



1912
100

Dec. 15 1983

f.a. on
Anglo-U.S. relations.

A.S.C. $\frac{4}{12}$

Dear Prime Minister,

I much enjoyed dinner yesterday. I learned a lot, particularly about the Lebanon.

I did think though, one part of our conversation disturbing. That related to yr. current view of the U.S.

I saw, more clearly than before, how blunderingly the U.S. behaved in the way that they misled you over Grenada.

Still it did occur to me that there is danger of in drawing up a general indictment of the U.S. administration on the basis of that event: unless there is some alternative general underpinning of our foreign policy with which you wish to experiment.

De Gaulle used his last-minute consultancy (personally, by Acheson) by Kennedy over the missile crisis in Cuba in 1962 as one of the props of his go-it-alone nuclear policy in 1963, expressed in his icy rejection of the test partial test ban treaty in the course of that year.

But although Grenada could I suppose, be made the pretext, or occasion, for a new look at 'European defence collaboration', I think you have ruled that out, for the reasons you explained.

Indeed, no effective collaboration could work unless it were with the blessing of the U.S., as was the case with the old European Defence Community of 1950-55. I think that is right.

So I cannot feel there is any real alternative (I anyway I wd. prefer it) to a considered attempt to mend our fences with the U.S. In this respect, Reagan has, it seems to me, talked grandiosely but, apart from Grenada, done little (Even the new relations with Israel is really, surely, the formalisation of an old friendship). I have the impression that it is tactics (use of naval power instead of a substantial landing of infantry) that divides us in the Lebanon.

In addition, it does look as if Reagan will be with us as president till 1989, if he survives. A democratic president if elected next year, wd. presumably have more characteristics with which we wd. disagree

So, all things considered, surely there is a strong case for, after Christmas, trying to make a new start in our relations with the U.S. You have such a fine reputation over there. Those of us who look to you to provide us with the kind of direction that de Gaulle gave France have always insisted pointed out that your strength, in comparison with the general is that you do accept the essential part that the US has had since 1945. All US officials & politicians whom I meet always except you from their general moans about European defeatism. You can surely rebuild on the basis of those facts. How that is to be done is a matter of tactics, though I shd. have thought that a suggestion that the Alliance might develop regular consultation on out-of-NATO-area problems might be a beginning (or a sub-~~title~~ of the Alliance).

Thank you ^{again} very much indeed for dinner

Yours ever

Angus.