

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):
2005-1002-F; 2008-1289-F

FOIA Number:
2005-1002-F; 2008-1289-F

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: National Security Council
Series: H-Files
Subseries: NSC/DC Meetings Files

OA/ID Number: 90010
Folder ID Number: 90010-004

Folder Title:

NSC/DC 025 - May 17, 1989 - NSC/DC Meeting on NSR-12 Section ii and iii / U.S. Defense Strategy
for the 1990s and Force Posture Issues, Keywords: Defense Policy

Stack:

V

Row:

15

Section:

2

Shelf:

3

Position:

2

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Doc. No. / Type	Subject/Title	Date	Restriction	Classification
01a. Minutes	Re: Minutes of Deputies Committee Meeting on NSR-12, Sections II and III (U.S. Defense Strategy for the 1990s and Force Posture Issues) [FOIA EXEMPTIONS REDACTED] (4 pp.)	5/17/89	(b)(1)	S
01b. Summary	Re: Summary of Conclusions for NSC Deputies Committee Meeting (1 pp.)	5/17/89	(b)(1)	S
02. Memo	Don M. Snider to Robert M. Gates Re: Hard Questions the NSR-12 Review Failed to Ask (Or Answer) (2 pp.)	5/16/89	(b)(1)	S
03a. Memo	Don M. Snider to Robert M. Gates Re: May 16th Deputies Committee (DC) Meeting on Sections II and III, NSR 12 (US Defense Strategy for the 1990's and Force Posture Issues) (7 pp.)	5/15/89	(b)(1)	S
03b. Report	Re: Response to National Security Review #12; Review of US Defense Strategy Executive Summary (28 pp.)	5/13/89	(b)(1)	S
03c. Agenda	Re: Deputies Committee Meeting National Defense Strategy Review (1 pp.)	5/16/89	(b)(1)	S
04a. Agenda	Re: Deputies Committee Meeting National Defense Strategy Review (1 pp.)	5/16/89	(b)(1)	S

Page 1 of 2

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records

Office: National Security Council

Series: H-Files

Subseries: NSC/DC Meetings Files

WHORM Cat.:

File Location: NSC/DC 025 - May 17, 1989 - NSC/DC Meeting on NSR-12 Section II and III/U.S. Defense Strategy for the 1990s and Force Posture Issues, Keywords: Defense Policy

Pinksheet Number: cap1429

QA/ID Number: 90010-004

Date Closed: 10/15/2009

FOIA/Sys Case #: 2005-1002-F

Re-review Case #:

P-2/P-5 Review Case #:

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Doc. No. / Type	Subject/Title	Date	Restriction	Classification
04b. Memo	G. Philip Hughes to Distribution List Re: Deputies Committee Meeting (1 pp.)	5/12/89	(b)(1)	S
04c. Agenda	G. Philip Hughes to Distribution List Re: Deputies Committee Meeting (1 pp.)	5/16/89	(b)(1)	S

Page 2 of 2

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records

Office: National Security Council

Series: H-Files

Subseries: NSC/DC Meetings Files

WHORM Cat.:

File Location: NSC/DC 025 - May 17, 1989 - NSC/DC Meeting on NSR-12 Section II and III/U.S. Defense Strategy for the 1990s and Force Posture Issues, Keywords: Defense Policy

Pinksheet Number: cap1429

OA/ID Number: 90010-004

Date Closed: 10/15/2009

FOIA/Sys Case #: 2005-1002-F

Re-review Case #:

P-2/P-5 Review Case #:

~~SECRET~~
NSC/S PROFILE

RECORD ID: 8920547
RECEIVED: 26 MAY 89 09

TO: GATES

FROM: SNIDER
KANTER

DOC DATE: 25 MAY 89
SOURCE REF:

KEYWORDS: MINUTES
DC

DEFENSE POLICY
NSR

PERSONS:

SUBJECT: MINUTES & SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS FOR DC MTG ON 17 MAY RE NSR 12
SECTION II & III / DEFENSE STRATEGY & FORCE POSTURE ISSUES

ACTION: GATES APPROVED RECOM DUE DATE: 26 MAY 90 STATUS: C

STAFF OFFICER: SNIDER

LOGREF: 8920472

FILES: IFM O

NSCP: DC025

NSR0012

CODES:

DOCUMENT DISTRIBUTION

FOR ACTION

FOR CONCURRENCE

FOR INFO

KANTER

SNIDER

DECLASSIFIED

White House Guidelines

E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006

By CAP NARA, Date 10/15/09

COMMENTS: _____

DISPATCHED BY _____ DATE _____ BY HAND W/ATTCH

OPENED BY: AC

CLOSED BY: LF

DOC 1 OF 1

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

RECORD ID: 8920547

ACTION DATA SUMMARY REPORT

DOC ACTION OFFICER

CAO ASSIGNED ACTION REQUIRED

001 GATES
001

Z 89052609 FOR DECISION
X 89053111 GATES APPROVED RECOM.

DECLASSIFIED

White House Guidelines

E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006

By CAP NARA, Date 10/15/09

~~SECRET~~

**National Security Council
The White House**

PROOFED BY:

LOG # 20547

URGENT NOT PROOFED:

SYSTEM PRS NSC INT

BYPASSED WW DESK:

DOCLOG A/O

	SEQUENCE TO	HAS SEEN	DISPOSITION
Dep Exec	<u>1</u>	<u>MD</u>	<u>A</u>
Philip Hughes	<u>2</u>	<u>10/6</u>	
Bob Gates	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	
Brent Scowcroft			
Philip Hughes			
Situation Room			
West Wing Desk	<u>4</u>	<u>27.5/31</u>	<u>N</u>
NSC Secretariat	<u>6</u>	<u>LM 5/23/70</u>	<u>R</u>
<u>Sittman</u>	<u>5</u>	<u> </u>	

89 MAY 26 A 8: 54

A = Action

I = Information

D = Dispatch

R = Retain

N = No further Action

cc: VP

Sununu

Other

Should be seen by:
(Date/Time)

COMMENTS

DC minutes / conclusions
17 May — WSR-12

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

20547

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

May 25, 1989

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT M. GATES

THROUGH: ARNOLD KANTER *AK*

FROM: DON M. SNIDER

SUBJECT: Minutes and Summary of Conclusions from May 17, 1989 Deputies Meeting on NSR-12, Sections II and III, US Defense Strategy for the 1990s and Force Posture Issues

The results of the subject DC meeting are attached for your review.

RECOMMENDATION

That you approve the minutes and summary of conclusions from the May 17 DC meeting on NSR-12, Sections II and III.

Approve 8

Disapprove _____

Attachments

Tab I

Minutes

Tab II

Summary of Conclusions

DECLASSIFIED

White House Guidelines

E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006

By CAF NARA, Date 10/15/09

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

~~SECRET~~

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
01a. Minutes	Re: Minutes of Deputies Committee Meeting on NSR-12, Sections II and III (U.S. Defense Strategy for the 1990s and Force Posture Issues) [FOIA EXEMPTIONS REDACTED] (4 pp.)	5/17/89	(b)(1)	S

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records

Office: National Security Council

Series: H-Files

Subseries: NSC/DC Meetings Files

WHORM Cat.:

File Location: NSC/DC 025 - May 17, 1989 - NSC/DC Meeting on NSR-12 Section II and III/U.S. Defense Strategy for the 1990s and Force Posture Issues, Keywords: Defense Policy

Document Partially Declassified
(Copy of Document Follows)
By SCS on 9/20/13

Date Closed: 10/15/2009	OA/ID Number: 90010-004
FOIA/SYS Case #: 2005-1002-F	Appeal Case #:
Re-review Case #:	Appeal Disposition:
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:	Disposition Date:
AR Case #:	MR Case #: 10-1773-MR(500)
AR Disposition:	MR Disposition: Released in Part
AR Disposition Date:	MR Disposition Date: 9/6/2011

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

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

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

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

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

(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

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

20547

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20508



Meeting of the NSC Deputies Committee

DATE: May 17, 1989
LOCATION: White House Situation Room
TIME: 5:45 - 6:45 p.m.

SUBJECT: Minutes of Deputies Committee Meeting on NSR-12,
Sections II and III (US Defense Strategy for the 1990s
and Force Posture Issues)

PARTICIPANTS:

The Vice President's Office
Carnes Lord

State
Reginald Bartholomew
Allen Holmes

DOD
Paul Wolfowitz
Stephen J. Hadley

DOE
W. Henson Moore
Troy E. Wade

OMB
William Diefenderfer
Frank Hodson

CIA
Fritz Ermarth
(b)(1)

JCS
Larry Seaquist
Jonathan Howe

ACDA
George F. Murphy

White House
Robert Gates

NSC
Arnold Kanter
Don M. Snider

Minutes

Robert Gates opened the meeting explaining that the purposes of the meeting were to review the Section II/III Executive Summary to ensure all issues were clearly identified; to review the adequacy of the options; and to ensure all relevant agency positions were known. He introduced the first issue, Dealing with Changing Soviet Military Power in Europe, indicating the issue was straightforward focused on the risk inherent in the imbalances of conventional capabilities in Europe. After presenting the issue he turned to Steve Hadley of Defense, who amplified based on his position as Acting Chairman of the Defense Policy Coordinating Committee. Robert Gates then opened the first issue for discussion, inquiring why the issue did not include a focus on readiness levels. He offered the fact of Soviet and Warsaw Pact units with various levels of readiness.

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED IN PART
PER E.O. 13526

2010-1773-MR
31 9/6/11

~~SECRET~~

2

~~SECRET~~

"This might have been something that the Committee should have looked at." Steve Hadley indicated that the issue was reviewed at least to some degree in the original report; he confirmed that OSD Staff and the new Secretary are concerned with the personnel aspects of readiness, and that Defense is also concerned with readiness responses of our allies, particularly Belgium and the Federal Republic of Germany. He restated the D/PCC's conclusion that we should be cautious on readiness adjustments, and, in fact, there may be no "readiness dividend." But our allies may want to pocket that part of the dividend as we're responding to changing Soviet military power.

A second question was raised by Ambassador Bartholomew of State, questioning why CFE didn't fit clearly into this first issue. After some discussion, Arnold Kanter of NSC responded that admittedly the first issue was cast with the two options independent of what we do as a nation or an alliance toward CFE -- we can reduce or accept the risk in many ways that do not affect CFE. The options had been cast this way by the Defense Committee, believing that this would provide more clear guidance for the issue. George Murphy responded that we definitely should follow the "do-nothing-unilateral" option. There was some discussion around the table by OMB and others wondering where we would take cuts as we adjust and considering the addition of a third option which would explicitly support CFE. There was no consensus on the possible third option as the Deputies concluded their discussion of the first issue.

Robert Gates introduced the second issue, Force Projection and Presence in the Third World, indicating the choices to be presented to the NSC were three: keeping the current allocation between Europe and the Third World, reallocating relatively more to Europe to reduce the risk, or allocating relatively more to our security efforts in the Third World. Steve Hadley amplified on the presentation noting that the Defense PCC had tried to get a handle on our adequacies to deal with Third World contingencies, and had concluded that we have sufficient numbers of forces, but we may have some deficiencies in training and appropriateness of equipment. We do definitely have some difficulties at the low end of the spectrum in the context of non-proliferation of weaponry and in dealing with low intensity conflict. With this the issue was opened to the Deputies Committee and responses were invited from around the table. State responded that the options were adequately stated, but did not agree with the conclusion in the Executive Summary that the security assistance problem really was a policy problem. Ambassador Bartholomew indicated straightforwardly State's position that security assistance was a management problem with the Hill. He indicated that State was already reorienting the rationale towards the Hill to include non-proliferation of weaponry. State does not believe and does not want to see an NSR on the security assistance policy -- "we simply did not think that it would come up with anything useful."

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

3

Admiral Howe responded that the Joint Chiefs and the CINCs view the security assistance issue, and our capabilities at the lower end of the conflict spectrum, as one of their "highest priorities" in terms of returns on the dollar. They did want to see the issue addressed. During questioning Admiral Howe indicated that the CINCs and the Chiefs had indicated that at some point they would be willing to consider use of some parts of the Defense budget to increase assistance to allied military forces, if it was necessary. Secondly, they also felt that the IMET rules were out of touch and needed modification. He concluded by restating the JCS position -- a policy review of security assistance would be helpful.

Henson Moore stated that we should, as a policy, do nothing to reduce our capabilities in the Third World, noting our increasing dependence on overseas oil. The OPEC area is one of increasing instability and insecurity. George Murphy added that the question is not one of allocating more defense effort toward Europe; in fact we should not allocate more of a conventional effort to Europe. Nuclear weapons have kept the peace, don't diminish that. Robert Gates summarized the discussion of this issue noting that qualitative requirements for our troops to participate in Third World contingencies had not been adequately addressed in the Executive Summary; and secondly, the paper did not say enough about what countries or areas, based on an analysis of our interests, were envisioned for potential US intervention. He commented that we could probably learn much from the British experience in the Falklands to assist in sharpening this aspect of the Defense review.

The Chairman introduced the third subject, Adjustments in Our Forward Deployments and Burdensharing, as it was presented in the Executive Summary, and opened the issue for discussion. State responded that the portion of the Executive Summary on base rights and renegotiations was far too pessimistic. Ambassador Bartholomew stated that it was quite possible we would have successfully renegotiated the major base rights and be able to use those bases through the turn of the century. Admiral Howe stated that while State may be correct on the possibility of concluding negotiations, it was doubtful that within those negotiations we could retain the same operational capabilities for our forces that now exist. In fact, if the operational constraints became too great, then it would be in our best interests not to conclude negotiations with those countries.

Ambassador Bartholomew asked again as he had under the first issue how the options being presented under the third issue related to CFE. Arnold Kanter responded that in this set of options CFE was explicit and that Option 1 for Europe, that of "holding the line," meant explicitly to support our CFE negotiating position. George Murphy of ACDA warned again that major adjustments in our forward deployments might be required in selected cases, but we should look at each, case by case, and not make sweeping conclusions as a broad policy. Fritz Ermarth

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

4

agreed, indicating even in a case by case basis the first time we move from one of the five major bases that we traditionally have held, it would be a major "sea change" in US policy. "We must be sure it is correct before we do it." Robert Gates summarized the discussion, indicating two weaknesses in the presentation of this issue. It did not address sufficiently the European pillar with respect to burdensharing and the potential it has to reallocate burdens, and secondly, the study does not focus sufficiently on US interests and what specific interests might be jeopardized if we cut forward deployments.

The third issue, Priorities and Allocation of Resources Between Current and Future Capabilities, was presented by the Chairman noting the lateness of the hour. Ambassador Bartholomew responded that State had no comments on the issue, believed the options to be well-framed and good for raising consciousness of members of the NSC. Frank Hodsoll of OMB noted that this was a good issue, with clear options. But, within those options there was not enough specificity in what is needed to meet the threat. Admiral Howe of the Joint Staff noted that this was an important issue of strategic choice. During the last Administration priority was given to current capabilities and readiness and we now may have a chance to leap ahead with technology. Henson Moore added regardless of what priority was chosen, one point that should not be forgotten is the current and urgent funding need for the work ongoing in the nuclear weapons laboratories. Fritz Ermarth emphasized that Soviet modernization might appear to have some hollowing going on, but we should be cautious about that judgment and understand the inherent instability in the current environment. He concluded by noting it was clear that the size of the Soviet military structure was going to decline, but it was not clear what objective design the reorganization would follow, and how much their capabilities might change as a result of restructuring.

Robert Gates then turned quickly to the policies and elements of strategy that had been reaffirmed in the Executive Summary and asked if any agency had disagreement. There were no disagreements. Similarly, he introduced the additional studies called for in the Executive Summary of the strategy review and only State responded with disagreement, again indicating that a national security review of security assistance policy was not necessary. As the meeting concluded, the Chairman indicated that the Executive Summary was too long for most NSC participants to read prior to the meeting. He directed that a six to eight page discussion paper be prepared for the NSC meeting. He also concluded that based upon the confusion the Deputies have had between the first and third options, particularly with respect to how they explicitly treated US and alliance support for CFE, the first issue should not be presented for decision at the NSC. Instead, he directed that the first option be reworked to provide context with which the NSC would consider the last three issues.

-- End of Meeting --

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

20547

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20508

Summary of Conclusions for
NSC Deputies Committee Meeting

DATE: May 17, 1989
LOCATION: Situation Room
TIME: 5:45 - 6:45 p.m.

SUBJECT: Summary of Conclusions of Deputies Committee Meeting
on NSR-12, Sections II and III (US Defense Strategy
for the 1990s and Force Posture Issues)

It was agreed that:

- The first issue (Dealing with Changing Soviet Military Power in Europe) should not be presented to the NSC as written. Directions were given to eliminate the options, present the issue for discussion only and allow it to serve as context for subsequent issues.
- The final three issues (Force Projection and Presence in the Third World; Adjustments to Forward Deployments and Burdensharing; Priorities and Allocations of Resources between Current and Future Capabilities) should be presented to the NSC as discussed in the Executive Summary.
- A discussion paper of 6-8 pages should be prepared for the NSC in lieu of the much longer Executive Summary.

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 13526

2010-1991-MR

MM 12/2/2016

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET/NO FORN DIS~~
NSC/S PROFILE

RECORD ID: 8920472
RECEIVED: 12 MAY 89 10

TO: GATES

FROM: KANTER
SNIDER

DOC DATE: 16 MAY 89
SOURCE REF:

KEYWORDS: DEFENSE POLICY
NSR
DC

MILITARY POSTURE
AGENDA

PERSONS:

SUBJECT: BACKGROUND MATERIAL FOR DC MTG ON 16 MAY RE NSR 12 RE II & III /
DEFENSE STRATEGY FOR 1990 & FORCE POSTURE ISSUES

ACTION: NOTED BY GATES

DUE DATE: 26 MAY 90

STATUS: C

STAFF OFFICER: SNIDER

LOGREF: 8920547

FILES: IFM O

NSCP: DC025

NSR0012

CODES:

D O C U M E N T D I S T R I B U T I O N

FOR ACTION

FOR CONCURRENCE

FOR INFO

DECLASSIFIED
White House Guidelines
E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006
By CAP NARA, Date 10/15/09

COMMENTS: _____

DISPATCHED BY _____ DATE _____ BY HAND W/ATTCH

OPENED BY: LF

CLOSED BY: AC

DOC 4 OF 4

~~SECRET/NO FORN DIS~~

~~SECRET/NO FORN DIS~~
ACTION DATA SUMMARY REPORT

RECORD ID: 8920472

DOC ACTION OFFICER

CAO ASSIGNED ACTION REQUIRED

001 HUGHES	Z 89051210 FOR SIGNATURE
002	Z 89051216 DONLEY SGD MEMO TO AGENCIES
003 GATES	Z 89051514 ADD-ON / FOR INFORMATION
003	X 90052315 NOTED BY GATES W/ COMMENT
004 GATES	Z 89051616 ADD-ON / FOR INFORMATION
004	X 90052315 NOTED BY GATES

DECLASSIFIED
White House Guidelines
E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006
By CAF NARA, Date 10/15/09

~~SECRET/NO FORN DIS~~

**National Security Council
The White House**

PROOFED BY: _____

LOG # 20472

URGENT NOT PROOFED: _____

SYSTEM PRS NSC INT

BYPASSED WW DESK: _____

DOCLOG Jc A/O 2

	SEQUENCE TO	HAS SEEN	DISPOSITION
Dep Exec	<u>1</u>	<u>MD</u>	<u>#</u>
Philip Hughes	<u>2</u>	<u>LPB</u>	
Bob Gates	<u>3</u>		
Brent Scowcroft	<u>4</u>	<u>✓</u>	<u>5</u>
Philip Hughes			
Situation Room			
West Wing Desk			
NSC Secretariat	<u>5</u>	<u>LMS 5/23/90</u>	<u>R</u>

89 MAY 16 PM 4: 51

A = Action	<u>= Information</u>	D = Dispatch	R = Retain	N = No further Action
------------	----------------------	--------------	------------	-----------------------

cc: VP Sununu Other _____

Should be seen by: _____
(Date/Time)

COMMENTS

NSR-12 - Questions Unanswered

FROM GATES FOLDER

LMS

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

20472 Add-on

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

May 16, 1989

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT M. GATES

THROUGH:

for (saw draft)
ARNOLD KANTER

FROM:

DON M. SNIDER

SUBJECT:

Hard Questions the NSR-12 Review Failed to Ask
(Or Answer)

Listed below are issues that were never well-developed during the deliberations of the D/PCC. We have categorized them under each of the four issues for discussion.

Dealing with Changing Soviet Military Power in Europe

- Soviet Union in the Year 2000 -- Which is most in our long-term interest, a "skinny Russian" or a "fat Russian"? Whichever it is, what do these options do over the next several years to help bring it about? (We discussed leverage, concluded we have little and then never discussed how Defense Strategy supported the larger National Security Strategy.)
- All options for resource allocation keep "readiness" at the top of the list, presumably because of the major threat...but given the study conclusion of reduction in the short-warning threat, why not lower readiness..at least in some units/locations? (This was not discussed -- a sacred cow.)

Force Projection and Presence in the Third World

- What are the real qualitative differences in the military capabilities needed for Third World contingencies in the 1990's versus the capabilities we are now building for the same period? (Paper refers only to quantitative deficiencies.)
- What non-Soviet threats to US interests in the Third World would likely cause US intervention -- other than the Middle East/Persian Gulf? (Paper says non-Soviet threats are "a rising threat to regional stability," but the discussion was mushy)

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 13526

2010-1991-MR

MM 12/2/2016

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

2

~~SECRET~~

Adjustments in Forward Deployments and Burdensharing

- NATO in the Year 2000 -- Where is NATO headed? Where are the Germans headed? What role can the "European pillar" play? What role does that leave for the US? Do we need to start now laying the groundwork for the evolution to a new security relationship? (This review does call for further study of nuclear deterrence in a post-CFE era, but it does not address the hard questions of shifting the burdens for conventional roles - good study topic.)
- How does the "reaffirmed" policy ["actively seeking to act in coalition with interested states whenever possible in the Third World"] address the real burdensharing issue, or does it still provide a free ride? (This was the best policy statement we could get -- does not differentiate where we would "go it alone," or where we won't ever go.)
- The study "reaffirmed" forward deployments as an element of US Defense Strategy...but where, and what US interests would be jeopardized if we make major reductions in our overseas deployments? (Our analysis of this was anything but fine-grained - and there is no follow-on study.)
- Does this notion of "global presence" as a contributor to Soviet aggression have validity...particularly if they adopt a more benign policy toward the Third World? (An unproven, and probably improvable hypothesis.)

Priorities for Allocation of Resources Between Current and Future Capabilities

- As a practical, bureaucratic matter, can we "shift defense resources at the margin;" is this type of guidance really helpful or are we kidding ourselves?

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET/NO FORN DIS~~
NSC/S PROFILE

RECORD ID: 8920472
RECEIVED: 12 MAY 89 10

TO: GATES

FROM: SNIDER
KANter

DOC DATE: 15 MAY 89
SOURCE REF:

KEYWORDS: DEFENSE POLICY
NSR
DC

MILITARY POSTURE
AGENDA

PERSONS:

SUBJECT: BACKGROUND MATERIAL FOR DC MTG ON 16 MAY RE NSR 12 SECTION II & III
DEFENSE STRATEGY FOR 1990 & FORCE POSTURE ISSUE

ACTION: NOTED BY GATES W/ COMMENT DUE DATE: 26 MAY 90 STATUS: C

STAFF OFFICER: SNIDER

LOGREF: 8920547

FILES: IFM O

NSCP: DC025

NSR0012

CODES:

DOCUMENT DISTRIBUTION

FOR ACTION

FOR CONCURRENCE

FOR INFO

DECLASSIFIED
White House Guidelines
E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006
By CAP NARA, Date 10/15/09

COMMENTS: _____

DISPATCHED BY _____ DATE _____ BY HAND W/ATTCH

OPENED BY: LF

CLOSED BY: AC

DOC 3 OF 4

~~SECRET/NO FORN DIS~~

~~SECRET/NO FORN DIS~~
ACTION DATA SUMMARY REPORT

RECORD ID: 8920472

DOC ACTION OFFICER

CAO ASSIGNED ACTION REQUIRED

001 HUGHES
002
003 GATES
003
004 GATES
004

Z 89051210 FOR SIGNATURE
Z 89051216 DONLEY SGD MEMO TO AGENCIES
Z 89051514 ADD-ON / FOR INFORMATION
X 90052315 NOTED BY GATES W/ COMMENT
Z 89051616 ADD-ON / FOR INFORMATION
X 90052315 NOTED BY GATES

DECLASSIFIED
White House Guidelines
E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006
By CAP NARA, Date 10/15/09

~~SECRET/NO FORN DIS~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

20472

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

May 15, 1989

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT M. GATES

THROUGH: ARNOLD KANTER *AK*
FROM: DON M. SNIDER
SUBJECT: May 16th Deputies Committee (DC) Meeting on
Sections II and III, NSR-12 (US Defense Strategy
for the 1990's and Force Posture Issues)

This memorandum sets forth our suggestions for the conduct of the meeting. The Executive Summary of Sections I, II and III of NSR-12 is at Tab I, and a revised agenda for the meeting is at Tab II. A separate report on Section IV (Arms Control Implications) will be forthcoming for subsequent DC/NSC meetings.

Background:

To review, NSR-12 asked the following questions:

- Section I - What are the key trends and uncertainties in the security environment that may affect the appropriateness of our defense strategy in the next five to ten years? (A report on this section was reviewed by the DC on April 4; it did not go forward to the NSC.)
- Section II - What are the shortcomings or risks in our current defense strategy? What elements should continue to guide our strategy and what elements should be modified; what new alternatives need further study?
- Section III - Given a very constrained resource environment, what combination of military assets (force posture) will provide the best deterrent -- keeping in mind where our defense capabilities need to be in the mid-1990s vis-a-vis our defense objectives and strategy?

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 13526

2010-1991-MR

MM - 12/2/2016

~~SECRET~~

2

~~SECRET~~

Section IV - To what degree can and should arms control be used to advanced US defense objectives and strategy? (A separate report will be forthcoming on this section.)

As the NSR-12 review progressed, it became quite apparent that the specific responses needed to be packaged in some coherent way to relate them to our defense strategy and to present choices relevant to the NSC level. At our urging, Paul Wolfowitz approved combining the responses of Section II with the corresponding responses of Section III so the modifications and adaptations to defense strategy were logically linked to their resulting force posture impacts. This produced six "clusters" of issues, each written as a separate report. (A notebook of these reports for your reference will be delivered separately to your office.)

While the match-up is not precise, impacts on the various elements of strategy are sufficiently clear for presentation and decision. The Executive Summary (Tab I) has been designed to present, in the context of the various elements of strategy, issues for decision in some logical descending order of importance, starting with how to deal with changing Soviet military power in Europe. For each issue, one of three outcomes is presented:

- current strategy or policy is reaffirmed,
- options are presented for a "strategic choice,"
- the issue is flagged for further study at either DOD or NSC level.

The Executive Summary draws most heavily from three of the reports noted above (Dealing with changing Soviet Military Power in Europe, Adjustments to Forward Deployments and Burdensharing, Force Projection into the Third World), but also includes several issues from the other three reports -- basically all the issues the D/PCC thought were worthy of DC/NSC review. Although the schedule for high level review has become very compressed, it can fairly be said that the strategy review will come to a close only eight days later than our original May 9th deadline.

Objectives of DC Meeting:

Using the Executive Summary as the basic decision document, the DC will need to decide for each of the issues presented:

- are the "policies reaffirmed" appropriate?
- are issues with options fairly and accurately presented and worthy of NSC deliberations (or should they be decided by the DC)?
- are the issues identified for study appropriate -- can we wait for decisions?

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

3

It will also be important to force, to the extent possible, that clear preferences be stated from among the options as presented, without waffling. The PCC framed the options to encourage clear strategic direction to be presented to the Executive Departments, particularly Defense, recognizing that there is "no free lunch" in a period of declining resources.

Organization and Conduct of the Meeting:

We suggest the meeting be organized following the sequence outlined below which is a slight modification of the sequence in Executive Summary, Section V - Strategic Options and Recommendations. Sections I and II are good background, but time will preclude a discussion of them. The sequence below allows you to lead the group through the four major issues to be presented to the NSC. Then, as time allows, the DC should review and approve the "policies reaffirmed" and the "issues flagged for further study." After you present each issue, you should give Paul Wolfowitz, the committee chairman, the opportunity to add his comments by way of opening each issue for discussion.

Issues for Decision:

- (1) Dealing with Changing Soviet Military Power in Europe (Section III-A, pages 6-11):

This first issue is straightforward -- it focuses on the risk inherent in the imbalances of conventional capabilities in Europe. We have lived for years with a higher level of risk than desirable, balancing that risk with nuclear capabilities. Given that the size of Soviet conventional forces will probably be reduced in the years ahead, we have the opportunity to revisit the issue of risk:

Option 1 - accepts the current level of risk, noting that NATO's strategy and forces have provided a successful deterrent for several decades, and plans to ratchet our force posture downward following any Soviet/Pact reductions, applying the resource savings either to security threats outside Europe or reallocating them outside Defense. This option would imply a reduction if and as the Soviet threat abates. But, these reductions would not necessarily come from US forces in Europe; they could be taken in reinforcements in CONUS and elsewhere.

Option 2 - reduces the risk inherent in the imbalance by planning to maintain roughly our current force posture as the Soviets/Pact reduce, and even perhaps strengthening areas of competitive advantage, thus reducing reliance on nuclear escalation for effective deterrence.

Clearly the choices are not mutually exclusive, and in fact the Committee recognized that political pressures may ultimately force a compromise. A successful CFE may also allow both at some

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Chairman's Security Environment

Reading levels? Short-winded?

CFE

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

4

point in the future. Either choice would have implications for Alliance management generally and CFE negotiating strategy in particular. But we need to ensure that the DC understands that us choosing between Option 1 and Option 2, it need not and should not prejudice our negotiating position in CFE.

Regardless, clear strategic direction is needed now for planning within the Department, so you should resist any tendency by the DC to roll to the middle of the mattress.

(2) Force Projection and Presence in the Third World (Section III-C, pages 16-20):

We believe you should discuss this issue second (even though the report places it third) because of its close relationship to the first. Both issues draw heavily on how the mid-range security environment is viewed and what opportunities it might afford. Given the probable decline in the Soviet threat in Europe and their more benign intentions manifested (but still impressive capabilities oriented) toward the Third World; and given the rise of regional powers coupled with rapid proliferation of sophisticated weaponry, what should we do at the margin in our resource allocation:

- keep the current allocation (Option 1);
- allocate relatively more to Europe to reduce risk (Option 2); or
- allocate relatively more to our security efforts toward Third World threats (Option 3).

Current defense strategy toward the Third World, which still retains a strong counter-Soviet influence, is designed to operate at three levels: directly deterring Soviet expansion (Korea, Afghanistan); responding to crisis and regional instabilities (Persian Gulf), and maintaining a peacetime presence in areas of high interest (naval deployment, joint exercises). The review found some, but not major, deficiencies in our military capabilities to deter and intervene if needed. In particular, we would have difficulty in deploying and sustaining forces in austere environment without mobilizing the Reserves and/or short changing Europe. And, once again, an ineffective security assistance program was documented, except for a handful of cases; and it was clear that cuts in defense resources will soon curtail many of our other "presence" activities.

You should note also that these options actually define priorities to be used in a period of decrements, at least until something changes to free current resources (CFE) or provide more resources (real growth).

Once again the tendency here will be to maintain the status quo which accepts high risk in one area (Europe) and relative

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

① Qualitative needs in 3rd world v. Europe

② Non-Soviet threats - B. intervention when US has no force

Security Posture

~~SECRET~~

5

~~SECRET~~

ineffectiveness in another (Third World). Recognizing that there is no free lunch, strategic direction for the 1990's is nonetheless required.

You should also note the relationship to the first issue. The choice here of allocating relatively more to the Third World (Option 3), is incompatible with reducing the risk in Europe (Option 2 of first decision) absent a currently unforeseen growth in real resources for defense.

(3) Adjustments in Forward Deployments and Burdensharing
(Section III-B, pages 11-16):

Unlike the previous two issues that portrayed new choices offered by a changing security environment, this issue focuses more on how to cope with growing pressures and costs involved in the forward US presence. The review reaffirmed that forward presence of US forces remains vital to our defense strategy, but concluded that guidance was needed on how to proceed, particularly given the growing tension between waiting for negotiated adjustments and going ahead and making a virtue of necessity on our own.

Two options are offered for dealing with pressures for change in Europe and two for dealing with pressures on our global deployments. In Europe, Option 1 prescribes holding the line, against near-term withdrawals from Europe, primarily in support of the Alliance position in CFE, but also in view of the military risks involved. Option 2 would have us respond to Soviet/Pact reductions, unilaterally as opposed to waiting for negotiated reductions. This approach, which anticipates and attempts to manage change rather than waiting for it to be forced on us, would offer the better opportunity to realign burdens with our Allies; however, it may well encourage the Allies into a similar response, with significant political repercussions for the Alliance and our bilateral relations with key Allies. With respect to our global presence, Option 3 would cope by making modest adjustment (read reductions) to global deployments by some mix of consolidations, force substitutions, and alternative basing arrangements. Option 4, which is probably a throwaway in the Administration even though seriously espoused by some external to it, offers major unilateral reductions in some of our global deployments -- such as reducing forward deployed carriers from four to two, etc.

(4) Priorities for Allocation of Resources Between Current and Future Capabilities (Section IV-C, pages 21-23):

The last issue for decision seeks priorities for internal resource allocation within Defense. The options have been framed to correspond to different views of when the threat will peak in the future -- the near-term, the late 1990's, or after the turn of the century.

All options accept readiness as primary in all time periods, but

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

*Basic
assumptions
of op. act.*

*Justified
bases*

*Liberalized
of Allied
increases*

*Forward
deployments
where? What
interests?*

*if we
major
is in
displacement*

*reduct.
overseas
displacement*

*role of
Eur. pillar?
when is
header? Limits
on exercising*

*burden-sharing
shift conventions
rules*

*Shift
defense
resources
at margin*

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

6

differ as to when our forces should be modernized and whether to do that with "current generation" equipment or not. Option 1 emphasizes preparing for war in the near-term (sustainability over modernization); Option 2 would emphasize the late 1990's (modernization over sustainability and procurement over R&D); Option 3 accepts greater risk than the others for the near and mid-term and emphasizes significantly more advanced capabilities for the 21st century (e.g., ATF over F-15 upgrade).

Again, there will be a strong tendency to roll to the middle of the mattress. Some progress has been made in both sustainability and modernization over the past decade and resources will apparently continue downward; thus, strategic direction is needed to ensure internal resource allocations are coincident with the Administration's view of the future.

Remaining Time

As time allows, you should also guide the DC through a review of those elements of strategy that the review reaffirmed (Section V, pages 23-25):

- Deterrence: Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces
 - reaffirmed current strategy of relying on offensive force modernization; development of strategic defenses; and arms control to deter Soviet attack, enhance strategic stability, and constrain the threat (decisions already taken by NSC),
 - reaffirmed fundamental principles for arms control (page 23),
 - reaffirmed that NATO can and should continue to plan on theater nuclear weapons to play a central role in deterrent strategy, and should continue to deploy a mix of longer and shorter range systems in support of that strategy.
- Deterrence: General Purpose Forces
 - reaffirmed that forward presence of US forces remains a vital element of US strategy.
- Force Projection and Presence in the Third World
 - reaffirms current policy which is aimed at achieving a capability for the Persian Gulf/Middle East -- and by extension for any non-NATO contingency -- that is partially additive to that for NATO.
 - reaffirms policy of working in conjunction with

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

7

Allies, friends, and other interested parties in Third World situations and providing support to resistance movements when it is in our interest to do so.

Lastly, the Committee should approve the five additional studies called for in the review (pages 25-26).

- Requirements for nuclear deterrence in the future - Defense Department study.
- Response to changes in warning time in Europe - Defense Department study.
- A National Security Review on US political and economic interests in Asia and the Pacific region.
- A reexamination of Defense planning and programming guidance for military capabilities in the Middle East/Persian Gulf.
- A National Security Review on our approach to security assistance, including potential future relationships to policies for arms proliferation, technology transfer, and arms control.

 Bob Blackwill,  Condi Rice,  Linton Brooks, and  Don Mahley concur.

Attachments

Tab I	Executive Summary
Tab II	Agenda

Separate Notebook - separate reports from NSR-12

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

Document No. and Type	Subject/Title of Document	Date	Restriction	Class.
03b. Report	Re: Response to National Security Review #12; Review of US Defense Strategy Executive Summary (28 pp.)	5/13/89	(b)(1)	S

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records

Office: National Security Council

Series: H-Files

Subseries: NSC/DC Meetings Files

WHORM Cat.:

File Location: NSC/DC 025 - May 17, 1989 - NSC/DC Meeting on NSR-12 Section II and III/U.S. Defense Strategy for the 1990s and Force Posture Issues, Keywords: Defense Policy

Date Closed:	10/15/2009	OA/ID Number:	90010-004
FOIA/SYS Case #:	2005-1002-F	Appeal Case #:	
Re-review Case #:		Appeal Disposition:	
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:		Disposition Date:	
AR Case #:		MR Case #:	
AR Disposition:		MR Disposition:	
AR Disposition Date:		MR Disposition Date:	

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

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

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

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

DEPUTIES COMMITTEE MEETING
NATIONAL DEFENSE STRATEGY REVIEW

Tuesday, May 16, 1989
White House, Situation Room
2:00 p.m.

NSR-12, SECTIONS II AND III
U.S. DEFENSE STRATEGY FOR THE 1990's
AND FORCE POSTURE ISSUES

Revised Agenda

- I. Introductory Remarks by the Chairman
- II. Issues for Discussion:
 - A. Dealing with the Changing Soviet Military Power in Europe
 - B. Force Projection and Presence in the Third World
 - C. Adjustments in Forward Deployments and Burdensharing
 - D. Priorities for Allocation of Resources Between Current and Future Capabilities
- III. Elements of strategy and policies reaffirmed
- IV. Studies to be undertaken

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 13526

2010-1991-MR
MM 6/30/2016

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

~~SECRET/NO FORN DIS-~~
NSC/S PROFILE

RECORD ID: 8920472
RECEIVED: 12 MAY 89 10

TO: AGENCIES

FROM: HUGHES

DOC DATE: 12 MAY 89
SOURCE REF:

KEYWORDS: DEFENSE POLICY
NSR
DC

MILITARY POSTURE
AGENDA

PERSONS:

SUBJECT: NOTIFICATION OF DC MTG ON 16 MAY RE NSR 12 SECTION II & III /
DEFENSE STRATEGY FOR 1990 & FORCE POSTURE ISSUE

ACTION: DUE DATE: 26 MAY 90 STATUS: C

STAFF OFFICER: SNIDER

LOGREF: 8920547

FILES: IFM 0

NSCP: DC025

NSR0012

CODES:

D O C U M E N T D I S T R I B U T I O N

FOR ACTION

FOR CONCURRENCE

FOR INFO

DECLASSIFIED

White House Guidelines

E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006

By CAF NARA, Date 10/15/09

COMMENTS: _____

DISPATCHED BY _____ DATE _____ BY HAND W/ATTCH

OPENED BY: LF

CLOSED BY: AC

DOC 2 OF 4

~~SECRET/NO FORN DIS-~~

~~SECRET/NO FORN DIS~~
ACTION DATA SUMMARY REPORT

RECORD ID: 8920472

DOC ACTION OFFICER

CAO ASSIGNED ACTION REQUIRED

001 HUGHES	Z 89051210 FOR SIGNATURE
002	Z 89051216 DONLEY SGD MEMO TO AGENCIES
003 GATES	Z 89051514 ADD-ON / FOR INFORMATION
003	X 90052315 NOTED BY GATES W/ COMMENT
004 GATES	Z 89051616 ADD-ON / FOR INFORMATION
004	X 90052315 NOTED BY GATES

DECLASSIFIED
White House Guidelines
E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006
By CAP NARA, Date 10/15/09

~~SECRET/NO FORN DIS~~

**National Security Council
The White House**

PROOFED BY: ST.

LOG # 20472

URGENT NOT PROOFED: _____

SYSTEM PRS (NSC) INT

BYPASSED WW DESK: _____

DOCLOG ST. A/O _____

	SEQUENCE TO	HAS SEEN	DISPOSITION
Dep Exec	<u>1</u>	<u>MD</u>	<u>A</u>
Philip Hughes	_____	_____	_____
Bob Gates	_____	_____	_____
Brent Scowcroft	_____	_____	_____
Philip Hughes	_____	_____	_____
Situation Room	_____	_____	_____
West Wing Desk	<u>2</u>	<u>CM5/12</u>	<u>2 Dx/D</u>
NSC Secretariat	<u>3</u>	<u>LMSS/23/90</u>	<u>R/D</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

89 MAY 12 AIO: 07

A = Action	I = Information	D = Dispatch	R = Retain	N = No further Action
------------	-----------------	--------------	------------	-----------------------

cc: VP Sununu Other _____

Should be seen by: _____
(Date/Time)

COMMENTS

DC - May 16 2:00-3:00
Agenda

WHITE HOUSE

59 MAY 15 P1:34

ROOM

WASHFAX RECEIPT

THE WHITE HOUSE

C

5/15
1337

MESSAGE NO. 0625 CLASSIFICATION SECRET PAGES 1
FROM G. PHILIP HUGHES (NAME) (EXTENSION) (ROOM NUMBER)

MESSAGE DESCRIPTION AGENDA RE DC MTG RE NATL DEFENSE STRATEGY REVIEW
16 MAY LOG #: 20472

TO (AGENCY)	DELIVER TO:	DEPT/ROOM NO.	EXTENSION
<u>TREASURY</u>	<u>MS. EMILY L. WALKER</u>	<u>EXEC SEC</u>	

REMARKS ***PLEASE DELIVER ASAP ATTN: BILL LUPKIC***

DECLASSIFIED

White House Guidelines

E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006

By CAP NARA, Date 10/15/09

WHITE HOUSE

89 MAY 15 P1:34

SITUATION ROOM

URGENT

C

WASHFAX RECEIPT

THE WHITE HOUSE

~~SECRET~~

MESSAGE NO. 0625 CLASSIFICATION _____ PAGES 1

FROM G. PHILIP HUGHES 54
(NAME) (EXTENSION) (ROOM NUMBER)

MESSAGE DESCRIPTION AGENDA RE DC MTG RE NATL DEFENSE STRATEGY REVIEW
16 MAY LOG #: 20472

<u>TO (AGENCY)</u>	<u>DELIVER TO:</u>	<u>DEPT/ROOM NO.</u>	<u>EXTENSION</u>
TREASURY	MS. EMILY L. WALKER	EXEC SEC	

REMARKS ***PLEASE DELIVER ASAP ATTN: BILL LUFSIC ***

DECLASSIFIED
White House Guidelines
E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006
By CAF NARA, Date 10/15/09

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

20472

DEPUTIES COMMITTEE MEETING
NATIONAL DEFENSE STRATEGY REVIEW

Tuesday, May 16, 1989
White House Situation Room
2:00 p.m.

NSR-12, SECTIONS II AND III
U.S. DEFENSE STRATEGY FOR THE 1990s
AND FORCE POSTURE ISSUES

Agenda

- I. Introductory Remarks by the Chairman
- II. Key Trends and Uncertainties in the Security Environment
- III. Elements of Current U.S. Defense Strategy
- IV. Impact of a Changing Security Environment on U.S. Defense Strategy:
 - A. Dealing with the Changing Soviet Military Power in Europe
 - B. Adjustments in Forward Deployments and Burdensharing
 - C. Force Projection in the Third World
 - D. Competing Elements of U.S. Defense Strategy
- V. Recommendations for the NSC

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 13526

2010-1991-MR
MM 6/30/2016

~~SECRET~~

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL DISTRIBUTION RECORD

Log Number 20472
Date 12 May 89

DC025

Subject: DC MTG ON NSR-12 / 16 MAY

DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION:

☐ TOP SECRET

~~SECRET~~

☐ CONFIDENTIAL

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION:

	#CYS	Date	Time	Received/Signed for By:
THE VICE PRESIDENT	1			
THE SECRETARY OF STATE Exec. sec/Room 7241	1			
THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY Main Bldg/Room 3422				
THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE The Pentagon				
DIRECTOR, ACDA Room 5933/Dept. of State	1	5/15	10:30AM	Barbara Stewart
CHAIRMAN US START DELEGATION % ACDA, 5933 State				
CHAIRMAN US INF DELEGATION % ACDA, 5933 State				
DIRECTOR, CIA Langley, VA				
CHAIRMAN, JCS The Pentagon				
DIRECTOR, OMB Room 252 OEOB	1			
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO UNITED NATIONS Room 6333, State Dept.				
THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE 14th & Const. Ave. NW, Room 5851				
THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY GA257, Forrestal Bldg.				
DIRECTOR, AID Room 5942, Dept. of State				
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL Dept. of Justice, Room 5119				
DIRECTOR, OSTP Room 360, OEOB				
DIRECTOR, USIA 400 C Street, S.W., Room 800				
THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR 18th & E. Street N.W., Room 6151				
THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE Independence & 14th S.W., Room 200A				
UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE Room 209 Winder Bldg. 17 & F St. NW				
THE DIRECTOR, FEMA 1500 C Street, Room 828				
DIRECTOR, DMSPA Room 3E813, Pentagon				
THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION 400 7th Street S.W.				
MANAGER, NATL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (NCS), Room 4125 8th & SO Courthouse Rd., Arlington, VA				
THE SECRETARY OF HHS 200 Independence Avenue, NW, Room 615F				
THE SECRETARY OF HUD 451 7th Street SW, Room 10000				
THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 4181				

DECLASSIFIED

White House Guidelines

E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006

By CAP NARA, Date 10/15/09

DATE, TIME & SIGN THIS RECEIPT & RETURN TO: WEST WING DESK, SITUATION ROOM, WHITE HOUSE

Page 1 of Pages

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL DISTRIBUTION RECORD

Log Number 20487

Date 15 May 1989

DC025

Subject: DC MTG on NSR-12 19 May

DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION:

☐ TOP SECRET

~~SECRET~~

☐ CONFIDENTIAL

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION:

	#CYS	Date	Time	Received/Signed for By:
THE VICE PRESIDENT	1			
THE SECRETARY OF STATE Exec. sec/Room 7241	1			
THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY Main Bldg/Room 3422				
THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE The Pentagon				
DIRECTOR, ACDA Room 5933/Dept. of State	1	5/16/89	8:30am	Barbara Starr
CHAIRMAN US START DELEGATION % ACDA, 5933 State				
CHAIRMAN US INF DELEGATION % ACDA, 5933 State				
DIRECTOR, CIA Langley, VA				
CHAIRMAN, JCS The Pentagon				
DIRECTOR, OMB Room 252 OEOB	1			
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO UNITED NATIONS Room 6333, State Dept.				
THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE 14th & Const. Ave. NW, Room 5851				
THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY GA257, Forrestal Bldg.				
DIRECTOR, AID Room 5942, Dept. of State				
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL Dept. of Justice, Room 5119				
DIRECTOR, OSTP Room 360, OEOB				
DIRECTOR, USIA 400 C Street, S.W., Room 800				
THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR 18th & E. Street N.W., Room 6151				
THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE Independence & 14th S.W., Room 200A				
UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE Room 209 Winder Bldg. 17 & F St. NW				
THE DIRECTOR, FEMA 1500 C Street, Room 828				
DIRECTOR, DMSPA Room 3E813, Pentagon				
THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION 400 7th Street S.W.				
MANAGER, NATL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (NCS), Room 4125 8th & SO Courthouse Rd., Arlington, VA				
THE SECRETARY OF HHS 200 Independence Avenue, NW, Room 615F				
THE SECRETARY OF HUD 451 7th Street SW, Room 10000				
THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 4181				

DECLASSIFIED

White House Guidelines

E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006

By CAP NARA, Date 10/15/09

DATE, TIME & SIGN THIS RECEIPT & RETURN TO: WEST WING DESK, SITUATION ROOM, WHITE HOUSE

Page 1 of Pages

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL DISTRIBUTION RECORD

Log Number 20472
Date 12 May 89

Subject: DC MTG ON NSR-12 / 16 MAY

DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION:

☐ TOP SECRET

~~SECRET~~

☐ CONFIDENTIAL

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION:

THE VICE PRESIDENT

THE SECRETARY OF STATE
Exec. sec/Room 7241

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY
Main Bldg/Room 3422

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
The Pentagon

DIRECTOR, ACDA
Room 5933/Dept. of State

CHAIRMAN US START DELEGATION
% ACDA, 5933 State

CHAIRMAN US INF DELEGATION
% ACDA, 5933 State

DIRECTOR, CIA
Langley, VA

CHAIRMAN, JCS
The Pentagon

DIRECTOR, OMB
Room 252 OEOB

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO UNITED NATIONS
Room 6333, State Dept.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
14th & Const. Ave. NW, Room 5851

THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY
GA257, Forrestal Bldg.

DIRECTOR, AID
Room 5942, Dept. of State

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
Dept. of Justice, Room 5119

DIRECTOR, OSTP
Room 360, OEOB

DIRECTOR, USIA
400 C Street, S.W., Room 800

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
18th & E. Street N.W., Room 6151

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE
Independence & 14th S.W., Room 200A

UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE
Room 209 Winder Bldg. 17 & F St. NW

THE DIRECTOR, FEMA
1500 C Street, Room 828

DIRECTOR, DMSPA
Room 3E813, Pentagon

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
400 7th Street S.W.

MANAGER, NATL COMMUNICATIONS
SYSTEM (NCS), Room 4125
8th & SO Courthouse Rd., Arlington, VA

THE SECRETARY OF HHS
200 Independence Avenue, NW, Room 615F

THE SECRETARY OF HUD
451 7th Street SW, Room 10000

THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 4181

#CYS

Date

Time

Received/Signed for By:

1

15 May 89

0842

Jay Abram

1

5/12/89

2240

Alan Dant

1

5-15-89

10:05

Joe Mitchell

1

5/15/89

925

Mark Blum

DECLASSIFIED

White House Guidelines

E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006

By CAP NARA, Date 10/15/09

DATE, TIME & SIGN THIS RECEIPT & RETURN TO: WEST WING DESK, SITUATION ROOM, WHITE HOUSE

Page 1 of ____ Pages

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL DISTRIBUTION RECORD

Log Number 20472

Date 12 May 89

Subject: DC MTG ON NSR-12 / 16 MAY

DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION:

☐ TOP SECRET

~~SECRET~~

☐ CONFIDENTIAL

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION:

	#CYS	Date	Time	Received/Signed for By:
THE VICE PRESIDENT	1			
THE SECRETARY OF STATE Exec. sec/Room 7241	1	5/12/89	2310	Paul Boudreau
THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY Main Bldg/Room 3422				
THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE The Pentagon				
DIRECTOR, ACDA Room 5933/Dept. of State	1			
CHAIRMAN US START DELEGATION % ACDA, 5933 State				
CHAIRMAN US INF DELEGATION % ACDA, 5933 State				
DIRECTOR, CIA Langley, VA				
CHAIRMAN, JCS The Pentagon				
DIRECTOR, OMB Room 252 OEOB	1			
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO UNITED NATIONS Room 6333, State Dept.				
THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE 14th & Const. Ave. NW, Room 5851				
THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY GA257, Forrestal Bldg.				
DIRECTOR, AID Room 5942, Dept. of State				
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL Dept. of Justice, Room 5119				
DIRECTOR, OSTP Room 360, OEOB				
DIRECTOR, USIA 400 C Street, S.W., Room 800				
THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR 18th & E. Street N.W., Room 6151				
THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE Independence & 14th S.W., Room 200A				
UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE Room 209 Winder Bldg. 17 & F St. NW				
THE DIRECTOR, FEMA 1500 C Street, Room 828				
DIRECTOR, DMSPA Room 3E813, Pentagon				
THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION 400 7th Street S.W.				
MANAGER, NATL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (NCS), Room 4125 8th & SO Courthouse Rd., Arlington, VA				
THE SECRETARY OF HHS 200 Independence Avenue, NW, Room 615F				
THE SECRETARY OF HUD 451 7th Street SW, Room 10000				
THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 4181				

DECLASSIFIED

White House Guidelines

E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006

By CAP NARA, Date 10/15/09

DATE, TIME & SIGN THIS RECEIPT & RETURN TO: WEST WING DESK, SITUATION ROOM, WHITE HOUSE

Page 1 of ____ Pages

89 MAY 13 A 6: 26

WASHFAX RECEIPT

THE WHITE HOUSE

C

~~SECRET~~

MESSAGE NO. _____ CLASSIFICATION _____ PAGES 2

FROM G. PHILIP HUGHES _____
(NAME) (EXTENSION) (ROOM NUMBER)

MESSAGE DESCRIPTION DC MTG ON NSR-12 / 16 MAY

LOG #: 20472

<u>TO (AGENCY)</u>	<u>DELIVER TO:</u>	<u>DEPT/ROOM NO.</u>	<u>EXTENSION</u>
<u>STATE</u>	<u>J. STAPLETON ROY</u>	<u>EXEC SEC</u>	<u> </u>
<u>DOD</u>	<u>GOERGE COLE</u>	<u>EXEC SEC</u>	<u> </u>
<u>ENERGY</u>	<u>WILLIAM VITALE</u>	<u>EXEC SEC</u>	<u> </u>
<u>CIA</u>	<u>H. LAWRENCE SANDALL</u>	<u>EXEC SEC</u>	<u> </u>
<u>JCS</u>	<u>ANTHONY MANESS</u>	<u>EXEC ASST</u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

REMARKS _____

DECLASSIFIED

White House Guidelines

E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006

By CAF NARA, Date 10/15/09

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

20472

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

May 12, 1989

MEMORANDUM FOR

MR. CARNES LORD
Assistant to the Vice President
for National Security Affairs

MR. J. STAPLETON ROY
Executive Secretary
Department of State

COLONEL GEORGE P. COLE, JR.
Executive Secretary
Department of Defense

MR. WILLIAM V. VITALE
Executive Secretary
Department of Energy

MR. FRANK HODSOLL
Executive Associate Director
Office of Management and
Budget

MR. H. LAWRENCE SANDALL
Executive Secretary
Central Intelligence Agency

CAPTAIN ANTHONY MANESS
Executive Assistant to the
Chairman
Joint Chiefs of Staff

MS. BARBARA STARR
Acting Executive Secretary
Arms Control and Disarmament
Agency

SUBJECT: Deputies Committee Meeting on NSR-12, Sections II and
III, Tuesday, May 16, 1989, WHSR, 2:00 p.m. (S)

A meeting of the Deputies Committee will be held to discuss NSR-12, Sections II and III, (U.S. Defense Strategy for the 1990s and Force Posture Issues) on Tuesday, May 16, at 2:00 p.m., in the White House Situation Room. This meeting will focus on the implications of the changing security environment for U.S. Defense Strategy, and the resulting force structure issues. The paper for the meeting will be distributed by opening of business Monday morning by OSD to Principals of the Policy Coordinating Committee and the Deputies Committee. Attendance should be principals plus one. An Agenda for Tuesday's meeting is attached. (S)

Michael B. Donley
for G. Philip Hughes
Executive Secretary

Attachment
Tab A Agenda

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 13526

2010-1991-MR
MM 6/30/2016

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

20472

DEPUTIES COMMITTEE MEETING
NATIONAL DEFENSE STRATEGY REVIEW

Tuesday, May 16, 1989
White House Situation Room
2:00 p.m.

NSR-12, SECTIONS II AND III
U.S. DEFENSE STRATEGY FOR THE 1990s
AND FORCE POSTURE ISSUES

Agenda

- I. Introductory Remarks by the Chairman
- II. Key Trends and Uncertainties in the Security Environment
- III. Elements of Current U.S. Defense Strategy
- IV. Impact of a Changing Security Environment on U.S. Defense Strategy:
 - A. Dealing with the Changing Soviet Military Power in Europe
 - B. Adjustments in Forward Deployments and Burdensharing
 - C. Force Projection in the Third World
 - D. Competing Elements of U.S. Defense Strategy
- V. Recommendations for the NSC

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

DECLASSIFIED
PER E.O. 13526

2010-1991-MR

MM 6/30/2016

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

20472

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

May 11, 1989

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR G. PHILIP HUGHES

THROUGH: ARNOLD KANTER *AK*

FROM: DON M. SNIDER

SUBJECT: Deputies Committee Meeting to Discuss Sections II and III, NSR-12 (U.S. Defense Strategy for the 1990s and Force Posture Issues)

The subject meeting is scheduled for 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 16, in the White House Situation Room. This DC will focus on the third of at least four reports from NSR-12.

The notification memorandum for the May 16 meeting is attached at Tab I and the agenda at Tab A.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the memorandum at Tab I.

Approve MB

Disapprove _____

Attachments

Tab I Memo to Executive Secretaries
Tab A Agenda

1986
DECLASSIFIED

White House Guidelines

E.O. 12958, SEC 3.4 (B) September 11, 2006

By CAF NARA, Date 10/5/09

~~SECRET~~

Declassify on: OADR

~~SECRET~~