

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Poindexter, John: Files
Folder Title: Nuclear Freeze/Nuclear Policy (2)
Box: RAC Box 3

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name Poindexter, John: Files

Withdrawer

KML 12/20/2011

File Folder NUCLEAR FREEZE/NUCLEAR POLICY (2)

FOIA

F99-027/4

Box Number 12

WITTNER

48

ID	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
126276	MEMO	WHITE HOUSE TO ACTING SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	3	ND	B1

The above documents were not referred for declassification review at time of processing

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

1

Flo, ————— 4/2
Set up a "nuclear
freeze" file for me.

John

1

4/2

KAY:

WC said we should have a nuclear
freeze file.

j

2

Some misunderstanding has arisen regarding my response to President Brezhnev's recent proposal for a moratorium on nuclear missiles. While I welcome any overture by the Soviets suggesting a reduction to the threat of nuclear destruction, I do not believe his proposal went far enough.

It would leave the Soviet Union in a dangerous position of nuclear superiority by most measures while doing nothing to reduce the excessive level of nuclear warheads now in place. It would also be unverifiable.

My abiding goal is to reverse the uncivilized trend toward ever higher levels of nuclear weapons. At the same time history has proven that we cannot afford, in today's world, to act alone. We have tried that on several occasions in the past, only to witness an acceleration of Soviet programs. We can however by sensible, mutual agreement substantially reduce the numbers. I will wholeheartedly support and work for significant, verifiable reductions and an equitable balance.

Today the Soviets have 900 nuclear warheads mounted on 300 new intermediate-range missiles capable of reaching all of Western Europe, North Africa and the Middle East. NATO has no corresponding system able to strike the Soviet Union. To maintain effective deterrence, our NATO allies in 1979 proposed the deployment of cruise missiles and the Pershing II starting next year.

Last November I proposed that we forego that deployment in exchange for Soviet agreement to dismantle their intermediate range systems already in place. Our representatives in Geneva have tabled a draft treaty to this effect.

Here at home we are making plans for talks with the Soviet Union aimed at a substantial reduction of long-range strategic nuclear systems both here and in the Soviet Union. I am absolutely committed to this goal. If the Soviets will enter these talks with a corresponding commitment, we can achieve an equitable, verifiable agreement at reduced levels.

If the Soviets will cooperate in such an undertaking, we just might bring about an advance in civilized discourse among nations.

Tonight I want to touch briefly on our continuing efforts to enhance the prospects for world peace through meaningful reductions in the levels of nuclear arms.

We are living in an age when man has conceived the means of his own destruction. If we misuse it, modern technology, which has bettered the lives of millions, could destroy modern civilization as we know it. Since the discovery of nuclear weapons, the supreme interest of the United States has been to ~~avoid the extremes of either nuclear blackmail or nuclear catastrophe.~~ ^{and} ~~avoid~~ ^{avoid} ~~the extremes~~ ^{of either} nuclear blackmail or nuclear catastrophe. Deterrence and arms control have become essential and inseparable parts of American national security policy. The success of such a policy will mean not only the reduction of danger but also the release of resources so necessary for the alleviation of poverty and other social ills plaguing modern society on a global scale.

Last November I laid out the basic objectives of American arms control policy. I stressed our commitment to negotiate in good faith the reduction of both nuclear and conventional arms. I made a specific proposal to eliminate entirely two types of new US missiles about which the Soviet Union has expressed concern, if the Soviet Union would eliminate its missiles of similar type.

We remain committed to these objectives. In Geneva we have put forward the text of a treaty with the Soviet Union which embodies the proposals on intermediate range missiles I made on November 18. In Vienna we are negotiating, along side ~~of~~ our Allies, on reductions on non-nuclear forces in Europe. Here in Washington, we are completing our preparations to begin negotiations with the Soviet Union on strategic weapons aimed at achieving substantial reductions in nuclear arms to levels that

*April '53 - Eisenhower 19 drafts
appeal to Soviets in 18 Nov*

are equal and verifiable.

I share the sense of urgency expressed by many in this country and abroad that we move ahead in these areas. Is there nothing we can do to reduce the danger to civilization? Yes, there is, provided that we achieve sensible, mutual agreement with the Soviet Union to reduce these monstrous arsenals. I will work wholeheartedly to achieve an equitable and verifiable balance at much lower levels. Negotiations with the Soviet Union must be carefully prepared if they are to produce results worthy of the support of the American people, approval by the American Congress and acceptance by the international community. We do not want to repeat past mistakes. We do not want an arms control process that sends hopes soaring only to end in dashed expectations.

Last week a distinguished group of Senators and Congressmen submitted resolutions in the Senate and the House calling for sharp reductions of US and Soviet nuclear weapons to equal force levels. These are essential elements of truly effective arms control and have my support.

agrees. We welcome the support of these and are consistent with myself.

The concerns of those who support a freeze on nuclear weapons are also my concern. But a freeze is ^{simply} not good enough. A freeze ~~under~~ ^{level} ~~current~~ ^{sit} circumstances would perpetuate an unstable and unequal strategic balance. Perhaps more importantly, a freeze would foreclose the possibility of negotiated reductions because it would remove any incentive for the Soviets to negotiate seriously. We must be honest with ourselves. The only circum-

May 1

stances in which the Soviets are prepared to negotiate seriously is when the West shows it is prepared to respond to the Soviet military buildup. Finally, a freeze would be virtually impossible to verify forcing us to rely for our security on trust in the Soviet Union.

We must do better. This is why I have and will continue to put forward realistic proposals for arms control agreements on nuclear and conventional forces. Such agreements will reduce the risk of war, ^{conventional or nuclear} lower the level of armaments, and enhance global security. We can accept no less.

American national security policy is based on enduring principles. American leaders have long understood that the objective of our defense efforts must be to promote peace, deter conflict, and reduce the risk of war. For over a third of a century we and our Allies have preserved the peace through a strategy of deterrence. The essence of this strategy is to prevent war by presenting the would-be aggressor with risks that far exceed any conceivable gain.

Together with our Allies in the Atlantic Alliance, every President in the post-war period has followed this deterrent strategy. It has earned the overwhelming bipartisan support of the Congress and the country at large. Through our defense efforts we must maintain the military balance upon which peace depends. Through arms control we must seek to reinforce this equilibrium and shift it to lower levels of effort and risk. This will be my policy in the days ahead.

*No for use -
"peace is indivisible"*

weat

Tonight I want to touch briefly on our continuing efforts to enhance the prospects for world peace through meaningful reductions in the levels of nuclear arms.

We are living in an age when man has conceived the means of his own destruction. If we misuse it, modern technology, which has bettered the lives of millions, could destroy modern civilization as we know it. Since the discovery of nuclear weapons, the supreme interest of the United States has been to ~~avoid~~ ^{deter} the ~~extremes~~ ^{dangerous} of either nuclear blackmail or nuclear ~~catastrophe~~ ^{war}. Deterrence and arms control have become essential and inseparable parts of American national security policy. The success of such a policy will mean not only the reduction of danger but also the release of resources so necessary for the alleviation of poverty and other social ills plaguing modern society on a global scale.

Last November I laid out the basic objectives of American arms control policy. I stressed our commitment to negotiate in good faith the reduction of both nuclear and conventional arms. I made a specific proposal to eliminate entirely two types of new US missiles about which the Soviet Union has expressed concern, if the Soviet Union would eliminate its missiles of similar type.

We remain committed to these objectives. In Geneva we have put forward the text of a treaty with the Soviet Union which embodies the proposals on intermediate range missiles I made on November 18. In Vienna we are negotiating, along side of our Allies, on reductions on non-nuclear forces in Europe. Here in Washington, we are completing our preparations to begin negotiations with the Soviet Union on strategic weapons aimed at achieving substantial reductions in nuclear arms to levels that

are equal and verifiable.

I share the sense of urgency expressed by many in this country and abroad that we move ahead in these areas. Is there nothing we can do to reduce the danger to civilization? Yes, there is, provided that we achieve sensible, mutual agreement with the Soviet Union to reduce these monstrous arsenals. I will work wholeheartedly to achieve an equitable and verifiable balance at much lower levels. Negotiations with the Soviet Union must be carefully prepared if they are to produce results worthy of the support of the American people, approval by the American Congress and acceptance by the international community. We do not want to repeat past mistakes. We do not want an arms control process that sends hopes soaring only to end in dashed expectations.

Last week a distinguished group of Senators and Congressmen submitted resolutions in the Senate and the House calling for sharp reductions of US and Soviet nuclear weapons to equal force levels. These are essential elements of truly effective arms control agreements. *We welcome* and have my support. *then proposal supports*

The concerns of those who support a freeze on nuclear weapons are also my concern. But a freeze *at current levels* is not good enough. A freeze *at current levels* under current circumstances would perpetuate an unstable and unequal strategic balance. Perhaps more importantly, a freeze would foreclose the possibility of negotiated reductions because it would remove any incentive for the Soviets to negotiate seriously. We must be honest with ourselves. The only circum-

stances in which the Soviets are prepared to negotiate seriously is when the West shows it is prepared to respond to the Soviet military buildup. Finally, a freeze would be virtually impossible to verify forcing us to rely for our security on trust in the Soviet Union.

We must do better. This is why I have and will continue to put forward realistic proposals for arms control agreements on nuclear and conventional forces. Such agreements will reduce the risk of war, lower the level of armaments, and enhance global security. We can accept no less.

American national security policy is based on enduring principles. American leaders have long understood that the objective of our defense efforts must be to promote peace, deter conflict, and reduce the risk of ^{conventional or nuclear} war. For over a third of a century we and our Allies have preserved the peace through a strategy of deterrence. The essence of this strategy is to prevent war by presenting the would-be aggressor with risks that far exceed any conceivable gain.

Together with our Allies in the Atlantic Alliance, every President in the post-war period has followed this deterrent strategy. It has earned the overwhelming bipartisan support of the Congress and the country at large. Through our defense efforts we must maintain the military balance upon which peace depends. Through arms control we must seek to reinforce this equilibrium and shift it to lower levels of effort and risk. This will be my policy in the days ahead.

~~Use~~

Nuclear deterrence is a necessary element

11

OPENING REMARKS FOR DRAFTING SESSION ON "THE FREEZE"

I APPRECIATE YOUR COMING.

OUR PURPOSE IS TO PREPARE AN OPENING STATEMENT FOR THE PRESIDENT TO USE AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF HIS PRESS CONFERENCE TO DEAL WITH CALLS FOR A NUCLEAR FREEZE--WHETHER BY HATFIELD-KENNEDY, JACKSON-WARNER OR OTHERS.

THE PRESIDENT HAS REVIEWED YOUR INPUT PROVIDED OVER THE COURSE OF RECENT WEEKS.

HE HAS ABSORBED IT.

--HE UNDERSTANDS THE FALLACY OF ADOPTING THE TERM FREEZE.

--HE UNDERSTANDS THE TRAP REPRESENTED BY FREEZING THE CURRENT IMBALANCE AS PROPOSED BY KENNEDY-HATFIELD.

--HE UNDERSTANDS HOW IT REMOVES ANY INCENTIVE FOR EFFECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS

--HE ALSO UNDERSTANDS HOW IT IS VIRTUALLY UNVERIFIABLE.

THERE IS, HOWEVER, ONE POINT WHICH HAS BEEN MISSING FROM YOUR INDIVIDUAL INPUTS. THIS IS THE INFUSION OF CONCERN FOR THE EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR WAR. SPECIFICALLY, THE PRESIDENT MUST BE SEEN AS CONCERNED FOR THE HUMANITARIAN DIMENSION OF THE ISSUE. HE MUST COUNTER THE IMAGE OF BEING A WAR-MONGER.

THE PRESIDENT HAS SPENT THREE DAYS IN PERSONAL DRAFTING. HE HAS HAD THE BENEFIT OF CAP'S AL'S AND GENE'S WRITTEN PROPOSALS.

THIS MORNING HE PROVIDED ME HIS FINAL VERSION WHICH STRESSED THIS HUMANITARIAN DIMENSION.

HE ASKED THAT WE EXPAND THIS ELEMENT EVEN FURTHER.

ON SUBSTANCE, HE IS PERSUADED THAT WE MUST SUPPORT THE POSITIVE ELEMENTS OF THE JACKSON-WARNER RESOLUTION. SPECIFICALLY HE BELIEVES WE MUST SUPPORT THE CALL IN IT FOR REDUCTIONS. HE ACCEPTS THAT WE CANNOT:

--CALL FOR A FREEZE IN ANY RESPECT OR

--CALL FOR THE ULTIMATE ELIMINATION OF ALL NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

THIS THEN IS OUR GUIDANCE. I HAVE ASKED AL HAIG TO PREPARE A WORKING DRAFT AND WOULD LIKE TO TURN TO AL NOW SO THAT WE CAN PROCEED.

WE MUST SEND A DRAFT TO THE PRESIDENT THIS EVENING.

new Freeze file

Kay?

Only Russian too far
"D. M. ..."

FOREIGN POLICY QUESTIONS

Arms Control

1. Over 70% of the American people say they want a freeze on the nuclear arms race. Political leaders of both parties, nuclear experts and leading editorial writers are also endorsing the concept. Are you in favor of a freeze now? Would you favor a freeze after further negotiations? Or do you totally oppose the idea?

2. Do you believe that the United States has enough military power to defend itself against a Soviet attack?

freeze & hold
health & succession
4 this worth saying

Follow-up: Well, if that is so, why do we need more arms? Why can't we just freeze the arms race now?

W.K.
Vitas
shif to
of same

Salvador
Brow-Cosel
Pumotus

55 this mountain and

3. As you yourself have said many times, all the negotiations with the Russians in the past have led to the biggest arms race in history. Why aren't Kennedy and Hatfield right when they say that calls for new negotiations are only a figleaf -- that they are really hiding your plans to carry forward a huge increase in America arms.

Cuba
Ming
no negotiation

Wharvey

not lies

eye

Polish people

4. Whatever happened to the idea of linkage? You said many times that as long as the Soviets were misbehaving in Afghanistan and Poland, we could not do business as usual with them. Now you seem hell bent to get to the bargaining table. Are you just caving in to the latest public opinion polls?

Follow-up #1: How do you expect to bring progress in Poland and Afghanistan if you now tell the Russians, Let's get back to the bargaining table and be friends again. Aren't these inconsistent?

Follow-up #2: Let's come at the issue another way. You are now pursuing serious economic sanctions against the Soviets in order to tighten the screws on Poland and Afghanistan. Do you really think this will create a suitable atmosphere for nuclear arms talks with the Soviets?

6. Has there been any progress on INF at Geneva?

7. Have you decided yet what Brezhnev meant when he threatened to move Soviet missiles closer to the U.S.? Did he mean Cuba? What would your reaction be to that?

8. Why not meet with Brezhnev now?

9. What's happened to closing the "window of vulnerability" given the Senate setback to your MX plan?

10. Goldwater says Soviets don't want war -- do you agree?

11. Brezhnev illness -- outlook? What if he died?

Central America

1. A year ago Robert D'Aubbisson was denied a visa to the U.S. because his presence was judged "prejudicial to the U.S. interest." The former U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador called him a "pathological killer." Can you continue to provide U.S. support -- or will Congress let you -- if he is the leader of the new interim government or the power behind the throne? What if Duarte is shunted aside by a right wing coalition?

2. Are you now prepared to support negotiations between the government of El Salvador and the rebels?

3. In view of General Walters' recent talks with Castro, what negotiations are going on between the U.S. and Cuba?

4. The Soviets have apparently violated the 1962 understandings yet again with the shipment of MIG 23's to Cuba. Your Administration has spoken time and again on the Cuban problem. What are you doing about it and going to do about it?

17

5. When will the U.S.-Nicaragua talks arranged by Mexico begin? Are you prepared to pledge that the U.S. will not seek to destabilize the Nicaraguan Government?

6. If you are so enthusiastic about the elections in El Salvador, why the benign, "no comment" position on the coup in Guatemala? What are the implications of that coup for U.S. policy?

Mideast

1. Many observers believe the Israelis are planning to annex the West Bank. What would your reaction be to such an action?

2. Is there any real hope for the Camp David process when Mubarek won't go to Jerusalem, when the West Bank is filled with violence, when the autonomy talks seem to be stalled? Isn't a new U.S. initiative essential?

3. Wouldn't there be more progress in the Mideast if Begin were out of power?

Poland

1. There seems to be little improvement in the situation in Poland. When will you take the actions you said would be forthcoming if the situation failed to improve? Why not declare Poland in default?
2. Why has the Administration apparently given up on the pipeline? What did the Buckley Mission accomplish?
3. What have so-called allies done to help us on Poland? How long can U.S. taxpayers pick up the bill for defending Europe when the allies fail to act more decisively on such a key issue as Poland?

China

1. Are you prepared to risk the U.S./Peking strategic relationship over a spare parts sale to Taiwan?

OR 91

Finally I want to express our continuing efforts to enhance the prospects for world peace. That is particularly necessary in view of the ~~conflict~~

~~There has been~~ some confusion voiced regarding my response to President Brezhnev's recent proposal for a moratorium on nuclear missiles. While I welcome any overture by the Soviets suggesting a reduction to the threat of nuclear destruction, ~~I do not believe~~ his proposal ^{did not go} ~~went~~ far enough.

It would leave the Soviet Union in a dangerous position of nuclear superiority while ^{it would} doing nothing to lessen the danger inherent in the tens of thousands of nuclear warheads now in place.

Earlier in this century the civilized world abided by rules of warfare that protected civilian populations from attack. Then came World War II and the barbarious concepts of "total war"; a repudiation of civilization itself. Now in the name of national security military strategy is based on the ability to incinerate by the millions, men, women, children -- the non-combatants of the world.

Are we incapable of returning to that earlier level of civilization we had once achieved? (~~No nation can afford, in today's world, to unilaterally give up such weapons.~~) * We can however

by sensible, mutual agreement substantially reduce ^{these monstrous inhumane weapons} them in number. ~~No single nation can afford to take such action unilaterally but together we can,~~ I will wholeheartedly support and work for this to achieve a verifiable ~~reduction and~~ an equitable balance ^{at a greatly reduced number.} ~~When that is achieved we can then talk about an end to further production.~~

Today on the Western European front the Soviets have 900 nuclear warheads mounted on 300 intermediate-range missiles ~~These~~

~~are~~ capable of reaching all of Western Europe, North Africa and the Middle East. ~~We therefore~~ ^{Our allies have nothing in the way of a deterrent to this threat -} are building nuclear weapons requested

by our European Allies to be deployed in Western Europe ^{to provide such} ~~and~~ a deterrent.

Last November I proposed ^(UNSCAD) the total elimination of these weapons -- ours and theirs. Our representatives are in Geneva trying to negotiate such an agreement.

Here at home we are making plans for talks with the Soviet Union aimed at a substantial reduction of long-range strategic nuclear missiles both here and in the Soviet Union. If this can be achieved there must be mutual verification so as to eliminate suspicion and doubt.

If the Soviets will cooperate in such an undertaking we just might bring the world to an advance in civilization.

I'm pleased to endorse a measure now before the Congress - the ~~bill~~ resolution introduced by Sen. Jackson, ~~Warner & Mann~~ which calls for ~~the~~ substantial reduction in all nuclear weapons.

NUCLEAR ARMS OPENING STATEMENT

Tonight I want to touch briefly on ~~our continuing efforts~~ ^{what I view as} ~~to control the nuclear arms race.~~ ^{my foremost responsibility -- keeping the} ~~to be remembered for above all else, it is the role of peace-~~ ^{safeguarding the} ~~maker.~~ ^{peace,}

If there is one ~~thing I would like~~ ^{contribution} this Administration ~~to be remembered for above all else, it is the role of peace-~~ ^{could make to the betterment of mankind it would be to achieve} ~~maker.~~ ^{a permanent reduction of nuclear arms.} Twice in my lifetime I have seen the world plunge

blindly into tragic global wars that inflicted untold suffering on millions of innocent people. I share the determination of today's young people that such a tragedy -- which would be rendered even more terrible by the monstrous, inhumane weapons in the world's nuclear arsenals -- must never happen again. My goal is to reduce nuclear weapons dramatically, and to do so in a way that will assure lasting peace and security.

But protecting peace and security requires more than ~~a~~ ^{sentiment} ~~vague vision.~~ We must move forward with ~~carefully-thought-out~~ ^{serious} proposals that are verifiable and will work.

That is what we are doing ^{in Geneva.} Last November I laid out the basic objectives of American arms control policy. I stressed our commitment to negotiate in good faith the reduction of both nuclear and conventional arms. I made a specific proposal to eliminate entirely intermediate range missiles in Europe.

~~We~~ ^I remain committed to ~~these~~ ^{the goal} objectives. In Geneva we have put forward the text of a treaty with the Soviet Union which embodies the proposals on intermediate range missiles I made on November 18th. In Vienna, along with our allies, we are negotiating reductions of non-nuclear forces in Europe.

Here in Washington, we are completing preparations for talks with the Soviet Union on strategic weapons reductions. I hope those negotiations can begin this summer.

We know all too well from past experience that negotiations with the Soviet Union must be carefully prepared if they are to produce worthy results. We cannot afford to repeat past mistakes, to hastily arrive at an arms control process that sends hopes soaring only to end in dashed expectations.

Last week a distinguished group of Senators and Congressmen submitted resolutions to the Senate and House calling for major, verifiable reductions of U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons to equal force levels. This is an important move in the right direction, and these points are essential elements of a truly effective arms control agreement -- elements which are consistent with ^{my} ~~the~~ views of this Administration. I commend Senators Jackson and Warner and all those who joined with them in this important initiative.

I also understand the concern of those who call for a freeze of nuclear weapons. But a thorough examination of proposals to freeze nuclear forces at present levels has convinced me that they simply do not go far enough and are not fair enough.

A freeze under current conditions would perpetuate an unstable and unequal strategic balance. It would do nothing to reduce the danger inherent in the thousands of nuclear warheads now in place. Most importantly, a freeze would virtually wipe out the possibility of negotiating any new reductions

in nuclear weapons since the Soviets would have no incentives whatsoever to bargain seriously.

We must be honest with ourselves. The Soviets have only been prepared to negotiate seriously when the West showed that it was prepared to respond to a Soviet military buildup if necessary. A freeze on the current status quo would eliminate this indispensable Soviet incentive. Finally, a freeze would be virtually impossible to verify; our security would have to rely on the word of the Soviet Union alone.

We must do better than that. This is why I have and will continue to put forward realistic arms control agreements on nuclear and conventional forces. I want an agreement on strategic nuclear weapons that reduces the risk of war, lowers the level of armaments, and enhances global security. We can accept no less.

America's national security policy is based on enduring principles. Our leaders and our allies have long understood that the objective of our defense efforts has always been to deter conflict and reduce the risk of war, conventional or nuclear. For over a third of a century we and our allies have preserved the peace through a strategy of deterrence. In plain words, this has meant preventing war by presenting the other side with risks that far exceed any conceivable gain he could make by attacking.

Together with our partners in the Atlantic Alliance, every President in the post-war period has followed this strategy --

and it has worked. It has earned the overwhelming bipartisan support of the Congress and the country at large, and it has kept world peace.

I intend to hold true to this tested policy for peace: first, by maintaining a military balance that will deter aggression and foster peace and, secondly, by negotiating in good faith to lower the level of armaments so that the risk of war is further diminished and both the free peoples of the west and those who live under the Soviet system can turn more of their resources to building a better, more abundant life for their people.

This will be my policy in the ^{months} ~~days~~ ahead.

Yesterday, with the successful completion of the Columbia Space Shuttle's latest mission, we were all reminded of the great things the human race can achieve when it harnesses its best minds and efforts to a positive goal. Both the United States and the Soviet Union have written proud chapters in the peaceful exploration of outer space.

I invite the Soviet Union to join with us now to substantially reduce nuclear weapons and make an important breakthrough for lasting peace on earth.

3
OPTION

W

NUCLEAR ARMS OPENING STATEMENT

I think it would be timely to discuss our plans and our continuing efforts to enhance the prospect for world peace through arms control. Twice in my lifetime I have seen the world plunged blindly into global wars that inflicted untold suffering upon millions of innocent people. I share the determination of today's young people that such a tragedy -- which would be rendered even more terrible by the monstrous, inhumane weapons in the world's nuclear arsenals -- must never happen again.

While I welcome any overture by the Soviets which suggests reducing the threat of nuclear destruction, Mr. Brezhnev's proposal just doesn't go far enough. It would do nothing to lessen the danger inherent in the thousands of nuclear warheads now in place and it would leave the Soviet Union in a dangerous position of nuclear advantage. The only acceptable goal if we are to truly have peace and security is a substantial reduction in the number of nuclear weapons now in place.

Last November, I stressed our commitment to negotiate in good faith for the reduction of both nuclear and conventional arms. I made a specific proposal to eliminate entirely intermediate range missiles.

We remain committed to these goals:

- In Geneva we have proposed a treaty with the Soviet Union which embodies our proposals.
- In Vienna, along with our allies, we are negotiating reductions of conventional forces in Europe.

-- Here in Washington, we are completing preparations for talks with the Soviets on strategic weapons reductions.

We know all too well from past experience that negotiations with the Soviet Union must be carefully prepared. We cannot afford to repeat past mistakes, to arrive hastily at an arms control process that sends hopes soaring only to end in dashed expectations.

Last week a distinguished group of Senators and Congressmen submitted resolutions to the Senate and House calling for major, verifiable reductions of U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons to equal force levels. This is an important move in the right direction, and these points are essential elements of a truly effective arms control agreement -- elements which are consistent with the views of this Administration. I commend Senators Jackson and Warner and all those who joined with them in this important initiative.

I have and I will continue to seek realistic arms control agreements on nuclear and conventional forces. I want an agreement on strategic nuclear weapons that reduces the risk of war, lowers the level of armaments, and enhances global security. We can accept no less.

America's national security policy is based on enduring principles. Our leaders and our allies have long understood that the objective of our defense efforts has always been to deter conflict and reduce the risk of war, conventional or nuclear.

Together with our partners in the Atlantic Alliance, every President in the postwar period has followed this strategy -- and it has worked. It has earned the overwhelming bipartisan

support of the Congress and the country at large, and it has kept world peace.

Yesterday, with the successful completion of the Columbia Space Shuttle's latest mission, we were all reminded of the great things the human race can achieve when it harnesses its best minds and efforts to a positive goal. Both the United States and the Soviet Union have written proud chapters in the peaceful exploration of outer space.

I invite the Soviet Union to join with us now to substantially reduce nuclear weapons and make an important breakthrough for lasting peace on earth.

I believe the people of the world want a return to civilized behavior. Most of all they want peace. So do I. There have been four wars in my lifetime. We can begin the search for peace with an agreement to substantially reduce the number of nuclear weapons threatening all of us. I pledge to you my total commitment to that goal.

NSC/
March 31, 1982
5:00 p.m.

OPTION 1

NUCLEAR ARMS OPENING STATEMENT

I think it would be timely to discuss our plans and our continuing efforts to enhance the prospect for world peace through arms control. Twice in my lifetime I have seen the world plunged blindly into global wars that inflicted untold suffering upon millions of innocent people. I share the determination of today's young people that such a tragedy -- which would be rendered even more terrible by the monstrous, inhumane weapons in the world's nuclear arsenals -- must never happen again.

While I welcome any overture by the Soviets which suggests reducing the threat of nuclear destruction, Mr. Brezhnev's proposal just doesn't go far enough. It would do nothing to lessen the danger inherent in the thousands of nuclear warheads now in place and it would leave the Soviet Union in a dangerous position of nuclear advantage. The only acceptable goal if we are to truly have peace and security is a substantial reduction in the number of nuclear weapons now in place.

Last November, I stressed our commitment to negotiate in good faith for the reduction of both nuclear and conventional arms. I made a specific proposal to eliminate entirely intermediate range missiles.

We remain committed to these goals:

- In Geneva we have proposed a treaty with the Soviet Union which embodies our proposals.
- In Vienna, along with our allies, we are negotiating reductions of conventional forces in Europe.

-- Here in Washington, we are completing preparations for talks with the Soviets on strategic weapons reductions.

We know all too well from past experience that negotiations with the Soviet Union must be carefully prepared. We cannot afford to repeat past mistakes, to arrive hastily at an arms control process that sends hopes soaring only to end in dashed expectations.

Last week a distinguished group of Senators and Congressmen submitted resolutions to the Senate and House calling for major, verifiable reductions of U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons to equal force levels. This is an important move in the right direction, and these points are essential elements of a truly effective arms control agreement -- elements which are consistent with the views of this Administration. I commend Senators Jackson and Warner and all those who joined with them in this important initiative.

I have and I will continue to seek realistic arms control agreements on nuclear and conventional forces. I want an agreement on strategic nuclear weapons that reduces the risk of war, lowers the level of armaments, and enhances global security. We can accept no less.

America's national security policy is based on enduring principles. Our leaders and our allies have long understood that the objective of our defense efforts has always been to deter conflict and reduce the risk of war, conventional or nuclear.

Together with our partners in the Atlantic Alliance, every President in the postwar period has followed this strategy -- and it has worked. It has earned the overwhelming bipartisan

support of the Congress and the country at large, and it has kept world peace.

Yesterday, with the successful completion of the Columbia Space Shuttle's latest mission, we were all reminded of the great things the human race can achieve when it harnesses its best minds and efforts to a positive goal. Both the United States and the Soviet Union have written proud chapters in the peaceful exploration of outer space.

I invite the Soviet Union to join with us now to substantially reduce nuclear weapons and make an important breakthrough for lasting peace on earth.

I believe the people of the world want a return to civilized behavior. Most of all they want peace. So do I. There have been four wars in my lifetime. We can begin the search for peace with an agreement to substantially reduce the number of nuclear weapons threatening all of us. I pledge to you my total commitment to that goal.

big
(NSC/Bakshian/RR)
March 31, 1982
1:30 p.m.

82

W

OPTION 1

NUCLEAR ARMS OPENING STATEMENT

Twice in my lifetime I have seen the world plunged blindly into global wars that inflicted untold suffering upon millions of innocent people. I share the determination of today's young people that such a tragedy -- which would be rendered even more terrible by the monstrous, inhumane weapons in the world's nuclear arsenals -- must never happen again.

My goal is to reduce nuclear weapons dramatically, assuring lasting peace and security.

Last November, I stressed our commitment to negotiate in good faith for the reduction of both nuclear and conventional arms. I made a specific proposal to eliminate entirely intermediate range missiles

We remain committed to these goals:

- In Geneva we have proposed a treaty with the Soviet Union which embodies our proposals.
- In Vienna, along with our allies, we are negotiating reductions of conventional forces in Europe.
- Here in Washington, we are completing preparations for talks with the Soviets on strategic weapons reductions.

We know all too well from past experience that negotiations with the Soviet Union must be carefully prepared. We cannot afford to repeat past mistakes, to arrive hastily at an arms control process that sends hopes soaring only to end in dashed expectations.

Last week a distinguished group of Senators and Congressmen submitted resolutions to the Senate and House calling for major, verifiable reductions of U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons to equal force levels. This is an important move in the right direction, and these points are essential elements of a truly effective arms control agreement -- elements which are consistent with the views of this Administration. I commend Senators Jackson and Warner and all those who joined with them in this important initiative.

I have and I will continue to seek realistic arms control agreements on nuclear and conventional forces. I want an agreement on strategic nuclear weapons that reduces the risk of war, lowers the level of armaments, and enhances global security. We can accept no less.

America's national security policy is based on enduring principles. Our leaders and our allies have long understood that the objective of our defense efforts has always been to deter conflict and reduce the risk of war, conventional or nuclear.

This has meant preventing war by presenting the other side with risks that for exceed any conceivable gain.

Together with our partners in the Atlantic Alliance, every President in the postwar period has followed this strategy -- and it has worked. It has earned the overwhelming bipartisan support of the Congress and the country at large, and it has kept world peace.

Yesterday, with the successful completion of the Columbia Space Shuttle's latest mission, we were all reminded of the great things the human race can achieve when it harnesses its best minds and efforts to a positive goal. Both the United States and the Soviet Union have written proud chapters in the peaceful exploration of outer space.

I invite the Soviet Union to join with us now to substantially reduce nuclear weapons and make an important breakthrough for lasting peace on earth.

Fls,

—

Nuclear Freeze file.

V

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name
Poindexter, John: Files

Withdrawer
KM 12/20/2011
L

File Folder
NUCLEAR FREEZE/NUCLEAR POLICY (2)

FOIA
F99-027/4
WITTNER

Box Number
12

48

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
126276	MEMO WHITE HOUSE TO ACTING SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	3	ND	B1

The above documents were not referred for declassification review at time of processing
Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.