Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Executive Secretariat, NSC: National Security Decision Directives (NSDD): Records Folder Title: NSDD 85 [Eliminating the Threat from Ballistic Missiles] (2 of 2) Box: RAC Box 5

To see more digitized collections visit: <u>https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material</u>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit: <u>https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories</u>

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

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

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

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name	EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT, NSC: NSDD FILE			hdrawer
mile Proteins	NODD OF FUR ADIA TRIC THE THREAT FROM		DLE	
File Folder	NSDD 85 [ELIMINATING THE THREAT FROM BALLISTIC MISSILES] (2 OF 2)		FOL	
			F05-	
Box Number	91289		2 WE	STWICK
ID Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
25305 MEMO	BILL CLARK TO GEORGE SHULTZ,	1	4/5/1983	B1
	CASPAR WEINBERGER, RE: CONSULATION WITH NATO ALLIES			
	CONCERNING THE PRESIDENT'S			
	STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE			
25306 MEMO	BOB LINHARD/RAY POLLOCK THRU	1	4/1/1983	B1
	RICHARD BOVERIE TO CLARK, RE:			
	REASSURANCE FOR THE ALLIES			
	CONCERNING THE PRESIDENT'S STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE			
	CONSULTATIONS ON THE PRESIDENT'S	3	ND	B1
	PROPOSAL FOR BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE	5	112	
	R 1/11/2008 NLRRF05-171			
25308 MEMO	COPY OF #25305 WITH ANNOTATIONS	1	ND	B1

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.

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name	EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT, NSC: NSDD FILE		Witl	hdrawer
			DLB	6/6/2006
File Folder	NSDD 85 [ELIMINATING THE THREAT FROM		FOL	A
	BALLISTIC MISSILES] (2 OF 2)		F05-	171
Box Number	91289		WES	STWICK
			2	
ID Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
25309 MEMO	RAY POLLOCK, BOB LINHARD, GIL RYE THRU BOVERIE TO CLARK, RE:	2	4/4/1983	B1

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-6 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(6) 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.

	4 Gg 4	NSC/S	PROFILE		NFIDENTIAL		ID	830	217	78	
		·		CLASSIFIED	db,	RECEIVED	01	APR	83	19	
TO	CLARK		FROM	LINHARD	alulou	DOCDATE	01	APR	83		4
	•		•	POLLOCK			01	APR	83	2	
				BOVERIE			01	APR	83		

STRATEGIC FORCES

1

KEYWORDS: NATO

.

SUBJECT: CONSULTATION W/ ALLIES RE PRES STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

ACTION: FOR SIGNATURE DUE: 04 APR 83 STATUS X FILES FOR ACTION FOR CONCURRENCE FOR INFO CLARK

COMMENTS

REF#	LOG	NSCIFID NSD	D85 (J/)
ACTION OFFICE	$\frac{C}{4/5} \frac{ACTION}{C}$		COPIES TO RL, RB, PO Sndif
DISPATCH	4/5 Cm	W/ATTCH	FILE FILE (C)

Ronald Reagan Library

	ection Name CUTIVE SECRETARIAT, NSC: NSDD: RECORDS		Withdrawer DLB 6/6/2	
NSD MISS	Folder D 85 [ELIMINATING THE THREAT FROM BALLISTIC SILES] (2 OF 2) Number		<i>FOIA</i> F05-171 WESTWIC	K
<i>Box</i> 1 9128			2	
ID	Document Type Document Description	No of pages	Doc Date	Restric- tions
2530	5 MEMO	1	4/5/1983	B 1

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]

Ronald Reagan Library

	ction Name CUTIVE SECRETARIAT, NSC: NSDD: RECORDS		Withdrawer DLB 6/6/2006	
NSDI MISS	Folder D 85 [ELIMINATING THE THREAT FROM BALLISTIC SILES] (2 OF 2) Number		FOIA F05-171 WESTWIC	K
91289			2	
ID	Document Type	No of	Doc Date	Restric-
	Document Description	pages		tions
2530	<i>Document Description</i> 6 MEMO	pages	4/1/1983	tions B1

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]

S/S 8308880



CONFIDENTIAL

. . .

United States Department of State

Washington, D.C. 20520 SYSTEM II 90373

83 MAR 25 PII: 54

March 25 WHITE HOUSE SITUATION ROOM

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. WILLIAM P. CLARK THE WHITE HOUSE

SUBJECT: GAMEPLAN FOR CONSULTATIONS ON THE PRESIDENT'S BMD INITIATIVE

As requested in the March 23 meeting on the President's speech chaired by General Boverie, attached is a suggested approach for consultations on ballistic missile defense for interagency clearance. We have provided an information copy of this memorandum to the Department of Defense.

Charles Hill

L. Paul Bremer, III Executive Secretary

Attachment: Draft Memorandum on Consultations

DECLASSIFIED By ______ NARA, Date ______

DECL: OADR

CONFIDENTIAL

25307

Consultations on the President's Proposal for Ballistic Missile Defense

Other governments were informed in advance of the President's March 23 speech, and he promised in the speech that there would be further consultations on his ballistic missile defense initiative. Subsequent to the speech we provided foreign governments with additional information on the initiative. Further consultations will now fall into four categories: our NATO Allies, other concerned and friendly governments, the Soviet Union and the non-aligned.

NATO

.: ...

The concerns of the NATO Allies are likely to focus on five areas:

1) The existing NATO strategy of flexible response, which holds out the prospect of nuclear escalation in order to deter a conventional attack. NATO governments, particularly the German, want to retain the threat of nuclear retaliation as the best means of preventing conventional war. They would not welcome technological developments which potentially denied NATO capacity to threaten the Soviet Union with nuclear attack.

2) Closely related to the first is the concern that the U.S. nuclear guarantee -- which couples the security of Europe to our own strategic umbrella -- might be neutralized through the development of such technology.

3) Also related is concern that technology which protected the U.S. and Soviet Union from the threat of long range ballistic missiles might not provide Europe with the same degree of protection against attack from shorter range missiles and other tactical delivery systems. Thus, a nuclear conflict might be centered in Europe.

4) Nuclear Allies Britain and France would be concerned that the development and employment of such technology would undermine the credibility of their nuclear forces. Just the prospect of such technology could make securing the funds for these forces more difficult in years ahead, particularly in the UK.

5) Finally, the NATO Allies will be troubled about the potential consequences for arms control.

DECLASSIFIED NLRR F05-171 25307 CONFIDENTIAL BY CIJ NARA DATE / 11/08

CONFIDENTIAL

Other Concerned and Friendly Countries

Chief among these countries are China (a nuclear power with concerns about independent deterrence similar to those of the British and French), Japan, and our ANZUS Allies. Japan and the ANZUS Allies will be concerned that whatever system we develop for the protection of our NATO Allies be available to them as well. They will also share many of the concerns noted above for NATO.

We do not plan special talks with China on this issue and there are no trips of appropriate senior U.S. officials planned at this time. If the Chinese express concern, we would offer them a special briefing in Washington to their Embassy personnel. Assistant Secretary Wolfowitz will be prepared to respond to Japanese questions during his visit there next week and we could agree to discuss the issue at the next Security Commission talks if the Japanese desire. We plan to touch briefly on the issue later this month in the U.S.-Australian Politico-Military talks in Canberra, at which New Zealand will be represented.

The USSR

We plan no special explanation for the Soviets beyond Ambassador Hartman's March 24 discussion with Korniyenko. Our Embassy and arms control delegations have the agreed background material on which to draw. They may also note that what the President has initiated is a program similar to research in which the Soviet Union has been involved for many years.

Other Nations

Other nations, largely the non-aligned, have been briefed using the background material sent to all diplomatic posts. That material may have to be elaborated for use in other international conferences and fora such as the Committee on Disarmament.

Conclusion

In the short run, we will work to allay any concerns, by emphasizing the long-range nature of the President's initiative and its focus on ballistic missiles. We have already prepared Qs and As to this effect for use with Allied and friendly governments. We will stress these same points publicly here and abroad. We also will be developing more detailed material, for use by our Missions abroad, which would outline the President's intentions and respond to host government concerns.

CONFIDENTIAL

Over the longer term, we will want to ensure that foreign -- and particularly Allied -- concerns are reflected in the study the President has directed, while at the same time we influence foreign views on ballistic missile defense in a positive direction. We are considering whether, at some stage, visits by senior officials to selected capitals and NATO Headquarters would contribute to this end.

CONFIDENTIAL

· · · · · · · · · · ·

The first step will be early preparation of detailed material on the structure and objectives of the projected research into ballistic missile defense, the content of which will be aimed at allaying Allied concerns. A second step will be the preparation of presentations for the Secretaries of Defense and State to their NATO colleagues at the June NAC and DPC Ministerial meetings. A possible third step, to be considered in the coming months, would be the dispatch of a team of senior officials to selected Allied capitals and NATO Headquarters for more detailed consultations.

CONFIDENTIAL

National Security Council 604 The White House 83 APR I P7: 38 Package # 2178

......

-

.

, °

WILLE HOUSE SITUATION ROOM

	SEQUENCE TO	HAS SEEN	ACTION
John Poindexter	2	×	
Bud McFarlane		m	A
Jacque Hill	3	V,	
Judge Clark	4		H
John Poindexter		-	
Staff Secretary			
Sit Room			
	<u> </u>	etimines (int.	

I-Information A-Action R-Retain D-Dispatch N-No further Action DISTRIBUTION VP Other cc: Meese Baker Deaver

COMMENTS

NSC/S PROFILE

CONFIDENTIAL

ID 8390373

TO	
TO.	

CLARK

CLASSIFIED ENCLOSURE B 6 004 FROM BREMER

RECEIVED 26 MAR 83 11 DOCDATE 25 MAR 83

KEYWORDS: NUCLEAR WEAPONS

STRATEGIC FORCES

UNCLASSIFIED UPON REMOVAL OF

SUBJECT: GAMEPLAN FOR CONSULTATIONS ON PRES BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

INITIATIVE

ACTION:	PREPARE MEMO FOR CLARK	DUE:	STATUS S	FILES IFD	0
	FOR ACTION	FOR CONCURRENCE		FOR INFO	
-	BOVERIE				
. **					
			2		

2.7

COMMENTS

REF# 8308880	. LOG 8	390276	NSCIFID NSDD	0085 (B/)
ACTION OFFICER (S)	ASSIGNED	ACTION REQUIRED	DUE	COPIES TO
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
DISPATCH			W/ATTCH	FILE (C)

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT, NSC: NSDD: RECORDS		Withdrawer DLB 6/6/2006			
NSD	Folder D 85 [ELIMINATING THE THREAT FROM BALLISTIC SILES] (2 OF 2)		<i>FOIA</i> F05-171 WESTWIC	K	
<i>Box 1</i> 9128	Number 9		2		
ID	Document Type Document Description	No of pages	Doc Date	Restric- tions	
2530	8 MEMO COPY OF #25305 WITH ANNOTATIONS	1	ND	B1	

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]



2/5/87 Originals for file Documents destroye by: #8.Lest

No. NSDD 84

COPY <u>WH CHIEF OF STAFF</u> SYSTEM II 90318

NATIONAL SECURITY Signed: 3/11/83 COUNCIL INFORMATION

Notice

The attached document contains classified National Security Council Information. It is to be read and discussed only by persons authorized by law.

Your signature acknowledges you are such a person and you promise you will show or discuss information contained in the document only with persons who are authorized by law to have access to this document.

Persons handling this document acknowledge he or she knows and understands the security law relating thereto and will cooperate fully with any lawful investigation by the United States Government into any unauthorized disclosure of classified information contained herein.

Access List

DATE	NAME	DATE	NAME
······			
	UNCLAS	SIFIED	

9	NS	C/S PROFILE		DENTIAL SENSITIV	
то	CLARK	EDOM	CLASSIFIED ENCL POLLOCK	dib eluloy DOCDA	
10	CLARK	r Kom	LINHARD	U DOCDA	04 APR 83
		-	RYE		04 APR 83
KE YWORDS	: ABM		NUCLEAR WEAR	PONS	
	NSDD				
SUBJECT:	ORGANIZATIONA	L ISSUES RE IN	IPLEMENTATION	I OF NSDD 85	
ACTION:	FOR DECISION		DUE:	STATUS C	FILES IFD O
	FOR ACTION		FOR CONCURE	RENCE	FOR INFO
	CLARK				
COMMENTS					
REF#		LOG 82902	273 8390270	5 NSCIFTO NSDD	0085 (В/В)
ACTION OF	FICER (S) AS	405 Cl	action Requir	RED DUE tel Mart	COPIES TO t2 PO, RL, RY KD
DISPATCH				W/ATTCH	FILE (C)

National Security Council The White House

Package # 40417

1700 APR 0 4/1983

		SEQUENCE TO	HAS SEEN	ACTION	
	John Poindexter		4	A	
	Bud McFarlane		m		
	Jacque Hill				-
	Judge Clark				
	John Poindexter	· · ·		any specific a star star star and a star	
	Staff Secretary		•1		1
6	Sit Room				
	F	-le:		14 were	
	1		l	PR N	



100

625

SYSTEM II THE WHITE HOUSE 90417 WASHINGTON 415 Ray Pollock. When we get agency Comments back on NSSD, jant in an administrative paragraph that covena this.

Ronald Reagan Library

	ction Name CUTIVE SECRETARIAT, NSC: NSDD: RECORDS		Withdrawer DLB 6/6/2006			
NSDI	<i>Folder</i> D 85 [ELIMINATING THE THREAT FROM BALLISTIC SILES] (2 OF 2)		FOIA F05-171 WESTWICK			
Box N	Number					
91289	9		2			
ID	Document Type	•	Doc Date	Restric-		
	Document Description	pages		tions		
	Document Description	pages				
2530	9 MEMO RAY POLLOCK, BOB LINHARD, GIL RYE THRU	2	4/4/1983	B1		

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.

NSC/S PROP	TILE	CONFID	SNTIAL			ID 839	0373
• • • •			NCLASSIFIED UPON LASSIFIED ENCLOSI	TREAM	RECEIVED	26 MAR	83 11
то	CLARK	FROM	BREMER alb	6/104	DOCDATE	25 MAR	83
KEYWORDS	NUCLEAR WEAD	PONS	STRATEGIC F	ORCES			
SUBJECT:	GAMEPLAN FOR INITIATIVE	CONSULTATIONS	ON PRES BAL	LISTIC MI	SSILE DEF	ENSE	
ACTION:	PREPARE MEMO	FOR CLARK	DUE:	5	TATUS S	FILES I	FD O
	FOR ACTION		FOR CONCUR	RENCE		FOR INFO	
	BOVERIE						
COMMENTS							
REF# 830	8880	LOG 8390	276	NSCIE	ID NSDD00	85 (E	1BI
ACTION OF	FICER (S) A	ssigned R 0 1/2 19834 Lu	ACTION REQUI	red ted hi	0	COPIES 1 - 2178	
			1	\triangleleft			
DISPATCH				W,	ATTCH FI	LE	(C)

SENSITIVE

System II 90444

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506 CHRON FILE

April 7, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR

Mr. Donald Gregg Assistant to the Vice President for National Security Affairs

Mr. Charles Hill Executive Secretary Department of State

Colonel John H. Stanford Executive Secretary Department of Defense

Dr. Alton Keel Associate Director for National Security and International Affairs Office of Management and Budget Mr. Thomas B. Cormack Executive Secretary Central Intelligence Agency

Ms. Jacqueline Tillman Executive Assistant to the United States Representative to the United Nations

Colonel George A. Joulwan Executive Assistant to the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

Mr. John Tierney Acting Executive Secretary Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

Dr. George A. Keyworth Director Office of Science and Technology Policy

SUBJECT: Strategic Modernization Announcement, April 12

The attached draft remarks have been prepared for the President's announcement on strategic forces modernization in the East Room on April 12.

Request your review and comments/concurrence not later than 5:00 p.m., April 8 If we have not received your comments at that time, concurrence will be assumed.

Considering the sensitivity of these remarks, particularly in regard to timing formal notification to the Congressional leadership, and briefings to foreign governments, distribution must be held to an absolute minimum.

ichael O. Wheeler

Michael O. Wheeler Staff Secretary

Attachment Draft Remarks

SENSITIVE

lst Cut: Draft Remarks Strategic Forces Announcement

The end of World War II a generation ago, left the world with two terrible and wholly unacceptable views of the future: Hiroshima and Auschwitz.

These two places, totally obscure 40 years ago, now symbolize the twin dangers we face. Modern mass destruction and modern totalitarianism can only be understood together since our challenge is to avoid both.

Our words, policies, and actions should all make clear the deeply held American conviction that nuclear war of any scale would be a tragedy of unparalleled scope for humanity. It is this fundamental belief that drives our strategy of deterrence and arms control.

Several weeks ago in Los Angeles, I discussed our efforts to limit and reduce the danger of nuclear weapons through reliable, verifiable, and stabilizing arms control agreements. The arms control path runs parallel to our policy of deterrence. Both

seek to prevent conflict and reduce the risk of war. If we are to pursue deterrence successfully, we must have a strong and militarily effective strategic posture.

Deterrence is not, and cannot be, bluff. In order for

100

deterrence to be effective we must not merely possess weapons, we must be perceived to be able and prepared, if necessary, to use them. While we seek to achieve arms control agreements that reduce instabilities and channel strategic weapons modernization of both sides toward stabilizing developments and reductions, we cannot forego the imperatives of deterrence.

. .

It was against this background that I established a Commission on Strategic Forces last January and directed that it review the strategic program for United States forces with particular emphasis to be given to the intercontinental ballistic missile systems and associated basing alternatives. The distinguished group of Americans who served on the Commission and their senior counselors have vast experience in national security matters and technical know-how. This bipartisan group came from six Administrations. Their common bond was unquestioned competence and a complete dedication to their country.

During the past three months the Commission held dozens of formal meetings and numerous smaller conferences, talked to over 200 technical experts, and consulted closely with the leadership and other interested members of Congress.

The Commission has completed its work and, last week, submitted its report to me. I am pleased to announce that the members have unanimously agreed on a number of important conclusions and recommendations. As you know, after I met with the National Security Council yesterday, the report was released to the

public.

I endorse the Commissioner's recommendations and as a result, this morning, I met with the leadership of the Congress to advise them of my conclusions.

These conclusions are as follows:

First, we should continue our strategic modernization program that I recommended to Congress in October 1981 with specific emphasis on improving the command, control and communications for our strategic forces, and continuation of our bomber, Trident submarine, and air launched cruise missiles programs.

Second, we should modernize our ICBM forces in two ways. We should immediately produce and deploy 100 MX missiles, in existing Minuteman silos at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming. Due to the long lead times involved, "immediate" in this case means a first deployment in December 1986, with the deployment complete by the end of the decade.

At the same time we should begin engineering design of a small, single warhead missile. If strategic and technical considerations warrant, such a missile could be ready for full scale development in 1986 and potential deployment in the early 1990's.

The reasons for these missile decisions are complex, but in

summary, the ICBMs we have are old, obsolete, and wearing out. We cannot safely allow our ICBM force to wither away in the face of Soviet actions over the past two decades, and action on our part is necessary as an incentive to arms reduction agreements. Some large rockets are necessary in our forces, but_in the longer run smaller, less valuable missiles could be more stable in time of crisis.

• 1

Survivability of the deterrent, not any one pilot, crew, or leg of the TRIAD is what really counts, and cost is an important consideration. This ICBM plan will reduce my 1984 budget request by \$1.5 billion, and the 1985 and 1986 request by even more.

Since both of these ICBMs are solid propellent rockets, planned to replace Minuteman, and capable of placement in Minuteman silos, I have decided to name them Minuteman IV and Minuteman V respectively.

Third, we should conduct major research into, and the most rigorous examination of, all forms of ballistic missile defense.

Fourth, we must proceed with a thorough study of the whole concept of major improvements in hardening silos for land-based missile systems.

I urge the Congress to join me now in this bipartisan effort to settle on a modernization plan for our strategic forces. For more than a decade each of four Administrations has made proposals for arms control and modernization that have become embroiled in political controversy. The members of the Commission, the Secretary of Defense, the JCS, and I have all had to take fresh looks at our previous positions. Despite the range of views these groups have held in the past, we are presenting to you a unanimous view on this vital issue. Your support for this consensus can unite us in making a major step forward in our common search for ways to ensure national security.