WHORM Subject File Code: IT067
(International Organizations:
North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO))
Case file Number(s): 216612 (1 of 2)
Box Number: 14

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name WHITE HOUSE OFFICE OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT (WHORM): SUBJECT FILE

File Folder IT067 (NATO) (216612)

Box Number

Withdrawer DLB 3/21/2023

FOIA S9352/3 SYSTEMATIC

82

ID	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
249242	MEMO	ROBERT MCFARLANE TO THE PRESIDENT, RE: PRESIDENTIAL REPORT ON NATO'S CONVENTIONAL CAPABILITIES	2	7/16/1984	B1
249243	REPORT	IMPROVING NATO'S CONVENTIONAL CAPABILITIES	119	6/1/1984	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.

C.F.
216612
1120
1230
IT061
RS
N2018
FG006-12
FG038
FG034
FG013

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 12, 1984

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Pursuant to section 1104(b) of the FY 1984 Defense Authorization Act (P.L. 98-94), this report contains my views and recommendations on improving NATO conventional defense capabilities. These views and recommendations take into consideration the findings in Secretary Weinberger's report on "Improving NATO's Conventional Capabilities." I have reviewed that report and endorse its recommendations. It is the product of thorough research and contains a candid assessment of NATO's achievements to date and additional needs for the future.

Few disagree with the pressing need to improve NATO's conventional forces in order to enhance deterrence and defense. The quality of NATO's equipment and the readiness and skill of the forces manning that equipment have improved significantly over the last several years. The absolute defense capabilities of NATO forces are substantially greater today than three or four years ago. However, the measure of adequacy in deterrence and defense is not any static or absolute ability, but a dynamic relationship to the threat opposing that defense. The Warsaw Pact threat has increased by an even greater qualitative and quantitative increment, creating the necessity that NATO be ever more efficient and effective.

In analyzing the requirements for conventional force improvements, we must remember that NATO's principal objective is not to fight and win a war, but to ensure that a war in Europe does not occur. Further improvements in conventional capability would augment a vital element of overall deterrence and lessen pressure for early escalation to nuclear confrontation. At the same time, as the DoD report concludes, conventional forces cannot totally supplant the nuclear dimension of deterrence. NATO must also continue to maintain a credible nuclear deterrent, as outlined in Secretary Weinberger's report on NATO's Nuclear Posture.

NATO's strategy must be based on the geographic and political realities of NATO, and the fact that NATO, as a defensive alliance, concedes the initiative at the outset of conflict. In this context, flexible response and forward defense provide the only viable deterrent and defense strategy for the Alliance. NATO's task is to do a better job of providing the forces and the doctrine to support the strategy.

2166125S NSC #840453L Letter also to George Bush attached

Delivered by hand: 9/12/84 (1:45p)

The United States can be proud of our leadership by example over the last several years. We must continue to pursue those programs we have already begun, while seeking even more effective ways to enhance conventional defense. The support of Congress, in providing the funding for operations and maintenance costs, readiness, sustainment improvements, new equipment, force structure, research and development, and other defense programs, is essential to our efforts. However, the United States cannot fill the gap alone. Every member of the Alliance must participate in improving conventional forces. The Allies recognize the need, and now must make the additional sacrifices needed to improve, further NATO's military capabilities. The recent debate in the U.S. Senate will provide reinforcement to those Allies trying to assume their proportional burden. We will continue to prod all Allies to make better contributions to NATO defense.

Secretary Weinberger's report and the Supreme Allied Commander-Europe's (SACEUR's) independent assessment spell out the most important areas that need improvement. I agree with their recommendations. We must carefully balance our efforts, both by program area (such as readiness) and by task (such as defense against a first echelon). We must ensure that defense efforts and resources provide the most effective product for defense. We must critique the application of resources until we are satisfied that they are producing the optimum defense capability possible. No one can afford wastefully duplicative development programs, nor pursue programs that have only a limited military need. In sum, we must have a military strategy and an investment strategy. And these strategies should encompass our own programs and those of Allies -- in closer integration and cooperation than ever before.

The fundamental and inescapable reason for American cooperation and leadership is that a strong NATO defense is in our basic national self-interest, and we simply cannot succeed by ourselves. The plans and programs in the current United States defense budget and five-year defense plan support these objectives. While we will continue to review plans and modify requests to fit new opportunities and requirements, enduring Congressional willingness to support required defense programs is essential if we are to improve NATO's conventional defense. No plan, no matter how well conceived, can succeed if the resources to achieve it are insufficient or inconsistent. We and our Allies have recognized NATO's conventional defense problems, and have taken the first steps toward recovery. Now, we must accelerate our efforts.

Making the changes necessary to supplement existing plans or to replace those which become obsolete requires bold thinking and leadership. We will continue to consult closely and

frequently with our NATO Allies and with the U.S. Congress on new and better ways to use defense resources. There is no "instant" solution to any of the existing problems. Solutions will be achieved only by a long-term commitment. Nonetheless, we must start down the right paths, which are presented in Secretary Weinberger's report.

United States programs emphasize the need to provide the strategic lift to rapidly supplement in-place forces and to augment the thin strategic reserves available to SACEUR. We are working with Allies to ensure that Europe is prepared to receive these reinforcements and get them to where they can be most effective. We have stressed the need to increase the funding levels in the unglamorous but tremendously cost-effective Infrastructure Program. For example, by providing shelters and other supporting capabilities for aircraft, we can substantially improve the survivability and hence the capabilities of our Air Force.

Improving NATO's deterrent and defense posture will also require the Alliance to move in entirely new directions and to modify existing projects. "Exploitation of Emerging Technologies" is a fine example of new directions. This initiative, proposed by the United States in mid-1982, has already stimulated identification of projects for accelerated development. Although it will still be several years before this initiative contributes directly to NATO's defense capabilities, this effort marks an important first step in using the West's major advantage: its technological base.

In the short term, we must improve the deterrent capability of the conventional leg of NATO's deterrent Triad by increasing readiness and sustainability. Over the longer term, we must devote the necessary resources to provide all of the elements of an effective defense. This will require a clear understanding by the publics in all NATO countries of the nature and magnitude of the threat we all face.

I ask the Congress to join in the important endeavor of strengthening NATO's conventional defense.

Sincerely,

Ronald Reagan

The Honorable Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
Speaker of the
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 12, 1984

Dear Mr. President:

Pursuant to section 1104(b) of the FY 1984 Defense Authorization Act (P.L. 98-94), this report contains my views and recommendations on improving NATO conventional defense capabilities. These views and recommendations take into consideration the findings in Secretary Weinberger's report on "Improving NATO's Conventional Capabilities." I have reviewed that report and endorse its recommendations. It is the product of thorough research and contains a candid assessment of NATO's achievements to date and additional needs for the future.

Few disagree with the pressing need to improve NATO's conventional forces in order to enhance deterrence and defense. The quality of NATO's equipment and the readiness and skill of the forces manning that equipment have improved significantly over the last several years. The absolute defense capabilities of NATO forces are substantially greater today than three or four years ago. However, the measure of adequacy in deterrence and defense is not any static or absolute ability, but a dynamic relationship to the threat opposing that defense. The Warsaw Pact threat has increased by an even greater qualitative and quantitative increment, creating the necessity that NATO be ever more efficient and effective.

In analyzing the requirements for conventional force improvements, we must remember that NATO's principal objective is not to fight and win a war, but to ensure that a war in Europe does not occur. Further improvements in conventional capability would augment a vital element of overall deterrence and lessen pressure for early escalation to nuclear confrontation. At the same time, as the DoD report concludes, conventional forces cannot totally supplant the nuclear dimension of deterrence. NATO must also continue to maintain a credible nuclear deterrent, as outlined in Secretary Weinberger's report on NATO's Nuclear Posture.

NATO's strategy must be based on the geographic and political realities of NATO, and the fact that NATO, as a defensive alliance, concedes the initiative at the outset of conflict. In this context, flexible response and forward defense provide the only viable deterrent and defense strategy for the Alliance. NATO's task is to do a better job of providing the forces and the doctrine to support the strategy.

Delivered by hand: 9/12/84 (2:01p)

The United States can be proud of our leadership by example over the last several years. We must continue to pursue those programs we have already begun, while seeking even more effective ways to enhance conventional defense. The support of Congress, in providing the funding for operations and maintenance costs, readiness, sustainment improvements, new equipment, force structure, research and development, and other defense programs, is essential to our efforts. However, the United States cannot fill the gap alone. Every member of the Alliance must participate in improving conventional forces. The Allies recognize the need, and now must make the additional sacrifices needed to improve,further NATO's military capabilities. The recent debate in the U.S. Senate will provide reinforcement to those Allies trying to assume their proportional burden. We will continue to prod all Allies to make better contributions to NATO defense.

Secretary Weinberger's report and the Supreme Allied Commander-Europe's (SACEUR's) independent assessment spell out the most important areas that need improvement. I agree with their recommendations. We must carefully balance our efforts, both by program area (such as readiness) and by task (such as defense against a first echelon). We must ensure that defense efforts and resources provide the most effective product for defense. We must critique the application of resources until we are satisfied that they are producing the optimum defense capability possible. No one can afford wastefully duplicative development programs, nor pursue programs that have only a limited military need. In sum, we must have a military strategy and an investment strategy. And these strategies should encompass our own programs and those of Allies -- in closer integration and cooperation than ever before.

The fundamental and inescapable reason for American cooperation and leadership is that a strong NATO defense is in our basic national self-interest, and we simply cannot succeed by ourselves. The plans and programs in the current United States defense budget and five-year defense plan support these objectives. While we will continue to review plans and modify requests to fit new opportunities and requirements, enduring Congressional willingness to support required defense programs is essential if we are to improve NATO's conventional defense. No plan, no matter how well conceived, can succeed if the resources to achieve it are insufficient or inconsistent. We and our Allies have recognized NATO's conventional defense problems, and have taken the first steps toward recovery. Now, we must accelerate our efforts.

Making the changes necessary to supplement existing plans or to replace those which become obsolete requires bold thinking and leadership. We will continue to consult closely and

frequently with our NATO Allies and with the U.S. Congress on new and better ways to use defense resources. There is no "instant" solution to any of the existing problems. Solutions will be achieved only by a long-term commitment. Nonetheless, we must start down the right paths, which are presented in Secretary Weinberger's report.

United States programs emphasize the need to provide the strategic lift to rapidly supplement in-place forces and to augment the thin strategic reserves available to SACEUR. We are working with Allies to ensure that Europe is prepared to receive these reinforcements and get them to where they can be most effective. We have stressed the need to increase the funding levels in the unglamorous but tremendously cost-effective Infrastructure Program. For example, by providing shelters and other supporting capabilities for aircraft, we can substantially improve the survivability and hence the capabilities of our Air Force.

Improving NATO's deterrent and defense posture will also require the Alliance to move in entirely new directions and to modify existing projects. "Exploitation of Emerging Technologies" is a fine example of new directions. This initiative, proposed by the United States in mid-1982, has already stimulated identification of projects for accelerated development. Although it will still be several years before this initiative contributes directly to NATO's defense capabilities, this effort marks an important first step in using the West's major advantage: its technological base.

In the short term, we must improve the deterrent capability of the conventional leg of NATO's deterrent Triad by increasing readiness and sustainability. Over the longer term, we must devote the necessary resources to provide all of the elements of an effective defense. This will require a clear understanding by the publics in all NATO countries of the nature and magnitude of the threat we all face.

I ask the Congress to join in the important endeavor of strengthening NATO's conventional defense.

Sincerely,

Ronald Reagan

The Honorable George Bush
President of the Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release September 12, 1984

TEXT OF A LETTER FROM THE
PRESIDENT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE

September 12, 1984

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

Pursuant to section 1104(b) of the FY 1984 Defense Authorization Act (P.L. 98-94), this report contains my views and recommendations on improving NATO conventional defense capabilities. These views and recommendations take into consideration the findings in Secretary Weinberger's report on "Improving NATO's Conventional Capabilities." I have reviewed that report and endorse its recommendations. It is the product of thorough research and contains a candid assessment of NATO's achievements to date and additional needs for the future.

Few disagree with the pressing need to improve NATO's conventional forces in order to enhance deterrence and defense. The quality of NATO's equipment and the readiness and skill of the forces manning that equipment have improved significantly over the last several years. The absolute defense capabilities of NATO forces are substantially greater today than three or four years ago. However, the measure of adequacy in deterrence and defense is not any static or absolute ability, but a dynamic relationship to the threat opposing that defense. The Warsaw Pact threat has increased by an even greater qualitative and quantitative increment, creating the necessity that NATO be ever more efficient and effective.

In analyzing the requirements for conventional force improvements, we must remember that NATO's principal objective is not to fight and win a war, but to ensure that a war in Europe does not occur. Further improvements in conventional capability would augment a vital element of overall deterrence and lessen pressure for early escalation to nuclear confrontation. At the same time, as the DoD report concludes, conventional forces cannot totally supplant the nuclear dimension of deterrence. NATO must also continue to maintain a credible nuclear deterrent, as outlined in Secretary Weinberger's report on NATO's Nuclear Posture.

NATO's strategy must be based on the geographic and political realities of NATO, and the fact that NATO, as a defensive alliance, concedes the initiative at the outset of conflict. In this context, flexible response and forward defense provide the only viable deterrent and defense strategy for the Alliance. NATO's task is to do a better job of providing the forces and the doctrine to support the strategy.

more

(OVER)

The United States can be proud of our leadership by example over the last several years. We must continue to pursue those programs we have already begun, while seeking even more effective ways to enhance conventional defense. The support of Congress, in providing the funding for operations and maintenance costs, readiness, sustainment improvements, new equipment, force structure, research and development, and other defense programs, is essential to our efforts. However, the United States cannot fill the gap alone. Every member of the Alliance must participate in improving conventional forces. The Allies recognize the need, and now must make the additional sacrifices needed to improve further NATO's military capabilities. The recent debate in the U.S. Senate will provide reinforcement to those Allies trying to assume their proportional burden. We will continue to prod all Allies to make better contributions to NATO defense.

Secretary Weinberger's report and the Supreme Allied Commander-Europe's (SACEUR's) independent assessment spell out the most important areas that need improvement. I agree with their recommendations. We must carefully balance our efforts, both by program area (such as readiness) and by task (such as defense against a first echelon). We must ensure that defense efforts and resources provide the most effective product for defense. We must critique the application of resources until we are satisfied that they are producing the optimum defense capability possible. No one can afford wastefully duplicative development programs, nor pursue programs that have only a limited military need. In sum, we must have a military strategy and an investment strategy. And these strategies should encompass our own programs and those of Allies -- in closer integration and cooperation than ever before.

The fundamental and inescapable reason for American cooperation and leadership is that a strong NATO defense is in our basic national self-interest, and we simply cannot succeed by ourselves. The plans and programs in the current United States defense budget and five-year defense plan support these objectives. While we will continue to review plans and modify requests to fit new opportunities and requirements, enduring Congressional willingness to support required defense programs is essential if we are to improve NATO's conventional defense. No plan, no matter how well conceived, can succeed if the resources to achieve it are insufficient or inconsistent. We and our Allies have recognized NATO's conventional defense problems, and have taken the first steps toward recovery. Now, we must accelerate our efforts.

Making the changes necessary to supplement existing plans or to replace those which become obsolete requires bold thinking and leadership. We will continue to consult closely and frequently with our NATO Allies and with the U.S. Congress on new and better ways to use defense resources. There is no "instant" solution to any of the existing problems. Solutions will be achieved only by a long-term commitment. Nonetheless, we must start down the right paths, which are presented in Secretary Weinberger's report.

United States programs emphasize the need to provide the strategic lift to rapidly supplement in-place forces and to augment the thin strategic reserves available to SACEUR. We are working with Allies to ensure that Europe is prepared to receive these reinforcements and get them to where they can be most effective. We have stressed the need to increase the

funding levels in the unglamorous but tremendously cost-effective Infrastructure Program. For example, by providing shelters and other supporting capabilities for aircraft, we can substantially improve the survivability and hence the capabilities of our Air Force.

Improving NATO's deterrent and defense posture will also require the Alliance to move in entirely new directions and to modify existing projects. "Exploitation of Emerging Technologies" is a fine example of new directions. This initiative, proposed by the United States in mid-1982, has already stimulated identification of projects for accelerated development. Although it will still be several years before this initiative contributes directly to NATO's defense capabilities, this effort marks an important first step in using the West's major advantage: its technological base.

In the short term, we must improve the deterrent capability of the conventional leg of NATO's deterrent Triad by increasing readiness and sustainability. Over the longer term, we must devote the necessary resources to provide all of the elements of an effective defense. This will require a clear understanding by the publics in all NATO countries of the nature and magnitude of the threat we all face.

I ask the Congress to join in the important endeavor of strengthening NATO's conventional defense.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN

# # # # #

7/16/84 5:30p

Letters for these two packages being finalized 7/16/84 (5:00 pm).

Due to the classified nature of these packages, please hold in your office.

Letters will be brought forward as soon as they are prepared.

Dan

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Dear Mr. President: P.L. 98-94

Pursuant to section 1104(b) of the FY 1984 Defense Authorization Act (~~SR 98-213~~), this report contains my views and recommendations on improving NATO conventional defense capabilities. These views and recommendations take into consideration the findings in Secretary Weinberger's report on "Improving NATO's Conventional Capabilities." I have reviewed that report and endorse its recommendations. It is the product of thorough research and contains a candid assessment of NATO's achievements to date and additional needs for the future.

Few disagree with the pressing need to improve NATO's conventional forces in order to enhance deterrence and defense. The quality of NATO's equipment and the readiness and skill of the forces manning that equipment have improved significantly over the last several years. The absolute defense capabilities of NATO forces are substantially greater today than three or four years ago. However, the measure of adequacy in deterrence and defense is not any static or absolute ability, but a dynamic relationship to the threat opposing that defense. The Warsaw Pact threat has increased by an even greater qualitative and quantitative increment, creating the necessity that NATO be ever more efficient and effective.

In analyzing the requirements for conventional force improvements, we must remember that NATO's principal objective is not to fight and win a war, but to ensure that a war in Europe does not occur. Further improvements in conventional capability would augment a vital element of overall deterrence and lessen pressure for early escalation to nuclear confrontation. At the same time, as the DOD report concludes, conventional forces cannot totally supplant the nuclear dimension of deterrence. NATO must also continue to maintain a credible nuclear deterrent, as outlined in Secretary Weinberger's report on NATO's Nuclear Posture.

NATO's strategy must be based on the geographic and political realities of NATO, and the fact that NATO, as a defensive alliance, concedes the initiative at the outset of conflict. In this context, flexible response and forward defense provide the only viable deterrent and defense strategy for the Alliance. NATO's task is to do a better job of providing the forces and the doctrine to support the strategy.

1104(b) report
As done by NSC
Final done from
this 7/16/84
LWM

The United States can be proud of our leadership by example over the last several years. We must continue to pursue those programs we have already begun, while seeking even more effective ways to enhance conventional defense. The support of Congress, in providing the funding for operations and maintenance costs, readiness, sustainment improvements, new equipment, force structure, research and development, and other defense programs, is essential to our efforts. However, the United States cannot fill the gap alone. Every member of the Alliance must participate in improving conventional forces. The Allies recognize the need, and now must make the additional sacrifices needed to improve further NATO's military capabilities. The recent debate in the U.S. Senate will provide reinforcement to those Allies trying to assume their proportional burden. We will continue to prod all Allies to make better contributions to NATO defense.

Secretary Weinberger's report and the Supreme Allied Commander-Europe's (SACEUR's) independent assessment spell out the most important areas that need improvement. I agree with their recommendations. We must carefully balance our efforts, both by program area (such as readiness) and by task (such as defense against a first echelon). We must ensure that defense efforts and resources provide the most effective product for defense. We must critique the application of resources until we are satisfied that they are producing the optimum defense capability possible. No one can afford wastefully duplicative development programs, nor pursue programs that have only a limited military need. In sum, we must have a military strategy and an investment strategy. And these strategies should encompass our own programs and those of Allies--in closer integration and cooperation than ever before.

The fundamental and inescapable reason for American cooperation and leadership is that a strong NATO defense is in our basic national self-interest, and we simply cannot succeed by ourselves. The plans and programs in the current United States defense budget and five-year defense plan support these objectives. While we will continue to review plans and modify requests to fit new opportunities and requirements, enduring Congressional willingness to support required defense programs is essential if we are to improve NATO's conventional defense. No plan, no matter how well conceived, can succeed if the resources to achieve it are insufficient or inconsistent. We and our Allies have recognized NATO's conventional defense problems, and have taken the first steps toward recovery. Now, we must accelerate our efforts.

Making the changes necessary to supplement existing plans or to replace those which become obsolete requires bold thinking and leadership. We will continue to consult closely and

frequently with our NATO Allies and with the U.S. Congress on new and better ways to use defense resources. There is no "instant" solution to any of the existing problems. Solutions will be achieved only by a long-term commitment. Nonetheless, we must start down the right paths, which are presented in Secretary Weinberger's report.

United States programs emphasize the need to provide the strategic lift to rapidly supplement in-place forces and to augment the thin strategic reserves available to SACEUR. We are working with Allies to ensure that Europe is prepared to receive these reinforcements and get them to where they can be most effective. We have stressed the need to increase the funding levels in the unglamorous but tremendously cost-effective Infrastructure Program. For example, by providing shelters and other supporting capabilities for aircraft, we can substantially improve the survivability and hence the capabilities of our Air Force.

Improving NATO's deterrent and defense posture will also require the Alliance to move in entirely new directions and to modify existing projects. "Exploitation of Emerging Technologies" is a fine example of new directions. This initiative, proposed by the United States in mid-1982, has already stimulated identification of projects for accelerated development. Although it will still be several years before this initiative contributes directly to NATO's defense capabilities, this effort marks an important first step in using the West's major advantage: its technological base.

In the short term, we must improve the deterrent capability of the conventional leg of NATO's deterrent Triad by increasing readiness and sustainability. Over the longer term, we must devote the necessary resources to provide all of the elements of an effective defense. This will require a clear understanding by the publics in all NATO countries of the nature and magnitude of the threat we all face.

I ask the Congress to join in the important endeavor of strengthening NATO's conventional defense.

Sincerely,

The Honorable George Bush
~~The~~ President of the Senate
~~U.S. Senate~~
Washington, D.C. 20510

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Dear Mr. Speaker: P.L. 98-94

Pursuant to section 1104(b) of the FY 1984 Defense Authorization Act (~~SR 98-213~~), this report contains my views and recommendations on improving NATO conventional defense capabilities. These views and recommendations take into consideration the findings in Secretary Weinberger's report on "Improving NATO's Conventional Capabilities." I have reviewed that report and endorse its recommendations. It is the product of thorough research and contains a candid assessment of NATO's achievements to date and additional needs for the future.

Few disagree with the pressing need to improve NATO's conventional forces in order to enhance deterrence and defense. The quality of NATO's equipment and the readiness and skill of the forces manning that equipment have improved significantly over the last several years. The absolute defense capabilities of NATO forces are substantially greater today than three or four years ago. However, the measure of adequacy in deterrence and defense is not any static or absolute ability, but a dynamic relationship to the threat opposing that defense. The Warsaw Pact threat has increased by an even greater qualitative and quantitative increment, creating the necessity that NATO be ever more efficient and effective.

In analyzing the requirements for conventional force improvements, we must remember that NATO's principal objective is not to fight and win a war, but to ensure that a war in Europe does not occur. Further improvements in conventional capability would augment a vital element of overall deterrence and lessen pressure for early escalation to nuclear confrontation. At the same time, as the DOD report concludes, conventional forces cannot totally supplant the nuclear dimension of deterrence. NATO must also continue to maintain a credible nuclear deterrent, as outlined in Secretary Weinberger's report on NATO's Nuclear Posture.

NATO's strategy must be based on the geographic and political realities of NATO, and the fact that NATO, as a defensive alliance, concedes the initiative at the outset of conflict. In this context, flexible response and forward defense provide the only viable deterrent and defense strategy for the Alliance. NATO's task is to do a better job of providing the forces and the doctrine to support the strategy.

The United States can be proud of our leadership by example over the last several years. We must continue to pursue those programs we have already begun, while seeking even more effective ways to enhance conventional defense. The support of Congress, in providing the funding for operations and maintenance costs, readiness, sustainment improvements, new equipment, force structure, research and development, and other defense programs, is essential to our efforts. However, the United States cannot fill the gap alone. Every member of the Alliance must participate in improving conventional forces. The Allies recognize the need, and now must make the additional sacrifices needed to improve further NATO's military capabilities. The recent debate in the U.S. Senate will provide reinforcement to those Allies trying to assume their proportional burden. We will continue to prod all Allies to make better contributions to NATO defense.

Secretary Weinberger's report and the Supreme Allied Commander-Europe's (SACEUR's) independent assessment spell out the most important areas that need improvement. I agree with their recommendations. We must carefully balance our efforts, both by program area (such as readiness) and by task (such as defense against a first echelon). We must ensure that defense efforts and resources provide the most effective product for defense. We must critique the application of resources until we are satisfied that they are producing the optimum defense capability possible. No one can afford wastefully duplicative development programs, nor pursue programs that have only a limited military need. In sum, we must have a military strategy and an investment strategy. And these strategies should encompass our own programs and those of Allies--in closer integration and cooperation than ever before.

The fundamental and inescapable reason for American cooperation and leadership is that a strong NATO defense is in our basic national self-interest, and we simply cannot succeed by ourselves. The plans and programs in the current United States defense budget and five-year defense plan support these objectives. While we will continue to review plans and modify requests to fit new opportunities and requirements, enduring Congressional willingness to support required defense programs is essential if we are to improve NATO's conventional defense. No plan, no matter how well conceived, can succeed if the resources to achieve it are insufficient or inconsistent. We and our Allies have recognized NATO's conventional defense problems, and have taken the first steps toward recovery. Now, we must accelerate our efforts.

Making the changes necessary to supplement existing plans or to replace those which become obsolete requires bold thinking and leadership. We will continue to consult closely and

frequently with our NATO Allies and with the U.S. Congress on new and better ways to use defense resources. There is no "instant" solution to any of the existing problems. Solutions will be achieved only by a long-term commitment. Nonetheless, we must start down the right paths, which are presented in Secretary Weinberger's report.

United States programs emphasize the need to provide the strategic lift to rapidly supplement in-place forces and to augment the thin strategic reserves available to SACEUR. We are working with Allies to ensure that Europe is prepared to receive these reinforcements and get them to where they can be most effective. We have stressed the need to increase the funding levels in the unglamorous but tremendously cost-effective Infrastructure Program. For example, by providing shelters and other supporting capabilities for aircraft, we can substantially improve the survivability and hence the capabilities of our Air Force.

Improving NATO's deterrent and defense posture will also require the Alliance to move in entirely new directions and to modify existing projects. "Exploitation of Emerging Technologies" is a fine example of new directions. This initiative, proposed by the United States in mid-1982, has already stimulated identification of projects for accelerated development. Although it will still be several years before this initiative contributes directly to NATO's defense capabilities, this effort marks an important first step in using the West's major advantage: its technological base.

In the short term, we must improve the deterrent capability of the conventional leg of NATO's deterrent Triad by increasing readiness and sustainability. Over the longer term, we must devote the necessary resources to provide all of the elements of an effective defense. This will require a clear understanding by the publics in all NATO countries of the nature and magnitude of the threat we all face.

I ask the Congress to join in the important endeavor of strengthening NATO's conventional defense.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
~~The~~ Speaker of the House
~~U.S. House of~~ Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE CLERK
TRACKING SHEET FOR PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

TITLE: II Confidential Report on NATO's Conventional Capabilities

CAS 5/14/99

TYPE DOCUMENT:

PROCLAMATION — MESSAGE TO THE CONGRESS/SENATE

EXECUTIVE ORDER — STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

MEMORANDUM — SIGNING STATEMENT

LETTER (S)

OTHER: _____

RECEIVED: ~~7/6/84~~ Time: 4:50 a.m./p.m.

SENT TO CORRESPONDENCE FOR TYPING IN FINAL:

Date: ~~7/6/84~~ Time: 4:55 a.m./p.m.

TO RICHARD DARMAN'S OFFICE:

Date: 7/16/84 Time: 6:35 ~~a.m.~~/p.m.

INFO, INCLUDING STENCIL, TO PRESS OFFICE:

Date: 9/11/84 Time: 5 a.m./p.m. for am release

NOTIFICATIONS:

DJM (initial)

On any major transmittals to the Congress, and in every instance when draft legislation is sent, notify Linda Bennett (ext. 2230).

DJM (initial)

N.S.C., when appropriate ~~(Brian Merchant, ext. 2585)~~ 9/11 Kathleen 4:40p

OTHER INFORMATION:

released 9/12/84 (9:32a)

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name
WHITE HOUSE OFFICE OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT (WHORM): SUBJECT FILE

Withdrawer
DLB 3/21/2023

File Folder
IT067 (NATO) (216612)

FOIA
S9352/3
SYSTEMATIC

Box Number
82

ID	*Document Type* *Document Description*	*No of pages*	*Doc Date*	*Restrictions*
249242	MEMO ROBERT MCFARLANE TO THE PRESIDENT, RE: PRESIDENTIAL REPORT ON NATO'S CONVENTIONAL CAPABILITIES	2	7/16/1984	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.