PEACE PROPOSAL

Basic Tasks Confronting U. S. World Leadership

1) Help Win World Peace

Continuation of the arms race threatens the human race; human survival compels finding a rational way to world peace.

a) We must find the way to bring China into the peace race.

2) Assist the Have-Not Peoples of the World

The growing gap between the have and have-not peoples of the world is such that peace and the future of the human race cannot be made secure with some of the people becoming richer and the remaining people becoming relatively poorer.

3) Strengthen the Free World Community -- Establish a Grand Alliance for Peace

The Free World Alliance is falling apart.

a) It grew out of insecurity and fear -- negative factors.

b) It must find new motivation in the positive commitment to waging peace.

4) Improve the Quality of U.S. Society

Meet the challenge of determining which economic and social system can harness man's creative genius in the field of science and technology and relate that progress to the fulfillment of man's peaceful needs and the improvement of the quality of human society.

1) Unemployment -- Full Production -- Full Employment in the Face of Accelerating Technological Progress

2) Poverty

3) Opportunities for Youth

4) Security for the Aged

5) Equal Rights and Equal Opportunity for the Negro

6) Balance of Payments

7) Continuing High Expenditures for Armaments

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

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

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
9. Dynamics of peace as the vehicle to changes in the power structure of authoritarian nations

The Plan

Make 250 years of progress in 25 years -- a ten-to-one ratio

Financing

A. Participating nations will contribute as follows:

1) $2,000 per capita per year or more

First 10 years	3%of Gross National Product
Second 10 years	2% of Gross National Product
Remaining 5 years	1% of Gross National Product

2) $1,500 - $2,000 per capita per year

First 10 years	2% of Gross National Product
Second 10 years	3/4 of 1% of Gross National Product
Remaining 5 years	1/2 of 1% of Gross National Product

3) $1,000 - $1,500 per capita per year

First 10 years	1/2 of 1% of Gross National Product
Second 10 years	1/4 of 1% of Gross National Product
Remaining 5 years	No contribution

B. In addition, 50% of savings resulting from a reduction in the level of armaments will also be committed by each nation participating. The base from which to compute the 50% savings will be determined against armaments expenditures over a reasonable number of years preceding the start of the plan.

Structure, Eligibility and Tasks to Perform

1. Establish an International Economic and Social Fund whose purpose is to help underdeveloped countries develop their economies, raise the living standards of their people, improve education, medical care and generally enhance the quality of their societies.

2. An agency would be created to administer the Fund, either as an agency of the United Nations or an agency outside the United Nations.

3. Eligible nations would be all those which are prepared to cooperate in waging the peace, implementing a disarmament program (including a total nuclear test ban) and in assisting the underdeveloped countries. Eligibility is unrelated to political philosophy or economic theory of government.

4. Any country having an annual per capita income below $1,000 would be eligible for assistance from the International Economic and Social Fund.

5. Assistance would be in the form of long-term loans, interest free. Repayment would not begin until the receiving nation achieved a per capita annual income in excess of $1,000, and annual repayments would not exceed 5% of the Gross National Product of the nation.

Repayment could be in the form of cash or goods in kind. Repayments would be made on a pro-rated basis to the nations which contributed to the Fund.

(A formula must be devised for payment of in-kind repayments.)

6. New Concept of the Use of World Resources: Exploit World Resources to Meet the Human Needs of the World Community.

a) Assistance should be given to establishing regional planning for regional development of resources and production. The purpose is to coordinate economic development and create an integrated world economic community in which nations are not attempting to exploit each other, but rather the resources of the world for the benefit of the world community. (Example: Mekung River project)

* establish regional conferences comprised of citizens (see 1950 total peace offensive proposal)

* establish international regional universities and international universities for exchange of students between nations, including a vast scholarship program

* establish technical task forces, trained in international technical and professional schools to survey need and devise ways to meet the need: housing, power, medical care, sanitation, education, agriculture

    a) establish international regional health centers; also exchange health information, coordinate health research

    b) mass produce small atomic power plants (perhaps 5,000 kilowatts) and locate them in areas in which they are short of electric power

    c) develop a massive program of water use and conversion of salt water to fresh water.

IB/ja
oeiu42
5-12-65

carbon #3

DRAFT - A New Strategy to Defeat Old Enemies
May 21, 1965

I. Introduction

The world has evolved in the twenty years since the Second World War, and a new strategy is needed to defeat the old enemies of war and poverty under new conditions. The overriding challenge remains to end the nuclear arms race before it leads to a catastrophic war. [Old postwar alliances, East and West, are steadily becoming less relevant.]

The arms race has diverted attention and resources from another massive challenge, that of raising living standards throughout the underdeveloped world. A new form of international cooperation is needed to force disarmament and concentrate more of the resources of industrially advanced nations on the urgent tasks of development in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The Unted States, because of its unique economic potential and performance and our democratic heritage, must take the initiative of launching such a new approach, which, like the Marshall Plan, would be open to all nations, regardless of political complexion, provided they could satisfy certain essential conditions such as adherence to the nuclear test ban treaty. By (page 2 follows)

launching a massive program of assistance to developing countries to be administered by an international agency, we and our allies would leave the Soviet Union no realistic alternative to participation; and in order to participate, given her strained resources, the Soviet Union would be obliged to find the means by diverting resources from armament (entering into meaningful disarmament agreements). At the same time, the U.S. contribution to such a program would result in increased demand for the products of our industries, and would give enough additional impetus to our economic performance here at home to secure and maintain full employment and meet unsatisfied needs of the American people.

The teach-ins have dramatized a quickening concern over foreign policy among the most serious and informed of our college youth. In these teach-ins, as in the divil rights movement, young Americans, together with liberal and labor allies of an older generation, have pointed the way toward

a deeper involvement of Americans generally in the problems devolving upon our country, which we all must confront if we want to build a great society at home on the essential foundation of peace in the world. The new strategy here proposed would focus this concern and give it a wider perspective from which to consider the world situation; it offers the means to go beyond a crisis-by-crisis response to brush-fire wars, of breaking out of the nuclear stand-off and away from the risks of nuclear destruction; of converting resources from the essentially negative purposes of military conflict to the creative tasks of peaceful development. It offers the prospect of shifting the whole struggle in the world from a military confrontation which nobody can really win and all may ultimately lose, to the level of a peaceful contest, in the social and economic realms, between different ways of life.

On this terrain, democracy is bound to win, because the have-not

peoples of the world, who will play a larger and larger role in shaping human destiny and who are already determined to have their just share of the fruits of science and technology, will inevitably, in the process of attaining higher living standards, come to value and to demand the freedoms which go hand in hand with material well-being in the most advanced industrial societies.

II. End of An Era: The Postwar World Is Gone

The world as it is today is not the world that existed at the end of the Second World War. The alliances born of Cold War are in the process of dissolving, both East and West. The Cuban missile confrontation of 1962 and the partial nuclear test-ban treaty hammered out by the Kennedy Administration and the Khrushchev government produced an unwritten understanding between the two super-powers to avoid all-out, catastrophic nuclear war and to grope toward broader areas of coexistence.

The limited detente that followed was accompanied by a loosening of ties among NATO partners and within the Communist bloc. President de Gaulle of France went farthest among the nations of the Atlantic Community in asserting that what he called the "division of the world between two great powers" was over.

Yet while the new pluralism and what was called the new polycentrism in the Communist bloc reduced some of the tensions of the Cold War in Europe, the emergence of China as leader of aggressive Communism kept the Cold War alive in Asia, Africa and Latin America; and the risks of eventual nuclear war were escalated as both France and China entered the nuclear club. In short, the overhanging threat of nuclear destruction was not lifted, and was in fact posed ever more acutely as nuclear technology became more efficient, to the point of prompting two scientific advisers to the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, Jerome Wiesner

and Herbert York (Scientific American, October 1964) to conclude:

> "Both sides in the arms race are thus confronted by the dilemma of steadily increasing military power and steadily decreasing national security. It is our considered professional judgment that this dilemma has no technical solution. If the great powers continue to look for solutions in the area of science and technology only, the result will be to worsen the situation. The clearly predictable course of the arms race is a steady open spiral downward into oblivion."

This professional judgment would probably be shared by most scientists and most reasonable men everywhere. The arms race itself must be stopped. Yet the problem of ending it, as has been indicated, has been aggravated by the advent of Red China as a coming nuclear power and as the leader of the irreconcilable wing of World Communism. There are two dangers implicit in the Chinese policy of fomenting and supporting aggressive wars of "national liberation". One is the danger that they will escalate into more general wars and ultimately involve the use of nuclear weapons. The other is that by centering our policy on a military defense

of areas threatened by Chinese-inspired aggression, we surrender the initiative to Communism and are drawn into a series of military engagements and a crisis environment in which there is little disposition to seek disarmament.

In such an environment, moreover, the real problems of the masses of the world's people in the crisis areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America are given only peripheral attention. The rate of economic progress in the industrially advanced nations continues to outstrip the rate of growth in the have-not regions, which in many instances fails to keep abreast of population growth. (Expand this idea) Communism is then able to exploit the frustration and bitterness that results -- and our major response then becomes that of attempting by military means to stop Communism, rather than to deal directly and adequately with the problems of economic and social well-being and justice which Communism exploits.

This in turn gives the Communists fuel for propaganda to create a false image of the U.S. in many parts of the world -- an image that portrays our country on the one hand as a blustering bully threatening world peace, and on the other as a capitalistic exploiter of other nations through such international corporations as United Fruit Co., Standard Oil, General Motors, etc.

With a new pluralism both in the free and in the Communist worlds, the assumption that has ruled American foreign policy since the end of the Second World War -- that the planet is divided between two armed camps and that our main business is to outface Communism with military power -- has become not only irrelevant but downright dangerous because it bids up the potentially lethal arms race, and leads to neglect and aggravation of the economic and social problems that Communism exploits.

III. The Crisis of the Third World

We need a new policy, a new strategy and new forms of world cooperation, based upon recognition of the world as it is today, not as it was in the 1940's. While we cannot abdicate the responsibilities involved in deterring aggression and maintaining the precarious military balance, we must recognize that there is no security and no solution in military force in the age of overkill, particularly when neither the United States nor Russia can control the spread of nuclear weapons to other powers.

Limited military engagements have a way of extending and prolonging themselves and, as in the Dominican Republic, involving us in support of right-wing military and economic cliques and pitting us against elements with a claim to constitutional legitimacy. We need a policy which puts first things first, and the first things, twenty years years after the end of the Second World War, are the need to end the

arms race and to shift from a negative military posture to a positive and creative waging of the peace.

The key to waging the peace lies in the Third World of mass poverty in Asia, Latin America and Africa. We have never honestly confronted the unique dimensions of that poverty, and the economic assistance we have given to the peoples of those continents, measured on a per capita basis, does not begin to compare with the aid we dispensed to Western Europe under the Marshall Plan. No wonder results have been meager, and no wonder there has been a growing disillusionment with our programs of foreign aid in the country and in the Congress.

Yet the fact remains that, if we are to wage the peace, we must wage it in these have-not areas, and wage it on a scale that can give these peoples the leverage to begin to lift themselves, in this generation, out of poverty. We should not and we need not do this alone, for both Europe and Japan have now recovered from the devastation of war and can now

carry a heavier share of the tasks of peaceful development. Yet the United States has the primary responsibility because we have the greatest national wealth and most advanced economy. We should take the initiative in proposing a program that will be commensurate with the needs of the world's poor.

These needs are massive. (Here cite the elements of the problem and the extent of the challenge, including a reference to recent International Monetary Fund report on financial situation of underdeveloped countries, reported in WSJ).

These countries are caught in the vise of low prices for the primary commodities they export and the high prices of manufactured goods, and the difficulty of obtaining, on terms they can meet, the loans they require for internal development. To many of them, authoritarian methods may seem to provide the only solution. The United States and

the other nations with advanced economies face a choice between fostering steady evolutionary economic and social progress in these lands -- or facing crisis after crisis as more drastic solutions are tried, quite possibly with Communist help.

IV. Great Society vs. Great Hunger

Peace in the world, founded on a steady movement toward economic and social justice, is an indispensable foundation for creation of a durable Great Society in the United States. In the course of assuming leadership in an international coalition for peace and peaceful development, the United States, in mobilizing its resources toward those ends, would reap the substantial economic reward of sustained full employment in our own economy.

Whereas the resources of the Soviet economy and those of most of the industrial nations are strained, those of the United States,

even during the conditions of growth of the past several years, are far from fully utilized, as the continuing high rate of unemployment testifies.

(Here develop the picture of American economic performance and potential in recent past, to show what we could have done with unused potential and what we can do from now on, if our potential is mobilized to meet the needs both at home and abroad).

V. Challenge the Russians to Wage Peace

The purpose of the strategy here proposed is not, however, to offer another American solution to world problems. It is rather to issue a challenge to all industrial nations -- but particularly the Russians -- to convert resources and attitudes from the negative purposes of Cold War to the economic and social tasks of development which are central to waging the peace. Against the background of the American potential outlined above, let us consider the Russian response to an American

challenge to invest the equivalent of $_____ billion in an XXX

internationally administered program to lift living standards in the

Third World of poverty.

(Here develop the picture of Russia's economic situation

and why, despite strained resources, the Soviet Union could not afford

to ignore the American challenge but would be obliged to participate).

VI. The Heart of the Strategy

Here state the crux of the challenge: To participate, the

Soviets would have to bid for disarmament. Savings from disarmament

would then be partially applied to augment the resources available to

the development program, thus forcing further disarmament agreements

on the Russians.

Show also how it WOULD weaken the ability of the Chinese Communists

to foment trouble abroad, (a) by helping to eliminate the poverty and

ignorance that give Communism its emotional base and (b) by demonstrating that democratic methods can be more efficient than authoritarian ones. At the same time, rising living standards in countries like India and other neighbors of China will lead the Chinese people to insist on faster economic progress in their own country, which will divert the energies and resources now being used to support subversion in other countries.

A concluding reference in this section to the probable response of European nations and Japan.

VII. A Grand Alliance for Peace

This section would explain how the program would work, and would suggest answers to such matters as encouraging social reform as a necessary condition for economic growth, the need for regional arrangements, the question of an expanded version of the Peace Corps,

regional universities, health centers, distribution of mass-produced atomic power plants, etc.

VIII. Conclusion: Drift or Mastery

A recapitulation of the argument stressing the dangers of the present course and the advantages at home and abroad of the strategy, and underscoring the point that this would have American support but would not be an American solution but a truly international attack on ancient evils, and a giant step forward toward the new, broader communities of peoples which are the only genuine alternative to anarchy and devastation.

###

mv/oeiu42aflcio

Irv -
Intro chapter

[1965]

DRAFT

THE PROBLEM AND THE NEED

We live in a period of revolutionary challenge and change. Forces are at work in the world which could destroy everything we cherish or could bring our values to their greatest fulfillment. The uncertainty of the future is all the more distressing because it is both pregnant with the possibilities of nuclear war and the self-destruction of the human family and at the same time it is bright with the promise of peace and unprecedented human progress.

The same scientific and technical know-how that provides the capability of fashioning the weapons of overkill also tenders the capability of creating and using the fantastic tools of modern technology to build a good life for mankind in a climate of human fulfillment. For the first time in history, the human family can master its physical environment, produce untold abundance and fulfill the basic material needs of the human community. From the dawn of history, there have been many more empty bellies than there has been the ability to produce enough food; there have been many more naked backs than there has been the ability to produce sufficient clothing; there have been many more families than there was the

ability to build adequate shelter. Now, however, we have learned to produce the abundance to satisfy our physical needs. The great challenge before the human family - the challenge that transcends all others - is to determine for what purpose man will use this creative genius; to what ends will man bend the twentieth century technological revolution? Will he continue to forge the weapons of annihilation or will he construct a rational and responsible world community in which he can harness the rising star of science and technology to the needs and the rewarding purposes of peace and progress?

It has been said - and it bears repeating - that the world is too dangerous for anything but the truth and too small for anything but brotherhood.

Certainly we are at the crossroads of destiny - ascending to new heights of human achievement or tottering on the rim of hell.

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. 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."

War and peace is no longer the question of years past. It is no longer an extension of politics to determine who will win or who will lose. For the question of war and peace for the first time in history 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 overkill, the future of the richest and the most secure is as blighted as the future of the poorest. This unvarnished fact must be made understandable so that the human family can achieve a new sense of purpose and direction; so that it will act rationally, responsibly and, above all, morally toward the ultimate goal of a world community in which peace and progress are assured.

The peace is threatened by the unceasing armaments race and by the increasing gap between the industrialized nations of the world and the emerging have-not nations of Africa, Asis and Latin America. It is an alarming and tragic fact that the poor nations are growing poorer in relation to the rich nations. It is an alarming and tragic fact that the high hopes born with the creation of the United Nations that man would turn from war to find the path to peaceful coexistence have not been realized; for the world is spending $200 billion a year for weapons which no one dare use and the greater the commitment to military purpose, the greater the insecurity.

The choice, therefore, is clear and compelling. Either the human race must act rationally to end the nuclear arms race or in time the irrational arms race will end the human race.

Yet neither the free world nor the world behind the Iron Curtain feels it can disarm unilaterally. The hard realities of a discordant world require adequate military defensive power to meet aggression and the threat of aggression for otherwise we would be at the mercy of the power decisions and the immoral acts of those who continue to build military strength. While we must remain strong enough to defend freedom, however, we must realize that military power is but the negative aspect of the total effort required of the forces of freedom. It buys only a limited opportunity to safeguard our values while it hangs as a constant threat to all we hold dear. The free world, therefore, must act affirmatively to accelerate world-wide economic and social development and enhance the opportunities for economic and social justice in the world. Neither peace nor freedom can be made secure in a world in which half the people go hungry, in which disease and ignorance prevail, in which brotherhood is a pious phrase and not a democratic deed.

Hundreds of millions of people in the emerging nations are being swept forward in a great human tidal wave - the revolution of rising expectations. These seething millions of men, women and children are straining to catch up with the twentieth century. It is not the Communists who have fomented this revolution. Rather it was born out of man's desperate search for social justice. The Communists would like to ride to dominance on the naked backs of these people hungry to rid themselves of their despair. They want to exploit poverty, ignorance and the yearning for a better existence and forge it into political power.

In the struggle for the hearts and minds of these desperate people, the free world will be judged, not by what it says, but by what it does to give meaning, substance and purpose to the values of democracy and freedom.

This struggle offers the historic opportunity to shift the emphasis of the world power contest from a negative nuclear arms race that no one can win to a positive alliance for peace. We must not determine which social system can build the most destructive nuclear weapon, but rather which system can best harness

man's creative genius and relate the abundance he can produce to the unmet needs of the human family. Only by pursuing such a course can we raise living standards and improve the quality of life and living by devoting massive economic and human resources to the task of accelerating the economic and social development of the people in the emerging nations.

The only war that can be won is the war against the scourges of mankind. I believe that the free world is equal to such a challenge if only it will mobilize its full economic potential and employ the same will, dedication and determination toward waging the peace as it has invariably demonstrated it is capable of doing when faced with the challenge of war. If we are capable of meeting the challenge of war when we are driven by common fears and common hatreds, we must be equal to meeting the challenge of peace when we share common hopes, common aspirations and a common faith.

To do this, we must come to the realization that the millions upon millions in the developing nations will not stand by and watch history leave them

further and further behind. We must help them narrow the widening gap between their state of development and the twentieth century. We must forge a grand alliance of nations dedicated to waging the peace and we must be ready to commit the resources necessary to the task, just as we have always been prepared to do to meet the challenge of waging war.

In short, we must make 250 years of economic and social progress in the next 25 years in Asia, Africa and Latin America, or else there can be no peace and there can be no freedom. And this we must fashion in a manner that will bring to the people of the world relief from armaments, relief from the threat of war, relief from the constant, nagging fear of self-annihilation; in a manner that will satisfy mankind's need for food, shelter, clothing and good health and provide the great mass of humanity opportunities for cultural and spiritual development.

These pages propose such a program. Not every "i" is dotted nor every "t" crossed, but its outline and its format carry what may promise to be the possibility of a world living in peace and progress, in which men and women live with peace, bread and freedom, and the laughter of children spells hope for future generations.

oeiu42
12-27-65

Irv's

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 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 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.

If those who love freedom and the guarantee of human rights are to make progress, if an effective lasting program to thwart the encroachment of communism is to succeed, 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 measure of economic and social justice for all people. We must never make the tragic mistake of believing that freedom's fight - whether in Vietnam, Korea, the Congo, 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 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.

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

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 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 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.

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

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

developments 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 ideological 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 politicalxxx 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 together with the other industrialized countries of the free world has in its grasp such a new element to inject into the strategy that will break the deadlock in the current world situation. The new element will not be

found in military might, for that might break the deadlock but destroy the world. It is in the use of the vast 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 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 for the communist propaganda that the United States is dominated and controlled

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

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 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 be put our faith in freedom on the line, confident that we could be more effective than the communist 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 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 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 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.

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 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 ideological 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 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

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 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 standards. 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 badly needed at ~~hoj~~xx 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 by cutting back their military establishment. However, the Communists 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, 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 as we reduced our military expenditures, we could turn the screw tighter on the challenge to the Soviet economy by 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 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 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.

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 bourgeois 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 impace 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 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 shine in its own sun. The United States by advancing a program for a total waging of the peace could provide the leadership 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 $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 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 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 other wise 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. 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 resource development and do the many other things needed to improve the quality of American life and achieve the 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 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

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 at home and at the same time make available the vast sums needed to accelerate the economic and social development to the people in the developing countries.

Tofail 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 ~~xtxx~~ standards and the standards of the industrialized West. If the privileged minorities of the industrially advanced countries fail to meet 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 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.

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 economic contributions. The assistance would be considered as long term, interest free loans repayable only when the recipient countries' Gross National Product were to readh 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 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

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 National 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 to achieve a specified <u>average</u> per capita annual income 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 would 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 recipient countries would be in the best position to understand and describe 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 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 favor the kind of total peace offensive here described should raise pointed questions and criticism 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 can be 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 whold question lies in whether we will tontinue to drift 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 to win the peace, who in the final analysis will be the tough, practical realist moving a troubled and tortured world toward 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. We must contemplate a greater sense of national urgency, a deeper sense of national purpose, a total commitment to a total peace offensive.

lm
oeiu42
11-2-65