

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Ermarth, Fritz W.: Files
Folder Title: Background Book, Meetings
between President Reagan and General Secretary
Gorbachev December 1987 (1)
Box: RAC Box 2

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

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

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

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

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name ERMATH, FRITZ: FILES

Withdrawer

CAS 3/19/2009

File Folder BACKGROUND BOOK: MEETING BETWEEN
PRESIDENT REAGAN AND GENERAL SECRETARY
GORBACHEV, DECEMBER 1987 (1)

FOIA

M08-125/5

Box Number RAC BOX 2

CHARLES

66

ID	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
67207	BRIEFING PAPER	RE INTERMEDIATE RANG NCULEAR FORCES R 6/10/2010 M125/5	1	ND	B1
67208	BRIEFING PAPER	INF TREATY VERIFICATION R 6/10/2010 M125/5	1	ND	B1
67209	BRIEFING PAPER	RE START R 6/10/2010 M125/5	2	ND	B1
67210	BRIEFING PAPER	RE DEFENSE AND SPACE R 6/10/2010 M125/5	1	ND	B1
67211	BRIEFING PAPER	RE NUCLEAR TESTING R 6/10/2010 M125/5	1	ND	B1
67212	BRIEFING PAPER	RE COMPLIANCE ISSUES R 6/10/2010 M125/5	1	ND	B1
67213	BRIEFING PAPER	RE VERIFICATION R 6/10/2010 M125/5	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.

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name ERMATH, FRITZ: FILES

Withdrawer

CAS 3/19/2009

File Folder BACKGROUND BOOK: MEETING BETWEEN
PRESIDENT REAGAN AND GENERAL SECRETARY
GORBACHEV, DECEMBER 1987 (1)

FOIA

M08-125/5

Box Number RAC BOX 2

CHARLES

66

ID	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
67214	BRIEFING PAPER	RE ABM TREATY INTERPRETATION <i>R 6/10/2010 M125/5</i>	1	ND	B1
67215	BRIEFING PAPER	RE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION <i>R 6/10/2010 M125/5</i>	1	ND	B1
67216	BRIEFING PAPER	RE CHEMICAL WEAPONS TREATY <i>R 6/10/2010 M125/5</i>	2	ND	B1
67217	BRIEFING PAPER	RE CW PROLIFERATION <i>R 6/10/2010 M125/5</i>	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.

SECRET

**BACKGROUND BOOK
for
MEETING BETWEEN
PRESIDENT REAGAN
and
GENERAL SECRETARY
GORBACHEV
Washington D.C.**

December 8-10, 1987

UNCLASSIFIED UPON REMOVAL
OF CLASSIFIED ENCLOSURES

SECRET

Fritz Ermarth

SECRET

THE PRESIDENT'S BACKGROUND BOOK
TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. ARMS CONTROL

1. Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces
2. INF Treaty Verification
3. START
4. Defense and Space
5. Nuclear Testing
6. Compliance Issues
7. Verification
8. ABM Treaty Interpretation
9. Nuclear Non-Proliferation
10. Chemical Weapons Treaty
11. Chemical Weapons Proliferation
12. Conventional Arms Control in Europe
13. CSCE/Conventional Stability Talks
14. Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe (CDE) Implementation
15. Comprehensive System of International Peace and Security (CSIS)
16. Soviet Military Practices
17. Gorbachev's Murmansk Speech

II. HUMAN RIGHTS

1. Overview
2. Cases of Special Interest to U.S. Government
3. US-Soviet Human Rights Dialogue
4. Representation List Cases (Separated spouses, divided families, dual nationals)
5. Emigration and Family Visits
6. Political Dissent in the Soviet Union
7. Religion in the Soviet Union
8. Proposed Moscow Human Rights Conference
9. Soviet Human Rights Agenda

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526, Sec. 3.4(b)
White House Guidelines, Feb. 19, 2000
BY dlb 11/17/94

III. REGIONAL ISSUES

1. Regional Dialogue
2. Afghanistan
3. Central America
4. The Caribbean
5. The Soviets and the Iran-Iraq War
6. Middle East Peace Process
7. Southern Africa
8. Terrorism
9. East Asia and the Pacific
10. India-Pakistan Nuclear Issue
11. President's Berlin Initiative
12. Ethiopia

IV. U.S.-SOVIET BILATERAL ISSUES

1. Bilateral Cooperation Checklist
2. Cultural and People-to-People Exchanges
3. U.S.-Soviet Maritime Boundary
4. Embassy Management Issues
5. Kiev Consulate
6. Soviet Disinformation
7. Free Flow of Information

V. U.S.-SOVIET ECONOMIC ISSUES

1. Soviet Economic Performance
2. Soviet International Economic Initiatives
3. U.S.-Soviet Trade
4. Grain Trade
5. Fisheries
6. Textiles

VI. SOVIET DEVELOPMENTS

1. Gorbachev's Leadership
2. Political and Economic Reforms
3. Recent Trends in Soviet Foreign Policy

I. ARMS CONTROL

I. ARMS CONTROL

1. Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces
2. INF Treaty Verification
3. START
4. Defense and Space
5. Nuclear Testing
6. Compliance Issues
7. Verification
8. ABM Treaty Interpretation
9. Nuclear Non-Proliferation
10. Chemical Weapons Treaty
11. Chemical Weapons Proliferation
12. Conventional Arms Control in Europe
13. CSCE/Conventional Stability Talks
14. Confidence and Security Building Measures and
Disarmament in Europe (CDE) Implementation
15. Comprehensive System of International Peace and
Security (CSIS)
16. Soviet Military Practices
17. Gorbachev's Murmansk Speech

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES (INF)

I. HISTORIC AGREEMENT

- o INF is first agreement in history actually to reduce, not simply limit build-up of, nuclear weapons.
- o By perseverance, we achieved goal you set in 1981 -- elimination of an entire class of nuclear weapons.
- o Credit to NATO unity and steadfastness; US deployments proceeded despite Soviet threats, 1983 walk-out from talks. (INF basing countries: UK, FRG, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands.)
- o INF has most stringent verification regime in history.

II. WHAT IS BEING ELIMINATED

- o All US and Soviet ground-launched missiles and launchers of intermediate-and shorter-range (from 500-5500 km).
- o For Soviets: SS-20, SS-4, and SS-5 intermediate-range missile systems, and SS-12 and SS-23 shorter-range missile systems; those now deployed are capable of carrying over 1500 nuclear warheads.
- o For US: Pershing II ballistic missiles and ground-launched cruise missiles (GLCMs); those now deployed are capable of carrying over 400 nuclear warheads. (US has no shorter-range INF deployed.)
- o Both sides are also destroying hundreds more non-deployed missiles and launchers.

III. WHAT HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED

- o Elimination of Soviet SS-20, a mobile triple-warhead nuclear missile, which presented new threat to Europe.
- o Success for NATO's 1979 "dual track decision" -- deploying US INF in Europe while pursuing negotiations with Soviets to restore INF balance at lowest possible level.
- o Have met the standards you established in 1983:
 - US-Soviet equality;
 - US and Soviet systems only; i.e., no compensation for UK/French systems;
 - Global limits (i.e., no transfer of threat to Asia);
 - No weakening of NATO's conventional capability (i.e., no dual-capable systems included); and
 - Effective verification (see separate paper).

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES (INF)
TREATY VERIFICATION

I. VERIFICATION OBJECTIVES

- o Enhance confidence in Treaty;
- o Deter violations by increasing risk of getting caught;
- o Quick detection of violations if they occur.

II. VERIFICATION REGIME CALLS FOR:

- o Locations for treaty-limited items to be specified until they are eliminated.
- o Exchange of comprehensive data on treaty-limited systems;
- o Updates of data throughout reduction period;
- o Specific procedures to verify elimination of treaty-limited systems;
- o Provisions for on-site inspection (OSI);
- o Provisions for verification by National Technical Means (NTM).

III. VERIFICATION PROCESS

- o Provisions have been made for routine exchange of data and to respond to compliance concerns.
- o In 11/87, sides began data exchange -- on missiles, launchers, bases. After Treaty is ratified and enters into force, initial "baseline" on-site inspection will check number of missiles and launchers.
- o There will be on-site inspection of missile/launcher destruction during three-year reduction period.
- o Sides are allowed to conduct short-notice on-site inspections of certain declared sites suspected of illegal activity during three-year reductions and for ten years afterward.

IV. INF VERIFICATION IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

- o US will seek verification measures that build and improve on INF experience for START agreement.
- o Intrusiveness of INF verification regime sets a positive precedent for other regimes.

STRATEGIC ARMS REDUCTION TALKS (START)

- o Agreed Reykjavik goal is 50% reductions to 6000 ballistic missile warheads and bomber weapons, 1600 strategic nuclear delivery vehicles (incl. bombers, missiles [though Soviets focus on launchers, while US emphasizes missiles]).
- o Bracketed Joint Draft Treaty Text developed in Geneva. Talks resume January 14, 1988; goal is to finish treaty by spring 1988.

Major Issues:

- o Sublimits: After long resisting the concept, Soviets recently tabled their own version of sublimits. There are significant differences between the two sides.
 - We propose 4800 ballistic missile warheads. Soviet formal proposal implies, but does not state, 4800-5300. Privately Soviets have said they could accept 5000 but only with complete freedom to mix between Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs) and Submarine Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBM).
 - Soviets propose 800-900 air-launched cruise missiles; US probably needs more of these stabilizing slow-flyers.
 - US prefers 3000 limit on ICBM warheads; will accept 3300. Soviets propose 3000-3300, but only if US accepts drastic limits on submarine warheads.
 - US wants 1650 limit on heavy and high-warheaded ICBMs. Soviets propose limit of 154 heavy ICBMs with "derived" limit of 1540 warheads on heavy ICBMs only.
 - Soviets propose a one-sided submarine warhead limit of 1800-2000. US wants more -- Soviet proposal would force us to largely restructure our forces and deploy very few submarines.
- o Linkage to Strategic Defenses: Soviets continue to link START with a Defense and Space Agreement limiting SDI. We argue that strategic reductions are good regardless.
- o Throw-weight: Soviets offer only a unilateral statement; we want to codify 50% limit in the Treaty text.
- o Mobile ICBMs: Soviets already have 100 road-mobile ICBMs; 10-warhead rail-mobile system is near deployment. We plan comparable systems. We propose ban on mobile ICBMs on grounds of verification and stability; have put onus on Soviets to show how mobiles could be monitored if allowed.

- o Sea-launched Cruise Missiles: Soviets want limit of 400 on long-range SLCMs (nuclear/conventional) with none on surface ships. At Reykjavik we agreed to find solution to problem of limiting deployments of nuclear armed SLCMs outside the 1600/6000 limits. Soviet proposal would gut our program, pose unacceptable military risk, not be verifiable.
- o Time frame to complete reductions: We propose 7 years; Soviets prefer 5 years but are willing to consider 7 years.
- o Allowing modernization of heavy ICBMs: Soviets insist such modernization be allowed; we would ban it and impose a flight test ban on existing heavy ICBMs.
- o Range cutoff and armament for ALCMs under a treaty: Soviets seek to use SALT II cutoff range of 600 km and would count all ALCMs as nuclear. We have not arrived at a position; may need significantly higher range and/or exceptions for conventional ALCMs.
- o Inclusion of Backfire: Soviets claim Backfire is a theater weapon which does not belong in a START treaty. We insist Backfire be included in strategic totals.
- o Non-circumvention and Trident II transfer: The Soviets, under the guise of non-circumvention, seek provisions that would ban transfer of the TRIDENT II (D-5) missile to the United Kingdom. We cannot accept such a limitation.
- o Verification: We differ on many important details. We have urged major focus on verification, especially on On-Site Inspection. We also have urged the Soviets to address how mobile ICBMs, if allowed, could be verified.

Soviet Special Concerns:

- o Constraints on SDI are continuing major issue for Soviets.
- o Gorbachev claims mobile ICBMs, the Backfire bomber, limits on Sea Launched Cruise Missiles (SLCMs), and allowing modernization of heavy ICBMs are all "artificial" impediments that must be removed.

DEFENSE & SPACE

I. Reykjavik

- o Sides agreed not to withdraw from ABM Treaty for 10 years, but disagreed over scope of offensive reductions (US proposed eliminating offensive ballistic missiles, Soviets all nuclear weapons) and over ABM activities during the period (Soviets sought to restrict SDI to lab research).

II. Current Status

- o Our April proposal, including commitment not to withdraw from ABM Treaty through 1994, remains on table.
- o Soviets acknowledge some ABM-related testing can occur in space, but they firmly reject US broad interpretation.
- o October 30 Joint Statement called for developing new instructions to delegations for a separate treaty "on observance of and non-withdrawal from the ABM Treaty for an agreed period" as a summit objective.
- o Round VIII ended November 19; next round begins January 14.

III. US Position

- o Commitment through 1994 not to withdraw from ABM Treaty in order to deploy systems other than those permitted by Treaty (contingent on 50% START reductions).
- o Sides would observe ABM Treaty provisions while continuing research, development and testing, which are permitted by the Treaty.
- o Either side will be free to deploy advanced strategic defenses after 1994, unless agreed otherwise.
- o "Predictability package" including data exchange, "open" laboratories, reciprocal observation of tests.

IV. Soviet Position

- o 10-year nonwithdrawal commitment to ABM Treaty and strict observance of ABM Treaty as "signed and ratified" in 1972; and
- o Either agree on list of devices not to be put in space if they exceed certain performance parameters; devices below thresholds could be put in space for any purpose, including ABM-related. "Other" research restricted to labs.
- o Or, "strict observance" incompatible with broad interpretation; unclear whether it equates to narrow interpretation.
- o Material breach of ABM Treaty would release other side from START obligations.

NUCLEAR TESTINGI. BACKGROUND

- o First round of talks ended November 20. Sides agreed to "familiarization" visits to each other's test sites in January 1988 (President first suggested such visits in September 1984 UNGA speech). Talks resume in February.
- o Next round, sides will try to agree on Joint Verification Experiments that address Soviet concerns re: CORTEX system.
- o Threat of Congressionally imposed testing limits has receded; could return depending on course of negotiations.

II. US POSITION

- o US requires a stage-by-stage process.
- o First, improved verification; ratification of Threshold Test Ban/Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaties (TTBT/PNET).
- o Then, along with a program to reduce and ultimately eliminate nuclear weapons, negotiate further intermediate limitations on, and ultimate cessation of, nuclear testing.
- o Negotiations on strategic arms cuts must be in progress, but not necessarily concluded, for talks on intermediate testing limits to begin; a reductions agreement must be ratified before completing negotiations on intermediate limitations.
- o Comprehensive Test Ban (CTB) remains long-term US goal, but only when we no longer depend on nuclear deterrence to ensure international security/stability, and when we have achieved: broad, deep and verifiable arms reductions; substantially improved verification capabilities; expanded confidence-building measures; greater balance in conventional forces.

III. SOVIET POSITION

- o Soviets agreed to reach agreement on effective verification measures for TTBT/PNET to permit ratification, but continue to press for intermediate test limits and near-term CTB.
- o Pushing for early Joint Verification Experiments, completion of TTBT/PNET verification protocols by mid-1988.
- o Gorbachev has pushed test ban since 1985. In June 1987, called for an immediate interim 1-Kiloton threshold and quota of 2-3 tests annually (some support for this in Congress).
- o Soviets observed moratorium from 8/6/85 - 2/26/87. Since then, they have conducted 19 tests (US 16; two more scheduled in December before summit).

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

DECLASSIFIED

NLRR M08-125/5 #67211
BY RW NARA DATE 6-10-10

COMPLIANCE ISSUES

ABM Treaty Review

- o Five-year review of the Treaty must be held between October 1987 - October 1988.
- o Soviets are pressing to set date for review. US has replied that: the review should be held; date and venue should be determined later through diplomatic channels.
- o We believe review should be deferred until both sides can better assess possible outcomes of discussions in Geneva arms control talks and elsewhere.

President's Report to Congress on Soviet Noncompliance

- o 1987 Report currently being prepared.
- o Principal findings of 1986 Report to Congress unchanged from 1985 Report, except SALT issues were only summarized.
- o Most important findings in 1986 Report were:
 - that the large radar under construction in Siberia near Krasnoyarsk is a clear violation of the ABM Treaty's restrictions on such radars;
 - that the Soviets may be preparing an illegal nationwide defense.
- o New issue during 1987 now being considered within USG concerns whether ABM radars have been moved from an authorized location -- an ABM test range -- to an electronics plant at Gomel, an action that may violate the Treaty.
- o US has raised this issue with Soviets in Geneva and has accepted Soviet offer to visit Gomel to collect information on whether Soviet activities there violate the ABM Treaty.
- o Important details of the Gomel visit (e.g., what will be open to inspection, how many US inspectors and for how long) are still to be negotiated.

VERIFICATION

- o General: Soviets have accepted, in principle, some elements of on-site inspection in most arms control negotiations. They hope to convince Western publics they are more serious about verification than we.
- o START: US tabled draft treaty with extensive verification provisions and details on conversion and destruction; Soviet draft treaty calls for some on-site inspection, but lacks details on many verification issues.

To complete work on verification, US must make decisions on technical issues such as how to count missile warheads and how to determine which types of air-launched cruise missiles will be counted under warhead limits. US has put onus on Soviets to show how mobile ICBMs can be monitored; will insist they be banned unless verification/stability concerns can be met.

- o Defense and Space: Verification barely discussed. Soviets have proposed vague provisions, such as pre-launch inspection of certain payloads, for their list of devices to be banned from space.

In the Conference on Disarmament, Soviets have suggested that international inspectors might monitor payloads before launching, to enforce ban on space weapons.

- o Nuclear Testing: First round of stage-by-stage negotiations on nuclear testing held November 9-20. First agreed stage is to achieve verification improvements required to permit ratification of the Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty. Sides have agreed on exchange of visits by experts to test sites, and have discussed a joint experiment to demonstrate verification methods.
- o Chemical Weapons: Soviets accepted "in principle" challenge inspection without right of refusal; concept of verification of data to be exchanged with US before treaty signature. INF experience suggests tough sledding ahead in addressing details.
- o Conference on Disarmament in Europe (CDE): Soviets for first time accepted mandatory air and ground inspection of military exercises on Soviet soil. US carried out the first such inspection in August; Soviets inspected NATO exercises in Turkey and the FRG in October.
- o Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions (MBFR): Soviets did not respond constructively to Western 1985 offer on verification provisions; reiterated view that provisions not commensurate with the scale of reductions.

SECRET

Declassify on: OADR

DECLASSIFIED

NLRR M08-125/5 #67213

BY RW NARA DATE 6-10-10

ABM TREATY INTERPRETATION

I. Current Status

- o SDI program now complies with narrow interpretation. In 1985 USG concluded broad interpretation was fully justified. President decided as matter of policy not to restructure SDI program at that time, but reserved right to do so in future.
- o In 1987 in-depth legal analyses of negotiating record, ratification proceedings, and subsequent practices confirmed that broad interpretation is fully justified.
- o November 1987 consultations with Congress resulted in agreement to adhere to FY 88 testing program (consistent with narrow interpretation), unless Congress specifically grants funds for tests under broad interpretation. FY 88 funds may, however, be used to plan for such tests.

II. US Position

- o ABM Treaty poses no limitations on ABM-related research, regardless of where such research takes place.
- o For Article II systems and components (i.e., "traditional" physical principles), prohibited development begins with field testing of a prototype of an ABM component.
- o For systems and components based on "other physical principles" (OPP), Agreed Statement D bans deployment regardless of basing mode, but permits development and testing.
- o US decision to deploy strategic defenses would be subject of consultations with Allies and consultations and negotiations, as appropriate, with Soviets, as envisioned under ABM Treaty, or as specified in new treaty.

III. Soviet Position

- o Since NST talks began, Soviets have attempted to limit research and impose tighter restrictions on development and testing beyond those agreed to in the ABM Treaty in 1972.
- o In September they acknowledged for first time that some ABM-related testing in space is permitted; now stress that the sides should "strictly observe" the ABM Treaty "as signed and ratified in 1972."
- o Not clear the Soviets view this as identical to narrow interpretation; list proposal would place restrictions on research. They have emphasized that the "broad" interpretation is incompatible with the ABM Treaty.

NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

I. Bilateral Consultations

- o Nine rounds of US-Soviet non-proliferation consultations completed. Next round planned for Washington in January. Consultations generally productive and non-confrontational.
- o Soviets have presented us a draft for bilateral agreement to combat nuclear terrorism that addresses the wrong issues.
- o We have proposed more practical ways to cooperate to combat nuclear terrorism.

II. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

- o Both US and USSR are strong supporters of IAEA.
- o Partly for propaganda (and to counter the Chernobyl disaster), Soviets have made their contribution to IAEA early, while US contributions are reduced and late, due to Congressionally-imposed reductions.
- o We expect Soviets to urge prompt and full US payment.
- o We view IAEA as high priority and will continue strong support within appropriations limits.

III. Regional Issues

- o South Africa: At September IAEA General Conference, Pretoria announced willingness to consider adherence to Nonproliferation Treaty and offered discussions with nuclear weapons states. Both we and the Soviets have stated readiness to talk with South Africa.
- o South Asia: We want Soviets to help our efforts to draw India and Pakistan into constructive dialogue on regional non-proliferation solution. Soviets have not pressed India.

IV. Nuclear Safety and Cooperation

- o Soviets have made a proposal for technical cooperation with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on nuclear safety. While not all aspects of it are acceptable, we are giving it serious consideration.
- o US, USSR, European Community and Japan have begun three-year cooperative effort to design advanced fusion reactor. No decision has been made on actual construction.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS TREATY

I. BACKGROUND

- o 1925 Geneva Protocol bans the use of chemical weapons, but possession and transfer remain unconstrained.
- o In 1984, Vice President Bush tabled US draft treaty at 40 nation Conference on Disarmament in Geneva (CD).
- o At Geneva summit, agreed to accelerate bilateral negotiations with Soviet Union toward global ban.
- o Major obstacle has been Soviet unwillingness to accept stringent verification measures. Soviets now claim to accept US proposals in principle, though their negative reaction to US suspect site provisions in INF calls their commitment into question.
- o To date, the US has not been able to identify measures that would make the draft CW treaty effectively monitorable, or verifiable to protect the security interests of the US and its allies.
- o Have conducted exchange of visits to US, Soviet chemical weapons facility as confidence-building measure and means to promote greater openness.
- o US modernization program proceeding on schedule; final assembly of binary (155 mm. howitzer shells) weapons may begin December 16.

II. US POSITION

- o Pursue effective, verifiable global ban on chemical weapons.
- o Prompt, mandatory challenge inspection with no right of refusal essential for all suspect sites.
- o US continues to have verification concerns regarding undeclared stocks/facilities, novel agents.
- o Continue to study ways to develop effective verification, ensure security of all states within chemical weapons treaty regime.
- o Proliferation of CW-capable states introduces additional concerns about effectiveness of a CD-sponsored convention.
- o US now seeking a way to codify a constrained residual deterrent while gaining confidence that a convention is being complied with.

III. SOVIET POSITION

- o Have publicly admitted possession; announced production moratorium, work on destruction facility.
- o Now accept most of US draft treaty, including challenge inspection with no right of refusal. Fine print still unknown.
- o Pushing for completion of treaty by mid-1988. Proposed joint summit statement, with commitment to sign ban, as way to give "political impetus" to multilateral negotiations.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS (CW) PROLIFERATIONI. The Problem

- o The number of states possessing chemical weapons has grown dramatically. Approximately 20 states now possess chemical weapons; several more are actively seeking such capability.
- o Chemical weapons are known as the "poor man's nuclear weapon" -- a cheap, effective weapon for Third World states.
- o Proliferation is particularly acute in conflict-torn regions, such as the Middle East and South Asia.
- o Have also seen alarming increase in use of chemical weapons -- in clear violation of 1925 Geneva Protocol.

II. The Solution

- o US has adopted three-part program of concrete measures:
 - Technical measures, such as export controls, to slow proliferation by drying up supply, raising cost;
 - Direct political action with proliferating states and other third parties to discourage acquisition;
 - Support for international investigations of use to prevent illegal use.
- o US has taken steps in all three areas; strongly encouraged other states -- East and West -- to do the same.

III. International Dialogue

- o At Geneva Summit, agreed to initiate dialogue with Soviets on problem of chemical weapons proliferation.
- o Three rounds of bilateral discussions have identified considerable common ground: Soviets accept concept of US three-part approach, have imposed export controls, support investigations of use.
- o However, Soviets remain reluctant to take difficult but necessary political steps, such as protests to client states.
- o US has also engaged friends and Allies: 19-member "Australian Group" has adopted chemical "warning lists," condemned CW use.