

MEMORANDUM

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

REFER TO OSD

URGENT INFORMATION

January 26, 1972

~~TOP SECRET/SENSITIVE~~

MEMORANDUM FOR DR. KISSINGER

FROM: Phil Odeen *PO*

SUBJECT: New Information on ABM Proposals for SALT

JCS REVIEWED 29-Nov-2010: NO OBJECTION TO DECLASSIFICATION

Some new information has come to our attention about ABM proposals for SALT. It should be of use for you at the Verification Panel meeting tomorrow.

JCS Position

The JCS have recently modified their 3-for-3 ABM proposal to include a vague Hard-Site Defense option. The JCS representatives have been very hesitant to spell out any details, essentially saying only that each side should have the right to deploy, after consultation, an agreed number of additional "limited-range" ABM interceptors and radars in defense of two ICBM fields.

This agrees in theory with the OSD proposal to allow an option for Hard-Site Defense.

However, there are differences between the JCS and OSD. The JCS would like 3-for-3 ABM sites initially (versus 1-for-1 of OSD) and would like the option of HSD defense of two ICBM fields (versus one for OSD). Probably more important than the numerical differences, the JCS would (contrary to OSD):

- Probably not want any initial exploration of "fundamental principles" before the U.S. makes its offer;
- Probably be against strict qualitative controls on ABM radars and ABM interceptors;
- Almost certainly be against each side having a veto power over the other side's construction of Other Large Phased Array Radars (OLPARs).

OSD REVIEWED 28-Nov-2011: NO OBJECTION TO DECLASSIFICATION

~~TOP SECRET/SENSITIVE~~

DOS REVIEWED 07 NOV 2011 NO OBJECTION TO DECLASSIFICATION

Soviet Position

The Soviets said at Tuesday's meeting in Vienna that they were strongly opposed to detailed qualitative controls on ABM components for ICBM defense. They say they would accept at most a general statement that these ABM components were not to have a substantial capability for population defense.