

(March?)

1952

R-42

## YOU DO NOT WANT WAR WITH RUSSIA?

You will get it whether you want it or not--for it is in the making--unless you do something about it and do it quick.

You may think there isn't anything you can do about it and perhaps you are right for this war might come now any day and there mightn't be time left even for mature reflection. But if there is left a short period of grace, and if enough of us understand what is to be done, and if we put our foot down maybe the war can yet be averted and real peace be secured.

What can you do? First of all you can try to understand what real peace means and how it might be gotten. See if this will make sense to you.

I say to you that there will be peace only if there is an overall settlement of all issues outstanding between America and Russia.

Can such a settlement be reached, and if so would it lead to lasting peace? Clearly such a settlement would have to embrace many nations and once reached its observance could be enforced by collective action with respect to most nations but it could not be ~~en~~<sup>thus</sup> enforced with respect to either America or Russia. There are not enough nations of sufficient independence left in the world whose combined forces would be strong enough to coerce either Russia or American. Neither of these two giants can be coerced short of a world war of indefinite duration and uncertain outcome.

What then, you may ask, would be the value of our having an agreement with Russia if the observance of that agreement can not be enforced? This is a good question and if there is an answer to it your life and mine may depend on finding that answer.

An agreement that can not be enforced with respect to Russia and America (even though most other nations could be ~~compelled~~ compelled to continue its observance) will remain in force only if it gives both these countries security and permits them to achieve and to maintain economic prosperity. It will remain in force only if it regarded by America and Russia at the time when they put their signatures to it as advantageous, and if they continue to regard it as advantageous so much so that they would wish to maintain it in operation even if they have retained the right legally to abrogate it at any time.

Could such an agreement be devised? This above all is the question to which we must find the answer if we want peace to prevail.

If we think about an agreement with Russia in these terms then we shall see no objection to let Russia and America retain the legal right to abrogate the agreement (even though this right could not be granted to most other nations that may be signatories to it) and there would be perhaps even some advantage to let them retain the right to abrogate. For disputes arising out of the implementation of the agreement will sooner or later arise between America and Russia, and it is difficult to see how they could interest any international body with their settlement. The right to abrogate would enable them, however, effectively to press for a remedy of their grievances if these are sufficiently serious to warrant the risking of the continued existence of the agreement.

If we think in these terms about a Russian-American agreement, then the argument that we must be fully armed before we can negotiate an advantages

agreement loses its validity. During this past five years, this argument has been advanced again and again; it is time the fallacy of it be recognized for what it is. Yes, if Russia and America were two private persons about to negotiate an agreement the one in the stronger position would probably get the best of the deal. For if ~~two private persons enter into an agreement~~ you enter into an agreement with a private person, once you get the other fellow to sign on the dotted line you can make him keep the agreement ~~by taking him to court~~ if necessary by taking him to court. But where Russia and America are concerned there are no courts to which they could appeal. Our problem is not to write an agreement that Russia will sign but to write one which Russia will be eager to keep, not only for the next few years but ten years and twenty years hence. To devise such an agreement requires imagination and resourcefulness rather than patience and firmness; it requires thought and perhaps some compassion rather than arms.

You may ask, have we not tried again and again to reach such an agreement with Russia? The answer is that we have not. In the May issue of the bulletin of the Atomic Scientist, Hans Morgenthau, Professor of International Relations, wrote:

Only the government can negotiate the agreement that is needed, but <sup>in a democracy</sup> we can not rely on the government to do all the thinking that has to go into it. All of us can take, and must take, a part in ~~it~~ that.

What should be the substance of such an agreement? Here is one man's concept for what it is worth: You may be able to improve upon it, and if you are will you please let me know:

It seems clear that

1) ~~No~~ agreement will remain in force unless it provides for far-reaching disarmament and means through which Russia and America can make certain that the provisions relating to disarmament are not secretly evaded

- a. How ~~far~~ <sup>should</sup> ~~disarmament~~ go and what <sup>should</sup> ~~be~~ its nature. What type of disarmament would strengthen the defensive against the offensive and could <sup>security to</sup> give Western Europe which in case of abrogation of the agreement would be faced with overwhelming Russian land armies arising almost over night?

The kind of disarmament needed would eliminate all heavy mobile arms such as atomic bombs, ordinary bombs, bomber planes, tanks, mobile guns, flame throwers, etc. and ~~not~~ it would permit among mobile weapons only rifles and machine guns which may be necessary for internal policing. Permitted, however, would be also the building of fortifications and heavy guns and other fixed weapons which are built into fortifications.

As long as the agreement is not abrogated by either America or Russia, <sup>be protected</sup> countries like France, Belgium, and Holland could ~~not~~ <sup>be protected</sup> against any surprise by maintaining a Maginot line. In case of abrogation, presumably there

would start another arms race. But with such an arms race starting from scratch American and Western Europe would have years in which to prepare for the worst.

As long as the agreement is in force Russia and America must be able to re-assure themselves that there is no secret evasion <sup>of the ~~disarming~~ disarmament provisions</sup> anywhere. Within the framework of an overall agreement, with all outstanding political issues settled, and with disarmament an accomplished fact, there would no longer be a legitimate reason left for continued secrecy. There is no reason why we should not permit Russian spies to operate openly or secretly in the United States, why we should not grant immunity to spies of any nation, and revoke the Espionage Act to permit our own citizens freely to cooperate with spies of any nation. <sup>would be</sup> Nor ~~is~~ there any rational reason for Russia to grant such facilities to our spies. Russia might resist this thought and so might many people in this country, but there can be no security in this world short of complete abolition of all secrecy, and such Russian reluctance as will become manifest will have to be overcome by emphasizing the great advantages which Russian acceptance of the overall agreement would give Russia. Russia might legitimately wish to safeguard herself against ~~subversion~~ subversion by our agents and we should not hesitate to give her guarantees on that score. That Russian agents might be able to subvert the United States seems hardly likely to me, but many people might think otherwise, and if necessary safeguards would have to be provided against such a contingency.

To negotiate some such agreement we do not have to wait until we are fully armed, but we may have to wait until we have a Secretary of State who has the faith that such an agreement can be negotiated, for to get such an agreement will be a hard job, and it will take faith. It will take the faith of a great man in charge of the negotiations and the faith of many people who will rally to his support. No statesman can do this job unless there is first a popular demand that the job be done.

If we want this job to be done, we have little time to lose.

For immediate action there are to be set up A LOBBY FOR REAL PEACE in Washington.

And for action in 1952, there are to be set up A POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE which will cut across the political parties and will make its weight felt in the forthcoming presidential election.

What can you do? Right now very little, for the plan outlined above will mean little unless outstanding Americans who can command respect will take the leadership. But this you can do right now. Think this plan through as fast as you can and make up your mind. Would you support such a plan if men in whom you have confidence were to come forward with it? And if such men did come forward, would you part with one per cent of your income in its support?

Make up your mind and let me know your answer. Don't send me money, checks, or pledges, for I have no use for them. What I shall do is this. If your letters show that there is enough support for the line of action proposed, I will try to see if the men who are to lead this movement will take courage, step forward, and assume the leadership. ~~What is the result of your support?~~ If they do, I shall report back

to you and you will have to decide whether they have your confidence, and if you wish to give them your support.

Do you want war with Russia?

~~YOU DO NOT WANT WAR WITH RUSSIA?~~

You will get <sup>more</sup> whether you want it or not--for it is in the making--unless you do something about it and do it quick.

You may think there isn't anything you can do ~~about it~~ and perhaps you are right for this war might come now any day and there mightn't be time left even for mature reflection. But if there is left a short period of grace, and if enough of us understand what is to be done, and if we put our foot down maybe the war can yet be averted and real peace be secured.

What can you do? First of all you can try to understand what real peace means and how it might be gotten. See <sup>if</sup> this will make sense to you.

I say to you that there will be peace only if there is an overall settlement of all issues outstanding between America and Russia.

Can such a settlement be reached, and if so would it lead to lasting peace?

Clearly <sup>it</sup> such a settlement would have to embrace many nations and once reached ~~its~~ <sup>its</sup> observance <sup>perhaps</sup> could be enforced by collective action with respect to <sup>most</sup> ~~most~~ <sup>nations of them</sup> nations but

it could not be ~~so~~ <sup>thus</sup> enforced with respect to either America or Russia. There are

not enough nations of ~~independent~~ <sup>independent</sup> independence left in the world <sup>whose</sup> ~~whose~~ combined

forces <sup>are not</sup> ~~would be~~ strong enough to coerce either <sup>of these two worlds</sup> ~~Russia or American~~. Neither ~~of~~

<sup>one</sup> ~~these two giants~~ can be coerced short of a world war of indefinite duration and

uncertain outcome.

What <sup>value</sup> ~~then~~, you may ask, ~~would be the value of our having~~ an agreement with

Russia <sup>how far us</sup> if <sup>its can be met</sup> the observance ~~of that agreement~~ can not be enforced? This is a good question

and if there is an answer to it your life and mine may depend on finding that

answer.

*clearer*

An agreement that can not be enforced with respect to Russia and America

(even though most other nations could be ~~compared~~ *not* compelled to continue its observance) will remain in force only if it gives both these ~~countries~~ *nations* security and permits them to achieve and to maintain economic prosperity. It will remain in force only if it ~~is~~ *is* regarded by America and Russia *not only* at the time when they put their signatures to it as advantageous, *but* and if they continue to regard it as *so* advantageous *so much so* that they would wish to maintain it in operation even if they ~~have~~ *had* retained the right legally to abrogate it at any time.

Could such an agreement be devised? This above all is the question to which we must find the answer if we want peace to prevail.

If we think about an agreement with Russia in these terms then we shall see no objection to let Russia and America retain the legal right to abrogate the agreement (even though this right could not be granted to most other nations that may be signatories to it) and there would be perhaps even some advantage to let them retain the right to abrogate. For disputes arising out of the implementation of the agreement will sooner or later arise between America and Russia, and it is difficult to see how they could interest any international body with their settlement. The right to abrogate would enable them, however, effectively to press for a remedy of their grievances if these are sufficiently serious to warrant the risking of the continued existence of the agreement.

If we think in these terms about a Russian-American agreement, then the argument that we must be fully armed before we can negotiate an advantageous

*Mure*

agreement loses its validity. During ~~this~~ *the* past five years, this argument has been advanced again and again; it is time the fallacy of it be recognized for what it is. Yes, if Russia and America were two private persons about to negotiate an agreement the one in the stronger position would probably get the best of the deal. For if ~~two private persons enter into an agreement~~ you enter into an agreement with a private person, once you get the other fellow to sign on the dotted line you can make him keep the agreement ~~by taking him to court~~ if necessary ~~by taking him to court~~. But where Russia and America are concerned there ~~are~~ *is* no courts to which they could appeal. Our problem is not to write an agreement that Russia will sign but to write one which Russia will be eager to keep, *and will keep* not only for the next few years but ten years and twenty years hence. To devise such an agreement requires imagination and resourcefulness rather than patience and firmness; it requires thought and perhaps ~~some~~ *some* compassion rather than arms.

You may ask, have we not tried again and again to reach such an agreement with Russia? The answer is that we have not. In the May issue of the bulletin of the Atomic Scientist, Hans Morgenthau, Professor of International Relations, wrote:

*Our absolute willingness to arm and our willingness to do so - if necessary - may have same effect on Russia - ~~as we have~~ ~~to think in terms~~ ~~willingness to establish~~ to cooperate with us in establishing real peace. But once Russia knows that we have determined to remain as she now does now <sup>that</sup> there is little ~~to be~~ gained by making <sup>with the Americans</sup> ~~any~~ ~~movement~~ ~~because~~*



*awr*  
in a democracy

Only the government can negotiate the agreement that is needed, but we can not rely on the government to do all the thinking that has to go into it. All of us can take, and must take, a part in ~~it~~ that.

What should be the substance of such an agreement? Here is one man's concept for what it is worth: You may be able to improve upon it, and if you are will you please let me know:

*for security*

It seems clear that 1) ~~no~~ agreement will remain in force unless it provides for far-reaching

disarmament and means through which Russia and America can make certain that the provisions relating to disarmament are not secretly evaded

a. How far ~~shall~~ <sup>should</sup> disarmament go and what ~~shall~~ <sup>should</sup> be its nature. What type

of disarmament would strengthen the defensive against the offensive and could give <sup>security to</sup> Western Europe which in case of abrogation of the agreement would be faced with overwhelming Russian land armies arising almost over night?

The kind of disarmament needed would eliminate all heavy mobile arms such as atomic bombs, ordinary bombs, bomber planes, tanks, mobile guns, flame throwers, etc. and ~~it~~ it would permit among mobile weapons only rifles and machine guns which may be necessary for internal policing. Permitted, however, would be also the building of fortifications and heavy guns and other fixed weapons which are built into fortifications.

As long as the agreement is not abrogated by either America or Russia, <sup>then find</sup> ~~countries~~ like France, Belgium, and Holland could ~~protect themselves~~ <sup>protect</sup> against any surprise by maintaining a Maginot line. In case of abrogation, presumably there

would start another arms race. But with such an arms race starting from scratch  
America and Western Europe would have years in which to prepare for the worst.

As long as the agreement is in force Russia and America must be able to re-  
assure themselves that there is no secret evasion/anywhere. <sup>of the ~~disarming~~/disarmament provisions</sup> Within the framework  
of an overall agreement, with all outstanding political issues settled, and with  
disarmament an accomplished fact, there would no longer be a legitimate reason  
left for continued secrecy. There is no reason <sup>then</sup> why we should not permit Russian  
spies to operate openly or secretly in the United States, why we should not grant  
immunity to spies of any nation, and revoke the Espionage Act to permit our own  
citizens freely to cooperate with spies of any nation. <sup>would be</sup> Nor ~~is~~ there/any rational  
reason for Russia to <sup>withhold</sup> grant such facilities <sup>from</sup> to our spies. <sup>of course</sup> Russia might resist this  
thought and so might many people in this country, but there can be no security in  
this world short of complete abolition of all secrecy, and <sup>therefore</sup> such Russian reluctance  
as will become manifest will have to be overcome by emphasizing the great advantages  
which Russian acceptance of the overall agreement would <sup>allow</sup> give Russia. <sup>P</sup> Russia might  
legitimately wish to safeguard herself against ~~subversion~~ subversion by our agents  
and we should not hesitate to give her guarantees on that score. That Russian  
agents might be able to subvert the United States seems hardly likely to me, but  
many people might think otherwise, and if necessary safeguards would have to be  
provided against such a contingency.



To negotiate some such agreement we do not have to wait until we are fully armed, but we ~~may~~ <sup>will</sup> have to wait until we have a Secretary of State who has the faith that such an agreement can be negotiated. For to get such an agreement will be a hard job, and it will take faith. It will take the faith of <sup>same</sup> great man in charge of the negotiations and the faith of many people who ~~will~~ <sup>must</sup> rally to his support. No statesman can do this job unless there is first a popular demand that the job be done.

If we want this job ~~to be~~ <sup>done</sup>, we have little time to lose.

For immediate action there are to be set up ~~a~~ LOBBY FOR REAL PEACE in Washington.

*— — — to help bear the Administration and Congress. —*

And for action in 1952, there are to be set up ~~a~~ POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

which will cut across the political parties and will make its weight felt in the forthcoming presidential election.

What can you do? Right now very little, for the plan outlined above will mean little unless outstanding Americans who can command respect will take the leadership. But ~~this~~ <sup>there is one thing</sup> you can do right now: Think this plan through as fast as you can and make up your mind. Would you support such a plan if men in whom you have confidence were to come forward with it? And if such men did come forward,

would you part with one per cent of your income in its support? *For now less than 1% will be enough to do the job best possible.*

Make up your mind and let me know your answer. Don't send me money, checks,

or pledges, for I have no use for them. What I shall do is this: If your letters

show that there is enough support for the line of action proposed, I will try to

see if the men who ~~are~~ <sup>ought</sup> to lead <sup>such as</sup> ~~this~~ <sup>arranging for</sup> movement will take courage, step forward, and

assume ~~the~~ <sup>big</sup> leadership. ~~Whatever I succeed or not~~ If they do, I shall report back

to you and you <sup>can show</sup> ~~will have to~~ decide <sup>if</sup> ~~whether~~ they have your confidence, and if you wish to give them your support.



not enough

There is ~~an~~ ~~enormous~~ ~~number~~ of nations ~~left~~ ~~left~~ of independent independence left ~~out~~ in the world ~~who~~ by whose combined forces would be strong enough to cause ~~them~~ either Russia or America; ~~at best they might~~ ~~could~~ start a world war of indefinite duration of course allied with America or Russia ~~try to~~ "enforce" ~~it~~ they ~~may~~ try to "enforce" ~~it~~ ~~was~~ ~~but~~ ~~world~~

At best

They might attempt to enforce by force America or Russia by resorting to war - a world war of indefinite duration and uncertain outcome. - ]

Neither of these two grants can be enforced short of a world war of indefinite duration and uncertain outcome

What then can I say <sup>would be the</sup> ~~is the~~ ~~future~~ of having an agreement with Russia if it cannot be enforced? ~~E~~

This is a good question, and if there is an answer in it our hope and future may depend on finding that answer. See then if this will make sense to you:

An agreement that can not be enforced over Russia and America (even though <sup>could</sup> ~~must~~ other nations <sup>be</sup> ~~be~~ <sup>compelled</sup> ~~to~~ ~~obey~~ ~~it~~ ~~and~~ ~~its~~ ~~observance~~)

will remain in force only if  
gives both America and Russia security  
and permits them to achieve and to maintain  
economic prosperity + stability if it is regarded  
by them as advantageous ~~not only~~ <sup>at the time when</sup> they  
put their signatures to it ~~but~~ <sup>and</sup> if they  
could use to regard it as an advantage was  
that they would wish to maintain it  
in operation even if today loyalty they  
have retained the right to abrogate it  
at any time.

Could such an agreement be devised?  
This above all is the question to which  
one must be answer if we want peace  
to prevail.

If we think about ~~an~~ an agreement  
with Russia in these terms then we ~~can~~ <sup>see</sup>  
~~that there are objections to~~ ~~the~~ ~~agreement~~ ~~to~~ ~~Russia~~ ~~and~~ ~~America~~ ~~regarding~~  
the legal right to abrogate the agreement.  
[Even though ~~one~~ one could not grant such  
a right to ~~most~~ <sup>most other</sup> nations that is one  
objection to it] ~~and these~~ ~~objections~~ ~~would~~ ~~be~~ ~~perhaps~~ ~~even~~  
more serious than ~~the~~ ~~objections~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~agreement~~ ~~to~~ ~~Russia~~ ~~and~~ ~~America~~ ~~regarding~~  
the legal right to abrogate the agreement.  
Some ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~objections~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~agreement~~ ~~to~~ ~~Russia~~ ~~and~~ ~~America~~ ~~regarding~~  
the legal right to abrogate the agreement ~~are~~ ~~that~~ ~~if~~ ~~the~~ ~~agreement~~ ~~is~~ ~~made~~  
it will make it possible  
for America to insist on that ~~disposition~~  
of both the spirit and the letter of the  
agreement ~~must~~ ~~be~~ ~~kept~~  
and in the absence of some international  
body to which it and Russia might be  
willing to entrust the settling of  
disputes which might arise of the  
fulfillment of the agreement  
America and Russia might not be able  
to ~~be~~ ~~entrusted~~ ~~to~~ ~~entrust~~ ~~any~~.

disputes arising out of the <sup>implementation</sup> of the <sup>agreement</sup> <sup>may occur at a later date</sup> <sup>between</sup> America and Russia might be further ~~imposed~~ <sup>imposed</sup> to ~~trust~~ <sup>trust</sup> to any ~~international~~ <sup>international</sup> 4

For disputes arising out of the implementation of the agreement will sooner or later arise between America and Russia and it is difficult for me to see how they could entrust any part badly with their settlement, the right to ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~change~~ <sup>change</sup> would enable them however effectively to press for a remedy of their grievances if these are sufficiently serious to warrant ~~noting~~ <sup>noting</sup> the continued existence of the agreement.

If we think in these terms of an agreement, then ~~what it becomes clear~~ <sup>the agreement that has been</sup> the agreement that we must be fully assured before we can <sup>probably</sup> ~~negotiate~~ <sup>negotiate</sup> an agreement <sup>loses its validity by</sup> during these past ~~two~~ <sup>three</sup> years this agreement ~~has~~ <sup>has</sup> been advanced again and again. It is time the fallacy of it be recognized for what it is, — ~~deceitful~~ <sup>deceitful</sup> It is <sup>in general</sup> ~~in general~~ on the line that if ~~one~~ <sup>one</sup> ~~individual~~ <sup>individual</sup> ~~negotiate~~ <sup>negotiate</sup> an agreement

the one in the stronger position will get away with the ~~truth~~ <sup>truth</sup> best of the deal, for once he gets the other fellow to sign on the dotted line he is ~~handed~~ <sup>handed</sup> & he will have to keep the agreement or the other ~~side~~ <sup>side</sup> will be taken to court.

~~When~~ But where Duroso and  
Duroso is concerned there is no  
Court to which to appeal. The problem  
is not to make an agreement  
which ~~to~~ we may be able Duroso  
to get to sign with sign but  
to make one which ~~she will~~ <sup>not only in the next few years</sup> ~~but~~  
be easier to keep ~~(now, five years~~  
~~from now, ten years from now~~  
or twenty years hence. — To divorce  
such an agreement requires ~~duress~~  
malice and ~~reproachfulness~~ <sup>rather than</sup>  
it requires thought ~~and~~ <sup>rather than</sup>  
impulse. —

~~These things ~~because~~ ~~in fact~~~~  
~~is in case of our~~ ~~they might~~  
decide who ~~us~~ ~~of~~ ~~us~~  
and as long as ~~we~~ we think there  
will be ~~us~~ we may wish to  
agree but let us not be pulled  
inches ~~of~~ by pretending that  
we ~~can~~ <sup>must</sup> so that ~~travelling~~ ~~around~~ <sup>we</sup>  
~~and~~ ~~then~~ ~~we~~ ~~an~~ ~~advantageous~~ <sup>we</sup>  
agreement that will permit us <sup>may</sup>  
to divorce. — We are in trouble <sup>get</sup>  
now and nobody will do but  
the truth the full truth and  
nothing but the truth. ]

~~How can we~~  
You may ask have we not ~~been~~  
been ~~again~~ ~~and~~ ~~again~~  
to reach an agreement with  
Duroso? The answer is <sup>that</sup> we have  
not. The rest of the matter is

in the ~~name~~ of the Government  
as  
(Hans Morganthau has pushed  
//

Only the government can negotiate  
the agreement that is needed  
but can not rely on the Government  
to do all the skinning that has  
to go into it. — All of us can take  
and must take part in that. What  
should be the substance of such  
an agreement? Here is one man's  
concept what it is worth. — You  
may be able to improve upon  
it and if you are ~~you~~ should  
~~not~~ ~~be~~ ~~sure~~ will you please  
let me know?

1.) The agreement will ~~be~~ remain in force  
unless it provides for for reaching this agree-  
ment and means through which ~~Britain~~  
and America can ~~be~~ ~~sure~~ ~~make~~ ~~some~~  
that ~~the~~ the provisions relating to  
this agreement are not ~~stated~~ ~~secretly~~  
enacted. —

a) How far should it ~~be~~ ~~enacted~~ ~~or~~ ~~not~~  
what should be its nature?

Question can be effectively checked out of



by the or Russia

a Mayday time. — In case of  
abrupt ~~with~~ <sup>rather</sup> ~~pre~~ <sup>pre</sup> ~~minally~~ <sup>minally</sup> ~~then~~ <sup>then</sup>  
would short another arms race  
but with such a race starting from  
scratch there would be ~~it would~~  
~~take years~~ before Russia and  
Western Europe would have years  
in which to prepare for the worst.

As long as the agreement is in  
force Russia and America ~~would~~  
~~confront~~ ~~themselves~~ must have  
means to reassure themselves  
that there is no secret weapon  
anywhere. —

Nothing the name work of an  
over all agreement that has  
~~settled~~ ~~the~~ ~~entire~~ settled all outstanding  
issues ~~has~~ ~~been~~ and with ~~the~~ ~~agreement~~  
went an accomplished fact there  
is no legitimate reason for  
continued secrecy. There is no  
reason why ~~we~~ should not ~~allow~~  
~~the~~ ~~agreement~~ <sup>permit</sup> Russian spies to operate  
openly or secretly in the U.S., why  
we should not grant <sup>and</sup> immunity to  
Russian spies ~~and~~ ~~also~~ ~~revoke~~  
the espionage act to permit our  
own citizens to cooperate with Russian  
spies. Nor is there any valid reason  
for Russia to ~~be~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~dark~~ to object against  
doing otherwise & she might wish

to safeguard herself against  
 against subversion by our agents  
 and we should not hesitate to  
 give such ~~encouragement~~ — if necessary  
 that our own agents  
 I do not believe for a moment  
 the U.S. seems hardly likely but  
 if necessary safe grounds ~~may~~ could  
 be provided against that contingency.

~~The~~ ~~importance~~ of the ~~subject~~ of ~~these~~  
 considerations Russia might be very  
 reluctant to ~~accept~~ to ~~these~~ grounds  
 of which are for ~~the~~ beyond ~~the~~  
 not type of inspection ~~the~~ but ~~the~~  
 would have might possibly ~~disappear~~  
 of the great ~~benefits~~ ~~of~~ the agreement  
 after ~~the~~ ~~concerns~~ ~~which~~ ~~are~~  
 may affect ~~the~~ ~~respective~~ ~~their~~ ~~with~~  
 consideration.

- 2.) Germany
- 3.) ~~Japan~~ Japan
- 4.) ~~Fornosa~~ Fornosa
- 5.) ~~Asia~~ Asia
- 6.) ~~Adl~~ Adl
- 7.) ~~Communist~~ Communist
- 8.) Cultural exchange
- 9.) Navy

~~Now~~ ~~from~~ ~~the~~ ~~subject~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~

Political pressure

1) Talker

2) Political action etc

Leaders

Your share

To negotiate some such agreement we do not have to wait until we are fully aroused but we may have to wait until we have a secretary of state who has the power that such an agreement can be negotiated.

For that we have to get such an agreement will be a hard job and it will take ~~all the~~ ~~path~~ ~~and~~

~~the~~ the path at a great expense and the path of many people who will rally to his support.

No man can do this job unless there is a popular demand that

the job be done. —

What can you do?

It will take a lot

If we want this job to be done

We had better set up a lobby -

If we want this job done  
we have little choice but to move  
for immediate action there  
ought to be ~~we~~ set up immediately  
a lobby for real peace to ~~Bellevue~~  
the administration and Congress  
And for action in 1952 there ought  
to be set up a political action  
committee which will cut across  
all party lines and will make  
its weight felt in the press-  
club and mediums. There is a

~~is a~~  
What can you do?

Right now very little. For ~~the~~  
the program I outlined above will  
~~what~~ mean little unless antiparty

personnel who have your  
can command respect will  
adopt it at their own and  
take <sup>the</sup> leadership. — But this you  
can do right now: think it

through as fast as you can. Would  
you suggest such a plan if the ~~for~~  
~~was~~ a group of men in whom  
you have confidence were to  
come forward with it? And would  
you put forth 1% of your income  
in its support?

And will you sit down  
and write me ~~down~~ <sup>your</sup> ~~with~~  
~~about~~ the (answer & bank  
sent money or checks <sup>per</sup> ad have  
no use for them. Part of your  
letter says that there is  
enough ~~support~~ support for

This line of action. I will  
see if ~~the~~ there are enough

standing members  
the man who ought to lead  
this movement will take

charge and will take will

step forward and assume  
leadership. — If they do

I shall come back for

you for help ~~to~~ I shall

report back to you and

that you will be able

to do and that will be

the time for you to make  
your decision ~~it~~ and to give your

~~My~~ My memory goes back to the  
time when I was two years old, and  
~~my~~ before my brother was born -  
I remember vividly seeing the  
tapes my mother told <sup>me</sup> ~~me~~ <sup>many</sup> ~~many~~  
~~tapes~~ for the purpose of  
of them. It seems to me in retrospect told  
for a purpose. My mother told  
us that "duals" and she wanted  
to transmit them to her children.  
My mother was always gentle  
with me ~~and~~  
those tapes expressed. These tapes  
were expressions about she thought  
right and beautiful. By telling us  
these tapes she set us the standard  
which was right and beautiful  
~~before~~ <sup>was my</sup> and I know that  
my badge set of values is derived  
from these tapes. I was a sensitive  
child ~~and~~ my mother was a gentle  
woman, ~~and~~ ~~and~~ ~~and~~  
~~important things were concerned~~  
and I don't remember having my  
perceived punishment but I  
remember that I wanted to  
please her. I remember that  
as I climbed up her I explored  
~~the mystery of~~  
my own body with ~~the~~ <sup>the same kind</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>curiosity</sup>  
~~at that in essence~~ and <sup>in (objectively)</sup> ~~the same~~  
spirit as I explored later on  
as I did later on the mysteries

of the external ~~world~~ world and kept  
on order to find out what  
was possible and was out  
I asked my mother point  
black, I was quite willing to  
take things my mother world  
but <sup>on</sup> since she had ~~been~~ ~~seen~~  
laid down the rules I ~~was~~ ~~not~~  
~~it~~ I became ~~firm~~ ~~the~~ ~~point~~  
it was not within her power to change  
and ~~was~~ ~~there~~  
they looked upon I looked  
upon these rules as a mutual  
agreement in which things  
permitted and things forbidden  
had ~~the~~ there proper balance  
and I met ~~it~~ ~~with~~ ~~firm~~ ~~refusal~~  
and ~~any~~ ~~attempt~~ ~~to~~ ~~persuade~~  
me from ~~doing~~ ~~anything~~  
that ~~was~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~line~~  
been classed in the "permitted"  
category. — The set of rules  
had to be consistent and  
I used this requirement of  
consistency to ~~the~~ ~~throw~~  
~~out~~ ~~rules~~ ~~that~~ ~~became~~

have become convinced  
some of the more inconvenient  
rules. — I discovered the power  
of the intellect rather early and  
used it when I was <sup>about</sup> 4 or 5 years  
old to rescue myself from a  
rather messy ~~circumstance~~ into

which I got myself + as the  
~~one of the~~ result of look-  
ing to my mother's face I  
I ~~as the result of~~ ~~intending~~  
my mother placed a very high  
value on truth and seeking it  
and speaking it and a promise

As the result of my mother's course  
I learned I received I

was something holy <sup>(once given)</sup> ~~not~~ ~~it~~  
to be broken was not to  
be broken. — In the little

deeds which I made about  
this time with first

of the kind many children  
will make about this age —

Supposed "I <sup>had</sup> <sup>say</sup> <sup>of</sup>  
allowing me <sup>to</sup> <sup>go</sup> <sup>down</sup> <sup>for</sup>  
a walk <sup>in</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>street</sup> <sup>with</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>mother</sup>  
"in time" or <sup>never</sup> <sup>little</sup> <sup>"</sup>  
" <sup>or</sup> <sup>after</sup> <sup>four</sup> <sup>years</sup> <sup>"</sup>

~~a walk in the street~~  
a walk <sup>with</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>mother</sup> <sup>in</sup> <sup>a</sup> <sup>wash</sup> <sup>room</sup>  
"in time" or <sup>never</sup> <sup>little</sup> <sup>"</sup>  
" <sup>or</sup> <sup>after</sup> <sup>four</sup> <sup>years</sup> <sup>"</sup>

at one hand or another  
~~the way~~ that I will so say  
too prayers or do certain  
things. - Gradually I got down  
the habit of making such  
promises more and more  
rashly and ~~fast~~ ~~lightly~~ ~~into~~  
appears thus ~~with~~ their  
fulfillment, which weighed  
heavily on my conscience. Aug  
I was suffering badly & Aug  
suffered long enough under  
this condition and determined  
to suffer no longer. I had  
an idea of standing on top  
of my little dining table  
and having my legs above  
all my boys scattered  
on the floor. I made the  
solemn promise to  
to make any promises for  
7 years ~~to~~ and ~~the~~ ~~purpose~~  
this that the ~~prayer~~ and the  
spell was for



That this ~~that~~ might be  
my soul which appeared  
because I am about to die  
gave me ~~the~~ anxiety &  
~~to consider to wake~~  
my parents not permitting  
myself to ~~wake~~ <sup>call to</sup> my parents  
of ~~my~~ <sup>my</sup> ~~parents~~ <sup>parents</sup> my head on  
the page that ~~that~~ the  
noise would awaken them  
but I was a small child  
cannot grind his teeth  
very loudly and my parents  
~~were not awake~~ <sup>had</sup>  
~~a~~ ~~sleep~~ ~~rather~~  
~~awake~~ ~~or~~ ~~remained~~  
~~asleep~~ & of the same time  
~~was~~ ~~in~~ ~~anxiety~~  
seeing that I had not  
died I concluded that  
the odd sleep thing  
~~cannot be my soul~~  
must be some thing  
other than my soul and  
I fell asleep.

It seems that for  
~~it might be very desirable~~  
for me  
family reasons it would  
be desirable for me to  
take more of my vacation  
now and prolong stay in  
N. Y. I shall call you Friday  
to find out ~~of~~ this will  
be a lot of low work  
this would  
vds