

Handwritten notes at top left, partially illegible.

*The family first in this
I've seen off in the
that was with in the
F+H books*

Two matters bearing directly on our peace efforts have

recently become prominent in public discussion. I don't wish to dwell on them tonight. This much I feel obligated to say -- not as a candidate for re-election to the Presidency, but as your President and the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces.

There are certain facts applying to the development and testing of H-bombs that, while ~~already~~ ^{at Washington and places} published, have seemingly escaped public notice in this latest flurry of argument. The ~~fact~~ ^{main} fact is this. ~~Some~~ months back our government turned its development and testing work away from the

search for bigger and more destructive bombs, to the perfection of smaller and cleaner ones. ^B By this, I mean hydrogen bombs that ~~would~~ have very

little radio-active fall-out. ^{in this case the use} One of the purposes ^{is to defend our country} against the possibility of ^{missiles} a long-range hydrogen bomb ^{being used} against our cities.

There seems to be no possibility to stop the arrival of such a missile, except by the employment of ^{defensive missile} bearing a small hydrogen bomb. My question is simply this: Without knowing -- I repeat, without knowing -- that ^{Communist will, with us,} every other nation is ready to follow our lead in stopping the development and

making of H-bombs, are we to allow our security to be based wholly on wishful thinking, not on our own best efforts? ^{without any... that... why the... change}

Another fact to be pointed out is that the development work on the H-bomb

Handwritten notes at bottom, including "without any..." and "why the... change"

REPRODUCED AT THE DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER LIBRARY



I mean hydrogen bombs that have very little radio-active fallout. ~~this~~

in the development of small, clean H-bombs

~~work~~ Our purpose is to defend our country against the possibility of long-

range hydrogen bomb missiles directed against our cities. There seems

to be no possibility to stop the arrival of ~~such~~ ^{an intercontinental} missile, except by the

employment of defensive missiles ^a bearing small hydrogen bombs ^a My

it for from to destroy its intended target.

question is simply this: Without knowing -- I repeat, without knowing

that the Communists will, with us, stop the development of H-bombs, are

we to allow our security to be based wholly on wishful thinking, not on

our own best efforts.



Another fact to be pointed out is that, without inspection, first

development work on the H-bomb could not be detected until bombs were actually

tested. Yet such tests ^{are always, and} would necessarily be preceded by many months of

preparatory work. Consequently if we, acting in good faith, stop all this work,

we could, without warning, suddenly be confronted with a type of attack for which

we would be, through our own neglect, woefully unprepared.

The final fact is that the mass of our ~~peop~~ best scientific conclusion

holds that testing on the scale so far carried out by the Soviets and this nation

has not added materially to the radio-active content of the atmosphere and that the

Given the H-bomb development giving one is for the purpose of protection of our own cities rather than for the purpose of inter-continental destruction we can meet upon a protective strategy.

REPRODUCED AT THE DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER LIBRARY

idea that we are immediately facing a condition in which the human race will suffer deterioration or destruction because of this radio active danger is incorrect.



Nevertheless our government has clearly recognized that the world faces a great dilemma brought on by the fearful potentialities of a war featuring the use of A- and H-bombs. To wage such a war could have the most fearful consequences on civilization as we know it. ~~This~~ all the more clearly points up the fact that to be unable to deter or defend such an ~~effect~~ ^{attack} on the part of an aggressor would spell our ~~fatal~~ - sure destruction.

This truth provides the incentive and the mainspring for all the tireless work we have been carrying on in the field of disarmament, always featuring adequate mutual inspection. But of one thing we are determined --

we will not allow ourselves to be unable either to deter or to defeat aggression. ^{to do this} ^{either} because in this way we would change the possibility of self-destruction ^{in dignified manner into shame} to practical certainty.

Weakness involves aggression - as so far proved by our own history!

5 times by 1945 is 1/2 of 1945, 1/2 of 1945

So while this makes mutual disarmament a necessity for human survival, it