

April 12, 1967

**Intelligence Note from Thomas L. Hughes to the
Acting Secretary, 'Soviets Continue to Denounce
American Interpretation of Nonproliferation Treaty'**

Citation:

"Intelligence Note from Thomas L. Hughes to the Acting Secretary, 'Soviets Continue to Denounce American Interpretation of Nonproliferation Treaty'", April 12, 1967, Wilson Center Digital Archive, RG 59, Entry UD-UP 141, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Reports Coordination and Review Staff, Intelligence Reports, 1961, 1963-67, box 2, IN-220-319-1967; 26B. Contributed by William Burr, National Security Archive.
<https://digitalarchive.umd.edu/document/134072>

Summary:

The Soviets were insisting that article III on safeguards mention only the IAEA but not the European Atomic Energy Community [EURATOM], even though West Germany and other EURATOM members resisted the idea of IAEA inspections in Western Europe. It would take quite a few months before the Article III wording was to everyone's satisfaction, but the Soviets also objected to US interpretations of the proposed Article II which would permit a nuclear-armed, united Western Europe.

Credits:

This document was made possible with support from Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY)

Original Language:

English

Contents:

Original Scan

SECRET/NO FOREIGN DISSEM/LIMDIS

*Intelligence
Note* - 283

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DIRECTOR OF INTELLIGENCE AND RESEARCH

April 12, 1967

To : The Acting Secretary
Through: S/S
From : INR - Thomas L. Hughes *TLH*

Subject: Soviets Continue to Denounce American Interpretation
of Nonproliferation Treaty

Soviet commentators continue to deplore the American interpretation of Articles I and II of the draft on nonproliferation, but they remain vague as to the nature of the American interpretation and as to its consequences for the treaty.

Reaction to Finney Story: The Soviet commentaries have been in reaction to John Finney's article in the March 30 New York Times. The first was by Sergei Zykov in Izvestiya on April 1, and took the line that any interpretation which would allow for West German participation in a European nuclear force "...is a clear violation of the meaning and aims of the contemplated treaty." His argument was echoed in further commentaries in Pravda and Izvestiya, deploring what the Soviets called the American "guarantee" to Bonn to this effect. But it remained for an April 9 Moscow broadcast to make clear that the interpretation at issue involved the question of establishing a European nuclear force in the event of European political integration. Even so, the Soviet commentator did not explain the rationale that a European federation would be the successor state to a present nuclear power.

SECRET/NO FOREIGN DISSEM/LIMDIS

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

SECRET/NO FOREIGN DISSEM/LIMDIS

- 2 -

Soviet Intentions. The commentaries make a public record of Moscow's opposition to interpretations of Articles I and II which had been expressed in private earlier by the Soviet delegation in Geneva and by Gromyko in Moscow. In publishing these commentaries, Moscow evidently intended to warn the US that any official public statement of the Western interpretation of the articles would not go unchallenged. But beyond that, neither the public commentaries nor the private statements make clear what the consequences of contradictory Western and Soviet interpretations of the treaty may be. The Soviets doubtless regard the prospect of a European federation as extremely remote, and hence of little practical importance. Nevertheless, as the Soviets publicly dig in with charges that the US has offered to guarantee a loophole for the Germans, they may find it increasingly embarrassing to conclude and ratify an agreement.

SECRET/NO FOREIGN DISSEM/LIMDIS