MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

PARTICIPANTS:
- President Gerald Ford
- Dr. Fred C. Ikle, Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
- Lt. General Brent Scowcroft, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

DATE AND TIME: Monday, January 6, 1975
12:15 p.m.

PLACE: The Oval Office
The White House

President: Happy New Year.

Ikle: I have a bit of good news. The Senate has ratified the Geneva Protocol. A signing ceremony would show that the Legislature and Executive are now cooperating.

Another issue: The danger of nuclear proliferation. The Congress is very worried. Brazil, Argentina, Pakistan, Libya all may be looking around. South Korea also. A number of efforts are under way. We are trying to deal with the export of nuclear materials. Action is slow because the French are obnoxious.

What this comes down to is a number of hard decisions which may come at a price. For example, the Italians are holding back from signing the NPT. Some never will sign. But if it begins to unravel we could be accused of not doing enough.

President: How many potentials have not signed?

Ikle: Most of them. But if we could show motion with Italy, it might keep a sense of momentum.

President: What nuclear powers haven't signed?
Kile: France and the PRC. But the PRC has not exported material. I bring this up to show that things have to be done. We are preparing a package for you of things which have to be done.

President: I think the success of getting the Senate to move was excellent and I congratulate you. I haven't focused on a signing ceremony.

Giscard seemed forthcoming on this at Martinique.

Scowcroft: Their team is coming next week. We don't know what they're coming with.

Kile: But maybe if they won't join a conference we can work with them bilaterally. But France is preparing to export reprocessing plants, and there is no way to prevent diversion of materials from these.

President: Do they have the technical people -- Israel, Pakistan, etc.?

Kile: They are developing it, and the expertise is transferable from other (such as reactor) areas.

President: What do we do now?

Kile: We must develop proper safeguards, such as we have in the export of reactors to Israel and Egypt.

President: What do they think of Vladivostok?

Kile: They think the dropping of FBS was real progress. Some of them want the levels brought down and additional limitations added. Most of them feel this is a turning point. It will be important as we flesh out the treaty to deal with verification. We can't be trapped into promising absolute verification, but within limits. If we promise further negotiations, that will be important in getting the academics on board.

President: But first we must get this one signed. I think the opposition is dying, isn't it?

Kile: Several of them want to know how much we will save.

President: If the sense-of-the-Senate resolution about renegotiating goes through, I will tell the Senators they should add a clause promising the five to ten billion dollars that will be necessary if they destroy the agreement by forcing a renegotiation.
Ikle: In the last analysis, few of them will want to destroy the agreement. Do you have time for a minute on MBFR?

President: Yes.

Ikle: The talks are somewhat stalemated. There are three key elements: One, the nuclear package. It shouldn't follow too closely on Vladivostok. But the Nunn Amendment requires the Secretary of Defense to report on reductions in overseas nuclear deployment. Two, the Soviet pressure for European reductions. Three, the connection with CSCE. It would look bad if there were no progress in MBFR. While there is no formal coupling, there is an informal political coupling. We don't care about CSCE, but we do care about MBFR. It would be embarrassing if one moves without the other.

President: Is MBFR stalemated?

Ikle: We do have tentative agreement on adding air manpower. We may be able to combine stages one and two into one, to help the USSR. In the last analysis, if there is no agreement, we should have at least made a proposal that is convincing to the Congress.

President: I think the new House will be worse than the last. It would be bad to be forced to give something without getting anything in return. With the new Congress reconvening, we have to have a story of pushing hard.

Any change of attitude on the part of the Europeans?

Ikle: The Germans are not pushing for reductions, but as you know, the Brits are. We have to be careful a landslide doesn't start, because Congress wants American, not European reductions.

President: How about the Threshold Test Ban?

Ikle: The talks start in February. The big issue is PNE's above the threshold. It has implications for the NPT. As a personal judgment, if we can't get PNE's restricted to below the threshold, we may not want to sign the TTB and submit it to Congress. The Soviets probably wouldn't want it submitted if it would be defeated.

President: I appreciate your bringing me up to date. I hope we can give Resor some forthcoming recommendations. It would be a disaster to have to give things away without getting anything in return.

Thanks for coming in. Keep me posted through Henry or Brent and I'll see you at the next NSC meeting.
P. Higby - Nov 75

1. A bit of good news. The Senate has ratified the
Geneva Protocol. A signing ceremony will
probably occur tomorrow.

2. Another case of some kind of mumps. Company
wondering about Angora, Pakistan, help, and
may be coming. S. Kain asks, a # of Hino
smells away - part of some medication, action in
their absence from headquarters.

3. What is necessary now is a # of abrasion
materials money amount a pair. For ex. abrasives
are leading local from seeing QPT. Some sales
will report that it began to arrest, we could
be accused of not doing enough.

4. What many potential do not equal?

5. I don't think that we could have sustained it.

6. What things have they equal?

7. First place that I was not repeated material

8. They're going to work things having to be done.

9. We're going to arrange a passage for the trip, which

10. I think we're getting some to move was,

11. I can't agree with you. I haven't seen

12. Current need pushing at Martinsburg.

13. Can I have any more work? I can't think.

14. But maybe if they won't give a very good

15. by suppressing plants there is no way to

16. suppress depression.
P. Do they have technical people?

I. They are allegedly applying it in a private setting outside from other public (such as digital) areas.

P. What do you mean?

I. We cannot apply it to equipment, because it's

P. Understand.

I. They think it BS was not proper. Some want tools bought down a little more. Not the one in a turning point with her important values placed up. What is the role of measurement? It has to be played in another, absolute environment, but within limits. I've promised further negotiations that would be important in getting academic and broad.

P. But I'm not sure yet. This is a signal. I think the opposite is going to happen?

I. I'm not sure. I am not sure how much we will do.

P. If I'm sure of something, negotiate with you now. I tell Sintra they should deal

I. But this meeting, we will want to delay the agreement. Do you have time for that?

P. Yes.

I. I'm somewhat frustrated. Please say something.
one word. Not done amendment apparently
in depth without in validation without
issue. (2) Case prevent for Emir restriction
(3) Connection with CEC. Should be talk of
we progress in MBR. While we refused
everything there is unknown part every
We don't need CEC but de about
MBR would be embarrassing if we made
worse other.

1. So MBR premature.

I was the team lead agreement another
and dangerous. We may be able to combine
implementation to help CEC. In
short analysis, if no agreement we should
done at least manual approach (German)

1. I think even though with be worse than is box.

Would you like to provide something
is going any thing in written CEC. Even
becoming in have a story of passing
word.

Any change of attitude on Emir?

I believe not passing for Emir, but is your
boring, a little one. We have to manage to
handle with detail that because Emir wants
us, not Emir reduction

1. How about (18)

I take the view that Emir. He says no ETE
above threshold. The implication for NRT.
G preamble judgment if we can't put the material
to follow threshold, we may not want to sign.
Submit a copy. No comments are needed, but I would like a copy of the final draft.

- Descriptive phrases bring things to life.

- We won't give you more than necessary.

- You need to learn things on your own by reading and writing.

- Thanks for coming. Make sure you bring your meetings.

- Be sure to sign up at X-503 C-524.