

30 Rockefeller Plaza

New York 20, N. Y.

August 9, 1956

Room 5600

Dr. Leo Szilard  
The Quadrangle Club  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Leo:

It was very good to see you again. However, I'm sorry you left us when you did because there was an old magazine store just two blocks further down the street, where I purchased the enclosed. I hope you will read Bullitt as carefully as you have been reading Kennan, and I look forward to seeing you soon again.

Sincerely,

*Ted.*

T. F. Walkowicz



30 Rockefeller Plaza

New York 20, N. Y.

August 30th, 1956

ROOM 5600

Dr. Leo Szilard  
The Quadrangle Club  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Leo:

Cynthia Mason dropped off a draft letter for you, which is enclosed in its original and hastily edited form. I presume that she has separately provided you with the appropriate enclosures, should you decide to attempt to get Mr. Stevenson to participate in the Arden House conference.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Ted." with a horizontal line underneath.

T. F. Walkowicz



Г. В. ИВАНОВИЧ

*[Handwritten signature]*

СЛУЖБЕНИ

ко Влада Републике Српске  
Београд, Београдски булевар  
Београд, Београдски булевар  
Београд, Београдски булевар  
Београд, Београдски булевар  
Београд, Београдски булевар  
Београд, Београдски булевар  
Београд, Београдски булевар  
Београд, Београдски булевар  
Београд, Београдски булевар

Београд, Београдски булевар

СЛУЖБЕНИ  
Београд, Београдски булевар  
Београд, Београдски булевар  
Београд, Београдски булевар  
Београд, Београдски булевар

5435

*[Handwritten initials]*

Београд, Београдски булевар

Београд, Београдски булевар

Београд, Београдски булевар



Walkowicz

30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York 20, N. Y.

Room 5600

October 15, 1956

*file*

Dr. Leo Szilard  
The Quadrangle Club  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Leo:

Enclosed are the two items we discussed last Thursday noon. I trust you will keep both of these private, until we have had a chance to discuss them again. Regarding the article, please keep in mind that it is a third-from-the-last draft and that, at this point, I am merely "trying on for size" various ideas. Please do use a red pencil directly on this draft, and be as merciless as you wish.

It was good to see you briefly, and I'll be looking forward to our next.

Sincerely,

*Ted.*

T. F. Walkowicz

*revised Oct 19/56 Jh.*



Walkowicz

*File*

The Quadrangle Club  
The University of Chicago  
Chicago 37, Illinois  
September 4, 1956

Mr. T. F. Walkowicz  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
Room 5600  
New York 20, New York

Dear Ted,

I received your letter of August 30th with Cynthia Mason's enclosed text. While I think that such a meeting might do some good, I doubt that it matters much one way or another. But more important, since I do not know Stevenson personally, I doubt very much that I am the best vehicle or even a good vehicle for approaching him. Of course, I could write to Harrison Brown about this matter but every additional link in the chain makes <sup>the</sup> action weaker. Why not approach Stevenson through Norman Cousins who has worked with him closely, in addition to Finletter to whom you have already spoken? Also you probably know Lloyd Garrison in New York who is very close to Stevenson.

It seems to me that somebody who knows Stevenson must be talked to and must, to some extent, identify himself with the enterprise when he approaches Stevenson for the action to be effective.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

Leo Szilard

P.S. I have so far not received the appropriate enclosures from Cynthia. When I get them I shall have a second look at the matter and write you again.



July 19, 1957

Mr. T. F. Walkowicz  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
Room 5600  
New York 20, N.Y.

Dear Ted,

This is in reply to your letter of July 17th. Attached you will find a statement which was issued by the Conference. None of the very interesting circumstances of this Conference will be reflected in any routine report, and I am quite anxious to talk to you about this meeting when I am in New York because I believe that this meeting, while in itself of little use, represents a very important experience. I know now precisely to what limit we may expect Russian scientists to speak openly at a closed meeting. As a result of my experience at Pugwash, I am now convinced that if we set up a meeting of the right kind between American and Russian scientists, it could be a very important vehicle for getting across thought both to the Russians and the American government. Included in the meeting could be non-scientists who are close to their governments, and who would attend as observers, since clearly they could not participate in the freewheeling way in which scientists can who are free from any governmental ties.

I found that once the Russians were convinced that I was not anti-Russian, I was able to say in the meeting just anything that was true without causing them to resent it and, while they were obviously not free to speak up, they were free to smile and nod. On the basis of such sign language, I had no difficulty in learning what was in their minds.

You will notice that the statement issued by the Conference lacks my signature. I dissented because the first sub-committee report talks about a hundred thousand men and women who will die in the next thirty years (over the whole world) from leukemia and cancer if the bomb tests are continued at the present rate. While this might be,



strictly speaking, true, it is nevertheless grossly misleading and served a political purpose rather than the purpose of clarification of the real situation. I also objected to a sentence in the second committee's report which read as follows: "The prompt suspension of nuclear bomb tests could be a good first step for this purpose." As a compromise I suggested that the reports of these committees be not adopted by the Conference, but that the Conference merely record that it had received these reports.

It is interesting to note that after I had voiced my objections Skobeltzyn proposed that inasmuch as I felt so strongly about these two passages the passages be deleted.

Well over half of the time of the meeting was wasted both in the subcommittees and in the full meetings in an attempt to draft a statement, and it is quite clear that if we want to have a useful meeting in the future, we must stipulate in advance that the meeting shall not issue a statement but shall merely issue a communique listing the topics discussed, the various points of view and different thoughts that were expressed, but that the meeting must not issue any pronouncements representing the conclusions reached. Clearly we could not ask our Russian colleagues to agree to any statement which contains anything that is in flat contradiction <sup>to declared</sup> of Russian policy aims, and in the circumstances the American participants must not be asked to agree to any conclusion which is contrary to <sup>declared</sup> American policy. I made this point at the meeting, and I am certain that the Russians got the point. I am not so sure about some of the English and American participants.

*P* At the request of the Chairman of the meeting, I tried to write down in the form of a statement what I believed those who participated in the meeting actually were agreed on. I wrote such a statement, which was based mainly ~~was~~ on my private conversations <sup>rather</sup> than on the speeches made during the meeting, and I am enclosing the statement for your information. As you will see, part of this statement was incorporated in the statement released by the Conference.

When I am in New York, perhaps I can get together both with you and Colonel Leghorne. Please transmit this letter to him with the enclosures after you have finished with them.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Leo Szilard

m  
Encl.



July 19, 1957

Mr. T. F. Walkowicz  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
Room 5600  
New York 20, N.Y.

Dear Ted,

This is in reply to your letter of July 17th. Attached you will find a statement which was issued by the Conference. None of the very interesting circumstances of this Conference will be reflected in any routine report, and I am quite anxious to talk to you about this meeting when I am in New York because I believe that this meeting, while in itself of little use, represents a very important experience. I know now precisely to what limit we may expect Russian scientists to speak openly at a closed meeting. As a result of my experience at Pugwash, I am now convinced that if we set up a meeting of the right kind between American and Russian scientists, it could be a very important vehicle for getting across thought both to the Russians and the American government. Included in the meeting could be non-scientists who are close to their governments, and who would attend as observers, since clearly they could not participate in the free wheeling way in which scientists can who are free from any governmental ties.

.....

You will notice that the statement issued by the Conference lacks my signature. I dissented because the first sub-committee report talks about a hundred thousand men and women who will die in the next thirty years (over the whole world) from leukemia and cancer if the bomb tests are continued at the present rate. While this might be, strictly speaking, true, it is nevertheless grossly misleading and served a political purpose rather than the purpose of clarification of the real situation. I also objected to a sentence in the second committee's report which read as follows: "The prompt suspension of nuclear bomb tests could be a good first step for this purpose." As a compromise I suggested that the reports of these committees be not adopted by the Conference, but that the Conference merely record that it had received these reports.

It is interesting to note that after I had voiced my objections Skobelzyn proposed that inasmuch as I felt so strongly about these two passages the passages be deleted.



Well over half of the time of the meeting was wasted both in the subcommittees and in the full meetings in an attempt to draft a statement, and it is quite clear that if we want to have a useful meeting in the future, we must stipulate in advance that the meeting shall not issue a statement but shall merely issue a communique listing the topics discussed, the various points of view and different thoughts that were expressed, but that the meeting must not issue any pronouncements representing the conclusions reached. Clearly we could not ask our Russian colleagues to agree to any statement which contains anything that is in flat contradiction to declared Russian policy, and in the circumstances the American participants must not be asked to agree to any conclusion which is contrary to declared American policy. I made this point at the meeting, and I am certain that the Russians got the point. I am not so sure about some of the English and American participants.

At the request of the Chairman of the meeting, I tried to write down in the form of a statement what I believed those who participated in the meeting actually were agreed on. I wrote such a statement, which was based mainly on my private conversations rather than on the speeches made during the meeting, and I am enclosing the statement for your information. As you will see, part of this statement was incorporated in the statement released by the Conference.

When I am in New York, perhaps I can get together both with you and Colonel Leghorn. Please transmit this letter to him with the enclosures after you have finished with them.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Leo Szilard

m  
Encl.



30 Rockefeller Plaza

New York 20, N. Y.

November 7, 1957

Room 5800

Mr. Morton Grodzins, Chairman  
Department of Political Science  
The University of Chicago  
1126 East 59th Street  
Chicago 37, Illinois

COPIED FROM ORIGINAL  
IN THIS COLLECTION

Dear Mr. Grodzins:

Thank you for yours of October 28th. In my judgment, Szilard should be strongly encouraged to go forward with a series of post-Pugwash meetings. The only reason I have not written sooner is because I expected to see Szilard here in New York some time ago.

Thinking about the impact of such meetings on American opinion, we must be careful not to let the Soviets use them merely as another propaganda device, either during the meetings themselves or in what they print or say when they get back to the USSR. If the Americans who participate are wise, the risk of this happening is small, compared to the opportunities which the challenge represents.

Sincerely,

T. F. Walkowicz