

Authority <u>EO 12958</u>.

By <u>TW</u> NARA Date8-30

cpariment of State

TELEGRAM

 $\circ \bar{\omega}$

CIT

TOP SECRET

Ø75:

PAGE 01 BONN 00714 231613Z

50

ACTION SS#45

INFO: OCT-01 /046 W

RE 231545Z JAN 70:

FM AMEMBASSY BONN

TO SECSTATE: WASHDC 6733

THOUPES ELCIR ELT BONNE714

EXDIS

SUBJECT: US#FRGUNUCLEAR CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS:

REF: STATE 196674, BONN: 15625

I. THE AMBASSADOR. ACCOMPANIED BY THE DCM. CALLED ON SCHMOOT JANUARY 21. THE AMBASSADOR DOD NOT ASK SCHMOOT DORECTLY WHETHER HE HAD MENTIONED THE USEFRG ARRANGEMENTS TO HEALEY. BUT INSTEAD ASKED HIM WHETHER THE FROM WANTED THE BILATERAL ARRANGEMENT KEPT STRICTLY BETWEEN THE USEAND THE FRG. SCHMOOT MADE NO REFERENCE, TO HES CONVERSATION WITH HEALEY. BUT FULLY AGREED THAT KNOWLEDGE OF THE ARRANGEMENT SHOULD REMAIN STRUCTLY US AND GERMANY ONLY. IT WAS EVIDENT THAT SCHMOOT GOT THE POINT SCHMOOT ALSO GONFIRMED THAT KNOWLEDGE OF THE BILATERAL ARRANGEMENTS SHOULD BE CONFINED TO A VERY SMALL CIRCLETOF TOP OFFICIALS IN EACH GONERNMENT AND THAT THE AGREEMENT REMAINED VALUE FOR THE BRANDT GOVERNMENT AND

2% IN: A SEPARATE CONVERSATION BETWEEN SAHM, OF THE CHANCELLOR S:
OFFICE: AND: THE DOME, SAHMEREMEARED: THAT HELDS ACCOMERTY TO THE OPENSE ARRANGMENT. (THIS IS UNDERSTANDABLE STNCE SAHMETS: THE TOP DEFENSE MAN! IN THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE INTHE NEW GOVERNMENT.) SAHMES ALD THAT HE WAS AWARE OF WHAT IS CALLED IN THE GERMAN GOVERNMENT.
"SCHMIDT'S INDISCRETION." SAHMESAID THAT THE EXPLANATION WAS THAT SCHMIDT'S INDISCRETION. SAHMESAID THAT THE EXPLANATION WAS THAT SCHMIDT HAD BEEN IN OFFICE ONLY THREE DAYS BEFORE MEETING HEALEY. HE HAD BEEN BRIEFED ON ALL THE MOST VITAL DEFENSE MATTERS:
DURING THOSE THREE DAYS, INCLUDING THE USEFRG CONSULTATION ARRANGE.
MENT. HE HAD. HOWEVER, RECEIVED ONLY A QUICK BRIEFING, AND THE IMPORTANT ASPECT OF KEEPING KNOWLEDGE OF THE ARRANGEMENT STRICTLY
BILATERAL HADNOT BEEN CLEAR IN SCHMIDT'S MIND. AS FURTHER BACK.

NOT TO BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT THE SECRETARY



t of State

TELEGRAM

TOPPSECRET

PAGE 02 BONN 00714 2316432

GROUNDISCHMEDT SAIDETHAT HEALEY HADEREFERRED TO THE HUSSERG CONSULTATION ASSUDETIFICATION FOR A SIMILARLARRANGEMENTS FOR THE BRITISH BUCCANEERS BEING INTRODUCED INSGERMANY. ACTUALLY, SAHMI FELT, IT WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN NECESSARY FOR SOME JUSTIFICATION COULD HAVE REFERRED TO THE USFREG ARRANGEMENT SOME JUSTIFICATION COULD HAVE BEEN GIVEN FOR A JUSTIFICATION ARRANGEMENT. SUGH ASSITHE POSSIBILITY LADMITTEDLY THEORETICALD THAT OTHER COUNTRIES LIKE THE FRENCH MEGHT CONCEIVABLY SOMEDRY INTRODUCE INDERENDENT

3. SAHM: ALSOLOONFIRMEDITHATTTHE FROMMOST STRONGLY DESTRES: TO KEEP KNOWLEDGE OF THE ARRANGEMENT AS IS I I E HE HURELY US AND FROM HE WONDERED HOWEVER. WHETHER FOR REASONS OF GERMAN RELATIONS WITHE THE UNITED KINGDOM IT MEGHT NOT BELINECESSARY FOR THE US AND FROM TO FIND SOME MUTUALLY AGREED WAY TO INFORM THE BRITISH NOW THAT THEY HAVE KNOWLEDGE OF IT. THE DOMMMADE NOU COMMENT ON THUS LAST POINT, ASSUMING THAT WASHINGTON MIGHT HAVE RESERVATIONS ON SAHMAS SUGGESTION.

4. REQUEST GUIDANCE ON THUS LAST PRODUT.

NOT TO BE REPRODUC WITHOUT THE SAURHORIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY