its en e Sentinel system as a bargaining chip the upcoming SALT negotiations. ure a grier arguments for the system as a prothe Station against a possible nuclear strike ess shim China, as a device for countering an ne concidental missile launching, and as a proothers, tion against a first strike, had all been e so-caind wanting. The Nixon Administration called the bargaining-chip argument in ture againg to sell its Safeguard ABM system. pectate U.S. SALT negotiator, Gerard Smith, n; but so far as to send an urgent telegram tegic members of the Senate in August 1970 akes reggesting that a vote in favour of limiting e mine Safeguard system to two sites would s esser detrimental to the outcome of SALT. ithout such an intervention, the limit ALT agite likely would have passed. As it was, to the proposal failed by five votes. nvolved

especade

inter, if the threat of an ABM race were inequat enough to get the Soviet Union to increre to a ban on the ABM, the Nixon Since ministration also sought to justify the gh to  $x_{
m IRV}$  system as a hedge against the te has wiet ABM. MIRV was to have made it et such ar to the Soviet Union that it would ceptibl<sub>ver be</sub> able to provide an effective deamentice against a United States retaliatory ike. It is interesting to note, however, have and there was no discussion of stopping imiting RV developments once agreement on her gros ABM was reached and, as indicated of increlier, MIRVing continues at a rapid pace. pet proje Perhaps the best illustration of how

dures military bargaining chip can force the

on systvelopment of unneeded weapons and, in

lys form, impede the prospects of arms controit foul, is found in the development of a tageousiise missile. According to John W. Finy in an article published in the New rk Times on January 21, 1976, it was cretary of State Henry Kissinger who rting apposed that the Pentagon undertake desufficielopment of long-range cruise missiles as ilitary (argaining chip for the SALT II negotiaat yet ns. According to Finney, Mr. Kissinger such w laments in private conversations that have b"didn't realize the Pentagon would fall on of "love with cruise missiles". Similar secially monthoughts have been expressed by oductiocretary Kissinger about the MIRV syses pressn, which had earlier been sold as a ts own rgaining chip but after production berather ne a serious obstacle to reaching agreeole outcont because of the inspection problems he exercreated. Kissinger is reported to have ks has dethat he wished he "had thought just sucough the implications of the MIRVed he otherld more fully in 1968-70". The best the firste to stop an arms race involving any ohnson apon system is before work begins on s, prop weapon - at a time before vested interests become committed and before deployment complicates inspection.

Despite recurring problems with bargaining chips, which have really never been cashed, a substantial number of weapon systems have in recent years been supported on the ground that they would provide effective bargaining counters in negotiations with the Soviets. Such arguments have been made by Pentagon and Administration officials with respect to proposals for Trident, the B-1 bomber, NCA defence, the development of an advanced airborne command post, site defence, the Manoeuvering Re-entry Vehicle, and higher-yield and more accurate missiles. On August 19, 1975, President Ford also attempted to pressure the Soviets into an agreement on SALT when he suggested that the strategic-arms budget would have to be increased by \$2.8 billion if agreement were not reached.

According to some authorities, the SS-9 represented an effort by the U.S.S.R. to create its own bargaining chip. Also the rapidity with which the Soviet Union rushed into development of the SS-16through-SS-20 series is suggestive of a desire to increase its bargaining position during SALT II. The same can be said of the scheduling of a series of ICBM tests at the end of May 1972, just as SALT I was signed, and further tests conducted on the eve of the resumption of the SALT talks on February 20, 1974, following a long delay in negotiations.

## Increase of fear

Bargaining chips tend to increase fear on the part of the adversary, and the traditional reaction is one of responding in kind. To have either side emphasize bargaining chips makes it more difficult for the moderates in the other country to plead for realistic arms restraint. Ammunition is merely provided for the hawks to press for higher defence budgets and to sabotage any effort towards arms reduction.

On the whole, bargaining chips have been costly, but if it could be shown that partial agreements such as those reached in SALT had stimulated more extensive reductions of armaments, they would be worth the price. Unfortunately, this does not seem to have been the case. Instead, the agreements to date have tended to generate increased suspicion and have actually slowed down the momentum towards more significant agreements.

Suspicion about possible evasions of an arms-control agreement is likely to be pervasive in a world that is high in threatperception and heavily armed. Indeed, a state may be trapped by public pressures

Difficulties increasedfor moderates advocating arms restraint