

Susanne Peters

The Germans and the INF Missiles

Getting Their Way in NATO's Strategy of Flexible Response



**Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft
Baden-Baden**

Contents

Preface	v
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Nature of the Problem	2
1.2 State of the Debate	6
1.3 Approach and Purpose of the Research	12
I The Contradictory Nature of the Strategy of Flexible Response	25
2 The Evolution of Flexible Response	25
2.1 The Nature of Nuclear Deterrence	26
2.2 Refinement of Nuclear War-Fighting Deterrence	30
2.2.1 Counterforce options as consistent elements in U.S. strategy	31
2.2.2 The continuation in PD 59 and Discriminate Deterrence	37
2.2.3 Retreat from massive retaliation	41
2.3 Consistent Problems in NATO's Hardware Decisions	44
2.3.1 The introduction of TNF	44
2.3.2 The deployment of IRBM in the 50s and 60s	46
2.3.3 Parallels between the plan for a Multilateral Force and the LRTNF decision	48
3 Flexible Response and Its Divergent U.S. and German Interpretations	53
3.1 Description of Flexible Response	56
3.2 Reactions in the Federal Republic	59
3.2.1 German parties	59
3.2.2 Institutionalising of research: the Ebenhausen Institute	61
3.3 Divergent National Doctrines (U.S./FRG)	64
3.3.1 Nuclear versus conventional	65
3.3.2 Strategic versus tactical	69
3.3.3 Political versus military use	70

3.3.4	Two incompatible first use concepts	71
3.4	Ambiguity of Flexible Response: the TNF Posture	73
3.4.1	Description of the TNF	73
3.4.2	Attempts at TNF reductions	75
3.5	German Apprehensions Concerning First Use	79
3.5.1	Nuclear weapons' employment planning	80
3.5.2	Supersession of NATO's command system	85
 II The NATO Dual-Track Decision as a Solution: The Federal Republic's Role within Its Evolution		93
4	Evolution of the LRTNF Decision within NATO	93
4.1	Evolution of the LRTNF Decision in the Nuclear Planning Group	94
4.1.1	Development of the Nuclear Planning Group (1965-67)	94
4.1.2	Provisional Political Guidelines (1967-1969)	96
4.1.3	Nuclear Consultation Procedures	99
4.1.4	Schmidt's success with the ADM	100
4.1.5	Follow-on use	102
4.1.6	German approval for military use	104
4.2	Restructuring NATO's TNF	106
4.2.1	U.S. revision of TNF	107
4.2.2	New technological developments: mininuke and neutron weapon	110
4.2.3	German revision of TNF	116
5	The LRTNF Decision as a Result of U.S.-German Conflicts over SALT	119
5.1	Offer of an Extension of the Consultation Process	121
5.2	The Federal Republic's Interest in FBS in SALT I	124
5.2.1	Another cycle of concern about the U.S. guarantee	124
5.2.2	Political and strategic value of the FBS	126
5.2.3	The FBS's relationship to SALT negotiations	129
5.3	Disagreement over Long-Range Cruise Missiles in SALT II	134
5.3.1	Development of the Cruise Missile	135
5.3.2	The Ban on Cruise Missiles	137
5.3.3	German insistence on the Cruise Missile	143
5.3.4	Schmidt's public interference with the SALT process	146
5.3.5	Schmidt's strategic doctrine	150
6	The Evolution of the Transatlantic Consensus	159
6.1	The Shifting Policy of the U.S. Administration	160

6.1.1	The establishment of the High Level Group	160
6.1.2	Transatlantic alliance of the Defence Secretaries' deputies	162
6.1.3	The Neutron bomb debacle	167
6.1.4	Presidential Review Memorandum 38	172
6.1.5	The Euro-American Workshop	174
6.1.6	The High Level Group's final report	176
6.2	The Predominance of German Positions	180
6.2.1	Non-singularity	180
6.2.2	The land-based option	183
6.2.3	Insistence on link to arms control	191

III The Solution of LRTNF Modernisation: Its Possible Employment Options **197**

7	Compatible Strategic Doctrines and Rationales	197
7.1	Key Justification for the LRTNF Decision: the SS-20	198
7.2	LRTNF as a Means for Escalation Control	203
7.2.1	Compensation of the loss of Escalation Dominance	204
7.2.2	Assumptions implied in the acceptance of flexible options	206
7.2.3	Parallels between Deliberate Escalation and Escalation Control	209
7.2.4	Dual role of LRTNF	210
7.2.5	Compatibility through the ambiguous Pershing II data	212
7.3	Conclusion: Blurring of Traditional Categories	216
8	LRTNF Modernisation as a Result of U.S. Doctrines	219
8.1	Pershing II and Cruise Missiles: Spearheads of a First Strike Strategy?	220
8.1.1	The political background	220
8.1.2	Characteristics of first strike weapons	222
8.1.3	The scenario of a disarming first strike	225
8.2	Schlesinger's Doctrine of Limited Strategic Options	229
8.2.1	Description of the doctrine of Limited Strategic Options	231
8.2.2	Basic features of the Limited Strategic Options	234
8.2.3	The role of the TNF in Schlesinger's doctrine	237
8.3	LRTNF for Follow-On Use	243
8.3.1	Counterforce targeting	244
8.3.2	Criticism of the LRTNF	246
8.3.3	Intolerable degree of vulnerability	250

9	LRTNF Modernisation as a Result of German Doctrines	259
9.1	Implementation of First Use Concept	259
9.1.1	Rühl's discussion of the Schlesinger doctrine	260
9.1.2	Governmental level	263
9.1.3	Theory of controlled nuclear strategic war	265
9.1.4	Pershing's employment options in German first use concept	275
9.1.5	LRTNF as a means for first and follow-on use	281
9.2	Predominance of German Doctrines in the Hardware Decision	284
9.2.1	The prevalence of the Pershing's extended range	284
9.2.2	Land deployment versus sea deployment	288
9.2.3	Vulnerability	292
10	Summary and Conclusions	297
10.1	Germany's Role in the Evolution of the LRTNF Decision	298
10.2	Germany and the Implementation of the 1979 Decision	299
10.3	The 1979 NATO Decision as Background to the INF Treaty	302
	Abbreviations	307
	Bibliography	311