

THE PRESIDENT HAS ORDERED

SECRET

THE WHITE HOUSE

INFORMATION

WASHINGTON

January 18, 1975

DOS REVIEWED 16 MAR 2011 NO OBJECTION TO DECLASSIFICATION

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT

FROM: HENRY A. KISSINGER *HK*

SUBJECT: Legislative History of Air-Launched Cruise Missiles

MAJ

You asked the other day for background information on Congressional attitudes toward cruise missile programs, especially that of Senator Jackson. Our research shows that both the Congress in general and Jackson in particular have been general supporters of cruise missile programs.

In the FY 73-74 period, the missile being developed by the Air Force was the Subsonic Cruise Armed Decoy (SCAD). The SCAD was intended to be carried by the B-52 and B-1; it would present additional objects that the Soviets would have to counter with area air defenses. It was being designed to carry both a decoy package to simulate a bomber to Soviet radars, and a warhead and an improved guidance system to give it a capability to attack targets. This would force Soviet air defenses to deal with it even if the decoy package did not work.

In FY 73, the President requested \$49 million for SCAD development. The Congress appropriated the full amount.

In FY 74, the President requested \$72 million for the SCAD. However, the request ran into two problems. First, the Senate Armed Services Committee (of which Senator Jackson is a member) believed the Air Force was dragging its feet on developing the warhead and guidance system which would make the SCAD a lethal weapon rather than a decoy only. Second, the Air Force encountered technical, cost and schedule difficulties with the SCAD. This triggered DOD to cancel the program and delete the initial budget request. At this point I objected to the deletion and forced Defense to put a cruise missile program back in. Defense asked for \$22 million for a reoriented technology program (which laid the groundwork for the Air Launched Cruise Missile program). In response to all this, the Congress eventually appropriated \$11 million for FY 74.

OSD REVIEWED 15-Mar-2011: NO OBJECTION TO DECLASSIFICATION

SECRET

SECRET

- 2 -

The result of the FY 74 technology program was the Air Launched Cruise Missile Program (ALCM). The ALCM was planned from the outset as an attack missile rather than a decoy. It is being designed for a 200 KT yield, an accuracy of about 600 feet, and a range up to about 2500 km.

In FY 75, the President asked for \$80 million for the ALCM, plus \$45 million for the Navy's Submarine Launched Cruise Missile (SLCM). The Congress balked at the request, expressing concern that DOD was developing two duplicative systems and was asking for more money than it could usefully spend. The Senate Armed Services Committee directed DOD to prepare a report justifying the need for cruise missiles, assessing system effectiveness, and describing program controls to insure a joint Service development effort. The final FY 75 appropriation was \$67 million for the ALCM, and \$38 million for the SLCM -- close to the original requests.

In preparing its budget for FY 76, DOD decided to cancel the ALCM and consolidate cruise missile development into one program -- the Navy's SLCM. However, in response to your concern, DOD reversed its decision and reinstated the ALCM. The President's FY 76 budget now includes \$51 million for the ALCM and \$102 million for the SLCM.

Senator Jackson's Position

Although he has not openly played an advocate's role, Senator Jackson has supported cruise missile development since SALT I. He has voted in favor of cruise missiles in every floor vote. (There is no available record of how he voted in the Senate Armed Services Committee, although he has probably voted the same way there as he has on the Senate floor.) Informal sources indicate that he recently offered even stronger support for the ALCM. (The Boeing Company, Seattle, Washington, has a substantial interest in the ALCM. Boeing is building the airframe and carrier aircraft equipment, e.g., racks, pylons, and electronics interface systems.)

SECRET

MEMORANDUM

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

INFORMATION

January 13, 1975

SECRET

*Turned into
memo for Pres.*

MEMORANDUM FOR:

SECRETARY KISSINGER

FROM:

JAN M. LODAL *JML*

SUBJECT:

Legislative History of Air-Launched
Cruise Missiles

This memorandum summarizes the legislative history of air launched cruise missiles starting in FY 73 and briefly discusses Senator Jackson's position on air launched cruise missiles. In summary, both Congress and Jackson have supported cruise missile programs in the past.

FY 73-74: The Subsonic Cruise Armed Decoy (SCAD)

→ FY 73-74
In this period, the missile being developed by the Air Force was the Subsonic Cruise Armed Decoy (SCAD). The SCAD was intended to be carried by the B-52 and B-1; it would present many additional objects that the Soviets would have to counter with area air defenses. It was being designed to carry both a decoy package to simulate a bomber to Soviet radars, and a warhead and an improved guidance system to give it a capability to attack targets. This would force Soviet air defenses to deal with it even if the decoy package did not work.

In FY 73, the President requested \$49 million for SCAD development. The Congress appropriated the full amount.

In FY 74, the President requested \$72 million for the SCAD. However, the request ran into two problems. First, the Senate Armed Services Committee (of which Senator Jackson is a member) believed the Air Force was dragging its feet on developing the warhead and guidance

SECRET - XGDS

at this point I objected to the deletion

program back in. Defense asked

system which would make the SCAD a lethal weapon rather than a decoy only. Second, the Air Force encountered technical, cost, and schedule difficulties with the SCAD. This triggered DOD to cancel the program, ^{and} delete the initial budget request, ~~and ask instead for~~ \$22 million for a reoriented technology program (which laid the groundwork for the Air Launched Cruise Missile program). In response to all this, the Congress eventually appropriated \$11 million for FY 74.

will properly take for them

FY 75-76: The Air Launched Cruise Missile (ALCM)

The result of the FY 74 Technology program was the Air launched
The ALCM ^{was} ~~has been~~ designed from the outset as an attack missile rather than a decoy. It ~~will have~~ ^{is being designed for} a 200 KT yield, an accuracy of about 600 feet, and a range up to about 2500 km.

Cruise Missile Program (ALCM)

In FY 75, the President asked for \$80 million for the ALCM, plus \$45 million for the Navy's Submarine Launched Cruise Missile (SLCM). The Congress balked at the request, expressing concern that DOD was developing two duplicative systems, ~~and that it~~ was asking for more money than it could usefully spend. The Senate Armed Services Committee directed DOD to prepare a report justifying the need for cruise missiles, assessing system effectiveness, and describing program controls to insure a joint Service development effort. The final FY 75 appropriation was \$67 million for the ALCM, and \$38 million for the SLCM -- close to the original requests.

In preparing its budget for FY 76, DOD decided to cancel the ALCM and consolidate cruise missile development into one program -- the Navy's SLCM. However, in response to your concern, DOD reversed its decision and reinstated the ALCM. The President's FY 76 budget now includes \$51 million for the ALCM and \$102 million for the SLCM.

Senator Jackson's Position

Although he has not openly played an advocate's role, Senator Jackson has supported cruise missile development since SALT I. He has voted in favor of cruise missiles in every floor vote. (There is no available record of how he voted in the Senate Armed Services Committee, although he has probably voted the same way there as he has on the Senate floor.) Informal sources indicate that he recently offered even stronger support for the ALCM. Jackson's support is not uninfluenced by the fact that the Boeing Company, Seattle, Washington, has a substantial interest in the ALCM. Boeing is building the airframe and carrier aircraft equipment (e.g., racks, pylons, and electronics interface systems).