

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):
2009-0275-S

FOIA Number:
2009-0275-S

FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an
administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential
Library Staff.**

Record Group/Collection: George H.W. Bush Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin: Scowcroft, Brent, Collection
Series: Meetings Files
Subseries: Handwritten Meeting Notes Files

OA/ID Number: 91158
Folder ID Number: 91158-006

Folder Title:
Wehrkunde '90

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	34	49	1	2

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet (George Bush Library)

Doc. No. / Type	Subject/Title	Date	Restriction	Classification
01. Handwritten Memcon	Re: Wehrkunde '90 (19 pp.)	1990	(b) (1)	

Page 1 of 1

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Scowcroft, Brent, Collection
Series: Meetings Files
Subseries: Handwritten Meeting Notes Files
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: Wehrkunde '90

Pinksheet Number: cap1309
OA/ID Number: 91158-006
Date Closed: 8/7/2009
FOIA/Sys Case #: 2009-0275-S
Re-review Case #:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:

LGEN
SCOWCROFT'S
FILES

Document Originally
Attached to
Following Page

SOENNECKEN

Wehrkunde '90

**Spiral-
Notizblock**
liniert
50 Blatt

Nr.1118

Brent,

I can't believe

BAKER agreed to that!

(ie = de facto neutraliz - of
DDR territory)

It's bound to create a permanent
source of instability, and of
hostility turns towards W. Germany

Rene

Sturmer -

- Woud be easy to convince parliaments (people) or SC of a continued role of NATO
- The future of Csr in its fundamental sense is also being discussed - not only NATO
- NATO must redefine itself
 - " must give SC assurance

Kuizer - Alliance must change its character - no surprise attack, no mass int threat

- Would SC accept rearm for a changed NATO it woudnt accept for present form of NATO
- Have issue as change of
- * Sov policy - only by a security system

⊖ We seem to see emergency
brakes put on reunification

* - Transitional situation
wants very ^{concurrent} w/ special status for
outtransited GDR

* - Red Army no longer avail-
able for rearmament of E.C.

Comb (Belg def. min)

Wozig (CSU Min. Fin.)

- Motions

- Positive elements

Reun./structural growth

- Problematical

- Negative

- Mid. neutrality

- U.S. mid. presence is
imperative

strategic
concept
we reacting out - learned
lesson
US preeminence is fact
accomplish

① Don't think we will be
pushing to stay in Europe
if we aren't ~~so~~ wanted.

- NATO ~~is~~ not only a security

④ role. It is a institutional
basis presence for US in Eur.

- Transformation of security
sit. makes transitional
arrangements attractive

④ - also reassure SU.
- NATO has a wider role
but it is a security organ

- Break a link bet US

④ & Sov free w/ drawab.

- We have a # of elements

④ overlapping security
- Post collapse of
ER - EU
- Decline of NATO security
arrang.

Bahr
Unity can be achieved
faster than all of these
structures we are discussing

- Beesh CFE good because
we regain initiative

+ ~~Beesh~~

Teller - Says that systems
of 3 world missiles
are proliferating

- Teltser - Says asked several
questions

- All dialogue vs concentration
on Ostpolitik

? - Were E more weight in alliance

- Should E do more outside
areas

- Don't we need common
strategy for CSCE

- Objective of MacBride proposal was
neutrality.

- Vital how we respond

- So will take it up as it
looks successful

- WP act is finished - EE trying to leave it.
 We should not try to define Eastern original arrangements
 - Let them define their own ~~point~~ interests
- A certain # of rums are stabilizing
 - Even Sov see that.
 - We need US rum umbrella.
- Sov pres in Azer are there also as show of pres against Iran & that border.
- SU must never think they are losing a position they lost 20 million to establish (cost)
 - Bush CF E good because it lets Sov save face.

(Brit hawk nose)

Colvin - NATO has made
many special adjustments
for NATO members.

- 195 won't make much
diff because we actually
have already a mobile
defense.

- We need defense against
deep, sustained defense.

- Where will Ger. be defended?

- Not on inter-Ger border
which won't exist

- Mobility is answer

- FOTL

- Missile is added &
must be credible

- Means forward
deployment

- Now have mix of
air/arty / missiles

- arty not mobile
 - air on vulnerable fields
 - ~~few best~~ above shore

Intersections of a # of trends &
Effects which create prob-

- esp of rest focus on only one
- can't think of existence by one cause of
- Pol collapse of EE ^{interaction}
- Raising prospect of GR sum
- Mil erosion of Sov security
- system -
- How do

- Change in character of
sit facing NATO

- Eur unification

- Do things in way which
doesn't ^{expose} ~~expose~~ Sov personnel
(A) resulting in pressures for
solutions far from optimal.

- 195000 pressure
(2) - 275 ~~unrealistic~~ ^{shiny} floor
- Establish sustainable position -
- Break linkage - ^{binding} towards person
pressure not
just 5 or 10

(3) Burden sharing
- Reducing US proportion
alters balance.
- Focus on roles & contributions
rather than head counting

missiles we will depend on
security for few of these.

- Von Bulow

-

- Hls - Keeping R & D

- ~~Gen~~ Mr Sato

- Japan will help Pol & Hungary
- Don't want to get in way
of the debate on Eur.
- We will increase our
sense of resp, which has
been too low til now.

- Winston

SPD seems to want to
convert CSCE to replace
NATO.

- i.e., Common European
House or Molotov
proposal of 1954.

- CDD - even if SU loses
Baltic + Caucasus, it is
still a predominant power
in Eur (so CSCE can't
be a security orgn. ??)
- SU has tried for 40 yrs to
pull Germany away from
west. Would be tragedy
if they succeeded at
this stage

Vaught-

- No one in GDR supports NATO membership
- Self deter means we can't go over heads of these people.

*Kohl - Saturday afternoon
to Sunday afternoon
*Woerner - Must leave for
Ottawa Sunday
morning.

Woerner - What can replace
NATO - can EC take over
civil aspects?

- Not for foreseeable future
- WEU etc can complement
not replace NATO
- There needs to be a residual
minimum of mcs.
- NATO + WP are fundamentally
diff.
- We don't ask for future
or dissolution of WP. It
is up to them.
- Has no impact on
preservation of NATO

- Recognition on basis of self-determining & Germanies.
- Only & anchoring in West can provide basis for reun.
- SV ~~is~~ should not wish for neutral Ger.
- One could look at moves to allay Sov concerns
 - Not extend NATO instruments to East Ger
 - Spm military arrangements for GDR.

Chernomont-

- The present sit. is result of persistence & ~~Exer~~ centrality of us all.
- And also of Gerb.
- Existing institutions have served us well but their scope & function must be examined to be more political

(made at 1:00)

- Went is very useful device for a near future.
- NATO is institution of un-
arable flex. It will ~~be~~
remain a symbol of atl
coop
- However NATO couldn't be
extended to East part of
a new Ger.
- Neutral Ger would be a
destabilizing influence.
- EC is institution for
coop w/ EEC
- Following START I & 2
superpowers should move
toward new deter.

King. Revue is a triumph
of NATO.

- < Each of opportunities facing
us brings risks - incl. revue
- eg what might ~~for~~ seen
of Ger mean for NATO

- Hist of recent time shows
 SU is not in position to resist
 on this or that.
- The people of E_u will
 decide & politicians & govts
 will follow on behind.
- Dissolution of WP should not
 be mirrored by NATO.
- We should concentrate
 now more on multilateral
 units & interoperability
- Terrorism - We must prevent
 a flow of arms from reductions
 in E_u to Terrorists.

Shaefer (FRG) NATO must
 change. We all operators
 with FRG to stay in NATO.

- E_u want to be a part
 of West but certainly not
 a part of NATO

- They also won't meet requirements for entering EC, so what do we do w/ them.
- There can't be a neutral Germany nor an extension of NATO.
- So can't be interested in neutral Ger either

** Enquired - Danish Minister
 - heard from papers that 9th Division (scheduled to reinforce them) was to be demobilized.

Conclusion (Closing)

- SC will remain a big power but not necessarily civil superpower
- we are used to it (some more than others)

- (Disunion of France leaving Nul, NATO + impossibility of US forces in France)
- Reun should not take place in disorder.
- US has a major role in E Eur & world balance
- we need a rebalance w/in NATO so E Eur have more resp.
- E Eur confederation should be open to all democracies.
- Chem & bio threats are very real
- E fitted confederating E Eur to East & S.