

File No.
Department CHANCERY
Drafted by R W RENWICK
(Block Capitals)
Tel. Extn. 4253

OUTWARD
TELEGRAM

Security Classification
CONFIDENTIAL
Precedence
IMMEDIATE
DESK BY Z

FOR COMMS. DEPT. USE	Despatched (Date) (Time) Z	POST BY Z
----------------------	---	-----------------

PREAMBLE

(Time of Origin) Z(G.M.T.) (Restrictive Prefix)
 (Security Class.) CONFIDENTIAL (Caveat)
 (Codeword) (Privacy marking)
 (Desk by) Z

TO IMMEDIATE FCO (precedence) (post) Tel. No. of

AND TO (precedence/post)

AND TO SAVING

INFO IMMEDIATE UKDEL NATO, MOSCOW, PARIS, BOONN, UKMIS NEW YORK
(FOR SECRETARY OF STATE'S PARTY)

INFO SAVING

Distribution:—

CH7 (CT?)

Copies to:—

[TEXT]

BRITISH AND FRENCH NUCLEAR FORCES ~~IN ARMS CONTROL~~

1. Associated Press this morning carried a report quoting Vice President Bush as having said to reporters yesterday that British and French nuclear forces ^{SHOULD} ~~must~~ be included in arms control negotiations. We raised this immediately with Gregg, National Security Adviser to the Vice President. Having checked with Mr Bush, Gregg telephoned Head of Chancery to say that Mr Bush had been mis-reported by Associated Press. A Washington Post account (text by bag) was more accurate. What
/Mr Bush

CONFIDENTIAL

Mr Bush had said was that the ~~difficult~~ question of British and French nuclear forces must eventually be addressed in relations to arms control ("somewhere along the line"). He had made clear that British and French nuclear systems could not be included in the INF negotiations ~~saying~~ ^{adding}: "We cannot negotiate for the British and French and we do not intend to dictate to them". Gregg thought this fully compatible with our position that if very substantial reductions were agreed in the US and Soviet strategic arsenals and there ~~was~~ ^{were} no up-grading of Soviet air defences, we should be prepared to review our position in relation to arms control. We reminded Gregg of the concern the US Administration had shown in the context of the Prime Minister's response to Andropov that no impression should be created that British or French forces ~~should~~ ^{might} be counted ~~in any way~~ ^{in any way} or compensated ~~for~~ ^{START} in the ~~bilateral US/Soviet strategic arms~~ negotiations. Gregg said that this was the Vice President's position. He referred approvingly to Mitterrand's forthright remarks on this subject in the UN General Assembly yesterday.

had
29/7?

Bush Says Talks Cannot Ignore British Missiles

By Don Oberdorfer
Washington Post Staff Writer

The thorny question of British and French nuclear forces in Europe eventually must be answered in arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union, Vice President Bush said yesterday.

In a meeting with reporters, Bush said he did not advocate inclusion of British and French nuclear missiles in the U.S.-Soviet negotiations on intermediate-range forces in Europe.

The Soviet Union has demanded, against the strong opposition of the United States and its NATO allies, that the 162 British and French missiles be taken into account in the European nuclear balance.

To count the British and French weapons on the western side, as Moscow has demanded, would reduce the number of nuclear weapons the United States could deploy in western Europe under an equal forces arrangement with the Soviet Union.

"Somewhere along the line" the western European missile forces must be addressed and answers found if the hopes for arms reductions are to be realized, Bush said. He was unable to say how the problem should be handled or in which future negotiation, only that he believes it should be addressed.

"We can't negotiate for the British and French and we don't intend to dictate to them," Bush said.

The deployment of U.S. Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe before the end of the year—and the talks to stave this off through U.S.-Soviet negotiation—were among the topics Bush discussed on a recent trip to several eastern European countries.

Bush said he told his hosts that it is "a non-starter" to propose a delay in the scheduled U.S. missile deployment in order to give more time for negotiations.

He said he had made the point in Europe that there isn't any "give" in the U.S. position regarding the timetable for putting in the new weapons.

Special to The New York Times

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., Sept. 28

— Following are excerpts from speeches to the General Assembly today by President François Mitterrand of France, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi of India and President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt. The United Nations translated Mr. Mitterrand's remarks from the French and Mr. Mubarak's from the Arabic.

Mitterrand's Remarks

Following a continuous escalation all across the European soil, a new situation has been created whereby the Soviet Union, and it alone, has a sizable intermediate-range nuclear force on our Continent, with triple-warhead missiles which are mobile and accurate and have a range of approximately 5,000 kilometers. Since they cannot cross the Atlantic, their only possible target is the nations of Western Europe.

The same reasoning holds true for the missiles deployed in the Asian territory of the U.S.S.R. and pointed at the neighboring states in this region. France welcomed the opening in Geneva of negotiations on this type of weapon between the Soviet Union and the United States as a very positive act, coming as it did after the United States had announced that it would install Pershing 2 and cruise missiles in various European countries as of the end of this year, in application of the "two-track" decision taken by the member states of the NATO integrated military command, of which France is not a member."

One can compare only that which is comparable: It is unacceptable to include the central defense system on which the independence and survival of my country rest with the intermediate-range nuclear forces of the two superpowers, which in their case merely complement their formidable strategic arsenals.

A Fear for the Future

Since in concrete terms we are talking about a request on the part of the Soviet Union, on what grounds does this country expect France to renounce something so vital? I refer to its national defense. Of course, we are told that this is not the aim of the proposal, and I would like to believe it.

We are assured that inclusion of the French force in the Geneva talks would not lead to any reduction in it. But once France enters into an equation in which it has no part, would it not be exposed to the risk of seeing the modernization of its defense come under the control of the two superpowers, and would it not be assuming a responsibility it rejects — that of upsetting world equilibrium?

My country is independent. Its deterrent force is under the exclusive command of the President of the republic. France's loyalty to the Atlantic alliance does not undermine its autonomy. We respect the great Russian people and hope to preserve the centuries-old good relations which join us. My country has neither the intention nor the means — and it does not desire them — to impose its will by force of arms. It has the weapon to insure its own defense. Nothing more, nothing less. It would not understand if the Soviet Union were allowed to have a monopoly of intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe, as is the case today. It hopes that mutual concessions between the two partners in Geneva will make it possible to end this monopoly while creating the conditions for a new equilibrium — something I fervently hope for.