

# Naval War College Review

---

Volume 36  
Number 4 *July-August*

Article 10

---

1983

## In My View

Douglas L. Clark  
*U.S. Navy*

J. A. Schweigart  
*USNR*

Theodore C. Taylor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

---

### Recommended Citation

Clark, Douglas L.; Schweigart, J. A.; and Taylor, Theodore C. (1983) "In My View," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 36 : No. 4 , Article 10.

Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol36/iss4/10>

This Additional Writing is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu](mailto:repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu).

# IN MY VIEW . . .



Ian Oliver

## No Violation This

In his article “The Trident System: Submarines, Missiles, and Strategic Doctrine” in the January-February 1983 issue, Commander Tritten states on page 65 that the SALT II Treaty limits the Trident C4 missile to a maximum of seven reentry vehicles (RVs), and that the reported USN deployment of eight RVs on this missile would thus be in technical violation of this admittedly unratified treaty.

This is not the case. While it is true that the First Agreed Statement to both paragraphs 10 and 12 of Article IV of SALT II notes that the maximum number of RVs tested on the C4 as of 1 May 1979 was seven, the pertinent paragraph of the Treaty states that either side can flight test or deploy a maximum of fourteen RVs on *any* SLBM type then in testing or production, which would include the C4. The exact wording is:

Article IV, paragraph 12. Each Party undertakes not to flight-test or deploy SLBMs with a number of reentry vehicles greater than the maximum number of reentry vehicles with which an SLBM of either Party has been flight-tested as of May 1, 1979, that is, fourteen.

Commander Tritten might have confused the SLBM restrictions with the SALT II ICBM RV restrictions. Paragraph 10 of Article IV restricts the specified ICBMs to the maximum number of RVs that have been flight-tested on an ICBM *of that type*. As you can see, this individual type limitation is not included in the SLBM case.

While SALT II has not been ratified, both sides have agreed to abide by its provisions. We remain anxious to hold the Soviets to this pledge, and it is important to make clear that should we deploy more than seven RVs on the C4, we would not be in violation of the Treaty as long as we did not exceed fourteen.

Captain Douglas L. Clark, US Navy  
Nuclear Planning Branch  
International Military Staff  
NATO Headquarters, Brussels

## Who is Wilfred Burchett?

Sir:

It is interesting to see in the "Recent Books" section of the January-February 1983 issue that the Naval War College would select a book for its library authored by one Wilfred Burchett. It is even more interesting that the accompanying annotation only identifies this character as "an Australian journalist." More needs to be said in this regard.

Joel S. Lisker, chief counsel and staff director of the Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, recently made the following comments:

"Burchett is fairly well known among those who study [Soviet propaganda] as a mouthpiece for the Communists on a variety of issues.---[H]e was identified in sworn testimony by a former K.G.B. officer as a member of the Australian Communist Party who had virtually begged the K.G.B. to recruit him while he was working in Moscow.---[T]estimony of American and British soldiers who were P.O.W.s in Korea identified Burchett as assisting the North Koreans and Red Chinese in interrogating P.O.W.s who were abused when they refused to collaborate . . . ."

Senator Jeremiah Denton of Alabama had an encounter with Burchett when the Senator was a Navy commander and a P.O.W. in North Vietnam. He speaks of Burchett as a "cheap traitor" in his book *When Hell Was In Session*. In my view, anything written by Burchett should be consigned to the scrap heap.

J.A. Schweigart  
LT, CEC, USNR  
Lake Worth, Florida

## Cruel and Unusual Punishment

Sir,

The last book review, on page 111 of the March-April *Review*, contains an unfortunate error. Jellicoe's book, *The Submarine Peril*, does not contain anything on Jellicoe's version of the Battle of Jutland. The entire book makes reference to Jutland only once, on page 38, with a fragment of one sentence.

I suggest that whoever wrote this short review read *The Submarine Peril* as an act of penance. After that, the memory of having slogged through 227 pages of Jellicoe's tedious writing should serve to discourage such sloppy scholarship.

Theodore C. Taylor

(Editor's note: The sentence in question should read as follows: "Jellicoe published his own version of the event in 1919 in a book entitled *The Grand Fleet, 1914-1916: Its Creation, Development, and Work.*")