

Message Text

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 01 GENEVA 02180 01 OF 03 222016Z
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 EA-07 IO-13 ISO-00 AF-08 ARA-06
CIAE-00 PM-04 H-01 INR-07 L-03 NASA-01 NEA-10
NSAE-00 NSC-05 OIC-02 SP-02 PA-01 PRS-01 OES-06
SS-15 USIA-06 MC-02 /123 W
-----222133Z 043603 /67

R 221826Z MAR 77
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 6131
INFO AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
AMEMBASSY MOSCOW
AMEMBASSY OTTAWA
AMEMBASSY STOCKHOLM
AMEMBASSY ROME
AMEMBASSY TOKYO
USMISSION USUN NY
USMISSION NATO
ERDA HQ WASHDC
ERDA GERMANTOWN RHEGGTN
SECDEF WASHDC

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE SECTION 1 OF 3 GENEVA 2180

E.O. 11652: N/A
TAGS: PARM, CCD
SUBJECT: CCD: ASSESSMENT OF THIRD ROUND OF INFORMAL MEETINGS ON
SOVIET PROPOSAL ON NEW MASS DESTRUCTION WEAPONS (MDW)

1. INFORMAL CCD MEETINGS WITH EXPERTS ON MDW WERE HELD
MARCH 14 THROUGH 17, 1977. THIS WAS THE THIRD ROUND OF
INFORMAL CCD MEETINGS ON THE SUBJECT, WITH ROUNDS ONE
AND TWO HAVING BEEN HELD IN 1976.

2. MAIN CARRY-OVER PROBLEM FROM PRIOR MEETINGS WAS
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 GENEVA 02180 01 OF 03 222016Z

DOUBTS ABOUT UNDERSTANDINGS OF COVERAF OF EXISTING ARGEE-
MENTS, PARTICULARLY BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION, THAT
HAD BEEN RAISED BY REPRESENTATIVES AND EXPERTS OF USSR
AND SEVERAL EASTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES. A PRIME US
OBJECTIVE THIS SESSION WAS TO ACCOMPLISH SATISFACTORY
CLARIFICATION OF THIS MATTER. THAT WAS DONE, AND USSR AND
EASTERN EUROPEAN OFFENDERS MADE CLEAR AND EXPLICIT STATEMENTS

AFFIRMING SCOPE OF COVERAGE OF BW CONVENTION AND A PROSPECTIVE CW CONVENTION.

3. OBJECTIVE TAKEN UP BY US DELEGATION IN AUGUST 1976 DISCUSSIONS WAS TO ENCOURAGE ACCEPTANCE OF 1948 UNITED NATIONS DEFINITION OF NDW AS WORKING BASIS FOR DISCUSSION. THIS EFFORT TOOK HOLD RATHER WELL THIS SESSION. WESTERN GROUP ENDORSED THIS APPROACH AND SPEAKERS FROM CANADA, FRG, ITALY, SWEDEN, UK EXPLICITLY ADVOCATED USE OF 1948 DEFINITION. MAIN PURPOSE OF THIS EFFORT HAS BEEN TO IMPOSE ON DISCUSSIONS THE COMPARABILITY STANDARD SET FORTH IN 1948 AS BASIS FOR IDENTIFYING ANY NEW CANDIDATE WEAPON TYPE AS A WEAPON OF MASS DESTRUCTION, I.E., THAT IT MUST "HAVE CHARACTERISTICS COMPARABLE IN DESTRUCTIVE EFFECT TO THOSE OF ATOMIC EXPLOSIVE WEAPONS, RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL WEAPONS, LETHAL CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS". THIS COMPARABILITY STANDARD SETS A REASONABLE BASIS FOR REJECTING SOVIET SUGGESTIONS THAT A MIXED BAG OF WEAPON POSSIBILITIES BE ANOINTED AS WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION. COUNTRIES MENTIONED ABOVE WHO NOW ADVOCATE USE OF 1948 DEFINITION ALSO EXPLICITLY REJECT THE MDW-CANDIDATE WEAPON POSSIBILITIES PROPOSED BY USSR ON THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS OF NON-COMPARABILITY WITH RECOGNIZED MDW CATEGORIES. USSR STATEMENTS HAVE ENDORSED THIS COMPARABILITY STANDARD, INCLUDING PREPARED STATEMENT DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR LIKHACHEV; HOWEVER, THEY NOW CLAIM COMPARABILITY FOR THEIR MDW-CANDIDATE SYSTEMS (SEE PARA 6 BELOW).

4. SOVIET REAFFIRMATION OF SCOPE OF COVERAGE OF EXISTING AGREEMENTS, ESPECIALLY BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION, HAS LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 03 GENEVA 02180 01 OF 03 222016Z

HAD THE EFFECT OF REMOVING FROM THE DISCUSSION A LARGE CHUNK OF THE MORE BIZARRE SUBJECT MATTER THAT FIGURED HEAVILY IN THE SESSION OF AUGUST 1976. ACCORDINGLY, THIS TIME, THERE WAS VERY MUCH LESS RHETORIC ABOUT CAUSING PSYCHIC DISORDERS AND STRIKING AT GONADS. THE COSMIC RANGE OF MDW POSSIBILITIES BASED ON ALL OF PHYSICS SUGGESTED IN EARLY SOVIET PRESENTATIONS ALSO SHRIVELLED UP ON AFFIRMATION OF THE COVERAGE OF THE ENMOD CONVENTION. THE SET OF PROPOSED NEW MDW-CANDIDATE SYSTEMS WAS REDUCED BY USSR THIS TIME TO FIVE MORE-OR-LESS SPECIFIC TYPES. DISCUSSED IN PARAS 6 THROUGH 9 BELOW. THE PROBLEM OF DOUBTS BEING RAISED ABOUT COVERAGE OF EXISTING OR PROSPECTIVE AGREEMENTS HAS NOT YET, HOWEVER, BEEN ENTIRELY PUT DOWN -- SEE PARA 11 BELOW.

5. PREVIOUS SOVIET PRESENTATION INCLUDED ELABORATE TEXTS ON DEFINITION OF NDW WHICH WERE NOT ONLY COMPLEX AND CONVOLUTED BUT ALSO WOULD SUPPORT CHARACTERIZING VIRTUALLY ANYTHING (INCLUDING THE JAW-BONE OF AN ASS) AS A WEAPON OF MASS DESTRUCTION. THEY DID NOT PURSUE THIS LINE FURTHER

THIS SESSION. ALSO, DURING THE LAST MEETING (MARCH 17),R
SOVIET EXPERT IN A PREPARED STATEMENT SAID THAT PRIOR TEXTS
AND STATEMENTS ON DEFINITION HAD BEEN PUT FORWARD ONLY TO
ASSIST DISCUSSION AND WAS NOT INTENDED TO BE DEVELOPED INTO
"JURICAL LANGUAGE" FOR AN AGREEMENT. ALSO ON MARCH 17,
INDIAN REP TOOK NOTE OF USSR SEEMING ENDORSEMENT OF
COMPARABILITY STANDARD IN 1948 DEFINITION BUT POINTED OUT
THAT USSR HAD VOTED AGAINST THE UN RESOLUTION THAT PROMULGATED
THAT DEFINITION. HE ASKED WHAT PRESENT USSR POSITION WAS
ON THIS MATTER.LIKHATCHEV DID NOT REPLY.

6. AS MATTERS NOW STAND, USSR PROPOSES: -. THAT THERE BE
A TREATY BANNING ALL NEW TYPES AND STSTEMS OF MDW, AND B. THAT
THE FLOWING CLAIMED NEW TYPES OF SYSTEMS BE INCLUDED IN THAT
BAN:.

A. SYSTEMS THAT GENERATE AND PROPAGATE LOW-FREQUENCY
ACOUSTIC WAVES (INFRA-SOUND) TO KILL, INJURE OR DISTURB HUMAN
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 04 GENEVA 02180 01 OF 03 222016Z

BEINGS AND DAMAGE BUILDINGS, ETC.

B. SYSTEMS THAT GENERATE AND PROPAGATE REAIO-FREQUENCY
WAVES (INCLUDING MICROWAVE REDIATION) TO KILL, INJURE
OR DISTURB HUMAN BEINGS.

C. FUEL/AIR EXPLOSIVES.

D. NUCLEAR WEAPONS BASED ON FISSIONABLE ELEMENTS
ATOMICALLY HEAVIER THAT URANIUM 235 AND PLUTONIUM 239

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

NNN

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 01 GENEVA 02180 02 OF 03 222046Z

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 EA-07 IO-13 ISO-00 AF-08 ARA-06

CIAE-00 PM-04 H-01 INR-07 L-03 NASA-01 NEA-10

NSAE-00 NSC-05 OIC-02 SP-02 PA-01 PRS-01 OES-06

SS-15 USIA-06 MC-02 /123 W

-----222137Z 043923 /67

R 221826Z MAR 77

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 6132

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW
AMEMBASSY OTTAWA
AMEMBASSY STOCKHOLM
AMEMBASSY ROME
AMEMBASSY TOKYO
USMISSION USUN NY
USMISSION NATO
ERDA HQ WASHDC
ERDA GERMANTOWN RHEGGTN
SECDEF WASHDC

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE SECTION 2 OF 3 GENEVA 2180

E. USE, FOR DELIVERY OF MDW TO TARGETS ON THE SURFACE OF THE EARTH, OF "AEROSPACE" VEHICLES HAVING CHARACTERISTICS COMBINING THOSE OF AIRCRAFT AND SPACECRAFT OR BALLISTIC MISSILES, E.G. SPACE SHUTTLE.

7. STATEMENTS BY SPEAKERS FOR US (AND OTHERS, CONCERNING THE FIRST FOUR) OF THE FIVE MDW CANDIDATES ABOVE, SAID ESSENTIALLY THE FOLLOWING:

-- A B AND C ARE NOT MDW AND DO NOT COME CLOSE TO SATISFYING THE COMPARABILITY STANDARD OF THE 1948 DEFINITION. CONCERNING C, IT WAS ALSO POINTED OUT THAT FUEL/AIR LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 GENEVA 02180 02 OF 03 222046Z

EXPLOSIVES ARE EXPLICITLY IDENTIFIED AS CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS IN LAWS-OF-WAR DELIBERATIONS.

D WOULD, IF REALIZED, BE NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND SHOULD BE GOVERNED ACCORDINGLY.

E. IS A DELIVERY -SYSTEM, AND THEREFORE COULD APPROPRIATELY BE RAISED IN OTHER FORUMS DEALING WITH SUCH QUESTIONS (INTENDING INDIRECTLY TO CONVEY THE SUGGESTION THAT THIS IS AN ISSUE WHICH SHOULD BE ADDRESSED, IF AT ALL, IN SALT). SEE PARA 10 BELOW CONCERNING OTHER ASPECTS OF THIS ITEM.

8. SOVIET EXPERT REPLIED TO POINTS IN PARA 7, ABOVE, AS A B AND C ARE MDW; HE HAD EXPLAINED WHY; THOSE WHO DENY IT HAVE NOT EXPLAINED THEIR VIEW.

D. SHOULD BE PLACED UNDER A SEPARATE BAN, NOT SUBJECTED TO THE SMAE AGREEMENTS THAT NOW EXIST OR MAY BE DEVELOPED COVERING NUCLEAR WEAPONS GENERALLY.

E. SHOULD BE SUBJECT TO A BAN DEVELOPED IN CCD, NOT DEALT WITH IN SOME OTHER FORUM CONCERNING DELIVERY VEHICLES.

9. SOVIET EXPERT, WITH SOME SUPPORT FROM THE POLISH EXPERT CONCERNING INFRA-SOUND, CLAIMED SYSTEMS A, B, AND C ABOVE COULD HAVE DESTRUCTIVE EFFECTS COMPARABLE TO THOSE OF

CURRENTLY-RECOGNIZED MDW BUT DID NOT SUPPORT THIS CLAIM BEYOND SAYING, IN ESSENCE, THAT THEY CAN KILL PEOPLE.

10. IN DISCUSSING "AEROSPACE" VEHICLES AS A CLASS, OF WHICH SPACE SHUTTLE IS THE CURRENT ACTUAL MEMBER OF THAT CLASS, SOVIET EXPERT STATED THAT IT COULD BE USED TO: A. PLACE MDW IN ORBIT, OR B. DELIVER MDW TO SURFACE TARGET. WHEN IT WAS POINTED OUT THAT A. IS KIND OF SUBJECT APPROPRIATE TO OTHER FORUMS CONCERNED WITH DELIVERY VEHICLES, AND ARGUED SPECIFICALLY FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A BAN IN CCD. HUNGARIAN EXPERT (ESS GENEVA 2129) PURSUED SUBJECT FURTHER. HE ARGUED THAT SPACE SHUTTLE, AS AN AERODYNAMIC VEHICLE, CAN OPERATE IN ALTITUDE RANGE FROM 30/40 KILOMETERS TO ABOUT 160 KILOMETERS WITHOUT LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 03 GENEVA 02180 02 OF 03 222046Z

EXECUTING ORBITAL FLIGHT. THIS MODE OF OPERATION OF AN MDW CARRIER, HE SAID (PROBABLY RIGHTLY), WOULD NOT BE PROHIBITED BY OUTER SPACE TREATY. HE THEN WENT ON TO ARGUE THAT AIR DEFENSES CANNOT HANDLE THIS FLIGHT REGIME AND THAT AIR DEFENSES WERE LIMITED BY ABM TREATY: THEREFORE, A NEW KIND OF DEFENSE WOULD NEED TO BE SOUGHT, TOUCHING OFF A NEW ARMS RACE. REFERENCE TO ABM TREATY IN THIS CONTEXT IS AMBIGUOUS AT BEST. LITERAL DEVELOPMENT OF DEFENSE SYSTEM TO BE EFFECTIVE AGAINST SPACE SHUTTLE AT ALTITUDES UP TO 160 KILOMETERS PROBABLY WOULD BE VERY MESSY WITH RESPECT TO ABM TREATY.

1. GDR EXPERT PICKED UP A LINE THAT HAD BEEN OPENED BY USSR IN AUGUST 1976 SESSION. HE TALKED AT SOME LENGTH ABOUT "COMBINATION" WEAPONS IN WHICH A CHEMICAL OR BIOLOGICAL AGENT WOULD BY ITSELF HAVE A MILD EFFECT, BUT WOULD SENSITIZE THE ORGANISM TO REACT ADVERSELY TO PHYSICAL STIMULI (E.G. LOUDNOISES, FLASHING LIGHTS) WITH PERHAPS LETHAL EFFECT. SUCH WEAPONS, HE SAID, WOULD CONSTITUTE A NEW MDW AND WOULD NOT COME WITHIN THE COVERAGE OF THE BW CONVENTION OF A CW CONVENTION. HIS NET CONCLUSION IS THAT AGREEMENTS COVERING INDIVIDUAL TYPES OF WEAPONS (E.G., CHEMICAL OR BIOLOGICAL) ARE NOT ENOUGH, AND AN UMBRELLA LIKE THAT PROPOSED BY USSR IS NEEDED. THIS IS A SORT OF VIGOROUS EXTENSION OF THE QUESTIONS RAISED BEFORE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION AS TO WHETHER SUCH A SINGLE-TYPE AGREEMENT MIGHT WEAKEN THE GENEVA PROTOCOL OF 1925. IT IS NOT CLEAR WHETHER THIS IS A SERIOUS CONCEPTUAL PROBLEM OR JUST ANOTHER INDICATOR OF NEED FOR CAREFUL DRAFTING OF -- FOR EXAMPLE -- A NEW CW AGREEMENT.

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

NNN

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 01 GENEVA 02180 03 OF 03 222120Z
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 EA-07 IO-13 ISO-00 AF-08 ARA-06
CIAE-00 PM-04 H-01 INR-07 L-03 NASA-01 NEA-10
NSAE-00 NSC-05 OIC-02 SP-02 PA-01 PRS-01 OES-06
SS-15 USIA-06 MC-02 /123 W
-----222142Z 044380 /67

R 221826Z MAR 77
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 6133
INFO AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
AMEMBASSY MOSCOW
AMEMBASSY OTTAWA
AMEMBASSY STOCKHOLM
AMEMBASSY ROME
AMEMBASSY TOKYO
USMISSION USUN NY
USMISSION NATO
ERDA HQ WASHDC
ERDA GERMANTOWN RHEGGTN
SECDEF WASHDC

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE SECTION 3 OF 3 GENEVA 2180

12. BULGARIAN EXPERT SPOKE ON RADIOLOGICAL WEAPONS AND
ADVOCATED THEIR PROHIBITION WITHIN FRAMEWORK OF SIVIET MDW
PRPOOSAL. INDIAN REP ASKED WHAT US POSITION WAS ON
RW IN CONTEXT OF MDW. US REP STATED THAT, ON BASIS OF
1948 DEFINITION, REDILOGICAL WEAPONS ARE WEAPONS OF MASS
DESTRUCTION. HE FURTHER SAID THAT CCD MAY WISH TO TAKE UP
SUBJECT OF RW AGINN AT A TIME CONSISTENT WITH CCD PRIORITIES.
POLISH EXPERT, IN A BURST OF CREAPIVITY, SUGGESTED THAT MEANING
OF TERM RADIOLOGICAL WEAPONS BE EXTENDED TO INCLUDE ACOUSTIC
WAVES. FORTUNATELY, 1948 DEFINITION REFERS TO REDILOGICAL
WEAPONS BY USE OF TERM "RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 GENEVA 02180 03 OF 03 222120Z

WEAPONS" WHICH IS NOT AMENABLE TO BEING CONSTRUED, EVEN FROM
A VERY LIBERAL STANDPOINT, AS INCLUDING ACOUSTIC WAVES.

13. IN STATEMENT ON AUGUST 12,1976, (GENEVA 6524 OF

AGU 13,1976) IN ARGUING PROBABLE NEED FOR APPROACHING ANY AGREEMENTS ON NEW TYPES OF SYSTEMS ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS, US EXPERT MENTIONED NEED TO DEAL APPROPRIATELY WITH VERIFICATION IN MDW DISCUSSIONS. US DEL HAS REFRAINED FROM ANY FUTURE REFERENCE TO VERIFICATION IN ORDER TO AVOID GIVING ANY IMPLICATION THAT SOVIET PROPOSAL IS OTHERWISE ACCEPTABLE. FURTHER, EXERCISING SUBJECT OF VERIFICATION IN THE ABSTRACT COULD ONLY HAVE IRRITATED SOVIETS ANYWAY.

14. IN STATEMENTS IN AUGUST 1976 AND EARLIER, SOVIETS REFERRED -- WITH NO SPECIAL EMPHASIS -- TO DESIRABILITY OF REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE TO SEEK OUT AT INCIPIENT STAGE POTENTIALITIES FOR NEW MDW. THIS NOTION LAY DORMANT UNTIL DISCUSSIONS THIS TIME, WHEN IT WAS SET IN MOTION -- WITHOUT PRIOR MENTION TO US OR WESTERN GROUP -- BY UK EXPERT (GARNETT) IN HIS FIRST STATEMENT. HIS WARM REFERENCE TO SUCH A SCHEME SEEMED TO APPEAL TO CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE AND (PERHAPS ONLY INITIALLY). TRADELEGATION. SUBSEQUENT DISCUSSION IN WESTERN GROUP (GENEVA 2095), WITH HELP OF CANADIAN AND NETHERLANDS EXPERTS, SUBSTANTIALLY LOWERED ZEAL FOR INTERNATIONAL LITERATURE REVIEW ARRANGEMENT, BUT DID NOT ENTIRELY SET IT ASIDE. US EXPERT AGREED TO, AND DID, INCLUDE IN STATEMENT REMARKS ABOUT NEED FOR VIGILANCE WITH RESPECT TO EMERGENT MDW POSSIBILITIES AND AT SOME DISTANCE IN STATEMENT, ALSO MENTIONED AVAILABILITY OF SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE AS A HELP IN PERCEIVING WHAT MAY BE IN PROSPECT. IN RECIPROCATION, UK AND CANADIAN SPEAKERS ALTHOUGH PRIVATELY STILL EXPRESSING A BENT IN THAT DIRECTION, REFRAINED FROM ADVOCACY OF ANY SPECIFIC CCD ACTION (E.G., ESTABLISHMENT OF EXPERTS GROUP TO REVIEW PERIODICALLY SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE FOR SIGNS OF MDW POTENTIALITIES). IN WESTERN GROUP (AND PERHAPS MORE WIDELY) THERE WAS A VIEW THAT USSR SHOULD LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 03 GENEVA 02180 03 OF 03 222120Z

BE OFFERED SOME "WAY OUT" OF THEIR POSITION ON MDW AND THAT WAY OUT SHOULD INVOLVE REALIZATION OF SOMETHING SPECIFIC AND/OR FORMAL IN CCD. THAT VIEW WAS ALMOST SURELY PART OF BASIS FOR EXPRESSIONS FROM CANADA, NETHERLANDS AND UK SUMMARIZED ABOVE, AND OF OTHER COUNTRIES NET OUTCOME OF LAST WESTERN GROUP MEETING WAS TO DECIDE TO WAIT AND SEE WHAT IS DONE NEXT BY USSR RATHER THAN TRY TO FEND OFF USSR ADVOCACY OF NEW MDW TREATY BY OFFERING THEM INSTEAD A CCD ARRANGEMENT OF PERIODIC REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE. AS OF NOW, THE "WAIT AND SEE" VIEW HAS PREVAILED AND NO "WAY OUT" HAS BEEN SUGGESTED TO USSR.

15. NO SUGGESTIONS WERE MADE FOR FURTHER ROUNDS ON THIS SUBJECT; HOWEVER, INDIAN REP SAID HE SAW A NEED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION. USSR REP SAID HE WOULD HAVE MORE TO SAY LATER.

16. THIS TIME, THERE WERE NO US/USSR BILATERAL MEETINGS AND NONE WERE PROPOSED.

17. AS OF THE END OF THIS FOUND STATUS IS AS FOLLOWS:

- A. USSR STILL ADVOCATES THEIR PROPOSAL;
- B. THE WESTERN GROUP WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE SUBJECT GO AWAY BUT DOUBT THAT IT WILL;
- C. EASTERN EUROPEANS ARE DOING WHAT IS EXPECTED OF THEM;
- D. INDIA AND A FEW OTHERS SAY THEY LIKE THE SOVIET PROPOSAL;
- E. OTHER CCD PARTICIPANTS HAVE REMAINED SILENT;
- F. DEFINITIONAL SUBJECT HAS ARRIVED AT A STAGE WHERE THERE IS FAIRLY WIDE SUPPORT (COMPLETE IN WESTERN GROUP) FOR CARRYING ON WITH THE 1948 UN DEFINITION OF MDW. SOVIETS HAVE STAYED SILENT ON THIS, BUT HAVE UTILIZED PRINCIPLE OF COMPARABILITY CONTAINED IN ABOVE DEFINITION.
- G. FINALLY, ATTRITION IMPOSED ON USSR PROPOSAL HAD EFFECTIVELY REDUCED THEM TO ARGUING WHAT THEY STARTED OUT WITH, I.E., THAT THE FUTURE IS UNCERTAIN AND THAT THE "BAD" PARTS OF THAT FUTURE SHOULD BE PROHIBITED IN ADVANCE IN GENERAL LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 04 GENEVA 02180 03 OF 03 222120Z

TERMS. THEIR ATTEMPTS TO BE SPECIFIC AS TO DEFINITIONS OR EXAMPLES OF NEW MDW HAVE NOT FLOURISHED.

18. IN EARLY STAGES LAST YEAR SOME DELEGATIONS CAME TO THE TABLE WITH AN OPTIMISTIC VIEW THAT SOVIET PROPOSAL WAS A PROMISING START ON DEVELOPMENT OF LIMITATIONS ON COMPETITION IN QUALITATIVE ARMS ADVANCEMENT; HOWEVER, THE ABSURD CHARACTER OF SO MUCH OF WHAT SOVIETS HAVE DONE IN "CLARIFYING" THEIR PROPOSAL HAS DISCOURAGED MUCH OF THE ORIGINAL OPTIMISM. THIS POINT WAS WELL STATED BY SWEDISH SPOKESMAN IN AUGUST 1976 AND QUALITY OF SOVIET PERFORMANCE HAS NOT IMPROVED. SORENSON

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01-Jan-1994 12:00:00 am
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MEETING AGENDA, ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS, MASS DESTRUCTION WEAPONS, MDW
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Sent Date: 22-Mar-1977 12:00:00 am
Decaption Date: 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 22 May 2009
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1977GENEVA02180
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D770098-0609
Format: TEL
From: GENEVA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1977/newtext/t19770336/aaaabeyx.tel
Line Count: 424
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 14f434b4-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 8
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 05-Oct-2004 12:00:00 am
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 3038526
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CCD: ASSESSMENTOF THIRD ROUND OF INFORMAL MEETINGS ON SOVIET PROPOSAL ON NEW MASS DESTRUCTION WEAPONS (MDW)
TAGS: PARM, UR, CCD
To: STATE
Type: TE
vdkgvkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/14f434b4-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
22 May 2009
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009