REPRODUCED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIV	ES '	, ,		
	DECLASSIFIED Authority MAD 852 931			·.
n fa	CULTARE DATE CLASSING			
(2	DEPARTMI Memorandum	This documen Copy No of Conversation	of consists of <u>5</u> page	9 •
	SECURITY, INI	FORMATION	DATE: March 6, 1953	
SUBJECT:	Use of United Kingdom Base United Kingdom on the N	es and Consultation w Use of Atomic Weapons	th the	
PARTICIPANTS:	United Kingdom Foreign Minister Eden Ambassador Sir Roger Mal Sir Pierson Dixon		y of State Dulles eson	1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1997 - 19
COPIES TO:	S/AE	Ch Retain class'n Ch	SSIFICATION REVIEW hange/classify to concurrence of Date: G - 2A.99	<i>う</i> // ,
<u></u> .	Speaking to the general pr	oblem of atomic weap	ons, Secretary Dulles	(v)
said	we should not allow a tabo	· .	· · · · ·	01.
view	it was wrong to attach the	stigma of immoralit	y to any particular	ľ
weapo	on. Doubtless the first wi	ld animal that was k	illed by man armed	W
. with	whatever weapon, be it clu	b or stone, felt that	t man had taken	6
unfai	ir advantage of it. One co	ould not stop inventi-	veness nor the	E 5 9.
impro	ovement of weapons. The pr	oblem was how to dea	l with these improve-	N/
ment	s and how to use them if ne	ecessary. Immorality	attached to the	```
laund	ching of aggressive war, no	ot to the means that :	might be used for	b
wa gil	ng it. As to the general p	problem of casus bell	i, war would occur	•
whet	her the United States dropp	ped an atomic bomb on	Moscow or ten block	
(bust	ers. Mr. Dulles felt that	the problem to be co	nsidered was whether	
the	United States and the Unite	ed Kingdom should con	sult together on the	

DECLASSIFIED 2.0. 14965, 9ec. 8.6 nn0 951004

Date_

STIP

31100

1

By.

SFCI



question of going to war or not, rather than on the question of the use of atomic weapons as such.

Foreign Minister Eden said that as regards the use of United Kingdom bases it was recognized that the commitment for prior agreement should be in general terms without singling out atomic weapons. He recalled the pertinent text of the Truman-Churchill communique of January 9, 1952, which dealt with this point.

/The cited language is as follows:

"Under arrangements made for the common defense, the United States has the use of certain bases in the United Kingdom. We reaffirm the understanding that the use of these bases in an emergency would be a matter for joint decision by His Majesty's Government and the United States Government in the light of the circumstances prevailing at the time."7

<u>Mr. Eden</u> stated that what the United Kingdom wanted on this aspect of the matter was simply a reaffirmation by the new Administration of the understanding quoted above. He hoped that the President and the Secretary would consider whether it might be possible to give this reassurance publicly. The United Kingdom Government attached great importance to having this assurance reaffirmed by the new Administration. (<u>Mr. Dulles</u> inquired of Mr. Arneson whether it would be necessary to take this point with the National Security Council. <u>Mr. Arneson</u> responded that this position had already received the concurrence of the Department of Defense,



REPRODUCED AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES Authority NND852931 Unite 6/30/05 TOP SECRET SECURITY INFORMATION

the other agency most vitally concerned, and that the Secretary could give his agreement to the insertion of this language without further checking.) <u>Mr. Dulles</u> stated that he was prepared to agree to have language along the lines quoted inserted in the communique, and that the text as contained in the Truman-Churchill communique seemed about right to him. Minor drafting changes would be desirable, principally to substitute "confirm" for "reaffirm." This being agreeable to Mr. Eden, it was left that Mr. Arneson should prepare the draft language to be inserted in the communique which it was expected would be issued the following day.

<u>Mr. Eden</u> said that the other matter which the Prime Minister had asked him to take up was the question whether President Eisenhower would be prepared to give Prime Minister Churchill a private, personal assurance--as Truman had done with Attlee and Churchill--that the President would not decide on the use of atomic weapons without consultation with the United Kingdom. Mr. Eden stressed that the United Kingdom did not want any publicity on this assurance, if given, nor would they intend that this assurance should, constitute a power of veto by the United The United Kingdom considered itself in a very exposed position Kingdom. in the event of war and had a vital concern about possible use of atomic Ambassador Makins recalled that under the Quebec Agreement weapons. the United Kingdom had a veto on the use of atomic weapons -- this veto had been abrogated by subsequent negotiations, namely those leading to the modus vivendi of January 7, 1948. The personal assurances given by





Mr. Truman to Attlee in 1950 and Churchill in 1952 had been most helpful. The United Kingdom hoped that such private assurances could again be given by President Eisenhower. Mr. Dulles asked Mr. Arneson what we knew about these prior personal commitments. Mr. Arneson stated that while no such assurances had been officially given, it was understood that Truman had talked privately with Mr. Attlee about his own personal intention to consult with him in the event a decision to use atomic weapons had to be taken. The official governmental position on this matter was as reflected in the joint communique issued on December 8, 1950 and the joint communique of the Truman-Churchill talks dated January 9, 1952. The private assurances given Attlee by Truman could not be considered binding on the United States Government, either at the time or subsequently. At most, such assurances were personal in nature. Mr. Eden agreed that there was no official governmental commitment involved in the private assurances referred to and the United Kingdom was not asking for a governmental assurance. What they did hope for was a personal and private commitment from President Eisenhower to Prime Minister Churchill that the President would consult with the Prime Minister prior to taking a decision to use atomic weapons.

<u>Mr. Dulles</u> said that the United States looked upon the United Kingdom as its major ally and would hope for its full support in the event of war. The United States clearly did not want to take any action which would endanger the safety of the United Kingdom. To the extent that time and circumstances permitted, the United States would of course wish



S/AE:RGArne

DECLASSIFIED Authority <u>MAD 852 931</u> R. MARA Drue <u>6/30/05</u> TOP SECURITY INFORMATION -5-

to consult with the United Kingdom on situations that may arise which might lead to general war. We would also want to consult together as to the means best calculated to deal with the situation. He felt that this was the more useful approach to adopt. As to the question of a personal commitment from the President, this of course was a matter which could be decided only by the President himself. Mr. Dulles undertook to bring the matter to the President's attention noting that Mr. Eden intended to raise this point with the President on Monday, March 9. In commenting on the nature of the requested personal assurance, Mr. Dulles said it was obvious that President Eisenhower, if he chose to give such assurance to Prime Minister Churchill, could give it only for himself and to Churchill personally. Such assurances clearly could not be binding on others. Mr. Eden commented that this was indeed so. He felt certain, however, that should a new Prime Minister come into office in the United Kingdom he too would be most anxious to have such assurance.

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

(After the meeting broke up, Mr. Arneson prepared the draft language to be incorporated in the communique on the question of the use of United Kingdom bases and also a memorandum for the President from the Secretary suggesting the position that should be taken on the question of giving a personal assurance to Churchill. After some editing, this memorandum was signed by Secretary Dulles and dispatched to the White House prior to the Secretary's departure for the General Assembly in New York Saturday afternoon, March 7, 1953.)



National Security Archive,

Suite 701, Gelman Library, The George Washington University, 2130 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C., 20037, Phone: 202/994-7000, Fax: 202/994-7005, nsarchiv@gwu.edu