

May 29, 1980

MEMO

TO: PT  
FROM: CHRIS C.

RE: BACKGROUND FOR MEETING WITH CPPAX

1. The meeting will cover foreign as well as domestic topics.
2. You may be asked to comment on CPPAX proposed "Mutual Nuclear Weapons Moratorium". Authored by people from the Boston Study Group, including Sommarippa, Morrison, and others, the Moratorium is an updated, more systematically constructed version of the Hatfield nuclear moratorium amendment proposed during the pre-SALT debate maneuverings last year. This new moratorium would freeze the production, testing, and deployment of all warheads, missiles, and delivery systems in the Soviet Union and the U.S. The proponents claim that production can be verified.

Skeptics of such a proposal will say that arms control is possible only through structured parity of strategic strength. A moratorium freezes the relative strength at a given point in time and is therefore an overly blunt instrument of arms control. The moratorium is unrealistic in its objective of cutting all production and testing. Ongoing programs have a momentum and constituency which would be very difficult to neutralize here as well as in the USSR.

If the framers of this moratorium think that it is time to jettison SALT II and the SALT approach in favor of the moratorium idea, they risk losing even moderate steps to arms control. We should not over interpret the present anti SALT mood in Congress. A Reagan presidency might well be credible enough with the American right to push through a SALT II treaty.

A moratorium, however, cannot be dismissed as simply out of step with SALT. Any proposal to end the arms race must be aired now because an arms control vacuum has clearly formed.

2. Draft Registration. CPPAX has expressed its preference that you join with Hatfield in his filibuster and give him your anti cloture vote. They know that you are opposed to registration but want more.

You have joined with Hatfield in a dear colleague signed by 16 senators expressing opposition to registration as ill-conceived and counterproductive and enclosing a number of supporting documents, editorials, etc.

The bill as reported out of appropriations contains the "conscientious objector" amendment of Hatfield. The amendment provides for a question on the registration form asking if the registrant wishes to be considered a c.o.

Hatfield's strategy now is to begin a filibuster and a show of strength which will enable him to cut a deal for the post mobilization alternative of more computer money and upgrading selective service capability.

3. MX Missile - CPPAX is of course opposed to the MX for reasons of its "first strike" capability more than the arms control or budgetary implications. You may well be asked for your views on the "Shallow Underwater Missile" (SUM) concept as an alternative to the various land-based modes for MX. SUM is attractive to CPPAX people because it is based at sea, not on land where population is located. It also is invulnerable to attack and thus is stabilizing. Those who want to deploy Minuteman II missiles on SUM instead of a new MX are reassured by the resulting reduction in first strike capability. SUM is becoming a more politically feasible program now due to new political opposition to MX in the south west and also because SALT is on the back burner and with it any real probability of an invulnerable land based system. MX on land in a world without SALT is a losing proposition strategically and fiscally. SUM on the other hand is within reach of our technology and costs could be less than MX on land. DOD is opposed to SUM and issued an evaluation of the concept in April, 1980 which severely criticized SUM on technical, financial, and strategic grounds. SUM proponents feel that MX is the Air Force's big prize and that the Air Force is not about to surrender this major strategic system to the Navy. SUM proponents such as Kotsas Tsipis of MIT and Sidney Drell of Stanford want DOD to undertake a major study of SUM under the auspices of the Secretary's office rather than the DOD Research and Engineering shop which is tied to land based MX and which performed the hatchet study on SUM in April. A lot of this debate boils down to the triad and its sanctity in defense circles. SUM is a sea based system and despite all its claims to distinctiveness (small subs, very quiet engines, ease of communication and control) it still places two eggs in one basket. There is an analogy with gun control here - "don't take our handguns away - we might need'em some day", a progress versus nostalgia line up.

On balance, SUM is worthy of more than a perfunctory hatchet job by DOD. I recommend that you support the idea of a serious study and that you come out for the MX mounted on the small subs, rather than the Minuteman.