

Institute for Nuclear Studies  
University of Chicago  
Chicago 37, Ill.

December 12, 1956.

Mr. Hamilton Fish Armstrong  
Foreign Affairs  
58 East 68th Street  
New York 21, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Armstrong,

I wish to thank you for your very kind letter of November 19th. I very much want to write up something on the subject in which you are interested. Jack Fisher of Harpers has also expressed an interest to have such an article.- When the article is actually written it might turn out that it is too long for Harpers, or that they don't like it; it might turn out that you don't like it, and it might turn out that I don't like it. Thus I am not in a position to promise an article but I shall do my best to produce one; though probably not in time to meet your deadline.

Upon your return from the Middle East I should be delighted, however, to discuss with you this and some related topics. Right now I am in New York staying at the St. Moritz; I might be gone by the time you return but I expect to be in New York again some time in January.

Very sincerely yours,

Leo Szilard

FOREIGN  AFFAIRS

AN AMERICAN QUARTERLY REVIEW

HAMILTON FISH ARMSTRONG  
EDITOR

58 EAST SIXTY-EIGHTH STREET  
NEW YORK 21, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: FORAFFAIRS, NEW YORK

March 4, 1957

Professor Leo Szilard  
Institute for Nuclear Studies  
University of Chicago  
Chicago 37, Illinois

Dear Professor Szilard:

I have been thinking and thinking, but can't persuade myself that the theme is not too speculative for us. Perhaps I doubt that man is so rational as you assume; and if you say you aren't assuming that he will be rational in action but only that he should be rational enough to understand and consider your proposals, I'm afraid I must disagree. In fact, I must go so far as to register a vague anxiety lest as schematic an approach as you favor to the problem of living with the atom may be so upsetting, not to say confusing, that people (including those who make policy) may take their minds off the problem in despair. Am I wrong? I wish I could be made to feel it, for I hate to set my frail judgment against yours, even though it is in the field where your outstanding knowledge must be conditioned by political considerations rather than rest on scientific knowledge.

I wish there were another subject in this field that we could agree on for you to write about -- I put it this way not because agreement on findings or conclusions is a prerequisite but because agreement between an author and editor as to the field of inquiry is. I admire so deeply your scientific performance, and enjoyed our conversation so much, that I should hate to put off indefinitely the chance to number you among our contributors. If and when another subject occurs to you please let me hear about it.

With warm regards,

Yours very sincerely,

*Hamilton Fish Armstrong*

*Gen Post*

April 5, 1957

Mr. Hamilton Fish Armstrong  
Foreign Affairs  
58 East Sixty-Eighth Street  
New York City 21, New York

Dear Mr. Armstrong:

Upon my return to Chicago I found your very kind letter of March 4th. Many thanks for having given the matter thought and informing me of your views.

With kind personal regards,

Yours very sincerely,

Leo Szilard

m

June 21st. 1960.

"Foreign Affairs",  
For the attention of Mr. Hamilton Fish Armstrong,  
58 East 68th Street,  
New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Armstrong,

Attached you will find an article which I have written for LOOK magazine. Even though LOOK promptly accepted this article and paid for it, it is now uncertain if, and when, they can print it. In these circumstances they generously offered to release the article if I wish to have it printed elsewhere. The attached copy is merely a rough draft, but it should be sufficient to enable you to say whether you would be interested in printing it in FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

For your information I am attaching, confidentially, a copy of an article which I received from Chester Bowles which relates to the article, "How to Live with the Bomb", which FOREIGN AFFAIRS rejected. I am further enclosing a text of a broadcast by Edward P. Morgan which relates to the same article.

The article which I wrote for LOOK magazine has been circulated privately and a copy appears to have reached Senator Kennedy, whose response I attach, in confidence.

Your office can reach me over the telephone in New York at ext. 133 at Memorial Hospital, TRafalgar 9 - 3000.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Leo Szilard.

P.T.O.

# FOREIGN AFFAIRS

AN AMERICAN QUARTERLY REVIEW

HAMILTON FISH ARMSTRONG  
EDITOR

PHILIP W. QUIGG  
MANAGING EDITOR

58 EAST SIXTY-EIGHTH STREET  
NEW YORK 21, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: FORAFFAIRS, NEW YORK

June 22, 1960

Professor Leo Szilard  
Room 812  
Memorial Hospital  
444 East 68th Street  
New York 21, N.Y.

Dear Professor Szilard:

Thank you for letting me see this mimeographed copy of your new article, which covers some of the same ground as the long manuscript you once submitted to us and as your article in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. I am sorry not to see my way to using it in FOREIGN AFFAIRS. This is not, obviously, because I disagree with your objective, but simply because I cannot convince myself that the methods you have devised for dealing with the situation which the world faces are practicable or can usefully be propagated. I might make three or four observations to support this view.

We would have no check on the procedure mentioned on page 4 under which the Soviet Government would announce its disarmament policy and offer rewards for the discovery of evasions within its own borders. The suggestion that, in a police state where the press is controlled, the Government could not practicably exercise its power to arrest an "informer," or could not keep that arrest secret, seems to me purely speculative.

On page 6, there seems no logical reason to take the example of Poland vis-à-vis a German danger 25 years hence when there are striking examples of a reverse sort of danger at the present time. Why not describe the situation, of, say, Cambodia, Iran, Turkey or India in face of an invasion by the Soviet Union or Communist China this year or next?

Page 7 suggests that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. might remain indifferent to wars of any sort, including wars of

aggression, among other nations. No solution of the unacceptable moral or political features of such a situation is proposed.

Page 10. Since we are "imagining," why not imagine the reverse of the situation described? Let us imagine that a warning were issued by the U.S. Government, in reply to a Soviet invasion of, say, Iran, that in four weeks a U.S. bomb would destroy Odessa. One of several things might happen. Would the U.S.S.R. retire from Iran? Or would it passively wait four weeks so as to have the right to destroy Pittsburg in retaliation for Odessa? Or would it instantly reply by devastating not one but 20 American cities and the bulk of the U.S. ability to retaliate?

Finally, if the threat to pick out a city for destruction came from the Soviet Union in connection with some alleged American aggression, you yourself imply that the U.S. Government would be "lobbied" by distraught citizens into surrender. What would be the results? There would be two at any rate. Even if the American action which the Soviets complained of were in support of the just rights of some weak nation, or of some vital American interest, that action would be terminated. Secondly, the Soviet Union's conclusion would be that it could act with impunity, now or later, since the U.S. could be coerced by terroristic tactics.

I may have read your ideas wrongly in part, but I feel that my general doubts as to their soundness are sufficient to make it unwise for FOREIGN AFFAIRS to sponsor them as a basis for intellectual discussion. I write you this with deep regret in view of my respect for your sincerity and my knowledge of your great contributions in your own scientific field.

*With warm regards,*

Yours sincerely,

*Roberton Tin Armstrong*

September 20, 1960.

Hamilton Fish Armstrong,  
c/o Foreign Affairs,  
58 East Sixty-Eighth Street,  
New York 21, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Armstrong,

When I received your letter of June 22, I called you over the telephone, but was told that you had just left for Europe. Whatever the merits of the general position you take in your letter may be, I have a good and valid answer to the five specific points which you raise in your letter and I had intended to convey these answers to you over the telephone. It might be, however, that you will be able to supply these answers yourself, if you read the enclosed manuscript.

The preface explains the circumstances in which it was written. Incidentally, I plan to make an article out of these "Excerpt". It needs to be edited and it could be somewhat shortened, though it couldn't be shortened very much. Should you be interested in printing an article along these lines in 'Foreign Affairs', I should be grateful to you for letting me know. I am quite well for the time being; I frequently go out for dinner and sometimes for lunch as well, so that if there is anything to discuss I could meet you at your convenience away from the hospital.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Leo Szilard  
Room 812,  
The Memorial Hospital,  
444 East 68th Street,  
New York 21, N.Y.

Tel.: Tr 9-3000, Ext.133

Enclosure

# FOREIGN AFFAIRS

AN AMERICAN QUARTERLY REVIEW

HAMILTON FISH ARMSTRONG  
EDITOR

PHILIP W. QUIGG  
MANAGING EDITOR

58 EAST SIXTY-EIGHTH STREET  
NEW YORK 21, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: FORAFFAIRS, NEW YORK

September 26, 1960

Dr. Leo Szilard  
Room 812  
The Memorial Hospital  
444 East 68th Street  
New York 21, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Szilard:

I am delighted to know that you are making such good progress and getting away from the hospital from time to time. Mr. Armstrong, I fear, is less mobile than you for the moment, as he recently had an operation on his back and is now recuperating in the country.

In his absence I would like to give you at least a preliminary response to the mimeographed excerpt from "The Voice of the Dolphins". It contains much that is provocative and much that is wryly humorous, but, as in your earlier manuscripts, I find your assumptions about the political nature of the Soviet Union and Communist China profoundly disturbing. You find symmetries - as in your assumption that Chinese imperialism will perfectly parallel the British - where I find only asymmetry. Moreover, it is surprising to me that all of your many touches of irony throughout the paper are at the expense of the Western world.

I do not, of course, want to speak for Mr. Armstrong, but as he will not be able to see your paper for some time, I think you should not count on us as an outlet for your manuscript.

With best wishes for your continued health,

Yours sincerely,

*Philip W. Quigg*



TO Mr. Hamilton Fish Armstrong, FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Please return these when you no longer need them.

Leo Szilard,  
Room 812,  
Memorial Hospital,  
444 East 68th Street,  
New York 21, N.Y.