

REMARKS OF SENATOR BOB DOLE
GEORGIA JAYCEE MOCK LEGISLATURE

STATE CAPITOL
ATLANTA, GEORGIA
OCTOBER 22, 1977

It's a pleasure to be in Atlanta. I recall that on my last visit to your beautiful state -- a little over a year ago -- I spoke to political gatherings in Atlanta and Macon. I then was assured by the enthusiastic crowds which greeted us that the Ford-Dole ticket would crack the solid South and might even carry the home state of the Democratic Presidential nominee. Well, things didn't quite turn out that way.

The solid South didn't crack. President Ford didn't carry Georgia. And Jimmy Carter was elected President.

Today, after nine months in office he is the leader of the free world. To be sure, nine months in the most difficult office in the world has left its mark on your fellow Georgian. The burden of the Presidency shows itself as Jimmy Carter tries to sort out the bad ideas from the good ones, the policies which will lead to world stability, not chaos, and an economic course which leads to prosperity, not recession. It's a difficult job. And we all -- Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals -- hope he is successful.

For he is not just a Democratic President or a Southern President. He is the President of all the people. He's my President too. And even though we have been and are political adversaries, I know I join all Americans in wishing him well in the months and years ahead as he makes the difficult decisions for America.

And, really, that is the essence of American statecraft.

Every two years or every four years we engage in tough -- often hotly contested -- campaigns in which you, the American electorate must decide who is best qualified to lead your city, your state, and your nation. In America, there are still two great political parties which vie for the reins of leadership. Right now, my party -- the Republicans -- has yielded the predominant position to the Democrats. It hasn't always been that way -- and it won't always be that way in the future.

National stability -- of the kind we have known for over two centuries -- can only be achieved through a strong two-party system of government. And although I am not here to give a political recruitment speech, I can't think of a better place to stress the virtues of a two-party democracy than to the Jaycee's mock state legislature. I happen to think that my party -- its philosophy, its hopes and dreams for the future -- best represents the views of many, if not most, Georgians. And I can only hope that outstanding community leaders like yourselves will work diligently in the party of your own choosing to build a strong two-party system in Georgia.

Tremendous challenges confront the future leaders of Georgia and the nation. So, too, will there be tremendous opportunities for outstanding, patriotic and dedicated Americans, like yourselves. On any number of issues -- foreign and domestic, federal, state and local -- the nation cries out for leadership. And there is a need for strong leaders in both political parties, on both sides of important public issues. As community leaders throughout Georgia, your fellow citizens will be looking to you for leadership.

Now let me turn to a specific area of vast national and world significance -- foreign policy generally and S.A.L.T. in particular.

The Carter Administration has provided the nation with new foreign and defense policies. The American people have hardly been able to keep up with these new departures, tumbling from the White House one after the other: withdrawal from Korea, downgrading of Taiwan, recognition of Cuba and Vietnam, the President's U.S. Ambassador warmly praising the victorious struggle of North Vietnam and the President's Action Director attending the North Vietnamese victory celebration, bringing the Soviets back into the Middle East with a joint declaration, cancelling the B-1, and of course, the Panama Canal Treaty.



NEWS from U.S. Senator Bob Dole

(R.—Kans.) New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510 (202) 224-6521

REMARKS OF SENATOR BOB DOLE

GEORGIA JAYCEE MOCK LEGISLATURE

STATE CAPITOL
ATLANTA, GEORGIA
OCTOBER 22, 1977

It's a pleasure to be in Atlanta. I recall that on my last visit to your beautiful state -- a little over a year ago -- I spoke to political gatherings in Atlanta and Macon. I then was assured by the enthusiastic crowds which greeted us that the Ford-Dole ticket would crack the solid South and might even carry the home state of the Democratic Presidential nominee. Well, things didn't quite turn out that way.

The solid South didn't crack. President Ford didn't carry Georgia. And Jimmy Carter was elected President.

Today, after nine months in office he is the leader of the free world. To be sure, nine months in the most difficult office in the world has left its mark on your fellow Georgian. The burden of the Presidency shows itself as Jimmy Carter tries to sort out the bad ideas from the good ones, the policies which will lead to world stability, not chaos, and an economic course which leads to prosperity, not recession. It's a difficult job. And we all -- Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals -- hope he is successful.

For he is not just a Democratic President or a Southern President. He is the President of all the people. He's my President too. And even though we have been and are political adversaries, I know I join all Americans in wishing him well in the months and years ahead as he makes the difficult decisions for America.

And, really, that is the essence of American statecraft.

Every two years or every four years we engage in tough -- often hotly contested -- campaigns in which you, the American electorate must decide who is best qualified to lead your city, your state, and your nation. In America, there are still two great political parties which vie for the reins of leadership. Right now, my party -- the Republicans -- has yielded the predominant position to the Democrats. It hasn't always been that way -- and it won't always be that way in the future.

National stability -- of the kind we have known for over two centuries -- can only be achieved through a strong two-party system of government. And although I am not here to give a political recruitment speech, I can't think of a better place to stress the virtues of a two-party democracy than to the Jaycee's mock state legislature. I happen to think that my party -- its philosophy, its hopes and dreams for the future -- best represents the views of many, if not most, Georgians. And I can only hope that outstanding community leaders like yourselves will work diligently in the party of your own choosing to build a strong two-party system in Georgia.

Tremendous challenges confront the future leaders of Georgia and the nation. So, too, will there be tremendous opportunities for outstanding, patriotic and dedicated Americans, like yourselves. On any number of issues -- foreign and domestic, federal, state and local -- the nation cries out for leadership. And there is a need for strong leaders in both political parties, on both sides of important public issues. As community leaders throughout Georgia, your fellow citizens will be looking to you for leadership.

Now let me turn to a specific area of vast national and world significance -- foreign policy generally and S.A.L.T. in particular.

The Carter Administration has provided the nation with new foreign and defense policies. The American people have hardly been able to keep up with these new departures, tumbling from the White House one after the other: withdrawal from Korea, downgrading of Taiwan, recognition of Cuba and Vietnam, the President's U.S. Ambassador warmly praising the victorious struggle of North Vietnam and the President's Action Director attending the North Vietnamese victory celebration, bringing the Soviets back into the Middle East with a joint declaration, cancelling the B-1, and of course, the Panama Canal Treaty.

The popular outcry has been loudest on the Canal Treaty, perhaps because the people see it against this background of withdrawal and apology.

CARTER ADMINISTRATION AND S.A.L.T.

But the most important of all the Carter Administration national security departures has yet to receive wide notice. So as I indicated, I would like to talk with you briefly about S.A.L.T., the negotiations the Carter Administration have been conducting with the Russians.

It is a paradox that this most important of all national security issues for the American people seems the most elusive and complicated in detail. To master its complexity requires the learning of a new language of MIRVs and MARVs, of ALCMs and SLCM, MLBMs, SSNX-18S and SNDVS. But once mastered, this language reveals SALT to be like all policy matters, amenable to applied common sense. Let us review the simple issues of SALT, stripped of jargon and ask some common sense questions.

The first important question must be: What is it we seek to achieve through SALT negotiations? The answer can only be to achieve increased security of the United States and its allies. The answer to this question will be the sole criterion by which we in the U.S. Senate must judge the coming SALT treaty.

By which issues do we judge the fairness and balance of the treaty limitations to find whether it increases or decreases our security?

FOUR CRITERIA

Fred Ikle, recent Director the Arms Control Agency has suggested the four criteria by which we should measure that success or failure in a SALT treaty.

First, a SALT treaty ought to strengthen deterrence. Deterrence simply means dissuading the Soviets from attacking us or our allies by persuading them that the consequences to them of attacking us are worse than anything they could gain by doing so. SALT should strengthen that dissuasion.

Second, SALT must secure an even balance -- real self-evident equality or parity.

Third, SALT should achieve some reduction in nuclear arsenals and ease the burden on taxpayers.

Fourth, the treaty must be strictly enforceable and verifiable without having to place blind trust in the Russians.

Now let us turn to what actual limitations seem near to agreement. The Senate as a whole has not been briefed, so for details on what has now been agreed we must rely on recent news articles quoting "informed sources." To compare where we started from, we have the March proposal made public by the President himself:

CEILING ON STRATEGIC LAUNCH VEHICLES, ICBMS, SUB-LAUNCHED SLBMS, AND LONG-RANGE BOMBERS

- Carter proposed in March a ceiling of 1800
- the Russians insisted on 2250
- reported "compromise" 2250

CEILING ON MULTIPLE WARHEAD VEHICLES

- Carter proposed in March a ceiling of 1100
- the Russians insisted on 1320
- reported "compromise" 1320

CEILING ON LAND-BASED ICBMS

- Carter proposed in March a ceiling of 550
- the Russians insisted on 850
- reported "compromise" 850

LIMITS ON SOVIET HEAVY MISSILES (SIX TIMES THE PAYLOAD OF THE U.S. MINUTEMAN)

- Carter proposed in March [U.S. - 0] [Soviets - 150]
- the Russians insisted on 308
- reported "compromise" [U.S. - 0] [Soviets - 308]

LIMITS ON SOVIET BACKFIRE LONG-RANGE SUPERSONIC BOMBER

- Carter proposed in March strict numerical limits on backfire
- the Russians insisted there be no limits other than assurances they would not use it against the U.S.
- reported "compromise": no limits other than assurances

LIMITS ON U.S. SEA-LAUNCHED AND GROUND-LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILES

- Carter proposed in March there be no limits on U.S. medium range (up to 2500 km) cruise missiles
- the Russians insisted all SLCMS and GLCMS be limited to 600 km range (320 miles)
- reported "compromise": all SLCMS and GLCMS limited to 600 km range

If the facts of this new agreement as reported in NEWSWEEK and elsewhere are true, then doing some simple arithmetic on my tablecloth, we find that this treaty would leave us with the following balance sheet by 1985:

	<u>U.S.</u>	<u>SOVIET</u>
ICBM PAYLOAD	2.5 million lbs.	9 million lbs.
ICBM WARHEADS	1650	6000
LONG-RANGE BOMBERS	120 B-52s	unlimited backfires (about 500 by 1985)

MEASURE UP

Returning to the four issues of former Arms Control Director Ikle, how do these terms measure up?

First; deterrence: it is hard to see how such a record of U.S. concessions resulting in such lop-sided numbers could strengthen Soviet fear of U.S. counterattack. It would seem to me deterrence would be weakened, not strengthened.

Second, even balance: the imbalance would seem to be staggering.

Third, reductions: there are indeed U.S. reductions, but net Soviet increases.

Fourth, enforceable and verifiable: it is agreed in the intelligence community that a 600 km limit on cruise missiles is not verifiable, but other enforcement arrangements seems so far to have been a subject deferred by the Administration.

It is difficult to believe that any President could be so ill-advised as to conclude such a treaty as described above. Let us hope these many authoritative news stories are wrong.

A treaty cannot be achieved except by limitations unequal and unfair to the U.S., or by terms unenforceable and built only on Soviet assurances of good intentions, then the answers to our opening question is an obvious NO. U.S. security will not be enhanced by ratifying such a treaty, and a bipartisan majority of the Senate will reject it without hesitation.

Let us hope that these events do not occur. All of us would prefer to curb arms competition and reduce the risk of war, but none of us will do so at the risk of future U.S. security. It is the responsibility of all of us to make special efforts to inform ourselves in these difficult matters. The advice of the people, and the judgement of the Senate must be based on a reasoned understanding of strategic issues.

#####

REMARKS OF SENATOR BOB DOLE
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

HYATT REGENCY
ATLANTA, GEORGIA
OCTOBER 22, 1977

Elizabeth and I are honored to join you at this great convention of Republican women.

During the last several months, I've had the opportunity to travel throughout the country a good bit, and I've addressed quite a few Republican audiences along the way.

I have found time and time again that Republicans all over America are looking to the future with a new sense of confidence and optimism. It shows in the vigor of their campaign efforts -- which have enabled us to win special congressional elections in Washington, Minnesota and Louisiana.

This party is on the move again, going full speed ahead toward a great Republican year in 1978. The resurrection of the Republican Party never seems to get as much attention as the obituaries we get every few years. The death of our party has been predicted -- and even celebrated -- dozens of times over the last forty years. But somehow the funeral is always called off.

That kind of defeatist talk was heard once again last year when we lost the presidential election. But we have proven this year that the Republican Party is alive and well and a political force to be reckoned with.

We are moving steadily away from the elitist image that has plagued our party too long. We've lost too many elections simply because we're perceived as the party that cares for the rich and not the poor; the businessman and not the consumer; the industrialist and not the environmentalist; those who are well off and not those who need help.

We've gone too long as the party that can only say "no." Well, just saying "no" won't do -- criticizing Democrats is not enough -- in fact it is sometimes counter-productive. We need them, and Independents as well.

We've got to reach out to new voters -- to all Americans. We must have well-qualified, attractive candidates and organize neighborhoods that may never have seen a Republican before.

We cannot disregard these voters if we expect to be something more than a frustrated, quibbling voice crying in the wilderness.

Still, we must not lose sight of the fact that the Democratic Party and its leadership are not without their faults -- and that exposing those faults to the American people is a principal duty of the opposition party. To do less would be an abdication of our responsibilities.

LEADERSHIP NEEDED

You know the story of the guy who was told by Carter forces that if he voted for Jerry Ford, within a year our country would be adrift, our foreign policy would be in disarray, our adversaries would have contempt for us and our allies would be suspicious of us, our economy would be in shambles, business would turn against the Administration and so would labor and so would women and blacks.

In spite of all that, he voted for Jerry Ford anyway. And sure enough, our country is adrift, our foreign policy is in disarray, our economy is stagnant . . .

Our country today needs leadership. Americans thought they were electing a man who would consult the national interest in leading this nation, and instead we've got a fellow who consults Pat Caddell, his pollster. I might not mind so much if Caddell was helping the President full time, but he spends most of his time working for the private sector. If he was a Republican, that would be called a conflict of interest.

-2-

I checked the other day to see what President Carter had accomplished in the last nine months, so I could praise him for something. Believe me, the list is not long.

Maybe the next nine months will produce more. For patriotic reasons, I look ahead with hope. But based on precedent, I have to look ahead with trepidation.

ENERGY

Domestically, the chief initiative of the Carter Administration has been his energy proposal. Let me say first that this is not a partisan issue. And let me say second that I don't believe that the Congress has treated it as a partisan issue. It is, after all, a Democratic Congress, and it is a Congress Jimmy Carter said he would get along with much better than Jerry Ford did. So I think we can all agree that our energy situation and the problem of passing an energy bill is not one that can be laid at the door of the Republican minority in Congress.

You know who initiated this mess as well as I do. President Carter did. The so-called National Energy Plan is not an energy bill to begin with. It is a giant tax bill. It is inflationary. It is designed to redistribute income, which is another way of buying votes with other people's money. Even with the redistribution of income it would heavily damage the real income of the lowest income groups in America.

While Congress wrestles with the problem, the President is jumping up and down, calling names and talking about "the people" -- which is his version of leadership.

His so-called policy for "the people," would have provided no more energy for the people, no more safety for the people from Arab economic blackmail -- from embargoes and boycotts -- no more assurance for the people that they won't face one energy crisis after another, each worse than the last; it would have moved billions of dollars of the people's money around through rebates and other income redistribution schemes -- all this for "the people."

That is just a lot of patronizing rhetoric. Jimmy Carter has learned the language of populism without bothering to learn the point of it. Which is just another example of his devotion to style over substance.

That's the problem with his design of the energy policy, and that's the problem with his defense of it.

Labor opposes that bill, consumer groups oppose it, business opposes it, key members of his own party oppose it, and putting all that opposition aside, the overriding fact is that the White House itself did a very, very bad job of selling the bill to its own leaders in Congress.

So the fiasco belongs wholly and exclusively to President Carter. He refuses to claim it, naturally. But he can't lay it off on all the Democratic special interest groups who oppose the bill -- he's already in enough hot water with them.

So who gets the booby prize? The oil industry. Why? Because Pat Caddell marched into the Oval Office with the startling news that the energy companies are unpopular with the American public. So now it's their fault that Carter has still another political catastrophe on his hands. They are guilty of "war profiteering," according to Carter. They are ripping off "the people." I turned the television on after he'd started his attack and I couldn't believe he was talking about the business leaders and the hundreds of thousands of working men and women who take the financial and sometimes physical risks and labor so long and hard to provide energy for this nation.

POLITICS OF POLARITY

That isn't leadership. That isn't populism. That is the plain old politics of polarity. Turn one group against another -- blame your failures on one group of Americans and curry favor with another at the same time.

A year ago we were being asked, "Why not the best?"

Why not, indeed? The question remains today. You don't call forth a people's best effort by appealing to their worst instincts. That is the political equivalent of moral bankruptcy. And that is what Carter is resorting to as his failures pile up and his approval rating goes down.

And if the first nine months are any indication, we're going to have a lot more of it over the next thirty-nine.

I am concerned about what those thirty-nine months may bring. We have problems today in this country which require that all our people work together and pull together, and not be pulled apart. We do have an energy problem. It is severe. It will require leadership to solve it. And we don't have that leadership. There will be an energy bill of some kind. I don't know if it will be adequate. But it will be a Congressional bill, not the Administration bill, and that is the beginning of the Congress taking the leadership which is not being provided elsewhere.

Today our economy is faltering. Our dollar is weak. Our business community is rapidly losing confidence in the commercial environment. The recovery which began with the Ford economic policies is being frittered away, and we are looking ahead to a renewed surge of inflation with no reduction in unemployment, and that means recession. You don't solve those problems with fireside chats and Town Meetings and symbolic gestures and all the other public relations gimmicks that pass for leadership today in Washington.

FOREIGN POLICY

We are in trouble at home today and we are in greater trouble abroad.

The Soviet Union's success in manipulating the Carter Administration has been astounding. Secretary Vance went to Moscow and was sent home empty-handed. Now, to get back into the good graces of Moscow, the Soviets have been invited back into the Middle East. We will shortly see how much further Carter has been willing to go to appease Brezhnev when the SALT treaty is presented to Congress for review.

The Panama Canal fiasco is another triumph of style over substance. We got all the trappings of a treaty -- the signing ceremony, the White House dinner, all the chatter about what an historical step the Administration was taking, and after all that they remembered that the Constitution requires the Senate to play a role in the process. Which has been a disappointing discovery, apparently. We think there are some problems with the treaty, and Carter says there aren't because he and Mr. Torrijos have an understanding. They don't want to put the understanding in the treaty, however, because if they do, they say, neither country will accept it. That concerns me.

The President said last week that the American people don't understand the treaty. That may be true. After all, the contents were kept secret until the last moment. It was bad enough that we didn't know how it was worked out. On top of that we didn't even know what was worked out until the parties started and the flashbulbs were popping.

It wouldn't surprise me if the American people don't understand the treaty, when the President has demonstrated that he doesn't understand it himself. He and General Torrijos had to get together two weeks ago to discuss the intent and the meaning of the document they had signed a month ago. I certainly hope, when he gets down to signing a SALT agreement, he understands what he's signing and that we all interpret it in the same way.

I don't oppose change concerning the Panama Canal -- perhaps we need a new treaty. I do oppose this one, however. I think we need to have a treaty that protects our rights and interests, and I think we need to have the same understanding of it that the Panamanians have.

As you know, I released a lowly "classified" document recently that I thought would help clarify some of the differences. I thought that would be useful since we couldn't clarify the agreement. And, of course, the Administration was upset -- which surprised me. I was just trying to help the President run an open Administration, the way he said he would. The contents of that cable weren't a secret to the Panamanians -- just to Americans. And if that vital piece of information hadn't been publicized -- the information that Panama didn't agree with the interpretation of the treaty which the Carter people were putting out -- I doubt seriously that the Carter-Torrijos "clarification" would have been issued last week.

I can't predict the outcome of the situation. But I do think it demonstrates the danger of rushing around the international arena in pursuit of a few headlines. I would feel a lot more comfortable if they would get a little practice in diplomacy on something easy -- say the U.S. Canadian border disputes -- until they get the hang of it.

The difficulty is that there does not seem to be a capacity for growth there, or a willingness to learn.

MIDEAST

Instead, failure breeds further failure, and we now see the security of our closest ally in the Middle East being placed in grave jeopardy through Jimmy Carter's desperate search for a success in international affairs. We can't push Russia around, or China, or any of our European allies, and even little Panama has maneuvered us around as she chooses.

The one nation most susceptible to U.S. pressure tactics is Israel. And so we are applying the pressure; we have invited the Soviet Union to help us apply it; we have thereby assured the Arab nations and their terrorist front groups that we are willing to apply as much as necessary to help them get through propaganda and specious diplomacy what they have failed to take in four wars of aggression.

-4-

I do not believe that the people of this country elected Jimmy Carter to squander away our prestige and credibility among the nations of the world. I do not believe he was elected to use what has been described as "brutal pressure" to try to force an ally like Israel to move against its own security interests, just because he is down in the polls and needs a success to shore up his image. I do not believe he was elected to divide our people, but to keep them united.

"President" is a nine letter word, and Jimmy Carter hasn't gotten past the first two. He has not abdicated the role of President; he has yet to assume it. And the hour is growing late for all of us: for Democrats and Republicans alike. This is not a partisan issue. We are all Americans. Neither party has a monopoly on wisdom, or virtue, or vision, or decisiveness, or compassion, or strength.

NEXT YEAR'S ELECTIONS

I know we are concerned about the outcome of next year's elections, and I intend to work as hard as I can, just as you are all doing, to elect Republicans. And I know we always beat the tub about getting more Republicans in Congress because the combination of a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress is unhealthy. That's all true, normally. But this is not a normal situation. This Democratic Congress is not united with President Carter. In spite of the majority he ought to command there, he is being widely opposed because, while many may share a different philosophy of government than we do, they find no philosophy of government in the White House behind which they can unite.

That is the most important problem confronting us as a people -- and it affects both parties. I have no prescription for curing that problem. I simply say to you that the issue is not just Republican leadership vs. Democratic leadership. The issue is the absence of any leadership whatsoever.

This means that for the foreseeable future, national leadership will have to come from the Congress. Given that conclusion, this Party must demonstrate again that it is worthy of sharing the nation's leadership; and, we are, and we can demonstrate that, and I think we are already demonstrating it in the Congress. It is this demonstration of leadership which will help to carry our candidates in 1978, in my view.

#####

-3-

If the facts of this new agreement as reported in NEWSWEEK and elsewhere are true, then doing some simple arithmetic on my tablecloth, we find that this treaty would leave us with the following balance sheet by 1985:

	<u>U.S.</u>	<u>SOVIET</u>
ICBM PAYLOAD	2.5 million lbs.	9 million lbs.
ICBM WARHEADS	1650	6000
LONG-RANGE BOMBERS	120 B-52s	unlimited backfires (about 500 by 1985)

MEASURE UP

Returning to the four issues of former Arms Control Director Ikle, how do these terms measure up?

First, deterrence: it is hard to see how such a record of U.S. concessions resulting in such lop-sided numbers could strengthen Soviet fear of U.S. counterattack. It would seem to me deterrence would be weakened, not strengthened.

Second, even balance: the imbalance would seem to be staggering.

Third, reductions: there are indeed U.S. reductions, but net Soviet increases.

Fourth, enforceable and verifiable: it is agreed in the intelligence community that a 600 km limit on cruise missiles is not verifiable, but other enforcement arrangements seems so far to have been a subject deferred by the Administration.

It is difficult to believe that any President could be so ill-advised as to conclude such a treaty as described above. Let us hope these many authoritative news stories are wrong.

A treaty cannot be achieved except by limitations unequal and unfair to the U.S., or by terms unenforceable and built only on Soviet assurances of good intentions, then the answers to our opening question is an obvious NO. U.S. security will not be enhanced by ratifying such a treaty, and a bipartisan majority of the Senate will reject it without hesitation.

Let us hope that these events do not occur. All of us would prefer to curb arms competition and reduce the risk of war, but none of us will do so at the risk of future U.S. security. It is the responsibility of all of us to make special efforts to inform ourselves in these difficult matters. The advice of the people, and the judgement of the Senate must be based on a reasoned understanding of strategic issues.

#####

The popular outcry has been loudest on the Canal Treaty, perhaps because the people see it against this background of withdrawal and apology.

CARTER ADMINISTRATION AND S.A.L.T.

But the most important of all the Carter Administration national security departures has to receive wide notice. So as I indicated, I would like to talk with you briefly about S.A.L.T., the negotiations the Carter Administration have been conducting with the Russians.

It is a paradox that this most important of all national security issues for the American people seems the most elusive and complicated in detail. To master its complexity requires the learning of a new language of MIRVs and MARVs, of ALCMs and SLCM, MLBMs, SSNX-18S and SNDVS. But once mastered, this language reveals SALT to be like all policy matters, amenable to applied common sense. Let us review the simple issues of SALT, stripped of jargon and ask some common sense questions.

The first important question must be: What is it we seek to achieve through SALT negotiations? The answer can only be to achieve increased security of the United States and its allies. The answer to this question will be the sole criterion by which we in the U.S. Senate must judge the coming SALT treaty.

By which issues do we judge the fairness and balance of the treaty limitations to find whether it increases or decreases our security?

FOUR CRITERIA

Fred Ikle, recent Director the Arms Control Agency has suggested the four criteria by which we should measure that success or failure in a SALT treaty.

First, a SALT treaty ought to strengthen deterrence. Deterrence simply means dissuading the Soviets from attacking us or our allies by persuading them that the consequences to them of attacking us are worse than anything they could gain by doing so. SALT should strengthen that dissuasion.

Second, SALT must secure an even balance -- real self-evident equality or parity.

Third, SALT should achieve some reduction in nuclear arsenals and ease the burden on taxpayers.

Fourth, the treaty must be strictly enforceable and verifiable without having to place blind trust in the Russians.

Now let us turn to what actual limitations seem near to agreement. The Senate as a whole has not been briefed, so for details on what has now been agreed we must rely on recent news articles quoting "informed sources." To compare where we started from, we have the March proposal made public by the President himself:

CEILING ON STRATEGIC LAUNCH VEHICLES, ICBMS, SUB-LAUNCHED SLBMS, AND LONG-RANGE BOMBERS

- Carter proposed in March a ceiling of 1800
- the Russians insisted on 2250
- reported "compromise" 2250

CEILING ON MULTIPLE WARHEAD VEHICLES

- Carter proposed in March a ceiling of 1100
- the Russians insisted on 1320
- reported "compromise" 1320

CEILING ON LAND-BASED ICBMS

- Carter proposed in March a ceiling of 550
- the Russians insisted on 850
- reported "compromise" 850

LIMITS ON SOVIET HEAVY MISSILES (SIX TIMES THE PAYLOAD OF THE U.S. MINUTEMAN)

- Carter proposed in March [U.S. - 0] [Soviets - 150]
- the Russians insisted on 308
- reported "compromise" [U.S. - 0] [Soviets - 308]

LIMITS ON SOVIET BACKFIRE LONG-RANGE SUPERSONIC BOMBER

- Carter proposed in March strict numerical limits on backfire
- the Russians insisted there be no limits other than assurances they would not use it against the U.S.
- reported "compromise": no limits other than assurances

LIMITS ON U.S. SEA-LAUNCHED AND GROUND-LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILES

- Carter proposed in March there be no limits on U.S. medium range (up to 2500 km) cruise missiles
- the Russians insisted all SLCMS and GLCMS be limited to 600 km range (320 miles)
- reported "compromise": all SLCMS and GLCMS limited to 600 km range