

ALLEN J. ELLENDER, LA., CHAIRMAN

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, S.C.  
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, FLA.  
JAMES O. EASTLAND, MISS.  
HERMAN E. TALMADGE, GA.  
WILLIAM PROXMIRE, WIS.  
B. EVERETT JORDAN, N.C.  
EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, MINN.  
MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, OREG.  
GEORGE MCGOVERN, S. DAK.  
J. HOWARD EDMONDSON, OKLA.

GEORGE D. AIKEN, VT.  
MILTON R. YOUNG, N. DAK.  
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, IOWA  
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, KY.  
J. CALEB BOGGS, DEL.  
E. L. MECHEM, N. MEX.

*gen. file.*

## United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON  
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

COTYS M. MOUSER, CHIEF CLERK

March 26, 1963

Dear Doctor Szilard:

Congratulations on the wonderful article in yesterday's Sunday Star Magazine. As one who has received the benefit of your good works, I was especially interested in reading this report of your activities.

I appreciate, too, the congratulatory telegram which you and Dr. Doering sent to me on my maiden speech.

The Council, as you know, is now arranging to mail it out to their members and friends.

With very best wishes,

Sincerely,

  
George McGovern

Doctor Leo Szilard  
Dupont Plaza Hotel  
Washington, D.C.

Geneva, October 2nd, 1963.

The Honourable George McGovern,  
United States Senate,  
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Senator McGovern,

I have been away from the United States since June and I had meant to write to you before this. I do not want to delay any further, even though I am now scheduled to be back in Washington by October 18th, where I expect to stay for a week.

I keep continuing getting favourable responses to the general idea of the "Hearings" which we have discussed and I wondered whether you might not think that the time has come for you to take matters into your own hands. There are a few things which have come up since I talked to you:

a) Before leaving Washington, I had lunch with Justice Goldberg who was generally sympathetic but warned that the administration will be concerned with leaks to the press and that unless this objection can be met, the administration could be expected to say that because of the danger of such leaks, members of the administration would not, and should not, feel free to state their views, particularly if these views do not conform to the current official policy of the Government.

Since I talked to Justice Goldberg, it occurred to me that there might be a way to make reasonably sure that there would be no such leaks to the press. There are only five or six likely channels through which such leaks might occur, which include Drew Pearson and James Reston. You might see these five or six people individually, describe to them the value of the project which you are about to set up, and explain to them that such a project could not succeed except if they agree to co-operate and to pledge in advance that they would not accept any leaks that might reach them.

b) I had a letter from Edward Murrow just after I left Washington, who expressed real enthusiasm for the project and said that he would be willing to meet with anyone at any time, to discuss how it might best be implemented. Please feel free to contact him and to refer to the interest which he expressed to me in his letter.

c) I am enclosing correspondence which I had with Adlai Stevenson for your information, and if you think it might be useful to you, please contact Adlai Stevenson and refer to this correspondence. You may keep the originals but I would appreciate it if you were to give me photocopies if I call at your office around 20 October.

d) I believe I mentioned to you already that Harriman reacted favourably and offered to invite to dinner a few people to discuss with him and with each other how the general idea might be best implemented. If you think it might serve a useful purpose, you might take him up on this.

e) Arthur Schlesinger Jr. with whom I had lunch before I left Washington, seemed to like the idea and offered to help.

f) Benjamin Read, who used to be Legislative Aide to Senator Clark but who is now with the Department of State, likes the idea very much and you might find it worth your while to talk to him about its implementation.

g) I do not know whether I mentioned to you that I talked to Senator Fulbright. He said that while he did not know whether or not such an operation could be in fact set up, he did think it would be a good thing if it could be set up. He did not offer to take a hand in promoting the project but he did indicate that he would want to participate in it if it came about. You probably would want to talk to him at your convenience.

h) Robert Eichholz, a lawyer and "man about town" in Washington (who recently married Justice Douglas's divorced wife), said that he would be very much interested in working for this project. He has a private income and is in no need of a salary. Since many people in Washington know him, you should have no difficulty in getting further information about him and then, depending on whether or not you would need his services, contact him and refer to the interest which he expressed to me before the summer. I know that he would have liked to work for the State Department and that this desire of his was frustrated because, for some reason or other, Ball does not like him. If you know Ball, perhaps you could find out from him what he has against him. It may be, of course, that your own staff, or staff borrowed from other senators can take care of the work which is involved, and that you do not need the services of Eichholz.

i) I discussed the project with Thomas Watson Jr., Chairman of I.B.M. He seemed to like the general idea very much and offered to help if his help were needed. If you wish, you might contact him and refer to the conversation which I had with him.

j) I also discussed the project with Ambassador Wadsworth, at the time when I thought that it might be advisable to set up a small sponsoring citizens' committee. He expressed interest in the project and offered his help. You might contact him if you think you can use him.

k) I have discussed the project with Franklin Long, up to recently Assistant Director for Research and Technology of the US Agency for Arms Control and Disarmament, who is now back at the Department of Chemistry, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. I found him very sympathetic. I believe that he would be an excellent man to speak before the group and he might perhaps be the first one whom you would want to ask. I saw him recently at the Pugwash meeting in Dubrovnik and told him that I am going to write to you and that you might contact him.

\* \* \*

I believe that it would not be advisable to try to clear this project with the White House in advance. It would be better first to hold two or three sessions and to contact the White House at a time when one is able to show them the kind of material that is being produced.

The enclosed memorandum dated October 2nd 1963 reflects my current thoughts regarding the implementation of the memorandum of 28 May which you have in your files.

Between now and my return to Washington on or about October 18th, I shall be on the go and cannot be reached. I intend, however, to call you on my arrival in Washington, over the telephone, and you can tell me then whether you would be prepared to carry the ball from here on and whether there is anything further that you would want me to do to facilitate the implementation of the project.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

Leo Szilard.

Geneva, October 2nd, 1963

MEMORANDUM

from : Leo Szilard  
to : Senator George McGovern

This memorandum reflects my current thinking regarding the implementation of my memorandum of 28 May.

There would be formed a group of perhaps twelve to fifteen distinguished citizens who are knowledgeable and seriously concerned about the trend of current events. This group would meet once a week and on each such occasion the group would have one individual, chosen from a list of about twenty from within the Administration, as its guest. The task of the "guest" would be to try to look into the future and to come up with a set of desirable objectives which he thinks might, with luck, be attainable by the end of President Kennedy's second term. The "guest" could say how, what he would like to see done on a short-term basis, would fit in with this set of objectives and he could elaborate on one particular objective which is closest to his own field of interest.

In the ensuing discussion, the set of objectives presented by the "guest" would be scrutinized by the group; the group would presumably discuss whether these objectives are compatible with each other and whether - to the extent as these objectives may involve other nations - they are likely to become negotiable in the predictable future. The discussion which would follow the presentation of the prepared statement would be off the record. Members of the group may however submit their observations in writing within two weeks to the secretary of the group. These observations would be made available to the "guest", who may within two weeks submit his answers in writing.

The prepared statement of the "guest", the observations submitted by members of the group, and the answers of the "guest" would be transmitted to the President. In addition, they would also be made available to such individuals within the Administration as are designated by the "guest".

In this fashion, those individuals within the Administration who are invited to appear before the group, would have an opportunity to communicate their views to the President, without having to ask for the privilege of seeing the President.

No classified material would be communicated to the group. Its members would be free to make use of any thoughts expressed in these deliberations, but not to attribute any particular view to any particular individual or to discuss such views in circumstances in which they could be traced to a particular individual who had participated in the deliberations of the group.

I am inclined to believe that it would be possible to secure distinguished and knowledgeable persons as members of the group and to arrange for the appearance of distinguished individuals from within the Administration before the group, provided this made sense to the President, and provided that the President made it clear that he would want to receive a copy of the prepared papers that are presented together with the "observations" and "answers".

It would seem advisable, however, to contact the White House only after a few sessions have been held. Only after a few sessions have been held is it possible to show what kind of material the sessions are going to produce.

Also, only after a few sessions have been held will it be possible to say that members of the administration who appear as "guests" before the group need not be apprehensive of leaks to the press that might embarrass them. It might prove possible to secure the co-operation of the five or six people who would be likely channels for such leaks and to obtain an assurance from them that they would not accept such "leaks".

June 4, 1963

Senator George S. McGovern  
United States Senate  
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Senator McGovern:

This is a final mimeographed version of the memo which poses the problem. It should be read in conjunction with the typed text, "A Proposal" dated May 27th, which is in your files.

With very best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

Leo Szilard

Memorandum

Draft

from: Leo S. Clark  
to: Senator George McGovern

Geneva, 2 October 1963

This memorandum reflects my current thinking regarding the implementation of my memorandum of 28 May.

---

It would seem adviseable, however, to contact the White House only after a few sessions have been held. Only after a few sessions have been held is it possible to ~~know~~ <sup>show</sup> what kind of material the sessions ~~would produce.~~ <sup>are going to</sup> Also only after a few sessions have been held will it be possible to ~~see what kind of~~ <sup>say</sup> ~~assurances one may be able to give~~ that members of the administration who appear as "guests" before the group need not be apprehensive of leaks to the press that might embarrass them.

~~It is conceivable that some effort should be made to secure the co-operation of the five or six people who would be likely channels for such leaks and to obtain an assurance from them that they would not ~~serve as channels for such~~ <sup>accept</sup> "leaks".~~

Geneva Oct 2<sup>nd</sup> /63

Memorandum  
from: Leo S. Clark  
to: Senator George McGovern