1) Nothing new in U.S. position.
Question as to whether we closer on solution Soviet will study our remarks.

2) Don't feel U.S. has fully reacted to compromise proposal set out by Soviet side.

3) Points out that we have put heavy emphasis on resolution of new type issue. But now American side is acting as if nothing had happened on this issue.

4) Naive to feel yet a desire to speed up process of reaching a solution.

5) F.D.R. wants to review main points of Soviet position:
   a) Would adopt U.S. new type position on condition that U.S. accept Soviet position on
      a) C.H. (b). b) C.E. (b).
6) Also moved toward U.S. position on number of workers in ICBM's + SLBM's.

7) Entitled to expect U.S. to be forthcoming on entire range of EM issue.

(a) Stressed Nuclear - a nuclear issue.
(b) No discussion on a bomber - stressed linkage on this issue on fractionation of our agra. in 20 per bomber.

8) Soviets willing to consider a co-efficient formula. i.e.,

21-40 worker count or 2
41-60 worker count or 3.

against The 1320 aggregate.

[What about our average?]

9) Cruise missile range.

Repeats that oedometer range is only way to compute or define range.

(Ref to lower + upper limit?)
There would be 3 limit B. 6000 km on that missile. There would be no limit on 2500 AICM.

10. All provisions for cruise missile should be included in treaty.

11. Dismantling
   Dec. 30, 1980 is the only starting point.
   Can't accept another starting date. June 30, 1981 only gives the Soviets 6 mos.

12. Backfire