

U.S. to Build Missile Defense But Still Wants Arms Controls

By BERNARD GWERTZMAN
Star Staff Writer

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara says the U.S. will build a \$5 billion defense against future Red Chinese missile attack but argues that this in no way makes less urgent the need for an arms control agreement with Russia.

Nearly three-fourths of McNamara's major speech last night was devoted, in fact, to a discussion of the U.S.-Soviet nuclear balance, and the fact that both Russia and the United States "can mutually destroy one another."

He appealed to Russia to agree to the U.S. proposal for talks on limiting the size of missile and bomber arsenals, since both countries already have surplus weapons and are on the brink of what he called a "foolish and reckless" new arms race.

The Reaction

McNamara told a meeting of United Press International editors and publishers in San Francisco that the United States would begin production by the end of this year of the \$5 billion anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system to defend against possible attack from Red China in the mid-1970s.

Because China has such a rudimentary nuclear arsenal, this "thin" ABM system would have a relatively high degree of re-

Partial Text of McNamara's Speech
on the ABM. Page A-4

liability in case of attack, McNamara said.

Congressional reaction was generally favorable, although some military-minded legislators criticized the delay in going ahead with the "thin system."

Sen. Clinton P. Anderson, chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy subcommittee on security, said "the decision to proceed with the production and eventual deployment of an ABM system was required to insure our national security particularly in light of the Communist China nuclear threat."

Chairman L. Mendel Rivers, D-S.C., of the House Armed Services Committee, said "I hope it is not too late," noting that McNamara had "finally" come around to what military leaders and Congress had been urging for two years.

To Guard All U.S. Cities

But on the other side, Sen. J. William Fulbright, D-Ark., chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said the decision represented a "very serious failure of diplomacy," and predicted the "thin system" would "be thick before long."

Pentagon sources said the Nike-X defense system is designed to protect all U.S. cities and most missile sites. According to estimates, China by the mid-1970s will have 10 to 50 rudimentary intercontinental ballistic missiles.

If the United States had no defense, these Chinese missiles could kill between 5 and 10 million Americans, but with the ABM, losses could be cut to less than a million, sources said.

The Russians have such a powerful nuclear force, however, that no contemplated ABM system could prevent the death of more than 100 million Americans in case of attack.

But the "thin system" will

give protection in case of accidental attack by a few missiles—and will give some additional security to the underground U.S. offensive missiles, the Minute-men.

The ABM system now planned involves two types of defensive missiles and two types of radar.

The mainstay is the Spartan missile which would intercept incoming nuclear warheads a few hundred miles away—when they're still in the stratosphere. It would be guided by a special perimeter acquisition radar.

Any missiles that got through would be challenged in the atmosphere—less than 25 miles from target—by the Sprint missile, which is guided by missile sight radar.

The Spartan is chiefly responsible for protecting populated areas, and the Sprint for guarding missile sites.

A Slow Decision

Neither of these missiles has been tested in intercept attempts, but both will undergo such tests at Kwajalein Atoll in the Pacific. Sprint recently was given preliminary test firings at White Sands Missile Range, N.M.

The funds for the first year of the "thin system" production already have been allocated. Pentagon sources say that about

See MISSILES, Page A-6

Continued From Page A-1
\$360 million will probably be spent in the remainder of this fiscal year.

The decision to go ahead with the \$5 billion system was made somewhat reluctantly by the administration after nearly a year of trying to get the Russians interested in talks on a general freeze of all missiles.

Although the "thin system" is not designed to have any appreciable relation to U.S.-Soviet military balance, it was thought here that it would be easier to interest the Russians in talks before there was any deployment of the U.S. ABM.

Historically defense-minded Russia has begun building of a small-scale ABM system of its own around Moscow, and is in the midst of constructing a nation-wide net that may be a larger ABM system.

The deployment of Soviet ABMs led to strong concern in Congress that the United States could fall behind. The Joint Chiefs also favor matching the Soviet deployment.

A proposed "heavy ABM shield" would cost about \$40 billion, McNamara said, but would not buy "a significant improvement in our security."

He said that rather than spend money on a big ABM, the administration would simply improve and expand its offensive missile force.

"Every ABM system that is now feasible involves firing defensive missiles at incoming offensive warheads in an effort to destroy them," McNamara said.

"But what many commentators on this issue overlook is that any such system can rather obviously be defeated by an enemy simply sending more offensive warheads, or dummy warheads, than there are defensive missiles capable of disposing of them.

"Were we to deploy a heavy ABM system throughout the United States, the Soviets would clearly be strongly motivated to so increase their offensive capability as to cancel out our defensive advantage.

Sees Futility

"It is futile for each of us to spend \$4 billion, \$40 billion, or \$400 billion—and . . . to be relatively at the same point of bal-

ance on the security scale that we are now," he said.

This was essentially the same argument McNamara used at Glassboro, N.J., when President Johnson asked him to explain the U.S. view on the need for talks. But Soviet Premier Alexei N. Kosygin apparently showed no interest in this rather sophisticated argument, and merely said that Russia sees nothing provocative in building its ABM system.

McNamara acknowledged that the decision to go ahead with the "thin system" would produce "strong pressure" to expand the system into a Soviet-orientated one.

But he said "we must resist that temptation firmly . . . because our greatest deterrent against a Soviet strike is not a massive, costly, but highly penetrable ABM shield, but rather a fully credible offensive."