

April 10, 1980

Memorandum for Zbigniew Brzezinski from Jerry Oplinger, NSC Staff, 'Minutes of the PRC on April 9, 1980,' enclosing minutes of meeting on 'Non-Proliferation Matters'

Citation:

"Memorandum for Zbigniew Brzezinski from Jerry Oplinger, NSC Staff, 'Minutes of the PRC on April 9, 1980,' enclosing minutes of meeting on 'Non-Proliferation Matters'", April 10, 1980, Wilson Center Digital Archive, Jimmy Carter Presidential Library, RAC Document NLC-28-32-8-2-6 <https://wilson-center.drivingcreative.com/document/145120>

Summary:

At the meeting of the Policy Review Committee, Gerald Smith gave a full briefing of the policy and procedural changes that he sought.

Original Language:

English

Contents:

Original Scan

5

MEMORANDUM

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

NSC review(s)
completed.

UNCLASSIFIED
WITH SECRET ATTACHMENT

April 10, 1980

DOE review
completed.

State Dept. review
completed

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR:

ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI

FROM:

JERRY OPLINGER

SUBJECT:

Minutes of the PRC on
April 9, 1980

Attached for your information and review is a copy of the minutes of the Policy Review Committee Meeting on Non-Proliferation Matters held April 9 and 4:00 p.m.

UNCLASSIFIED
WITH SECRET ATTACHMENT

POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

April 9, 1980

SECRET

Time and Place: 4:00 p.m. - 5:30 p.m., White House
Situation Room

Subject: Non-Proliferation Matters

Participants:

White House

Mr. David Aaron
Ambassador Henry Owen

State

Secretary Cyrus Vance
Deputy Secretary Warren Christopher
Ambassador Gerard Smith (Ambassador-at-Large and Special Representative
of the President for Non-Proliferation)
Mr. Frank Hodson (Deputy Special US Representative for Non-Proliferation
Matters)

OSD

Deputy Secretary W. Graham Clayton, Jr.
Mr. Walter Slocumbe (Deputy Under Secretary for Policy Planning)

Energy

Mr. Worth Bateman (Acting Under Secretary)
Deputy Secretary John Sawhill
Dr. George Cunningham (Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy)

JCS

General David Jones

DCI

Admiral Stansfield Turner
 (Special Assistant for Nuclear Proliferation Intell.)

ACDA

Mr. Spurgeon Keeny (Deputy Director)
Mr. Charles Van Doren (Assistant Director, Non-Proliferation Bureau)

OSTP

Dr. Frank Press
Mr. Benjamin Huberman

OMB

Dr. John White
Mr. Dan Taft (Deputy Associate Director Special Studies Division)

SECRET

Review 4/10/86
by GGOplinger

5A

SECRET

2.

CEQ

Mr. Gus Speth

Domestic Policy

Mr. Stuart Eizenstat

Ms. Kitty Schirmer

NSC

Dr. Lincoln Bloomfield

Mr. Jerry Oplinger

Mr. Thomas Thornton

MINUTES

Vance opened the meeting by stating that the objectives of the President's 1977 non-proliferation policies remain valid. But do our assumptions about how to achieve those objectives? Our policies have not been as effective as we hoped, and have caused resentment with our Allies. We have to respond to their energy needs, and this could lead to a better non-proliferation regime. Smith's proposals have been approved by DoE and ACDA, and we should try to agree to send the paper forward to the President as soon as possible. (S)

Smith said that in preparing his paper, he did not want to demean the President's 1977 policies. Those policies have greatly increased international awareness that the fuel cycle is a "dangerous beast." Our successes include persuading the FRG and France not to export sensitive technologies, turning off dangerous developments in Korea and Taiwan, and cancellation of the reprocessing contract in Pakistan. INFCE came out better than expected. On MB-10 issues, while there has been a fair amount of static, we did not turn any down. Our failures include the FRG/Brazil deal, Argentina and our efforts to use organized sanctions in Pakistan. We have not made a dent on India, and have not made much progress with South Africa, although we probably did manage to abort a test. (S)

We now face the problem of the post-INFCE period and the NPT Review Conference. The law requires us to get consent rights over reprocessing in the US-EURATOM agreement. Europeans have hinted that they might be willing to give us the juridical right if there were an implied understanding on how we would exercise it. The Japanese plan to build a large reprocessing plant; they want predictability in meeting their plutonium requirements. (S)

Smith said that we have essentially three options: to continue on our present course, which would not get us to our 1977 objectives; to follow the course advocated by the UK (a universal code of nuclear trade) which is dangerous, or to become more flexible and try to build a better regime. The proposals put forward would not require a change in the law, but he personally hoped that we would change it later. (S)

SECRET

SECRET

3.

Smith defined the regime he seeks as including:

- full-scope safeguards as a common supplier requirement for new export commitments;
- deferral of thermal recycle;
- IPS;
- reaffirmation and perhaps extension of FRG and French policies not to export enrichment and reprocessing technology;
- enhanced cooperation in dealing with mavericks; and
- multinational auspices for sensitive facilities. (S)

Smith said that what he seeks now is approval of planning assumptions; i.e. authority to take soundings in some depth on the Hill and abroad, particularly on the central question of relaxing our MB-10 policy to permit generic approval of reprocessing and plutonium use in advanced countries. (S)

There was some discussion of which countries might qualify for this treatment. Would Korea, for example, qualify? Smith said that the scheme was intended to have an evolutionary character, if Korea and Taiwan want in, it would be hard to say no. (S)

Smith said that he also wanted to offer long-term fuel licenses; for NPT parties he would issue licenses for the life of the reactor. (S)

Smith said that if we fail to do something along these lines, our policy would begin to fall apart. Other countries are turning to the Soviets; Europe is currently doing more enrichment for Europe than the U.S. They are also building their own enrichment plants. He did not think that the changes would have any affect on domestic nuclear programs such as Barnwell and Clinch River. He had talked to Congressman Bingham and other staffers; we would run into some static, but there are other Congressmen who will believe the changes don't go far enough. (S)

Owen asked exactly what the President is being asked to decide; would it be authority to open negotiations. Smith said it would be authority to go ahead with Congress and Japan and Europe, with the President's approval to be sought before we get locked in. It is hard to define when he would come back to the President; perhaps before we give them specific proposals. But the President would be free to change the timing or substance as we go along. (S)

Smith said that no concessions would be agreed until everything in the package was agreed; the "deal" is a whole package. (S)

SECRET

SECRET

4.

As for the risks of public perception of a major change, Smith said that is why he regards his proposals as planning assumptions. At the end of the negotiation, he felt that the public would accept the result. (S)

Asked about the acceptability of relaxing our MB-10 policy only for some countries, and not for advanced LDC's like Brazil, Argentina and Taiwan, Smith said Argentina won't be producing plutonium in quantities until the next decade. He could not predict the future, but full-scope would help to prevent new deals without adequate safeguards. (S)

Aaron said that what the US would give up is clear; it is not clear what we would require in return. There would be increased flow on plutonium, but the regime the flow goes into is not very clear. The goal of better cooperation for problem countries may become a constantly moving target; others will pocket our concessions but it is not clear we will get the desired return. (S)

Smith said that if we only succeed in getting an effective IPS, we would be better off than now. (S)

Eisenstat said he had real concerns on the signal this change would send with regard to our position on Clinch River and domestic reprocessing; he wanted to consider this further and take Congressional soundings. We have a great deal of water to carry on the Hill already with energy matters and the NRC reorganization plan. He did not want to set off a wave of indignation among those who have supported the President. He reserved his position. (S)

Keeny agreed that Smith's proposals would be helpful to non-proliferation. We should be clear about the package of quids. Generic approval of MB-10's should not constrain us in arguing against premature plutonium commitments, and IPS should not be taken as a green light for reprocessing. We should retain our bilateral approval rights in establishing an IPS. (S)

Speth said that the effect of the proposals would be to put the US stamp of approval on reprocessing and plutonium use. In the long run, the policy would be based on an explicitly discriminatory regime. He felt that the paper presented one point of view; the President needs to hear the contrary case. He felt this might be presented by the NSC. He was not optimistic that the line that we were not radically changing the policy would wash, and felt that Bingham, Zablocki and others would be very skeptical. (S)

Aaron said he had reservations about Congressional explorations. That could trigger newspaper stories about a major change in policy. He felt we need a systematic study of all options. Smith's proposals may be better than other ideas, but the questions of quids, other options, and the effect on near-proliferators needed to be closely analyzed. He also felt it was important to look at the question of timing. (S)

SECRET

SECRET

5.

Claytor said he thought Smith was absolutely right and it was time to move. (S)

Jones also supported Smith. (S)

Vance said a working group would be established to produce a full options paper in two weeks. (S)

SECRET