~~THE~~ A GRAND ALLIANCE FOR PEACE AND PEACEFUL DEVELOPMENT

A sober historical analysis of the mass of facts and figures, of argument and evaluation relating to the history of nations and people since the end of World War II points essentially to three basic problems confronting the world.

1. The continuing drift toward war and the overriding need for a viable proposal to achieve disarmament.

2. The staggering needs of the developing nations to achieve peaceful economic, social and political development.

3. The need to build firmer the structure of international cooperation for all nations and all people to enjoy.

In addition, we must find new avenues to develop in the free world a new sense of cohesion and purpose.

Then, of course, turning our sights inward on our own economic and social problems at home, we must find the way to interrelate the solution of world problems with our own.

The Struggle Between Conflicting Ideologies

The world scene today is torn between the drive of two antagonastic political ideologies for dominance in the world. Both the cold war and the sporadic

influence United States policy toward relying more on military power than economic power to meet the threat of communism. It attempts to compel a negative policy of military intervention and divert us from the pursuit of a positive program of social action - the only key to achieving economic security and human dignity for the poverty stricken peoples of the world. The fury of the communist attack upon the uses of peaceful development is symptomatic of its concern to thwart the free world from helping people help themselves to win a better life. In Vietnam, the Communists destroy the schools, they destroy the health centers, they assassinate medical advisers and teachers. For in these manifestations of peace, they see the greatest threat to their take-over.

Problems A Peace Offensive Must Resolve

It is for the free world therefore to take the initiative in developing and fashioning a positive strategy for peace. It can no longer rely simply upon responding to aggressive acts with the defensive use of military arms.

The negative strategy of deterrence must be replaced by a positive strategy for peace. Such a strategy for peace, to be successful, must

influence United States policy toward relying more on military power than economic power to meet the threat of communism. It attempts to compel a negative policy of military intervention and divert us from the pursuit of a positive program of social action - the only key to achieving economic security and human dignity for the poverty stricken peoples of the world. The fury of the communist attack upon the uses of peaceful development is symptomatic of its concern to thwart the free world from helping people help themselves to win a better life. In Vietnam, the Communists destroy the schools, they destroy the health centers, they assassinated medical advisers and teachers. For in these manifestations of peace, they see the greatest threat to their take-over.

(insert A)

We must come to the realization that the same scientific and technical know-how that gives man the capability of fashioning the weapons of over-kill also gives him the capability of utilizing the fantastic new tools of science and technology to solve mankind's ancient problems: the shortage of food, of clothing, of adequate housing, of ignorance and disease. For the first time in the history of the human family, man is capable of mastering his physical environment and of fulfilling

(A) Problems A Peace Offensive Must Resolve

It is for the free world therefore to take the initiative in developing and fashioning a positive strategy for peace. It can no longer rely simply upon responding to aggressive acts with the defensive use of military arms.

the basic material needs of the human community to build a good life. Through the centuries there have always been more empty bellies than there has been the capability of producing adequate food. There have always been more naked backs than there was the ability to produce sufficient clothing. There have always been more families to be housed than there was the ability to build adequate shelter. In this day and in this time, however, man has learned to produce abundance to meet his physical needs. The great challenge is not to find the way to produce abundance but rather to determine for what purpose man will deploy his creative genius to produce abundance. Will he continue to fashion the weapons of self-destruction, or will he harness the rising star of science and technology to the rewarding purposes of peace and plenty?

The answer ~~of~~ to this question is clear and unmistakable. On both sides of the Iron Curtain men share the common anxiety which was expressed by President Kennedy when he said to the United Nations:

> "Today every inhabitant of this planet will be contemplating the day when it may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles hung by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident, miscalculation or madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us..."

With few, albeit, important exceptions, capitalist and communist alike have come to the realization that disarmament is the only possible means to draw humanity back from its headlong race to disaster. ~~before it is too late from what Sir Winston Churchill aptly called "the rim of hell".~~ A leading American corporation building arms for the United States defense has sponsored conferences on disarmament because as one of its Vice-Presidents explained, "we want to go on serving live customers". Mr. Khrushchev expressed the same thought in his own terms when he said:

> "Anybody who says a revolution needs a war should know that more warmongers die than anyone else... we want communism not on the ruins of the world but on the foundations of Marxism - Leninism."

The question of war and peace is no longer the same as in years past. It is no longer the question of which side can win and which side will lose. For the first time in history, the question of war and peace has been reduced to the simple common denominator of human survival. The richest family in Park Avenue, living in the most luxurious penthouse, the poorest exploited sharecropper on the Mississippi Delta, the impoverished beggar living and sleeping in the slums of the streets of Calcutta, the poorest African, are all in the same boat. For if mankind in its drift toward the insanity of war should use the weapons of over-kill, the future of the

richest and most secure is as blighted as the future of the poorest.

This simple fact must be made understandable so that the human family will achieve a new sense of solidarity - so that it will act rationally, responsibly and morally toward building a world community in which the human family will have some prospect of survival and of progress through peace.

We have pointed out, however, that peace is not achievable through military buildup or in a world in which agonizing poverty and deprivation exist in the midst of plenty, in which compelling human needs remain unmet in the midst of idle productive capacity, in which huge strides are made in the physical sciences while we fail to make comparable progress in the human and social sciences. Any program for peace, therefore, must encompass a program for peaceful development. The growing gap in economic and social progress between the have and the have-not peoples of the world must be narrowed by helping the people in the developing nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America to catch up with the 20th century and be enabled to share in the blessings and the abundance of the technological revolution.

The search for peace, then, is also the search for fashioning a better life for all people everywhere. We cannot make the peace more secure

if a few years from now we have developed a kill capability equivalent to 30 tons of TNT for every man, woman and child on earth. We cannot make the peace more secure if we aspire some day to developing an armament posture equivalent to 50 tons of TNT for every human being. We cannot make the peace more secure as long as people must continue to struggle for tomorrow's piece of bread and not find it. Unless we face up to these compelling facts and act accordingly, either the human race is going to act rationally to end the nuclear arms race or in due time the nuclear arms race will irrationally end the human race.

It is simultaneously true that the world in which we live requires the maintenance of adequate military power for if we did not maintain defensive strength, we would be at the mercy of the power decisions and the immoral acts of others who continued to build military strength. Military power, however, is but the negative face of the total effort freedom must assume if we are to win the struggle for peace and if we are to fulfill freedom's agenda of unfinished business in the world. Military power can only buy us the time and the opportunity to do what must be done to solve the economic and social problems of the world and of our own country.

meet the fundamental problems noted earlier.

It must break the deadlock in disarmament negotiations and keep the evil genie of nuclear catastrophe permanently bottled.

It must lay the foundation for building a firmer structure of International cooperation.

It must free the energies and abilities of people in the emerging nations to raise their standards of economic and social well-being at an accelerated pace.

It must offer the free world a new opportunity for future progress.

At the same time, it must help meet the still unresolved problems, economic and social, in our own "affluent society".

The Strategy of a Rational Peace Offensive

How then can we fashion such a strategy for peace?

Perhaps we can learn from the example of collective bargaining in labor-management relations. For over 25 years, for instance, the United Auto Workers Union has sat in negotiations with a number of the world's largest corporations. The stakes in labor negotiations are large in terms of money and social progress but the stakes in disarmament negotiations and in the pursuit of peaceful world-wide

~~Thus~~, The negative strategy of deterrence must be replaced by a positive strategy for peace, ~~if mankind is to avoid the nuclear abyss.~~ Such a strategy for peace, to be successful, must meet the fundamental problems noted earlier ~~above~~. ¶ indented It must break the deadlock in disarmament negotiations and keep the evil genie of nuclear catastrophe permanently bottled. ¶ indent It must ~~and~~ lay the foundation for building a firmer structure of international cooperation. ¶ indented It must free the energies and abilities of people in the emerging nations to raise their standards of economic and social well-being at an accelerated pace. ¶ indented It must offer the free world a new opportunity for future progress. ¶ indented At the same time, it must help meet the still unresolved problems, economic and social, in our own "affluent society".

The Strategy of a Rational Peace Offensive

How then can we fashion such a strategy for peace?

Perhaps we can learn from the example of collective bargaining in labor-management relations. For over 25 years, for instance, the United Auto Workers Union has sat in negotiations with a number of the world's largest corporations. The stakes in labor negotiations are large in terms of money and social progress but the stakes in disarmament negotiations and in the pursuit of peaceful world-wide

by warmongers who fatten on the profits of war. History has proven that the United States is indeed capable of a total effort when confronted with the challenge of war. We must prove to ourselves and the rest of the world - and especially the communist world - that we are wholly capable of a comparable effort when faced with the infinitely more complex challenge of winning the peace.

Elsewhere, we have noted that our recessions, our failure to utilize our productive capacity, our unemployment have cost us _____ million man hours of labor and _____ billion in lost wealth during the past 10 years. There lies the weakness in our society but it is these very facts which can and should be converted into sources of great strength. The missing element in our strategy for peace is our unused productive capacity. It is ~~the margin of~~ America's unused productive capacity which can be made mankind's margin of survival. With its proper use and deployment, we have the means to transform the arms race into a peace race. It affords us the opportunity to transmute the stockpiling of annihilation into a peaceful contest in freeing mankind from hunger, ignorance and disease. This is the element which can be molded into the leverage that will move the communist nations toward a

many other communist nations? It is their straining, struggling economies - hard pressed to stay in the arms and space races while at the same time attempting to meet the needs and wants of their people whose rising expectations for a better life remain still merely a promise in some distant future. Our strategy should consist of drawing these countries, and particularly the wealthiest one of them, the Soviet Union, into a contest in which we take maximum advantage of our unused economic strength to impose further stress on their already over-strained economies.

The Plan for a Peace Offensive

How then do we make the most efficient and effective use of the great unused productive capability of our economy? Do we spend more to build more fire power? Do we hoard unto ourselves our abundance and storage it in huge warehouses to rot and waste away? Or do we use it to challenge the communist wo rld to join with us - or failing that, to compete - with us and the other member nations of the free world in the peaceful economic development of the have-not nations? Only in this way could we put our faith in freedom on the line, confident that we could promote the economic advancement of developing nations and assist them to find their own way toward the achievement of freedom, democratic procedure, and the guarantee of a free society.

many other communist nations? It is their straining, struggling economies - hard pressed to stay in the arms and space races while at the same time attempting to meet the needs and wants of their people whose rising expectations for a better life remain still merely a promise in some distant future. Our strategy should consist of drawing these countries, and particularly the wealthiest one of them, the Soviet Union, into a contest in which we take maximum advantage of our unused economic strength to impose further stress on their already over-strained economies.

The Plan for a Peace Offensive

How then do we make the most efficient and effective use of the great unused productive capability of our economy? Do we spend more to build more fire power? Do we hoard unto ourselves our abundance and storage it in huge warehouses to rot and waste away? Or do we use it to challenge the communist world to ~~compete~~ join with us (or failing that, to compete with us) and the other member nations of the free world in the peaceful economic development of the have-not nations? Only in this way could ~~be~~ we put our faith in freedom on the line, confident that we could ~~be more effective than the communist nations in promoting~~ promote the economic advancement of developing nations and ~~in assisting~~ assist them to find their own way toward the achievement of freedom, democratic procedure, and the guarantee of a free society.

injustice does not deny the people of these countries the opportunity of finding democratic solutions to their problems based upon consent and not coercion.

This announced commitment would be coupled with an invitation to other advanced and industrialized countries, both of the free world and the communist world, to join in the over-all plan to bring large scale economic aid to the developing countries. It would be accomplished, moreover, with a formal invitation to the Soviet Union and the rest of the communist nations to conclude a disarmament agreement with proper and adequate inspection requirements and to shift the men, machines and materials freed by the military cut back to the peaceful work of economic development. It would not be necessary - in fact it should be made clear - that we are not waiting for the communist nations to give agreement to or join in the program but rather that we will proceed immediately with our own massive aid program together with other nations which will join in the effort. Disarmament cannot be brought about unilaterally and without agreement, but in the search for peace, we can seize the initiative and act unilaterally and boldly without agreement.

This, in effect, would be a declaration of peace but there would

retype pg

injustice does not deny the people of these countries the opportunity of finding democratic solutions to their problems based upon consent and not coercion.

This announced commitment would be coupled with an invitation to other advanced and industrialized countries both ~~of the free world~~ and the communist world to join in the over all plan to bring large scale economic aid to the developing countries. It would be accomplished, moreover, with a formal ~~challenge~~ invitation to the Soviet Union and the rest of the communist nations to conclude a disarmament agreement with proper and adequate inspection requirements and to shift the men, machines and materials freed by the military cut back to the peaceful work of economic development. It would not be necessary - in fact it should be made clear - that we are not waiting for the communist nations to give agreement to the ~~plan~~ program or join in but rather that we will proceed immediately with our own massive aid program together with other ~~free~~ nations ~~who~~ which will join in the effort. Disarmament cannot be brought about unilaterally and without agreement, but in the search for peace, we can seize the initiative and act unilaterally and boldly without agreement.

¶ This, in effect, would be a declaration of peace but there would be one essential difference from earlier declarations. This would be a positive, aggressive search for peace - a peace offensive.

be one essential difference from earlier declarations. This would be a positive, aggressive search for peace - a peace offensive.

Thus we would seize the initiative. What choices then for action would be left open to the Soviet Union and its satellite communist nations.

The immediate alternative would be for the Communist bloc of nations to join in the program and commit their equitable share toward economic development within the framework of the program. At the same time they would be obligated, as a condition of participation - as is the condition for all who participate - to conclude a disarmament agreement including the guarantee of adequate inspection requirements. Should the Soviet Union choose the course - by far the most desirable - the family of nations could move together with immediate and massive steps toward a brighter future. The detente so longingly anticipated could become a reality and co-existence would represent not so much a practical willingness to live together but an affirmative desire to work and build together tied to the common cause of peace. Perhaps this is too much to hope for, but what hosannas from all over the world would greet such an act of peace. Cooperative effort would replace challenge.

Affirmative, constructive peace building would replace the cold war and armed skirmishes. Hope for future generations would replace fear and despair. And the huge outlays of money currently diverted to weaponry could be diverted instead to the peaceful uses of a better life.

Suppose, however, the invitation to cooperative effort is rejected (and the history of communist reaction to the proposals of free world nations to achieve economic cooperation and disarmament unfortunately would cause us to anticipate a rejection) what other alternatives would be open to the communist nations? For, regardless of communist rejection, we would nevertheless proceed with the program.

At first glance, it might appear that they would have three other alternatives to choose from. Upon closer analysis, however, it would become clear that only one of the three choices would be open for them, and, failing an initial acceptance to participate cooperatively, that choice is the one we would want them to take.

Confronted with the free world's unilateral challenge of massive economic assistance to the have-not people of the world, the Soviet Union must ponder whether to:

1) default the contest between freedom and tyranny in the emerging countries, or;

2) accept the challenge and obtain the resources to meet it by reducing the living standards of their people, or;

3) accept the challenge by meeting it through serious efforts to negotiate a disarmament agreement which would permit them to stay in the contest by diverting resources from the arms race to the tasks of peaceful competition in economic development.

Thus we would seize the initative. What choices then for action would be left open to the Soviet Union and its satellite communist nations? At first glance it might appear that they would have three alternatives to choose from. Upon analysis, however, it would become clear that there is only one choice for them and that choice is the one we would want them to take.

Confronted with our unilateral challenge of massive economic assistance to the have-not people of the world, the Soviet Union must ponder whether to:

1) default the contest between freedom and tyranny in the emerging countries, or;

2) accept the challenge and obtain the resources to meet it by reducing the living standards of their people, or;

3) accept the challenge by meeting it through serious efforts to negotiate a disarmament agreement which would permit them to stay in the contest by diverting resources from the arms race to the tasks of peaceful competition in economic development.

(B)

¶ The immediate alternative would be for the Communist bloc of nations to join in the program and commit their equitable share toward ~~the~~ economic development ~~plan~~ within the framework of the program. At the same time they would be obligated, as a condition of participation — as is the condition for all ~~others~~ who participate — to conclude a disarmament agreement including the guarantee of adequate inspection requirements. Should the Soviet Union choose this course — by far the most desireable — the family of nations could move immediate and massive steps together with toward a brighter future.

The detente so longingly anticipated could become a reality and co-existence would represent not so much a practical willingness to live together but an affirmative tied to the common cause of peace desire to work and build together. Perhaps this is too much to hope for, but what Rosannas from all over the world would greet such an act of peace. Cooperative effort would replace challenge. Affirmative, constructive peace building would replace the cold war and armed skirmishes. Hope for future generations would replace fear and despair. And

(over)

the huge outlays of money currently diverted to weaponry could be diverted instead to the peaceful uses of a better life.

Suppose, however, the invitation to cooperative effort is rejected (and the history of communist reaction to the proposals of free world nations to achieve economic cooperation and disarmament unfortunately would cause us to anticipate a rejection) what other alternatives would be open to the communist nations? For, regardless of communist rejection we would nevertheless proceed with the program.

The communist bloc would now be faced with an economic challenge which they could not ignore. It is not difficult for them to meet the economic challenge of a $3 billion foreign aid program. They can scrape enough together to stay in the game but under all circumstances they cannot afford to default an intensified economic contest. Our challenge would relate to a contest for waging the peace in the very arena where the communists profess that their social system is superior to ours. Mr. Khrushchev in 1961 glorified the superiority of the Soviet system as compared with capitalist economy and no doubt the current leadership of the Soviet Union ~~feels~~ harbors the same sentiments. He said to the Soviet people:

> "The superiority of the Socialist economy over the capitalist economy is now not only being proved by theoretical arguments. The material evidence of this is already distinct. The countries of the Socialist community are from year to year demonstrating their superiority in the rate of economic growth, in the development of scientific and technical thought, in the raising the living standards of the working people and in many other fields...
>
> "Vladimir Ilyich Lenin's profound and unshakable faith in the superiority of the Socialist system enabled him to challenge capitalism to economic competition, to advance the idea of peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems.
>
> "Those who are confident of the economic victory of their social system need not impose this system upon other peoples by force of arms."

The communist bloc cannot abdicate the contest for the loyalties and the support of the hundreds of millions of people in the developing nations for that is what the political idealogical contest in the world is all about. That is what the power struggle is all about. Since it is in the field of economic development that the communists claim the superiority of their system over ours, since it is in this sense that they intend to "bury us", they will have to ~~join~~ remain in the contest in the have-not lands where most people go to bed hungry every night and where communism counts on forging human poverty into political power. The strategists of the communist bloc are schooled in the politics of power but they respect superior power, particularly superior economic power. They work hard at projecting the techniques by which they can forge human poverty into political power. Therefore, if communism is to have any future outside the countries where it is already in power, that future must reside in the developing countries. Should communism fail in these areas, it must recognize that it is doomed to become a diminishing force in the world.

An announcement by the United States of a ~~peaceful~~ free world peace offensive in these very lands and in behalf of these very people would call the communist bluff. They would have no choice but to stay in the game and such a program for the total waging of the peace would shift the current world contest from the nuclear arms race which no one can win to an economic contest between competing social systems which would compel both sides in the contest to back up propaganda promises with practical performance, to convert pious slogans into tangible acts of assistance.

Assuming then that the communist bloc could not under any circumstances abdicate the economic contest, it might find the resources to stay in the contest. As noted earlier, as long as the United States continues to divert approximately $3 billion a year toward economic aid, the communists can stay in the competition, especially if they concentrate their aid in a few areas most crucial to their interests. But at the point our commitment is suddenly and dramatically increased to $20 billion a year and other free nations join to provide additional billions, then the communist effort will be in trouble. Our economy is marked by

to reduce armaments by $10 billion, we would then also be able to reduce armament expenditures by $10 billion and we could divert $5 billion of that savings into intensifying the economic contest and at the same time use the other $5 billion to help meet our domestic needs. Once the move toward disarmament begins and large sums of money are released to step up the peace offensive, the need for further disarmament will feed upon itself. In order to keep pace in the developing nations, the Communist bloc would be obligated continually to increase its economic aid expenditures and reduce its own armaments expenditures.

II. The Peace Offensive Resolves Problems In The World And At Home

Thus, we would be in a position to use our economic power as a basic strategic weapon to compel the communist nations to move increasingly toward total disarmament or else surrender in the economic contest and the ideological contest among the have-not nations of the world. The only real answer which they would have to such a peace offensive would be to seek ultimate total disarmament coupled with some means such as the creation of a strong United Nations peace force to safeguard them as well as ourselves against the possibility of other aggressors.

success. It has been running as fast as it can economically to stand still. Annual per capita income is approximately $70.

The hard economic fact is that a nation can look forward to accelerated economic development as it finds the way to accumulate capital. In earlier years of industrial development, capitalist nations accumulated their capital by exploiting their workers. In their developing stages, communist nations do exactly the same. In the Soviet Union, the plans of economic development relied for success on the build-up of capital goods by exploiting the living standards and the welfare of the masses of working people on farm and factory. China, today, with all its economic progress, climbing out of the abyss of a thousands of years old feudal economy, must continue to demand its workers tighten their belts to make economic room for increasing accumulation of capital. They are compelled to save rather than expand as much of their wealth as they can to deny rather than satisfy the demands of their people for the necessities and comforts of life precisely at a time when their people are already too much denied and too much deprived. But these economic restrictions are required, since developing nations such as China want to - even

have to - make progress toward economic abundance within a much shorter period than did the capitalist nations. While the United States has been moving toward its present affluent state over a period of 200 years of economic development and accumulation of capital, China must span the economic gap in a matter of decades.

If China, employing its authoritative centralized control of its economy is able to accumulate capital by hoarding large sections of its economic potential each year at a rate faster than India is capable of doing through its democratic way of life, then China can continue in its recalcitrant isolation. But should India move ahead quickly, building an economic base more adequately satisfying the needs of its people, outstripping with seven league boots the economic growth of China, then China cannot ignore that fact. It must find a way to meet that economic challenge and its search will include the bright and promising economic advantages of the peace offensive.

Suppose, therefore, a massive economic aid program helped raise the living standards of the people of India over seven-fold to $500 a year. China, sitting on the vast India border, could not resist the revolutionary impact

of that fact. The Chinese need not worry as long as India can move its per capita annual income from $70 to $72 and then to $75, etc. but China could not ignore the leverage that a fast improving standard of living in India would mean to its own people. This fact would offer the leverage to begin to halt the nuclear arms race on which China is currently embarked and we could bring to bear such positive dynamic forces in the arena of economic competition and social well-being that these forces would begin to cancel out the negative dynamics that make for war.

At this point the question of economic trade, cultural exchange, diplomatic recognition of China and the question of China's admission into the UN will become increasingly pertinent and more easily grasped. The world cannot forever search for peace while the single largest group of its people remains outside the main stream of world-wide economic, social and political development. But obviously the conditions governing China's entry in the program would be the same peace-directed conditions as prevail for all other entrants.

retype

success. It has been running as fast as it can economically to stand still. Annual per capita income is approximately $70. Suppose, ~~however,~~ therefore a massive economic aid program helped raise the living standards of the people of India over seven-fold to $500 a year. China, sitting on the vast India border, could not resist the revolutionary impact of that fact. The Chinese need not worry as long as India can move its per capita annual income from $70 to $72 and then to $75, etc. but China could not ignore the leverage that a fast improving standard of living in India would mean to its own people. This fact would offer the leverage to begin to halt the nuclear arms race on which China is currently embarked and we could bring to bear such positive dynamic forces in the arena of economic competition and social well-being that these forces would begin to cancel out the negative dynamics that make for war.

At this point the question of economic trade, cultural exchange, diplomatic recognition of China and the question of China's ~~entering~~ admission into the UN will become increasingly pertinent and more easily grasped. The world cannot forever search for peace while the single largest group of its people remains outside the main stream of ~~its~~ world-wide economic, social and political developme nt. But obviously the conditions governing China's entry in the program would be the same peace directed conditions as prevail for all other entrants.

(C) R

The hard economic fact is that a nation can look forward to accelerated economic development as it finds the way to accumulate capital. In earlier years of industrial development capitalist nations accumulated their capital by exploiting their workers. In their developing stages, communist nations do exactly the same. In the Soviet Union the plans of economic development relied for success on the build-up of capital goods by exploiting the living standards and the welfare of the masses of working people on farm and factory. China, today, with all its economic progress climbing out of the abyss of a thousands of years old feudal economy, must continue to demand its workers tighten their belts to make economic room for increasing accumulation of capital. They are compelled to save rather than spend, to deny rather than satisfy the demands of their people for the necessities and comforts of life as much of their wealth as they can precisely at a time when their people are already too much denied and too much deprived. But these economic restrictions are required, since

(over)

developing nations such as China want to — even have to — make progress toward economic abundance within a much shorter period than did the capitalist nations. While the United States has been moving toward its present affluent state over a period of 200 years of economic development and accumulation of capital, China must span the economic gap in a matter of decades.

If China, employing its authoritative centralized control of its economy is able to accumulate capital by hoarding large sections of its economic potential each year at a rate faster than India is capable of doing through its democratic way of life, then China can continue in its recalcitrant isolation. But should India move ahead quickly, building an economic base more adequately satisfying the needs of its people, outstripping with seven league boots the economic growth of China, then China cannot ignore that fact. It must find a way to meet that economic challenge and its search will include the bright and promising economic advantages of the peace offensive.

enormous unmet needs of people at home and in the rest of the world. Moreover, because of the slack in our own economy the expenditures to wage the peace offensive would represent not an amount of wealth sacrificed by our consumers but rather an amount of wealth we are otherwise losing as a result of unemployment and idle productive capacity. We would, in effect, be converting waste into economic wealth. As has already been noted merely to keep unemployment from rising above present levels our nation must achieve an economic growth rate of at least 5% a year. Even at the 5% rate, we would be growing less rapidly than other industrialized countries. The expansion of the increased rate of growth brought about by using our un used productive capacity would expand our Gross National Product and raise living standards at home and eliminate poverty from our midst. It would be employed to build more schools, to train and hire more teachers, to wipe out our educational deficits, to clear our slums and re-fashion our cities, to build more modern hospitals, to expand highway construction and resource development and do the many other things needed to improve the quality of American life and achieve the good and great society.

enormous unmet needs of people at home and in the rest of the world. Moreover, because of the slack in our own economy the expenditures to wage the peace offensive would represent not an amount of wealth sacrificed by our consumers but rather an amount of wealth we are otherwise losing as a result of unemployment and idle productive capacity. We would, in effect, be converting waste into economic wealth. As has already been noted merely to keep unemployment from rising above present levels our nation must achieve an economic growth rate of at least 5% a year. Even at the 5% rate, we would be growing less rapidly than other industrialized countries. The expansion of the increased rate of growth brought about by using our unused productive capacity would expand our Gross National Product and raise living standards at home (and eliminate poverty from our midst). It would be employed to build more schools, to train and hire more teachers, to wipe out our educational deficits, to clear our slums (and re-fashion our cities), to build more modern hospitals, to expand highway construction and resource development and do the many other things needed to improve the quality of American life and achieve the good and great society.

Can We Afford The Peace Offensive?

There are those who will argue that "we cannot afford" the massive economic aid required to implement this peace strategy. These are the same people, however, who have always been the apostles of "too little and too late". The American economy is freedom's greatest material asset if we will only harness its full potential. Those who consider economic aid as "a give away" simply reveal a lack of understanding of the economic facts of life for so long as there is slack in the economy we "give away" in aid only what we would not produce if we did not give it away. The fact is that in giving aid we stimulate our own economy to produce more for our own people. The men and women now unemployed or partially employed who would be put to work under this proposal to fabricate the tools of economic development would spend their earnings to satisfy their family needs. Their income would be in the form of high velocity dollars spent on consumer goods immediately rather than stored away in savings. This, in turn, would give rise to a second wave of demand for goods and services forming a chain reaction which would create still more jobs. The workers moved from idleness to productive work would earn incomes out of which they would pay taxes. The factories employing them would earn increased profits which, in turn, would yield higher tax

enough to move the developing nations toward the achievement of 20th century economic and social standards under conditions of freedom, then surely these nations will fall prey to forfeiting their freedom for the promise of bread. The ultimate result of our failure can and will lead to a nuclear holocaust, for peace and freedom in the world cannot be made secure when more than half its people are ill fed and ill clothed - the have-nots of the human family.

Structure of the Peace Offensive

How then can the total peace offensive be constructed and administered in order to fulfill its great promise?

There would have to be established an International Social and Economic Agency to administer an International Social and Economic Fund. The purpose of the agency would be to assist the developing countries to build their economies, raise living standards, improve education, medical care, etc. and generally enhance the quality of their societies. In order to finance the enormous tasks that lie ahead, each country participating in the work of the International Social and Economic Agency would commit a given percentage of its Gross National Product as a contribution to the International Social and Economic Fund. This percentage could be worked

out on a sliding scale depending upon the per capita annual income within the country and its economic growth rate. It would be necessary for the International Social and Economic Agency to establish an economic base measured in terms of per capita annual income below which a country would be eligible to receive economic aid out of the International Social and Economic Fund. Assistance could be provided in goods and services, measured in terms of currency, or under given circumstances in direct, earmarked economic contributions. The assistance would be considered as long term, interest free loans repayable only when the recipient countries' Gross National Product were to reach a specified amount of per capita annual income and the repayment and the method of repayment and the amount of repayment per year would be determined by the International Social and Economic Agency not to exceed for any one country a specified percentage of Gross National Product per year. Such repayment, in fact, would represent the contribution which each country makes to the program, once it has reached that stage of economic development permitting it to become a donor nation rather than a recipient nation.

Certain conditions would have to be established before a nation could participate in the work of the International Social and Economic Agency either as a contributor or as a recipient. For instance, it would be a primary obligation for each such nation to commit itself to adhere to the nuclear test ban treaty or any

out on a sliding scale depending upon the per capita annual income within the country and its economic growth rate. It would be necessary for the International Social and Economic Agency to establish an economic base measured in terms of per capita annual income below which a country would be eligible to receive economic aid out of the International Social and Economic Fund. Assistance could be provided in goods and services, measured in terms of currency, or under given circumstances in direct earmarked economic contributions. The assistance would be considered as long term, interest free loans repayable only when the recipient countries' Gross National Product were to reach a specified amount of per capita annual income and the repayment and the method of repayment and the amount of repayment per year would be determined by the International Social and Economic Agency not to exceed for any one country a specified percentage of Gross National Product per year. Such repayment, in fact, would represent the contribution which each country makes to the program, once it has reached that stage of economic development permitting it to become of donor nation rather than a recipient nation.

Certain conditions would have to be established before a nation could participate in the work of the International Social and Economic Agency either as a contributor or as a recipient. For instance, it would be a primary obligation for each such nation to commit itself to adhere to the nuclear test ban treaty or any

THE GRAND ALLIANCE FOR PEACE AND PEACEFUL DEVELOPMENT

A sober historical analysis of the mass of facts and figures, of argument and evaluation relating to the history of nations and people since the end of World War II points essentially to three ~~four~~ basic problems confronting the world.

1. The continuing drift toward war and the overriding need for a viable ~~workable~~ proposal to achieve disarmament.

2. The staggering needs of the developing nations to achieve peaceful economic, social and political development.

3. The need ~~search~~ to build the former ~~a new~~ structure of international cooperation for all nations and all people to enjoy.

In addition, we must find new avenues to develop in ~~4. To achieve the objective of affording~~ the free world ~~the United States included~~ a new sense of cohesion and purpose.

Then, of course, ~~In~~ turning our sights inward on our own ~~society's~~ economic and social problems at home, we must find the way to interrelate ~~integrate~~ the solution of ~~the~~ world problems ~~together~~ with our own.

The world scene today is torn between the drive of two antagonastic political ideologies for dominance in the world. Both the cold war and the sporadic hot wars are essentially a struggle for men's minds and hearts and their loyalties. ~~morality~~. If those who love freedom and the guarantee of human ~~individual~~ rights are to make progress, if an effective lasting program to thwart the encroachment of communism is ~~are~~ to succeed ~~be made~~, if an enduring peace is to be won, we must meet the challenge not by using pious slogans about the virtues of democracy but by employing a positive program of action that can and does win an adequate ~~a fuller~~ measure of economic and social justice for all people.

translate money into tangible
accomplishment

World Congress - People's Meeting
advisory body
old Peace Proposal

We must never make the tragic mistake of believing that freedom's fight - whether in Vietnam, Korea, the Congo ~~the Dominican Republic,~~ or in any other part of the globe - can be won on the battlefields alone. The fight for freedom can be won only by proof of the democratic deed. Men, women and children by the hundreds of millions are hungry and disease ridden and lack the basic educational rudiments for self-realization and self-fulfillment. They will not respond to verbal descriptions of a world filled with the painted promise of the democratic way of life. They will respond to the more tangible program that fills empty bellies, substitutes decent clothes for rags, offers books instead of guns and points the way to a better life.

Communist strategy on the world scene is to create a series of crises, each serious in its proportion and potential, designed to condition and influence United States policy toward relying more on military power than economic power to meet the threat of communism. It ~~They~~ attempts to compel a negative policy of military intervention and divert us from the pursuit of a positive program of social action - the only key to achieving economic security and human dignity for the poverty stricken peoples of the world. The fury of the communist attack upon the uses of peaceful development is symptomatic of its concern to thwart the free world from helping people help themselves to win a better life. In Vietnam, the Communists destroy the schools, they destroy the health centers, ~~in South Vietnam~~ they assassinated medical advisers and teachers. For in these manifestations of peace they see the greatest threat to their take-over.

We must come to the realization that the same scientific and technical know-how that gives man the capability of fashioning the weapons of over-kill also gives him the capability of utilizing the fantastic new tools of science and technology to solve mankind's ancient problems: ~~of~~ the shortage of food, of clothing, of adequate housing, of ~~eliminating~~ ignorance and disease. For the first time in the history of the human family, man is capable of mastering his physical environment and of fulfilling the basic material needs of the human community to build a good life. Through the centuries there have always been more empty bellies than there has been the capability of producing adequate food. There have always been more naked backs than there was the ability to produce sufficient cloth. There ~~were~~ have always been more families to be housed than there was the ability to build adequate shelter. In this day and in this time, however, man has learned to produce abundance to meet his physical needs. The great challenge is not to find the way to produce abundance but rather to determine for what purpose man will deploy his creative genius to produce abundance. Will he continue to fashion the weapons of self-destruction, or will he harness the rising star of science and technology to the rewarding purposes of peace and plenty?

The ~~two sides~~ answer of this question ~~are~~ is clear and unmistakable. On both sides of the Iron Curtain men share the common anxiety which was expressed by President Kennedy when he said to the United Nations:

> "Today every inhabitant of this planet will be contemplating the day when it may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles hung by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident, miscalculation or madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us..."

With few, albeit, important exceptions, capitalist and communist alike have come to the realization that disarmament is the only possible means to draw humanity back before it is too late from what Sir Winston Chruchill aptly called "the rim of hell". A leading American corporation building arms for the United States defense has sponsored conferences on disarmament because as one of its Vice-Presidents explained, "we want to go on serving live customers". Mr. Khrushchev expressed the same thought in his own terms when he said:

> "Anybody who says a revolution needs a war should know that more warmongers die than anyone else --- we want communism not on the ruins of the world but on the foundations of Marxism - Leninism."

The question of war and peace is no longer the same as in years past. It is no longer the question of which side can win and which side will lose. For the first time in history, the question of war and peace has been reduced to the simple common denominator of human survival. The richest family in Park Avenue, living in the most luxurious penthouse, the poorest exploited sharecropper on the Mississippi Delta, the impoverished beggar living and sleeping in the slums of the streets of Calcutta, the poorest African, are all in the same boat. For if mankind in its drift toward the insanity of war should use the weapons of over-kill, the future of the richest and most secure is as blighted as the future of the poorest.

This simple fact must be made understandable so that the human family will achieve a new sense of solidarity - so that it will act rationally, responsibly and morally toward building a world community in which the human family will have some prospect of survival and of progress through peace.

We have pointed out, however, that peace is not ~~always~~ achievable through military buildup or in a world in which ~~great~~ agonizing poverty and deprivation exist~~s~~ in the midst of plenty, in which compelling human needs remain unmet in the midst of idle productive capacity, in which huge strides are made in the physical sciences while we fail to make comparable progress in the human and social sciences. Any program for peace, therefore, must encompass a program for peaceful development. The growing gap in economic and social progress between the have and the have-not peoples of the world must be narrowed by helping the people in the developing nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America to catch up with the 20th century and be enabled to share in the blessings and the abundance of the technological revolution.

The search for peace, then, is also the search for fashioning a better life for all people everywhere. We cannot make the peace more secure if a few years from now we have developed a kill capability equivalent to 30 tons of TNT for every man, woman and child on ~~E~~earth. We cannot make the peace more secure if we aspire some day to developing an armament posture equivalent to 50 tons of TNT for every human being. We cannot make the peace more secure as long as people must continue to struggle for tomorrow's piece of bread and not find it. Unless we face up to these ~~and~~ compelling facts and act accordingly, either the human race i~~s~~ going to act rationally to end the nuclear arms race

or in due time the nuclear arms race will irrationally end the human race.

It is simultaneously true ~~At the same time there is general recognition of the fact~~ that the world in which we live requires the maintenance of adequate military power for if we did not maintain defensive strength, we would be at the mercy of the power decisions (and the immoral acts) of others who ~~would did and of their immoral acts~~ continued to build military strength. Military power, however, is but the negative face of the total effort freedom must ~~make~~ assume if we are to win the struggle for peace and if we are to fulfill freedom's agenda of unfinished business in the world. Military power can only buy us the time and the opportunity to do what must be done to solve the economic and social problems of the world and of our own country.

Thus, the negative strategy of deterrence must be replaced by a positive strategy for peace if mankind is to avoid the nuclear abyss. Such a strategy for peace must meet the fundamental problems noted earlier above. It must break the deadlock in disarmament negotiations and keep the evil genie of nuclear catastrophe bottled permanently (and lay the foundation for building a firmer structure of international cooperation). It must free the energies and abilities of people in the emerging nations to raise their standards of economic and social well-being at an accelerated pace. It must offer the free world a new opportunity for future progress. ~~and help build a new structure of international cooperation and~~ At the same time, it must help meet the still unresolved problems, economic and social, in our own "affluent society". ¶ Perhaps we can learn from the example (of collective bargaining in labor-management relations).

How then ~~must~~ can we fashion such a strategy for peace? For over 25 years, ~~we have~~ for instance, the United Auto Workers union has sat in negotiations with a number of the world's largest

corporations. The stakes in labor negotiations are large in terms of money and social progress but the stakes in disarmament negotiations and in the pursuit of peaceful world-wide development are infinitely higher since these latter involve nothing less than the survival of mankind. The difference in the size of the stakes, however, does not alter the fact that there are certain basic characteristics common to all negotiations. When both parties in the bargaining process get themselves committed to rigid, inflexible, uncompromising positions they are in trouble. Deadlocks in collective bargaining negotiations may result in a strike or a lock-out or both. A breakdown in collective bargaining can cause serious damage to the parties and in certain critical industries, to the whole nation. A breakdown in the search for peace, however, threatens the ultimate in damage - the elimination of human life from the face of our planet.

There is something to be learned from the art of collective bargaining which may help mankind avoid this ultimate fate. How do we break the deadlock between the opposing military and idealogical forces confronting the world? What can be done to induce maneuverability in situations in which both parties are painting themselves into their separate corners? How do we break our way out when within the framework of the current world situation each party has forfeited its initiative and become a prisoner of the deadlock?

In collective bargaining, the parties have faced this kind of situation many times and have discovered that to break the deadlock requires the creation of a new dimension in the bargaining process - the introduction of a wholly

new factor that provides sufficiently strong leverage to move the other party toward agreement. The art of bargaining is the art "of boxing in" your opponent so that he has no other recourse but to move in your direction. The key is to find that strategy which will accomplish this purpose. There is no reason why a similar key cannot be equally effective in the bargaining process between world powers and between political ideologies. It requires only the discovery of that new element in the bargaining process which will create sufficient leverage to shift the negotiations from deadlock to understanding and finally to agreement. The introduction of the new element is all the more compelling when it is dramatic and overwhelming.

The United States ~~and~~ together with the other industrialized countries of the free world ~~have~~ has in ~~their~~ its grasp such a new element to inject into the strategy that will break the deadlock in the current world situation. ~~It is in the use of their~~ ~~not~~ The new element will not be found in military might, for that ~~will~~ might break the deadlock but destroy the world. It is in the use of the vast ~~unutilized~~ unused potential of the American economy - the idle workers and idle machines capable of producing untold abundance. This unused productive power currently lost and wasted, if properly employed with rare boldness and creative imagination, can move the world toward peace and move its peoples toward peaceful development.

Americans were shocked some years ago when Mr. Khrushchev, confident that communism rides the wave of the future, announced that ~~he~~ communism will "bury us". His statement, however, should not have come as a surprise for, as dogmatic

Marxists, the communist world is of the view that our free society is composed of competing, conflicting, irreconcilable pressure groups incapable of rising above selfish interests and therefore incapable of achieving a sense of national purpose and national unity in the absence of war. They are convinced that our kind of society is capable of achieving full employment, full production, and the full use of our economic resources only when we are producing for war. This, in fact, is the basis ~~of~~ for the communist propaganda that the United States is dominated and controlled by warmongers who fatten on the profits of war. History~~, indeed,~~ has ~~told~~ proven that the United States is indeed capable of a total effort when confronted with the challenge of war. We must ~~convince~~ prove to ourselves and the rest of the world - and especially the communist world - that we are wholly capable of a comparable effort when faced with the infinitely more complex challenge of winning the peace.

Elsewhere, we have noted that our recessions, our failure to utilize our productive capacity, our unemployment have cost us _____ million man hours of labor and _____ billion in lost wealth during the past 10 years. ~~These are the facts of~~ There lies the weakness in our society but it is these very facts which can and should be converted into sources of great strength. The missing element in our strategy for peace is our unused productive capacity. It is the margin of America's unused productive capacity which can be made mankind's margin of survival. With its proper use and ~~deployment~~ deployment, we have the means to transform the arms race into a peace race. It affords us the opportunity to transmute the stock-piling of annihilation into a peaceful contest in freeing mankind from hunger, ignorance and disease. This is the element which can be molded into the leverage

that will move the communist nations toward a genuine disarmament agreement at the diplomatic bargaining table and at the same time move mankind toward a higher plateau of economic and social well-being.

The question then is how properly to use this new element in the strategy for peace to accomplish these objectives. Once again perhaps it would be fitting to refer to the art of collective bargaining. In every major collective bargaining situation - as is true in all bargaining situations - the successful bargainer must make a clear-headed, objective evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses on both the company and the union side. His strategy must pit his greatest strength against his opponent's most serious weakness.

Our greatest strength resides paradoxically in our current weakness - our unused industrial capacity: our steel mills that lie idle or only partially used, our factories, machine shops and assembly lines that run only part of the time and above all, the unused skills and productive capacity of our millions of unemployed and under-employed workers and of our poverty stricken multitudes. Against the great economic power which can be fashioned out of this economic weakness, what is the fundamental weakness of the Soviet Union, of China, and of many other communist nations? It is their straining, struggling economies - hard pressed to stay in the arms and space races while at the same time attempting to meet the needs and wants of their people whose rising expectations for a better life remain still merely a promise in some distant future. Our strategy should consist of drawing these countries, and particularly the wealthiest one of them, the Soviet Union, into a contest in which we take maximum advantage of our unused economic

strength to impose further stress on their already over-strained economies.

How then do we make the most efficient and effective use of the great unused productive capability of our economy? Do we spend more to build more fire power? Do we hoard unto ourselves ~~what~~ our abundance and storage it in huge warehouses to rot and waste away? Or do we use it to challenge the communist world to compete with us and the other member nations of the free world in the peaceful economic development of the have-not nations? Only in this way could we put our faith in freedom on the line, confident that we could be more effective than the communist ~~group of~~ nations in promoting the economic advancement of developing nations and in assisting them to find their own way toward the achievement of freedom, democratic procedure, and the guarantee of a free society.

The first step in the use of this new element in the strategy for peace would be dramatically and publicly to announce America's commitment to a massive long-range program of economic aid of such enormous proportions that it can effectively move the emerging and developing countries ~~in the developing parts of the work~~ steadily toward a break through into self-sustaining growth.

Specifically we should commit an average of $20 billion a year to this purpose over the next 25 years. It is possible that not all of this commitment could be used to best efficiency at the beginning of the program before the recipient countries were adequately ~~properly~~ prepared to absorb such massive economic assistance. Perhaps, moreover, less would be needed toward the end of the 25 year period as some of the countries acquired their own economic momentum

but we should flatly commit ourselves to earmarking for economic aid an average of $20 billion a year over the entire period, to be spent when and where it can best accomplish the intended objectives of raising living standards of the have-not peoples of the world and accelerating progress toward the development of free societies so that there is some assurance that the desperation of poverty and social injustice does not deny the people of these countries the opportunity of finding democratic solutions to their problems based upon consent and not coercion.

This announced commitment would be coupled with an invitation to other advanced and industrialized countries of the free world to join in the over all plan to bring large scale economic aid to the developing countries. It would be accomplished, moreover, with a formal challenge to the Soviet Union to conclude a disarmament agreement with proper and adequate inspection requirements and to shift the men, machines and materials freed by the military cut back to the peaceful work of economic development. It would not be necessary - in fact it should be made clear - that we are not waiting for the communist nations to give agreement to the plan but rather that we will proceed immediately with our own massive aid program together with other free nations who will join in the effort. Disarmament cannot be brought about unilaterally and without agreement but in the search for peace, we can seize the initiative and act unilaterally and boldly without agreement. This, in effect, would be a declaration of peace but there would be one essential difference from earlier declarations. This would be a positive, aggressive search for peace - a peace offensive.

Thus we would seize the initiative. What choices then for action would be left open to the Soviet Union and its satellite communist nations? At first glance it might appear that they would have three alternatives to choose from. Upon analysis, however, it would become clear that there is only one choice for them and that choice is the one we would want them to take.

Confronted with our unilateral challenge of massive economic assistance to the have-not people of the world, the Soviet Union must ponder whether to:

1) default the contest between freedom and tyranny in the emerging countries, or;
2) accept the challenge and obtain the resources to meet it by reducing the living standards of their people, or;
3) accept the challenge by meeting it through serious efforts to negotiate a disarmament agreement which would permit them to stay in the contest by diverting resources from the arms race to the tasks of peaceful competition in economic development.

The Communist bloc would now be faced with an economic challenge which they could not ignore. It is not difficult for them to meet the economic challenge of a $3 billion foreign aid program. They can scrape enough together to stay in the game but under all circumstances they cannot afford to default an intensified economic contest. Our challenge would relate to a contest for waging the peace in the very arena where the communists profess that their social system is superior

to ours. Mr. Khrushchev in 1961 glorified the superiority of the soviet system as compared with capitalist economy and, ~~of course,~~ no doubt the current leadership of the Soviet Union ~~must~~ feels the same sentiments. He said to the Soviet People:

> "The superiority of the Socialist economy over the capitalist economy is now not only being proved by theoretical arguments. The material evidence of this is already distinct. The countries of the Socialist community are from year to year demonstrating their superiority in the rate of economic growth, in the development of scientific and technical thought, in the raising the living standards of the working people and in many other fields.... "/

> ""Vladimir Ilyich Lenin's profound and unshakable faith in the superiority of the Socialist system enabled him to challenge capitalism to economic competition, to advance the idea of peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems.

> "Those who are confident of the economic victory of their social system need not impose this system upon other peoples by force of arms."

The Communist bloc cannot abdicate the contest for the loyalties and the support of the ~~countries~~ hundreds of millions of people in the developing nations for that is what the political idealogical contest in the world is all about. That is what the power struggle is all about. Since it is in the field of economic development that the Communists claim the superiority of their system over ours, since it is in this sense that they intend to "bury us", they will have to join the contest in the have-not lands where most people go to bed hungry every night and where communism counts on forging human poverty into political power. The strategists of the Communist bloc are ~~skilled~~ schooled in the politics of power but they respect superior power, particularly superior economic power. They work hard at projecting the techniques by which they can forge human poverty into political power. Therefore, if communism is to have any future outside

~~outside~~ the countries where it is already in power, ~~they~~ that future must reside in the developing countries. Should communism fail in these areas, it must recognize that it is doomed to become a diminishing force in the world.

An announcement by the United States of a peaceful free world peace offensive in these very lands and in behalf of these very people would call the communist bluff. They would have no choice but to stay in the game and such a program for the total waging of the peace would shift the current world contest from the nuclear arms race which no one can win to an economic contest between competing social systems which ~~wax~~ would compel both sides in the contest to back up propaganda promises with practical performance, to convert pious slogans into tangible acts of assistance.

Assuming then that the Communist bloc could not under any circumstances abdicate the economic contest, it must find the resources to stay in the contest. As noted earlier, as long as the United States continues to divert approximately $3 billion a year toward economic aid, the Communists can stay in the competition, especially if they concentrate their aid in a few areas most crucial to their interests. But at the point our commitment is suddently and dramatically increased to $20 billion a year and other free nations join to provide additional billions, then the Communist effort will be in trouble. Our economy is marked by slack while the Communist economy is marked by strain. While we have huge unused resources of idle men and machines, they do not have enough of anything to meet their needs and their plans. While we have enormous surpluses of food and fiber, they must seek sources of supply of these items outside their own borders. Their agricultural problems are compounded because they have starved their farms

of needed machinery and fertilizers in order to build more armaments and more space vehicles.

Just as would be true in the United States or in any other nation, the Communist leaders could successfully call upon their people to tighten their belts to pay for nuclear weapons as a measure of defense. They can always rally their people by the cry of defense against the "threat of the Wall Street warmongers". Would they, however, be willing to risk the consequences of calling upon the Russian people for further drastic sacrifices to pay for economic aid to other countries? Would they be able to withdraw from use by their own people much needed consumer goods which they have already promised to produce in greater quantity and ship these goods to the have-not nations? There have already been reports of disturbances in the Soviet Union in the wake of new austerity measures that dampened hopes for the promised higher living stnadards. Riots have been reported between workers and police when meat and butter prices were raised and a strike occurred by longshoremen in the Black Sea port of Odessa in protest against shipment to Cuba of consumer goods ~~to Cuba~~ badly needed at home.

It is therefore most doubtful that the Communist bloc would stay in the economic contest by maintaining and accelerating their arms build up and demanding further sacrifices of the good things of life from their people.

There is then only one alternative for the Communists in the face of our announcement of this strategy for peace. Unable to abandon the contest for the hearts and minds of the people in the developing countries; equally unable to impose further sacrifices upon their own people, they must find the resources

in men and materials to meet the challenge of our peace offensive ~~only~~ by cutting back their military establishment. However, the Communist can no more move toward disarmament on a unilateral basis than can we, for like us they are prisoners of the stalemate of nuclear terror. Reduction of arms must be bi-lateral not unilateral. If this new element in our strategy for peace leaves no other alternative ~~that~~ then the Communists must seek agreement on arms reduction and ultimately, disarmament. Such agreement could be obtained only if they are prepared to accept terms that would provide for a total nuclear test ban and for the effective implementation of a disarmament program with inspection under conditions that would insure the people and the nations of the world against any possible duplicity.

It would appear at first glance that here again alternatives are open to the Communist bloc. For instance, they could seek arms reduction on a basis that would maintain the present relationship between their potential for over-kill and our potential for over-kill, but on a reduced level for both sides. Or, they could seek total disarmament. Straight arms reduction, however, could not be any long-term solution to the economic problems posed for the Communist nations by our total peace offensive. For, ~~if~~ as we did reduced out R military expenditures, we could turn the screw tighter on the challenge to the Soviet economy by ~~additing~~ adding a substantial portion of the released resources to our own economic aid program, thereby intensifying the competitive pressures upon them and their already strained economy. If, for instance, by reason of the peace offensive the Communist nations were compelled to reduce armaments by $10 billion, we would then also be able to reduce armament expenditures by $10 billion and we could divert $5 billion of

that savings into intensifying the economic contest and at the same time use the other $5 billion to help meet our domestic needs. Once the move toward disarmament begins and large sums of money are released to step up the peace offensive, the need for further disarmament will feed upon itself . In order to keep pace in the developing nations, the Communist bloc would be obligated to continually to increase its economic aid expenditures and reduce its own armaments expenditures. Thus, we would be in a position to use our economic power as a basic strategic weapon to compel the Communist nations to move increasingly toward total disarmament or else surrender in the economic contest and the idealogical contest among the have-not nations of the world. The only real answer which they would have to such a peace offensive would be to seek ultimate total disarmament coupled with some means such as the creation of a strong United Nations peace force to safeguard them as well as ourselves against the possibility of other aggressors.

The question must be raised: Could China ignore this total peace offensive? In the current period of the history of mankind, China represents the real problem in the world for China still makes great noises about the need for the use of force as the way to impose its ideology upon other people. While the Soviet Union has come to recognize that the possibility of nuclear war has changed the entire historic concept of the Marxist-Leninist theory - the theory that war is an extension of the class struggle and that war may be risked to overturn the bourgeoisie state and enthrone the dictators of the proletariat, China has not yet learned that lesson. The H-bomb has made the Communist theory of world revolution obsolete for a nuclear war will leave no world to inherit. The force of the massive economic thrust of a total peace offensive in solving the problems of the have-not countries could not long be ignored by China.

Let us examine this in a more specific way. The window to China is India, the only other country in the world comparable to China in terms of population. In India there is the attempt at the democratic free society approach to the solutions of hunger, poverty and disease. India, however, has not had large success. It has been running as fast as it can economically to stand still. Annual per capita income is approximately $70. Suppose, however, a massive economic aid program helped raise the living standards of the people of India over seven-fold to $500 a year. China sitting on the vast India border could not resist the revolutionary impact of that fact. The ~~Chinese~~ Chinese need not worry as long as India can move its per capita annual income from $70 ? to $72 ? and then to $75 ?, etc. but China could not ignore the leverage that a fast improving standard of living in India would mean to its own people. This fact would offer the leverage to begin to halt the nuclear arms race on which China is currently embarked and we could bring to bear such positive dynamic forces in the arena of economic competition and social well-being that these forces would begin to cancel out the negative dynamics that make for war.

At this point the question of economic trade, cultural exchange, diplomatic recognition of China and the question of China entering into the UN will become increasingly pertinent and more easily grasped. The world cannot forever search for peace while the single largest group of its people remain outside the main stream of its economic, social and political development.

The free world alliance has been held together primarily by the negative necessities of military defense against actual and possible Communist aggression. As the Soviet threat of open aggression in Europe has receded, the free world alliance has shown increasing signs of strain and stress. France, particularly, has moved away sharply from the concept of coordinating cooperation as it seeks to fixxx shine in its own sun. The United States by advancing a program for a total waging of the peace could provide the leadershup necessary to reshape the free world defense community into a Grand Alliance for Peace with a new and heightened sense of historic purpose.

The investment of $xxx $20 billion annually in the waging of the peace would provide the American economy with a sorely needed thrust by expanding demand, for economic aid wxxxxxxxxx in large measure would be in the form of trucks, tractors, tools and other goods of use to the developing countries. If we were able to achieve full employment and full production in war because we geared the productive potential of the American economy to the needs of war, we can achieve and maintain full employment and full production in similar fashion if we will gear our productive potential to the enormous unmet needs of people at home and in the reast of the world. Moreover, because of the slack in our own economy the expenditures to wage the peace offensive would ~~react~~ represent ~~in~~ not an amount of ~~money~~ wealth sacrificed by our consumers but rather ~~only a part of the~~ an amount of ~~money~~ wealth we are loosing otherwise as a result of unemployment and idle productive capacity. We would, in effect, be converting waste into economic wealth. As has already been noted merely to keep

unemployment from rising above present levels our nation must achieve an economic growth rate of at least 5% a year. Even at the 5% rate, we would be growing less rapidly than other industrialized countries. The expansion of the increased rate of growth brought about by using our unused productive capacity would expand our Gross National Product and raise living stnadards at home. It would be employed to build more schools, to train and hire more teachers, to wipe out our educational deficits, to clear our slums, to build more modern hospitals, to expand highway construction and resources development and do the many other things needed to improve the quality of American life and achieve the ~~great~~ good and Great Society.

There are those who will argue that "we cannot afford" the massive economic aid required to implement this peace strategy. These are the same people, however, who have always been the apostles of "too little and too late". The American economy is freedom's greatest material asset if we will only harness its full potential. Those who consider economic aid as "a give away" simply reveal a lack of understanding of the economic facts of life ~~and~~ for so long as there is slack in the economy we "give away" in aid only what we would not produce if we did not give it away. The fact is that in giving aid we stimulate our own economy to produce more for our own people. The men and women now unemployed or partially ~~un~~ employed ~~would~~ who would be put to work under this proposal to fabricate the tools of economic development would spend their earnings to satisfy their family needs. Their income would be in the form of high velocity dollars spent on consumer goods immediately rather than stored away in savings. This, in turn, would give rise to a second wave of demand

for goods and services forming a chain reaction which would create still more jobs. The workers moved from idleness to productive work would earn incomes out of which they would pay taxes. The factories employing them would earn increased profits which, in turn, would yield higher tax revenues and produce more funds for industrial expansion. The end result would be a spurt in the wealth available to the people of the United States. An increase in the revenues of the government at the local, state and federal levels would permit the acceleration of construction of public facilities and provide needed public services and at home at the same time ~~that it would~~ make available the vast sums needed to accelerate ~~more easily possible the creating~~ the economic and social development ~~of the needed goods and services~~ to the people in ~~of~~ the developing countries.

To fail to take advantage of our idle capacity and idle manpower is exactly what we cannot afford to do. We cannot afford to lose the _____ billion in wealth during the next 10 years represented by the difference in our current growth rate and our possible growth rate nor can we afford to lose for the cause of freedom the hundreds of millions of people who today are uncertain of their destiny.

Whether we will it or not, we are in a race against the nuclear count down. Science and technology constantly draw humanity together in a shrinking world. Population pressures aggravate the dilemma of the have-not nations of the world and widen the gap between their economic standards and the standards of the industrialized West. If the privileged minorities

of the industrially advanced countries fail to meet ~~its~~ their obligation and responsibilities on a scale massive enough to move the developing nations toward the achievement of 20th century economic and social standards under donditions of freedom then surely ~~they~~ these nations will fall prey to forfeiting their freedom for the promise of bread. The ultimate result of our failure can and will lead to a nuclear holocaust, for peace and freedom in the world cannot be made secure when more than half its people are ill fed and ill clothed - the have-nots of the human family. ~~More specifically,~~

¶ How then can the total peace offensive be constructed and administered in order to ~~perform its function.~~ fulfill its great promise?

There would have to be established an International Social and Economic Agency to administer an International Social and Economic Fund. The purpose of the agency would be to assist the developing countries to build their economies, raise living standards, improve education, medical care, etc. and generally enhance the quality of their societies. In order to finance the enormous tasks that lie ahead, each country participating in the work of the International Social and Economic Agency would commit a given percentage of ~~their~~ its Gross National Product as a contribution to the International Social and Economic Fund. This percentage could be worked out on a sliding scale depending upon the per capita annual income within the country and its economic growth rate. It would be necessary for the International Social and Economic Agency to establish an economic base measured in terms of per capita annual income below which a country would be eligible to receive economic aid out of the

International Social and Economic Fund. Assistance could be provided in goods and services, measured in terms of currency, or under given circumstances in direct economic contributions. The assistance would be considered as long term, interest free loans repayable only when the recipeint countries' Gross National Product were to reach a specified amount of per capita annual income and the repayment and the method ~~of~~ repayment and the amount of repayment per year would be determined by the International Social and Economic Agency not to exceed for any one country a specified percentage of Gross National Product per year.

Certain conditions would have to be established before a nation could participate in the work of the International Social and Economic Agency either as a contributor or as a recipeint. For instance, it would be a primary obligation for each such nation to commit itself to adhere to the nuclear test ban treaty or any successor treaty. Each such nation would agree to join in any negotiated program of general disarmament. As for recipient nations, consideration should be given to seeking their agreement as a condition of cooperation from the International Social and Economic Agency to devise and implement plans of economic and social development and to effectuate in practice the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. Ways and means should be explored to insure the equitable distribution of any increase in personal income. It is not enough ~~that~~ to achieve a specified average per capita annual income ~~be achieved~~ since averages do not necessarily define equitable treatment. It may even be possible for the International Social and Economic Agency to attempt to adopt objective standards relating to the fulfillment of the requirement for equitable distribution of economic wealth.

The International Social and Economic Agency would be staffed by nationals of all participating countries including recipient countries. Its operations and functions could reach out far beyond the collection and distribution of money and goods in the implementation of the peace offensive. It could, for instance, establish an International Peace Corps and an International Technical Task Force to provide direct manpower assistance in the economic development of recipient nations. It could assist nations in devising development programs and it could bring together groups of nations covering vast geographical regions adaptable to regional economic development as may be appropriate. Since the ~~xxxxxx~~ recipient countries would be in the best position to understand and describe ~~its~~ their individual needs and since the International Social and Economic Agency would know best its resources, both present and future, it would be essential that plans for economic development be drawn up cooperatively so that the needs of the one can be dovetailed with the resources of the other.

[It is not necessary that the International Social and Economic Agency or its Fund be a body separate and ~~xxxxx~~ apart from the United Nations. It would be desireable to be able to establish the International Social and Economic Agency within the framework and under the auspices of the United Nations. This, however, obviously would require the assent and cooperation of the Communist bloc nations which are members of the UN. If these nations were willing to join in this vast human endeavor their participation would be a

?

welcome addition to the task. In either case, however, the Agency must be international in character, must seek out voluntary participation, and must be motivated by the desire to assist others in order that the world community might be moved faster and more effectively toward peaceful development.

It is right and proper that even those who would ~~gaxx~~ favor the kind of total peace offensive here described should raise pointed questions and critisicm concerning its feasibility and its possibility of success. I will attempt to deal with the various questions that may arise in the following chapter.

It is, however, only through such an instrument of positive, affirmative, peace-bringing objectives that the basic tasks facing humanity and the basic problems confronting the United States ~~society~~ can be ~~fulfilled~~ met. We are at the place in human history when the idealist has become the realist. Too often those who take a hard line on communism, in fact play into the hands of the Communists simply because they close their eyes to the pressing problems of peace and the social injustices out of which Communism builds its power. The whole question lies in whether we will continue to draft from crisis to crisis - into new Cubas and Congos and Vietnams until events finally become unmanageable or whether we will seize and hold the initiative long enough and boldly enough to move mankind away from the threat of nuclear annihilation to the dawn of a world community in which men can have bread and freedom. It is the idealist in today's world who, with imagination and vision, wishes to mobilize ~~America~~ to win the peace, who in the final analysis will be the tough, practical ~~andx~~ realist~~s~~ ~~who bring about a world bent~~ moving a troubled and tortured world toward on peace and peaceful development.

The system and the culture which we cherish as free people are equal to the challenge of the total peace offensive. As a people and as a nation we have always been unanimous in our understanding that deep crises will not be met with half-way and half-hearted measures and with a policy of too little and too late. Our unanimity, however, in past decades has flourished when there was the challenge of war. Today, with the survival of the human family at stake, we need to comprehend with even greater clarity that a total effort is necessary if we are to meet the infinitely more complex challenge of peace ~~fox~~ We must contemplate a greater sense of national urgency, a deeper sense of national purpose, a total commitment to a total peace offensive.

oeiu42
11-29-65