

3.3.1 The Negotiation Process (Continued)

issues may be defined as matters whose importance to the security of states is perceived by both to be paramount. This approach has been favored for several reasons.

- (a) Given the importance of the issues and assets under discussion, direct participation by others in the negotiation process has been considered imprudent by both Superpowers. In certain cases, consultations with Allies take place when their territory or interests are implicated, but a formal negotiating role for them is eschewed.
- (b) Since such negotiations generally relate to assets which are solely owned by the Superpowers, and are deployed on, in or over Superpower or international territory, there is, in a strictly legal sense, no requirement to seek the acquiescence of other states in agreements concerning these systems.
- (c) As a result of the nature and importance of the systems in question, national security data and intelligence have been an inevitable part of these negotiations; disclosure of such information to third parties has been considered unwise.
- (d) It is widely recognized that the process of bargaining between two parties with very different strategic programs, interests and perspective is in and of itself sufficiently delicate and difficult to make the involvement of other states, with their own interests and perspective, undesirable in terms of managing the negotiating process and producing a successful outcome. The most important area where these considerations have applied is strategic nuclear arms control where all negotiations in this field have been purely bilateral in nature.

Multilateral arms control negotiations, on the other hand, have been pursued under a different set of conditions. In general terms, a multilateral approach has been adopted when the issues under discussion have demanded it, or when the probable impact of an agreement is sufficiently secondary in a military sense, to allow