

1155 East 57th Street  
Chicago 37, Illinois  
April 25, 1950

Mr. Grenville Clark  
31 Nassau Street  
New York, New York

Dear Mr. Clark:

Since our very pleasant luncheon in New York, the Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists has decided to initiate the setting up of an organization for the purposes which we discussed in New York. The Emergency Committee has appointed Professors Joe Mayer, Harrison Brown, and myself to act for her in this matter as the "Committee of Arrangements."

We are proposing that an organization to be called "Council of Inquiry into the Conditions of Peace" be set up entirely independent of the Emergency Committee and be organized on a tax-exempt basis. This "Council" might operate along the lines discussed in Memorandum dated March 27 which is enclosed. An appendix to this memorandum, containing a further discussion of the terms of reference of the "Commission" of the "Council," is in preparation.

We are asking Mr. Hutchins to act as chairman of the Board of the "Council," and Mr. Clarence Pickett to act as its vice-chairman. Mr. Hutchins has accepted, and we hope that Mr. Pickett will accept also. We recommended to Mr. Hutchins to choose the initial members of the Board of the Council from among the following list of names: Laird Bell, Henry E. Cabot, Grenville Clark, Marshall Field, Reuben G. Gustavson (University of Nebraska), Fowler McCormick, R. L. Stearns (University of Colorado), and James G. Patton. Mr. Hutchins leaves for Europe on May 2, and by that time



2 - Mr. Grenville Clark - April 25, 1950.

we hope to have the initial board members lined up so we can proceed to incorporate the Council. Carter, Ledyard, and Milburn, who have been acting for the Emergency Committee, will be asked to act for the Council also and to try to obtain an advance ruling from the Treasury concerning tax exemption. No public announcement of formation of the Council is planned until we have secured a fund of perhaps \$200,000 for the Council.

It is our understanding that Mr. Hutchins will try to reach you before he leaves for Europe and ask you to serve as a member of the Board. We hope very much that you will accept. We realize, of course, that you cannot take on any duties that are very strenuous. Membership on the Board might involve your spending two days a month with the "Commission" of the Council which is the full-time organ of the Council; but if this should prove too strenuous for several Board members, it might be possible to form an Executive Committee of the Board and thereby to ease the burden of the Board members. An Executive Committee might have to be formed in any case if the Board should be enlarged much beyond 15 members.

Lately I have spent a week in Colorado and found such enthusiastic response to our "plan" that I feel quite heartened by it. This experience strengthens me in the belief that the Council will have to draw much of its strength from the Middle West and the West. I am also inclined to think that the formation of regional committees in Minnesota, in Colorado, and perhaps in Oregon might be very useful. These regional committees could be affiliated with the Council and would have the task to keep the people of the "region" informed of the activities of the Council.

With respect to the composition of these regional committees and also the Board of the Council, I believe we ought to make an attempt to enlist



5 - Grenville Clark - April 25, 1950.

outstanding men who, in the past, have kept aloof from public affairs but who now, at last, are really concerned and are willing to take their share of the burden.

Sincerely yours,

Leo Sillard

wv

cc: Joe Mayer  
Harrison Brown



GRENVILLE CLARK

DUBLIN, NEW HAMPSHIRE

TELEPHONE DUBLIN 1

May 2, 1950.

Professor Leo Szilard,  
Institute of Radiology  
& Biophysics,  
University of Chicago,  
Chicago 37, Ill.

Dear Mr. Szilard:

With regard to your letter of April 25, I am, as I told you in New York last winter, very interested in having carried out a careful study by non-official persons of what can be done to achieve an over-all East-West settlement, and to make progress towards world order. So I am glad to see that you are proposing to go ahead.

As to my own participation, I am complimented to be asked to go on the Board of the proposed Council and, as I also have confidence in Mr. Hutchins, I'd be glad to accept if I saw my way to it. But I regret to say that I cannot. I could not give it the necessary attention because I have all my time and energy tied up for quite a while ahead. I want to try to finish in the next year a piece of work I have in progress with Louis B. Sohn in the shape of "Detailed Proposals for Revision of the U. N. Charter." It is a long and difficult job and, with my other commitments, will take all my working time.

I realize what you say about having an Executive Committee and that not all the Board members would necessarily be expected to come to meetings, etc. But if I were on the Board, I would want to keep in close touch and, in the circumstances, could not do that.

I venture some comments on your letter and your memo. of March 27.

First, and most important from my standpoint, I certainly hope that the idea on p. 6 of your memo. that the "issue of transforming the U. N. into a world government or otherwise setting up a world government" would "go beyond the scope of the work of the Commission, as presently envisaged" will not be adopted. I think this would vitiate the whole project right at the start. This is because I don't think that there can be an East-West settlement or "stable peace" without general and universal disarmament (in all arms and by all nations); and I think it obvious that such



LS p.2.

disarmament can't be obtained unless a world government limited to the sphere of war prevention is established.

In the sentence on p. 6 preceding the intimation that the question of a world government (any world government apparently) would be excluded, you say that the "terms of reference of the Commission should enable them to deal with any issue that is relevant to the creation of a stable peace." Since I think that the creation of a world government is not only relevant to but a precondition of a stable peace, I think the two sentences are contradictory. When I read them together, I couldn't help thinking of the old rhyme: "Mother, may I go in to swim? Yes, my darling daughter. Hang your clothes on a hickory limb, and don't go near the water."

Seriously, I hope no limitation of this or any sort would be put on the Commission's thinking.

Second, I wonder whether the enterprise needs so much elaboration. What is really required is some hard thinking by a few competent independent people who are not over-burdened like the officials, by day-to-day duties and not inhibited by tradition and politics, like most of the State Department. There is ample material; in fact, it is easy to bog down in it. Also, if the Commission is large, they might well bog down in interminable discussions and have too many divergent views. I should think about five good men on full time for six months (with a few assistants) could do better than 15. And I think a Board or Executive Committee or Advisory Committee of 6-10 would be enough to keep in touch, criticize and advise.

When it comes to putting out the Commission's Report and having it widely discussed, that is another matter; and there I can see a function for a large Citizens' Committee and regional committees.

If it were pruned down in this way, \$200,000 should do the whole thing.

Third, I like the idea of two teams. But they needn't necessarily all be Commission members. Two teams of three or four each could be recruited for two-three months after the Commission had defined the issues somewhat, - partly composed of Commission members and partly of others.



Fourth, I don't like any idea of trying to get a governmental blessing for the enterprise. Citizens have a right to study a subject and submit their conclusions to the people and the Government without anyone's blessing. They had better do just that here. I don't know what "clearing" the enterprise with the State Department or White House means. It may seem to imply asking approval. That approval might be withheld and what then? You have either to drop the project or go ahead against the Government's opposition. Or if approval were granted, would it strengthen the enterprise or weaken it by giving the impression that it was a sort of agency of the State Department? In getting up the Selective Service Act in 1940, the Citizens Committee of which I was Chairman, didn't ask the blessing or approval of the War Department or President. We just went ahead, drew our Bill and got it introduced. In this way, we avoided the complications of possible disapproval on the one hand or having it an Administration measure on the other. It was much better that way.

This isn't a case of negotiating with a foreign government, where the Logan Act might apply. It is simply doing what all citizens have a right to do without any permission from anyone.

This isn't to say that any secret should be made of the enterprise or that the State Department and President shouldn't be informed. They both should be, just as we informed the War Department and President Roosevelt of the move for a Selective Service Act. All that needs is two letters politely informing them of the project and its purpose. This should be done, I think, only after the enterprise is actually organized and ready to function; and the letters should be carefully framed to avoid any implication that any permission or approval is requested.

The enterprise will succeed or fail by virtue of the wise and constructive character of the Report or the opposite and the success or lack of success in getting it publicly discussed. It is quite unnecessary and I think unwise to try to "clear" it with anyone in the Government.

- - - - -

Some of these comments may seem unsympathetic. But that is not my intention. I have long thought that our Government people are incapable (for a variety of



LS p.4.

reasons) of producing the ideas essential to achieving disarmament and a "stable peace" and that these ideas must come from non-official sources. Believing this, I have been trying myself as a sort of one-man "Commission" to produce a set of ideas and I shall get out a document within six weeks which is what I would recommend if I were a member of a group such as you envisage. It will be in the form of "A Statement for a Sub-committee of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U. S. Senate." I think I'll have the temerity to call it a "Plan for Peace," since it will purport to be a program of ideas and procedure to achieve an over-all settlement.

So I'm very sympathetic to such a study and would, indeed, like to see several such, provided they all were by experienced and competent persons. And if the Commission isn't excluded or discouraged from canvassing or recommending limited world government (which, as I say, would, in my opinion, render the enterprise futile or worse), I'd be just as much interested in its work, even though I couldn't be active in it.

I'm sending a copy of this to Bob Hutchins, whom I like and admire.

Sincerely yours,

*Preville Clark*  
m



D U P L I C A T E    C O P Y

GRENVILLE CLARK

DUBLIN, NEW HAMPSHIRE

TELEPHONE DUBLIN 1

May 2, 1950.

Professor Leo Szilard,  
Institute of Radiology  
& Biophysics,  
University of Chicago,  
Chicago 37, Ill.

Dear Mr. Szilard:

With regard to your letter of April 25, I am, as I told you in New York last winter, very interested in having carried out a careful study by non-official persons of what can be done to achieve an over-all East-West settlement, and to make progress towards world order. So I am glad to see that you are proposing to go ahead.

As to my own participation, I am complimented to be asked to go on the Board of the proposed Council and, as I also have confidence in Mr. Hutchins, I'd be glad to accept if I saw my way to it. But I regret to say that I cannot. I could not give it the necessary attention because I have all my time and energy tied up for quite a while ahead. I want to try to finish in the next year a piece of work I have in progress with Louis B. Sohn in the shape of "Detailed Proposals for Revision of the U. N. Charter." It is a long and difficult job and with my other commitments will take all my working time.

I realize what you say about having an Executive Committee and that not all the Board members would necessarily be expected to come to meetings, etc. But if I were on the Board, I would want to keep in close touch and in the circumstances could not do that.

I venture some comments on your letter and your memo. of March 27.

First, and most important from my standpoint, I certainly hope that the idea on p. 6 of your memo. that the "issue of transforming the U. N. into a world government" would "go beyond the scope of the work of the Commission, as presently envisaged" will not be adopted. I think this would vitiate the whole project right at the start. This is because I don't think that there can be an East-West settlement or "stable peace" without general and universal disarmament (in all arms and by all nations); and I think it obvious that such disarmament can't be obtained unless a world government limited to the sphere

or otherwise  
setting up  
a world  
government"



LS p.2.

of war prevention is established.

In the sentence on p. 6 preceding the intimation that the question of a world government (any world government apparently) would be excluded, you say that the "terms of reference of the Commission should enable them to deal with any issue that is relevant to the creation of a stable peace." Since I think that the creation of a world government is not only relevant to but a pre-condition of a stable peace, I think the two sentences are contradictory. When I read them together I couldn't help thinking of the old rhyme: "Mother, may I go in to swim? Yes my darling daughter. Hang your clothes on a hickory limb, and don't go near the water."

Seriously, I hope no limitation of this or any sort would be put on the Commission's thinking.

Second, I wonder whether the enterprise needs so much elaboration. What is really required is some hard thinking by a few competent, independent people who are not over-burdened, like the officials by day-to-day duties and not inhibited by tradition and politics, like most of the State Department. There is ample material, in fact it is easy to bog down in it. Also if the Commission is large, they might bog down in interminable discussion and have too many divergent views. I should think about five good men on full time for six months (with a few assistants) could do better than 15. And I think a Board or Executive Committee or Advisory Committee of 6-10 would be enough to keep in touch, criticize and advise.

When it comes to putting out the Commission's Report and having it widely discussed, that is another matter; and there I can see a function for a large Citizens Committee and regional committees.

If it were pruned down in this way, \$200,000 should do the whole thing.

Third, I like the idea of two teams. But they needn't necessarily all be Commission members. Two teams of three or four each could be recruited for two-three months after the Commission had defined the issues somewhat, - partly composed of Commission members and partly of others.

Fourth, I don't like any idea of trying to get a governmental blessing for the enterprise. Citizens have a right to study a subject and submit their conclusions to the people and the Government without anyone's blessing. They had better do just that here. I don't know what



LS p.3.

"clearing" the enterprise with the State Department or White House means. It may seem to imply asking approval. That approval might be withheld and what then? You have either to drop the project or go ahead against the Government's opposition. Or if approval were granted, would it strengthen the enterprise or weaken it by giving the impression that it was a sort of agency of the State Department? In getting up the Selective Service Act in 1940, the Citizens Committee of which I was Chairman didn't ask the blessing or approval of the War Department or President. We just went ahead, drew our Bill and got it introduced. In this way, we avoided the complications of possible disapproval on the one hand or having it an Administration measure on the other. It was much better that way.

This isn't a case of negotiating with a foreign government where the Logan Act might apply. It is simply doing what all citizens have a right to do without any permission from anyone.

This isn't to say that any secret should be made of the enterprise or that the State Department and President shouldn't be informed. They both should be, just as we informed the War Department and President Roosevelt of the move for a Selective Service Act. All that needs is two letters politely informing them of the project and its purpose. This should be done, I think, only after the enterprise is actually organized and ready to function; and the letters should be carefully framed to avoid any implication that any permission or approval is requested. The enterprise will succeed or fail by virtue of the wise and constructive character of the Report or the opposite and the success or lack of success in getting it publicly discussed. It is quite unnecessary and I think unwise to try to "clear" it with anyone in the Government.

- - - - -

Some of these comments may seem unsympathetic. But that is not my intention. I have long thought that our Government people are incapable (for a variety of reasons) of producing the ideas essential to achieving disarmament and a "stable peace" and that these ideas must come from non-official sources. Believing this, I have been trying myself as a sort of one-man "Commission" to produce a set of ideas and I shall get out a document within six weeks which is what I would recommend if I were a member of a group such as you envisage. It will be in the form



IS p.4.

of "A Statement for a Sub-committee of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U. S. Senate." I think I'll have the temerity to call it a "Plan for Peace," since it will purport to be a program of ideas and procedure to achieve an over-all settlement.

So I'm very sympathetic to such a study and would, indeed, like to see several such, provided they all were by experienced and competent persons. And if the Commission isn't excluded or discouraged from canvassing or recommending limited world government (which, as I say, would, in my opinion, render the enterprise futile or worse) I'd be just as much interested in its work, even though I couldn't be active in it.

I'm sending a copy of this to Bob Hutchins, whom I like and admire.

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd.) Grenville Clark



1155 East 57th Street  
Chicago 37, Illinois  
May 13, 1950

Mr. Grenville Clark  
Dublin  
New Hampshire

Dear Mr. Clark:

I appreciate very much your giving us your comments in some detail. I am passing on copies of your letter of May 2 to professors Joe Mayer and Harrison Brown with whom I propose to discuss the points which you have raised. We shall discuss these points again after Mr. Hutchins returns from Europe on June 5 and then write you about them. In the meantime, I do not want to impose upon you by engaging you in a protracted discussion of the subject.

Sincerely yours,



Leo Szilard



GRENVILLE CLARK

DUBLIN, NEW HAMPSHIRE

TELEPHONE DUBLIN 1

February 25, 1954.

Prof. Leo Szilard,  
c/o King's Crown Hotel,  
420 West 116th Street,  
New York, New York.

Dear Professor Szilard:

I enclose that document I mentioned to you on the phone this morning, i.e., the Preliminary Print of "Peace Through Disarmament and Charter Revision" on which Prof. Louis B. Sohn of the Harvard Law School and I have been collaborating. I enclose also an address of mine at the annual dinner of the American Philosophical Society last April and a Statement I wrote in January, 1953 called "Essentials for Genuine Peace". These will give you a good idea of my line of thought.

With the information gradually being given out by President Eisenhower, Representative Cole and others as to the growing number and power of the bombs, I've had it in mind for some time to get in touch with you to see if we could get together for a talk. Indeed, I was about to write you when I received the other day a letter from Dr. David Bradley (the author of NO PLACE TO HIDE) of which I enclose a copy. You will notice that he mentions you and this led me to ring you up at Brandeis University.

What I'd like to do is to induce you to come up here to Dublin and talk things over with me for a couple of hours, telling me what you feel able to as to what you think is coming in the development of these new weapons. I have some funds at my disposal that enable me to pay the expenses and a modest honorarium of \$50 a day to a distinguished authority like yourself by way of a consultation fee.

I have an office here in Dublin and will be here right along except for two or three absences between now and March 22. Since these are rather uncertain, I think that some day during the week of March 22 or the week of March 29 (but preferably not Friday) would be very good, if convenient to you.

As to getting here from Waltham, there is a train from Waltham at 8:25 A.M. arriving at Winchendon (20 miles from this house) at 10:07 where I would send to meet you. Returning to Winchendon and Boston, there is an afternoon train from Winchendon at 2:57 which would get you to Waltham at 4:44 and Boston at 5:05. Or, if you wanted to go from here to New York, there is an afternoon train from East Northfield (30 miles from here where I could send you) at 4:40, arriving at Grand Central at 9:20 P.M. Or, if you wanted to fly to New York, there is a non-stop plane from Keene, N. H. (12 miles from here) at 7:18 P.M. arriving at LaGuardia at 8:31.

I understand that at your convenience you will ring me up



Prof. Szilard

2

February 25, 1954.

collect at Dublin 42 ring 2 (any morning except Saturday) or at  
Dublin 1 where you can reach me almost any evening at 6:00.

I am hoping that we can arrange to get together in some  
mutually convenient way.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

*Grenville Clark*



GRENVILLE CLARK

DUBLIN, NEW HAMPSHIRE

TELEPHONE DUBLIN 1

March 26, 1954.

Prof. Leo Szilard,  
c/o King's Crown Hotel,  
420 West 116th Street,  
New York, New York.

Dear Professor Szilard:

I have just heard that you will soon receive an invitation from Mr. George C. Holt, who is organizing a conference on disarmament and U. N. Charter revision in Springfield, Mass. from May 14-16, to take part in that conference.

This conference will consist of possibly two hundred persons from all parts of New England who have studied the subject of disarmament and Charter revision, - the purpose being to exchange views and, if possible, arrive at a consensus of opinion.

This conference is being organized by first-rate people with the highest motives. I believe that it will be of real importance and of sufficient consequence to justify your participation. I do hope, therefore, that you can accept.

Sincerely yours,



P. S. I am disappointed at not having heard further from you with regard to my telephone call and my letter of February 25 with which I enclosed Dr. David Bradley's letter. On the chance that these miscarried, I enclose copies of them. I am still anxious to induce you to come here for a leisurely talk and would try to arrange it in the most convenient way for you any time during April or early May.

G. C.



**GRENVILLE CLARK**

**DUBLIN, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**TELEPHONE DUBLIN 1**

April 1, 1954.

Prof. Leo Szilard,  
c/o King's Crown Hotel,  
420 West 116th Street,  
New York, New York.

Dear Prof. Szilard:

Thanks very much for phoning me on last Tuesday and for putting me in touch with Dr. R. E. Lapp of Washington. He phoned me yesterday and since it happens that he is to be near here in New Hampshire on April 8, he is going to stop for a talk with me.

I enclose a check for \$25 that will cover your telephoning expenses and as to any excess, please consider it as a token compensation for your time and trouble.

I got some interesting ideas from Prof. Charles F. Brooks of the Blue Hill Observatory, Harvard University, and his colleague, Dr. Raymond Wexler, on some meteorological aspects of the "fall-out" of radio-active dust. Putting this together with what I may get from Dr. Lapp and from medical knowledge as to the effect of the dust on human beings, perhaps I shall be able to arrive at some estimate or reasonable "guesstimate" as to the thing I'm driving at, i.e., to judge whether bombs of this latest type may be a real danger to the people of the U. S., not because of their power to destroy cities by blast and heat, but through the entirely different effect of creating radio-active dust which, blown from West to East and settling down over the country in considerable amount and concentration, would be dangerous to human and other life.

Sincerely yours,

*Grenville Clark*