(2).

10 DOWNING STREET

Prime Minister

From Laurens Van der Post.

I think he makes some good points which we should try to get over to American opinion.

A.J.C. 5/4.

Please see Page attached

Prime Minister

I have acknowledged. 24 Chelsea Gardens,
S.W.3.
9.6.14
April 5.

Margaret Dear: Hey I put these suggestions for your address to-morrow which I know have been implied in all you have said but should now be brought to the fore and underscored because they are of ultimate importance and: is the "ethical basis" on which the Americans whether they think it or not are impaled and compelled to chose its rather than the Argentinians act not look for a compromise that would be appeasement.

Some small but important-good news of potential "great importance" to speak on Thursday.

yours ever,
Jacs.

It was right to start with the fundamental of British sovereignty and the right of British subjects to self-determination in your approach to the Falkland Islands crisis and you have done it superbly, but I believe that in the days to come, this is not going to be enough. The signs are already there that this so-called gut patriotism displayed by the Opposition last Saturday, is going to be full of second thoughts not only because they are not "gut patriots" but because they are extremely plausible on these occasions and are going more and more to tell the public that it is now too late to look at the issue this way and that the cost in human life and in money is going to be too great to correct an error which should never have been made: the cost of life, particularly of the Falkland Islanders, have now forfeited the price of sovereignty. I think all these stories of a bloodbath and the destruction of Port Stanley is nonsense. Even I, with my experience of war, can think of various ways of overcoming resistance on islands with so vast a coastline without a bloodbath and I would certainly not be so stupid as to start with an attack on Port Stanley. In fact, I would leave Port Stanley as a suitable site for ultimate surrender and fight my battles elsewhere once I have cut off the islands from the mainland. The real battle, I fear, is not only this half-baked counting of cost but also the battle of diplomacy that must now be taking place. In this battle there is one supreme value which surpasses even that of our sovereignty which is at stake and that is that the whole of the policy of the Western Alliance is based on the principle that naked aggression will not be allowed and wherever it occurs, it will be resisted and overcome. I think this aspect must be very clearly brought to the front and emphasised to Parliament because it is the one principle for which the cost now in life and money, however high, will be set against the cost we will one day have to pay if this principle is allowed to go by default. It is essential to make it clear that on this there can be no compromise whatsoever and that no diplomacy can have any effect until this is accepted and acted upon by the Argentinians. The very clear and comprehensive under-scoring of this principle by you is particularly important in relation to the U.S.

The U.S. is on the same ethical hook of policy of the Western Alliance as we ourselves and nothing must be allowed as a plausible excuse for getting off it. They cannot maintain that aggression must be resisted with all we have got even if necessary with nuclear arms in Western Europe and the frontiers of Poland if it is condoned in the South Atlantic off the coast of Argentina. We know, as you rightly said last night, from the 30s how the greatest world war in history grew from small beginnings of appeasement. To appease aggression and evil is to connive a greater aggression and evil later on. I was dismayed by Reagan's performance last night and his lame statement that both these countries are our friends and not a word about agression. I know the answer will be that he was merely being diplomatic: this is a kindergarten and feeble concept of what diplomacy is about. The 'achilles heel' of American so-called diplomacy is that in their anxieties about Communist penetration of the Americas, they are sucking-up to all sorts of evil dictatorships in that world including this monstrous fascist junter in the Argentine. I have just come from America and the criticism of the

Reagan administration on this matter is spread far and wide over the country from the normally liberal East Coast to the deeply orthodox and conventional Middle West. If we make the universality of our determination of the free West to create a world free from agression, I am certain American public opinion will compel the Reagan administration to abandon double standards and expediency and stand fast with us on principle. But it is important that not only they should know it, but that the British public should instinctively be entirely on your side and against the Argentinians, in spite of all that has happened, and should know that in dealing with the Falkland Islands issue, we are engaged in the long sustained process ahead of us in preventing greater aggression in Europe. If we fail to deal with the fascist Argentine, the Russians will be even more encouraged than they are already to nibble away with more and more acts of aggression in what is left of a free world. I would beg you, please call on all your sense of history to put this with clarity and force to Parliament tomorrow.

Yours ever,

PS I also think that in justifying the Government's reading of the Argentine situation, it is important to stress that it is almost impossible to foresee, particularly at such long distances, what I call "Pearl Harbour" afflictions in the minds of fascist governments. I think these by-stories as far as possible want to be laid to rest immediately or if not laid to rest, put in perspective. Good old fashioned words of infamy and related adjectives should be used and not suppressed for reasons of tact or diplomacy. There is no substitute for the right word at the right time and place and what is needed to rally us all is what is instinctive in our values and natural honour, concepts of fairness and outrage which have been provoked.

* * * *

Please forgive any errors in construction and typing because this hasbeen done in great haste but I believe the main drift is clear and from what you said on television last night coincides with yours.