



32A CCPC (2)

Prime Minister

COP
27/x

MO 25/2/43/2

SECRETARY OF STATE'S MEETING WITH MR WEINBERGER IN THE MARGIN OF THE
NPG AT GLENEAGLES, 21ST OCTOBER: NOTE FOR THE RECORD

Those present:

The Rt Hon George Younger MP
Secretary of State for Defence

The Hon C Weinberger
Secretary of Defense

Adm of the Fleet Sir J Fieldhouse
Chief of the Defence Staff

Adm W J Crowe
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

Mr M O'D B Alexander
Ambassador, Permanent
Representative to NATO

The Hon D M Abshire
Permanent Representative to NATO

Mr D Nicholls
DUS(P)

The Hon R N Perle
Asst SECDEF/ISP

Mr J K Ledlie
CPR

V Adm D S Jones
Snr Mil Asst

Mr J F Howe
PS/Secretary of State

and other US officials

1. The Secretary of State had a 40 minute discussion with Mr Weinberger before the opening session of the NPG.

Reykjavik

2. The Secretary of State said that we supported what the President had done at Reykjavik. We were grateful to the US for consulting us as closely as was practicable in the circumstances. He wished however to register one important point of emphasis: in the European context, the concept of eliminating nuclear weapons was not at all attractive unless the conventional and chemical threats were also removed. Mr Weinberger said that he took the point and did not see it as a problem. If deep reductions, approaching zero, could be achieved, then these other issues would become of the first priority. He saw no difficulty in making this point clear. The Secretary of State said that we could accept the zero solution for INF, but strategic weapons were another matter for us, and it would be essential to do something about conventional weapons if we were to get to the stage of very deep cuts in strategic weapons. Mr Weinberger repeated that there was no misunderstanding about this point. It was also important to go on emphasising that verification must be a vital part of any arms control agreement. Neither in the sense of Mr Younger's point, nor in terms of inadequate verification, must a gap be allowed



to develop in which deterrence was lost. Mr Perle interjected that the US for their part were not talking about zero strategic weapons - this was a Russian proposal; what the US were proposing was zero ballistic missiles.

3. There then followed a discussion of the possible tactics that the Secretary-General might adopt at the NPG discussion on Reykjavik. Mr Weinberger emphasised that the US did not want the Secretary-General to present a formal remit to Permanent Representatives, which would lead to an unnecessarily divisive and prolonged exercise.

CW arms control

4. The Secretary of State said that the Soviet reaction to the British initiative on Article X had been reasonably promising. We needed to keep the pressure on them to respond positively. He asked how Mr Weinberger viewed the Soviet reaction, and what line the US proposed to take with the Soviets bilaterally. Mr Weinberger said that he did not know in detail how the Russians were reacting. For his own part he considered a strong verification clause vital. Mr Perle said that he was not pleased to hear that the Soviets found our proposal constructive. He understood that it had been part of the British rationale that the Russians were bound to reject our proposals. If the Soviets did accept our scheme then the Alliance really would be in trouble because we had not provided for mandatory inspection. Mr Weinberger said that we needed to secure much stronger verification measures than the Soviets had hitherto spoken of. Mr Abshire said that it was nevertheless helpful that Congress had authorised primary production. Mr Perle said that the production would cease if there were an agreement. The US had never liked our proposals, which vitiated the unencumbered right of inspection.

5. Mr Weinberger said that the matter was too important for concessions to be made for the sake of consensus. The attitude that verification was an obstacle to arms control agreements was a worrying one. Admiral Crowe said that the military side was looking at inspections very carefully.

Glenn/Trafficant

6. The Secretary of State thanked Mr Weinberger for the Administration's actions on the Glenn/Trafficant amendments. Mr Weinberger said that he hoped that these two particular amendments were now disposed of but the protectionist sentiment in Congress survived. Mr Perle suggested that we might invite Senator Glenn to Britain to see the work we were doing on the SDI. The Secretary of State said that this might well be a good idea, but later on when there was more work to see. He added that he was grateful to note that the Administration had also successfully deflected another protectionist amendment, that by Senator Dole.



Tracked Rapier

7. The Secretary of State said that he hoped the US would give very careful consideration to tracked Rapier to fulfil the requirement for a forward area defence system to replace the cancelled DIVADs programme. Rapier had the great advantage that it was a developed system and it was ready now.
8. The meeting concluded with a brief discussion of communique points.
9. The subject of maritime ROE was not raised.

J. F. H. .

Ministry of Defence
21st October 1986

Distribution

PS/Minister (AF)
PS/Minister (DP)
PSO/CDS
PS/PUS
HDES
DUS(P)
ACDS(Pol/Nuc)
AUS(DS)
D/NATO
Head of DACU
D Pol SDI PO
CPR

PS/Prime Minister
PS/Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary
PS/Cabinet Secretary
HM Ambassador Washington
UK PERM REP NATO