

course, other elements in the situation which might counterbalance this pessimism. In particular, it would seem to me that even if one now accepts such limitations on international atomic energy activities, there might still be good reasons for assigning a major role to the Agency in this limited field.

I think that what really should be taken from Breithut's remarks is simply the fact that, whatever the considerations involved, there is not much steam behind U.S. participation in the Agency at the moment. I doubt that merely talking with U.S. officials would generate any significant additional amount of steam. This situation may, of course, change, especially when the new U.S. member of the Agency's Board of Governors is appointed. Breithut hinted that the selection of the new U.S. representative had already been made, but he was obviously not prepared to divulge the name. I rather gathered from the way Breithut talked that the new U.S. Governor was unlikely to be a ball of fire (or an atomic "fireball").

All of this is rather discouraging, but I thought it worth reporting since it pretty well confirms the impression which Harry Williamson and I (and I am sure Max) have had about the current U.S. approach to the affairs of the Agency.

The only optimistic note sounded by Breithut was on the subject of safeguards. On this matter he felt that the Ottawa meeting³⁵ had been extremely useful, and would be helpful here in getting the AEC to make some move. Breithut felt that the chances of progress on this particular subject within the near future were reasonably good. Such an advance by itself would not, however, give enough substance to the Agency to overcome the malaise which is worrying Max.

In brief, it seems to me that consultations with the U.S. would be pretty unproductive unless, of course, we had previously worked up plans for some new initiative which would appeal to the U.S. authorities (and in which we ourselves would be doing something new and significant). I do not think that any such constructive initiative is likely to emerge in the course of a meeting with the U.S. officials in their present state of mind. I think that it would have to be prepared well in advance. If we had some constructive ideas, consultation with the U.S. could be helpful to the Agency. If we had no such constructive thoughts, talk with U.S. officials over the next several months would have little value, since the U.S. side would almost certainly be barren of ideas.

In the unlikely event that we learn of any improvement in U.S. thinking about the future of the Agency, we shall, of course, let you know. Meantime, I fear that any report we might make in response to a formal request from you would hold out little promise of fruitful results from early consultations with the United States.

If, of course, Max is going to be in Ottawa anyway, I would hope that he would find it possible to come to Washington for talks about the Agency. He should not, however, expect too much from such talks unless some unexpected change occurs here in the interim.

I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter along to Max Wershof in Geneva.

Regards,
Yours sincerely,
A.E. RITCHIE

³⁵ Voir/See Document 567.