

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Executive Secretariat, NSC: Meeting File
Folder Title: NSC 00039 02/04/1982 [Poland,
Libya, Export Controls, Oil, Gas] (7 of 7)

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 EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT, NSC: MEETING FILE

Withdrawer

CAS 1/18/2005

File Folder NSC 00039 04 FEBRUARY 1982 [POLAND, LIBYA, EXPORT CONTROLS, OIL, GAS] (7/7)

FOIA

2000-002

Box Number 91283

SKINNER

37

ID	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
2593	PAPER	RE STRATEGY ON POLAND (SAME TEXT AS 2559) PAR 2/22/2008 F00-002	13	ND	B1
2594	PAPER	RE POLAND: POSSIBLE MEASURES (TAB C) PAR 6/6/2006 / R 8/21/2013 M325/1 #2594	3	ND	B1 B3
2595	PAPER	RE NEXT STEPS (SAME TEXT AS 2582) R 2/22/2008 F00-002	2	ND	B1
2596	FORM	RE SUMMARY DECISION SHEET (SAME TEXT AS 2577) R 2/22/2008 F00-002	2	2/3/1982	B1
2597	FORM	RE SUMMARY DECISION SHEET P. 21-22 R 2/22/2008 F00-002	2	ND	B1
2598	AGENDA	FOR NSC MEETING R 8/21/2013 M325/1	1	2/4/1982	B1
2599	PAPER	RE SIBERIAN PIPELINE (SAME TEXT AS 2552) D 6/6/2006	19	2/3/1983	B1 B3

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.

~~TOP SECRET~~

/SENSITIVE

STRATEGY ON POLAND:
POSSIBLE NEXT STEPS AGAINST THE U.S.S.R.

I. ANALYSIS OF THE SITUATION

We are approaching a crossroads over Poland, and our handling of the situation will have far-reaching implications for U.S. foreign policy, particularly the future of our relations with the Soviets, the Poles, and the Western Alliance. Unless we continue clearly to demonstrate our seriousness in this crisis, the Soviets may draw conclusions that could lead them to test our resolve at other critical points over the next three years.

The Soviet Stake in Poland:

The Soviets consider a "friendly" Poland absolutely critical to the U.S.S.R.'s vital security interests. Poland has historically been an avenue for invasion of Russia, and, since World War II, it has been the essential line of communication to Soviet ground forces in Germany. From the political perspective, maintenance of the status quo in Poland preserves the post-war division of Germany and ensures the continued existence of a "world socialist community".

Although the Soviets have historically been willing to tolerate some deviations from the Poles, the Soviet-instigated Polish crackdown demonstrated that Moscow remains prepared to risk bloodshed and increased international tension in order to retain control over events in Poland. This was true after Yalta; it is still true after Helsinki.

West European Dimension:

In defending what it sees as its critical interests in Poland, Moscow seeks to play upon divisions of the West. The Soviets see West Europeans as inclined to accept Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe and less willing than the United States to forgo the benefits of "detente." These divisions in the West were one among many reasons why the U.S.S.R. rejected the option of a direct invasion--which would have united us and the allies--instead pressuring the Polish Government into brutal repression. This suggests that allied support for U.S. policy toward Poland can have an important impact on Soviet conduct.

The Outlook in Poland:

Moscow will continue to press the Polish martial law regime to crush Solidarity and restore the kind of orderly, if economically inefficient, Polish dictatorship the Soviets feel they

~~TOP SECRET~~

/SENSITIVE

RDS-3 1/28/12

DECLASSIFIED IN PART

NLS F00-002 #2593

By LOI, NARA, Date 2/22/08

can comfortably control. The martial law regime has achieved its initial objective of suppressing active resistance, but is perplexed as to where to go from there. Even regime spokesmen admit privately that the generals in charge have neither a policy for solving the country's problems nor the political talent to develop and implement one. Despite the decapitation of Solidarity, passive resistance continues and there are signs that it could become active. The economy was in shambles before December 13; it has steadily worsened since. Little or no progress has been made in rebuilding the shattered Polish Communist Party, and conflict continues between orthodox hardliners and more pragmatic elements within the leadership. The regime has been moving to fend off resistance and further Western sanctions by cosmetic adjustments of the martial law regime, but the generals know they have not yet begun to deal with Poland's overwhelming problems.

It is impossible to predict with any certainty what will occur in Poland in the next 12-18 months. There are a wide range of possible scenarios. But we believe these can be grouped within four broad categories:

(1) A Soviet invasion, most probably resulting from large scale bloodshed among the Poles. Such bloodshed could occur in a variety of ways: as a consequence of intensified repression, from increased food shortages, or from some other triggering of the pent-up bitterness and frustration now held in check by Polish security forces. Should the Soviets intervene, Western leverage for any amelioration of repression would largely vanish. But the likelihood of bringing the Allies along in the imposition of major, far reaching sanctions against the Soviets would greatly improve.

(2) Continuation, largely unchanged, of Martial Law. While economic deterioration would continue, the government might succeed in keeping the lid on by heavy reliance on its security organs. Despite its potential instability, such an outcome would represent a victory, albeit perhaps temporary, for the Soviets. This situation would be the most susceptible to Western leverage. But the instability inherent in martial law would make Polish leaders fearful of moving too far, too rapidly. The Soviets could be expected to keep heavy pressure on Jaruzelski not to make substantial compromises.

(3) An incremental and partial restoration of human rights. In an effort to undercut our efforts to gain allied support, the Polish Government might move to restore a sense of normalcy to Poland by taking highly publicized steps such as the release of a large number of prisoners and the opening of a limited dialogue with the Church and some elements of Solidarity. The central aspects of martial law - e.g. the high degree of control currently being exerted by Polish security organs - would continue. If carried out well by the Poles, this would be the most difficult scenario for the West to deal with. It would particularly complicate efforts to maintain a

unified Western position toward returning to business as usual with Moscow and Warsaw.

(4) A return to dialogue and reform, holding open the possibility for further political and social evolution. This would require that the Polish regime (with at least tacit Soviet acquiescence) see no viable long-term alternative to developing a relationship with the Church and the working class that preserves a significant number of the gains made since August 1980, and which guarantees the Soviets' basic interests. The security apparatus would undoubtedly remain active enough to assure the Soviets and the Polish establishment that control would not again be threatened. But, if this resulted in real latitude for trade unions and the Church, it would preserve the possibility of future peaceful change in Poland and other East European countries. The Soviets, however, could be expected to maintain their campaign of calculated pressure to limit the extent of the Polish Government concessions.

It is becoming clear that the Soviets now foresee a lengthy process with an uncertain outcome. Whatever the next year brings for Poland, the Soviets face inevitable long-term pressure for change throughout Eastern Europe. However, recent events in Poland suggest that the Soviets will continue to react to such pressures by taking whatever steps are necessary, including the use of force, to preserve their hegemony in Eastern Europe. Gromyko's categoric rejection of Secretary Haig's presentation on Poland at their Geneva meeting is further evidence of Soviet determination to implement this view of its security interests in Eastern Europe. Thus, Poland in the near term, and the entire region over time will remain a source of tension in East/West relations.

II. U.S. OBJECTIVES

Poland relates to so many fundamentals (the future of Eastern Europe, the Alliance, Soviet security, American political and moral leadership) that our objectives must be placed in the context of our overall foreign policy. Our overall objective is to maintain U.S. capacity for world leadership by halting and if possible reversing adverse trends in the world power balance over the last decade or more. But we recognize that we must navigate through a period of some vulnerability as we rebuild our strength.

Thus we seek to establish a sense that the U.S. is prepared to accept the responsibilities of political and moral leadership --without provoking confrontations with the U.S.S.R. which could carry unacceptable risks in the nuclear age. Since our response to the Polish crisis will inevitably be regarded as a critical test of our ability to meet this longer-term challenge, our policy must be both prudent and effective. In this sense, we face an historic juncture in Poland, and our

actions will have profound consequences for the future across a broad front of basic U.S. interests.

This strategic objective and the analysis of the concrete situation set forth in Section I dictate the following specific objectives for the U.S. response to the Polish crisis:

- Toward the situation within Poland, to secure the agreed Western objectives of lifting martial law, release of detainees, and restoration of a minimum of freedom (e.g. for trade union activity), without creating a public perception that we are responsible should there be a violent ending.
- Toward the Soviet Union, to drive home that the U.S.S.R. will pay a heavy price in U.S.-Soviet relations if it continues on its present course in Poland, without seeming to threaten vital Soviet security interests to the point of direct confrontation.
- Toward the Alliance, to exert strong pressures and leadership for concrete measures, without pushing so hard that we tear the Alliance apart (recognizing that a divided alliance deprives us of much of our ability to affect Soviet behavior).
- Toward the American people, to demonstrate that we are living up to our moral and political responsibilities, without creating expectations that cannot be fulfilled given the present balance of forces, Poland's geographical situation, the State of the Alliance, our economy, etc.

III. ACTIONS AND IMPACT TO DATE

We must view the situation to date both in terms of our own actions and the overall situation facing the U.S.S.R. and Poland.

A. Specific Actions

The specific actions we and our Allies have taken to date represented a measured response which has imposed a cost on the USSR.

--The package of economic and political measures against the Soviet Union announced on December 29 was deliberately restrained in order to send a primarily political signal to Moscow of our readiness to impose more substantial costs if the repression was not brought to an early end. Specifically, we: (1) suspended Aeroflot service; (2) closed the Soviet Purchasing Commission; (3) suspended issuance of licenses for high-technology exports; (4) halted exports for the oil and gas industry;

(5) suspended talks on a new maritime agreement and imposed strict controls on Soviet access to U.S. ports; (6) refused to set a date for talks on a new long-term grains agreement; (7) decided not to renew three bilateral cooperation agreements that expire this year. We also have stepped up VOA broadcasting to the U.S.S.R. by the introduction of medium-wave frequencies.

--At the January 11 Ministerial and follow-up meeting on January 23, the Allies moved closer to getting on board with modest political actions versus the Soviets. A number of Allies, under EC-10 aegis, are prepared to limit selected imports of manufactured and luxury goods from the USSR (although not oil or other raw materials). The EC Foreign Ministers have decided to recommend to the OECD a more restrictive status for the USSR, effectively raising the interest rate for credits to that country. Several Allies are considering tightened travel controls on Soviet diplomats and nonrenewal of exchange agreements. On the most prominent economic issue, the Siberian Pipeline Project, the Italians have advocated "a pause" in negotiations, but French companies on January 23 signed a major contract with the Soviets for purchase of natural gas from the future pipeline. Meanwhile, the Allies have agreed to suspend rescheduling of the Polish debt, as well as to suspend all export credits to Poland.

B. IMPACT

This listing of specific actions misses the larger consequences for the Soviets. Prior to the December 13th repression, US-Soviet INF negotiations were moving ahead, it appeared that a beginning date for START might be announced at the Haig/Gromyko meeting, there were massive demonstrations in Europe primarily directed against U.S. nuclear deployments, and the Soviets' "Peace" offensive threatened to drive a wedge between the Allies. Since then, START has been postponed indefinitely and another burden added to INF, there have been significant demonstrations against the repression, the "peace movement" in Western Europe is, at least for the moment, less effective, and the Allies have been moving, albeit slowly and unevenly, in an anti-Soviet direction. Allied Ministers will be at our side condemning the Soviets when the CSCE meeting resumes.

In terms of Poland itself, before December 13th the West had provided Poland with some assistance in dealing with its massive economic problems. Now the future of Western aid is much more problematical, thus adding to the economic drain of the Polish crisis on the Soviet Union. It is clear that the Polish regime is already feeling pain as a result of this stance. We should, of course, do everything possible to maximize these economic and political costs to the Soviet Union.

Within Poland, even our modest response has given heart to those who wish to save as much of the achievements of the past year and a half as can be saved. The Polish Council of Bishops and leading Polish intellectuals recently denounced the regime in language that reads like an echo of the President's December 23 statement and the January 11 NATO declaration.

On the other hand, the Soviets have achieved their minimum objectives in Poland -- restoring order and Soviet control over the situation -- without having to resort to direct military intervention. Thus they have staved off, at least for the present, a strategic loss in Poland at the cost of exposing the bankruptcy of the Soviet-imposed system, as well as a potentially serious turn-down in East-West relations, and a new crisis in relations with the largest communist party in Western Europe.

IV. OPTIONS

The following general considerations will have to be taken into account as we review our options:

1. It is possible that nothing we can do in the short term will be enough to induce Moscow to back away from its determination to crush Polish renewal. However, over the longer term there is a chance that, by imposing real costs on Moscow, we can exert some leverage in inducing Soviet and Polish moderation.

2. There is no reason to hold tough economic measures in reserve pending direct Soviet military intervention. Once a Soviet decision to intervene is made, we will not be able to reverse it by imposing additional economic and political sanctions.

3. We will be under considerable domestic pressure to move forward with more energetic measures in the near future. If Lane Kirkland should follow through on his threat to create a de facto embargo through labor action (which he may not be able to do), the costs to the domestic economy would be as great as if we had instituted a de jure embargo, but we would have gained little or no leverage vis a vis our allies or the Soviets. The result would be a blow to our international credibility which could have far reaching implications.

4. The primary, although still marginal, leverage available to the West is economic, but the U.S. alone cannot do enough to produce an effective response (although leverage can be exercised unilaterally on the debt issue). If we cannot bring the Allies along, we may well not be able to achieve the objectives outlined above.

5. There is no hope of getting European agreement on tough and painful action, unless they believe we are making corresponding sacrifices ourselves. Specifically, they see a direct relationship between the kind of tough European sanctions we are asking for and our grain sales. Without a grain embargo, we have no hope of stopping or even suspending the pipeline or of gaining European agreement to other tough measures, such as a partial embargo. At the same time, while tough U.S. action is necessary to achieve comparable European measures, it still may not be sufficient. We may also have to express our willingness to share the costs of sanctions that penalize our Allies disproportionately.

6. We will have to wrestle with two thorny aspects of the question of reversibility--the sure growth of pressure to reverse and the adverse effects on our international credibility of doing so. Our sanctions are linked to Soviet behavior toward Poland and should be reversible, to give the U.S.S.R. an incentive to moderate its repression, but the sorry post-Afghanistan experience suggests that erosion is almost inevitable over time, whether or not the Soviets change the behavior which caused sanctions to be imposed. We and the Allies are certain to disagree on when the lifting of sanctions is justified, and these differences undoubtedly will be exacerbated by Soviet and Polish adjustments of the martial law regime designed to create an appearance of improvement. Moreover, erosion of sanctions over time could force us to consider a reversal of our policy without evidence of real improvement in Poland, thus acknowledging the defeat of our strategy.

7. It may not serve our interests to suggest that all sanctions should be reversible. This is particularly true of the pipeline, since we would continue to oppose the project (while working to develop energy alternatives) independent of the Polish situation. On balance, however, the Europeans will only agree to sanctions if they are linked explicitly to Poland, and we will have to accept the principle of reversibility if we are to obtain the cooperation of Europeans -- and Americans -- who will be asked to sacrifice. Thus, we have to be prepared to accept a reversible halt to the pipeline.

8. In political terms, reversing at some future point in time sanctions we impose will carry a heavy price, both domestically and internationally, if the objectives we attach to them now have not been met. If erosion of sanctions or domestic political pressure forced us to remove the sanctions without achieving our objectives, the implications for our credibility with Moscow and in our international relationships more generally would be immense and long-lasting. In economic terms, the cost of many possible sanctions is not reversible -- trade, major contracts and associated jobs lost and future US competitiveness diminished by casting a shadow across the image of the United States as a reliable trading partner. The economic effects feed back into and reinforce the domestic political cost already noted.

Polish Debt:

A possibility which should be considered whatever else we choose to do is to continue to refuse to reschedule Poland's 1982 debt.

The act of calling in Poland's debt would have highly negative consequences. The Soviets may have to choose between paying off the Polish debt or being open to the risk that other creditors (private and/or official) would then call a formal default on Poland's other loans and thereby undermine the credit position of the entire Eastern Bloc. However, an SSG

paper (at TAB A) concludes that the Soviets in all likelihood would be affected only indirectly (through reduced availability of Western credit) by a Polish default and that the international monetary system would suffer a severe blow if the default spread to other Eastern European countries. The irreversible step of calling in Poland's debt or an overt threat to do so would also provoke a serious fissure in the Alliance. An overt threat carries the additional risks of panicking private creditors into precipitating default and encouraging the Allies to settle with the Polish Government as preferred creditors.

This suggests that the leverage we derive from Poland's massive foreign debt is both limited and difficult to use. Nevertheless, a Presidential reiteration of our established policy that Government-to-Government debt cannot be rescheduled until internal conditions in Poland warrant should be considered as an adjunct to the following specific options.

OPTION 1

Continue with our current efforts to gain Allied agreement to take specific actions against the U.S.S.R., while for the present holding in abeyance new unilateral U.S. steps. Our interim objective would be to bring the Allies as close as possible to the point we reached with our December 29 measures, while holding open our options for future U.S. actions either with or without the Allies. At the same time, we would use events such as the February 9 resumption of the Madrid meeting, on which we have already achieved a considerable degree of Allied unity, to keep public pressure on the Soviets.

Pros:

This course would build upon the degree of Allied unity already achieved, and thus maximize the likelihood of united Western action against the Soviets and the Polish military. It would avoid the political fire we would come under if we announced another series of "half-measures." It would not preclude our taking more severe steps at a later stage, if conditions in Poland warrant.

Cons:

This option would expose us to further charges that we are long on rhetoric but short on action. It might also lead to increased pressure or unilateral action by Kirkland. Depending on how long we delayed and on the course of events in Poland, this course could have profound consequences for our credibility with the Poles, the Soviets, the Allies and the American people.

OPTION 2:

Further intermediate measures against the U.S.S.R. There are numerous mixes of measures which could be adopted within

this option, the effects of which can be tailored to fall at various points within the broad gap between Options 1 (no new actions) and 3 (a relatively sweeping action package). A list and brief discussion of a number of such measures is at Tab C. In order to make clear that U.S. policy is steadily building, these could be implemented almost immediately and accompanied by a Presidential reiteration of the existing policy to suspend Polish debt rescheduling. They include:

- embargoing all industrial exports to the U.S.S.R. or at a minimum imposing more selective economic sanctions, such as a ban on chemical exports which focuses on the agricultural sector, including pesticides, fungicides, fertilizers and fertilizer ingredients (especially phosphates which alone could have a significant impact in the short to medium term on Soviet grain production), revoking already-issued licenses for exports such as International Harvester/Combine technology, suspending joint-venture fishing operations, etc.
- declaring a state of national emergency and imposing an embargo on all non-strategic imports from the Soviet Union;
- discouraging tourism to the USSR;
- reducing Soviet commercial representation in the U.S. to a skeletal force;
- suspending activities under existing bilateral exchange agreements, or even abrogation of all remaining agreements;
- not setting date for grain consultations scheduled this spring. Up to now we have avoided violating any existing agreements with the USSR. This step and the one above would be a departure from this policy.

Pros:

An embargo on all industrial exports, particularly on chemicals, would impose significant costs on the Soviets, although it would not affect the item that accounts for two-thirds of our exports to the U.S.S.R., grain. The other measures would enhance the political impact of this step and would involve only minimal costs to us. Taken together, however, these steps would seem to foreshadow a full embargo, thus possibly increasing our leverage.

Cons:

Singling out industrial exports would be a departure from the President's position that all sectors should share equally the burden of any future economic sanctions against Moscow. At

the same time this would not entail U.S. sacrifices sufficient to induce the Allies to curtail their own far more extensive exports to the U.S.S.R. Cuts in exchanges and commercial representation might be emulated by the Allies, but these steps could be criticized by the U.S. public as inadequate half-measures that fail to live up to our rhetorical condemnation of Soviet actions in Poland.

Option 3:

A ban on all exports to the USSR not covered by existing contracts either covering all items or exempting agricultural trade. Exempting agricultural trade would involve less domestic costs, but would make our action less credible to our Allies, who allege that the U.S. is only taking actions which don't hurt itself. Including agricultural trade, however, could trigger the legal obligation to compensate producers under the Farm Bill, which is not clear on this point.

Pros:

This would impose substantial economic costs on the Soviets (particularly if agricultural trade were included) by grinding U.S. trade with the USSR slowly to a halt without forcing suppliers with signed contracts to abrogate legal obligations. It would be consistent with our early 1981 discussions with the Allies in NATO, and thus easier for them to accept. If followed by Allies this would give real meaning to their pledge not to undercut U.S. restrictions.

Cons:

It would not have an immediate impact because of the exemption for deliveries under existing contracts. If it included grains, they would be affected faster than industrial goods. It could encourage our allies to increase pressure on us to exempt existing contracts from our previously announced oil and gas sanctions. Though this step would have a real bite over time, it might not be seen as forceful enough by our domestic critics. It could trigger the obligation to compensate producers under Section 1204 of the Farm Bill.

OPTION 4:

Total export embargo against the Soviets. One bold action would be for the U.S. to embargo all exports, including grain, to the U.S.S.R. Under current legislation, in order to embargo grain without triggering USG parity price payments (30 billion dollars per year), there must be a total export embargo. (see Tab B).

Pros:

This would impose the greatest economic costs on the Soviets of any option available to us. By demonstrating our

readiness to make substantial economic sacrifices (especially in grain sales), it could help induce the Europeans to take comparably tough measures against Moscow, such as suspension of the pipeline project or a partial but significant embargo on their own industrial trade with the Soviets. Taken together, the U.S. and Allies actions might be costly enough to the Soviets, if sustained over time, to influence them to ease the repression in Poland.

Cons:

A total export embargo may not be enough to bring the Europeans along, and if implemented unilaterally, could exacerbate severe strains in the Alliance. Even if the Europeans did take parallel action, the Western embargo could begin to erode quickly with the Europeans undercutting or circumventing the restrictions as they did after Afghanistan, and with U.S. farmers ending up sacrificing billion of dollars in grain sales without comparable sacrifices by the Europeans. This is certain to amplify already growing anti-European sentiments in the U.S., leading to demands for U.S. troop withdrawal and ultimately weakening the Alliance to the point of irrevelancy. Moreover, to be fully effective, other grain exporting countries would have to join in. This may be possible with Australia, but unlikely with Canada and Argentina. Finally, a grain embargo could cost thousands of jobs in the U.S., and increase USG farm price support payments by 3 billion dollars per year.

Option 5

Actions to hit the Soviets in other regions. Recognizing that even the most serious U.S. and Allied sanctions may not succeed in changing Soviet behavior toward Poland, we should also give serious consideration to action in other regions to drive up the costs to Moscow of its international irresponsibility. These steps could be taken as an alternative to any of the actions set forth in options 1-4 or as a complement to them. In many cases, we have already made decisions to act against Soviet allies and proxies, and the actions we will be taking could be explicitly or implicitly linked to Poland either with the Soviets are publicly. We could also consider expanding the scope of action already decided upon as a direct response to the Polish crisis. In this connection, we would stress that our decisions reflect the overall determination of the Administration to counter Soviet use elsewhere of the kind of indirect military force which crushed the renewal movement in Poland. Possibilities include:

Actions Against Libya: The NSC is already scheduled on February 4 to consider new actions against Libya, including imposition of a U.S. oil boycott and termination of U.S. exports to Libya. We are also taking steps which could have the effect of making it illegal for American citizens to reside in Libya or work for the Libyan government. Since it is public

~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~
~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~
~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~ ~~Redacted~~

Analysis

The major issue in choosing this option is the tension between a) the desirability of our choosing where to respond so as to maximize our strengths and Soviet vulnerabilities, and b) the disadvantages of diverting attention from Soviet actions in Poland. In consideration of this tension, two factors are:

--the visibility of the U.S. action: covert actions may not become visible and may not, therefore, divert moral indignation from the Soviet action to our own. At the same time, covert actions do not permit us to make a public display of our determination which could be helpful in bringing the Allies along or in satisfying domestic political demands for tough action.

--the Allied response to Poland: the reason we do not want to divert attention from Poland is so that the Allies will not find an excuse to do less in response to the Soviet action there. If the Allies ultimately do little, or if what they do is largely irreversible, we may be less constrained.

Pros:

These actions would have the advantage of not requiring direct NATO cooperation, which would be difficult to achieve in the case of a total export embargo or an effort to call in Poland's debt. This option might therefore pose fewer risks of creating profound fissures within NATO (depending on the severity and success of the actions we take), and would drive up Soviet costs without dismantling the framework of the U.S.-Soviet bilateral relationship. The anti-Soviet sentiment aroused by the Polish crisis could result in greater public understanding and support for actions against Cuba and Libya.

Cons:

These actions would entail considerable risk and costs, including the risk of a wider confrontation with Moscow and a backlash on the part of the U.S. public and Allied publics and governments. By taking action against Cuba and Libya, we would shift attention from Polish and Soviet repression to "U.S. military aggression." Such actions could be seen more as an attempt to exact retribution than to affect outcomes in Poland. Because these actions may be justifiable on other grounds and were, in some cases, publicly discussed before the Polish crackdown, they would be difficult to reverse and thus questionable as responses to the Polish crisis.

The disadvantages of this option would be compounded because we could not, as a legal matter, rely on an asserted linkage to Poland to justify our actions against other countries.

POLAND: POSSIBLE MEASURES AGAINST THE USSR
SHORT OF A TOTAL EXPORT BAN OR EMBARGO

A. Near-Term Measures

The following are possible measures which we could take against the Soviets in a matter of weeks, and which would have a greater political than economic impact. Of course, measures taken against the Poles can also impose costs on the Soviets.

1. Embargo on export of all industrial products. Under the Export Administration Act we could prohibit the export of all US manufactured commodities or technology. This would have an economic impact on the Soviets and add to our credibility in our efforts to gain similar sanctions from our Allies.
2. Embargo on chemical exports This step would hurt Soviet fertilizer production; the CIA has concluded that , among product areas embargoed by the US alone, suspension of chemical exports would have the most substantial effect on the Soviet economy. This combined with an import embargo would torpedo the twenty year \$20 billion deal Occidental has with the Soviet Union.
3. Embargo on all imports from the Soviet Union. This step would require a declaration of national emergency by the President. It would cut off a source of hard currency that earned the Soviets \$453 million in 1980 and \$312 million through October in 1981. Imports consisted mainly of petroleum and products, agricultural chemicals, and metals. Our greatest dependency on the USSR for imports is in palladium and titanium . Alternative supplies could be arranged to replace these imports.
4. Revoke already issued licenses for export of high-technology items to the USSR, including the license for transfer of International Harvester combine technology. This step is parallel to the actions we hope the Allies will take in regard to their pipeline companies' contracts, but would be inconsistent with our earlier NATO agreement on the sanctity of contracts. Foreign firms could pick up the deal unless we had firm commitments from the Allies not to undercut us. Revoking the International Harvester license would cost the firm earnings of \$300 million, and could send it into bankruptcy.
5. Suspend Soviet-American joint-venture fishing operations. There is at present one such joint venture on the Pacific Coast; its suspension would be a low-cost gesture and would

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE~~
GDS 1/27/88

DECLASSIFIED

NLRR M325 # 2594

BY RW NARA DATE 8/21/13

have a financial impact on the Soviets. However, the U.S. fishermen are having a difficult year already and suspension of this joint venture would hurt them. Soviet purchases under this arrangement were \$4 million in 1980.

6. Not set dates for semi-annual grain consultations. Under the US-USSR Grains Agreement we are required to consult with the Soviets on further grain availability semi-annually and whenever either party requests consultations. Curbing Soviet grain purchases through refusing consultations might trigger law suits from farmers demanding compensation under the Farm Bill. However the Soviets have never requested consultations and are not likely to now. The semi-annual consultations are due to take place this spring. We should take no steps to set dates at this time. We should simply let the meeting slide until we receive a request from the Soviets to hold the consultations. This decision should not be publicly announced; a public announcement could trigger claims for compensation under the Farm Bill. By not setting dates we are able to put off an untimely meeting with the Soviets on grain sales.
7. Abrogate existing exchange agreements. Our December 29 announcement means that three of the eleven technical agreements will be allowed to lapse during the first half of 1982. The others are not up for renewal until much later. Abrogating them would send a tough signal, but would not seriously hurt the Soviets in a practical way. It would also violate our legal obligations, since the agreements have no provision for unilateral termination.
8. Suspend activities under existing scientific and technical agreements. Such activities were cut to the bone after Afghanistan, but full suspension would be feasible and would further underline our outrage over the Soviet role in Poland. The cost to the Soviets of such a step, on the other hand, would be relatively minor.
9. Seek U.N. condemnation of the Poles and Soviets. Security Council consideration of the Polish crisis, or General Assembly action under the Uniting for Peace Resolution, would not be possible except in the event of Soviet military intervention.
10. Further reduce Soviet commercial representation in the U.S.
(See also Tab B)
Expulsion would have primarily a political impact, but it would be appropriate for us to eliminate those commercial representatives whose economic activities have been curtailed by other sanctions. There are three Soviets here

with the shipping organization Sovfracht and some representatives at Amtorg who work on maritime and shipping affairs. Also, Aeroflot staff is still present in the U.S. and there is one representative who works with the fishing joint venture. Reciprocal cuts in diplomatically-accredited commercial representatives could be considered later. If the Soviets retaliate by expelling U.S. private commercial representatives, a loss of \$10-15 million in investments and the loss of some export sales is likely.

11. Discourage tourism to the USSR. A public USG statement urging Americans not to visit the USSR could reduce Soviet hard-currency earnings and would tend to brand Moscow an international pariah. Such a move, however, could spur domestic and foreign criticism as an attempt to interfere with the free movement of persons.
12. Seek discussion of Polish and Soviet actions in the U.N. Human Rights Commission. Initial soundings indicate that it would not be difficult to get the Polish crackdown on to the UNHRC agenda. (This would not necessarily lead to further consideration by other U.N. bodies, which may not be feasible short of direct Soviet military intervention.)
13. Reciprocal cuts in diplomatic representation in Moscow and Washington. We and the Soviets presently have about the same numbers of diplomatic personnel in our respective Embassies. Large-scale staff cuts would hurt our Embassy more because of the closed nature of Soviet society, the Soviets' large U.N. presence in New York, and our Embassy's greater vulnerability to retaliation due to our reliance on Soviet employees for non-sensitive support functions. The Embassy could endure cuts in certain sections -- e.g., culture, science, commercial -- where activities have been reduced because of our other sanctions.

~~TOP SECRET~~

DECLASS

NLRB

FOO-002 #2595

BY

LOT

, NARA, DATE

2/22/08

SUBJECT: Libya: Next Steps

Issues

- o Now that most Americans are out of Libya, can economic and security measures be taken that will have the political effects of: 1) making US policy coherent; 2) demonstrating US determination; and 3) pressing Libya to cease such policies as international terrorism and subversion of regimes friendly to the US?
- o In the absence of some unequivocal Libyan provocation, is there adequate legal authority and political justification to impose sanctions against Libya?

Facts

- o Changes since December. Since you issued National Security Decision Directive 16 on December 10, 1981, developments in Poland and in the Middle East have increased somewhat the political costs to the US of sterner actions against Libya.
- o US objectives in December were limited to deterring Libyan attacks and ensuring the safety of departing Americans so that future US freedom of action would be greater.
- o US objectives now are broader -- to coerce Libya to cease international terrorism and subversion of regimes friendly to the US while isolating Libya as an outlaw regime.

Discussion

- o Interagency consensus: Although the economic effects of a unilateral American boycott of Libyan oil and ban on US exports to Libya remain negligible on both countries, the political benefit of sterner actions remains high.
- o Dissent: Treasury. In the absence of some unequivocal Libyan provocation there is inadequate legal authority or political justification to impose sanctions on Libya by invoking the International Economic Emergency Powers Act (IEEPA).
- o Dissent: US Special Trade Representative makes the case (with Treasury concurrence) that since economic sanctions will have a negligible economic impact on Libya, they are not worth implementing, especially given the political costs of implementation vis a vis the western allies and the Arab countries with investments in the US.

~~TOP SECRET~~

Cl. by William P. Clark

Rvw. on Feb. 3, 1988

- o Dissent: Commerce doubts the efficacy of economic sanctions but is less concerned with efficacy since the goals are to demonstrate resolve and to pressure Libya. Commerce also doubts that there is enough support in the nation and among the allies to impose sanctions successfully.
- o The Bottom Line Consensus: Stern actions, such as embargoing Libyan oil, set the context for even tougher actions later, and the public can be brought along to support sterner actions.

At Tab I is a summary of the interagency consensus in a paper drafted by State.

At Tab II is a Summary Decision Sheet listing 12 options concerning Libya. After the discussion at the NSC meeting on Thursday, February 4, recommendations will be made to you concerning these 12 options.

NLS FOO-002#2596

~~TOP SECRET/SENSITIVE~~

BY LOT, NARA, DATE 2/22/08

ECONOMIC AND SECURITY POLICY TOWARD LIBYA
SUMMARY DECISION SHEET

<u>Option</u>	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>
1. <u>Implement Unilateral US Oil Embargo Immediately (NSDD 4a)</u>	_____	_____
2. <u>Implement Tightened Export Controls Against Libya (Prohibiting Export of Dual Use Items; Instituting Licensing Requirements).</u>	_____	_____
3. <u>Implement Full Embargo of US Exports to Libya (NSDD 4b)</u>		
a. <u>With extraterritorial enforcement</u>	_____	_____
b. <u>Without extraterritorial enforcement</u>	_____	_____
4. <u>Mandatory Withdrawal of Americans</u>		
a. <u>Unnecessary</u>	_____	_____
b. <u>Combine with other IEEPA-mandated Restrictions (Oil Embargo and/or Embargo of US Exports)</u>	_____	_____
5. <u>Implement Transaction Controls on US Firms Doing Business in Libya</u>	_____	_____
6. <u>Timing of Economic Measures</u>		
a. <u>Simultaneous</u>	_____	_____
b. <u>Phased</u>	_____	_____
c. <u>Implementation Delayed While Building Public Support</u>	_____	_____
7. <u>Enhanced US Security Assistance</u>		

	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>
8. Enhanced US Economic Assistance	_____	_____
9. Increased US Military Presence		
a. Special Forces, Airborne, Marine, Navy and Tacair Exercises, some Jointly with Friendly States	_____	_____
b. Semiannual Exercises in the Gulf of Sidra	_____	_____
1. Resume as soon as possible	_____	_____
2. Delay so as not simul- taneous with Economic Measures	_____	_____
10. Expanded Security Cooperation with Local States (e.g., Regional Training Center in Egypt)	_____	_____
11. Contingency Planning with Egypt to Respond to Libyan Threat	_____	_____
12. Validation of JCS Contingency Plans for Responding to a Libyan Provocation Against US Targets (NSDD Item 5)	_____	_____

NLS FOO-002#2597~~TOP SECRET SENSITIVE~~

21

BY WJ, NARA, DATE 2/22/08ECONOMIC AND SECURITY POLICY TOWARD LIBYA
SUMMARY DECISION SHEET

<u>Option</u>	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>
1. <u>Implement Unilateral US Oil Embargo</u>		
a. Immediately (NSDD 4a)	_____	_____
b. Implementation Delayed While Building Public Support	_____	_____
2. <u>Implement Tightened Export Controls Against Libya</u> (Prohibiting Export of Dual Use Items; Instituting Licensing Requirements).	_____	_____
3. <u>Implement Full Embargo of US Exports to Libya</u> (NSDD 4b)		
a. With extraterritorial enforcement	_____	_____
b. Without extraterritorial enforcement	_____	_____
c. With extraterritorial application only to oil and gas technology.	_____	_____
4. <u>Mandatory Withdrawal of Americans</u>		
a. Unnecessary	_____	_____
b. Combine with other IEEPA-mandated Restrictions (Oil Embargo and/or Embargo of US Exports)	_____	_____
5. <u>Implement Transaction Controls on US Firms Doing Business in Libya</u>	_____	_____

~~TOP SECRET SENSITIVE~~

	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>
6. <u>Timing of Economic Measures</u>		
a. Simultaneous	_____	_____
b. Phased	_____	_____
7. Enhanced US <u>Security Assistance</u>	_____	_____
8. Enhanced US <u>Economic Assistance</u>	_____	_____
9. <u>Increased US Military Presence</u>	_____	_____
a. Special Forces, Airborne, Marine, Navy and Tacair Exercises, some Jointly with Friendly States	_____	_____
b. <u>Exercises in the Gulf of Sidra</u>		
1. Resume as soon as possible	_____	_____
2. Delay so as not simul- taneous with Economic Measures	_____	_____
10. Expanded <u>Security Cooperation</u> with Local States (e.g., Regional Training Center in Egypt)	_____	_____
11. <u>Contingency Planning</u> with Egypt and Others to Respond to Libyan Threat	_____	_____
12. Validation of <u>JCS Options</u> for Responding to a Libyan Provocation Against US Targets (NSDD Item 5)	_____	_____
13. <u>Diplomatic Initiatives Against</u> <u>Libyan Peoples' Bureaus in</u> <u>Other Countries</u>	_____	_____

A G E N D A

National Security Council Meeting
3:30-5:30 p.m.
Thursday
February 4, 1982

I. POLAND

- A. Introduction of Issue on Scope of Sanctions - Bill Clark
- B. Intelligence Update - Bill Casey
- C. Background on Further Sanctions - Al Haig
- D. Commerce Requirements - Mac Baldrige
- E. Discussion of Scope and Further Sanctions

II. LIBYA

- A. Introduction of Issue on Next Steps - Bill Clark
- B. Intelligence Update - Bill Casey
- C. Background on Next Steps - Al Haig
- D. Discussion of Next Steps
- E. Decision on Next Steps

(Break up into NSPG in Oval Office)

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT, NSC: MEETING FILES:
RECORDS

Withdrawer

CAS 1/18/2005

File Folder

NSC 00039 04 FEBRUARY 1982 [POLAND, LIBYA, EXPORT
CONTROLS, OIL, GAS] (7/7)

FOIA

2000-002
SKINNER

Box Number

91283

37

<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>
2599	PAPER RE SIBERIAN PIPELINE (SAME TEXT AS 2552)	19	2/3/1983	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.

*Contents destroyed
from*

~~CLASSIFIED~~

37

THE WHITE HOUSE

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL MEETING

3:30 PM

Thursday, February 4, 1982

DECLASSIFIED
White House Guidelines, August 28, 1997
By *CTC* NARA, Date *11/4/84*

JUDGE WILLIAM P. CLARK

~~CLASSIFIED~~

