

~~SECRET~~ - EYES ONLY

Dear Mr. President:

I have reviewed the planning thus far and have the following comments for you:

As I have said I think your personal emissaries should deliver your messages to C and K. There is no disagreement as to C. As to K an emissary could better supplement the gravity of the situation you have communicated to Gromyko. And talking with K would afford a chance of uncovering his motives and objectives far better than correspondence thru the "usual channels."

As to your announcement, assuming it becomes imperative to say something soon, I think it would be a mistake at this time to disclose that an attack was imminent and that merely reciting the facts, emphasizing the gravity of the situation and that further steps were in process would be enough for the first announcement.

Because an attack would very likely result in Soviet reprisals somewhere -- Turkey, Berlin, etc. -- it is most important that we have as much of the world with us as possible. To start or risk starting a nuclear war is bound to be divisive at best and the judgments of history seldom coincide with the tempers of the moment.

If war comes, in the long run our case must rest on stopping while there was still time the Soviet drive to world domination, our obligations under the Inter-American system, etc. We must be prepared for the widespread reaction that if we have a missile base in Turkey and other places around the Soviet Union surely they have a right to one in Cuba. If we attack Cuba, an ally of the USSR, isn't an attack on NATO bases equally justified. One could go on and on. While the explanation of our action may be clear to us it won't be clear to many others. Moreover, if war is the consequence, the Latin American republics may well divide and some say that the U.S. is not acting with their approval and consent. Likewise unless the issue is very clear there may be sharp differences with our Western Allies who have lived so long under the same threat of Soviet attack from bases in the satellite countries by the same IRBMs.

But all these considerations and obstacles to clear and universal understanding that we are neither rash, impetuous or indifferent to the fate of others are, I realize, only too familiar to you.

~~SECRET~~ - EYES ONLY

SECRET - EYES ONLY

-2-

I know your dilemma is to strike before the Cuban sites are operational or to risk waiting until a proper groundwork of justification can be prepared. The national security must come first. But the means adopted have such incalculable consequences that I feel you should have made it clear that the existence of nuclear missile bases anywhere is negotiable before we start anything.

Our position, then, is that we can't negotiate with a gun at our head, a gun that imperils the innocent, helpless Cuban people as much as it does the U. S. , and that if they won't remove the missiles and restore the status quo ante we will have to do it ourselves -- and then we will be ready to discuss bases in the context of a disarmament treaty or anything else with them. In short it is they, not the U. S. , that have upset the balance and created this situation of such peril to the whole world.

I confess I have many misgivings about the proposed course of action, but to discuss them further would add little to what you already have in mind. So I will only repeat that it should be clear as a pikestaff that the U. S. was, is and will be ready to negotiate the elimination of bases and anything else; that it is they who have upset the precarious balance in the world in arrogant disregard of your warnings -- by threats against Berlin and now from Cuba -- and that we have no choice except to restore that balance, i. e. , blackmail and intimidation never, negotiation and sanity always.

Yours, ,

/s/ Adlai S. Stevenson

Wednesday morning, Oct. 17

P. S. I'm returning to New York and can return, of course, at your convenience.

SECRET - EYES ONLY

DECLASSIFIED

E. O. 11652 SEC. 1.21, 5.0, 5.0 ADD'Y

State NLK-77-1036
MEM DATE 9-12-78

Dear Mr. President -

I have reviewed the planning therefor and have the following comments for you:

As I have said I think your personal communique should deliver your messages to C and K. There is no disagreement as to C. is to it an emergency could better supplement the gravity of the situation you have communicated to Ermyko. And talking with K would afford a chance of ~~finding~~ uncovering his actions and objectives far better than correspondence through the "usual channels".

As to your announcement, recognizing it becomes imperative to say something soon, I think it would be a mistake at this time to disclose that an attack was imminent and that merely ~~emphasizing the gravity of~~ listing the facts, emphasizing the gravity of the situation and that further steps were in process would be enough for the first announcement.

Because an attack would very likely result in Soviet reprisals somewhere - Turkey, Berlin etc - it is most important that ~~you~~ we have as much of the world

with us as possible. To start an air attack on Moscow
 war is bound to be decided at least and its judgments of
 history seldom coincide with the feelings of the moment.

If war comes, in the long run our case must rest
 on stopping while there was still time the Soviet drive to
 world domination, our obligations under the Inter-American
 system, etc. We must be prepared for the widespread
 reaction that if we have a missile base in Turkey and
 other places around the Soviet Union surely they have a
 right to one in Cuba. If we attack Cuba, an ally of
 the USSR, is an attack on NATO bases equally
 justified. One could go on and on. While ~~these~~ the
 explanation of our action may be clear to us it ~~is~~
 won't be clear to many others. Moreover, if war is
 the consequence, the Latin-American republics may
 well divide and some say that the U.S. is not
 acting with their approval and consent. Likewise
 unless the issue is very clear there may be sharp
 differences with our Western allies who have lived
 so long under the same threat of Soviet attack from
 bases in the satellite countries by the same I.R. 3 Ms.

But all these considerations and obstacles to clear

and unimpaired understanding that we are within reach,
impetuous or indifferent to the fate of others are, I realize,
only too peculiar to you.

I know your dilemma is to strike before the Cuban
sites are operational or to, ^{with} ~~without~~ a proper ground
mark of justification can be prepared. The national security
must come first. But ^{the} means adopted ^{have} such
incalculable consequences that I feel you should have
made it clear that the ^{existence of} nuclear missile bases anywhere
is ~~is~~ negotiable before we start any thing.

Clearer position, then, is that we can't negotiate with
a gun at our head, and if they a force that
imperils the innocent, helpless Cuban people as
much as it does the U.S., and that if they won't
remove the missiles and restore the status quo ante
we will have to do it ourselves - and then we
will be ready to discuss bases in the context of a
disarmament treaty or anything else with them.
In short it is they, not the U.S., that have upset
the balance and created the situation of such
jeopardy to the whole world.

~~Dear~~

I confess I have many qualms about the proposed course of action, but to discuss them further would add little to what you already have in mind. So I will only repeat that it should be clear as a fait accompli that the US was, is and will be ready to negotiate the elimination of bases and ~~any other~~ form of anything else; that it is they who have upset the previous balance in the world in arrogant disregard of your warnings - by threats against Peking and now from Cuba - and that we have no choice except to restore that balance, ~~and~~ i. e. blackmail and intimidation never, negotiation and security always.

Yours -

Allen S. Brewster

Wednesday morning Oct 17.

D. D. Lin returns to Washington and can return, if
convenient, at your convenience.