

Prime Minister

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

I suspect that there will be greatly increased anti-nuclear agitation after the promised showing of the nuclear war film in this country.

This is a long shot, but I wonder whether it might not be worthwhile suggesting again, as the West did in 1946, the internationalisation of all nuclear energy?

This is still one simple and obvious way that the risk of nuclear war could seriously be diminished. The Acheson-Lilienthal plan of 1945/46 might just have been accepted by Stalin had not the US in 1946 written into the scheme a provision whereby, in cases in which there was a breach of the arrangement, the veto in the Security Council would not apply to the 'condign' punishment of an offending state.

Probably, however, Stalin would never have accepted a state of affairs in which the USSR would have had to live with a world in which the US had residual knowledge of how to split the atom, and they did not. But now? I just wonder.

Could someone look into the idea? It might mean major sacrifices by all of us - France above all - who had invested heavily in "atoms for peace". But it would have great benefits. If the Russians were to turn it down there would be a propaganda advantage to us.

Even if nothing were to come of any such proposal (and the odds must be that it would not) it might be helpful to you politically to propose such an idea; perhaps especially so with the US, if you were to couch the proposal in terms to recall Truman and Acheson-Lilienthal. Am I being too cynical? (Lord Salisbury in his last phase?) *As well as naive?*

Hugh Thomas

Lord Thomas.

The Rt. Hon. Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister.

22nd November 1983.

Box

*Return to
Cockburn House
not*

Letter to F/C.O.

A.S.C. 8/12.