without preconditions. . . ." These demarches did not elicit a positive response from the Soviets.¹⁵

Unfortunately, just as the INF issue required maximum Alliance cohesiveness, differences of opinion among the Allies on how to respond to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan began to surface. The United States took a very hard line against what was in fact an act of

naked aggression. The Allies, and the Germans in particular, did not want to allow an event in distant Southwest Asia to upset the relative improvements that had been made in East–West relations. While they supported such U.S. initiatives as the boycott of the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games, they worked to keep open the channels of communication with Moscow. It was in this context that Chancellor Schmidt undertook a visit to Moscow in June 1980.¹⁶

Reporting on his meeting with Brezhnev to the Bundestag on July 3, Schmidt said that Brezhnev had, for the first time, agreed to drop conditions for negotiating with the United States on INF weapons in Europe. The Soviets confirmed this report the next day.¹⁷ The fact that the Soviets chose to use the occasion of the German chancellor's visit to announce a change in policy toward a more cooperative arms control posture was a clear indication of their focus on Germany and on the growing activities of the so-called peace movement there. It also demonstrated that the Soviets were responsive to the fact that the dual-track approach was being viewed positively by a large portion of NATO's publics. Having decided to play the public relations game, the Soviets were finding themselves bound by its rules.

The sides eventually agreed to hold preliminary talks on INF systems in Geneva beginning on October 16, 1980. While the talks only lasted until November 17, they were able to cover a good deal of ground. Most of the issues that were addressed later during the INF negotiations were raised during the preliminary "talks about talks" session. Discussions included the basic questions of whether the talks should focus on equal reductions or on an equal outcome and whether British and French systems should be taken into account on the U.S. side of the ledger. The discussions were inconclusive. Likewise the geographic scope of an agreement, whether aircraft and naval forces should be included, and what range criteria should be applied were all reviewed. While the discussions were deliberately exploratory in nature, the substantive positions put forward by the sides were the tough problems and would be reintroduced when detailed negotiations resumed.

The Reagan Administration Takes Command, But Would It Take Up the INF Baton?

An intervening event, however, set back the timetable for any resumption of negotiations. While the preliminary talks were still underway, Ronald Reagan was elected president. Before embarking on any direct

negotiations with the Soviet Union, the new administration wanted a thorough review of U.S. policy.

The Allies' interest in seeing the INF talks continue was manifested in a paragraph of the December 11–12, 1980, NAC Communiqué, which expressed satisfaction that “serious and substantive” discussions were underway and which noted that a date would be set for resumption of the talks. Indeed, it was obvious to American officials at NATO Headquarters that failure on the part of the United States to resume the talks would doom any prospect of TNF deployment and have a far more negative impact on the Alliance, and thus on U.S. security interests, than even the neutron bomb affair. We conveyed our views to Washington via various channels.

The new administration did not have the luxury of holding off indefinitely on important but controversial decisions, pending policy reviews, and confirmations of senior appointed officials. Other countries and international organizations such as NATO had their own schedules and events. The latter in particular were “action forcing.” U.S. representatives would be at an enormous disadvantage if they continued to plead they could not state a position. U.S. leadership would be diminished; others would move to fill the role. On March 31, 1981, the new Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs Lawrence Eagleburger and officials from the other interested U.S. government agencies were at NATO headquarters for a meeting of the SCG. Eagleburger had come to the meeting in part to demonstrate that the United States intended to remain the key player in the INF area.

However, as we met in the offices of the U.S. Mission to NATO for a final discussion on how the United States would approach the SCG meeting, two U.S. officials visiting NATO for another meeting (two congressional staffers) came into the room. Both were former transition team members charged with making suggestions to the new administration on matters of policy and personnel in the international security area, and they were politically connected to the more conservative elements within the Republican Party.

The officials proceeded to attack the very premise of the U.S. participation in a NATO meeting discussing INF. They made it clear they were opposed to the U.S. SCG delegation giving any indication that the United States was prepared to continue moving along the dual-track. As the discussion grew more heated, they hinted at retribution against Eagleburger, or anyone who would have the temerity to suggest that the United States would continue along the path set in December 1979. With confidence that Secretary of State Alexander Haig would support him, Eagleburger stood up to them.

The Allies were assured at the SCG meeting that although the new administration was naturally reviewing policy options, it was not going to walk away from NATO's dual-track decision. The United States confirmed its commitment to resume INF arms control talks with the Soviet Union. The first step toward the reopening of negotiations had been taken. Had the new Reagan administration not taken this step, the negative impact on the Alliance, given the previous political effort, especially by the Europeans, that went into agreeing on the dual-track decision would have been enormous.

The internal American ideological skirmish, which had been fought out before the SCG meeting, was one of many that would accompany and complicate U.S. efforts to deal with the INF issue. There was no one on our side who favored capitulating to the Soviet Union on this or any other issue. But there were considerable differences over whether arms control ought to be one of the methods for attaining U.S. security goals.

Debate Over the Value of Arms Control

For some, particularly those who had opposed the outcomes of the SALT negotiations, arms control was a snare and a delusion. Moreover, they argued that the United States should not be negotiating arms control agreements with the Soviets while the latter were abusing human rights, threatening some neighbors, and invading others. In essence they saw arms control negotiations as a favor to the Soviets and not as an opportunity for the United States to improve its security via placing limits on the Soviet military. But perhaps of equal importance, they doubted the ability of U.S. negotiators to secure an agreement with Moscow that would be advantageous to the United States and respected by the Soviets.

In fact some of President Reagan's early public statements suggested the United States would take a very jaundiced view toward entering arm control talks with the Soviets. At his first press conference, in January 1981, he portrayed the Soviet leadership as "immoral" and accused them of being ready to "commit any crime, to lie, and to cheat" to attain their goals. By April, however, it became known that he had sent a letter to Brezhnev. While that letter took strong objection to the Soviet military buildup and the direct and indirect use of force in the third world, it also noted U.S. interest in discussing "the entire range" of contentious issues between the two powers.¹⁸ Whatever his earlier qualms, the president would henceforth be the strongest supporter of an INF negotiation that served

American interests and met the agreed NATO criteria and objectives. Although opponents of the arms control track would continue to attack it, they could no longer claim to have the backing of the president.

Many who had deep reservations about arms control also had reservations about the wisdom of, and need for, the United States to fashion its security policy in ways that helped maintain Alliance unity. They argued that the United States should develop policies and forces allowing it to proceed on its own, unencumbered by the need to make changes in our approach because of Allied views. Many of them also seemed to favor a more active U.S. role in assuring security around the globe.

I disagreed strongly with the latter approach. It seemed to me that it would be almost perverse for the United States to adopt an openly more independent approach while simultaneously moving toward an activist, interventionist policy. Surely, if we were going to take on more responsibility for international stability, it would be preferable to have more help even if that meant we might on occasion have to make adjustments in our policies.

As for arms control, I considered it neither the Holy Grail nor the devil's own handiwork. It is an important element of that part of foreign and security policy whose objective is the maintenance of peace and freedom. But arms control cannot by itself lead to that objective. The maintenance of a credible deterrent is essential to preventing both armed aggression and its political counterpart, the threat of the use of military capability to achieve political goals. Arms control can play an important role in helping to strengthen deterrence by channeling defense policy toward deployment of systems that are stabilizing, reduce the risks of attack, and remove the temptation to use arms, particularly nuclear weapons, as a means of intimidation.

Seen in this light, arms control and defense/deterrence policy are not in opposition to one another but rather are inextricably intertwined. Both can and must be focused on the same result: maintaining freedom and peace. With a proper mix of arms control and defense initiatives, we can continue to fashion a security policy that achieves that result, that is, two sides of the same coin.¹⁹

I was among those who believed we could develop an INF Treaty that would help meet that goal; others did not. The tensions arising from the differing fundamental appreciation of what arms control could accomplish—the ones that manifested themselves at that February 1981 encounter at the U.S. Mission to NATO—continued throughout the length of the negotiations and into the ratification

process. These disagreements certainly delayed the process of policy formulation and, on occasion, provided ammunition for the self-styled "peace movement." But, in the end, they did not prevent the negotiation of a sound and durable treaty.

The philosophical differences also affected the appointment process. The position of Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) remained unfilled well after the leadership of the other agencies and departments had taken office. When it was filled, the agency had already suffered bureaucratically. As a consequence, ACDA and its new director, Eugene Rostow, while specifically charged with arms control issues, including backstopping arms control negotiations, were at a bureaucratic disadvantage. With other agencies led by strong-minded leaders, especially the Department of Defense, the National Security Council, and the Department of State, and represented at Assistant Secretary-level interagency meetings by knowledgeable and energetic officials, ACDA never really recovered the role it had played in earlier administrations. The result was that the one voice within the government that was designed to speak for arms control was somewhat muted.²⁰

Nonetheless, movement toward implementing the dual-track decision continued apace. The HLG continued to refine deployment options and the new missiles were moving from the drawing boards into production phase. At the May 4–5, 1981, NAC ministerial meeting, the United States informed the Allies of its "intention to begin negotiations with the Soviet Union on TNF arms control within the SALT framework by the end of the year." Secretary Haig also informed the NAC that he would meet Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko in September at the United Nations.²¹

The Soviets had not been inactive during this period. Seeking to take advantage of the reviews and readjustments of policy and personnel that accompany every change of administration in the United States, the Soviets called for more action in East–West arms control. They renewed offers to reduce their nuclear missiles if NATO dropped plans to deploy cruise missiles and Pershing II missiles in Europe. However, the activity was totally verbal with no substantive change in policy.

TAKING THE FIRST STEPS

PREPARING TO ENGAGE

On September 23, 1981, Secretary Haig and Foreign Minister Gromyko announced that INF talks would begin on November 30 in Geneva. In his first press conference at the White House, President Reagan had pronounced the SALT II Treaty unacceptable. With no SALT framework to attach itself, the INF negotiations would proceed on their own merits. This development had some important advantages. In particular it reduced the Soviet potential for setting up "NATO splitting" situations in which the United States could be offered concessions in the strategic arena in return for making concessions in INF.

By the time of the announcement that INF negotiations would begin in the fall, I had begun my transition out of the U.S. Mission to NATO and into the INF negotiations with the Soviet Union. Having been deeply involved with INF issues and NATO for several years, the opportunity to engage directly with the Soviets on INF was extremely appealing. I made my interest known. Paul Nitze was chosen as chief negotiator, and I was selected as deputy chief negotiator and State Department representative on the delegation.

Nitze had been the first Washington official I had ever laid eyes on. It was at a conference on national security issues with senior-year students selected by their university; in my case, the University of Illinois. The year was 1955. I do not recall what he said, but I did remember the positive reaction I had to it and to him.

I left my position as Deputy U.S. Permrep to NATO, returned to Washington at the beginning of November, and joined the U.S. INF delegation's preparations for the opening round of the INF negotiations. I soon found that Nitze and I approached problems in a similar manner. At our delegation meetings, all ideas, regardless of who proposed them, were considered and subjected to a rigorous logic check. If they passed the check, they were adopted. If one part of an

argument was questionable, it had to be dropped. If the proposition could not stand without that argument, the proposition would be discarded. When Nitze's contributions were subjected to the process, he was, to his credit, quite prepared to rethink his position if he or the group concluded that someone else had a better idea or formulation. We both appreciated the value of constructive ambiguity and bifurcated clarity in situations where it might be necessary temporarily to put aside a difference during a negotiating process. We both also saw no room for this device in the formulation of a treaty that would legally bind the United States.

The members of the U.S. delegation knew that every proposal or comment the United States made at the negotiating table, especially the formal written statements we presented, could, if they were faulty, be used by the Soviets to attack the United States if the negotiations broke down. We gave these statements a very close review, seeking to find the phrase or word that most accurately conveyed our thoughts.

To better guide our work and focus our efforts, Nitze asked our legal advisor, Tom Graham from the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), to begin the process of drafting a treaty; the final version of which would mark the culmination of our negotiating efforts. Getting an early start on this task would also help ensure that we would be able to table a treaty draft early in the negotiating process and thus improve the prospects that the negotiators would, in effect, work from our draft but without anyone making a point of it.

Noting the political nature of the INF issue, I urged that the substance of our position, as reflected in the draft treaty, be rooted in NATO's 1979 dual-track decision. This was not SALT. We were acting as agents for the NATO Allies as well as for the United States. We would have failed were we to end with an agreement that was technically sound from a U.S. standpoint, but which left the Allies with the impression their interests had not adequately been taken into account. To ensure this did not happen, the negotiators would need to remain in close contact with the Special Consultative Group (SCG) process, the activities of the North Atlantic Council at NATO headquarters, and the NATO capitals.

THE ZERO OPTION: A RADICAL MOVE IN SUBSTANCE AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

While we in the delegation were constructing the U.S. approach to the opening round of the negotiations and to the final outcome we

would seek, a major interagency debate was under way on one of the more crucial elements of any future agreement: the number of missiles each side would be allowed to keep. It was fought out behind the scenes, but it was announced as the centerpiece of a presidential statement.

The doctrinal concern that led to the decision to deploy U.S. INF missiles in Europe was predicated in part on the belief that, with the advent of strategic parity and the deployment of the SS-20, a “gap” existed in the spectrum of deterrence that might lead the Soviets, even if wrongly, to conclude they could use their INF systems to make or threaten limited strikes against NATO Europe. Filling “the gap” would probably require some U.S. counterdeployments of nuclear missiles in Europe.

As we have seen, the Germans had been arguing that the phrase “NATO should seek the lowest possible number of deployments” could encompass zero. U.S. participants in the SCG and High-Level Group (HLG) meetings did not contradict the German contention, which was logically correct. However, the United States had been proceeding on the broad assumption that the final number of deployed INF missiles for both sides would result in a militarily viable and significant force for the United States, numbering somewhere below the scheduled deployment of 572 INF missiles.

This assumption was effectively challenged by Secretary of Defense Casper Weinberger and his Assistant Secretary Richard Perle. In a memo to the president, they argued that the United States should propose a zero outcome for both sides. This proposal would be a dramatic step giving the United States the moral high ground both inside the negotiations and in the public arena. It would certainly meet with support from NATO European, and particularly German, public opinion.

Skeptics concluded it was a clever way to ensure the negotiations would never succeed. Since the Soviets would never accept the destruction of all their new INF missiles, only the deployment track would reach its destination. Others were concerned that the move would undermine one of the key arguments in favor of deployment, the need to close the “gap in deterrence,” and thus make it all the more difficult to maintain NATO public support for the dual-track approach.

The president approved the zero option. On November 18, 1981, less than two weeks before the opening round of the INF negotiations and on the eve of a Brezhnev visit to Bonn, the president announced it to the world. He said, “representatives at the negotiations will

present the following proposal: the United States is prepared to cancel its deployment of Pershing II and ground-launched cruise missiles if the Soviets will dismantle their SS-20, SS-4, and SS-5 missiles." "This," he added, "would be an historic step. With Soviet agreement, we could together substantially reduce the dread threat of nuclear war which hangs over the people of Europe." He also underscored the disparity between the size of the U.S. and Soviet INF: "While the United States deployed no new intermediate-range missiles and withdrew 1,000 nuclear warheads from Europe, the Soviet Union deployed 750 warheads on mobile, accurate ballistic missiles." He went on, saying that "they now have 1,110 warheads on the SS-20, S-4, and SS-5 missiles and the United States has no comparable missiles, having dismantled the last such missile in Europe over 15 years ago."¹

The president also said that the United States was prepared to reopen talks with the Soviet Union on strategic nuclear forces. He called for progress in the negotiations on reducing conventional forces in Europe, and, through measures being negotiated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, for reducing the risks of surprise attack.²

Thus the United States had launched a veritable "peace offensive," with the INF zero option as its centerpiece. Whatever its technical or doctrinal drawbacks, the zero option, as its proponents had predicted, gave us the initiative and the high ground inside and, as importantly, outside the actual negotiations. There was only one problem. What if the attraction began to wear off, if U.S. insistence on it began to appear as an unwillingness to consider any alternatives? The same question arose with regard to the 1979 decision's exclusion of aircraft and sea-based systems. We would need to consider this possibility within the contexts of both the negotiations themselves and the public's appreciation of them. We would need to be ready to move before we found ourselves placed on the defensive in either of these two areas.

NEGOTIATIONS GET UNDERWAY: ORGANIZING THE U.S. TEAM AND THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS

In keeping with the determination to consult closely with our NATO Allies, I had returned to Brussels in mid-November to attend the last SCG meeting before the negotiations opened. Two days before the November 30, 1981, start of the INF negotiations, Nitze and I traveled to Bonn to meet with Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher and then to Hamburg to meet with Chancellor Schmidt. We briefed

them on our plans for the opening round, our commitment to the NATO dual-track decision, and the importance of continued Allied solidarity including moving forward with deployments even as we negotiated limitations of those deployments.

The U.S. INF delegation spent Sunday, November 29, 1981, in Geneva preparing for the formal opening of the negotiations on the following day. Ambassador Nitze held a “get acquainted” meeting with his Soviet counterpart, Ambassador Yuli A. Kvitsinsky.

Symbolic of the underlying nature of this negotiation, our first task on the opening day was to meet with a group of European parliamentarians. We reviewed and compared the negotiating positions of both sides, noting the importance of Allied solidarity, including continuing to move forward with the deployments, if we were to achieve an agreement that met the security needs of the NATO countries.

International media interest in the negotiations was obvious from the large number of journalists who covered the opening of the talks. We would agree with the Soviets that the negotiators would not carry on their negotiations in public. Officials in Washington and Moscow, however, would be less constrained. In reality, given the high profile political nature of these negotiations, both sides would do their best to make sure the substance of their views was made available to the public. We could not, for example, turn down invitations from Allied governments to address forums in their countries. What we did avoid, almost completely, was public disputations between the negotiators themselves. There would be ample opportunity for that inside the negotiations.

The modalities for the INF negotiations followed those established during SALT. Each of the departments or agencies involved in the negotiations—State, Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Intelligence Community—provided a senior delegation member who was dual-hatted as a counselor to Nitze and me and as a representative of his/her home agency. Washington also provided advisors to carry out the staff work for the entire delegation. Secretaries and clerical staff were assisted by the departments and agencies for their representatives. ACDA and the U.S. Mission to the United Nations in Geneva were responsible for funding and local administrative support: transportation, care and maintenance of the offices, and meeting rooms.

The U.S. delegation was housed in a private office building, which was erected by an international financier who had fallen upon hard times. The “Botanic Building” was located across the street from the Geneva Botanical Gardens and was a very short distance from the

main U.S. Mission to the United Nations headquarters in Geneva and to its Soviet counterpart UN Mission. In addition to the ACDA offices, the Botanic Building also housed the Geneva offices of the United States Special Trade Representative. Other tenants included the German representative to the United Nations Disarmament Conference (with offices abutting the conference room in which we met with the Soviets), several commercial firms (including a lighting company that suspiciously never seemed to have any customers, and which closed its doors when the U.S. arms control delegations moved out of the building in the late 1990s), and the Geneva offices of a member nation of the Warsaw Pact.

It was clearly not ideal from a security standpoint and would become less secure when the threat of outright acts of terrorism also became a major concern. Beyond that circumstance, a good deal of repair work was required. ACDA's quarters in the building had been on a low-maintenance diet during the long interval between the end of the SALT II negotiations and the opening of the INF negotiations.

On the positive side, the "Botanic" offices were bright and cheerful, and the main conference room, which doubled as a reception room, offered fine views of the Alps and Jura. A fair amount of our time, however, was spent in a room that lacked these amenities.

The Negotiating Process

The U.S. and Soviet delegations would normally hold formal "plenary meetings" twice a week, alternating the venue between our place and theirs. On a typical meeting day, the members and advisors would read the overnight cable traffic and the newspapers. They would individually consider what developments and reactions might flow from the "take" and perhaps discuss this with one or two others. The delegation would meet around 10:00 a.m. Our first delegation task was to review the formal U.S. plenary statement scheduled for presentation on that day and to ensure it was factually correct and that it accurately conveyed our points.

An advisor would have been assigned to draft the statement, which would have been developed in outline form at an earlier delegation meeting and already subjected to at least one or two reviews. The entire delegation would once again go over the draft, fine-tuning it if necessary. It would then be put into final form and translated into Russian. The English version was considered authoritative. The Russian version was a "courtesy" to allow non-English speakers on the Soviet side to refer to the U.S. statement during the discussions.

Both would be handed to the Russians. The Soviets followed the same procedure to give us their plenary statement.

Having approved the statement, we would rehearse the arguments in its favor. Finally, we would discuss what we thought the Soviets might introduce at the meeting, how they might react to our statement, and how we should react to their remarks. We would use the precision of a rifle in laying out our position but the wide coverage of a shotgun when considering what the Soviets might have in store for us. I had introduced the latter approach to help reduce the chances of being caught unawares and thus to improve the chances of reacting appropriately and confidently and not having to improvise on the spot. By and large the system worked.

The plenary meetings would usually begin at 11:00 a.m. with an exchange of the formal statements. Usually there would only be a brief discussion at the table as the sides often preferred to save their comments for the next part of the meeting when the delegations would break down into smaller groups for informal "post-plenary" discussions. These groups were arranged by occupation. The chiefs and deputy chiefs of the delegations constituted one group, the representatives of the State Department and the Soviet Foreign Ministry another. The military and intelligence officers had their separate groups. All the groups were accompanied by an American and a Soviet interpreter. When there was a delicate subject on which we wanted to probe the Soviets, we would assign an individual to raise it with a particular Soviet delegation member or advisor. I would escort the Soviet delegation head Ambassador Yuli A. Kvitsinsky and the deputy Soviet delegation head Colonel General Nikolay N. Detinov out of the building, affording another opportunity to gauge the Soviets' reaction to the meeting or reinforce one of our points.

The meetings would break up between 1 and 2 p.m. The delegation would usually go to our secure conference room, exchange reports on the plenary and informal meetings, analyze the Soviets' remarks for any hints of movement or signs of retrenchment, and offer our estimates of the Soviet reaction to our presentation. We would also consider what suggestions we might make to Washington for tactical, or if warranted, strategic moves. Summary reports, including analysis and action recommendations would be prepared on each of the meetings and sent out at the end of the day; which often meant well after nominal closing time. Verbatim reports, prepared by the interpreters, would follow. Colonel Norman Clyne, our very able delegation executive, was responsible for putting the entire package together. Nitze and I would review and approve each of the reports before they were sent.

It made for a long day. After leaving the office, many members of the U.S. team, including support staff, would go out together for dinner, then to their respective hotel rooms for calls back home and bed. The negotiation was broken down into “rounds” that would last about two months. The rounds would then be followed by about two months in the capitals. The chief, deputy chief, and their immediate staff, and the “members” were expected to stay the course of the negotiations. The “advisors” and most of the support staff might skip every other round. Most members were accompanied by their spouses; the advisors usually came alone.

Recognizing the importance of continued close consultations with our European Allies, I opted to be based in Geneva after the first round and to use part of the inter-round period to attend SCG meetings, visit NATO capitals, meet with government and opposition leaders, attend conferences where INF was a main topic of discussion, and generally get our points across to opinion leaders, the media, and the public. I would usually return with the delegation to Washington for the initial debriefings and the determination of work assignments for the inter-round period. I would return to Washington in time to participate in the final preparation of our instructions for the next round, returning to Geneva with the delegation.

The First Round: Opening Diplomatic Moves and Soviet Cynicism

All of this was ahead of us as we made our way to the formal opening of the INF negotiations. The media were out in force as we waved and walked into the Soviet Mission. As was to be expected, both sides used the first formal meeting to lay out, in broad terms, their basic positions and the reasoning behind them. We underlined the concerns of the United States and its Allies that led to the December 1979 NATO decision. We related those concerns to the principles that the United States and its NATO Allies had embodied in that decision. We highlighted the principle of an equal outcome, explaining why it was essential to a balanced agreement. We reviewed the arguments for concentrating on long-range intermediate-range nuclear forces (LRINF) missiles, placing global limitations on them and the importance of incorporating an effective verification regime within a treaty.³

The Soviets had been proposing moratoriums on new INF missiles in Europe, via the media, before the negotiations had begun. Not surprisingly they put forward a proposal for a moratorium on the deployment, or preparations for deployment, of new or additional

INF systems in Europe at the first plenary meeting. It was a patently one-sided position that would have left the Soviet Union with over 1,000 warheads on its LRINF missiles and frozen the United States at zero.

While the Soviet plenary statement contained no surprises, the informal session was surprisingly revealing of the Soviet position and Kvitsinsky's view of relations between states. Kvitsinsky began our first "post-plenary" informal session by saying he wanted to tell us a joke about a rabbit and a bear. The two were traveling in the same train compartment. Sometime after the train had left the station, the rabbit began feverishly searching his pockets and then let out a gasp. "What's wrong," asked the bear. "I seem to have lost my ticket," replied the rabbit. "So what" said the bear. "So what" exclaimed the rabbit, "when the conductor comes around, he will find I have no ticket and have me locked up." "Don't worry," said the bear, "I can take care of it." "How" asked the rabbit. "Well" the bear said, "when the conductor knocks on the door, I'll pick you up by the ears and hold you out the window. I'll give him my ticket, and he won't know you were here." Assured that the powerful bear would protect him, the rabbit calmly awaited the conductor's arrival. Then as promised, when the conductor knocked on the door the bear picked up the rabbit by his ears and held him out the window of the speeding train. "Where is your ticket?" the conductor asked. "Right here," the bear said showing his ticket with his right hand. "And what do you have in your other hand?" the conductor asked. "Nothing," the bear replied, pulling his now empty left hand out of the window.

The U.S. plenary statement had made several references to the importance we placed on serving the interests of our NATO Allies. Nitze and I concluded that Kvitsinsky's "joke" was meant as an object lesson for how great powers should deal with their Allies. We were astonished by Kvitsinsky's near recklessness (in a situation where anything you say can and will be used against you) in suggesting so openly to us that this is how the Soviets would act if they were in our place, and by his failure to understand that we neither would, nor could, play the role of the bear. I did not fail to repeat the "joke" at future meetings with NATO Allies.

As the round progressed, both sides continued to expand upon their opening statements. On December 11, 1981, the United States, via its plenary statement, formally placed the mutual zero proposal before the Soviets, noting it would, if adopted by both sides, lead to an equal outcome and obviate the need for U.S. deployments. Soviet President Brezhnev provided a high-level public response

on December 16, calling the zero-zero proposal one-sided disarmament.⁴

The Soviets also introduced further details and refinements of their position. Without withdrawing the moratorium offer, they put forward a reductions approach under which NATO (i.e., the United States, United Kingdom, and France combined) and the Soviet Union would each reduce “medium-range” missiles and aircraft “in or intended for use” in Europe to 300.

The following weekend, the Polish government, under obvious pressure from the Soviet Union, declared martial law in an effort to staunch the growing Solidarity movement that was calling for drastic reform of Poland’s communist system. Washington was bound to react. Would it put a hold on the negotiations? In the end, it was determined that the talks should continue. The Reagan administration had demonstrated the priority it was now placing on the role of arms control as an element of security policy. A convenient Christmas break also reduced the visibility of the negotiations during this period.

The break ended on Sunday, January 10, 1982, when the U.S. INF delegation gathered in its Geneva offices to review our game plan for the rest of the first round. Work had progressed on developing a draft treaty based on a double zero outcome, and we hoped to have it ready for presentation before the end of the round.

On February 2, 1982, the United States tabled a draft treaty based on the double zero proposal. Developing a draft treaty is a painstaking procedure. Once tabled, it becomes part of the formal record; its contents are fair game. There is no room for error, misstatement, or formulations that can be attacked as illogical. Moreover, tabling a treaty underscores the seriousness with which a party is treating the negotiation and is thus a public statement of commitment to the negotiating process.

The basic provision of the draft treaty called for the elimination of ground-launched, nuclear-armed ballistic and cruise missiles with ranges between that of the Pershing II (1,800 kilometers) and that of strategic missiles, as defined in the SALT Treaties (5,500 kilometers). The missiles, their launchers, agreed support structures, and equipment would all be destroyed. New missiles within this range band would be banned.

The United States and its NATO Allies had recognized that shorter-range Soviet INF missiles (SRINF), those with ranges between 500 and 1,800 kilometers deployed in Eastern Europe, could reach some of the same targets in Western Europe as Soviet LRINF missiles specifically covered by the draft treaty. Accordingly,

while emphasis would be placed on the greater LRINF threat, it had been generally agreed in Washington and among the Allies that some form of collateral constraints would have to be placed on Soviet SRINF missile systems. The draft treaty sought to achieve this objective by limiting Soviet SRINF missiles with ranges between the SS-23 and the SS-12/22 to the number deployed as of January 1, 1982. Any missiles above that number at the time of treaty signature would have to be destroyed, although modernization and replacement on a one-for-one basis and with some qualitative limitations would be permitted. The effect of the limitations on LRINF and SRINF missiles would have been to ban all missiles with ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers.

The draft U.S. treaty also contained provisions for definitions and type rules (determining what category in which to place a missile; for example, range) along with procedural matters and placeholder language on verification. It would be of unlimited duration.

The Soviets responded two days later with a "Statement of Intentions" incorporating their moratorium and reduction proposals. It called for the United States and the Soviet Union to reduce their medium-range missiles and aircraft in "or intended for use" in Europe to 600 by the end of 1985 and to 300 by the end of 1990. It included U.K. and French forces under the U.S. total. In effect it would leave the United States with zero missiles and a reduction in its dual-capable aircraft.

The Soviet proposal permitted modernization and replacement of missiles and aircraft on a one-for-one basis. Since the United States had no INF missiles in Europe, it would only allow modernization of, and replacement for, Soviet, U.K., and French missiles. Destruction would be the primary means of reduction, but some systems would be withdrawn.

Finally, the Soviet's "Statement of Intentions" called for a moratorium on new deployments of "medium-range" systems in Europe, not further defined, and for an agreement to remain in effect until the end of 1990 unless the sides agreed to renew it.

Thus this initial set of exchanges had the virtue of identifying for the record some of our essential differences. We had not begun to enter this "forest"—let alone to clear cut the differences—but we had assured ourselves that the dimensions of our differences were those that we had anticipated. Whether they would prove resolvable would be the next question.

This page intentionally left blank

THE END OF THE BEGINNING

MEASURING THE SIZE OF THE GAP

Comparisons of the two approaches reveal the width of the gap that separated the two sides. The underlying differences were fundamental. First among these was a basic disagreement over whether the United States and its NATO Allies had a legitimate right to deploy U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe capable of reaching targets in the Soviet Union. The United States and its European Allies based their position on the inherent right to individual and collective self-defense accorded by Article 51 of the U.N. Charter. This inherent right underlies the foundation of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance. It was buttressed by the precedent of earlier deployment of U.S. medium-range Thor and Jupiter nuclear missiles.

The Soviet position, in denying that the United States and its Allies had a right to deploy U.S. missiles in Europe in defense of NATO, presented in effect a challenge to the legitimacy of NATO itself. In devising proposals, all of their variations had a common theme: no deployments of U.S. INF in Europe, while allowing the maintenance by the Soviets of all their new SS-20 force and modern “medium-range” aircraft. With this approach, the Soviets were seeking to give practical and juridical legitimacy to their claim that the United States had no role to play in Europe and that the issue of INF missiles was one for the Europeans to handle alone.

Kvitsinsky understood this position perfectly. At one of our early meetings when I noted Soviet unwillingness to move in our direction, he replied that their very participation in these negotiations with the United States was in itself a major concession. Given the Soviet point of departure, he was right. But in making his comment, he had also acknowledged that by agreeing to the talks the Soviet Union had knowingly accepted the premise of our position. It remained to be seen whether the practical outcome of the negotiations would further support the underlying U.S. and NATO position.

Closely allied to this underlying philosophical/political difference was a question of principle: Should the outcome be based on equal reductions, as the Soviets argued, or on an equal outcome, as the United States proposed? Connected to this dynamic was the Soviet insistence that U.K. and French nuclear forces be “taken into account” in determining the existing and future balance of INF missiles and aircraft between the United States/NATO and the Soviet Union. No issue in the negotiating process took up more time than this fundamental nexus of the linked questions of legitimacy, the nature of equality, and the bilateral nature of the negotiations.

To help achieve the result they sought, the Soviets, at this stage of the negotiations, sought to include U.K. and French nuclear forces within the 300-missile ceiling for “NATO” INF missiles in Europe. During the first round, they claimed the British and French had 263 medium-range missiles and aircraft between them. This would have prevented any U.S. INF missile deployments and would have left the United States with only 37 dual-capable aircraft in, or intended for use in, Europe. To justify their inclusion of U.K. and French nuclear forces on the U.S. side of the ledger, the Soviets argued that they were our Allies and that Soviet INF-range missiles must therefore offset U.K. and French INF systems as well as those of the United States.

It did not take us long to determine that a host of false assumptions underlay their arguments. To begin, they were premised on the existence of a balance. In fact even if U.K. and French forces were wrongly included in an objective tally of INF systems, the Soviet Union still would have had a large numerical advantage. Indeed, the Soviets themselves (while *inter alia* continuing their arbitrary exclusion of certain Soviet INF aircraft, but including less capable U.S. aircraft) acknowledged they had more INF delivery vehicles than the United States, United Kingdom, and France combined (938 to 857 in mid-1984, even after U.S. deployments had begun).

Yet even this admission was based on the fallacy that aircraft and missiles are so sufficiently comparable that they can be lumped together to produce a meaningful aggregate number. When these categories are correctly separated, the Soviets’ own count, in mid-1984, showed 473 Soviet INF missiles in Europe alone, as opposed to 162 missiles—all but 18 on submarines—for the United Kingdom and France.

But that is not all. The Soviets went on to argue that NATO had an advantage in “nuclear charges” of 1.5 to 1. They arrived at this ratio by assigning to their already arbitrary count of INF aircraft almost

four bombs per U.S. aircraft, but only 2.5 per Soviet aircraft. In addition, the Soviet “nuclear charges” tally treated bombs on aircraft on a par with warheads on missiles. The latter, in which the Soviets by their own count had a great lead (and an even greater one by our count), were far more capable than the former and could not be compared with them on an equal basis.

The Soviet argument for subtracting from U.S. systems the systems of the United Kingdom and France was based on other logic traps. To mention only three more:

- “Soviet submarines are strategic systems, but UK and French submarines are ‘medium range.’ ” Patently false; they are essentially the same type of systems.
- “The Soviets must have SS-20s to offset UK and French systems.” Not correct. The SS-20 was not the only Soviet nuclear system that could strike the United Kingdom or France. Literally thousands of other Soviet nuclear systems had that same capability.
- “The Soviet Union should be allowed to field in the European part of the Soviet Union, the same number of SS-20 warheads as UK and French warheads.” That the world’s largest nation, with its widely dispersed population and industrial centers, needed to match with its SS-20s alone the nuclear forces of much smaller Britain and France in order to deter Britain and France, defies logic. Indeed, so does the argument that either Britain or France would attack the Soviet Union, as opposed to their being prepared to deter a Soviet attack on themselves.

To this analysis must be added the point that the Soviets sought to limit the geographic scope of any agreement to systems deployed in Europe, or “intended for use” in Europe. They proposed, therefore, that Soviet SS-20s deployed east of the Ural Mountains should not be covered by an agreement since they could not reach NATO Europe (an incorrect statement) and were intended for use in Asia. Yet they argued that U.S. aircraft on aircraft carriers east of the southern tip of Greenland should be considered “intended for use” in Europe as there was “no other apparent role” for them (the Middle East apparently having been forgotten).

Moreover, implicit in the Soviet position was the proposition that while they would sign a treaty with the United States placing limits on U.S. and Soviet INF, Soviet numbers could increase or decrease depending on what actions Britain and France, who were not parties to the treaty, might take in the future. Finally, the Germans and other

European NATO Allies did not believe that the United Kingdom and France could provide the deterrent strength provided by the U.S. nuclear umbrella. Without that umbrella, the risk of succumbing to Soviet intimidation would be greatly increased.

Medium-Range Aircraft

The Soviets also claimed that all U.S. aircraft in, or “intended for use” in, Europe were “medium range” but sought to exclude from limitations many of their more capable aircraft. We had proposed that the negotiations should concentrate on missiles, since aircraft were less threatening than missiles, can be called back after launching, and are relatively slow flying and thus subject to being shot down by anti-aircraft and defensive fighters.

We had been making these rather defensive points the centerpiece of our position on aircraft. As the debate wore on, I suggested we might go over to the offensive. By our count, the Soviets had far more INF range aircraft than the United States and NATO. We might suggest to the Soviets that while we continued to consider missiles more worthy of priority attention, we were quite prepared to consider reductions in aircraft and then confront them with the quantitative asymmetry. The U.S. Air Force had some qualms about this tactic but when they ran the numbers and saw how we could argue in good conscience that the Soviet INF-range aircraft outnumbered ours, they took up the challenge.

Among the aircraft that the Soviets sought to exclude was their new Fencer. This aircraft, they argued, could not fly a 1,000 kilometer round-trip mission. At the same time, they insisted that older U.S. aircraft could undertake such a mission. When we probed the Soviets on how they could have come to such a conclusion, the discussion turned into a technical question of flight profiles.

Aircraft use less fuel when flying at higher altitudes, where the air is thin and offers less resistance, but more fuel at lower altitudes, where the air is denser and offers more resistance. It was generally understood that most aircraft take off low, fly high toward the target, then drop down, under the radar, to deliver their weapons and exit the target area, and then fly back to base at higher altitudes. The Soviets claimed that their flight profile called for flying low to and from the target. As a result their range was limited. When we asked them why their aircraft had to fly such a flight profile, while they assumed our aircraft would fly a more efficient and effective flight pattern, they replied that our planes had technical advantages over theirs.

For the Soviets to make such an argument was most unusual. The fact they used it was an indication of the importance they placed on being able to protect their claim that NATO had an advantage in INF aircraft, even if it meant acknowledging the superiority of U.S. equipment. We continued to hammer away at this chink in their armor. In any event, the seeds were planted that would eventually lead both sides to agree to drop aircraft altogether from the INF Treaty regime.

In addition to their February 4, 1982, proposal, the Soviets made two other offers during the first round. Both were variations on the principal Soviet theme and would have resulted in the same outcome: no U.S. deployments and vastly unequal outcomes between the United States/NATO and the USSR. The first of these moves called for reductions of Soviet “medium-range” nuclear forces in Europe to an equal level with those of the United Kingdom and France. The numerical outcome would have allowed the Soviets to field 263 INF systems in Europe (instead of the 300 permitted under their February 4 proposal). The United States would have been allowed no missiles and no aircraft.

The other proposal called for the elimination of all “medium-range” and tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. This variant would have eliminated all U.K., French, and U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe and prevented U.S. deployments of new systems. The Soviet strategic nuclear force, and Soviet SS-20 missiles, based east of the Urals but within range of NATO Europe, would thus reign supreme on the European continent. They dubbed this blatantly one-sided proposal the “true zero” approach.

Negotiating Tactics at the Most Basic Levels

Despite—or perhaps because of—the inability of the sides so early in the negotiations to move off of their opening positions, the verbal jousting during the post-plenary sessions continued apace. In preparing for my job as deputy chief U.S. negotiator, I read a number of articles about Soviet and Russian negotiating tactics. Some of these were provided by my European NATO colleagues, thus giving me more than one slant on this topic. In addition, my previous work in the international trade arena had exposed me to a wide variety of national and individual negotiating approaches.

Among the frequently mentioned ploys, the desire to get the last word and the device of putting your words in an interlocutor’s mouth and vice versa seemed to have been particularly well learned by

our Soviet counterparts. I pointed out to Nitze after our first two post-plenary meetings that Kvitsinsky seemed especially fond of these two old standards. As our next meeting drew to a close, he was at it again. Nitze, however, got the best of him by saying, "Well Mike, we know he has to have the last word, so let's give it to him and get out of here."

At the next post-plenary meeting, Kvitsinsky, indirectly referring to the tale of the rabbit and the bear, suggested that in approaching the negotiation we should "go beyond good and evil." I said, "that judgment comes from Nietzsche, and you know what that led to." "Yes I do," said Kvitsinsky. "Nietzsche led to Wagner." "And Wagner," I rejoined, "Gave us the Gotterdamerung." Soon thereafter, as the meeting seemed about to enter into the last word jockeying phase, Kvitsinsky turned to General Detinov and said, "Well Nikolay, Glitman always has to have the last word so let's give it to him and leave." Later in the negotiations, Soviet rhetorical ploys took on a more counterproductive and perhaps sinister aspect, adversely affecting efforts to find common ground.

Results of the First Round

The round ended on March 16, 1982. Not unexpectedly, there had been no sign of any real movement from either party. On the positive side, even with the verbal jousting, the discussions had been generally businesslike. Moreover, both sides had a good picture of the other's opening position and an understanding of where the key differences lay and why those were the key differences.

As we have seen, the major points of contention concerned the ultimate outcome of an agreement. The United States sought the elimination of all U.S. and Soviet LRINF missiles regardless of location. By a number of stratagems, the Soviets sought to block the deployment of U.S. LRINF missiles while maintaining at least a portion of theirs. The principal argument was seeking to treat U.K. and French forces as if they were American. In addition they proposed moratoria that would leave the United States with zero while allowing the Soviet Union to maintain its existing LRINF in Europe and the ability to expand its LRINF in the Asian portion of the USSR, from which it could reach targets in NATO Europe. At the same time, the Soviet proposals would have either eliminated or greatly diminished the number of U.S. aircraft in Europe, while preserving the major portion of Soviet aircraft in Europe.

As the Special Consultative Group (SCG) Progress Report commented, the sides also differed over a number of other issues:

- Treatment of shorter-range systems: the United States proposed to limit certain shorter range systems. The Soviets argued that short of eliminating all nonstrategic nuclear forces from Europe, systems with ranges under 1,000 kilometers should not be constrained;
- Method of reduction: the United States favored destruction, the Soviets preferred a combination of destruction and some withdrawal; and
- Duration of agreement: unlimited in the U.S. version; until 1990 in the Soviet approach.¹

THE SECOND ROUND OF NEGOTIATIONS AND THE EMERGING PUBLIC RELATIONS BATTLE IN EUROPE

Public interest in the negotiations and in the broader issue of the control of nuclear weapons had been growing, in part because of the impression that nuclear arms control negotiations had been given a lower priority by the Reagan administration, and in part because of a well-prepared Soviet propaganda campaign to shift attention from Poland and Afghanistan to the continuing and intensified U.S. effort to strengthen its military forces in the wake of the Vietnam War. Prospective U.S. INF deployments were an obvious target and the success of the ban the neutron bomb campaign an obvious model for new action.

Even before the negotiations began, some 100,000 protested in Hamburg (Chancellor Schmidt's hometown) against nuclear policies on June 20, 1981. The following day Schmidt (perhaps sensing the target of the demonstrators) "reaffirmed West Germany's willingness to have U.S. nuclear missiles on her territory."²

The coming months would see more such demonstrations. Four days of "peace rallies" in West Germany attended by 480,000 ended on April 12, 1982. On June 5, 15,000 in Paris and 300,000 in Rome demonstrated against nuclear weapons. On June 6, 115,000 in London marched for the same objective. Over 300,000 demonstrated in Bonn on April 10.³ On June 12, some 800,000 demonstrated in New York in support of the nuclear freeze movement.⁴ While primarily aimed at the U.S. strategic nuclear force, the "freeze" on new deployments fit perfectly with the one-sided Soviet INF moratorium proposal and would have undercut NATO's dual-track decision.

On August 5, the U.S. House of Representatives failed by two votes to pass a resolution in support of an immediate freeze in the production, deployment, and testing of nuclear weapons.⁵ On October 30, over 20,000 demonstrated in Ottawa over a U.S.-Canadian agreement to permit testing of U.S. cruise missiles in Alberta.⁶

Before the year was out, Helmut Schmidt's government had collapsed, due in some part to disagreements within the German Social Democratic Party (SPD) on how to proceed with INF. With his departure, the leadership of the SPD took a decided turn to the left. No longer responsible for governance, the SPD, while not directly backing away from the 1979 NATO decision, did become less supportive and more critical of the U.S./NATO position in the negotiations.

It was obvious that the outcome of the negotiations would depend on the ability of European NATO governments and the U.S. government to maintain public support for the dual-track decision. The negotiations themselves would settle down into a campaign of maneuver, with each party introducing variations on their basic theme and working to show that it was being flexible. But there would be no give on the fundamental differences. The Soviet proposals, no matter how they were dressed up, all led to the same conclusion: there must be no deployments of U.S. INF in Europe, while the Soviets would retain a substantial portion of their new SS-20 force.

Thus during the second round (May 20–July 20, 1982), the Soviets tabled, in response to our draft treaty proposal, a draft treaty of their own based on their proposal that both NATO and the USSR reduce their “medium-range systems” to 300. NATO's 300 would consist of U.K. and French forces with only a small number of U.S. aircraft in the mix; no new types of INF missiles (i.e., no Pershing II and cruise missiles) would be allowed. Restrictions would not apply to Soviet forces in the Far East. Ground- and sea-launched cruise missiles (GLCMs and SLCMs) would be banned regardless of location. The Soviets did agree that a treaty could be of unlimited duration, specified a “zone of withdrawal,” and agreed that Soviet INF systems west of the 80th degree of longitude (which would just miss capturing a major SS-20 base complex near Novosibirsk) would be subject to limitations. They also suggested that systems with ranges below 1,000 kilometers could be covered in a side protocol.⁷

The new proposal made some minor adjustments in the Soviet position, but it did not change the fundamentals. It would still lead to an unequal outcome, exclude any U.S. INF missile deployments, and allow the Soviets to deploy an INF force that would equal the number

of all U.K. and French INF systems. It would not, however, limit Soviet strategic forces that could also target the United Kingdom and France. Even the willingness to agree in principle to place limitations on some Soviet INF missiles just east of the Urals ignored the fact that Soviet systems well east of the 80th meridian of longitude could reach targets in NATO Europe—let alone the mobility or transportability of these systems.

For its part, the United States worked on the basis of making progress where it could be made while continuing to explicate its position and to dissect the weaknesses of the Soviet proposals. The United States suggested and the Soviets agreed to set up working groups to examine technical issues. The first group, the “Data Experts,” would consider and try to reduce differences in each side’s data on such issues as the number of existing systems and their capabilities. The next group, the Treaty Text Working Group, would begin trying to blend together the language of the two draft treaties in those noncontroversial areas based on “boiler plate” language where they were already quite close.

The Walk in the Woods: We Try to Slice the Gordian Knot

The political situation in West Germany had been growing increasingly tense, with the demonstrations both reflecting and helping create a climate of *angst*. Nitze and I had visited Foreign Minister Genscher and his arms control and security staff in Bonn and Chancellor Schmidt in Hamburg in mid-April, between the first and second rounds, and around the time that a series of major peace rallies had attracted up to 480,000 people. We had come away from our meetings feeling that the German leadership would stand by the 1979 decision and carry out the deployments. Both of us were concerned, however, that the result might resemble a Pyrrhic victory, with considerable damage inflicted upon the Alliance as a result of the disaffection of a large portion of the public in several Alliance member states.

As the likely end of the second negotiating round came into view, Nitze became increasingly concerned over the situation in Germany. With these concerns in mind and with word from Kvitsinsky that Moscow would be holding a major review of the negotiations during the summer break, he discussed with me and others his belief that the United States would need “to cut through the morass of issues and to try to find a basis for a deal” and that the United States was unlikely

“to achieve agreement involving substantial movement on the Soviet side unless we were prepared for substantial movement on our side.”⁸

I shared his concern and his belief that the United States would need to make some changes in its position. The “zero-zero” proposal remained an excellent bedrock upon which to base our position, but the Soviets, by putting forth variant after variant of their basic unequal outcome proposal, had created the appearance (but not the reality) of flexibility. In my view, what the United States needed was to offer an equal outcome at some number other than zero, while retaining zero as our preferred outcome. In other words, an “interim proposal” that would show movement on our part without abandoning our principled approach.

More fundamentally, although I was very much in favor of trying out some variations of our own in order to demonstrate flexibility, I remained persuaded that the Soviets would not agree to any outcome other than one of their unequal proposals before the United States had deployed its new INF missiles in Europe. To do otherwise would in effect appear to sanction U.S. deployments, thus undercutting their possibilities of overturning the 1979 NATO decision and splitting the Alliance. There would be no serious movement on the core question of an equal outcome from the Soviet side until NATO had demonstrated the will and the ability to deploy.

At this point, in effect, we were attempting to trade a bucket of ashes for a bucket of coal. The Soviets had spent their funds on SS-20s; these were now “sunk costs.” Until we had paid, both financially and politically, to match them, the likelihood of any agreement was marginal.

In the meantime, the Soviets would rely on their negotiating and public relations skills and on the political impact of the antinuclear demonstrations on NATO governments to help fashion a favorable outcome. We know now that the Soviet negotiator’s instructions were indeed “mainly to prevent American INF deployments.”⁹ We would need all our skills to prevent that result or a Pyrrhic victory.

Without revealing that he was considering going soon to Kvitsinsky with his concept, Nitze outlined parts of what would become his personal initiative “walk in the woods” formula to me.¹⁰ The proposal’s main feature was an equal outcome at a number above zero—Nitze proposed 225 LRINF missiles and aircraft in Europe—and below 572. The United States would deploy only cruise missiles. The idea was that although we would drop Pershing II, obtaining Soviet agreement to the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles in NATO Europe would meet our political and military requirements. Moreover,

I believed that even if the Soviets would not accept any U.S. deployments, the proposal was imaginative. Its eventual move into the public realm would help us and Allied governments in what had become the all-important struggle for public support in NATO Europe.¹¹

Two days before Nitze and Kvitsinsky took their “walk in the woods,” I attended a dinner at which Nitze and Kvitsinsky were among the invitees. After dinner Kvitsinsky and I had a serious, and for his part gloomy, conversation. After going over our respective views of the state of the talks, Kvitsinsky said he thought the negotiations were headed toward an impasse and that he could see no way out. When I commented that we needed to recognize that the talks were likely to go on for some time and that what seemed impossible today might be possible tomorrow, Kvitsinsky said he thought that sort of hopeful circumstance was unlikely. “In the end you will deploy and we will walk out in indignation.” Thirty-six hours later he would walk with Nitze down a path in the Juras.

Walking In: The Substance and the Reasoning

This “walk,” which became the most discussed and analyzed element of Cold War arms control negotiations, was not lightly undertaken by Nitze. Recounted in substantial detail by Strobe Talbott’s works on Nitze and arms control (*Deadly Gambits* and *Master of the Game*), the exchange has been parsed and weighed like a Harvard MBA case study. Indeed, to the degree that arms control is ever “sexy” to the public, the Nitze–Kvitsinsky relationship and the manner in which the proposal subsequently played out had sufficient drama to stimulate a theatrical, long-running play, thus giving INF a dramatic cachet no other arms control negotiation has been able to achieve.

Nevertheless, in its essence, the proposal was a straightforward compromise from which both the United States and the Soviet Union could proclaim to be winners (or be denounced as losers). The calculations on soggy pieces of paper on a drizzling mountainside were nothing out-of-the blue. The meeting had been foreshadowed by many private discussions between Nitze and Kvitsinsky and hints that “back channel” unofficial and, thus, deniable moves could advance the negotiations. Nevertheless, Nitze kept the details of his emerging proposal to himself, and his plans to approach Kvitsinsky privately reportedly were known only to Eugene Rostow, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency’s (ACDA) director.

At its core, the proposal (ultimately entitled a “joint exploratory package for the consideration of both governments”) postulated that each side would be limited to 75 launchers in Europe. For the Soviets this would mean 75 SS-20s with 225 nuclear warheads. For the United States, the 75 launchers would be GLCM Tomahawks, each carrying four cruise missiles with a total of 300 nuclear warheads. Presumably, we would be free to base these GLCMs throughout NATO with each of the basing countries getting their mite.

There would also be limits on nuclear capable aircraft in Europe (150 for each side) affecting Soviet Backfire, Badgers, and Blinders and for the U.S. F-111s and FB-111s. However, there would be no limits on British and French forces or U.S. dual capable or carrier-based aircraft. Moreover, there would be a freeze on Soviet SS-20 deployments in Asia so our Far Eastern Allies would not be disadvantaged by an agreement in Europe.

There were some obvious pluses for each side. The United States would obtain limits, indeed reductions, of Soviet SS-20s, Soviet acceptance of the legitimacy of U.S. INF deployments, and have a larger number of INF warheads. Much of the prospective political battle over deployments presumably could be avoided. The Soviets would eliminate the ballistic Pershing II missile, have a monopoly on such “fast flyers” in Europe, and have placed constraints on U.S.-NATO nuclear modernization.

Significant attention was paid to the deniability of the proposal. Each side was supposed to be able to walk away and blame the other. Nitze ultimately averred that 80 percent had come from him and 20 percent from Kvitsinsky, but the emphasis was on a “package” for acceptance or rejection. Likewise, Nitze kept the elements of what he had agreed very closely held, initially producing only a rather vague report on the facts of his session with Kvitsinsky for limited consumption and restricting the specific details of the weaponry proposals only to the most senior members of the United States Government (USG) national security team.

Consequently, while the proposal and its aftermath had the qualities of drama with the “grand old master” (Nitze) opposed by the “dark prince” (Richard Perle) who steals away “the precious” (an early INF agreement), the “package” from the walk in the woods was always problematic. Although I did not know Nitze’s plans in detail at the time, I was sufficiently aware of his thinking to conclude that it would not work. There literally could not be a negotiation on the grounds that we were offering and, I believed that Moscow would reject it. That did not mean the proposal was not worth making: perhaps there

was a chance in 50 that agreement could be obtained on these terms and, since our Kremlinology was always imprecise in an era of leadership transitions, even a long shot is occasionally a winner. Nevertheless, our major objective on the eve of deployments should have been not to fool ourselves over the prospects of the “package” and to lay the groundwork for bringing the Soviets back to the bargaining table when they implemented Kvitsinsky’s depressing but accurate judgment that “you will deploy and we will walk out in indignation.”

The “Walk” Plays Out in Washington

The round ended soon after the walk in the woods. Nitze had arranged that he and Kvitsinsky would communicate while both were in their respective capitals, via a special point of contact at the Soviet Embassy in Washington. As the summer passed without word from Kvitsinsky, opposition to the concept began to grow within the U.S. administration. The stated concern was that the Soviets would reject the overall approach but pocket those aspects that they liked, as concessions the United States had made to the USSR. Others considered that allowing the Soviets to retain ballistic missiles and limiting the United States to more vulnerable and less capable cruise missiles was in effect an unequal qualitative outcome regardless of the numerical equality.

However, it was agreed that when Nitze met with Kvitsinsky in Geneva (or Secretary of State Shultz if the subject came up during his scheduled meeting with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko), he would say the United States had “examined the package and considered it to be unequal because the United States was not permitted to have in Europe any missiles comparable to the SS-20 and was allowed only slow-flying cruise missiles.” The United States also took exception to that part of the “walk in the woods” formula that allowed the Soviets to retain 90 SS-20s in the eastern USSR, which could reach or be moved into range of, targets in NATO Europe. The United States was, however, prepared to continue the exchanges in the “informal” Nitze–Kvitsinsky channel.¹²

Nitze carried out these instructions in Geneva during a meeting with Kvitsinsky on September 29, 1982, the eve of the formal opening of Round III. Kvitsinsky, in turn, gave Nitze a short paper that reiterated the main lines of the Soviet position: full compensation for U.K. and French nuclear forces; no U.S. deployments; no constraints on Soviet INF systems east of the Urals; major reductions in dual-capable

aircraft including those on U.S. aircraft carriers; and full adherence to the concept of “equality and equal security” (a Soviet formulation that sought to provide a philosophical foundation for inequality). Finally, Kvitsinsky told Nitze that he would not continue discussions with Nitze in this channel. In sum Moscow had rejected both the substance of what Kvitsinsky and Nitze had both agreed to present to their capitals, as well as the informal channel that had given birth to the proposal.

Unfortunately, when the episode inevitably leaked, the media portrayed the issue largely in personal terms and placed emphasis on internecine bureaucratic warfare in Washington. The result gave the public the impression that it was Washington’s reaction, and not Moscow’s, that was mainly responsible for the failure of the “walk in the woods.”

Why did Kvitsinsky continue his discussion during the walk with Nitze even after Nitze had said that there would be no point in continuing their conversation if Kvitsinsky had no flexibility on third-country systems? Why did he take the first step down that path, despite his having forecast (correctly, as it turned out) that this phase of the negotiations would end with the United States deploying and the Soviets walking out? Neither Nitze nor I asked him. The whole episode left a bad taste in everyone’s mouth, and there was little interest in pursuing motivations in a failed attempt.

The Third Round: Getting to Stalemate

The formal round would continue and the U.S. side would try to make progress toward convergence in the secondary areas where the sides had similar positions, often based on language agreed in previous arms control agreements. The Soviets, however, held back, arguing essentially that no progress could be made unless the United States accepted their basic approach to an agreement. As the round continued, they began to introduce obstacles to progress—for example, refusing to enter into technical discussions to support their assertions on missile and aircraft ranges. They introduced two “new” basic proposals, both of which were new variants of their unequal outcome approach. These variants would have allowed no U.S. deployments, would have matched Soviet LRINF missiles with U.K. and French nuclear missile forces (once again ignoring Soviet strategic missiles), and would have virtually eliminated U.S. dual-capable aircraft from Europe.

The Soviets also stepped up their threats of countermeasures should NATO proceed with the deployment of U.S. LRINF missiles.

They hinted at further new deployments of their own and of the possibility they might walk out of the negotiations.

It was obvious the Soviets were both seeking to give the impression of a stalemate and creating the reality of one. It was also obvious, as I had believed from the outset, that their real target audience was not their negotiating partners but rather, the European, and to some extent, the U.S. public. The number and size of antideployment demonstrations were attracting wide media attention. The impression was being given of an unstoppable movement. The future of the North Atlantic Alliance and the course of the Cold War would be determined by how well NATO would respond to this challenge.

This page intentionally left blank

LIFE AFTER “THE WALK IN THE WOODS”: THE TALKS BREAK DOWN

SLOGGING ON IN GENEVA

The nature of the failure of the “walk in the woods,” particularly the clear sign that the Soviets would not agree to any approach which permitted U.S. deployments nor one which would result in an equal outcome between the United States and the USSR, reinforced my view that no agreement could be reached until we had U.S. long-range intermediate-range nuclear forces (LRINF) missiles on the ground in Europe. At the same time, we were determined to negotiate seriously and to be seen as doing so. Accordingly, when Round III opened on September 30, 1982, the U.S. delegation continued with its effort to persuade the Soviets at least to acknowledge that NATO had legitimate security concerns as a result of the new Soviet INF deployments and to recognize that the United States was prepared to work out an agreement that met both sides’ concerns. We also continued to seek to make progress in those areas where the positions of the sides had begun to converge, where common language had been agreed to in earlier negotiations, and where the sides could move ahead even if they remained deadlocked on the key issues.

We opened a discussion of the verification elements that would be required in an INF agreement. National Technical Means (NTM)¹ would of course be a major part of an INF verification regime. However, we began to suggest that given the relatively small size and mobility of the systems, something further might be required, as would detailed provisions for the elimination of reduced weapons.

In all these areas, the Soviets, while showing up for the meetings, declined to tango. Their basic argument was that there was no value in working on such subjects without the United States first accepting

the Soviet view on the key issues. On the other hand, they continued their rather effective effort to give the impression of flexibility by pouring the old wine of an unequal outcome into new bottles of varying shapes. A “new” approach was presented in late October designed to reduce the “U.S.-Soviet confrontation” in Europe to zero. But lurking within this verbally promising alternative was the condition that would once again allow the USSR to maintain INF systems equal in number to the sum total of all U.K. and French nuclear forces, leaving no room for any U.S. deployments.

The Soviets did provide some new information concerning their views on shorter-range missiles (SRINF). They proposed that constraints would be quantitative in nature and apply only to missiles with ranges between 500 and 1,000 kilometers. They specifically included the SS-12/22 and the Pershing I, *but they continued to deny the existence* of the SS-23. They also proposed a subceiling for missiles. While it appeared the subceiling would be set at the level of U.K. and French forces, it did represent an acknowledgment that missiles and aircraft should not be treated as equally potent weapons. The overall result of their proposals, however, was to leave intact their basic unequal outcome approach.

In addition to the carrots offered inside the negotiation, Soviet leaders publicly proffered various proposals throughout 1982. These were couched in general terms and looked very enticing on the surface. Some, like Secretary General Brezhnev’s announcement of a unilateral freeze on SS-20 deployments, proved very short-lived. All, upon examination, remained rooted in the fundamental Soviet unequal outcome position: no U.S. deployments, and equation of Soviet LRINF with U.K. and French nuclear forces. But the continued “adjustments” gave the impression of Soviet movement and flexibility, while by contrast, the United States gave an impression of not being willing to consider anything other than the equal zero proposal. Finally, while the Soviets had been brandishing sticks along with carrots, there was a notable increase in the threats of countermeasures that would follow any U.S. deployments. These were clearly designed to frighten European publics.

The Special Consultative Group (SCG) Progress Report aptly summed up the U.S. INF delegation’s view on the status of the negotiations at the end of this “post-walk in the woods” round.

It increasingly became apparent that the Soviet effort in Geneva was aimed to a significant extent, if not primarily, at public opinion. The Soviets tabled several variations of the same proposal—all of which

would have the same essential outcomes—apparently to position themselves to claim that they had shown “flexibility” and had offered a range of solutions to the INF problem. At the same time, they increasingly stymied progress, even on the smallest of issues, in an effort to create the appearance of a negotiating deadlock, the blame for which they attempted to place on the U.S. Their calculation undoubtedly was that such a stalemated negotiation would generate pressure for U.S. concessions and against proceeding with deployments as scheduled.²

There are times in a negotiation when one must stand firmly on a position, and there are elements of a position that one cannot abandon or compromise without undermining the fundamental approach to the negotiation. However, there are also times in a negotiation when one must demonstrate flexibility by offering alternatives that would not breach the fundamental premises of one’s approach to the negotiations, in order to avoid creating a situation outside the negotiations even more harmful to one’s interests than a demonstration of flexibility might engender. Moreover, there are times when one will need to make some changes in the fundamental position in order to come to closure on an outcome which, despite the change in position, is still basically favorable to one’s interests. I believed, even before the round had ended, that we had reached such a point.

We had held firmly to the equal zero approach for a year. It was a strong position and served to underscore the desire of the United States and NATO to pursue the ultimate arms control outcome for these negotiations. But the Soviets were proving adept at transmuting trivial changes into the perception of major shifts and “concessions.” We were equally adept at proving these moves were indeed smoke and mirrors and represented no change in the basic Soviet position. Nevertheless, the dynamics of the exchange placed us on the defensive. We needed to show that we too could propose a change in our basic position. Moreover, Western European political leaders were beginning to suggest that it was becoming time for the United States to make a “new” move of its own.

I had been considering the benefits of offering an interim alternative for some time. Nitze had, in effect, proposed one in the “walk in the woods” formula. Although I did not believe the Soviets would accept any outcome that we might accept until NATO had demonstrated it could deploy, we would need to take an initiative if we were to hold our own in the public arena. But the initiative need not, indeed ought not, compromise our basic position of an equal outcome, in this case formulated as equal in both qualitative and quantitative

terms. The change could be rather simple. We would continue to express a strong preference for a double zero, but now (because of Soviet unwillingness to go that far) we would propose any number below 572—the number of U.S. LRINF scheduled for deployment in Europe. Delegation members were to collectively and individually carry this concept back to Washington after the end of the round on November 30, 1982.

There was some resistance in Washington to moving from an exclusively zero option approach. Opponents contended that it was not what the president wanted, with the accompanying implication that any deviation would be disloyal. Some argued that the situation was, in fact, well in hand, and there was no need for us to make any moves. In the end, agreement was reached that the U.S. position would remain based on the double zero outcome. However, we would be authorized to say that while it was our preferred solution, and surely the best for all concerned, we were prepared to consider alternative outcomes at numbers above zero but below 572.

TRYING SOME VARIATIONS: THE UNITED STATES MOVES FROM THE ZERO OPTION

At the opening of Round IV on January 26, 1983, the United States repeated its belief that an equal zero approach provided the best possible outcome for the negotiations. But without presenting a formal proposal, it emphasized that it was ready to consider reasonable alternatives. The United States set out five criteria, based essentially on the 1979 NATO decision, by which it would judge any proposed outcome:

- (1) An agreement must entail equal rights and limits between the United States and the USSR;
- (2) An agreement should address only the systems of the United States and the USSR;
- (3) An agreement should apply limits to INF missiles regardless of location and should not result in an exportation of the security problem in Europe to the Far East;
- (4) An agreement should not weaken the U.S. contribution to NATO's conventional deterrence and defense; and
- (5) An agreement must be verifiable.³

The five points covered the key issues for the United States. Point 1 is self-evident, an equal outcome. Point 2 goes to the issues of not

including U.K. and French forces.⁴ Point 3 calls for global limits, which meant SS-20s in the eastern USSR must be included in the Soviet tally. Point 4 is linked to blocking Soviet efforts to use the INF negotiations to reduce the number of U.S. aircraft in Europe, which have an essentially conventional role. Point 5 makes clear that effective verification is not a secondary issue for the United States but, rather, is among its primary concerns.

The Soviets chose not to take up the U.S. offer to explore the possibility of reaching an agreement at an equal number above zero. Instead, they continued to proffer their variations on the principal theme of an outcome in which the Soviet LRINF systems would be set at a level that would match U.K. and French forces. They made clear that if the United Kingdom and/or France should increase the quantity or quality of their forces, the Soviets would be authorized to take comparable action. We expressed wonder at how the Soviets could expect the United States to participate in such an agreement with them or why the United Kingdom and France would approve of such a scheme. They repeated their positions, occasionally citing a Russian proverb that "Repetition is the mother of learning." If so, we proved to be unwilling students.

The unproductive round ground on. Perhaps buoyed by the continued antinuclear demonstrations, the Soviets displayed even greater intransigence and halted productive work on secondary issues. They also set out their own "prerequisites" for the main issues:

- (1) An agreement could not entail deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe;
- (2) Negotiations must address only the most "urgent and acute" problem, the situation in Europe;
- (3) Negotiations should encompass all types of "medium-range" systems: land- and sea-based aircraft as well as missiles; and
- (4) Negotiations must "take into account" British and French forces.⁵

Point 1 repeated a core Soviet demand. It essentially claimed the U.S./NATO position was illegitimate and provided no grounds for negotiation. Point 2 sought to leave SS-20s in the eastern portion of the Soviet Union free from any limitations and thus free to attack and/or intimidate NATO Europe. Point 3 sought to use the INF negotiations to eviscerate U.S. conventional aviation in Europe. Point 4 sought to provide a rationale for an unequal outcome in which there would be no U.S. deployments in Europe, and the United Kingdom and France would find their entire nuclear force equated with only a small portion of the overall Soviet nuclear arsenal.

As the round drew to its March 29, 1983, close, the United States formally tabled its interim proposal that we had been informally discussing throughout the round. In so doing, we established for all to see that the United States and its NATO Allies were willing to modify a major element of our initial position, the zero outcome. While the Soviets and the Western opponents of deployments downplayed the move, they could not deny that the United States had shown flexibility. That did not, however, deflect the 500,000 marchers who turned out for an antideployment demonstration in West Germany a few days after the round had ended.⁶

On the other hand, the right-of-center pro-deployment Christian Democratic Union under Helmut Kohl had defeated the increasingly antideployment left-of-center Social Democrats in elections held on March 30. As the election had been fought at least partly on the issue of INF deployments, the prospect of a Bundestag majority in favor of deployments improved the real political situation for NATO and the United States.

Round V

When we returned to Geneva on May 17, 1983, for Round V, we tabled a new draft treaty based on the interim approach. We did not specify a particular number of INF systems, leaving it to the negotiating process to find a mutually acceptable level somewhere between zero and 572. Perhaps buoyed by the well-publicized continued anti-nuclear agitation, and not sufficiently mindful of the political situation in the Bundestag, the Soviets refused to participate in the process.

The United States was determined to press ahead with its efforts to make progress wherever possible even if the main issues remained deadlocked. Accordingly, we indicated that we could accept collateral constraints on U.S. SRINF missile systems and specifically on the Pershing I missile on a reciprocal basis with similar constraints on Soviet SRINF. We suggested these limits could take the form of freezing U.S. Pershing I missiles and Soviet SS-12/22 and SS-23 missiles at their respective levels as of January 1, 1982. By making this proposal, the United States had chosen to consider a freeze and an unequal outcome. This move would have been justified because the constraints were collateral to an agreement on LRINF, which would have been based on an equal outcome.

Nevertheless, the Soviets limited their response to the by now standard argument that no progress could be made on collateral or secondary issues unless the central issues had been resolved. The same

response was made to our efforts to move ahead on verification questions, data exchanges, and work on the noncontroversial elements of a treaty text. To my recollection, the Soviets did not attempt to use our mid-1983 SRINF proposal as an argument for seeking to obtain an unequal outcome in SRINF when that issue came under serious discussion later in the negotiations.

The Soviets continued to offer up variations on their basic themes. On May 3, 1983, Soviet General Secretary Yuri Andropov (who had succeeded Leonid Brezhnev upon the latter's death in November 1982) proposed to negotiate on the basis of warheads as well as missiles. The keystone of this proposal, which was introduced at the opening of the round, was an equal level for only the Soviet Union's LRINF warheads and the combined total of all the warheads on U.K. and French nuclear forces. The Soviets again demanded the right to increase the size of their LRINF systems should the United Kingdom and/or France increase the number of warheads on their nuclear systems. There was no room for U.S. deployments and no equal outcome. The absurdity of the United States and the Soviet Union signing a treaty whose foundation rested upon the actions of nonsignatories, who had already stated they would not be bound by such an agreement, remained as glaring. It virtually trumpeted that the Soviets were not serious (or believed that we would twist the French and British into political pretzels simply to obtain an agreement).

The Soviets did make some adjustments in their regional approach, which would in effect extend the boundaries of Europe somewhat to the east of the 80th degree of longitude. But given the ability of the SS-20 to strike targets in NATO Europe from well behind even the modified line, the change would have no practical effect. Moreover, they continued to ignore the fact that the SS-20 was mobile, transportable, and did not need to be launched from a fixed silo.

The Soviets introduced some confidence-building measures such as prior notification of missile launchings and of take-offs of large numbers of aircraft. While these proposals could have been positive contributions, they refused to participate in a confidence-building working group or to negotiate such measures until the major issues had been resolved. One could only conclude that all of these "new" ideas were meant more for public consumption than for serious negotiation. And indeed, from the Soviet standpoint, given the great stock they had placed in the peace demonstrators' ability to block the deployments and thus grievously damage NATO, it was understandable that they did not wish to let it appear that an agreement might be possible after all.

From their standpoint, the worse the negotiating situation looked, the better the climate for inducing demonstrations.

We all began to sense a change in the Soviets' demeanor. It was almost as if an order had been given to be particularly difficult, unpleasant, and a bit imperious. Indeed, we had on occasion noted that the Soviets not only followed the same policy line—that was to be expected—but that they also seemed to coordinate what personal attitude they would adopt on a given day. These displays of what looked like deliberate efforts at psychological manipulation did not contribute to developing that degree of trust that even cautious, and sometimes cynical, negotiators must have in order to work constructively together.

In any event, the moment of truth was not far off. Round VI would begin on September 6, 1983. It was quite likely that we would still be in session when the first of the U.S. INF missiles were deployed in Europe. Even before the round began, General Secretary Andropov on August 26 tried to give an impression of Soviet flexibility by offering to destroy all SS-20 missiles over the number of all of the British and French missiles if the United States did not deploy new missiles in Europe. Most of this proposal will sound familiar and ought not to require any further rebuttal. What appeared new at first blush, however, was the offer to “destroy” SS-20s as part of an agreement. Once we began to probe the Soviets on this point its “newness” began to evaporate as they were unable to give a clear understanding of precisely what the USSR had in mind. In particular, it appeared that their proposal would allow them to build or stockpile new missiles without constraints.

With the negotiations clearly moving toward a climactic moment, the United States increased the frequency of its consultations with the Allies. Thanks to the support of the U.S. Air Force, I was able to attend SCG meetings and visit Allied leaders in capitals in Europe and return to Geneva on the same day. As a consequence, we could give the Allies timely briefings on the state of the negotiations and receive first hand their reactions and those of the Washington officials at the meetings. These close and frequent consultations helped cement the sense of solidarity between the United States and its NATO Allies as we prepared for the arrival of the U.S. missiles in Europe.

One of the consequences of the consultations was the tabling of three new U.S. proposals on September 22, 1983.

- “Within the context of an agreement providing the right to equal levels of US and Soviet LRINF missiles warheads globally, the United States would consider not offsetting the entire worldwide Soviet LRINF deployment by US LRINF deployments in Europe.”

In other words, we would have the right to deploy LRINF elsewhere up to the global level of SS-20 deployments thus maintaining the principle of an equal global outcome.

- "In the context of an agreement involving significant reductions from current Soviet and planned U.S. deployment levels, the United States is prepared to apportion the reductions . . . between the Pershing II and the ground-launched cruise missile in an appropriate manner." This proposal could help meet specific Soviet concerns regarding the PII and while "appropriate" remained to be defined, it did indicate a U.S. willingness to take those concerns into account, and indicated that we would not reduce only cruise missiles.
- "The United States is prepared to explore equal, verifiable limits on specific types of U.S. land-based aircraft . . . consistent with Allied criteria for an INF agreement." The Soviets had sought, and the United States had been less than enthusiastic about, including aircraft in the negotiations. However, as noted before, given the size of the Soviet airplane inventory compared with that of the United States, they were quite likely to face greater reductions to reach an equal level than would the United States. Nevertheless, the offer did move toward the Soviet position.⁷

The Soviet reaction was swift and negative. They would not discuss any proposals that were based on the deployment of new U.S. INF systems in Europe. To do so would legitimize deployments. The United States in response to the Soviet reaction noted that it had negotiated while the Soviets were deploying SS-20s and pointed out that its position envisaged eliminating its LRINF missiles in the context of an equal agreement.

The Soviets remained adamant. There was nothing to discuss as long as the United States continued to pursue the deployment track. On October 22, 1983, well over a million people participated in antinuclear demonstrations in West Germany, Britain, and Italy. Once again, as we now know, the Soviet position was shaped at least in part by their consideration of the role of the "peace" demonstrators. And once again, the Soviets failed to consider that the governing parties in most NATO countries, and particularly in the basing countries, were supporting deployments.

On October 24, the efforts to intimidate NATO into abandoning the 1979 decision took an additional step. The Soviets announced they had begun moves to deploy unspecified nuclear missiles into Eastern Europe, and they would complete the process if new U.S. missiles were deployed in Western Europe.⁸

On October 26, General Secretary Andropov proposed in a TASS interview that the USSR would reduce SS-20s in Europe to about 140 missiles (each of which carried three warheads). This would bring the SS-20 warhead count to 420, which equated to the number of warheads the Soviets attributed to the United Kingdom and France. He also offered to freeze SS-20 deployments in the eastern USSR and to be flexible as regards aircraft. The package was dependent, however, on no U.S. LRINF deployments in Europe.

The following day, the Soviets tabled the full TASS article in Geneva. The details did not make the package any more attractive.

- The freeze in the east was contingent on a vague “no change in the strategic situation,” and would not go into effect until any treaty had entered into force. Until then they would have time to increase the number of missiles in that region.
- The offer to “reduce” SS-20 warheads to the combined British and French level was based on an inflated estimate of the size of those forces. Indeed, the Soviets acknowledged that given their projections for the future growth in British and French warhead numbers, they might not have to reduce any or only a few SS-20s, and could even increase that number as the United Kingdom and France modernized their forces.
- The airplane offer was also deeply flawed. It was based on aggregating U.S., U.K., and French aircraft, and the Soviets acknowledged only one type of non-U.S. aircraft would be affected by the proposed reductions, meaning that the full weight of the cuts would apply to U.S. forces.
- Finally none of this would be possible if U.S. LRINF missiles were deployed. It was yet another effort to repackage the basic position without changing the substance.⁹

With the deployments of GLCMs and Pershing II missiles scheduled to begin in Europe within weeks, the room for maneuver within the negotiations, rather limited at the outset, had shrunk. But there was still time left for carrying out the struggle in the public arena before the Bundestag took its final vote on deployment and the first Pershing II arrived in West Germany.

THE “WALK IN THE PARK:” A FAILURE IN SOVIET DUPLICITY

The Soviets used the time to try one last ploy to derail NATO’s 1979 decision. In essence it was another unacceptable “equal reductions to

an unequal outcome" scheme, but with a strange twist. In parallel with the formal negotiations, at which the sides continued to exchange views and proposals, an informal channel was opened by Kvitsinsky on Sunday, November 13, 1983, during a meeting with Nitze. Their conversation took place in the Geneva Botanical Garden, and the resulting episode would be known as the "walk in the park."¹⁰

On November 13, the day before the first U.S. INF missiles were due to arrive in Europe, Kvitsinsky (at his request) met with Nitze in the Botanical Gardens. Kvitsinsky, noting he was acting under instructions from Moscow, said "If the U.S. Government were to propose equal reductions of 572 warheads on each side, the Soviet Government would accept that proposal, and it was Moscow's view that the remaining issues could be worked out. The Soviet Government reserved the right to raise the issue of British and French forces in an appropriate future negotiating forum."¹¹

The Soviet approach involved the United States "proposing" that it reduce its INF deployments by 572 warheads, that is, to zero. The Soviets would propose reducing their INF deployments by an equal amount. The Soviets would not demand any "compensation" for British and French forces—that would be the subject of future negotiations. However, Kvitsinsky added, the Soviets wanted the proposal to be made formally by the United States. Nitze's reaction was non-committal but not promising. He did not believe Washington would accept it, and he insisted Kvitsinsky make it clear to Moscow that the idea was Kvitsinsky's and not Nitze's.

In subsequent discussions, both Nitze and Kvitsinsky stated that their respective capitals were aware of and following these informal discussions. When Nitze asked whether Kvitsinsky "had made it clear to Moscow that the idea of equal reductions had been his" and that Nitze had made it clear he did not believe Washington would accept it, he received a fuzzy answer from Kvitsinsky. While we were far from certain Kvitsinsky's approach was genuine and Nitze "had no doubt" Washington would consider it unacceptable even if it were, we all agreed that the United States should respond with a counterproposal rather than a flat rejection, to show willingness to continue the effort to find a solution, and to have the last word if the Soviets walked out.

On the next day, November 14, the United States announced a proposal that each side limit its LRINF to 420 warheads worldwide, a level that corresponded to the number of warheads to which Soviet General Secretary Andropov had suggested the Soviets would limit themselves in Europe. Also on that day, the first cruise missiles arrived at Greenham Common air base in the United Kingdom under the angry eyes of the women peace demonstrators who had been camping

out at the site for some time. The deployments had begun. On the evening of the November 14, the Soviets, without any explanation, sent the traditional end of round farewell gifts for their U.S. counterparts.

Nevertheless, the Soviets continued to participate in the negotiations even following the U.S. deployments. At a scheduled plenary on November 15, the United States formally tabled its 420-warhead proposal. The Soviet reaction was negative. Our proposal, while meeting the oft-repeated Soviet call for equal reductions, allowed U.S. deployments. The Soviet equal reductions argument was thus exposed as bogus. What was left was unbending opposition to either eliminating their own INF weapons or permitting the United States on behalf of NATO to match Soviet warhead numbers at any number from zero on up.

My wife Chris and I had offered to host a reception for the Soviet delegation on November 15. The date had been chosen with the GLCM deployments in mind. I had mentioned to her that we were, of course, wondering how the Soviets would react when the first U.S. INF missiles arrived in Europe. She suggested that we invite them to a reception timed for the anticipated arrival. If they came, it would suggest that both formal and informal talks could continue at least for a while. If they turned down the invitation or did not show up, we could hold the traditional end of round party.

The Soviets came. In so doing, and in continuing to negotiate after the GLCMs had arrived in the United Kingdom, they once again demonstrated that their real target was not deployments *per se* but rather where the deployments took place and perhaps also the particular missiles being deployed. Our conversations with the Soviets reinforced this analysis. It was Germany and the Pershing II (which coincidentally was only being deployed in Germany, as a replacement for the Pershing I) that were at the sensitive core of the Soviet political and military position.

The final vote of approval for INF deployments by the Bundestag had yet to take place. Until then the Soviets would stay in Geneva. But I believed that once the Bundestag had given its approval they would, as Kvitsinsky had predicted at that dinner shortly before the “walk in the woods,” walk out of the negotiations in indignation.

As Nitze described his discussions with Kvitsinsky, the emphasis the Soviet negotiator had placed on incorporating the concept of equal reductions to an unequal level intrigued me. Could we perhaps find a number combining missiles, launchers, and warheads, which would permit an equal reduction to an equal outcome? True, Kvitsinsky had

reiterated to Nitze that the Soviets would only accept an equal reductions approach if it led to zero for the United States and a sizable contingent of SS-20s (in one formulation the number would have been 120 missiles or 360 warheads) for the USSR. But, given the lop-sided nature of such an outcome, our offer of using equal reductions to reach an equal outcome would be seen as reasonable.

Such an offer could be based on existing Soviet numbers and the 572 missiles that the United States would ultimately deploy absent an agreement. It might be possible by taking advantage of the fact that each SS-20 launcher carried one missile with three warheads, each Pershing II launcher carried one missile with one warhead, and each cruise missile launcher contained four missiles with one warhead each. I threw out the challenge at an internal delegation meeting. Our lawyer, Raymond Waters, came up with a solution, and we sent the counterproposal back to Washington for consideration.

Before Washington could respond to our suggestion, the Soviets moved to spring their trap. On November 17, 1983, the Soviet Ambassador in Bonn, Vladimir Semenov, delivered a note to the Foreign Ministry claiming that Nitze had proposed an equal reductions scheme; that Moscow had looked favorably upon it, but that Washington had turned it down. Moreover, they misrepresented their own proposal, and put the lie to their contention that this was all a nefarious American plot, by reintroducing the direct link to U.K. and French forces—something the United States and NATO had adamantly opposed. The trap failed to spring because the Germans and other NATO members had already been informed by the United States of the real situation.

The U.S. INF delegation had been keeping Washington, and through Washington our Allies, fully abreast of the Soviet moves both in the formal negotiations and in the informal "walk in the park" channel. Kvitsinsky's continual effort to suggest that while he had put forward the proposal, Nitze should be seen as the originator had put us on our guard. The Soviets also leaked their story to the press, but here as well Allied spokespersons were ready to refute the false tale. The effort to entrap us failed, indeed once exposed, their deception backfired.

On Saturday, November 19, Nitze asked Kvitsinsky to meet him in our delegation's offices. There he delivered to Kvitsinsky the official U.S. rejection of the very unequal Soviet proposal to maintain a force of 120 SS-20s with the U.S. LRINF level set at zero. He also confronted Kvitsinsky with the evidence of Soviet duplicity during the "walk in the park" episode. At that point, Kvitsinsky walked out of Nitze's office.¹²

I looked up from my desk to see Kvitsinsky leaving Nitze's office in a somewhat disoriented daze. I was aware of the message he would receive but assumed that, while he would not like it, he could hardly have expected otherwise. I was surprised, therefore, by his pale and downcast mien. He seemed to be taking the outcome very personally. I wondered whether he feared that the failure of the "walk in the park," following the failure of the "walk in the woods" (in which I believed he must have gone well beyond the basic Soviet position of not accepting any U.S. deployments and even further beyond his prediction to me that the negotiations would ultimately fail), would have deep and negative personal repercussions for him.

I escorted him out of the Botanic building. He remained crestfallen and unusually quiet on the way out except to say "Everything is finished." When we reached the front door, the fog was as thick as Kvitsinsky's gloom. The forecast had called for clearer skies in the mountains. "The sun is probably shining in the Jura," I said. "Perhaps you can take some time off after you file your report and take your wife up there with you." I never found out whether he did.

ALLIANCE MANAGEMENT: KEEPING NATO INFORMED AND THE GERMANS COMMITTED

Beginning with Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld's briefing of the North Atlantic Council (NAC) on the Soviet military buildup in the summer of 1976, including the sensitive intelligence information on the SS-20 capabilities and deployments, our efforts to ensure that the Allies were kept abreast of INF developments in Washington and Geneva in a timely manner, and our willingness to listen to their concerns and adopt their suggestions when they had a better idea, had been instrumental in maintaining a united NATO. In turn that unity provided the political underpinning for the U.S. negotiating position. Now with the talks heading for a Soviet walkout and the battle for public support about to take a new turn, we and our colleagues, in Washington and at our embassies in NATO capitals, worked to ensure that the Alliance consultative mechanisms were fully employed.

On November 19, 1983, the SPD held an internal vote on the INF question. The extent of the party's shift away from the moderate positions of Helmut Schmidt, who had been among the first to point out the growing Soviet threat to NATO, was exemplified by the result. The party voted overwhelmingly to condemn deployment of U.S. LRINF in West Germany.¹³

The Soviets could look upon the SPD reversal as a major accomplishment. It demonstrated the extent to which the fabric of the NATO defense consensus had been damaged by the debate over INF. But that "victory" would not be definitive. Everyone involved with the INF issue realized that the outcome of the Bundestag debate, which would begin on November 21, would be decisive for the future of the deployments, the negotiations, and the Alliance.

On November 22, I flew to Brussels to give the NATO SCG members, who had come from their capitals, a first-hand status report including our estimate of what would happen next. I noted that it had been over a week since the GLCMs had arrived in the United Kingdom, and that the Soviets had, nevertheless, continued to meet with us. However, Germany was the key for the Soviets. NATO members should thus be ready by the end of the day with an agreed Alliance public position predicated upon a Soviet walkout, following a positive Bundestag vote for deployment. By the time I returned to Geneva from Brussels that night, the Bundestag had made its decision. By a vote of 286 to 226, it agreed to deploy Pershing II and GLCMs on German soil. The next day the first Pershing II missile parts arrived in West Germany.

THE SOVIET WALKOUT

In accord with our standard negotiating procedures, a plenary was scheduled for November 23. It would take place at the Botanic. In keeping with protocol, Kvitsinsky would speak first. At Nitze's suggestion, we had prepared three different responses depending upon whether the Soviets left open any possibility of continuing the talks, or laid down conditions that would make continuation difficult, or simply refused to continue the negotiations. The plenary meeting did not take long. Kvitsinsky's statement seemed clear. As far as the Soviets were concerned, the negotiating round was over, and no date would be agreed for resumption. Yet there was something in their statement that sounded to me like a small ambiguity. But this sliver of light was not sharp enough to merit my suggesting we could consider the Soviet statement anything other than a clear refusal to continue negotiating.

Commenting on the Soviet delegation's appreciation of this moment, senior Soviet interpreter Palazchenko wrote, "The delegation had come up with what seemed an elegant way of withdrawing from the negotiations. Kvitsinsky prepared and cleared with Moscow a statement saying that because the Americans were beginning deployment

of their missiles, and the overall strategic situation was therefore changing rapidly, the Soviet Union would have to reconsider its position in a fundamental way. The Soviet delegation was thus declaring that the current round of talks was over and that it would not set a date for resumption of the talks.” “Without saying so, we felt we left the door open—just a little.”¹⁴ The language did carry with it a sense of “we will review and then determine our position,” and it did not say these talks are over for good unless the United States meets some stated condition. However, the overwhelming thrust of the statement was negative and the Soviets were walking out. Nitze read out the response prepared in the event the Soviet statement was a clear refusal to continue negotiations. Our statement held the Soviets responsible for the breakdown and said the United States remained ready to continue the talks. When he had finished, the delegates rose, shook hands formally, and separated.¹⁵

As usual I rode down the elevator with Kvitsinsky and Detinov. I expressed the hope that they would eventually return to the table. Kvitsinsky was not at all hopeful. We reached the front door and were immediately engulfed by a sea of journalists and cameras. I stayed long enough to note Kvitsinsky’s remarks to the media, which tracked their plenary statement and sought to place blame for the breakdown on the United States. Then I headed back to the U.S. delegation meeting room, where our team was preparing our own statement for the media and our report to Washington.

“The following day,” Palazchenko wrote, the Soviet delegation watched an announcer on Moscow television “read a blunt statement by Andropov” regarding the end of the negotiations. There was “no diplomatic language, no openings left.” The “U.S. deployments made it impossible for the Soviet side to continue the talks; talks could only resume when U.S. missiles were withdrawn from Europe. It was, of course, a totally unrealistic demand. . . .” “Most of us were unpleasantly surprised, and some even appalled, by the statement’s crudeness.” Judging from Palazchenko’s comments, it is possible to conclude that the Soviet delegation may have considered the walkout itself a strategic error.¹⁶ Historically, a “walkout” has always left the remaining party holding the high ground for public relations purposes.

In reality it proved so to be. The Soviets were in a bit of a quandary. If they had continued to negotiate despite their dire threats and warnings of the negative consequences of U.S. deployments, they would have been seen as having fully legitimized those deployments. Such an approach would have cut the rug out from under the peace movement.

Even worse, however, it would have appeared that NATO had successfully called their bluff.

The same logic applied to the Soviet statement ending the talks. A softer statement that held open the prospect of further negotiations without placing an "unrealistic demand" for withdrawal on the United States would have encountered strong opposition from hard liners and from those who could argue that such a more nuanced approach could undercut the antideployment "peace movement." On the other hand, the harder the language, the more it allowed the United States to be seen as the reasonable party, ready to keep on talking without conditions. One can extrapolate from Palazchenko's comments that the Soviet delegation concluded (rightly in my view) that a softer approach would have had wider appeal in the West and would thus have best advanced the Soviet Union's political goals.

One member of that delegation, General Nikolay N. Detinov, has also commented on the question of the Soviet withdrawal from the negotiations. Writing in 1995 (along with Aleksandr' G. Savel'yev), he noted that "the decision to withdraw from the talks was reached by the Politburo." "There were no disagreements because of the genuine concern by the leadership and agencies over the threat posed by the American missile deployments. . . . [U]nder the conditions of such an increase in U.S. capabilities, no reduction in Soviet strategic forces was possible." "It was agreed that if the talks were to continue under conditions of a U.S. deployment, the Soviet Union stood to lose politically and militarily."¹⁷

Soviet Calculations and U.S. Assessments: Hope for Resumed Negotiations

The Soviets also probably assumed that a walkout would have given the impression of heightened tensions and inspired the "peace" movement to intensify pressure on elected NATO governments to refuse deployments. Detinov and Savel'yev concluded, however, that, "It is now clear that the Soviet side overestimated the potential of the antiwar/antimissile movement in Europe, which, in fact, failed to decisively influence the American and NATO plans." They also faulted the Soviet leadership for failing to analyze the consequence of a walkout and for having suspended the talks with "no clear understanding of how they might be resumed."¹⁸

We were at a disadvantage in not knowing what was happening inside the Kremlin compared with the Soviets' knowledge of what was happening along the corridors of power in Washington. The sort of

insight presented by Palazchenko and Detinov in their books was not always available. We had to rely on intelligence estimates and the careful analysis and interpretation of Soviet statements. The Soviets had these same facilities plus the U.S. media, ever ready to pounce on a good story of internecine warfare among the Washington agencies, which all too often fought out their battles in the public arena.

The day after the negotiations ended was Thanksgiving. I spent part of the holiday preparing for a series of briefings beginning with a return trip on Friday to NATO headquarters and then continuing with Allied leaders and the media in Belgium, the Netherlands (both of whose parliaments had not yet voted on deployment), France, and Norway. I would continue to make the rounds in the coming months. The negotiations had broken down, but the INF battle would go on.

The main lines separating the parties had been identified during the preliminary talks that had taken place in late 1980. From November 1981 to November 1983, we had gone over the same terrain, both sides refining their arguments in support of their positions and refining their attacks on the other side's approach. While we had identified some common ground on secondary issues, we remained fundamentally at odds on the key differences, and, in particular, whether the outcome would be an equal one for the United States and the Soviet Union.

Despite this impasse, I was rather confident the Soviets would eventually return to the negotiating table. If they stayed away, they would be seen as the uncooperative party, while in the meantime the deployments would continue. If they returned to the negotiations, their political flank would be covered, while they could pursue their efforts to weaken the resolve of those NATO governments whose parliaments had not yet formally voted to accept deployments. Although the "peace movement" had failed to prevent deployment in Germany, there was still a possibility it, and the Soviets, might succeed somewhere else. There would be no chance of this occurrence if the Soviets continued to boycott the Geneva negotiations.

They would, therefore, return. Indeed, as Savel'yev and Detinov put it years later ". . . At a certain point in time, it became clear to the Soviet Union that the pressure tactic, which seemed so promising in 1983, had been exhausted, and that a more realistic course was required."¹⁹

Lessons Learned from the Walks

With the "walk in the woods" and its less meaningful sequel ("walk in the park"), the first INF effort came to a conclusion. The effort was not

without merit; the negotiations were far more than a political rationale for "selling" INF deployments to fearful or skeptical Europeans. The United States would clearly have preferred an outcome that avoided both the massive costs of production/deployment and the political costs that we knew foreign basing would entail. Consequently, there are some interesting subconclusions from these final efforts.

First, the "walk in the woods" demonstrated the new limits to personal diplomacy. Ambassador Paul Nitze was perhaps the last of the World War II generation of mandarin diplomats. Others of his ilk were men such as Ellsworth Bunker and David Bruce. These were men (and they were all men) who through a combination of family heritage, "old school tie" elite education, and close personal-social-business-political relations with national authorities had developed over the decades a reputation for intelligence and perception on the issues of the day. (To illustrate Nitze's personal credibility in Washington, he was one of the few individuals for whom a naval vessel was dedicated while he was still alive.) The point of employing such men as high-level interlocutors in key assignments was the *personal* credibility they brought to a discussion. It harks far back into history when a diplomat, an envoy, the king's representative had the personal authority to make an agreement and commit his government and nation to it. To be sure, this authority was also a reflection of reality; with no quick communication, decision-making and the authority to make decisions moved far away from capitals. And indeed, times have changed.

We assumed, probably incorrectly in retrospect, that Kvitsinsky carried comparable personal authority and that, as was the case with Nitze, his "word was his bond," and you could take his commitment "to the bank." Or that if he were willing to engage in such a discussion, as a supercautious survivor of the Soviet system, he had assured himself of support for some predictable U.S. compromises.

What we found, however, that politics now trumps personality. It was not that Nitze's proposal was radical, let alone wrong. There remain technical and political arguments in its favor: for example, the PII was never really a "military" weapon, so eliminating it was not a tactical military problem. The proposal was not, however, sufficiently political in the larger sense and not one which other, more conservative elements in Washington were prepared to accept. Thus, in many respects, we were fortunate that the Soviets had equal level of difficulty in accepting the obtainable agreement. It was too much for Moscow to swallow, and Kvitsinsky had neither the personal nor party credibility (nor, probably, the desire to put his career on the line) for the agreement.

Moreover, there was an “NIH” (not invented here) factor in play. Bureaucrats are suspicious about proposals sprung on them; senior bureaucrats are concerned that bright new ideas that have not survived long inter- and intra-agency testing are more likely to be a problem than a solution. Reversing long decided decisions (produce Pershing II missiles) and stopping long agreed efforts (full U.S. INF deployments) looked more like dangerous gambles than safe bets. And for all of his articulate persuasiveness, Nitze lacked powerful Washington allies and had accumulated opponents with greater access to President Reagan and as strong a tactical case for delay as Nitze had for his compromise.

Finally, the failure of the “walk in the woods” demonstrated that getting something for nothing is not diplomacy (“the art of the possible”). If one side is overwhelmingly powerful or the other side overwhelmingly desperate, perhaps one can get something for nothing. But that is rarely the case for modern negotiations that, if not always between states that are equals, are usually between those that are comparables. Thus, although we presented our proposals adroitly and from multiple directions, they were still an effort to convince the Russians to come down from a position of power to a position of equivalence. They would pay the cost of eliminating systems while we would avoid the cost of building them. Had the Soviets made us a “reverse of the coin” proposal, I doubt that Washington would have turned other than a gimlet eye upon it. Consequently, we were disappointed (but hardly surprised) when the proposal met no resonance in Moscow. Before we could expect the Soviets to address our proposals seriously, we needed to put serious counters on the board. And in this case, these counters were to be INF systems throughout the basing countries with all of the political pain entailed.

PART II

This page intentionally left blank

PICKING UP THE PIECES: A NEW BEGINNING

FROM GENEVA TO VIENNA AND BACK AGAIN

The actual deployment of U.S. INF missiles in Europe marked the end of an important phase of the INF saga. With the missiles, their support equipment, facilities, and troops on the ground, much of the wind had gone out of the opponents' sails. They had failed to block deployment. Nevertheless, while interest in INF had fallen well below the level it had reached before the NATO deployments and the Soviet walkout, the issue continued to attract attention. With the military part of the two-track decision now a *fait accompli* in all but Belgium and the Netherlands, and with the prospects for deployment in those two countries looking more likely than not, much of that interest was focused on the prospects for the negotiating track.

As time passed, it became increasingly obvious that by walking out of the talks, and thus appearing unwilling even to try to find a political solution to the INF issue, the Soviets had placed themselves and the Western opponents of the 1979 NATO decision at a severe disadvantage. In addition, the key political and military elements that underlay the negotiations remained unresolved and could still provide useful material for Alliance splitting. Thus, I remained persuaded that the Soviets would become uncomfortable in the dead-end in which they had placed themselves. I was also persuaded that they had not abandoned their effort to use the INF issue as a device for undercutting the Alliance. Sooner or later they would come back to the negotiating table.

For a period after the Soviet walkout, I remained in Geneva, using it as a base from which to visit European capitals and meet with government officials, political leaders, journalists, and academic specialists. I sought to underscore our continued readiness to negotiate and, with the recognition that the end of the talks had not marked the end of the

struggle for European “hearts and minds” and that the talks were more likely than not to start up again at some point, to keep the U.S. and NATO position before these opinion makers and the public in general.

I believe this effort helped maintain support for our position in the wake of the Soviet walkout and while the deployments continued, but it was obviously a temporary effort. In early March 1984, I heard that the position of head of the U.S. delegation to the Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions (MBFR) negotiations covering NATO and Warsaw Pact conventional forces in Europe would be coming open at the end of the summer. I indicated an interest in the position and in August I arrived in Vienna where the MBFR negotiations were located to take up the work.

These negotiations sought to prepare a treaty that would lead to reductions in NATO and Warsaw Pact conventional forces. They had been underway for over a decade at that point. While the completion of a treaty had proved elusive, the existence of the talks helped to calm the overall atmosphere and provided a forum in which the participants could gain a better understanding and appreciation of the other side’s views and positions and the concerns and goals which underlay them. Organizationally, the MBFR negotiations had some structural defects. For one thing, France refused to participate and warned that its forces and territory must not be taken into consideration. For another, it was decided early on that the talks would concentrate on a rather small area of central Europe comprising West Germany and the Benelux on our side and East Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia on the other. This meant that if U.S. and Canadian forces were negotiated out of the area, they had to withdraw 5,000 kilometers; but withdrawn Soviet forces needed only to go back a few hundred kilometers.

Indeed, while at NATO, I had undertaken a study of the Soviet/Warsaw Pact positions and proposals at MBFR. Among the conclusions was that one of the objectives of many of those positions and proposals was not only to gain negotiating advantage, but also to serve as vehicles for driving wedges between the Allies. Not exactly a goal that the United States and its Allies could be expected to share.

After our arrival in Vienna, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), the so called Stockholm Conference, which was considering the development of confidence-building measures (CBMs) in Europe, announced that it would hold a major meeting in that city to consider the broad aspects of European security issues. The CSCE was charged with this activity and had begun to develop and implement confidence-building measures such as exchanging observers at NATO and Warsaw Pact maneuvers.

Although MBFR and CSCE had different mandates, there was an element of overlap in their activities. It was conceivable that both organizations meeting in the same town at the same time might cause observers to question the need for two such organizations and might draw unfavorable attention to the fact that while CSCE had some concrete achievements, MBFR, despite the positive aspects of its activity noted above, had no such achievements. Was it possible that MBFR might be reaching the point where, the parties, having concluded that it had done as much good as it could, might consider its demise?

With this in mind, I commissioned a study by the delegation testing alternative futures for the negotiations. Leo Reddy, a career Senior Foreign Service Officer with extensive experience in European affairs, put the study together. Rather long compared to most government studies of this nature, "Leo's big paper" was a comprehensive overview of the reasons why MBFR was founded (which included providing an alternative to former Senator Mike Mansfield's call for a drastic reduction in U.S. forces in Europe); what its objectives ought to be, given the overall political military situation; and the options for action within the negotiations.

We listed several of these as "quick and dirty," a U.S.-Soviet agreement to reduce each side's forces by 10 percent, declare the negotiations a success, and end them; "fold, spindle, and mutilate," that is, agree to disagree and end the talks with minimal recriminations; "death and transfiguration," that is, agree to bring the talks to an end but also agree to reconfigure the negotiations in a manner that would make a successful outcome more likely. This last option, my personal favorite, is what in effect happened when MBFR was replaced by the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) negotiations, which did produce an agreement.

Any such agreement was still a glimmer in the future. While we were completing the paper, my own future was about to take another turn. Both the United States and the Soviet Union had continued the verbal sparring over arms control issues that had followed the Soviet walkout. The profile of this sparring was raised by President Reagan in a September 24, 1984, speech to the United Nations in which he called for constructive negotiations with the USSR on arms control.¹

BACK TO INF: ONCE MORE INTO THE BREACH

On November 22, 1984, the United States and the USSR announced agreement to begin negotiations on nuclear and space weapons.

These negotiations would lead off with a meeting in Geneva between Secretary Shultz and Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko in early January.² It was clear that the Soviets were moving to reopen bilateral arms control negotiations with the United States and that INF would certainly be among them. I naturally wondered whether I would have a part in the renewed talks or would stay in Vienna. Having devoted so many years to INF, I hoped I would be able to participate in the final chapter; but my work was in Vienna, and I made no inquiries concerning any future reopening of the INF talks.

By mid-December, however, after receiving phone calls from President Reagan and Secretary Shultz, I was back in Washington to begin transitioning from MBFR to the renewed INF negotiations. The renewed negotiations would, however, be undertaken in a different negotiating framework.

Organizing the Negotiations

While the INF and the Strategic Arms Reductions Talks (START) had generally followed the same schedule with the negotiating rounds more or less timed for the same periods, the two talks proceeded on their own timetables and without any open linkage between them. Now, the two sides agreed to organize the negotiations in the form of a single Nuclear and Space Talks (NST) delegation with three autonomous negotiating groups: INF, START, and Defense and Space (DST).

Ambassador Max Kampeleman would head the overall NST delegation and also serve as Chief Negotiator for DST issues. Senator John Tower was designated the Chief Negotiator for START, and I would be the Chief Negotiator for INF. All three of us (and eventually our deputies) would have ambassadorial rank. Moreover, we were provided with a suite of offices on the seventh floor of the State Department within the area set aside for the secretary and deputy secretary of state, thus underscoring the importance the administration was placing on the negotiations.

There was indeed a conceptual linkage among the three subjects, and an argument can be made that perhaps all three negotiations might benefit from taking advantage of any synergy that could be created by extending the negotiations across subject lines. However, the Soviet interest in linkage went beyond the conceptual realm. From an INF standpoint, linkage could provide the Soviets with an opportunity to maneuver among the three negotiations in a manner that could be manipulated to give the impression that the United States

was trading off concessions in INF where NATO European interests were directly involved, in order to gain advantage in START and D&S, which dealt only with U.S. and Soviet strategic relations. The issue was not new.

The negotiations resumed in Geneva on March 11, 1985. Two days prior to their opening, Soviet President Konstantine Chernenko had died. His prompt replacement by Second Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Mikhail Gorbachev would prove to be a decisive development in the ultimate outcome of the INF negotiations and in the history of the Cold War.

Also of interest, the day after the negotiations resumed, Belgium announced the arrival of its first INF missiles. Only the Netherlands remained to complete the program, and while it was not certain, it seemed likely the Dutch would do their part as well. The timing could not have been better. The visible proof of continued NATO solidarity on the INF issue improved the prospects for obtaining an agreement along the lines NATO had laid out in 1979. However, to achieve that goal we now had to ensure that the INF negotiations could in fact move ahead without being derailed by START or DST considerations.

The Concept of Linkage and the INF Negotiations

The question of whether an agreement covering U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons with ranges below those of strategic weapons (5,500 kilometers) should be the subject of a separate agreement or folded into an agreement covering both strategic and intermediate range nuclear weapons was a factor in both the SALT I and SALT II negotiations.

In essence, the Soviets sought to include U.S. intermediate-range systems based in Europe, arguing that since they could reach the Soviet Union, they had a strategic effect on Soviet security. However, since comparable Soviet systems could not reach targets in the United States, they should not be part of the equation. The United States countered that its intermediate-range weapons were in Europe to protect its Allies against what, for them, were strategic Soviet systems even if these Soviet systems had ranges below 5,500 kilometers. Therefore, any agreement that included intermediate range U.S. systems should include comparable Soviet systems.

Efforts to reach an agreement on these systems during the SALT negotiations failed with the two sides agreeing to disagree and setting intermediate-range systems aside for another day. The question of

whether to have a separate INF negotiation or to fold it into a SALT III negotiation was also touched on during the NATO discussions leading to the 1979 "dual-track" decision. That decision specified that "Any future limitations on U.S. systems principally designed for theater missions should be accompanied by appropriate limitations on Soviet theater systems." It also specified that "Limitations on U.S. and Soviet long-range theater nuclear systems should be negotiated bilaterally in the SALT III framework in a step by step approach."

However, the SALT II Treaty was never ratified and thus the SALT III framework never materialized. Nevertheless, given the sensitive political situation underlying the INF issue (including the need to overcome the arguments of an active and vociferous European opposition to NATO's 1979 decision to deploy U.S. intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe and to negotiate reductions in U.S. and Soviet INF missile systems) made it imperative that once the United States and the Soviets agreed to negotiate, the talks should begin regardless of the status of the negotiations on strategic weapons.

As a consequence, while there was an obvious conceptual link between the INF and SALT/START issues, the INF negotiations began six months before START I opened. In time it became apparent that keeping the two negotiations on separate tracks was very much in the United States' interest. Separate negotiations made it more difficult for the Soviets to make Alliance-splitting proposals; for example, offering concessions to the United States in the START context in return for U.S. concessions in INF that could be perceived as damaging to our European allies.

The Soviets had accepted separate INF and START negotiations during the period of talks between 1981 and the Soviet walkout in 1983. However, the apparently growing prospect of the U.S. development of an antimissile strategic defense network added a new dimension to the relationships between intermediate-range and strategic nuclear weapons. In essence, the Soviets saw the potential for derailing the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) by holding a START treaty hostage to U.S. acceptance of Soviet views on the space defense issue. If the strategy were successful, the Soviets could drive a hard bargain on START while sabotaging SDI.

U.S. officials, however, also saw some benefit in a negotiation that linked START and SDI. Clearly there is a strong conceptual linkage between strategic offense and defense. The value and role of SDI can most effectively be explained in the context of shifting the means to deter attack on the United States away from a near total reliance on the credible threat of a U.S. counterattack, to a combination of a

counterattack and a defensive force that could credibly prevent an aggressor's weapons from reaching their targets. Linking the two negotiations would help the United States underscore the validity of this concept, from its standpoint.

However, the Soviets would be at a distinct disadvantage in a situation where they had not also developed a credible defensive force. In those circumstances, the United States could blunt a Soviet attack while its offensive forces could attack the Soviets without having to face a credible defensive force. The strong Soviet objections to SDI demonstrated a lack of confidence that they could develop such a force. Under these circumstances, the prospects of achieving an agreement on SDI were not good.

By late 1984, it became clear that the Soviets, having realized that their November 1983 walkout from the INF and START negotiations was a political blunder, were now ready to return to Geneva. Secretary of State George Shultz, having laid out the realities and advantages of SDI-START linkage, was authorized by President Reagan to explore with the Soviets the possibility of discussing "the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative and Soviet ballistic missile defense programs in the context of the relationship between offensive and defensive capabilities."³

During hard-fought negotiations with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko in early January 1985, Shultz reached agreement to begin new negotiations on nuclear and space arms. The sides agreed "that the subject of the negotiations will be a complex of questions concerning space and nuclear arms, both strategic and intermediate range, with all the questions considered and resolved in their interrelationship." It was also agreed that the "negotiations will be conducted by a delegation from each side, divided into three groups." The talks would cover INF, START, and SDI.⁴ The agreement represented an artful example of "bifurcated clarity." It held open the potential for both a grand package involving all three negotiating tracks and for separate agreements. What constituted "interrelationship" was left open for the negotiators to decide.

As for the INF negotiations, although key Allied governments had by this time successfully overcome strong domestic opposition to the deployment of U.S. INF weapons, the issue and especially our handling of the negotiations remained politically sensitive. Any indication that the United States was risking the prospects of achieving an INF agreement in order to complete a START or SDI agreement would be used by Europeans who had opposed INF deployments to question our good faith in the negotiations and would be politically harmful to those European leaders who had supported the 1979 NATO decision.

This sensitivity became even more pointed with the ascent to power in Moscow of the media savvy Mikhail Gorbachev. His wooing of the Western European public, including visions of constructing "our common European home," showed that the Soviets had not given up their hopes of driving wedges between the United States and its NATO partners.

In addition, as noted above, there was a broad conceptual linkage among the three negotiating areas. Both U.S. and Soviet INF missiles could be said to have an effect on the strategic situation even if they did not meet the definition of a strategic missile, that is, a range of 5,500 kilometers or beyond. Soviet SS-20s deployed in the Soviet Far East could hit Alaska (and could, if deployed in the Anadyr region, reach the northwestern corner of Washington state). U.S. INF missiles deployed in Europe to counter Soviet INF weapons targeting U.S. Allies and U.S. bases in Europe could reach targets in the European portion of the Soviet Union including key command and control centers, which could well have had a strategic function.

U.S. SDI deployments, however, were not a particular threat to Soviet INF missiles. Thus the link between SDI and INF was not as salient as that between SDI and strategic offensive forces. It would, therefore, be difficult to explain to our NATO Allies why an INF agreement was being held up for lack of an agreement on SDI, particularly when the Allies were somewhat skeptical about the concept and utility of SDI.

Moreover, developing a grand package balancing the needs of both the United States and the Soviet Union within and among INF, START, and Space/Defense would be a very difficult and time-consuming task. While the deployments were going forward, the political situation in some of the NATO countries remained tense. A delay in reaching an INF agreement because of the inability to reach an agreement on SDI would exacerbate the situation. Taking all the factors into account, it seemed to me that dealing with INF separately held the greatest promise for obtaining a sound and durable INF agreement and its associated long-term political and security benefits, and would not impair work in the START and DST negotiating forums.

THE U.S. TEAM: MANAGING THE BUREAUCRATS

Dealing with these substantive questions was complicated, however, by the internal U.S. procedural arrangements that flowed from the

January 1985 Geneva agreement between Shultz and Gromyko. Having agreed at Geneva to conduct the negotiations by “a delegation from each side, divided into three groups,” responsibility for the conduct of negotiations in each of the groups appeared clear—it would rest with the chief negotiator for that group: Kampelman for the Strategic Defense group; Tower for START; and myself for INF. It soon became apparent that answering the questions of how, when, or if to consider and resolve the three subject areas in their “interrelationship” was less clear.

Kampelman was designated “Head of Delegation” for the Nuclear and Space Talks, (NST) and carried the additional title of “Chief of Mission.” The latter meant that the NST delegation would be afforded the same type of administrative arrangements as an embassy: a decided advantage in terms of obtaining administrative support.

During a press conference following the announcement of the U.S. negotiators, Secretary Shultz was asked about the duties of the “Head of Delegation” and the relationship of the “Head of Delegation” to the three specific negotiations. “Would you say, then, that Senator Tower and Mr. Glitman will report to Mr. Kampelman who in turn, will report to you, who will report to the President. Is that the chain of command?” The secretary replied, “The chain of command is that each of these heads of delegation, or heads of these groups, will get their instructions directly from the President. Now the process of developing the instructions for each session is obviously something that we all participate in.” “But in the end, there will be instructions for each one of these talks . . . Now I think that it has been very clear to us for some time—and the Soviets have put a lot of emphasis on this point too—that there are very clear relationships among these different sets of issues. So we expect that it will be important in their conduct that there be a lot of comparing notes across the different groups. And Ambassador Kampelman on the spot will be the person whose responsibility it is to coordinate that and be sort of the convener.”⁵

Secretary Shultz’s reply made clear that each of the three negotiators would bear the responsibility for their specific negotiations and have their own channel of communications with Washington. But what would need to be coordinated, and the definition of the role of the “Head of Delegation” as a “convener,” was less clear, especially if there was no “grand package” to coordinate.

The head of delegation would, in Shultz’s words, convene meetings of all three groups when or if these were considered desirable, presumably in situations where there was some overlap between the

work of the three groups. In practice, while there were two to three joint plenary sessions per round, involving all three groups, there was never any real overlap between INF and the other groups except for the Soviets on again/off again linkage of an INF agreement with the satisfactory conclusion of an SDI agreement, nor did the joint plenary sessions have any markedly positive impact on resolving INF issues or on the START–SDI relationship.

Neither John Tower, Ronald Lehman (who succeeded Tower as the START negotiator), nor I considered these joint plenary sessions useful. While we recognized that they were in essence mandated by the Shultz-Gromyko agreement, we sought to minimize their content and frequency. Each of the three negotiations was complex and detailed. INF and later START grew more so as those talks moved closer to resolution. Putting an agreement together in one of these areas would be difficult enough. Trying to trade off concessions among them would greatly delay or even block a final agreement.

While some of us questioned the merits of holding joint plenary sessions, the Soviets were anxious to hold them: in part perhaps because they hoped they would improve the prospect of embroiling the United States and NATO in an effort to roll up the three negotiations into a single grand package. The head of delegation would be responsible for putting such a grand package together, if it were to materialize.

Seeing “himself as the one with prime responsibility” while having “no intention of interfering with how (the other negotiators) pursued their own substantive areas of responsibility,” yet at the same time expressing his “determination to be in charge,” Kampleman set up a small staff that would serve him in his capacity as head of the NST delegation. It would, he wrote, help avoid “unnecessary competition, misunderstandings, and jockeying for position.” Yet those negative aspects would be minimized to the extent that each of the three groups concentrated on their specific issue and intensified to the extent that gains in one area might have to trade off for losses in another.⁶

One of the reasons [why] I preferred serving abroad rather than in Washington was the near constant battle over “turf” at the seat of the national government. It is thus not my intention to belabor bureaucratic intricacies. Nevertheless, in this instance form had the potential for becoming substance. Ultimately the manner in which the INF agreement was sought, including its relationship with the strategic and defense and space issues, would have a major impact on many of its elements, and on how it and the process of its negotiation was perceived by our Allies and the Soviets.

What the NST staffing arrangement did was to provide a core group for overseeing the development and negotiation of a “grand package.” Under it, Kampleman would have “prime responsibility” for orchestrating such a package (and for the defense and space negotiations). He would not, as Shultz noted, have responsibility for INF or START. Nevertheless, the seriousness with which Kampleman viewed the objective of reaching a grand package was manifested by his use of the term “prime responsibility” and his designation of Warren Zimmermann, a senior Foreign Service Officer with Russian experience, as his deputy for overall coordination of the NST with the rank of ambassador, and the designation of Henry (Hank) Cooper as his Deputy for [the] DST.

Unfortunately, this staffing arrangement and the related quest for the grand package set up the possibility of a potential conflict of interest. In my conversations with Zimmermann, who also was skeptical of our being able to obtain a separate INF agreement, he recognized that in the absence of a grand package negotiation, his role as deputy head of the NST delegation would not have much scope. In a rather short time, it also became evident that the Defense and Space Talks were unlikely to achieve an agreement. The differences between the sides began to appear too great to bridge. Unconditional supporters of SDI on the U.S. side, and its unconditional opponents on the Soviet side, appeared ready and able to deflect any sign of movement toward an agreement that might result in deployment of even a modified SDI.

Moreover, unlike the American INF and START groups, which developed a strong sense of common purpose and *esprit de corps*, the DST contingent was often fractious. Without a grand package, little scope would remain for highly talented individuals entrusted with such a package and/or Defense and Space issues to make their mark. In the end, both INF and START produced treaties that forwarded the interests of the United States. The Defense and Space Talks never bore fruit in the form of a treaty, and the issue remains a point of contention today between the United States and Russia, albeit considerably less so than in the 1980s.

DAY TO DAY IN GENEVA: NEGOTIATIONS ON THE FRONT LINE

The day-to-day conduct of the talks continued in the same manner as before the Soviet walkout. Twice a week plenary talks followed by informal discussions, weekly luncheons with chief and deputy chief

negotiators and of course, additional short-notice meetings. By and large this was a time of testing, neither side moving off of its position, both probing to see if there was any give by the other.

One improvement was made, however. The meetings often ran well into the afternoon. Both sides laid out peanuts, cookies, and so on to help fuel the participants. It was not the healthiest diet. My wife Chris suggested we put out some fresh vegetables and fruit. It would cost less and be better for us. We took her advice. The Soviets tried to follow the approach, but after awhile the peanuts and cookies returned. It was one more reason to prefer meeting at our place.

Another reason we preferred the U.S. site was that the Soviet rooms were gloomy. They had windows, but day or night these were usually covered by heavy drapes. These might have obscured bugging devices and did probably prevent us from seeing parts of the Soviet compound. The compound itself was a communal arrangement, with offices, meeting rooms, and apartments for the permanent staff, and, we were told, shared dining arrangements for the visiting Soviet delegation, all behind a high wall. Very few of the Soviets would stay at apartment hotels, the arrangement favored by the U.S. delegates. There was one other distinction of interest: we always invited all of our staff to attend “social” events with the Soviets. The Soviets in contrast limited attendance on their side to the officers. So much for their “classless” society.⁷

The Struggle to Delink—Both with the Soviets and the Americans

During my conversations with Kampleman and Zimmermann before and soon after we arrived in Geneva, I contended that a separate INF agreement would be relatively easier to obtain than one linked tightly with START and DST. The link between the latter two was emotionally charged and was certain to make agreements in those areas more difficult. At the same time, we would jeopardize the political cohesiveness of the Alliance and give the Soviets an opportunity to split NATO if we were seen delaying INF in order to obtain unrelated objectives in START and DST.

If, as I believed, INF was more about the Soviet effort to break up the U.S.-European Alliance than arms control, the Soviets would be driven by the same logic. They too could not afford to insist on linkage that appeared to sacrifice progress on INF in order to gain advantage in the START or DST arenas. Kampleman said flatly to me and subsequently to Major General William Burns, the Joint Chiefs of

Staff representative on the INF negotiating team (and later the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency [ACDA] Director), that a separate INF agreement was not possible. It could, he said, only be achieved as part of a package including agreements covering the other two areas. John Tower shared my view regarding INF and held open the possibility that a separate START agreement might also be concluded. In his own memoir, Tower also notes that he considered seeking to develop a grand package was more in the Soviet interest than ours.⁸

This basic difference in approach led to a certain amount of tension. Kampleman tended to emphasize working as an NST delegation and seemed almost eager to hold joint plenary negotiating sessions and joint “social” events in that framework. For my part, I sought to emphasize the separate nature of INF, preferring to carry on negotiations in the context of the INF group and to hold social events (which were in reality a continuation of negotiations in a different format) with the Soviet INF members rather than in the NST framework. In my view, it would have made no sense at all for members of one of the U.S. negotiating groups, for example, INF, to engage in informal negotiations with Soviet officials dealing with a different negotiation, such as space and defense. The issues at that level of expertise and detail are best entrusted to those who are working with them full time.

During the first week of the renewed negotiations, I met alone over lunch with my Soviet counterpart, Ambassador Alexi Obukhov. During our conversation, I emphasized that while one could see the logic of a linkage between strategic offensive and defensive systems, that same logic was not as compelling in the case of INF. It seemed to me that a separate INF agreement was a distinct possibility and that the negotiators should proceed on the basis that such an outcome was entirely possible.

Obukhov, responding in the didactic manner I had been told to expect, opined that the chain of logic had some merit, but that there were other ways of considering what was logical. I then asked him whether the Soviets would agree to a separate INF Treaty in a situation where the United States had accepted the Soviet position in INF. After some reflection, Obukhov allowed that in such an unlikely event it probably would. His reply carried with it the implication that the same conclusion would logically apply in the case where the two sides had reached a mutually acceptable agreement. With the point made, I did not need to belabor it further. The conversation left me with the distinct impression that the Soviets, could, and ultimately would, accept a separate INF agreement.⁹

About the same time as I was holding that first meeting with Obukhov, Zimmermann was meeting with Alexandrov, the Executive Secretary of the Soviet NST delegation. It was clear from his report of that meeting that Zimmermann had leaned decidedly toward the view that working toward a grand package would be the most effective way for the two delegations to approach the negotiations. This conversation resulted in sending the Soviets a mixed signal regarding the U.S. approach to INF. Moreover, it undermined the effort to avoid providing the Soviets with a negotiating framework that would enhance the Soviets' ability to drive wedges between the U.S. and its European NATO Allies. The differences in approach would not be mended until it became recognized by all that it was in the U.S. interest that INF be negotiated separately, that such an outcome was attainable, and that, in any event, there would be no grand package at this time.

Linkage and Delinkage: A Persistent Subtheme

Given the strong emphasis the Soviets placed on derailing SDI and their frequent public and private references to linkage, it was understandable that the Soviet position on linkage could appear unshakable. Certainly the statement issued by the Soviets at the May 30, 1985, opening of the second round of the renewed negotiations was categorical in insisting upon linkage: "nuclear and space arms questions must be considered in their organic relationship as provided for in the Soviet-U.S. agreement of January 8, 1985. This agreement should be strictly adhered to in all its parts."¹⁰ It was hardly an encouraging sign.

Yet a May 26, 1985, *Pravda* editorial previewing the upcoming round made a very subtle, but important, distinction between the linkage of the SDI issue to START and to that of INF. "It is absolutely clear that the acquisition by the United States of attack space arms would drastically disrupt the strategic equilibrium between the USSR and the United States," *Pravda* wrote. But in commenting on INF, the editorial made no mention of SDI stating only that, "It is equally clear that it is impossible to determine the size of the reduction of strategic arms without taking due account for medium-range arms."¹¹

Moreover, in its summation, the May 26 *Pravda* editorial drew an even sharper distinction. The START section began by emphasizing the link: "On strategic offensive arms the USSR proposed, given a ban on attack space arms . . ." and closed by noting that "Naturally, restrictions on strategic weapons would be decided upon also with

due account of the way in which the question of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe would be resolved." In contrast, the *Pravda* summation of the INF negotiations made no reference to either of the other two negotiations, portrayed INF as self contained, and related it to the "situation in the European continent and outside it." The last phrase could easily be taken as an oblique reference by the Soviets to the political nature of INF. And it was that political aspect of INF that carried with it the imperative for the Soviet Union (and the United States) not to be seen as holding INF hostage to the Soviet effort to get their way on SDI or START.

While far from a definitive delinking of INF, the *Pravda* editorial did suggest that the Soviets were drawing some distinctions between the relationship of INF to the contentious SDI issue and the relationship of the other two negotiations to each other. Moreover, while the Soviet negotiators in the other two groups regularly raised linkage, our counterparts in the INF talks generally steered clear of the subject. Accordingly, I continued to downplay the linkage issue within the context of the INF negotiations, except for an occasional reminder of the logic of a separate INF agreement and to proceed as if the SDI-START nexus did not affect the course of INF.

The sense that INF was *de facto* proceeding on its own grew stronger throughout the year. During his October 1985 visit to Paris, Gorbachev spoke of the possibility of a separate INF agreement, "Concerning medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, with the aim of making easier agreement . . . we consider it possible to conclude a corresponding agreement separately, outside of direct connection with the problem of space and strategic arms. This road, as it appears, may turn out to be practical."¹²

At the November 1985 Geneva Summit, Gorbachev moved further in that direction.¹³ However, on January 16, 1986, as part of a major statement on arms control, Gorbachev referred to a settlement of the SDI question as precondition for moving ahead on his proposal for the elimination of all offensive nuclear weapons by the year 2000. The format of the speech, nevertheless, hinted that INF might be in a somewhat different category. The specific linkage with SDI was contained in the portion of the sweeping proposal dealing with nuclear arms "which can reach each other's territory," that is, strategic arms. A separate portion of the speech called for the "complete liquidation of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone."¹⁴

Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister Georgiy M. Korniyenko at a January 16, 1986, Moscow press conference, however, made it somewhat clearer that the link with SDI would apply to INF.¹⁵ Korniyenko

was notably hard line and occasionally at variance with Gorbachev, as Shultz observed. This might account for the interpretation he placed on linkage in Gorbachev's speech and the contrast between that approach and the one Gorbachev had announced only a few months earlier. On the other hand, the Soviets in Geneva interpreted the January 16 speech as linking INF to SDI, although the Soviet INF group did not go out of its way to press this point.¹⁶

The press guidance for our discussions with foreign officials and the media indirectly took note of the slight ambivalence in Gorbachev's statement on linkage by noting that it appeared strict linkage between a ban on SDI and a START agreement "may also extend" to Soviet proposals for an INF agreement. In any event, neither Gorbachev's January 1986 speech nor the follow-on tactics of the Soviet INF group in Geneva changed my view that a separate INF Treaty was in the U.S. interest and was attainable.

The January speech, with its offer of massive Soviet cuts and its promise of a nuclear free world, was a public relations success. Nevertheless, the linkage of INF to the defense and space question could be seen, and made to be seen, both as holding INF hostage to other issues and as a step backward, in the INF context, which would make the realization of Gorbachev's announced long-term program much harder to achieve. With arms control a focal point of public interest, with the European media critical of the Soviet linkage approach, and given the Soviet political goals in Europe, it would not be an easy position to sustain. It was also a position that we could turn to our advantage. Thus, while some on the U.S. side saw Gorbachev's statement on linkage in his January speech as offering renewed prospects for a grand package, I continued to conduct the INF negotiations on the premise that a separate agreement was possible.

In a rather short time, the linkage was dropped. On February 7, 1986, Gorbachev used the media-worthy event of a visit by Senator Ted Kennedy to suggest once again that a separate INF Treaty was possible. On February 25, 1986, as part of a major policy report to the 27th CPSU Congress, General Secretary Gorbachev announced that "The star wars program must not be allowed to be used both as a stimulus for a further arms race and as an obstruction on the road to radical disarmament." He went on, "Tangible progress in matters pertaining to acute reduction in nuclear capacities could be of serious assistance in overcoming this obstacle. This is why the Soviet Union is ready to make a real step in this direction—to resolve the issue of medium-range missiles in the European zone separately and not in direct connection with problems of strategic weapons and space."¹⁷

In delinking INF from the other two negotiations, Gorbachev moved the Soviets off of a politically disadvantageous position. Indeed, delinking INF from the other two negotiations was essential to the development of the "common European home" theme, which Gorbachev would soon make a defining element of Soviet propaganda. Within the context of the INF negotiations, the formal delinking made what had been a *de facto* situation the official position of both governments.

Yet despite these considerations, the Soviets at the October 1986 Reykjavik Summit reinstated linkage. This action was all the more surprising because the Soviets confirmed at that summit the moves they had made during the August 1986 meeting in Moscow of high-level officials at which the Soviet participants had agreed that British and French nuclear forces would not be part of the INF calculation.

Kamplaman was perturbed by the relinking and believed the Soviets would now persist in linking INF to the other two negotiations. I had an instinctive feeling, reinforced by mixed signals in public from Soviet spokespersons, that the Soviet position was not fixed in concrete and that the relinking at Reykjavik was more a consequence of bitterness over the failure to resolve the START/SDI question at the summit than a well thought out move in the context of INF.¹⁸

For its part, the U.S. INF team once again continued to put the Soviet relinkage aside and to negotiate on the premise that an INF Treaty would be completed and implemented, delinked from the other two negotiations. I told the Soviets as much and repeated that they should expect no credit from us at the negotiations when they returned to delinked. Indeed, we now know the Soviets were also rethinking along these lines. According to Palazchenko, "There had been a lot of discussion in the foreign ministry about separating INF from other arms control areas, and everyone seemed to agree that was desirable."¹⁹

In time our approach and perseverance were vindicated. On February 28, 1987, Gorbachev announced, "The Soviet Union proposes taking the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe out of the block of issues and concluding a separate agreement on this subject."²⁰ The delinkage would remove much of the "nuclear burden from our common home, which is Europe." There would be no further relinking; a fact happily recognized and supported by all three NST groups.

President Reagan welcomed General Secretary Gorbachev's announcement. The president also made reference to the European political aspect of this event by stressing the importance of close

cooperation between the United States and its European Allies: "As we proceed it is well to remember that nothing is more important to the cause of peace than the credibility of our commitment to NATO and our other Allies, and to the vitality of these alliances of free nations."²¹

The question remains, however, as to why the Soviets found it useful to play the linkage card. The most plausible answer is that they hoped to portray SDI as the major stumbling block to major reductions in both INF and START. In the end, their effort to link SDI with INF worked against them. Their effort to link made it appear that they were holding up an INF agreement. The broad political elements that underlay the INF issue once again proved the controlling factor in the course of the negotiations.²²

NATO Deployments Continue

As we have seen, the early contacts in the renewed negotiations with the Soviets carried with them promise of progress in not holding INF hostage to the other negotiations, a promise that eventually bore fruit. In sharp contrast, however, our contacts with the Soviets during this period on the other key negotiating issues were far less encouraging. Having failed to stop the deployment program from commencing, the Soviets turned their attention to slowing and trying to stop the continuation of U.S. deployments.

This effort took the form of proposing a moratorium in various shapes, culminating in the announcement on April 7, 1985, by the new Soviet President Gorbachev of a unilateral moratorium that would last until November 1985, with the prospect of subsequent reductions resulting in zero U.S. deployments and Soviet INF missiles at levels equivalent to British and French strategic forces. All the moratoria proposals would have led to the same result: the United States would be frozen into an unequal outcome with the Soviets. Moreover, despite the moratorium, the Soviets continued their deployments at sites already under construction. They insisted, however, that no such activity was underway even though they must have known our intelligence capabilities.²³

The Soviets sought to portray their variations on a theme as evidence of flexibility. However, it was not a serious attempt at negotiating and suggested that the Soviets were still more interested in trying to persuade elements within the Western body politic to scuttle the deployments than in reaching a mutually acceptable outcome with the United States and its NATO Allies.

Our basic negotiating approach and goals remained tied to the December 1979 NATO decision. The principles set forth in the December 1979 document remained relevant, and the continued Allied support of those principles provided a sound foundation upon which to base our negotiating position. We quickly put our specific proposals—global elimination on INF missiles or an interim agreement on equal INF missile limits at the lowest possible number—back on the table.

The round ended on April 23, 1987, without much progress having been made in dealing with core issues; except for some positive signs that a separate INF agreement might be possible. My first stop on the way back to Washington was NATO headquarters where I briefed the Special Consultative Group (SCG) representatives and the North Atlantic Council ambassadors on the rather limited results of the round.

The time in Washington was spent in similar briefings and with urging Washington officials to move ahead in reaching agreement on more detailed elements of our proposal, such as the phased reductions and, above all, verification procedures. Putting these concepts into treaty language was difficult because it required the agencies to reach closure on issues of importance. But it had the decided advantage at Geneva in providing the United States with a carefully spelled out approach. It also meant that the Soviets, if they continued to use less precise language to describe their position, would little by little find themselves working from our text. The effort to prod Washington to resolve differences would continue until the final days of the negotiation. Judging from which side managed to table treaty language first, our internal differences were usually resolved sooner than those of the Soviets.

We returned to Geneva in late May. We continued to maintain our principled position, but we emphasized that we had the flexibility to accept any outcome that resulted in equal global limits on U.S. and Soviet INF missiles. The Soviets continued to insist on a halt to new U.S. INF deployments and the withdrawal of all the systems that had been deployed. The Soviets also continued to insist that any agreement would take into account U.K. and French nuclear weapons. In short, the negotiations were at a stalemate.

But the deployments of the new, very capable Pershing II and Ground-Launched Cruise Missiles (GLCMs) continued, and we sensed that the reality was beginning to make itself felt at the negotiating table. While we wanted a good arms control result, it was a two-track decision and NATO by its action was making that clear.

The round ended on July 16 with little progress to record in the negotiations. George Vest, a senior and very experienced U.S. diplomat had counseled me that there are periods in a negotiation where things just need time to jell. There is no sense in spinning your wheels during these periods. Take long walks instead. This was one of those periods, and it was good advice.

The time in Washington was spent in the familiar round of debriefings and preparations for the next round. The Senate had established an observer group to follow our talks headed by Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska. House members also followed the talks closely; but given the special role of the Senate in giving its advice and consent to treaties, it was natural that Senators should pay special interest to a treaty negotiation. The group visited us in Geneva about once per round, and, during the breaks, we made it a point to meet with them in Washington. Paul Nitze, special assistant to the president and secretary of state, and others also kept in close touch with the group on a continuing basis in Washington. It was time well spent by all.

Indeed, my initial reaction to the thought of a group of senators and staff joining with the U.S. and Soviet negotiators was negative as a result of an earlier experience with congressional staff observers during a bilateral trade negotiation when I was the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Trade. However, the INF experience proved to be quite the opposite. The members of Congress were interested, knowledgeable, disciplined, and helpful, including during their discussions with Soviet negotiators.

We returned to Geneva on September 19, 1985, after having met with the president and the secretaries of State and Defense. These well-publicized meetings had the effect of demonstrating the importance the leaders of the U.S. government placed on the negotiations and that the positions we presented at Geneva represented the views of the highest level in our government. It helped strengthen our hand with the Soviets and demonstrated to the NATO Allies the seriousness with which the United States was approaching the arms control negotiations.

The new round had settled into the usual routine when Soviet President Gorbachev on October 3 announced in an address to the French National Assembly two nuanced, but potentially important, changes in the Soviet position on INF. One, as we have already seen, dealt with the possibility of a separate INF Treaty. ("Concerning medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, with the aim of making easier agreement on their speediest mutual reduction . . . we consider it possible to conclude a corresponding agreement separately outside of direct connection with the problem of space and strategic arms.")²⁴

The other dealt with another key issue, the place of U.K. and French forces in any U.S. Soviet INF agreement. "I consider it important to explain our position on such a question as the place of the nuclear potential of France and Britain in the European balance of forces. This potential is growing and we can no longer ignore it. It was said from the French side that the nuclear forces of France are not subject to discussion without her participation. This stands to reason. It follows from this that it is time to start between us a dialogue on this theme and try to find an acceptable way out through a joint effort." As regards the level of French forces, Gorbachev said, "It appears to us the question of a reduction of her (France's) armaments does not stand."²⁵

In both of these moves, Gorbachev displayed a deft hand, a willingness to play to European sensibilities, and a readiness to shift positions without necessarily abandoning principle. In another portion of his speech, however, he also showed skill in taking back much of what he seemed to be offering. Having acknowledged that French and U.K. forces were independent and might be delinked from U.S. forces, and having in effect stated that he did not seek a reduction in French forces, Gorbachev went on to suggest that SS-20 missiles in Europe could be limited to 243 missiles (with three warheads each for a total of 729 SS-20 warheads) in Europe alone. In doing so, Gorbachev did not indicate the Soviets had abandoned their position that the number of warheads on Soviet INF missiles in Europe "would be gradually brought to the number of the warheads on the French and British missiles."²⁶ One can assume that the number of Soviet INF missile warheads remaining in Europe would have approximated Soviet estimates of U.K. and French warheads and that the net result would have been to leave the United States with zero and the Soviets with INF missile systems equal to U.K. and French INF systems.

While much of this was clever repackaging, Gorbachev's position did carry with it one important move. He had in effect recognized that the United States could not and would not negotiate an outcome which, even if only indirectly, seemed to have an impact on U.K. and French nuclear forces. It was a small shift in the Soviet position, but it suggested that this key issue might be resolved after all. Taken together with Gorbachev's separation of INF from the START-SDI nexus, it gave hope to the prospects of a successful outcome.

We also noticed that when pressed for more, and confirming, details concerning the position taken by Gorbachev, the Soviet negotiators in Geneva tended to fall back upon the old formulations.

This apparent disconnect between the activist Soviet leader and the more conservative Soviet representatives in Geneva (and whoever in Moscow was authorizing the Soviet representative's presentations) would manifest itself again during the remaining course of the negotiations.

Gorbachev himself comments upon the foot-dragging by his own negotiators and military. In his *Memoirs*, he states "Everyone agreed at the Politburo meeting that Reykjavik would improve our image in the world, demonstrating our determination to prevent a new arms race. But our generals and even some people in the Foreign Ministry and in our negotiating team in Geneva were doubtful. They were firmly stuck in the logic of antagonism, and the military sought to protect their corporate interests. The existing state of affairs seemed to suit some of our negotiators in Geneva, who enjoyed having their wages paid in hard currency, thinking the longer the negotiations the better for us."²⁷

In all of this, one can see the importance of Gorbachev's tactical and strategic approach. To adopt a military analogy, the new Soviet leader was prepared to mount a war of movement as opposed to the trench warfare negotiating style that characterized earlier Soviet leaders, and apparently some of Gorbachev's staff. Gorbachev's approach offered us more opportunity and room for maneuver. For by opting to base his strategy in part on a successful appeal to Western public opinion, Gorbachev would be forced to adopt policies that would meet, or at least appear to meet, the security requirements of those publics.

We could hold Gorbachev to that standard, especially where appearances could be shown to be misleading. The political risk for us, however, was also greater: he could appear more reasonable while still seeking the same goals. On balance, though, the prospects for agreeing on a sound and durable INF Treaty seemed to have improved with Gorbachev's arrival, and with his eagerness to engage openly in the public diplomacy contest. But in the fall of 1985, we still had a long road ahead of us.

Following Gorbachev's early October Paris statements, Soviet negotiators on October 14 presented to us yet another variation on basic Soviet themes. The new element in this variant was a proposal that would have permitted the United States to retain between 100 and 120 GLCMs in Europe for a limited time. However, the ultimate result would have been an unequal outcome in the Soviets favor.

In its response, the United States, while preferring the total elimination of U.S. and Soviet INF, proposed an interim agreement

under which the United States and the Soviet Union would have an agreed equal limit of between 420 and 450 INF warheads in Europe. The proposal also required the Soviet Union to reduce its SS-20 launchers in Asia by the same proportion as the reductions in its launchers within range of NATO Europe. The United States also called attention to the need to place appropriate constraints on shorter-range INF missiles (SRINF) to ensure these weapons could not be used to circumvent an agreement covering longer-range INF missiles (LRINF). The proportional concept was of course linked to our determination neither to fail, nor be seen as failing, to take into account the security interests of our Asian allies. The rather general point on SRINF was in essence putting down a marker that this issue would eventually need fleshing out.²⁸

This page intentionally left blank

PEACE MOVEMENTS

FIRST ENCOUNTER

While Gorbachev's adroitness added a new dimension, it is difficult to exaggerate the important role played by public diplomacy during the entire period when INF was the crucial point where U.S. NATO Europe, and Soviet interests intersected. One of my early direct encounters with the phenomena took place in Vermont.

We were on home leave in Vermont from assignment at U.S. NATO in August 1981 when my wife Chris pointed out an article in the *Burlington Free Press*. A group of local peace activists was holding an antinuclear rally that featured a walk from Washington to Moscow—both in this instance being small towns in Vermont. They had invited speakers from both the U.S. Department of State and the Soviet Embassy in Washington DC. The embassy had agreed to send someone, but the State Department (short of funds as ever) had declined. Chris said the U.S. government ought not to appear afraid to take up the challenge. I agreed, and after checking with the department, called the organizers and offered to speak.

I had, of course, been working on both the deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe and the proposal to negotiate limitations on those weapons. I believed the United States and its Allies had a logical and sound position. I had put this position to Europeans and was prepared to propound it before an American audience.

My family accompanied me to the outdoor rally in Washington, Vermont. There was a fairly large crowd by Vermont standards. It appeared from the banners and placards and the comments of the speakers that all were of one mind: opposition to the very idea of nuclear deterrence, support for a nuclear freeze, and a readiness to see the United States and the Soviet Union as equivalent states.

My talk was designed to lay out an alternative proposition based on the premise that the Reagan administration was serious about both providing a strong defense and achieving negotiated reductions in

U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons. It was among the first of many such efforts to persuade the “peace movement” that the United States was determined to enhance its and NATO’s security by deploying new weapons; by negotiating a sound and durable INF arms control agreement; or through a combination of the two.

Arguing that the “better red than dead” slogan was based on a faulty juxtaposition of alternatives, my talk emphasized that “with a proper blend of defense and arms control policies we can continue to enjoy our freedoms and avoid nuclear war.” To underscore that there was no equivalency between the United States and the Soviet Union, I pointed out that “one need not be a believer in international conspiracy theory to recognize that the Soviet Union is a totalitarian state; to look at its historical record, or at least a map, is to see a pattern for concern; to recall Afghanistan, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary; to be aware of its use of military power to intimidate; and to be cautious of a regime which forces distinguished intellectual and artistic leaders into exile, or worse, while refusing to let others leave.”

Then to underscore our willingness to negotiate, I continued by stressing that this litany does not lead to the conclusion “that we should have no contact with the Soviets.” Instead, I concluded that, “while we must and should seek agreements with them . . . the only way to achieve successful arms control and reduction agreements is through a long slog of complex, extensive, and intensive negotiations backed by the will to rearm.”

In order to demonstrate that the U.S. administration was far from being isolated in its approach, I cited statements by left-of-center European leaders and others who recognized that a “freeze” would leave the West at a dangerous disadvantage, especially given the continuing Soviet buildup. They understood that the Soviets would never negotiate seriously with us unless we had missiles of our own to remove.

When the seriousness of our intent becomes clear to the Soviets, I said, “They will tire of proposals such as those which seek to freeze NATO’s modernization program before it has begun, while reserving for themselves the advantages of hundreds of deployed SS-20s. They will recognize that what is required in our mutual interest is serious negotiation, not efforts to achieve one-sided advantage.” I was to return to many of these themes throughout the next seven years.

However, while I was still only part way through my speech, some in the audience began shaking their placards and shouting, “We’ve heard enough; let’s start marching.” I particularly noted the proverbial energized, gray-haired woman in sneakers. One of the event

organizers whispered to me to “wrap it up.” I reminded him that they had asked me to speak for 20 minutes and I had prepared my remarks accordingly.

At that point a voice called out to “Let the man finish,” and the crowd quieted down until I had finished. The voice it turned out was that of our son Erik—and without prompting from his mother. Afterwards a few of the audience paid me a backhanded compliment, congratulating me on doing an excellent job defending a bad policy. I would see the placard shaking woman again several years later under very different circumstances.

The local news reports, as I recall, stressed that the Soviet speaker (who gave his talk in Moscow, Vermont) and I were both cut from the same cloth, wearing similar clothing and arguing our cases in a similar manner. It was a phenomenon that I would encounter again and again. Unfortunately the effort to appear even-handed sometimes ended with the appearance of establishing moral equivalency between the United States and the Soviet Union. There was no chance the Soviet media or “peace” organizations would reciprocate.

The event was my first encounter with the American peace movement. The fervor and the evident unwillingness of some of the group to hear, or even to allow others to hear, a differing opinion made a deep impression. It appeared that the struggle for public opinion would take place on three fronts: countering the Soviet propagandists directly; seeking the support of the European NATO publics; and maintaining the support of the American public. I passed my observations to colleagues in Washington, many of whom had not been aware of the extent to which the homegrown version of the European peace movement had developed.

This struggle mattered greatly. Gaining public support for American security policy was an essential feature of the Cold War. The effort, however, had a decidedly one-sided quality. Most of the nations that were considered part of “the free world” had at least a modicum of free speech and an uncensored media. But the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact Allies were tightly controlled societies.

The United States and its Allies did their best to present their point of view through the Iron Curtain barriers. However, most of the efforts to win over and maintain public support were directed at people in the non-Communist world, especially in NATO Europe—in part because these were the principal target audiences for the Soviets. While we could not expect to influence the public in the Soviet Union (and in any event that public had little ability to influence its ruling elite), it was absolutely essential in our democratic societies that the

American public and those of our NATO Allies agree that our objectives and negotiating position merited their support.

The effort and need to explain security policies during the Cold War in a manner that would be both accurate and persuasive reached its apogee during the period leading to and including the INF negotiations. As we have seen, the INF phase of this struggle had its immediate origins in the so-called neutron bomb affair. The Soviets, believing that through their manipulation of Western public opinion they had led an American president to back away from a nuclear weapons deployment, worked to duplicate this result with regard to INF deployments.

THE OPENING ROUNDS IN THE WAR OF THOUGHTS AND WORDS

Beginning with the period of intra-Allied discussions leading to NATO's December 1979 dual-track decision, the Soviets mounted a propaganda campaign to persuade Western publics to oppose any new deployments of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe, while at the same time accepting the new Soviet deployments. As with all their efforts during the INF period, the Soviets used an adroit mixture of threats, forewarnings, and blandishments.

Above all they sought to divide NATO. One of their principle themes, therefore, was that the United States sought to deploy nuclear missiles in Europe in order to confine any future war to Europe and leave U.S. territory unscathed. As we have seen, this charge was the exact opposite of NATO's principle *raison d'être* for deploying: to underscore NATO linkage and to deter a Soviet conventional and/or nuclear attack. Indeed, the NATO Treaty makes it implicitly clear that an attack on one is an attack on all.

Among other themes which the Soviets propounded were (1) that U.S. deployments would upset the existing balance (an argument that we countered with facts to the contrary); (2) that the Soviet Union did not seek military superiority in the INF balance (another statement contradicted by facts); (3) that the Soviet Union, unlike NATO, pledged "no first use" of nuclear weapons (such a NATO pledge would have been, given the Soviet advantage in conventional forces, tantamount to making Europe safe for conventional aggression); (4) that NATO's INF deployments would stimulate a new round in the arms race (when in fact it was new Soviet deployments, particularly the SS-20 force, which NATO was seeking to balance); (5) that NATO deployments would lead to Soviet counterdeployments;

(6) threats that NATO countries hosting U.S. INF missiles would become targets for a Soviet strike (forgetting that they already were targets); and (7) that NATO's deployment would increase the likelihood of war (in fact, the deployments strengthened NATO's deterrence posture and reduced the risk of war).¹

For its part, NATO public diplomacy prior to the December 1979 decision was handicapped because the Alliance was still formulating its position. We were certainly "not singing off the same page." Indeed, as has been noted, at the beginning of the INF saga, the United States argued that INF deployments were not necessary to deterrence, while the Europeans, particularly the Germans, expressed concerns that the linkage of the U.S. strategic deterrence with NATO would be undermined without INF deployments.

Naturally, the United States and its Allies did begin to lay out the conceptual foundation for their eventual approach as they prepared the 1979 decision. The basic argument was founded on the fact that despite achieving parity with the United States in the strategic nuclear field, the Soviets were nonetheless modernizing and expanding their INF forces, including the Soviet monopoly in longer-range INF missiles, and continuing to maintain their advantages in conventional forces.

The combination of these factors constituted a serious threat to the Alliance. The main thrust of the argument was that, if left unchecked, these factors "could give rise to the risk that the Soviets might believe—however incorrectly—that they could use long-range forces to make or threaten limited strikes against Western Europe from a 'sanctuary' in the Soviet Union. There could be a misperception that without adequate theater-based systems capable of reaching Soviet territory, and in the era of parity at the strategic level, NATO lacked credible and appropriate means of response."²

Our position on this and other aspects under negotiation with the Soviets had merit. However, its underlying logic required careful thought and analysis. I recall saying at a NATO meeting that a Soviet position, while inherently faulty, could usually be presented as a slogan on the front of a T-shirt. Our logic stood up better under careful examination, but required several paragraphs to explain.

The Official Record

This situation continued throughout the period of deployment and negotiation. Perhaps as a reflection of it, we placed very great emphasis on ensuring that any expositions of our approach would hold up to

close public scrutiny. Thus, as previously noted, during the many rounds of the Geneva negotiations, the classified plenary statements we turned over to the Soviets were prepared with great care to guarantee not only their accuracy, logic, and persuasiveness, but also their ability to stand up to public scrutiny should the Soviets leak them to the media.

The Soviets Launch a Peace Offensive

The Soviets had a very keen understanding of the need to avoid being thrown off balance in one area of activity by the negative fallout from their actions in another. Following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan only days after NATO's dual-track INF decision, some of us speculated that the Soviets might seek both to divert attention away from their aggression in Southwest Asia and to counter the positive public relations impact of our dual-track decision by undertaking a "peace offensive" on their European flank. The speculation proved correct.

Vladimir Bukovsky, the Soviet dissident, spelled out the organization and implementation of this offensive in *Commentary*.³ Bukovsky began by noting that "The 'struggle for peace' has always been a cornerstone of Soviet foreign policy." But, he also showed how the "power" of peace, including the use of force, had been used to further Soviet objectives. And he demonstrated how the Soviet propaganda machine helped create and foster Western concerns that war, indeed nuclear war, might soon befall them.

As an example, Bukovsky noted that following the invasion of Afghanistan, and thus shortly after NATO's December 1979 disarmament proposals, "the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council declared (and the whole European peace movement repeats it as if under a hypnotic spell) 'the people of the world are alarmed. Never before has there been so great a danger of a world nuclear holocaust. The nuclear arms build-up, the accumulation of deadly arsenals, has reached a critical point. Further escalation in the arms build-up could create a most dangerous situation, facing humanity with the threat of annihilation.'"⁴

One can see how this line served the twin goals of directing attention away from the invasion of Afghanistan and undermining U.S. INF policy. Bukovsky noted that "the only public movement in Western Europe that never condemned the invasion [of Afghanistan] is the Peace Movement." In addition, he noted, its posture created a sense of anxiety, while ignoring and thus diverting attention away from NATO's call for negotiations.

The War of Facts

With the Soviet agreement in July 1980 to open exploratory talks with the United States (an agreement that, significantly, was announced following a German-Soviet summit meeting), the pace of the public debate intensified. Much of the debate turned on facts. How many missiles and aircraft does each side possess? What are their capabilities? Where are they located? and so on.

It became apparent that the United States and NATO needed a document that would provide the facts. Given the closed nature of the Soviet Union, and the suspect nature of the information they were purveying, there was a particular need for unclassified information on Soviet forces. Putting the document together was a major undertaking involving the intelligence community, the U.S. Department of Defense, and those who needed accurate information to support the U.S./NATO position.

The publication of the document *Soviet Military Power* in 1981 was a significant event in the campaign for public support. Its presentation at NATO headquarters was also a significant "first." Secretary of Defense, Casper Weinberger, and the head of the United States Information Service, Charles Wick, proposed to use a satellite television hookup in which Secretary Weinberger would brief NATO officials about the document. To my surprise, there was some opposition both at NATO and within the U.S. bureaucracy to what, at the time, was an innovation.

In the end, the experiment went forward and was quite successful. *Soviet Military Power* was well received by officials and members of the media who followed the INF issue. The pamphlet was revised annually and was later joined by a NATO pamphlet "NATO and the Warsaw Pact: Force Comparisons." Both documents fulfilled the important role of providing NATO nations with a common, accurate database from which to argue the Alliance's position both inside the negotiations and in the public arena. Moreover, *Soviet Military Power's* high-quality color photographs and graphics made it easier for the general public to understand the technical subject matter. *Soviet Military Power* also helped buttress domestic support in the United States for the administration's defense programs.

The Soviets paid homage to the effectiveness of the U.S. initiative by publishing a database pamphlet of their own entitled *Whence the Threat to Peace*. We found that, while an uninformed reader might be misled into accepting the document at face value, the "facts" did not stand close scrutiny. Accordingly, we carefully reviewed each edition

of *Whence the Threat to Peace* and were ready to counter its misstatements in public and private discussions.

One of the authors of *Whence the Threat to Peace* has shed light on its preparation, substantiating our view of the pamphlet. Sergey Tarasenko, a thoughtful diplomat who headed the Planning Department at the Soviet Foreign Ministry and was a close advisor of Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, wrote in *Moscow New Times* in late 1990, "I have always been ashamed of knowing almost everything about the armed forces of the United States, simply by virtue of my ability to read in English, and nothing about the armed forces of my own country, because no information about them has ever appeared in Russian. I also feel shame that as a diplomat I had to take part in the doctoring of Soviet and American military statistics for the annual propaganda booklet *Whence the Threat to Peace* making it look as if the United States is the threat."⁵

Forwarding the U.S./NATO Position on the Conference Circuit

The INF issue was also a featured topic at international conferences and I, along with other officials, often carried the U.S./NATO banner at such gatherings. The United States and the Soviet Union had agreed informally that the negotiators would not negotiate in public. Specifically, we would not get into a tit-for-tat debate in the press. This agreement did not, however, prohibit the negotiators of either side from speaking at conferences. It was also informally agreed that officials in capitals would be free to engage in long-distance debate via the media.

Working full time on the negotiations and having been involved with the INF issue from its outset did, of course, give me a certain advantage on the conference circuit. The main lines of my public statements were based on the principles that formed the foundation of our position and the arguments we developed to counter Soviet assertions made during negotiating sessions.

For example, during a speech to a NATO-wide audience in the spring of 1983 (when the Soviet effort to block U.S./NATO deployments while retaining its own force was reaching a crescendo), I highlighted a statement by Soviet leader Yuri Andropov ("let no one expect unilateral disarmament from us. We are not a naive people.") to underscore the error of freezing our forces at zero while allowing the Soviets to maintain their force. In making this statement, I said, the Soviet leadership sent the world a double message: first, that it

would negotiate only on the basis of its view of the correlation of forces; and second, that the Soviet Union should not be expected to credit the unilateral moves of others. Moreover, if the Soviets consider that it would be naive of them to adopt a unilateral approach to arms control and disarmament, then what must they think of others who adopted such a policy, and, more importantly, how would they react to it? To ask the question was to answer it.

In response to the calls from peace activists for some “gestures” of goodwill on our part, I cited several examples of U.S. and NATO willingness to forego deployment of new systems. One of these was the reduced blast warhead whose non-deployment, as we have seen, was linked to an (unanswered) call for Soviet restraint. I also cited the U.S. decision not to proceed with the B-1 bomber and to slow down production of our submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) force. Additionally, I noted that while the level of Soviet nuclear weapons in Europe was growing, the level and the explosive power of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe had been declining—thanks in part to NATO’s decision to withdraw 1,000 nuclear warheads from Europe in connection with the December 1979 decision.

All these actions, I pointed out, had fallen into Orwellian oblivion and had become nonevents as far as the Soviets were concerned. No approach based on gestures, I concluded, could provide a solid basis for an arms control policy *vis-à-vis* the Soviets. What was needed was a strong, legally binding document based on the principles upon which the NATO Allies had agreed.

Once the negotiations to produce such a document got underway, it became both necessary and advantageous to have a consistent approach to the same issue regardless of whether we were dealing with it inside or outside the negotiations. Moreover, arguments that proved especially strong in one forum usually translated well into the other.

Consequently, speaking to a 1984 conference sponsored by the Spanish Socialist Party during the period following the Soviet walk-out, I sought to impress upon the audience the political context in which the INF negotiations were taking place and the fact that all of us in the West were both subjects and objects of a complex geopolitical “great game” of which those negotiations were a key element. With this calculus in mind, I stressed the underlying importance of a sound and durable conclusion to the INF issue for the future of the Western world.

Noting the responsibility of governments to develop credible arms control and defense/deterrence policies, I stressed to the audience the special political circumstances surrounding the INF issue for Western

interests. All of us—government officials, parliamentarians, media, academics, citizens at large—had a responsibility to at least approach that issue in the spirit of the classical enlightenment and not that of the romantic age. Because of the impact on Soviet perceptions of Western solidarity and resolve on the INF issue, the INF discussion needed to be de-emotionalized. All of us had the responsibility to appreciate that among the stakes at risk were the ability to maintain peace and freedom. We needed to recognize that only with the correct mix of defense and arms control policies could we continue to enjoy both peace and freedom.

The discussions at these conferences were usually polite, but at times they grew heated. This intensity rarely occurred in exchanges between U.S. and NATO officials and their Soviet counterparts, but it was more frequent in exchanges between Western officials and members of the Western peace movement, who on occasion were less flexible than the Soviets. For example, after I completed my remarks at the conference in Spain, a prominent British peace activist was moved to state that she found my call to de-emotionalize the INF issue “chilling.” Apparently she preferred to approach policy issues via emotion rather than reason.

I also took the occasion of conferences, contacts with parliamentarians, and interviews with the media to outline the key issues under discussion at the negotiations underscoring that the facts and logic supported our position, which I emphasized was developed within and by the Alliance. I also noted that we sought to conduct ourselves at the negotiations to reflect the fact that we were working from common U.S. and European security interests and positions.

To help emphasize the difference between the ways the United States worked with its Allies when compared with the Soviet approach, I would contrast the U.S. and Soviet approaches toward Europe’s security interests. For example, as in my 1984 speech in Spain, I underscored that the United States premised its position on the proposition that whatever affects the security of its European Allies affects American security. Although the SS-20 could not strike the U.S. mainland from its then current deployment areas, by striking our Allies, it could have a strategic effect on the United States because such an action, or the threat of such an action, would bring the United States into a conflict or crisis.

From the Soviet perspective, however, whatever affected Soviet security also affected non-Soviet Warsaw Pact countries. This was the reverse of how the United States regarded the issue. Hence, the Soviets contended that since the SS-20 could not reach the

United States, the United States had no reason to counter it. Put another way, the logic of the Soviet position would have had it that neither the United States nor its European allies had grounds for erecting an Alliance deterrent to Soviet LRINF missiles.

Some supporters of the "Peace Movement," I had noted, denigrated the use of facts and figures to back up an argument. They would cite the use of numbers as somehow being cold blooded and showing a lack of "feeling." Therefore, usually at this point in my talks, I would emphasize that the devil does indeed lie in the details and that in order to expose him it would be necessary not only to understand the broad arguments but also to see how the Soviets sought to manipulate or obfuscate facts and figures. I then sought to bring into even sharper focus the differing U.S. and Soviet approaches to European nations by contrasting the way the two countries approached the question of aircraft along the lines outlined above.

The Soviet Union, I pointed out, argued that only "medium-range" aircraft with a combat radius of 1,000 kilometers and above should be considered in the negotiations. The rationale for this position was that a 1,000-kilometer combat radius is the approximate round-trip distance between West Germany and Soviet territory. Accordingly, the Soviets asserted that what should concern the negotiators were those U.S., French, and British aircraft that could deliver nuclear weapons to Soviet territory and those nuclear-capable Soviet aircraft launched from Soviet territory that could strike targets in NATO Europe.

At first glance, I noted, this might appear reasonable. But from the perspective of the United States and its NATO Allies, such an approach ignored a fundamental point. Soviet INF aircraft with radii of action well below 500 kilometers could, from bases in Eastern Europe, strike targets deep into NATO Europe. Such systems could thus affect the security of the United States and its Allies and should be included in any objective analysis of the INF aircraft balance or in any negotiations involving INF aircraft. Moreover, I argued, the Soviet posture revealed a deeper geopolitical calculation. The Soviet 1,000-kilometer criteria suggested that for the Soviet Union only the USSR and the United States have strategic interests. European states did not. It suggested that the United States should in this sense consider itself different and separate from its NATO European Allies.

I also made it a point to attack what I considered two fundamental and related flaws in the Soviet negotiating position, in which they persisted until the closing period of the talks. First, I would note that the Soviets contended that the U.S. proposals either to eliminate U.S. and

Soviet INF missiles, or to reach an agreement on the lowest equal number of such systems, represented a demand for unilateral Soviet disarmament. This contention was premised on their view that what mattered was who had to reduce how much of what, not the end result. The Soviet were in effect demanding a bonus for deploying modern INF missiles first and seeking *inter alia* to obtain that bonus by trying to focus attention on the means (equality of reductions) rather than the results (equality of outcome).

The Soviet position came down to arguing that the only acceptable agreement was one that left the Soviet Union with a militarily significant LRINF missile force and the right to expand that force should nations that were not a party to that agreement—to wit Britain, France, and China—increase their nuclear forces. At the same time, the United States would not be allowed to deploy any LRINF missiles in support of NATO Europe. In essence, as Ambassador Nitze liked to point out, the Soviets were demanding absolute security for themselves: a nuclear force equal to the sum total of all their potential enemies and thus greater than any one of them.

The second fundamental flaw in the Soviet position was directly related to the Soviet effort to secure an unequal outcome. This was the Soviet insistence that U.S. forces should be lumped together with U.K. and French forces. Via the addition of U.K. and French forces, and the manipulation of data concerning the numbers of such forces, the Soviets sought to claim that a balance would exist without any U.S. deployments.

My 1984 presentation in Spain, as in the scores of others I gave, also dealt with those specific contentious issues that were under discussion at the negotiations and in which the Soviet positions were poorly founded and open to criticism, if not ridicule, such as the Soviet position on aircraft noted above.

Commentaries such as this 1984 talk would also be accompanied by supporting factual material and data. The overall effect, I hoped, would be to make clear that the U.S./NATO position was reasonable, responsible, and designed to enhance Alliance security, freedom, and peace. I also hoped it would lead some of those in the West who were skeptical, but open to reason, to consider our position with an open mind.

THE SOVIET VIEW OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

The peace movement was not only influenced and, on occasion, manipulated by the Soviets. It also had a significant effect on Soviet

policy. By and large that impact was not helpful to the effort to negotiate a mutually acceptable outcome to the INF issue. More than once, the Soviets caught themselves in their own public relations campaigns and were misled by both its successes and its failures.

For example, the Soviets, misreading the neutron bomb affair, wrongly concluded that President Carter's decision not to proceed with the deployment of that weapon was directly related to the Soviet-influenced anti-neutron campaign in Europe. As I have pointed out, the Allies had been prepared to move ahead and accept deployment. The president's decision, in my view, was more closely related to his own concern over the morality of that weapon and how he might be judged by history were it to be used.

The Soviets had, of course, recognized that the peace movement offered possibilities for forwarding Soviet interests, especially with regard to West Germany. That country was of enormous importance for several reasons: (1) the inner-German border was the heart of the East-West military confrontation; (2) the Pershing II missiles, which, because of their short time of flight and accuracy were of greatest concern to the Soviets, were being deployed only in West Germany; and (3) important segments of the German peace movement had neutralist tendencies and presented a possible vehicle for stimulating German departure from NATO and might, perhaps in time, become the catalyst for NATO's dissolution.

Thus Soviet analyst G. Vorontsov advised the Soviet government to "take advantage of pacifism in Western Europe as part of a strategy to cancel the installation of new American missiles."⁶ Vladimir Zagladin, a leading Soviet propagandist, argued that the peace movement provided an opportunity to develop a better understanding of Soviet foreign policy goals in Western Europe.⁷

The Impact of the Peace Movement on Soviet Policy

Swayed by their misinterpretation of the neutron bomb outcome as reflecting the impact of the demonstrators rather than President Carter's internal personal calculus, the Soviets accorded far too much political weight to the anti-INF demonstrations in Europe. Along with other American negotiators, I cautioned them that European governments are formed by counting votes and not by counting the size of crowds.

In fact we now have confirmation of the negative effect of the peace movement on the prospects for achieving an INF Treaty.

Writing in *The Big Five: Arms Control Decision Making in the Soviet Union*, General Lieutenant Nikolay N. Detinov (the deputy head of the Soviet INF delegation 1981–1983 and my counterpart during those talks) and Dr. Aleksand'r G. Savel'yev noted that the “antimissile movement had engulfed Europe” and that “dozens of delegations” came to Geneva. “All of the Delegations opposed American missile deployments in Europe.” While the groups protested the SS-20, “the demonstrations suggested that the American missiles constituted a greater danger. . . .” They also noted that the “active role that Western European communists, socialists, and other leftist movements played” in the “antiwar movement,” “complicated the overall negotiations context.”⁸

The sense that history, in the form of the demonstrators, was on their side played a crucial role in the Soviet reaction to the “walk in the woods” compromise and to the Soviet decision to walk out of the negotiations in November 1983. Thus Savel'yev and Detinov noted that the Soviets were in a “dilemma.” If they accepted an outcome that permitted only the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles (and thus no new Pershings), “the step would have been interpreted as a betrayal of Europe’s communist and workers’ parties who backed the antimissile movement.” Savel'yev and Detinov added that “from a purely military standpoint, that option would have been sufficiently acceptable for the Soviet Union,” but “this argument lost favor at the upper echelons for political reasons, the first of which was a desire not to ‘betray’ the antimissile movement.”⁹

This same theme was elaborated by Pavel Palazchenko, the senior Soviet interpreter. Palazchenko speculated that the Soviet leadership turned down the “walk in the woods” approach in part because it would have led to Soviet acceptance of U.S. deployments and in part because “our leaders might still have hoped that the antimissile movement in Western Europe would make any U.S. deployment impossible and, therefore, that there would be no need for Soviet concessions. If that was the reason for rejecting the ‘walk in the woods’ idea, it, was the height of narrow-mindedness.”¹⁰

Savel'yev and Detinov also suggest that Soviet considerations for the role of “antimissile movements” were a factor in their decision to walk out of the negotiations. “The Soviet leadership was unanimous in believing that a continuation of the talks after the Euromissile deployment had started could be interpreted as Soviet acceptance of American actions,” and hence a “betrayal” of the “movement.”¹¹

Reflecting on this aspect of the INF experience, Savel'yev and Detinov wrote, “It is now clear that the Soviet side overestimated the

potential of the antiwar/antimissile movement in Europe, which in fact, failed to decisively influence the American and NATO plans. The Soviets noticed neither the weakness of the antimissile movement nor the impact of its own SS-20/RSD-10 deployment, which continued apace. "As for the resumption of the talks, at a certain point in time it became clear to the Soviet Union that the pressure tactic, which seemed so promising in 1983, had been exhausted, and that a more realistic course was required."¹²

Gorbachev's comments on INF, years after the treaty had entered into effect, are even more revealing and relative. They also contain echoes of the arguments I and others were making before and during the INF negotiations. Writing in his *Memoirs*, Gorbachev noted, "The decision to deploy SS-20 missiles in Eastern Europe had reflected the style of the Soviet leadership at the time, decision-making fraught with grave consequences for the country. I had arrived at the sad conclusion that this step, fateful both for our country and Europe and for the rest of the world, had been taken without the necessary political and strategic analysis of its possible consequences."¹³

Gorbachev claimed that Soviet Defense Minister Ustinov had suggested to Brezhnev that obsolete missiles in European parts of the Soviet Union be replaced with SS-20s whose technical advances gave them the "characteristics of strategic weapons" He admitted, however, the Soviet leadership misjudged Western reactions. "I would go so far as to characterize it as an unforgivable adventure, embarked on by the previous Soviet leadership under pressure from the military-industrial complex. They might have assumed that, while we deployed our missiles, Western countermeasures would be impeded by the peace movement. If so, such calculation was more than naive."¹⁴

Gorbachev further argued that those "Western countermeasures" to the Soviet deployment of SS-20s "resulted in a serious threat to Soviet security" and that the Soviets saw the INF negotiations and treaty as essential to removing that threat. "I deemed it my duty to avert the deadly danger to our country and to correct the fatal error made by the Soviet leadership in the mid-1970s."¹⁵

Gorbachev's remarks make it crystal clear that the U.S./NATO deployments of the Pershing II and ground-launched cruise missiles (GLCM) were the crucial element in persuading the Soviets to negotiate the removal and elimination of their SS-20s and other missiles. Had the United States and its Allies adopted the arguments of the peace and freeze movements, there would have been no INF Treaty, no elimination of an entire class of nuclear weapons, and perhaps no end to the Cold War. Even if the Cold War had ended, the Russians

would have retained their SS-20 force along with its ability to intimidate NATO Europe. It is even possible that the presence of such systems would have made it more difficult to expand NATO and left former Warsaw Pact members in politically more ambiguous circumstances.

Nevertheless, it is fair to say that the peace movement played an important role in INF. The movement's actions, demonstrations, and projected political power influenced Allied governments, especially in Germany. The major effect was to impress on NATO leaders that the Alliance's response to the Soviet buildup would not receive the necessary domestic political support unless it contained an arms control component. The concept of a dual-track approach was present in President Carter's "neutron bomb" decision and thus had an American antecedent. But the strongest force for an INF negotiating track came from the Federal Republic of Germany, whose government was much attuned to the need to outflank the peace movement and to maintain Germany's security and role in NATO.

On the other hand, it is evident from Soviet sources that once the negotiations began, the peace movement's involvement stiffened Soviet unwillingness to seek a sound and durable agreement and thus prolonged and jeopardized the negotiations. Yet in the end, despite the objections of the peace movement, the validity of the U.S./NATO approach to the INF problem was underscored both by the fact that every one of the guiding principles and objectives, first established by the United States and NATO before the negotiations began, were incorporated in the INF Treaty. Their validity was additionally confirmed by the subsequent statements of Gorbachev and other Soviet officials.

Some may argue that the Soviets would have acted in the same manner even if the "antimissile movement" had either not existed or had been more truly even-handed. I think not. Their own words say otherwise. In essence, once the Soviets began to take the potential reaction of Western public opinion into account when formulating their political and negotiating posture, they, like us, found that a successful conclusion to the INF issue would require the support of that public opinion. That opinion ultimately manifested itself in the democratic election process; that process supported deployment. Deployment in turn formed the foundation for the negotiation since, as the Soviets now acknowledged, an even-handed agreement which met NATO security interests would not have been achievable without deployment.

Deployment would not have been possible without the support of all NATO members. Indeed, NATO had to "win" in every prospective basing state, while the Soviets had only to crack a single link in the chain in order to take a major step toward the breakup of the Alliance.

Moreover, it can be argued that the Cold War would not have ended as it did had the “peace movement” succeeded in its efforts first to block the deployments and later to undermine the U.S./NATO negotiating position. Chancellor Kohl noted in 1992 that Gorbachev in a conversation with him had acknowledged that it was “the unity and steadfastness of the Alliance in the early 1980s that contributed to the ‘new thinking’ of the Soviet leadership and in the final analysis also to German unification.”¹⁶

The effort to win over Western public opinion did not, however, end with the signing of the INF Treaty. Writing in his *Memoirs*, Gorbachev argues that he was ready to “face the realities and accept the existing structures, pushing them at the same time towards cooperation—and hence towards a gradual transformation of both NATO and the Warsaw Pact. . . . We did not intend to leave either the United States or Canada outside the ‘common European home.’ ”¹⁷

Conceivably, Gorbachev probably recognized that reducing American presence and influence in Europe might better be attained by a Soviet policy of moving toward the reduction of tension via agreement, rather than one mixing the promise of peace with the threat of annihilation. The very title of the concept, a “Common European Home” connotes the prospect of a Europe with at least a reduced U.S. presence. Furthermore, the United States is conspicuous by its absence in the passage in *Memoirs* in which the fundamental elements of the concept are outlined.¹⁸

Moreover, Gorbachev’s positive reception in West Germany and elsewhere would, understandably, have caused him to at least contemplate the prospect of easing the United States out of Europe by strewing the path with rose petals. Whether he would have been tempted to move in that direction or whether he would have acted more in keeping with his call for better relations will remain an unanswered and unanswerable question.

As for the gray-haired, placard-shaking woman in sneakers, she was present at a ceremony to celebrate the INF Treaty held in Burlington, Vermont, and organized by some of the same groups that had organized the “Washington to Moscow” peace march in 1981. I made a few remarks including noting that had their calls for a nuclear weapons freeze been heeded there would have been no INF Treaty. Most of their concurrent commentary called for further reductions, but all recognized that the treaty marked a positive turning point. In so doing, they also recognized that the U.S. government had carried out the promise I had outlined to them over six years earlier. All, that is, except for one—the lady who would not accept that reality, and continued to shake her placard.¹⁹

This page intentionally left blank

BREAKING THE BACK OF THE BIGGEST PROBLEMS

ASIA AND GLOBAL ZERO

While the relationship among the United States, its European Allies, and the Soviet Union was at the core of the INF issue, the relationship among the United States, its Asian Allies, China, and the Soviet Union also played a significant role in the development and outcome of the process. Even before NATO's 1979 decision to deploy and negotiate, the United States and its Allies knew they would have to factor the Soviet INF forces stationed in Asia into any arms control agreement.

The U.S. and NATO position called for a global approach. But that approach was essentially linked to concerns that Soviet SS-20s based east of the Urals could either reach targets in Europe or be moved to accomplish that objective.

Thus in his seminal November 18, 1981, speech announcing the zero option, President Reagan placed INF squarely at the juncture where U.S., Western European, and Soviet political and security issues meet. The major portion of the speech was devoted to reviewing the history of the Alliance and the benefits that Allied solidarity had bestowed on its members. The Soviet military buildup, especially of its INF missiles, was also outlined in the context of its threat to the Alliance, as was the Alliance's response: the December 12, 1979, decision to deploy U.S. INF in Europe and to negotiate with the Soviets in order to reduce INF systems to the lowest possible level: a level that the president in this speech had proclaimed as zero.

The President did deal with SS-20s east of the Urals, but in a manner that linked them back to Europe. Noting that "Soviet spokesmen have suggested moving their SS-20s beyond the Ural mountains will

remove the threat to Europe,” the President pointing to a map demonstrated that “almost all of Western Europe [its] great cities . . . all of Scandinavia; all of the Middle East; all of Northern Africa [are] within range of these missiles, which incidentally are mobile and can be moved on short notice.¹

An article in the February 1982 *NATO Review* by Assistant Secretary of State Lawrence S. Eagleburger, published a few months after the negotiations had opened, illustrates the intensity of our focus on European considerations:

We believe it is necessary to take a global approach to limitations on landbased INF missiles. Because of the long range and mobility of land-based INF missiles, regional constraints—such as the Soviets publicly advocate—will not prove sufficient. . . . SS-20s immediately east of the Urals can strike targets on the territory of every European member on NATO. SS-20s based well to the east of the Urals can still strike significant portions of NATO Europe, and even those in the Far Eastern portions of the USSR, because of their mobility, could readily be moved to within range of NATO Europe.

Thus, an agreement limited in geographic scope to Europe could easily be circumvented. Such limitations of Soviet deployment of the SS-20 would be practically meaningless. Deployment could still take place—without any restriction or hindrance—east of the Urals, where SS-20s would still be within range of Western Europe. The Soviet superiority in INF would be maintained and nothing gained for the security of the Alliance.²

Although well argued in its basic premise, the article—which certainly was widely cleared within the U.S. Government—reveals no concern that if deployed in Siberia and the Soviet Far East, the SS-20s could reach our Asian Allies or U.S. territory in Alaska. Yet, because the political imperatives of the European aspect of the complex of INF issues were so compelling, the importance of the Asian elements was not at first given the full attention it deserved.

In part, this oversight was a reflection of the pattern of Soviet deployments, which began and were most heavily concentrated in the Western portion of the USSR. By the summer of 1981, it had become apparent that a militarily significant portion of the SS-20 force was being deployed in the Asian portion of the Soviet Union. Elements of that force (which we called the “swing force”) were able to strike targets in Europe and Asia. Other elements deployed farther to the east were unable to strike Western Europe but could hit Allies in Japan, South Korea, and the Philippines, as well as China and other targets in

Asia. Those deployed at the Drovyanaya complex in eastern Siberia could even reach parts of Alaska.

Fortunately, at the Geneva negotiations we had John Woodworth to remind us of this issue. John served from November 1981 to November 1983 as the representative of the Department of Defense on the INF delegation and from January 1985 to the end of the negotiations as the Deputy Chief Negotiator, with the rank of ambassador. He made it a point to insist that we factor in Asian considerations whenever we were considering how to approach a given issue and to make certain that our formal plenary statements contained appropriate mention of Asia.

In time, the official U.S. policy line on this issue was broadened to make Asian concerns an important part of the argument that an INF Treaty needed a global basis. In his February 22, 1983, speech to the American Legion, President Reagan listed as one of the principles that would underpin our negotiating position the proposition that "Soviet proposals which have the effect of merely shifting the threat from Europe to Asia cannot be considered reasonable." The "no shift of the threat" argument would become one of the mainstays of our position at the negotiations and in the public arena, both because of its logic and because of its political potency.

As the scope of Soviet deployment in Asia became clearer, we were increasingly obliged to take it into account. Looking at a map showing where the Soviets had deployed missiles in Asia in the past, I noted that were they to deploy SS-20s in the region of Anadyr in far northeastern Siberia they could reach all of Alaska, part of Canada, and the U.S. Northwest. Indeed, it was estimated that the SS-20 could in fact target 62 percent of the world's population including all of Europe, China, the Middle East and the Near East, most of India, much of Southeast Asia, and a large portion of Northern Africa.³

Our global approach provided a strong basis for seeking to capture all the Soviet INF systems, but we recognized that we might have to work out a formula for a geographical apportionment of those global limits, if the outcome were greater than zero. Nonetheless, it was in Europe that we would deploy our INF missiles; it was in Europe that the media campaign and activities of the peace movement were most intense, and thus it was the European aspects of INF that drove the course of the negotiations. Because of this reality and, to a lesser extent, because our potential for deploying U.S. INF missiles in Asia was theoretical at best, it was understandable that our main effort would be to find a formula that would reinforce our political posture in Europe. Still, we were fully aware that an INF agreement that did

not take into account our geopolitical interests in Asia would be an inadequate agreement.

In the process of trying to grapple with the broad question of how to bring the Soviet's Asian INF into an agreement, I probed our Soviet interlocutors on their views of the political aspects of INF in Asia and particularly their view of China's place in the equation. They were leery of even discussing this subject. Only Lt. General Nikolay N. Detinov, the Soviet military's senior man at the INF negotiations from their opening in 1981 until November 1983, was prepared to engage on this topic. His comments, while elliptical, left me with the impression that a deeply ingrained Soviet concern, verging on fear, over China would be a factor in their decision on whether and to what extent they would be prepared to reduce their Asian INF missiles in the context of a bilateral negotiation with the United States.

Indeed, in his memoir, *My Years with Gorbachev and Shevardnadze*, Pavel Palazchenko, the lead Soviet interpreter during the early years of the INF negotiations, noted that fear of China was widespread in the Soviet Union, "including the country's leaders," and "often reached the point of hysteria."⁴

The Soviets also attempted to shift the discussion of INF in Asia by charging that U.S. land and naval air power in Asia would more than counterbalance Soviet INF missiles there and that consequently there was no issue. But even this discussion was in part a reflection of a similar debate concerning U.S. nuclear-capable, carrier-based aircraft in European waters. The United States disputed Soviet claims of American superiority in aircraft quantity (and implicitly quality) in either Europe or Asia and argued that the negotiations should focus on the more destabilizing and threatening Soviet missile force.

Nevertheless, as the negotiations continued, the United States became increasingly aware of and ready to act upon Asian concerns. Secretary of State George Shultz comments upon this in his memoir noting that he had "assured" Japanese Foreign Minister Abe in early 1983 that "the United States would never do something welcomed by Europe but destructive to the rest of the world."⁵

The Soviets also began to show some signs of concern regarding how their INF posture was viewed in Asia. In his October 1983 proposal, Soviet General Secretary Andropov added an offer to one of the many Soviet proposals to reduce SS-20s to match the Soviet count of British and French warheads, essentially to freeze the number of SS-20s in Asia as long as the United States deployed no similar weapons in the region.⁶ However, it would not be until Gorbachev took over the reins that the Soviets began a more serious effort to

improve relations with the Asians and to recognize how their INF deployments in Asia impacted on that effort.

The Soviets, and the Asian Issue, Return to Geneva

The Soviets walked out of the negotiations before we had any real exploration of INF in Asia, let alone any progress. But when the Soviets returned to Geneva, the issue returned with them. Indeed, with the scope of their deployment pattern becoming clearer, the Asian element took on growing importance after the negotiations resumed. The appointment of Senator Stevens of Alaska to cochair the Senate Observer Group also played a role in focusing our attention on the Soviet's Asian SS-20 deployments. Stevens lost no time in reminding us that the SS-20s could reach portions of his state. Keeping him abreast of our efforts to obtain reductions (and eventually elimination) of SS-20s in Asia, I encouraged him to take his concerns to the Soviets during his visits to Geneva.

However, while the ongoing deployments of Pershing IIs and GLCMs in Europe provided us with visible leverage in Europe (which complemented the political power of our zero-option goal), comparable leverage was absent in Asia. Our task was made more difficult by a fact that could be easily exploited for public relations purposes: China would not be part of any INF arms control regime in Asia, and any Soviet INF reductions on the Chinese border would not be matched by China. Nevertheless, the Soviets would maintain a massive superiority vis-à-vis China in strategic missile forces, dual-capable aviation, and tactical nuclear weapons even if they were to eliminate all their INF missiles.⁷

In short, our negotiating position as regards Soviet INF in Asia needed the additional strength that could be provided by developing at least the appearance of potential Pershing and GLCM deployments in places where they could be seen as counters to the Soviets' Asian-based SS-20s. The Soviets in effect provided us with that possibility. As Asian considerations became a regular feature of the negotiations, they began to probe whether the United States might be considering counterdeployments. Although we had no plans for Asian deployments and were fully aware of the political ramifications on our relations with Japan, South Korea, and China of any such action, I was careful to couch responses to Soviet probes in an ambiguous manner that did not foreclose this possibility, but which ought not create concerns among our Asian Allies and China.

Japanese Concerns

U.S. officials, General Edward Rowny in particular, made frequent visits to Asia, especially Japan and China, to report on developments in each of the nuclear negotiations. This helped to ensure that Asians had a clear picture of the talks and provided them with opportunities to ask questions and express their views. I visited Japan in July 1986 to meet with cabinet ministers, officials, and the media. I emphasized that our approach was global in nature and that given its capabilities the Soviet SS-20 force, regardless of where it was located in the Soviet Union, could impact and impinge upon the security of the United States and its Allies. The United States, I pointed out, was prepared to be bound by a treaty that would be global in its scope. We were working to persuade the Soviets of the merits of such an outcome.

I did not hide the fact that while I was optimistic that we would eventually have a sound and durable treaty, we had not yet made the necessary breakthroughs in such key areas as agreeing on an equal outcome. As with the other visits I made, this one gave both my interlocutors and me an opportunity to obtain first-hand views on a subject of common interest and hopefully to give them a sense that I was aware of their concerns and would continue to keep them in mind during the course of the negotiations.

An authoritative Japanese view of the INF issue was presented by Japanese Foreign Minister Tadashi Kuranari in Kyoto on September 8, 1986, to the Twenty-Eighth Annual Conference of the International Institute for Strategic Studies. The minister noted that while the United States, Canada, Western Europe, and Japan were becoming more aware that “there were many aspects of international security questions on which they share common interests, in reality their perception regarding the security implications of each specific question they faced involved elements of both identity and variance.” He added that there was inadequate understanding about this reality itself.⁸

This was understandable “given the history of Western security policy where the security of Europe and that of the Asia Pacific region have been considered in mutual isolation. . . .” This, he noted, applied to the INF issue and Soviet SS-20s in particular. NATO relies on U.S. nuclear forces to supplement NATO’s conventional “inadequacies,” and the arrival of the SS-20 led to concerns that this new missile might “decouple” the defense of Western Europe from U.S. strategic nuclear forces. This in turn, the minister continued, led to NATO’s decision to deploy U.S. INF missiles in Europe.⁹

From a Japanese perspective, however, the deployment of SS-20s “does contain an additional threat, if we do not take into consideration the functioning of the extended U.S. nuclear deterrence.” In short, the Japanese weighed the SS-20 threat in the context of the global balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. The minister also noted, however, that Asian leaders tended to see China as the real target of the Soviet’s Asian-based SS-20s. Japan, he concluded, has “been demanding a global and total elimination of SS-20s for three reasons.”¹⁰

First, “the weapon can reach Japan” and thus “increases the potential threat against Japan.” Second, Japan believed the Soviets were using the SS-20 as a political weapon to “drive wedges between the U.S. and its European and Asian Allies.” Third was a concern that the very existence of the SS-20s “would work to push up the level of the East-West nuclear force balance in the global context and might end up destabilizing the mechanism of deterrence.” The minister also said he was “greatly encouraged by the deep understanding shown by the United States and the Western European countries toward our views” despite their different strategic environments. He attributed this to the close consultations among the United States, Western Europe, and Japan on this issue.¹¹

A RAY OF POSITIVE LIGHT

While our efforts to maintain solidarity with our Allies were bearing fruit, we were not making any real progress toward meeting the essential need to obtain a Soviet commitment to reduce or eliminate their Asian INF. For the moment, it appeared we were stymied and that this issue could be a treaty breaker.

The situation took a new turn in mid-August 1986. Washington and Moscow had concluded that the three sets of negotiations had reached a point where it would be useful to have a group of high-level officials (minus the INF and START negotiators) meet outside of Geneva.

In the end, when it became clear that all the Soviet negotiators would be included, Ron Lehman and I were added to the U.S. team. The first set of informal talks would take place in mid-August in Moscow. These would be followed by talks in early September in Washington.

The U.S. side, disappointed that the Soviet team would for the most part consist only of Soviet officials who had been directly involved with the United States in the negotiations (and were considered by

some in Washington as blocking progress), entered the Moscow meeting (held at the Soviet Foreign Ministry's country guest house, Meshcherino, formerly a private estate) with a degree of pessimism. The meeting began with a rather typically fruitless discussion of defense and space issues noteworthy only for Richard Perle's lucid explication of the U.S. position. The discussion of START issues demonstrated a seriousness of purpose, even if there was no significant progress. But, there was potentially a major breakthrough in INF.

As was standard in sessions of this type, I gave a summary of the U.S. INF position and objectives. During the course of the discussion, I repeated the U.S. position that an equal outcome for both parties was essential. While we preferred a zero outcome, we could accept an equal number below 572; preferably one well below that number. General Nikolay F. Chervov, the head of the Soviet Defense Ministry's arms control section, then asked whether we could accept an equal number of 100 warheads for both parties in Europe. There was a moment's silence as all the U.S. members looked toward me. Was he merely trying to call our bluff or was this serious. We had after all said we could accept any equal number below 572 warheads.

Thanks to the close cooperation that existed among the civilian and military members of the INF delegation, I was aware that there was a level below which our INF would not be "militarily viable." I answered "yes," but then sought clarification on two issues. Since Chervov had stated "100" warheads for both parties, he had implied there would be no Soviet demand for "compensation" for U.K. and French forces. "Does your proposal cover only U.S. and Soviet weapons?" I asked. Chervov said "yes." Seeking further precision regarding Soviet efforts to stop U.S. and Allied nuclear cooperation, I asked "British and French systems are thus excluded from this formula? There are no obligations on their part?" Chervov again said "yes."

While I had been negotiating with the Soviets long enough to know that they could change their minds and add conditions, the basic elements of this exchange struck me as likely to stick. If that were to prove the case then, the most difficult aspect of the INF negotiations—the issue that had consumed more time and effort than any other—had been successfully concluded. The Soviets had accepted an equal outcome for both U.S. and Soviet missile systems and had dropped their insistence on counting U.K. and French systems on the U.S. side of the ledger as if they belonged to us. With this move, assuming it would be reconfirmed, they also accepted our fundamental proposition that the United States and its NATO Allies had a legitimate right to deploy U.S. weapons systems in Europe to offset Soviet

deployments. By extension, the Soviets would in signing a treaty based on our formulation formally acknowledge their acceptance of the security link between the United States and its NATO Allies. The fact that the Soviets did not raise the issue during the early September follow-on talks in Washington was a positive sign.

In the end, the Soviets did not seek to back away from their dropping the demand for compensation for U.K. and French forces. They did, however, reintroduce some other caveats. In particular they sought to limit U.S. LRINF deployments to GLCM, thus denying the United States the right to deploy Pershing II ballistic missiles. The U.S. side said it was prepared to discuss the mix between Pershing II and GLCMs [missiles] but Pershing II must be part of the U.S. force.

However, when, at the Moscow meeting, I turned to the third point of clarification and asked whether an equal outcome in Europe would be accompanied by concurrent proportional reductions in Soviet INF missiles in Asia, Chervov was less forthcoming. The basic Soviet position on the Asia issue at both the Moscow and Washington meetings was to agree that in the context of a finite European limit, the USSR would "limit" the number of warheads on its LRINF deployed in Asia. They refused, however, to discuss any reductions in their Asian SS-20s or to specify their existing levels in Asia. The Soviets also suggested that the United States should be entitled to a number of warheads on LRINF missiles that could be deployed in the continental United States exclusive of Alaska, equal to the level of Soviet LRINF missile warheads in Asia. This proposal was thoroughly disingenuous. Such a force could not hit targets outside of North America.¹²

In a briefing to NATO on the Moscow and Washington meetings, I stated that the United States intended to indicate to the Soviet side that its suggestion for an equal ceiling of 100 warheads in Europe would be acceptable only if the Soviet Union agreed to reduce and limit concurrently its SS-20s in Asia to 100 warheads or less.¹³

It was clear from the Moscow and Washington discussions that Asian issues would not be resolved at "high-level experts" meetings. The vexing question of where the boundary would be drawn between Europe and Asia for purposes of determining which missile bases should be considered "Asian" or "European," and how the swing force would be treated required political consideration. Given the important political nature of this issue, with its implications for both U.S. and Soviet relations with Asian nations, it seemed unlikely it would be resolved without top-level intervention.

Nevertheless, given the highly satisfactory conclusion to the U.K.-French issue (with the sides agreeing they would be limited to an

equal number on a global basis), I left the meetings in Moscow and Washington with a strong sense that we were going to succeed in creating a sound and durable INF Treaty. With the equal outcome issue now resolved, in so far as European INF deployments were concerned, the question of getting the Soviets to accept inclusion of their Asian INF in the final agreement took on greater importance.¹⁴

Asian Complications: Looking for Leverage

As noted earlier, I had deliberately left open the impression that we might deploy INF systems in Asia. However, it seemed to me that without some sign that such deployments were under serious consideration, any Soviet perception that this gambit was based on reality might not last much longer. Accordingly, during a meeting of U.S. officials in early September 1986 to prepare for a luncheon encounter in Washington with the visiting Soviet experts, I suggested that we trade off our potential for deploying INF on the Asian mainland for a Soviet commitment to make their Asian deployments part of the final package. This commitment could take the form of including the swing force in their European numbers and reducing their Asian INF, which could not strike targets in Europe, in proportion to the reductions in their European INF. The reaction of my colleagues, with Richard Perle in the lead, was overwhelmingly negative; we should not budge, this was no time to be making any "concessions" to the Soviets.

The working lunch for which we had prepared was held at the Soviet Embassy. I found myself relegated by their seating plan to a table in a corner of the room along with more junior members of the Soviet group. The Soviet negotiators, including my counterpart, were seated far away along with a group of Washington-based U.S. officials. The probable purpose of the seating arrangement later became apparent. Ron Lehman rushed up to me as the luncheon concluded. He had been seated at a table next to that of the Soviet negotiators and senior officials from Moscow, and Washington-based U.S. officials. He had overheard a part of their discussion in which Perle and the other Americans had effectively given away the possibility of any U.S. deployments in Asia. It would not be the last time that the Soviets would seek to move me out of the front lines.

When the U.S. side regrouped after the lunch, I asked whether what Lehman had told me was correct. Perle said it was. I asked him what they had gotten in return for this concession. His reply, in effect, was nothing. I reminded him and the others of our prelunch coordination

session and of the strong negative reaction to my suggestion that we trade off Asian deployments for a Soviet concession. Now rather than either holding firm or getting something in return for moving, they had given away part of what little leverage we had. Perle responded that I would now have to find some other form of leverage. I said that any new leverage would have to come from the potential of U.S. INF basing in Alaska and probably one of the westernmost of the Aleutian Island chain, Shemya, where there was an Air Force installation. (I had already been considering this as a supplement to or a fallback from the “possibility” of deployment on the Asian continent and had identified Shemya as one potential cruise missile deployment site.)

At the end of the month, the United States and Soviet Union announced that a summit would be held on October 11–12, 1986, at Reykjavik, Iceland. Clearly, insofar as INF was concerned, the key issues would be threefold: confirming at the highest level agreement to an equal ceiling of 100 U.S. and Soviet INF warheads in Europe (while not deserting the ultimate goal of zero); obtaining an acceptable definition of “Europe” that would include the Soviet SS-20 swing force; and obtaining Soviet agreement to proportional cuts in their remaining Asian INF missile force (again without deserting the ultimate goal of zero). Keeping open the prospect of deployments in Alaska would be part of the U.S. approach. The INF portion of the presummit briefings of the president and the secretary of state focused on these issues and goals. Given the limited space at the Reykjavik meeting site, we were told, Lehman and I would not accompany the party to Iceland. We would, however, be part of a team that would debrief European leaders and officials.

As with the discussion at Reykjavik of START and defense and space issues, the discussion of INF issues also took an unexpected turn. We came into the meeting expecting the Soviets to open with the prospect of equal levels (100) of U.S. and Soviet LRINF warheads in Europe that General Chervov had raised at the August 1986 experts’ meeting in Moscow. Although global zero remained our preferred outcome, we were prepared to discuss an outcome based on 100 LRINF in Europe but one that also included a proportional reduction in Asia. Gorbachev, however, proposed to go to zero U.S. and Soviet LRINF missiles in Europe. The Soviet Union, he proposed, would have the right to deploy 100 LRINF missiles (presumably SS-20s) in Asia, and the United States would have the right to deploy 100 U.S. LRINF missiles in the United States. While the reduction in Asia would not drop to the zero level, there would still be a significant reduction in the number of SS-20s in that region.

The net result would be an agreement to eliminate all LRINF in Europe and for the Soviet Union to retain 100 LRINF missiles in Asia while the United States would have the right to deploy an equal number on US territory including Alaska. The question of how to resolve differences over SRINF was not resolved although the Soviets showed a new willingness to bring them under restraints by offering to freeze their force levels, albeit on condition that the United States do the same: a result that would have produced a very unequal outcome.

The Soviets, as we have seen, also relinked an agreement in INF to agreements in the other two negotiating areas. Although this development was a step backward, I was determined (as I had been from the outset) to move ahead on the basis that we would, in the end, obtain a separate INF agreement. Moreover, as seen above, I told Obukhov in Geneva that when they returned to a delinked position they would get absolutely no credit from us for making a purported "concession."

Alaska Deployments of INF?

The Soviets had already evidenced some veiled concern over the possibility that we might counter their far eastern deployments of SS-20s with deployments of GLCMs in Alaska. I sensed that Alaska Senator Stevens' stated concerns over the SS-20s had helpfully added to the Soviet apprehensions over potential U.S. counterdeployments. Building on these concerns, I steered a post-Reykjavik conversation with Obukhov around to the question of Soviet-Asian deployments and specifically the validity of Stevens concerns. Obukhov challenged my assertion that SS-20s could not only reach Alaska but parts of Canada and the U.S. northwestern states as well. It was technically impossible, he insisted.

At our next meeting, I brought along a globe and a piece of string. The Soviets had formally stated that the maximum range for the SS-20 was 4,000 kilometers. I measured out the string against the mileage indicator on the globe and placed one end at the former Soviet missile base at Anadyr, in far northeastern Siberia. Using the string, I drew a range arc. Even allowing for the unsophisticated materials, I argued it was apparent that the SS-20 could reach as far south as Seattle (and its nearby nuclear submarine base). Then lengthening the string to demonstrate the extent to which the SS-20s could reach targets in the United States and Canada when using the 5,000-kilometer range (which had appeared in some estimates) I drew a second arc. In this case, much of the U.S. Northwest could be struck.

Obukhov said it was simply “not possible.” I offered to let him draw the arc himself. He could measure the string and determine that it was not made of elastic material. Obukhov refused the offer. I said that whether or not he drew the arc himself, the evidence was incontrovertible. “It was not” he replied. His experts said the SS-20 could not reach those targets and that made it a fact. I could put the globe away.

Aside from illustrating the intellectual and diplomatic constraints under which the Soviet negotiators operated, this episode also led me to question the potential effect of such a mindset on an inspection regime. Would we have to anticipate that a Soviet base commander faced with the incontrovertible uncovering of a banned missile, for example, would maintain that the U.S. inspectors were looking at something entirely different, and that what was without question a banned missile was in reality a harmless object? It made me all the more determined to press for the most rigorous verification regime that we ourselves could accept. I should add that I am unaware of anything like this ever having arisen during the many inspections carried out under the INF Treaty, but the Soviet negotiating posture contributed to Washington’s decision to push for more stringent verification measures.

Dr. Fred Ikle, the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, saw the value of giving the Soviets something to worry about in the Far East and moved to give the possibility of an Alaskan deployment a semblance of reality. He thus arranged for the dispatch of a team of military officers to Alaska to scout out potential basing sites for U.S. INF missiles.

This approach could have sharply focused the Soviet’s attention on the need to bring reductions of their Asian-based INF into a final agreement. Unfortunately, I surmised, there was insufficient coordination within the administration and, far more importantly, it appeared no coordination with Senator Stevens or others of the Alaska congressional delegation. As a result, when confronted with news reports that the U.S. military were looking into possible deployment sites in Alaska, Stevens, totally blindsided, strongly objected to such a development. I believe that, if Stevens had been brought into the picture, he would have worked to support our efforts at the negotiation. Needless to say, we did not probe the Soviets for their reaction to the press accounts. Nor did they raise it with us; perhaps because they had discounted Ikle’s move or perhaps because it would mean getting into a discussion of going to zero.

In the formal negotiations and informal discussions with the Soviets, I continued to argue for the inclusion of Soviet INF based in

Asia and to hint that the United States had not foreclosed what deployment options it might adopt in order to provide counterweights to the remaining Soviet INF in Asia. This persistence may have had some effect on the Soviets. Despite the public airing of Stevens's reaction to Ikle's aborted effort, in early December, Ambassador Viktor Karpov, in charge of arms control issues at the Soviet Foreign Ministry, raised concerns over possible Alaskan deployment during a post-Reykjavik visit to Geneva to meet with Kampleman who was also visiting that city. Kampleman in effect told Karpov that Alaska was not a serious possibility and that the Soviets should not worry about it. With this, the last vestige of any leverage coming from our keeping the Soviets uncertain of our reaction to their retention of an INF force in their Asian region was essentially eliminated.

Fortunately, Gorbachev provided us with a potent political argument. His growing campaign to improve relations with Asian countries was being widely publicized by the Soviets. The contradiction between the Soviets' purported desire to improve relations with the Asians and the Soviets' unwillingness to agree to eliminate the 100 SS-20s and other Soviet INF systems menacing these same Asians smacked of hypocrisy. The stark contrast between their menacing attitude in Asia and their willingness to remove the Soviet INF threat in Europe, which, as I reminded them, could readily be interpreted as a form of discrimination, provided a form of negotiating pressure every bit as powerful as the potential threat of counterdeployments. It was an argument well suited to moving beyond the Reykjavik formula and achieving a global zero outcome.

Thus I pressed the case for a global zero, noting that the world, and especially Asian nations, would know that it was the Soviet Union alone that was preventing the removal of the INF threat from their region. The United States for its part was ready to go to zero, and everyone knew it. Nonetheless, the Soviets abiding concern for their security situation in Asia remained a major impediment to an agreement to reach global zero. I thought that an additional "sweetener" might provide the final impetus. Once again, fortuitously, one appeared.

BRINGING GERMAN PERSHING MISSILES INTO THE MIX

Although the United States had agreed to a zero level for its INF in Europe, established programs of cooperation (POCs) involving nuclear weapon systems provided to our Allies were not affected.

The Federal Republic of Germany had purchased and deployed U.S.-manufactured Pershing Ia missiles for which the United States had provided nuclear warheads under a POC. It was technically possible to upgrade the Pershing Ia missile force by converting the first stage of a Pershing II missile into what would be called a Pershing Ib. (The second stage of the Pershing II would presumably be destroyed, in effect eliminating the Pershing II missile as required by the INF Treaty.) In other words, instead of destroying all of our Pershing II missiles, the first stage of some of them would be converted into Pershing Ib missiles.

Because we had insisted that arrangements covered by established POCs would not be affected by an INF agreement, we would thus have the right to convert some of our PII missiles into PIB missiles, sell them to the Germans, and make U.S.-owned and U.S.-controlled nuclear warheads available for use on them under the so-called dual-key system, which required joint U.S. and German agreement to release the warheads for actual use. The result of such a modernization would be to bring the 1969-vintage German Pershing force up to a state-of-the-art technical level. Both U.S. and German officials were interested in conversion when the possibility first became apparent. The Soviets were also aware of this possibility and no doubt helped move the issue into the media's domain, undertaking a public and private campaign to pressure the German government to forego conversion. In time, the German authorities let us know privately that the prospects for conversion were dim at best.

The Germans were concerned for a number of reasons. First, they did not want to be "singularized," holding the only significant INF systems in Europe following an INF Treaty. Second, they did not want to give the Soviets, and elements in their domestic body politic, a high-profile focal point for attacking the government of the Federal Republic. Nevertheless, they wanted to be good allies and certainly not damage either the Alliance negotiating position or NATO's military posture should the INF negotiations fail. Consequently, they did not want to allow this issue to become a treaty breaker, nor, I believe, did they want to open another debate over the deployment of a nuclear weapon system. If the Germans were to retain a nuclear-capable missile force, it would be an obsolescent one.

The near certainty that conversion would not take place seemed to me to provide an opportunity to trade off our agreement to forego conversion of the German Pershings in return for Soviet willingness to join us in the global elimination of INF missiles. Accordingly, I contacted Washington, laid out the basic proposition, and suggested that

I float it past the Soviets as a personal idea. If the proposal elicited interest, we could follow up by making it more concrete. If the Soviets treated it as a nonstarter, we could drop it. In response, I received a green light.

On June 1, 1987, I met alone at lunch with Obukhov. Turning the conversation toward a discussion of the remaining 100 LRINF missile systems, I noted that we had been intrigued by the questions General Medvedev had raised at a steering group meeting concerning the relationship between conversion and a global zero outcome. I also noted that Obukhov had also raised questions about how various aspects of a treaty might look in a global zero environment. I replied that I was prepared to explore this question on a “personal” basis and ready to discuss how verification requirements could be eased along with other issues, which could be either eliminated or greatly eased in a zero environment.¹⁵

Obukhov then asked whether something might be done about conversion in a global zero environment. I said that the conversion issue fell into a different category from the questions we had been discussing. I asked if the Soviets could contemplate some sort of package of trade-offs that could include agreement on a global zero LRINF outcome in the treaty we were developing. Obukhov referred to the current Soviet position and then said it would be useful to know what the United States was prepared to do. I replied that the United States had already made a major concession when it agreed to the sides retaining 100 warheads each outside of Europe. Any specific problems related to the Soviet insistence on retaining those 100 warheads would have to be solved on the basis of the United States having made its concessions at Reykjavik. Obukhov said that the United States should understand that among the key points that the Soviets believed must be dealt with were no conversion of LRINF missiles and the actual destruction of U.S. systems right from the beginning of the reductions process. The Soviets were particularly concerned over the prospect of Pershing IIs being converted into Pershing Ibs and provided to the Germans.

I responded that including the German Pershings in a U.S.-Soviet agreement was out of the question. The missiles were owned and manned by Germans. The warheads were American, but we had an established program of cooperation with the Germans going back decades with regards to these systems. The continuation of this program could not be considered a circumvention of an agreement that would be signed years after the program had been put into effect. In any case if NATO supported a global zero SRINF outcome, the

possibility of the United States converting to a banned system would appear to be moot. Obukhov then asked what the U.S. position would be on converting GLCMs to SLCMs (sea launched cruise missiles) in a global zero LRINF environment. I asked if he was now ready to begin discussing on a personal basis what sort of a package might be put together to arrive at a global zero outcome. Obukhov said he would consider our conversation and would “make a sign” if he was ready to continue the discussion on a personal basis.

A few days after my conversation with Obukhov, the Soviets told us that General Chervov would be visiting Geneva. This visit would provide an exceptional opportunity to put the concept directly to a key Moscow player. The first meeting with Chervov on June 17, 1987, took place over lunch at the Soviet Mission. I was accompanied by Ambassador John Woodworth and our interpreter, Dmitri. Arensburger. On the Soviet side, in addition to Colonel General Chervov were Ambassador Obukhov, General Medvedev, and Mr. Roslyakov. The discussion began with the by-now familiar differences of view regarding the German Pershing Ia missiles, with the Soviets insisting that these missiles must be covered by a treaty. The U.S. participants stressed that the noninclusion in a bilateral U.S.-Soviet Treaty of German PIa missiles, covered by an existing program of cooperation, was a matter of principle. The discussion then began to focus on the question of conversion, with the Soviets arguing that missiles subject to reduction under an INF Treaty should be destroyed and the United States countering that elimination could be achieved by conversion.¹⁶

Chervov pressed me for a summary of the U.S. view on conversion and SRINF. I replied that the U.S. position had several components. One was that we had an existing program of cooperation with the Germans on SRINF missiles. I noted that the Soviets had never raised the issue of German or other NATO Allied aircraft equipped with U.S. nuclear bombs. Those systems were analogous to the German Pershings. Chervov argued that the Soviets had made numerous concessions in an effort to obtain a treaty but now the United States was raising new obstacles. The U.S. approach contained logic, he said, but it was all in favor of the U.S. side. Chervov then said he understood the U.S. position as follows: zero globally on SRINF missiles, the United States abandons conversion for U.S. PII to PIb but maintains its program of cooperation with the Federal Republic. If the FRG should ask for it, the United States could convert PII to PIb.

After further review of the PII to PIb conversion issue, Chervov summed up the Soviet position. If the Soviet side were to accept a

double global zero, the United States must in turn physically destroy all PIIs, with no conversion, and physically destroy all GLCMs with no conversion. He hinted that the Soviets might be prepared to accept retention of the existing German PI missiles. He would leave for Moscow on June 20 and perhaps the U.S. side could give him an answer before he left. All the participants agreed that the discussion had been helpful and the farewell handshakes were heartier than usual.

Movement Toward an Agreement

I informed Washington of the planned meeting with Cherov and set out the talking points I intended to use for it. The main points included the following:

A. If the Soviet Union agreed to the following:

- global elimination of LRINF missile systems;
- global elimination of SRINF missile systems;
- inclusion of the elimination of SRINF missiles systems as an integral and binding part of the INF agreement;
- strict and effective verification provisions;
- application of the INF Treaty only to the LRINF and SRINF systems of the United States and the Soviet Union;
- the Soviet Union understands that the United States retains the right to continue established patterns of cooperation with the FRG regarding the Pershing missiles systems.

B. Then the United States would be prepared to consider the following:

- destruction/dismantlement of all U.S. LRINF and SRINF missile systems;
- no conversion of U.S. LRINF and SRINF missiles and launchers;
- consequently, no transfer of any existing U.S. LRINF or SRINF missiles or launchers (that is, those actually in the U.S. force) to any third parties.

I was given an informal go-ahead, on a secure line, but told to expect a more definitive and detailed response after U.S. officials had an opportunity to review the talking points more carefully. When I arrived at the U.S. Mission on Saturday morning, I was told there were no messages for me. Chervov, accompanied by General Medvedev, who had been named the official Soviet INF negotiator, was at the door. I decided to proceed along the lines I had proposed to Washington.¹⁷

To open the conversation, I repeated our arguments supporting the double global zero INF proposal we had raised on June 16. (Double global zero referred to a zero level for Soviet and U.S. LRINF and SRINF missiles.) I also noted we were aware of Soviet concerns over the possible conversion and modernization of the German Pershing Ia force. Chervov saw where I was heading and allowed that it might be possible to reach a solution to both problems. I also took this occasion to put forward a concept I had been considering for some time.

For purposes of verification, we were interested in ensuring the destruction of banned missiles. This, however, would mean our having to forego converting GLCMs to SLCMs. Given the fact that our GLCMs and SLCMs were virtually identical this would be "wasteful." It occurred to me that we could satisfy both our verification and cost concerns by putting forward a proposal that would ensure that cruise missile airframes were destroyed but that would permit us to remove the motors, guidance systems, and rocket boosters. We would also be able to use the mobile launchers in other capacities or at a minimum be able to detach the tractors (prime movers) and use them to haul other cargoes such as tanks. This arrangement was eventually accepted.

At the same time, I suggested, both sides would make clear that neither would transfer to third countries any existing U.S. or Soviet LRINF or SRINF missile systems. Existing meant those in the force now. This nontransfer provision would include the Federal Republic of Germany. However, I made it equally clear that it was a matter of principle for the United States that the German Pershings were not a part of this agreement. The United States would retain the right to continue the established program of cooperation for the Pershing systems. However, I did not envisage the support for that program going beyond the framework of that established pattern.

Chervov again expressed concern over the possibility that under the approach I had proposed, the United States would have the right to convert PII missiles into PIb missiles for the FRG. He believed his authorities would find this difficult to accept since it would be seen as an inequity. Having laid out our respective positions, we both came to an informal agreement, stressing we were speaking informally and unofficially. There would be a Soviet commitment to eliminate their remaining INF systems in Asia (in essence a double global zero), and the United States would not convert any of its PII into PIbs. The Soviets could accept retention of the existing German PIa force.

The one point on which we agreed to disagree concerned the continued application of the U.S. program of cooperation with the

Germans. I made it clear that we would not abandon that arrangement without German agreement. Chervov commented that this would “pose a major difficulty for the Soviet side.” Nevertheless, we both understood that each of us would present the informal agreement to our respective capitals.¹⁸ As I bid farewell to Chervov, I was more confident than ever that we would get a sound and durable INF agreement incorporating the principles we had worked out with our NATO Allies back in 1979. As it was, that confidence would soon be tested.

Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Yuli Vorontsov and Kampleman came to Geneva more or less as Chervov was departing. On June 23, 1987, John Woodworth and I met with Vorontsov, Obukhov, and Medvedev. Vorontsov was taking a rather negative and pessimistic line. In response, I noted that we had made progress during Chervov’s visit and expressed the hope that we could move further with Vorontsov. When I outlined the discussion with Chervov, Vorontsov exploded. “Decisions on such issues are made by us in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and not in the Defense Ministry,” he said. Chervov’s views and suggestions, he concluded angrily, “are not our policy and have no standing.” Neither Medvedev, who had been present during my conversations with Chervov, nor Obukhov, who had been present at the luncheon meeting with Chervov, made any comment. Both carefully controlled their body language. Despite, or perhaps even more because of Vorontsov’s bluster, I concluded that of the two Chervov’s was the more authentic voice. In any event, we continued our efforts to move the Soviets to accept our global zero approach and patiently awaited developments.¹⁹

Soviets Accept Double Global Zero—But with a German Twist

On July 22, 1987, we got our answer. It took the form of an interview by Gorbachev in the Indonesian newspaper *Merdeka*. In essence, Gorbachev accepted the U.S. double global zero concept. But he sought to present it as his own and as a Soviet contribution to improving security in Asia. His choice of an Asian newspaper to unveil the Soviet move was also meant to send an obvious message. Nevertheless, the incompatibility between his call for closer Soviet-Asian ties and the Soviet insistence on keeping SS-20s targeted on most of Asia (and perhaps to some extent our exploitation of that political military incongruity) had forced a change in Soviet policy. The next day the Soviets in Geneva formally tabled the proposal outlined in the *Merdeka* interview.

However, this move forward included the introduction of a new but not unexpected caveat. The Soviets made agreement contingent on the inclusion of the German PIA in an INF agreement. After the formal session, Obukhov took me aside and expressed the Soviet expectation that the United States would now follow through on the accord reached with Chervov. Aware that we had been in close contact with the Germans on this issue and that conversion was not in the cards, I said we would. On the other hand, I noted the German PIA would have to remain outside any U.S.-Soviet agreement.

As for Vorontsov's explosive denial, he may have been angry at Chervov for having agreed with me on a move that might not have been fully coordinated within the Soviet bureaucracy. It is also possible that Vorontsov may have been aware of consideration being given to something like Gorbachev's *Merdeka* article as a way to make it appear that the Soviets deserved a "thank you" from the Asians for gaining global zero in INF. In any case, the result of my conversation with Chervov was a "win-win" outcome for both sides.

The Soviets would avoid the risk of a modern NATO/FRG nuclear missile force. The United States would obtain the global zero it sought to the benefit of itself and its NATO and Asian Allies. Both parties would gain from the improved prospects for effective verification, which a zero outcome would create. Moreover, by reaching an agreement on an equal global zero, we had helped make verification of an agreement easier. With all INF systems banned, there would be less scope for trying to claim that a given weapon that we had sighted was among the permitted ones. The sighting of even one banned weapon would be sufficient to create a treaty violation.

While there was still work ahead for us, we had at this point obtained the zero outcome that President Reagan had made as his prime goal six years earlier. We had secured Soviet agreement to the NATO-agreed principles that had guided us from 1979. We had obtained Soviet recognition of the legitimacy of U.S. deployments of nuclear weapons in Europe, and by extension their acceptance of our military presence in Europe, as a counter to Soviet deployments threatening our NATO Allies. And we had defended the interests of our Asian Allies by obtaining the elimination of the Soviet INF threat against them.

None of these accomplishments, however, had been translated into agreed legal language, and both sides had proceeded on the usual negotiating understanding that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. Reykjavik's confirmation of the August Moscow experts' meeting had moved us a long way, but several important issues

remained unresolved. Two of them, SRINF and verification, had in fact not gone much beyond the preliminary discussion stage. We had hoped that since an important part of INF had been agreed at Reykjavik, we might be able to make progress in some of these other areas. Yet as we have seen, the Soviet side during this period reinstated linkage and took a generally negative approach.

We were not alone in sensing that our across-the-table partners were being more difficult than their leader. In his *Memoirs*, Gorbachev reveals his own frustration with his negotiators.

Everyone agreed at the Politbureau meeting that Reykjavik would improve our image in the world, demonstrating our determination to prevent a new arms race. But our generals and even some people in the Foreign Ministry and in our negotiating team in Geneva were doubtful. They were firmly stuck in a logic of antagonism and the military sought to protect their corporate interests. The existing state of affairs seemed to suit some of our negotiators in Geneva, who enjoyed having their wages paid in hard currency, thinking the longer the negotiations, the better for us.²⁰

It is difficult to imagine a harsher criticism. Later, after we review similar examples of Soviet foot-dragging, we examine possible reasons for this behavior.

REVIEWING THE BIDDING: SHORT-RANGE INF

On November 14, 1986, I reported to the North Atlantic Council (NAC) on the post-Reykjavik state of the negotiations. I noted that on October 23, 1986, the United States, in an effort to build upon the progress made at the summit, had tabled a new INF proposal "reflecting the U.S. understanding of what was agreed at Reykjavik as well as additional elements that need to be included to form the basis for a complete agreement."²¹ The new proposal would limit U.S. and Soviet LRINF missiles to an equal global ceiling of 100 LRINF missile warheads with zero warheads on each side in Europe and 100 warheads on each side outside Europe. Regarding those outside Europe, the Soviets would be restricted to Soviet Asia, and the U.S. to the United States.

The LRINF missile reductions would be carried out in a phased manner to be completed prior to the end of 1991. There would be provision for follow-on negotiations to begin on a date aimed at the

elimination of the remaining LRINF missile systems. The phasing of reductions was an important concept for both parties, but each side had a different timetable in mind. The problem lay in the fact that the Soviets had far more existing missiles than the United States. Our aim was to phase the reductions in a manner in which the sides would reach an equal level early into the reductions process. The Soviet aim was to maintain their numeric advantage until almost the very end of the process. It proved to be a difficult, but not impossible problem.

Specific provisions for SRINF missiles were included for the first time. They called for “appropriate qualitative constraints” on SRINF missile systems and a ban on SRINF missiles between the ranges of the Soviet Scaleboard/SS-12 (900 kilometers) and the Pershing II missile systems. Equal ceilings would be placed on U.S. and Soviet SRINF missiles at the current global level of Soviet SS-23 and Scaleboard SRINF missile systems. Negotiations on SRINF missile reductions would begin six months after an initial INF agreement was reached.

The U.S. proposal also introduced specific verification proposals. These included data exchanges, on-site observation of the elimination of treaty-limited INF missile systems, and “effective monitoring of the remaining INF missile systems and associated facilities, including on-site inspection.”²² Finally, the United States proposed that the treaty be of unlimited duration and remain in effect until replaced by an agreement on further reductions.

I reported to the NAC that the round “had been marked by a general Soviet unwillingness or inability to engage in serious, substantive discussions.” As specific examples, I cited the Soviets’ presentation in Geneva as implying “that the agreement on LRINF missiles reductions outside of Europe would be separate from agreement on European reductions.” The Soviets also failed to propose a timetable for reductions outside Europe. Moreover, the Soviet proposal would have prohibited deployment of U.S. LRINF missile systems in Alaska. This was a retrograde step given that earlier Soviet post-Reykjavik statements, both publicly and in Geneva, had made no reference to Alaska.²³

The picture as regards SRINF was similarly clouded by Soviet unwillingness to move forward. They continued to push for a freeze by both sides of their respective SRINF in Europe. The practical effect would have been to institute a Soviet right to a monopoly in SRINF missile systems covered by an INF Treaty. Moreover, as was the case with LRINF, the Soviets proposed that limitations on SRINF would relate only to Europe. This was also a retrograde step in that, earlier

Soviet statements, in Geneva and publicly, had made no reference to limiting their SRINF freeze proposal to Europe. Indeed, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Petrovsky had told the United Nations in October that the freeze would apply to Europe and Asia.²⁴

As for the timing of follow-on SRINF negotiations, Gorbachev stated publicly on October 12, 1986, that such negotiations “would begin immediately.” The Soviet negotiators in Geneva used the same formulation until November 7, when in a formal presentation, they chose to obfuscate this issue by proposing that there would only be follow-on negotiations to “deal further” with these missiles and giving no indication of when such talks should begin or of their objectives.

For its part, the United States repeated its basic position on SRINF constraints as noted above. I added that in a Vienna meeting between Secretary Shultz and Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, we indicated that in the context of prompt follow-on talks on SRINF, we would consider reductions in systems down to 150-kilometer range. I added that the United States and its NATO Allies would want to consider the pros and cons of appropriately adopting the Soviet “1,000 kilometers and below” concept to our approach to an SRINF negotiation. The point here was that such an approach could result in the elimination of all U.S. nuclear missile forces in Europe.

As to verification, while the Soviet approach appeared close to ours in some of the elements described above, they made no mention of on-site observation of the LRINF elimination process. I noted to the NAC that a senior Soviet arms control official, Victor Karpov, had told me this was an oversight, but if so, the Soviets in Geneva failed to correct it in their final INF plenary statement.²⁵

I concluded by discussing the Soviet reinstatement of linkage of INF to defense and space issues and expressed my belief the Soviets would ultimately drop the link. I summed up the then current state of the negotiations by stating that “while we are disappointed we are not discouraged. We have seen this type of Soviet backpedaling before. In the past at least, these steps backwards have been followed by more steps forward. Our aim will be to make this pattern repeat itself until an acceptable agreement is reached.” As always I ended by stressing the vital importance of Alliance solidarity to the successful conclusion of the INF negotiations.²⁶

A Needed Christmas Break

In keeping with the aim to persevere, the United States and the Soviets, at U.S. urging, scheduled an extraordinary set of “ad referendum”

negotiations in early December 1986 hoping that the extra meetings would provide the impetus that had been found lacking in the previous post-Reykjavik months. The initial omens were not good. The Soviets announced that Ambassador Obukhov would no longer be in charge of the INF negotiations and would be replaced by a cautious and less senior negotiator, L.E.M. Masterkov. Little had been accomplished by the time the negotiations closed for the holidays.

One can only empathize with Gorbachev's frustration with the Soviet negotiators. But his implicit admission that he could not control them raised serious questions concerning who was actually in charge in Moscow at this point. My guess was that power in Moscow at this time was becoming far more diffuse than the monolith that we envisaged, and that the military and reactionary elements in the party were increasingly uneasy with the direction Gorbachev was taking them.

Following the meeting, I debriefed NATO and returned to Washington for the usual briefings and meetings to consider moves for the next round. Christmas was spent at home in Vermont with my wife and our family. Before returning to Geneva, the U.S. negotiators met with President Reagan. These pre- or post-round meetings were of considerable benefit. The negotiators had an opportunity to report directly to the president and to receive his reaction. While he did not delve into the intricate details of the talks (that would require a full-time job), he did set the direction and gave me a sense that he would back me up if I could demonstrate how a specific proposal would help us reach our goals. Moreover, I also felt that he would be prepared to turn down a proposed agreement if it was not fully in the U.S. interest. This provided me with a foundation upon which to take a firm position in the face of Soviet maneuvering.

Upon our return to Geneva on January 17, 1987, we reintroduced our November 14, 1986, presentation in an effort to engage the Soviets on specific issues. The Soviets unfortunately continued to resist any serious discussion, falling back on their reinstatement of linkage as an excuse for nonengagement. Once again it was Gorbachev who moved the Soviet position forward.

As we have seen, the Soviets on February 28, 1987, removed linkage from the Soviet position and announced their willingness to sign a separate INF agreement independent from START and the defense and space negotiations. On March 2, 1987, Ambassador Vorontsov—who had been named the Soviet Nuclear and Space Talks (NST) negotiator tabled the delinking at the Geneva negotiations. The fact that the Soviet negotiators chose to table the delinking at a joint plenary of all three groups, rather than in the INF talks, does

raise the possibility, given our knowledge of Gorbachev's disappointment in his negotiators, that the choice of venue might have been prompted in part by a desire to underscore the negotiators' disapproval of delinking. On the other hand, it was an action that affected all three groups.

MOVING THE BALL FORWARD: TABLING A DRAFT INF TREATY AND SUMMING IT UP FOR NATO

Two days later it was the United States' turn to move the ball forward. On March 4, 1987, the United States tabled a draft INF Treaty. I was delighted that after pleadings and interventions by the Geneva INF group, our colleagues in Washington had completed the difficult task of transforming our proposal into a potentially legally binding document. We now had a full treaty text upon which to focus the work of the negotiators. The very next day I was at NATO headquarters in Brussels to report to the NAC on the status of the negotiations.

The draft treaty I noted had been presented to Special Consultative Group (SCG) representatives on February 6, 1987, and the full text was provided to Allied governments on March 2. The contents of the draft treaty, I told the NAC, "reflect the results of close and long-standing consultations with the Allies on INF and incorporate the INF agreement discussed at Reykjavik."

- 100 INF missile warheads globally with zero in Europe and the remaining 100 deployed in Soviet Asia and on U.S. territory;
- Constraints on SRINF with a U.S. right to equality at the present Soviet level of such missiles; and
- Strict provisions for a detailed and effective verification regime.²⁷

We had reminded the Soviets, I told the NAC, that they had noted several times during this round that in-depth negotiations would begin once the sides began work on an actual text. In tabling its draft treaty, "the U.S. had provided the basis for starting promptly with the expeditious drafting of a sound and durable INF agreement."²⁸

Turning to other developments in the round, I noted that the Soviets wanted to engage the United States in drafting the common text of a "framework" INF agreement. This document, together with companion documents in START and defense and space, were to have formed "the overall package solution which the Soviets were touting, up until their delinkage of INF." When it came to actually discussing

their package, the Soviets were rather vague; from their perspective, such “inconsequential details” could be discussed later.²⁹

The[re] Soviet were also backtracking. They would not reconfirm their long-standing offer not to deploy SS-20s west of 80 degrees east longitude. Without this restriction, the Soviets would be able to move their SS-20s into positions just east of the Urals from which they could reach all of Europe.

On an issue of fundamental principle, the Soviets continued to insist that remaining U.S. and Soviet LRINF missiles be deployed “beyond striking range of the other side’s territory.” This Soviet position “calls into question the foundation” upon which NATO is based, since, “in effect it seeks to restrict the ability of the U.S. to deploy its INF missile systems within range of Soviet territory while at the same time leaving the Soviet Union free to threaten U.S. Allies with comparable Soviet missile systems.”³⁰ The Soviets also hinted that follow-on negotiations to deal with the remaining 100 INF missiles should cover other systems. This appeared to the U.S. INF group to mean aircraft and possibly third-country systems. The result would be to add complications to the prime goal of eliminating the most dangerous systems, INF missiles.

I noted that there was agreement to use destruction and dismantlement as a means to eliminate LRINF missiles. However, the Soviets had raised strong objections to conversion as a procedure for elimination, despite the fact that they had used this process under past arms control agreements. They argued that under conversion the United States would merely be converting missiles from one class to another. This would be inconsistent with the “goal” of eliminating nuclear weapons. In reply, I told the NAC that conversion would indeed eliminate LRINF missiles systems. They would cease to exist. Moreover, we argued, it should be of no concern to the Soviet Union whether those missiles came from conversion or from new production, as long as U.S. SRINF missiles remain within agreed limits and constraints.³¹

Despite the Soviets’ reluctance to get into depth on verification issues, we were able to reconfirm the three general areas of verification agreed at Reykjavik: exchange of data; monitoring (including on-site inspection of reductions); and on-site inspection of remaining inventories. The Soviets, however, were unprepared to discuss with us how they would reflect these elements in a treaty. Moreover, they were unprepared to agree, at this time, on noninterference with national technical means.

The Soviets objected to the U.S. proposal to negotiate verification provisions in parallel with the negotiation of reductions and limitations.

They sought to put off in-depth work on verification provisions until after signature.

I concluded my review of the current state of the negotiations by noting how the combined efforts of all the Allies had been responsible for moving the Soviets a long way toward the NATO/U.S. INF position. Soviet agreement to delink INF from the other negotiations was a case in point.³²

There were several other remaining issues. Some we had begun to discuss, others had not yet surfaced. Indeed, at this point we were still unaware of some of them. Of the remaining issues the two most pressing were verification and SRINF. While our basic verification position had been placed before the Soviets, there were a large number of details yet to confront. The SRINF issue, on the other hand, had become [more] politically sensitive. Moreover, as I reported to the NAC on March 5, the Soviets had begun to move on SRINF in directions that could create differences between the NATO Allies.

SHORTER-RANGE INF—SEALING
OFF THE POTENTIAL
FOR CIRCUMVENTING
THE TREATY

INF became a vital issue largely because of the SS-20 and its 4,500-kilometer range, because this range enabled the missile to reach targets in Europe, Asia and, North America from the Soviet Union. But geography made it imperative that, from an Alliance standpoint, a sound and durable outcome would have to include shorter-range INF systems (SRINF) (those between 500 and 1,000 kilometers) that could also strike portions of NATO Europe from the western Soviet Union and from Warsaw Pact locations.

Thus, from the outset of the intra-Allied discussions leading up to the 1979 NATO decision, it was recognized that an INF agreement would have to constrain Soviet missiles with ranges below 1,000 kilometers. Such Soviet systems, especially those deployed with Soviet forces in Eastern Europe, were capable of striking targets in NATO Europe, thereby fulfilling some of the missions of Soviet LRINF missiles. If left unconstrained, they would in effect allow the Soviets to circumvent an INF agreement. In contrast, U.S. Pershing I missiles deployed in Germany were far less capable of fulfilling the role of U.S. LRINF missiles, in that from their base in Western Germany they were not within range of the Soviet Union.

Accordingly, during the first round of INF negotiations (November 30, 1981–March 16, 1982), the United States proposed that “collateral measures designed to enhance the effectiveness of the ban on LRINF missiles by limiting Soviet SRINF missiles with ranges of and between those of the Soviet SS-23 and SS-12/22 to the number deployed as of January 1, 1982. Excess such missiles would

be destroyed, although modernization and replacement, within certain qualitative limits, would be permitted on a one-for-one basis.”¹

The Soviets, for their part, proposed that “short of eliminating all non-strategic nuclear forces from Europe, systems with ranges under 1,000 kilometer should not be constrained.” The net effect of eliminating all nonstrategic nuclear forces from Europe would have been to leave the Soviet Union with the only ground-launched INF-range nuclear missile force in Europe (the 18 independent French intermediate-range nuclear missile force aside.) It is noteworthy that the Soviets at this point, before the talks had begun, were prepared to envisage a zero level of SRINF, at least in a manner which ended the U.S. nuclear presence, while allowing the Soviets to maintain an overall advantage in Europe.²

The Soviet rationale for using the 1,000-kilometer range floor was tied to their argument that a 1,000-kilometer combat radius was the approximate round-trip distance between West Germany and Soviet territory. They also argued that all U.S. aircraft in or near Europe capable of carrying nuclear weapons would be capable of that combat radius, while large numbers of Soviet nuclear-capable aircraft would not.

They justified the exclusion of these Soviet aircraft on the grounds that they were not as capable as their United States counterparts. When pressed they acknowledged that they had used different flight profiles for roughly comparable U.S. and Soviet aircraft; using high fuel consumption flight profiles for their aircraft and more efficient ones for ours. We of course challenged this absurd method of accounting. In any event, the net effect of the various elements of the Soviet approach would have been the elimination from Europe of all United States dual-capable combat aircraft while large numbers of Soviet nuclear-capable combat aircraft would have remained at their bases in Eastern Europe well within range of NATO Europe.

SRINF was not a major consideration in subsequent discussions during this period of the negotiations, with both sides holding to their opening positions. However, SRINF was taken into account in the “walk in the woods” package of July 1982. Under that proposed approach, U.S. and Soviet SRINF would have been limited to existing levels. Another modification in the approach to SRINF was proposed by the United States during Round V (May 17–July 14, 1983). The United States “offered to make collateral constraints on SRINF reciprocal, that is, U.S. Pershing Ia missiles would be limited in the same manner as Soviet SS-12/22 and SS-23 missiles.”³

NATO estimated in the early 1980s that the Soviets had deployed approximately 650 SS-12/22s and Scuds (with the SS-23 in development), compared to 171 of the Pershing Ia’s, which would

continue to be reduced to 72 upon full deployment of the Pershing II missiles. It is evident, therefore, that at this early stage in the talks, the United States and NATO were prepared to accept “collateral constraints” that might in effect result in an unequal level of SRINF systems, while as we have just seen, the Soviets were prepared to contemplate an equal level at zero.⁴

The Soviets, however, showed little interest in discussing the U.S. position on SRINF. Moreover, they did not put forward any ideas of their own, arguing that SRINF could not be addressed until key issues were resolved.⁵ Indeed, as late as October 1983, Colonel General Nikolay F. Chervov in an interview with *Stern* magazine baldly stated that while the Soviets had short-range SS-21 missiles, “rockets of the SS-22, and SS-23 don’t exist at all, they exist only in the imagination of the Americans.” There was some question about the SS-22, but there was no question about the existence of the SS-23.⁶

While the Soviets eventually agreed in principle to quantitative limits on missiles with ranges between 500 and 1,000 kilometers, they did not provide detailed explications of their position or table concrete provisions during the phase of the INF negotiations preceding their walkout in November 1983. Their agreement in principle to these quantitative limits may have been a politically motivated desire to appear responsive to the arguments of the “peace movement” rather than a desire to reach agreement.

One SRINF-related point on which they did express sensitivity concerned Kaliningrad. When I challenged Kvitsinsky’s effort to equate U.S. Pershing Ia missiles based in West Germany with Soviet SRINF that could reach targets in NATO Europe, he rejoined that the Pershing Ia could indeed strike Soviet territory, citing Kaliningrad as an example. I did not accept his basic contention, which I noted implied a range for Pershing Ia well beyond its actual range. However, I also commented, somewhat tongue-in-cheek and with a smile, that if the Soviets had not taken Kaliningrad as a prize of war, the problem would not have arisen. Kvitsinsky replied that the area was recognized as part of the Soviet Union.

During the period following the Soviet walkout, I visited European NATO capitals and attended conferences where INF was on the agenda. I made it a point to raise the SRINF issue in the context of exposing the weakness of the Soviet position on aircraft and also underscoring how unconstrained Soviet SRINF could allow the Soviets to circumvent an INF agreement. The reaction of the European participants, aside from those opposed to NATO’s 1979 “dual-track” decision, encouraged me that our stand was correct.

When the sides returned to the negotiating table in early 1985, SRINF continued to be viewed as an important part of the negotiations, but as a “collateral” issue. By and large, the discussions were unproductive. While the Soviets offered at Reykjavik to freeze SRINF levels pending follow-on negotiations of SRINF reductions, the freeze would have left the Soviets with their existing SRINF and the United States with zero.⁷

The patently unequal outcome of the Soviet freeze proposal led the United States to place less emphasis on collateral constraints and more on the need for an equal outcome in SRINF as well as in LRINF. Virtually imperceptibly an equal outcome in SRINF became our formal position. Indeed, the same logic that underpinned our LRINF position, that is, what mattered was not how much a side reduced its LRINF missiles but rather that the outcome should be equal also ought to apply to SRINF, given its ability in many cases to substitute for LRINF. In any event, to the best of my recollection, the Soviets never protested our movement from “collateral constraints” to an equal outcome for SRINF.

As the negotiations continued, the United States fully embraced the equal SRINF (and LRINF) outcome, raising it to a “principle.” Thus, in my March 5, 1987, report to the North Atlantic Council (NAC) I noted that during a conversation with Vorontsov, I had underscored the importance of equality as regards an SRINF outcome and the U.S. right to match Soviet SRINF numbers. I also reported that the U.S. INF group had told the Soviets that equality in SRINF was a *sine qua non* for an agreement in the INF negotiations.⁸

The Soviets, I told the NAC, had taken the position that U.S. insistence on equality amounted to a pretense for U.S. desire to increase its nuclear forces in Europe. In contrast, the Soviets, conveniently ignoring the fact that they would be left with a near monopoly in SRINF missiles, sought to portray their “freeze in place” proposal as a boon to the United States and NATO since it would preclude the further buildup of Soviet SRINF in Europe.

The Soviet negotiators in Geneva were not, however, prepared to go into any detail on their SRINF position. For example, when asked which missiles they proposed to include in their freeze proposal and what their current levels were, the Soviets characterized such information as “superfluous details.”

Moreover, I noted to the NAC that the Soviets had become even more evasive with regard to their SRINF position. Soviet negotiators, including Vorontsov, visiting Geneva on March 3, 1987, were unable or unwilling to clarify the precise meaning of Gorbachev’s February 28,

1987, statement that the Soviets were prepared to begin talks immediately with a view to reducing and fully eliminating "theater" missiles, or to confirm whether their proposal to freeze SRINF missiles concurrently with reducing and limiting LRINF missile systems remained the actual Soviet position.⁹

I pressed Vorontsov on what the Soviets might have in mind with respect to SRINF, underscoring the importance of equality and the U.S. right to match. He replied that the SRINF issue would be resolved and noted that the Soviets might agree to reduce their SRINF or agree to some U.S. SRINF deployments. But then to U.S. surprise and consternation, during a subsequent meeting with U.S. senators visiting Geneva, Vorontsov began to argue a linkage between U.K. and French forces and Soviet SRINF. Taken aback by the strong U.S. objections, Vorontsov returned to his vague "this will be resolved" formulation, but would not confirm that the Soviet SRINF freeze proposal remained on the table.¹⁰

The possibility of a major shift in the Soviet approach, however, appeared during this visit when Ambassador Viktor Karpov, a senior Soviet Foreign Ministry arms control official, joined the group for a working lunch at the Soviet Mission. During the lunch, I took the opportunity to raise SRINF, essentially to put down a marker that the United States remained determined to constrain SRINF as part of any INF agreement.

Karpov responded by stating, in the presence of Vorontsov and the other Soviet negotiators, that if the SRINF issue represented an obstacle to an early INF accord, the Soviet side was prepared to eliminate SRINF at the same time that LRINF missiles were reduced to 100 warheads globally and eliminated in Europe. When I asked which Soviet systems he was referring to, Karpov indicated Scaleboard and SS-23. While noting that a global outcome rather than one limited to Europe would be the most appropriate result, I thanked Karpov and urged him to come to Geneva more often with proposals of this sort.¹¹

While I obviously did not state them, I also had misgivings about the effect of Karpov's trial balloon on intra-NATO relations. The prospect of removing all U.S. SRINF from Europe could be seen as a major Soviet interest in so far as it could be a major step toward the Soviet goal of undermining the linkage of the strategic interests of the U.S. and European NATO members.

U.S. dual-capable aircraft would still remain in Europe (the Soviets had dropped their effort to include them in the negotiation in the fall of 1985), but they would not provide the same amount of deterrent

value as the missiles. Unlike the missiles, the aircraft had conventional roles and would encounter anti-aircraft defenses. Conservative leaders in Europe, who had been in the forefront of supporting the U.S. INF approach and who considered the maintenance of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe as crucial to their countries' security, were likely to raise concerns over a double zero outcome. Karpov's hint carried with it the potential for a serious debate within NATO on how to respond.

THE GERMAN PERSHING Ib: A NEW CONCERN FOR THE SOVIETS

In addition to the potential for stirring up disagreement among the Allies, Karpov might have had another motivation for trotting out a possible zero level SRINF outcome. The Soviets saw both political and military advantage in stopping the conversion of U.S. PII missiles into Pershing Ib missiles, which would then be sold to the Germans as a modernized replacement for their 72 Pershing Ia missiles.

Conversion was an economically and militarily attractive option for NATO. The United States had said it would not increase the total number of new Pershing missiles in Germany above the number of its existing Pershing Ia force. But with a zero level of PIIs in the offing, the question arose of whether some of the PIIs that would not be deployed in Germany might be used to update the 72 aging German-owned and-controlled PIa (the United States controlled the missiles' nuclear warheads).

The conversion would probably be accomplished by removing one stage from a Pershing II, thus *ipso facto* transforming it into a Pershing Ib making it unable to reach LRINF ranges. Its range would probably have been close to that of the Pershing Ia (according to the IISS *The Military Balance 1988-1989*), or about 720 kilometers. The converted missiles would also be equipped with updated electronics.

The United States maintained, and the Soviets did not strenuously object to, the proposition that "existing programs of cooperation" would not be affected by an INF agreement. Our nuclear weapons arrangements with the Germans, as well as with the British and other Allies, fell under this rubric. The Soviets would, however, be in a stronger position to argue against the modernization of the German Pershings if the United States were to agree to a zero level of U.S. and Soviet SRINF in Europe. In any event, that argument would have resonance with the opposition parties in Germany and elsewhere, while the prospect of further weakening the U.S. nuclear presence in Europe would worry conservatives.

Nevertheless, we did our best to make sure the Soviets understood there could be no INF agreement without constraints on SRINF. Thus when I appeared on “This Week with David Brinkley” on Sunday, March 8, 1987, I responded to Brinkley’s question about SRINF by stating that dealing with SRINF was “a *sine qua non* for a solid agreement. We will not have one without them included.” I made similar remarks during a press briefing held at the White House on March 6 and carried by USIA to all our European diplomatic posts.

German Angst: Concerns With (or Without) SRINF

Over the next two to three weeks, however, Karpov’s trial balloon seemed to float away. The Soviet negotiators did not broach the subject or respond to our careful probing. Bonn was growing restive over SRINF. German officials were increasingly concerned both over the prospect of Germany’s deploying modernized PIa missiles and the possibility of a zero level for U.S. SRINF in Europe. The reaction of German officials at NATO meetings at which I briefed on Karpov’s trial balloon led me to suggest that I visit Bonn to explain the situation directly to cabinet level officials.

On March 30, accompanied by John Woodworth, I met separately with Foreign Minister Genscher, Defense Minister Woerner, and German Socialist Party (SPD) Bundestag group Deputy Chairman Horst Emke. Woerner was a solid supporter of the Alliance, of the deployments of Pershing IIs and GLCMs in Germany, and of our negotiating position. I explained to him that I believed Karpov’s zero-level SRINF trial balloon could well be serious and that, while it was not then being pressed by the Soviets, we needed to prepare for its formal introduction.

The problem I acknowledged was that accepting zero SRINF could be construed as a step toward the ultimate elimination of all U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe, with the clear implication that the linkage between NATO European defense and U.S. nuclear forces could be seriously weakened if not broken. The potential fracture of the link could, however, be mitigated if NATO moved ahead to modernize its remaining shorter-range nuclear forces (SNF), that is, weapons systems with ranges below 500 kilometers. This objective could be accomplished by deploying a follow-on to the surface-to-surface Lance missile (FOTL) and a new theater air-to-surface missile (TASM).

On the other hand, if we did not accept a zero level for SRINF, we would certainly incur criticism for having turned down a Soviet offer

to go to zero while at the same time arguing the need to modernize NATO's SRINF. Not to modernize would place us at a military and political/psychological disadvantage vis-à-vis the Soviets. We would have turned down an offer for an equal outcome at zero and willingly accepted an unequal outcome providing the Soviets with a distinct advantage. We would have been left holding obsolete systems solely in German hands. The ability of the Alliance to deter Soviet political intimidation and aggression would be greatly weakened.

Woerner responded by arguing that the negative side of moving to zero SRINF would have more serious consequences than turning down any Soviet offer, since zero SRINF on top of the zero already agreed for LRINF would have a negative effect on the linkage with U.S. strategic systems and hence between the United States and other members of the Alliance. Moreover, relying on SNF alone to provide the linkage would have the major disadvantage of leaving Germany particularly exposed and singled out as the potential nuclear battlefield. At the same time he cautioned against any possibility of modernizing NATO's SRINF even if we turned down a zero offer.

I told Woerner that we understood and shared the German concerns, but the logic of the situation made it very difficult to defend refusing a Soviet offer to move to zero SRINF but not take steps to update SRINF systems, in an environment where SRINF would remain present. We parted amicably, but it was clear that there had not been a complete meeting of the minds and that further discussions would be required.

Genscher, for his part, stressed the importance of completing an INF Treaty along the lines agreed at Reykjavik while calling for immediate follow-on negotiations on shorter-range intermediate missiles, which he called a "paramount interest" of the German government.¹²

Emke told the German press after our meeting that he had "discovered a willingness to compromise and a determination to reach disarmament solutions." However, inside the meeting, and later with the press, he also took a very negative attitude regarding conversion of Pershing II into a Pershing Ib. "This" he told the press "would run counter to the Federal Government's protestation that a disarmament success would remove the medium-range missiles totally from German soil."¹³

THE SOVIETS MOVE TO GLOBAL ZERO FOR SRINF

At the end of the day, it seemed increasingly likely that if the Soviets adopted a zero SRINF position and we turned it down, we would find

ourselves both unable to deploy SRINF to match the Soviets and in a rather indefensible position back home. Under the circumstances, a zero SRINF outcome, with some prospect of upgrading remaining shorter-range nuclear forces, was probably the best outcome. While this outcome would leave the United States and its NATO Allies with the least desirable nuclear systems in Europe (missiles and artillery with ranges below 500 kilometers and air-delivered weapons), it would still pack a punch and provide visible evidence of the linkage between NATO and the U.S. nuclear deterrent. But we would first have to persuade Woerner and his cabinet colleagues of this judgment.

As it turned out, we would have only a limited time in which to accomplish this objective. The day after visiting Bonn, I returned to Washington to help in the preparations for meetings in Moscow between Secretary Shultz, President Gorbachev, and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. INF was certain to be a major issue on the agenda. I emphasized that we might be confronted with a Soviet zero SRINF proposal and that we would have to move carefully given the German concerns. These points were reinforced during the pre-ministerial meetings held by the U.S. team in Helsinki prior to going to Moscow.

As we had anticipated, SRINF was a prominent element at the April 14, 1987, Moscow ministerial meeting. Secretary Shultz raised the topic during his meeting with Gorbachev. The Soviet leader first suggested that the Soviets would withdraw nuclear systems in East Germany and Czechoslovakia and that both sides would then freeze SRINF levels. The secretary responded by citing our cardinal principle: any agreement must be based on an equal outcome, and a freeze at current levels would not be equal. Gorbachev then suggested that SRINF be treated in the same manner as was agreed at Reykjavik for LRINF: zero in Europe and 100 in Soviet Asia and the United States. Noting that the SRINF weapons systems could be easily moved, the secretary rejected this approach noting that “the only sensible outcome is equality on a global basis.” Finally, the Soviet president proposed a global zero. Well aware of the sensitivity of this issue with our Allies, the secretary made it clear that he would have to consult with the Allies before responding to Gorbachev’s offer.¹⁴

U.S. Officials Have Qualms over Double Zero

We were scheduled to meet with our NATO Allies in Brussels directly after the meeting in Moscow. Since I had been working on verification issues at the “expert” level during the Moscow meeting, I was only able to begin preparing the secretary’s talking points on SRINF for

use at the North Atlantic Council meeting after we boarded the airplane headed for Brussels. The arguments I had used with Defense Minister Woerner formed the basis of the talking points. We could accept global zero for SRINF or an equal finite number for both sides. But, to accept an outcome in which we turned down the Soviet offer of a global zero for SRINF (while not deploying modern SRINF) would create an unbalanced and politically indefensible result. If NATO did not accept zero, then it had to deploy SRINF to match the Soviets.

As we flew toward Brussels, I cleared the paper with Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs "Roz" Ridgeway and several other members of the secretary's party. Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle was preparing a message of his own, but I was able to obtain a quick "OK" from him once we arrived at Brussels. With coordination completed, I turned the paper over to the Secretariat Staff (S/S) for final typing and delivery to the secretary in the morning and went to bed.

But not for long! Charles Thomas, director of the State Department's NATO Office, called and urged me to get back to the delegation's offices in the hotel. A group of officials who had just joined the party and our ambassador to NATO, Alton Keel, had taken the talking points paper from S/S and were arguing that its entire premise was wrong, and that it should be entirely rewritten.

I found the delegation in intellectual turmoil. The new arrivals were insisting the zero offer must be turned down because it would undermine the nuclear linkage between the U.S. and NATO Europe and thus the overall deterrent. As for the considerable likelihood that Germany and other Allies would not support deployment of new U.S. SRINF, they argued it would be sufficient to leave open the possibility of deployment at some future time, our (unexercised) right to deploy would balance the existing Soviet force.

I went over the arguments with the group. Before any conclusion could be reached, it was announced that a press backgrounder, which Ridgeway had been asked to give, would be held in a few minutes. The lure of seeing and being seen by the media proved more powerful than dealing with the SRINF issue. The crowd, Richard Perle aside, surged toward the doors.

Barring the exit I said, "We need to wrap up this paper for the secretary now." Ridgeway said she had already cleared my draft. The others in effect said they would leave their proxy with Perle and made for the media. Once they had left the room, Richard and I sat down and went over the paper. He made a couple of suggestions,

which did not affect the substance of the paper, and which I readily accepted. By the time the others returned, the paper was retyped and back with the Secretariat Staff awaiting delivery to the secretary.

Secretary Shultz used the paper to good effect. The Germans, as expected, agonized at length over the decision. In the end, they and the other Allies recognized that the global zero SRINF outcome was in NATO's overall interest. It presaged a global zero for INF, and it would make verification easier and relatively more certain than verifying a finite number.

On the other hand, going to zero, as I pointed out in my Brinkley show interview, did carry with it a requirement to "insure that the remaining nuclear weapons in Europe are . . . 'high tech.'"¹⁵ The fact that I underscored the need for maintaining a modern SNF force in Europe reflected my concern that we needed to lay the groundwork for such action in order to meet the concerns of those Europeans who believed an INF agreement would undermine linkage and deterrence along with uneasiness over the prospects for obtaining broad enough European support for the deployment of such systems.

The uneasiness was intensified by the growing signs that a follow-on SNF negotiation (with the possibility of pressure for another "third zero" outcome) could be in the offing if we succeeded in INF. Genscher's call for follow-on negotiations certainly strengthened the prospect of a new round, if not its outcome. With the Cold War still a factor, the prospect of the removal of all U.S. nuclear forces from Europe (while the Soviet Union would continue to hold European cities hostage to its remaining strategic nuclear forces) and the effect that outcome would have on our ability to deter a Soviet attack, and thus on the Alliance, was not particularly agreeable to contemplate.

More German Angst over SRINF

There would, however, be several more SRINF-related obstacles to surmount before we would reach that point. All the obstacles would be interrelated, and Germany would figure prominently in all of them. On June 1, 1987, the Germans informed the United States that they were prepared to accept a global zero-level SRINF outcome. A NAC ministerial meeting at NATO headquarters on June 12 put the Alliance's imprimatur on that decision, and we tabled it in Geneva on June 16 as the formal U.S. proposal for SRINF.¹⁶ Thus, at this point, the United States and the Soviet Union had reached agreement on an INF Treaty that would eliminate all INF missiles except for 100 Soviet LRINF in the Asian part of Russia and 100 U.S. LRINF missiles on

U.S. territory, and appeared closer to reaching an agreement to eliminate their SRINF missiles on a global basis.

The same NAC ministerial meeting also called for the continued presence of “adequate and effective” U.S. nuclear forces in Europe. This commitment was meant to be a clear signal that modern U.S. SNF systems should remain in Europe even if a double global zero INF Treaty was successfully negotiated. As Prime Minister Thatcher put it, a “firebreak” was thus put in place to ensure that “zero” would not be extended to cover all U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe. However, while conservative Germans supported this approach as essential to maintaining deterrence, other Germans believed that “the shorter the missile the deader the German.” In this climate, support was growing in favor of a new negotiation to cover SNF.

The Soviets at this juncture began turning the spotlight of their private and public attention to the German Pershing Ia. A treaty outcome more to their liking and the prospect of exacerbating divisiveness within and among Allied nations were their twin goals.

At the time of the 1979 NATO INF decision, the Germans had 72 PIa missiles. Like their 108 U.S. PIa counterparts, they had been first deployed in 1962. The 1979 decision called for the modernization, on a one-for-one basis, of the 108 U.S. Pershing Ia to Pershing II. The modernization involved more than extending the range of the missile and included other important technological improvements in its electronics and guidance mechanisms, notably increasing reliability and accuracy.

As we have seen above, with the growing likelihood that the United States and the Soviet Union would conclude an agreement calling for zero INF missiles in Europe (and probably worldwide), and with the German PIa missile system becoming obsolescent, it appeared sensible to convert some of the U.S. PII missiles into PIb missiles for the Germans. This conversion, as noted above, could be easily accomplished by removing one of the stages of the PII. The resulting missile, dubbed the PIb, would have a range below 1,000 kilometers and thus be roughly equivalent to that of the PIa.

Moreover, since the United States had insisted, and the Soviets had accepted, that the INF negotiations involved only U.S. and Soviet forces, and that established programs of cooperation, such as we had with the Germans (which included their Pershing Ib) would not be affected by a U.S.-Soviet INF agreement, we believed we had a strong, albeit legalistic, case for arguing that eliminating U.S. PII missiles, by converting them into PIb and providing them to the Germans, would not contravene a treaty eliminating U.S. and Soviet INF missiles. As is covered below, the German government (with

domestic political considerations in mind) became concerned that conversion and upgrading of their PIa missiles might appear inconsistent with the removal of U.S. PII missiles and GLCMs from Europe and could, whatever the strength of our legal arguments, be politically damaging within Germany. We have already seen the role that dropping conversion played in attaining a global zero INF agreement.

The Soviets Leverage the Germans

But that still left the existing 72 German PIa missiles. With a range of over 700 kilometers they fell within the definition of an SRINF missile. But since they were not a U.S.-owned and -controlled missile, they were outside the scope of the developing bilateral U.S.-Soviet agreement. The Soviets, however, had other ideas and began increasingly to bring up what they considered the anomaly of maintaining any missiles with INF range in Germany. The draft treaty they tabled on April 23, 1987 contained a proposal to include the warheads on the German Pershings as part of the agreement.

Obukhov, during private meetings with me in early-mid June (during the same time period as I was preparing the “no conversion in return for a global zero LRINF missiles” trade-off with Chervov), made a specific point of arguing that the retention of the German Pershings would put the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact Allies at a distinct disadvantage because none of them would have a comparable system. I strongly objected to his position, noting that we had made clear that existing programs of cooperation could not be affected by an agreement and that we could not accept an agreement that would have such an effect. I also pointed out that the Soviet negotiators had told us they had no existing programs of cooperation with their Warsaw Pact Allies, and Obukhov continued to argue that the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact Allies would be disadvantaged because they did not have any missiles similar to the German Pershings. I noted that the Soviets were not restricted to their SRINF or LRINF missiles when it came to targeting NATO Europe.

On one occasion, Obukhov cited the Soviet agreement to eliminate its SS-23 missiles as a factor in their view that the retention of the German Pershings would put the Warsaw Pact at a disadvantage. The Soviets had fought hard to keep the SS-23 out of the INF agreement. They argued that its range was less than 500 kilometers and should not be included among the missile systems subject to elimination under the proposed treaty. Our information was that the SS-23 had shown such a capacity.

Exacerbated by what was becoming a circular and fruitless debate, I told Obukhov that we could go on arguing whether the SS-23 could travel 500 kilometers, but the key point was that our Allies, and especially the Germans, were convinced that the SS-23 was a particularly serious threat to them. A treaty that did not include the SS-23 could well run into insurmountable political obstacles with the Congress and the Allies. It simply had to be included.

Following the April ministerial meeting in Moscow, the Soviets tabled a formal SRINF proposal, which included the SS-23. (Recall that Karpov had included the SS-23 when he floated his zero-level SRINF proposal.) Nevertheless, the Soviet officials seemed very unhappy that their leadership had agreed to the inclusion of the SS-23 and would raise it from time to time as a “concession” which we ought to take into consideration when they asked for something.

As the Soviets arguments for the elimination of the German PIa warheads grew more frequent inside and outside the negotiations, I made another trip to Bonn in early July. Meeting again with Defense Minister Woerner, I reviewed the state of play on this issue. The Soviets were making much of the problem, but I was not prepared to cave on this issue. Given the crucial importance of NATO’s principled position that an INF Treaty could cover only U.S. and Soviet systems, I hoped the Germans would hold firm. We needed to recognize that the pressure could become quite intense. Woerner said he favored Germany keeping its Pershing Ia, but he did not foresee their modernization any time in the near future. Moreover, although he hoped they could remain with German forces, he would be prepared to see them eliminated if that were necessary to gaining an INF Treaty that was true to NATO’s stated principles and goals.

On August 6, 1987, Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze raised the issue of the German Pershings at length in a sometimes impassioned address to the United Nations Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Calling the German Pershings the “main snag” preventing the conclusion of an INF agreement, he argued that the agreement to a global double zero must include all U.S. and Soviet INF warheads including those on German Pershing Ia missiles. “If, however, the United States does not want a zero option, as is clear from its present ‘72 equals 0’ formula, that would be a different ball game.”¹⁷

Shevardnadze, in a line echoing that taken by Obukhov inside the INF negotiations, continued by noting that, “We too have allies, who are concerned over the fact that a neighboring country retains shorter-range nuclear missiles which could pose a threat to their security. They could ask for the stationing of similar systems on their

territories, and the Soviet Union could meet their request. But what would a Soviet-U.S. agreement be like as a result of all this? It would be truncated, emasculated, and anemic.”¹⁸

Shevardnadze twisted the facts to make it appear that Germany and the United States were colluding to turn Germany into a nuclear power. Putting maximum pressure on the German government, he placed the full burden of reaching an INF agreement on Germany’s giving up its Pershing Ia missiles. Once again the intense Soviet desire to use the negotiations to create dissension within Germany and between Germany and other Allies, which had been a hallmark of the Soviet approach to INF from the outset, was apparent.¹⁹

The issue continued to fester for 20 more days. Then on August 26, 1987, Chancellor Kohl put it to rest when he announced that Germany would eliminate its PIa missiles after the INF Treaty was signed. With the PIa missiles gone, it was only logical for the United States to state that it would withdraw the PIa nuclear warheads.

The Soviets, however, were not content to leave it there. They argued that the disposition of the German Pershings and their warheads must be made an integral part of an INF Treaty. I objected that the treaty was strictly bilateral in nature; no other country was a party to it and no other country’s missile systems could be made part of it.

The Soviets continued to press their demand in Geneva and raised it in Washington on September 17 during a ministerial level meeting chaired by Shultz and Shevardnadze. The Soviet foreign minister pushed exceptionally hard on this point. Frank Carlucci, who had become President Reagan’s National Security Advisor, came out of the meeting with Shevardnadze and told me that the issue had become a major obstacle to reaching an agreement. The Soviets feared that without some formal mention in the agreement with us that the warheads on the German Pershings would be removed from Europe, they would have no legal ability to claim the United States was not in compliance with the treaty if the warheads were not withdrawn. Carlucci asked if it would be possible to meet the Soviet concerns by including some mention of the warheads on the German Pershings in the treaty.

Creating Treaty Language to Solve the FRG’s Pershing Problem

The effort to keep third party systems out of the INF Treaty had been a critical element of our position. We had not budged on it, recognizing that to do so would open the way for the Soviets to argue that

British and French nuclear forces should be included on the U.S. side of the ledger and undercutting our key philosophical point: an INF Treaty must lead to an equal outcome for the United States and the Soviet Union. While it bothered me to have to move even a millimeter toward the Soviets on this issue, I also recognized that neither Carlucci nor Shultz would have raised the possibility if they had not judged a solution was essential to the conclusion of a treaty that would meet all the basic goals the United States and its NATO Allies had set out to achieve in December 1979. I told Carlucci that we should not make any reference to the German Pershings or their U.S. warheads in the treaty. But, I did think that I could find a place to indirectly refer to them in one of the treaty annexes.

Shortly thereafter I was called down to join the ministers. Karpov and I were instructed to find some place in the formal documents, (which were being prepared in Geneva) to refer to the problems posed by the German Pershings and their U.S. warheads. Having known what to expect, I had already located the place and prepared the words to accomplish this task. When Karpov and I sat down, I suggested that the Protocol on Elimination would be the appropriate place to refer to the elimination of U.S. or Soviet warheads on INF missiles owned by other countries and which had by unilateral decision of those countries been released from an existing program of cooperation.

There was no specific reference to the German Pershings and the section was drafted in a manner that made it applicable to both sides. It also accommodated the need for the United States and the Soviet Union to eliminate all their INF missile systems 15 days prior to the end of the overall period of elimination. (This rather convoluted procedure was required so that the United States could withdraw the reentry vehicles, which had been placed on the German Pershings, to the United States for elimination before the end of the elimination period called for by the treaty.) Karpov and I reported back to the ministers, and they agreed with our proposal. The wording was subsequently included in the treaty and implemented accordingly.

FOLLOW-ON PROBLEMS: SHORT-RANGE MODERNIZATION AND NEW SOVIET PRESSURES

However, before the three-year elimination period had run its course, an "eliminated" SRINF system would return to prominence. As foretold by the June 1987 NATO ministerial statement, the United States

and its Allies began the process of modernizing the remaining SNF in Europe. These, it should be noted, had been reduced in numbers during the course of the INF negotiations in Europe in part because some were obsolete, and in part in order to underscore our *bona fides*. As we have noted, the modernization plans called for an improved artillery warhead, a follow-on to the Lance missile (FOTL), and a new theater air-to-surface missile (TASM). As anticipated, these plans were seen as essential by some of our European Allies, and as contrary to the spirit of the INF Treaty by others.

As they became controversial, the Soviets once again geared up their propaganda machines, seeing in this issue yet another opportunity to split the Alliance. With Gorbachev's popularity high and his call for a "common European home" (which implied a limited role for the United States) resonating with many in Germany, Soviet spokesmen began to attack NATO's modernization plans.

Ambassador Kvitsinsky, who was then Soviet ambassador in Bonn, likened the proposed follow-on to the Lance missile as going beyond modernization because the Soviets under the INF Treaty "sacrificed" their comparable SS-23s "so that weapons of this kind will disappear completely from Europe. If NATO now builds a missile that has a range of perhaps 20 or 50 km less than our SS-23, this is fraud. This eliminates the basis for doing business."²⁰

Raising the pressure on the Germans, Kvitsinsky went on to threaten that "If NATO agrees to this pseudo-modernization, a big, ugly, strange blot will appear on the recently opened new page in the relations between the FRG and the Soviet Union. We wanted to fill this page with new positive content. . . . This decision would be against the spirit of the time and against the meaning of the development which is emerging in our relations."²¹

The equating of the SS-23 to the FOTL was even more pronounced in an interview that Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Akhromeyev gave to *Pravda* on April 19. "NATO leaders are claiming that the Soviet Union and the countries of the Warsaw Pact as a whole, while opposing the so-called modernization of NATO's tactical nuclear missiles, have themselves already carried out such a modernization of their own missiles and are misleading the public in an effort to align it against the NATO Bloc."²²

The "reality," the marshal continued, is that

The Warsaw Pact armies are equipped with missiles created between 15 and 27 years ago. It is true that the Soviet Army has a modern missile with a range of up to 500 km. It is the SS-23 missile, which became

part of the arsenal in the eighties. However, it is being eliminated in accordance with the (INF) Treaty. The Soviet Union deliberately took this step so as to ensure that by eliminating missiles of this type there would be no more nuclear missiles of this range in any country. . . . Now, however, completely unembarrassed by the fact that the U.S. representatives at the talks sought the elimination of the SS-23 missile, the United States intends to deploy in Europe a “modernized Lance” nuclear missile with a range—up to 450 km—virtually identical to the range of the Soviet Oka (SS-23) missile being eliminated.

Akhromeyev, like Kvitsinsky, then added to his commentary a mix of threats of a new arms race and promises of more arms reductions, depending on whether modernization went forward.²³

SOVIET DECEPTION REVEALED

On March 6, 1990, a news report from Germany revealed that the Soviet Union had provided SS-23 missiles to East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria. With the GDR collapsing, the secret was out of the bag. My immediate reaction was one of anger at Soviet duplicity and concern that I had not unearthed this during the course of the negotiations. Upon reflection I recalled the several conversations I had with Obukhov in which he had argued that the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact Allies would be at a disadvantage if the Germans kept their PIA force since the Pact had no comparable missile. I called Washington and passed on my recollections. I promised to try to provide some specific citations.

That night I awoke with a start and called out “Akhromeyev and Shevardnadze” waking my wife in the process. I said, in reply to her “What are you talking about?”, “I think I kept some of their statements about Lance modernization, the SS-23, and the German Pershings.” The next morning I did indeed find the articles noted above as well as the dates of the conversations with Obukhov. The articles were of particular value because they were on the public record. No one reading them then or now can come to any conclusion other than that the Soviet foreign minister, the leading Soviet military officer, and a former Soviet chief INF negotiator and well-plugged-in ambassador, were either unaware of the transfer of the SS-23s to the GDR, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia or were knowingly falsifying, or to put it bluntly, lying when they claimed that they and their Warsaw Pact Allies would be disadvantaged if the Germans kept their PIA missiles or NATO modernized its Lance missile because the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact Allies had no comparable missile.

The Soviets tried to argue that the SS-23 missiles provided to the three Warsaw Pact states were not subject to the INF Treaty because they were nonnuclear. But, as they well knew, the treaty applies to all INF missiles whether conventional or nuclear armed. Moreover, with the East German SS-23s available for inspection, it became clear that those missiles were configured to accept nuclear warheads. Yet the Soviets continued to argue that the transferred SS-23s were “conventional” weapons and thus not subject to the treaty.

During a conversation, a Russian international security expert told me that it was indeed possible that Shevardnadze and even Akhromeyev might have been unaware of the SS-23 transfers at the time when they made their statements. The expert confirmed that some of these SS-23s were configured to accept nuclear warheads, but others were not. There was bad blood between Akhromeyev and some of the Soviet field commanders who favored a harder line. Thus, he believed, it was conceivable that those commanders could have made the transfer look like a routine shipment of conventional weaponry.

Asked at an April 6, 1990, press conference in Washington whether he was aware of the transfer, Shevardnadze first noted that the missiles did not have “nuclear charges” and then said “I believe that Comrade Gorbachev was not aware of this and I can guarantee to you personally that I was not aware of it.” Later in the same press conference, an unnamed U.S. official commented that the transfer was “certainly not an act of bad faith on the part of the Soviet government as a whole. There are obviously some people who have got to be held to account for why this happened.” An unnamed Soviet official added that the diplomats and negotiators did not know of the transfer.

This might explain why the statements of Soviet leaders and those of our Soviet interlocutors in Geneva (on how they and their Warsaw Pact Allies would be disadvantaged by the retention of the German Pershings or the modernization of the Lance missile since they and their Allies would not have a comparable missile) were not in keeping with the facts and misleading. However, the continued effort of Soviet diplomats and negotiators to justify the transfer on the grounds that the SS-23s were not nuclear armed does raise some questions concerning their *bona fides*.

For example, on March 31, 1990, a former member of the Soviet INF delegation, Stanislav Shemyakin, during an interview on *Radio Moscow*, insisted that there was no comparison between the German PlA situation and that of the SS-23s provided to the three Warsaw Pact countries. The difference, he claimed, was that the SS-23s were

“non-nuclear.” Indirectly contradicting the claims that the Soviet negotiators were not aware of the SS-23 transfers, Shemyakin stated that it was this so-called nonnuclear status that “prompted the Soviet Union to refrain from bringing up the subject of OTR-23s during the INF talks and later.”²⁴

During the observance of the destruction of the last U.S. Pershing missile on May 6, 1991, I raised the SS-23 issue with General Vladimir Medvedev, then head of the Soviet equivalent of the On-Site Inspection Agency. Medvedev had served on the Soviet INF delegation from the inception of the negotiations, becoming Obukhov’s deputy during the end game. We had spent many hours together, and while he usually hewed closely to the party line, he was occasionally willing to enter into an exploratory “what if” conversation.

Referring to our past discussions, I took Medvedev to task for having misled us by arguing that the Soviets did not have programs of cooperation concerning INF missiles with their Allies similar to the ones we had with ours. I also pointed out that the nuclear versus conventional argument was bogus as he well knew. He did not deny my charge but looking rather contrite—which was most unusual—he replied that “sometimes in the course of a negotiation, one had to do things one would have preferred not to do.” It was as close to an apology as I had ever heard from a Soviet in such circumstances. But it did seem to suggest that at least one of their negotiators might have been witting.

Furthermore, a senior Soviet military officer directly contradicted Shevardnadze’s statement of nonawareness. Quoted in *Krasnaya Zvezda* (March 16, 1991), First Deputy Chief of Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces General Staff Colonel General B. A. Omelichev said, “Some people—even in our country are trying to claim that the General Staff shipped these OTR-23 missiles without authorization and that the Foreign Ministry knew nothing about it. They quote one of E. Shevardnadze’s statements. In actual fact, of course, he did know about it. Corresponding documents exist bearing his signature.”²⁵

The Soviet military at this time were probably viewing Shevardnadze in a very poor light. Omelichev’s statement might well have been designed as much, if not more, to undermine the foreign minister’s standing with his Western and especially American counterparts than to present an accurate picture.²⁶

In any event, the failure of the Soviets to press their Warsaw Pact Allies to return the SS-23s for destruction, as the West Germans had done with their P1a missiles, raises further doubts about the Soviets’ *bona fides* in this affair. If the Soviets were truly remorseful over an

unintended deception, one might have expected appropriate actions to right the wrong.

Whether the full truth will see the light of day remains to be seen. In my view, there was no question but that the Soviet statements made inside and outside the negotiations led ineluctably to the conclusion that they had no programs of cooperation with their Warsaw Pact Allies and had not transferred INF-range missiles to them. Accordingly, three years later I recommended that the United States refer to the Soviet behavior as a deliberate deception. The administration, probably with broader goals in mind during that time of transition, downgraded it to an act of "bad faith."

Regardless of the degree of Soviet duplicity, and even accepting that Soviet officials at the highest levels and our negotiating counterparts were unaware of the transfer, the fact is that the SS-23 affair marked an important intelligence failure. Press reports stated that the mobile SS-23s were located among mobile SS-21 units kept under cover almost all of the time and only brought out at night. This could account for some of the problems in identifying the presence of the SS-23s in the three Warsaw Pact countries.

The under-500 kilometer range SS-21s were not subject to the INF Treaty. It is possible that the Soviets had envisaged the SS-23 as a modern replacement for the SS-21. If so, our insistence on their inclusion under the INF Treaty would have upset Soviet plans for modernizing Warsaw Pact SNF. This might explain their strong reluctance to acknowledge that the range of the SS-23s was above 500 kilometers and their harping on the "sacrifice" of the SS-23.

MODERNIZING SHORT-RANGE SYSTEMS: ENDING THE OPTION

If the Soviets' SNF modernization plans were set back by the elimination of the SS-23, NATO's SNF modernization plans were being set back by a growing reluctance in Germany and elsewhere to countenance an upgrading of SNF weapons in Europe at a time when INF missile systems were being eliminated. Gorbachev was actively promoting his common European home theme and his peace campaign was also having an effect on public support for maintaining a credible U.S. SNF deterrence in Europe.

The common European home theme aside, in many ways, the reluctance to build up NATO's SNF was not illogical. The ground-launched short-range nuclear weapons, especially the nuclear artillery shells, were, given their limited range, a threat to NATO populations

and troops. The aircraft-delivered bombs could be carried beyond the frontiers of NATO member states, but their most likely targets would have included non-Soviet Warsaw Pact Forces (who are now NATO members). In what were the closing days of the Cold War, this prospect was becoming less persuasive.

Thus, the “firebreak” sought by Prime Minister Thatcher and called for in the June 1987 Ministerial Communiqué began to crumble within 24 months. First came NATO’s May 29, 1989, announcement of a two-year postponement of a decision on upgrading the nuclear artillery round and deploying FOTL. Then on May 3, 1990, President Bush announced the cancellation of FOTL and of any further modernization of U.S. nuclear artillery shells deployed in Europe. With the Warsaw Pact collapsing and the Soviet Union itself showing signs of internal stress, President Bush on September 27, 1991, announced a unilateral U.S. decision to remove all its ground-launched SNF from Europe and called upon the Soviet Union to follow suit. Gorbachev obliged. TASM was also abandoned.

There would be no “follow-on” SNF negotiation, and both sides undertook unverified, unilateral, reciprocal reductions in their SNF. All that remains today of the U.S. nuclear force located in Europe are several hundred nuclear bombs carried on dual-capable aircraft belonging to the United States and Allied nations. Estimates of the number of Russian SNF warheads vary widely and without verification are not likely to become accurate.

These remaining weapons systems are now also coming under some scrutiny. Their unrefueled radius of action from the bases where they are stationed would not allow them to reach Russia except for parts of Kaliningrad oblast. The implications of this development for an enlarged NATO are obvious. Nonetheless, NATO communiqués continued to support the retention of U.S. nuclear weapons and the European delivery systems.²⁷

As the negotiations moved into the late spring and early summer of 1987, we had made some progress in several of the key issues before us. Of the remaining issues, two—verification and the phasing of reductions—clearly needed priority attention; the former because of its importance to the development of a sound and durable agreement and because of its complexity; the latter because it ought to have been relatively easy to achieve and thus could serve to underscore the sides’ ability to make progress.

Finding a mutually acceptable timetable for the elimination of INF missiles was inherently difficult because of the great disparity in the sides’ holdings of existing missiles. From the U.S. standpoint, it was preferable that the sides reach equality early in the process. This would

require large reductions by the Soviets while the United States would be taking much smaller cuts. From the Soviet standpoint, it was preferable that the sides not reach equality until late in the process. This would permit the Soviets to reduce at a slower pace and maintain their position of superiority until very late in the process.

One variable the sides could use to help overcome their differences was the length of time the reductions process would take before arriving at the total elimination of both sides INF missile systems. The United States had proposed a three-year reduction period with equality reached at the end of the first stage, that is, one-third of the way through the reductions process. The Soviets had proposed a five-year reductions process with equality reached at the end of the penultimate stage, that is, four-fifths of the way through the reduction process.

During the June 17, 1987, luncheon with Chervov and Obukhov, the Soviet negotiators had argued that under the U.S. approach the Soviet Union, in order to reach the proposed level at the end of the first phase of reductions, would have to reduce by 70 percent and the United States by only 10 percent. I said it was inevitable that the Soviet Union, which possessed more INF missiles, would have to reduce more missiles and that, if we were to reach equality before the end of the process, it would have to reduce more rapidly. I suggested that the United States could accept the five-year reduction period proposed by the Soviet side. However, I noted that the time would come for both sides when the reductions process would reach a point where the remaining force would no longer be militarily viable.²⁸ It was essential that both sides go through that portal at the same time. If the sides reduced on the basis of an equal percentage approach, the United States would reach that point well before the Soviet Union. That would not be equitable, could create a danger for the United States, and thus might even be destabilizing.

I suggested that the United States might accept the Soviet five-year reduction period if the Soviets agreed to reach equality after two and one-half years. Under this approach, the Soviets would maintain a larger force for half of the reductions process, and the sides would be at equality for the last half of the process. John Woodworth added that the sides could agree to reduce to a level below that of the United States by the end of the first phase thus assuring there would be U.S. reductions as well as Soviet ones. The sides did not reach agreement on this basis, but the conversation opened the way to a resolution.

The final outcome called for a three-year reduction phase (after entry into force of the treaty) with equality reached after 29 months. Additional safeguards called for the sides not to exceed specific levels for the numbers of deployed and non-deployed launchers and missiles

when crossing the 29th month threshold. SRINF missiles would be moved within 90 days after entry into force of the treaty to elimination facilities where they would remain until they were eliminated.²⁹ The phasing approach was acceptable to our military, taking into account the concern that both sides go through the portal of vulnerability at the same time. The procedures were carried out without a hitch.

As we moved into greater detail and the actual drafting of the treaty and its annexes, it became apparent that each one of the annexes and the agreements with the five basing countries would require a "chief U.S. negotiator" of their own. I, with John Woodworth's help, would oversee the entire process and its results. I would be expected to initial each of the annexes and thus accept responsibility for them. But the assigned officers would do the day-to-day work with the Soviets on each of these separate documents.

Thus, Ronald Bartek of the Department of State was in charge of preparing the Elimination Protocol. James Hurd of the Department of Defense would be in charge of preparing the Memorandum of Understanding Regarding the Establishment of the Data Base for the Treaty. Dr. Stanley Fraley of Sandia National Laboratories would have similar duties as regards the Protocol Regarding Inspections Relating to the Treaty, and Senior Foreign Service Officer Leo Reddy of the Department of State would be in charge of working out the arrangements with the basing countries. Additional experts brought in from the relevant U.S. government departments and agencies assisted each of the annex leaders. It was a team effort.

Our delegation lawyer, Karin Look, provided legal advice on the treaty, the annexes, and the agreements with the basing countries. As the legal work became increasingly intense during the final stages of treaty drafting, ACDA Legal Advisor Tom Graham and State Department Lawyer Goeff Levitt also joined the team. Senior Foreign Service Officer David T. Jones took on the heavy task of preparing reporting cables on the INF team's daily activities and forwarding, and following up on, specific requests for Washington guidance. INF delegation Executive Secretary Army Colonel Jeff Ankley helped keep up morale by anticipating administrative requirements and inserting the occasional practical joke to help lighten the tension. My staff assistant and secretary, Susan Kosinski, made sure that I saw all of the papers and that any comments I might have got back to the right parties.

Although we were dealing with all the elements which made up the treaty, the issues concerning verification remained the most difficult to resolve.

PART III

This page intentionally left blank

UNDERTAKINGS: THE STORY OF A WORD

The Soviet effort to undermine the ties between the United States and its European Allies was a crucial component of the INF negotiation. This strategy took many shapes. One of them was to use the negotiating process to plant the impression that the United States was willing to sell out its Allies' interests in order to obtain an agreement with the Soviets. This effort was a major element in Soviet negotiating strategy and principally took the form of Soviet attempts to force the United States to bring U.K. and French systems into the negotiations.

DEFENDING PROGRAMS OF COOPERATION

Another example of this effort to break the bonds of trust between the United States and the Alliance's two other nuclear powers, the United Kingdom and France, involved the well-known, established programs of cooperation in nuclear weaponry between the United States and the United Kingdom and the far more modest and undisclosed cooperation that existed between the United States and France. The latter would come to public attention only after the treaty had entered into effect.¹

In addition to these programs, the United States also had established programs of cooperation, some dating back to the 1950s, with several Allies, including West Germany, in which the United States provided nuclear warheads that could be delivered to their targets by Allied weapon systems (artillery, aircraft, or missiles). The Soviet stratagem in this instance was to seek to introduce language into an INF Treaty that would have the effect of circumscribing, if not ending, such cooperation.

The specific target was what would eventually be Article XIV of the INF Treaty. The Soviet Union's opening ploy was to introduce

language into the draft treaty that would have paralleled that of Articles XII and XIII of the SALT II Treaty. Article XII bound the parties not to “circumvent” the treaty “through any other state or states or in any other matter.” Article XIII bound the parties “not to assume any international obligation that would conflict with” the treaty.

The United States had accepted this language in SALT II, but it was not without its critics, and contributed to the judgment that the treaty was “fatally flawed.” The articles do appear to presuppose that the parties were considering cheating. Presumably a state does not sign a treaty that it intends to circumvent or to undertake obligations that conflict with the treaty. On the other hand, the articles can be seen as seeking to eliminate the creation of unforeseen loopholes.

In any event, some in the Congress were concerned that such language could interfere with our existing patterns/programs of cooperation and thus could be expected to object to the inclusion of such language in the INF Treaty. Its inclusion thus could have cost us substantial support in the Senate and with the NATO Allies. Of equal if not greater importance, however, the Soviets had expended an enormous amount of energy inside and outside of the negotiations trying to develop the claim that if U.K. and French nuclear forces were not accounted for by the INF Treaty, their very existence would in effect constitute a circumvention of that treaty. Thus the Soviet motives for seeking a noncircumvention clause in the treaty were as transparent as were our efforts to ensure such a clause was not included.

Dealing with “Noncircumvention”

With the SALT II precedent on their side, the Soviet had us at a disadvantage. Nevertheless, we deployed a series of counterarguments: (1) the proposed Soviet articles on noncircumvention and no conflicting obligations were superfluous; (2) a treaty should not give the impression that the parties had entered into solemn obligations with the intention of either circumventing them or assuming obligations that would conflict with them; (3) putting these clauses in the treaty could be seen as an admission that the other provisions of the treaty did not have the effect of making it “illegal” to circumvent the treaty or to assume obligations that conflicted with it; (4) moreover, such actions could constitute a material breach of the treaty and thus trigger countermeasures including abrogation. Thus a practical response to such actions already existed.

The INF group held fast to this line for several months. Then, during the fall of 1987 with another ministerial meeting on the horizon, the Soviets hinted at some flexibility. We waited to see what they might have to offer, gaming the possible variations and our responses to them.

The ministerial meeting took place on October 22–23. As was the custom, it did not take place in the Foreign Ministry's main building but rather in the "Osobnyak," a prerevolutionary mansion of a former Moscow merchant converted into a meeting center. The opening plenary was held in a large high-ceiling room with a good deal of white marble and dark wood. The principals went over the proposed agenda in broad terms and then agreed on the nature and composition of the subgroups: INF, START, SDI, human rights, and other bilateral issues.

The INF and other arms control meetings got off to a slow start as the Soviet participants were "delayed," that is, they were still working out their positions, for more than an hour. Then after a brief discussion that only made it clear that the Soviets were not yet ready for serious business, it was time for a scheduled break.

When the time came to reconvene, the INF subgroup was ushered into the largest room in the complex—providing bureaucratic evidence that the Soviets were going to give priority to INF. Indeed, Soviet and American staff members who did not have responsibility for a specific topic gravitated to the INF session.

One of the key purposes of meeting in capitals was to bring Washington- and Moscow-based officials together to help "push" the negotiations along. Certainly, the meetings with their attendant media coverage created an action-forcing event that focused attention on demonstrating progress, while the presence of the secretary of state and the national security advisor provided the essential political power needed to overcome the toughest problems. But at the next level below the cabinet officers, the "working level" discussions quickly became so detailed that only those who were following the negotiations full time could comprehend the technical issues and, more importantly, how those issues interrelated and affected overall strategy and broad political goals. The result was that inevitably the wisest senior subcabinet officials from both capitals saw their role as providing guidance while leaving the detailed discussions to the negotiators.

Soviet Compromise on Noncircumvention

As this session moved into greater detail, Paul Nitze, who served as Ambassador-at-Large and Special Advisor on Arms Control to the

President and the Secretary of State, asked me to take the lead. The Soviets were seeking to use the presence of officials from Washington to see if they could force a change in the U.S. posture of opposition to “noncircumvention” and “no conflicting obligations” articles in the treaty. In response to the firm reiteration of our line on this point, Viktor Karpov, who was in charge of the arms control and disarmament section of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, offered a compromise. The Soviets would drop their insistence on a noncircumvention article if the United States would accept language that explicitly bound the parties not to assume any international obligations that would conflict with the treaty. This was one of the possible Soviet moves that we had anticipated during our gaming sessions in Geneva. Our projected reaction was to pocket the elimination of the noncircumvention article and move to render the no conflicting obligations article innocuous.

Behind the maneuvering, the Soviet aim was to develop a legal artifice allowing them to argue that we had agreed not to carry on any new activities under our existing programs of cooperation with the United Kingdom and France. Having obtained a Soviet offer to drop the noncircumvention clause, but with the SALT II precedent still against us, we moved to the next step as gamed out by the U.S. INF team in Geneva.

Accordingly, I began to lay down a series of qualifying reservations and commentary designed to bolster the view that a “no conflicting obligations” article would have no relevance for existing programs of cooperation. I opened by stating that similar language in the SALT II Treaty had obviously been interpreted by the Soviets as not affecting our existing patterns or programs of cooperation with our Allies. Moreover, this cooperation had continued in its normal manner without any negative comment from the Soviets. I added that the parties were bound by international law not to take any actions that would contravene that treaty, even if it had not been ratified.

Therefore, I said, if the INF Treaty were to contain a “no conflicting obligations” article, that article would also have no effect on the manner or execution of those programs of cooperation. Next, I asked Karpov whether the Soviets would state now and on the record that nothing in the article could in any way be construed or interpreted to suggest that exchanges of plans, blueprints, and the like, as well as the transfer of parts, components, and materials, or meetings to discuss cooperation in nuclear weapons matters between U.S. officials and officials of countries with whom we had on going patterns/programs of cooperation, would in any way contravene the letter and the spirit

of the treaty including any article along the lines suggested by the Soviets. To all this Karpov responded, "Yes." I told him in that case, I believed we could develop mutually acceptable language.

After returning to Geneva, the INF delegation began to develop appropriate treaty language. While our Soviet counterparts did not disown Karpov's acceptance of my interpretation of what such an article would encompass and its practical effect, they did not rush to move the article into the "finished" column.

"WE'RE FROM WASHINGTON AND WE'RE HERE TO HELP"

There the matter stood until mid-November 1987 when we heard from Washington that Kampleman and Vorontsov would meet in Geneva to see if they could help move the talks to conclusion. Both nominally headed their country's respective Nuclear and Space Talks delegations. In reality, both had left Geneva months earlier to reside in their capitals and take up senior appointments covering a wide array of issues. Moreover, neither had been responsible for the INF talks when in Geneva, and the negotiations had evolved in the interim. The will-o-the-wisp of reaching an overarching agreement covering all three negotiations, which they were responsible for negotiating, had long since evaporated. The negotiations in Geneva on INF were now down to the painstaking, "devilish" details.

Nonetheless, the two officials had the confidence of their governments and arrived in Geneva ready to put their imprint on the talks. Their meeting had not been making much progress in dealing with the remaining issues when Vorontsov reopened the noncircumvention/no conflicting obligations issue. Recognizing his comments as an effort to roll back the agreement that I had reached with Karpov, I raised strenuous objections to Vorontsov's suggestions. I said I thought Vorontsov had come to help close out the remaining problems, yet here he was trying to resurrect ones that we had resolved.

After a bit more of this back and forth, Vorontsov said he would agree to drop the noncircumvention article but insisted that the United States would have to agree to stronger wording in the no conflicting obligations article. After reviewing our proposed wording for the no conflicting obligations article, and without any discussion with me, Kampleman suggested the word "undertakings" be added to the article so that it would read, "The parties . . . shall not assume any international obligations *or undertakings* which would conflict with its [the Treaty's] provisions."

I leaned over to Kampleman and with our backs to the table, I argued vigorously, but quietly, that “undertakings” was a terrible word in this context. Its meaning is vague. Its lack of precision would give the Soviets opportunities to argue that even the most inconsequential contact between U.S. and Allied officials on nuclear weapons issues would constitute an “undertaking” and thus contravene the treaty. It had not been used in SALT II, and we would be hardpressed to explain why it had been inserted in the INF Treaty. Moreover, we had already reached a better deal in Moscow having carefully restricted the meaning of the article. We should hold Vorontsov to it. Kampleman brushed my arguments aside. He said that he was a lawyer and knew what he was doing. For his part, Vorontsov swooped on the word.

Kampleman’s strongest skills were those of a mediator, a conciliator, and an arbitrator. For example, during one of the visits to Geneva by the Senate Observer Group, he brilliantly and most impressively developed a formula for bridging the differences among the senators on a Defense and Space issue. It is possible that he had instinctively drawn on those skills during the meeting with Vorontsov.

The other members of the INF delegation shared my dismay at seeing a point we had worked so hard to win being so cavalierly overturned. The INF delegation lawyer, Karin Look, was particularly concerned. She urged me to have another go at the Soviets at an INF meeting scheduled for later in the day. I did go at it again, but it was too late. The Soviets had pocketed the concession and were not about to undo Vorontsov’s accomplishment.

Walking Back the Cat

Thinking about how to get around this harmful development, I went back to the office and pulled out the dictionary and a thesaurus. I found several synonyms for “undertakings.” Unfortunately, as I had feared, most suggested the word had a rather vague quality such as a “promise” or “setting about to do something.” But one synonym fortunately was precise. It would define undertaking as an “act” or a “compact.”

I called in our chief interpreter and translator Dimitri Arensburger. Showing him the thesaurus, I asked him to find the Russian word for “undertakings” that most closely accorded with the English word “act” as in an international document such as the “Helsinki Final Act.” If the Soviets agreed to accept a Russian word that carried this connotation, there would be no leeway for them to claim that anything short of a formal written contract opening an entirely new or

different area of cooperation would qualify as an undertaking. After some researching, Arensburger reported that he had found such a word. It was rather archaic, but it was in the Russian dictionary. Sensing we would need to demonstrate to the Senate, our Allies, and possible opponents of the treaty that we had overcome the problem created by the insertion of this word, I instructed him not to give in on this point.

Given the origin of the problem, our effort in Geneva at limiting the damage was not highlighted in our cables, but was the subject of informal discussions, particularly among those following the treaty text and associated legal aspects. For their part, our Washington backstoppers did not comment formally on the issue.

As the negotiation drew to a conclusion, I kept a close eye on this issue. The Soviet translators adamantly resisted our effort to apply the Russian word that we wanted in the Russian version of the treaty text. Eventually, Obukhov raised the issue with me. I told him this was a serious matter for us and it ought to be one for the Soviets as well. Imprecise treaty language could lead to misinterpretations and disputes. Neither side would benefit from that.

The Soviets continued, however, to push for a Russian word that would accord with a loose definition of “undertakings.” Beyond the archaic nature of the Russian word we were insisting on, which we were told bothered their purists; the Soviets recognized the political utility of the vague open-ended words they favored. Other translation points were resolved, but not an agreed translation for “undertakings.” It was not until December 7, 1987, as we were preparing to leave for the summit meeting in Washington that Obukhov told me he had instructed his interpreters to accept the Russian word for “undertakings” that we had insisted upon. It was the very last issue agreed upon at the negotiations.

It was not, however, the last we would hear of “undertakings.” The word caught the attention of several U.S. senators and staffers during the hearings on the treaty’s ratification. Kampleman was never confronted with the need during the hearings on the INF Treaty to deal with “undertakings.” By an odd twist that task fell exclusively to me.

Critics noted that the SALT II language dealt only with obligations, and SALT II, they added, had never been ratified. This language looked worse to them. Why had “undertakings” been added to the INF Treaty? My response was to note that the INF language also differed from the SALT II language in that we had avoided a noncircumvention clause. I also explained the import of having persuaded the Soviets to accept a Russian word that would severely circumscribe

what constituted an undertaking. One of the senators told me that only after he had reviewed the memo of the Kampleman meeting with Vorontsov did he understand how the word had gotten into the treaty. He appreciated how we had managed to keep the issue from becoming a problem for the United States and our Allies.

Pluses and Minuses of Senior Official Participation

Deciding when and who to bring in to help move a negotiation forward is an important and sometimes crucial decision. The presence of the secretary of state (at times along with the national security advisor) provided the essential political power needed to overcome the toughest problems; we would not have broken through in the end without secretary Shultz's direct participation at such crucial times. The issues he worked on with his Soviet counterparts were those that had taken on a political significance beyond their sometimes technical nature. The secretary and his counterparts were the ones who would, and could, carry the political burden of having agreed on their resolution.

There is less utility and need for directly injecting higher level officials who are not working full time on the negotiations into the detailed negotiating process. Certainly, the results of the August 1986 senior officials meeting in Moscow (where the Soviets agreed that U.K. and French forces would not be counted against the U.S. total and that we would thus have an equal outcome) is a positive example of the value of joining senior officials from capitals with negotiators. The "undertakings" episode is an example of the risks of bringing officials from capitals into a negotiating process that has moved into its detailed phase. Because of their manifold duties, they cannot follow the negotiations as intently as needed.

VERIFICATION: MAKING TRUST ACCEPTABLE

While persuading the Soviets to accept an equal outcome in terms of U.S. and Soviet missiles occupied the greatest amount of time during the INF negotiations, no subject proved more contentious than the question of how best to verify such an accord. And the contentiousness was as difficult to resolve within the U.S. government as it was between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The issue was inherently complex. It involved technical considerations and intelligence estimates. While seemingly objective in nature, an appreciation of both these factors can become somewhat subjective. Indeed, in order to comprehend fully the complexity of this issue, it is necessary to recognize that the U.S. position was driven by at least a measure of political and ideological contention.

No aspect of arms control has been more subject to differing opinions than verification. Yet, as with the other aspects, there is room here only for hard choices and none for emotions. It is not possible to attain 100 percent confidence that compliance with the provisions of an agreement can be verified. There are simply too many ways to cheat. If 100 percent assurance becomes a *sine qua non* for signing arms control agreements, none will be signed.

On the other hand, relying on good faith or depending only on national technical means (NTMs, a euphemism for satellite intelligence gathering) cannot provide the necessary basis for sufficient confidence in every case. Camouflage, dummy systems, and concealment are well-known and often effective practices. As we learned during the Gulf War and in Bosnia and Kosovo, bridges, underpasses, and structures with roofs exist, and mobile missiles are difficult to find.

In sum, arms control agreements cannot be founded on absolutist views concerning verification. What is required is recognition that each system we seek to control has its own characteristics; some will

require more intrusive measures than others to ensure compliance, and some probably cannot be monitored with confidence.

The criteria for a verifiable agreement can realistically be neither 100 percent certainty that an agreement is being carried out nor 100 percent trust in the good faith of the negotiating partner. What is needed is the establishment of verification regimes in which the parties are confident. These regimes must be sufficiently effective to deter cheating on a scale that could result in a buildup as rapid and large as to provide unilateral strategic advantage. Such an advantage, or even the perception that it could be attained, would upset stability and increase the risk of war. Moreover, it would provide the party that has, or is perceived as being able to accomplish, a "breakout" from a treaty, with the possibility of establishing political/military hegemony over the other party. To ensure high confidence in the ability of the verification regime to enable parties to detect militarily significant cheating, therefore, should be the focus and goal of verification. And it is an attainable goal.

There is more to verification than merely protection against cheating. Confidence in the ability to monitor and verify compliance with the terms of an agreement helps to ensure that the agreement does not itself become a source of contention. An agreement whose vague verification provisions end by breeding distrust is worse than no agreement at all.

The need to assure that both parties complied with a treaty's provisions was taken into account during both the SALT I Treaty (negotiated during the Nixon presidency) and the SALT II Treaty (negotiated during the Carter presidency). Both accords contained similar verification provisions. In both treaties, the parties agreed (1) to use NTMs for verification; (2) to provide assurance of compliance; (3) to commit not to interfere with the other parties NTMs; and (4) not to use deliberate concealment measures that impede verification of compliance by NTMs.

While neither NTMs nor any other verification regime can provide a 100 percent guarantee that a party will never be able to get away with cheating, it is relatively more effective in dealing with the fixed, land-based strategic missiles and submarine-based strategic missiles covered by the SALT (and subsequently, START) Treaties. Land-based strategic missiles required large silo complexes that could be monitored by satellites. Submarine-launched missiles could be seen at their berths when in port. They could be tracked at sea. In both cases, the sides were able to estimate with considerable accuracy the number of missiles per silo complex or per submarine. On-site inspection

(OSI) would have brought additional confidence, but its absence did not prevent either side from believing that it had an adequate understanding of the size, characteristics, and composition of the other side's strategic nuclear force. In any event, neither the United States nor the Soviets proposed OSI for the SALT Treaties: the United States did not do so because its defense and intelligence communities were concerned that invasive verification would provide more benefit to the Soviets than to the United States.¹

THE NEED FOR INF VERIFICATION BECOMES A REALITY

INF was quite different. INF missiles systems were mobile, smaller, and easier to conceal than strategic systems. The issue of verification was considered during the NATO deliberations leading to the December 1979 INF decision. But while it was accepted that any agreement would have to be verifiable and that verification of INF systems would be challenging, verification was not among the most intensely discussed topics. Consequently, the nature of an INF verification regime was not fully developed when the decision was taken. Nevertheless, the United States, already evidencing more concern than the other Allies, did obtain support for the inclusion of "adequate" verification as one of the principle elements of the U.S./NATO negotiating position.

The change of administration following the 1980 elections brought a major change in the emphasis placed on the verifiability of an INF Treaty. One early manifestation of this evolution was the shift away from "adequate" verification to "effective" verification. Although the two words are similar in meaning, "adequate" can carry with it a sense of "barely sufficient or suitable."² In any case, "adequate" was not an adequate criteria for the Reagan administration. "Effective" remained to be defined, but its introduction signaled an intention to call for more stringent verification and thus to distinguish between the degree of verification upon which the new team would insist, when compared with its predecessor. Given the initial skepticism toward arms control among elements of the Reagan administration, the introduction of the new word served in part as a form of inoculation against charges from within its own political base that, in agreeing to arms control negotiations, it was simply following in the steps of its predecessors.

Agreeing on an effective monitoring and verification regime would be the last major treaty element resolved during the negotiations.

In large part, it was last because it was the most complex. Moreover, it proved very difficult to agree upon and develop a comprehensive verification regime within the Washington arms control community—even before we could negotiate it with the Soviets. The development of our verification proposals, and their formal presentation to the Soviets, therefore, moved forward in a rather piecemeal fashion. We were obliged to use “place holder” language to indicate the general direction that we planned to take. It would be several years before the United States was ready to table the detailed verification language required in a formal treaty proposal.

Parameters for Verification

There were several reasons for this delay, including the intrinsic difficulties of monitoring small, mobile systems. First, the verification regime could not be developed in a vacuum. It had to relate to precise agreements concerning the disposition of the missile systems covered by the treaty’s provisions. The elaboration of the treaty’s verification provisions had thus to wait upon the completion of the other provisions. Moreover, the Soviets moved even more slowly than the United States in introducing their specific verification proposals or in responding to ours. Finally, the United States, of course, had to accept the same monitoring regime that it wished to see applied to the Soviet Union. At times this began to look like a very expensive trade off. Indeed, the closer one attempts to reach 100 percent certainty about the other side’s behavior, the greater the need for highly intrusive measures that can put your own non-treaty interests at risk. Eventually, as the SALT negotiations had demonstrated, the point is reached where intrusiveness will be so potentially harmful to U.S. security interests that the security costs of implementing such measures outweigh the monitoring gains.

The problem was further complicated by the tendency of right-of-center officials of the Reagan administration and members of Congress to view support for highly stringent verification as a litmus test for political correctness. This circumstance in turn propelled some officials to argue for ever more stringent verification in order to prove their *bona fides* and others, perhaps, to see verification as a device for making the achievement of an agreement more difficult if not impossible. Certainly, and without seeking to ascribe motivations, the fact is that at some point a verification regime could become so stringent that it endangered U.S. security interests. The potential did, therefore, exist for using the demand for hyper-stringent verification as an artifice for seeking to render an INF agreement impossible.

This situation created the possibility that the effort to reach a negotiated outcome could fail because of the inability to develop a monitoring regime that was sufficiently stringent to at least approach 100 percent certainty that the United States would be able to detect Soviet cheating, but which at the same time did not create an unacceptable risk that the Soviets would, in the course of carrying out their INF inspections of U.S. facilities, obtain critical information on U.S. defenses.

In fact the very process of trying to make the verification/monitoring regime as foolproof as possible created a cycle, which at times appeared endless. I labeled this a “nightmare-dream syndrome.” Thus the U.S. negotiators and their Washington-based colleagues would consider the ways in which the Soviets could attempt to cheat with respect to a particular weapons system or type of military installation. Then we would consider how to close the loophole. No sooner had we found a monitoring approach that could close that loophole than a method would be suggested for cheating under that new monitoring approach. We were being stymied by our own ingenuity, or perhaps paranoia.

The “Fruit Loops” Scenario

The process reached its highest or lowest point, depending on one’s point of view, with the suggestion that the only way to approach full confidence that the Soviets would not cheat was to insist on the right to a short-notice, “any time, any where” inspection regime. U.S. Air Force Colonel Robert Linhard, the National Security Council official responsible for arms control matters and a major force for common sense within the Washington arms control bureaucracy, labeled this approach the “Fruit Loops” proposal because it would have required the United States to allow the Soviets to inspect factories as far removed from missile production as a Kellogg’s Fruit Loops breakfast cereal plant. The “Fruit Loops” example underscored the extraordinary powers the U.S. government would need to acquire and exercise were it to adopt a “short-notice, any time, any where” inspection regime. It was obvious that American democracy would not and could not accept such an intrusive invasion of privacy, proprietary rights, and private property. The United States could not live with the threat of every U.S. military or intelligence facility being subject to short-notice, any where, any time challenge.

Fruit Loops marked a turning point. Afterwards, our emphasis was on determining when we had reached the point where we could be as

confident as possible that the monitoring regime would work but before we reached the point where the United States would be unable to accept reciprocal intrusiveness. We could develop and insist upon the most intrusive and stringent inspection regime yet developed. But, if we were to reach an INF agreement, the nightmare-dream cycle would have to stop short of short-notice, "any time, any where" inspections.

Fortunately, the Soviet acceptance of the zero outcome on July 27, 1987, made the verification task somewhat easier. One of the arguments that we had been making in Geneva in favor of a zero outcome was that it would be easier to verify than an outcome that permitted an equal number of INF missile systems. Obviously, in a zero environment, the presence of even a single banned system anywhere, and at any time, would be a clear violation. Palazchenko notes that the desire to ease verification problems was a factor in the Soviets' agreement to eliminate the final 100 missiles, along with the desire to improve relations with the Asians, another point which we had been emphasizing.³

SOVIET VERIFICATION TACTICS

Before we could begin the serious negotiation of the treaty's verification provisions, we were obliged to overcome another obstacle. While Gorbachev in his January 16, 1985, arms control speech had expressed a readiness to accept on-site inspection in arms control treaties, the Soviets in Geneva generally steered clear of the subject. Perhaps aware of our recognition that short-notice, "any time, any where" inspections were not politically feasible for the United States, they began to drop hints, both at the negotiations and via controlled press leaks, that they were ready for such inspections.

It was unusual for the Soviets to take the lead on verification. We doubted that they were serious and suspected their real target was Western public opinion. At the first opportunity, I said as much to Obukhov, urging him to work with us to develop stringent, effective, and reasonable measures, including on-site, short-notice inspections.

At about this time, according to Palazchenko, the Soviets decided to take a more constructive (and astute) approach. Mirror imagining my own appreciation of the situation, he notes that "the pattern was always the same: the Americans would raise some technical difficulty, the Soviets would object, almost automatically, that there was no need for overly intrusive verification, and the issues would assume political significance and thus become more difficult to

resolve. With Shevardnadze's quiet prodding, our delegation was changing its approach. It often agreed to look at a U.S. proposal and then tried to hold the Americans to their own stringent standards. The approach seemed to work on some technical issues, such as monitoring of production facilities." The Soviets, it seems, had correctly recognized that we had gone too far with "fruit loops" and had tried to take advantage of our zeal.⁴

There would be more obstacles to overcome on the road to an effective verification regime, and the Soviets would have to be brought along. As we moved into the fall of 1987, the Soviet effort to give priority to propaganda over substance faded into the background under the pressure of meeting the deadline posed by the upcoming December Washington Summit.

Even with the improved atmosphere, the remaining verification problems continued to vex the negotiations. This situation was partly due to human nature. As other issues, particularly those involving broad principles such as obtaining an equal outcome, were resolved, relatively specific issues—especially the details of the verification regime—began to assume greater importance. This development was due in part to their intrinsic importance, but also to the fact that these details were all that were left and thus moved to high priority status.

Moreover, largely because of the U.S. insistence on stringent verification provisions, and especially the introduction of on-site inspections and monitoring, the INF Treaty broke new ground in the area of verification. On occasion the U.S. negotiators and their Washington backstop team had to improvise.

SOLVING SOME KNOTTY TECHNICAL PROBLEMS

The INF Treaty called for the elimination of all INF missiles and banned the production of any new ones. The Soviets, however, had acknowledged that the second stage of their new SS-25 strategic missile was "similar to but not interchangeable with" the second stage of the banned SS-20 INF missile. Under the circumstances, the United States considered it important to be able to monitor, on a permanent basis, what was emerging from the Soviet missile production facility at Votkinsk where the SS-20 had been produced and the SS-25 was still being produced.

However, the Soviets would not agree to such an arrangement, unless they were allowed a comparable arrangement at a comparable U.S. facility. The two situations were far from similar. The United States

was not planning to continue building a missile, one of whose stages looked like a stage of a banned missile, and U.S. missile production methods differed from those of the Soviets in that there were none from which the entire, finished product emerged.

Eventually, we provided the Soviets with a list of several missile production facilities from which they could choose one to monitor. The Soviets had told us informally that they would choose the Longhorn Army Ammunition Plant at Marshall, Texas. The plant had been involved in the production of the Pershing Ia missile, but it was, at the time we were negotiating, producing small arms ammunition. When the two delegations met to make their selection formally, Ambassador Obukhov began to speak. Before he could complete his first sentence, the senior KGB officer on the Soviet delegation left his place at the table and whispered in Obukhov's ear. Obukhov nodded, reshuffled his papers and shifted gears, asking what was being produced at the Marshall, Texas facility. When my reply made it clear missiles were not among the products, Obukhov said that it would not do and instead selected the Hercules plant at Magna, Utah.

It was a better choice for the Soviets. The Utah plant, as the KGB (but perhaps not the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) knew was at least involved in missile production. The key, however, was Soviet insistence that the treaty treat both sides in an equal and symmetrical manner. While the United States was technically correct in arguing there was no U.S. counterpart either to the Votkinsk operation or the continued manufacture of a missile stage that was identical to that of a banned missile, Soviet insistence on the appearance of equal treatment was understandable. The United States would probably have been just as insistent in a similar circumstance.

While senators raised questions about the arrangement at Magna, they were satisfied with our explanation of how it came about and how U.S. security agencies would help ensure that there would be no threat to security. Federal agencies responsible for internal security were naturally concerned that the Soviet presence at Magna could create a security threat. They helped to design the arrangements to deal with that contingency. The Soviets insisted on similar arrangements to cover U.S. personnel stationed at Votkinsk.

While recognizing the concerns, I also thought that exposing a group of Soviet officials to daily life in the United States would be a good idea. Their U.S. escorts noted that on the first outing to purchase food and household items, the Soviets were impressed but skeptical. This is a fine store, they said, but we also have special stores like this one. They doubted there would be another store like it in the

entire area. The escorts took up the challenge and brought the Soviets to several other stores. The point was made and left no doubt.

Having secured Soviet agreement to permanent on-site monitoring, we needed to devise a means for examining the canisters within which missiles were housed as they left the plant. The Soviets began by arguing that the United States could only open a relatively small number and only in a fixed sequence, for example every thirtieth missile. After some classic bargaining, and aided on our side by experts on sampling theory, agreement was reached allowing the United States to open, at random, eight canisters per year.

Having resolved this aspect of the problem, we also needed to find a way to inspect from the outside those missile canisters that we would not be able to open. As our delegation considered the possibilities, I half jokingly asked, "Why not use an x-ray machine?" Stan Fraley, on loan to us from Sandia National Laboratories, replied that any x-ray machine that could penetrate the canister and provide a picture of its contents would need to be powerful enough to cook anything between Votkinsk and the Ural mountains beginning with the missile. "So much the better," I said. Stan and his colleagues, however, did not let it lie there. They developed a device that they called "cargo scan," which the Soviets eventually accepted. It did the job without any harm to the contents of the canister or the surrounding countryside.

Duration of a Verification Regime

We moved in a similar manner to ensure that the treaty would be flexible enough to permit us to introduce other monitoring/inspection devices that had not yet been invented or produced. An example of this development is a device permitting U.S. inspectors to determine the number of nuclear warheads on a missile. This device was needed to prevent the Soviets from substituting triple-warhead SS-20s for single-warhead SS-25 strategic missiles.

During the fall of 1987, the sides also agreed on the duration of the inspection and monitoring regime. The INF Treaty is of unlimited duration, that is, it has no expiration date. It will be in effect in perpetuity unless one or both parties exercise their right to withdraw from it if "extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this Treaty have jeopardized its supreme national interests." We favored this approach because of our, and our Allies, belief that it was in our joint interest to prevent a re-creation of a political-military situation in which the Soviets might again be tempted to brandish their INF

missiles in an effort to split NATO. The treaty binds the successor states of the USSR as effectively as it did the Soviets.

While the treaty is of unlimited duration, we had to decide whether the inspection regime should also be of unlimited duration. The Soviets favored a termination date, and the United States also saw advantages in that approach, including an end to the costly verification regime. U.S. experts in both the military and intelligence communities concluded that 13 years of monitoring and on-site inspections would be sufficient. The reasoning behind this judgment was that even if the Soviets had not in fact destroyed all their INF missiles, any remaining systems would be well beyond their “use by” date at that point. The U.S. side also calculated that our NTM would eventually uncover the existence of the unique military training exercises that are essential to maintaining an effective force, and without such exercises, a force would not pose a threat to the United States and its Allies.

The On-Site Inspection Agency and Dispute Settlement

Recognizing the need to be able to carry out inspections as soon as the treaty would enter into force, the United States moved to establish the On-Site Inspection Agency (OSIA) that would be in charge of the inspection regime and provide the personnel and equipment. There was some discussion at the outset concerning which U.S. government agency would provide a “home” for the OSIA. Based on my experience there was only one logical answer: the Department of Defense and the armed services. They had the trained and knowledgeable personnel, could provide the transportation, and, most importantly of all, would have the greatest likelihood of obtaining the necessary funds. Other agencies would, however, also be represented, and in recognition of the need to interface with Allied governments as well as the Soviets, a foreign service officer served as the deputy to the military officer in charge of the OSIA. The inspection regime worked well. It ended in the summer of 2001 in accordance with the treaty’s provisions.

Article XIII of the INF Treaty provided for a dispute settlement regime: the Special Verification Commission (SVC). Among its duties are to serve as a forum for discussing and resolving questions concerning verification issues including those related to inspections. Agreeing on the SVC was relatively easy since the parties had established a similar body, the Standing Consultative Commission (SCC),

as part of the SALT II Treaty. Nevertheless, every word of Article XIII in the INF Treaty was given careful scrutiny.

Ironing Out Wrinkles Involving Special Systems

Our task was further complicated by the addition of unforeseen issues. As the prospect of actually obtaining an INF Treaty became more apparent, U.S. officials working on various research and development (R&D) programs, began, rather tardily, to ask whether and how the treaty that was taking shape would affect their activities. Some of these programs were known to the technical community but not much beyond that restricted group. Others were considered top secret or “black” programs. The U.S. negotiators were unaware of the existence of either category until very late in the negotiations.

Among the nonsecret systems were booster rockets, which are used to send objects such as satellites or test warheads into space. Some of these boosters had range characteristics that could classify them as INF systems subject to the treaty’s provisions were they ever to be used or tested as a weapon delivery system. It was not until the late summer of 1987 that the operators of these booster rockets became aware that the INF Treaty might ban their test or satellite launch vehicles. We had assumed that anyone operating missiles would have been following a negotiation that had been front-page news for years. Similarly, the operators had assumed that we were fully aware of their activities. A parallel problem arose with regard to antiballistic missiles (ABMs). Fortunately, the lights came on in time for us to insert provisions in the treaty that would allow the use of these booster rockets and ABMs while ensuring they could not be used to disguise an INF missile force.

Neither the United States nor the USSR wished to see such booster missiles banned by the INF Treaty. That fact, plus the reluctance of either side to allow the other to carry out on-site inspections of these missiles or the R&D sites where they were located, made it relatively easy to prepare treaty language that could accomplish the desired result. Nonetheless, the U.S. negotiators had to work hard to ensure that the treaty provisions covering these systems would enhance NTM monitoring of the booster missiles and their launch sites and provide the United States with the confidence that it could detect treaty violations. The United States also succeeded in inserting a provision excluding antiballistic missiles from the treaty’s application. The product of these efforts was Article VII, paragraphs 3 and 12, which set

clear limits on the location, use, and configuration of such missiles and their launch sites.⁵

UNRAVELING THE FINAL VERIFICATION KNOTS

Secretary Shultz and Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze had agreed at their September 15–18, 1987, ministerial meeting in Washington that the INF Treaty would be signed at a summit that would be held in Washington on December 8. Verification issues became even more prominent as the date of the summit approached. As we moved deeper into the detailed provisions essential to making “effective” verification a reality, the Soviets became increasingly unwilling to accept provisions that we considered essential to reach that objective.⁶ We were obliged to move some of these questions to the political level. As a consequence, Secretary of State Shultz, Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, and Soviet Marshal Sergei Akromeyev became involved in reaching agreement on technical details. I regretted having to call on the secretary to break some of the impasses, but there was no alternative.

The Soviet negotiators’ posture strongly suggested that they were not getting adequate guidance from Moscow to develop mutually acceptable solutions. Perhaps they and their Moscow-based comrades, who were closely associated with the INF negotiations, considered it politically expedient to be seen as tenaciously carrying contested technical and detailed issues to the U.S. and Soviet cabinet levels, before accepting a U.S. suggested outcome.

It must have been a difficult time to be a Soviet official. As we have seen, Gorbachev was not pleased with what he saw as foot-dragging by the Soviet negotiators. At the same time, powerful elements in the Soviet hierarchy were dissatisfied with Gorbachev’s leadership. Indeed, Gorbachev’s seeming inability to put an end to the “foot-dragging” raises doubts of just how much he was really in charge. All of this must have posed a dilemma for astute Soviet officials trying to determine which way to jump.

The Transporter-Erector-Launcher

An example of a technical issue that had to be brought to the cabinet level for resolution was the question of how to eliminate INF missile transporter/launchers. The U.S. transporter/launchers were in effect “semis,” tractor-trailers with a tractor (cab) that could be separated from the trailer and driven away. Thus we argued that the surest way

to eliminate these vehicles would be to cut up the trailers that carried the missile launcher equipment. However, the Soviet missile transporter-erector-launchers (TEL) were an inseparable “straight bed” truck; the tractor/cab could not be detached from the rest of the body and driven off. Given this situation, the Soviets argued that both sides should be allowed to keep the entire vehicle and put them to other uses such as carrying large pipes for pipelines.

The Soviet proposal would have put us at relatively greater military disadvantage than our proposal would have put them. Under their plan, while we were able to keep the tractor, with the missile transport/launcher “trailer” cut up for scrap, the U.S. INF missile system would have ceased to exist. The Soviets, on the other hand, would have kept their mobile transporter/launcher system intact with only whatever modifications were needed to allow it carry large pipes, or other such objects.

Under our proposal, both parties would have destroyed the missile transporter/launcher’s ability to launch an INF missile. However, the Soviets insisted they could not accept a situation in which the United States would be able to keep and use part of its missile transporters for other military purposes, for example, hauling a tank transporter, fuel tank, or cargo trailer, while the Soviet missile transporter/launchers would be rendered useless for any purpose and effectively destroyed as the drive shafts were cut.

The Soviet negotiators, it would seem, had not been given the necessary leeway to work out a solution. For our part, we recognized how difficult it would be to explain why we had to destroy the tractor/cabs that could easily be assigned non-missile transporter/launcher tasks.

This esoteric issue was added to the list of subjects that were bucked to the cabinet level for final resolution before the December 8, 1987, Washington Summit. A meeting between Secretary Shultz and his Soviet counterpart was set for November 23–24 in part to accomplish this purpose. During the discussion of the elimination of the missile transporters, it became apparent the two sides had very different concepts of the most effective and economical method to eliminate treaty-banned weapon systems. While the U.S. military had considered converting the trailer part of its missile transporters to other uses, for example, tank transporters, the cost of conversion would be greater than the cost of purchasing new equipment. The opposite was the case for the Soviets. Marshal Akromeyev, commenting on the difference, noted that the U.S. approach was evidence of its greater economic strength.

In a sense, however, Akromeyev missed an important point. It was not just that we had more financial resources than the Soviets, but

rather than we had devised a more efficient system. Instead of investing in a single-purpose, oversized transporter-erector-launcher combination, we created a system that separated the erector-launcher from the tractor. At any time, we could have detached the tractor from the missile erector/launcher and used it to haul some other item on a flatbed/cargo trailer. In contrast the Soviet TEL was not much good for any purpose other than to haul and launch SS-20s.

In the end, the sides agreed that the Soviet missile transporters could be converted, but the converted transporter/launchers would have to be modified in a manner that would render them permanently incapable of ever launching an INF missile. Guided by our technical experts, the U.S. negotiators placed precise language to achieve this result in the treaty's Elimination Protocol. The United States would be allowed to drive the tractors away and use them for other purposes. The U.S. transporters (trailer sections) would be destroyed since that was the most efficient way for us to deal with them.

The ministerial level meeting in November permitted us to resolve a large number of the outstanding verification issues. However, we were breaking new ground in the area of verification, and it was inevitable, even as the summit loomed, that new issues would crop up as we worked to transform agreed concepts into agreed legal treaty language.

Determining the Smallest Item that Could be Inspected

A prime example of this complexity involved the question of the size of an object that the sides could open for inspection during an on-site inspection. It had been agreed that the sides could open an object that was the size of the smallest stage of a declared INF missile. During a late-night session on December 5, John Woodworth obtained agreement that the Soviets would be able to open a container the size of the smallest stage of a U.S. missile and the United States would be able to open a container the size of the smallest stage of a Soviet missile. The next day Obukhov withdrew the proposal on the grounds that the Soviet missiles were transported and stored as a single object. The U.S. missiles, he argued, were transported and stored in the form of their component stages.⁷

John and I retorted that the Soviet missiles did have stages, and these were identified in the Memorandum of Understanding and database appended to the treaty. Despite this undeniable fact, Obukhov continued to stonewall. As the evening turned into night and with both delegations physically exhausted and due in Washington the next

day, the tension rose. I told Obukhov that it was simply unacceptable for the U.S. side to bring back a treaty in which the Soviets would have the right to look into a container the size of the smallest stage of a U.S. missile covered by the treaty, but the United States would only be able to look inside an object the size of the smallest assembled Soviet missile.

Obukhov reacted by launching into one of his signature “numba-logues” without allowing the interpreter to speak. I asked him to please stop long enough to give us a translation. He persisted. I got up, left the table and headed for the back of the room. Obukhov stopped talking, and the interpreter began. I picked up a glass of orange juice and came back to my seat. We were still making no progress. I tried again to explain our position to Obukhov, and he again filibustered, dancing around the issue without actually discussing it. Finally, I looked at my watch, noted the hour, and suggested that perhaps we all get a few hours of rest and come back in the morning with fresh minds. At that I picked up my papers and, followed by the U.S. delegation, headed for the door.

Obukhov caught up with me in the corridor. “What is the problem,” he asked. “It is simple,” I replied. “We are not bringing back a treaty that allows the Soviet Union to look inside a box which could contain the smallest stage of our key missile while the United States can only look inside a box which would contain an entire SS-20. If the Soviet Union can look inside a box small enough to contain the second stage of a Pershing II, the U.S. must have the right to look into a box small enough to contain the second stage of an SS-20.” “Well if that is all there is to it,” Obukhov said, “then we have no problem. We can agree to that.”

Squeezing Blood from Stones

Negotiators are often tempted to bring home more than their governments have asked. It is possible that after reporting to Moscow on his discussion with Woodworth, Obukhov had been instructed to make one more effort to gain U.S. acceptance of the Soviet position. Had he been rebuked for accepting the U.S. position during the December 5 discussion with Woodworth, his incentive to bargain hard on this point would have been further magnified. Furthermore, the Soviet negotiators might have felt [under] exceptional pressure arising from the internal opposition to some of Gorbachev’s INF initiatives (of which we were unaware at the time, but of which the Soviet negotiators might have had some knowledge).

For my part, I was willing to take the risk of suspending the negotiations for a few hours. First, I knew that a U.S. Air Force plane would be waiting at the Geneva airport to take us to Washington the next day whenever we were ready. We would have time in the morning to clean up any remaining issues, including this inspection question. I also knew that Obukhov planned to rely on a commercial flight. Second, while I also knew that we would be able to look inside a relatively small container the size of a Soviet SSC-X-4 cruise missile, I was concerned that the lack of symmetry between the treatment of the Pershing II and the SS-20 would raise questions during the Senate hearings on the treaty. While they could be answered, the seeming lack of symmetry would be a complicating factor raising concerns and charges that we had given away too much in this and other areas.

The definitive preparation of the actual treaty, plus disposing of the residue of fast food meals that had accumulated over the final days and nights of the negotiations, and the classified material that we had to destroy before leaving Geneva, went on longer than expected. At the same time, arrangements were made for Obukhov, his deputy General Medvedev, and a Soviet secretary (the first we had ever seen, since unlike the United States, the Soviets never included their secretarial and administrative staffs in any social events) plus a large box with a computer in it, to fly with us on the USAF plane to Washington. The computer was needed because the Soviets did not have a floppy disk system, and all of their work, including the treaty text, was stored within that computer.

We also took advantage of the Soviets' presence on the flight to initial two of the documents appended to the treaty. That task, the pilot informed us, began as we flew over Chartres, France. The rest of the time was spent catching up on sleep. As the aircraft began its descent into Andrews Air Force Base, an uproarious pillow fight broke out among the U.S. INF delegation. Our Soviet guests looked on somewhat mystified. We were coming home with an initialed treaty.

MOVING TO THE HILL: SENATE RATIFICATION

The Senate Majority Leader, Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia, had made it clear that the senate would not simply “rubber stamp” any treaty. In subjecting the INF Treaty to detailed scrutiny, the senate was carrying out its constitutional duties in a responsible manner. The specific remedies that it requested and which necessitated an additional post-signature negotiating session with the Soviets are another question. In any event, it became apparent early on in the hearings process that some senators were going to “put their mark” on this document, as was their duty. However, once the Senate had openly raised doubts about the accuracy of the administration’s contention that U.S. and Soviet negotiators shared the same understanding of the meaning of specific words and phrases in the treaty, the senate’s concern became a self-fulfilling prophecy. The public raising of such doubts by the legislative branch made it imperative that the United States obtain Soviet reconfirmation, lest the meaning of the treaty be cast into question as a result of the expressed doubts and loopholes thereby opened.

It was also obvious that if the United States requested some “clarifications” of the treaty, the Soviet Union would make similar requests. On this occasion, we were able to deal with these in a positive manner. But it is worth remembering that there is no free lunch when dealing with critical and politically charged issues such as the verification of a treaty that eliminates an entire class of weapons. Whatever the merits of our request for a change or a clarification, the other signatory, or signatories, will feel obliged to introduce an element of symmetry into the process.

Indeed, the verification provisions of the INF Treaty were probably its most hard fought elements both within the U.S. government and between the United States and the Soviet Union. Our difficulties in

coming to closure on verification issues in Washington occasionally put us on the defensive with the Soviets. A continuing cycle of dreaming up the perfect verification and monitoring systems, followed by the nightmare of finding loopholes in those systems, can play out almost to infinity. At some point, the ideal becomes the enemy of the effective; that point was reached several times in the INF process. Moreover, proposing more stringent inspection regimes than we ourselves were prepared to accept gave the Soviets an opportunity to practice "one up-manship" and, at a minimum, led to the sort of embarrassment with Allies and adversaries that can weaken an otherwise strong negotiating position.

Lastly, the U.S. administration was on occasion not of one mind on how to resolve the tension between stringent provisions that could limit options for the Soviets and improve the prospects for effective verification, and the desire to maintain a free hand for ourselves, especially in the area of new technologies. The desire to bind an adversary while maintaining a free hand for one's self is natural. However, I am confident that had the negotiators brought back a treaty that permitted conventional cruise missiles, many of the more ardent advocates of that approach would have sought to defeat the treaty on the grounds that we had left a loophole for the Soviets large enough to warrant the Senate's not providing its advice and consent to the treaty.

SENATE RATIFICATION MEETS VERIFICATION REALITIES

Verification issues played an important role during the treaty ratification process. Yet, while the negotiators and other U.S. officials who were working on the treaty had anticipated that the slings and arrows would be aimed at the perceived weakness of the verification measures, the strongest attacks on the treaty came from those who thought it would do too good a job of eliminating INF weapons. As was the case with the booster rockets, this issue eventually centered on the question of weapon systems that had not been brought to the negotiators' attention: in this instance, not until after the treaty had been signed.

The controversy centered around the following: (1) why the INF Treaty had banned conventionally armed ground-launched cruise missiles; (2) whether or how the INF Treaty would affect "futuristic" systems, that is, systems that would be based on new technologies that might be considered so different that they would not be covered by the INF Treaty; and (3) whether the treaty would ban or allow

remotely piloted vehicles. What all three systems had in common was that they were in essence unmanned aircraft, one of which, the ground-launched cruise missile, was explicitly banned by the treaty.

The existence of these systems, some of which were highly secret “black” developments, first came to the negotiators’ attention in an analysis of the treaty for the American Enterprise Institute prepared by Richard Perle and Frank Gaffney. Perle, as Assistant Secretary of Defense, had played an important role in the NATO effort to deploy INF missiles and in the preparations for the negotiations. Gaffney had served as Perle’s deputy and as Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense after Perle’s departure from government. Both continued to be well informed on Pentagon activities and were forceful advocates of a strong defense. Both essentially argued that the United States would always be able to maintain a technological lead over the Soviets and thus should not enter into agreements, including reductions of nuclear weapons, if they interfered with our ability to maintain our technological lead and deploy better weapons.¹

Several senators in essence supported that approach. The prime senatorial questioner on this issue was Dan Quayle of Indiana, visibly urged on by his staff. Quayle, Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina, and others expressed concern that the United States had made a major mistake in banning ground-launched cruise missiles. They argued that the United States had a technological lead in the area and should not give it up. In response, other administration witnesses and I noted that (1) the U.S. military had not identified a role for a conventional ground-launched cruise missile; (2) it would be impossible to verify a treaty that banned nuclear ground-launched cruise missiles but allowed conventional ones; and (3) the United States would still be able to deploy sea- and air-launched conventional cruise missiles as ultimately we have done. I summed up by noting that “there has to be a balance between those who want to operate more systems and those who worry about verifying the systems that are there. And we have tried to reach that balance in this agreement.”²

In his reply, Senator Quayle confirmed that he would like to see the United States deploy a conventional ground-launched cruise missile and that he was not worried that the Soviets might cheat under an arrangement that permitted such systems. “I do not want to restrict us. I am not worried about what they are going to do,” he said.³

The discussion about the merits or demerits of deploying a conventional cruise missile segued into a debate over whether the INF Treaty would or should ban remotely piloted vehicles (RPVs, or drones). The subsequent discussion again focused on the tension

between verifying a nuclear arms control treaty and retaining a free hand to develop and deploy new types of weaponry. This part of the hearings was indirectly affected by an ongoing dispute between the administration and members of congress related to the president's Strategic Defense Initiative. Several members of congress believed that the administration had incorrectly and unilaterally changed the interpretation of key words and phrases in the ABM Treaty as presented to the senate during hearings on that treaty. Senators on both sides of the aisle were determined not to create a similar misunderstanding with regard to the meaning of the language in the INF Treaty or to the testimony of administration officials during the INF hearings.

Time and again, senators led by Senator Quayle probed to determine if hypothetical systems would be banned or permitted under the treaty. In response I cited the range criteria for a ground-launched cruise missile (GLCM) subject to the INF Treaty ban, that is, between 500 and 5,500 kilometers, and quoted from Article II, paragraph 2 of the INF Treaty. "The term 'cruise missile' means an unmanned, self-propelled vehicle that sustains flight through the use of aerodynamic lift over most of its flight path. The term 'ground-launched cruise missile (GLCM)' means a ground-launched cruise missile that is a weapon-delivery vehicle."

As a specific example, I pointed out that a class of drones or RPVs that met all of the criteria for being considered as a banned INF missile, except that they had been used only for reconnaissance purposes and had never been tested or deployed as weapon-delivery vehicles, would be permitted under the treaty. However, if such an RPV or a drone were ever tested or deployed as weapon-delivery vehicle, then it would be considered a GLCM and would be banned under the treaty. I noted that unlike the conventional cruise missile, we could tell the difference between RPVs or drones that were used for reconnaissance and those that might be used as a weapon-delivery system, since the deployment, training, and flight patterns would be different.

Trying to explain what was, and what was not, covered under the treaty's prohibitions became even more complicated when Senator Quayle introduced two weapons systems that were totally unknown to me or others on the INF delegation, including those who represented the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Having never been briefed on these systems, we were naturally hard-pressed to answer precisely whether they would or would not be banned under the treaty. What we could do was to repeat the treaty's criteria for banning a system and ask our interlocutors to apply those criteria to the system about which they were inquiring.

That approach unfortunately led us deeper into the definitional briar patch. Having recognized that the term weapon-delivery vehicle was a crucial determinate when considering if an RPV or drone would be banned under the treaty, I was next asked what the treaty meant by “weapon-delivery vehicle,” particularly what it meant by a “weapon.” It appeared that some of my questioners were aware of classified U.S. efforts to develop a new type of weapon system that would employ new physical forces found somewhere on the electromagnetic spectrum. I regretted that these issues were being discussed in open session.

At a point in the deliberations, I found a moment alone with Senator Quayle. I told him that I thought I understood what he was driving at. I said it seemed to me that he could best protect those options he seemed anxious to retain by not pushing me to be increasingly precise. “If you continue to press me for a definition of a weapon, I will give you the most accurate answer I can, but you may not like it.”

The questioning, however, continued. When asked whether the U.S. side had ever considered the need for a precise definition of a “weapon,” I replied that there is a clear common meaning of that word: a weapon is something that damages or destroys. The questions then turned to whether a series of hypothetical systems would or would not be considered “weapons.” In each case I applied the common “damages or destroys” definition.

Finally I said, “Senator, I am really very uncomfortable, frankly, in sort of off the top of my head, giving you definitions about futuristic systems you seem familiar with but which are unknown to me. It really is not fair to this committee or to the administration for me to pursue this any further with you. You can take those as my own personal definitions, but I cannot say that I speak authoritatively on this.”⁴ The senator expressed concern that my definition of a weapon was “very broad.” It was very broad, but it was also correct. On April 14, I delivered the official authoritative definition of a weapon to the committee. A weapon was defined as “any mechanism or device which when directed against a target is designed to damage or destroy it.”

In an effort to invalidate this definition, Senator Quayle began questioning whether the United States and the Soviet negotiators had ever discussed the definition of a weapon. I replied that “There are literally tens of thousands of words that we never discussed and among words we never discussed was “weapon . . . We did not have to, in our view. It is a commonly-understood word.” I also noted that international law supports this point.⁵

The issue was further complicated by the language in the administration's official "Article by Article Analysis of the Treaty," which defined "weapon-delivery" as "those types of ground-launched cruise missiles that have been . . . flight tested or deployed with any type of warhead device or simulation thereof." The Senate Foreign Relations Committee's report on the treaty commented, "This suggests that GLBMs or GLCMs which destroyed their targets with other, perhaps more futuristic or exotic means would not be covered." The administration's authoritative response was that such means would be considered a weapon if they damaged or destroyed a target.⁶

The questioning then turned to whether the Joint Chiefs of Staff had consciously decided to include futuristic weapons under the INF Treaty's prohibitions. U.S. Air Force General Robert Herres, while noting that just because the Joint Chiefs of Staff "did not discuss any specific futuristic technologies that one might wish to consider for these kinds of weapons platforms does not necessarily mean we had any intention of excluding any weapon delivery platform from coverage by this Treaty that fell into this category." General Herres added that, "I just cannot imagine the Chiefs and their staffs not dissenting if they had any idea that we meant to exclude future technologies from coverage by the INF Treaty." In other words, the Chiefs expected that future technologies would be covered by the INF Treaty. To back this up, Herres noted that "anything we would wish to do with these kinds of platforms" (that is, ground-launched INF-range missiles), "we would prefer to do with a sea-launched or air-launched platform."⁷

Several things were going on here. First, there was an effort to create loopholes in the treaty to permit U.S. deployment of "futuristics" and conventional cruise missiles. It is of course perfectly legitimate to conclude that in a specific case the balance of advantages to the United States between giving ourselves a free hand or constraining the Soviets' lies in the direction of keeping our options open. But in the case of INF, the proponents of this view could not overcome the point that the U.S. military did not agree with that position. The Joint Chiefs of Staff argued that the balance of advantage for the United States lay with constraining the Soviets as well as ourselves. Indeed, they preferred using the un-banned sea-based or air-launched missiles of INF range to the ground-launched versions banned by the INF Treaty. Moreover, had we presented a treaty that exempted conventional cruise missiles or new futuristic weapons from its prohibitions, we would have been severely criticized by many of those who sought to create such exemptions during the ratification process as having

brought back a treaty with “fatally flawed” verification provisions. In this latter case, they would have been right, as I testified.

There are those who lean toward the view that the development and deployment of U.S. weapons should be unconstrained even if potential opponents are equally unconstrained. Conversely there are others who lean toward the view that U.S. national security is strengthened if constraints are placed on the development and deployment of potential opponents even if comparable constraints are placed on the United States. It was, and remains, difficult to find the optimal balance between these two approaches.

It was also, and remains, difficult to find common ground between those who believe that, in general, the national security of the United States would be strengthened if no limits were placed on the weapons it could have, even if that would mean there would be no limits on the same type of Soviet (or some other adversaries) weapons, and those who believe the national security of the United States would be strengthened if limits were placed on Soviet (or some other adversaries) weapon systems, even if that would mean placing limits on the same type of U.S. weapons. The only way to proceed is case by case. In the case of INF, the scales tipped in favor of mutual constraints. But a bit of ambiguity might have been helpful.

Senator Quayle’s insistent questioning, however, led to an outcome that would make it difficult to claim a loophole that might allow the United States to develop futuristic ground-launched unmanned weapons within the INF-range band. Indeed, by the year 2000, the U.S. military was actively pursuing the use of unmanned weapon systems in an effort to lower costs and loss of life. Some of the interest seemed focused on sea-launched systems, and the United States has already demonstrated it can launch cruise missiles from aircraft. Perhaps a ground-launched version might not be the weapon of choice. But unless a ground-launched weapon-delivery system’s range was less than 500 kilometers or more than 5,500 kilometers, I would be hard pressed to see how it could be compliant with the INF Treaty, unless it was not “launched” but took off by itself, for example, like an airplane. The choice the U.S. government had made in 1987 between verification and freedom to deploy determined the outcome.⁸

Verification issues continued to attract attention as the Senate hearings ground on. Despite our efforts, key senators on both sides of the aisle, with the ABM Treaty interpretation problem fresh in their minds, insisted that we get further clarification and confirmation in writing from the Soviets that the sides agreed on the meaning of certain phrases, including “weapon-delivery,” and the coverage of “futuristic”

systems. We had thought these issues had been put to bed by letters from Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze to Secretary Shultz confirming that both sides had the same understanding of “weapon-delivery” and of how the treaty would affect “futuristics.”

With only weeks before Presidents Reagan and Gorbachev were scheduled to meet at Moscow for a summit, at which the exchange of ratified copies of the INF Treaty would be the centerpiece, Secretary Shultz led another mission to Geneva to get further proof in writing from the Soviets that the sides had the same interpretation of the treaty.

The U.S. negotiating team arrived at Geneva shortly after noon on May 11, 1988. The secretary and his Soviet counterpart held the opening session of a marathon meeting. Max Kampelman was put in charge of the effort to develop a formal exchange of diplomatic notes, which would make clear beyond any doubt that the United States and the Soviet Union shared a common understanding of what is a “weapon-delivery vehicle” and that “futuristic” weapons would be covered. This task was accomplished in relatively short order, the parties having already exchanged correspondence on the subject. In both cases, these understandings corresponded to the informal answers that I had given during the hearings in response to Senator Quayle’s questions.

I was put in charge of the effort to reach agreement on a number of technical issues dealing primarily with the implementation of the treaty. Most of them were at the request of the United States. One, involving monitoring at Votkinsk, was placed on the agenda by the Soviets. Another Soviet request asked for a clarification of their rights to inspect for INF missiles at the Pueblo, Colorado, missile storage facility. It became apparent that their real aim was the right to inspect for German Pershing I missiles, which were also stored at the Colorado facility. We were able to develop a letter from me to Chervov that met what I took to be a Soviet need to show they had also raised several topics. The letter allowed them to demonstrate that they had been given an answer, but not one that would compromise our position of principle that the Pershings were German property and that our bilateral treaty with the Soviets did not encompass any Soviet rights to place controls on those missiles.

General Nikolay F. Chervov and Ambassador Victor Karpov took the lead on the Soviet side. As usual with issues of detail, the going was slow. The session did not end until 12:30 a.m. with several issues still outstanding. We reconvened at 9:30 a.m. By 3:30 p.m. we had reached agreement in principle and expected to complete our work by early evening. However, at around 8:00 p.m., the Soviets called to say

they were having problems with an issue concerning monitoring at Votkinsk and would get back to us.

I was scheduled to return to Washington with National Security Advisor General Colin Powell, and we were to brief the senators on the results of the meetings with the Soviets. Eventually the window of departure for General Powell narrowed, and I told him it looked unlikely that I would be able to accompany him but that I would try to get a message to him when we had completed our work.

At about 12:30 a.m. the Soviets called. They asked to meet with Ambassador Kampleman to resolve the remaining issue. When I called Kampleman, he told me he had taken a sleeping pill but would nonetheless come over. I suggested he might want to forgo the pleasure, especially as he had taken a sleeping pill and was not familiar with the subject matter; however, he felt he had a responsibility to attend. This was not the first time that the Soviets indicated a preference for dealing with someone other than me. I saw it as a positive indicator.

The Soviets were again led by Chervov and Karpov with the latter taking the lead role as the discussion began at the U.S. Mission. Also present was Gennadiy K. Khromov, who represented the Soviet military-industrial complex and who had been a difficult interlocutor during the START negotiations. After the opening formalities, Kampleman effectively turned the meeting over to me. As the U.S. side continued to stand by its position, General Chervov put forward another variation of the Soviet approach. Khromov, looking very unhappy, moved from his front row seat to one in the back. I called for a time out and moved our team into another room.

Fortunately, some of our team members were able to provide technical support. As we studied the Soviet proposal, we concluded that the language it contained would be better for our purposes than their original proposal. It appeared to us that the revised Soviet proposal seemed designed to protect from monitoring at Votkinsk a new missile with dimensions that had more girth, but less length than the SS-20. In any case, it was not an SS-20.

It was important at this point for us to recall that the purpose of the monitoring regime was to ensure there was no further production of SS-20s. While it would have been useful to have gained more knowledge of other Soviet systems, we had no grounds to insist that they make them subject to the special provisions put into effect to ensure that SS-20s were not being produced at Votkinsk. We concluded that we could accept the revised Soviet position.

General Chervov and I initialed the document (commonly referred to as an "agreed minute") at 7:15 a.m. on May 13, 1988. I and the

other Washington-bound members of the secretary's party dashed to the Intercontinental hotel where the motorcade for the airport had already formed. I gave the secretary a "thumbs up" sign, and the document in hand, got into one of the waiting cars and headed for the airport. The senate was satisfied with the outcome of our efforts. The last major hurdle to obtaining the senate's advice and consent to the INF Treaty had been taken.

The senate gave its approval of the treaty at 3:15 p.m. on May 27, 1988. There were signs warning observers not to make any noise. But one of the members of the INF delegation began to applaud after the 93 to 5 vote was announced. Others in the galleries followed suit and many of the senators on the floor joined in the applause. On June 1, 1988, presidents Reagan and Gorbachev exchanged the instruments of ratification. We did not know it, but the last battle had been favorably concluded and the end of the Cold War was now in sight.

* * *

From its inception in 1977 to its conclusion with the agreement by Slovakia and Bulgaria in 2000 to destroy their SS-23 missiles, the INF issue spanned five U.S. administrations. These administrations differed in their approaches to many of our foreign policy challenges and opportunities. Yet, having been either directly or indirectly involved with INF questions during this entire period, what strikes me is the degree of continuity that marked U.S. INF policy throughout almost a quarter of a century. This fact alone underscores the importance the United States placed on its relations with its Allies and adversaries, the stakes at risk in this venture, and the validity of our policy approach to the issue. There is no doubt in my mind that had we failed either with regard to the deployments or to the negotiation of the treaty, the Cold War would not have ended as positively as it did.

UPSIDES AND DOWNSIDES

In the end, the INF Treaty broke new ground in verification. Its stringent provisions became the foundation for similar constraints in the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties (START) and the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty and remain the point of departure for the verification and monitoring of arms control and disarmament treaties including those dealing with post-Cold War threats arising from weapons of mass destruction.

Among the verification measures which came out of INF are the following:

- *Data Exchanges*: Undertaken before the treaty was signed and updated periodically after it entered into force, these exchanges help set the foundation for verifying compliance. The exchanges include declarations by each side of the number and location of weapon systems limited by the treaty and of production, final assembly, testing, storage, and deployment facilities of these weapon systems.
- *Baseline Inspection*: Undertaken immediately after the treaty entered into force, these on-site inspections help verify the accuracy of the data provided in the data exchange.
- *On-site Observation* of the elimination of treaty-limited weapon systems, which provides visual and physical proof that the items have been eliminated.
- *Short Notice On-site Inspections* of (1) declared locations listed in the data exchange during the process of reducing or eliminating weapons systems; and (2) locations where treaty-limited systems had been located (formerly declared facilities). These provisions provide an opportunity to verify that the treaty is being properly implemented at locations where parts of the infrastructure for deploying treaty-eliminated systems may remain in place after the missiles have been eliminated.

The INF Treaty also contained novel arrangements designed to enhance national technical means (NTM). This included opening the retractable roofs of garages at declared SS-25 sites in order to verify that the missiles inside were indeed strategic-range SS-25s and not the banned INF-range SS-20s.

The INF Treaty also broke new ground in establishing continuous perimeter and portal (entry and exit) monitoring of a missile production and support facility to help verify that treaty-banned missiles were not being produced at that location.¹

As noted, all the relevant new verification provisions of the INF Treaty found their way into the START and CFE Treaties and also into the Chemical Weapons Convention. There could also be a role for these provisions in the on-going post-Cold War effort to control the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Indeed, the fact that the two key Cold War rivals were ultimately able to agree on an intrusive verification regime holds open the prospect that in time similar results could be reached on a broader multilateral scale.

Nevertheless, there were also some downsides. The Soviets did succeed in getting U.S. Pershing IIs and ground-launched cruise missiles out of Europe, thereby weakening the important sense of joint responsibility of the Allies for the NATO nuclear deterrence. After all, we had argued in 1979 that U.S. INF deployments were necessary not just to counter the SS-20 but also to close the gap in deterrence, which existed precisely because we did not have land-based INF in Europe. Eliminating the SS-20 would not remove the need to fill the gap in deterrence.

The problem could have been mitigated in part by the United States and its NATO Allies continuing to deploy nuclear-capable aircraft in Europe carrying state-of-the-art nuclear weapons and by modernizing those ground-launched nuclear systems that were outside the INF Treaty's limitations. In fact this did not happen. The Soviets mounted a strong campaign against modernization and the Allies, fatigued by the years of internal debates on this issue, dragged their feet. Plans to modernize the Lance short-range nuclear-capable missile and to deploy a modern nuclear-capable air-to-surface missile never reached fruition. But if NATO was not going to modernize its remaining SRINF systems, it continued to espouse some of the same doctrinal points in its communiqués.²

Yet none of this really mattered as much as it had earlier. As the Soviet Union headed for collapse in the autumn of 1991, President Bush, concerned by the signs of impending chaos in the Soviet Union, unilaterally removed all U.S. nuclear-capable systems from Europe

with the exception of a relatively small number of nuclear bombs carried by aircraft and obtained Gorbachev's agreement to take similar steps. INF was the last battle of the Cold War, and it was fitting that the last vestiges of the issue, which propelled the complex of INF issues, would depart the scene along with that war.

CONCLUSION

The high degree of continuity of personnel on the U.S. INF delegation and the close teamwork which that delegation—composed entirely of career Foreign Service, Civil Service, and armed services personnel—had attained was another factor in the successful outcome of the negotiations. Our national leaders during this period, flawed and imperfect like all of us, would, however, have been held responsible if this issue had not turned out as it did. They should also be credited for its success. In particular, that success was due to the efforts of President Reagan for his wholehearted support to both the deployment and arms control tracks; the leaders of the other NATO countries for having held to the course despite strong domestic opposition, which cost some of them their careers; and President Gorbachev, for having taken some of the most difficult decisions, over the opposition of important elements in the Soviet system, and which ultimately played a role in his losing his presidency.

I believe Gorbachev was motivated in part by a desire to accomplish by warmth what his predecessors failed to accomplish by the cold wind of intimidation, namely the splitting of NATO and the exclusion of the United States from a so called common European home. Nevertheless, Gorbachev paid a high political price for moving Soviet policy toward a competitive but more open and peaceful approach toward achieving its goals.³

In any event, Gorbachev made a great difference in how things turned out not only for INF, but through INF, for the world. Let us give him the last word; one which I believe many of those who worked to resolve the INF issue would share. "The INF Treaty set the whole process in motion. It is doubtful whether we would ever have been able to sign the subsequent agreements without it. The INF Treaty represented the first well-prepared step on our way out of the Cold War, the first harbinger of the new times."⁴

This page intentionally left blank

NOTES

1 SETTING THE TABLE

1. Ambassador Paul Nitze suggested the phrase Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces, or INF. INF in turn was broken down into LRINF for missiles with ranges between 1,000 and 5,500 kilometers and SRINF for missiles between 500 and 1,000 kilometers. These ultimately became the common usage in the West to describe the systems covered by the INF Treaty. I have thus chosen to use INF, LRINF, and SRINF throughout this book even though these designations were not formally introduced until later in the process which culminated in the INF Treaty. The treaty itself is formally titled “Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles.”
2. Before and during the negotiations several different names were applied to the class of systems which were under discussion—namely nuclear-capable weapons systems with ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers. At the outset, these were referred to as medium-range or theater-range nuclear weapons. The former designation tended to be used by the Soviet side and thus implied that their concept was the basis of the negotiation. We wanted to put our own stamp on the nomenclature. The latter designation carried with it the implication that the weapons in question were designed for use in a theater of military operations namely Europe. I believed this was politically insensitive.
3. *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization: Facts and Figures* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1981), 30–31.
4. May 9–11, 1955, NAC Communiqué, *NATO Final Communiqués, 1949–1974* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1975), 89.
5. December 15–16, 1955, NAC Communiqué, *NATO Final Communiqués, 1949–1974* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1975), 95, 96.
6. May 2–3, 1957, NAC Ministerial Communiqué, *NATO Final Communiqués, 1949–1974* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1975), 105.
7. December 16–19, 1957, NAC Communiqué, *NATO Final Communiqués, 1949–1974* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1975), 113.
8. April 16–17, 1958, Defense Ministers Communiqué, *NATO Final Communiqués, 1949–1974* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1975), 117.

9. On September 27, 1991, President George H. W. Bush announced that the United States would unilaterally withdraw all of its tactical nuclear weapons from Europe. Except for some air-delivered weapons, they are now all gone.
10. These included two ballistic missiles, the Jupiter and the Thor, and one cruise missile, the Mace. All three systems had become obsolete and were removed well before the INF issue arose.
11. May 24, 1963, NAC Communiqué, *NATO Final Communiqués, 1949–1974* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1975), 151.
12. May 5–6, 1962, NAC Ministerial Communiqué, *NATO Final Communiqués, 1949–1974* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1975), 143–144.
13. See Paul H. Nitze, *From Hiroshima to Glasnost* (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1989), 308–310.
14. See Helga Haftendorn, *Security and Détente* (New York: Praeger, 1985), 132–133.

2 SOVIET INF: NATO AND THE UNITED STATES MOBILIZE TO COUNTER THE THREAT

1. “1977 Ministerial Guidance” in the Annex to the May 17–18, 1977, Defense Planning Committee Communiqué, *NATO Final Communiqués, 1975–1980* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1975), 71.
2. June 8–9, 1977 Nuclear Planning Group Communiqué, *NATO Final Communiqués, 1975–1980* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1981), 75.
3. “The 1977 Alistair Buchanan Memorial Lecture,” *Survival*, January–February 1987, 2–10.
4. Indeed, one observer notes, “In historical retrospect Schmidt has interpreted his speech as an attempt to give impetus to an improvement and modernization of NATO’s medium-range potential.” Haftendorn, *Security and Détente*, 136.
5. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, Jimmy Carter 1978*, Book I, January 1–June 30, 1978 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979), 536.
6. *Ibid.* Confirmed in May 5, 1978, press conference by President Carter. See page 875.
7. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, Jimmy Carter 1978*, Book I, 702.
8. *Ibid.*, 874–875.
9. *Strategic Survey, 1978* (London: International Institute of Strategic Studies, 1979), 107.
10. May 30–31, 1978, NAC Communiqué, *NATO Final Communiqués, 1975–1980* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1981), 94. This communiqué, and the one issued the following May, were marked by the

presence of roman numerals. France was not a member of NATO's integrated military command structure and did not wish to be seen as associating itself, especially in a published official document, with any activity, e.g., new nuclear deployments, which were connected with the integrated military command structure. The French, therefore, did not wish to have any reference to such deployments in an NAC communiqué. They proposed that the Alliance issue a separate document to cover this topic. The United States and the other Allies, however, wanted to put the issue forward as part of their broad approach to all the issues facing NATO. I was particularly sensitive to the possibility that the Soviets might misconstrue NATO's inability to issue a single document as a sign of a deep rift on this issue. Working with my French colleague Jacques Jessel, an able defender of French interests, we came up with the compromise of a single document with two clearly defined sections. He obtained a green light from his senior officers; I was confident mine would accept the arrangement. With the dawn approaching, we gave the document to the NATO printing service to publish and distribute. Alas, when we saw the printed communiqué later that morning, we found that the roman numerals had been placed on the side of the text and not in the middle of the page as Jessel and I had agreed. This did not sit well with some of the more senior French officials; but they recognized the fault lay with the printers, and probably the very late hour. We used the same device to get around the same problem in the May 1979 NAC Communiqué. This time the roman numerals were correctly placed in the middle of the page. This device continued in use in subsequent communiqués until the INF negotiations got underway. From that point onward, under the rubric of reviewing reports on all the arms control negotiations, the French were able to accept the communiqués without requiring a separate document for INF or roman numerals within the communiqué.

11. May 29–30, 1975, NAC Communiqué, *NATO Final Communiqués, 1975–1980* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1981), 30.
12. France did not participate in the SCG. While we did not expect them to join, they had not formally informed us of their intentions before the first meeting. To make the point to all the Allies that the United States would welcome them to the group, I had placed the French placard on the table. It was removed once the meeting got underway.
13. This seminar-like approach was key to the success of the HLG and SG in developing broad consensus on NATO positions. Both groups were composed of high-level officials who were experts and who could come together either to speak for their governments or speak with expert knowledge of the direction of their government's thinking.
14. Conversation with David McGiffert, March 22, 2000.
15. April 18–19, 1978, NATO Nuclear Planning Group Communiqué, *NATO Final Communiqués, 1975–1980* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1981), 85.
16. *Ibid.*, 117.

17. *Strategic Survey, 1979* (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1980), 102.
18. *Ibid.*, 102–103.

3 NATO FACES THE SOVIET CHALLENGE

1. France's nonparticipation in the special meeting was marked by a footnote to the document.
2. "12 December 1979: Special Meeting of Foreign and Defense Ministers," *NATO Final Communiqués, 1975–1980* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1981), 121–123.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*
14. December 13–14, 1979, NAC Communiqué, *NATO Final Communiqués, 1975–1980* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1981), 129.
15. June 3–4, 1980, NPG and June 25–26, 1980, NAC Communiqués, *NATO Final Communiqués, 1975–1980* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1981), 137 and 145 respectively.
16. Helga Haftendorn, *Security and Détente* (New York: Praeger, 1985), 146.
17. *Strategic Survey, 1980–1981* (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1981), 137.
18. *Strategic Survey, 1981–1982* (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1982), 29.
19. The above two paragraphs are extracted from a speech I gave to a USIA organized conference on East–West relations, March 30–31, 1984, at Baden bei Wien, Austria. The views expressed represent my approach to arms control before, during, and since the INF experience.
20. ACDA provided administrative support to the U.S. INF delegation in Geneva, and in Washington, ACDA was responsible for coordinating the interagency process that developed guidance and analysis for the delegations.
21. TNF (theater nuclear forces) and INF (intermediate-range nuclear forces) were phrases used interchangeably at first. Once Allied officials adopted and defined "INF," the use of TNF fell by the wayside.

May 4–5, 1981, NAC Communiqué, *NATO Final Communiqués, 1975–1980* (Brussels: NATO Information Service, 1981), 28.

4 TAKING THE FIRST STEPS

1. “Remarks to Members of the National Press Club on Arms Reductions and Nuclear Weapons, November 18, 1981,” *Public Papers of the Presidents, Ronald Reagan, 1981* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982), 1062–1067.
2. Ibid.
3. The Special Consultative Group (SCG) circulated its December 8, 1983, “Progress Report to Ministers,” released by the NATO Press Service, after the Soviets walked out of the negotiations. The report was based largely on the U.S. INF delegation’s reports and analysis of the negotiations up to that time. I have drawn on it, as well as on my memory, and annotated appointments books in reviewing the negotiating rounds up to the Soviet walkout.
4. *Strategic Survey, 1981–1982*, 140.

5 THE END OF THE BEGINNING

1. SCG Progress Report, December 8, 1983, 13.
2. *Strategic Survey, 1981–1982* (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1982), 130.
3. Ibid., 147.
4. Ibid., 144.
5. Ibid., 145.
6. Ibid., 145.
7. SCG Progress Report, 14–15.
8. Aleksandr’ G. Savel’Yev and Nikolay N. Detinov, *The Big Five: Arms Control Decision Making in the Soviet Union* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1995), 62; Paul H. Nitze, *From Hiroshima to Glasnost* (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1989), 374, 375.
9. Savel’Yev and Detinov, *The Big Five*, 62.
10. Given the personal nature of what would later transpire, and his undertaking to speak about it only to ACDA Director Eugene Rostow, Nitze was right to keep it to himself. Had he asked my opinion, I would have said I did not think the timing was propitious; there would be no agreement until and unless we deployed. However, I would also have said it was worth trying if only to demonstrate willingness of the United States to seek alternative formulas for obtaining an equal outcome.
11. See Nitze, *From Hiroshima to Glasnost*, 376–389, for full exposition of the “walk in the woods” formula.
12. Ibid., 388.

6 LIFE AFTER “THE WALK IN THE WOODS”: THE TALKS BREAK DOWN

1. National Technical Means (NTM) is a term of art for arms control meaning those systems, usually satellite photography and electronic intercepts, employed by intelligence agencies.
2. SCG Progress Report, December 8, 1983, 21.
3. *Ibid.*, 22.
4. Both France and the United States publicly stated their refusal to include their nuclear forces in the INF negotiations on January 2 and 10 respectively. *Strategic Survey, 1983–1984* (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1984), 139.
5. SCG Progress Report, 24.
6. *Ibid.*, 128.
7. *Ibid.*, 30.
8. *Strategic Survey, 1983–1984*, 128.
9. SCG Progress Report, 33.
10. See also Paul H. Nitze, *From Hiroshima to Glasnost* (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1989), 389–398, for a direct participant’s view of the “walk in the park.”
11. *Ibid.*, 391.
12. *Ibid.*, 304–305.
13. *Strategic Survey, 1983–1984*, 130.
14. Pavel Palazchenko, *My Years with Gorbachev and Shevardnadze* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), 19.
15. The Soviets also carried out their threat to leave the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks that had opened in Geneva in June 1982, announcing a suspension of those talks in early December 1983.
16. Palazchenko, *My Years with Gorbachev and Shevardnadze*, 19.
17. Aleksandr’ G. Savel’Yev and Nikolay N. Detinov, *The Big Five: Arms Control Decision Making in the Soviet Union* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1995), 67–68.
18. *Ibid.*, 68.
19. *Ibid.*

7 PICKING UP THE PIECES: A NEW BEGINNING

1. *Strategic Survey, 1984–1985* (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, Spring 1985), 140.
2. *Ibid.*
3. George Shultz, *Turmoil and Triumph* (New York: Scribners, 1993), 489 and 491.
4. *Ibid.*, 519.
5. USIS Wireless File, January 19, 1985.

6. Max M. Kampleman, *Entering New Worlds* (New York: HarperCollins, 1991), 296–298.
7. The first time any of us saw a Soviet secretary was when she, along with Ambassador Obukhov and General Medvedev, joined us for the U.S. Air Force flight back to Washington for the treaty signing ceremony.
8. Tower commented that “The Soviets wanted to conduct the arms control talks by way of one grand negotiating forum, broken into three subgroups. The U.S. position was that there should be three separate and distinct negotiating teams loosely gathered under one umbrella organization. (The Soviet) objective was to merge the three major categories of issue together to maximize negotiating leverage. This could have paralyzed any movement towards an agreement on strategic weapons by injecting the SDI controversy into the proceedings.” John G. Tower, *Consequences: A Personal and Political Memoir* (New York: Little Brown and Company, 1991), 262.
9. James Goodby and Mark Palmer had dealt with Obukhov in START and the preliminary INF talks respectively and had found him verbose and rather unimaginative. Those who had worked with him during the SALT II negotiations had a far better opinion of him. Whatever the cause, he had changed from a relatively open and imaginative interlocutor in SALT II to a hyper-cautious one. This tendency was most vividly shown during a luncheon at a Chinese restaurant in keeping with our effort to underscore the interests of Asian states in the INF negotiations. When the time came to order beverages, I suggested a Tsingtao beer. Obukhov looked very skeptical. To ease his mind, I pointed out that the brewery had been built by Germans who certainly knew about beer and that the product was quite acceptable. Obukhov demurred. “Why not try it,” I asked. “I never try anything I haven’t had before” he replied.
10. Gorbachev address to the French National Assembly as released by the Soviet Embassy at Paris, France and reported by the United States Embassy at Paris, France on October 4, 1985.
11. *Pravda*, May 30, 1985, in FBIS.
12. *Ibid.*
13. See Shultz, *Turmoil and Triumph*, 605.
14. Gorbachev speech, January 16, 1986, in FBIS.
15. See reply to question by First Deputy Foreign Minister Georgiy M. Korniyenko in FBIS London 201009Z January 1986 at a press conference held in Moscow on January 18, 1986, for Soviet and foreign journalists.
16. See Shultz, *Turmoil and Triumph*, 604.
17. Gorbachev speech to 27th CPSU Congress, February 25, 1986, in FBIS.
18. In a letter to me dated October 23, 1990, Kampleman referred to the post-Reykjavik time as an “uncertain period” in which “we did not know where they were heading” on linkage. In my reply to him of October 29, 1990, I wrote that “as far as I was concerned the post-Reykjavik period

was not an ‘uncertain’ one as regards linkage. I was confident, as I had been since March 1985 that we were headed toward a separate, unlinked INF Treaty and that the U.S. side could and should calmly act accordingly.” Eventually, as the likelihood of obtaining a separate INF agreement grew, Kampleman began to change his mind about the prospect of obtaining a separated INF Treaty. His earlier skepticism (cited above) notwithstanding, he wrote in his book; “I was convinced we could obtain an INF and START Treaty without dealing with SDI. I consistently maintained that position.” Kampleman, *Entering New Worlds*, 341n.

19. Pavel Palazchenko, *My Years with Gorbachev and Shevardnadze* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), 64.
20. *Public Papers of the President, Ronald Reagan*, Administration of Ronald Reagan, 1987, March 3, 1987 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989), 191–192.
21. Gorbachev speech to 27th CPSU Congress, February 25, 1986, in FBIS.
22. To the best of my recollection, at no time did either the United States or the USSR put forward a proposal that either explicitly or implicitly called for trade-offs between INF issues and those of START or Defense and Space. This could be an indication that both parties realized that such an approach would be too unwieldy to obtain results and/or neither party wanted to be seen as seeking advantage in one area at the expense of the other. This would seem to apply with special force in the case of INF where the political aspects were so important. My conclusion—that it was both too unwieldy and politically unattractive.
23. Indeed, years later while researching American efforts at mediating disputes, I came across a passage in a book dealing with Theodore Roosevelt’s mediation of the Russo-Japanese war. Roosevelt in a letter to Senator Henry Cabot Lodge commented on the differences in negotiating tactics between the Japanese and the Russian ambassadors. He had a distinct preference for the former. As regards the latter, Roosevelt observed that at times “he will lie even when he knows you know he’s lying.” We on more than one occasion made the same observation when hearing some of the Soviet arguments. Eugene D. Trani, *The Treaty of Portsmouth* (Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 1969), 65. One ought to recognize the pressures imposed on those who live under despotic regimes where dissent is not tolerated; indeed, it is a sort of “lie or die” regime.
24. U.S. Embassy Paris 39592, October 3, 1985.
25. Ibid.
26. *Pravda*, editorial, May 27, 1985, as reported by FBIS.
27. Mikhail Gorbachev, *Memoirs* (New York: Doubleday, 1996), 415.
28. “INF Chronology 1977–1988” prepared by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The proposal, like several the United States put forward during the negotiations, was based on using the differences in the number of warheads on missiles carried by U.S. and Soviet launchers

to arrive at equal outcomes. For example, one GLCM launcher carried four single warhead missiles. One SS-20 launcher carried three single warhead missiles. One Pershing II launcher carried one single warhead missile.

8 PEACE MOVEMENTS

1. Soviet themes extracted from "Soviet Propaganda Campaign Against NATO," unpublished manuscript prepared by Charles A. Sorrels of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, September 5, 1983.
2. SCG Progress Report, December 8, 1983, 5.
3. Vladimir Bukovsky, "The Peace Movement and the Soviet Union," *Commentary* (May 1982): 25–41.
4. Ibid.
5. Sergey Tarasenko, *Moscow New Times* in English, No. 48, November 27–December 3, 1990, 15–16; "Tanks or People," FBIS, December 6, 1990.
6. Ibid.
7. Cited in Kim R. Holmes, "The West German Peace Movement and the National Question," Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, March 1984, 38.
8. Aleksandr' G. Savel'Yev and Nikolay N. Detinov, *The Big Five: Arms Control Decision Making in the Soviet Union* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1995), 66–68. Emphasis added.
9. Ibid., 66.
10. Pavel Palazchenko, *My Years with Gorbachev and Shevardnadze* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), 17.
11. Savel'Yev and Detinov, *The Big Five*, 66.
12. Ibid., 68.
13. Mikhail Gorbachev, *Memoirs* (New York: Doubleday, 1996), 443.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid., 444.
16. Helmut Kohl, quoted in Ronald D. Asmus, *German Strategy and Opinion After the Wall, 1990–1993* (Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1994), 3–4.
17. Gorbachev, *Memoirs*, 432.
18. Ibid., 428.
19. Rutland Vermont, *Herald*, December 15, 1987, 1.

9 BREAKING THE BACK OF THE BIGGEST PROBLEMS

1. "Remarks to Members of the National Press Club on Arms Reductions and Nuclear Weapons, November 18, 1981," *Public Papers of the President, Ronald Reagan, 1981* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982), 1062–1067.

2. Lawrence Eagleburger, "The U.S. Approach to the Negotiations on Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces," *NATO Review*, Volume 30, No. 1 (February 1982), 9.
3. Estimate of the Strategic Analysis Service of the French Ministry of Defense as reported by Jacques Isnard in *Le Monde*, October 21, 1983, 3.
4. Palazchenko, *My Years with Gorbachev and Shevardnadze*, 4.
5. George Shultz, *Turmoil and Triumph* (New York: Scribners, 1993), 184.
6. *INF Chronology, 1977-1988*, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, 1988.
7. An example of the Chinese approach is a statement by Premier Zhao Ziyang to the People's Rally for World Peace in Beijing on March 21, 1986. The premier underscored that the United States and the Soviet Union, possessing the "largest nuclear arsenals, should take the lead in halting the testing, production, and deployment of all types of nuclear weapons." "This would create favorable conditions for an international conference on nuclear disarmament with the participation of all the nuclear-weapons states to discuss further nuclear disarmament and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons." The implications of this general statement are obvious. But in one important area, Premier Zhao's position came closer to that of the United States than to the USSR's. He called for a "simultaneous and balanced reduction, and on-the-spot destruction of, medium-range nuclear missiles deployed in Europe and Asia by the Soviet Union and the United States." *Beijing Xinhua* in English, March 25, 1986, as reported in FBIS Okinawa, 251938Z, AMR 86/01.
8. Tadashi Kuranari, "Japanese Security Policy," *Survival*, January-February 1987, 84-86.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Ambassador Glitman's INF statement to the NAC on September 17, 1986, U.S. NATO 4987, September 17, 1986.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. NST Geneva 06740, June 19, 1987.
16. Ibid.
17. The message later turned up. While it was serving no practical purpose at this point, we were still saddled with the combined delegation superstructure. The message had been given to the combined delegation duty officer, who worked on the Defense and Space group and had no knowledge of this INF issue. The message had been put aside for the combined delegation executive officer, who, it being a Saturday, had come in later in the morning. The message gave me a green light and called for only one relatively minor change in the talking points.
18. NST Geneva 06746, June 20, 1987.
19. We did not know at the time what we know now. The Soviet Defense Ministry, and Chervov himself, played a leading role in the

Soviet interagency committee providing direction to the Soviet negotiators. In this connection it is interesting to note that it was Chervov who put forward several of the Soviet's major moves: an equal level for the United States and USSR in Europe; no compensation for U.K. or French forces; and global zero. Aleksandr' G. Savel'Yev and Nikolay N. Detinov, *The Big Five: Arms Control Decision Making in the Soviet Union* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1995).

20. Mikhail Gorbachev, *Memoirs* (New York: Doubleday, 1996), 415.
21. U.S. NATO 06142, November 14, 1986.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid.
27. U.S. NATO 01366, March 5, 1987.
28. Ibid. March 5, 1987. Owing to the complexity of the issue and the need to obtain Allied agreement to a regime that would involve Soviet inspectors visiting U.S. bases on Allied territory, we would not table specific verification provisions until March 12, 1987.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid.

10 SHORTER-RANGE INF—SEALING OFF THE POTENTIAL FOR CIRCUMVENTING THE TREATY

1. SCG Progress Report, December 8, 1983, 10.
2. Ibid., 13.
3. Ibid., 25.
4. "NATO and the Warsaw Pact: Force Comparisons," NATO Information Service, Brussels, 984, 36.
5. Ibid., 26.
6. *Stern*, October 20, 1983, 234.
7. We had committed to NATO to retire our 108 SRINF PIa missiles on a one-for-one basis with the PII missiles entering the force, and it would have been politically difficult, especially in Germany, to have been seen as abandoning this arrangement.
8. U.S. NATO 01366 March 5, 1987. Secretary Shultz, speaking to the media in Moscow on April 15, 1987, said the United States believes any SRINF constraints must be set up on the "principle of equality." INF Chronology, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
9. U.S. NATO 01366 March 5, 1987.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.

12. FBIS: March 30, 1987, DPA, "Genscher, Glitman Exchange Views on INF."
13. FBIS: March 30, 1987, DPA, "U.S. Official Outlines State of INF Talks."
14. George Shultz, *Turmoil and Triumph* (New York: Scribners, 1993), 891.
15. FBIS: March 9, 1987.
16. NATO Information Service, Statement on the Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council at Reykjavik, June 11–12, 1987.
17. Statement by E. A. Shevardnadze, Member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, August 6, 1987, delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the Conference on Disarmament, Geneva.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid.
20. FBIS: May 11, 1989, "Interview with the Soviet Ambassador to Bonn, Juliy Kvitsinsky," by Wolf Perdelwitz and Dieter Wonka: "This Would Be Deceit." (Date and place not given.)
21. Ibid.
22. FBIS: April 18, 1989, Moscow *Pravda*, April 19, 1989 first edition, 4, Interview with Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Akhromeyev.
23. Ibid.
24. FBIS: April 2, 1990, "Observer says SS-23s violation of INF Treaty" Moscow in English to North America, 23:00 GMT, March 31, 1990.
25. FBIS: February 19, 1991, "Arms Pact Backtracking; Charges refuted," *Krasnaya Zvezda*, March 16, 1991.
26. We do know that the Soviet military were very angry at Gorbachev's acceptance of the U.S. argument that the SS-23 should be covered by the INF Treaty (see Aleksandr' G. Savel'Yev and Nikolay N. Detinov, *The Big Five: Arms Control Decision Making in the Soviet Union* [Westport, CT: Praeger, 1995], 134).
27. See Paragraph 4, June 7, 2001, DPC-NPG Ministerial Final Communiqué.
28. Below a certain number of deployed missiles, logistics, command and control, training, and other problems accumulate out of proportion to benefits.
29. See Articles IV and V of the INF Treaty.

11 UNDERTAKINGS: THE STORY OF A WORD

1. R. Jeffrey Smith, "France, U.S. Secretly Enter Pact to Share Nuclear Weapons Data," *The Washington Post*, June 17, 1996, A6.

12 VERIFICATION: MAKING TRUST ACCEPTABLE

1. September 1, 1999, conversation with Norman G. Clyne, Executive Director, United States SALT delegation.

2. See *Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary* (New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1996), 24.
3. Pavel Palazchenko, *My Years with Gorbachev and Shevardnadze* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), 67.
4. *Ibid.*
5. Article VII, paragraph 3 of the treaty provides that a ground-launched ballistic missile (GLBM) "of a type developed and tested solely to intercept and counter objects not located on the surface of the earth shall not be considered to be a missile to which the limitations of this Treaty shall apply." Article VII, paragraph 12 provides a similar, but more circumscribed, exception for booster systems "used only for research and development purposes to test objects other than the booster systems themselves."
6. Washington had originally considered December 7 as the date for the summit. However, before that date was transmitted to the Soviets, it was pointed out that the 7th of December was historically encumbered and might not be the most suitable one.
7. I had been going without a break for some time, and the Soviets were double-teaming me, sending Medvedev to conduct the negotiations for some meetings, Obukhov to conduct others. I sensed that the lack of rest was bringing me close to losing my temper. Accordingly I benched myself for a period, while John Woodworth conducted the talks.

13 MOVING TO THE HILL: SENATE RATIFICATION

1. Gaffney had been considered the likely successor to Pearle. He did not, however, get the job. He then resigned, and almost immediately thereafter, he became a strong vocal critic of the treaty.
2. "NATO Defense and the INF Treaty," Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate, One Hundredth Congress, Second Session, February 24, 25; March 18, 24; April 14, 1988. Part 5, 267.
3. *Ibid.*, 267.
4. *Ibid.*, 346.
5. *Ibid.*, 418.
6. *Ibid.*, 454.
7. "The INF Treaty, Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations United States Senate" (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 14, 1988), 474.
8. "NATO Defense and the INF Treaty," 454–458.

14 UPSIDES AND DOWNSIDES

1. Drawn from "The INF Treaty, Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations United States Senate" (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 14, 1988), 65–66. The report acknowledges the important precedent setting verification provisions in the INF Treaty.

2. June 7, 2001, NATO DPC/NPG Ministerial Final Communiqué, Paragraph 4.
3. Gorbachev in his *Memoirs* denies he sought to exclude the United States from his “Common European Home.” Thus he said, “We did not intend to leave either the United State or Canada outside the Common European Home.” Mikhail Gorbachev, *Memoirs* (New York: Doubleday, 1996). His comments concerning the United States and Europe in his book *Perestroika* lead me to a different conclusion. Mikhail Gorbachev, *Perestroika* (New York: Harper and Row, 1987), 207–209.
4. Gorbachev, *Perestroika*, 443.

INDEX

- Abe, Shintaro 148
ABM *see* antiballistic missiles
ACDA *see* Director of the Arms
Control and Disarmament
Agency
Afghanistan
Soviet invasion 47, 132
aircraft 56, 71, 89, 90
Fencer 68
aircraft, dual-capable
U.S. 66, 77–8, 174, 177–8
aircraft, medium-range 68–9, 85
British and French 66
Soviet posture 62, 63, 65, 72, 137
aircraft, nuclear-capable 76, 137
Soviet 174
U.S. 148, 174, 234
aircraft, unmanned 225
U.S. 67
Akhromeyev, Sergei 189–90, 191,
218, 219
Alexandrov 116
alliance management 94–5
Andropov, Yuri 87, 88, 90, 91, 96,
134, 148
Ankley, Jeff 196
antiballistic missiles (ABM) 217
Antiballistic Missiles (ABM) Treaty
12, 226
language of text 229
antinuclear movements *see* peace
movements
Arensburger, Dimitri 161,
204, 205
arms control 19, 21, 28–30,
38–9, 43
INF issue 43–4
Soviet change in policy 48
unilateral approach 134–5
U.S. debate over value of 50–2
Asia
considerations in INF Treaty
147–8, 149, 153
Athens Guidelines *see* NATO
B-1 bombers 135
Backfire bombers 20, 41
Bahr, Egon 23–4
Bartek, Ronald 196
Bartholomew, Reginald 34
baseline inspections 233
Belgium
INF deployment 107
opposition to INF deployment 38
Bennett, W. Tapley 22, 25, 26, 27
booster rockets 217
Brezhnev, Leonid 39, 48, 61–2,
82, 141
Brinkley, David 179
Britain 10, 32, 67
peace movements 89
Brown, Harold 16, 17, 20
Bruce, David 99
Bukovsky, Vladimir 132
Bunker, Ellsworth 99
Burns, William 114
Burt, Richard 34
Bush, George H. W. 194, 234

- Carlucci, Frank 187, 188
- Carter, Jimmy 15, 29, 139
neutron bomb issue 24, 26,
27–8, 142
- CBMs *see* confidence-building
measures
- CFE *see* Conventional Forces in
Europe
- Chemical Weapons Convention 234
- Chernenko, Konstantine 107
- Chervov, Nikolay F. 152, 153,
155, 161–2, 163–4, 175,
195, 230, 231
- China 149
Soviet fear of 148
- Clyne, Norman 59
- Conference on Security and
Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)
46, 56, 104–5
- confidence-building measures
(CBMs) 87, 104
- Conventional Forces in Europe
(CFE) 105, 233, 234
- conventional forces, NATO 5, 9
LTDP's focus 16
- conventional forces, Soviet
emphasis in NATO's LTDP 17
- Cooper, Henry (Hank) 113
- coupling strategy 6, 16
- cruise missiles 35, 37, 52, 72,
74, 77
definition 226
deployment in Europe 91–2
importance to NATO 19–20
U.S. Senate discussion
225–7, 229
- CSCE *see* Conference on Security
and Cooperation in Europe
- data exchanges 167, 233
- Defense and Space Talks (DST)
106, 113
- de Gaulle, Charles 10
- Denmark
opposition to INF deployment 43
- deterrence 51
and INF deployment 32–6
- Detinov, Nikolay N. 59, 70, 96, 97,
140–1, 148
- Director of the Arms Control and
Disarmament Agency (ACDA)
(US) 52
responsibilities during INF
negotiations 57
- dispute settlement regimes 216–17
- drones *see* remotely piloted vehicles
- DST *see* Defense and Space Talks
- dual-capable aircraft *see* aircraft,
dual-capable
- Eagleburger, Lawrence S. 34,
49, 146
- EDC *see* European Defense
Community
- Emke, Horst 179, 180
- Europe
“common European home” 110,
119, 143, 189, 193
concerns over American nuclear
policy 18
peace movements 71, 89, 136
- European Defense Community
(EDC) 7
- Fencer aircraft 68
- follow-on to the surface-to-surface
Lance missiles (FOTLs) 179,
189–90, 194
- FOTL *see* follow-on to the surface-
to-surface Lance missiles
- Fraley, Stanley 196, 215
- France 5
programs of cooperation with
U.S. 199
refusal to participate in MBFR
negotiations 104
role in NATO deterrence 10
- futuristic weapons/technologies
scope under INF Treaty
228–30

- Gaffney, Frank 225
- Gelb, Leslie 34
- Genscher, Hans-Dietrich 25, 56–7, 73, 179, 180
- Germany, East
- Brezhnev's promise of withdrawal of troops 39
- Germany, West
- angst over SRINF 183–5
 - conversion of Pershing II missiles 159–62, 163–4, 165, 178–9, 184–5
 - electoral victory of Kohl 86
 - INF deployment 95
 - INF deployment, opposition to 38, 94–5
 - NATO membership 7
 - neutron bomb issue 25, 26
 - peace movements 71, 89
 - purchase of Pershing Ia missiles 159
 - rearmament 7
 - response to Soviet invasion of Afghanistan 47–8
 - strategic importance for Soviet Union 139
- Glitman, Maynard W. 8, 60, 73–4, 75, 92, 95, 96, 98, 103–4, 111, 112, 115, 121, 134, 135–6, 139, 149, 151, 152, 175, 181–2
- 1977 Netherlands visit 24
 - 1987 report to NAC 176
 - Asian deployment tradeoff 154–5
 - benefits of interim alternative 83
 - career 8
 - David Brinkley show 179
 - German Pershings issue 159–62, 163–4
 - incorporation of nuclear weapons section in LTDP 16
 - initialing of agreed minute 231–2
 - joining INF negotiation delegation 35, 53–4
 - language of INF treaty 203–6
 - meeting with German ministers and officials 56–7, 73, 179–80
 - negotiating tactics 69–70
 - neutron bomb issue 25–7
 - on Nitze's proposal 76
 - no conflicting obligations article 202–3
 - and peace movement 136, 137
 - post of Deputy U.S. Representative at NATO 22
 - pre- and post-round meetings 169
 - size of object for inspection 220–1
 - SS-20 range debate 156–7
 - supervision of INF Treaty drafting process 196
 - tour of Allied capitals with Mondale 15
 - value of arms control 51
 - Vermont rally talk 127–9
 - visit to Japan 150
- GLCM *see* ground-launched cruise missiles
- Gompert, David 26
- Gorbachev, Mikhail 107, 168, 212, 221, 230, 232, 235
- acceptance of double global zero approach 164
 - Asian deployment proposal 155–6
 - comments on INF 141
 - “common European home” 110, 119, 143, 189, 193
 - concern over INF posture in Asia 148–9
 - delinkage of INF issues from START and NST 117, 118–19
 - frustration with Soviet negotiators 166, 169, 170, 218
 - Paris statements 122–4
 - SRINF freeze proposal 176–7, 181

- Graham, Tom 54, 196
- Greece
 opposition to INF deployment 43
- Gromyko 53, 77, 106, 109, 111
- ground-launched cruise missiles (GLCMs) 72, 76, 89, 90, 153, 224, 225, 226, 228, 234
- conversion to SLCMs 161, 163
- U.S./NATO deployment 121, 141, 149
- U.S./NATO deployment in West Germany 95
- Haig, Alexander 49, 52, 53
- Helms, Jesse 225
- Herres, Robert 228
- Humphrey, George 7
- Hurd, James 196
- Ikle, Fred 157, 158
- INF missiles *see* intermediate-range nuclear force missiles
- INF Treaty *see* Intermediate-range Nuclear Force Treaty
- intermediate-range nuclear force (INF) missiles 107
- Alaskan counterdeployment 156–8
- HLG agreement on deployment 36–7
- NPG 1979 Communiqué 37–8
- Soviet deployment in Asia 149
- Soviet deployment pattern 146–7
- Soviet inventory 4
- Soviet supply to satellites 190–3
- U.S. deployment in Asia 154–5
- U.S. deployment in Europe 95, 103
- U.S. deployment in Europe and deterrence 32–6
- U.S. deployment in Europe, continuation 120–1
- U.S. deployment in Europe, legitimacy of 65
- Intermediate-range Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty 143, 235
- 1986 informal talks 151–4
- 1986 proposals 16, 167–8
- ad referendum negotiations 168–9
- annexes and agreements 196
- conversion issue 171
- double global zero outcome 155, 158, 160–2, 163, 164, 182, 183–4
- double global zero, Soviet acceptance 164–6
- draft treaty, full text 170–2
- draft treaty, Soviet 72
- draft treaty, U.S. 54, 62, 86
- European aspects 147
- Japanese concerns 150–1
- joint plenary sessions 112
- lessons 98–100
- movement toward agreement 162–4
- negative effect of peace movement on 139–40
- negotiations *see* negotiations
- non-transfer provision 163
- place of UK and French systems 12–13, 44, 45, 48, 63, 66–7, 69, 70, 72, 76, 82, 84–5, 87, 90, 119, 121, 123, 138, 152, 153–4, 177, 187–8, 206
- ratification *see* Senate ratification
- round I 60–3, 69, 173–4
- round I results 70–1
- round II 72–3
- round III 78–9, 81–3
- round IV 84–6
- round V 86–90, 174–5
- round VI 88
- scope and limitations 224–5
- technical issues 213–15, 218–20
- zero-zero option 37, 45, 48, 55–6, 61–2, 74, 83, 84–5, 145–6, 152–3, 154

- Japan
INF concerns 150–1
- Jones, David T. 196
- Kamplman, Max 106, 111, 112,
114–15, 119, 158, 164, 203–4,
205, 206, 230, 231
- Karpov, Viktor 158, 168, 177,
178, 179, 188, 202–3,
230, 231
- Keel, Alton 182
- Kennedy, Ted 118
- Khromov, Gennadiy K. 231
- Kohl, Helmut 86, 143, 187
- Komer, Robert 16
- Korniyenko, Georgiy 117–18
- Kosinski, Susan 196
- Kuranari, Tadashi 150, 151
- Kvitsinsky, Yuli A. 57, 59, 61, 65,
70, 73, 75, 76, 77–8, 91, 92–4,
95–6, 99, 175, 189
- language of INF Treaty 203–6
debate in Senate 226–30
to solve German Pershing issue
187–8
- LTDP *see* Long Term Defense
Program
- Leber, Georg 20
- Lehman, Ronald 112, 151,
154, 155
- Levitt, Goeff 196
- Linhard, Robert 211–12
- Lisbon force goals *see* NATO
- long range intermediate range
nuclear forces (LRINF) 60–1,
62–3, 70, 74, 78, 81, 84, 85,
87 125, 153, 163
phased reduction 16–7
U.S. global deployment 88–9
- long range theater nuclear forces
(LRTNF) 44–5
- Long Term Defense Program
(LTDP) 16–17
- Look, Karin 196, 204
- LRINF *see* long range intermediate
range nuclear forces
- LRTNF *see* long range theater
nuclear forces
- Luns, Joseph 25, 26, 27
- McGiffert, David 34
- Mansfield, Mike 105
- map exercises 9
- Masterkhov, L. E. M. 169
- MBFR *see* Mutual and Balanced
Force Reductions
- medium-range aircraft *see* aircraft,
medium-range
- Medvedev, Vladimir 160, 161, 162,
164, 192, 222
- military, American
rebuilding in Europe 3
Soviet document on 133–4
- military, Soviet
Pentagon photographic briefing
1976 3–5
U.S. document on 133
- missile production facilities
monitoring 213–15, 230
- Mondale, Walter 15
- Mutual and Balanced Force
Reductions (MBFR) 28–9
negotiations 104, 105
Option III 43
- NAC *see* NATO
- national technical means (NTM) 81,
171, 207, 208, 216, 217, 234
- NATO (North Atlantic Treaty
Organization)
1957 Communiqué 8
alliance management 94–5
Allies nuclear commitment 5
Athens Guidelines 10–11
Carter administration's efforts to
strengthen defense
capabilities 15–16
dual-track approach/decision 33,
37, 41–6, 72, 142, 235

- NATO—*continued*
- High-Level Group (HLG) 30–1, 34–5: 1979 presentation 36–7; deployment program 47, 52
 - Lisbon force goals 6–7
 - Ministerial Communiqués 18–19
 - North Atlantic Council (NAC) 3, 166, 167, 168, 170, 176, 183: 1978 Communiqué 29–30; U.S. SALT negotiators' briefing 20–1
 - Nuclear Planning Group (NPG) 11–12: June 1977 meeting 18, 19, 20; April 1978 meeting 29; May 1981 meeting 52
 - Special Consultative Group (SCG) 34, 35, 45, 47; presentation of full draft treaty 170
 - “NATO and the Warsaw Pact: Force Comparisons” 133
 - negotiations 12, 13, 48, 134
 - modalities 57–8
 - organization 106–7
 - political context 135–6
 - process 58–60, 113–14
 - renewal 105–6
 - senior official participation 206
 - tactics 69–70
 - Netherlands
 - opposition to INF deployment 38
 - neutron bomb program 29
 - Allies position on 25
 - anti-neutron bomb movement 24–5
 - media attack on 21–3
 - Soviet misreading of outcome 139
 - U.S. decision to defer production 26–8, 142
 - Nitze, Paul 35, 53–4, 56–7, 59, 61, 70, 73–4, 75, 99, 100, 122, 201–2
 - arms control proposal 74–8
 - informal talks with Kvitsinsky 91, 92–3
 - noncircumvention
 - Soviet compromise 201–3
 - Soviet proposals 200–1, 203
 - North Atlantic Council (NAC) *see* NATO
 - North Atlantic Treaty Organization *see* NATO
 - NST *see* Nuclear and Space Talks
 - NTM *see* national technical means
 - Nuclear and Space Talks (NST) 106, 203
 - staffing arrangements 111, 112–13
 - nuclear-capable aircraft *see* aircraft, nuclear-capable
 - nuclear deterrence
 - NATO 5–6, 9–10
 - opposition 127
 - U.S. 7, 8
 - Nuclear Planning Group (NPG) *see* NATO
 - nuclear policy, NATO 7–8
 - nuclear weapons, American
 - decline in Europe 135
 - deployment of new weapons in Europe 30–1
 - role in Europe 8, 29
 - warhead withdrawal from Europe 43
 - nuclear weapons, Soviet 4–5
 - modernization 41–2
 - Obukhov, Alexi 115, 156–7, 160–1, 164, 165, 169, 185, 186, 190, 195, 205, 212, 220–1, 222
 - Omelichev, B. A. 192
 - On-Site Inspection Agency (OSIA) 216–17
 - on-site inspections (OSI) 208–9, 212, 213–15, 233
 - OSI *see* on-site inspections
 - OSIA *see* On-Site Inspection Agency
 - Palazchenko, Pavel 90, 96, 97, 98, 119, 140, 148, 212

- peace movements 71, 85, 89, 97,
136, 137
 impact on Soviet policy 139–43
 Soviet view 138–9
 U.S. 127–9
- peace offensive, Soviet 132
- Pentagon
 NATO Allies briefing 1976 3–5
- Perle, Richard 35, 55, 76, 152,
154–5, 182–3, 225
- Pershing I ballistic missiles 36, 86
- Pershing Ia missiles 159, 174–5,
178, 184–5, 186–8
- Pershing Ib missiles 159–62,
163–4, 165, 178–9, 184–5
- Pershing II ballistic missiles 35,
36–7, 52, 56, 62, 72, 74, 89,
90, 92, 234
 conversion to Pershing Ib missiles
 159–62, 163–4, 165, 178–9,
 184–5
 U.S./NATO deployment 121,
 141, 149
 U.S./NATO deployment in West
 Germany 95
- Petrovsky, Vladimir 168
- Pincus, Walter 22, 23
- POC *see* programs of cooperation
- Poland
 martial law 62
- Powell, Colin 231
- programs of cooperation (POCs)
 158–9, 160–1, 163–4
 defending 199–200
- propaganda literature 133–4
- public diplomacy
 Glitman's 127–30
 NATO 131
 Soviet 130–1
- Quayle, Dan 225, 226, 227, 229
- ratification *see* Senate ratification
- Reagan, Ronald 48, 50–1, 53,
55–6, 100, 105, 106, 109, 111,
119–20, 145, 147, 165, 169,
209, 230, 232, 235
- Reddy, Leo 105, 196
- remotely piloted vehicles (RPVs)
 225, 226, 227
- Ridgeway, Roz 182
- Rostow, Eugene 52, 75
- RPV *see* remotely piloted vehicles
- Rumsfeld, Donald 3, 22, 94
- SALT *see* Strategic Arms Limitations
 Talks
- Savel'yev, Aleksandr G. 140–1
- Scaleboard SRINF missile systems
 167, 177
- SCC *see* Standing Consultative
 Commission
- Schmidt, Helmut 21, 25, 28, 41,
48, 56–7, 71, 72, 73, 94
- Scuds 174
- SDI *see* Strategic Defense Initiative
- sea-launched cruise missiles
 (SLCMs) 72
 conversion of GLCMs to 161, 163
- Semenov, Vladimir 93
- Senate ratification 223–4
 and verification issues 224,
 229–32
- Shemyakin, Stanislav 191–2
- Shevardnadze, E. 168, 186–7, 191,
192, 213, 218, 230
- shorter range nuclear force (SRINF)
 missiles 62–3, 82, 86, 87, 125,
 156, 163, 166
 German angst 183–5
 imperative to include in INF
 Treaty 173
 modernization 188–90
 negotiations on reductions 167–8
 round I negotiations 173–4
 round V negotiations 174–5
 Soviet freeze proposal 176–7, 181
 Soviets move to global zero
 180–1
 stop to modernization 193–4
 U.S. qualms over double zero
 181–3
 zero-level proposal 177–8,
 179–80

- short-notice on-site inspections
211–12, 233
- Shultz, George 77, 106, 109, 118,
148, 168, 181, 183, 187, 188,
218, 219, 230
- Shultz-Gromyko agreement (1985)
109, 111, 112
- Single Integrated Operational Plan
(SIOP) 32
- SIOP *see* Single Integrated
Operational Plan
- SLBM *see* submarine-launched
ballistic missiles
- SLCM *see* sea-launched cruise
missiles
- Soviet Military Power* 133
- Soviet Union
concern over INF posture in Asia
148–9
efforts to undermine U.S. INF
deployment 39
fear of China 148
INF propositions 66–9, 72,
137–8
strategic interests in West
Germany 139
walkout from INF negotiations
95–7, 109, 140, 149
- Special Verification Commission
(SVC) 216
- SRINF missiles *see* shorter range
nuclear force missiles
- SS-12 63, 82, 86, 167, 173–4
- SS-16 20
- SS-20 nuclear missiles 4–5, 15, 19,
20–1, 32, 38, 40, 55, 56, 67,
72, 74, 82, 93, 141, 153, 155,
213, 231, 234
Andropov's proposal to
destroy 88
Andropov's proposal to reduce
90, 148
in eastern USSR 67, 69, 72,
85, 90, 110, 145, 146–7,
149, 171
Gorbachev's proposal 123
Japanese concerns 150–1
in NATO Communiqué 17
Nitze's proposal 76, 77, 99
range 156–7
significance 136–7
- SS-22 63, 82, 86, 173–4
- SS-23 63, 82, 86, 173–4, 174, 175,
177, 185–6
equating with FOTLs 189–90
Soviet supply to satellites 190–3
- SS-25 213, 234
- Standing Consultative Commission
(SCC) 216–17
- START *see* Strategic Arms
Reductions Talks
- Stevens, Ted 122, 149, 156,
157, 158
- Stockholm Conference *see*
Conference on Security and
Cooperation in Europe
- Strategic Arms Limitations Talks
(SALT) I 12, 19, 20, 107
Schmidt's concerns 21
verification provisions 208
- Strategic Arms Limitations Talks
(SALT) II 12, 43, 53,
107, 200
language 202, 204, 205
verification provisions 208
- Strategic Arms Limitations Talks
(SALT) III
and INF 107–8
- Strategic Arms Reductions Talks
(START) 106, 152
conceptual linkage with INF
issues 107–10
conceptual linkage with SDI
108–9, 116
linkage and delinkage of INF
from 116–20, 156, 169–70
negotiations 108
struggle to delink INF from
114–16
verification measures 233, 234

- Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) 226
 conceptual linkage with INF 110, 116, 117–18
 conceptual linkage with START 108–9, 116
 linkage and delinkage of INF issues from 116–20, 156
 submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) 135
 verification regimes 208
 SVC *see* Special Verification Commission
 swing force *see* SS-20 nuclear missiles
- Tarasenko, Sergey 134
 TASM *see* theater air-to-surface missiles
 Thatcher, Margaret 194
 theater air-to-surface missiles (TASM) 179, 189, 194
 Thomas, Charles 182
 timetable for elimination of missiles 166–7, 194–5
 Tower, John 106, 111, 112, 115
 transporter/launchers
 elimination 218–20
- United Kingdom *see* Britain
 United States
 delegation to INF negotiations 53–4, 57–8, 81
 internal ideological skirmish 49–50
 peace movements 127–9
 position on conference circuit 134–8
 response to “ban neutron bomb” movement 24
 response to Soviet invasion of Afghanistan 47–8
 unmanned aircraft *see* aircraft, unmanned
 Ustinov, Dimitri Fyodorovich 141
 verification 45, 63, 81–2, 121, 157, 163, 165, 166, 194, 207–8, 209–10, 223–4
 measures 233–4
 parameters 210–11
 regime duration 215–16
 regimes 208
 short-notice, anytime, anywhere regime 211–12
 smallest item that could be inspected 220–1, 222
 Soviet objection to U.S. proposal 171–2
 Soviet tactics 212–13
 and treaty ratification process 224, 229–32
 U.S. proposal 167, 168, 171
 Vest, George 122
 Vorontsov, G. 139, 169, 176, 177, 203, 204, 206
 Vorontsov, Yuli 164
- Waters, Raymond 93
 weapon-delivery vehicles 226, 227–8, 229–30
 Weinberger, Casper 55, 133
Whence the Threat to Peace 133–4
 Wick, Charles 133
 Woerner, Manfred 179, 180, 182, 186
 Woodworth, John 147, 161, 164, 179, 196, 220, 221
 World Peace Council 132
- Zagladin, Vladimir 139
 Zimmermann, Warren 113, 114, 116