

Spring 4-28-2013

## History of Negotiations and Politics of Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT)

Brian E. Kempfer

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/honorsprojects>

**How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!**

---

### Repository Citation

Kempfer, Brian E., "History of Negotiations and Politics of Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT)" (2013).  
*Honors Projects*. 40.

<https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/honorsprojects/40>

This work is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at ScholarWorks@BGSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Projects by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@BGSU.

History of Negotiations and Politics of Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT)

Brian Kempfer

HONORS PROJECT

Submitted to the University Honors Program  
at Bowling Green State University in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements for graduation with

UNIVERSITY HONORS

27 April 2013

Advisor Walter E. Grunden, Department History  
Typed Name and Department

Advisor Marc V. Simon, Department of Political Science  
Typed Name and Department

Brian Kempfer

History 4800H

Prof. Grunden and Prof. Simon

27 April 2013

History of Negotiations and Politics of Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT)

**ABSTRACT**

This paper examines the United States' negotiation strategy in the First Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. It uses a framework that combines Graham and Allison's bureaucratic politics model; negotiation theory articulated by Thompson; and a modified version of two level games as articulated by Knopf. This paper argues that these three frameworks reveal that the SALT negotiations required President Nixon to satisfy five different negotiating partners: the American bureaucracy, Congress, the American public, America's NATO Allies, and the Soviet Union. One must consider all of these five groups to avoid viewing American negotiating positions like the decision to offer to reduce their Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement (BATNA), the decision to not come up with a clear negotiating objective and the decision to deny the opportunity to "expand the pie" by including medium range nuclear weapons as irrational.

On May 26, 1972, President of the United States Richard M. Nixon and the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Leonid I. Brezhnev, two men who had the power to launch a nuclear war that could destroy civilization in the northern hemisphere met to sign two agreements in St. Vladimir Hall in the Kremlin. These two documents, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and the Interim Agreement with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (Interim Agreement) marked the first step in limiting strategic offensive and defensive nuclear weapons. Together these two agreements marked the culmination of the first round of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks or SALT.<sup>1</sup>

It is easy to view the first SALT agreement as a moment made possible by the actions of the Soviet Union and the United States acting as unitary states in their own best interests. This view describes the two countries and their respective leaders as unitary actors who both negotiate to achieve their rational interests. This view is not unreasonable given the outcome of the first SALT negotiations. However, this limited view is what political scientists Graham T. Allison and Morton H. Halperin label as "Model I." Model I ignores the multitude of actors within a state and thus does not present a holistic picture of how foreign policy is conducted.<sup>2</sup> Allison and Halperin propose instead a Bureaucratic Model of Politics which defines decision making policies based on game theory and the interests of those in government.<sup>3</sup> This model provides a

---

<sup>1</sup> All references to SALT or the first phase of SALT in this paper refers to the first phase of Strategic Arms Limitation Talks that began with the talks in Helsinki on November 17, 1969 and concluding with the ratification of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and the Interim Agreement with Respect to Offensive Nuclear Arms.

<sup>2</sup> Graham T. Allison and Morton H. Halperin, "Bureaucratic Politics: A Paradigm and Some Policy Implications," *World Politics* 24.S1 (1972): 41-42.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 43-47.

much better understanding of the actions of the United States Government during the negotiations. However, as Fisher et al points out in their case study of the first SALT negotiations, the president has to appeal to five different levels of actors: the bureaucracy; the United States Congress; the American people; allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO); and the Soviet Union.<sup>4</sup> To better evaluate how the United States managed these multilevel negotiations this paper uses the framework for negotiations laid out in Leigh H. Thompson's *The Mind and Heart of the Negotiator* to better understand the process of the United States' negotiation and the emergence of United States' positions. Thompson's framework will be combined with Allison and Halperin's game theory framework and Knopf's models of how domestic politics can effect foreign policy to model the negotiations. The model will show how each of the five levels played into the creation of a negotiating position and a final agreement. Without the framework of the five levels of negotiation Nixon's negotiating strategies could seem irrational based on Thompson's bargaining framework. First, as this paper shows, without this model Nixon's decision to damage his bargaining position by deciding to change the deployment of the American Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) System so that the system would serve the more limited role of protecting the American nuclear deterrent instead of protecting the population of the United States from a nuclear first strike. Nixon also appeared to weaken his bargaining position by offering to put a moratorium on the testing of one of the only nuclear weapons systems the Americans were ahead in developing, Multiple Independently Targetable Reentry Vehicles (MIRVs). Throughout this process Nixon

---

<sup>4</sup> Rodger Fisher, A. K. Schneider, and B. Ganson, "Case Study on Arms Control: The Antiballistic Missile Treaty," in *Coping with International Conflict: A systematic Approach to Influence in International Negotiation* (Upper Saddle River, NJ : Prentice Hall, 1997), 96.

also did not establish a clear goal for the negotiations and the result appears to be multiple, contradictory negotiation positions being put forward at the same time an activity that chief SALT negotiator for the United States called playing "games" where the Soviets were expected to guess at what the United States was actually proposing.<sup>5</sup> This action is illogical according to negotiation theory where you want to make the first offer to establish the "anchor point" around which negotiation will take place.<sup>6</sup> Lastly, Nixon refused to meet the Soviet desire to include so called Forward Based Systems (FBS), which included American aircraft in Europe even though the Soviets expressed interest in expanding the pie of negotiation in this area.

## **Background**

To better understand the negotiation of SALT, some background on the origins of the United States-Soviet Union relationship and how that relationship eventually led to the SALT negotiations is essential. Antipathy between United States and Soviet Union dates back to the founding of the Soviet Union. The *Saturday Evening Post* called the revolution that formed the Soviet Union a, "dictatorship of the dregs," and predicted that the revolution would be overturned.<sup>7</sup> The United States sent in troops to help ensure that outcome. Even after the two allies had overcome the Axis Powers in the Second World War, a cloud lay over their relationship. Soviet Leader Joseph Stalin had hoped for a strategic balance after the war to ensure Soviet security, but the American use of the

---

<sup>5</sup> Gerard Smith, *Doubletalk: The Story of the First Strategic Arms Limitation Talks* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company Inc., 1990), 152.

<sup>6</sup> Leigh H. Thompson, *The Mind and Heart of the Negotiator 5th ed* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2012), 44.

<sup>7</sup> Quoted in Michael H. Hunt, *Ideology and US Foreign Policy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987 [2009]), 113.

atomic bomb at Hiroshima in 1945 had broken the balance and thus he began a crash Soviet program to match the Americans' nuclear program.<sup>8</sup>

The Soviet game of catch-up became a lot easier when Robert S. McNamara and the Johnson Administration began to see the build up of nuclear weapons as offering little security for a great cost to the United States' budget.<sup>9</sup> They therefore set a ceiling for strategic nuclear weapons of 1,054 ICBMs.<sup>10</sup> The United States shifted its focus from quantity of nuclear weapons to making qualitative improvements including an increase in accuracy and greater ability to penetrate Soviet defenses hoping such expenditures would be more cost effective.<sup>11</sup> These arguments were not completely dominate, as evidenced by the fact that while McNamara did manage to control ICBM production he could not stop the Joint Chiefs of Staff from persuading Congress to approve more funding for bombers over his opposition for five consecutive years.<sup>12</sup>

While the Americans worked on qualitative improvements, the Soviet Union, motivated by their perceived failure during the Cuban Missile Crisis to gain at least

---

<sup>8</sup> Stephen J. Zaloga, *The Kremlin's Nuclear Sword: The Rise and Fall of Russia's Nuclear Forces* (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2002), 7.

<sup>9</sup> Robert S. McNamara, "National Security and Nuclear Strength," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 20.2 (March 1964), 35-39.

<sup>10</sup> Henry Kissinger, *White House Years* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2011 [1979]), 125.

<sup>11</sup> Albert C. F. Westphal, "Staff Memorandum on the Current status of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Program, March 3, 1967" (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), 1.

<sup>12</sup> Lori Esposito Murray, "SALT I and Congress: Building a Consensus for Nuclear Arms Control, Vol. 1" (Ph.D Diss., Johns Hopkins University: 1989), 65.

nuclear parity, began building up ICBMs.<sup>13</sup> Under Brezhnev, the Soviet Union began the most intense portion of the arms race and came close to that goal.<sup>14</sup>

While the offensive arms race continued, both sides were developing defenses against the new threat of ballistic missiles. The Soviet Union also began testing an ABM defense system in the 1950s that developed into the A-35 anti-ballistic missile system, which was deployed around Moscow.<sup>15</sup> The United States had also been testing their own Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems since the 1950s, however most experts had opposed its deployment due to expenses and technical inadequacies.<sup>16</sup> The Joint Chiefs of Staff began encouraging Congressional support for an ABM system arguing that such a system could limit the amount of damage that would be done in the event of a nuclear war.<sup>17</sup>

McNamara attempted on several occasions resist this demand by the Pentagon by arguing it was not feasible and cost effective plan.<sup>18</sup> Appeals to delay the deployment of the American ABM system held until 1967 when President Lyndon B. Johnson announced observing deployment of the Russian A-35 system in January 1967.<sup>19</sup> The Congress responded by pushing harder for the deployment of an American ABM system to counter

---

<sup>13</sup> Zaloga, *Kremlin's Nuclear Sword*, 87.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 101-102.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 101-102, 126. The A-35 was originally only capable of intercepting eight ICBMs.

<sup>16</sup> *Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Disarmament Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate on Strategic and Foreign Policy Implications of ABM Systems, First Session*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969), 25-26 (Statement Donald J. Fink).

<sup>17</sup> Betty Goetz Lall, "Congress Debates the ABM," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 23.7 (September 1967), 28-30.

<sup>18</sup> Jeremy J. Stone, "McNamara's Story Continues," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 22.2 (April 1966), 40.

<sup>19</sup> Smith, *Doubletalk*, 19. The system was codenamed "Galosh" by the Americans.



the Soviets.<sup>20</sup> McNamara responded by trying to link nonuse of ABM system to arms control with the Soviet Union.<sup>21</sup> The result was that Johnson proposed a "thin" ABM system called Sentinel and attempted to begin strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union.<sup>22</sup>

Negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States at this point appeared to be possible for several reasons. First, the United States had developed satellite technology that allowed it to observe Soviet arms deployment without need for the onsite inspections that had previously been necessary and had destroyed prior chances at arms control agreements.<sup>23</sup> Second, both the United States and the Soviet Union had a common interest in avoiding a defensive ABM arms race that could end up costing in the billions of dollars.<sup>24</sup> This is especially true given that the United States was facing balance of payments deficits and was negotiating tough budgetary constraints as a result of the Vietnam war,<sup>25</sup> while the Soviet Union was facing pressure to shift production to consumer goods and division over the next five year plan. However, the Soviet Union still remained behind the United States in all major measures of strategic forces and thus the military remained opposed to strategic arms negotiations, seeing them as

---

<sup>20</sup> Murray, "SALT I and Congress, Vol. 1," 78-79.

<sup>21</sup> McNamara interview with Murray quoted in *Ibid.*, 92.

<sup>22</sup> Murray, "SALT I and Congress," 99-100.

<sup>23</sup> John Newhouse, *Cold Dawn: The Story of SALT I* (McLean, VA: Pergamon-Brassey, 1989 [1973]), 70-71.

<sup>24</sup> Westphal, "Staff Memorandum," 3, 5-6.

<sup>25</sup> Lyndon B. Johnson, *The Vantage Point: Perspectives on the Presidency 1963-1969* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1971), 537, 409, 438-442.

treasonous.<sup>26</sup> The result was that Premier Alexi Kosygin ignored American attempts to discuss arms control at the Glassboro Summit in Glassboro, New Jersey with the Johnson Administration.<sup>27</sup> Another opportunity for the beginning of arms control came in 1968 but it was shortly followed by the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, which was caused in part by continuing Soviet military opposition to arms control.<sup>28</sup> The invasion forced Johnson to ignore the Soviet proposal for a summit on arms control and at the urging of the incoming Nixon Administration Johnson decided to stop trying for an arms control deal so as not to force the Nixon Administration to accept a deal they may not want.<sup>29</sup>

Thus the Nixon Administration entered into a situation where both sides had expressed their desire for the beginning of the strategic arms negotiations. The Johnson Administration had even conducted internal bureaucratic negotiations to come up with a position approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff meaning that the potentially most vocal bureaucratic opponents had endorsed the move.<sup>30</sup> However, Nixon had yet to commit to arms control as a priority. In fact according to the order in which he created his National Security Study Memoranda, he ranked SALT behind 27 other issues,<sup>31</sup> and he told his advisors that they had to keep the public option open of not beginning SALT.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Jonathan Haslam, *Russia's Cold War: From the October Revolution to the Fall of the Wall* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011), 218.

<sup>27</sup> Johnson, *The Vantage Point*, 483-484.

<sup>28</sup> Haslam, *Russia's Cold War*, 240.

<sup>29</sup> Kissinger, *White House Years*, 49-50.

<sup>30</sup> Newhouse, *Cold Dawn*, 114-118.

<sup>31</sup> Jeffrey W. Knopf, *Domestic Society and International Cooperation* (Ithaca, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 164.

<sup>32</sup> "Letter from President Nixon to Secretary of State Rodgers," (February 4, 1969) in *Soviet-American Relations: The Détente Years, 1969-1972*, edited by Edward C. Keefer et al, (Washington, D.C.: U.S.

These decisions effectively delayed the beginning of SALT. That delay appeared to have several advantages from Nixon's prospective. First, it ensured that Nixon was not bound by Johnson's positions laid out in papers that had already been exchanged with the Soviets. Second, the delay allowed Nixon a chance to draft his own policy based on a thorough review of the American strategic position. This latter action was particularly desirable given the ad hoc nature of the formation of Johnson's SALT policy.<sup>33</sup> Third, it allowed Nixon to separate himself from Johnson and thus increase the chances that he would be credited with the accomplishment of SALT. The desire for credit, as his aide Kissinger notes, was a major motivating factor for Nixon so that this particular reason may have had greater weight.<sup>34</sup>

### **Literature Review**

The SALT negotiations that followed Nixon's delay lasted for almost Nixon's entire first term and have been criticized by many actors of the period. The negotiations are relatively recent, so much so that not all of the relevant briefings and reports have been declassified. However, the history of the histories of the negotiations dates back almost to the immediate aftermath of the talks with John Newhouse's *Cold Dawn*. While claiming to be *The Story of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks*, *Cold Dawn* is a journalist's account of the talks, based heavily on interviews with the main actors at the time.<sup>35</sup> Even so, Newhouse offers one of the first accounts of the relevant levels of the negotiations. He cites four: negotiations between United States and Soviet Union;

---

Government Printing Office, 2007), 4. An identical letter was sent to Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, *FRUS, SALT I*, 1.

<sup>33</sup> Newhouse, *Cold Dawn*, 108-139.

<sup>34</sup> Kissinger, *White House Years*, e.g. 29.\

<sup>35</sup> Newhouse, *Cold Dawn*, 171-173.

between the United States and its NATO allies; between the president and Congress; and between the respective bureaucracies.<sup>36</sup>

Newhouse's account was followed by memoirs and case studies that focused on varying aspects of the negotiations and agreements. Nixon's memoirs focused on the domestic and bureaucratic politics surrounding the agreement, and spend relatively little time on the negotiations. Nixon's memoirs focus on the domestic political dimensions of the agreements and observe a tendency towards distrust of the established government authorities which came out of Vietnam as a motivating factor in many opponents of the Anti-Ballistic Missile system, renamed Safeguard, that he was trying to pass.<sup>37</sup> Henry A. Kissinger, Nixon's Assistant for National Security Affairs, recounts in some detail the negotiation process. He recounts the secrecy of the Nixon presidency which centralized national security policy in the White House and blamed such secrecy on Nixon for his paranoia regarding press leaks. That paranoia was encouraged by watching Johnson suffer from a large number of leaks before Nixon took office.<sup>38</sup> This decision to centralize decision-making in the White House has been thought to have decreased the role of the bureaucracy in decision-making during the SALT negotiations.<sup>39</sup> While such isolation may disincentive contributing to the policy formation process, it could also create an incentive to leak, as the only means of getting policy positions considered. Such secrecy could also result in decision-makers and their bureaucracies having incomplete

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 31-32.

<sup>37</sup> Richard Nixon, *RN: The Memoirs of Richard Nixon* (Simon and Schuster, 1995), 415-417.

<sup>38</sup> Kissinger, *White House Years*, 19-32, 138.

<sup>39</sup> e.g. Kissinger argues that it increased decisiveness but decreased consensus building, see Ibid., 805.

information.<sup>40</sup> One example of how bureaucratic discontent could manifest itself during SALT was Gerard Smith's angry reaction to being excluded from participation in the Moscow Summit until called for a press conference where he responded to questions from the media by stating that he, the head of the SALT delegation was not familiar with the substance of the agreements.<sup>41</sup> Kissinger later asked Smith if he was "trying to cause a panic" with his remarks.<sup>42</sup>

A counter to Kissinger's account are the accounts of Arms Control and Disarmament Agency director Gerard Smith who criticized Kissinger's handling of the negotiations. Smith paints a picture of Kissinger as so egotistical he falsely believed he could confront the whole Soviet government almost single handedly while he confused the negotiating by conducting a back channel negotiation with Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin.<sup>43</sup> Raymond Garthoff and Thomas Graham Jr., both in the ACDA in at the time and thus involved in the negotiation, echo many of these criticism of Kissinger and the Administration for making technical decisions without consulting their experts and thus creating difficulties later on in the process.<sup>44</sup> Smith did not just criticize Kissinger's secret negotiations but also their consequences, as he described them causing long delay by playing "games" with the Soviet delegation by either making propositions

---

<sup>40</sup> Robert Alan Strong, "Bureaucracy, Statesmanship, and Arms Control: The SALT I Negotiations" (Ph.D Diss., University of Virginia, 1980), 198-206.

<sup>41</sup> See parallel accounts in Kissinger, *White House Years*, 1242-1243 and Smith, *Doubletalk*, 436-438.

<sup>42</sup> Smith, *Doubletalk*, 438.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 225-226, 336.

<sup>44</sup> Thomas Graham Jr., *Disarmament Sketches: Three Decades of Disarmament and International Law* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002), 46-49 and Garthoff, Raymond L. *Détente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Regan Revised Ed* (Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1994), 153-202.

that the other side would never accept or by making multiple simultaneous proposals without indicating which one was preferred.<sup>45</sup> The result of these maneuvers, according to Smith, was that the Soviet Union had more time to build up more nuclear weapons and almost guaranteed that the United States would be in a position of strategic inferiority.<sup>46</sup> Smith and Garthoff also criticize Nixon for losing the opportunity to ban the MIRV.<sup>47</sup>

The political science literature is not that far removed from the narrow focus of the memoirs. When treated at all, SALT I is often treated as the precursor to SALT II or a model for a particular type of negotiation theory. These examinations generally have a narrow focus. For example, Lori Esposito Murray, "SALT I and Congress: Building a Consensus for Nuclear Arms Control" focuses almost exclusively on Executive-Congressional relations during SALT concluding with very little support that Nixon's mishandling of SALT I sewed the seeds of the failure of SALT II, by failing to adequately articulate the purpose of the SALT process to Congress.<sup>48</sup> Given her focus it is ironic that Murray pays little attention to the revolution in begun in ABM hearings chaired by Albert Gore which signaled according to Alan Platt, a nascent Congressional "Revolution" against the norms of executive-dictated policy formation.<sup>49</sup> Platt also points

---

<sup>45</sup> Smith, *Doubletalk*, 211-212.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 457.

<sup>47</sup> Garthoff, *Détente and Confrontation*, 160-162.

<sup>48</sup> Murray, "SALT I and Congress," 3-4.

<sup>49</sup> Alan Platt, "The Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty," in *The Politics of Arms Control Treaty Ratification*, Michael Krepon and Dan Caldwell eds., *The Politics of Arms Control Treaty Ratification* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), 255-258.

out that ratification and limited Congressional debate was made possible by a combination of logrolling and the extreme secrecy that characterized the negotiations.<sup>50</sup>

In addition to his commentary on Congressional relations, Platt is one of the first in the group to seriously address the impact of public opinion which he calls minimal as public interest was low. However, interest groups did form in response to the plan to install ABM sites near cities that aroused protest and scientific activism.<sup>51</sup>

Scott Allen's comparison of the SALT I negotiations to the Washington Naval Conference system points out what Murray appears to be missing. The United States and the Soviet Union have different conceptions of the doctrine upon which their agreement rests. The United States had unofficially endorsed Mutually Assured Destruction while the Soviet Union was still striving for superiority.<sup>52</sup> The result of this doctrinal difference is that the SALT agreement is not functional as a predictor of future actions as such agreements are supposed to be to remain practical and effective.<sup>53</sup> However, as Francis J. Gavin argues, declassified documents reveal that Nixon did not endorse the idea of mutually assured destruction either, as he and Kissinger believed that nuclear superiority was the only way the United States could keep a credible deterrent against a Soviet strike in Europe. The only problem was, as suggested by the background above, the United States lacked the economic and political will to achieve that objective.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 255-264.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., 264-268.

<sup>52</sup> Scott Allen, "A Comparison of the Washington Naval Arms Treaty of 1922 and the Strategic Arms Limitation Agreements of 1972" (Ph.D Diss., University of Hawaii, 1976), 1-14, 19-36, 196.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 196,

<sup>54</sup> Francis J. Gavin, *Nuclear Statecraft: History and Strategy in America's Atomic Age* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012), 110-114.

George Bunn also does not hold with the agreement as a result of doctrinal similarities but rather returns to a broader analysis advanced in the case study tradition. Bunn identifies three "committees" that the president must appeal to in addition to the Soviet Union: Congress, the Bureaucracy and NATO.<sup>55</sup> As has already been noted the literature also includes the work of Fisher et al who describes the five constituencies that the this paper argues the president must satisfy, because unlike Bunn it does not assume that the Congress always represents domestic will, nor does it hold with Platt that Congress and the Bureaucracy can be removed or significantly marginalized by secrecy.

Having considered the specific literature on SALT it should be noted where the general literature places the SALT agreements. These histories tend to view SALT as Jonathan Haslam describes as political rather than anything that has real substantive importance outside the field of politics.<sup>56</sup>

### **Analysis of Negotiations**

To better examine this "political settlement," an examination of the bargaining process mentioned above is in order. According to Thompson, the Bargaining process begins with preparation. 80% of the work of negotiation is done in this phase.<sup>57</sup> In the planning phase of the negotiation process the prime actor (in this case the President Nixon) must identify his goals and his negotiating partner's (or partners') interests. The president must first conduct research to determine what is possible and what his

---

<sup>55</sup> George Bunn, *Arms Control by Committee: Managing Negotiations with the Russians* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994), 7.

<sup>56</sup> Haslam, *Russia's Cold War*, 263.

<sup>57</sup> Thompson, *The Mind and Heart of the Negotiator*, 13.



alternatives are.<sup>58</sup> The president must make four determinations to better formulate a bargaining position. First, he must have determined his best alternative to a negotiated agreement or BATNA. Second, the actor must have determined his aspiration price, or the best possible deal for him and his interests. Third, the actor must determine his target price or objective. Lastly, the actor must determine his reservation point or the lowest option at which a negotiated agreement is advantageous.<sup>59</sup>

The President's BATNA was clearly understood from before the formal negotiations began and was laid out in a Department of Defense Report on the costs of delay. The Soviet Union was rapidly building new ICBMs and submarines while the United States had no new offensive weapons systems programmed to enter service until the mid-1970s. Thus delay in negotiation or no negotiation at all would result in the shift of the strategic balance in favor of the Soviet Union. The only two programs that the United States had planned to counter this growing advantage before 1975 was the MIRV and ABM programs.<sup>60</sup> Therefore the American BATNA was to build MIRVs and ABMs in an attempt to counter the looming Soviet strategic nuclear advantage.

### **Rolling Back the American BATNA**

The first part of the BATNA, the Anti-Ballistic Missile system named Sentinel that was approved by Johnson before he left office. The Sentinel program had not yet begun deployment, but had already been slated to deploy ABM launchers and radar near cities. Citizens in Chicago and Boston were upset by the ABM system being placed in

---

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 14-16.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 16.

<sup>60</sup> "Military Consequences of a Delay in Opening Strategic Talks," in *FRUS, SALT I*, 2-3. There is no date on this document but it was prepared for the February 14, 1969 National Security Council meeting see Ibid, 2 note 1.

their backyards because of two concerns first the potentially negative impact on property values and second reports by expert scientists that ABM systems contained nuclear warheads that could accidentally explode.<sup>61</sup> The public in these cities chose to enter into an action game, i.e. they chose to protest. The goal of these protests was to influence policy formation by convincing the politicians in Congress that the median voter, the average person whom they needed to appeal to, to win reelection was roused against this measure.<sup>62</sup> The popular actions had even swayed senators to oppose the ABM placement near cities including the vehemently pro-ABM Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson who opposed placement of an ABM system in his home state of Washington under pressure from his constituents.<sup>63</sup>

Nixon responded by preparing a new ABM system using the same components as Sentinel but to be deployed to defend missile silos and not around cities as Kissinger explained in a private meeting with Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin.<sup>64</sup> This new system was called Safeguard.<sup>65</sup> Thus to retain support on Capital Hill, calm down protesters, and retain what he thought would be a critical "bargaining chip" in the negotiations with the Soviet Union Nixon was forced to devalue his BATNA to satisfy the interests of the American public who in turn influenced Congress. No longer would the American ABM system be the city-based system designed to reduce the maximum amount of damage

---

<sup>61</sup> Peter A. Moldauer, "The ABM Comes to Town," *Bulliten of the Atomic Scientists* 25.1 (January, 1969), 4-6. Mary Silk, "Sentinel in the Backyard," in *Ibid.*, 7.

<sup>62</sup> Knopf, *Domestic Society*, 3, 54.

<sup>63</sup> Kissinger, *White House Years*, 538.

<sup>64</sup> "Memorandum of Conversation (USSR), March 3, 1969," in *U.S.-Soviet Relations*, 31-32.

<sup>65</sup> *FRUS, SALT I*, 14.

from a nuclear war. It would now be a system designed to protect the American nuclear deterrent, its ICBM force.

However, Nixon's ABM BANTA was still not safe as a subcommittee chaired by Albert Gore relied on scientific experts to excoriate the Safeguard system. Experts scientists, including former presidential science advisors took stances against the ABM as an ineffective and costly system that the American people could not afford.<sup>66</sup> Thus Congress, influenced by domestic actors, in this case scientists who shifted the Congressional balance of power by providing Congressmen with professional support,<sup>67</sup> became even less willing to fund the ABM and the President had to appeal to Gerard Smith to write a note supporting Safeguard expansion as an essential part of the American bargaining strategy telling Smith to "sign or resign."<sup>68</sup> Thus Nixon had to depend on his bureaucracy as a sort of authentication to his statement that Safeguard was necessary to the negotiations. As Platt, cited above, noted the Congress was becoming more independent and less trusting of the President's word requiring him to make such appeals and to rely on his bureaucracy to ensure success.

The second BATNA strategy was the United States' program to develop MIRVs. The Americans were ahead in developing the MIRV technology.<sup>69</sup> However, Nixon was under pressure from elements of his bureaucracy to place a moratorium on MIRV testing as a sign of good faith to try to get the Soviet Union to reciprocate. Acting Secretary of

---

<sup>66</sup> *Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Disarmament Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, passim.*

<sup>67</sup> Knopf, *Domestic Society*, 178-180, 186-187.

<sup>68</sup> Nixon's notation on "Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon," (February 24, 1970), in *FRUS SALT I*, 192.

<sup>69</sup> "Military Consequences of a Delay in Opening Strategic Talks," in *FRUS, SALT I*, 2, 4.

State Richardson and Chief Negotiator Gerard Smith both argued that if there was not a stop on MIRV testing, which could be verified, then the opportunity to control this weapon would be lost.<sup>70</sup> That position was leaked to the press and Nixon faced not just bureaucratic opposition but also opposition in the Congress embodied by a sense of the Senate resolution that advocated a MIRV ban.<sup>71</sup> Nixon propose a MIRV ban in one of the negotiating packages in the second round of the SALT negotiations at Vienna.<sup>72</sup> However, as Gerard Smith notes Nixon attached the requirement of onsite verification to the proposal of a MIRV ban, essentially ensuring that it would be rejected by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union did not want a deal either, according to Smith.<sup>73</sup> Thus all the Soviets had to do was to put a proposal on the table that would be equally unlikely to gain American support, which they did.<sup>74</sup>

In this case we see three levels of interaction the president is here interacting indirectly with: Congress, the Soviet Union and the bureaucracy. First, we see what Knopf calls his third method of the American people actively shaping government policy that is introducing a new idea into Congress to try to change the debate.<sup>75</sup> This action

---

<sup>70</sup> *FRUS, SALT I*, 18 and "'MIRV TESTING,' Memorandum from Acting Secretary of State Richardson to President Nixon, May 22, 1969," in *ibid.*, 18-19. Smith proposed a "Stop Where We Are" proposal that would include a moratorium see "Prepared Paper by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, June 11, 1969," in *ibid.*, 41-50.

<sup>71</sup> Kissinger, *White House Years*, 540-541.

<sup>72</sup> Newhouse, *Cold Dawn*, 181-183.

<sup>73</sup> Smith, *Doubletalk*, 170-176.

<sup>74</sup> Garthoff, *Detente and Confrontation*, 158-160. Garthoff is a little more optimistic than Smith. Based on his conversation with his Soviet counterpart at the negotiations he believed that a MIRV ban was possible. However, it is clear the Soviets were aware, according to Garthoff, that their counter-proposal would also be rejected as it could not be verified.

<sup>75</sup> Knopf, *Domestic Society*, 3.

suggests that the bureaucracy can serve a dual role by both fulfilling their duty to help shape domestic executive policy and as an active citizen who introduces new ideas to Congress. Nixon responded by appeasing his bureaucracy and Congressional critics to a certain degree by claiming that he attempted to resolve the issue. Keeping the bureaucrats appeased is essential to the running of a large complicated government. Disenchanted bureaucrats can misinterpret or distort policy decision,<sup>76</sup> or in extreme circumstances they can rebel against the executive by engaging in policies that deliberately hurt the executive, such as leaking or starting false stories. Bureaucrats who do not feel like they are being treated properly, because the interests of their organization, which they associate with the national interest,<sup>77</sup> are not being addressed may become rebellious and serve as the source of some of the leaks that plague the administration. Alternatively, bureaucrats can disrupt the policy-making process in more subtle and less intentional ways. As noted above Smith's temper at being the press conference at the Moscow Summit threatened to bias the reception of the SALT agreements. Thus it is critical for the Nixon Administration to maintain some bureaucratic support. While it is true that Kissinger and Nixon cut into the bureaucratic power base by moving foreign policy inside the White House to the extent possible, it was still necessary to deal with bureaucrats to ensure a functioning foreign policy. Nixon was able to do so in this situation because it could cooperate with the Soviet Union at a different level of negotiation to make sure the proposal appeared to fail after a good faith effort.

### **The Failure to Set The American Negotiating Position**

---

<sup>76</sup> Allison and Halperin, "Bureaucratic Politics," 48, 52-53.

The fact that Nixon was able to float the MIRV ban tied to onsite inspection in the negotiations without destabilizing the negotiations was due to the fact that Nixon's preparation for the first few rounds stopped at determining and maintaining his BATNA. Nixon did conduct this research by issuing National Security Study Memorandum 28 that order the preparation of potential positions to be taken during the SALT negotiations.<sup>78</sup> He reviewed several options and got various opinions on them. However, Nixon does not give Smith a bargaining position for the first round in Helsinki. Instead he tells Smith his goal is to probe the Soviet position.<sup>79</sup> The National Security Council became concerned with such vague directions. In a November tenth meeting they asked what they should do if the Soviets ask for a proposal. Nixon responded by ordering the negotiators to go slowly and feel out the position of the Soviet Union.<sup>80</sup> Thus it appears there is little evidence that Nixon had a position going into the first round of the SALT negotiations. Not only did Nixon not have a firm position but he had no target price, or ultimate goal for the negotiations; nor did he have a clear reservation price. Or at least that is how it appears. Smith observes that while Nixon did not firmly establish a position the position that he had the delegation table at the first round of the SALT negotiations at Helsinki as the suggestion for discussion covered most of the issues covered in the final agreement.<sup>81</sup> Thus Nixon may have made such a decision ahead of time and withheld all backup positions or real positions at all to avoid leaks. However, there is no evidence to suggest

---

<sup>78</sup> "National Security Decision Memorandum 33," in *FRUS, SALT I*, 160-162.

<sup>79</sup> "Letter From President Nixon to the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (Smith)" (Washington, July 21, 1969) in *FRUS, SALT I*, 107.

<sup>80</sup> "Minutes of National Security Council Meeting, November 10, 1969," in *Ibid.*, 158-160.

<sup>81</sup> Smith, *Doubletalk*, 89-91.

this was the intentional method as neither Nixon nor Kissinger records such a plan in their memoirs of the period. Furthermore, Kissinger describes how he was delegated to create a plan for the second round of the SALT negotiations in Vienna without clearly stating that his position was approved by the president.<sup>82</sup>

Such an indistinct position might be desirable as a way of ensuring that the bureaucracy did not rebel. If Nixon did not have a firm plan going into SALT then he could not be said to be passing up on opportunities for arms control by those bureaucracies who have an institutional interest in promoting such agreement, namely the CIA, who would gain a more important intelligence role; the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), which would be fulfilling its reason for existing by completing a wide ranging SALT deal; and the State Department which tended to work closely with the ACDA.

Nixon did gained some flexibility by not laying out his objectives, and he did pay a price. The reason for creating a reservation price, a target price and an aspiration price is to try to maximize one's negotiating potential and not leave potential gains on the table.<sup>83</sup> While there is no solid evidence that suggest that Nixon certainly did leave potential gains on the table, it remains a possibility. Nixon did pay the price in two areas: the creation of a numerically inferior nuclear position in the agreements and the a deadlock over whether to include Submarine Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBM) that almost prevented the deal.

---

<sup>82</sup> Kissinger, *White House Years*, 540-545.

<sup>83</sup> Thompson, *Mind and Heart of the Negotiator*, 15-16.

What is clear is that in the time that elapsed during the negotiations Nixon did lose. As previously noted the longer the negotiations lasted the larger the Soviet strategic forces grew. However, it is very probable that the Soviet Union may not have agreed to an arms control agreement unless the agreement ratified their position of relative superiority, so criticisms that Nixon spent too much time in the negotiation and lost the possibility for a more equitable agreement are rather speculative at best.

Another consequence of not preparing a position was conflict over the inclusion of SLBMs. The SALT negotiations had been stalemated after the United States withdrew an offer to limit the deployment of ABM to just one site around the national capital as Americans realized that the Congress would not fund such a proposal and proceeded to put forward unacceptable proposals to get the Soviets to move towards proposal they believed Congress would be more likely to fund.<sup>84</sup> Kissinger and Dobrynin attempted to break the stalemate and Kissinger hoped to gain control over the negotiation process by coming to an agreement. The problem with the agreement was that among other things, it excluded SLBMs.<sup>85</sup> This was apparently because Kissinger had not realized that the American government had a strong preference for controlling SLBMs. In fact, Nixon believed that an agreement was possible and even desirable without SLBMs.<sup>86</sup> However,

---

<sup>84</sup> Kissinger, *White House Years*, 810-811. It is worth noting that this mistake, which Kissinger attributes to the bureaucracy (see *Ibid.*, 542), is likely due to the fact that there was no target price known to the administration. Lacking such a target to anchor their own internal negotiations, the American government began to consider the question of what the Soviets would accept rather than what would be in the Americans' best interests. Thus the anchor for negotiations were being set by the status quo for the opposing nation in a situation where both sides are withholding the process of establishing a position.

<sup>85</sup> Garthoff, *Détente and Confrontation*, 167-168.

<sup>86</sup> "Conversation Among President Nixon, the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger), and the Assistant to the President (Halderman), March 9, 1972," in *FRUS, SALT I*, 693.



the Joint Chiefs of Staff were opposed to excluding SLBMs,<sup>87</sup> which forced the administration to consider walking away from the negotiation very early in 1972. The Soviets and Americans did agree to limits on Soviet SLBMs which gave the Soviets the superiority that Kissinger predicted they would have had without the agreement,<sup>88</sup> but the lack of communication combined with the strong position of the Joint Chiefs provided a real incentive for the Nixon Administration to change their positions in other levels of the negotiation.

### **The Exclusion of Forward Based Systems (FBS)**

While Nixon may have adopted a vague front in an attempt to keep his side united, Nixon was very clear on certain items. In his very first set of instructions to Gerard Smith he was clear that the strategic nuclear forces of Britain and France as well as tactical American forces in the area were not on the table.<sup>89</sup> Nixon also made sure to consult with NATO members and had Gerard Smith brief the Atlantic Council prior to the negotiations.<sup>90</sup> In fact, the Nixon briefs of the NATO allies that many Congressmen were upset that the allies were getting more information about the negotiations than members of his own government.<sup>91</sup> This abundance of information and consultation was designed in part to assuage European fears that a SALT agreement would be the

---

<sup>87</sup> "Conversation between President Nixon and Presidential Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger), March 31, 1972," in *ibid.*, 749.1

<sup>88</sup> Garthoff, *Détente and Confrontation*, 186-191. Kissinger does claim that the agreed limit of 950 SLBM launchers was 200 lower than the Soviets would have built without of an agreement. Garthoff points out that this figure refers to what they were *capable* of building not what they had planned to build, see *Ibid.*

<sup>89</sup> "National Security Decision Memorandum 33," in *FRUS, SALT I*, 161-162.

<sup>90</sup> Smith, *Doubletalk*, 470.

<sup>91</sup> e.g. complaint by Senator Fulbright quoted in Murray, "SALT I and Congress," 311.

beginning of a United States-Soviet Union condominium.<sup>92</sup> Such fears could lead the Europeans to attack the American negotiations and appeal over the head of Nixon directly to the public. Such "cross-channel" appeals or appeals from governments of one country to domestic populations in another are particularly strong when they come from allies.<sup>93</sup> Given that not too long before, American senators were refusing to pass a consular agreement with the Soviet Union on the grounds that Soviet Union was supply weapons to the North Vietnamese resistance and thereby killing Americans,<sup>94</sup> The United States and the Nixon administration probably believed that they could not afford European opposition to a SALT agreement that had any chance of lasting through the long term. The United States was conscious that one of the strategies of the SALT talks might be to try to pull the United States away from their strong allies in Western Europe<sup>95</sup> and the Nixon Administration was going to do everything possible to make sure that would not happen. Thus when the Soviets proposed limiting American Forward Based Systems, or tactical nuclear weapons such as bomber, stationed in Europe or on nearby aircraft carriers that were capable of striking the Soviet Union, the United States flatly refused the offer to expand the negotiations to include FBS and the proposal was eventually dropped.<sup>96</sup>

### **Examining the Outcomes**

---

<sup>92</sup> Kissinger, *White House Years*, 94.

<sup>93</sup> Jeffery K. Knopf, "Beyond Two Level Games: Domestic-International Interaction in the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Negotiations," *International Organization* 47.4 (1993), 606, 611.

<sup>94</sup> Murray, "SALT I and Congress," 43.

<sup>95</sup> Kissinger, *White House Years*, 127.

<sup>96</sup> Smith, *Doubletalk*, 90-93, 128-129, 330-331, 446. The Soviets made multiple attempts to limit FBS.

Based on what was eventually agreed, the negotiating strategy the United States used to preserve its BATNA appeared to be effective. While it did not have the city defense, it was still able to sign the ABM Treaty which capped both sides at two sites each, and the United States maintained MIRV which allowed them to match the Soviet warhead numbers while not matching the number of launchers.

As previously noted, the American failure to develop a firm negotiating position led to delays that allowed the Soviet Union to get a superiority in the number of strategic launchers that was recognized in the Interim Agreement. However, the damage was not as bad as it might have been as the Soviets also did not want to put forward an early position.<sup>97</sup> This behavior was likely due to the Soviet Union's internal divisions as Brezhnev had yet to consolidate his power in the wake of Khrushchev's ouster in 1964. However, as the negotiations proceeded Brezhnev became stronger, he was able to purge anti-SALT members of the Politburo<sup>98</sup> and his country's relative military position was improved to the point that when an agreement was in fact reached, the Soviet Union was in the lead in all of the armaments officially controlled except for the ABM system.<sup>99</sup>

In the end many of the interests of the Soviet Union gained recognition of its superiority in some strategic arms, while the United States got the Soviet Union to stop widening the gap between the two nations. The Soviet Union did not have to submit to onsite inspections and the United States got a tacit agreement on the part of the Soviet

---

<sup>97</sup> Smith, *Doubletalk*, 94.

<sup>98</sup> Kissinger, *White House Years*, 1234-1235.

<sup>99</sup> See the text of the ABM Treaty and the Interim Agreement with protocols and common understandings reprinted in Smith, *Doubletalk*, 487-515. Soviet Union had an advantage of 950 SLBMs versus America's 740 ceiling. Both sides get two ABM sites with 100 launchers each. ICBMs are frozen at the current levels which put the United States at a disadvantage.

Union not to "significantly increase" in their heavy SS-9 missile which Americans feared would become a first strike weapon.<sup>100</sup> Lastly, both sides benefited by the prevention of an defensive missile race that threatened to be incredibly expensive.<sup>101</sup> The Americans were able to get both agreements ratified in no small part due to the fact that when it mattered each of the five groups felt that their interests were at least marginally addressed by the agreement.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the application of Thompson's preparation for bargaining framework, the bureaucratic politics theory of Allison and Halprein, and the domestic pressure framework of Knopf it is clear that international negotiation is not just a bargaining process between two unitary actors. Nor is it just a domestic battle played out on the international stage. There are five distinct groups of players whose interests must be mollified. If one of those groups interests are hurt then the entire negotiation can be in jeopardy which is why leaders who have highly fragmented followings, in this case at least, tend to take broad vague approaches and rapidly change positions. Nixon had to contend with the rivalries between the defense establishment and the arms control lobbyists both inside the bureaucracy and the Congress. Nixon also had to cut his BATNA to meet domestic anger at the Sentinel ABM deployment and keep Congressional support. Nixon also had to keep allies satisfied that they were having their interests protected and of course had to agree to some Soviet positions to get an agreement. In attempting to balance all those competing interests it is not surprising that Nixon may have failed to establish firm objectives for the negotiations, but such failures

---

<sup>100</sup> Newhouse, *Cold Dawn*, 161.

<sup>101</sup> Richard Nixon, *RN*, 617.

may have cost him significant negotiating advantages. However, the appearance of irrationality in decisions like reducing his BATNA, putting off creating a firm negotiating position and refusing to expand the negotiations to include Forward Based Systems. The conclusion appears to be that the historians and policymakers alike ignore any of Fisher et al's five main groups at their own risk when studying or negotiating arms control agreements, because no matter how hard policy-makers like Nixon tried to use secrecy to shut some of these parties out of the process, they could not succeed..

## Annotated Bibliography

### Primary Sources

*Bulletin of Atomic Scientists.*

Established in Chicago by members of the Manhattan Project, this publication served as a forum for experts in atomic physics and strategy to share their views on technological developments as well as the policy implications of various scientific advances, especially those advances related to the atomic bomb.

*Foreign Relations of the United States 1969-1976 vol. 32: SALT I, 1969-1972.* Edited Erin R. Mahan. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office: 2010.  
[Abbreviated *FRUS*, *SALT I* in footnotes after first use.]

This book is a chronologically ordered collection of government documents related to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. It includes memorandums of conversation and other important primary sources including sources describing the nine months of preparation for the negotiation process. This source should provide an inside look into the negotiation process and show what the primary concerns of the negotiators were.

Garthoff, Raymond L. *Détente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Regan Revised Ed.* Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1994.

This book describes the development of foreign relations between the United States and Soviet Union with an emphasis on arms control negotiation. That emphasis is due in no small part to the fact that Garthoff was involved in several of the arms control negotiations described including SALT I. So this book provides another insider's perspective on SALT I as well as an attempt to blend that account with other arms control experiences.

Graham Jr., Thomas. *Disarmament Sketches: Three Decades of Disarmament and International Law.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002.

This memoir reflects the experience of a member of the staff of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Not only was Graham a member of the Agency for most of its life and thus has an insider's knowledge of its functions, he was also a member during SALT so he can offer perspective from inside the bureaucratic framework on how the agreements were reached.

*Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Disarmament Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate on Strategic and Foreign Policy Implications of ABM Systems.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

This three part collection of the report of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Disarmament Affairs provides background into the views of members

of Congress and executive branch officials on Anti-Ballistic Missile systems. Because ABM systems were the only systems that got a permanent (rather than an interim agreement) as a result of the SALT I talks, it is important to review this collection of statements and views on ABM systems as the main object at stake during the negotiations. These hearings are also good evidence for how the Congress began rebelling against executive authority as they began for the first time consulting non-governmental witnesses and doubting "government witnesses."

Kissinger, Henry. *The White House Years*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2011 [1979].

This memoir of foreign policy advisor to President Nixon will provide background and analysis of the Nixon's first term, the term where all S.A.L.T. negotiations took place and the final agreements were signed and ratified. While this account does not focus exclusively on S.A.L.T. it does put S.A.L.T. into perspective vis-a-vis other foreign policy initiatives and domestic issues. This also provides the thoughts of one of the key figures in policy formation of the time as well as Dr. Kissinger's assessment (biased but still useful) of his contemporary's abilities and motivations.

Dr. Kissinger's tendency to editorialize and attempt to describe many actors as characters in a drama makes this not an attempt to be detached rational but fits into his own theory that policy is made by insecure human beings.

Newhouse, John. *Cold Dawn: The Story of SALT I*. McLean, VA: Pergamon-Brassey, 1989 [1973].

This account of SALT I was based heavily on interviews of American public officials during and after the negotiation process. Newhouse, a journalist was at the time of the negotiations working at the Brookings Institute. *Cold Dawn* was an account serialized in *The New Yorker*. It provides a contemporary account that portrays SALT as a modern-day Congress of Vienna, an amoral, secretive, abstruse series of negotiations that may not have been based in the will of the people but may serve to make war less likely.

Nixon, Richard. *RN: The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*. Simon and Schuster, 1995.

The memoirs of the president who signed the First SALT agreements. This account is focused primarily on domestic politics and handles SALT mostly peripherally and in terms of its domestic implications.

Smith, Gerard. *Doubletalk: The Story of the First Strategic Arms Limitation Talks*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company Inc., 1990.

This account of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks was written by Gerard Smith, the negotiator on the United States side. Thus it provides an insider's account of the negotiations and the reasoning behind the decision-making in the negotiation process.

*Soviet-American Relations: The Détente Years, 1969-1972.* Edited by Edward C. Keefer et al. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2007.

This collection of American and Russian documents is the result of a collaboration between the U.S. Department of State and the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

### **Secondary Sources**

Allen, Scott. "A Comparison of the Washington Naval Arms Treaty of 1922 and the Strategic Arms Limitation Agreements of 1972." Ph.D Dissertation, University of Hawaii, 1976.

This dissertation compares and contrasts the agreements that emerged from the Washington Naval Conference of 1922 and the First Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. The goal is to discover commonalities in the agreements and the doctrines that underpinned them. This thesis will provide prospective on the S.A.L.T. I agreements in terms of other international agreements and their place in diplomatic maneuvering and strategic planning.

Allison, Graham T. and Morton H. Halperin. "Paradigm and Some Policy Implications." *World Politics* 24.S1 (1972): 40-79.

This ground breaking study of bureaucratic politics suggests that most bureaucrats tend to view the interests of their organization as synonymous with the national interest and thus take actions that might not appear, objectively to benefit the national interest. It also accounts for why it is so difficult for bureaucracies to interpret signals from foreign governments as they tend to interpret such signals based on their own beliefs.

Bunn, George. *Arms Control by Committee: Managing Negotiations with the Russians.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994.

This series of case studies uses the same set of basic negotiation questions to evaluate different arms control negotiations, including SALT I. Bunn concludes that SALT I was a failure as there was a missed opportunity to place limits on MIRVs.

Fisher, Rodger, A. K. Schneider, and B. Ganson. "Case Study on Arms Control: The Antiballistic Missile Treaty," in *Coping with International Conflict: A systematic Approach to Influence in International Negotiation.* Upper Saddle River, NJ : Prentice Hall, 1997.

This study is an attempt to apply international negotiation theory to the negotiation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. This paper takes the contention made in this chapter that the ABM Treaty was a result of the president appealing to five different groups and applied it more thoroughly to the ABM Treaty and added in the Interim Agreement on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Weapons.



Gavin, Francis J. *Nuclear Statecraft: History and Strategy in America's Atomic Age*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012.

This brief account of nuclear strategy draws heavily on primary sources to attempt to provide a framework for understanding both historic and modern nuclear theory, strategy and issues.

Haslam, Jonathan. *Russia's Cold War: From the October Revolution to the Fall of the Wall*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011.

This account of Soviet foreign policy surveys the origins of the policy in the October Revolution and the need of the Soviet leadership to preserve their tenuous grasp on power in the aftermath of that revolution. Based primarily on Russian sources this is a thorough overview of Russian foreign policy history.

Hunt, Michael H. *Ideology and US Foreign Policy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987 [2009].

This account of the evolution of American foreign policy examined the role the ideology has played in its development. It emphasizes the importance of radicalized images, the conflict between a small and large state and American's conflicting opinions on national revolutions from the founding to the early Cold War.

Knopf, Jeffrey W. *Domestic Society and International Cooperation*. Ithaca, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

In this book Knopf examines the impact of civilian protestors and activists on foreign policy formation in the United States. Knopf takes as his case studies the decisions the U.S. made to enter arms control negotiations including the SALT I process. He argues that domestic political pressure exerted by civilian activists does play a significant role in shaping foreign policy initiatives. He finds three ways in which domestic society can effect foreign policy formation: (1) convincing politicians that there has been an electoral shift, (2) providing aid to shift the Congressional balance of power, or (3) introducing new ideas to either the Congress or the bureaucracy to reframe the debate.

---. "Beyond Two Level Games: Domestic-International Interaction in the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Negotiations." *International Organization* 47.4 (1993): 599-628.

Knopf lays out here a modified version of two level games where he considers three levels of interaction and describes three ways in which domestic societies and governments of different countries can interact: intergovernmental interactions (i.e. interactions between the governments), "cross-channel" interactions (i.e. interactions between one nation's government and the domestic sphere of another country) and

transnational interaction--or the interaction between non-governmental actors of different countries.

Murray, Lori Esposito. "SALT I and Congress: Building a Consensus for Nuclear Arms Control." 2 vols. Ph.D Dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1989.

This dissertation is a two volume narrative that describes the creation of the S.A.L.T. agreements beginning with the debate of the shift in strategic arms theory that occurred in the 1960s executive discourse and concluding with analyses of the campaign to ratify the agreement in the United States Senate. The perspective of this dissertation is almost exclusively American and the author argues that S.A.L.T. was an artificial agreement, meaning that it was ratified despite the fact that the arms control regime it represented had not gained full senatorial support. Murray argues the reasons for the failure of a "real consensus" were due to executive mismanagement of the treaty-making process. Primarily, Murray points to the executive's (here she means both Nixon and Johnson) failure to explain their policy thoroughly, failure to set clear goals for the policy ahead of time, failure to consult with Congress during the negotiations, and lastly, Murray criticizes Nixon for politicizing the arms control process to distract attention away from domestic tensions.

Murray's account is useful because it describes the S.A.L.T. agreement as an outgrowth of American domestic rather than foreign politics. Thus the internal domestic divisions between the presidency and Congress and within the executive branch take center stage in the foreign policy making process.

Platt, Alan. "The Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty." In *The Politics of Arms Control Treaty Ratification*, Michael Krepon and Dan Caldwell eds., *The Politics of Arms Control Treaty Ratification*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991, 229-278.

This chapter is part of a series of case studies designed to demonstrate the processes and politics of successful treaty ratification. This chapter argues that while Nixon was successful in gaining ratification he did so by excluding Congress and then overselling the treaty it was agreed to by the Soviet Union.

Strong, Robert Alan. "Bureaucracy, Statesmanship, and Arms Control :The SALT I Negotiations." Ph.D Dissertation, University of Virginia, 1980.

Strong describes the major theories of bureaucracies and their dysfunctions. He then applies those theories to the SALT I negotiations to see how accurate those models are and whether they appropriately describe the process of policy formation during the SALT I negotiations. This dissertation will help by examining how the U.S. negotiators represented less a monolith than a conglomerate of different interests and how those interests were shaped by and put forward through the lens of bureaucratic theory.

Thompson, Leigh H. *The Mind and Heart of the Negotiator 5th ed.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2012.

This book provides an overview of negotiation tactics and strategies. It provides a firm background on the current psychological studies of the negotiation process as well as the how non-monolithic actors negotiate. This book provides a lens, that of negotiation theory.

Zaloga, Stephen J. *The Kremlin's Nuclear Sword: The Rise and Fall of Russia's Nuclear Forces*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2002.

Zaloga describes the history of the Soviet and later the Russian nuclear force with a special emphasis on the development of new weapons systems and the internal politics that surrounded said development. Thus this book provides an account of the development of Soviet nuclear forces, examines its strengths and weaknesses, and the doctrine the underlies decisions to develop certain weapons systems as well as the overall structure of the nuclear force. Of special relevance to my work is Zaloga's discussion of the Russian development of an Anti-Ballistic Missile System. As Zaloga argues the obsolescence and expense associated with the ABM system was a key factor in encouraging the Soviets to negotiate the ABM Treaty, one of the two agreements that emerged from SALT.