

file 6

MEMORANDUM

FROM: Leo Szilard

DATE: June 14, 1962

TO: Maya Pines

(1) On Page 1, please write "convince" instead of persuaded. Also I patented the principles of chain reactions not in 1939 but in 1934. I suggest you cross out "having patented the principles of the chain reactions".

(2) On page 2 omit the expression "would reduce tension". The objective which I propose are not aimed at reducing tensions. Instead of "would reduce tension" you might write: "would open the door to an agreement on arms limitations and perhaps general disarmament."

(3) On page 3 - you write " an eventually run its own candidates. There is no intention of running our own candidates rather what the Lobby hopes to do is to find good men throughout the country who are concerned about the drift towards war and who could get elected if they receive the nomination of their Party. The Lobby would seek to persuade such men to seek the nomination of their Party and would help them to get it by assuring them in advance of adequate campaign funds.

(4) Our major immediate objective is not a declaration by the United States, but rather the adoption of the policy by the United States of not to bomb Russian bases or cities unless, etc.

(5) It is not my view that an all-out arms race would necessarily lead ~~to~~^a war, that neither America nor Russia wanted. The danger of such a war arises rather out of the absence of a political settlement, but if we now get into an all-out arms race, and if then there is a war, which escalates both America and Russia would be likely to be totally destroyed.

(6) I suggest the minor corrections indicated in pencil in the manuscript.

(7) I suggest the minor correction indicated in pencil in the manuscript.

(8) In my view an all-out war would be equivalent to murder and suicide (Please cross out the word wholesale ~~is~~) but is not unthinkable.

(9) The correct word would be as follows:

"They want very much the kind of disarmament which would lead to substantial economic savings", he says, " They have a severe housing shortage and shortage of consumer's goods and

this provides strong motivation to them for wanting disarmament which results in economic savings. The economic savings achievable through disarmament do not provide an equally strong motivation for us. I am convinced that for the sake of obtaining general disarmament Russia will be willing to pay a commensurate price and might perhaps agree to an acceptable political settlement."

(10) The correct vote is as follows:

Students often ask me whether progress towards disarmament is impeded because so many people in America are strongly opposed to it." Dr. Szilard reports: "My stock answer is that progress towards disarmament is impeded because so few people in America are wholeheartedly in favor of it. Disarmament would not automatically guarantee peace. In a world disarmed down to machine guns, with inspection going full blast an improved armed equipment ed with machine guns could spring up so do speak over night. How can you prevent in one of the disturbed regions of the World a Nation from attacking its neighbor? Nobody seems to know how peace may be secured in a disarmed world. No adequate studies of this problem have been made to date either in America or in Russia. I believe however, that progress along these lines might be made reasonably fast through serious, non-governmental discussions among carefully selected Americans and Russians."

(11) Minor correction marked in pencil on Manuscript.

(12) See pencil correction in Manuscript on Page 7.

(13) Teller and I did not shake hands on how to eliminate the causes of war tensions. I shook hands with Teller after he had said "I agree with you that our intention not to strike first should be more clearly stated and made more firmly a part of our policy" (this requires some rearrangements of the relative paragraph on page 8).

(14) Don't leave out Chinese please.

(15) Minor corrections in Page 9 ~~would~~ which I have penciled into the Manuscript.

114 East 84th Street
New York 28, N.Y.
July 13, 1962

Dr. Leo Szilard
Hotel Dupont-Plaza
Washington 6, D.C.

Dear Dr. Szilard:

Thank you very much for going over the first version of my article.

The reason you have not heard from me since then is that the Times asked me to rewrite it, focusing it more on you than on your movement, although of course that is included too.

Enclosed please find the newer version, which the Times has not yet seen, but will get at the same time you do.

If you have any comments about it, would you be good enough to write me c/o General Delivery, Fair Harbor, Fire Island, N.Y.? I shall go there tomorrow morning for a two weeks' vacation.

With all good wishes, and many thanks for your help, I am

Very truly yours,

Maya Pines

Maya Pines

July 15, 1962

Maya Pines
General Delivery
Fair Harbor
Fire Island, New York

Dear Maya Pines:

Many thanks for your kind letter of July 13 and the enclosure. I find that it reads very well. I am returning the manuscript with a few minor changes which I have penciled in and which are self-explanatory. In addition, I should like to say the following:

On page two, Dr. Stonier attributes views to me which I do not hold. I do not believe that our current ^{troubles} ~~troubles~~ come from holding on to national sovereignty, nor do I believe that some supra-national structure must be worked out before we can make any major, significant progress.

On page three, in the lower half, the quote attributed to me is not in my words. I suggest that you use instead the following quote:

"Ever since 1945 we have been following the line of least resistance. We followed this line when we dropped the Bomb on Hiroshima, and we are following this line at the present time. In 1945 Japan was suing for peace, but it was easier to stick to the demand of "unconditional surrender" and to drop the Bomb, than to arrive at a decision - jointly with our allies - on the peace terms to be offered to Japan. At the

present time it is easier to keep on building long-range solid fuel rockets, as fast as they can be produced, than to propose an agreement on arms limitation that Russia could accept. And if we keep following this line of least resistance we may reach, within a few years, a point of no return in an all-out arms race. The open conspiracy that I am ^{now} trying to organize is aimed at getting us off the line of least resistance."

I am enclosing an extra copy of this quote for your convenience.

On the bottom of page five, I have crossed out a parenthetical sentence that seems to indicate that I have not been concerned with the problem of inspection. The fact of the matter is that the Voice of the Dolphins goes quite heavily into the problem of inspection, and so does a paper on disarmament which I submitted at the Pugwash Conference that was held last September in Vermont. Still, I believe that the real stumbling block today is not the issue of ^{INS} inspection, but rather the failure to offer the Russians something that they want and for which they would be willing to pay the price of inspection.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

Leo Szilard

LS:jl

encls.

The quote on page three should read:

"Ever since 1945 we have been following the line of least resistance. We followed this line when we dropped the Bomb on Hiroshima, and we are following this line at the present time. In 1945 Japan was suing for peace, but it was easier to stick to the demand of "unconditional surrender" and to drop the Bomb, than to arrive at a decision - jointly with our allies - on the peace terms to be offered to Japan. At the present time, it is easier to keep on building long range solid fuel rockets, as fast as they can be produced, than to propose an agreement on arms limitation that Russia could accept. And if we keep following this line of least resistance, we may reach, within a few years, a point of no return in an all-out arms race. The open conspiracy that I am now trying to organize is aimed at getting us off the line of least resistance.!"