

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

SECRET/NODIS/XGDS

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12958 Sec. 3.8

MR 01-101, #22, OSD etc 3/2/04, etc etc 11/27/01

del NARA Date 7/20/04

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

PARTICIPANTS: President Ford
Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense
Brent Scowcroft, Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs

DATE AND TIME: Monday, January 26, 1976
9:25 - 10:30 a.m.

PLACE: The Oval Office

SUBJECT: Secretary Kissinger's SALT Discussions
with Brezhnev

Kissinger: Wade did very well.

Rumsfeld: He was very pleased. It worked well.

The President: Henry, why don't you bring us up to date?

Kissinger: They totally rejected Option IV. I then went to Modified Option III because I thought it was better for them. They rejected that on grounds that Backfire couldn't be counted. They will give us in writing the range of the Backfire and a commitment that it wouldn't be upgraded or used in an intercontinental role. It is not a lie based on design mission profile.

I think if we wrote down some specifications and some constraints, they would at least look at them.

They accepted the ALCM proposal. We can say we are giving something up, but since they wanted to count each missile, they gave up -- especially their agreeing to 2500 kilometers.



SECRET/NODIS/XGDS

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

They accepted SLCM from subs, but not surface ships.

They want 600 kilometers for land-based. We made the mistake of going from 5500 to 2500. It called their attention to it.

Then they gave us the heavy missile definition.

Rumsfeld: This will defuse the violation argument on SALT I.

Kissinger: The soft areas are surface-ship SLCMs and land-based cruise missiles.

I get wildly different interpretations of the utility of surface-ship SLCMs. We could maybe count them as MIRV with an upper limit. Maybe if we counted land-based in the 2400.

Scowcroft/Rumsfeld: That won't solve the European problem.

Kissinger: They will hang tough, I think, on 2500 kilometers on land-based. We can probably solve the surface-ship SLCMs.

Rumsfeld: But in Europe they are just like FBS.

Kissinger: But from Europe and Japan we can cover four-fifths of the USSR and they can just cover Europe.

We have insisted on 2500, but I think they won't buy it.

Rumsfeld: There is also the nuclear versus the conventional warhead. Another issue is third country acquisition. If you bar conventional, you are barring the possibility of replacing some present systems.

I have never seen so much leaking as came out of your party.

Kissinger: It was done because it would have leaked after I briefed NATO.

Rumsfeld: Don't blame it on NATO.

Kissinger: Cruise missile verification is really their problem through '85. That can be our excuse for the nuclear versus conventional.



Rumsfeld: Cruise missile verification is a horror.

Scowcroft: You have the same problem with range if you allow 5500.

The President: I think we should look at all the issues and reach a judgment. What is the time schedule?

Kissinger: I think we should get something back to them before their Party Conference.

Rumsfeld: I was thinking we could get the VP Working Group going and try to get back to Dobrynin by 8 or 10 February.

Kissinger: One way would be to count all land-based over 600. That way we could have a few.



PIK/R

26 Jan 76

- R Wade did very well
- R He was very pleased. It worked well
- P R, why don't you bring us up to date.
- K They totally rejected option IV. ~~For~~ I then went to ~~and~~ option III cause I thought it better factor. They rejected that on grounds that Backfire wouldn't court. They will give us in writing a range of Backfire & that it wouldn't be as good. ^{or used in incremental vol.} It is at a ~~high~~ level based on design mission profile. I think if we wrote down some specs & constraints they would at least look at them. They accepted a SHCM proposal. We can say we're giving something up, but since they counted & count each missile, they gave up - exp ^{their agreement to 2500 per} They accepted SHCM from sub, but not SS. They want 600 per for land based. We made mistake going from 5500 to 2500. ^{attention to it} It called them. Then they gave us the heavy missile def.
- R This would dispose the evolution argument on Sect I
- K The soft ones are SS Shero & land based ~~was~~ CM's. I get wildly diff. interpretation of utility of SS Shero. ~~On~~ We could maybe count them as MIRV w/ an upper limit. Maybe if we counted land based in a ~~low~~ 2400.

- S/R That would solve Euro. problem.
- K They will bring tough, I think a 2500 per on land based. We can prob solve - SS SHCM's.
- R Best in Euro. they are just like FBS.
- K Best from Euro & Japan we can even 4/5 of USSR & they can just wear Eur.



cat working going going Today

K We have invested over 2500, but I think they won't buy it.

R There is also a move to conventional warhead. Another issue is 3rd country acquisition. If you have conventional, you ~~have~~ having possibility of replacing some present systems.

R I have never seen so much leaking as came out of your party

K Dave because it would have leaked after NATO

R Don't blame it on NATO

K Call verification is really their job then is it.

R That can be our expense fact we are conventional

R EM verification is a house

S Same prob w/ range if you allow 5500.

P I think we should look at all the issues and reach judgments - what is true + what?

R I think we should get something to be before party conf.

R I was thinking we could get a WG going & try to get back to D by 8 or 10 Feb.

K Our way would be to commit all land based over 600. That way we could have a few

→ ~~Commit~~ Dept a letter to a Speaker on Angola.
- Cuba
- USSR
- Impact.

Money to friends
12000 Cubans

