

STARS

University of Central Florida
STARS

PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements

1-1-1960

Labor's stake in Peace

American Friends Service Committee

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

Recommended Citation

American Friends Service Committee, "Labor's stake in Peace" (1960). *PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements*. 14.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism/14>

LABOR'S STAKE IN PEACE

FULL TEXT OF
ADDRESS BY

EMIL MAZEY

SEC. TREAS.
INTERNATIONAL
UNION, UAW

EXCERPTS FROM
SPEECHES BY:

WILLIAM C. DAVIDON

NUCLEAR PHYSICIST

FENNER BROCKWAY

BRITISH LABOR
PARTY M.P.

LABOR'S STAKE IN PEACE



Published as an educational service by

THE AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

FOREWORD

The remarks in this pamphlet by William Davidon, Fenner Brockway, and Emil Mazey, were originally given as speeches at a labor rally in Chicago, February 20, 1960, held under the auspices of the American Friends Service Committee. The meeting, attended by some 700 trade unionists who gave Mr. Mazey a tumultuous standing ovation upon completion of his speech, had as its theme the title of this pamphlet, "Labor's Stake in Peace."

Due to limitations of space, we are able to print only excerpts from Davidon's and Brockway's speeches. On the other hand, we are including the full text of Emil Mazey's speech because we feel it is one of the most significant speeches on this subject given by any high ranking American labor official to date.

Everyone in his right mind today wants peace. Everyone, including the President of the United States and spokesmen for both major political parties, speaks glowingly of peace. Yet, as a nation, we continue to prepare for war.

Development of more powerful nuclear missiles continues. Production for germ warfare continues. We spend over 40 billion dollars a year on armaments. There is little if any serious planning for disarmament and an economy which will insure full employment if and when disarmament begins.

Obviously, if there is actually to be peace there must be action taken to end the cold war, stop the runaway arms race, and plan an economy that can produce for peace.

In the past, the American labor movement has taken the lead on vital social issues. Today, along with all mankind, Labor faces the one crucial issue — the issue of nuclear war and mass annihilation. Will it have the vision and the courage to take an unequivocal stand for disarmament and production for peace? The rally in Chicago and Emil Mazey's speech suggest that it might.

Perhaps the first step in this direction, as Mr. Mazey suggests, is to initiate throughout the labor movement, open discussion of foreign policy and the vital issues that affect war or peace. To this end we have published this pamphlet and urge that it be carefully read and thoroughly discussed by trade unionists across the country.

Chicago, April 5, 1960

Jack Bollens, Director
Peace Education Program
Chicago Regional Office
American Friends Service Committee

NUCLEAR WEAPONS: NO DEFENSE

By WILLIAM DAVIDON,

Theoretical Physicist, Argonne National Laboratory; Chairman, Chicago Chapter, Federation of American Scientists; Member, Third Pugwash Conference of International Scientists in Vienna.

War has always been a chronic disease in human society, but it is no longer a chronic disease. It has suddenly become a very malignant cancer. It will either wipe us out, or we will take action which will enable us to get the power into our hands that will keep it from wiping us out. What now exists in the world is grossly different from anything in past human affairs.

Why has this big change suddenly occurred? What are the specific facts which have produced this most unusual change in human affairs? They are different from anything in our personal experience, different from anything in the history of our race. And so, it takes that uniquely human capability of being able to think objectively about events, of being able to respond to a situation distinct from any which we have been prepared for by our biochemistry.

One can point out that the biggest bomb exploded during World War II equaled the approximate size and weight of three automobiles. In contrast to this, the atom bomb which was exploded 1800 feet above Hiroshima, and which produced some 200,000 casualties, fissioned only about three tablespoons of uranium. This is an abrupt change in human affairs. The amount of material which one can hold in the palm of one's hand is capable of wiping out a large city, and human beings have never before had energy concentrations of this kind available to them. We will either respond to these facts in a rational fashion, or go out of existence.

This bomb which was exploded over Hiroshima produced by fire and heat alone the damage that would be produced by one thousand tons of high incendiaries carefully distributed over the city. This Hiroshima bomb was large in comparison with the past. However, in comparison to today's hydrogen bomb, the Hiroshima bomb was small. Let's briefly describe some of the effects of one large thermonuclear weapon.

We can point out that within the space of a few cubic feet more energy is released when a thermonuclear explosion goes off than is generated by the largest hydroelectric station in a couple of years. Picture for example the northwest part

of our country, a good part of its power coming from Grand Coulee Dam. Picture the power used for industry, for transportation, for heat and light. Picture all these phenomena going on in this part of the country for two years, and then picture all of this energy being concentrated in the space of a few cubic feet, and being released within a millionth or two of a second. This is the phenomenon which takes place when a thermonuclear bomb goes off.

The reactions which take place during such an explosion are more intense than those which go on in the interiors of most stars, let alone on the surface of the earth. It would burn the eyes of an individual some 300 miles away from the point of the explosion. It would look about 100 times as bright as the sun at a distance of 100 miles from the point of the explosion. It would set fire to objects and char human skin over an area considerably larger than 1000 square miles. This is the effect of a single weapon which can be carried in a single missile or plane.

In addition to the blast, in addition to the fire and the heat released by such an explosion, large quantities of radioactivity are produced. We can point out that an H-bomb explosion in March, 1954, caused some 7,000 square miles to be covered by lethal quantities of radioactivity. The whole land surface of the earth, not just that now used by human beings for their living and growing of food, but all land above sea level over all the surface of the earth, could be covered by about 8,000 such explosions. Eight thousand weapons costing about one million dollars a piece — eight billion dollars, about one-fifth of our annual military budget. This is the cost in money of enough weapons to destroy the earth's population.

In the Holifield Committee hearing (about which you will be hearing more this evening from Emil Mazey), assumptions were made about the effects of a limited nuclear war. In the words of the committee, "The attack pattern and basic assumptions established by the subcommittee for consideration in these hearings reflected an attack against the United States on a limited scale." That is, the number and total megatonnage of the weapons employed were less than the potential that the enemy is capable of launching against us. In this limited, hypothetical attack only 263 nuclear weapons were used. Yet fifty million Americans were killed immediately, twenty million were seriously injured, half of the homes in the nation were made unuseable, and heavy doses of radioactivity covered vast areas of the country.

We are placing this kind of destructive capability at the finger tips, not only of leaders of national powers, but in the hands of small numbers of people sitting in submarines, small numbers of people flying bomber planes, small numbers of

people operating the whole range of apparatus available to modern military forces. This is an unstable situation, to say the least.

It is important to realize that the development of delivery systems has kept pace of development of the weapons themselves. For instance, the speed of a modern missile is many times that of a high speed rifle bullet. If a missile were to fly across the front of this auditorium, it would be going so fast that we would not be able to see it. It would be a block or two past us before the sound would reach our ears. It would not be coming in a straight line along the surface of the earth, or at a given height in the air. Rather, it might be coming anywhere in a large region several hundred miles high and thousands of miles in breadth.

In the midst of this vast region, each missile carries with it the destructive power to wipe out any city. If you knock down ten percent, or fifty percent, or even ninety percent of such missiles, the fact remains that each one which gets through will still produce vast quantities of destruction. In the light of these developments, the possibilities of defending ourselves in the usual ways just don't exist. Thus, an entirely new expedient has been adopted. Unable to defend our people and our cities by any tangible means, military and political leaders have substituted the untried and untested program of deterrence. That is, no longer able to stop the enemy physically, they hope to deter the enemy by threatening the indiscriminate slaughter of the whole population.

It is as though we were unable to put out fires any longer, and therefore the fire departments, having all this apparatus at their disposal, decide that since they cannot fight fires successfully, they will deter fires. And so they go around the city spreading gasoline, kerosene and high explosives through the streets and in everyone's basement. Then nobody will dare drop a match in a city all set to go up in flames. The fire engines would parade through the streets spreading their explosives and carrying banners saying, "These are our defense forces." And the people would cheer, "These are for our defense. They protect us because they deter anybody from dropping a match and starting a fire." I wonder how secure we would feel in such a city.

Again, it is as though we were trying to stop automobile accidents, and so went around tying children of all families to automobile bumpers. Nobody would dare have an automobile accident, if their kids were strapped to the front bumpers of automobiles. How happy we would be, busily manufacturing defense racks to be mounted on bumpers, and in which we would strap our neighbors' children to make sure that they would not smash their automobiles into ours.

Obviously, this would not provide us with defense. This would not provide security, and similarly in the the world situation, our reliance upon threats of indiscriminate slaughter does not provide us with any means of protecting ourselves.

In 1945 the United States and Russia had nuclear weapons. In 1952 the United States, Russia and Great Britain had nuclear weapons. In 1960 the United States, Russia, Great Britain, and France have nuclear weapons. Other countries now have nuclear weapons programs under way. It is not only that the major powers are spreading gasoline and kerosene around the areas of the world. More and more small groups of people are clamoring to get into the act.

We cannot constantly be putting more hands on the trigger that might set off disaster and expect to get away with it indefinitely. If we are going to survive, and if we are going to have a society that is moving ahead to fulfill the potentials for growth and advancement which our world society has today, something drastic has to take place. A basic change is needed.

Such a basic change cannot be outlined in a few words tonight. It is at least a starting point, however, to recognize clearly that we are in a new and untried situation — a situation which requires new and radical action if we are to cope with it. Rational men don't decide on a course of action simply by choosing the midpoint in the spectrum of other men's thoughts. They observe what is occurring in the world and then take action commensurate with the events and the task at hand.

We might ask ourselves, are we happy simply being tools for other men? A well oiled tool, one which is kept in fine condition, but nevertheless a tool whose handle rests in someone else's hands. Are you happy about seeing your labor unions converted into large tool boxes to conveniently keep this bunch of tools? Are you happy being used as a pawn in this fantastic game of military buildup and counter military buildup, nuclear threat and counter threat? Do we want to have some responsibility for running our lives and controlling our future, or are we satisfied with being the complicated objects at the disposal of other men? These are questions that we will have to answer soon.

I think we realize that we do have a power in our hands which is greater than that of the atom. We have the power to control the atom — the nucleus is at the disposal of human beings. How human beings spend their time and energy is at the disposal of themselves. This meeting tonight is in part an answer to the question, what are we going to do with this power? I am glad to see that we are turning to these problems after a long period when we tried to hide from them.

BRITISH LABOR AND AMERICAN LABOR

By FENNER BROCKWAY,

Outstanding British Labor Party Leader, Member of Parliament for Eton - Slough, recognized world authority on colonialism and international affairs.

I am speaking tonight to a gathering of trade unionists, so let me state clearly to you the view of our labor movement in Great Britain. Before our gathering tonight, I was present at a discussion between representatives of your trade unions in Chicago on this problem of war and peace, and it was recognized that there are two views within your labor movement. First, there is the view of most of your official leadership, which is difficult to distinguish from the views of other leaders who are skeptical about disarmament and who believe that America must arm and arm. Second, there are views which I hope to hear tonight from Mr. Mazey, in a speech which I believe may be quite historic for the labor movement in this country — views which urge that in this situation we must find a way of establishing peace and bringing about disarmament.

There are also two views in the British labor movement. The views that Brother Mazey holds represent the majority viewpoint in Britain today. Let me state them in specific terms.

First, the whole labor movement in Britain is opposed to the return of any testing of atomic or hydrogen bombs. The whole labor movement has declared that the construction of military bases in Britain, including the bases where there are American weapons, should be stopped at least until the disarmament conference has met and had an opportunity to develop a disarmament plan. The whole labor movement desires that Britain shall lead the formation of a non-nuclear club among nations which will have no nuclear weapons whatsoever. For this policy, the whole of our trade union movement, the whole of our Labor Party, the whole of our cooperative movement is pledged.

Second, there is the view in our labor movement which goes further than this. It is a view which, I suppose, is already supported by one third of our labor movement, including our largest trade union, the Transport and General Workers Union with close to two million members, of which Mr. Frank Cousins is the distinguished secretary. This view is that Great Britain should take the unequivocal step of leadership in the world by

disbanding itself of nuclear weapons altogether. I share this view and urge it on both practical and moral grounds.

I have been in America five weeks, travelling from the West Coast to the East. I have gotten this impression of America. There is a great well of opinion here which desires disarmament and peace, just as deeply as any people on earth. I find it everywhere — but you must find some means of giving it practical political expression. Forgive me if I say this, but I am puzzled when I look at your two political parties. We have been taught to believe, and since I know some of its leaders I do believe, that your Democratic Party is the more liberal of the two. But I get deeply disturbed when I find some of your Democratic leaders even "outrightening" your Republican leaders in the advocacy of more armaments.

While I have found this great well of peace sentiment here — found it in the universities, found it in the factories, found it in the churches — I am disturbed by another element in American society. Whilst I was in California I visited the Rand Corporation. Now the Rand Corporation consists of scientists and technicians who advise your Air Force and who advise your government. I spent two hours in discussion with those scientists and technicians, and frankly I came away frightened. They did not seriously consider the possibility of disarmament. They believed that the only way to maintain peace in the world is for Russia and the United States to develop an equality of arms, each producing correspondingly more efficient and destructive weapons. I said to them that it is unlikely that we can build up these mighty mountains of destruction without some accident taking place, without some miscalculation, without some local conflict leading to a world conflict. While America and Russia are building their skyscrapers of arms in this way, other nations will no doubt take similar action. Britain already has its hydrogen bombs, France has now invaded the nuclear sphere. Who next — China, Egypt, Yugoslavia, Eastern European countries, Japan, Western Germany? At this moment there are twelve governments which are capable of producing the hydrogen bomb.

I say to this audience, if the nuclear arms race continues with other nations producing these bombs, manageable disarmament will become impossible. We should then be face to face with human suicide. No sane person can contemplate this. We must have disarmament or perish.

I went to your factories in San Diego, miles of them. Ninety percent of the labor there is making weapons of war — bombing planes, rockets, missiles. Here, when one thinks of disarmament, he must think of unemployment too. Disarmament — unemployment. What is the answer? The answer is new employment. The answer is a better life for all. Whenever in the

British House of Commons we ask for more to be spent on education, more on housing, more on health, more on meeting the problems of poverty, the answer is, "We can't afford it — expenditure upon defense." I have said to them, and I say to you, reduce your expenditure on defense. Finally end your expenditure upon defense, and turn those vast sums in every country of the world to lifting the lives of people.

Unemployment need not be. If we decided through the United Nations to pool there the expenditures we have been making on arms, to lift the standards of life in the underdeveloped countries, the immediate demand would be on the industries which are now making arms. There would be a great demand for power stations, for dams on rivers, for electrification, for irrigation, for locomotives and tractors, for pumping stations to lift the water under the deserts to the surface so there would be fertile soil. Such a policy would make an immediate and overwhelming demand on our industries, and the work of our men, instead of being devoted to death and destruction, would be devoted to construction for life.

I conclude by saying to you, this struggle against war is not only a negative struggle to prevent disaster to mankind. It is that. But it is also the great constructive struggle to lift man to higher planes than man has ever reached before. This is a crucial year, and I ask you, brothers and sisters, to take every possible step and measure during this year to let your leaders and representatives know that the will of the people is to disarm and live in peace.

FOREIGN POLICY

By **EMIL MAZEY.**

Secretary-Treasurer, International Union, UAW

I welcome the opportunity to discuss the Foreign Policy of the United States because workers of our country have the most to lose if our Foreign Policy should lead to World War III. As in all Wars, workers are the first and most numerous casualties.

Therefore, we in organized labor have a special interest and a special concern for the maintenance of peace.

Labor leaders, the same as leaders of other elements of public life, have been reluctant to speak out on Foreign Policy issues because of the fear of being misunderstood and because of the fear of being labeled soft on Communism. To emphasize this timidity on the part of the labor movement, I wish to point out that in February of 1955, during the Matsu and Quemoy Island disputes, I raised the subject matter at a closed meeting of the CIO Executive Board, and expressed my deep concern for policies that I thought were improper on the part of our government and that would lead to World War III. I did not ask the CIO on this occasion to take a position, but urged them to re-evaluate our attitude towards the entire China crisis. I was shocked when a motion was made to expunge my remarks from the record and was even more shocked when a majority of the Board Members supported this action.

I am sure that what I have to say today will be unpopular with some labor leaders and among some of the politicians of the country, but I am going to express my views whether anybody likes what I have to say or not.

I am deeply concerned with the real possibility of an atomic-missile war that could destroy a good part of the world.

The movie and the book, "On the Beach," only slightly exaggerates the consequences of an atomic attack on the peoples of our world.

The Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recently issued a report based on findings and testimony of specialists from U. S. Government Agencies on the effect of a mass nuclear attack on the United States if the attack took place in mid-October.

TARGETS HIT WOULD BE: 71 big urban areas, 21 atomic installations, 132 military installations.

WEAPONS USED: 263 nuclear missiles and bombs, with power ranging from 1 million to 10 million tons of TNT.

HERE'S WHAT WOULD HAPPEN—

FALL-OUT: Shown here as it would be 7 hours after the attack, the fall-out pattern would cover much of the U. S., with radioactive debris blown by winds typical of mid-October.

DAMAGE INFLICTED: Most big cities wrecked, a fourth of all dwellings destroyed, another fourth made unuseable, food supplies contaminated.

CASUALTIES: 50 million American dead, 20 million seriously injured.

I am not secure in the assurances given us by some of our public officials and military leaders that we have deterrent power, that is the power to retaliate, and, therefore, we need not be too concerned about the possibilities of war as long as as we maintain an adequate arsenal of atomic and nuclear weapons.

I find it difficult to know what the truth is concerning our defenses against possible nuclear warfare because of the conflicting views and opinions of men in public office and of our military leaders.

It becomes even more difficult for a layman to properly evaluate the seriousness of our defense posture because so many former generals and admirals now occupy key positions at scandalous salaries for companies engaged in defense production that it is hard to know whether our military leaders are expressing honest, patriotic views or are merely making a pitch for a post-service job for a company engaged in military production.

An additional difficulty in objectively discussing the elements for peace is the vested interest that many corporations have in the continuation of the cold war. Over 90% of all the aircraft production in our country is for military purposes and the only customer is Uncle Sam. Therefore, the aircraft industry, which has been built as a result of large subsidies from the U. S. Treasury, has a special interest to keep the cold war going. The end of the cold war could mean the end of their business.

Workers engaged in military production also have a vested right in the continuation of the cold war because our government has no plans on how to use the defense plants for peacetime production and how to adequately guarantee full employment and purchasing power to workers engaged in military production.

During World War II, any worker who was warm was able to get a job, despite his age, sex or color of his skin. Many of them were heard to remark, "I hope the war lasts forever." This comment is understandable, especially after a worker has been plagued with unemployment, insecurity and want, many of them from the dark days of the 1930 depression.

In view of the conflicting political and military opinions, and because of the obvious vested rights that employers and some workers have in the continuation of the cold war, it becomes increasingly difficult to get intelligent public discussion of what steps our nation can take to achieve lasting peace and to bring about universal disarmament and the end to wasteful expenditures of our resources, which now amount to more than \$41 billion yearly. One hundred seventy-five billion dollars is spent yearly by all of the countries of the world for military purposes.

In preparing my remarks for this meeting tonight, I have done more reading and more studying of the defense needs of our nation than in any other period of my life. I have read remarks and some statements of military leaders wherein it is maintained that because of the development of the atom and H bomb and other nuclear and atomic weapons, and the development of the missile, there is no possibility of an attack being made on our country because of our ability of immediate reprisal that would destroy or seriously cripple a potential attacker.

I have read statements by some of our leaders who try to reassure the people of our country that not everybody would be destroyed in a nuclear war — that only a portion of the population would be destroyed.

I have read with alarm proposals by one military leader who believes that we ought to keep our planes in the air on a 24-hour continuous alert basis, fully armed with atomic weapons.

I have read proposals that we ought to increase our atomic submarine fleet and that we ought to have some of them stationed off the coast of Russia, submerged under water for as much as 4 or 5 months, ready to retaliate immediately in the event our country is attacked.

After reading and studying these numerous proposals, I am more alarmed than ever that World War III might start as a result of an accident, a crash of a plane loaded with atomic weapons, or by some trigger-happy Colonel who would push a

button because he misread signs that appeared to be an attack against us.

I HAVE, THEREFORE, REACHED THE CONCLUSION THAT THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE TO PEACE.

The people of our nation have been spared the horrible experiences of destruction of our homes and our families through bombing of our cities. Although almost every American family had some members in the armed forces during World War II, and although all of us have been touched in one degree or another by loss of life of a relative or friend in World War II, I am afraid that our citizens do not as yet fully comprehend the significance of war with modern weapons. The people in England, Germany, France, Hiroshima and other cities and countries, that felt and experienced destructive power of military machines in World War II, have a stronger yearning for peace because of these experiences. We have been protected from warfare in our country by the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans in World War I and World War II. We no longer have that protection.

The development of jet planes and bombers and the development of missiles capable of firing a hydrogen bomb warhead completely destroys the protection that we had in the last two bloody World Wars.

Recently United States Admiral Arleigh Burke, testifying before a Congressional Committee, was asked the following question:

"Senator Stennis: We have a memorandum here that last year the Secretary of Defense made the statement that one polaris submarine carries as much destructive power as all the bombs dropped by both sides during World War II."

"Admiral Burke: Yes, sir, this missile — warhead — will be many times the size of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. It is not a small one."

Because of these facts, I believe that it is incumbent upon us to publicly discuss the question of peace and war in a rational and objective manner so that we can develop policies and programs that can minimize the tensions that could erupt into World War III, and endeavor to create a public climate that could make universal disarmament a reality.

I am alarmed at the increase of the Nuclear Club which now contains as members the United States, Russia, Great Britain and France. I am particularly worried about France having the atom bomb because of its internal problems in Algeria and the internal dissension that exists in France. I am afraid to trust atomic and nuclear weapons in the hands of people like General Massu of the French Army.

I believe that the following steps must be taken to reduce world tension and to establish a basis for maintenance of world peace:

We must step up our discussion with the Russians, Great Britain and France for the ending of the testing of atomic and nuclear weapons. We must seek ways and means of fool-proof inspection and detection of testing of weapons. In the meantime, the United States should not engage in any testing of nuclear weapons and should urge the other countries to join them in banning the tests.

I believe that serious consideration should be given to the proposal of Thomas E. Murray, former member of the Atomic Energy Commission, who believes we ought to set up a UN Commission with the power of destroying the stockpile of nuclear weapons on a matching basis with the Russians and other countries, who have these weapons.

I believe that we must work towards universal disarmament and be more flexible in our discussions with the Russians on this subject.

Our government must also immediately establish a National Planning Board for the peaceful use of our military plant so that we can guarantee full employment to the workers now engaged in military production.

This proposal is not new. Walter Reuther, President of the UAW, proposed after World War II, the use of our aircraft plants to produce housing on a mass production basis.

If only one per cent of the one hundred seventy-five billion dollars that is annually spent for military purposes was used to wipe out hunger and raise the living standards of the backward countries of the world, we would have one billion seven hundred fifty million dollars available for these purposes. If all of the countries reduced their military expenditures across the board on a ten per cent basis, this would mean seventeen and one-half billion dollars available in the war against hunger and disease.

I believe that no meaningful decision towards universal disarmament can be achieved with our present policy towards Red China. I urge a complete re-evaluation of our Foreign Policy towards China on a realistic and objective basis.

I believe that it is foolish to pretend that Red China with 600 million people, over half of Asia, doesn't exist.

I believe that tensions with China and with other sections of the world are unnecessarily prolonged by the belief that Chiang Kai-shek and his discredited, corrupt military dictatorship is the

true spokesman for China and that it is the policy of the United States to return Chiang Kai-shek to the Chinese Mainland.

President Eisenhower must take the major blame for our completely unrealistic attitude towards Red China.

You recall that in his first State of the Union message on February 2, 1953, President Eisenhower told the world that he "had unleashed Chiang Kai-shek." He also charged former President Truman with "using the United States Navy as a defensive arm for Communist China." These are the exact words of the President:

"There is no longer any logic or sense in a condition that required the United States Navy to assume defensive responsibilities on behalf of the Chinese Communists. This permitted those Communists, with greater impunity, to kill our soldiers, and those of our United Nations allies, in Korea.

"I am, therefore, issuing instructions that the 7th Fleet no longer be employed to shield Communist China."

I believe that our government should give immediate and serious consideration to proposals by the "CONLON COMMISSION" that made studies on the United States Foreign Policy for the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate.

This Commission concluded, "A government having effective control over only 10 million people cannot indefinitely hold a 'major power' position in the name of 600 million Chinese."

They further said that, "Isolation in relation to our policy with China always serves totalitarianism."

One of the alternatives they proposed to the Chinese question was to take steps to establish normal relations with China that would include:

1) The recognition of Communist China by the United States; 2) support for its seating in the United Nations, and 3) general treatment equal to that which the United States accords to the Soviet Union. The Commission supports this policy on the following grounds.

"a) In accordance with established international practices to which U. S. policy has usually adhered, the recognition of Communist China would not signify approval of the regime, but rather its existence as a de facto government, having control over some 660 million people. To accept these facts of life is in the national interests of the United States because it is essential that we establish a realistic policy toward Asia as the first step in a long range economic and political competition with Communism. Nonrecognition has not prevented the rise of Communist China. It has isolated us as much as the Communists, giving our policy

an essentially unilateral character, making it defensive, and negative.

b) Normalization of relations, if successful, would give us greater access to the Chinese people, from whom we are now almost completely cut off. It would thus make possible some kind of informational and cultural relations program which might provide certain pressures upon the Communist leaders to demphasize hate and fear of the United States. Moreover, it would provide us with direct communications in terms of official channels, thereby reducing the threat of miscalculation on both sides.

c) The primary function of the United Nations today is an international forum whereby issues can be debated and nations called to account before the world; as an instrumentality for the mediation of disputes through its technical staff; and as a valuable organization for a multitude of nonpolitical purposes of a social, educational, or research nature. As long as the government controlling one-half of the people of Asia is outside the United Nations, that organization will be seriously handicapped in terms of the above functions."

And Communist China outside the United Nations may be more of a disruption than Communist China in the United Nations in a variety of ways. There are advantages in being an international outlaw, not being legally bound to international agreements, having to take only such stands as one wishes, and thereby being able to compartmentalize one's policies. Moreover, the U. S. policy of supporting the Government of Taiwan as the only legitimate government of China in the UN is in serious danger of losing by attrition. Despite our pressure, this position is becoming more difficult to sustain in the international scene, and is being sliced away, a sliver at a time.

The problems of peace and the problems of war must become the concern of all the people and not just military and political leaders.

I call upon all of our citizens to take greater interest in our Foreign Policy — to stimulate objective discussion without fear of the slurs and the slanders of those within our government who use the fear of Soviet Russia and Communism as a convenient way to stifle democratic discussion of this most important problem.

I am confident that we can find a way to reduce the world tensions and to work towards world disarmament.

I am sure that if we can use our good common sense we can, during our lifetime, develop an America and help build a world in which we have abundance, in which we have security, in which we have freedom and justice and in which we have peace not only for our time, but for all time.

SUGGESTED READINGS

available from the AFSC

BOOKS

The Causes of World War Three, by C. Wright Mills. N.Y., Simon and Schuster, 1958, 172pp., paper cover, \$1.50.

Defense in the Nuclear Age, by Commander Stephen King-Hall, with introduction by Edward R. Murrow. 1959, 234pp., hard cover, \$2.75.

The Arms Race. A Program for World Disarmament, by Philip Noel-Baker. N.Y., Oceana Publications, 1958, 563pp., paper cover, \$2.00.

No More War! by Linus Pauling. Dodd, Mead & Company, 1958, 237pp., paper cover, \$1.85.

PAMPHLETS

Labor and the Cold War, by Stewart Meacham, 31pp., 35¢

The Morals of Extermination, by Lewis Mumford, 14pp., 10¢

Speak Truth to Power, by AFSC working committee, 70pp., 25¢

Getting Rid of War: National Policy and Personal Responsibility, by A. J. Muste, 12pp., 10¢

Morals and Missiles, essays by group of Catholic clergymen, 76pp., 40¢

1970 Without Arms Control, by National Planning Association committee, 72pp., \$1.25

Questions on Disarmament and Your Job, by Friends Committee on National Legislation, 15pp., 10¢

Deterrence Assures our Defeat, by Sid Lens, 6pp., 5¢

Weaponry, Technology, Science: Life or Death?, by William C. Davidson, 4pp., 5¢

Order additional copies from
NATIONAL PEACE LITERATURE SERVICE
AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE
20 South 12th St., Philadelphia 7, Pa.

or nearest AFSC office:

AUSTIN 1, TEXAS
1705 North Congress Ave.

NEW YORK 3 (NYC area only)
237 Third Ave.

CAMBRIDGE 38, MASS.
130 Brattle St.
P. O. Box 247

PASADENA, CALIFORNIA
825 East Union Ave.
P. O. Box 991

CHICAGO 7, ILLINOIS
300 West Congress Parkway

PHILADELPHIA 7, PA.
20 South 12th St.

DAYTON 6, OHIO
915 Salem Ave.

PORTLAND 15, ORE.
4312 S. E. Stark St.

DES MOINES 12, IOWA
4211 Grand Ave.

SAN FRANCISCO 15, CALIF.
1830 Sutter St.

HIGH POINT, N. C.
1818 S. Main St.
Box 1307

SEATTLE 5, WASHINGTON
3959 15th Ave., N. E.

Quantity orders: 16¢ each per 100
12¢ each per 500