

(d) the advent of the hydrogen bomb makes an undisclosed and virtually undiscoverable atomic molehill into a thermonuclear mountain in terms of destructive power;

(e) some authorities now believe that it may be possible to dispense with the uranium-plutonium detonator of an "H-bomb" — and, as the lighter elements are relatively plentiful and require less elaborate processing, the control problem may be made still more difficult;

(f) a certain amount of mutual trust is a prerequisite of disarmament — and it does not exist;

(g) not only its concept of national sovereignty but the very foundations of the Soviet State would be so deeply undermined by the acceptance of the type of international control organization proposed by the Western Powers that it is hardly conceivable their leaders would ever agree to it.

55. Without attempting to provide answers to questions that are perhaps unanswerable, it may be useful to attempt to clear some of the ground in preparation for any serious "new look" at disarmament that may be undertaken, either in conjunction with Mr. Stassen's re-examination of the problem, or separately.

56. Disarmament negotiations during the past nine years have invariably come to a standstill on the question of control. If, as some experts say, there is no way of ensuring the complete elimination of existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons by any method of control, a way around the control problem may be sought in three directions:

(a) in place of a comprehensive disarmament programme embracing all aspects of the question, certain fields might be isolated. As a short-cut of this type, the USSR has been harping for years on a series of propaganda themes isolating the atomic side of the problem ("ban the bomb", "ban the use of the bomb", and now "destroy atomic stockpiles");

(b) on our side, for logical strategic reasons the inverse of this proposition might be suggested; that an attempt be made to control conventional armed forces and armaments, and in particular all means of delivering atomic weapons, while accepting the continuation of nuclear and thermonuclear stockpiles on both sides at or near the point of saturation;

(c) both sides have also proposed, in connection with large programmes, a freeze of armed forces and armaments as a first step on the road towards disarmament.

57. Of these three propositions, only the third may be feasible. The first has been repeatedly rejected by the Western Powers for the same strategic reasons as the second is not likely to interest the Soviet Union. The atomic and conventional sides of the problem are now inseparable. A freeze might have real attractions for the USSR, particularly if, as they have proposed in London, it were subject to more or less nominal control. But unless such a scheme were implemented as part of a comprehensive programme, it could lull Western public opinion into a quite unreal sense of security that could be more dangerous than the present stalemate.

58. While it might be desirable to examine possible short-cuts from a technical standpoint, it might be more fruitful to consider what reduction might be acceptable in the safeguards to be applied to the whole field of disarmament. If control is the barrier, and we cannot get around it by reducing the categories to be controlled, we might examine once again whether we must insist on such stringent control measures as in the past. For we can now bring to the re-examination the realization that since we do not have, and cannot hope to have, absolute security, or anything approaching it, we are compelled to consider whether relatively greater security might be attainable through disarmament. Could we, in short, have less control rather than less to control? And could adjustments be made in the timetable for the establishment and gradual build-up of the control organization in such a way as to provide a better balance of risks and safeguards on both sides at each stage?