

Telephoned from New York

9/20/61

The following are Mr. McCloy's and Mr. Dean's comments on the working draft of the President's speech.

Bottom of page 3. They would not use the phrase "We have presented to the Soviet Union under their own label of general and complete disarmament." We use this phrase in our own paper of June 27, 1960. It was used in General Assembly Resolution 1378 of Nov. 20, 1959. It was used by Amb. Lodge in his statement of Aug. 16, 1960 before the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations. And it was used all through the 10-Nation conference by Amb. Frederick Eaton.

page 4. We ourselves have not yet stated that we were willing to give up the veto in the Security Council or that we were prepared to have an international peace force under the UN act without any supervisory voting control by the permanent members of the Security Council. Therefore, we suggest the elimination of the 3rd sentence in the second paragraph on page 4. (then there is a comment that they consider the balance--presumably of the paragraph-- inappropriate.)

Believe the statement in the last para. on page 4 about disarming our northern frontier was not really carried out until 1871 and is not quite accurate. Might also consider mentioning Washington Naval Conference of 1922.

top of page 5. We should not require instructions from the General Assembly and we should propose that disarmament negotiations resume promptly and continue without interruption until the entire program for complete and general disarmament has actually been agreed upon. We should continue to negotiate until it has been achieved.

page 6. We should make clear that the nuclear test ban treaty we propose would end nuclear tests in all environments under effective and workable controls and that a ban on atmospheric testing would be without controls and that we have not abandoned over-all treaty proposal as newspapers seem to think.

para. 5. The material with respect to our nuclear strength does not seem to fit with the thought in this paragraph and might better be transferred to the last paragraph on page 12. Also do not believe any doctor or scientist can guard against the danger of radioactive fallout, although they might help to cure the patient after the radiation has taken place. The only guard we know of is to be in a bomb-proof shelter when radiation takes place.

bottom of page 6. Make it clear we are still for separate negotiations on test ban treaty to stop testing in all environments and we are not for the merging of the test ban negotiations with general disarmament negotiations.

top of page 7. Would make it clear that we are talking about stopping production and are for the transferring of fissionable materials now used for weapons to uses for peaceful purposes. In the draft which we received from you, the 1st para. on page 7 is badly garbled and does not read correctly.

The Soviets and others may well point out that the statement by Amb. Lodge before the UN Disarmament Commission of Aug. 16, 1960 in consideration of the Soviets' ending the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes offered to set aside 30,000 kilograms of weapons grade U-235 if the Soviets would do likewise. This is approximately 10 times the 3,600 kilograms per annum under the proposed proposal, so that it would take 10 years to equal the Lodge proposal. The Soviets will make a comparison.

Suggest you give consideration to repeating the Lodge proposal still tied into the ending of the production of fissionable material, or, in the alternative, to the making of this proposal not tied into the ending of production of fissionable material. In any event, the transfer should be in trust and should be upon the conclusion of a satisfactory and effective agreement in the field of disarmament and not upon the conclusion of any agreement.

top of page 8. Is crime synonymous with war? Will we offend the Irish and the Swedes if we talk about improperly trained UN troops?

top of page 9. We should emphasize world-wide declaration of independence as taking place in the free world, in contrast to the subjection of the satellite states in the Communist world.

Since Britain's form of colonialism in the North American continent in 1776 was such a completely different type of colonialism than exists in Africa today, we are inclined to question whether this symbolism actually carries much weight or is very convincing. We would recognize that this is largely a matter of opinion but believe it causes smiles.

(page 9. cont'd) While figures with respect to those still living in colonies is arithmetically correct, as you know, recently independent African states are urging an early end to colonialism and a program of gradualism is regarded as pro-colonialism, and they do not regard self-determination as anything but a slogan.

page. 10. Might consider mentioning our contribution to the special fund of the UN, even though it is relatively small as, compared to the negative contribution of the Soviet Union.

page 11. Believe parts of speech relating to West Berlin and East Berlin will have to be carefully coordinated with American policy and thinking in this respect. As at present in speech, seems to assume continuing dichotomy between West and East Berlin which may run counter to some of our notes and statements.

3rd paragraph. 2nd sentence. Would omit the oblique reference to Communist China, which some might think relates to the Soviet Union since it follows immediately after the reference to Berlin; or would deal with the matter clearly and explicitly.

2nd paragraph. Would state by whom the law is being daily defied.

In General, believe VII would be materially improved by considerable cutting and perhaps putting in one place all of the thoughts with respect to West Berlin and East Berlin. For example, bottom of page 13 and top of 14 might well cause tremendous concentration in West Berlin and they might believe this is a prelude to the Allies' giving up occupational forces and to the abandonment of maintenance of treaty rights, and to a proposal that access routes be turned over to the UN for solution.

With the death of Hammarskjold and the Soviets pushing for Troika in the Secretariat, any proposal to place this delicate subject in the hands of the UN today could be fraught with the gravest consequences, and we suggest ought not even to be mentioned.

bottom of page 11. somewhat garbled. As we have it, it reads "contempt for views of mankind can raise us to heights..."

page. 12. 2nd paragraph. "Orange groves" should probably be "olive groves." The last sentence on p. 12 reads as though we were threatening a nuclear attack or at least a nuclear response on the Soviet Union after their attack. If this is so, it should be carefully considered and worded.

8

top of page 13. Word "abnormally," although we have used it, is really a word of Soviet origin with respect to the present situation in Berlin, and would suggest its deletion.

4th paragraph. 2nd sentence garbled, as of course the sealing off has actually affected access.

last paragraph, 1st sentence. Seems inconsistent with what follows.

page 14. The last paragraph is unclear as to what the plebiscite would be about and whether the plebiscite in West Berlin would be separate from that in East Berlin. (see additional comment on p. 5 of this paper)

page 15. The second and third paragraphs on page 15 also seem inconsistent with the thought on the top of 14 about placing Berlin access routes under the custody and control of the UN.

page 16. It seems weak to say "...if the West is prepared to resist force," because on page 15 we have stated that the Western Powers have calmly resolved to defend the free citizens of West Berlin.

At this point we believe you should give serious consideration to the fact that there exists strong friendship between the peoples of the U. S. and the Russian people. We could say that we fully understand what happened in the Soviet Union as a result of the devastation and deaths caused by the German invasion, and that if the present difficulties and tensions of West Berlin are primarily caused by these fears of a united, reorganized, and revitalized Germany, there are ways and methods by which these fears can be overcome without sacrificing the freedom of the people of Berlin and without running the risk of war which neither of us wants.

Top of page 17. The events of the next year may end history, as well as deciding it for the next 10,000 years. Again, we believe that this paragraph must be reconciled with firm statements on page 15 that we will meet our obligations with respect to Berlin.

next to last paragraph. Suggest stronger word than "permit." Do not get sense of clear-cut and concisely-stated policy with respect to Berlin, and may cause confusion and even hysteria. Believe we should be most careful not to try out any thoughts which might scare the Berliners half out of their wits.

top of page 14. Do not believe that the significance of new Economic Commission for Europe is sufficiently well known to recommend locating it in West Berlin, and in any event, we ought not to distinguish between West and East Berlin as I am sure Ambassador Dowling would confirm. Also Khrushchev now has a profound contempt for the UN. Furthermore, the placing of access routes to Berlin under the control of the UN would mean re-stationing of Soviet troops in West Berlin as well as in East Berlin, which again would cause great consternation and excessive doubts and fears as to what our policy really is and whether we will really continue a firm stance.

#####