WITHDRAWAL SHEET
Ronald Reagan Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
~~1. briefing book~~	~~the meetings of President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev, December 1987~~ 26p R 12/9/05 M03-1471 #1H-1J	~~n.d.~~	~~P 1, P 5~~

COLLECTION:		
	DANZANSKY, STEPHEN I.: Files	db
FILE FOLDER:	RAC Box 19	
	Briefing Book: the meetings of Reagan/Gorbachev, 12/87 Box ~~91605~~ (1/4)	11/8/94

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- **P-1** National security classified information [(a)(1) of the PRA].
- **P-2** Relating to appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA].
- **P-3** Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA].
- **P-4** Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA].
- **P-5** Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA.
- **P-6** Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA].

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

- **F-2** Release could disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA].
- **F-7** Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA].
- **F-8** Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA].
- **F-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.

TALKING POINTS: NST ISSUES

1. INF Treaty

2. START

3. Defense and Space

4. Compliance

5. Follow-on Negotiations

TALKING POINTS: INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES (INF) TREATY

-- INF is a fine Treaty.
-- The key to its success is full implementation of its provisions, including all of the verification measures that were so painstakingly negotiated.
-- The measures that we have agreed to are new and there will no doubt be wrinkles to iron out as we proceed.
-- What is important is for both sides to have confidence from the very beginning that it is going to work.
-- We will be under terrific scrutiny. But I think we should take our cue from the successful first year of the Stockholm Document's inspection regime.
-- I think we both agree that the INF Treaty should only be the first step.
-- It wasn't easy getting here, so let's make this hard work serve as a guide for future agreements.
-- Specifically, let's remember the importance of the principles of US-Soviet equality and effective verification as we hammer out the details of a START treaty.
-- For as the security of our two countries increases, so will the prospects for peace and security throughout the world.
-- Our INF verification experience will provide a good foundation for the comprehensive verification measures that will be necessary in other arms negotiations, especially in START.

TALKING POINTS: STRATEGIC ARMS REDUCTIONS (START)

-- We have come a long way since we first met in Geneva. Expectations are rising that we can reach a START agreement before next summer.

-- I think it can be done, but we can't waste any time. At the same time, I'm only interested in a sound, verifiable treaty. You should be under no illusions that the fact that I have only a year remaining can be used to pressure us into a hasty or unwise agreement.

-- We have agreed that our meeting here should result in specific instructions to our negotiators. I'd like to run through some issues that require our attention now.

-- (Sublimits) We are close on both the concept and levels.

-- Sublimit on all ballistic missile warheads.

  -- We prefer 4800. You say 5000 or 5100. We should solve this while you are here.

-- Sublimit on ICBM warheads.

  -- A sublimit on ICBM warheads would help stability.

  -- You obviously don't disagree in principle since you proposed 3000-3300 in October. We should try to reach final agreement on this now.

-- Sublimit on heavy ICBMs.

  -- You have offered to limit your heavy ICBMs to 154 and heavy ICBM warheads to 1540 -- this is constructive and should be written into the treaty.

-- (Throwweight) Your side has said it will reduce throwweight by half, and not exceed this limit. So we agree on the basic substance.

-- This issue is important to us.

  -- Your missiles can deliver much more payload than ours.

  -- Without reductions and enduring limits on throwweight, many here will question seriously whether a START agreement actually improves our security.

-- Your side has offered a unilateral statement about reducing and limiting throwweight.

-- We think this matter is too central to our security and the viability of a START treaty to be handled that way.

-- We should agree in Washington to instruct our negotiators to work out a way to record this limit in the treaty.

-- (Mobile ICBMs) You have objected to our proposed ban on mobile ICBMs.

-- You are deploying two varieties. The SS-25, which goes on roads, and the SS-24, which goes on the railroad.

-- We, too, are developing plans for ICBMs that would move along highways and railroads. If you have such missiles, we must too.

-- We recognize that such missiles might be attractive, but we have serious concerns over verification and stability.

-- Verification is the key.

-- As Secretary Shultz has told you, we are willing to work very hard on this with you, but thus far we see no acceptable verification approach, and you haven't been able to suggest one.

-- You and I should agree that since we can't find such an approach, mobile ICBMs should be banned.

-- (Sea-Launched Cruise Missiles) At Reykjavik, both sides agreed that nuclear-armed SLCMs would be dealt with outside the 6000 limit. We agreed to find a solution to limiting these weapons.

-- Your solution is a specific limit on SLCMs. We see two major problems with this:

  -- Your proposed limits would severely hamper our conventional naval capabilities. We cannot accept that in an agreement on strategic nuclear forces.

  -- And, we just don't see any effective way to verify limits.

-- Perhaps we should look at the problem in a new way -- as one of predictability, not hard limits. Under this approach, the goal would be to provide each other a sense of each side's plans and programs.

-- This would help ensure against surprises, and allow each side an opportunity to plan intelligently.

-- (Verification) We need to focus the work of our Geneva delegations on the issue of verification.

-- There are two reasons this is crucial:

  -- Our experience with INF points out that important issues will arise; many unexpected. so it is not too soon to get cracking on this.

  -- Second, intensified work on this issue might point the way to solutions to the remaining problems.

-- So a real effort is needed now.

-- (Link to Defenses) I need to tell you frankly that we cannot accept your tactic of holding strategic offensive reductions hostage to your efforts to cripple our SDI program.

-- Strategic offensive reductions are long overdue, on their own merits. It is time to get on with them.

-- On the other hand, there is no need for further limits on defenses beyond those actually agreed in the ABM Treaty, and we cannot accept them.

TALKING POINTS: DEFENSE AND SPACE (D&S)

-- (Preserving or Foreclosing Options) As Secretary Shultz and Secretary Carlucci framed the issue for you in Moscow, we need to find out whether there is a formulation which gives you assurances for the future but which preserves the strength and thrust of the SDI program.

-- What the issue comes down to, for me at least, is the question of preserving options for the future.

-- When we met in Geneva, you tried to convince me to renounce the SDI program altogether.

-- At Reykjavik, we had a good discussion going, but you insisted on restricting SDI to the laboratory.

-- What both Geneva and Reykjavik said to me was that you were trying to foreclose options.

-- You were trying to cut SDI off at the knees before it ever had a chance to prove itself -- and before we ever had a chance to consider its possibilities.

-- I will not do this. I will not give up what I believe is an opportunity -- for the first time since nuclear weapons came into existence -- to reduce the risk of war by learning how to defend effectively and efficiently against ballistic missile attack.

-- I am not saying you must sign onto this opportunity now. I wish you would, but you may not have as much faith as I do in

technology and our ability to use it to create effective defenses.

-- That's all right. I am willing to convince you of the validity -- and viability -- of my vision for the future as time goes by and it becomes clear without a doubt.

-- What I am asking -- indeed, I cannot accept anything but -- is that you not try to foreclose that option now.

-- If your intent is to shut off possibilities before they've had a chance, then our efforts to find common ground in this area will ultimately fail.

-- But if we can agree that our fundamental objective here is to preserve options, then perhaps we can work this out.

-- (Specific Formulations) So how do we find that formulation?

-- Seems to me we agree on one basic thing: that there will be a nonwithdrawal period from the ABM Treaty for a certain length of time and, during this time, the sides will observe the ABM Treaty.

-- That seems straightforward enough but, as we both realize, it really isn't complete.

-- Three things are missing. There are also a number of smaller problems that our delegations have been working on, but I think that if you and I resolve the bigger questions, the other problems might become easier.

-- (Length of Nonwithdrawal from ABM Treaty) The first is how long the nonwithdrawal period will last.

-- You say ten years. We say through 1994.

-- Our proposal would take us into the middle of the next decade -- a very long time if you consider that we would be undertaking an obligation affecting at least two future U.S. Presidential terms.

-- (What Happens After) The second is the question of what happens after the nonwithdrawal period ends.

-- I would like to see spelled out a "right to deploy."

-- Having the right to deploy would not obligate a side to exercise that right, any more than having the right to withdraw obligates a side to withdraw.

-- Rather, getting back to the point I was making earlier, it is needed to preserve options.

-- Should effective defenses prove feasible -- and that means meeting the criteria that I set of military effectiveness, survivability, and cost-effectiveness at the margin -- then I want to make sure that we can see it through.

-- If effective defenses do not prove feasible or as long as we are still evaluating their potential, then we would not exercise the right to deploy and -- as long as you did not exercise that right -- we would continue to respect our ABM Treaty obligations.

-- (Activities During Period) The last big issue with regard to a formulation on "observance of and nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty" is what the sides mean when they say "observe."

-- I think you know my views very well on this. I will not accept any restraints that go beyond those agreed to in 1972.

-- This means that we should be able to take advantage of our full rights, including development and testing of systems based on new technologies.

-- I am less clear about what your position is.

-- You now say that some ABM testing could occur in space. I think that's a welcome development.

-- But I have heard several different interpretations about your position; perhaps you would tell me yourself now.

-- However, it is clear that some of your proposals would place limits on research and associated testing which go beyond the ABM Treaty. Given what I have said about maintaining future options, we can't accept this.

-- We also have our top experts with us. They should get together and report back to us through Secretary Shultz and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze.

Contingency Points

If Gorbachev argues that "right to deploy" forecloses Soviet options:

-- As I said, having the right to deploy would not obligate a side to use it. Rather it preserves that option.

-- I'm not sure what we're arguing about; even under your proposal, the sides could deploy.

-- Currently, either side can deploy after giving six months' notice of intent to withdraw from the ABM Treaty.

-- So even under your proposal either side could deploy after the nonwithdrawal period if it gave six months' notice.

-- So what is the real concern here? A six-month notification period or making explicit what already is an implicit right?

~~SECRET~~

TALKING POINTS: COMPLIANCE WITH PAST AGREEMENTS

-- Full compliance with the obligations of all the agreements between us is essential.

-- The record of the Soviet Union in this regard is very troublesome. No example stands out more clearly than the large radar you are building in Siberia near Krasnoyarsk (Kraz-NOH-yarzk).

-- To my mind, Krasnoyarsk is something like the SS-20 -- a Soviet deployment decision taken years ago that has caused deep suspicion in the West about Soviet intentions.

-- You must decide whether Krasnoyarsk adds to your security -- or whether, like the SS-20, it is more of a liability.

-- What I want you to understand clearly is how large a liability it really is.

-- The suspicion aroused by Krasnoyarsk will make itself felt in all else you and I are trying to do:

    -- For example, I must answer this basic question -- if the Soviet Union has not complied with past agreements, why should the Senate ratify new ones?

    -- This will be a tough question to deal with on INF. And it could stop a START agreement in its tracks.

-- You have said you are stopping construction of the radar. But that is not enough.

-- The only real solution -- one that will dispel the mistrust caused by Krasnoyarsk -- is to dismantle the radar.

~~SECRET~~

Contingency Points:

If Gorbachev raises the modernization of THULE (Greenland) and/or FYLINGDALES (U.K.) -- two large radars the US is building to replace old equipment at those locations:

-- The situation is not analogous to Krasnoyarsk. Krasnoyarsk is a crystal-clear violation of the ABM Treaty. It's the wrong type of radar, in the wrong location and pointed in the wrong direction.

-- The US radars you mentioned are permitted by the Treaty. Early warning radars have always been there and modernization is permitted by the Treaty. We do not intend to, nor would Congress allow us, to trade legal radars for an illegal one.

-- Even the Congressmen that visited Krasnoyarsk came back convinced that it was a clear violation of the Treaty.

~~SECRET~~

TALKING POINTS: FOLLOW-ON NEGOTIATIONS

Contingency Points:

If Gorbachev raises negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons:

-- We have just agreed on a dramatic reduction in nuclear weapons in Europe. It's logical to think of next steps.
-- My objective in arms control is to enhance security -- not to negotiate just for the sake of negotiating.
-- Moreover, when I consider short-range systems, or dual-capable aircraft, I always do so in a NATO context.
-- Right now, NATO has agreed that our arms control priorities must be to work for conventional stability at lower levels, and for a comprehensive global ban on chemical weapons.

If Gorbachev raises short-range forces (below 500 km):

-- As I said, we are discussing this within NATO. Our Allies agree with us on the need to give priority now to conventional and chemical arms control.
-- I am not going to get into a discussion with you about how we consult on these questions with our allies.

NON-NST ARMS CONTROL ISSUES

~~SECRET~~

POINT PAPER: NON-NST ARMS CONTROL

Chemical Weapons

-- Soviets pushing for early completion of treaty; have publicly accused US of backing off global ban, encouraging proliferation through binary production.

-- We continue to have serious concerns regarding verification; studying ways to enhance security within treaty regime.

-- Round VII of bilateral talks began November 30 in Geneva. Encourage serious effort to tackle unresolved issues.

Nuclear Testing

-- First round of Nuclear Testing Talks November 9-20 in Geneva. Agreed to exchange visits to testing sites in January 1988, in preparation for Joint Verification Experiments (JVEs).

-- Stress need for constructive effort to complete verification for Threshold Test Ban Treaty/Peaceful Nuclear Explosion Treaty (TTBT/PNET).

Conventional Stability Talks

-- Main threat to stability in Europe is substantial Eastern conventional superiority. New negotiations should focus on conventional ground forces; participation should be limited to NATO and Warsaw Pact members.

-- NATO's objectives -- greater openness, stable balance at lower levels -- are in both sides' interest.

Vienna CSCE Follow-up Meeting

-- 1987 conclusion unlikely. East stalling on both security, human rights issues. Drafting moving at snail's pace.

-- Stress US willingness to stay in Vienna as long as necessary to achieve balanced outcome.

Nuclear Non-proliferation

-- Need to focus efforts on South Asia. Soviet support for Indo-Pakistani non-proliferation talks would encourage process.

-- Soviets should also consider our suggestion for joint summit statement calling on India and Pakistan to halt nuclear arms race in South Asia.

-- Tenth round of Nuclear Proliferation Treaty (NPT) bilateral consultations set for Washington in January.

~~SECRET~~

Soviet Military Practices

-- The Soviet military has taken a number of actions which have killed, injured or endangered US military personnel.

Soviet Nuclear Weapon Free Zone Proposals

-- Should Gorbachev raise his proposals for nuclear weapon free zones, contingency talking points are provided.

Gorbachev's Murmansk Speech

-- Should Gorbachev raise the proposals suggested in his Murmansk speech, contingency talking points are provided.

Soviet Asian Initiatives

-- Should Gorbachev raise recent Soviet initiatives in Asia, contingency points are provided.

TALKING POINTS: NON-NST ARMS CONTROL

1. Chemical Weapons

2. Nuclear Testing

3. Conventional Arms Control

4. CSCE Follow-up Meeting

5. Nuclear Non-Proliferation

6. Soviet Military Practice

7. Nuclear Weapon Free Zones

8. Gorbachev's Murmansk Speech

9. Confidence Building Measures in Asia

TALKING POINTS: CHEMICAL WEAPONS (CW)

-- When you and I met in Geneva in 1985, we agreed to "accelerate" negotiations on a chemical weapons ban.

-- There has been progress since then, but our negotiators have a lot of hard work ahead.

-- The Soviet Union has said that a chemical weapons ban can be concluded in the near future.

-- The US remains committed to a ban -- but only to one that protects our security by being truly global and verifiable.

-- That's a tall order to fill, but one we'll keep working at.

Contingency Points:

If Gorbachev Raises US Binary Program:

-- The US chemical weapons modernization program is designed to provide a stable, safer deterrent at lower levels.

TALKING POINTS: NUCLEAR TESTING

-- The first round of negotiations got off to a good start in November.

-- It's important that we make progress on verification improvements for the existing treaties, so they can be ready for ratification as soon as possible.

-- I am also pleased by the Soviet decision to accept my long-standing invitation to visit nuclear testing sites. This can provide a good basis to move forward.

-- Our next step, however, should be taking those actions needed to improve verification so that we can finally ratify the Threshhold Test Ban and Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaties (TTBT/PNET).

TALKING POINTS: CONVENTIONAL ARMS CONTROL

-- Now that we've reached an INF agreement, conventional stability deserves our priority attention. Warsaw Pact conventional superiority is largest obstacle to greater stability.

-- We are encouraged by your businesslike approach in Vienna on a negotiating mandate for conventional stability from the Atlantic to the Urals.

-- Our objectives in the new negotiations will be to establish a more stable balance of conventional forces at lower levels and more openness in military activities.

-- We will not agree to address nuclear weapons or capabilities in these negotiations, nor should neutral and nonaligned nations have a right of review over NATO-Warsaw Pact agreements that emerge from these negotiations.

-- Our final decision to proceed with new conventional stability talks -- as well as with distinct negotiations on confidence-and security-building measures -- will depend on getting a balanced result at the Vienna CSCE meeting. We'll be looking for significantly improved Soviet performance in human rights.

TALKING POINTS: CSCE FOLLOW-UP MEETING

-- We are hopeful that this conference in Vienna can successfully conclude soon with a balanced final document.

-- However, we are prepared to stay in Vienna as long as necessary to get a satisfactory result.

-- We believe it essential that the outcome reflect satisfactory progress in human rights and the other parts of the Helsinki accords as well as the security area.

~~SECRET~~

TALKING POINTS: NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

-- I think we both agree with the principle that proliferation of nuclear weapons should not occur.

-- The most dangerous place right now for potential proliferation is South Asia.

-- Soviet support for non-proliferation talks between India and Pakistan would encourage those two states to negotiate.

-- I would urge you to agree to a joint statement calling on India and Pakistan to halt their nuclear arms race.

TALKING POINTS: SOVIET MILITARY PRACTICES

-- I am concerned by several recent instances in which actions by the Soviet military either did or could have resulted in serious injury -- even death -- to Americans or our Allies.

-- On September 17, a two-man US Military Liaison Mission team was fired on by a group of Soviet soldiers in East Germany, and the US driver was injured.

-- I understand that Soviet officials have already apologized for the incident and have said they are taking steps to prevent similar incidents from happening in the future. That's a welcome development.

-- But, given the killing of Major Nicholson in 1985, this most recent incident should not have occurred at all.

-- I'm sure you'll agree with me that our number one priority should be preserving life. When life is lost because of senseless actions, it is up to you and me to look into the matter to ensure that it does not happen again.

-- Likewise, I was very concerned about the test-firing of Soviet ICBMs near Hawaii. It could have had very grave consequences if something had gone wrong.

TALKING POINTS: NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE-ZONES (NWFZ)

Contingency Points:

If Gorbachev raises his proposals involving nuclear weapon free zones:

-- The best way to limit the spread of nuclear weapons is the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

-- The US has supported certain nuclear weapon free zones, e.g., the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which advance non-proliferation objectives and do not place other security interests at risk.

-- However, as a matter of policy, we oppose nuclear weapon free zones that erode nuclear deterrence and undercut existing security arrangements.

-- This is why we oppose them in Europe.

TALKING POINTS: GORBACHEV'S MURMANSK SPEECH

Contingency Points:

If Gorbachev raises the proposals in his Murmansk speech:

-- We and our Allies see little for us in the security aspects of your Murmansk speech.

-- Many of these issues are already being treated in existing fora; other proposals which you endorsed, such as a nuclear weapons free zone, would not contribute to stability and security.

-- Main tasks now are clear:

  -- A START Treaty implementing 50 percent reductions;

  -- A global chemical weapons ban;

  -- Conventional stability talks covering the whole of Europe.

-- We noted the reaction of your European neighbors was not enthusiastic: some said the speech represented "a step backward."

TALKING POINTS: CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES IN ASIA

Contingency Points:

If Gorbachev raises his proposals for confidence-building in Asia mentioned in his Vladivostok speech or his interview in Merdeka magazine:

-- The confidence-building proposals included in your Vladivostok speech and Merdeka interview are asymmetrical and fail to address the real sources of tension in the region.

-- These stem from the massive build-up of Soviet forces in Asia over the past 25 years and the use of force by the Soviet Union, Vietnam and North Korea against their Asian neighbors.

-- If you want to contribute to stability in the region, these are the issues you need to start with.