be Su P. C. Sies Jos. ALX

SECRET 2

10 DOWNING STREET

From the Private Secretary

23 May, 1986.

MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT REAGAN: COMPLIANCE WITH ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENTS

I enclose a copy of a message from President Reagan to the Prime Minister received this evening about the decision which he has reached on future compliance with the SALT II Treaty. The message covers the text of a statement which the President will make on 27 May.

As you will see, the President rejects the idea of a further extension of the US observance of the terms of SALT II, and makes clear that he will announce next week that the United States will proceed to equip its 131st B-52 heavy bomber for cruise missile carriage near the end of this year. The President asks for the Prime Minister's understanding and support.

You will wish to consider whether a further reply from the Prime Minister is appropriate. We shall also need to consider carefully the terms in which we comment on the President's statement when it is made on 27 May. I should be grateful if you could telegraph the necessary recommendations to us in Israel or on the return flight on 27 May.

I am sending copies of this letter and its enclosure to John Howe (Ministry of Defence) and Michael Stark (Cabinet Office).

C.D. Powell

A.C. Galsworthy, Esq., CMG, Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

SECRET

SUBJEGI CC MASTER OPS

SUBSECT US Declassified 14

PERSONAL MESSAGE

SERIAL No. 797/86

WAGO18
OO WTE24
DE WTE £3131 1431607
O 231728Z MAY 86
FM THE WHITE HOUSE
TO CABINET OFFICE
ZEM

S E C R E T EYES ONLY VIA CABINET OFFICE CHANNELS WHO3131

PLEASE DELIVER THE FOLLOWING MESSAGE TO PRIME MINISTER MARGARET THATCHER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 23, 1986

DEAR MARGARET,

AS YOU KNOW, THE NEXT U.S. TRIDENT SUBMARINE, USS NEVADA, WILL BEGIN SEA TRIALS ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 28. I WOULD LIKE TO SHARE WITH YOU, IN ADVANCE OF INFORMING OUR OTHER COLLEAGUES TO WHOM I PLAN TO WRITE THIS WEEKEND THROUGH NORMAL CHANNELS, THE DECISION THAT I HAVE MADE CONCERNING U.S. INTERIM RESTRAINT POLICY. THIS HAS NOT BEEN AN EASY DECISION.

IN COMING TO MY DECISION, I CAREFULLY REVIEWED YOUR APRIL LETTER. I STRONGLY SHARE YOUR VIEW THAT DEMOCRATIC NATIONS MUST STRICTLY OBSERVE TREATIES. THERE IS NO QUESTION THAT THE UNITED STATES HAS, AND WILL CONTINUE TO DO JUST THAT. HOWEVER, IN REACHING MY INTERIM RESTRAINT DECISION, I HAVE STRUGGLED WITH ONE BASIC, FUNDAMENTAL FACT. THE SALT II TREATY IS A FLAWED DOCUMENT THAT WAS NEVER RATIFIED UNDER THE PROCEDURES SET FORTH IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES. EVEN HAD IT BEEN, IT WOULD HAVE ALREADY EXPIRED. MOREOVER, THE SALT II TREATY HAS BEEN UNDERCUT BY THE SOVIET UNION THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT AND SUBSEQUENT FLIGHT-TESTING OF THE SS-25, AND BY OTHER SOVIET VIOLATIONS OF ITS TERMS. THIS BEING THE CASE, THE SALT II TREATY SIMPLY DOES NOT REPRESENT A LEGALLY BINDING COMMITMENT ON THE UNITED STATES.

I FIRMLY BELIEVE THAT THE UNITED STATES HAS GONE MORE THAN THE EXTRA MILE. DESPITE MY RESERVATIONS ABOUT SALT II, IN 1982, ON THE EVE OF THE START NEGOTIATIONS, I UNDERTOOK NOT TO UNDERCUT EXISTING AGREEMENTS, INCLUDING SALT II, PROVIDED THE SOVIET UNION EXERCISED EQUAL RESTRAINT. LAST JUNE, I DECIDED TO DISMANTLE A POSEIDON SUBMARINE TO PROVIDE, ONCE AGAIN, BOTH THE TIME AND THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE SOVIET UNION TO JOIN US IN ESTABLISHING AN INTERIM FRAMEWORK OF MUTUAL RESTRAINT, ONE WHICH WOULD ALLOW US TO FOCUS OUR EFFORTS ON PURSUING THE SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS WE CONTINUE TO SEEK IN STRATEGIC NUCLEAR ARSENALS.

REGRETTABLY, THE SOVIET UNION HAS NOT RESPONDED CONSTRUCTIVELY TO OUR INITIATIVES. IN FACT, THE SOVIET UNION HAS

END OF PAGE 01

WAGO18
00 WTE24
DE WTE £3131 1431607
0 231728Z MAY 86
FM THE WHITE HOUSE
TO CABINET OFFICE
ZEM

S E C R E T EYES ONLY VIA CABINET OFFICE CHANNELS WHO3131

PLEASE DELIVER THE FOLLOWING MESSAGE TO PRIME MINISTER MARGARET THATCHER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 23, 1986

DEAR MARGARET.

AS YOU KNOW, THE NEXT U.S. TRIDENT SUBMARINE, USS NEVADA, WILL BEGIN SEA TRIALS ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 28. I WOULD LIKE TO SHARE WITH YOU, IN ADVANCE OF INFORMING OUR OTHER COLLEAGUES TO WHOM I PLAN TO WRITE THIS WEEKEND THROUGH NORMAL CHANNELS, THE DECISION THAT I HAVE MADE CONCERNING U.S. INTERIM RESTRAINT POLICY. THIS HAS NOT BEEN AN EASY DECISION.

IN COMING TO MY DECISION, I CAREFULLY REVIEWED YOUR APRIL LETTER. I STRONGLY SHARE YOUR VIEW THAT DEMOCRATIC NATIONS MUST STRICTLY OBSERVE TREATIES. THERE IS NO QUESTION THAT THE UNITED STATES HAS, AND WILL CONTINUE TO DO JUST THAT. HOWEVER, IN REACHING MY INTERIM RESTRAINT DECISION, I HAVE STRUGGLED WITH ONE BASIC, FUNDAMENTAL FACT. THE SALT II TREATY IS A FLAWED DOCUMENT THAT WAS NEVER RATIFIED UNDER THE PROCEDURES SET FORTH IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES. EVEN HAD IT BEEN, IT WOULD HAVE ALREADY EXPIRED. MOREOVER, THE SALT II TREATY HAS BEEN UNDERCUT BY THE SOVIET UNION THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT AND SUBSEQUENT FLIGHT-TESTING OF THE SS-25, AND BY OTHER SOVIET VIOLATIONS OF ITS TERMS. THIS BEING THE CASE, THE SALT II TREATY SIMPLY DOES NOT REPRESENT A LEGALLY BINDING COMMITMENT ON THE UNITED STATES.

I FIRMLY BELIEVE THAT THE UNITED STATES HAS GONE MORE THAN THE EXTRA MILE. DESPITE MY RESERVATIONS ABOUT SALT II, IN 1982, ON THE EVE OF THE START NEGOTIATIONS, I UNDERTOOK NOT TO UNDERCUT EXISTING AGREEMENTS, INCLUDING SALT II, PROVIDED THE SOVIET UNION EXERCISED EQUAL RESTRAINT. LAST JUNE, I DECIDED TO DISMANTLE A POSEIDON SUBMARINE TO PROVIDE, ONCE AGAIN, BOTH THE TIME AND THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE SOVIET UNION TO JOIN US IN ESTABLISHING AN INTERIM FRAMEWORK OF MUTUAL RESTRAINT, ONE WHICH WOULD ALLOW US TO FOCUS OUR EFFORTS ON PURSUING THE SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS WE CONTINUE TO SEEK IN STRATEGIC NUCLEAR ARSENALS.

REGRETTABLY, THE SOVIET UNION HAS NOT RESPONDED CONSTRUCTIVELY TO OUR INITIATIVES. IN FACT, THE SOVIET UNION HAS

SELECTIVELY UNDERCUT THE VERY AGREEMENTS UPON WHICH OUR INTERIM RESTRAINT POLICY WAS BASED. UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES, I AM CONCERNED THAT, THROUGH A FURTHER EXTENSION OF OUR OBSERVANCE OF THE TERMS OF SALT II, I WOULD, DE FACTO, INSTITUTIONALIZE WHAT AMOUNTS TO INDEFINITE UNILATERAL U.S. COMPLIANCE WITH THE UNRATIFIED SALT II TREATY. I CAN NO LONGER PRUDENTLY TAKE SUCH A RISK. TO DO SO WOULD ERODE THE NECESSARY CHECKS AND BALANCES INHERENT IN THE TREATY RATIFICATION PROCESS ESTABLISHED BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES AND BY SUBSEQUENT LEGISLATION. I HOPE, MARGARET, THAT YOU WILL APPRECIATE MY CONCERN ABOUT THE PRECEDENT THAT COULD BE SET BY SUCH ACTION.

IN THE ATTACHED STATEMENT, WHICH I INTEND TO RELEASE ON TUESDAY, MAY 27, YOU WILL SEE THAT I AM DIRECTING THE RETIREMENT AND DISMANTLEMENT OF TWO POSEIDON SUBMARINES. HOWEVER, GIVEN THE LACK OF A SOVIET RESPONSE TO OUR CALLS TO JOIN US IN ESTABLISHING AN INTERIM FRAMEWORK OF TRULY MUTUAL RESTRAINT, I HAVE DETERMINED THAT, IN THE FUTURE, THE UNITED STATES MUST BASE DECISIONS REGARDING ITS STRATEGIC FORCE STRUCTURE ON THE NATURE AND MAGNITUDE OF THE THREAT POSED BY SOVIET STRATEGIC FORCES, AND NOT ON STANDARDS CONTAINED IN A FLAWED TREATY WHICH WAS NEVER RATIFIED, WHICH WOULD HAVE EXPIRED IF IT HAD BEEN RATIFIED, AND, WHICH HAS, IN ADDITION, BEEN VIOLATED BY THE SOVIET UNION.

FURTHER, MY STATEMENT POINTS OUT THAT SINCE THE U.S. WILL RETIRE AND DISMANTLE TWO POSEIDON SUBMARINES THIS SUMMER, THE U.S. WILL REMAIN TECHNICALLY IN OBSERVANCE OF THE TERMS OF THE SALT II TREATY UNTIL WE EQUIP OUR 131ST B-52 HEAVY BOMBER FOR CRUISE MISSILE CARRIAGE NEAR THE END OF THIS YEAR. I DO GO ON TO NOTE THAT, GIVEN THE DECISION THAT I HAVE BEEN FORCED TO MAKE, I INTEND AT THAT THE TO CONTINUE DEPLOYMENT OF U.S. B-52 HEAVY BOMBERS WITH CRUISE MISSILES BEYOND THE 131ST AIRCRAFT AS AN APPROPRIATE RESPONSE WITHOUT DISMANTLING ADDITIONAL U.S. SYSTEMS AS COMPENSATION UNDER THE TERMS OF THE SALT II TREATY.

SINCE WE WILL REMAIN IN TECHNICAL COMPLIANCE WITH THE TERMS OF THE EXPIRED SALT II TREATY FOR SOME MONTHS, THE SOVIET UNION WILL HAVE ADDITIONAL TIME TO CHANGE THE CONDITIONS WHICH NOW EXIST. I CONTINUE TO HOPE THAT THE SOVIET UNION WILL USE THIS TIME CONSTRUCTIVELY. IN FACT, MY PUBLIC PRESENTATION MAKES IT CLEAR THAT SHOULD THE SOVIETS DO SO, WE WILL TAKE THIS INTO ACCOUNT.

I AM VERY AWARE OF YOUR CONCERN ABOUT HOW SUCH A DECISION WILL BE RECEIVED BY THE EUROPEAN PUBLICS AND GOVERNMENTS. THUS, I HAVE EXPLICITLY STATED THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL CONTINUE TO EXERCISE RESTRAINT. MY STATEMENT NOTES THAT THE UNITED STATES SEEKS TO MEET ITS STRATEGIC NEEDS BY MEANS THAT MINIMIZE INCENTIVES FOR CONTINUING SOVIET OFFENSIVE FORCE GROWTH. AS WE MODERNIZE, WE WILL CONTINUE TO RETIRE OLDER FORCES AS OUR

NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIREMENTS PERMIT AND I DO NOT ANTICIPATE ANY APPRECIABLE NUMERICAL GROWTH IN THE NUMBER OF U.S. STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE FORCES. IN FACT, I WILL EMPHASIZE THAT THE U.S. WILL NOT DEPLOY MORE STRATEGIC NUCLEAR DELIVERY VEHICLES OR MORE STRATEGIC BALLISTIC MISSILE WARHEADS THAN DOESTHE SOVIET UNION.

AS I HAVE OFTEN TOLD YOU, I HIGHLY VALUE YOUR EXCELLENT ADVICE AND I HAVE GIVEN THE FULLEST POSSIBLE WEIGHT TO THE CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU HAVE RAISED. I HAVE TRIED TO BALANCE THESE IN A MANNER THAT WILL PERMIT US TO CONCENTRATE OUR EFFORTS ON ACHIEVING THE SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS IN NUCLEAR ARSENALS THAT WE BOTH SEEK. MARGARET, I KNOW YOU HAVE SOME RESERVATIONS, BUT I NEED YOUR SUPPORT AT THIS IMPORTANT JUNCTURE.

WITH WARMEST REGARDS, RON

ON THE EVE OF THE STRATEGIC ARMS REDUCTIONS TALKS (START) IN 1982, I DECIDED THAT THE UNITED STATES WOULD NOT UNDERCUT THE EXPIRED SALT I INTERIM OFFENSIVE AGREEMENT OR THE UNRATIFIED SALT II AGREEMENT AS LONG AS THE SOVIET UNION EXERCISED EQUAL RESTRAINT. I TOOK THIS ACTION, DESPITE MY CONCERNS ABOUT THE FLAWS INHERENT IN THOSE AGREEMENTS, TO FOSTER AN ATMOSPHERE OF MUTUAL RESTRAINT CONDUCIVE TO SERIOUS NEGOTIATIONS ON ARMS REDUCTIONS. I MADE CLEAR THAT OUR POLICY REQUIRED RECIPROCITY AND THAT IT MUST NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT OUR NATIONAL SECURITY INTERESTS IN THE FACE OF THE CONTINUING SOVIET MILITARY BUILDUP.

LAST JUNE, I REVIEWED THE STATUS OF U.S. INTERIM RESTRAINT POLICY. I FOUND THAT THE UNITED STATES HAD FULLY KEPT ITS PART OF THE BARGAIN. AS I HAVE DOCUMENTED IN THREE DETAILED REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS, THE SOVIET UNION, REGRETTABLY, HAS NOT. I NOTED THAT THE PATTERN OF SOVIET NON-COMPLIANCE WITH THEIR EXISTING ARMS CONTROL COMMITMENTS INCREASINGLY AFFECTED OUR NATIONAL SECURITY. THIS PATTERN ALSO RAISED FUNDAMENTAL CONCERNS ABOUT THE INTEGRITY OF THE ARMS CONTROL PROCESS ITSELF. ONE SIMPLY CAN NOT BE SERIOUS ABOUT EFFECTIVE ARMS CONTROL UNLESS ONE IS EQUALLY SERIOUS ABOUT COMPLIANCE.

IN SPITE OF THE REGRETTABLE SOVIET RECORD, I CONCLUDED AT THAT TIME THAT IT REMAINED IN THE INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS ALLIES TO TRY, ONCE MORE, TO ESTABLISH AN INTERIM FRAMEWORK OF TRULY MUTUAL RESTRAINT ON STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS AS WE PURSUED, WITH RENEWED VIGOR, OUR OBJECTIVE OF DEEP REDUCTIONS IN EXISTING U.S. AND SOVIET NUCLEAR ARSENALS THROUGH THE GENEVA NEGOTIATIONS. THEREFORE, I UNDERTOOK TO GO THE EXTRA MILE, DISMANTLING A POSEIDON SUBMARINE, USS SAM RAYBURN, TO GIVE THE SOVIET UNION ADDITIONAL TIME TO TAKE THE STEPS NECESSARY TO

END OF PAGE 03

JOIN US IN ESTABLISHING AN INTERIM FRAMEWORK OF MUTUAL RESTRAINT. HOWEVER, I MADE IT CLEAR THAT, AS SUBSEQUENT U.S. DEPLOYMENT MILESTONES WERE REACHED, I WOULD ASSESS THE OVERALL SITUATION AND DETERMINE FUTURE U.S. ACTIONS ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS IN LIGHT OF SOVIET BEHAVIOR IN EXERCISING RESTRAINT COMPARABLE TO OUR OWN, CORRECTING THEIR NON-COMPLIANCE, REVERSING THEIR UNWARRANTED MILITARY BUILD-UP, AND SERIOUSLY PURSUING EQUITABLE AND VERIFIABLE ARMS REDUCTION AGREEMENTS.

LATER THIS MONTH, THE 8TH TRIDENT SUBMARINE, USS NEVADA, BEGINS SEA TRIALS. IN ACCORDANCE WITH OUR ANNOUNCED POLICY, I HAVE ASSESSED OUR OPTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THAT MILESTONE. I HAVE CONSIDERED SOVIET BEHAVIOR SINCE MY JUNE 1985 DECISION, AND U.S. AND ALLIED SECURITY INTERESTS IN LIGHT OF BOTH THAT BEHAVIOR AND OUR PROGRAMMATIC OPTIONS. THE SITUATION IS NOT ENCOURAGING.

WHILE WE HAVE SEEN SOME MODEST INDICATIONS OF IMPROVEMENT IN ONE OR TWO AREAS OF U.S. CONCERN, THERE HAS BEEN NO REAL PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING U.S. CONCERNS WITH RESPECT TO THE GENERAL PATTERN OF SOVIET NON-COMPLIANCE WITH MAJOR ARMS CONTROL COMMITMENTS. PARTICULARLY IN THOSE AREAS OF MOST OBVIOUS AND DIRECT SOVIET NON-COMPLIANCE WITH THE SALT AND ABM AGREEMENTS. THE KRASNOYARSK RADAR REMAINS A CLEAR VIOLATION. THE DEPLOYMENT OF THE SS-25, A FORBIDDEN SECOND NEW ICBM TYPE, CONTINUES APACE, THE SOVIET UNION CONTINUES TO ENCRYPT TELÉMETRY ASSOCIATED WITH ITS BALLISTIC MISSILE TESTING IN A MANNER WHICH IMPEDES VERIFICATION. WE SEE NO ABATEMENT OF THE SOVIET STRATEGIC FORCE BUILD-UP. FINALLY, SINCE THE GENEVA SUMMIT. WE HAVE YET TO SEE THE SOVIETS FOLLOW-UP CONSTRUCTIVELY ON THE COMMITMENT MADE IN THE JOINT STATEMENT ISSUED BY GENERAL SECRETARY GORBACHEV AND MYSELF TO ACHIEVE EARLY PROGRESS, IN PARTICULAR IN AREAS WHERE THERE IS COMMON GROUND, INCLUDING THE PRINCIPLE OF 50 PERCENT REDUCTIONS IN THE STRATEGIC NUCLEAR ARMS OF BOTH COUNTRIES, APPROPRIATELY APPLIED, AS WELL AS THE IDEA OF AN INTERIM AGREEMENT ON INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES (INF).

BASED ON SOVIET BEHAVIOR SINCE MY JUNE 1985 DECISION, I CAN ONLY CONCLUDE THAT THE SOVIET UNION HAS NOT, AS YET, TAKEN THOSE ACTIONS THAT WOULD INDICATE ITS READINESS TO JOIN US IN AN INTERIM FRAMEWORK OF TRULY MUTUAL RESTRAINT. AT THE SAME TIME, I HAVE ALSO CONSIDERED THE PROGRAMMATIC OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE U.S. IN TERMS OF THEIR OVERALL NET IMPACT ON U.S. AND ALLIED SECURITY.

WHEN I ISSUED GUIDANCE ON U.S. POLICY ON JUNE 10, 1985, THE MILITARY PLANS AND PROGRAMS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986 WERE ABOUT TO BE IMPLEMENTED. THE AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY THAT ANY NATION HAS IN THE NEAR-TERM FOR ALTERING ITS PLANNING IS MODEST AT BEST. OUR MILITARY PLANNING WILL TAKE MORE TIME TO MOVE OUT FROM UNDER THE SHADOW OF PREVIOUS ASSUMPTIONS, ESPECIALLY IN THE BUDGETARY

CONDITIONS WHICH WE NOW FACE. THESE BUDGETARY CONDITIONS MAKE IT ESSENTIAL THAT WE MAKE THE VERY BEST POSSIBLE USE OF OUR RESOURCES.

THE UNITED STATES HAD LONG PLANNED TO RETIRE AND DISMANTLE TWO OF THE OLDEST POSEIDON SUBMARINES WHEN THEIR REACTOR CORES WERE EXHAUSTED. HAD I BEEN PERSUADED THAT REFUELING AND RETAINING THESE TWO POSEIDON SUBMARINES WOULD HAVE CONTRIBUTED SIGNIFICANTLY AND COST-EFFECTIVELY TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY, I WOULD HAVE DIRECTED THAT THESE TWO POSEIDON SUBMARINES NOT BE DISMANTLED, BUT BE OVERHAULED AND RETAINED. HOWEVER, IN VIEW OF PRESENT CIRCUMSTANCES, INCLUDING CURRENT MILITARY AND ECONOMIC REALITIES, I HAVE DIRECTED THEIR RETIREMENT AND DISMANTLEMENT AS PLANNED. RATHER THAN TO REFURBISH THEM.

AS PART OF THE SAME DECISION LAST JUNE, I ALSO ANNOUNCED THAT WE WOULD TAKE APPROPRIATE AND PROPORTIONATE RESPONSES WHEN NEEDED TO PROTECT OUR OWN SECURITY IN THE FACE OF CONTINUING SOVIET NON-COMPLIANCE. IT IS MY VIEW THAT CERTAIN STEPS ARE NOW REQUIRED BY CONTINUED SOVIET DISREGARD OF THEIR OBLIGATIONS.

NEEDLESS TO SAY, THE MOST ESSENTIAL NEAR-TERM RESPONSE TO SOVIET NON-COMPLIANCE REMAINS THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OUR FULL STRATEGIC MODERNIZATION PROGRAM, TO UNDERWRITE DETERRENCE TODAY, AND THE CONTINUED PURSUIT OF THE STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE (SDI) RESEARCH PROGRAM, TO SEE IF IT IS POSSIBLE TO PROVIDE A SAFER AND MORE STABLE BASIS FOR OUR FUTURE SECURITY AND THAT OF OUR ALLIES. THE STRATEGIC MODERNIZATION PROGRAM, INCLUDING THE DEPLOYMENT OF THE SECOND 50 PEACEKEEPER MISSILES, IS THE FOUNDATION FOR ALL FUTURE U.S. OFFENSIVE FORCE OPTIONS. IT PROVIDES A SOLID BASIS WHICH CAN AND WILL BE ADJUSTED OVER TIME TO RESPOND MOST EFFICIENTLY TO CONTINUED SOVIET NONCOMPLIANCE. THE SDI PROGRAM REPRESENTS OUR BEST HOPE FOR A FUTURE IN WHICH OUR SECURTY CAN REST ON THE INCREASING CONTRIBUTION OF DEFENSIVE SYSTEMS THAT THREATEN NO ONE.

IT IS ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL THAT WE MAINTAIN FULL SUPPORT FOR THESE PROGRAMS. TO FAIL TO DO SO WOULD BE THE WORST RESPONSE TO SOVIET NON-COMPLIANCE. IT WOULD IMMEDIATELY AND SERIOUSLY UNDERCUT OUR NEGOTIATORS IN GENEVA BY REMOVING THE LEVERAGE THAT THEY MUST HAVE TO NEGOTIATE EQUITABLE REDUCTIONS IN BOTH U.S. AND SOVIET FORCES. IT WOULD SEND PRECISELY THE WRONG SIGNAL TO THE LEADERSHIP OF THE SOVIET UNION ABOUT THE SERIOUSNESS OF OUR RESOLVE CONCERNING THEIR NON-COMPLIANCE. AND, IT WOULD SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE THE RISK TO OUR SECURITY FOR YEARS TO COME. THEREFORE, OUR HIGHEST PRIORITY MUST REMAIN THE FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF THESE PROGRAMS.

SECONDLY, THE DEVELOPMENT BY THE SOVIET UNION OF ITS MASSIVE ICBM FORCES CONTINUES TO CHALLENGE SERIOUSLY THE ESSENTIAL BALANCE

WHICH HAS DETERRED BOTH CONFLICT AND COERCION. LAST JUNE. I CITED THE SOVIET UNIONS SS-25 MISSILE, A SECOND NEW TYPE OF ICBM PROHIBITED UNDER THE SALT II AGREEMENT. AS A CLEAR AND IRREVERSIBLE VIOLATION. WITH THE NUMBER OF DEPLOYED SS-25 MOBILE ICBMS GROWING, I NOW CALL UPON THE CONGRESS TO RESTORE BI-PARTISAN SUPPORT FOR A BALANCED. COST EFFECTIVE, LONG-TERM PROGRAM TO RESTORE BOTH THE SURVIVABILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE U.S. ICBM PROGRAM. THIS PROGRAM SHOULD INCLUDE THE FULL DEPLOYMENT OF THE 100 PEACEKEEPER ICBMS. BUT IT MUST ALSO LOOK BEYOND THE PEACEKEEPER AND TOWARD ADDITIONAL U.S. ICBM REQUIREMENTS IN THE FUTURE INCLUDING THE SMALL ICBM TO COMPLEMENT PEACEKEEPER. THEREFORE, I HAVE DIRECTED THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO PROVIDE TO ME BY NOVEMBER, 1986, AN ASSESSMENT OF THE BEST OPTIONS FOR CARRYING OUT SUCH A COMPRÉHENSIVE ICBM PROGRAM. THIS ASSESSMENT WILL ADDRESS SPECIFIC ALTERNATIVE CONFIGURATIONS FOR THE SMALL ICBMS IN TERMS OF SIZE, NUMBER OF WARHEADS, AND PRODUCTION RATES.

PROGRAM BE ACCELERATED. THIS WOULD NOT DIRECT ANY INCREASE IN THE TOTAL PROGRAM PROCUREMENT AT THIS TIME, BUT RATHER WOULD ESTABLISH A MORE EFFICIENT PROGRAM THAT BOTH SAVES MONEY AND ACCELERATES THE AVAILABILITY OF ADDITIONAL OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE.

THIS BRINGS US TO THE QUESTION OF THE SALT II TREATY. SALT II WAS A FUNDAMENTALLY FLAWED AND UNRATIFIED TREATY. EVEN IF RATIFIED, IT WOULD HAVE EXPIRED ON DECEMBER 31, 1985. WHEN PRESENTED TO THE U.S. SENATE IN 1979, IT WAS CONSIDERED BY A BROAD RANGE OF CRITICS, INCLUDING THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, TO BE UNEQUAL AND UNVERIFIABLE IN IMPORTANT PROVISIONS. IT WAS, THEREFORE, JUDGED BY MANY TO BE INIMICAL TO GENUINE ARMS CONTROL, TO THE SECURITY INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS ALLIES, AND TO GLOBAL STABILITY. THE PROPOSED TREATY WAS CLEARLY HEADED FOR DEFEAT BEFORE MY PREDECESSOR ASKED THE SENATE NOT TO ACT ON IT.

THE MOST BASIC PROBLEM WITH SALT II WAS THAT IT CODIFIED MAJOR ARMS BUILDUPS RATHER THAN REDUCTIONS. FOR EXAMPLE, EVEN THOUGH AT THE TIME THE TREATY WAS SIGNED IN 1979, THE U.S. HAD, AND ONLY PLANNED FOR, 550 MIRVED ICBM LAUNCHERS AND THE SOVIET UNION POSSESSED ONLY ABOUT 600, SALT II PERMITTED EACH SIDE TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF SUCH LAUNCHERS TO 820. IT ALSO PERMITTED A BUILD-UP TO 1,200 MIRVED BALLISTIC LAUNCHERS (BOTH ICBMS AND SLBMS) EVEN THOUGH THE U.S. HAD ONLY ABOUT 1,050 AND THE SOVIET UNION HAD ONLY ABOUT 750 WHEN THE TREATY WAS SIGNED. IT PERMITTED THE SOVIET UNION TO RETAIN ALL OF ITS HEAVY BALLISTIC MISSILES. FINALLY, IT LIMITED BALLISTIC MISSILE LAUNCHERS, NOT THE MISSILES OR THE WARHEADS CARRIED BY THE BALLISTIC MISSILES. SINCE THE SIGNING OF SALT II, SOVIET BALLISTIC MISSILE FORCES

HAVE GROWN TO WITHIN A FEW LAUNCHERS OF EACH OF THE 820 AND 1,200 MIRVED LIMITS, AND FROM ABOUT 7,000 TO OVER 9,000 WARHEADS TODAY. WHAT IS WORSE, GIVEN THE INEFFECTIVENESS OF SALT II IN CONSTRAINING BALLISTIC MISSILE WARHEADS, THE NUMBER OF WARHEADS ON SOVIET BALLISTIC MISSILES WILL CONTINUE TO GROW VERY SIGNIFICANTLY, EVEN UNDER THE TREATYS LIMITS, IN THE CONTINUED ABSENCE OF SOVIET RESTRAINT.

IN 1982. ON THE EVE OF THE START NEGOTIATIONS, I UNDERTOOK NOT TO UNDERCUT EXISTING ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENTS TO THE EXTENT THAT THE SOVIET UNION DEMONSTRATED COMPARABLE RESTRAINT. UNFORTUNATELY. THE SOVIET UNION DID NOT EXERCISE COMPARABLE RESTRAINT, AND UNCORRECTED SOVIET VIOLATIONS HAVE UNDERCUT THE SALT II TREATY. LAST JUNE. I ONCE AGAIN LAID OUT OUR LEGITIMATE CONCERNS BUT DECIDED TÓ GO THE EXTRA MILE, DISMANTLING A POSEIDON SUBMARINE, NOT TO COMPLY WITH OR ABIDE BY A FLAWED AND UNRATIFIED TREATY. BUT RATHER TO GIVE THE SOVIET UNION ONE MORE CHANCE AND ADDITIONAL, ADEQUATE TIME TO TAKE THE STEPS NECESSARY TO JOIN US IN ESTABLISHING AN INTERIM FRAMEWORK OF TRULY MUTUAL RESTRAINT. THE SOVIET UNION HAS NOT USED THE PAST YEAR FOR THIS PURPOSE. GIVEN THIS SITUATION, I HAVE DETERMINED THAT% IN THE FUTURE, UNITED STATES MUST BASE DECISIONS REGARDING TS STRATEGIC FORCE STRUCTURE ON THE NATURE AND MAGNITUDE OF THE THREAT POSED BY SOVIET STRATEGIC FORCES, AND NOT ON STANDARDS CONTAINED IN A FLAWED TREATY WHICH WAS NEVER RATIFIED, WHICH WOULD HAVE EXPIRED IF IT HAD BEEN RATIFIED, AND, IN ADDITION, WHICH HAS BEEN VIOLATED BY THE SOVIET UNION.

SINCE THE UNITED STATES WILL RETIRE AND DISMANTLE TWO POSEIDON SUBMARINES THIS SUMMER, WE WILL REMAIN TECHNICALLY IN OBSERVANCE OF THE TERMS OF THE SALT II TREATY UNTIL THE U.S. EQUIPS ITS 131ST B-52 HEAVY BOMBER FOR CRUISE MISSILE CARRIAGE NEAR THE END OF THIS YEAR. HOWEVER, GIVEN THE DECISION THAT I HAVE BEEN FORCED TO MAKE, AT THAT TIME I INTEND TO CONTINUE DEPLOYMENT OF U.S. B-52 HEAVY BOMBERS WITH CRUISE MISSILES BEYOND THE 131ST AIRCRAFT AS AN APPROPRIATE RESPONSE WITHOUT DISMANTLING ADDITIONAL U.S. SYSTEMS AS COMPENSATION UNDER THE TERMS OF THE SALT II TREATY. OF COURSE, SINCE WE WILL REMAIN IN TECHNICAL COMPLIANCE WITH THE TERMS OF THE EXPIRED SALT II TREATY FOR SOME MONTHS, I CONTINUE TO HOPE THAT THE SOVIET UNION WILL USE THIS TIME TO TAKE THE CONSTRUCTIVE STEPS NECESSARY TO ALTER THE CURRENT SITUATION. SHOULD THEY DO SO, WE WILL CERTAINLY TAKE THIS INTO ACCOUNT.

THE UNITED STATES SEEKS TO MEET ITS STRATEGIC NEEDS, GIVEN THE PAST SOVIET BUILD-UP, BY MEANS THAT MINIMIZE INCENTIVES FOR CONTINUING SOVIET OFFENSIVE FORCE GROWTH. IN THE LONGER TERM, THIS IS ONE OF THE MAJOR MOTIVES IN OUR PURSUIT OF THE STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE. AS WE MODERNIZE, WE WILL CONTINUE TO RETIRE OLDER FORCES AS OUR NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIREMENTS PERMIT. I DO

NOT ANTICIPATE ANY APPRECIABLE NUMERICAL GROWTH IN THE NUMBER OF U.S. STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE FORCES. THE UNITED STATES WILL NOT DEPLOY MORE STRATEGIC NUCLEAR DELIVERY VEHICLES THAN DOES THE SOVIET UNION. FURTHERMORE% THE UNITED STATES WILL NOT DEPLOY MORE STRATEGIC BALLISTIC MISSILE WARHEADS THAN DOES THE SOVIET UNION.

IN SUM, WE WILL CONTINUE TO EXERCISE THE UTMOST RESTRAINT, WHILE PROTECTING OUR STRATEGIC DETERRENCE, IN ORDER TO HELP FOSTER THE NECESSARY ATMOSPHERE FOR SIGNIFICANT REDUCTIONS IN THE STRATEGIC ARSENALS OF BOTH SIDES. THIS IS THE URGENT TASK WHICH FACES US. I CALL ON THE SOVIET UNION TO SEIZE THE OPPORTUNITY TO JOIN US NOW IN ESTABLISHING AN INTERIM FRAMEWORK OF TRULY MUTUAL RESTRAINT.

HOWEVER, NO POLICY OF INTERIM RESTRAINT IS A SUBSTITUTE FOR AN AGREEMENT ON DEEP REDUCTIONS IN OFFENSIVE NUCLEAR ARMS, PROVIDING WE CAN BE CONFIDENT OF SOVIET COMPLIANCE WITH IT. ACHIEVING SUCH REDUCTIONS HAS RECEIVED, AND CONTINUES TO RECEIVE, MY HIGHEST PRIORITY. I HOPE THE SOVIET UNION WILL ACT TO GIVE SUBSTANCE TO THE AGREEMENT I REACHED WITH GENERAL SECRETARY GORBACHEV IN GENEVA TO ACHIEVE EARLY PROGRESS, IN PARTICULAR IN AREAS WHERE THERE IS COMMON GROUND, INCLUDING THE PRINCIPLE OF 50 PERCENT REDUCTIONS IN THE STRATEGIC NUCLEAR ARMS OF BOTH COUNTRIES, APPROPRIATELY APPLIED, AS WELL AS THE IDEA OF AN INTERIM INF AGREEMENT. IF THE SOVIET UNION DOES SO, WE CAN TOGETHER IMMEDIATELY ACHIEVE GREATER STABILITY AND A SAFER WORLD.

END TEXT OF PRESIDENTIAL STATEMENT 3554 £3131

NNNN

PRIME MINISTER

US: COMPLIANCE WITH ARMS CONTROL TREATY

I attach a copy of a message from President Reagan, which came in this evening setting out his decision on whether the United States will continue to comply with the SALT II Treaty. It says, in effect, that he has decided not to follow your advice. Rather, he will announce next Tuesday that, while the United States will dismantle two Poseidon submarines now, it will definitely proceed to equip the 131st and subsequent B 52 heavy bombers with cruise missiles by the end of the year, thus breaching SALT II Treaty limits. He has sent you the text of the statement which he intends to make.

The only concession is to say that if the Soviet Union brings itself into compliance with SALT limits by the end of the year, the United States would take this into account.

I am seeking advice from the Foreign Office and Ministry of Defence. But it seems to me that there is little point in further contesting this decision which is clearly a firm one. We face a difficult decision ourselves on how to respond publicly when the statement is made next Tuesday. As you will see, the President asks for your support. I am asking for advice on this to be telegraphed to us in Israel.

(D)

~

CDP

23 May, 1986.

JD46