1 Drs

January 18, 1965

Walter

Irving

Partial Rough Draft: Margin of Survival

Attached is a rough partial outline for the book: Margin of Survival.

It merely serves to set forth the bare outlines of some of the subject matter to be covered and describes by way of example a more complete outline of one of the important areas of concern, namely, Unemployment: Full Production-Full Employment.

I thought this might serve as a stimulant to our conversation when we meet to discuss the book.

It points up the need for a "table of contents" to give the book cohesiveness and direction and attracts attention to areas requiring extensive research.

IB:mp
oeiu 42
Att.

cc: Nat Weinberg

1/18/65

DRAFT

~~MARGIN OF~~ SURVIVAL

I. BASIC TASKS OF U.S. LEADERSHIP IN THE WORLD

A. Improve the Quality of American Society

B. Assist the "Have-Not" Peoples in the World

C. Strengthen the Free World Community - Establish a Grand Alliance for Peace

D. Help Win World Peace

II. PROBLEMS TO OVERCOME IN ACCOMPLISHING THESE BASIC TASKS

A. Problems At Home

1. Unemployment: Full Production-Full Employment in the Face of Technological Progress

2. Poverty

3. Opportunities for Youth

4. Security for the Aged

5. Equal Rights and Opportunities for the Negro

6. Balance of Payments

7. Analysis of Armament Program

(Each of the above is to be treated comprehensively so that the problem is clear and unmistakable. For instance, immediately following is an example of the proposed exposition of the subject entitled: Unemployment: Full Production-Full Employment in the Face of Technological Progress)

a. Historical analysis of the U.S. economy--in war and in peacetime

b. Statistical analysis of unemployment showing ever-rising trend in numbers and percentages following each recession; comparisons with other industrialized countries

c. Loss to nation in gross national product; man years of lost production, etc.

d. Impact on GNP of an increase of economic growth to 5% annually for the next ten years (comparison of growth rate with other industrialized countries)

   1) effect on federal income and federal budget

   2) social improvements made possible by such economic growth

   3) effect on state and local budgets

   4) effect on capital resources and on wages and profits

e. Analysis of Automation

   1) statistics regarding job loss in selected industries

2) research concerning acceleration of technological progress

3) ultimate effect on jobs - not only production, but white collar and management jobs as well

4) specific examples of automation and computer technology

5) description of automated society thirty years hence

f. Needed - Increased Purchasing Power

1) analyze job creating thrust of increased purchasing power

g. Analysis of current legislative trends

1) Ineffectiveness of current and projected programs to meet the problem of unemployment and create a full production-full employment economy

h. Khrushchev remarks concerning U.S., its ability to survive and the prediction that the soviet System will "bury" us.

B. Problems Abroad

1. Analysis of the Nuclear Rat Race
2. Peace as a Condition of Human Survival
3. Analysis of Poverty, Ignorance, Disease in the "Have-Not" Conntries
4. Emerging Nations as the Determinates of the Future Character of World Society
5. Image of the U.S. Among the Emerging Nations
6. Analysis of Soviet Union
   a. economic problems
   b. social problems
   c. political problems
7. Analysis of Rift in Russian and Chinese Relationship
8. Problem of Increasing Number of Countries Having Nuclear Capability

III. PROPOSAL TO MEET ALL FOUR BASIC TASKS

DRAFT

MARGIN OF SURVIVAL

I. BASIC TASKS OF U.S. LEADERSHIP IN THE WORLD

~~A. Win the Peace~~

B. Assist the "Have-Not" Peoples in the World

A. Improve the Quality of American Society

C. Strengthen the Free World Community - Establish a Grand Alliance for Peace

D Help Win World Peace

II. PROBLEMS TO OVERCOME IN ACCOMPLISHING THESE BASIC TASKS

A. Problems At Home

1. Unemployment: Full Production-Full Employment in the Face of Technological Progress

2. Poverty

3. Opportunities for Youth

4. Security for the Aged

5. Equal Rights and Opportunities for the Negro

6. Balance of Payments

7. Analysis of Armament Program

(Each of the above is to be treated comprehensively so that the problem is clear and unmistakable. For instance, immediately following is an example of the proposed exposition of the subject entitled: Unemployment: Full Production-Full Employment in the Face of Technological Progress)

Toward A Full Production - Full Employment Economy

a. Historical analysis of the U.S. economy - in war and in peacetime

b. Statistical analysis of unemployment showing ever-rising trend in numbers and percentages following each recession; comparisons with other industrialized countries

c. Loss to nation in gross national product; man years of lost production, etc.

d. Impact on GNP of an increase of economic growth to 5% annually for the next ten years (comparison of growth rate with other industrialized countries); translate this into concrete accomplishments in schools, housing, hospitals, resource development, etc.

1) effect on federal income and federal budget

2) social improvements made possible by such economic growth

3) effect on state and local budgets

4) effect on capital resources and on wages and profits

e. Analysis of Automation

1) statistics regarding job loss in selected industries

2) research concerning acceleration of technological progress

3) ultimate effect on jobs - not only production, but white collar and management jobs as well

4) specific examples of automation and computer technology

5) description of automated society thirty years hence

f. Needed - Increased Purchasing power

1) Analyze job creating thrust of increased purchasing power

g. Analysis of current legislative trends

1) Ineffectiveness of current and projected programs to meet the problem of unemployment and create a full production-full employment economy

h. Khrushchev remarks concerning U.S., its ability to survive and the prediction that the soviet system will "bury" us.

i) Analysis of specific programs needed to bring about a full-production - full employment economy

B. Problems Abroad

1. Analysis of the Nuclear Rat Race

2. Peace as a Condition of Human Survival

3. Analysis of Poverty, Ignorance, Disease in the "Have-Not" Countries

4. Emerging Nations as the Determinates of the Future Character of World Society

5. Image of the U.S. Among the Emerging Nations

6. Analysis of Soviet Union

   a. economic problems

   b. social problems

   c. political problems

7. Analysis of Rift in Russian and Chinese Relationship

8. Problem of Increasing Number of Countries Having Nuclear Capability

~~III. PROPOSAL TO MEET ALL FOUR BASIC TASKS~~

9) Dynamics of Peace as the Vehicle to Changes in the Power Structure of Authoritarian Nations

Magnetic tape #1 - to be corrected, edited, etc.

rough draft - pages 1 thru 20

February 13, 1965

WPR:

To make it simple, I suggest that we make 250 years of progress in the 25 years - a ten to one ratio.

Now with respect to the financing of such a proposal I would suggest that the nations where the per capita income is $2,000 per year per person or more would for the first ten years contribute 3% of the gross national product. In the second ten year period 2%, and in the last five years of the 25 year period none per cent. Nations having a per capita income of $1,500 to $2,000 would contribute 2% for the first ten years, 3/4% for the second ten years, and 1/2% the last five years. Nations with $1,000 to $1,500 per capita income would contribute 1/2% for the first ten years, 1/4% for the second ten years and nothing in the final period.

Now, what we would need to do is to take the industrialized nations of the world - this would include the United States, Canada, the major nations of Europe, New Zealand, Australia, Japan - and using these as the criteria, ascertain what this would mean in terms of the free world what this would yield in the way of economic projecting the gross national products of each of these countries into the future at a level of full employment. Then the same projections should be made for the Soviet Union and any other iron curtain country that would fit into this group.

Now this would be the structure for financing. Now, we have also paralleled with this the proposal that 50% of the savings that would occur by the reduction of the level of armaments would also be committed to the total waging of the peace with the major thrust being trying to raise the living standards and improve the quality of life of the people in the emerging nations.

Now we would want a projection of that figure so that we could get some idea of what the total economic resources would be if you projected a percentage of the gross national product of these nations based on this criteria plus a percentage of the savings because of the reduction. And then, after having done that, we will then be able to get some concept as to what resources this would create and we would then try to think in terms of the allocation of these resources so that the various countries of the world, in terms of India, in terms of Africa, in terms of Asia, in terms of Latin America, we can get some idea then of the dimensions of the resources that would be available.

MAY I ASK A QUESTION AT THIS POINT? Would this indicate then that the percentage of gross national product which would be committed to this idea, would be the equivalent of the reduction in armaments contemplated? In other words, when you say 50% of savings in the reduction of armaments would then be recommitted in addition, what represents in percentage or dollar terms the savings in the reduction of armaments? Is that the 3% that is committed out of gross national products?

WPR: No, these two figures are unrelated.

IB: We have to have some base to determine what the savings in reduction of armaments is to determine what 50% of that would be.

WPR: All right. We would take a period that would be a reasonable period for computing what the level of armament expenditures were for that period and then we would move that period into the future, and any figure below that would represent a savings - and that figure, then, would be divided in half. 50% of that would be

used to shore up the peace ~~efforts~~ offensive and the other 50% could be used by each country making a savings to do as it chose - reduce taxes, or to improve schools or housing or medical care or anythingit wanted.

Question: Do you want to have aperiod like a schedule since armament won't sort of break ~~offx~~ -- and keep from ~~having and keep from~~ having dislocation ---- staggered --inaudible

WPR: Well, the reduction in armaments would be over a period of time --I mean, if you ~~get~~ could get for example --if in order to participate in this total ~~waging~~ waging of the peace, the Soviet Union whose economy is currently operating at maximum but as they don't have any idle steel capacity/~~and~~ or idle capacity in consumer goods and so forth. In order for the Soviet Union to in effect participate as a full partner in the total waging of the peace then they would have to agree to a reduction in armaments. Let's assume that ~~their~~ that reduction was $10 billion dollars spread over a period of two years so that an average of $5 billion dollars a year over the two year period may not all take place evenly ~~but~~ but over that two year period of time the Soviet Union would agree to an overall reduction of $10 billion dollars in its leveling of armament expenditures. Well, that would mean then that the Soviet Union would be asked to put ~~hax~~ half of that into the waging of the peace in addition to what they ~~x~~would be obligated to put in under this other criteria, based on the gross national product,would not be very much.

IB: Well, studies have been made ~~ojx~~ on the rate of the decline of armaments which are possible without seriously disrupting the economy and what we ~~can~~ could do is project these and/perhaps even go beyond that a little since this is going

to be income coming from the other expenditures in purchase of goods ~~and~~ in ~~time~~ kind.

WPR: If you have the economic stimulus of the waging of the peace then the absorb~~ing~~tion of ~~this~~ dis location that takes place because of arms ~~xxxxxxxx~~ reduction is no problem. The reduction of armaments becomes a serious economic problem in terms of dislocation of employment if you add that to idle capacity in the economy because you are not making full use of it, but it is not a problem if you are making full use of it -- you just do more of what you're doing.

RR: ? WPR? more or less since certain countries reach a natural because of the weather, climate and natural resources some countries that may well not be a major industrial power may be able to furnish other countries other things if you now get into this very cooperative --they could produce a lot more of that and make it available to other countries and they could cut this off-- in other words, with less effort yet - the total

WPR obviously this is the whole idea behind ~~it~~ the total waging of peace is to create a world community that's based upon cooperation in which military power will never be used to resolve a ~~dispxtexbetxx~~ dispute between nations and between peoples and ~~we~~ you can thereby also bring about the maximum degree of economic integration and in one section of the world as economically situated where it has natural economic advantages to produce certain things it would be completely assinine to have that country industrialized to make something it couldn't make economically. ~~Itxxxx~~ ought to divide that kind of thing ~~to~~ for the world community and somebody else that has a different kind of advantage produces something else and they exchange it and they both get the benefit of the advantages that each of them ~~have~~. has

~~WPR~~: All right, now the next point that we need to discuss -- this is the third point is who would be eligible to receive funds from what we might call an "International, Economic and Social Fund" which is created for the purpose of helping people develop their economies, raise their living standards, improve their education, improve their medical care and in general improve the quality of their lives.

Now, this Fund would be administered by a special agency which would be created - whether it would be an agency of the United Nations - it would be that kind of agency - and it would be an agency through which you would have the special machinery essential to facilitate the cooperative implementation of this kind of a program and all nations would be eligible who are prepared to cooperate in the waging of peace and in a disarmament program and this also includes a complete nuclear test ban agreement.

Now, in other words, communist China, who obviously would be one of the countries of the world that could get the most out of this - their living standards are low, they're not developed in terms of their industrial and productive potentials - they have the largest population of any country in the world, so that if China would agree not to pursue the building of a nuclear capability - if they would agree to a nuclear test ban - if they would agree to a disarmament program, they, then, would become eligible to receive funds out of this international, economic and social construction instruction front. In other words, the eligibility is non-ideological and non-political so long as the country who is asking for the right to participate and therefore receive funds is prepared to join in the waging of the peace which means they are prepared to also reduce some the number of their armaments and sign

a nuclear test ban agreement and all other such agreements that relate to a meaningful disarmament program. But there are no ideological obstacles that would deny you the right to participate.

Question: You're not denying China the right to develop the atomic ... explosion... inaudible ... ?

WPR: They can develop for peaceful purposes, but I'm talking about for military purposes. They would have to join and sign the nuclear test ban agreement and this program ultimately would make for a complete nuclear test ban agreement - not only in the air but underground, with inspection and everything and the Peoples Republic of China (Red China) would have to agree to these things in order to qualify. And the whole idea being that the massive economic resources that this would make available would facilitate such tremendous economic and social progress in the emerging nations in countries like India, they would just go forward with seven league boots instead of just crawling forward as they are now - inch by inch. They would be able to go ahead with seven league boots and the people of Red China would become aware very quickly that the reason all their neighbors are making such tremendous economic and social progress and their living standards are going up and their educational standards and their health standards and all these other things is that these other countries have chosen to travel the path of peace and they have joined in this effort that's being made in the whole world by all these other countries of waging the peace and fighting poverty and fighting ignorance and fighting disease - and fighting this war - and the people of China would be told, "Well, your government chooses to travel this other road and that's

why your living standards are as low as they are - that's why you aren't ~~making~~ making the progress, because your governments and your leaders are doing two things that your make for continued poverty. Number one, they're spending a tremendous share of your own gross national product for armaments, and number two, because they are unwilling to sign these other disarmament agreements, they are disqualified ~~in~~ from receiving this money from this other fund."

IB: Walter, to get back to the eligibility problem, would this indicate then that any country with a per person income below $1,000 would be eligible provided it meets all the other eligibity requirements?

WPR: That's right. That's right.

? ~~---inaudible~~

~~WPR: Yeah, we would consider that any country and~~ that would mean that Japan for a period ~~would not~~ would qualify to get help although this is a thing we ~~would~~ have to think through. I just cited these ~~not as the figures - I cite these~~ as illustrations of the kind of criteria that we need.

Now, the next point that I think we should discuss is this whole basic question of how do you give people economic aid - do you give it to them as loans or do you give it to them as grants - and the whole question of, if they're loans, when are they obligated to pay back on the principal - what about the interest and so forth. In this respect, I believe, that in the long pull, it's really not very important whether you give somebody a grant or a loan, because the amount of ~~ex~~ the economic aid is a relative thing. It's very important now - and it seems overwhelming now if they have to take it on as an obligation. But if you look ahead fifty years, this is ~~very~~ very

unimportant fifty years from now. And so, I believe, that you would get a better reaction if you gave these as long ~~tix~~ term loans and you stipulated that there would be no interest and that no payment on the principal would be required until the people of the ~~xxxxxxx~~ recipient country had a per capita income equal to $1,000 per person? per year. At that point, you could have a mechanism that triggered in in which they then began to pay off the principal over a long period of time so that the payment of principals would not exceed 5% of the gross national products and ~~they could also be a provision~~

.. ~~turn it off --I'm telling you, this is....~~

at the point that they have a per capita income on the average of $1,000 per year they ~~xxxxx~~ then become obligated to begin to pay on the principal but not to exceed an annual payment of 5% of the gross national products so that you don't cut too deeply into their ~~bill~~ ability to continue ~~xxxx~~ to ~~x~~ make progress and raise their per capita income and there also would be provisions worked out so that they can pay in terms of goods and raw materials so that this would stimulate their further economic growth and development.

Now, as ~~x~~ I said before, there ~~would~~ would be no political strings whatsoever and any country regardless of its ideological position, its political position, its economic or social system ~~that it was trying to develop~~ would be eligible provided it was prepared to join in the total waging of the peace with other nations and providing it was prepared to disarm and to sign the necessary treaties in ~~the~~ terms of nuclear test bans ~~and~~ or any other ~~xxxxx~~ treaties that may be developed.

IB: If repayment of the principal is in money obviously it goes back into the international fund, but if its in goods or raw material to whom is it paid?

.xxxxxx ....inaudible...

WPR: The point is that the principal would be repaid to the people to the nations that contributed to the fund and it would be pro-rated. It wouldn't be United States for example made a direct loan to Country "A", and therefore when Country "A" was prepared to pay back it would pay into the fund and the fund would allocate to all the nations that had made a contribution a proportionate share. Now, if this country said that we've got rubber that we can contribute or that we've got some other raw materials or some other goods, then they could- any country that made a contribution to the fund could say, "We will accept so many tons of this kind of raw material in lieu of cash." And then you'll get credit. This would require some bookkeeping but this would not be complicated.

Now, the agency that would be created to implement this kind of a program whether it was a special agency of the United Nations or whether some other agency of that character was created - this is a detail we can talk out but it would have to be so that no nation could veto the implementation of the plan.

RR? --- Walter, may I inject in here at this particular point, I think you better do some further exploration .... because? in certain emerging nations in certain areas when we think about Africa, ... one country is considerably .... although their natural inclination

would be to make coffee or a similar products and if they can pay in kind....if they can pay in kind of materials I can see one country sort of really planting and ~~and Christ~~ just destroying ~~just~~ the coffee market and if there isn't some kind of arrangement ... create chaos with the economy of the other countries.

IB: This is why I raise the question.

WPR: Well, this approach obviously will necessitate the kind of coordinating economic development agency so that a section of Africa for example, let's take Tanganyika, Uganda, and Kenya, just by way of illustration, since ~~because~~ those three countries have been closely related and the common monetary system the common postal system and so forth. Now, if each of those countries decided that they were going to really concentrate on raising coffee, see, this would be very unwise because you've got to have some overall regional planning. If Kenya, for example could do one crop better than Tanganyika and Tanganyika could do a crop better than Kenya, then they shouldn't be competing. ~~they ought to~~ ~~so~~ There's got to be regional development, just like you have a regional power development. They've got to plan these ~~other~~ things and there would be created agencies ~~mechanisms~~ of engineers and agricultural experts and people like ~~this~~ that who would coordinate and you would get broad regional economic development because the whole idea is not to build a world in which you have the kind of cutthroat competitive approach to the world market but in which you develop an integrated world economic community in which everybody is trying to produce that product or that commodity or those goods where they have natural advantages and other countries get the benefit of their advantages and they in turn get the benefit of the advantages that other countries have. It's this kind of a rational, cooperative approach in which you achieve maximum economic integration because you're not

trying to exploit each other. You're trying to exploit the resources of the world and the whole world community would get the benefit, and I think in this respect since we're talking about this we've got to raise this point. This may be a point further down on my list, ~~but since we're talking about it.~~ I think it is completely unrealistic to think that you can make the peace secure in the world with the accidents of history and geography giving some people a piece of the earth's real estate which is above a disproportionate share of the world's resources. I just think it's completely unrealistic to believe that a continuation of that and all of the economic advantages that that may give that small group of people who may occupy that particular piece of the world's real estate that there forever and a day and their grandchildren in a million years from now are always going to have these advantages just because geographically by the accidents of history they happen to live on that piece of real estate. So that what we're thinking about is that we have to recognize that the fact that some nations had all the advantages was the source of some of the pressures that made for war and what we're going to do is that we're going to develop an approach in which the total community of man by a program of cooperation and economic integration in cooperation in terms of politics, disarmament and so forth, we are going to together exploit the world's resources for the benefit of the total world community.

Now, this also means that as technology makes tremendous strides forward we need to create international mechanisms by which we work together - scientists of the world - in developing substitute materials for scarce raw materials which an expanding population in the world will tend to consume, so that one

nation will not feel the urgency of ~~kind of~~ getting a monopoly on some portion of the world's resources because it's afraid that if it shared it with anybody it ~~would~~ won't ~~not~~ be enough. ~~We've got to break through just as we now know (noise) ...let me continue on these notes that I made....~~

~~Now I feel very strongly that in~~ my 1950 total peace offensive proposal I suggested there that there be some sort of peoples advisory committees created. I think that getting people involved who can communicate and who can talk about their problems in a very informal, untechnical kind of way, that this is the best guarantee that this kind of temendous program is always close enough to the attitudes and/the needs of ~~the~~ people and ~~it isn't through~~ isn't as though it becomes ~~a~~ comes a grand scheme above the people and above their needs.

We could ~~Our view~~ for example ~~could~~ create ~~needs~~ means first of all regional conferences so that not only the technicians and the politicians and the bureaucrats got together, but people got together. And this could be worked out. I think they ~~could~~ would learn a great deal from each other and from the kind of problems they have and I think it would always tend to be the kind of a democratic check on the machinery so that the machinery doesn't become the end purpose of the effort rather than the people.

RR?... What sort of thing - like educators, ~~like a~~ agricultural people?

WPR: That's right.

RR?.. trade unionists.....technological kind of thing.....?

WPR: That's right. Now, I think also that into this kind of an effort - take the whole question of education. I think that this kind of an effort offers a tremendous opportunity to create regional and international universities. Obviously, if you make

a dozen small countries out of an area controlled by the British, or the French, or the Belgium, each of those small countries can't quick enough develop a university with the faculty and all the other things that make a university a center of learning. Well, you're going to create regional universities..

RR?...you said regional, you mean international region ?

WPR: That's right. Regional in the sense that you might have five or six small countries, countries who have a regional university, you see, and then you try to staff that - you try to get the faculty in there to really make it a center of learning.

And then I think that there is a temendous advantage in having a number of international universities around the world where students from all over the world could come. Now there's a tremendous difference between an international university and the University of Michigan which has international students. There's a tremendous difference. This would be a university operated by this world community instrument and its purpose would not only be to give young people the skills and the training and the competence which they need whether it be in the field of engineering or agriculture or medicine or law but in the process to create a whole new body of world citizens who come out of the same educational environment and who grow up and live together (noise).

Now, I think also that this idea would lend itself to the organization of international peace corps. Now the peace corps that the United States has developed is obviously one of the finest and most exciting things that we've done. As I said in the conference in Washington, the day before yesterday,

in introducing Sargent Shriver, I said I think it can be said that never before has so much been done for so many with such a small investment as the Peace Corps. Now you just look at that. But look at how much more exciting and how much more effective it could be, ~~that if the Peace Corps were not only~~, let's say you send in a thousand young people into a country, that if they came not from the United States or not from the Soviet Union, or not from England, or not from France, or not from Germany, or from Italy, but they came from an agency which is the world cooperative agency in which all of these nations had people participating then no one would think they were being captured, no one would think that they were being used in the cold war, no one would think that they were there for reasons of national advantage. Anyway, you take all the advantages of the United States Peace Corps and you multiply them many many times over, if you could create an international peace corps ~~which would be a corps,~~ now as you reduce the level of armaments, and you get the tension and the insecurity out of the world, it means that millions of young people who historically have been drawn into military service would be available for peace service. They would be the troops building the peace - and this is the whole idea.

Now this also means that we work out scholarships and in the first period when we're trying to do everything we can to build the bridges of understanding and create the sense of security and mutual confidence and mutual trust between the major countries in the blocks who have been waging the cold war in the arms race between the Soviet Union and the United States, we would make a special effort to work out a special exchange scholarship program so that we would not only want to be sending young people to the emerging nations to help them but we would work out this scholarship program in which we would try to get the Soviet Union to accept 5,000

young Americans for a period of two years and we would accept 5,000 young Soviet students and we would work it out with Great Britain and France and Italy and our other allies so that they would get a comparable number from the Soviet Union and the satellite nations and they would send a comparable number to the Soviet Union and the satellite nations so that - let's just assume we could get an exchange of 10,000 students each way - that's 20,000 - in ten years you'd get 200,000 young people who would spend two years living in the other person's country and we would work it out so that these students would not live like the Americans all lived together in a dormatory at the University of Moscow - they would be worked out so that an American and a Russian student lived together in the Soviet Union, and an American and a Russian student lived together at Harvard or wherever they were located. So that they lived together and this would build the bridges of understanding and you could just see that after this kind of a program went on for a while, and you were disarming and you were cooperating in the international field and so forth, you would begin to tear down all of the misunderstandings and the questions of suspicion and out of that would come the kind of climate that peace could be made secure in.

ROY R ?..... the cold war troops could be called ..... the cold war.....
laugh.... inaudible

WPR: Now, this approach would also mean that we would really work out on a massive scale this whole concept of the organization and the training of technical task forces. We've been saying in the automotive industry that one of the very pressing needs of the nations of Africa, Asia, and this is probably true of Latin America, these are the emerging nations, that their transportation breaks down. They've

got - it's mostly all mass transportation - busses, they have very few private automobiles, and busses and tractors and things like that. Now the real problem is not only to enable them to get more adequate equipment but to maintain that equipment once they've got them. So ~~we would work out~~ with these special technical task forces ~~and~~ we would for ~~xxxxxx~~ example train 3,000 young Americans ~~on~~ how to repair automobiles trucks, tractors, all that type of equipment. And we could then take those young Americans, in ~~tx~~ teams of three, because you ~~xxxxx~~ can't send them individually, he gets sick or something and the whole program goes to pot. Take teams of three and we say three young Americans and they would go into a village and we would give them enough equipment so that they could set up a training center and they would have a few power ~~xxx~~ tools, welding equipment, lathe, shaper, and a drill press and a grinder and then we could strip our junk yards in this country and send them ~~old loaders~~ over ~~and they could tear about and use it~~ and that ..... and in the process of maintaining in working condition good the equipment that they have and the new equipment which they ~~will~~ get, they will train the young people in those villages how to do this themselves. If this sort of thing multiplies - we would do this ~~with~~ in agriculture, we would do this in education - in all of these fields - we would just multiply - and we would just send thousands of people ~~xxx~~ over there - in some cases we would send them as a part of the American effort, we'd be asked to do it, in other cases they would be ~~px~~ a part of the international peace corps approach.

RR: ...say right here, Walter, this is an area where right now today many of these kids, underprivileged kids, never will get to college - maybe this is a field that you could give them technical training ~~to~~ at a ~~xxx~~ cost that would be ~~xxxx~~ within their capability and they could ~~xx~~ make a tremendous contribution. You know, give them some additional

training. You could train some people who could also do this. You know, not just take the people who are there. Here again, I'm thinking of young kids who may be school dropouts that you could get them in, train them with the stipulation that they would spend some time doing .. inaudible....

WPR: We ought to make reference to that regional development of the river in Southeast Asia where there has been a proposal to develop the total resources of that area that is being drained by this river and this proposal has been worked out by an international agency in which all nations had cooperated and despite the fact that this is an area of the world in which there have been military difficulties and guerrila activities, this project for developing this river basin and its resources, is moving ahead, and that shows you the great sense of urgency and need for the development of the resources of an area, when it can proceed under these trying difficulties of military hostility, you can understand how much more progress could be made if this could go forward in the atmosphere of peace and this has been put out by the Quakers and we must refer to that.

IB: I'll look it up and get it. I have it on the desk, I know.

WPR: All right. Now we need to get these kinds of figures. We need to project the economic growth of full employment in the United States for the next twenty five years - what it would mean - how much that would make possible for the peace offensive and how much more that would make possible for domestic purposes, and then reach back and show what we lost in the eight years of the Eisenhower Administration and the first two years of the Kennedy Administration. And that we could show them that this proposal , because

it would stimulate full employment and maximum economic growth, actually without costing the people of the United States one penny, they will actually get a great deal by giving away this portion of the gross national product they will wind up with more than if they hadn't given it away.

RR:. . . . . yet. . . . yes? . . . and include in their the gross population of the United States, too.

WPR: ~~All of that~~. We want to also then deal with this whole question of the balance of payments because the world has got to find an answer to this absolutely assinine, obsolete, antiquated business of facilitating exchange. ~~I mean. . the crisis. . what is~~ this crisis, it's all paper crisis.

If we made these payments in goods and service and not in money then there would be no balance of payments problem.

?. . . . did you read about that. . ?

WPR: We won't talk about that. ~~We don't want to talk about that.~~ ~~We want to talk about that.~~ ?

Then the next point I would like to talk about is the ~~cost of agricultural program, the~~ cost of the agricultural program. How much is the agricultural program of the United States costing America for the last twenty five years? What it would cost if we projected it for the next twenty five years because this approach that we're talking about will abolish all foreign subsidies and we will gear American agriculture to the full needs of the world and we will take the shackles off the American farmers, so instead of paying the American farmer for not producing we will pay him for producing. And he will feel better, the tax payers will be better

off and people who are hungry will have food.

Now, the whole agricultural program in America in terms of the world market has been in terms of the distribution of surplus foods. And so we say to some country, "We've got some corn that we will give you", but they say "But we don't use corn". ~~This whole business, Roy, that, you see, so we got tremendous surplus corn. So we say "We got corn" - they say, "we don't need corn"~~. Well, why don't we raise what they eat? As long as the American farmer has a market for it and he gets paid, he doesn't care.

?...

WPR: ~~Sure. So what we have to do~~, we have to raise food to meet the needs of the world community and not just say, "We've got some surplus stuff that we can't use, can we give it to you, or sell it to you?" ~~And, and, and~~, we've got to take the position that it's not only economically unsound but it's morally wrong to pay American farmers for not producing food when there are hungry people in the world.

We would also in this whole approach create regional health centers all over the world, where they not only ~~, you know,~~ provide medical care but where there are the great centers of research concerning the special health problems in that part of the world.

~~RR: Training centers....~~

WPR: ~~Training centers for doctors and where they - you know~~, here's an area where they have tropical diseases, so we have centers, and we have the best experts in the world ~~concentrating~~ concentrated, exchanging information, coordinating research. These would be the kind of regional headquarters for a world research project in terms of health and then coordinate them - one fellow's making progress here - he doesn't do that in isolation, everybody else knows about it. He knows what some-

body else is doing - coordinate this thing.

~~Ah. . ah.~~

(end of tape #1)

Now the basic argument that were trying to suggest here is

WPR: that the total waging of the peace is an attempt to solve the three basic problems in the world and the three basic problems in the United States. The three basic problems in the world are number

1. that the continuation of the arms race and certainly now that China has it - has got the nuclear weapon, threatens the very survival of the human race and therefore as a matter of survival the human race has got to find some rational way in putting them in the race.

Number 2. The growing gap between the have and the have-not peoples of the world is such that peace and the future of the human race cannot be made secure with half the people getting richer and richer and the other half getting relatively poorer and poorer and this has got to be met, and thirdly,

3. The free World Alliance which is coming apart at the seams, is coming apart at the seams because it was put together in a period of human history when the pressures were negative and there was essentially insecurity and fear and so forth and now what we've got to do is to find a new sense of historic purpose that for the Free World Alliance so it will have the cohesion out of the positive commitment to peace than it got out of the negative fear of the insecurity of war. Now these are the three basic problems that face us. In other words the question of peace and survival, this whole question of the gap between the have and the have-not peoples of the world which is getting greater and greater because of the developed nations, we're making tremendous progress with our technology and we're using tools of the twentieth century technological revolution

and the emerging peoples are still working with the tools of the seventeenth and eighteenth century.

All right now, the basic problems in the United States as we all know are the continuing levels of chronic unemployment which we have not solved. Secondly this whole basic problem that you can't solve Civil Rights problems in a vacumn and its related to the whole question of full employment and opportunities this ties in with the problem of youth. How do you give young people who are coming into our society a sense of purpose - a sense of something to do and all of these things tie together with the whole question of the quality of our kind of society, and what we really need to do is to bring into being a shift of the whole struggle in the world from a purely negative power struggle, waged in terms of an increasingly heavier and heavier expenditure for armaments into a contest between our two social systems. Which system can harness man's creative genius in the field of science and technology and relate that to man's peaceful needs in terms of improving the quality of human life and the quality of society.

~~Irv: That's a good sentence. When using. We'll use it.~~

~~WPR: That bothers me.~~

~~IRV: It does.~~

WPR: We need to get together the cost of armaments, how much we're spending - how much we've spent since the end of the second World War - how much we spent in the second World War - how much the World spent since the end of the second World War, and how much we would spend if the level of armaments continues to move upward in the next twenty five years, because we're

And we really are talking about what a peace offense is going to cost or what a continuation of the arms race is going to cost.

RR: And Walter there is an ingredient on this cost factor which I think we can forget. Lets assume that we have three million people and we're paying them $60 a month or a $100 a month and this is the cost. But these three million people who have peace - what they could be doing! There's another contribution.

WPR: That's right. Obviously if you got three million people under arms and they're not producing anything that is an economic loss and therefore that also is part of the cost of armaments.

RR: Thats the point.

WPR: That's right. Now, it is not only not enough to find out what the great powers are spending for armament but we want to get a projection and listing of what India is spending for armaments. What other countries small because they are all the victims of the arms race - what they're spending. This is even a double tragedy.

RR: India is a good example because they are so peace loving and they finally got into it.

WPR: Then, we ought to translate this into people. How much that we're spending -- what this means in terms of the average person and then you would see.

RR: Per capita year here?

WPR: - no no - then you would see how much we're spending in terms of the people that need the help. If they had been getting this kind of economic == in other words, if in the last twenty five years we spent that amount of money for economic aid what it would have meant.

RR: We could still save a lot of money.

WPR: What it would mean in terms of hospitals, in schools and housing and all these things. In other words translate it into the things -- so you say we spent 30 billion dollars, I mean 230 billion dollars - it doesn't mean a thing. But if you said if we had spent this money for peace this is what we could have done - hospitals, schools - this is how much we could have raised their living standards.

In other words you put it into meaningful human terms so you can understand what we're talking about. ////////////////////////////////////

~~RR: ..subsequently..employment.....is all part of a screwy kind of economy which developes out a... kind of econo-my.. right?~~

WPR: We also want to get figures on the foreign aid programsto date. How much we've spent - how much has been for military and how much has been for economics. Because what we really have got to do is to convince people. They're going to say "well, we have had a foreign aid program it hasn't gotten these kind of results; and, therefore, you're purposing we spend even more money when we haven't gotten the results out of what we spent." What we have to show them is, number one. Most of the foreign economic aid money we've spent has been for military purpose is to give people guns to defend the status quo where the status quo was not worth defending, secondly, We have to show that the whole idea of this waging of the peace is to create the dynamics in the world that are so over whelming for peace that they are stronger than the negative forces that make for war. Now, you can't do that if you spend $50 billion for armaments - as the United States will do this year and we spend $1 billion for economic aid. Because, if you take out of the $3 billion dollars the military, I am sure that $1 billion is for economic aid. So, you can't have a fifty to one ratio and expect the $1 billion to perform miracles

when it is competing with the $50 billion which is determining the basic relationship of nations and the basic thrust of World dynamics. What we have to do is to create the dynamics of peace in which the positive forces of waging the peace of building a good life for people is more over whelming than the negative forces that make for war. Now, you can't do that if you "peddle." That's why you need this massive thrust - you've got to get people marching in peace.

RR: This business of the Marshall plan I think - here again you ought to get a summary of that - the investment - the economic investment in the Marshall program and how it was not only successful but it was an investment in freedom. I think a summary of that...

WPR: The Marshall plan thing, Roy, if you took the Marshall plan and you figured out how much the United States provided for the Marshall plan you will find that over whelmingly we gave a great deal more to help rehabilitate France where the job of rehabilitation was big but not nearly comparable to starting from scratch like an emerging nation where they had nothing and yet we gave so much more money and that - that illustrates this other problem.

The other thing I think we have to emphasize is that if you create these kind of dynamics this is the only force that can change the power structure of some of the countries where a few people control the power structure and are not willing to cooperate with bringing about a fundamental change in the economic and social status of the great mass of people. Latin America is a good example of that. That they can't resist the kind of over whelming dynamics

that we're talking about - they can resist the kind of "piddling" that we've been doing.

IRV: Yeah, well this is an extremely important point to answer the cynics, in this area.

WPR: That's right. Now, this next point that we've already talked about and that's - I make the point here that we've got to develop a whole new concept in the frame-work of the twentieth century technological revolution with respect to the right to access to the resources of the world. I mean the total world community must have equal access to the resources of the world with respect to their living standards. ~~RR: Same with the man? Man to man? Same way with the man.~~

WPR: That's right. But, now we're dealing with the economics of abundance, and not with the economics of scarcity and if we will ulitize man's full economic potential and if we exploit the resources of the world in terms of the need of the total world community - and if we will concentrate on finding new resources and substitute materials for materials and goods in short supply, then there is no need to struggle over scarcity because we can all share in the fruits of abundance.

Then we want to develop this idea that I've expressed. This is really the first time in the history of the human family where and where the idealist has become the realist, look, Because if you talk about brotherhood, if you talk about cooperation, if you talk about building the world - the rational world community — these are all idealistic things but they have to be the pragmatic, practical thing to do because that's the only way you can save the human family. The real tough guys - you know the guy that says "this is dog eat dog" - he can't save the world.

IB: He can destroy it.

WPR: He can destroy the world so that the realist is now

the idealist. Brotherhood has become a necessity. Not just some abstract concept, you know, for the dreamers - it has now become a necessity. This has got to be brought home - people have got to understand this. This is not pie in the sky, this is not some guy dreaming. We can't save the human family excepting if we do these kind of things.

I got here this creation of international technical clearing house to co-ordinate research and facilitate the exchange of technical knowledge in the field of science, technology, medicine, agriculture. So you have these centers all over the world and then a central clearing house, you see, and right now for example, in the question of cancer research, how much duplication do you think is going on in the world? How much - how many guys are working in total isolation, you know, they don't know what somebody else is doing.

Well, why don't we have a way to find out so that what one guy is doing helps somebody else? This whole field - we've got to -

IB: Would this also be handled through the world agency that would be handling the funds?

WPR: Well, we create a special agency-

~~IB: Pardon?..... Apart from....?~~

~~WPR: ....inaudible..... (refreshments brought in at this point?).. Irv were and therefore, the interruption? Mary~~

WPR: See, we have to point out the German problem, for example. Is there a solution to the German problem? Yes. There is a solution to the German problem only as there is a solution to the world power struggle. The Russians will never give up East Germany. Why should they? as long as this is a power contest. But if you solve the power contest, so you've got a peaceful competition and not a military threat to each other, then you can put Germany together because there's no reason why it shouldn't go together.

Then we have got this long range problem of world markets ~~for and the~~ stabilizing of prices - for countries that have got one or two crop economy. This is a very serious problem and we have got to not only get diversity there but we've got to tie them in so that they've got security.

Then I think that if we could develop some mass produced atomic power plants, you know, ~~not used ones~~ not huge ones, with maybe 5,000 kilowatts, so that they could be mass produced in one place where you get the benefit and the economies of mass production and then spot them all over these countries, you see, so that they have - where they don't have natural power resources, you know, either hydro-electric, or coal,

and so forth, so that they would have access and then relate to that a massive program of the diversion of water - salt water and the fresh water. You see, these are the kind of things you can do with this kind of a program.

IB: Now, here again, you're talking- you're thinking of this in terms of a world agency doing this rather than..

WPR: That's right. The world agency would contract it - and say okay, "you were going to give your share of this year's "x" billions of dollars" - well the staff that is programming would say, "We'd like to have you build us a thousand of these atomic reactor power stations", you see, and so each charged against your contributions - this is what we're going to get it in - in good reserves - they don't want it in cash - what in the hell would you do - dump a million dollars - dump a billion dollars in the middle of Africa - you can't eat it. They want things - they want tools- and goods - that's what they want. They don't want money. They want what money will buy.

IB: In this regard, let me raise a question that's been asked time and time again in the stuff that's being written now. There's a complaint being raised that these emerging countries can handle only so much increased economic development on an annual basis - that there is a limit to the amount of assistance and the amount of aid that they may derive in any given period of time until they took a breather and then would go on to the next stage. I haven't read anywhere of a determination of well, how much can they take, but the point has been made I think that in this total document somehow it should be.

RR: That's true. But what they're doing on this particular point, Irv, when they move in and they say "Well, you can't have - you can't have a -

for instance, you can't have a tractor because these people don't know how - you see they're operating on the basis of the present. Walter's proposing that teams go out and train and this is all based on the present situation. True, that there is a lag but there'll be many many areas that you can -

WPR: Let's address ourselves to that criticism which is, as you say, is one of the major criticisms - let's just say they can't take it in that large a dose.

IB: They can't absorb it that quickly.

WPR: That's right. Now, all right. Let's talk about the question of... ~~inaudible ..noise...(clearing throat)~~..... The first thing that would have to happen in the implementation of this kind of massive waging of the peace is the creation of the technical bodies that would have to survey areas and regions to determine the kind of economic development projects that should be invested in such regions. Now one of the things they would do, - let's say - let's take portions of Africa where they have tremendous potential hydro-electric power development. So they would go in there. Well, this is the kind of things that can absorb massive financial investments. Supposing you went in there and you had a master plan for the development of the hydro-electric power potential of whole sections of Africa, so that you would start building dams, you would start getting ready in terms of the generators and so forth and get this whole thing going. Now, that kind of a project could go forward and obviously nobody can say that you can't build a dam and you can't get ready to harness the power of that river and to control the floods and irrigate land - no one can say, "Well, they can only absorb so much of that." If that project is feasible you can build it as quickly as the manpower committed to it and the resources to provide the tools

are made available. So that doesn't matter whether the people can absorb it. Now, they ~~can~~ might argue that if you build ~~this~~ those power plants that you might not be able to use the full power potential for five years until you get the industry and so forth going, that's true. But you shouldn't hold back on the building of the power projects just because ~~they take~~ it may take you- because even in the United States you don't build a power plant in 1965 just for 1965 power needs - you build it for ten years ahead sometimes.

IB: The only way we do that in the United States is when we build highways. We don't project them for ten years down the road.

WPR: That's right. So you can take down these big massive programs which would take the major capital and then these other things depend almost entirely upon how much technical help you give/people the in raising their level of technical competence. And if you don't - if you obviously can't put ~~gre~~ great investments in capital expenditures if you don't put money in raising the level of ~~tech~~ technical competence. But the ~~type~~ kind of a program we're talking about would be so massive we would do both. And, therefore, this argument is valid, but it's more valid in the context of the limited program than it is in terms of the massive program because a ~~massive~~ massive program would have sufficient resources, sufficient personnel to do both things.

RR: Look, when you can take a guy like Tom Mboya who learned to write in sand, and now he's Minister of Justice, you can in country after country with the right kind of massive technical assistance you can leapfrog - there'll be problems,

but

that you can just do - things that they say you can't do you can do.

WPR: Well, let's take some of the basic needs. Housing - Can anybody tell you that you can't go into a place where they have bad housing and do a massive housing project? Do you mean they can only absorb so many good houses a year.? Why can't you have sewage disposal, put in water systems, and then give them decent housing? Nobody can say that well if there are a million people who need good housing you can only build ten thousand a year. Who says you can only build ten thousand a year? The point is that on housing there's no limit. On education, on building the schools, and sending in enough teachers - what's the limit? Well, the limit is the need. There is no limit excepting that you shouldn't exceed the need. That's the limit.

On medical care. If you can set up medical centers and clinics and send in people to train them. You know, first of all, very simple things they can do. You know, just recognizing that drinking water out of a place that you wash your feet in is not a good place to drink water - that kind of thing. On agriculture - well, just getting good seeds and getting fertilizer - fertilizer and all these things - I mean, I believe that the outer limit of help is the basic need. Now obviously the key is a balanced coordinated program. You shouldn't build one part of the plant when the other half of it is neglected. So that having built that, you can't utilize it because you neglected the other half. If you have a balanced coordinated program the only outer limit that I can see is need on the one hand and your ability to provide the man power and the capital on the other.

IB: That's where they couldn't absorb skyscrapers but they can absorb little

homes for people.

WPR: That's right. And they can have drinking water that is safe, and they can have medical care and they can have better education. These are the basic things, you know.

IB: Now this raises another question though that's related to this whole problem. If part of this contribution, or in some cases all of the contribution, is to be made in goods ~~we made good~~ ~~and time~~ which would stimulate ~~kind~~ ~~stimulate~~ ~~....~~ the home economy, then you may find the question of the limit of absorption - how many tractors, for instance, can be absorbed around the world within a given period of time? How many refrigerators? Obviously, this is for down the road. But the goods ~~and~~ time kind problem, I think, perhaps puts some kinds of limitations on this which money does not and yet there must be a wedding of both.

WPR: Well, I think it's a question here that if we can't take the United States and say "well, we got a surplus of television in our television industry so let's think in terms of dumping televisions in Africa. What we have to do is relate our economic potential to their needs in addition to our own needs and we have got to work this thing out so that we put first things first. What does Tanganyika need? What does it need not only in terms of its economic future and the development of its resources but what does it need in this overall plan in terms of Uganda and Kenya and so forth? All right. We know, for example, that housing is a problem all over the world. There isn't a section of the world in which housing is not a basic human need that we aren't meeting. All right. So that we would have a

technical task force, dealing with housing. In each of these major areas, because housing differs, you don't build the same kind of housing in Tanganyika that you build in some cold part of the world, so that we would have a technical housing group there and they would coordinate this. They would develop some basic housing and they would develop those housing in terms of what kind of raw materials are available in the given area. Now they may have an unlimited amount of rough stones and things like that, that with some relatively simple crushing mechanism they could convert with cement and make a fairly good cement block for construction. All right. So we would in that case work in that direction and we would have a massive housing program. One of the basic problems in all of these areas when you improve their agriculture, if you give them power tools for example which that they don't have in Tanganyika, you give them power tools and you give them fertilizer and better seeds, one man can grow as much as ten now grow. The question is, what do you do with the nine that you put off the land? So, that's where they'll be making housing, they'll get drawn into building schools, and they'll get drawn into building hospitals, and laying a water system and doing some irrigation. The point is, this is the kind of thing that has to be done. A fellow says, "you can't give them power tools because then you will disrupt their economy instead of them all raising enough just to eat for themselves, they will raise three times as much - so, then what are you going to do with the two guys you lay off?" This is the kind of argument.

IB: That's right.

WPE: If you think there'll be a big massive program there will be something else

for these other people to do.

RR: All right. If this country doesn't have to pay it back until they reach a certain (pause) they can pile back into this thing -- you know -- there's so much savings there.

WPR: If you take housing, education, medical care and agriculture. Just take those three and

IB: Sanitation.

WPR: Sanitation. Well, that ties in with medical care. God, the world- the needs of the world are so fantastically great. In this business, just you can't absorb it. It's just a lot of damn nonsense. You take India. How much housing do you think India needs? And this gets to this whole question of population growth - You see, I don't believe - I don't believe, that you can really deal with the population explosion effectively - As long as half the people of the world live in poverty. Do you realize that just putting a light in that hut where they sleep could have an impact in itself upon the birth rate? They would do other things. You can't separate population growth from the bottom of the economic pyramid. From raising the level of living standards and education and sanitation they all tie together. And so they say "Yes, but my God, if you are really going to have medical care and they are now growing at the rate that they are and you make them live longer you're just going to have worse problems." That's not true, because the whole history of the world shows that if you raise the living standards - and Sweden is the best example in the world - has the highest living standards in Europe and the lowest rate of population growth.

WPR:

Two things go together.

IB: This is true but --

WPR: That's why you need massive attacks. This "piddling" on the fringe never will do the job.

IB: Of course, what what you say about population, Walter, but at the same time even in a country such as ours, our population continues to grow, because even though we are in this more affluent state, the number of people who live longer and the number of births even though less proportionately than in other countries nevertheless keeps up a constant growth in the population.

WPR: That's right - But some day, you see, the human family and as far as I'm concerned we are not at near that level yet because the technology is moving so much faster than the rate of growth in the population so that we can be ahead of this-but let's assume that there comes a time - then, man has to make the decision on whether he wants to just multiply and in the process of multipling create new problems for himself or maintain a relative state. There is nothing immoral, you know, in not having a lot of kids. Some families will have more some will have less-this will balance out, you see, but this is always going to be a problem. But no one can use that as an argument and "Well, why say that's why you can't fight proverty. ~~They You've got to have them here and they've got to die off. You got to let them starve to death and have malnutrition (all the God Damn)~~ and have diseases because if you don't, they're really going to multiply like flies." That's not a argument.

IB: That's an immoral argument.

WPR: It's not an argument it's an excuse! It's really an attempt to run away

from your obligations as a member of the world community, you know - And, if you look at Indian, and there, you say they can't absorb massive aid. I mean, this is some argument, isn't it? (noise .....) Note: ((probably refreshments or lunch served at this point)...M.P.

WPR: What to do, Irv, is to take these questions and give them to these guys in advance.

IB: And let them study them.

RR: That's right. And then we have a session - we have a session - with them and we talk about these technical problems - you see.

IB: Let me ask some questions which aren't technical and whether you want to get into them because they may have some importance. You have the problem of Russia and this is what we've been talking about primarily - Ah but the theme of the book is to cause all countries, not only Russia, to disarm because they have no other rational recourse except to disarm. You've got the question of France (and Red China we talked about the other day) but you have the question of France. How do you bring France into this idea so that it, too, will find that it has no other recourse but to-

WPR: Well, you see - you start out, the central core of this idea is that the world is in deep trouble and if we permit a continuation of the drift in the arms race in which the great powers of the world - United States and the Soviet Union being the two major powers in the two power blocks - if they continue to put billions and billions and billions into the arms race and, as the result of that with greater and greater scientific technical personel being devoted to this arms

race, we're ~~are~~ going fashion in the immediate period ahead weapons that in terms of their ~~xxxxx~~ destructive ~~xxxxx~~ potential will make what we have now look like primitive weapons. Now, with this going on and the arms race spreading, with Red China now getting into it - Red China will have sophisticated nuclear weapons in just a matter of time, and when ~~xxxxx~~ you're talking about survival and that's what we are talking about ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ whether Red China gets these weapons five years earlier or five years later, this is kind of academic. The facts are that a ~~continuing~~ continuation of the arms race will mean that the great powers will develop more destructive weapons and more and more and more of these kind of weapons will fall into the hands of more and more nations, and the nuclear club membership will get greater and greater - Now - the more powers that have nuclear weapons, and the more destructive those weapons are, the greater the jeopardy of survival of the human family. And the greater possiblity, not only by calculation but primarily by miscalculation, you can trigger a nuclear war.

[Now, the whole idea behind this peace offensive is to find a way to put into motion the ~~dynamics~~ dynamics of a new idea which can generate ~~sufficient~~ sufficient thrust to check the arms race. And ~~ultimately~~ ultimately, having checked the arms race, bring about a rational reduction of the level of armaments and ~~ultimately~~ ultimately achieve disarmament.] Now, you can't fill a vacumn with a vacumn. ~~you have~~ You've got to have something afirmative and therefore the only way that you can really ~~effective~~ effectively check the arms race which threatens the very survival of the human family, if it remains unchecked, is to create a new contest in which the ~~dynamics~~ dynamics of waging the peace really becomes ~~a~~ the contest between the power blocks and the - We ~~purpose~~ propose to

do that by taking the offensive on the peace front in the emerging nations who ~~are~~ in effect are the balance of power between two ~~Power~~ power blocks. I mean, as we have said many times, the Soviet Union really doesn't believe that it can subordinate or subvert the United States - they don't really think that they can take us over. On the other hand, we don't really think we can convert the Soviet Union and the people of the Soviet Union to our kind of economic and social system. Now the real contest is not the contest to subvert each other - the real contest is to win the loyalty and the support and the alliance of the emerging peoples. They are the great majority of the peoples of the world. They are the people who make up the emerging nations and the people who essentially are the have-not people of the have-not nations in the world. Now - if we could shift the dynamics of the power struggle of the world from the nuclear arms race, which no one can win, to a contest between our two social systems as to which social system can best find workable and practical and rational and responsible answers to the needs of the human family and to demonstrate that primarily by specific and practical work in the emerging nations of the world and do that parallel to improving the quality of life for the people in the country that is taking the initiative.

Then, this becomes, we would hope, a contest between our two social systems not in terms of which one can channel most of its technical personnel with economic resources in an arms race, but which social system can best find the answers to the problem of the human family. Now - It is our contention that the economic aid program that United States has invested many billions of dollars in, was primarily number one, a military thing and we were trying to win military

allies. Now, this program will have nothing to do with military allies. This is going to be a completely de-militarized peace offensive. We're not going to be tying economic aid programs by saying, "we will give you some agricultural tools but you're going to take a cut glove and the facts will show as we will dig into them that the amount of money that the United States appropriated, that we call foreign aid, that went into purely military assistance was far greater than the economic aid that we gave in terms of the basic economic and social problems of the people that we're helping. Now - it is our contention that this program has not been as successful as it should have been because number one, we had the major emphasis on military and it was therefore an extention of the cold war and this changed - this determines the attitude of people because they don't think you're helping them. They think you are trying to use them in the overall cold war. And therefore you get a different kind of psychological relationship. Secondly, we were giving them military aid when their primary needs were economic and social. And, thirdly, that the amount of economic aid that we gave them was so peripheral in terms of its impact upon their basic dimensions of their basic needs that it failed to make the kind of impact that must be made to achieve the dramantic results that we think is essential to shift the dynamics of this whole struggle. Now - If we went into this thing and we put into it the kind of economic aid that would really be adequate with the dimensions of the to deal human needs that we are trying to deal with, and we got our allies to begin to channel resources, we could then get something in the neighborhood of 25 to 30 billion dollars a year, and the dimensions of that attack upon the basic economic and social needs of these countries - now you couldn't spend that much the first

week-I mean, this would have to be programmed, but you would be committing these kinds of resources - that this would be great that we could begin to shape the future of these nations and the Soviet Union could not stay outside of this contest.

Now, if the Soviet Union came into the contest, it obviously would have to come into this new contest- and this is not an extension of the cold war- this is a straight economic peace offensive, helping people who need help. Helping them to meet their problems - helping them to develop their resources -helping them to educate their children - helping them to fight disease - helping them to meet their problems. Now, obviously the dimensions of this thing would be so overwhelming, that the Soviet Union couldn't ignore it. And, if they chose to compete with us, then they could find the resources-the economic resources-only if they reduced the level of armaments. And, at the point they are prepared to reduce the level of armaments, we reduce the level of armaments but we intensify the economic contest by plowing into the economic aid program the peace offensive 50 percent of the savings brought about by the reduction of armaments. So that, if they reduce armaments 10 billion, in order to have a 10 billion dollar thrust on the peace front in competition with our 30 billion, we would make our 30 billion, 35 billion, and we would constantly intensify this. And, when the people of the Soviet Union found that we were prepared to reduce the level of armaments, they would begin to understand that their living standards could

be raised because the greatest drain upon the living standards of the people of the Soviet Union is the nuclear arms race is far greater than the drain upon the American people because of the limited resources. When you look at the Soviet budget, and you measure the Soviet military budget in terms of their total budget, then you can appreciate how much more meaningful a reduction in armaments would mean to the Soviet people in terms of raising their living standards, although it would mean a great deal to the people of the United States.

IB: Well, let me go back to a question I asked, however, which I think has to be answered. It's true, obviously, that given this kind of program the Soviet Union would be boxed in to the point where it would have no recourse except to move in our direction. France, on the other hand, has taken an independent course because it wants to dominate a particular sphere ../.. influence within the world. On what basis would it be possible to get France to join and involve itself in this kind of program?

WPR: All right. I think that to begin with you've got to recognize that the Atlantic Alliance, or the NATO, essentially is a military, mutual security organization.

IB: That's right.

WPR: It was created at the end of the war when the Russians had a great massing of ground troops on the Eastern border of Free Europe and so that there was a grave concern that the countries of Europe that make up the NATO Alliance

were so economically and physically and psychologically exhausted from the war that they were ripe for Communist take-over. And so we created the Atlantic Alliance (NATO) as a collective security instrument and we created the Marshall Plan to rebuild the economies of those countries. Now, I suppose that you could have a long debate on whether or not, if we had not created this Alliance, and if we had not had the Marshall Plan, whether or not Europe would have gone Communist. And I think you could make it a pretty persuasive case that it would have gone Communistic. But it didn't. And, so the countries of Europe that were exhausted and whose economy was in a total state of collapse at the end of the war, those economies have been rehabilitated and they are now at a much higher productive level than they were before the war-much higher. Their The standard of living has gone up and there has been a general relaxation of the tension and the potential threat to the question of the communizing of Europe. And, therefore, because you had a purely negative alliance that grew essentially out of fear and insecurity, it is coming apart; as a matter of fact, the more successful we are, I say "we", the more it will come apart because if a the thing is put together around insecurity and fear, the more secure you become, the less cohesion there is in the alliance that's built around fear and insecurity. Mr. DeGaulle understands that and so he is taking advantage of the fact that he is more secure now, and because he is sufficiently secure, he's independent. He's independent of the United States. He is in effect saying to the countries that make up NATO, "We don't need the United States anymore. We, on our own, are strong enough - it's true we don't have the same nuclear determent that they have - but we

know it's there, and we can rely upon it, even though we're not as closely integrated in a purely operational military sense, as may be the ~~nuclear mutual free~~ ~~mutual nuclear free~~ freaks and these kind of things would suggest." Now, Mr. DeGaulle, therefore, operating ~~on a~~ under the general umbrella of the greater security that the United States ~~would~~ provides and which the whole NATO system helped organize, and in the light of the fact that the threat that brought that NATO Alliance into being has been reduced considerably- he, now, has got a right to strut upon the world stage and try to achieve a place in history for France. But, how does he do it? He does it in terms of developing a French nuclear capability..

(end of tape #2)

oeiu /42/mp
3/5/65