My Correspondence with Bertrand
Russell on Peace (IV)

Shigetoshi Iwamatsu

April 28, 1964

My Lord:
I am anxious about your health, for I have not heard from you for three months.
I am sorry to say that the present condition of the Japanese peace movement is not yet improved.
I read the news organ of the Japan Communist Party every day, which reproaches and attacks, day after day, those who oppose all tests of any country and support the treaty of partial suspension of nuclear testing. The Party calls them "revisionists", which means the persons who make a thorough revision of Marxism-Leninism, and "disunionists", which means the persons who intend to disunite the labouring class and peace movement, such as members belonging to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, revisionists who attack the Communist Party, and Trotskyists.
It says that all members of the Socialist Party and the General Council of Trade Unions of Japan are not the revisionists and disunionists, but only the right wing leaders of the Party and the General Council are. But I am not able to understand what it says.
According to the organ, it is obvious, at any rate, that we are classified under the group of revisionists and disunionists, because we oppose all tests of any nation and appreciate the treaty of partial suspension of testing as the beginning of the road towards peace.

The March 2nd issue of the organ said that the Japan-Soviet Friendly Association in Japan answered the letter from the Soviet-Japan Friendly Association in the Soviet Union which demanded that they should support the treaty, by saying that they regarded it as appropriate not to express their own attitude toward the demand for supporting the Moscow Treaty as a result of the peaceful coexistence. I suppose the Japan-Soviet Association takes the part of China rather than that of the Soviet Union, being influenced by the opinion of the Japan Communist Party.

The organ says, "The Japanese peace movement centering around the Japan Council Against A. & H. Bombs has are markable tradition and a definite principle, which opposes American Imperialism and fights for independence and peace, and has been supported by all the people of the world. The people of the world have been isolating American Imperialism and we Japanese people have been performing our own duties, for we have been observing and developing the tradition of the Japanese peace movement. We cannot make a compromise with the revisionists and disunionists, who are backed up by American Imperialism and International Revisionism. We should clarify the difference between our own route and that of revisionists and disunionists without fear."

Now, I think, there are three kinds of people. The first
kind of people, the great majority, are unconcerned about the peace movement. The second kind of people belong to and are sympathetic with the Japan Communist Party, and they are the most active. The so-called “peace” campaign in Japan is greatly influenced by the Communist Party. The third kind of people opposes, individually, all tests of any nation and appreciates the treaty. Among them, however, only few are working for peace and the rest do not sustain the peace workers.

I have, to my regret, not been publicly upheld by the readers of my essays and translation of your two Peace Foundations. I keenly feel that peace workers in Japan are almost independent of each other and isolated. I have often written many letters to the unacquainted who seemed to have worked for peace. Very few, however, have ever answered me.

Have you received my contribution to the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation?

I have not been informed of the achievements which the two Peace Foundations have made since their establishment. I would be very pleased to know the Foundations’ results.

A few days ago, a conservative television company broadcasted, an English drama “Espionage—gentile spies—”, which showed the peace activity in your country. The leader of the activity in this drama was probably modeled on you, although I think the drama did not present you as you really are. I was surprised that the conservative broadcasting company actually broadcast such a drama as this.

The peace pilgrimage which was organized by Mrs. Reynolds left Japan for America and European countries on April 21.
It is composed of about 40 men and women, of whom 20 are A-Bomb sufferers. I am not acquainted with anyone of them and have never been consulted. They will call on you. It is very good that they have gone to foreign countries in order to appeal against the approaching danger of nuclear war and to inform of the sufferers' life and thought to all the people of the world directly.

It was decided a few days ago that the Japan Council Against A. & H. Bombs would hold its Tenth World Conference for Peace in Tokyo, Osaka, and Kyoto in July and August this year, being backed by the Communist Party.

On the other hand, it was decided that the Liaison Conference of the Three Prefectures Suffering From A. & H. Bombs would hold the Peace Conference in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August, being upheld by the Socialist Party, which opposes all tests of any country.

With every good wish,

Very respectfully yours,

Shigetoshi Iwamatsu

This letter might have been, for Russell, a gloomy report of Japanese peace movement. But he simply answered me as follows:

May 7, 1964

Dear Mr. Iwamatsu:

Thank you very much for your letter. I enclose literature plus a six month summary of our work. I don't believe we have received your contribution.

Yours sincerely,

Bertrand Russell
In this letter were enclosed four materials — (1) SUMMARY OF OUR WORK TO DATE, (2) the covenant form of the ATLANTIC PEACE FOUNDATION, (3) a printed Statement by Bertrand Russell on launching the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation and Atlantic Peace Foundation, and (4) the prospectus of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation. I already referred to (2), (3) and (4). Material (1) has remained untouched, but has much importance.

The main part of the SUMMARY OF OUR WORK TO DATE is as follows:

With regard to accomplishments to date of the Foundation I should mention that approaches have been made to twenty-two countries concerning (a) political prisoners (b) persecuted minorities (c) persons threatened as a result of their political dissent.

Some of these appeals have concerned large numbers of people and others single individuals. The countries concerned have been communist, capitalist, and neutral. Concrete results were obtained in thirteen countries. These results include the release of prisoners, the commutation of death sentences, and the amelioration of the conditions undergone by prisoners or groups. We are not prepared to make public the information concerning the countries to which these appeals have gone or the individuals on whose behalf they were sent. This is because the work is discreet and depends for its effectiveness upon its remaining so.

The work involves research, travel and meetings with responsible officials. It has been considerably increased since first begun.

The Foundation has undertaken mediation on several questions.
These include the Arab-Israeli dispute, the Sino-Indian border dispute, the question of the Yemen, conflict in Ruanda and Burundi, Cuba and the United States, Cyprus, Vietnam and other areas of dispute. The proposals sent to heads of states and responsible officials with respect to the dispute in question are preceded by research and consultation with ambassadors or designated officials of the embassies of the countries concerned.

The Foundation has co-operated with other organisations on various questions. For examples, on the question of the war in Vietnam, material has been provided for the Student Peace Union, Stanford University Peace Cancus, student groups at Haverford College, 225 other American Colleges, 35 American newspapers, wire services, radio networks and F. M. radio stations under the control of Pacifica Foundation in San Francisco, Los Angeles and New York. The material with regard to Vietnam has been used as well in over 20 countries. Work on this scale was also undertaken on behalf of political prisoners in Greece. These are two examples of Foundation activity with regard to major public issues.

May 18, 1964

My Lord:
I wish you many happy returns on this happy occasion.
I think it my duty to inform you about the antagonism among the Japan Communist Party. On May 15, the ratification bill for the partial nuclear test ban treaty, signed in Moscow last July, was presented to the Lower House plenary session
by the government. The Liberal-Democratic, Socialist, and Democratic Socialist Parties spoke for and the Communist Party against the treaty. Representing the Communist Party, Mr. Kanichi Kawakami spoke against the treaty. After the debates, the treaty was ratified by a majority vote. At the time of vote-taking, Mr. Yoshio Shiga, one of the five Communist members of the Lower House, one of the greatest Japanese Communists who has been devoting his life to the party for forty years, voted his approval. This lone dissension caught the eyes of the whole floor. As the Japan Communist Party declared, on the 14th of this month, that it would oppose the partial nuclear test ban treaty, his dissension has a significant meaning. It is generally believed, as I wrote, that the Japan Communist Party is following the Peiping line. Mr. Shiga, the party says, follows the Moscow line with several other communists, who compose the anti-main-current.

Soviet First Deputy Premier Mikoyan arrived in Tokyo on May 14. The Japan Communist Party, however, does not seem to have welcomed him so warmly as I expected. The 16th issue of the news organ did not report that Mr. Shiga had voted for the treaty, but the 17th issue gave an article severely criticizing him at the beginning. He was, it is reported, severely punished by the party executives. Now I don’t believe the truth of the organ any more, as it has never reported that there are communists who follow the Moscow line and approve the treaty.

With every good wish,

Very respectfully yours,
Answering to my letter, Russell wrote the following letter.

May 30, 1964

Dear Mr. Iwamatsu:

Thank you very much for your letter, and birthday wishes. Could you contact Mr. Genzaburo Yoshino, editor-in-chief, of Iwanami Shoten Publishers, 3, 2-Chome, Kanda Hitotsubashi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, who is helping our work in Japan?

With good wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Bertrand Russell

June 16, 1964

My Lord:

I have received your letter with gratitude. I can contact Mr. Genzaburo Yoshino by the good office of Mr. Midorikawa, one of the editors of the magazine World. Would you please order me to do anything you want? I recently received letters from several persons who informed me of their support for your Peace Foundations. Mr. Y. H., a biologist of Nagoya University, wrote to me that he had just sent your Foundation his contributions which had been raised in several faculties of Nagoya University.

He wrote, also, that while he would be absent, studying in the U.S.A., Professor T. S., of the Faculty of Literature of the same university, would take the trouble to collect contributions. I sent a letter and three copies of the brochure
of the Foundations to him.

Mr. Y. N., Nagoya Women’s College, wrote me that he had heard of me from one of Mr. H.’s friends and asked me to send him a brochure, which I immediately did, and reported to me that Mr. S., of Meijo University, Nagoya, intended to collect contributions. I wrote a letter to him, too.

In Tokyo, the Liaison Conference of Supporters of “Bertrand Russell Peace Foundations” has been established, reports the “Japan Reading Newspaper”.

I am very glad that not a few people in Japan have begun to support your peace activity.

With every good wish,

Very respectfully yours,

Shigetoshi Iwamatsu

To this letter, Russell answered me as follows.

June 26, 1964

Dear Mr. Iwamatsu:

I am pleased to learn of the number of people who are interested in our work and I hope you will continue to inform me of developments.

With good wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Bertrand Russell

Before receiving Russell’s letter of June 26, I wrote a letter to Russell, on June 29, answering to his letter of May 7, which,
being sent by sea mail, reached me on June 18.

June 29, 1964

My Lord:

I have received your kind letter of May 7 and the copy of Summary of Our Work to Date, the pamphlet of the Atlantic Peace Foundation with deed of covenant, the Statement, and the brochure of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation with gratitude. I was surprised to learn that you didn’t believe you had received my contribution. I ordered the Nagasaki Office of the Bank of Tokyo to send my contribution on March 30. A bank clerk recently told me that the London Office of the Bank had already paid the money to the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation on April 2. Therefore would you please check once more if you did receive my contribution on April 2?

I have begun to contact the Liaison Conference of Supporters of “Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation” in Tokyo. I have given a representative of the Conference my advice that (1) the conference should be organised by conscientious individuals, (2) it should be organised on the basis of Lord Russell’s definite principle which opposes any testing of any country, and (3) it should never be under the control of the disunion and disorder of the present Japanese peace-activity.

With every good wish,

Very respectfully yours,

Shigetoshi Iwamatsu

P. S. The Summary of Our Work to Date states that a film is under preparation, and a brochure regarding it is enclosed for our attention. But it is not enclosed here. Would you kindly enclose the brochure at your convenience?
Russell answered to my letter as follows:

July 14, 1964

Dear Mr. Iwamatsu:

Thank you for your letter of June 29. I am pleased to confirm that your generous gift to our Foundation has arrived and I am sorry that you have been worried about its supposed loss.

Mr. Farley, one of the directors of our Foundation, will be in Japan in the first week of August and will be pleased to meet you in Nagasaki. He will be attending the World Conference in Hiroshima and Nagasaki Against A. & H. Bombs. I hope that it will be possible for you to see him on or about August 9 to discuss the development of our work in Japan. At this time he will be pleased to bring you a brochure concerning our film.

I am encouraged by all your efforts on our behalf.

With good wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Bertrand Russell

On the same day that Russell wrote to me, responding to my letter of June 29, as above quoted, I myself wrote to Russell my answer to his letter of June 26.

July 14, 1964

My Lord:

I have received your kind letter of June 26 with much gratitude.

Having received your letter of May 7 including some important materials, I took an opportunity to see newsmen on June 30,
to whom I talked about the results of the activity of your Peace Foundations. They took much interest in your work. In July 3rd issues, the “Asahi” (Morning Sun) and the “Nishi-nihon” (West Japan) published the summary of the results of the two Peace Foundations. Both devoted a good deal of spaces to this news, although, to my regret, they were only for Nagasaki Prefecture circulation. On July 1st, the producer of the Nagasaki Branch of the Japan Broadcasting Corporation (NHK) recorded my speech about the significance and results of your Peace Foundations, which was locally broadcasted for about ten minutes in the morning of July 4. I enclose the copies of the “Asahi” and “Nishi-nihon” here. The outline of the article in the “Asahi” is as follows: “The Report of the Activity of the Two Foundations, the Standard-bearer of Peace, has reached Assistant Professor Iwamatsu from Lord Russell, the Founder. According to the Report, the Foundation has appealed to 22 countries. In Tokyo, supporting activity has started. The news explains the character, aims and works of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation and Atlantic Peace Foundation.” It states, also, as follows: “Assistant Professor Iwamatsu has long been corresponding with Lord Russell, who asked him to support him in the case of the establishment of the Foundations. He stated, ‘I hope the number of people who sympathize with the ideal of Lord Russell and propose to help him will increase. I believe many people will respond to him when they know his daily devoted activity for peace. I hope we will make the window for the Foundation.’” The report in the paper “Nishi-nihon” is somewhat similar.
In the last paragraph, it says, "Mr. Iwamatsu appeals, 'it is a pity that many people are not likely to understand Lord Russell’s devoted peace-activity, owing to the trend of the public opinion, which underestimates the fear of war. In order to answer Lord Russell, who is much concerned about Nagasaki, I hope more people will support and help the peace-activity of Russell’s Foundations.'"

The translations of your two articles have recently been published — (1) the Vietnam War and Cruelties, which you had sent to Mr. Munenori Suzuki, Japan-Vietnam Friendly Association, in the magazine Sekai, and (2) What Follows the Treaty of Partial Suspension of Nuclear Testing in the Conditions of Peace, one of the series Present Age, both issued by Iwanami-Shoten Publishing Company.

I shall make a speech about you and peace-movement at a meeting of employees of the Nagasaki Broadcasting Corporation (commercial company) on the 21st of this month.

With good wishes,

Very respectfully yours,

Shigetoshi Iwamatsu

Russell responded to my letter as follows:

July 27, 1964

Dear Mr. Iwamatsu:

I was very glad to hear from you again and to receive the cuttings which contain the text of the broadcast of your recorded speech about the Peace Foundation. I shall be sending a representative to Japan very shortly to attend the Social Democratic Party Conference on nuclear weapons. I should be very pleased if it would be possible for you to
meet my representative in Japan. My representative will be either my private secretary, Mr. Ralph Schoenman, or Mr. Christopher Farley. They will be arriving in Tokio on 3rd August.

With good wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Bertrand Russell

On August 9, I met Mr. Christopher Farley, Russell’s representative, who came to Japan via Ethiopia from London, at the meeting of the World Conference Against A. & H. Bombs in Nagasaki. He did not have freedom to act as he wished, being restricted to spending his whole time according to the plan scheduled for all the foreigners attending the World Conference, and so I went along with him to a lobby of a hotel, in a taxi, in a bus, to the waiting-room of a station, to the platform and so on, in order to speak with him as much as possible. In the morning of August 10, he left Nagasaki reluctantly together with the other foreign delegates.

Farley wrote a letter to me on August 19 after he had gone back to London. It is:

August 19, 1964

Dear Professor Iwamatsu:

I was very pleased to meet you recently in Nagasaki, and wish to thank you for sparing so much of your time.

On my return to Tokyo I had long discussions with the Liaison Council of Supporters of our Foundation. We found that we were in very close agreement about our hopes for the future of this work in Japan and Lord Russell has today
written to Mr. Genzaburo Yoshino asking him to suggest a
list of eminent Japanese people who might be willing to serve
as sponsors in Japan.
I give below as promised a list of those who have agreed to
date to serve the Foundation as advisers or scientific advisers.
The list is by no means complete and Lord Russell is still
receiving replies to his invitations.
I expect to go to North Wales within the next few days to
visit Lord Russell and I know that he will be pleased to receive
your presents which I shall pass on to him at that time.

With many thanks and good wishes,
Yours sincerely,
Christopher Farley

Advisers
Mr. Charles R. Allen
Mr. Günther Anders
Mr. Leonard Boudin
Mr. Claude Beurdet
Prof. E. L. Bredsdorff
Prof. George Catlin
Mr. Fred J. Cook
Very Rev. Martin C. D’Arcy
Prof. Josue de Castro
Dr. Vladimir Dedijer
Mr. Leslie Kirkley
Prof. Seymour Melman
Father Martin Niemoller
Dr. Giorgio La Pira
Mr. Victor Purcell

Scientific Advisers
Dr. Otto Nathan
Dr. James R. Newman
Prof. Linus Pauling
Mr. Gerard Piel
Prof. Joseph Rotblat
Prof. Abdus Salam
Dr. Hideki Yukawa
At the following times, I wrote letters to Russell with my intention of informing him of concrete Japanese situations in rapid succession. They were written on August 1, August 6, and August 11 without expecting to receive answers from Russell.

August 1, 1964

My Lord:
I was very glad to receive on 28th your kind letter of July 14. I am most glad that I shall be able to meet Mr. Farley here. I will try to do my best to see him, as you hope, on August 9 and if this is possible, hope to discuss the development in Japan.

I made a speech about the peace-movement at the meeting of employees of the Nagasaki Broadcasting Corporation on July 30, although at first I was scheduled to make it on 21st, as I informed you in my last letter. In my speech, I explained your thought and activities for about two hours. Some of them confessed me that they had never been informed of your peace campaign before and praised your thought for its highest simplicity, although they did not yet seem to have been able to understand it very well. But they estimated my speech concerning your thought on peace so highly that they promised to give me an other opportunity to explain it once more on August 7.
With good wishes,

Very respectfully yours,

Shigetoshi Iwamatsu

My second letter is as follows.

August 6, 1964

My Lord:
I am very pleased to receive your kind letter of July 27.
I will see your representative, Mr. Schoenman, or Mr. Farley, without fail.
The American provoking attitude toward North Vietnam is very dangerous and will bring mankind to the edge of annihilation. I hope your initiative effort will settle this critical situation.
Just now, a radio newsman of the Nagasaki Branch of the Japan Broadcasting Corporation (NHK) has asked me, by telephone, for my critical opinion about the Japanese peace-movement, especially about the Japan Council Against A. & H. Bombs, in order to put it in the radio programme of August 10. I will tell him my opinion this afternoon.

With every good wish,

Very respectfully yours,

Shigetoshi Iwamatsu

My third letter is as follows.

August 11, 1964

My Lord:
I was very glad to have met Mr. Farley, who came directly from Africa to Japan, on 9th and 10th current.
He was very kind and friendly to me. He spoke to me so
clearly and slowly, and often repeated, what he had said, so that I could understand him very well. We had a talk about many subjects concerning the peace-movement and your daily life for about four and a half hours, which was the maximum time allowable to us to speak to each other. He agreed with my critical opinion on the Japanese peace-movement, and I agreed with his proposal as to the establishment of a Tokyo office of your Foundation. I have received a brochure concerning the film from him with much gratitude. I am very glad to have been able to cultivate a friendly relation with him.

Last night, a TV newsman of the Fukuoka Branch of the Japan Broadcasting Corporation (NHK) came to my home and recorded me my giving very short speech. He asked me for my neutral critical opinion on the disunited World Conference, which was the current topic in Japanese journalism, and on the aid and rescue of the A. Bomb sufferers. It was impossible, however, for me to explain my opinion enough, because my available time was only two minutes.

With all good wishes,

Very respectfully yours,

Shigetoshi Iwamatsu

September 7, 1964

Dear Professor Iwamatsu:
Thank you very much for your gifts which my associate Mr. Farley has passed to me. I am grateful to you for your
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kindness.

With good wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Bertrand Russell

There was one thing which weighed up my mind among various stories which I heard from Mr. Farley in Nagasaki. When I asked him one question about the numbers of the letters being sent to Lord Russell from all parts of the world, he answered that there were about one thousand letters a week and that Lord Russell read them and wrote answers to them for about three hours every morning.

This story compelled me to worry about the number of times that I wrote letters to Russell, who was 92 years old and the highest figure in the fields of science, culture, politics, and the peace-movement and a treasure to human beings. My frequent writing of letters to him would impose on him the task of writing many answers to me, which would mean the waste of his valuable time and health that should be devoted to the most important works for the human race. I should communicate in ordinary cases with young fellows like Mr. Farley and Mr. Schoenman and only in cases of special vital interest with Russell himself.

After considering this, I greatly reduced the number of times I wrote to Russell, and got into communication with Mr. Farley and Mr. Schoenman. Since then, accordingly, Russell's letters have decreased in number. My communication with the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation began to be kept through young directors rather than Russell himself.

But at present, I cannot subdue a regret that I had too
much restricted myself in my communication with Russell. I was too modest to hold close communication with him. He, as well as I, wanted to have much more correspondence with each other. His letters, say, of May 22, 1968; August 29, 1968; and January 22, 1969 indicate his expectation of and pleasure in receiving my letters. I should have met his expectation by much more frequent correspondence with him.

The next letter which I received from Russell was that of May 19, 1965. For about eight months from September, 1964 to May 1965, I wrote fourteen letters to the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, among which three letters were to Russell, three were to Russell and Farley, and the remaining eight were to Farley. During the same period, I received the same number of letters from the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, among which two letters came from Russell, ten from Farley, and two from Schoenman.

The above number of our correspondence shows a new situation of our communication. My correspondence with Russell was mostly replaced by correspondence with Farley, although Russell did not spare himself to write his answer to me on the relevant matters.
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September 16, 1964

My Lord:

Thank you very much for your kind letter of September 7, which has arrived this morning. I am very glad to know that you appreciated my small gifts.
I received a letter from Mr. Yoshino several days ago. He said that he had been consulting with Professor Yukawa about the election of the sponsors of the Japanese Foundation, but that it was a very difficult job.

The Japanese government suddenly accepted the U. S. proposal of the visits of nuclear-powered submarines to the Japanese ports, Sasebo and Yokosuka, on August 28, disregarding our objection. The Sasebo City Assembly recently approved the visits of U. S. Nuclear Sub. to the port. The government and the Ministerial party declared that they reposed absolute confidence in the statement of the U. S. government about the safety of radioactivity and about carrying no Subroc.

The Socialist party and the General Council of Japanese Labour Unions, and the Communist Party have been developing the anti-Nuclear Sub. movements partly jointly and partly independently.

I enclose a photograph of me speaking through TV on August 12, of which I informed you in my last letter.

With every good wish,

Very respectfully yours,

Shigetoshi Iwamatsu

To this, I received no answer.

I wrote letters to Farley on the same day, to which no answer came.

To my next letter of October 10 to Farley, he answered me on October 15.

October 10, 1964
Dear Mr. Farley:

I have long been waiting for you to send me documents which would report the result of the two Peace Foundations during the year. I suppose that you may have sent literature to some supporters in Tokyo and many newspaper companies. But it is necessary for you, I believe, to send me such literature, because I shall be able to publish it to the people living in western Japan, who would know nothing about your activities without my introducing them via journalism. Would you please send me your valuable literature?

I want to know the title of the book concerning Lord Russell and the name of its publisher, about which you told me at Nagasaki Station at the time of your leaving for Kyoto. Would you inform me of them? I will buy it through a Japanese bookshop dealing with foreign books.

Has Mr. Yoshino written to you about the list of eminent supporters?

The government will perhaps, very soon, decide to prohibit public servants, including professors belonging to the universities founded by the state, from opposing against the U. S. Nuclear-Submarines' calling at Japanese ports.

Would you please give my best regards to Lord Russell?

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

Shigetoshi Iwamatsu

Farley’s answer is as follows.

October 15, 1964

Dear Professor Iwamatsu:

Thank you very much for your kind letter of October 10.
I have sent you under separate cover a copy of the book which we published in connection with Lord Russell’s 90th birthday. Our Annual Report has not yet been completed but will of course be sent to you as soon as it is available. Meanwhile I have sent you separately some current articles which I hope will interest you.

Mr. Yoshino has been in correspondence with Lord Russell concerning sponsors of the Foundation in Japan and Lord Russell has written to a small number of people inviting their sponsorship. This was very recently and as yet he has not received a reply from any of them.

With all good wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Christopher Farley.

Materials which were sent under separate post were as follows:


(7) "Extract of Data Compiled on War in Vietnam", by Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, 6 pp.

The book (1) was prepared in honour of Russell's 90th birthday, and is a very nice and handsome brochure, profusely illustrated. It contains many tributes sent to him from seventy-five friends and admirers, such as Albert Schweitzer, Arthur Miller, Martin Luther King, Jr., Mischa Elman, Isaac Deutscher, Max Born, Niels Bohr and so on.

His essays (2), (3), (4), and (5) are all characteristic and very important works. These were made successively by his outstanding intelligence and strict sense of justice with marvellous energy. Among them, (2) is the most characteristic and attractive essay. It most typically represents his standpoint of non-alignment and neutral thoughts for peace at those times. It deserves to be observed carefully by those who have profound concern about war, arms race and colonialism.

He states at the beginning of this essay as follows.

"The great majority of the people of the world will continue to live in misery for as long as the Cold War continues. The arms race which accompanies the conflict between East and West not only imposes on mankind the appalling prospect of annihilation, but condemns most men to starvation and disease. The two issues which I consider to be the most urgent before mankind are ending the arms race, and beginning world planning for development through world government. These issues are closely connected. Unless the conflict between East and West ends and the arms race is eliminated, all efforts towards development will remain token and insufficient. The explosion of population and the depletion of resources which have taken place create greater problems of disease
and hunger with each year that passes. The conclusion which I draw from these contentions is that non-alignment is an essential policy for the survival of mankind and the social advance of the greater part of humanity.... As long as there are two contending blocs wasting the industrial potential of our planet in a conflict which benefits no-one, peace and wellbeing will be illusory goals.”

Russell examines, furthermore, the human and material cost of the arms race and considers its effect on underdeveloped countries. His examination and consideration are worthy of attracting serious attention of all people.

He gives an example of comparative costs: “One British aircraft carrier costs 65 million pounds. 40 million pounds would make drinking water available to everyone in Egypt. The same amount would provide 900 rural health clinics. One Atlas missile costs 30 million dollars. This amount represents the total investment for a nitrogen fertilizer plant with a capacity of 50,000 to 70,000 tons per annum. Translating these comparative costs into British terms, one Polaris missile equals four universities, one V-bomber equals seven secondary schools, one T. S. R. 2 equals five modern hospitals and one missile destroyer equals 10,000 tractors.”

Russell illustrates the wickedness of Western industrial behaviour by how food surpluses are handled in the United States. “Blue dye is poured into great mountains of butter and cheese to render them unusable. By 1960, 125 million tons of bread grain had been so stored in the United States enough to feed every Indian for a year. Each year there are 14 million more to be fed in India.” “The great industrial production of the Western world is consciously employed not only to perpetuate the hunger which exists in the world, but to increase it for purposes of profit.”
After examination of the deadly role of the arms race and the Cold War, he investigates the huge military-industrial complex in the United States. And then he quotes the believable estimation by Linus Pauling. “The Great Powers had stockpiled by 1963 the equivalent in T.N.T. of 320 thousand million tons of explosives. To exhaust this nuclear stockpile would involve the use of all the explosive power of the entire Second World War every day for 146 years. This nuclear stockpile doubles each year.”

He minutely explains the stockpiling of the nuclear and biochemical bombs, the missile systems, and the rapidly increasing danger of eventual accidental nuclear war.

He also points out the habit of governments to lie about their wicked policies.

He states, also, “I maintain that there are no criminals worse than those who, over many years, have based their policy and their practice upon this prospect. I further maintain that, apart from the base and immoral danger these potential mass murderers have presented to mankind, the result of their mental illness has been life expectancy averaging 25 years, the death through illness and hunger of tens of millions of people and suffering which cannot easily be calculated.”

Towards the end of this essay, Russell makes the following significant remark. “It is essential to make very clear now that the main obstacle to disarmament is the refusal of the West to accept proposals about which there can be no complaint. The main reason why the Cold War persists and the arms race continues is the unwillingness of the West to begin serious, sustained, large-scale, controlled disarmament.”

(September 19, 1976)