

With the defeat of Germany and Japan, the Allied nations are in a unique position to create a new international order based on the rule of law. As history has shown, peace is possible only when the most powerful countries of the world share common goals. The United States and the Soviet Union are different in many ways. But while we reject the Soviets' economic and political system, we share a mutual desire for peace. Now is the time to build on this area of agreement to ensure a future of international stability and legality. The United States can do its part to maintain peace by refraining from the threat or use of force, whenever possible. This is particularly true in the case of our relationship with the Soviet Union. After losing more than twenty million people in the last war, the Soviets are naturally fearful of outside threats. This explains the actions of the Soviet Union in eastern Europe. These strategic moves are regrettable, but understandable. The Soviets feel they need a buffer of friendly states on their borders to protect themselves from invasion. With similar logic, the United States has dominated the Caribbean for most of this century. Installing Western-style democratic governments in the Soviet sphere of influence cannot be achieved short of another world war.

The best way to promote the interests of the peoples of eastern Europe would be to diminish the Soviet sense of insecurity. U.S. economic assistance for the Soviet Union and those countries within its orbit would reduce tensions, raise living standards, lay the foundation for expanding trade, and open up access to natural resources. Finally, the U.S. monopoly over atomic weapons and the resulting "saber rattling" heard from some of our leaders present a major obstacle to better U.S.-Soviet relations. This type of talk only strengthens the hand of those elements within the Soviet ruling class that do not favor cooperation with the West. These hard-liners use signs of U.S. hostility to justify further militarization of the Soviet economy. By establishing secure international controls over atomic weapons, we could eliminate this source of friction and take another important step toward shaping a world of peace and cooperation.



To hold it together!

FROM THE HISTORICAL RECORD

Excerpt from testimony by General Dwight Eisenhower before the House of Representatives, November 15, 1945
 "There is no one thing, I believe, that guides the policy of Russia more today than to keep friendship with the United States...."

Excerpt from Secretary of War Henry Stimson's letter to President Truman, September 11, 1945

"Those relations may be perhaps irretrievably embittered by the way in which we approach the solution of the bomb with Russia. For if we fail to approach them now and merely continue to negotiate with them, having this weapon rather ostentatiously on our hip, their suspicions and their distrust of our purposes and motives will increase."

Excerpts from Secretary of Commerce Henry Wallace's letter to President Truman, July 1946

"American [military] actions since V-J Day...make it appear either (1) that we are preparing ourselves to win the war which we regard as inevitable or (2) that we are trying to build up a predominance of force to intimidate the rest of mankind. How would it look to us if Russia had the atomic bomb and we did not, if Russia had ten thousand-mile bombers and air bases within a thousand miles of our coast lines and we did not. Some of the military men and self-styled 'realists' are saying: "What's wrong with trying to build up a predominance of force? The only way to preserve the peace is for this country to be so well armed that no one will dare attack us. We know that America will never start a war." The flaw in this policy is simply that it will not work. In a world of atomic bombs and other revolutionary new weapons, such as radioactive poison gasses and biological warfare, a peace maintained by a predominance of force is no longer possible.... Within a very few years several countries can have atomic bombs and other atomic weapons.... The very fact that several nations have atomic bombs will inevitably result in a neurotic, fear ridden, itching-trigger psychology in all the peoples of the world, and because of our wealth and vulnerability we would be among the most seriously affected.... Insistence on our part that the game must be played our way will only lead to a deadlock. The Russians will redouble their efforts to manufacture bombs, and they may also decide to expand their 'security zone' in a serious way....

"...Russian history for over a thousand years has been a succession of attempts, often unsuccessful, to resist invasion and conquest.... It follows that to the Russians all of the defense and security measures of the Western powers seem to have aggressive intent.... Our resistance to her attempts to obtain warm water ports and her own security system in the form of 'friendly' neighboring states seems, from the Russian point of view, to clinch the case.... [We should] allay any reasonable Russian grounds for fear.... We should ascertain from a fresh point of view what Russia believes to be essential to her own security as a prerequisite to the writing of the peace and to cooperation in the construction of a world order. We should be prepared to judge her requirements against the background of what we ourselves and the British have insisted upon as essential to our respective security. We should be prepared, even at the expense of risking epithets of appeasement, to agree to reasonable Russian guarantees of security.... It is of the greatest importance that we should discuss with the Russians in a friendly way their long-range economic problems and the future of our cooperation in matters of trade. The reconstruction program of the USSR and the plans for the full development of the Soviet Union offer tremendous opportunities for American goods and American technicians...."

Excerpts from two books written by Walter Lippmann, one in 1943, the other in 1946

"We should not have learned the lessons of our failures in the past, especially the lesson of the failure of the League of Nations, if in our projects for organizing world peace we did not fix our attention first of all upon the powers capable of organizing it. Blueprints, covenants, contracts, charters, and declarations do not create living associations.... The will of the most powerful states to remain allied is the only possible creator of a general international order.... The worse one thinks of the Russians, the greater must be deemed the error of having elected to challenge the Russians first of all on the ground where they were most able to be, and were most certain to be, brutal, stubborn, faithless, and aggressive.... To apply the methods of domestic politics to international politics is like using the rules of checkers in a game of chess.... In a world of sovereign states conflicts are decided by power, actual or potential, for the ultimate arbiter is not an election but war."

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE THE FOLLOWING STEPS:

1. Recognize Soviet security interests in eastern Europe and stop encouraging groups in this area to resist the Soviets.
2. Avoid threatening the Soviet Union with our atomic monopoly and work for effective international control over the development of atomic power.
3. Focus on areas of mutual concern where there are some common interests, while using the United Nations as a forum to discuss differences and negotiate settlements.
4. Assist the Soviet Union and eastern Europe to rebuild, using U.S. expertise and economic assistance.
5. Avoid political and military alliances that might appear to the Soviets to be directed against them.

LESSONS FROM HISTORY

- The aftermath of World War I demonstrated that world peace cannot be maintained without the cooperation of all the Great Powers. To exclude a Great Power such as the Soviet Union from the process guarantees failure.
- While friction between Great Powers is an inevitable result of the international system, the extent of such friction in the past has been limited through diplomacy. Differences in economic and political systems do not inevitably lead to war between nations.
- Just as the United States has been historically dominant in the Caribbean and has reacted strongly to other powers meddling in the area, so the Soviet Union has been historically dominant in eastern Europe and has interests in some areas of the Middle East. This is natural behavior for a powerful state.
- The wartime collaboration showed that the United States and the Soviet Union can work together on common areas of interest, even though they have very different political and economic systems.

ARGUMENTS FOR OPTION 3

- Contact and cooperation with the Soviet Union is the best way to expose the Soviets to the benefits of the American democratic system. Eventually, the Soviets will become more like us.
- U.S. assistance in the economic development of the Soviet Union and eastern Europe will lead to increased trade and access to raw materials, which will benefit the American economy and raise the American standard of living.
- Since the U.S. atomic monopoly will not last long, the destructive power of these weapons requires that all nations refrain from threatening behavior and confrontations. No longer can the world's leaders engage in traditional games of threat and bluff.
- Reduced defense expenditures will promote American economic prosperity. American citizens should be engaged in productive, peacetime occupations, not in nonproductive, military establishments.