

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE/XGDS~~

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

PARTICIPANTS: President Nixon
 Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
 and Assistant to the President for
 National Security Affairs
 Senator George D. Aiken [R - Vermont]
 Congressman John J. McFall [D - California]
 Senator John O. Pastore [D - Rhode Island]
 Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr. [D - Virginia]
 Senator Hugh Scott [R - Pennsylvania]
 Senator Mike Mansfield [D - Montana]
 Congressman Carl Albert [D - Oklahoma]

DATE AND TIME: Wednesday, July 10, 1974
 8:30 a.m.

PLACE: The Cabinet Room

SUBJECT: Joint Leadership Meeting on the Summit
 Trip to Moscow

The President: We have a full plate today. I will go over the Brussels meeting and highlight Moscow and Henry will follow up on the meetings with the European leaders following the summit. They were significant. Those of you who saw the communique and heard the public utterances know most of what went on.

The stop in Brussels was useful. The Europeans have always been concerned about a US-Soviet condominium. We stopped to consult and sign the NATO declaration.

When I went to Europe in 1969, they thought we should do something about China and relations with the Soviet Union. The problem then for them was a possible US-Soviet confrontation. Since then, European attitudes have turned 180°. They have urged a European

CLASSIFIED BY Henry A. Kissinger
 EXEMPT FROM GENERAL DECLASSIFICATION
 SCHEDULE OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 11652
 EXEMPTION CATEGORY 5(b)(3)
 AUTOMATICALLY DECLASSIFIED ON Imp. to Det.

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE/XGDS~~

DECLASSIFIED
 E.O. 12958, SEC. 3.6
 NSC MEMO, 11/24/90, STATE DEPT. GUIDELINES, State Dep. inv. 3/19/04
 BY llh NARA, DATE 8/29/04



Security Conference on us; now they are cooling on it and on the idea of having a summit conclusion. Detente is a period of great opportunity and also of danger for the alliance. The Europeans wanted our assurances on security but they have been less than cooperative on economics, the Middle East, etc. They can't have it both ways -- they can't keep our forces up and confront us everywhere else. They don't always have to agree -- but they can't go off on their own and in antagonism. In Brussels, I met with the NAC and then individually with Schmidt, Wilson, Rumor and with others at the reception. Giscard was not there -- he is more cooperative but he still depends on the Gaullist forces and he can't move too fast. The Alliance was invigorated by this. The allies said they would try to strengthen their forces. The Alliance got a security shot in the arm -- which is difficult when all of them see the tension receding. On the economic side, we laid the foundation for more cooperation between the US and the Community. The Europeans' interests were almost exclusively economics. After talking with them, I wouldn't exchange our problems for theirs.

About Moscow: We didn't know the type of public reception we would get. There had been differences on the Middle East conflict and the October confrontation. The Soviet approach to the Middle East is to do everything at once. Ours is to use Geneva but also anything else which is helpful. They insist on having the Palestinians and immediate withdrawal to the '67 frontiers. That would blow up any conference. Thanks to Henry, we have cooled the area. Therefore the positions of the US and Soviet Union were far apart.

The discussions this year were the fullest and the least belligerent, and the relationships were "friendliest" in the proper interpretation of that term. We have laid over the years the groundwork for laying the hard problems out on the table, discussing them frankly, not giving up about disagreements but to continue to grapple. The Soviet Union now has positive interest in good relations with the United States.

In the bilateral area, it can't be said that these nonsecurity agreements will keep them from confrontation with us when our interests clash; but each one gives them an incentive not to throw over detente. We signed some new agreements -- in economics, housing, energy, and on research on the artificial heart. These don't get much play.

Then we discussed the international field. Europe. The Soviet Union wants a CSCE summit. We agree we'll do it if the substance warrants.



On the Middle East, they accepted the proposal that we must continue bilateral step-by-step efforts but they insist on playing a role and even more so on an early Geneva Conference. Our position is -- if you take the steps remaining, to get a pull-back on both fronts, the West Bank and the Palestinians -- if you lay it all out in Geneva, everyone there would oppose us and Israel. So they don't agree, but will go along with some bilateral efforts -- but we can't say this publicly.

Southeast Asia was also mentioned.

In the strategic area, we made some progress which if it happened two years ago would have been monumental. On ABM, we agreed to go to one site. Their field covers not only Moscow but also much of their industry and a missile field.

The TTB: The Soviet Union proposed it. Their motives are that we are far ahead in testing. They are worried about the Chinese, so the threshold at 150KT makes sense. Our military think that more testing is essential but fundamentally a comprehensive test ban is unverifiable. We won't yet submit the TTB because of the side issue of peaceful nuclear explosions. We will work out agreement on PNE. They have agreed on prior announcement and observers. It's the first on-site inspection ever agreed.

On environmental warfare, we agreed to talks. While it doesn't seem important now, but who knows what science will bring?

SALT is the toughest of all, as I told you before. The Soviet throw weight is greater but our advantage is enormous -- we have a 3.5-to-1 advantage in warheads and also in sophistication and accuracy. As we look to the future, if the Soviet Union agreed to freeze now, it would be freezing itself into a public position of inferiority -- which they won't do. The Soviet Union has a missile advantage, but you get hit by warheads. We would first discuss this, but our own warhead advantage doesn't include our allies -- but they count them. They are also worried about China; and we might have to be also. In 1972, I had a rough 4 1/2 hour session on Vietnam. In 1973, from midnight, we had a rough three hours on the Middle East. Had we crumbled in either case, there would not have been a Vietnam settlement or the present Middle East situation. What we come up with now was an agreement to conclude a 10-year agreement on quantitative and qualitative steps. We have to



choose whether to conclude an agreement which will protect us and yet be acceptable to them or, with their MIRV breakthrough, go into a race which we will win but which would leave neither side really better off. There comes a point where it makes no difference who has the most. Those are our choices -- negotiate a decent agreement or increase our defense and race with them.

Kissinger: At one point, we told Brezhnev what he would have with MIRVs; he confirmed our intelligence estimate. Then he told us what we had, which included everything -- bombers, overseas bases, everything. We never think this way, because we think of second-strike. The significance is that they can't hit NATO without fearing we will hit them as they cannot hit us, or if they hit NATO and the US, we will still have enough.

The President: I had a talk with Grechko. We agreed that Henry would go back this fall. We have narrowed the differences. There is still a gulf, but we hope we can agree on something. If we can't, they will go balls out, and with their throw weight, it will be a problem. It would be a race no one would win. We are laying the groundwork for a longer-term agreement.

Senator Aiken: What effect will the French development have?

The President: The Soviet Union puts great emphasis on French and British developments -- and also the Chinese. Looked at coldly, they are mini-powers.

Kissinger: After France has finished its program in 1980, they will have one half as many warheads as we have on one Poseidon.

The President: The last thing the Europeans want is for us to be more inferior to the Soviet Union, but they also fear a runaway race.

A Senator: Where is China? Better than France?

Kissinger: Not much better. They will have one-third as many as one Poseidon by 1978.

The President: But the Soviet Union thinks the Chinese are going much faster.

Kissinger: Also, how much is enough? The Chinese in four years could kill millions of Russians, and might accept millions of Chinese killed.

McFall: What would be a reasonable agreement? Can they both agree?

The President: We think so. It is very complex. All systems must be considered. We can't discuss numbers now. Our general view is that all of us concerned with this must not adopt the view of why bother to try for an agreement because we could win a race. But we don't want a bigger budget -- neither do the Soviets -- but lacking an agreement, we will move and have told them so.

Pastore: We have had a deterrent policy for 25 years. Our military now think those could be a limited nuclear war. That is impossible. Do the Soviets think that?

The President: The Soviets believe in inevitable escalation.

Kissinger: Soviet weapons are not geared that way.

Senator Pastore: Then why have more artillery shells?

Kissinger: We must distinguish between battlefield and strategic.

Pastore: A President shouldn't have to make a holocaust decision because artillery shells are 30 miles from the front.

Kissinger: We agree, but then we need more conventional forces.

The President: That is the point. More and more weapons won't help us.

Pastore: Let the Germans put up the forces.

Kissinger: The tough speeches the President made last spring have brought the Europeans to fundamentals. The changes in Germany and France have been very helpful.

The Europeans now also see that our energy institutions were far-sighted. They all wanted to talk energy. They are all running balance of payments deficits because of oil prices. Also the new deposits

coming in are short-term and lending is on a long-term basis. They now realize we weren't talking hegemony but enlightened self-interest to keep Europe healthy. The Europeans now want to cooperate. France has been stuck with exorbitant oil prices as result of bilateral deals, and energy cooperation is working so well that Giscard now wants to cooperate if he can do it without publicly reversing his course.

On the previous summits, the Europeans feared condominium. This time most felt it was successful -- it contributed to easing the atmosphere; they liked the measured way we are proceeding; and it encouraged progress on CSCE and MBFR. I made good progress on those two without backbiting. The most troublesome things are US domestic carping over US inferiority. Spain asked about Zumwalt's comment on the Navy having to stay out of confrontations. We must get the Europeans to strengthen their forces. The Soviet Union can't get superiority strategically, but at some level, though, strategic forces cancel each other out and conventional forces become critical.

They are okay on SALT, but they don't know enough to discuss the details. Their concern is to look into the future and their concern is economic.

Italy is in bad shape. Talking to them is like talking to a Harvard professor's seminar. With the communists and fascists, the democratic factions have little maneuver. They are tempted to move to the communists and we told them that would be dangerous.

Scott: Isn't it time they have decent alternatives?

Kissinger: Yes, they need able democratic parties to govern. In France, Giscard wants to cooperate; he has no hangups. They just need time and must maneuver carefully. Whatever France's policy, as long as they don't bring pressure on their allies, we can work it out.

Schmidt has none of Brandt's rapid sentimentality. Where a year ago they thought we needed them, that has changed. In the Middle East they see we are right and we are urging them to move in economics, as long as it is supportive.

Byrd: What were the issues that were impossible of resolution?

What are parameters of trade and what are the quids pro quo?

Kissinger: There are words being thrown around. Take throw weight. Married with MIRVs and high accuracy, they can be dangerous against fixed targets -- so they are more vulnerable than we. So far things have not gone to maximum MIRVing. If we can keep it there, we are okay. But if they put 20 MIRVs on a missile, it would be a problem. Also, we can put a big missile in the Minuteman III silos if need be.

In the Crimea we each told the other our intelligence projection of the each other's forces. Any MIRV limitation we could accept would severely limit them and look bad. Also, most of the buildup is coming just at the end of the extended period. We thought if we could extend the time, we could put a cap on numbers which is below the capacity of each side and slow down the arms race. It's still large numbers, but the instability comes from each racing. There is no way an attack on the United States could leave us with less than 4,000 warheads.

The President: An agreement means nothing unless it means both sides restrict what they would otherwise do.

Kissinger: We could have juggled the numbers, but it would have been hard to justify that it was less than their program. We want either to restrict them or to be sure they refuse to be limited.

The economic agreement doesn't involve transfer of resources. They facilitate trade.

There is a myth developing that detente is one sided. But:

- (1) We settled Vietnam on our terms.
- (2) We squeezed them in the Middle East in an unbelievable way.
- (3) We protected Berlin.
- (4) We stopped a Cuban submarine base.

What did they get? Some Ex-Im credits, a little trade, some wheat -- which was not part of detente. We tie everything to good foreign policy behavior. If we prevent benefits to them, they will go back to the cold war.

The President: The balance of trade with the Soviet Union is very favorable.

Kissinger: And if we don't trade, the Europeans and Japanese already are doing it, and it's better if it's done under our close controls than without them.

The President: We are trying to work out methods how a private trading economy can trade with a state system. Also, it will eventually pertain to the PRC.

Scott: They are opening a big trade center.

Kissinger: Look at the record. Every time they have moved, we have been tough. We have showed them if they move militarily, we will stop them. Conversely, if they cooperate, we will make it useful. Remember, until the 1972 summit, there was no trade at all.

When you get the Soviet leadership and news talking the success of detente, it gives them a stake -- though they can change.

We have paralyzed the left in Europe with this policy. What would happen if we had one crisis after another? There were no commitments as to loans, or transfer of resources.

The President: We told them we couldn't yet get MFN but we're working on it.

Three things moved them at this summit:

(1) What will happen with China? Will they force us into detente with China and opposition to them?

(2) Why didn't they react in Vietnam and the Middle East? Why did they settle Berlin: (1) fear of the tough United States. They are still obsessed with World War II. The people were out, and they could not do it just for peace but for friendship. Good relations with the United States is in their interest. They are doing better but they are far behind Europe and even more so, the United States. (2) The more stake we can give the Soviet leadership and people in peace and cooperation, the more they will lose if detente fails.

MFN -- you can say: "cut them off" -- but it applies in spades to the Chinese. But the more we can give them a stake in good relations, the more we can influence them. If we can get the trade bill, it may improve trade, and it will be more help on Jewish emigration than if

we slam the door. In 1969 there were less than 1,000 per year; last year it was 33,000. This year it's down, probably because of the October War. So we need them to fear us but also there has to be a positive element to give them an incentive. There is no give-away. There will have to be a quid pro quo, but no unilateral giveaways. Without MFN, they certainly won't change their policies.

Cedarburg: Any thought to sending the Secretary of Defense to Moscow?

The President: It might be good for someone to talk to Grechko.

Kissinger: If we want to drive the Europeans and Chinese crazy, just let the military staffs talk.

The President: That is not what the leadership is saying. But it is a sensitive area.

Mansfield: It is most inadvisable, Mr. President, and you better keep control.

The President: I will.

_____ : Netherlands defense cuts.

Kissinger: I think it won't happen.

Albert: How about energy?

Kissinger: It's an agreement on research and development exchanges on alternative sources, etc. It has nothing to do with purchases of Soviet energy, resources.

The President: Just an exchange.

Mansfield: Aren't these private deals?

Kissinger: For Armand Hammer, etc., yes -- but this agreement is on technical exchange. The development of energy resources is private. This is totally separate.



Joint Leadership Mtg ✓
10 July 74 8:30

P. Have full plenary. I will go over Brussels & highlight
Unesco & K will follow up with G5/Euro leaders
following summit, they were significant.

Those who saw a communique & public relations
been most of what went on.

Stop at Brussels was useful. Euro always concerned
about US-SU cooperation, US stopped to consult
& sign declaration.

When I went to Euro in 69, they thought we
should do something about PRC & relations w/SU.
But then father was US-SU cooperation ^{since} ~~since~~
& Euro attitudes have turned 180°. They urged
CSECF cooperation; now they are working on it &
summit conclusion. Detente a period of great
opportunity & also danger - for alliance. Euro wants
some assurances on security but they been
less than coop on economics, NE, etc. They
can't have it both ways - keep our faces up & confront
us everywhere else. They don't always have to agree -
but they can't go off on their own ^{in opposition} & antagonize.

In Brussels, I met w/ NAC & then w/ Schmidt, Wilton,
Ronne & w/others at reception. Giscard not there -
he more cooperative but still legends on summit
force & can't move too fast. ~~The~~ Alliance was inaugurated,
this said would try to strengthen forces. Alliance
got security shot in arm - difficult when
all see tension rising. On Euro side, we
lead parolator for more coop bet US & Community
Euro interests were almost exclusively econ.
After talking w/ them, I wouldn't exchange ^{their} ~~their~~
problems for theirs.

About Unesco - didn't know type public



Then field crews, notably Moscow but also much
embassy + missile field.

TTB - SU proposed it. Their motives - we are for ahead
in testing. They worried about PRC, + T at 150 but
makes sense. Some military think some testing
is essential, but fundamentally a CTB is unverifiable.
We won't get TTB because of side issues of
PNE. We will work out agreement on PNE - they had
agreed on prior commitment + observance - 1st on site
inspection later.

Environmental warfare - we agreed to talks, which doesn't
seem important now, but who knows what science
will bring.

SALT - Toughest of all, as I told you before. SU TW is
greater but our advantage is enormous - 3 1/2:1
advantage in warheads + also in sophistication + accuracy.
As we look to future, if SU agreed to freeze now,
it would be into future position of inferiority - which
they won't do. SU has missile advantage - but you
get hit by warheads. We would not discuss this, but
our combined advantage doesn't include our allies - but
they can't share. They also worried about PRC; we
might have to also. In 1972, I took a rough
4 1/2 session on V/4. In 1973, from midnight, we
had rough 3 hours on ME. Had we crumbled in
either case, there would not have been V/4 settlement
or present ME situation. What we came up w/ was
was agreement to conclude 10 yr agreement on
prohibitions + prohibitions steps. We have to choose
whether to conclude an agreement which will protect
us + yet be acceptable to them or, w/ their
MIRV breakthrough, go into a race that which



we will win but which would leave us with
really better off. There comes a point where it
makes no difference who has most. There are some
choices - negotiate a decent agreement or increase
our defense & ease up then.

K. At one point, we told Berg what he would have
w/ MRUS, he complained some until last. Then
he told us what we had - including everything.
We never think this way, because we think
of 2 ~~not~~ strikes. Sig is that they cannot hit NATO
w/o fearing we will hit them as they cannot, or
if they hit NATO & US, we will still have enough.

P. I had talk w/ Guekko. We agreed K would go back
this fall - we have narrowed diff - still a gulf
but we hope we can agree on something. If
we can't, they will go ballistic & w/ their TW,
it will be a problem. It would be a race no
one could win. We looking generally for
longer term agreement.

Askew What effect will French deployment have?

P. SU puts great emphasis on Fr & Br deployments - &
also PRC. hunched at coldly, they are minor powers

K. After Fr has finished into prog in 1980, they
will have 1/2 as many warheads as we have
on 1 President.

P. The last thing Enns want is for us to become
inferior to SU, but they also fear a runaway
race.

— Where is China? Better than France?

K. Not much better, they will have 1/3 as much
as 1 President by 78.

P. But SU thinks PRC is going much faster



R. Also, how much is enough. RLC in four years RLC could kill millions of SO, a single aircraft million of RLC killed

In Fall what would be a reasonable agreement? Can Taylor agree

P. We think so. They converge - all negotiations must be considered. Court discuss #s. ^{one} And issue is that all us concerned must not adopt view why bother to try for agreement because we could win a war. But we don't want bigger budget - winter de Loro - but looking an agreement as well. More - + have told them so.

Posture We have had deterrent policy for 25 yrs. Conventional view think there would be limited war war. That impossible. Do Sars think that?

P. Sars believe in inevitable escalation.

K. ~~Sar~~ Sar agrees are not general that army

Posture Then why have more military shells.

K. Most distinctive but battlefield + strategic

Posture Puz shouldn't have to make a holocaust decision because only shells are 30 miles from port.

K. We agree, but then we need more conventional forces.

P. Threat is point. Unconventional weapons want budget.

Posture. Let Garmers put up a paper.

K. The tough speeches - P made last spring have brought Eurus to fundamentals. Changes in Cez + Fe have been very helpful.



Euro zone also see that our energy
institutions were far sighted. They all wanted to
take energy. They all running BP deficit
because of ~~low~~ oil prices. Also a new chapter
coming on our short term & looking is on
long term basis. They were saying we weren't
talking long enough. But eventually self interest
to keep Euro healthy. Euro zone wants
to cope. France has been stuck w/ exorbitant
oil prices as result of bilateral deals, & energy
cop working so well. ~~The~~ Giscard was
wants to cope w/o publicly revealing course.
On previous summit, Euro faced condemnation.
This time, most felt it successful - contributed
to easing atmosphere, they liked the way
we proceeding, & it encouraged progress
on C-SLE + NIS + ER. I made good progress on
that 2 w/o hickhitting. The most troublesome
thing was US domestic copying over US
inferiority. Spain asked about ~~the~~ comment
on Nam staying out of representation.
We must get Euro to strengthen time pass.
SU can't get superiority strategically, but
at some level, the that forces could each
other out & some pass become critical.
They OK on SNT, but don't know enough to
draw details. Their concern is to look
into future & concern is econ. Italy is in
bad shape. Talking to them is like to a Harvard
prof. seminars. w/ costs & forecasts, & demo
factories have little momentum. They thought to
move to costs & we told them that 9 months.

Scott said at time they have no discern alternatives

K. Yes, they need the above posture & gas

In FA, Giscard wants to keep, he has no hangups.

They just hold time + must maneuver carefully.

Whatever FA policy, as long as they don't bring pressure on their allies, we can work it out.

Schmitt has more of rigid sentimentality.

Who a year ago they thought we would do them,

that has changed. In ME they all we are

right + we saying them to wear in down,

as long as it is very positive.

Byrd What were issues impossible of resolution?

What are parameters of trade & what are kind pro.

K. There are words being thrown ^{around} ~~away~~. Fake

T.W. Married w/ MIRVs + high accuracy they

can be dangerous against fixed targets - so

they more vulnerable than us. So far they

have not gone to max MIRVing. If we can keep

it there we OK. But if they put 25 MIRVs /

missile it would be pretty bad. Also, we can

put big missile on MXIII buses if need be.

In course we seek told other our intelligence

prog of other each other pass. Any MIRV

limitation we could accept would surely

bring them + back had. ~~But~~ Also, most of

building is coming just at end of a

extended period. We thought if we could extend

a time, we could put a cap on it's which is

below capacity on each side + slow down arms

race. Still large it's, but instability comes

from each racing. There is no way an attack



our US could have no w/ less than 4000 workers.

P. An agreement means nothing unless it means both sides restrict what they would otherwise do.

K. We could have juggled it but it would have been hard to justify it was less than their prog. We want either to restrict them or be sure they refuse to be limited.

The recent agreement doesn't involve transfer of workers. They facilitate trade.

Myth: keeping detente is one sided:

(1) We settled VN on our terms

(2) We squeezed them in ME in unlikable way

(3) We jammed Berlin

(4) Stopped Cuba sub base.

What they got? \$100 X-11 credits, a little trade, some wheat (not part of detente). We tie every thing to good F/P behavior. If we present benefits to them, they will go back to cold war.

P. B of T w/ SC is very favorable

K. And if we don't trade Euros + Japs already are, + better done under our close markets than w/ others.

P. We trying to work out methods how a private trading economy can trade w/ a state system. Also we think pertinent to PRC

Scott. They opening big trade center

K. Look at records. Every time they have moved, we have been tough. We have showed them if they move substantially, we will stop them. Conversely if they cooperate, we will make it useful. Remember, until 72 summit, there was no trade at all.



When you get Sov leadership & news talking
success of detente, it gives them a stake
tho they can change.

We have analyzed & kept in Euro w/ this
policy - what would happen if we had
one crisis after another.

There were no contacts as to loans, or
transfer of resources.

P. We told them could not get MIFN but
working on it.

3 things moved them at this point:

(1) What will happen w/ China (force us into
detente w/ PRC & opposition to China)

(2) Why don't they want in UK & ME? Why
settle Berlin: (1) Fear - the tough US. They are
still obsessed w/ WW II. The people were out, & they
called not just for peace but for friendship.

Good relations w/ US in their interest - they bring
batter but they fear behind Euro & even once so US.

(2) The more stable we can give Sov leadership & people
in place & energy, & more they will lose if detente
fails.

MIFN - You can say cut them off - applies in
exposed to PRC. But & more we can give them
a stake in good relations, & more we can
influence them. If we can get a trade bill,
it may inspire trade, & will be more help
on Jewish immigration than if we slam & close.
In '69 less than 1000 / yr, last yr 33000. Two
years down, put because of O.T. war.

Some need them to fear us but also a positive
element to give them incentive. There is no

get away. There will have to be guidelines, but
no unilateral guarantees. W/o MEXN, they
certainly won't change their policies.

Cedrick Any thought to sending Sec Dep to Moscow.

P. Might be good for someone to talk to Gorbachev

K. If we want to drive Enns + PRC crazy, just
let 'em slip talk.

P. That's not what Cedrick is saying. But something
over.

Manfred It's not inadvisable Mr P + you better keep
control.

P. Lowell

withholds details.

K. I think it won't happen

Albert How about energy

K. R + D exchange on alternative sources, etc. Nothing
to do w/ purchases of low energy sources

P. Just exchange

Manfred About these private deals

K. Arman & Hammer, etc, yes - but agreement
is on tech exchange. Absence of energy
sources is private. This is totally asymmetrical.

