

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Executive Secretariat, NSC:
Agency File
Folder Title: Secretary Weinberger Weekly
Report (06/22/1984-07/13/1984)
Box: RAC Box 7

To see more digitized collections visit:
<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:
<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: **reagan.library@nara.gov**

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

Last Updated: 6/6/2024

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT, NSC: AGENCY FILE

Withdrawer

RBW 5/21/2013

File Folder SECRETARY WEINBERGER'S WEEKLY REPORT
(06/22/1984-07/13/1984)

FOIA

M453

Box Number 7

SHIFRINSON

111

ID	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
159693	MEMO	TO RR RE. WEEKLY REPORT OF DEFENSE ACTIVITIES [PG. 1 ONLY; COPY OF DOC. 159694]	1	6/22/1984	B1
159694	MEMO	CASPAR WEINBERGER TO RR RE. WEEKLY REPORT OF DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	7	6/22/1984	B1
159695	MEMO	CASPAR WEINBERGER TO RR RE. WEEKLY REPORT OF DEFENSE ACTIVITIES R 2/1/2016 M453/7	8	6/29/1984	B1
159696	MEMO	CASPAR WEINBERGER TO RR RE. WEEKLY REPORT OF DEFENSE ACTIVITIES R 2/1/2016 M453/7	6	7/6/1984	B1
159699	MEMO	CASPAR WEINBERGER TO RR RE. WEEKLY REPORT OF DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	8	7/13/1984	B1

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT, NSC: AGENCY FILE

Withdrawer

RB 5/21/2013
W

File Folder

SECRETARY WEINBERGER'S WEEKLY REPORT (06/22/1984-
07/13/1984)

FOIA

M453
SHIFRINSON

Box Number

7

111

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
159693	MEMO	1	6/22/1984	B1

TO RR RE. WEEKLY REPORT OF DEFENSE
ACTIVITIES [PG. 1 ONLY; COPY OF DOC. 159694]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT, NSC: AGENCY FILE

Withdrawer

RB 5/21/2013
W

File Folder

SECRETARY WEINBERGER'S WEEKLY REPORT (06/22/1984-
07/13/1984)

FOIA

M453
SHIFRINSON

Box Number

7

111

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i>	<i>No of</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i>
	<i>Document Description</i>	<i>pages</i>		<i>tions</i>
159694	MEMO	7	6/22/1984	B1
	CASPAR WEINBERGER TO RR RE. WEEKLY REPORT OF DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

~~SECRET~~

The President has seen _____

9

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

RR

~~SECRET~~

June 29, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ROBERT C. McFARLANE

SUBJECT: Secretary Weinberger's Weekly Report

Attached is Cap Weinberger's Weekly Report for Friday,

June 29, 1984

cc: The Vice President
Ed Meese
Jim Baker
Mike Deaver

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED
Sec.34(b), E.O. 12958, as amended
White House Guidelines, Sept. 11, 2008
BY NARA RW, DATE 5/21/13

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

~~SECRET~~

June 29, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ROBERT C. McFARLANE

SUBJECT: Secretary Weinberger's Weekly Report

Attached is Cap Weinberger's Weekly Report for Friday,
June 29, 1984

cc: The Vice President
Ed Meese
Jim Baker
Mike Deaver

DECLASSIFIED
Sec 3.4(b), E.O. 12958, as amended
White House Guidelines, Sept. 11, 2006
BY NARA RW DATE 5/21/13

~~SECRET~~

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE



WASHINGTON, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DECLASSIFIED

NLRR M453/7 #159695

BY RW NARA DATE 2/1/16

June 29, 1984

34 JUN 29 P 8: 32

WHITE HOUSE
SITUATION ROOM

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Weekly Report of Defense Activities

Legislative Affairs: Senate and House conferees on the FY 1985 Defense Authorization Bill met several times this week to begin the process of reconciling the many major policy differences between the two bills. Work by the Defense conference has been slowed by the Speaker's addition of numerous extraneous House conferees outside the House Armed Services Committee to consider specific amendments such as PEACEKEEPER, ASAT, SLCM, and G.I. bill education benefits. The conference has been further slowed by the impasse in the Budget conference caused by the House rejection of the Senate proposal, which would have established a defense range with an upward ceiling of \$299 billion.

Thus far the Defense conferees have reached agreement on over half of the less controversial issues, but these decisions are all subject to further review. The Defense authorization bill conference is likely to resume on July 24 following the Democratic Convention recess. As the Democrats become more united against our defense programs, particularly the PEACEKEEPER, the job of the House-Senate conferees will become even more difficult. Despite the good intentions, it is unfortunate the conference was unable to complete its work before leaving town for the recess. Another unfortunate result caused by delay of the authorization bill conference is the ever present possibility of no FY 1985 Defense Appropriations Bill before a continuing resolution becomes necessary.

It is time to begin thinking of a major campaign against the Democrats and others who are responsible for denying the country of adequate defense funds to assure our national security.

This week the House also passed the FY 1985 Military Construction Authorization and Appropriations Bills. No significant amendments were adopted to either bill, and rumored attacks on PEACEKEEPER-related basing funds did not materialize. The House bills are very close to our revised request for the military construction portion of our budget request. (S)

CLASSIFIED BY SEC DEF

DECLASSIFY ON OADR

SEC DEF CONTR No. X31326

~~SECRET~~

UNCLASSIFIED

12
2

Department of Defense Progress Report: During my hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee on the most recent Budget reductions, I was asked "what have we received for the Defense expenditures over the last several years?" Accordingly, I ordered the preparation of a report that shows the tremendous improvements in military posture made by this Administration.

The report describes the state of our defenses when you took office, including the following:

- Readiness. Years of underfunding the readiness accounts had left our forces unprepared to respond quickly and reliably in a crisis.
- Facilities. Inadequate funding, high rates of inflation, and the advancing age of facilities made working and living conditions for many of our service members, especially those stationed in Europe, deplorable.
- Reserve Forces. The historical practice of equipping reserve units with outmoded or "hand-me-down" hardware had made their combat effectiveness dubious at best.
- Compensation. Military compensation had failed to keep pace with inflation; this failure threatened to cripple the volunteer force. Many were proclaiming the volunteer concept a failed experiment, and calls for a return to conscription were commonplace.
- Sustainability. Our ability to sustain our forces in combat was also severely lacking. Dangerously low stocks of ammunition and spare parts would have limited our forces to fighting for no more than a few weeks in many combat theaters.
- Nuclear Forces. The nuclear balance was tipping in the Soviets' advantage, eroding the deterrence value of our strategic forces. Elements of our strategic TRIAD of forces were becoming increasingly vulnerable to a Soviet first strike, threatening the retaliatory capabilities that have prevented the use of nuclear weapons for almost 40 years.
- General Purpose Forces. Necessary modernization programs were proceeding at rates too slow to keep pace with the growing sophistication of Soviet forces. Many procurement programs were budgeted at uneconomical

UNCLASSIFIED

~~UNCLASSIFIED~~

13
3

rates, and weapons development schedules had been stretched out, thereby delaying the deployment of new equipment needed in the field.

- Mobility Forces. We also found our mobility forces to be inadequate for their job of moving ground and air units from their peacetime locations to their wartime combat positions overseas.

Based on this assessment of the state of our defense in 1981, we set out to correct the deficiencies we had inherited, with an emphasis on the most pressing requirements. We have made significant strides in reversing the trends described above; our most important initiatives reflect the following themes:

- A renewed emphasis on proper compensation for our military personnel as well as adequate funding for the other ingredients of a combat-ready force.
- Modernization of our strategic nuclear forces, after years of neglect, that strengthens our sea-based deterrent through the development of the TRIDENT II missile; enhances our intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) force through the deployment of the PEACEKEEPER missile, and the development of a small, single-warhead ICBM; restores a proper balance in our bomber forces through the procurement of the B-1 bomber and the development of an Advanced Technology Bomber for the 1990s; and moves toward a greatly improved, survivable command and control capability.
- A significant expansion of the size and offensive striking power of our maritime forces, including aircraft carrier battle groups, battleships, amphibious forces, attack submarines, and cruise missiles.
- A major expansion of our intertheater mobility capabilities, required to support troop movements to overseas destinations in an emergency.
- An accelerated pace of modernization for our land and tactical air forces, providing the qualitative superiority necessary to overcome the quantitative advantages enjoyed by Soviet forces.

In conclusion, when your Administration took office, we confronted some serious deficiencies in our military posture.

~~UNCLASSIFIED~~

UNCLASSIFIED

14
4

Any one of the problems we faced would have required immediate attention, but we had to address them all simultaneously if we were to return America's defense programs to a safe and steady course. With the bipartisan support of the Congress, we did just that. As a result, we have, or expect to see by the end of the decade:

- A far more ready force, better able to sustain itself in combat.
- Strategic forces that can ensure a stable deterrent.
- Maritime forces able to defend our global interests.
- Mobility capabilities better able to support our combat units' transportation needs in times of crisis.
- Modern, well-equipped ground and tactical air forces, able to maintain their technological superiority over increasingly sophisticated Soviet armed forces.

In other words, we have received a lot for our defense expenditures over the last several years. (U)

B-1B Program Update: On Tuesday I held one of my regular monthly update meetings on the B-1B program. The first B-1B has been moved, using its own undercarriage, from the assembly hangar to a systems checkout hangar. It is currently generating its own power for systems checkout. The rollout for this aircraft is still planned for September 4, and we still hope you may be able to be present for a pre-Labor Day event that can demonstrate one of your many kept promises from 1980! Contractor cost and schedule performances continue to be on track. The modification and checkout of the #4 B-1A, which is the test platform for the B-1B avionics package, is ahead of schedule with its first flight still anticipated by July 31. The program is tracking very well with cost reductions and performance checks running ahead of anticipated goals. (U)

Special Operations Update: On Wednesday I reviewed the progress being made in strengthening our special operations forces (SOF). We now have a solid policy and planning foundation to revitalize these forces. As you know, they are our most frequently used units. They go into action before, in support of, or in lieu of conventional forces and are, therefore, a very valuable part of the total defense effort. In all three Services combined, they make up less than two-tenths of one percent of the DoD budget and provide a great return for a very small cost.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

15
5

The Services have completed their SOF Master Plans with the goal of full implementation by 1990. This will produce a growth of nearly 6,000 Army and 1,000 Navy personnel plus a substantial growth in Air Force SOF capabilities. We are also taking other steps to give SOF programs momentum to attain the levels necessary for our national security needs, including the activation of the Joint Special Operations Agency under the Joint Chiefs of Staff in January, other SOF reorganizations, and increased emphasis on our planning process. This is an area to which I will give special attention during our summer budget review to ensure that we apply the resources to match our plans and priorities. (U)

Mobilization Planning Update: Yesterday I received an update on the progress we are making in our mobilization planning. We are improving our plans for the best way to use quickly the big increase in mobilization manpower in the active Services during periods of crisis. We are also looking for improved means for equipping the new units that would be formed as a result of mobilization. In addition, we will soon have the first draft of a proposed Crisis Budget, which would state the requirements of the Department in times of mobilization and the funding required to meet these requirements. Finally, we are working with the other Departments and Agencies to develop plans to reallocate civilian and public resources to support a mobilization crisis. The more we can plan ahead the faster we will be able to convert civilian industry to vital military needs should we ever have to mobilize. (U)

Military Manpower Strength Assessment: As a follow-on to my June 15 report discussing recruiting and retention, we continue to enjoy success in this area. Our active force strength as of March 31, 1984 was 2,138,500. This represents 100 percent of the March 1984 plan and an increase of 11,100 over the strength level of a year ago. All of the military services have met or exceeded their overall first half FY 1984 recruiting objectives and have met their reenlistment objectives through March 1984.

In terms of quality, 93 percent of all new recruits had a high school diploma. This compares favorably with the 75 percent of the civilian youth population with high school diplomas and is higher than the 89 percent achieved during the first half of FY 1983. Additionally, 93 percent of the new recruits scored average or above on the enlistment test. For the Army, 89 percent of new recruits had high school diplomas, and 88 percent scored average or above on the enlistment test. If these trends continue, FY 1984 will be the best year in history in terms of the quality of new recruits for the Department of Defense.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

16

6

Overall reenlistment results continued to be excellent. The total DoD reenlistment rate for the first quarter FY 1984 was 71 percent, which is identical to the rate for the same period last year. The Services reenlisted the same number of careerists as they did during the first half of FY 1983. First-term rates were down slightly, but all objectives were met.

Further, the military services are continuing to recruit and retain representative proportions of the population. The 23 percent of new recruits who were Black, Hispanic, Native American, Asian, or Pacific Islander was the same as for the 18 to 24-year-old youth population as a whole. (U)

Senate Testimony of Mr. A. Ernest Fitzgerald, Air Force Deputy for Management Systems: As you know, Mr. Fitzgerald's testimony has received a lot of publicity. Here is some background information on the issue.

On May 25, Senator Grassley requested that Mr. Fitzgerald appear before his subcommittee to testify on the availability of agency information to the Government and Congress. On June 11, we informed Senator Grassley that Mr. Fitzgerald would be available. Subsequently, Mr. Fitzgerald submitted his prepared statement for security and policy review.

His statement was essentially a personal account of facts, events, and decisions based on his opinions, perceptions, and experiences. It was not an expression of policy, and it did not represent an official position. For those reasons, it could not be presented as official testimony; however, both Senator Grassley and Mr. Fitzgerald were informed in writing on at least two occasions that Mr. Fitzgerald was free--in fact encouraged--to testify on June 19 in his capacity as Management Systems Deputy and to submit his statement to Congress as an expression of his own opinion.

When Senator Grassley learned of this, he postponed the hearing by six days, citing Air Force opposition to Mr. Fitzgerald's testifying. He subpoenaed Mr. Fitzgerald in person, media in tow, evidently hoping to make headlines and to get us to sanction the testimony as an official statement. Since his testimony was not the Air Force position, we did not change our view that there was no way to verify the accuracy of a series of personal observations and experiences. At no point, however, was Mr. Fitzgerald prevented or discouraged from appearing before the subcommittee in his official capacity as Management Systems Deputy.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

7

Mr. Fitzgerald did testify on June 25, and the heavy media exposure (both print and television) prior to and subsequent to the hearing was, as expected, virtually one-sided. Though we made our position known in clearly-stated terms to all concerned, the "news" was, once again, that we were trying to muzzle one of our own watchdogs. (U)

Model Installation Program: Recently, we began an innovative management experiment to improve working and living conditions for personnel on military installations. The "Model Installation Program" will receive a three-year test at 15 bases, chosen from among all the Services, where local commanders will be able to try new management methods and retain any savings to improve local services and facilities.

During the test, Model Installation Program commanders will be given more authority to run their installations. The military service secretaries have the authority to waive regulations in order to allow new ideas to be tested. Congress may be asked for temporary statutory relief if requested by the base commander.

Commanders have been encouraged to involve local union officials in the program because of the important contributions the work force can make. Existing labor relations agreements and obligations will not be affected.

The Model Installation Program is expected to:

- Develop and disseminate information on better ways to operate bases.
- Identify and eliminate counter-productive or wasteful regulations and procedures.
- Demonstrate the advantages of giving commanders increased authority to go along with their responsibilities, and
- Create better working and living conditions for DoD personnel, which should improve morale, performance, recruitment, and retention.

(U)

Meeting with Danish Permanent Under Secretary of Defense:
On Monday Deputy Secretary Will Taft met with Denmark's Permanent Under Secretary of Defense, Jacques Hermann. Also present was Peter Wiese, Permanent Under Secretary in the Danish Prime Minister's office. Will pointed out that the Nunn Amendment was defeated because it was the wrong

UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECRET~~

18

8

message to send to our NATO allies, who had just survived a political ordeal to support NATO's nuclear policies and were now preparing to turn their attention to improved conventional defenses. The Danish budget was pointed out as an example that prompted the Nunn Amendment, because it is failing in supporting NATO on INF, and in not making an attempt to reach NATO's 3 percent annual real growth goal in defense spending. Mr. Hermann and Mr. Wiese acknowledged that Denmark's performance was a disappointment both to NATO and the Government of Denmark, blaming it upon the Government of Denmark's minority position in Parliament. Will expressed understanding of the Danish political situation, but pointed out that initiatives like the Nunn Amendment will become more difficult to defeat if such conditions continue to prevail.
(C)

Exercise VIGILANT OVERVIEW 84-2: This exercise, which began on Monday and ended yesterday, was a worldwide space and missile warning exercise of Canadian and U.S. Air Defense elements. The purpose was to exercise NORAD, supporting commands, space and missile warning systems, and air defense systems in the detection of objects, processing of data, and generation of tactical warning and attack assessment information to selected users. Both NORAD and Air Defense Command Operations Plans, as well as supporting plans, were exercised. Maximum integrated system training was provided in simulated environments moving from peacetime to war, with various stages of simulated system degradation caused by enemy nuclear attack. An important element of this exercise was to reinforce perceptions of the effective cooperation of U.S.-Canadian Air Defense forces and the flexibility of NORAD command and control systems under a variety of adverse conditions including both missile and air attacks. (S)

Rep -

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

~~SECRET~~

July 6, 1984

RR

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ROBERT C. MCFARLANE

SUBJECT: Secretary Weinberger's Weekly Report

Attached is Cap Weinberger's Weekly Report for Friday,
July 6, 1984.

cc: The Vice President
Ed Meese
Jim Baker
Mike Deaver

DECLASSIFIED
Sec. 34(b), E.O. 12958, as amended
White House Guidelines, Sept. 11, 2006
BY NARA *RW* DATE *5/21/13*

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

~~SECRET~~

July 6, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ROBERT C. McFARLANE

SUBJECT: Secretary Weinberger's Weekly Report

Attached is Cap Weinberger's Weekly Report for Friday,
July 6, 1984.

cc: The Vice President
Ed Meese
Jim Baker
Mike Deaver

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED
Sec. 34(b), E.O. 12958, as amended
White House Guidelines, Sept. 11, 2009
BY NARA RW DATE 5/21/13

~~SECRET~~



THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

WASHINGTON, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DECLASSIFIED

NLRR M453/7 #159696

BY

RW

NARA DATE

2/1/16

July 6, 1984

159696

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Weekly Report of Defense Activities

Legislative Affairs: Determination of a ceiling on Defense spending for FY 1985 will be at the top of the agenda when the Congress returns from its recess on Monday, July 23. Resolution of this issue will have a significant impact on two separate Congressional conference committees: (1) the conference on the FY 1985 First Concurrent Budget Resolution and, more importantly, (2) the FY 1985 Defense Authorization Bill. Both of these meetings broke up over the impasse associated with the overall level of spending that Congress should approve for Defense.

Without an authorization bill, the certainty of some type of continuing resolution for FY 1985 increases. In its strictest application, the Continuing Resolution for FY 1985 could simply extend Defense programs at FY 1984 rates. This would sharply curtail planned budget increases and seriously affect major programs. Such a continuing resolution could be in effect until February or March when the Congress has an opportunity to reconvene, reorganize, and take up old issues. This could mean no Defense Budget for up to one-half of the entire fiscal year. Such a delay could endanger the FY 1986 Defense Budget request, which would be presented at this same time. In addition, we would have serious internal problems putting together a credible FY 1986 new budget request before finalizing an FY 1985 budget.

Should the present impasse not be resolved, we invite the prospect for further politicization of the PEACEKEEPER issue and possible defeat in the appropriations process. As you know, both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees have approved the PEACEKEEPER by the slimmest of margins, and, particularly in the House, a widespread defection of key Democrats could erase the required bi-partisan support upon which rests further PEACEKEEPER funding without restrictions.

In summary, we need to move forward to determine what strategy will help realize the highest level of support for the Defense Budget from the Congress. This issue can best be addressed in the meeting John Tower is scheduling with you. (U)

CLASSIFIED BY SECDEF

DECLASSIFY ON OADR

~~SECRET~~

SEC DEF CONTR No.

X31397

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

22

2

Allied Reaction to the Strategic Defense Initiative: As you know, we have experienced in recent months some negative allied views on the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). In order to ameliorate these negative views, we have already expended much effort.

- Last fall, pursuant to NSDD 116, and preceding your decision on the scope of the research effort, consultations were held in capitals of key allies; following your decision, embodied in NSDD 119, briefing teams were sent to NATO headquarters and the capitals of our allies in Europe and the Pacific.
- SDI has been a consistent topic in bilateral meetings with my counterparts since your March 23, 1983 speech, and it was discussed at the fall 1983 NATO Planning Group (NPG), the December 1983 Defense Policy Council (DPC), and the North Atlantic Council (NAC) meetings. Most recently it was a key agenda item at April's NPG Ministerial Meeting in Cesme, Turkey.
- Fred Ikle has discussed the SDI with the Permanent Representatives to NATO in Brussels, Defense Minister Woerner, Defense Minister Hernu, Senior French Foreign Ministry officials, and the French Ambassador to the United States, all within the past several months. Similarly, Richard Perle has discussed the issue with members of the European Parliament (as have others associated with the SDI Program), and other representatives of West European Governments.
- Here in Washington, briefings also have been provided to Foreign Minister Genscher, Defense Minister Hernu, West European and Asian Military Attaches and other Embassy Staff, the FRG's Deputy CJCS, members of the NATO Defense College, and a wide variety of Parliamentarians from NATO countries.

A number of other efforts are underway or planned. Richard Perle, with General Jim Abrahamson's participation, sponsored an exploration of the subject in Brussels this week before the NATO Military Committee, The North Atlantic Council, and the High Level Group. A mid-level U.S.-French seminar on SDI will be held in Washington in late July (possibly to be followed later in the year by a similar senior level meeting). General Abrahamson will probably visit key NATO capitals in the fall. Efforts are underway to sponsor a meeting with some of NATO's technical bodies in Huntsville, Alabama. One of these bodies, the Advisory Group for Aerospace Research and Development (AGARD), is currently studying the issue of tactical ballistic missile

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

23

3

defense. The SDI office is taking steps to provide technical input to this study. Plans also are being made by Dick DeLauer for a meeting with his fellow NATO research and development chiefs in the Conference of National Armaments Directors (CNAD) this fall to discuss SDI technology. Finally, the groundwork is being laid for in-depth, bilateral talks on SDI between U.S. and allied policy and technical experts. In addition to discussions on the policy implications of SDI, such talks will provide an excellent opportunity to explore the degree to which our NATO Allies might actively participate in SDI research and development. Some discussion along these lines already has been conducted with German Representatives. If we can establish conditions in which our allies have a technological or financial stake in SDI, our job of easing their resistance to the program should be a good deal easier.

One area that has not received as much attention as it should is the foreign press. While individuals associated with the SDI program have spoken with members of the foreign press, and the USIA has been briefed on the program so that information conveyed to the foreign press and their publics will be accurate, a more concerted effort needs to be made to reach the foreign press on a regular basis. In this connection, I have urged the merits of SDI in several recent foreign interviews and Charlie Wick's EURONET Program, and Fred Ikle recently conducted a briefing on the SDI Program at the Foreign Press Center. We will continue to press this aspect of our campaign, perhaps with a USIA-sponsored tour by selected members of the foreign press, visits to European capitals, or a EURONET appearance to support our efforts.

In the near term, we expect little active support from our allies on this issue, because there is still a strong feeling abroad, and I might add some at home, that we can be forced to abandon SDI. Unfortunately, any suggestion that we would sign a treaty with the USSR barring ourselves from proceeding with SDI would encourage and confirm this feeling. However, I hope that with constant and strong reiteration by all of us as to the great merits of SDI, frequent and in-depth consultations with our allies, and their possible participation in the SDI research program, there is a reasonable prospect that their attitudes on this issue can be changed. (C)

Department of Defense Productivity Investment Fund: As a follow-up to our discussion of productivity increases during the June 28th Cabinet meeting, here is an update on Department of Defense (DoD) efforts in this area.

Since 1981, the DoD has sponsored an innovative approach for financing selected capital investments to improve the efficiency of DoD organizations. Projects range from a DoD-wide material

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~UNCLASSIFIED~~

4

bar-coding inventory system to modern office automation technology in administrative and professional organizations. These investments produce significant economies in the use of defense resources. For example, as a result of our allocation for this program in 1985, the Department expects to realize over \$22 for each \$1 invested. Over the past five years, the DoD has invested \$558 million in productivity improvement projects, and we anticipate savings of over \$3 billion by 1990, including saving 14,000 personnel space equivalents, which will be redirected to other priority needs, and thus eliminate the need for that many new employees. The productivity investment fund initiative demonstrates that significant productivity growth can be attained through the appropriate management emphasis and incentives for improvement. (U)

Support for Secretary Heckler's "Decade of the Disabled" Initiative: On June 25 Margaret Heckler wrote to me to ask for my help in mobilizing Defense contractors to support an accelerated initiative for the physically disabled. Since you have designated the 80's as the "Decade of the Disabled," Margaret feels that strong, highly visible action is needed to demonstrate the Administration's commitment and intent to produce results. An additional motive is to highlight the positive contributions being made to social problems indirectly through NASA and DoD programs. Such an approach can help to dispel the view that Defense resource requirements displace social resources and preclude solutions to social problems.

The focus of our contribution is technology transfer. There are some good examples of defense and space technology being applied to help the physically handicapped become more functional. For example, technology developed to help the Navy detect and analyze weak radar and sonar signals from enemy submarines has been used to develop an electronic device that transmits signals from upper body muscles to leg muscles, circumventing damaged sections of the spine so that paraplegics may walk again.

On Monday, Assistant Secretary Larry Korb attended a meeting at the Tandy Corporation in Fort Worth, at which the corporate representatives in attendance agreed to seize the initiative for this program. Since there is no good central source of information about existing activities involving technology transfer for the handicapped, some data collection will be necessary, and a plan of action will be developed once there is a better picture of the state-of-the-art.

Tandy Corporation will host another meeting of mid-level representatives of involved organizations on July 10. A format will be developed to collect information from major corporations

~~UNCLASSIFIED~~

~~SECRET~~

5

about their current activities in technology transfer for the handicapped. We will have someone there to make sure we stay abreast of developments and contribute as appropriate. (U)

Reserve Training Aboard USS EISENHOWER: Recently, we conducted training that reinforces our policy of horizontal integration of reserve forces into active units. Reserve Carrier Air Wing 20, located at Jacksonville, Florida, was put to sea as a complete air wing, marking the first time that this has been attempted, with a reserve unit. The training took place aboard the aircraft carrier USS EISENHOWER, which was made available for Air Wing 20's move aboard. All reports are that the training was a tremendous success, and that the ease with which the air wing embarked and settled into this operation allowed them to use and refine their own air wing tactical doctrine with unprecedented efficiency. (U)

TRIDENT I (C-4) Continuing Success: On Tuesday, the USS MICHIGAN, our second OHIO Class nuclear submarine, continued TRIDENT I Missile testing. All four missiles, launched from a distance of 5,000 miles, impacted within the target area. Since August 1983, 18 of 19 missiles fired have been fully successful. (S)

Recognition of three Department of Defense Dependents Schools: Your emphasis on the importance of education in American society is reflected in the increased attention we have been giving to our Department of Defense Dependents Schools (DoDDS). Recently we received an indication that our schools are indeed quality institutions and that we are following the right course in educating the dependents of Defense personnel.

Three schools in the DoDDS system are among the 202 outstanding public secondary schools selected for recognition in the 1983-84 Secondary School Recognition Program. These schools--Frankfurt High School, Heidelberg High School, and Rhein Main Middle School in the DoDDS-Germany Region--have been singled out as exemplary of the vitality and strength of American education.

The DoDDS system has 268 schools located in 20 countries around the world. The system provides educational opportunities from kindergarten through 12th grade for approximately 146,000 eligible minor dependents of the Department of Defense military and civilian employees on official overseas assignments.

I share your strong interest in the quality of education for our youth, and I am pleased to report this honor for DoD schools. (U)

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

26

6

Exercise COBRA GOLD 84: On Monday we began COBRA GOLD 84, which will last until August 10. This exercise, which is sponsored by USCINCPAC and directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is a joint and combined air, sea-land defense, land, amphibious, and special operations exercise designed to enhance professional capabilities and readiness of both U.S. and Thai armed forces. Specific objectives are:

- To train and exercise participating commanders and staffs in the planning, command and control, and execution of joint and combined operations.
- To enhance bilateral strategy and interoperability.
- To implement tactics, techniques, and procedures to include communications contingency and security procedures.
- To provide a firm basis for effective working relationships between the Royal Thai Armed Forces and U.S. Armed Forces. (C)

Pay

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

122

SECRET

July 13, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ROBERT C. McFARLANE

SUBJECT: Secretary Weinberger's Weekly Report

Attached is Cap Weinberger's Weekly Report for Friday,
July 13, 1984.

cc: The Vice President
Ed Meese
Jim Baker
Mike Deaver

DECLASSIFIED
Sec.34(b), E.O. 12958, as amended
White House Guidelines, Sept. 11, 2008
BY NARA RW DATE 5/21/13

~~SECRET~~

28

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

~~SECRET~~

July 13, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: ROBERT C. McFARLANE

SUBJECT: Secretary Weinberger's Weekly Report

Attached is Cap Weinberger's Weekly Report for Friday,
July 13, 1984.

cc: The Vice President
Ed Meese
Jim Baker
Mike Deaver

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED
Sec. 34(b), E.O. 12958, as amended
White House Guidelines, Sept. 14, 2009
BY NARA RW DATE 5/21/13

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT, NSC: AGENCY FILE

Withdrawer

RB 5/21/2013
W

File Folder

SECRETARY WEINBERGER'S WEEKLY REPORT (06/22/1984-
07/13/1984)

FOIA

M453
SHIFRINSON

Box Number

7

111

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
159699	MEMO CASPAR WEINBERGER TO RR RE. WEEKLY REPORT OF DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	8	7/13/1984	B1

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.