

Gromyko: On this, non-proliferation is a problem that is as important as it was ten years ago.

The President: Maybe so.

Gromyko: Two-thirds of the states have ratified it, but the remainder haven't. It would be good if we two did our best to get more states to ratify.

The President: I hope we could work effectively on this. I'm interested, Congress is, and if we could stabilize this...

Kissinger: These are two points. One is the spread of reactor technology. Maybe we can do something on this. The other is, the Foreign Minister wouldn't want some of his allies to get the impression of condominium.

Gromyko: If you mean our real allies [smile], it is no problem. No one can predict how someone might act irresponsibly.

Kissinger: Speaking frankly, France has sold four reactors to Iran and we don't know what safeguards there were. If we two can agree on safeguards, then we could go to the Europeans.

Dobrynin: Do you have sufficient safeguards?

Kissinger: In the Egyptian case, we have, we think, foolproof safeguards. If we two can agree and if we get the Europeans to agree, we can control the situation. We will tell you our safeguards -- maybe you have better ones.

Gromyko: Sometimes Japan and Brazil are mentioned. What do you think?

The President: Japan has its own problems...

Kissinger: The line between weapons and peaceful uses is vague. The Indian explosion obviously has military implication. The Japanese have a big nuclear program but have not done any explosion yet. If they moved this way, they would go like India and could be a big power very quickly.



The President: The Japanese are having trouble with their ship.

Dobrynin: Leakage on their nuclear vessel.

Gromyko: Fukuda told me Japan would not do it.

Kissinger: We have no idea they are moving.

Dobrynin: In the PRC they have a new Commander-in-Chief.

The President: One of the points we discussed yesterday. I agree with you and I think it was a constructive speech. I was looking over the report on our defense appropriations -- that was my expertise in Congress. And Congress has given us a good list with what we need to move ahead. I want you to know that despite the strength they gave me to move ahead, we want to cooperate with you -- but if we have to compete, we will. The American people will accept a planned equality, but if we are going to compete, the American people will want me to -- and I will -- keep the country in a strong position.

Gromyko: There are two ways to go: if we move ahead while negotiating. We could say to our peoples we will work on some areas. The first way is to say: stay strong while negotiating; the other is to say: the main task is to find areas for cooperation. When you go the first direction, we ask how we should report to our people. Now we prefer the second approach.

The President: We believe in restraint. But we must assure the American people that while we go through this process, our strength is adequate. I must assure that the American people are not in jeopardy.

Gromyko: It is difficult to find a way to cut the knot. Partial solutions are the more practical way to approach the problem. We just discussed non-proliferation.

The President: Competition which drains you and us is not useful. But until we can see the progress which can be made, I must preserve our security. The American people want us to move forward, but want to be secure also. Don't feel what I'm saying is to upset what I am talking about, but it is to assure the American people that as we move ahead our people are adequately protected.



Gromyko: I can assure you we will carry out our policy. We don't like some things we see on the U.S. scene -- like Jackson -- but it will not dissuade us. The summit conferences and any other talks will continue. The U.S., Soviet Union, Europeans -- and even the PRC -- do not want tension. But we won't give up what belongs to us. But we want to help be good neighbors. It is nothing directed against the United States. We want good relations with Europe -- and with China, but we will not give up territory which belongs to us. We proceed from that assumption. We are not against your good relations with Eastern Europe, if it is based on mutual respect and security.



P/Browning/K/Doug

21 Sept

(Initial pleasant)
~~Chat~~

G R follows me very closely - I cannot afford a mistake

P I enjoyed our talk & R filled me in on his talk w/ you.

K G just gave me response to suggestion re open an another - water safeguards - that important

D Would this have to be an agreement

K Yes, but each is each self completely

G On this, um - probly is just as simple as you say.

P Maybe so

G 43 of states have ratified, but remember haven't. Be good if we 2 did on best to get more to ratify.

P Agree we could work jointly on this - I interested, Com is + if we could start this...

K 2 points - one is water tech - maybe could smother. The other is FA's involvement some of his allies to get impression of combination

G If you were on one real allies (sumb), it is no prob.

We need can prohibit how ~~so~~ someone might act irresponsibly

K Speaking frankly, FA has sold 4 reactors to Iran & we don't know what safeguards. If we 2 can agree on safeguards, they then we could go to Eurus

D Do you have any safeguards

K In E case, we have we think probably safeguards - if we 2 can agree if we get E and FA eye, we can control a bit. We will tell you our safeguards - maybe you have better.

G Sometimes go Brazil are mentioned. What do you think

P Japan has its own probs - - -

K The line bet w/ you + peaceful is vague. The Indian explosion obviously has not, maybe not - Japs have big time prob but no explosion yet. If they moved this way, they would go like India



- * could be big punner very quickly
- P Navy trouble with their ship
- D Leakage
- G Fukuda told me Jap would not do it
- R We have no idea they are moving
- D for PRC they have new Cdr in Chief
- P One of ~~the~~ ^{pro} was downed yesterday - I think a construction speech. Looking over report on def app - that my expectations in Cong - Cong has given no agreed bid w/ what we want to move ahead. I want you to know that despite - strength they gave me to move ahead, we want to work w/ you - but if we have to stay at congress, as well. The Am people will accept a planned equality, but if we are going to congress, Am people will want the - + I will - to keep a country in a strong position.
- G There are 2 ways to go - move ahead while negotiating. We ~~should~~ ^{will} say to our people we will work on some cases. The first way is to stay strong while negotiating; another is to say the main task is to find areas for cooperation. When you go to a situation, we are based on the demand of our people. How we present a real approach
- P We believe in restraint. But we must assure our people that while we go through this process that our strength is adequate. I want assure that our people are not in jeopardy (washed something)
- G It is diff to find way to exit a knot - Partial solutions ~~are~~ ~~way~~ ~~are~~ are a more practical way to approach a prob. Was just discussed non-prov.



1 Competition which drains you + us is not useful.
But until we can see a program which can be
made, I must preserve our security. Some people
want us to ~~feel~~ move forward, but want
to be sure also.

Don't feel what saying is to upset what I talking
about, but to assure everyone that we are moving
ahead that perhaps adequately protected.

2 Assume you are well away out are policy. We
don't like the trip on US side - Jackson - but
will not dissuade us. The summit conference
+ some other talks will continue. US, SC, EEC
(now EC) do not want tension, but we want
fair report what belongs to us. But we want to
take hard feel ourselves. Nothing directed against
US. We want good relations w/ EEC - and w/ China.
We don't want to get up territory which belong to us.
We are forced from our side.

We not against your good relations w/ E
EEC ~~and~~ if based on mutual respect,
unity.

