

Confronting Nuclear War

The Role of Education, Religion and the Community

Bill Wickersham

Peace Studies Program,
College of Arts and Science,
University of Missouri-Columbia

WITH

Jared Gassen

School of Journalism
University of Missouri-Columbia

Table of Contents

Preface	3
Chapter I The Nuclear Weapons Problem	10
Chapter II Nuclear Weapons on Hair-Trigger Alert	26
Chapter III The Role of Media in Covering Nuclear Weapons Accidents	35
Chapter IV A Roadmap for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons	45
Chapter V The Role of the Citizen in Preventing Nuclear War	58
Chapter VI The Dialogue for Nuclear Disarmament	62
Chapter VII Social and Psychological Obstacles to Education and Citizen Action	88
Chapter VIII The Role of Higher and Secondary Education	113
Chapter IX The Role of Religion in Nuclear Disarmament	142
Chapter X Action: The Role of the Individual and Organizations	160
Appendix Resources on the Nuclear Weapons Danger	187

Preface

Nearly twenty years after the Cold War has ended, humankind is still faced with the genuine risk of instant extinction without representation. Even worse, this possibility could occur by accident, as a single computer miscalculation or mechanical error could lead to a civilization-ending nuclear war. The 9/11 attacks killed some 3,000 people causing enormous destruction, chaos, and grief. In comparison, a purposeful or accidental nuclear war between the U.S. and Russia would unquestionably kill tens of millions in the short-term, and untold millions in the long-term. Therefore, the threat of nuclear war is the most serious potential health, environmental, agricultural, educational and moral problem facing the human race.

Recently, President Barack Obama stated, "I will make the goal of elimination of nuclear weapons worldwide a central element of U.S. nuclear weapons policy." Without question, this is the most promising nuclear disarmament statement by a U.S. president in recent history. However, the

road to abolition will not be an easy one. The president will face many hurdles, given the financial and political power of the corporate/military nuclear weapons complex, and he must obtain strong grassroots support to convince members of Congress to endorse a comprehensive international disarmament regimen required to accomplish that goal.

Insufficient intellectual and political activity concerning nuclear disarmament, especially at the local level, is occurring in this country and the rest of the world. Despite the recent encouraging statements by well-known political figures both here and abroad, and excellent work by numerous non-governmental organizations, nuclear war prevention continues to rank low on the list of immediate citizen concerns. Additionally, most educators, clergy and social activists who normally focus on preventive measures regarding other deadly human problems, have seriously defaulted on the world's most pressing issue of survival. Nuclear war will not merely warm the planet, it will "sizzle" it.

It is with these educational, religious, and social activists in mind that Jared Gassen and I have written this book. I am an educational psychologist and adjunct professor of Peace Studies at the University of Missouri-Columbia and have been working towards nuclear abolition for

nearly 50 years. I am also a member of the Speakers Bureau of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation of Santa Barbara, California. Previous teaching assignments were at the Universities of Iowa and Southern Illinois-Carbondale, as well as Prescott College in Arizona. While at Iowa between 1973 and 1975, I was College Program Coordinator of the College of Law's Center for World Order Studies. From 1981 to 1985, I served as executive director of the Washington, D.C. based World Federalists Association. At that time, I was an early leader in the U.S. Nuclear Freeze movement. Later, I served as the manager of nationwide training courses for the U.S. Office of Personnel Management. In 2001, I received the Gandhi, King, Ikeda Peace Award from the Martin Luther King, Jr. International Chapel at Morehouse College, Atlanta, Georgia. All first-person statements in this book are my own, all of which are personal examples of what actions have, and have not, worked over the years.

Jared Gassen is a graduate student at the University of Missouri-Columbia School of Journalism. Without his efforts, this book would not have been completed. His work included writing about 35 pages to strengthen the arguments in the first four chapters, editing, fact-checking and updating information, and assembling and reformatting the manuscript

into its current form.

Within the following pages, we have attempted to equip activists with the tools needed to engage in ending nuclear weapons. We have concisely revisited the nuclear weapons issue and included a step-by-step roadmap for the abolition of nuclear weapons. Details of the roadmap, and related ideas, were secured from the writings of well-known nuclear weapons abolitionists Jonathan Schell, David Cortright, David Krieger, and the late Randall Caroline Forsberg. We have also described various social and psychological obstacles to education and action related to nuclear disarmament. The written works of Jerome D. Frank, Marc Pilisuk, Jamie Rowen, Judith Eve Lipton, and David Barash have informed this discussion. Moreover, inspiration for moral and environmental content regarding nuclear destruction and degradation was taken from the writings of our University of Missouri colleagues Steven Starr, director of the University's clinical science program, and from John Kultgen, Professor Emeritus of Philosophy.

One of the most important topics we address is "The Dialogue for Nuclear Disarmament." The late Dr. Theo F Lentz, director of the renowned Peace Research Lab in St. Louis, MO, originated this dialogue

process. It is a simple, democratic conversation technique that is used to fully engage individuals or small groups in careful, thoughtful exploration of various problems, obstacles, and solutions pertaining to the threat of nuclear war, and often results in the acquisition of substantial time, money and energy on behalf of nuclear disarmament.

Separate chapters are devoted to the role of education, religion, media, and the local community on behalf of nuclear weapons abolition. A unique feature of the book is the educational philosophic underpinning for instructional course development, with an emphasis on curriculum construction for academic institutions, faith communities, and local civic organizations.

The chapter on the media argues for the inclusion of a wider range of voices from the community and a more critical treatment of official sources. These conclusions are informed by a media content analysis using the Minot-Barksdale incident as a case study.

The chapter on religion makes the case that nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong, regardless of religious affiliation. The discussion of religion's role in nuclear disarmament has an extended description of the National Religious

Partnership on the Nuclear Weapons Danger, founded by the late Rev. William Sloan Coffin, former Yale University Chaplain and Executive Director of the nuclear disarmament organization, Sane-Freeze.

The final chapter describes a number of techniques for mobilization and civic participation in a variety of settings in which individuals and groups can provide and promote efforts on behalf of nuclear disarmament education. Numerous tips are also offered to conduct and organize public events such as "town meetings," public demonstrations, and non-violent direct action.

Bill Wickersham
November, 2009

The World Beyond the Megaton

by
Oscar Eggers

There is a world beyond the megaton

The intermittent rising rage

The anxious tear-washed peace that

sees no understanding beyond the
dream of understanding of yesterday

The stoic stance of statues bearing
spheres beyond the stars of chance

the matter power of orbit flight

and missile might

Beyond the world that made us
strongly weak and weakly strong

Beyond, but soon to touch our
fingertip and then our grasp

And in that grasp the clasp of faith
each in himself and theirs the other

As I am I of you and you are you of me

There is a world beyond

What may we yet together build?

What may we yet together be?

Upon some newer truths as yet unmade

Perhaps infinity.

Chapter I

The Nuclear Weapons Problem

The human race continues to be seriously threatened by thousands of strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. U.S. and Russian nuclear missiles can be launched in under four minutes, and have launch to landing times of 30 minutes or less. Additionally, various agents are seeking to acquire unsecured weapons and materials for clandestine missions of human destruction.

Today's world has nine nuclear-armed states—unlike when the U.S. was the only nuclear power and first used the technology against Japan without fear of reciprocation. About twenty additional states have the technology and know how to produce plutonium and make warheads, these countries are known as “virtual nuclear weapons states.” These virtual states are considered capable of producing a weapon within months if one chose to do so.¹ All of these countries are linked in a highly complex geopolitical interaction. Any nuclear action, whether ordered by a state or done by an independent agent, could be mistaken for an act of nuclear war.

¹ Borger, J. (2009, May 14). Mohamed El-Baradei warns of new nuclear age. *Guardian*. Retrieved from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/may/14/elbaradei-nuclear-weapons-states-un>

This could rapidly lead to nothing less than the end of all human life on earth.

Given the scope of the problem, one is inclined to assume that worldwide attention would be seriously focused on ways to eliminate the threat. Unfortunately, that is not the case.

What has brought us to this point?

The largest international effort to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and disarm states already with the capability is the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This treaty was the result of increased negotiations within the United Nations during the early 1960s, following momentum gained by President Dwight Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" plan, which proposed to spread peaceful nuclear technology while guarding against the spread of weaponization capabilities to more countries.² The treaty was opened for signatures in 1968 and currently is ratified by 189 countries.³

The treaty has ten articles, with the basic idea that the world is

² United Nations, 2005 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. (2005, May 2-27). History of the treaty. Retrieved from: <http://www.un.org/events/npt2005/background.html>

³ United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs. (n.d.). NPT (in alphabetical order). Retrieved from: <http://disarmament.un.org/TreatyStatus.nsf/NPT%20%28in%20alphabetical%20order%29?OpenView>

inherently less safe if nuclear weapons technology spreads to more countries. Therefore, the countries already possessing nuclear weapons would not share the technology with, or use a weapon against, a non-nuclear weapon state (Article I). While, a non-nuclear weapon state would not attempt to obtain the technology (Article II). The treaty specifically grants the “inalienable right” for all member countries to develop and use peaceful nuclear technology (Article IV).

The treaty was also meant to lead to complete disarmament. Article VI says countries should undertake negotiations to end the nuclear arms race and work towards a “Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.”⁴ However, when these negotiations were to take place was not specified and have been frequently delayed due to the U.S. and Russia’s unwillingness to completely disarm. While the NPT is signed by all but four countries in the world, this unwillingness to disarm by the two largest possessors of nuclear weapons, along with contradictions within the treaty itself, have seriously undermined the treaty’s effectiveness.

There was a period in the 1980's when the Nuclear Freeze Movement

⁴ A full text of the treaty can be obtained from the International Atomic Energy Agency at: <http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Infcircs/Others/infcirc140.pdf>

seemed to be making headway. Following the collapse of the Iron Curtain in 1989, President Bill Clinton proudly said at the beginning of his term that for the first time in several decades, Russians and Americans were not aiming nuclear missiles at each other's children. Needless to say, that was good news; the statement reflected the long-awaited reduction of political and military hostility between the superpowers.

Yet, the threat of nuclear annihilation remained. For starters, Clinton failed to mention that it takes just a few seconds to redirect both Russian and U.S. missiles to their Cold War targets. Additionally, even as the president announced the great upshot of the so-called "Peace Dividend," the U.S. Department of Defense under *his* command issued a set of strange statements that seriously undercut this message of hope. A study by the U.S. Strategic Command entitled "Essentials of Post-Cold War Deterrence," recommended that the U.S. continue the threat of nuclear destruction with an "irrational and vindictive" policy to ward off potential attackers such as North Korea, Iraq and others that were viewed as rogue states. The study stated:

Because of the value that comes from the ambiguity of what the United States might do to an adversary if the acts we seek to deter are carried out, it hurts to portray ourselves as too fully rational and coolheaded... The fact that some elements may

appear to be potentially 'out of control' can be beneficial to creating and reinforcing fears and doubts within the minds of an adversary's decision makers. That the U.S. may become irrational and vindictive if its vital interests are attacked should be part of the national persona we project to all adversaries."⁵

Clearly, President Clinton's publicly stated optimism was severely contradicted by policy planners within his administration. To his credit, he did seek support in the U.S. Senate for the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty although it was rejected, and to extend the Non Proliferation Treaty, which was set to expire in 1995. However, his overall effort to seek implementation of the disarmament provisions of Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), were anemic at best. And, his optimistic portrayal of U.S./Russian nuclear threat reductions helped to put the issue of nuclear war back into the closet.

When George W. Bush assumed the U.S. Presidency, any progress achieved since 1989 was quickly nullified. At the onset of his first term, Bush's military planners crafted a nuclear threat policy that appeared in the administration's "Nuclear Posture Review" (NPR)—a classified document

⁵ Policy Subcommittee of the Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) of the United States Strategic Command. (1995). *Essentials of post-Cold War deterrence*. Retrieved from: <http://nautilus.org/archives/nukestrat/USA/Advisory/essentials95.txt>
see also: Krieger, D. (1998). Nuclear weapons: A call for public protest. *Nuclear Age Peace Foundation*. Retrieved from: http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/1998/00/00_krieger_public-protest_print.htm

mandated by Congress that was leaked to the *Los Angeles Times* and *The New York Times* in March 2002. The NPR was a basic outline of the goals of the administration's national security strategy, including every situation in which the President might choose to use nuclear weapons. It outlined three such scenarios with which the U.S. would use nuclear forces:

1. Nuclear weapons could be deployed against targets capable of surviving non-nuclear attack;
2. In retaliation for use of nuclear, biological or chemical weapons:
3. In the event of "surprising" military developments.⁶

The NPR also said:

Nuclear weapons play a critical role in the defense capabilities of the United States, its allies and friends. They provide credible military options to deter a wide range of threats, including weapons of mass destruction and large-scale conventional military forces. These nuclear capabilities possess unique properties that give the United States options to hold at risk classes of targets that are important strategic and political objectives.⁷

This was an extraordinary admission of the benefits that U.S. leaders attributed to nuclear weapons in U.S. defense policy—benefits they

⁶ Gordon, C. (2003). *The New Nuclear Strategy*. The Washington Office of the Presbyterian Church (USA) Quarterly Bulletin, 3rd Quarter, p.2.

⁷ Krieger, D. (2002, November 26). *The Bush Administration nuclear policies and the response of citizens*. Nuclear Age Peace Foundation Newsletter, p.2.

sanctioned solely for themselves and a small group of other nuclear-weapons countries. The report further called for the development of contingency plans for the use of nuclear weapons against Russia and China, as well as Iraq, Iran, North Korea, Syria and Libya. Additionally, the administration's 2005 "Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations" reinforced the provisions of the NPR, including its policy of preemptive attacks on national or terrorist groups using weapons of mass destruction, the option of using nuclear arms to destroy known enemy stockpiles of nuclear, biological or chemical weapons.⁸

In sum, the Bush administration developed a strategy for indefinite reliance on nuclear weapons, and the maintenance of maintaining an industrial infrastructure to produce new and updated warheads to replace older models. This was a move explicitly opposed to measures agreed upon by the U.S. at the 2000 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference. Moreover, the Bush Administration began taking an aggressive stance against Russia, its one-time partner in de-militarization. One move that has been a central stumbling block is the proposed deployment of a ballistic missile defense system in Central Europe.

⁸ U.S. Department of Defense. (2005, March 15). Theater of nuclear operations, doctrine for joint operations, final coordination, Chapter 3, Page III-1, Joint Publication 3-12.

Russia's response to the Bush nuclear strategies, especially to the deployment of a ballistic missile defense system, was outlined in the October 3, 2003 issue of *The Moscow Times*. The article reported that President Vladimir Putin had ordered top military commanders to put multi-warhead SS-19 intercontinental ballistic missiles on combat duty. A Defense Ministry paper released in conjunction with Putin's statement warned that Russia might have to modify its plans for nuclear defense strategy if NATO did not change what it called its "anti-Russian strategy."

Russia's movements were not, in themselves, aggressive. They were reactions to the Bush administration's threatening posture. In that same 2003 article, Putin noted that his new efforts were instituted to upgrade his country's land-based strategic nuclear arsenal and to maintain its defense system. "I am speaking here about the most menacing missiles, of which we have dozens with hundreds of warheads," Putin told a gathering of commanders and Kremlin officials at a defense military headquarters. "Their capability to overcome any anti-missile system is unrivaled."⁹

In addition to Russia and the U.S., the Nuclear Non-Proliferation

⁹ Saradzhvan, S. (2003, October 3). Putin Beefs Up ICBM Capacity. *The Moscow Times*, p.1. Retrieved from: <http://www.themoscowtimes.ru/stories/2003/10/03/001.html>

Treaty explicitly recognizes six other nuclear weapons states¹⁰: The United Kingdom, France, China, India, Pakistan, and North Korea. The latter three states are outside of the treaty and have each presented their own unique challenges.

India was one of the first countries to propose an end to nuclear testing in 1954, as well as provided many of the principles of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1965. However, India has not signed the treaty because it says that rather than addressing the central objective of universal non-proliferation, the treaty legitimizes the continuing possession of nuclear stockpiles by those few states that possess them. The treaty only worked when nuclear weapon states disarmed, in addition to non-weapon states not attempting to acquire them.¹¹

In a speech before the United Nations in 1988, Rajiv Gandhi, then India's Prime Minister, argued, "We cannot accept the logic that a few nations have the right to pursue their security by threatening the survival of mankind...nor is it acceptable that those who possess nuclear weapons are freed of all controls while those without nuclear weapons are policed

¹⁰ "Nuclear weapons state" is an internationally designated status conferred by the NPT.

¹¹ Embassy of India. (n.d.) Nuclear non-proliferation. Retrieved from: http://www.indianembassy.org/policy/CTBT/embassy_non_proliferation.htm

against their production.”¹¹

Within 15 years of independence from British Colonialism, India lost badly in a short war started by China over disputed territory. India’s feeling of vulnerability was heightened by China’s successful nuclear weapons testing in 1964. This led to the creation of their own nuclear program that same year, and the successful detonation of a nuclear device in 1974. India was thwarted from detonating additional tests on three additional occasions—in 1982, 1995 and 1997—primarily due to being caught by CIA spy satellites preparing for the tests and the heavy international pressure that ensued to abandon the testing. Despite this, in what is considered one of the CIA’s biggest intelligence failures, India was able to test five nuclear devices in 1998.¹²

Even though remaining outside of the NPT, the U.S. announced a nuclear cooperation deal with India that would allow it to trade in nuclear materials. While, part of the agreement requires monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency, which is the U.N. sanctioned monitor

¹² Chengappa, R. (2000). *Weapons of Peace: Secret Story of India’s Quest to be a Nuclear Power*. Harpercollins India.

of the NPT, this deal further erodes the treaty's strength.¹³ India received its first batch of uranium fuel from France in March 2009 and will continue to receive regular supplies from French and Russian companies.¹⁴

Pakistan began its nuclear program in response to India's successful detonation in 1975. Both countries have also taken a similar position on the NPT and Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Uranium enrichment reportedly began in 1976, after A.Q. Khan stole blueprints of a centrifuge from a European lab. Allegations have also been made, mostly by India and the U.S., that the origins of Pakistan's program lies with China, in part because Pakistan's bombs closely resemble Chinese design. While Pakistan's technical base was slower than India's, the U.S. concluded Pakistan had the capability to build a nuclear device in 1990. The first device was not detonated until 1998, three weeks after India's successful test.

Shortly after this, scandal arose when it became clear that Khan was at the center of an international proliferation network. In a televised

¹³ International Atomic Energy Agency. (2008, July 9). Nuclear verification: The conclusion of safeguards agreements and additional protocols, (Agreement Text). Retrieved from: www.isis-online.org.

¹⁴ "India's 1st N-Fuel Supply This Week," (2009, March 31). *The Asian Age*. Retrieved from: <http://www.asianage.com/archive/htmlfiles/India/India%E2%80%99s%201st%20N-fuel%20supply%20this%20week.html>

confession in 2005, Khan admitted selling nuclear technology to Libya, Iran, and North Korea between 1989 and 2000. The network involved many middlemen and stretched from Germany to the Middle East and from China to South Asia. It was the worst known case of nuclear proliferation in history.¹⁵

The Pakistani government has since strengthened legislation on export controls and nuclear safety. Their official stance is that the Khan network is a closed case and all investigations are complete, while the full extent of other Pakistani official involvement in the network is still not clear. In addition to these problems, the U.S. has secretly provided at least \$100 million to help secure Pakistan's nuclear arsenal as part of the war on terror and the fight against the Taliban. This is only a small part of about \$10 billion given to Pakistan since Sept. 11, 2001.¹⁶

North Korea's history with nuclear politics dates back to the Korean War, when U.S. political leaders threatened the use of nuclear weapons to win a war that was otherwise grinding to a stalemate. The U.S. first put nuclear weapons in South Korea in 1958, and they stayed until 1991. North

¹⁵ Pike, J. (2005). A.Q. Khan. Globalsecurity.org. Retrieved from: <http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/world/pakistan/khan.htm>

¹⁶ Sanger, D., & Broad, W.J. (2007, November 2007). U.S. secretly aids Pakistan in guarding nuclear arms. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/18/washington/18nuke.html>

Korean government statements often cite the U.S. as a nuclear threat and claim the U.S. still has over 1,000 nuclear weapons in South Korea.¹⁷

North Korea's nuclear program dates back to the early 1960's when it constructed a research complex and small reactor with help from the Soviet Union, who also provided fuel for the reactor until 1973. Its nuclear weapon program started in the 1980's, when it constructed reprocessing facilities for the creation of Plutonium. Under international pressure, North Korea signed the NPT In 1985, but did not allow the IAEA to inspect its programs until 1992. A year later, North Korea announced it was withdrawing from the treaty which caused heightened tensions with the U.S. and South Korea. With intense diplomacy, North Korea agreed to stay in the treaty and to freeze its nuclear program in exchange for replacing the energy lost from the reactors.¹⁸

Even after this agreement, North Korea secretly continued its program with the assistance of Khan's proliferation network. In 2002, North Korean officials acknowledged the existence of a clandestine enrichment program. In January 2003, North Korea announced its intention to

¹⁷ North Korea Nuclear Overview. (2009, June). James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies. Retrieved from: http://www.nti.org/e_research/profiles/NK/Nuclear/index.html

¹⁸ Chaffee, D. (2003, April 10). North Korea's withdrawal from nonproliferation treaty official. Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. Retrieved from: http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/2003/04/10_chaffee_korea-npt.htm

withdrawal from the NPT, again. Shortly later, North Korea admitted they possessed nuclear weapons and demanded one-on-one negotiations with the U.S. This time, however, the Bush Administration refused to engage bilaterally as the Clinton Administration successfully did. The unproductive diplomacy led directly to North Korea's first nuclear test, a one-kiloton underground explosion in October 2006.¹⁹

The explosion was a wake-up call to the world and caused a higher level of diplomacy with the six-party talks. The back and forth negotiations were seemingly going well, North Korea agreed to give a full accounting of its nuclear program and disable its facilities. The progress was most visible with the demolition of the cooling tower at a nuclear reactor site broadcasted by the international media.²⁰

Despite the apparent progress, the six-party talks met an impasse on a verification plan for disablement. Negotiations have deteriorated further with North Korea exploding a more powerful device on May 25, 2009 and

¹⁹ Aftergood, S., & Kristenson, H.M. (2006, November 16). Federation of American Scientists. Retrieved from: www.fas.org/nuke/guide/dprk/nuke/

²⁰ Harden, B., & Kim, S. (2008, June 28). N. Korea razes cooling tower in show of nuclear accord. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/story/2008/06/26/ST2008062601444.html>

test firing other ballistic missiles.²¹ In the meantime, they have also been constructing a long-range missile launch site since 2000. This site has a 10-story tower which can support their largest ballistic and space launch devices.²²

There is, however, one other nuclear weapons state. Israel has hidden its capabilities, and has placed its own interests above those of world safety. Israel has a history of preemptively bombing nuclear facilities in the Middle East, starting with Iraq in 1981.²³ They again secretly bombed Syria in September 2007. U.S. and Israeli sources claimed that Syria was building a nuclear reactor with the help of North Korea.²⁴ This history makes Israeli threats to preemptively bomb suspected Iranian nuclear facilities highly credible.²⁵ Meanwhile, Israel certainly has nuclear weapons, but it has officially refused to confirm or deny this fact.

²¹ Lewis, P. (2009, May 25). North Korea conducts nuclear test. James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies. Retrieved from: cns.miis.edu/activities/pdfs/pr090525_dprk_analysis.pdf

²² "N Korea Builds New Missile Launch Pad: S Korean Minister." (2008, September 11). Agence France Presse. Retrieved from:

http://afp.google.com/article/ALEqM5iv5xQXa22tURCtvc3PyG0_DVsAOQ

²³ BBC on this day June 7, 1981: Israel bombs Baghdad nuclear reactor. (2005). BBC Online. Retrieved from:

http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/june/7/newsid_3014000/3014623.stm

²⁴ Hersh, S.M. (2008, February 11). Annals of National Security: A strike in the dark. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from: http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2008/02/11/080211fa_fact_hersh

²⁵ Frenkel, S. (2009, April 18). Israel stands ready to bomb Iran's nuclear sites. *Times of London Online*. Retrieved from:

http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/middle_east/article6115903.ece

Its nuclear weapons program began with materials stolen from the U.S. in the early 1950's. In the 1960's, with the help of French engineers, Israel secretly constructed a nuclear enrichment facility. Located in the Negrev desert, the Dimona facility is capable of producing the plutonium necessary for nuclear weapons, not merely the uranium necessary for nuclear power. Israel has never permitted international inspectors to visit this site, and so has acted outside of international law.

Thanks to information leaked by nuclear technician Mordechai Vanunu, the existence of Israel's nuclear arsenal is without doubt. Shortly after revealing this information, Vanunu was lured to Rome where he was drugged and smuggled back to Israel.²⁶ He was then convicted of treason and imprisoned for 18 years, with the first 11½ years in solitary confinement, being freed in April 2004.²⁷ Based on his information, Israel is estimated to have at least 100 and perhaps as many as 400 strategic nuclear weapons, with the fissile materials necessary to build more being stockpiled everyday.

Clearly, all nuclear weapons states have to be fully taken into account

²⁶ Vanunu's initial leaks appeared October 5, 1986 in *The Sunday Times*. To read the *Times'* 1986 coverage of his claims and arrest, go to:

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/article830147.ece>

²⁷ Israeli nuclear spy released. (2004, April 21). *CNN*. Retrieved from:

<http://www.cnn.com/2004/WORLD/meast/04/21/israel.vanunu/>

as incremental moves are sought toward nuclear disarmament and the abolition of both tactical and strategic weapons. However, the focus of this book is limited to the two greatest nuclear powers: the U.S. and Russia. Only when both of these global superpowers genuinely abide by the nuclear disarmament provisions of the NPT and work towards new agreements, will the abolition process have any real chance of success. Action to accomplish this goal must be started here in the U.S., now.

Chapter II

Nuclear Weapons on Hair-Trigger Alert

Currently, there are over 23,000 nuclear weapons in the world—a total of over 100,000 Hiroshima bombs or 7000 megatons of TNT. At its peak in 1964, the U.S. alone had the equivalent of 17,000 megatons. For perspective, all of the bombs dropped during WWII totaled only 3 megatons, which is about ten average-sized strategic nuclear weapons. Combined, the U.S. and Russia possess over 97 percent of these weapons. Of which, about 3,500 remain on high alert status and are ready

to be launched in minutes.²⁸

In a time of crisis or perceived attack, the Russian and U.S. presidents have three and eight minutes, respectively, to make a decision to order an attack against each other. Thus, a single miscalculation or computer error could lead to nuclear war (see table in appendix). Political leaders have taken elaborate steps to comfort these fears. However, the mere existence of these weapons maintains the possibility of an unpredicted sequence of events leading to its use.²⁹

A major obstacle to nuclear disarmament is the widespread belief by "political realists" and many other people throughout the world that nuclear weapons threat systems can be maintained ad infinitum without serious mistakes or accidental war. Such thinking is far from realistic. The true realists are those who endorse "Murphy's Law" which states, "Nothing is as easy as it looks. Everything takes longer than you expect. If anything can go wrong, it will at the worst possible moment."

Over the years, dozens of U.S. and Russian accidents and incidents with nuclear weapons have occurred. In some cases, near misses could

²⁸ Global Nuclear Arsenal 2009. (2009). Nucleardarkness.org. Retrieved from:<http://www.nucleardarkness.org/globalnucleararsenal/globalnucleararsenal/>

²⁹ see Atomic Energy Commission/Department of Defense. (1962). *The effects of nuclear weapons*.

have resulted in massive death and destruction. Fortunately, none of these episodes resulted in nuclear explosions. The following are a few examples of serious situations in which Murphy's Law was operable.

In early September 1983, tension between the Soviet Union and the United States was at a high point. Not only had the Soviet military recently downed a Korean passenger plane, but the United States was also conducting training exercises in Europe that focused on the use of tactical nuclear weapons against the Soviets. These exercises led some Soviet leaders to worry that the West was planning a nuclear attack.

To make matters worse, on September 26, 1983, the alarms in a Soviet early warning bunker, just south of Moscow, sounded as computer screens indicated that the United States had launched a nuclear strike against the Soviet Union. Lt. Colonel Stanislav Petrov was in charge of the bunker and its 200 personnel. His job was to monitor incoming satellite signals and report directly to the Russian early-warning system headquarters if indicators revealed that a U.S. missile attack was underway. Years later, Col. Petrov said, "I just felt as if I had been punched in my nervous system. There was a huge map of the States with a U.S. base lit up, showing that the missiles had been launched."

Douglas Mattern, President of the Association of World Citizens, described the scene:

For several minutes Petrov held a phone in one hand and an intercom in the other as alarms continued blaring, red lights blinking, and the computers reporting that U.S missiles were on their way. In the midst of this horrific chaos and terror, with the prospect of the end of civilization itself, Petrov made a historic decision not to alert higher authorities, believing in his gut and hoping with all that is sacred, that contrary to what all the sophisticated equipment was reporting, this alarm was an error... As agonizing minutes passed, Petrov's decision proved correct. It was a computer error that signaled a US, attack.³⁰

Had Petrov obeyed standard operating procedures by reporting the erroneous attack, it is likely that Soviet missiles would have devastated all major U.S. cities—and the Pentagon would have retaliated. "In principle, a nuclear war could have broken out. The whole world could have been destroyed," Petrov concluded.³¹

On Dateline NBC, November 12, 2000, Dr. Bruce Blair, former U.S. Minuteman launch officer and president of the Washington, D.C. based Center for Defense Information, said, "I think that this is the closest we've come to accidental nuclear war."³¹

³⁰ Association of World Citizens. (2004, Fall). A forgotten hero of our time honored with special world citizen award. Association of World Citizens Newsletter, p-1.

³¹ Association of World Citizens. (2004, Fall). A forgotten hero of our time honored with special world citizen award. Association of World Citizens Newsletter, p-2.

On January 25, 1995, another potentially disastrous early warning error occurred when Russian radar mistook a U.S. weather research rocket launched from Norway as an incoming nuclear strike from a U.S. Trident submarine. Even though the United States had notified Russia it would launch a non-military research rocket, those in control of Russia's strategic nuclear weapons did not receive the message. Fortunately, Russian President Boris Yeltsin, a man with a drinking problem, who had three minutes to order a retaliatory strike, elected to "ride out" the crisis and did not launch the thousands of nuclear-tipped missiles available on his command.³²

In 2001, it was reported that Russia's nuclear command and control system had seriously deteriorated, and its network of early-warning satellites was also on the verge of collapse. On average, the surviving elements of the system provided only "single string" coverage, meaning that one launch warning could not possibly be confirmed by another. Of equal concern was the fact that even the single-string coverage was operational for only about half of every day.³³ While the command and

³² Tri-Valley Committee Against Radioactive Environment. (1999). Back from the brink—Aims to reduce risk of accidental launch. Press Release. Retrieved from:

<http://www.trivalleycares.org/newsletter/cwdec99.asp>.

³³ Coalition to Reduce the Nuclear Dangers. (2001). Standing down U.S. and Russian nuclear

control structure was improved under President Putin, the dangers of false alarms and computer glitches have not disappeared.³⁴

Accident information related to Soviet/Russian nuclear weapons is not readily available, but it is safe to assume that their record is no better than the United States, which has many “false alarms” and significant accidents.³⁵ The Department of Defense first published a list of thirteen accidents in 1968, dating back to 1950, and published another list in 1980, but has not updated it since.³⁶ Exactly how many may never be known due to the probability that some mishaps were not reported, while others may still be classified.

The U.S. has irretrievably lost nuclear weapons on at least seven occasions prior to 1963. Each loss resulted from a nuclear-armed plane either crashing into the ocean or jettisoning the weapons after experiencing mechanical failures. Including the first acknowledged accident, which

weapons: The time for meaningful action is now. ISSE Brief, 5 (8), pp.1-2.

³⁴ Woolf, A.F. (2003, August 15). Nuclear weapons in Russia: Safety, security, and control issues. Congressional Research Service. Retrieved from: www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/crs/ib98038.pdf; see also: Bunn, M., and Wier, A. (2005, May). Securing the bomb 2005: The new global imperatives. Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government Harvard University. Retrieved from: www.nti.org/e_research/report_cnmupdate2005.pdf

³⁵ For a historical accounting of U.S. nuclear accidents, see: <http://www.nuclearfiles.org/menu/key-issues/nuclear-weapons/issues/accidents/index.htm>

³⁶ Tiwari, J., & Gray, C. (2009). U.S. nuclear weapons accidents. Center for Defense Information. Retrieved from: <http://www.cdi.org/Issues/NukeAccidents/Accidents.htm>

occurred in February 1950, when a bomb was jettisoned into the Pacific Ocean and never found again.³⁷

Another such event occurred on February 5, 1958, when a B-47 on a top-secret training flight, carrying a 7,600-pound Hydrogen bomb, collided with another military plane. The B-47's wing was badly damaged and the plane began nose-diving towards the ground. Rather than immediately ejecting from the airplane, the pilots bravely decided to try a crash landing. In order to lighten the aircraft and to eliminate the danger of an enormous explosion upon impact, the H-bomb was released into the Atlantic near Savannah, Georgia. The pilots were able to walk away from the landing, earning a Distinguished Flying Cross for their actions.

A search was immediately conducted, but was unsuccessful in recovering the weapon. Numerous subsequent searches have also been conducted over the fifty years since the event; all have been unsuccessful. Debate continues about its safety and location. The Air Force says it is safe wherever it is, and the pilot insists that a nuclear explosion is not possible because the bomb was not equipped with the plutonium trigger. Others fear it, along with any of the other lost bombs, could still potentially

³⁷ U.S. nuclear weapons accidents: Danger in our midst. (1997, August). Retrieved from: <http://www.milnet.com/cdiart.htm>

explode, destroying a large section of the East Coast, or an unwanted agent could recover it.³⁸

Other accidents have resulted in nuclear weapons being dropped onto land. About a month after the above incident, another B-47 accidentally dropped an unarmed nuclear weapon over Mars Bluff, South Carolina. The conventional explosive material of the device exploded on impact destroying a house and creating a crater about 70 feet across and 30 feet deep.

A B-52 bomber released two 24-megaton bombs over Goldsboro, North Carolina after structural failure on January 23, 1961. On one of these bombs, five of six interlocking safety devices failed. While these six devices were only part of the total safety mechanism and a detonation was not likely, the accident resulted in additional safety devices added to the weapons. An explosion of one of the bombs would have been 1,800 times more powerful than the bomb that exploded at Hiroshima, and would have left a hole called "North Carolina".³⁷

Two more extremely serious accidents occurred when nuclear-armed B-52's crashed in the late 1960s, causing the only two acknowledged

³⁸ Northam, G. (2009, June 22). Missing for 50 years-US nuclear bomb. *BBC*. Retrieved from: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/8107908.stm>

widespread scattering of nuclear materials. On January 17, 1966, a mid-air collision caused a B-52 with four 20-megaton bombs to crash near Palomares, Spain. Two of the weapons' high explosive material detonated on impact, scattering plutonium over about one square mile. The military spent the next 44 days removing 1,750 tons of soil back to South Carolina, and plowed under another 600 acres of topsoil to remove contamination. Another weapon fell into the ocean, causing "the most expensive, intensive, harrowing and feverish underwater search for a man-made object in world history."³⁹ The fourth weapon was recovered intact.

Nearby residents applied for nearly eight million dollars in compensation but received only about \$700,000. A 2007 Spanish study found that contamination was nearly three times larger than previously thought, and Spain has banned building or selling produce grown inside the area.⁴⁰

Two years later, another B-52 carrying four 1.1-megaton bombs crashed near Thule, Greenland. The conventional explosives detonated on all four of the weapons, releasing plutonium and causing a massive fire. A

³⁹ Palomares after the fall. (1969, January 24). *Time Magazine*. Retrieved from: <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,900563,00.html>

⁴⁰ Fuchs, D. (2007, July 2). More than 40 years on, Spain revisits a nuclear accident. *Guardian*. Retrieved from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2007/jul/02/spain.nuclear>

large-scale clean up effort was undertaken to bring contaminated ice and wreckage back to the U.S. Within days of the crash, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara ordered the removal of nuclear weapons from airborne alert, and policy was later changed to stop all airborne alert flights.

Denmark, which owns Greenland, prohibits nuclear weapons on or over their territory. The accident caused large demonstrations against the U.S. and its base. The clean up and compensation, while never fully disclosed, was in the millions of dollars.³⁷

Chapter III

The Role of Media in Covering Nuclear Weapons Accidents

Given the possible catastrophic consequences of such early warning errors and potential catastrophic accidents, it is reasonable to assume that such mishaps would have attracted worldwide attention. However, as with dozens of other historical nuclear weapons accidents and errors, they were not widely reported by the media, and went largely ignored by the general public.

Ignoring these facts can be dangerous. One personal example began in a restaurant in Iowa City, Iowa in 1975. I was having a conversation with a friend concerning issues of nuclear weapons and the possibility that they might be plagued with mechanical failures or computer glitches. A young fellow sitting next to us leaned over and said, "Do you really want to know how those things work?"

I obviously asked him to join us. He told us he had served four years as a launch technician on one of the Titan missiles deployed at an Air Force base near Tucson, Arizona. I made arrangements for him to come to my apartment the next morning to talk more. I asked him several questions about his work, including my concern about the possibility that Titan missiles were subject to malfunctions of various kinds.

The man told me that one of his biggest concerns was the strong possibility that Titans, even when not activated, would explode in their silos. He said that a red gaseous substance that powered the missiles, which his fellow airmen referred to as "Big Mother Fucking Red" (BMFR), often leaked and spewed from pipes that were part of the missiles launch system. He also said that the gas was of considerable concern to some of the officers and enlisted personnel who were in charge of the missiles.

After talking with the man on another occasion, I asked if he would be willing to discuss the possibility that a Titan might explode to a newspaper reporter. He said yes, so I placed a call to a well-known journalist named Marquis Childs, whom I thought might be interested in doing a story. When Mr. Childs and I talked, he expressed interest in doing an interview with the man. The arrangements were made and the interview took place. Following the interview, Childs and I had a conversation in which he told me he would likely do a story, but he needed to check with some of his military sources. After doing so, he said later that he had decided to not do the story.

It was truly unfortunate that Childs decided not to do the story. On August 26, 1978, at a Titan II nuclear weapons base near Wichita, Kansas, one man was killed and six injured when deadly fumes leaked from an intercontinental ballistic missile while it was being filled with the BMFR propellant. When the accident was reported, the gas was still leaking, forcing the evacuation of residents of Rock, Kansas.⁴¹

A second Titan II accident occurred on September 19, 1980, at Titan II Launch Complex near Dasmascus, Arkansas. It was the site of "the most

⁴¹ Beitler, S. (2009, July 20). Rock, KS missile silo accident, Aug 1978. *UPI*. Retrieved from: <http://www3.gendisasters.com/kansas/13357/rock-ks-missile-silo-accident-aug-1978>

highly publicized disaster in the history of the Titan II missile program.” An airman was killed, 21 more were injured, and the complex was destroyed at an estimated cost of nearly \$250 million.

The disaster started when a serviceman dropped a wrench 80 feet onto the rocket, causing a leak of the BMFR gas from the first-stage fuel tank. Within hours, nearby civilians were evacuated. About 12 hours after the leak began, the missile exploded, blowing the 740-ton launch duct closure door 200 feet into the air and some 600 feet from the launch complex. The nuclear warhead landed about 100 feet from the launch complex's entry gate. Fortunately, its safety features operated correctly and prevented any loss of radioactive material.⁴²

The Titan II explosions are examples in which journalists and others failed to fully take into account ideas and reports of individuals who do not hold a high status in an organization or society. In the case of the Titan whistleblower's story being scraped, it is likely that the word of a high-ranking officer (to whom the actual workings of a missile were probably abstractions) was believed, rather than that of a low-ranking enlisted man with first-hand knowledge of their danger. Marquis Childs may have sought

⁴² Christ, M.K. (2007, February 7). Titan II missile explosion. The Encyclopedia of Arkansas History & Culture. Retrieved from: <http://www.encyclopediaofarkansas.net/encyclopedia/entry-detail.aspx?search=1&entryID=2543>

the view of a Pentagon insider, who I can easily imagine assured him there was really nothing to worry about, or, he may have just flatly discounted the warning. Either way, two tragedies occurred after the story could have run. It is unclear, and unlikely, that the story would have prevented the tragedies, but it is likely that perceived "high official" opinion trumped that of an on-line technician who clearly knew what he was talking about.

Unfortunately, this scenario plays out untold times, as one of the most consistently replicated findings of research in American journalism is the dependence of professional journalists on government sources. These sources dominate news coverage because their statements are assumed to be authoritative and newsworthy, thereby giving the same perception to the story itself.⁴³ This has particularly been the case with National Security and nuclear weapons issues starting with the Cold War.⁴⁴ Following the National Security Act of 1948, secrecy and closed, elite decision making developed along with the vast expansion of military and intelligence bureaucracies. This system has largely shut out media, except through

⁴³ Gans, H. (1979). *Deciding What's News*. NY: Pantheon.; Soley, L. (1989). *The News Shapers: The Individuals Who Explain the News*. Minneapolis, MN: School of Journalism and Mass Communication.

⁴⁴ Meyer, D. (1995, April). Framing National Security: Elite public discourse on nuclear weapons during the Cold War. *Political Communication*, 12(2), 173-192.

routine channels, such as press conferences, press officers and government spokespeople. Often times, for fear of organizational reprisal, sources outside of these channels only speak on condition of anonymity.

Some researchers argue that reliance on routine channels and contacts initiated by officials results in stories that are often echo-chambers of government, while nongovernmental sources, or low-status government sources, rarely have the power to initiate stories. These factors combine in the larger social structure to narrow social discourse, making media agents of social control.

With the development and evolution of the Internet, some long held assumptions of accepted journalism practice are being challenged. Weblogs and blogging have developed entirely within the context of the Internet, rather than a lot of other on-line news, which is largely print-style adapted to the Internet platform. Blogs pose a challenge to journalistic authority and force professional journalists to renegotiate their roles as providers of authoritative political news.⁴⁵ On the Internet, most anyone with access can make a claim to knowledge. This challenges professional

⁴⁵ Carlson, M. (2007). Blogs and journalistic authority. *Journalism Studies* 8(2): 264–279.

journalists to distinguish their work from that of others. Just how this distinction will emerge has yet to be fully explored.

The topic is interesting grounds for observing the clash over who should have a right to speak in the political process and where those voices are currently given access. One recent opportunity to study the question began on August 29, 2007, when six nuclear warheads were flown under the wing of a B-52 Stratofortress from Minot Air Base in North Dakota to Barksdale Air Base in Louisiana. This was the first known flight by a nuclear-armed bomber over U.S. airspace without authorization in 40 years.⁴⁶ Accidents involving nuclear weapons have occurred in the past, but never in history has a nuclear weapon been loaded onto a plane without authorization. Effectively, for 36 hours, the location and condition of six of the world's most dangerous weapons were unknown.

The incident triggered a “Bent Spear” nuclear incident report that went straight to Defense Secretary Robert Gates and President George W. Bush. Gates immediately ordered a service-wide stand down of all nuclear weapons until an inventory and investigation was conducted, The investigation eventually led to the discipline of 70 service people, including

⁴⁶ Warrick, J., & Pincus, W. (2007, September 23) Missteps in the bunker. *The Washington Post*. p. A1.

firing Air Force Secretary Michael Wynne and Minot Base Commander Bruce Emig.

Talking during a press conference, Gates said the military was doing its best to reduce the chances of another such incident "to the lowest level humanly possible." But it "would be silly" to promise it won't happen again."⁴⁷ Clearly, Gates understands Murphy's Law.

The incident had to be either a potentially atomic explosion-level blunder or the service personnel responsible were operating under direct orders from outside the conventionally recognized chain of command. It is not clear which option is less troubling, but either option presents a good argument for the abolition of nuclear weapons.

News of the event did not surface until a week later, when the *Military Times* first reported the story. The facts of the case were leaked by three unnamed airmen.⁴⁸ Adding to the strangeness of the incident, the initial story reported five warheads were involved, while a follow-up reported six. Shortly thereafter, Internet sites connected a number of 'accidental' deaths

⁴⁷ Nuclear safety: Air Force to dismiss officers responsible for armed missile flight. (2007, October 19). *Greenwire*, Security Vol. 10 No. 9.

⁴⁸ Hoffman, M. (2007, Sept. 5). B-52 mistakenly flies with nukes aboard. *The Military Times*. Retrieved from: http://www.armytimes.com/news/2007/09/marine_nuclear_B52_070904w/

of Minot service people during the week of August 29 to the transfer incident.⁴⁹

A content analysis was conducted with 23 newspaper, 20 wire service, and 17 weblog stories on the incident to test how these media platforms covered the incident differently. Out of 353 citations from wires and newspapers on the topic, not one raised the possibility of the incident being a deliberate action. This strengthens the notion that traditional media is dismissive of alternate accounts, as these reports wholly ignored alternate accounts. Instead, 236 of these citations were related to the incident being an accident, reinforcing the official story from the Air Force. Alternatively, blog stories only included 38 accident citations, but included 28 citations for a deliberate action.

The traditional media platforms of newspapers and wire services were found to include statist sources, primarily from the military, more frequently than blogs. Meanwhile, non-government sourcing for the traditional platforms was miniscule. Only 24 citations came from a non-government source, of these, 18 were from the same person, Hans Christensen, from the Federation of American Scientists.

⁴⁹ Nazemroaya, M.D. (2007, Oct. 29). Missing nukes: Treason of the highest order. Retrieved from: <http://globalresearch.ca/PrintArticle.php?articleId=7158>

The results of this analysis shows that the traditional media dramatically limited the spectrum of acceptable discourse on the incident and squeezed out additional voices that could have contributed to a more complete view. One specific example of a left out category of sourcing was service people whose job was to load nuclear weapons, either current or retired. The blogosphere was shown to include more voices and had a wider spectrum of discourse. Some blogosphere stories did include this disregarded category, of which, the sources repudiated the plausibility of the official story.

The results also show that traditional media relied almost exclusively on the Air Force itself for the authoritative account of the event, and failed to provide probing questions to some rather troubling holes in the official story. Follow-up reporting reinforced this account by focusing almost exclusively on the pentagon's investigations, but did not make the effort of finding corroborating or contradicting evidence outside of high officials and spokespeople.

Stories from bloggers had a more critical tone and included more non-statist voices. They were willing to entertain the possibility, and ask questions about, alternative explanations of the event.

A free society depends on a free media to provide accurate contextualized information to help citizens make well-informed decisions. This and other media studies demonstrate that traditional media is not properly serving this function. While the blogosphere is growing rapidly in both size and influence, bloggers still do not have the economic or institutional resources to leverage answers from a closed governmental information system. Therefore, bloggers and the community at large still remain dependent on professional media to gain this access.

Journalists and “citizen” journalists alike must reverse this trend of dependence and naive acceptance of high officials who perpetuate illogical and unsafe nuclear weapons systems. Journalists of all types must be more critical of these statements and balance their perspective with additional sources.

Chapter IV

A Roadmap for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons

Despite signing the Non-Proliferation Treaty and other treaties limiting nuclear weapons, U.S. and Russian leadership have missed opportunities to reach necessary, irreversible cuts in nuclear stockpiles.

The 1986 meeting between Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev in Reykjavik, Iceland was nearly successful in reaching an agreement to completely eliminate nuclear weapons within 15 years. Unfortunately, a deal broke down. One primary reason was that Russian nuclear weapons reductions were conditional to an American agreement not to withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, which limited strategic missile defense. Reagan was convinced that if a missile defense shield could be built, then nuclear weapons would become useless. Reagan refused to give up U.S. plans for the Strategic Defense Initiative (a.k.a. “Star Wars”), which was a space-based plan for missile defense, whether it violated the ABM Treaty or not.⁵⁰ The missile defense issue was not resolved at the summit and still remains a central component to negotiations.

The meeting did lay the groundwork for the momentous 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), which required each country to reduce strategic deployment from about 10,000 to less than 6,000 warheads. Russia then ratified START II, which would reduce warhead levels to under 3,500, while Putin was calling for talks to reduce levels to as low as 1,000. Putin warned that these offers would be off the table if the

⁵⁰ Sokov, N. (2007, December). Reykjavik Summit: The legacy and a lesson for the future. *Nuclear Threat Initiative*. Retrieved from: http://www.nti.org/e_research/e3_95.html

U.S. continued plans to build a missile defense in violation of the ABM Treaty.⁵¹

Amazingly, Clinton Administration “talking points” were leaked to the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, which said the Russians need not fear a missile defense if Russia kept 2,500 weapons on launch-on-warning, hair-trigger alert. Not only was the U.S. rejecting Putin’s offer, but they were insisting that 2,500 warheads could overwhelm the planned missile defense system.⁵² Further killing negotiations, the U.S. Senate did not ratify START II in 1997.

The U.S. officially withdrew from the ABM treaty under President Bush in November 2001 to ramp up the missile defense program.⁵³ Bush also made it clear that the U.S. was not interested in START III.⁵⁴ Instead, the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT) was agreed upon by Presidents Bush and Putin in 2002. This treaty was much weaker in its verification requirements and did not address over 14,000 warheads both

⁵¹ Kimball, D.G. (2009, June 19). The START follow-on agreement and beyond. Arms Control Association. Retrieved from: http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2009_5/US-Russia

⁵² Slater, A. (2009, July 17). US plans for missile defense sabotage nuclear disarmament talks with Russia. Retrieved from: <http://www.counterpunch.org/slatter07142009.html>

⁵³ Perez-Rivas, M. (2001, December 14). U.S. quits ABM treaty. *CNN*. Retrieved from: <http://archives.cnn.com/2001/ALLPOLITICS/12/13/rec.bush.abm/>

⁵⁴ Sokov, N. (2001). U.S. Withdrawal from the ABM Treaty: Post-mortem and possible consequences. Center for Nonproliferation Studies. Retrieved from: <http://cns.miis.edu/reports/2abm.htm>

countries have intact but not regarded as “strategic.” It did limit each country to deploy 2,200 strategic nuclear weapons when the treaty expires in 2012, but the treaty expires on the day the limit takes effect.⁵¹

The implementation of the SORT Treaty is a good example of arms control obfuscation. While it reduced the number of missiles deployed, it has not resulted in actual destruction of the weapons stockpile in the spirit of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

It is also disingenuous to tout nuclear missile reductions while at the same time, the U.S. military has been developing space-based weapons since the creation of the U.S. Space Command in 1982. Currently, the U.S. Space Command employs about 40,000 people with a mission to “Provide an integrated constellation of space and cyberspace capabilities at the speed of need.”⁵⁵ Expressed in another way, from a document pulled from their website for being too straight forward, the Space Command’s intentions are more threatening. In Vision for 2020, goals of the command were articulated, including “dominating the space dimension of military operations” and to achieve “full spectrum dominance in real-time,” meaning

⁵⁵ Air Force Space Command Homepage. (2009). Retrieved from: <http://www.afspc.af.mil/index.asp>

to dominate land, sea, air, space and cyberspace, at every moment.⁵⁶

The U.S. military perspective on space weapons is best summarized by the Rumsfeld Space Commission, which was chaired by Donald Rumsfeld immediately prior to becoming Secretary of Defense:

We know from history that every medium—air, land, and sea—has seen conflict. Reality indicates that space will be no different. Given this virtual certainty, the United States must develop the means both to deter and to defend against hostile acts in and from space.⁵⁷

Russia and China have strongly pushed for an international agreement banning space weapons, but the U.S. has opposed any deal. In fact, in October 2006, President Bush signed an order affirming the right to American space weapons and opposing treaties or other measures to restrict them.⁵⁸ This stance could trigger a new space arms race and severely undercuts any chance that countries like China and Russia will seriously reduce their arsenals of nuclear weapons. If these countries feel outmatched in space, they will cling to nuclear weapons as an equalizer.

⁵⁶ U.S. Air Force. (1997, February). *United States Space Command: Vision for 2020*. Washington.

⁵⁷ Report of the Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization (“Rumsfeld Commission”). (2001, January 11). Executive summary, p. 10. Retrieved from: <http://www.dod.mil/pubs/space20010111.html>

⁵⁸ Russia issues warning on space-based weapons. (2007, September 27). *The New York Times*. Retrieved from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/27/world/europe/27iht-russia.4.7662417.html>

The U.S. and Russia's weak efforts at reduction continue to legitimize the use of nuclear arms and justify other countries' attempts of proliferation. Even at SORT levels, no legitimate strategic justification exists for maintaining such high numbers of nuclear warheads. In fact, these arsenals are increasingly being seen as a liability for theft or accidental use, as a clear link between proliferation and terrorism exists—more nuclear materials, inherently, means more accessibility for terrorists.⁵⁹

The arsenals are also extraordinarily expensive. Although the U.S. government does not have an official nuclear security budget, it is estimated that at least \$52.4 billion was spent in the 2008 fiscal year on nuclear weapons related programs.⁶⁰ To put the cost in perspective: international diplomacy and foreign assistance received \$39.5 billion, natural resources and the environment \$33 billion, and the entire budget for general science, space and technology was \$27.4 billion. It is almost 14 times what the Department of Energy spends on all energy-related research and development, and about 67 percent of the department's total

⁵⁹ Wickersham, B. (2003, January 21). Nuclear dishonorment: Bush must reverse course and lead way in ending proliferation of weapons. *Columbia (Missouri) Daily Tribune*, p.5A.; see also: Shultz, G.P., Perry, W.J., Kissinger, H.A., & Nunn, S. (2007, January 4). A world free of nuclear weapons. *Wall Street Journal*, p. A15.

⁶⁰ Schwartz, S.I., & Choubey, D. (2009, January 12). How \$52 billion on nuclear security is spent. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Retrieved from: <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=22602>

budget.⁶¹ The real cost is much higher, as this estimate does not include costs for classified programs, air defense, antisubmarine warfare, and most nuclear weapons-related intelligence programs.

The total financial cost of U.S. nuclear policy has never been fully understood or compiled by the government. The question was not even comprehensibly researched until the 1990s, by the Brookings Institution. The study found that from 1940-1996, the U.S. spent a minimum of \$5.8 trillion (in 1996 constant dollars) on its nuclear weapons program. This amounted to about eleven percent of the total money spent by the government during that time span.⁶² 2005 predictions estimated the cost to be over \$7.5 trillion.⁶³

For the money, the U.S. has produced more than 70,000 nuclear bombs and warheads up to 1990 and over 745.3 metric tons of highly enriched uranium and 103.5 metric tons of plutonium.⁶⁰ A long-term plan for disposing of this nuclear material, and hundreds of tons of additional toxic waste in its production, has not occurred. In fact, a controversial 25-year

⁶¹ Schwartz, S.I., and Choubey, D. (2009, January 12). The cost of nuclear security. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from: <http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-schwartz12-2009jan12,0,5207429.story>

⁶² Schwartz, S.I. (2008, October). The Costs of U.S. Nuclear Weapons. Monterey Institute for International Studies. Retrieved from: http://www.nti.org/e_research/e3_atomic_audit.html#fn3

⁶³ Cirincione, J. (2005, November/December). Lessons lost. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, p. 47.

plan to use Yucca Mountain, Nevada for holding nearly 70,000 tons of nuclear waste, at a cost of at least \$13.5 billion so far, was cancelled in 2009.⁶⁴

Instead of this inexorable movement towards nuclear and financial catastrophe, we must find means, with binding agreements, to both reduce and eliminate nuclear arms. In 2002, with such means in mind, the late Randall Caroline Forsberg, founder of the 1980s Nuclear Freeze Campaign, and authors Jonathan Schell and David Cortright, launched an internet-based campaign called UrgentCall.org. The site was created to provide a focal point for public interest group coalitions to pressure the U.S. and Russia into fulfilling commitments made under the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty and move together with other powers, step by carefully inspected and verified step, to eliminate the thousands of weapons that threaten human survival.

The Urgent Call Coalition produced a comprehensive, step-by-step outline calling upon the U.S. and other nuclear powers to develop a mutually acceptable "Roadmap to Abolition of Nuclear Weapons." Many similar plans have been developed since, but this "Roadmap" continues to

⁶⁴ Senate passes bill to close Yucca Mountain. (2009, July 30). Associated Press. from: <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/07/30/politics/main5197612.shtml>

be one of the most comprehensive, systematic, well-developed strategies in the field of nuclear disarmament advocacy. It provides a psychologically sound confidence building approach which many other nuclear abolition ideas and plans may be usefully weighed and measured.

The roadmap includes the following actions:

1. Permanently end nuclear weapons development, testing and production by:

- Ratifying the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT);
- Ending all funding for the design, development and production of nuclear weapons;
- Banning production of weapons grade plutonium and uranium;
- Banning research, development and deployment of weapons in space.

2. Secure existing nuclear weapons and weapon-grade material by:

- Installing safety devices (permissive action locks) on all nuclear weapons;
- Creating and regularly updating a global register of all weapon-grade uranium and plutonium to facilitate secure

storage and disarmament;

- Providing clearly-defined, well-funded, ultra-secure storage of nuclear warheads awaiting dismantlement and down-blending.

3. End dangerous policies for use of nuclear weapons by:

- Eliminating launch-on-warning policies of the U.S., Russia and other powers;
- De-alerting nuclear missiles that could be fired in a few minutes;
- Publicly announcing that they will never use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries (as promised when negotiating the 1970 Non-proliferation Treaty, and again in the 1995 NPT indefinite extension);
- Publicly announcing that they will never use nuclear weapons first.

Additionally, the Urgent Call Coalition challenges the provision of the 2002 SORT treaty that allows the retention of thousands of U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons in service or storage. Instead, the coalition says the two countries should cut back to hundreds of weapons and verifiably

dismantle them once withdrawn from active service. This action would put pressure on the other nuclear powers with arsenals numbering in the tens or hundreds—Britain, France, China, India, Pakistan, and Israel—to join in deeper global cuts. Currently, these countries resist making any cuts while the U.S. and Russia’s arsenals are so much larger.

President Barack Obama made a major speech in Prague, Czech Republic shortly after he was inaugurated in which he made promising remarks on his position against nuclear weapons. He said:

Some argue that the spread of these weapons cannot be checked—that we are destined to live in a world where more nations and more people possess the ultimate tools of destruction. This fatalism is a deadly adversary. For if we believe that the spread of nuclear weapons is inevitable, then we are admitting to ourselves that the use of nuclear weapons is inevitable.⁶⁵

Obama then said that the U.S. would “take concrete steps toward a world without nuclear weapons.” Some concrete steps mentioned included seeking treaties to reduce strategic warheads with Russia, end fissile materials for weapons, sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and to secure all vulnerable nuclear material around the world within four years.

While these are all admirable goals and words, actions so far have

⁶⁵ Obama, B. (2009, April 5). Remarks of President Barack Obama. Retrieved from: <http://prague.usembassy.gov/obama.html>

been underwhelming. For starters, almost every time he has stated that he will work towards a nuclear weapons free world, he undercuts his message by following in the same breath that this goal may not happen in his lifetime. Second, negotiations for renewing the START treaty has a goal for reducing strategic nuclear weapons levels that is far too low to make a significant difference—from 2,200 weapons in 1991 to levels still over 1,500 warheads. Lastly, and perhaps most troubling, is that the Department of Energy is continuing to push forward a George W. Bush administration program called “Complex Modernization.” The program is essentially designed to perpetuate the vast industrial infrastructure required to produce and maintain nuclear weapon systems. Included in the program are plans to expand two existing nuclear plants, and modify others, to allow them to produce new plutonium and bomb parts for use in a new generation of nuclear weapons.⁶⁶

President Obama runs the risk of falling into the historic "arms control trap" by taking this two pronged approach which calls for nuclear weapons abolition, while at the same time endorsing plans for the development of

⁶⁶ Cardinale, M. (2009, October 1). Obama asks world to reduce nuclear weapons while U.S. agency pushes new bomb production. *Inter Press News Agency*. Retrieved from: <http://www.newjerseynewsroom.com/nation/obama-asks-world-to-reduce-nuclear-weapons-while-us-agency-pushes-new-bomb-production>

new, "improved" nuclear devices and continuing weapons in space. In so doing, politicians and military leaders create the illusion of disarmament progress, while at the same time they tinker at the edges of the nuclear weapons problem and support the development of increasingly efficient, destructive weapons which ensure that no truly significant nuclear disarmament progress takes place.

Although lowering U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear warheads from 2,200 to some 1,500 on both sides reduces the statistical chances for accidental nuclear war, it does not make the world safer from purposeful nuclear attack. A mutual Russian-U.S. attack involving approximately 3,000 nuclear warheads would still end civilization. Thus, it is time to promote new ways of thinking and acting to ensure human survival. Now is the time for health, education, religious, environmental and nuclear disarmament organizations everywhere to build on President Obama's challenging nuclear disarmament goals and statements, as well as the prestige of his Nobel Peace Prize which was awarded, in part, for his vision of a nuclear weapons-free world. Nuclear weapons abolition has to become a top priority for educators, clergy and community activists throughout the U.S. and the world. It is imperative that they help pioneer

new approaches that will rally political leaders and the public to put an end to the nuclear weapons madness. Nothing could be more important.

Chapter V

The Role of the Citizen in Preventing Nuclear War

Achieving any kind of meaningful international nuclear disarmament will require considerable behavioral change on the part of U.S. leaders and other nuclear weapons countries. Such political change will require attitudinal change, which, in turn, will require sound education for nuclear disarmament aimed at politicians and citizens alike. Correspondingly, education must be offered to other nuclear states on a worldwide basis. Some individuals will insist that nuclear weapons policy and disarmament issues are not topics that they have the intellectual competence to address. Others may hesitate to confront those issues because they feel they have no substantial knowledge of what appears to be a highly technical, overwhelming field of inquiry. The fact is, a responsible citizen does not have to be competent in physical science or technology of any sort to challenge the madness of nuclear war. The stakes are too high for anyone to worry about technical incompetence or inter-personal embarrassment as

they face up to the threat of nuclear war. EVERYONE'S motto must be "JUST DO IT."

Educators, clergy and other citizens must start only with some basic facts on the subject. First, the human race is faced with the possibility of instant extinction without representation. If nuclear war occurs, there will be no parliamentary or congressional debates or declarations of war. This possibility does not gain the level of public or media attention that its consequences demand. Second, the situation is bound to worsen unless citizens worldwide demand action on the part of their leaders, and there will be precious little citizen action unless educators and activists help their fellow citizens confront the problem.

The likelihood of nuclear war is without doubt one of the most crucial problems in the world's history. Yet, sparse attention is being devoted to its elimination. Currently, insufficient intellectual and political activity concerning nuclear disarmament, especially at the local level, is going on in the U.S. or other parts of the world. Despite the many non-governmental organizations which are supplying timely information and strategies for political action, nuclear war continues to rank very low on the list of citizen concerns when compared with problems of personal income, health care,

environment, the economy, education, etc.

Accordingly, in recent years nuclear disarmament has received practically no attention during U.S. congressional and presidential campaigns. When it has, most presidential candidates make it clear that "the nuclear option" is always on the table. In other words, those candidates are willing to kill thousands, and perhaps millions of people on the planet, in order that the U.S. can "prevail" and have its way in certain bilateral or multilateral conflicts. The Russians also assume a similar posture. This is criminal tribalism and immorality at its worst.

If this situation is to change, and if our children and grandchildren are to have a nuclear weapons free, livable world, we will have to deal with the ignorance, denial, apathy and other avoidance mechanisms that block genuine, effective citizen action to eliminate the danger of nuclear war. Given the task's difficulty, a solution will demand the energies of a much greater proportion of our local citizens including activists, clergy, business people, educators, medical professionals and professionals of every other stripe. Pressure for nuclear disarmament has to come from the grassroots.

The problem will not be solved in Moscow and Washington, unless local citizens demand nuclear weapons abolition. The U.S. and Russian

military-industrial complexes have too much vested interest, too many politicians in their pockets, and too much financial gain from a perpetual arms race to initiate the abolition process. Thus, if citizens who have a sense of public responsibility regarding other pressing social and political problems do not turn some of their attention to the nuclear weapons hazard, it is possible that their other concerns will have little meaning. The overriding environmental and health problem facing the world today is the threat of nuclear extinction. Consequently, the role of responsible citizens in a democratic society is to focus their energies on human survival in much the same way they do on other local issues. Make no mistake about it, nuclear extinction is a local problem.

In sum, the role of the citizen in preventing nuclear war can be stated in the following propositions:

- Nuclear war prevention requires political change.
- Political change requires public pressure on elected officials.
- Public pressure requires attitude change on the part of a substantial portion of the citizenry.
- Attitude change requires education and social action at the local level.
- Education and social action require time, money, energy, and

dedicated, committed citizen participation.

Chapter VI

The Dialogue for Nuclear Disarmament

Everyday, social, political, religious, educational, and other groups meet to discuss every conceivable variety of human problems.

Unfortunately, only a tiny fraction of these innumerable conversations address the threat of nuclear war. One reason for this neglect may be the general psychological avoidance of a frightening issue. Another obstacle to meaningful discussion is the oft-cited admonition, "Don't just talk about the problem, do something about it." The fact is, talking *is* doing something. Talking is the first important step in mobilizing time, money, energy and political action for eliminating nuclear weapons.

During the late 1960's, I conducted a series of "dialogue for peace" exercises with people in the St. Louis and Columbia, Missouri areas. These exercises were done with my mentor, Dr. Theo. F. Lentz, director of the renowned Peace Research Lab in St. Louis, Missouri. In 1968 and 1969, we talked with a variety of "peace-minded" individuals regarding the possible development of a systematic, grassroots movement towards a

science of peace. Dialogues were conducted with 117 individuals who, in one way or another, were identified with the peace movement, or with other social and humanitarian goals.⁶⁷ Most of the participants were business or professional people, and in a few cases university undergraduate and graduate students were included.

The study also included prominent Missourians such as: Dr. Barry Commoner, Washington University in St. Louis scientist and U.S. presidential candidate; Missouri Lieutenant Governor Harriet Woods, who was then a radio talk show personality; and William Danforth, Washington University in St. Louis Chancellor.

Each participant was asked to respond to, and discuss the following questions:

1. In your opinion, how great is the danger of World War III?
2. If World War III comes, how disastrous will it be?
3. Do you believe war is preventable?
4. Are we likely to abolish war on the basis of present know-how?
5. Costs: How great an investment of manpower and money power would probably be necessary to solve this problem?

⁶⁷ Such groups included: the United Nations Association-USA, the United World Federalists, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Friends Meeting, St. Louis Ethical Society, etc.

6. How much would you like to help?

7. Assuming that you agree that more research is needed, what types of studies would you want us, or others, to do if you were paying to have the studies conducted?

A general conclusion of the study was that most of the dialogue participants did not see research as an urgent prerequisite in securing peace. Numerous individuals felt we already knew how to get peace: We just needed the political will to do so. When asked how that political will could be secured, most respondents had no substantive response.

Another interesting observation was the wide variety of definitions and meaning given to the word "peace." When it came to prescriptions for peace, the ideas ranged from Christian or humanist pacifism to democratic world federal government and the need for the rule of law, and many positions in between. This fact, itself, opened my inexperienced eyes to the individual perceptions, attitudes, and difficulties in the search for peace. I also came to see the incredible "spin-off" benefits of engaging others in a principled discussion of topics related to war and peace.

As is often the case, this dialogue exercise was successful in securing the services of several people who volunteered for various peace

endeavors. In addition to secretarial and publicity help for the Peace Research Lab, five individuals conducted studies related to peace and peace attitudes. One study was "Social Work's Contribution to Peace Education and Peace Research." Another was a factor analysis study of peace attitudes that used items from the Peace Research Lab's "International Opinionaire." That study involved an analysis of the responses of 991 college students' questions related to international affairs.

From a personal standpoint, one of the best outcomes of the project was the training I received in conducting dialogues, or as Ted Lentz put it, "democratic conversations." I have used Ted's techniques in many settings for over 40 years. These dialogues have resulted in tens of thousands of hours of peace work instigated by my conversations.

It is often difficult to accurately assess the results of one's efforts with "dialogue for peace" interactions because results are almost never immediate and the true fruits can be years down the road. However, the following examples document the outcomes of three such discussions in my early years of peace dialogues. The first example relates to a 1970 "dialogue for Peace Studies" I had with Dr. Jim McGinnis, formerly of St. Louis University. While the example deals only partially with education for

nuclear disarmament, it depicts the overall effectiveness of the Lentzian dialogue process itself.

In June 1970, Jim invited me to present a talk in St. Louis on the development of peace studies programs in colleges and universities throughout the U.S. and other countries. My talk was widely advertised, and Jim anticipated that attendance would be sizable. However, when I arrived at the 400-seat auditorium to speak, only three people were present—Jim, one of his colleagues, and I. Needless to say, Jim was disappointed that students and faculty had not shown up. On the surface, it appeared that I traveled all the way from Columbia for nothing. Jim was surprised when I showed no significant disappointment regarding the turnout, and suggested to him that we engage in a "dialogue for Peace Studies," and its implications for St. Louis University.

For the next hour, the three of us explored a wide range of peace topics. We discussed the meaning of peace and its many definitions. What the role of educational philosophy plays in determining the goals of higher education, the larger goals of St. Louis University, and how peace studies might fit within these goals. We explored ways to approach students and other faculty members with a dialogue, including how Peace Studies might

fit within specific curricula and examples of other Peace Studies programs. This led to brainstorming steps to develop new courses and modules in various academic disciplines and how to begin the process at St. Louis University.

As it turned out, our three-person conversation resulted in the establishment of the Institute for the Study of Peace (ISP) at St. Louis University, which graduated 100 peace studies students in its first five years. In 1975, ISP left the university and was incorporated as an ecumenical Institute for Peace and Justice (IPJ). In 1980, IPJ created the Parenting for Peace and Justice (PPJ) Network, which, over a 20-year period, conducted workshops in forty-nine U.S. states, five Canadian provinces, and Northern Ireland. PPJ books were translated into Portuguese, German and Spanish; its programs have also flourished in the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland. IPJ also established solidarity projects in Nicaragua, and family exchange programs in Russia and Jamaica. The dialogue "mustard seed" clearly grew into a fruitful tree.

Documentation provided by Dr. McGinnis indicates that the original "dialogue for Peace Studies" resulted in over four and one-half million contacts and activities on behalf of peace between 1970-1995. Included

were 25,000 teachers who attended IPJ workshops, who then reached over one million students. This mustard seed effect is often the result of dialogues for peace. What is so unusual in this case is the extent of the documentation provided by Dr. McGinnis.

Another example of the dialogue's effectiveness in peace organizational development also occurred in the early 1970's. Following a speech in opposition to the Vietnam War I gave at the University of Missouri-Columbia, a graduate student named Phil Gibbs contacted me regarding what he could do to help serve the cause of peace. We talked about the war and other issues like the population explosion, nuclear disarmament, human rights, and environmental degradation. We also talked about the Washington, D.C. based World Federalist-USA organization, of which I was the national field director in 1970-1971.

I told Phil that the World Federalists had done remarkable work in keeping the notion of "World Peace Through World Law With Justice" alive for many years. I also explained that the organization's Congressional lobbying efforts were failing because most U.S. members of Congress were short-term thinkers who focused primarily on immediate, functional approaches to problem solving, rather than big-picture ideas of world

federalism, which required long-term vision and considerable cultural change. I suggested that Phil move to Washington, D.C. and join the World Federalist youth group, which was entitled to one membership slot on the parent organization's board of directors. I also told him that he should run for president of that group.

Later, I learned Phil did move to Washington, and within a relatively short period of time, secured a position on the World Federalist's board of directors. In line with our earlier discussion, he wrote a proposal for the development of a new sister organization which would lobby directly for solutions to various world order issues. The organization eventually formed was named "New Directions." The group's leadership included: Father Ted Hesburg, president of the University of Notre Dame; Margaret Mead, world-renowned anthropologist; Norman Cousins, publisher and editor of *The Saturday Review*; and John Gardner, former U.S. Secretary for Health, Education and Welfare, and founder of Common Cause. In 1976, Russell Peterson, former Republican Governor of Delaware, became New Direction's first executive director. His successor was Sanford Gottlieb, former executive director of SANE (Citizens for a Sane Nuclear Policy).

Several years ago, I discussed the origins of New Directions with

Russ Peterson. He was unaware of the early input by Phil Gibbs, which was stimulated by our dialogue in Columbia, MO. The point here is not who deserves credit for the start-up of New Directions. Many people contributed to that effort. But, it shows how a purposeful dialogue can change the course of someone's life path. Phil Gibbs was already on the path of peace, but a subtle nudge of direction had significant results. It is also a significant historical fact that two concerned citizens in Middle America, via dialogue, could sow the seeds for the development of an organization that brought the energies of well-known scholars and politicians to bear on critical problems facing humankind.⁶⁸

A third and final example of the value of peace dialogues relates to the U.S. Department of Defense's plans to deploy its "Safeguard" anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system in 13 counties of West-Central Missouri in 1969 and 1970. The ABM system was to be used to protect the 150 U.S. Air Force Minuteman missiles, which had been located throughout the area. The ABM plans called for the use of numerous, five-megaton H-bombs to intercept Soviet nine-megaton weapons at high altitudes. Preferably, this would occur before their actual descent on U.S. missile silos, which had

⁶⁸ For an explanation of the role and scope of New Directions, see: Peterson, R. (1999). *Rebel With a Conscience*. Cranbury, N.J.: Associated University Presses, pp. 268-73.

been located near small Missouri towns and farms. In the likely event that the five-megaton anti-missile missiles failed to strike the incoming Soviet H-bombs, a smaller anti-missile nuclear warhead would be used to destroy the Soviet missiles at a much lower level. Thus, the U.S. Air Force would detonate small H-bombs directly over the towns, fields, and streams of Mid-Missouri, resulting in blast, radiation, and nuclear fallout—even if the action destroyed the incoming Soviet nuclear weapons. This was, to use C. Wright Mills' term, "crackpot realism" at its worst. Fortunately the "Safeguard" ABM was never deployed in Missouri.

Two organizations in Columbia, Missouri joined forces to oppose the ABM deployment. Both the local Committee for Informed Opinion on Nuclear Arms (CIONA), and the Missouri Peace Study Institute (MPSI) sponsored a series of group dialogues with citizens in Columbia, Missouri and the surrounding area. Previously, no attention had been paid to the impending ABM deployments aimed at the "protection" of the U.S. missiles in mid-Missouri.

As a result of individual dialogues, and extensive brainstorming with numerous small group discussions, it was decided to mount a statewide campaign of protest concerning the Air Force's plans for the ABMs. It was

decided that we would hold a series of town meetings in several neighboring towns, with the hope that our opposition to the ABM system would spread to other parts of the state. Such meetings were held in Columbia, Warrensburg, Higginsville, and Marshall. Appeals for local action were also extended to St. Louis and Kansas City, with the result being the formation of a statewide organization known as "Missourians Opposed to ABM and MIRV." Once again, individual and small group dialogues triggered important promotional activities with like-minded groups. We culminated our series of town meetings with a rally in Sedalia, a town not far from Whiteman Air Force Base on April 18, 1970.

Interestingly, these meetings drew much more attention than any of us realized at the time. I was able to attain my FBI file in 1976, with the help of Paul Simon, Illinois Congressman and later U.S. Senator. The file's contents covered some of my political activities related to nuclear deterrence, opposing the Vietnam War, and other problems associated with nuclear weapons deployments in mid-Missouri. One section of the file focused on the anti-ABM rally in Sedalia. Dated April 7, 1970, a teletype message addressed to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and Assistant FBI Director William Sullivan was entitled: "Citizens concerned about the ABM,

Anti-ABM rally. Liberty Park, Sedalia, Missouri.”

The message read:

On April Six, Seventy, Chief of Police W.E. Miller, Sedalia, PD, advised he was recently contacted by William Wickersham, Columbia, MO, identified as spokesman for the Missouri Branch of the 'Coalition on National Priorities and Military Policy', in company of Robert Scherer, employee of KSIS Radio Station at Sedalia, identified by Miller as one of the leaders of a Vietnam War Moratorium Committee March in Sedalia in the Fall of Sixty-nine, regarding planned ANTI-ABM Rally. Chief Miller said the group also identified as "Citizens Concerned About the ABM", currently plans to hold a rally from one to three p.m. April Eighteen Seventy, at Liberty Park, a Sedalia City Park.⁶⁹

The meeting in Liberty Park turned out to be an anti-nuclear war protest and celebration of life coupled with speeches, singing, laughing, and dancing. We released helium filled balloons with a message attached concerning nuclear fallout. The message noted that if the U.S. Air Force ABM system were to be activated, any individual who discovered one of the balloons would likely be a victim of nuclear fallout. Another highlight of the gathering was the performance of Berkley, California comedian "General Waste More Land," who often made jokes about General William Westmoreland, the U.S. Commander in Vietnam. The "General" was decked out in a green U.S. Army officer's uniform loaded with fake medals

⁶⁹ U.S. Dept. of Justice. (1970). Federal Bureau of Investigation file on Bill Wickersham.

on stretchable rubber "ribbons," and red plastic missiles protruding from his military headgear. He spoke of the absurdities of the Vietnam War and the U.S. upward escalation of the nuclear arms race through its plans for the Missouri ABM system.

All three of these examples were initiated by purposeful, systematic, "dialogues for peace." All three provide abundant evidence that *talking about peace* is the first step in significant *action for peace*. Such dialogues are a precursor to the generation of substantial time, money, and energy for peace research, education, action, and politics.

The Dialogue Process

The dialogue process developed by Ted Lentz is a consciousness-raising tool designed to stimulate thought and enable people to seriously consider ways to minimize destructive human interaction at various levels of society. Topical formats relate to many areas of peace concern, including the abolition of nuclear weapons. Years of experimentation with the dialogue shows strong possibilities in its use for establishing genuine reciprocal communication on behalf of nuclear disarmament and increasing public awareness of the dangers of nuclear weapons. This process is

designed to involve like-minded individuals and groups, as well as those with differing points of view. It encourages the discovery of new and creative ideas for promoting nuclear disarmament at all levels of society. Obviously, the Internet is a powerful tool to enable such ideas worldwide distribution. Dialogues also help to discover new human and financial resources for nuclear disarmament education and citizen action, while increasing networking and inter-organizational cooperation.

Experience indicates that many groups and individuals fail to be impressed with the value and effectiveness of the dialogue process as a tool for citizen action—especially if they have never been involved with the process or actually used it with another person. Lentz's view was that if the dialogue could reach only one percent of the U.S. population, it could be the stimulus for the acquisition of significant amounts of time, money and energy for the cause of peace. He also believed, as I do, that the dialogue helps to cause a multiplier effect, which will greatly broaden the efforts of non-governmental organizations and professional groups that have been educating for nuclear disarmament for decades. It also can result in substantial increases of membership for NGOs, as well as expanded and improved communication between NGOs. Finally, it is possible that the

dialogue process, if properly conducted on a widespread basis could provide the impetus for a widespread educational/action/political campaign, much like the Nuclear Freeze Movement of the 1980s.

Initiators and facilitators of these dialogues require a number of skills to be successful. The first and most important is a strong commitment to the abolition of nuclear weapons and discontent with the meager efforts of governmental, and some non-governmental, organizations to seek their abolition and the conditions for a livable world. They must have a sincere desire to empower others to use their individual strengths, skills and abilities for the cause of nuclear disarmament.

It is not the job of dialogue initiators and facilitators to "show-off" their own knowledge, skills and abilities. A non-argumentative approach to conversation and discussion is needed to not overwhelm or bludgeon one's conversation mates with disarmament "overkill"—especially with facts and strategies. Rather, the objective is respectful sharing of ideas. Tolerance, not condescension, is needed when hearing ideas from others that might tempt a less tolerant person to label their partner as stupid or confused. At the same time, one must be inoffensively frank and challenge ideas during the course of the dialogue. Lastly, they must have genuine respect for the

size and complexity of the problems surrounding the possibility of planetary destruction with weapons of unimaginable explosive power. Included here, is the necessity to appreciate the many social and psychological obstacles that impinge on individuals confronted with what appears, to many, to be an unsolvable problem.

It is very important to point out that the acquisition of the above qualities is not a simple matter. Many activists, by nature and habit have considerable difficulty in personally achieving these qualities. In my own case, I have great difficulty in dealing with the problem of disarmament overkill. My tendency is to talk entirely too much, with too many facts, and not always truly listen to my conversation mate. Lentz always told me, "Wick, don't give them a lecture, follow the dialogue rules." Today, I have an imaginary "impulse control button" which I visualize as located just over my heart. When my compulsive talking begins, I push on my chest to signify my need to cut back on the blabber.

Dialogue Principles

The quality of dialogue interactions is greatly enhanced when the

following principles are used. First, think of the dialogue as a democratic conversation with a mutual purpose and beware of the pitfall of heated argument. Do not seek to put the other person on the defensive; it is not a competitive game. If reciprocal communication is shown to be totally impossible, politely end the conversation. Remember, understanding is an evolutionary matter, not all or nothing, nor is it often suddenly acquired.

The dialogue is as much a questioning process as an answering process. It is important to assure the other person that no one, including the initiator, has all the knowledge and answers to the problems associated with the quest for nuclear disarmament. All citizens have a right and responsibility to address the important issues facing them and their fellow human beings. They are not expected to be experts. After all, it is the scientific and mathematical experts who are so competent in game theory, systems analysis and statistical computation who have been partly responsible for leading us into the wilderness of nuclear threat systems. Even without such expertise, average citizens can often see the nuclear forest better than highly trained military theorists and analysts.

Try to stay focused on the task at hand. Beware of irrelevant conversational directions and try to stay on the nuclear topic if possible

without offending the other person. Experience indicates that individuals who are in denial, or subject to other psychological mechanisms, will immediately steer nuclear war discussions in a different direction.

Numerous ways exist to initiate a dialogue for nuclear disarmament. On certain occasions, it may be appropriate to contact a potential dialogue partner via telephone or e-mail. In this case, the initiator simply explains the purpose of the dialogue and then sets a time and place to meet. On other occasions, one may wish to start the conversation on the spur of the moment while standing in line at a theater, grocery store or coffee shop. Professional meetings, civic gatherings, Sunday school classes, break times and numerous other settings are quite suitable for the start-up of a dialogue. Obviously, conversations can be kicked-off in a variety of ways, depending on the skills of the initiator and the personality characteristics of both partners.

The important thing for the initiator is to have a well thought out set of dialogue questions, or nuclear disarmament related statements, which can be posed to the other person so that the conversations run smoothly until the exchange becomes full-blown. A tool that can be used for more formal, pre-arranged dialogues is a propositionaire developed by Ted Lentz for our

St. Louis Peace Research project. This format is excellent for stimulating discussion. It is very important to allow the respondent to fully explain his/her answer before the initiator provides information or answers to any of the questions. However, when the respondent comes up with a "blank" response, the initiator should have well thought out answers.

Here are 15 questions and possible approaches to answer a blank response:

1. What are the chances that the U.S. and Russia will fight a nuclear war? -- Both nations still have hundreds of weapons aimed at each other, and in 2001, it was reported that Russia's nuclear command and control system had seriously deteriorated. Examples of past incidents could be given, or a discussion of the recent controversies surrounding America's attempts to create a "missile defense shield."
2. If it occurs, what will it mean to our lives and those of our children? -- In terms of a "limited strike" the initiator can draw a comparison with 9/11. The 9/11 terrorists killed about 3,000 people and destroyed buildings in a very limited area. One Russian H-Bomb would kill hundreds of thousands, and would essentially destroy a large city's over-all infrastructure. In the event of an all-out U.S./Russian nuclear

"exchange", civilization as we know it could be totally destroyed by global sizzling and then global freezing.

3. Is Nuclear War Inevitable? -- Maybe, maybe not. However, if the U.S. Russian nuclear arms race—egged on by U.S. weapons in space—continues, the probability of nuclear holocaust is significantly increased. Especially, if the Russian command and control and early-warning systems are not improved. "Murphy's Law" may not be an absolute, but it comes awfully close.
4. If not, what can be done to prevent nuclear war? -- The first step is the de-alerting of all U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons. The second step is for both countries to honor the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The third step is to sign a new Nuclear Weapons Convention, which includes U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The fourth step is the implementation of the previously noted "Nuclear Disarmament Road Map," which calls for systematic, transparent, mutual reduction and elimination of all nuclear weapons by all nuclear weapons states. The achievement of all of those steps will require attitude change, education, funding, and citizen action to pressure Congress to pursue their implementation.

5. Are you aware that both the U.S. and Russia still have thousands of nuclear missiles on hair-trigger alert? -- This is a very important point to emphasize in the dialogue. It is highly likely that most Americans are not even aware this problem exists. Even many experts in international relations fail to grasp or talk about this dangerous situation. They tend to believe the U.S./Russian nuclear conflict has gone away.
6. Do you know that launch to landing time for Russian missiles is 25 minutes, and the time for U.S. missiles is 10 minutes? -- Russian missiles aimed at St. Louis, Kansas City and Whiteman Air Force Base will, in fact, destroy those areas in 25 minutes, or less. For dialogues that take place in any other state, simply note that the largest city in the area is a likely target. The Russians are definitely believed to target all major U.S. cities.
7. Are you aware that the Boeing Corporation (a major U.S. defense contractor) is located in St. Louis, Honeywell Corporation (which makes nuclear weapons parts) is located in Kansas City, and Whiteman Air Force Base (which houses 21 B-2 bombers) is located at Knob Knoster, Missouri? And, all of these locations are obvious

targets for several of Russia's nuclear missiles which are on hair-trigger alert? -- A very large portion of Missouri will be incinerated if all-out nuclear war occurs. When the dialogue takes place in other states, the initiator just needs to mention the nearest major city or area which hosts large elements of the U.S. military-industrial complex. For example, North and South Dakota, and Wyoming currently host Minuteman intercontinental missiles. Or, Nebraska hosts the U.S. Strategic Command in Omaha, or Colorado Springs which hosts a variety of U.S. Air Force operations, including the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD). The initiator should point out that no one in the U.S. has absolute knowledge of Russian targeting. However, many nuclear war strategists and analysts accept the large city—military installation model, and it is quite appropriate to use that approach to put the issue of nuclear war into concrete terms.

8. Who in the community is seriously addressing this issue? -- This question is valuable in two ways. It allows the initiator to gain information concerning organizations, religious communities and others with whom s/he might not be familiar. It also enables the

initiator to inform his conversation partner about the various individuals and groups who s/he knows are working on the problem. In communities in which there are very few, or no nuclear disarmament efforts, initiators can help their partners understand the value of computer searches regarding activities and approaches used by numerous national non-governmental organizations dedicated to nuclear disarmament.⁷⁰

9. What are some of the possible obstacles to dealing with this issue? --

As previously noted there are a variety of social and psychological obstacles which nuclear disarmament advocates face when approaching others with their message. The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation cites three major obstacles which are ignorance, denial, and apathy.

10. How involved are the local faith communities, civic clubs, schools, colleges, universities and other groups in confronting the issue of nuclear war? -- This dialogue question presents an excellent opportunity to examine the philosophy and role of local groups, and how nuclear disarmament education can be linked to various

⁷⁰ A list of websites is listed in the appendix.

organizational goals, programs, and community activities.

Considering the fact that nuclear weapons threaten human survival, it might be assumed that the problem would be near the top of religious, educational, and civic agendas. Unfortunately, this is often not the case. While opinion polls indicate that high percentages of citizens do favor very significant reductions of nuclear arms, the issue is usually pretty far down on their list of priorities. Some local institutions do, in fact, confront the nuclear threat educationally, programmatically and politically. Most, however, do not.

11. What about the local media? Other resources? -- A little brainstorming on these questions may result in an accumulation of ideas concerning multiple outlets and contacts for the nuclear disarmament message. Newspaper editors, reporters, and several other media professionals such as radio and TV personalities are some of the most important contacts for nuclear disarmament discussions. It is often the case, that these individuals are never approached and challenged to offer such programs.
12. What "outside" resources and materials are available? -- This question enables the initiator to discover unknown educational,

organizational and financial resources of which s/he may be unaware. More likely, the initiator will be able to help dialogue partners to locate resources of which they are not aware. Website searches promise to be a valuable approach. It would be helpful if the initiator had a one page handout containing the names of nuclear disarmament organizations and their website addresses to present those with whom he or she talks.

13. In that both Russian and U.S. missiles remain on hair-trigger, would you favor a bilateral agreement to de-alert those missiles? -- The question will probably require define “de-alerting,” which means specific, feasible, and verifiable (via on-site inspections) ways to de-alert nuclear missiles, which includes:

- Pinning open the switches of missile motors so they cannot be started by remote electronic command
- Taking launch keys away from missile officers so they can not act independently
- Shutting off the missile launch circuits
- Deploying submarines out of range of their target
- Removing warheads from delivery systems, and putting them

under international monitoring

- Reducing the yields of all warheads by removing components know as tritium bottles and storing them separately.

Care must be taken not to use information "overkill" on this question. Most individuals will be adequately informed with exposure to only one or two of the above examples of de-alerting.

14. Are you aware that numerous organizations circulate petitions to change aspects of the nuclear weapon problem, such as the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, which is circulating a nationwide petition calling on the U.S. President to provide leadership for a nuclear weapons free world, and especially a Nuclear Weapons Convention for the phased, verifiable, and irreversible elimination of nuclear weapons. Would you be willing to sign a petition like this one? -- The initiator should stress the importance of this petition, and make the case that every concerned citizen can make a contribution to the cause of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation by signing on the dotted line.
15. What else needs to be done to deal with this problem? -- This may

be one of the most important topics of the entire dialogue schedule.

Usually the initiator has a bag full of ideas related to the Nuclear Disarmament Roadmap that can be suggested for citizen involvement in the campaign to abolish nuclear weapons. However, the conversation partner may also have several suggestions which the initiator has never considered, especially in a given community.

Chapter VII

Social and Psychological Obstacles to Education and Citizen Action

Chapter II described accounts of serious human and technical failures in U.S. and Russian nuclear warfare operations that could have resulted in catastrophic global events and consequences. Also, historically, media have under-reported these failures, while at the same time overwhelmingly sourcing “high officials,” the very perpetrators of nuclear weapons systems. Why isn't there a larger popular outcry about this overarching health and environmental problem threatening our very survival as a species?

Psychologists have identified numerous avoidance techniques that

prevent individuals from addressing these issues. The three basic reasons offered by David Krieger's Nuclear Age Peace Foundation DVD, *Nuclear Weapons and the Human Future: How You Can Help*, are ignorance, denial and apathy. My own research strongly supports David's assumptions. During many discussions with people locally, nationally and internationally, I have found that most people believe that the threat of nuclear war between the U.S. and Russia has essentially gone away. There is considerable talk about the nuclear weapons programs of North Korea, India, Pakistan, and Iran, and increasingly people are concerned with the possibility of terrorist attacks with "suitcase" nuclear bombs, "dirty" bombs, as well as attacks with chemical and biological weapons. But, unfortunately, most people seem to have no conscious sense or concern regarding the Nuclear Sword of Damocles, of which John Kennedy spoke, which still hangs over our heads by a slender thread.⁷¹ This is due, in part, because some folks simply do not have appreciable knowledge of the situation. It is also true that most nuclear weapons are simply "out of sight and out of mind."

⁷¹ Kennedy, J.F. (1961, September 25). Address before the General Assembly of the United Nations. Retrieved from: <http://www.jfklibrary.org/Historical+Resources/Archives/Reference+Desk/Speeches/JFK/003POF03UnitedNations09251961.htm>

In this regard, psychiatrist, Jerome Frank has stated:

Nuclear weapons [in distant countries] poised to kill cannot be seen, heard, or smelled, and so we scarcely think of them. We have evolved no sense organs for detecting radioactivity, a very new hazard in the history of man, and so it is hard to maintain concern about fallout or even about growing deposits of radioactive strontium-90 nibbling at our bone marrow.⁷²

While it is true that many individuals simply deny that a threat exists, some individuals are fully aware of the situation, are not in a state of denial, but are totally apathetic because they believe nuclear holocaust is inevitable.

An understanding of these personal reactions, as well as several other common responses to the nuclear threat, is vitally important to those who intend to work with others for the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons. One does not have to be a clinical psychologist to grasp the importance of the various mental roadblocks hindering discussion of this issue. Therefore, a rudimentary understanding of these phenomena is very useful when talking with others about this perplexing problem.

"I Don't Know Enough About Nuclear Weapons"

⁷² Frank, J.D. (1967). *Sanity and Survival in the Nuclear Age: Psychological Aspects of War and Peace*. New York: Random House, p. 27.

Many citizens, including business people, academics and other professionals, hesitate to become informed about nuclear war issues because they see it as an "all or nothing" proposition. "Either I fully understand the weapons technology, its strategic uses, and its scientifically determined consequences, or I will not deal with the problem at all."

Most people do not like to appear dumb or uninformed; especially on issues which one takes a vigorous stand. Obviously, nuclear war is an arcane, highly complicated topic leaving plenty of room to display one's ignorance. And frankly, many in the "nuclear priesthood," those with interests in a perpetual nuclear threat system, have a stake in making ordinary citizens feel insecure and inadequate when addressing this issue. In fact, they really don't want their fellow citizens to confront the issue at all. So, they do their best to discredit average citizens who attempt to bring some sanity to the world.

Consequently, the first order of business of nuclear disarmament educators, activists and organizers, is to help others overcome any sense of insecurity they may feel when working on the problem. They may easily do so by going immediately to the bottom line and simply pointing out that nuclear weapons are immoral, illegal if used, and incredibly expensive.

Furthermore, it can be pointed out that most of us don't understand the inner workings and hidden mechanism of our personal automobiles. Nevertheless, most people concern themselves with auto safety and accident prevention. The same reasoning may be applied to nuclear weapons. One does not need to fully understand nuclear physics or nuclear engineering to vigorously campaign against the very existence of nuclear weapons and the possibility that they may destroy our children's future.

It is also important to remember that many military officers, politicians (including most U.S. Presidents) and other civilian nuclear war strategists haven't the foggiest notion of how nuclear weapons really work, either. They just make decisions as to who will be killed with such technology.

Psychological Denial

When a potentially horrific problem such as annihilation by suicidal weapons of mass destruction threatens one's very existence and all one holds dear, one may simply "stick one's head in the sand." This mechanism allows frightened individuals to avoid facing up to the threat and horrors of

nuclear war. It is often the case that such denial is bolstered by the thought that "there's absolutely nothing I can do about the possibility of nuclear war anyway, so what's the use in worrying about it." Individuals will often either completely ignore the problem, or distance oneself from it by assuming that political, military and scientific experts will handle the situation. My experience with individuals and groups in denial about the problem indicates the existence of what might be called the "glazed eye effect."

In my early activist days, I noticed that the very mention of nuclear war caused audiences to simply "check out," and act as if they were in a collective trance. Then, as I continued speaking on various related topics, they appeared to be passive and generally disengaged from my presentation. When the talk was completed, I usually received a normal amount of applause, but there were few follow-up questions or comments of any real significance. The person in charge of the meeting would then thank me profusely for taking the time to be with the group, and would give me a certificate of appreciation, followed by another round of applause. The group would then effectively disintegrate; at most, one or two individuals would come to the podium to wish me good luck in future work on *my* problem. Obviously, I was making no real headway in speaking to

Rotary Clubs, Kiwanis Clubs, or other civic associations.

After experiencing this audience response on several occasions, I began to seriously read about and study the problem of psychological denial. Following such study, I decided to take another approach to the problem with a psychological technique known as "inoculation." This technique, in at least one form, is quite simple to implement. It involves an up-front description of how psychological denial actually works, and how it prevents individuals and groups from addressing issues that are frightening, or otherwise harmful to local citizens and their communities.

As I continued to meet and talk with civic organizations, I changed my presentation strategy. Instead of immediately launching into the facts and issues related to nuclear war prevention, I said something like the following:

Today, we will be discussing a topic that is unpleasant and frightening to most people. And, frankly, I would rather be here talking about music, sports, travel, or virtually any other subject. However, we must confront nuclear war because it is a distinct threat to our survival, and that of our children. Having said that, I need to emphasize that when some folks are asked to deal with it, they seem to just "check out," and simply refuse to address the issue or pay serious attention to any talk related to the problem. To some degree, this is an expected response. Anytime humans are faced with what appears to be a totally overwhelming problem, with no ready solution in sight, it seems reasonable to just ignore that problem.

I'm here today to say that if we put our minds to it, *there are* things you and I can do to assist with a systematic effort to

achieve mutual, verifiable arms reduction and abolition. It is my hope that you will do your best to stick with me, listen very carefully to the three major points that I will make in my talk, and then honestly and straightforwardly offer your ideas and questions during our 15 to 20-minute discussion period following the presentation. I also want to emphasize, that as far as I am concerned, there are no “dumb” or “insignificant” questions when we talk seriously about nuclear war. I will stick around for a while after the meeting to discuss any questions, criticisms, or disagreements that you may wish to address.

Once I began using this new approach, things started to radically change in terms of audience response to my message. Individuals seemed to be more alert, I received more questions and comments than before, and more people stayed with me after the meeting for more in-depth discussion. Thus, a simple explanation of psychological denial, as it relates to the discussion of nuclear war, has proven to increase the readiness, openness, and willingness of most people to carefully focus on the topic.

Insensitivity to the Remote

Another psychological block is the phenomenon known as "insensitivity to the remote." In discussing this problem, Jerome Frank said:

Human sense organs are magnificently equipped to detect tiny

changes in the environment—a few parts of illumination gas in a million parts of air brings the housewife rushing into the kitchen; a match flaring a quarter of a mile away on a dark night instantly flags an onlooker's attention. Only the environmental events within the range of our sense organs matter, and like our ancestors, we have no biological need to detect and respond to stimuli that do not impinge on any sense organ. With distant events becoming increasingly vital to our safety, this deficiency—“insensitivity to the remote”—is a particularly important source of the general failure to respond with appropriate vigor to the dangers of nuclear weapons.⁷³

One way to deal with such insensitivity is to remind individuals and groups that decision making time to launch U.S. or Russian nuclear missiles is very short, and launch to landing times are 25 minutes or less. The “Timeline to Catastrophe” table in the appendix of this book contains such data. The table is useful in helping others to face what may seem to be a distant, abstract situation. In fact, I always carry a copy of the table with me for individual dialogues, and also use it as a handout for seminars and even larger audiences. There's something about having the "Timeline to Catastrophe" in hand that brings the threat of nuclear war out of the abstract into the concrete.

⁷³ Frank, J.D. (1967). *Sanity and Survival in the Nuclear Age: Psychological Aspects of War and Peace*. New York: Random House, pp. 26-27.

Habituation

Jerome Frank also identified another psychological obstacle hindering meaningful discussion of problems associated with the threat of nuclear war:

Habituation, another property of our biological equipment, also impedes adequate appreciation of the nuclear danger. Survival in the wild requires the ability not only to detect tiny changes in the environment, but also to stop detecting them if nothing happens. If an animal kept on attending to every stimulus, his capacity to sense possible fresh dangers would be swamped. Therefore, continuing stimuli, except painful ones which represent a continuing danger, rapidly stop registering, thus freeing the sense organs to pick up new ones. The phenomenon is familiar to all of us—a person moving to a busy street soon sleeps through the traffic noise that at first kept him awake. As long as it is not overwhelmingly unpleasant or dangerous, any persistent environmental feature gradually comes to be taken for granted. One is reminded of Alexander Pope's comment on vice, “A monster of such evil mien/as to be hated needs but to be seen/but seen too oft, familiar with her face,/we first endure, then pity then embrace.”

As a new form of destructive power, the Hiroshima atom bomb, with an explosive equivalent two thousand tons of TNT, created considerable apprehension. Since then, the size of available nuclear weapons has about doubled annually, until today [In 1967] the world's stockpiles total at least 50 *billion* tons. We should be terrified, but because of habituation and insensitivity to the remote, we are not.⁷⁴

⁷⁴ Frank, J.D. (1967). *Sanity and Survival in the Nuclear Age: Psychological Aspects of War and Peace*. New York: Random House, pp. 27-28.

In talking about the nuclear threat, activists sometimes contribute to the habituation problem. On occasion, friends and relatives have said to me, "Bill, you have been talking and writing about nuclear destruction for over 40 years. Obviously, we have not had a nuclear war, and it seems that peace between us and the Russians has been fostered because both sides realize that nuclear war would be mass suicide. So, why do you continue to worry us with this problem?"

It would seem that nuclear disarmament advocates have sometimes been seen much like the little boy who cried wolf once too often. And of course, the problem with that story is that the wolf eventually did eat the sheep.

To counter the "cry wolf" situation it is essential to gently re-iterate the factual information related to historical nuclear weapons accidents, and to once again emphasize the folly of keeping U.S. and Russian nukes on hair-trigger alert. Even unconcerned and uninvolved individuals might be moved to support the de-alerting process, if they can be convinced that nuclear weapons are needlessly on hair-trigger status, and that "Murphy's Law" is a painful fact of life.

Self-Absorption

Often, when those concerned with nuclear disarmament encourage others to confront the threat, they find some individuals are almost totally occupied with the trials and tribulations of everyday life. After all, it is not a simple matter to put food on the table and to take care of the health, education, and other developmental needs of one's own family. When asked to discuss citizen responsibility for nuclear disarmament and human survival, it is not uncommon for parents to say, "I'm now overloaded as it is. If I am to take care of my family, I certainly cannot concern myself with a problem that I can't do anything about."

Such responses are very understandable. Many parents and families are definitely overloaded with the vicissitudes of daily life. Somehow, those who are totally occupied with personal survival have to be helped to understand that the threat of nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert is also a very important aspect of their individual lives, and that of their children. It is also important to note that not all families are hard pressed to "make it through the day." There are many people who have considerable leisure, but who use it almost solely for consumer-oriented activities or passive TV

watching, with very little concern for citizenship responsibilities. It is not the role of nuclear disarmament activists to criticize others for enjoying life. It is their job, however, to provide some mental stimulation for those who might consider helping the cause.

As previously mentioned, it is important to solicit the assistance of activists who are pursuing other socially responsible goals and objectives. If the dialogue for nuclear disarmament is successfully utilized, it is likely that many such persons will see the connection to their own efforts—in health, education, environment, and other areas of concern.

Feelings of Helplessness and Hopelessness When Dealing with “Large” Problems

Unquestionably, many individuals are fully aware of the nuclear weapons threat to human survival, but feel completely hopeless about the situation. They are convinced that they are helpless in terms of anything positive they can do to work on the problem. It is little wonder that some individuals have such feelings, which may be the result of a phenomenon known as "trained incapacity." The term represents a host of situations involving the breeding of narrow mindedness, tunnel vision and "hardening

of the categories.” Burke defines it as “that state of affairs whereby one’s very abilities can function as blindnesses,”⁷⁵ Also, feelings of helpless and hopelessness go beyond one's background, nurture and training, including such phenomena as current "stimulus overload," or authoritarian living and working conditions.

In a "pragmatically" oriented society like that of the U.S., students and citizens are taught to focus their attention on short-term, "practical" problems that "they can really get their teeth into" and wrap up in a relatively short period of time. In fact, they are subjected to civic and educational environments that discourage a large-scale global vision, one which shows the connection of their individual lives to that of the larger world. They are told to focus on problems in their immediate environment, and that leaders, experts, specialists and other powerful individuals will take care of big, distant problems like nuclear war. In short, many educational institutions, youth groups, churches, etc., train their clients to ignore problems "about which they can do nothing," and which require a substantial level of delayed gratification for their eventual solution. They are told to "live in the precious present." This type of living can be highly

⁷⁵ Burke, K. (1984). *Permanence and Change*. University of California Press.

useful, but if done with exclusion of consideration to the past and future, it becomes an irresponsible way of life.

On several occasions, while conversing with adults, I have been told that I should narrow my own vision and do something practical on other local peace issues. The implication was that, some how, such activity will markedly contribute to the abolition of nuclear weapons. In other words, working on other problems of human conflict or inter-group relations will spin-out in a way that national leaders will be convinced to begin the disarmament process. One friend told me, "Bill, if you *really* want to do something for peace, you need to go back to conducting your seminars on interpersonal competence like you did in the 1960's. After all, how can we possibly solve problems like nuclear war, unless we seriously address the root causes of human conflict?"

Such thinking seriously undercuts any immediate attempt to get rid of nuclear weapons. My friend's reasoning assumes that nuclear weapons are only a symptom of a deeper issue—the inability of people to solve their conflict in a non-violent, harmonious manner. And, until we do get to that root cause, we can never hope to get rid of nuclear weapons. This argument overlooks many factors, including weapons profiteering,

institutional empire building, basic technical barbarism, and others not intrinsically linked to basic human hatred and conflict. It also fails to take into account the fact that symptoms often kill the patient well before all root causes are even identified. Thus, waiting until we all learn to love each other will never achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons.

"Experts Know Best—Let Them Handle the Problem"

The topic of nuclear war can be daunting, challenging, and an arcane area of study if all its technical, strategic and organizational aspects are taken into account. Consequently, beginning students of the problem often experience feelings associated with stimulus overload. This can lead to feelings of ineptitude, causing them to give up their activities with the belief that politicians, scientific experts and military analysts/strategists are the only people suited to deal with the issue. Unfortunately, dependence on experts and political leaders has proven to be a seriously flawed approach.

As noted in Chapter I, politicians may obfuscate relevant facts, as in the case of President Clinton's rosy analysis of a supposed nuclear threat reduction, while at the same time his military planners were devising new

and better strategies to frighten adversaries. Historically, highly lauded nuclear arms control measures have often been the disease for which they should be the cure. This has been particularly true when short-term arms control measures, such as the SORT Treaty, have been used to turn attention away from highly improved, innovative nuclear weapons developments.

It is also the case that highly trusted academicians and experts in international relations inadvertently, or sometimes purposely, provide information that is inaccurate. This causes people to either overlook, or to deny, the reality of the actual situation. For example, in 1972, I was invited to speak at a national conference in Washington, D.C. entitled "A Citizens Hearings on What is National Security." Another speaker on our panel was Hans Morgenthau, one of the world's most highly respected experts in the field of international relations. At one point in his speech, Professor Morgenthau stated that as bad as the Soviet/U.S. nuclear standoff was, the balance of terror had appeared to prevent war between the two superpowers. And while in no way was Morgenthau a "nuclear war hawk," he was of the opinion that the superpowers' nuclear threat systems were stable in terms of command and control.

Following Morgenthau's speech, I asked him if he was aware that four young U.S. Air Force missile officers in Missouri, and others at Air Force bases in various parts of the country, could launch their Minuteman missiles with no higher order from anyone. He replied, "You're telling me this, but where's your data?" I then quoted the following statement from my 1969 paper *Rethinking the Unthinkable*:

The fact is it is possible for four officers in a Minuteman Squadron to launch and start World War III without authorization from anyone. If four officers, in two capsules, decide to turn their keys and launch, then they can do so without orders from anyone. There is no absolute guarantee that orders have to be followed. Naturally this would be "illegal," but who would be around to punish them?

Morgenthau asked where I got that information. I then explained that I had discussions with several launch officers stationed at Whiteman Air Force Base in Knob Knoster, Missouri, and that particular quote came from Air Force Captain Rick Beal. I also offered to provide him the names and phone numbers of five other officers who would confirm the four-man "illegal" launch scenario.

Upon hearing this, Morgenthau appeared to be somewhat disturbed. His concern stemmed from the fact that he knew the four-man launch possibility seriously undercut his brand of political realism, which saw

mutual assured destruction (MAD) as a balance of power deterrent to World War III. Underlying the MAD philosophy was the notion that "If you do bad to me, I will do bad to you. Therefore, neither of us will do bad to each other because the result will be mutual suicide." However, a critical component in the MAD strategy was the requirement of leadership stability, both mental and technical. Neither the U.S. president nor his Soviet counterpart could be crazy, and above all, both leaders had to have *COMPLETE* and ultimate control of their missiles. Both criteria were absolutely necessary for the existence of a stable MAD threat system.

Thus, Morgenthau knew that if the unauthorized four-man launch scenario were possible, the stability of the whole MAD strategy was very fragile and grossly inadequate in terms of assured command and control of the weapons. Consequently, his concept of a bilateral balance of power, based on the system of mutual nuclear terror, was deeply flawed.

Following the meeting, I met Morgenthau and gave him the promised list of U.S. launch officers. It is my understanding that in later presentations, he modified his reluctant enthusiasm for the MAD position, and even noted, "Four people could blow up the world."

This story points out that very well respected experts are often

unaware of key information that runs contrary to their carefully formed opinions and cherished beliefs. One other point needs to be made regarding the episode with Morgenthau. Several of my colleagues were upset with my challenge of Morgenthau's view of the benefits of nuclear weapons. In fact, one of my friends said that I had essentially made a fool of myself in challenging a man of his stature. From my point of view, it was ethically and intellectually necessary to do so. I did not pose my questions in a hostile way, but I was straightforward and firm in my approach to the Professor. The fact that he was a popular, world-class scholar was not, to my mind, grounds for failing to stress a very important point, which in some ways undercut a substantial portion of one of his major political theories. If somehow I was foolish in my approach, at least I was a "fool for peace and nuclear disarmament."

It is important to note, that the Department of Defense under Robert McNamara installed "permissive action links" or PALS, on the Minuteman missiles, which were essentially locks with specific combinations for each missile. McNamara called the PALS essential to preventing unauthorized launches. According to Dr. Bruce Blair, what McNamara didn't know was that the Strategic Air Command (SAC) in Omaha quietly decided to set the

“locks” to all zeros in order to circumvent this safeguard. The locks that could have prohibited the possibility of the illegal four-man launch were not activated until 1977.⁷⁶

Narrow Localism

A primary obstacle to local campaigns on behalf of nuclear disarmament is "narrow localism." In most small towns, suburbs and cities, concerned citizens naturally spend the bulk of their energies on matters related to schools, economic development, roads, health, education, sanitation, zoning, parks and recreation, etc. These are the vital issues and concerns that determine the quality of life in our local communities.

However, there is one additional local issue that often fails to receive adequate attention—the possibility that one's own community might be totally devastated by nuclear bombs. When activists approach local leaders with a request to hold town meetings or sign official declarations on behalf of nuclear disarmament, they often fail to see such measures as matters of local concern. In fact, they frequently emphasize the idea that they deal

⁷⁶ Blair, B.G, (2004, February 11). Keeping presidents in the nuclear dark (episode #1: The case of the missing “permissive action links”). *Center for Defense Information*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cdi.org/blair/permissive-action-links.cfm>

only with local issues, and leave international concerns such as nuclear disarmament to their members of Congress. The fact that missiles deployed thousands of miles away can wipe out their city in less than 30 minutes is not often recognized, or dealt with as a local problem. It is this kind of narrow localism that greatly hinders the movement for the abolition of nuclear weapons.

Such localism is often related to other avoidance mechanisms such as denial and habituation, and frequently takes two forms, which can only be called "tunnel vision" and "hardening of the categories." In dealing with local officials and others, it is very important to help them understand the concrete threat to community life and development. They should be informed that many things can be done educationally and politically to alert fellow citizens to the problem, such as plugging into programs of well-known national and international non-governmental organizations already seeking solutions to the nuclear weapons danger. Signing on to a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Declaration, or a presidential appeal for nuclear sanity are two major steps in a more comprehensive effort to change citizen attitudes. National and international adoption and implementation of the Road Map to Nuclear Disarmament is simply not in the cards, unless a

significant number of local citizens pressure their members of Congress to support its measures.

One of the most prominent programs engaging local citizens on behalf of nuclear disarmament is the "Mayors for Peace" project, originated by Takeshi Araki, former Mayor of Hiroshima. On June 24, 1982, at the Second U.N. Special Session on Disarmament, he outlined what he called the "Program to Promote the Solidarity of Cities Toward the Total Abolition of Nuclear Weapons." Mayor Araki's proposal demonstrated a strategy in which local cities worldwide could work jointly to promote education and political action for the elimination and abolition of nuclear weapons from our planet. Accordingly, the proposal encouraged mayors around the world to support the nuclear weapons abolition campaign.

Today, the Mayors for Peace project has a membership of over 3,000 cities, in 134 countries and regions throughout the world.⁷⁷ The project is officially registered as a United Nations non-governmental organization in "Special Consultative Status" of the U.N. Economic and Social Council. It builds solidarity, and facilitates coordination among member cities through advocacy leadership by spreading its message to, and establishing

⁷⁷ Details of the Mayors for Peace project can be found at:
<http://www.mayorsforpeace.org/english/index.html>

solidarity with, all who are concerned with human survival.

Cities can join by sending a letter from the mayor or chair of the City Council to the program's secretariat stating that the city supports the effort and would like to join. Not only will membership promote advocacy and education for nuclear disarmament, the very act of seeking program endorsement by mayors and city council members will, itself, bring nuclear weapons abolition to public attention.

Other Obstacles

Unfortunately, dozens of other social and psychological issues hinder serious study and action for nuclear disarmament. With that in mind, not everyone succumbs to the same roadblock. Giving consideration to those obstacles is a way to help newly recruited activists avoid discouragement when they are confronted with unresponsive recruits.

Marc Pilisuk and Jamie Rowen have addressed many of those issues in their book, *Using Psychology to Help Abolish Nuclear Weapons: A*

Handbook,⁷⁸ published by Psychologists for Social Responsibility. This handbook provides an invaluable tool for those who seek to educate and lobby for nuclear disarmament. One section of that book is titled, "The Psychology of Specific Audiences and Constituencies," which offers information and psychological advice concerning the following, and more:

- Political Leaders and Public Officials
- Reaching the Media on Nuclear Weapons Issues
- Reaching Those Only Active on Local Issues
- Radical and Evangelical Right-Wing Groups
- Nuclear Weapons Developers

David Barash and Judith Eve Lipton have also provided an analysis of psychological issues surrounding the search for nuclear disarmament. Their well written book, *Stop Nuclear War: A Handbook*, includes a chapter titled, "Psychology: Thinking and Not Thinking About the Unthinkable."

Topics in that chapter include:

- "The Neanderthal Mentality:" fighting pays; we win—you lose; either you're with us, or you're against us; it hasn't happened yet, so it won't happen

⁷⁸ A free online version of their handbook can be obtained at:
http://www.psyr.org/about/pubs_resources/Using%20Psychology%20to%20Help%20Abolish%20Nuclear%20Weapons.pdf

- Cognitive Dissonance
- "Nuclearism," or the "Strangelove Syndrome"
- "Shall We Overcome?": Religion; Morality and Sanity; Beyond
Psychic Numbing⁷⁹

In sum, there are many social and psychological obstacles hindering widespread educational and political support for the prevention of nuclear war. However, these obstacles are not insurmountable if nuclear disarmament educators have at least rudimentary knowledge of their characteristics and work with others to overcome them.

Chapter VIII

The Role of Higher and Secondary Education

The academic community has greatly neglected the issue of human extinction from nuclear weapons. Analysis, discussion and teaching about this issue is relegated to a handful of faculty at most high schools and universities. It is essential that educators lead the way in bringing the problem back into focus.

When horrific problems challenge positive human development, and

⁷⁹ This book is highly recommended: Barash, D.P., & Lipton, J.E. (1982). *Stop Nuclear War: A Handbook*. New York: Grove Press. pp. 214-239.

human survival is itself threatened, educators have to change their ways of thinking and behaving. After all, instruction for positive development is unquestionably a meta-goal of the entire educational enterprise. Those who leave out this goal default on sound educational philosophy. Educators need to be encouraged to include nuclear disarmament content in their ongoing courses as well as to develop new courses and programs. A number of professors and teachers nationwide do offer well-documented courses on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation strategies. Unfortunately, many other educators argue that they are already overloaded with the research and courses they are paid to teach, and they simply do not have the time to work on another specialty.

In a conversation I once had with noted economist and peace researcher, Kenneth Boulding, he used the term "sub-optimization" to refer to "doing extremely well that which doesn't need to be done at all in terms of human survival." Educators must not engage in sub-optimization. This is not to say that they must ignore their particular disciplinary efforts. Instead, the basic educational philosophic question must be, "In concert with my current curricular offerings, how can I include subject matter concerning the avoidance of the destruction of Planet Earth (with nuclear

weapons) into my course offerings?"

No question, some deans, administrators, and high school principals will balk at the inclusion of nuclear disarmament content into their established courses. Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, was known to repeat the quote: "Changing a college curriculum is like moving a graveyard—you never know how many friends the dead have until you try to move them." Indeed it is, but ultimately, it is not administrators who are responsible for what an instructor teaches. Freedom of speech extends to the classroom in the form of academic independence by those who do the actual teaching. There may be specific requirements for course offerings and the subject matter to be presented, but when an instructor truly deems a topic to be relevant, it is his or her choice to present that content within the framework of course requirements—school board and university trustee opinion notwithstanding.

A personal example of how the above question can be incorporated into existing courses, as well as how strong administrative resistance can be to such actions, relates to a "Community Recreation" course I taught years ago at the University of Missouri. The course included one chapter related to the history of health, physical education and recreation in the

U.S. and other parts of the world. It was taught during the late 1960's, when the U.S. war against Vietnam was in high gear. Many of my students were college athletes, some of whom eventually played football in the National Football League. In fact, one of the students became NFL Rookie of the Year.

In discussing the history of physical education, I pointed out that the field had been successfully utilized for centuries to prepare young men for military service and war fighting. Included on this list are the Greeks, Romans, Chinese, Germans, and the U.S. since World War I. The draftee physical fitness exam scores prior to both World Wars served as stimuli for strengthened secondary school programs of physical education in the U.S. In fact, the World War I draftees were found to be so out of shape that a movement was initiated to require that physical education be taught in all U.S. high schools. The motivation was definitely war preparation. To some degree, a similar situation inspired John F. Kennedy to sponsor the U.S. President's Council on Physical Fitness.

Within the war preparation context of the course, I posed the following question to the athletes and others in the class:

It has been said that the Duke of Wellington claimed that the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of the elite

English School—Eton.⁸⁰ What do you think the Duke meant by that statement, and do you agree or disagree with him that the battle was, in fact, won there?

Most of the students, like myself, did not know a great deal about the battle, but several students speculated that it could have been won because of the fitness habits learned by the young students at Eton. And, they probably also learned a great deal about cohesive team relations and patriotism, which had carry-over value to small group military activity such as that of an infantry platoon.

Following their comments, I posed another issue, "Lord Bertrand Russell, the world renown mathematician and philosopher, said, 'The Battle of Waterloo was not won on the playing fields of Eton—it was started there.'" We then talked about Russell's concern that sports activities, when improperly conducted, can lay the groundwork for male chauvinism and extreme militant nationalism.

Following that discourse, I held up a copy of *Life Magazine* displaying a picture of a young man named Pete Dawkins, a former All-American football player at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, who was also a Rhodes Scholar. The picture showed Captain Dawkins dressed in combat

⁸⁰ Some scholars question whether Wellington actually made that statement.

fatigues and wearing a red beret. The caption over the picture said, "Army's All-America Rhodes Scholar, Now in Vietnam: Captain Pete Dawkins Keeps on Winning."⁸¹

I then asked the students who is correct: the Duke of Wellington or Lord Russell? Needless to say, the question accomplished the goal of stimulating a great deal of discussion. The Wellington/Russell values clarification exercise was just one of many activities used in the "Community Recreation" course, as well as an additional undergraduate and graduate level course.

The dean who headed the School of Social and Community Services got word of my teaching material and approach to questions about war and peace. He became very dissatisfied, to the extent that he had someone in the class report back to him on my teaching. Later that year, the dean issued me a terminal contract, read "pink slip," even though I was completely covering all of the basic elements of a well-prepared course, which dealt with the concepts of comprehensive programs of publicly conducted and supported recreation. My firing was also carried out despite the fact that the undergraduate students of the Department of Recreation

⁸¹ *Life Magazine*. (1966, April 8).

and Park Administration presented me an award for outstanding teaching, and the fact that the number of students who signed up for my courses exceeded that of any other instructor in the department. Eventually, the American Association of University Professors censured the University of Missouri on my behalf. The case included a variety of conflict variables, including my activities as a campus anti-war protester, but the origins of the case had to do with "in-class" issues of academic freedom.

Clearly, including relevant subject matter not commonly included in conventional courses can be dangerous to one's long-term employment. Nevertheless, that's what creative teaching is all about. Throughout the educational system, a willingness to confront the difficult problems that threaten decent life and survival on this planet is needed from teachers. Those problems include: environmental degradation, large scale violations of human rights, rapidly increasing population growth, the prosecution of illegal wars, and the threat of nuclear holocaust.

Attention to these problems is demanded by a philosophy of education called "social reconstructionism," which is based on the idea that people are responsible for creating social conditions, therefore, they have the responsibility to improve life on our planet by changing the social order

via the application of democratic ideals and principles through education. Certainly, not all college teachers will operate under the tenets of social reconstructionism, but those who do can lead the way in bringing the threat of nuclear war back into focus on college campuses. They can also strongly encourage their colleagues to include nuclear disarmament and war prevention topics in their courses and community service activities. The same holds true for high school teachers, especially those who teach literature, writing, social studies, physical and biological sciences, health education, and other appropriate courses.

Again, it is important to stress that one does not have to be academically competent in physical science or physical technology of any sort to challenge the madness of plans for nuclear destruction. Rather, academics and others must simply comprehend that the insane possibility of nuclear holocaust is real and it does not get the level of educational attention its consequences demand. The situation is bound to worsen without citizen action, which will not occur unless educators assist in confronting the problem. Any reasonable philosophy of education must address the major human and natural threats to our survival, including that of nuclear war. Failure to do so is, in fact, an act of criminal negligence on the

part of teachers whose job it is to help students address the primary obstacles and threats to their own development and that of their fellow students. Unless teachers adopt such a philosophy, their other teachings may be of little or no consequence.

As discussed earlier, talking regularly and systematically about the problems associated with nuclear war is one of the first steps in actually dealing with the problem. Therefore, promoting and conducting "dialogues for nuclear disarmament" can help facilitate significant input into various academic curricula. Curriculum design and development concerning nuclear disarmament education can be initiated by any concerned faculty member who wishes to promote the integration of nuclear war prevention subject-matter into existing courses and departmental activities, or who wishes to develop new, relevant courses.

Dialogue questions pertaining to curriculum construction for use with faculty in sociology, political science, journalism, literature, writing, philosophy, psychology, social work, environmental studies, peace studies, health education, women's studies, religious studies, and other disciplines include:

1. What should be the role of higher education in confronting the

problem of nuclear war?

2. What can this discipline do to ensure that the issue is properly included in existing courses?
3. What are the primary, available texts, journals, course materials and on-line resources that relate to this problem?
4. What nuclear disarmament related courses are now available on this campus?
5. Which on-campus faculty members have shown interest?
6. Who are some of the "outside" experts who might be brought to campus for public presentations and curriculum consultations?
7. What is the possibility that new courses or new course modules might be designed?

Missouri University Nuclear Disarmament Education Team (MUNDET)

In conjunction with the above questions and the understanding that most college and university professors are seriously defaulting on nuclear war issues, the Peace Studies Program at Missouri University has initiated the Missouri University Nuclear Disarmament Education Team (MUNDET). This team is a good example of what can be accomplished at universities

across the country requiring only a small number of educators dedicated to the problem. In accordance with MU's mission of research, instruction, and public service, MUNDET's function is to consult with interested faculty and students at the university and elsewhere about research into nuclear disarmament. It provides assistance to academic units for curriculum development and aids educational, civic and faith-based organizations and other interested parties in disarmament programming.

The methods of MUNDET were inspired by agricultural extension clubs, which bring the resources of state universities to farmers and others in the community. Its mission is to inform citizens of Missouri and elsewhere of the urgent need to abolish nuclear weapons from the planet and to inspire them to work for this goal. In that spirit, it encourages people of all walks of life and educational background to join the team. It is not necessary to have a degree or expertise in international affairs to engage people on the topic.

MUNDET recruits leaders in nuclear disarmament education to serve as honorary coaches and to lend their expertise. The founding coaches are: Frances A. Boyle, professor of international law at the University of Illinois; David Kreiger, president, and Rick Wayman, director, of the Nuclear

Age Peace Foundation; and writer Jonathan Schell. The team joins in common cause with other nuclear disarmament coalitions and provides a model of action for university and educational groups.

One team member, Steve Starr, has become one of the foremost educators in the field of nuclear war and its climatic consequences. He presents talks both locally and internationally, including at the United Nations and Australia. His material can be found at his website called nucleardarkness.org. At the website, Steve summarizes several scientific studies following the famous 1983 in-depth study lead by Carl Sagan into the possible atmospheric consequences of nuclear war; all have confirmed the scientific validity of “nuclear winter.” This is the effect caused by millions of tons of smoke from nuclear explosions rising into the Earth’s stratosphere, far above weather movements. There, the sunlight blocking smoke could actually remain in the stratosphere for at least a decade.

The new research modeled a range of nuclear conflicts, beginning with a “regional” nuclear war of 100 Hiroshima-size weapons, such as between India and Pakistan, all the way up to a full-scale nuclear conflict using the entire global nuclear arsenal. Nuclear winter would still occur at the regional conflict level and would rapidly reduce temperatures by about a

degree Celsius and would also reduce average global precipitation by ten percent.

If 1/3 of the total global nuclear arsenal were detonated, about 60 percent of U.S. and Russian strategic weapons now on high-alert status, within days cooling would be worse than the coldest period of the last Ice Age 18,000 years ago. Thus, any conflict that targets even a tiny fraction of the global nuclear arsenal against large urban centers, will cause catastrophic disruptions of the global climate leading to the collapse of total ecosystems, followed by starvation among many people.⁸²

Nuclear Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Curriculum Materials

Faculty in all fields of education should explore possibilities for developing new nuclear disarmament courses and modules within their own academic specialties. In undertaking that task, educators should review various curricular resources that have already been developed and are presently in use. Two of the best sources for those materials are the Teacher's Tool Kit offered on-line by the Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI) and

⁸² all statistics taken from: Starr, S. (2008, April). Catastrophic climatic consequences of nuclear conflict. *INESAP Information Bulletin* 28. Retrieved from: <http://www.nucleardarkness.org/warconsequences/catastrophicclimaticconsequences/>

the Nuclear Age Course Syllabi Project of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation (NAPF).⁸³

The Course Syllabi Project is a unique online repository for the field of peace education that encourages communication among teachers and the public. Presently, 87 syllabi are provided at the website. These syllabi offer an abundance of curricular resources adaptable for use in several disciplines. Material can be added or subtracted to meet the needs of a particular academic discipline, both as units of existing courses or for the development of new courses.

The overview of a course offered at the American University's Nuclear Studies Institute, entitled "The Nuclear Age: From Hiroshima to Nuclear Terrorism," is a good example:

The nuclear age, now over fifty years old, has exerted an unimaginably profound effect on late twentieth-century patterns of thought and ways of living. From the detonation of the first nuclear weapons over Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, nuclear weapons, nuclear energy and the culture surrounding them have shaped our lives. The explosions inaugurating the nuclear age transformed international military and political relationships. They also transformed popular culture and social life: art, literature and film, as well as politics and military doctrine have all reflected and embodied the traumas of nuclear

⁸³ Bibliographies of all courses are included for both NTI's "Teachers Tool Kit" and Nuclear Files.org's Nuclear Age Syllabus Project on their websites at: http://www.nti.org/h_learnmore/h_index.html and <http://www.nuclearfiles.org/menu/educators/course-syllabi> respectively.

culture. Accessible to scientists and non-scientists, this course aims to explore the origins and development of nuclear culture, and tries to shed light on the interactions of science, technology, politics, gender and cultural production in the nuclear world. The course also asks: can a new understanding of nuclear discourse help us come to terms with the nuclear past, and does it offer any guidance as to how we should think about the nuclear present and the nuclear future?

Two other examples come from the NTI Teachers' Tool Kit. In the summer of 2000, instructor Michael Barletta offered an advanced research seminar called "Nuclear Proliferation, Non-Proliferation, and Counter-Proliferation" at the Monterey Institute for International Studies. The course was designed to examine the origins of nuclear weapons proliferation and its impact on U.S. and international security. The goal of the course was to familiarize students with the central debates and key cases in order to think analytically about the cause and consequences of nuclear proliferation, and to evaluate policy responses to impede, dissuade and cope with the spread of nuclear weapons.

A beginner's course was offered by Fredrick K. Lamb at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in the spring of 2006 called "Nuclear Weapons and Arms Control." It was a non-technical lesson on the physics of nuclear weapons and delivery systems, their effects, and

defenses against nuclear attack. The course included a presentation of current issues and was designed to assist students in making informed judgments about nuclear armaments and arms control.

A general content analysis of the courses listed on the Teacher's Tool Kit and Course Syllabi Project indicate common topical offerings. College and university instructors from many academic disciplines should consider the following as a starting point for developing their own courses in the field of nuclear disarmament education:

1. The origins and history of nuclear proliferation, including technological, humanitarian, and legal factors.
2. Present dangers and trends in nuclear proliferation.
3. Problems and threats of lateral nuclear proliferation, i.e., acquisition of nuclear weapons by those states that are now non-nuclear weapons states.
4. Nuclear disarmament processes and associated problems.
5. Central debates and key cases pertaining to the causes of nuclear weapons proliferation.
6. Questions related to past nonproliferation strategies and efforts, and their suitability for today.

7. Individual judgment-making regarding issues of arms control and disarmament.
8. How to improve arms control and disarmament strategies.
9. Applications of international law to nuclear disarmament.

Other Approaches to Course Development

I taught an honors course at the University of Missouri called "The Creative Peace Workshop," which examined many of the major issues related to peace and world order. The same method used for teaching this course could also deal exclusively with matters pertaining to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, and might be called, "Thinking Creatively About Nuclear Disarmament." There is no question that this approach works well with highly motivated honors students, but I believe a similar approach can be used with "regular" college and high school students, if the number of students is limited to 20-30 and school policies are flexible enough to permit this creative approach.

The 20 students in our "workshop" were asked to brainstorm suggestions regarding the question: "What is Peace?" Once the class agreed upon several basic definitions of "peace," they were asked to do

another brainstorm exercise regarding the question: "What are the major obstacles to the achievement of peace on our Planet?" As each student responded to the question, dozens of obstacles were listed on a flip chart, and the class then voted on the topics with which they wished to cover during the whole semester.

Through a process of "multi-voting," the number of topics was narrowed to a total of twenty. Students then agreed on which member of the class would be assigned a particular topic for purposes of library research, online research, special readings, the viewing of videos, interviews with campus or off-campus experts, etc. Emphasis was placed on the acquisition of up-to-date information and ideas concerning the assigned topics.

Students were then instructed to prepare a basic bibliography of materials pertaining to their chosen topic for distribution to the entire class. They were also told to prepare talking points for a 25-minute talk on their respective topics, to be followed by 25-minutes of class discussion. In that the semester was 16 weeks long, with three classes per week, we had time allotments for 20 student presentations, which required approximately seven weeks for completion.

For the remaining seven weeks, each student was asked to conduct three dialogues for peace with individuals in Columbia, MO. They were asked to present reviews of at least one of the dialogues to the entire class. Once again, the time limit per student was 25 minutes, with the remaining 25 minutes per class devoted to group examination and discussion of the information being presented. The rules of the presentations also allowed the presenting student to compare and contrast the responses of all three of the dialogue partners from whom s/he had obtained information.

It is important to note that the instructor provided guidance for in-depth analysis of the ramifications of all of the data provided by the student dialogue initiators. It is also important to point out that the heart of the "Creative Peace Workshop" approach is the notion that an instructor whose I.Q. may be lower (as mine was) than some of his/her honors students can use a proven educational technique and process to maximize student input and intrinsic involvement, while at the same time setting up the conditions to ensure that the information offered to the class is timely and up-to-date. This is not to suggest that standard resources were not available to students. A substantial amount of supplementary material was suggested, but students used those materials as they related to their own specific

needs and interests.

Another useful approach to course development is to build a course around a single, well-written, well-documented text. One creative way to do so comes from a peace studies colleague at the University of Missouri, John Kultgen, who is a MUNDET member and Emeritus Professor of Philosophy, taught a very popular course for many years called “Philosophies of War and Peace.” He has written an excellent book entitled, *In the Shadow of the Valley: Reflections on the Morality of Nuclear Deterrence*.⁸⁴ A simple model for using John's book as a guide for the development of a new course could be titled, "The Morality of Nuclear War." In so doing, an instructor could use the five major units of the book as the core elements of the course:

Part One: Facts of the Matter (Nuclear Deterrence)

- Policies
- Arsenals and Strategies
- Measures and Intentions (Uses of Nuclear Weapons)

Part Two: Moral Issues

- The Realists

⁸⁴ Kultgen, J. (1999). *In the Valley of the Shadow: Reflections on the Morality of Nuclear Deterrence*. New York: Peter Lang, ISBN: 0-8204-4473-1.

- The Moralists
- The Moral Argument for Deterrence
- The Natural Law Argument Against Deterrence

Part Three: Against the Use of Nuclear Weapons

- Précis of a Social Ethic
- Nuclear War and Proportionality
- Nuclear War and Discrimination

Part Four: Bases for Judgment of Deterrence

- The Question of Intentions
- Does Deterrence Work?

Part Five: The Pathology of Deterrence

- Seeds of Evil
- Growth of Evil
- Fruits of Evil
- The Way Out

In addition to the content outlined above, John Kultgen's book provides an extensive bibliography on nuclear disarmament issues, useful to any instructor who chooses to develop a new module or full course in his/her own discipline.

Nuclear Disarmament Education for High School Students

Most high school students receive little, if any, education on non-proliferation topics prior to entering college. In fact, they receive very little exposure to peace-oriented education, as the typical history courses are organized from war to war and general to general. This is a missed opportunity to set a good foundation for a lifetime commitment and involvement in nuclear disarmament issues. Access to this information cannot be limited only to the “academic elite” of the college educated because it is an issue that fundamentally affects everyone.

Unfortunately, state and federal mandates, such as the misleadingly named No Child Left Behind program, have discouraged teachers from exploring curricula outside of standard materials. Instead, teachers are forced to rush through materials to be covered on standardized tests, which determine student and teacher performance and how much money the school will receive. Education of this type only teaches students to be good test takers, not common sense or multi-dimensional thinkers. Clearly, with the implementation of metal-detectors at every entrance, resident police presences, strip searches, and lockdowns, schools have increasingly taken

on the characteristics of prisons. Instead of treating the next generation as violent captives, which is exactly what they will become if treated this way, an alternative to the current trend must be taken.

In a response to the August 2001 session of the Study on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Education, Leah Wells, then Peace Education Coordinator for the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, said:

For young people to become active in disarmament and non-proliferation, they must first have the opportunity to come to some understanding and awareness that these two topics are global problems with personal implications. Students are not taught to be system-oriented, seeing the world as a living organism and acknowledging the web of interconnections that span the globe. If our goal is to educate kids about disarmament and non-proliferation, then our first step is getting them to believe that our world is worth saving. The military now has direct access into high schools in America through programming called Channel One, which broadcasts "news" into schools for fifteen minutes every day. ROTC recruiters are allowed onto campuses, but conscientious objectors are thrown off school grounds. Specific classes in nonviolence education are few and far between in the United States, and many teachers are too overwhelmed with their current curriculum to believe that themes of peace and justice infused into their existing lesson plans could work.⁸⁵

Wells presents four recommendations to change this trajectory. First, schools must be made more nonviolent by making nonviolence education a

⁸⁵ Wells, L.C. (2001, August). NAPF response to the August 2001 session of Study on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Education. *Nuclear Age Peace Foundation*. from: http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/2001/08/00_wells_NAPF-response.htm

mandatory component and by removing the militaristic marketing and orientation. Rather than classrooms being corporate experiments, non-governmental organizations should utilize the “news” networks to encourage coverage of peace-friendly programming to an already captive audience. Second, non-governmental organizations should interface the existing materials on disarmament and non-proliferation and compile a “user-friendly” seminar and framework for allowing student participation in this issue, such as: how to write to a newspaper or member of congress, create a press release or petition, and how to engage their creativity towards a positive goal. Third, when possible, students need to experience first-hand the effects of governmental policies on other countries. If it is not possible to visit another country where young people are actively participating in conflict, then students could be taken on field trips to weapons testing sites or factories where the many different weapons are produced. Lastly, students need to be shown a more complete and real picture of the problem rather than blaming the warring parties for their reliance on weapons to settle conflicts. Students need to know that the number one export in America is weapons and that they are supplied to

both sides in most of the ongoing conflicts worldwide.⁸⁵

One model high school lesson on nuclear disarmament comes from the Canadian-based program called A World Without Weapons. This program developed a well prepared lesson plan titled, "Introduction to Disarmament and Non-Proliferation," which focuses on weapon systems including nuclear weapons. This lesson plan and its many activities can be easily adapted to deal only with nuclear weapons. Below is the lesson plan outline, which has been altered to include only issues related to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Course rubrics have also been altered to fit the "nuclear weapons only" mode. The original lesson plan calls for two class periods, but a more in-depth treatment of the suggested activities would require at least a week-long unit or module to successfully cover the lesson materials and activities.

Overview:

Students will gain an overall understanding of the major issues related to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Students will also study the motivations for armament and disarmament, and the process by which the international community, regional

organizations and the U.N. encourage the practice of disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Objectives/Expectations:

Upon completion of the lesson, students will be able to:

- Explain the meaning of disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons
- Identify key areas for nuclear disarmament
- Identify the range of actions with their successes and challenges in various campaigns aimed at disarmament
- Investigate the foreign policies on nuclear disarmament of various countries
- Identify stakeholders working toward disarmament
- Understand that creating a culture of change occurs at local, national and global levels through the efforts of individuals, groups and institutions
- Analyze the underlying culture messages and the prevalence of armament in the world.

Materials:

- Student contributed news articles on nuclear weapons issues
- Handouts on techniques of brainstorming
- Teacher provided materials including pictures of various kinds of nuclear weapons, and missiles to be obtained on-line
- Internet access for website research and questions⁸⁶

Lesson Activities:

1. Give students one week to collect 3-5 news clippings or on-line articles concerning nuclear weapons issues and, if possible, responses from individuals, communities and organizations. Other forms of media can also be used, along with teacher supplied materials. An additional possibility would be to have students conduct one or two "dialogues for nuclear disarmament."

Questions for small groups or teacher led discussions:

- How many nuclear war related articles did you locate?
- How many were local/national/international?
- Did those articles refer to the potential use of nuclear weapons,

⁸⁶ Teachers may visit the U.N. website to learn more about the U.N. before teaching this lesson at: <http://www.un.org/Pubs/CyberSchoolBus/index.html>

and/or did they refer to measures for nuclear disarmament?

- To what groups, individuals, organizations or countries did the article refer?

Begin class by showing various images and or texts related to the nuclear arms race. One of the best tools which offers an overview of the nuclear war problem is the DVD, *Nuclear Weapons and the Human Future: What You Can Do to Help*.⁸⁷

2. Brainstorming questions for student discussions with small groups or the whole class:

- Why do individuals in local communities take up arms?
- Why do countries pursue nuclear arms?
- What are some of the key threats of nuclear weapons to human security?
- What can be done to lessen the threat of nuclear weapons?
- What are the implications of the proliferation of nuclear armaments?

Class Projects and Activities:

⁸⁷ Directions for obtaining a free copy of the DVD can be found at: www.wagingpeace.org, which is the homepage of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.

1. Students can create a collage of images about nuclear weapons and their use.
2. Class members can produce an awareness pamphlet on nuclear disarmament including the following information:
 - Pictures and descriptions of various kinds of nuclear weapons
 - A brief historical background of the deployment of nuclear weapons—especially in U.S. states where nuclear weapons are deployed like Nebraska, Colorado, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Missouri, etc.
 - A brief mention of nuclear weapons treaties and other international agreements
 - Shocking statistics concerning the effects of nuclear war
 - Involvement/future actions that can be undertaken at local, national and global levels
 - Sources of more information

Extension/Community Activities:

- Involve your mayor in the Hiroshima Mayors' Program
- Ask your city council to designate your city as a "Nuclear Weapons Free Zone"

- In groups, prepare a case study on one facet of nuclear disarmament, and use skits, plays and musicals, such as the "Peace Child"
- Distribute the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation's petition titled: "U.S. Leadership for a Nuclear Weapons-Free World: An Appeal to the Next President of the United States"⁸⁸

In sum, there are countless approaches to high school and college curriculum development in the field of nuclear disarmament education. The previously cited cases provide several examples of model courses that can be adapted by instructors in virtually every field of academic endeavor. The need for creative use of these materials is crucial to human survival on this planet. In truth, there are no more important study materials in any segment of secondary or higher education.

Chapter IX

The Role of Religion in Nuclear Disarmament

At the top of any religion's priority list should be the quest for world peace. If so, members of these religions should be seriously concerned about weapons of war that can destroy the earth. In fact, it is the role and

⁸⁸ The high school lesson plan noted above was based on a section of the World Without Weapons Teacher's Guide at: <http://www.unac.org/learn/wwwp>

responsibility of religion in society to address the immorality of nuclear war, and to provide guidance that will ensure that nuclear weapons are not used to destroy a very important part of God's Creation.

Some members from all of the world's religions are doing excellent work towards this goal. However, history shows that religions are frequently co-opted for the political purposes of control and division; arguably, religion has led to more wars than it has prevented. Religion has also not impeded the accumulation of nuclear weapons, as all of the world's major religions, including atheism, are represented in the political leadership of nuclear weapons states. All U.S. presidents since the creation of nuclear weapons have claimed to be devout Christians of one type or another, but none have ruled out its use.

One segment of Christianity must be addressed in particular, as it is an important obstacle to human survival. Popularly called fundamentalists, millions of American Christians believe that the Bible is inerrant, meaning that every word is literally true, and their understanding of what it means is equally inerrant and the only correct interpretation. It is important to point out that the mentality of this Christian group has a closed-minded analog in each of the other religions as well.

In keeping with this faith in Biblical inerrancy is the absolute belief that Jesus Christ will return to conquer a devilish Anti-Christ and his demonic forces in a great final battle; he will then establish a Christian millennial kingdom on Earth. These two affirmations lead conservative fundamentalists of the political-right toward apocalyptic visions of the future of our planet. For many of these folks, the Bible's prophecies concerning the end of human history are being revealed in "sign of times" phenomena like the spread of AIDS and other diseases, the increasing development of weapons of mass destruction, and the outbreak of international wars—especially in the Middle East. Accordingly, these "signs of the times" are the beginning of a doomsday scenario, which is fulfilled in three steps: the Rapture, Tribulation, and Millennium. The *Left Behind* series, which has sold over 63 million copies, has promulgated this scenario.⁸⁹

At the on-set of the Rapture, which occurs before the really bad stuff happens, faithful Christians and deceased true followers of Jesus Christ will suddenly vanish from the Earth and "will be gathered up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air."⁹⁰ Then, a seven-year Tribulation, described in the Book of Revelation, will reflect God's judgment on the non-believing

⁸⁹ General FAQ. (2008). The Official Left Behind website. Retrieved from: http://www.leftbehind.com/06_help_and_info/faq_general.asp

⁹⁰ First Thessalonians, 4:17

rebellious people of the world. They will be destroyed by pestilence, plagues, fires, and nightmarish monsters that will be let loose on sinners everywhere. Then, following Israel's total occupation of its "biblical lands," hundreds of millions of soldiers from all over the world, led by demonic spirits and the Anti-Christ, will attack Israel and trigger a final battle at a place called Armageddon.

According to the late fundamentalist preacher Jerry Falwell, the armies of the Anti-Christ will number approximately 400 million soldiers and will be heavily armed with nuclear weapons. In his 1983 statement on "Nuclear War and the Second Coming of Jesus Christ," Falwell wrote, "The tribulation will result in such bloodshed and destruction that any war up to that time will seem insignificant."⁹¹

Asked by a reporter when this would happen. Falwell said his hunch was that it would be under 50 years, "I don't think my children will live their full lives out." He was then asked why a nuclear Armageddon would not bother him, Falwell replied: "You know why I'm not worried? I ain't gonna

⁹¹ Falwell, J. (1983). *Nuclear war and the second coming of Jesus Christ*. Old-Time Gospel Hour.

be here."⁹² He was apparently right about that much.

Although there are many views of the details of the Second Coming of Christ, fundamentalists generally agree that the Tribulation will end as Jesus returns from heaven to earth. According to the Book of Revelation, "The Lord Jesus will appear, and the armies of heaven clothed in fine linen will follow him on white horses, and he will slay the Anti-Christ and his forces. (19:14-21)" In so doing, Christ will forcefully put an end to man's cruel rule on Earth, and will rule the way it should have been if man obeyed God's will. Then, the Millennium will commence and will establish one thousand years of paradise on Earth.

Thus, given the promise of the Rapture and the Millennium, many of today's Christian fundamentalists maintain that Armageddon is not really their problem, and any thought of avoiding it, or improving the prospects for long-term human survival and development, is not a vital concern. This fundamentalist outlook of the world, history, and the future, sets people aside as helpless victims and passive agents who are totally incapable of shaping and directing human destiny. Why worry about global warming, nuclear war, or the increase of deadly conflicts throughout the world?

⁹² Robert Scheer interview with Falwell, *Los Angeles Times*, March 4, 1981, quoted in Halsell, G., (1986). *Prophecy and Politics: Militant Evangelists on the Road to Nuclear War*. Westport, Conn.: Lawrence Hill and Co., pp. 34-35.

These are merely a means to an end, *the* end.

Christian fundamentalists, like all other Americans, certainly have the right to their religious beliefs. However, when those apocalyptic beliefs are translated into political action, it is very important for other Christians and concerned citizens to raise the following questions in a variety of religious, educational, and political settings, especially during presidential and congressional election campaigns:

1. Is it reasonable to believe that a God of love and mercy planned from the beginning to purposely destroy the creation and creatures made in His/Her own image?
2. Is it not inconsistent to depict Jesus as a non-violent, loving, forgiving healer of bodies and souls on the one hand, while on the other, supporting the belief that he will return to Earth as commander-in-chief of the holy warriors of retribution?
3. Is it reasonable and consistent to denounce radical Islamic terrorism, while at the same time religiously supporting the terror of Armageddon?
4. How does the fundamentalist, apocalyptic vision of the future affect human motivation regarding the education and hard work required to

solve our most pressing human-made problems?

Without such questioning we may end up with political leaders whose religious beliefs cause Armageddon to be a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Many Christians do not hold such an extreme worldview, but they still hold a hypocritical view towards nuclear weapons illustrated in the following example. In the mid 1970s, William F. Buckley, Jr. spoke at The University of Iowa, in Iowa City. During his talk, he mentioned the virtues of the Judeo-Christian ethic and its historical contributions to the culture of the U.S. For some reason, in the middle of his speech, he praised the new "flexible response" nuclear weapons war-fighting strategy being put forth by then Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger. Following his talk, I asked him what he thought Jesus' response would be to Schlesinger's nuclear weapons strategy calling for the killing of millions of Soviet citizens under certain conditions. I also asked him if there were any conditions under which he personally, if he had the authority, would turn the key in a missile control center to launch a nuclear strike, thereby contributing to a nuclear exchange likely to kill millions.

Mr. Buckley's response to the first question was that he didn't feel he could speak for Jesus, although he had been doing so for much of the

evening. His reply to the second question was that under no circumstances would he turn the key for a nuclear missile launch. Instead, he preferred a system of "automatic retaliation," by which he meant something resembling a radar interpretation of incoming enemy missiles, which would result in a computer-triggered U.S. missile launch completely untouched by human hands. Thus, like many of his fellow citizens, Buckley was unable to discern the contradiction between his Christian belief system based on the life of a committed pacifist who was willing to die rather than defend himself, with his own willingness to use a form of high-tech barbarism that would annihilate millions of innocent people. Not to mention the errors of early-warning systems highlighted in chapter two.

It is very useful to pose the "What would Jesus do?" question to those of the Christian faith who also happen to be nuclear war hawks, and who apparently have never considered this a fundamental contradiction in their value system. It is also important to ask government officials and religious leaders "Under what conditions would you turn the key?" questions. These values questions take the issue of nuclear war killing out of the realm of the abstract. Years ago, the philosopher Jean Paul Sartre said that the biggest

crime of our time was to make the concrete abstract.⁹³ When respondents are forced to deal with nuclear criminality in concrete terms, rather than "Pentagonese" and "Nukespeak," they tend to not want to push the button.

Not all sects of Christianity suffer from a militaristic ethic and advocacy of nuclear weapons. Historically, the peace churches—the Friends, Mennonites, and Brethren—have straightforwardly addressed the morality of nuclear weapons, as have many "mainline" churches in the U.S. During the 1980s, with the rise of the Nuclear Freeze movement, numerous Christian theologians sought to convince members of the clergy and their parishioners to address the nuclear war problem. As a result, leadership from many Christian denominations and other religions have signed statements supporting disarmament.

For example, the United Methodist Council adopted a pastoral letter and foundation document called, "The Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace." In that letter, the bishops stated:

We say a clear and unconditional No to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We conclude that nuclear deterrence is a position that cannot receive the Church's blessing. Thus, it follows that nuclear weapons have no legitimate use for deterrence or actual war fighting, it is wrong for any nation to possess them. [...] We support the earliest possible negotiation

⁹³ Flynn, T. (2004, April 22). Jean-Paul Sartre. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved from: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/sartre/>

of phased, but rapid reduction of nuclear arsenals, while calling upon all other nuclear-weapon states to agree to parallel reduction, to the eventual goal of mutual and verifiable dismantling of all nuclear armaments.⁹⁴

In 1988, the United Methodist General Conference reiterated its support of the statements of the Council of Bishops. Four years later, the General Conference developed a resolution entitled: "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option," which said, "Now is the time to exercise the zero option: to eliminate all nuclear weapons throughout the globe."

In line with that pronouncement, the Conference approved the following statement of commitment and action:

We affirm the finding that nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. When used as instruments of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt and spiritually bankrupt. Therefore, we affirm the goal of total abolition of all nuclear weapons throughout Earth and Space.

The statement then gave a list of 10 recommended actions to all possessors of nuclear weapons:

1. Renounce unconditionally the use of nuclear weapons for deterrence

⁹⁴ In defense of creation: The nuclear crisis and a just peace. (1986). The United Methodist Council of Bishops. Nashville: Graded Press, p. 24.

and war fighting purposes.

2. Pledge never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary under any circumstance.
3. Immediately take all nuclear weapons off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and by other means.
4. Embark upon a program to systematically dismantle all nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles as soon as possible with adequate safeguards and verification, carried out under multilateral treaties and through reciprocal national initiatives.
5. Ratify and implement the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
6. Cease all research, development, testing, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons, and refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal.
7. Halt all efforts to develop and deploy strategic anti-missile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful.
8. Respect the requirements of nuclear weapon-free zones where they exist.
9. Enter into a multilateral process to develop, adopt, and carry out a nuclear weapons convention that outlaws and abolishes all nuclear

weapons under strict and effective international control.

10. Develop and implement a system for control of all fissile material with international accounting, monitoring and safeguards.⁹⁵

It is important to note the similarity of the Methodist Statement to the "Roadmap to Abolition," which was described earlier. In some ways the Methodist Statement is even more comprehensive. When I appear before United Methodist audiences, I usually use their Church's statement on nuclear war as a preface to my presentation, and give them a handout with the ten recommended actions listed above. A similar approach can be used with other denominations and faith communities.⁹⁶

Faithful Security:

The National Religious Partnership on the Nuclear Weapons Danger

Under the direction of the late Rev. William Sloane Coffin, a group of religious leaders from different national organizations met to address the threat of nuclear war. The group responded by establishing Faithful

Security: The National Religious Partnership to End the Nuclear Weapons

⁹⁵ Saying no to nuclear deterrence—United Methodist statement on nuclear war. (n.d.). Retrieved from: <http://www.zero-nukes.org/sayingno.pdf>

⁹⁶ These religious statements, including those by the World Council of Churches, The National Council of Churches, and other interfaith groups can be retrieved at: <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html>

Danger (Faithful Security). As a key project of its work, Faithful Security developed a very useful toolkit entitled, "Breaking Faith with Nuclear Weapons: A Guide to Religious Communities," which provides the resources that people of faith need to learn about the dangers associated with nuclear weapons, and actions they can take to build a safer world.⁹⁷

In 2005, Rev. Coffin initiated a powerful declaration entitled, "Call to Action on the Nuclear Weapons Danger," which opens with Psalm 33: "The warhorse is a vain hope for victory, and by its great might it cannot save." The body of the "Call" states:

Today our leaders are renewing nuclear production activities and upgrading nuclear testing facilities. They are invigorating arsenals that should be left to decay. Our country cannot rightly seek to halt the spread of nuclear weapons while at the same time developing new weapons capabilities of our own. As these dangerous weapons spread to North Korea and beyond, and as terrorists seek to acquire them, we must realize that we have made a very deadly mistake. It is time to break faith with nuclear weapons once and for all. Nuclear weapons merit unequivocal and unhesitating condemnation. The 30,000 nuclear weapons around the globe have more than 100,000 times the power of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. These are doomsday arms - genocidal, eccocidal, and suicidal.

It is our belief that only God has the authority to end all life on the planet; all we have is the power, and it is past time to surrender it. To live in a world within minutes of possible annihilation is to defy God's will not to do God's will.

⁹⁷ The toolkit can be retrieved at: www.faithfulsecurity.org/pdf/tool_kit.pdf

When the Cold War ended, many thought the nuclear danger had ended with it. It did not, and now, having assumed a more sinister shape, it is mounting again. Scores of admirals and generals from many countries have come to believe that nuclear weapons invite far more than they deter catastrophic conflict. They agree that the possession of nuclear weapons by some states is the strongest incentive for other states to acquire them. They are also painfully aware that nuclear weapons, while most useful to terrorists are utterly useless against them. Consequently, these leaders now advocate, as do we, the abolition of all nuclear arsenals. As General Lee Butler declared five years ago, "A world free of the threat of nuclear weapons is necessarily a world devoid of nuclear weapons."

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was a grand design struck in 1970. Since that time, over 180 non-nuclear countries have promised to forego nuclear weapons provided the nuclear powers abolished theirs. In other words—and this is crucial—non-proliferation was, from the beginning inextricably linked to nuclear disarmament. But instead of honoring their obligations under Article VI of the treaty, the nuclear powers have substituted a double standard for the single one intended. For 35 years, they have practiced nuclear apartheid, arrogating to themselves the right to build, deploy, and threaten to use nuclear weapons, while policing the rest of the world against their production.

We call on all members of America's religious communities, as a testament of our common faith to join Faithful Security, and to take action immediately to break faith with nuclear weapons. The first step to eliminate nuclear weapons is to demand that the U.S. government lead the way to global abolition of nuclear weapons by immediately making a plan for how to freeze, lock down, reduce, and eliminate nuclear weapons in a step-by-step process with ever increasing verification.

Fellow believers, we know how often justice appears a weary way off, peace a little further. But if we give up on justice, if we give up on peace, we give up on God. So let us resolve to labor mightily for what we pray for fervently, confident

in the poet's contention that 'we are only undefeated because we go on trying' and in the vision of the prophet that 'the earth shall be filled with knowledge of God as the waters cover the sea'. God Bless You All.⁹⁸

As previously noted, it is important to include a "what you can do" segment of any presentation on the dangers of nuclear weapons. The Faithful Security toolkit offers "Six Things People of Faith Can Do":

1. **KNOW THE FACTS.** Learn the basics about nuclear weapons and their current status in the U.S. and other countries. Keep abreast of current policy developments. Visit the most informative and useful websites, including the ones listed in the (tool kit's) 'National Resources' section. Stay current on legislation by joining the Faithful Security Network. (<http://www.faithfulsecurity.org>)
2. **PRAY.** The nuclear weapons danger cannot be addressed through action alone. All activism must be accompanied by an inner journey that faces the existence of nuclear weapons, the possibility of annihilation, and the power of God in the face of those threats. Religious people can be a voice of hope for the future while they are performing the prophetic task of warning powerful institutions to

⁹⁸ Coffin, W.S. (2005). Call to action. Breaking faith with nuclear weapons: A guide for religious communities. p.4.

change their course.

3. GET TOGETHER/ORGANIZE a small gathering in your home or religious community to strategize about how to raise awareness and take action. Consider showing a film that exposes the destructive power of nuclear weapons.
4. PASS A MODEL RESOLUTION. Once you've learned more about the nuclear weapons danger, encourage your religious community to pass the model resolution.
5. BUILD MOMENTUM. As you take action, keep letting others know about your efforts. Prepare an op-ed for your local newspaper. Meet with the editorial board of your local paper. Initiate conversations with your local religious leaders. Write an article for the regional newsletter in your faith community.
6. SPEAK TRUTH TO POWER. Our elected officials are the ones who are making the daily decisions to fund new nuclear weapons or to follow our treaty obligations by reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons. Build a relationship with your local and national elected officials by writing letters, making phone calls and setting up in-state

lobby visits.⁹⁹

The essence of the tool kit is summed up by Dr. Muzammil Siddiqi, of the Muslim-Christian Consultation on the Nuclear Weapons Danger, "It is not the work of one community only, it is not the work of somebody else, it is our work together."

A Buddhist View of Nuclear War Prevention

In a discussion of religion, Buddhism holds a unique position in that its leaders historically have refused to call it a religion. Dr. Daisaku Ikeda, founder of the Toda Institute for Global Peace and Policy Research, explains that Buddhism does not ask "What religion does this person follow," but, "What is this person's state of life?" He says, "Buddhism transcends all superficial differences and focuses directly on life."

With this philosophy, Dr. Ikeda penned the following September 14, 2006 article entitled, "Emerging from the Nuclear Shadow":

The startling development of military technology has entirely insulated acts of war from human realities and feelings. In an instant, irreplaceable lives are lost and beloved

⁹⁹ Faithful Security: The National Religious Partnership on the Nuclear Weapons Danger. (n.d.). Six things people can do. Breaking faith with nuclear weapons tool kit, p. 8.

homelands reduced to ruin. The anguished cries of victims and their families are silenced or ignored. Within this vast system of violence—at the peak of which are poised nuclear weapons—humans are no longer an embodiment of life. They are reduced to the status of mere things.

In the face of these severe challenges, there is a spreading sense of powerlessness and despair within the international community, a readiness to dismiss the possibility of nuclear abolition as a pipe dream.

Peace is a competition between despair and hope, between disempowerment and committed persistence. To the degree that powerlessness takes root in people's consciousness, there is a greater tendency to resort to force. Powerlessness breeds violence. But, it was human beings that gave birth to these instruments of hellish destruction. It cannot be beyond the power of human wisdom to eliminate them. [...]

The idea that nuclear weapons function to deter war and are therefore a 'necessary evil' is a core impediment to their elimination; it must be challenged and dismantled. If we are to eliminate nuclear weapons, a fundamental transformation of the human spirit is essential. Since the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, more than 60 years ago, the survivors have transformed despair into a sense of mission as they have continued to call out for nuclear abolition. As people living today, it is our shared responsibility -- our duty and our right -- to act as heirs to this lofty work of inner transformation, to expand and elevate it into a struggle to eliminate war itself. [...]

Crying out in opposition to war and nuclear weapons is neither emotionalism nor self-pity. It is the highest expression of human reason based on an unflinching perception of the dignity of life. [...]

Faced with the horrifying facts of nuclear proliferation, we must call forth the power of hope from within the depths of each individual's life. This is the power that can transform even the most intractable reality.

To emerge from the shadow of nuclear weapons, we need a revolution in the consciousness of countless individuals—a revolution that gives rise to the heartfelt

confidence that “there is something I can do.” Then finally, we will see a coming together of the world's people, and hear their common voice, their cry for an end to this terrible madness and destruction.¹⁰⁰

"Emerging from the Nuclear Shadow", must be a joint mission of Jews, Muslims, Buddhists, Christians, Hindus and other faith communities on a worldwide basis. Anything less, is to misunderstand the purpose of religion.

Chapter X

Action: The Role of the Individual and Organizations

The previous chapters have demonstrated that political change requires attitudinal change on the part of citizens and their religious, educational, and political leaders. Attitudinal change requires education, which requires time, money and energy on the part of both individuals and groups to create a core of well-informed, active citizens who can effectively spread the message for nuclear weapons abolition.

Citizens concerned with human survival must know and practice skills

¹⁰⁰ Ikeda, D. (2006, September 14). Emerging from the nuclear shadow. *Japan Times*. Retrieved from: <http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/ea20060914a3.html> ; see also: <http://www.daisakuikedada.org>

of critical thinking. They must analyze and weigh the motives and evaluate the evidence in the information provided by both nuclear “hawks” and “doves.” It is important to understand the methods and devices of propaganda on all sides of the issue. This can be accomplished best by cultivating the habit of keeping up-to-date on nuclear weapons issues through diverse sources of information, and discussing the issue with others, learning from others’ views and sharing one’s own reasoned opinions. People with shared opinions can form into groups to more effectively reach other people.¹⁰¹

I remember the statement of a labor union leader who was meeting with a group of under-paid, over-worked factory workers who were very disgruntled with their conditions of employment. His advice to the group was: "Don't agonize! Organize."

In Columbia, Missouri, those concerned with peace have found that to be excellent advice. For example, first, individuals began to speak out against the decision by the U.S. Air Force to locate 150 Minuteman missiles in our 13 neighboring counties. These individuals joined together in the early 1960s to found the "Committee for Informed Opinion on Nuclear

¹⁰¹ These citizen actions are adapted from *The American Citizens Handbook*, 6th Ed., National Council for the Social Studies, Hugh Birch-Horace Mann Fund, 1961, p.21.

Arms" (CIONA), which unquestionably multiplied research, education, and community action efforts to expose the madness of the military's strategy. By getting organized and acting collectively, we were able to vastly increase our outreach efforts to call for the cancellation of the 1970 deployment of the Safeguard Anti-ballistic missile system described in chapter five. Acting collectively was also a key factor in our increased efforts in speaking against the deployment of the ABM system in our area.

In the 1980's, thanks to the energetic leadership of a dynamic peace activist, Mark Haim, Columbia made a significant contribution to the nationwide Nuclear Freeze movement. Mark, and other local peace activists, eventually formed the local "Peaceworks of Mid-Missouri" organization, which, stimulated the formation of a coalition of 19 local peace groups (The Columbia Peace Coalition). This coalition now systematically focuses attention on the prevention of nuclear war and other peace, environmental and world order issues. Several of the coalition's members are local chapters of national or world organizations such as: the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, The Fellowship of Reconciliation, Catholic Workers, Veterans for Peace, and Global Action to Prevent War. Each of these groups relates to their national headquarters,

and in so doing, provides research information, educational materials, and other resources for local action.

Thus, when individuals or groups say they are frustrated, and don't know what to do to help, it is up to nuclear disarmament educators and activists to offer a checklist containing a comprehensive description of tools and techniques suitable to that individual or group. Without question, there is truly something *everyone* can do to work for the abolition of nuclear weapons. It is always important to help newcomers to the field understand how many resources are readably available for their use.

In *Civics for Democracy: A Journey for Teachers and Students*, Katherine Issac outlined numerous techniques for civic participation in a variety of settings in which individuals and groups are working on social issues. "Educating about a particular issue is essential to mobilizing public support," Issac writes, "and the methods for doing so are limited only by the imagination."¹⁰²

Distributing Information: Leaflets, Flyers, Posters, and Bulletin Boards

¹⁰² Issac, K., & Nader, R. (1992). *Civics for Democracy: A Journey for Teachers and Students*. Washington, D.C.: Essential Books. p.161.

One of the most common ways to publicize nuclear disarmament events are leaflets and flyers, which are useful ways to quickly spread information. Posters are more permanent announcements than flyers and help to keep the issue in the public eye. Issac writes that flyers are usually one page with a clear and concise message capable of attracting attention, “Thought should be taken to maximize the effectiveness of flyers by locating them where the maximum number of people will see it.”¹⁰³

While these suggestions appear to be obvious, sometimes organizations prepare leaflets or flyers that are unattractive, bland, confusing, or do not properly locate their target audience. Such materials will do very little to encourage community action for nuclear disarmament. It is also possible that poorly developed publicity materials will contribute to the on-going marginalization process that often depicts nuclear disarmament activists as a fringe element of society. During the 1960s and 1970s tacky, messy publicity pieces expressed contempt for the other slick advertising of the day. For better or worse, such an approach ensures promotional failure today.

Bulletin boards are also effective ways to spread information. A well-

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 161

designed, well-kept bulletin board is a major source of inter-communication between individuals and groups in a community. To be successfully used, bulletin boards have to be regularly maintained with up-to-date information, and this requires an individual who is the main point of contact, and who is clearly designated and known to be in charge of an organization's bulletin board(s). Otherwise, people will be turned off with overcrowded, outdated information and materials.

In addition to bulletin boards that are located in offices and other indoor settings, it is often the case that local communities have outdoor bulletin boards located in downtown areas, parks, and community buildings. Some places of business also have public bulletin boards, as do churches and recreation centers.

In Columbia, the Mid-Missouri Peaceworks organization makes regular weekly postings of flyers and/or posters at various downtown areas. These draw the attention of many citizens who otherwise might not be completely informed of key peace events in the city. The University of Missouri has an office whose staff members put up posters and flyers in all University dormitories, and maintains these bulletin boards in a professional manner. The University's Peace Studies Program often co-

sponsors events with the Columbia Peace Coalition, thus providing an excellent publicity resource concerning programs devoted to nuclear disarmament education.

Public Events: Attending and Making Presentations

Without question, town meetings offer an excellent opportunity to extend nuclear disarmament education and action to a variety of individuals and groups in a local community. Such meetings afford an opportunity for interested citizens, including many newcomers to the field, to express personal concerns about the threat of nuclear war. People can explore differing views in a truly democratic way with their fellow citizens.

As mentioned in chapter six, "The Missouri Coalition Opposed to ABM and MIRV" promoted a series of town meetings in 1969-70 to examine the "Safeguard" ant-ballistic missile system. Successful town meetings were held in Warrensburg, Sedalia, Higginsville, Marshall and Columbia, Missouri. Attempts were made to get speakers on both sides of the deployment issue at all of the meetings. The Warrensburg meeting had the services of two Washington, D.C. based U.S. Government scientists

who supported the deployment of ABM and MIRV, as well as local experts and activists opposed to the system. It is not always possible to secure experts on both sides of a town meeting issue, but it is very important to attempt to do so.

Care must also be taken to establish meeting ground rules that are fair to individuals of all political persuasions. Additionally, it is important to have a well-trained moderator who can civilly enforce the ground rules. Although a consensus is often impossible to achieve, in the case of our ABM/MIRV efforts, considerable letter writing and other contacts and appeals followed the town meetings to members of the Missouri Congressional delegation.

Town meetings may also involve two or three (at most) local "experts" who present talks with the purpose of stimulating audience participation. Then a skilled group facilitator can work with the audience to elicit their questions, fears, concerns, and suggestions for local actions that can contribute to nuclear weapons abolition. The previously mentioned Mayor's Peace Program and efforts for local nuclear weapons-free zones are natural topics for discussion, as are possible curriculum development efforts and other educational activities.

Peace organizations should utilize the need for local experts and speakers by keeping a bureau of people ready to give speeches or conduct workshops on specific issues.¹⁰⁴ The University of Missouri Peace Studies Program has a speaker's fund which is used to sponsor and co-sponsor guest speakers such as: Ted Turner of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, the late Rear Admiral Eugene Carroll of the Center for Defense Information, Ambassador Jonathan Dean of the Union of Concerned Scientists, writer Jonathan Schell, Dr. Robert Bowman of the Institute for Space and Security Studies, and others from peace and disarmament related organizations. To say the least, such speakers are very helpful in public relations matters connected with our mission of human survival. This is particularly true if local media outlets are appropriately alerted and prepared to cover the speakers.

Several other local groups, like Veterans for Peace, provide speakers and often jointly contribute funds to secure outside speakers. One group in Columbia is the Heartland Chapter of Global Action to Prevent War, which has a speaker's bureau that addresses issues of peace and world order. Members include Steve Starr and John Kultgen, mentioned in chapter

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, p. 162.

eight. I, too, lend my services on the topic: "Confronting Nuclear War: The Role of the Citizen," and related topics.

It is worth repeating again that one does not need to be an “expert” to speak against nuclear weapons. Anyone with a desire to do so and a little preparation can begin presenting talks in the community. Videos can be excellent kick-off tools for town meetings and other public presentations. Some good examples include: The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation's *Nuclear Weapons and the Human Future*, the CBS *60 Minutes* video "The Missiliers," the Center for Defense Information's *Military Leaders for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons*, and *Arsenal of Hypocrisy*, hosted by Bruce Gagnon of the Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space. At town meetings and similar events, it is also a good idea to have a one-page handout that succinctly states the problem, and also includes suggestions for political action.¹⁰⁵

In this capacity, I recently met with an adult "Lifelong Learning" group at the University of Missouri, which holds seminars on issues of public concern—especially, issues they believe are ignored or slighted during Congressional or Presidential election campaigns. Several members of the

¹⁰⁵ An example is the 10 myths and facts about nuclear weapons included in the appendix.

group are retired University faculty, and others are community activists of one kind or other.

I showed the 20-minute DVD, *Nuclear Weapons and the Human Future: What You Can Do to Help*, at one of the group's sessions. A brief statement concerning U.S and Russian nuclear weapons capabilities and possible strategies followed the DVD showing, including the probable Russian targeting of St. Louis, Kansas City, and Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri. At that point, class members were encouraged to ask questions, make personal statements and raise critical points regarding the information that has been previously presented. During that discussion, we talked about several things that local citizens can do to confront the possibility of human extinction by Russian and U.S. nuclear missiles. The discussion also focused, in part, on the DVD segment called, "What Individuals Can Do." The discussion seemed to go well, and I felt confident that we had adequately covered the basic educational and political activities.

However, several weeks later, I showed the DVD to another group of faculty, students and townspeople at the University's Memorial Student Union. Afterwards, one of the most respected members of the group, a

former Ivy League school administrator, said, "Bill, several weeks ago, we had this same DVD at our Lifetime Learning program, and we had essentially the same discussion we have had today. Unfortunately, our other group still feels frustrated because they say they don't really know what they can do to be truly effective in working on the problem of nuclear disarmament."

Needless to say, that response was disappointing. If the presenter is not able to "close the deal," that is, convince the audience that they, as concerned citizens, can engage in some kind of productive action for nuclear disarmament, then it is obvious that the presenter's efforts have not been successful.

In some settings, "closing the deal" is hindered by the time allotment set aside for presentations in formal classes at civic organizations, faith groups, etc. Sometimes, the speaker is given even less time than originally scheduled. Under these circumstances, it is crucial to use a portion of whatever time is given to presenting solutions to the problem.

For example, I recently spoke to a local civic club where I was promised a full 30 minutes on nuclear weapons, but I ended up with only 17 minutes. As a result, I had time to present only the nuclear weapons

problem, and virtually no time to offer solutions and suggestions for activities in which the club members could participate. Thus, I may have done more harm than good with my presentation. Under such conditions, the result is that audiences feel they have been confronted with a horrible problem and now feel frustrated because no short or long-term solutions have been put forth and discussed. This situation can definitely cause people to have feelings of helplessness and hopelessness, or to simply deny and ignore the problem altogether.

Given the problem associated with shorter than planned time allotments, as often occurs, I have found it advisable to have a "Plan B" arrangement for brief public presentations. One is to fashion a brief propositionaire such as:

1. The threat of nuclear war is the overriding health, environmental, and security problem confronting the people of our Planet.
2. Nuclear weapons are themselves, illegal, profoundly immoral and highly expensive.
3. Nuclear Weapons are highly incompatible with human security.
4. Nuclear weapons are subject to accidents, miscalculations and to computer error.

5. The issue of nuclear war does not receive the attention it requires.
6. There are several social and psychological obstacles that hinder education for nuclear disarmament.
7. There is great need for individual and group attention to the problem, including efforts by educators, people of faith and other members of this community.

This propositionaire can be presented within a five-minute timeframe before the showing of a video, or the presenter can move immediately to group questions, answers and dialogue. The first question to the audience might be: "What is your response to the seven propositions which were just offered?" While this approach is less desirable than a full 20-minute talk, it still enables truly interested members of the audience to engage in a discussion of solutions and future community events.

Signature Petitions

Widely circulated signature petitions can do much to raise public consciousness and action for the cause of nuclear disarmament.

Circulation can be achieved through person-to-person contacts, distribution of hard copy petitions with signature forms at various public settings, and by on-line circulation. An excellent setting for the use of petitions is at the 300 to 350 air shows at private and military airfields throughout the U.S. each year. Some air shows will likely permit petitioning, others may not.

In 2004, Maureen Doyle attempted to distribute anti-war flyers at the Memorial Day Salute to Veterans Air Show in Columbia, Missouri. At that same event, I attempted to move through the crowd with a "clean energy" petition directed to our local City Council. Maureen was removed from the display area of the air show by local police officers. I was arrested, handcuffed and removed from the premises by other police officers.

With the assistance of highly competent ACLU attorneys, Maureen and I sued Salute to Veterans and the City of Columbia, which was deemed by a Federal District Court Judge to be a co-sponsor of the Columbia Air Show. The judge ruled that leafleting, sign and banner carrying (under certain conditions) and the wearing of protest clothing, buttons, hats, etc. were to be allowed at future shows. However, the judge also ruled that petitioning was not to be allowed. When our adversaries took their case to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, a panel of three judges

unanimously upheld the original decision; and when the case was then appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, the court refused to hear the case.

Thus, peace and disarmament groups around the country can definitely handout flyers at U.S. air shows. While we in Columbia, Missouri are not now allowed to circulate petitions inside our show, we can stand outside the gate and collect as many signatures as possible. This does not mean that other air shows will not allow petitioning amongst their crowds on airport tarmacs. It does mean that if the organizers disallow such petitioning activity, groups can still contact people and ask them to sign petitions as they are approaching the entrance of the show.

Air shows are only one venue for leafleting and petitioning. Any large gatherings such as parades, holiday celebrations and some sports events, are also excellent for widespread distribution of flyers and petitions. Petitions are also very useful with local civic organizations and church groups.

It is a good idea to have a "mini-training" session to assist new petition gatherers in understanding how to successfully approach potential signers, and how to respond when individuals refuse to sign, or are extremely rude in their refusal. One of the most difficult things about

petitioning is convincing activists and others to actually collect the signatures. Many folks are hesitant to do so, and some are embarrassed when actually engaged in the petition collection process. Nevertheless, this is a very important activity, and ways to increase the autonomy levels of hesitant petitioners are needed.

Non-violent Direct Action

Direct action includes various kinds of non-violent, collective activity, which involves as many people as possible to pressure opponents, organizations, political leaders, etc., to change their behavior in some way.

"Protests, public demonstrations and marches can be effective on a mass scale or with only a small group of people," Issac writes. "These types of protests increase public awareness and show public support for an issue."¹⁰⁶

One of the largest political demonstrations in U.S. history was to support the citizen campaign for a freeze on nuclear weapon production; 750,000 people gathered in New York City's Central Park in June of 1982.

¹⁰⁶ Issac, K., & Nader, R. (1992). *Civics for Democracy: A Journey for Teachers and Students*. Washington, D.C.: Essential Books. p.166.

Protests against the second invasion of Iraq had even larger worldwide protests. Often, when a national demonstration occurs in cities like New York or Washington, D.C., local nuclear disarmament organizations hold supporting demonstrations in their own communities throughout the country. Most such demonstrations include a variety of activities, such as speeches, poetry readings, music, "guerilla theatre" etc.

In some cases, demonstrations also provide opportunities for civil disobedience, including demonstrations and sit-ins, at public buildings, parades, nuclear weapons installations, civilian weapons manufacturing plants, military recruiting offices, induction centers, or other military command posts. Those who do so must be prepared to be arrested and face possible jail sentences and fines. Such activity, including prosecution and court appearances can bring substantial attention to nuclear weapons and the threat they pose to human survival.

Issac defines civil disobedience as "the act of refusing to obey an existing law to protest the law or government policies or priorities."¹⁰⁷ Examples of effective non-violent civil disobedience are India's success under Gandhi to end British imperialism and the Civil Rights movement in

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, p.166

the U.S. When Rosa Parks broke the law by refusing to give her seat on a Montgomery, Alabama bus to a white man, her action triggered a boycott by African-Americans of the town's buses, which later succeeded in desegregating the public buses there.

An important lesson to learn from the civil rights movement is the success of boycotts. Nothing makes an uninterested party concerned about an issue faster than when they incur a negative financial impact. It was not one woman breaking an unjust law that desegregated the buses; it was the result of an entire community refusing to use a business because of its actions, thereby crippling the business until those actions were changed. In a world of increasing corporate conglomeration, these same actions could be effectively taken against the corporations taking part in nuclear weapons production or delivery.

In contrast to the above notion of civil disobedience, Francis Boyle, Professor of international law at the University of Illinois, states:

Measures of "civil resistance" must be carefully distinguished from acts of "civil disobedience" as traditionally defined. In today's civil resistance cases, [such as those involving nuclear weapons], what we witness are individuals attempting to prevent the ongoing commission of international crimes under well-recognized principles of international law and U.S. domestic law. This phenomenon is different from the classic civil-disobedience cases of the 1950s and 1960s, where

African-Americans and their supporters deliberately violated domestic laws for the express purpose of challenging and changing those laws.¹⁰⁸

By contrast, resisters who climb the fence at a U.S. Minuteman missile site are acting for the express purpose of upholding the rule of international law and the U.S. Constitution. In fact, "Today's civil resisters are the sheriffs," while leaders who threaten the use of nuclear weapons are the outlaws.

Members of the Catholic Worker Communities provide an example of such non-violent direct action when they climbed over the low-level fences surrounding Minuteman silos, such as those located in rural areas of the country. Such activity nearly always results in arrest, prosecution and jail time, but definitely brings the issue to the front pages of local and national news services.

Sometimes, direct action does not generate as much attention as expected. In the early 1970s, my daughter Beth, Professor Donald Granberg, and I mounted the front-end of a promotional fiberglass model of a U.S. Air Force Minuteman missile placed for public relations purposes in the lot of a shopping center in Columbia, Missouri. The missile was the

¹⁰⁸ Boyle, F.A. (2008). *Protesting Power: War Resistance, and Law*. Rowman and Littlefield. pp. 24-25.

exact size of a real Minuteman, except the missile covering was fiberglass rather than its usual material. We struck picture poses emulating "Slim" Pickens in *Dr. Strangelove or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb*. In which, he rode an H-bomb in its downward flight to a military target in the Soviet Union for the beginning of World War III and the destruction of Planet Earth. We expected to either be arrested on the missile or to be contacted by Air Force officials concerning our protest of the Whiteman Air Force Base mission. To our surprise neither occurred, and the missile was soon removed from the shopping center.

We did not generate the kind of publicity hoped for at the time, but we still left our mark. Our picture was published in a one hundred-year pictorial history of *The Columbia Daily Tribune*. Today, anyone who has never seen a nuclear missile, and who flips through that book, will be reminded of the terrible history of Missouri's role in the Cold War. It is hoped that they can also be reminded that the problem has not gone away.

Individual Action

The emphasis on organizational participation is not to say that

individuals, by themselves, cannot make significant contributions to the abolition of nuclear weapons. Some individuals who prefer to work by themselves can, through Internet blogs and other means of communication, make valuable contributions to the dialogue. Today, the blogosphere is an increasingly powerful tool to spread information to a wide audience. In addition, hundreds of organizations do computer searches for well-written opinion pieces on social and political issues. It is not unusual for a writer of such pieces to find his or her article quoted by other parts of the country and the world.

Individuals can make their voices heard directly by contacting government representatives by email or phone. Individuals can also participate in “call in” shows or in some other way “talk back” to the media. They can also sign Internet petitions, such as the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation's world-wide "Appeal to the Next President of the United States," which calls for U.S. leadership for a nuclear weapon-free world. Or, one can make a difference by making financial contributions to on-line organizations conducting research, education, and action aimed at the prevention of nuclear holocaust.

Letters to the editors of newspapers are an important form of “talking

back” to media and effectively air different points of view. Issac writes, "Americans read the letters to the editor column more frequently than anything else on the editorial page."¹⁰⁹ While newspapers do not print every letter received, many papers still accumulate these letters for in-house surveys.

Issac provides the following guidelines to increase the chances that the paper will print your letter:

- Newspapers will cut a long letter down to 250-350 words, keep it short and on target to avoid editing.
- Avoid flowery language and unnecessary lead-ins.
- Make reference to a recent editorial column or news story that prompted your letter.
- Send an original, neat, handwritten, or preferably typed, letter.¹¹⁰

Almost all newspapers provide an e-mail address that can be used to forward e-mails to the editor. Such "Open Column" arrangements usually require the writer to include one's name and an address and phone number, with the understanding that someone at the newspaper will do a phone check to be sure that the letter has been forwarded by the individual

¹⁰⁹ as cited in: Issac, K., & Nader, R. (1992). *Civics for Democracy: A Journey for Teachers and Students*. Washington, D.C.: Essential Books, p. 173.

¹¹⁰ Ibid, p. 173-174.

whose name accompanies the letter. Once the proper identification has been made, many papers will allow the writer to sign the letter " name withheld" if that is the writer's preference.

Similar to letters to the editor, most newspapers print opinion articles referred to as Op-eds. The authors of such articles are often syndicated columnists, but some are also local citizens who comment on local, national and world news. It is hoped that individuals throughout the U.S. will write letters to the editor and pen op-ed. pieces to up-date citizens everywhere on the need for de-alerting U.S. nuclear missiles, to abide by the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and to sign and ratify the CTBT. A piece of writing aimed at a local audience often reaches people around the world.

A Call to Action: Something for Everyone

All of the aforementioned techniques for nuclear disarmament education and action offer significant ways for individuals and organizations to contribute to human survival. Without question, there is truly something *everyone* can do to work for the abolition of nuclear weapons.

In speaking of the need for an upsurge in nuclear abolition activism and community involvement, Congressman Dennis Kucinich of Ohio, has issued "A Call to Action" in which he says:

We have reached a moment in our country's history where it is urgent that people everywhere speak out as president of his or her own life, to protect the peace of the nation and world within and without. We should speak out and caution leaders who generate fear through talk of the endless war or the final conflict. We should appeal to our leaders to consider that their own bellicose thoughts, words and deeds are reshaping consciousness and can have an adverse effect on our nation. Because when one person thinks fight! s/he finds a fight. One faction thinks nuclear! and approaches the abyss. And what of one nation which thinks peace, and seeks peace? [...]

As each one of us chooses, so becomes the world. Each of us is architect of the world. Our thoughts, the concepts. Our words, the designs. Our deeds, the bricks and mortar of our daily lives. Which is why we should always take care to regard the power of our thoughts and words, and the commands they send into action through time and space. [...]

The splitting of the atom for destructive purposes admits a split consciousness, the compartmentalized thinking of Us vs. Them, the dichotomized thinking, which spawns polarity and leads to war. The proposed use of nuclear weapons, pollutes the psyche with the arrogance of infinite power. It creates delusions of domination of matter and space. It is dehumanizing through its calculations of mass casualties. We must overcome doom-thinkers and sayers who invite a world descending, disintegrating into a nuclear disaster. With a world at risk, we must find the bombs in our own lives and disarm them. We must listen to that quiet inner voice which counsels that the survival of all is achieved through the unity of all. [...]

At this moment of peril we must move away from fear's paralysis. This is a call to action to replace expanded war with

expanded peace. This is a call for action to place the very survival of this planet on the agenda of all people, everywhere. As citizens of a common planet, we have an obligation to ourselves and our posterity. We must demand that our nation and all nations put down the nuclear sword. [...]

When peace is not on the agenda of our political parties or our governments, then it must be the work and the duty of each citizen of the world. This is the time to organize for peace. This is the time for new thinking. This is the time to conceive of peace as not simply being the absence of violence, but the active presence of the capacity for a higher evolution of human awareness. [...]

It is practical to work for peace. I speak of peace and diplomacy not just for the sake of peace itself. But, for practical reasons, we must work for peace as a means of achieving permanent security. It is similarly practical to work for total nuclear disarmament, particularly when nuclear arms do not even come close to addressing the real security problems which confront our nation. [...]

We can achieve this practical vision of peace, if we are ready to work for it. People worldwide need to meet with like-minded people, about peace and nuclear disarmament, now. People worldwide need to march and to pray for peace, now. People worldwide need to be connecting with each other on the web, for peace, now. [...]

Now is the time to think, speak, write, organize and take action to create peace as a social imperative, as an economic imperative, and as a political imperative. Now is the time to think, speak, write, organize, march, rally, hold vigils and take other nonviolent action to create peace in our cities, in our nation and in the world. And as the hymn says, 'let there be peace on earth and let it begin with me.' [...]

This is the work of the human family, of people all over the world demanding that governments and non-governmental actors alike put down their nuclear weapons. This is the work of the human family, responding in the moment of crisis to protect our nation, this planet and all life within it. We can achieve both nuclear disarmament and peace, as we

understand that all people of the world are interconnected. We can accomplish this through upholding an holistic vision and being a living testament to a Human Rights Covenant where each person on this planet is entitled to a life where s/he may consciously evolve in mind, body and spirit. [...]

Nuclear disarmament and peace are the signposts toward the uplifting path of an even brighter human condition wherein we can through our conscious efforts evolve and reestablish the context of our existence from peril to peace, from revolution to evolution. Think peace. Speak peace. Act peace. Peace.¹¹¹

¹¹¹ Kucinich, D. (2002, April 1). A call to action: Peace and nuclear disarmament. Retrieved from: <http://www.counterpunch.org/kucinichdisarm.html>

Appendix

Resources on the Nuclear Weapons Danger**Nuclear Weapons on Hair-Trigger: Timeline to Catastrophe¹¹²**

RUSSIA	Minutes	U.S.	Minutes
Amount of time Russian military has to decide that U.S. missiles are headed for Russia	3	Amount of time Pentagon has to decide that Russian missiles are headed for the U.S.	14
Amount of time Russian President has to make the decision to order a missile attack against U.S.	3	Amount of time U.S. President has to make the decision to order a missile attack against Russia	8
TOTAL TIME elapsed for making the decision to launch missiles	6	TOTAL TIME elapsed for making the decision to launch missiles	22
Amount of time it takes to launch Russian nuclear missiles	4	Amount of time it takes to launch U.S. nuclear missiles	3
Amount of time it takes missiles to hit U.S.	25	Amount of time it takes missiles to hit Russia	10

¹¹² Blair, B.G., Feiveson, H., & von Hippel, F.N. (1997, November). Taking nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert. *Scientific American*, pp. 74-81.

The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation provides two handouts called Ten Facts and Ten Myths About Nuclear Weapons; a copy can be retrieved at <http://www.wagingpeace.org>. These handouts work very well with NAPF's video "Nuclear Weapons and the Human Future," and with other presentations.

TEN FACTS ABOUT NUCLEAR WEAPONS

1. There are still some 26,000 nuclear warheads in the world, enough to destroy civilization many times over and destroy most life on earth.
Nuclear weapons make humans an endangered species.
2. More than 95% of all nuclear weapons are in the arsenals of the U.S. and Russia.
3. The average nuclear weapon in the U.S. arsenal is approximately eight times more powerful than the nuclear bombs that destroyed Hiroshima, immediately killing some 90,000 people.
4. There are currently nine countries with nuclear weapons (U.S., Russia, UK, France, China, Israel, India, Pakistan and North Korea.)
5. The 1970 Non-Proliferation Treaty, ratified by nearly every country in the world, requires the nuclear weapons states to engage in good

faith negotiations for nuclear disarmament.

6. The United States unilaterally withdrew from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in 2002, in order to pursue missile defenses and space weaponization. U.S. withdrawal from the treaty has caused both Russia and China to improve their offensive nuclear capabilities.
7. There are up to 2,000,000 kilograms of Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) in global stockpiles, and it takes just 15-24 kilograms for a nuclear weapon. There are 28 countries with at least one bomb's worth of HEU and 12 countries with at least 20 bombs' worth.
8. Plutonium created in nuclear power reactors is another source of bomb material. It takes as little as three to five kilograms of plutonium to create a nuclear weapon. There are now some 500,000 kilograms of separated plutonium in global stockpiles. Plutonium stocks continue to increase due to civilian 'spent' fuel reprocessing.
9. The 2001 U.S. Nuclear Posture Review provides for developing contingency plans for nuclear weapons use against seven countries: Iraq, Iran, Libya, North Korea, Russia, and China.
10. The Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT) between the U.S. and Russia requires the two countries to reduce their deployed

strategic warheads to between 1,700 and 2,200 by December 31, 2012. On the following day the treaty terminates, and each side can redeploy as many nuclear warheads as it chooses. Many of the nuclear warheads taken off deployed status are not being dismantled, but rather placed in storage, where they might be stolen by criminal or terrorist groups.

TEN MYTHS ABOUT NUCLEAR WEAPONS

1. Nuclear weapons were needed to defeat Japan in World War II. This is not the opinion of many leading U.S. military figures in the war. General Dwight Eisenhower, the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe during World War II and later president, wrote, "I thought that our country should avoid shocking world opinion by the use of a weapon whose employment was, I thought, no longer mandatory as a measure to save American lives. It was my belief that Japan was, at that very moment, seeking some way to surrender with a minimum loss of 'face'..."
2. Nuclear weapons prevented a war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. There were many deadly conflicts and "proxy" wars carried

out by the superpowers in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Vietnam War, which took several million lives, is a prominent example. These wars made the supposed nuclear peace very bloody and deadly.

3. Nuclear threats have gone away since the end of the Cold War. In the aftermath of the Cold War, a variety of new nuclear threats have emerged. Among these are the following dangers:

- Increased chances of nuclear weapons falling into the hands of terrorists willing to use them
- Policies of the U.S. government to make nuclear weapons smaller and more usable
- Use of nuclear weapons by accident, particularly because of decaying Russian infrastructure
- Spread of nuclear weapons to other states that may perceive them to be an "equalizer" against a more powerful state.

4. The U.S. needs nuclear weapons for national security. U.S. national security would be far improved if the U.S. took a leadership role in seeking to eliminate nuclear weapons throughout the world. Nuclear weapons are the only weapons that could actually destroy the U.S.,

and their existence and proliferation threaten U.S. security.

5. Nuclear weapons make a country safer. By threatening massive retaliation, the argument goes, nuclear weapons prevent an attacker from starting a war. There are many ways, though, in which deterrence could fail, including misunderstandings, faulty communications, irrational leaders, miscalculation and accidents.
6. No leader would be crazy enough to actually use nuclear weapons. U.S. leaders, considered by some to be highly rational, have used nuclear weapons in war against Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Threats of nuclear attack by India and Pakistan are an example of nuclear brinkmanship that could turn into a nuclear war. Globally and historically, leaders have done their best to prove that they would use nuclear weapons.
7. Nuclear weapons are a cost-effective method of national defense. The cost of U.S. nuclear weapons research, development, testing, deployment and maintenance has exceeded \$7.5 trillion.
8. Nuclear weapons are well protected and there is little chance that terrorists could get their hands on one. In the aftermath of the Cold War, the ability of the Russians to protect their nuclear forces has

declined precipitously. In addition, a coup in a country with nuclear weapons, such as Pakistan, could lead to a government coming to power that was willing to provide nuclear weapons to terrorists.

9. The U.S. is working to fulfill its nuclear disarmament obligations. The U.S. has failed for nearly four decades to fulfill obligations under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, requiring good faith negotiations to achieve nuclear disarmament. The U.S. has failed to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and has withdrawn from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.
10. Nuclear weapons are needed to combat threats from terrorists and "rogue states". The threat of nuclear force cannot act as a deterrent against terrorists because they do not have a territory to retaliate against. If the leaders of a rogue state do not use a rational calculus regarding their losses from retaliation, deterrence can fail.

SAMPLE LETTERS TO THE EDITOR:

Open Column
Columbia Daily Tribune
Columbia, Missouri
June 6, 2007

The National Nuclear Security Administration recently announced that it will replace Honeywell Corporation's old Kansas City plant with a half-billion dollar facility. The new facility is part of Complex 2030, a \$150 billion plan of the Bush Administration to rebuild the Cold War nuclear weapons complex and replace the old stockpile with new weapons.

In protest of this effort, I submit the following renunciation of nuclear weapons:

Mindful of the extreme dangers and costs that nuclear weapons bring to the world and to those who rely on them, and mindful of America's practical, moral and spiritual need to serve life rather than build instruments of death, I Bill Wickersham, a citizen of the United States of America, renounce, withdraw my citizen's consent for, and oppose any design, production, testing, planning for use, or use of nuclear weapons by the United States, against any nation, group, persons or person, at any time, and under any circumstances. I declare to my elected representatives and to all agencies of the United States government that if I die in an act of mass murder against the United States, I do not want further acts of mass murder committed in my name. I make this declaration in my own name and in the name of my mentor, the late Dr. Theo. F. Lentz, and all the children of the future.

For additional information on "A Citizen's Renunciation of Nuclear Weapons" see: www.nonnukes.org¹¹³

Open Column
Columbia Daily Tribune
Columbia, MO
Dec. 27, 2007

Many thanks to Bill Clark for his well-written article concerning the history of U.S nuclear weapons testing in the state of Nevada, and his own experience as a guinea pig for the 23-kiloton "Badger" test in 1953.

As Bill notes, U.S. atmospheric testing officially ended in 1963, which was in keeping with the signing and ratification of the U.S./Soviet Limited Test Ban Treaty which prohibited atmospheric testing, but did not outlaw

¹¹³ *The Columbia Daily Tribune* published the letter above, as did the *Kansas City Star* (with a slight modification)

underground tests by either country.

In 1996, President Bill Clinton signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which would have prevented further underground testing by both countries, and would have been a very positive step toward the elimination of nuclear weapons from Planet Earth. Unfortunately, the Republican majority in the U.S. Senate failed to ratify the Treaty.

Today, many former top ranking nuclear weapons warriors, such as U.S. Air Force Generals Eugene Habiger and George Lee Butler (both were commanders of the U.S. Strategic Command), along with civilian leaders, such as former Senator Sam Nunn of Georgia, and former Secretaries of State George Shultz and Henry Kissinger, are calling for an end to all nuclear testing and the total abolition of nuclear weapons.

In line with that advice, one of the first orders of business of a new U.S. President and Senate must be the signing and ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. This will be a major step in ending the nuclear weapons madness.

THE SCROLL

Phi Delta Theta Educational Foundation
2 South Campus Avenue
Oxford, Ohio 45056

Editor:

Thanks for the article on Senator Sam Nunn and his Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI). You could not have addressed a more important issue. Sadly, in recent years, the threat of nuclear war has been seriously neglected by most politicians, citizens and academics. NTI's DVD docudrama "The Last Best Chance," starring former U.S. Senator Fred Dalton Thompson, is one of the best tools available for helping us all confront the distinct possibility of a terrorist attack with weapons of mass destruction.

In the *Scroll* article, Sen. Nunn calls for a verifiable international treaty that would halt the production of additional fissile material for bomb purposes. As Brother Nunn knows very well, the signing and ratification of that treaty will face many political obstacles which will require a great deal of political education and action on the part of U.S. citizens, and those of

other countries. Widespread dissemination of "The Last Best Chance" can markedly contribute to such education and action. The DVD can be secured at no cost, by calling 1-800-336-0035. I highly recommend that every chapter of Phi Delta Theta obtain a copy of the film for showing to their brothers. They, in turn, can do much to educate their fellow students on this crucial problem, which truly threatens life on our Planet.

Bill Wickersham, Missouri Alpha 1955, Adjunct Professor of Peace Studies, University of Missouri - Columbia.

SAMPLE OP-ED

written on September 29, 1998 to a Columbia, Missouri newspaper.

Nuclear Ban Will Help U.S.

Sept. 24 marked the 35th anniversary of the U.S. Senate's 80-14 vote ratification of the Partial Test Ban Treaty, which prohibits the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. The larger goal of the treaty, also known as the Limited Test Ban (LTB), was to put "... an end to the contamination of man's environment by radio-active substances."

The document was the product of many non-governmental organizations and citizen groups who convinced key politicians that nuclear fallout would eventually make our beautiful planet unlivable.

Among those who took the lead in the research, education and political activities, which facilitated the LTB's successful development and confirmation, were several Missourians.

One of the most prominent researchers to address the fallout problem was Barry Commoner, noted molecular biologist at Washington University in St. Louis. He and fellow St. Louisans formed the Committee for Nuclear Information (CNI) which conducted research on radioactive fallout and disseminated information on its effects.

CNI's research on the baby teeth of St. Louis area grade school children produced clear evidence of the link between above ground-worldwide nuclear explosions, including those in Nevada, and the presence

of strontium 90, a product of nuclear detonations, in children's bones and teeth.

The nuclear explosion-strontium 90 deposit cycle occurred in the following sequence:

- An above-ground nuclear explosion occurred in Nevada;
- Strontium 90 from the mushroom cloud was deposited in Nevada clouds;
- Nevada clouds moved eastward to St. Louis County to become St. Louis clouds;
- St. Louis clouds then produced rain that fell on the local grass;
- St. Louis County cows ate the strontium 90 contaminated grass;
- Those cows produced milk;
- St. Louis mothers-to-be drank the milk;
- The mothers transmitted the strontium 90 to their unborn babies so that it was deposited in their bones and teeth;
- As the children's baby teeth "came out", they were given to CNI for research purposes.

With this evidence, and with encouragement by scientists such as Nobel Laureate Linus Pauling, the mothers of America, members of Columbia's Committee for Informed Opinion on Nuclear Arms and others, demanded an end to the nuclear testing.

The result was the LTB. Upon ratification of the treaty, protests subsided in the U.S., and both superpowers continued underground testing, which resulted in the development and deployment of thousands of new nuclear weapons by both sides.

Despite the upward escalation, a global halt to all nuclear weapons test explosions has been a stated objective of the United States since it was first put forth by President Dwight Eisenhower in 1958.

After 40 years of bipartisan effort, President Bill Clinton in 1996, became the first world leader to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, calling it "the longest-sought, hardest-fought prize in the history of arms control."

The CTBT, which will outlaw all nuclear test explosions, will strengthen U.S. security by helping stop the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations and will help prevent the renewal of a superpower nuclear arms race. But, our nation and others cannot enjoy the treaty's full scale benefits until it is ratified by a two-thirds vote of the U.S. Senate.

According to the Washington-based Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, the CTBT is supported by the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 70 percent of Americans and 140 nations, including Russia, China, Great Britain and France.

But, the treaty has been stalled in the U.S. Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations. For the U.S. to be able to continue its leadership in reducing the threat of nuclear weapons and controlling the spread of those weapons worldwide, it is imperative that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approve and submit the CTBT to the full Senate.

Consequently, it is urgent that Missourians contact Sens. John Ashcroft and Kit Bond to seek their support in encouraging Sen. Jesse Helms to bring the treaty to the floor of the Senate.¹¹⁴

The address for both Missouri senators is: United States Senate, Washington, D.C., 20510.

Bill Wickersham is a former MU Professor of Extension Education, and served as Executive Director of the World Federalist Association in Washington, D.C.

SAMPLE SPEECH

Nuclear Disarmament Now

A Paper Presented to a Symposium on Nuclear Disarmament, Nuclear Energy and Weapons of Mass Destruction at the 2009 Meeting of the Federation of Analytical Chemistry and Spectroscopy Societies

Our topic today is "Nuclear Disarmament Now." In speaking on that subject, I will address four key points, the first being a discussion of some of the main reasons why nuclear disarmament is urgently needed. The second point will focus on an action plan developed by the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation of Santa Barbara, California for advancing President Obama's nuclear disarmament agenda. (Incidentally, for the remainder of this presentation I shall refer to the organization as the Foundation).

¹¹⁴ Obviously, this op-ed. was not successful in persuading Sens. Bond, Ashcroft and Helms to work on behalf of the CTBT, but it did provide the kind of information that local citizens need to get the problem of nuclear war back on the political agenda.

Thirdly, we will discuss U.S. plans for the weaponization of space as an obstacle to global nuclear disarmament; and finally, I will discuss the campaign for a nuclear-free world which was recently launched by the International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Security, and what you can do to help with that effort.

At the outset, let's take a look at some of the critical issues that surround nuclear weapons and why they need to be eliminated from Planet Earth. First, they are extremely dangerous, and literally threaten to make human beings an endangered species. The exact number of nuclear weapons in possession of each of the nine nuclear weapons states is a closely held national secret. Nevertheless, publicly available information and occasional leaks make it possible to obtain best estimates about the size and composition of the national nuclear weapon stockpiles. More than a decade and a half after the Cold War ended, the world's combined stockpile remains at a very high level, i.e., more than 23,300 warheads. According to Hans Kristensen of the Federation of American Scientists more than 8,109 of these warheads are considered operational, of which approximately 2,200 U.S. and 2,200 Russian weapons are on high alert, ready for use on short notice.

In case of a nuclear weapons alert, the Russian President has three minutes to decide whether or not to launch an attack on the U.S. The U.S. president has 8 minutes to decide if he receives such an alert. Launch to landing time for Russian missiles is about 25 minutes. Launch to landing time for U.S. missiles is approximately 10 minutes.

During the past 64 years, there have been dozens of incidents, accidents and errors with nuclear weapons, including several near misses. One of those near misses occurred in early September, 1983, when tension between the Soviet Union and the United States was very high. Not only had the Soviet military downed a Korean passenger plane, but the United States was also conducting exercises in Europe that focused on the use of tactical nuclear weapons against the Soviets - a situation that led some Soviet leaders to worry that the West was planning a nuclear attack. To make matters worse, an unanticipated variable was thrown into the mix. On September 26, 1983, the alarms in a Soviet early warning bunker, just South of Moscow sounded as computer screens indicated that the United States had launched a nuclear strike against the Soviet Union. The officer in charge of the bunker and its 200 officers and enlisted personnel was Lt. Colonel Stanislav Petrov. It was his job to monitor incoming satellite

signals and to report directly to the Russian early warning headquarters if indicators revealed that a U.S. missile attack was underway. Years later, Col. Petrov said: " I felt as if I had been punched in my nervous system. There was a huge map of the States with a U.S. base lit up, showing that the missiles had been launched."

"For several minutes Petrov held a phone in one hand and an intercom in the other as alarms continued blaring, red lights blinking, and computers reporting that U.S. missiles were on their way. In the midst of this horrific chaos and terror, with the prospect of the end of civilization itself, Petrov made a historic decision not to alert higher authorities, believing in his gut and hoping with all that is sacred, that contrary to what all the sophisticated equipment was reporting, this alarm was an error... As agonizing minutes passed, Petrov's decision proved correct. It was a computer error that signaled a U.S. attack."

"Had Petrov obeyed standard operating procedures by reporting the erroneous attack, Soviet missiles could have devastated all major U.S. cities and the Pentagon would have retaliated. In reviewing the incident, Petrov concluded that a nuclear war could have broken out and the whole world could have been destroyed. On Dateline NBC, November 12, 2000, Bruce Blair, president of the Center for Defense Information, and himself a former U.S. Minuteman missile launch officer said: " I think this is the closest we've come to accidental nuclear war."

On January 25, 1995, another potentially disastrous early warning error occurred when a Russian radar mistook a U.S. weather research rocket launched from Norway as an incoming nuclear strike from a U.S. Trident submarine. Even though the United States had notified Russia it would launch a non-military weather research rocket, those in control of Russia's strategic nuclear weapons did not receive the message.

Fortunately, Russian President Boris Yeltsin, a man with a drinking problem, who had three minutes to order a retaliatory strike, elected to "ride out" the crisis and did not launch the thousands of nuclear tipped missiles available on his command. As previously mentioned, there have been many serious mishaps since the beginning of the nuclear age. For a comprehensive list by date, see: www.nuclearfiles.org.

In addition to the dangers posed by the nuclear threat systems, there are other basic reasons for abolishing them. Not only are they extremely dangerous, they are also illegal, immoral, environmentally destructive and very expensive. They kill men, women and children indiscriminately and

are virtually unlimited in their effects.

In addressing the illegality of nuclear deterrence, University of Illinois Professor of International Law, Frank Boyle quotes the 1996 World Court Advisory Opinion on Nuclear weapons which says: " States must never make civilians the object of attack, and must consequently never use weapons that are incapable of distinguishing between civilian and military targets." He goes on to say: "... U.S. strategic nuclear weapons systems do indeed make civilians the direct object of attack, and because of their incredible explosive power are also incapable of distinguishing between civilian and military targets."

In analyzing the immorality of nuclear weapons, the General Conference of the United Methodist Church has developed a resolution titled "Nuclear Disarmament The Zero Option", which states: " Now is the time to exercise the zero option to eliminate all nuclear weapons throughout the globe." In keeping with that pronouncement, the Conference approved the following statement of commitment and action which says: " We affirm the finding that nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. When used as instruments of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage to political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt and spiritually bankrupt. Therefore, we affirm the goal of total abolition of all nuclear weapons throughout Earth and Space." I don't think there is a better way to say it. Nuclear weapons and nuclear deterrence are unquestionably morally corrupt and spiritually bankrupt.

In 1983, Cornell University Professor Carl Sagan and four other NASA scientists conducted an in-depth study of the possible atmospheric consequences of nuclear war. The study concluded that the gigantic fires caused by nuclear detonation in cities and industrial areas would cause millions of tons of smoke to rise into the Earth's atmosphere. There the smoke would block most sunlight, causing average temperatures on Earth's surface to rapidly cool to Ice Age levels.

The 1983 study was repeated by Professor R.P. Turco of UCLA and Professor O.B. Toon of the University of Colorado, and others. The new research modeled a range of nuclear conflicts beginning with a "regional" nuclear war between India and Pakistan, then a "moderate" nuclear war which used about one third of the current global nuclear arsenals

(equivalent to the nuclear weapons now kept on launch-ready, high alert status by the U.S. and Russia), and lastly, a full scale nuclear conflict using the entire global arsenal. The new research substantiated the original 1983 findings, and found that smoke could actually remain in the stratosphere for at least a decade. A large nuclear conflict would cause crop-killing nightly frosts for more than a year in the world's large agricultural regions, destroy massive amounts of the protective ozone layer, and lead to the collapse of many ecosystems and starvation among most people.

Recently, my University of Missouri colleague, Steven Starr published a summary of the 2006 studies in the Bulletin of the International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation. In that article, Steve states: " U.S. researchers have confirmed the scientific validity of "nuclear winter" and have demonstrated that any conflict which targets even a tiny fraction of the nuclear arsenal against large urban centers will cause disruption of the global climate." To view that summary, simply Google www.nucleardarkness.org.

A final reason for abolishing nuclear weapons is the high cost of nuclear security spending. According to Stephen Schwartz and Deepti Choubey " nuclear security spending is the amount of money the United States spends to operate, maintain and upgrade its nuclear arsenal; defend against nuclear attack; prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons, weapons materials, technology, and expertise; manage and clean up radioactive and toxic waste left over from decades of nuclear production, and compensate victims of past productive and testing activities; and prepare for the consequences of a nuclear or radiological attack."

"Total appropriations for nuclear weapons and related programs in fiscal year 2008 were at least 52.4 billion dollars. That's not counting related costs for classified programs, air defense, anti-submarine warfare, and most nuclear weapons-related intelligence programs, of which only 5.2 billion dollars is spent on preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, weapons materials, technology and expertise" (9) Since the dawn of the nuclear age, the cost of U.S. nuclear weapons research, development, testing, deployment and maintenance has exceeded 7.5 TRILLION dollars. Clearly the abolition of nuclear weapons will free up billions of dollars for health, education and other human development programs.

So, what is needed to rid the world of these deadly, obscene devices? In June, 2009, the Board of Directors of the Nuclear Age Peace

Foundation adopted a five-point action plan to guide the Foundation's work through the end of 2010. The preface to the plan states: " The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation seeks a world free of nuclear weapons. We believe that nuclear arms reductions and the stabilization of nuclear dangers are not ends in themselves, but must be viewed in the context of achieving the total elimination of nuclear weapons. This is a matter that affects the future well-being , even survival, of the human race." In this light the foundation is pursuing the following five-point action program:

First, " we support a meaningful replacement treaty for the Strategic Arms Reductions Treaty between the United States and Russia. This treaty expires on December 2009. Under President Obama's leadership, the U.S. and Russia have embarked upon negotiations for a replacement treaty. The Foundation will press for a replacement treaty that has deep and verifiable reductions in the number of nuclear weapons on each side; one that reduces the high-alert status of the weapons on each side, and one that includes a legally binding commitment to NO FIRST USE of nuclear weapons. To this end, we will seek to form a coalition of like-minded organizations to put forward recommendations for a new treaty, to educate the public on the importance of such a treaty, and to lobby the Senate for the treaty's ratification."

"Second, we hope to secure a NO FIRST USE commitment from the United States. President Obama has called for reducing reliance on nuclear weapons, but he has not referred to the possibility of making a legally binding commitment to NO FIRST USE of nuclear weapons. We believe that such a commitment would be an essential step in downplaying the role of nuclear weapons in military strategy. We will educate the public and lobby the Obama Administration to make a legally binding commitment to NO FIRST USE of nuclear weapons and seek such commitments from other nuclear weapons states" as well.

Third, " We seek U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The U.S. has signed but not ratified the CTBT. President Obama has said, 'To achieve a global ban on nuclear testing, my administration will immediately and aggressively pursue U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.' The Foundation will work with other national organizations to achieve Senate ratification of the treaty."

Fourth, " We will promote a broad agenda for President Obama's proposed Global Summit on Nuclear Security. "President Obama has pledged to hold a Global Summit on Nuclear Security within the next year.

He has called for this Global Summit in the context of preventing nuclear terrorism. We will seek to broaden the agenda of the Summit to include a full range of nuclear security issues beyond only the issue of nuclear terrorism. This would include consideration of the security risks of the current nuclear arsenals and the need to open negotiations on a treaty banning all nuclear weapons. The Foundation will engage in public education, including interviews and op-eds, and networking with other organizations to lobby the Obama administration."

The fifth and final point of the 2009-10 Action Plan calls for a highly strengthened Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) by assuring a successful NPT Review Conference in 2010. " The NPT is at the heart of efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The treaty also requires the nuclear weapons states to engage in good faith negotiations to achieve nuclear disarmament in all its aspects. We believe that the key to achieving the goals of the NPT rests upon the commitment of the nuclear weapons states to take meaningful actions to achieve their Article VI nuclear disarmament obligations. Following the 2009 Preparatory Committee meeting for the 2010 NPT Review Conference, the five nuclear weapons states (who are parties to the treaty, i.e., the U.S., Russia, UK, France and China), also known as the P5, issued a joint statement in which they said: ' Our delegations reiterate our enduring and unequivocal commitment to work towards nuclear disarmament, an obligation shared by all NPT states parties.' These P5 states expressed their commitment to a new U.S.- Russian agreement to replace the Strategic Arms Reductions Treaty and to the entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), as well as negotiations for a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty. We believe that their case for strengthening the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) will be far more persuasive if they also join in assuring a broad agenda for a Global Summit on Nuclear Security and join in making legally binding commitments to NO FIRST USE of nuclear weapons. Thus, these prospects for a successful NPT Review Conference in 2010 will be considerably enhanced if the first four points of the Foundation's Action Plan are successful."

Clearly the Foundation's Action Plan will require strong support by U.S. scientists and many other citizens if it is to have any chance for implementation. The good news is that most Americans are in favor of seriously addressing the various issues related to nuclear disarmament. A 2004 poll by the Program on International Policy Attitudes found Americans to be highly concerned about nuclear weapons. Clear majorities favored

reducing their role and ultimately eliminating them under provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Eighty-four percent said that doing so was a "good idea". An even higher 86 percent wanted the United States "... to do more to work with other nations toward eliminating their nuclear weapons. In each case, more that 70 percent of Republicans and 80 percent of Democrats and independents favored working toward elimination."

The bad news is that some Americans, including several key Members of Congress are still victims of Cold War-era fear based thinking which argues that getting rid of nuclear weapons - even with open inspection and verification - would make us vulnerable. Additionally, there is another potential roadblock to genuine nuclear disarmament which centers on U.S. plans to deploy offensive weapons, including lasers, particle beams and rockets in outer space. The U.S. Air Force's long term proposal known as " Vision for 2020" is a plan for the U.S. to weaponize outer space for military and commercial purposes and to deny access to outer space to other states. The provisions of the plan clearly show missile defenses for what they truly are: an early phase of militarization of space and, as such, part of an unprecedented, global offensive system masquerading as defense. If the United States insists on the deployment of offensive weapons in outer space, it will be nearly impossible to convince Russia, China, and others to agree to the zero nuclear weapons option.

On the U.S. domestic front there have also been a number of nuclear deterrence advocates and military analysts who have been highly critical of disarmament measures such as those outlined in the Foundation's Action Plan, and of any efforts to halt the U.S. weapons in space program. The critics, including corporate producers of nuclear weapons, and other members of the military-industrial-academic-congressional complex, want absolutely no reduction in the tens of billions of dollars spent annually on nuclear weapons. According to the Natural Resources Defense Council: " Hundreds of companies, large and small, are involved in nuclear weapons research, development, production and support. Each Department of Energy (DOE) facility is managed and operated by a corporate contractor. And, nuclear weapons components and delivery systems are manufactured by hundreds of prime and subcontractors". Thus, lobbyists for giant companies such as Lockheed Martin, TRW, Boeing, Northrop Grumman, Raytheon and dozens of others will do everything in their power to prevent significant efforts for the elimination of nuclear weapons worldwide. Consequently, a highly mobilized citizen movement will be needed to

counter those vested interests.

Therefore, we must speak out now to protect our nation, other nations, and our entire planet. We must challenge those who believe that ANYONE has a right to genocidal weapons. We must also challenge those who want to build a new generation of nuclear weapons and offensive killing devices in outer space. In doing so, we must vigorously seek support for the provisions of the Foundation's Action Plan with its emphasis on ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, full implementation of Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and the elimination of all nuclear weapons from our Planet.

In addressing challenges to the zero option, we must emphasize the fact that such thinking is no longer the sole possession of the historic nuclear disarmament organizations, nor those only on the political left. Neither is it a Utopian dream. To date, several retired U.S. generals, including Eugene Habiger and George Lee Butler, both former chiefs of the U.S. Strategic Command, have voiced support for measures such as those outlined in the Foundation's Action Plan. Other well known political figures of both major political parties are also making the case for nuclear weapons abolition. For example, in a January 8, 2007 Wall Street Journal commentary titled "A World Free of Nuclear Weapons", former Secretaries of State Henry Kissinger and George Schultz, with former Secretary of Defense William Perry and former U.S. Senator Sam Nunn of Georgia wrote: "Nuclear weapons today present tremendous dangers, but also historic opportunity. U.S. leadership will be required to take the world to the next stage - to a solid consensus for reversing reliance on nuclear weapons globally as a vital contribution to preventing this proliferation into potentially dangerous hands, and ultimately ending them as a threat to the world... "

"Reassertion of the vision of a world free of nuclear weapons and practical measures toward achieving that goal would be, and would be perceived as, a bold initiative consistent with America's moral heritage. The effect could have a profoundly positive impact on the security of future generations. Without the actions, the vision will not be perceived as realistic or possible. We endorse setting the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons and working energetically on the actions required to achieve that goal."

In my opinion, it is critical that scientists and engineers lead the way in achieving nuclear weapons abolition as suggested by Kissinger, Schultz, Perry, and Nunn. In 1995, when Joseph Rotblat received the Nobel Peace

Prize, he appealed to his fellow scientists with the following statement: " At a time when science plays such a powerful role in the life of society, when the destiny of the whole of mankind may hinge on the results of scientific research, it is incumbent on all scientists to be fully conscious of that role, and conduct themselves accordingly. I appeal to my fellow scientists to remember their responsibility to humanity The quest for a war-free world has a basic purpose: survival. But if in the process we learn to combine the essential with the enjoyable, the expedient with the benevolent, the practical with the beautiful, this will be an extra incentive to embark on this great task. Above all, remember you humanity."

On August 6, 2009 the International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility (INES) launched a campaign in support of that zero option. The first act of the campaign was the signing of an appeal titled "Scientists for a Nuclear Free World" by forty individuals, 28 of whom are Nobel Laureates. The goal of the campaign is to increase scientific as well as public awareness of nuclear weapons issues, and to add weight to calls for an international Nuclear Weapons Convention which obligates all states to achieve complete nuclear disarmament by 2020. The last four paragraphs of the appeal state:

"Nuclear weapons were created by humans, and it is our responsibility to eliminate them before they eliminate us and much of the life on our planet. The era of nuclear weapons must be brought to an end. A world without nuclear weapons is possible, realistic, necessary and urgent."

"Therefore, we the undersigned scientists and engineers, call upon the leaders of the world, and particularly the leaders of the nine nuclear weapons states, to make a world free of nuclear weapons an urgent priority."

"We further call on these leaders to immediately commence good faith negotiations as required by the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the 1996 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, with the goal of achieving a Nuclear Weapons Convention for the phased, verifiable, irreversible and transparent elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2020."

"Finally we call upon scientists and engineers throughout the world to cease all cooperation in the research, development, testing, production and manufacture of new nuclear weapons."

For those who wish to participate in the INES campaign, there are

several things you can do:

- Sign the appeal individually or as an organization;
- Publish the appeal on your website, or in your newsletter, and forward it to members of organizations to which you belong;
- Collect as many signatures as possible within your network;
- Promote the appeal through your organizations; and
- Issue your own statement in support of our common cause.

For those of you who wish to sign the petition immediately, please see me following this symposium. I will have copies for your reading, signing and distribution. I will also have copies of Nuclear Age Peace Foundation materials which suggest other nuclear disarmament education activities, including information on our newly produced DVD which is titled: "U.S. Leadership for a Nuclear Weapons-Free World".

In closing, I want to quote my colleague, Rick Wayman, who is the Foundation's Director of Programs: " Now is the time to create a new equilibrium in the thinking of Americans. Public support is essential for strong U.S. leadership on the issue of nuclear weapons abolition. U.S. leadership is essential if progress is going to be made on the world stage. So the answer is simple. To change the reality of nuclear weapons, to reduce and then eliminate them, we must change thinking and grow the movement to support a new approach. Such a massive change in the public's thinking is a major undertaking. But it is necessary. Otherwise, fear will carry the day. And the nuclear hawks will play on American insecurity to stymie progress and enshrine the status quo of thousands upon thousands of nuclear weapons. True security will come only from global cooperation. We must be proactive. We must pioneer a new way of thinking in society. The goal of zero nuclear weapons must be accepted as the starting point of all discussions. To achieve this, we must rally the public"

I sincerely hope you will join this effort.

MODEL PETITION¹¹⁵

¹¹⁵ This petition can also be found at www.wagingpeace.com

U.S. LEADERSHIP FOR A NUCLEAR WEAPONS-FREE WORLD

An Appeal to the Next President of the United States

Nuclear weapons could destroy civilization and end intelligent life on the planet.

The only sure way to prevent nuclear proliferation, nuclear terrorism and nuclear war—before the next blinding flash—is to rid the world of nuclear weapons.

The era of nuclear weapons must be brought to an end. This can be done. It will require leadership and commitment. Nuclear weapons were created by humans, and it is our responsibility to eliminate them before they eliminate us.

The United States, as the world's most militarily powerful nation, must take the initiative in convening and leading the nations of the world in urgently take the following steps:

- De-alert. Remove all nuclear weapons from high-alert status, separating warheads from delivery vehicles;
- No First Use. Make legally binding commitments to No First Use of nuclear weapons and establish nuclear policies

consistent with this commitment;

- No New Nuclear Weapons. Initiate a moratorium on the research and development of new nuclear weapons, such as the Reliable Replacement Warhead;
- Ban Nuclear Testing Forever. Ratify and bring in to force the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty;
- Control Nuclear Material. Create a verifiable Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty with provisions to bring all weapons-grade material and the technologies to create such material under strict and effective international control;
- Nuclear Weapons Convention. Commence good faith negotiations, as required by the Non-proliferation Treaty, to achieve a Nuclear Weapons Convention for the phased, verifiable and irreversible elimination of nuclear weapons;
- Resources for Peace. Reallocate resources from the tens of billions currently spent on nuclear arms to alleviating poverty, preventing and curing disease, eliminating hunger and expanding educational opportunities throughout the world.

We call upon the President of the United States to make a world free

of nuclear weapons an urgent priority and to assure US leadership to realize this goal.

Name: _____

Signature _____

E-mail: _____

City, State and Zip Code: _____

To sign this petition online go to:

<http://www.wagingpeace.org/appeal>

Visit the following websites for helpful educational resources, action alerts, and information about national campaigns to abolish nuclear weapons. These are just a few of the hundreds of nuclear disarmament organizations that provide educational resources and materials:¹¹⁶

www.abolitionnow.org

The ABOLITION NOW! campaign aims to create the political will, through the mobilization of civil society, for the complete abolition of nuclear weapons by 20/20.

¹¹⁶ Breaking faith with nuclear weapons: A guide for religious communities. Faithful Security: The National Religious Partnership on the Nuclear Weapons Danger, p.15.

www.ananuclear.org

ALLIANCE FOR NUCLEAR ACCOUNTABILITY is a national network of organizations working on nuclear weapons and waste issues. Check out their website to find a local partner.

www.cctpp.org

The CHURCHES' CENTER FOR THEOLOGY AND PUBLIC POLICY has partnered with the Islamic Society of North America on the "Muslim-Christian Initiative on the Nuclear Weapons Danger." Visit their website for useful educational resources and more information.

www.faithfulamerica.org

FAITHFUL AMERICA is an online community of people of faith working together to build a more just and compassionate nation.

www.fourthfreedom.org

THE FOURTH FREEDOM FORUM devotes itself to freeing humanity from the fear of war by eliminating nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass

destruction and strengthening international law.

www.fcni.org/nuclear

The FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION is a Quaker lobby active on disarmament issues. Visit their website to subscribe to action alerts, the Nuclear Calendar, and to view helpful lobby guides.

www.zero-nukes.org

The INTERFAITH COMMITTEE FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT coordinates legislative strategy on nuclear weapons issues. Its website contains statements on nuclear weapons from religious organizations, military leaders, and international commissions.

www.nccusa.org

Representing 45 million persons from a wide spectrum of churches, the NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES has been a leading force for cooperation among Christians in the United States.

www.globalzero.org

In December 2008 in Paris, 100 leaders from around the world launched GLOBAL ZERO. They announced a plan for the phased, verified elimination of nuclear weapons, starting with deep reductions in the U.S. and Russian arsenals, to be followed by multilateral negotiations among all nuclear powers for an agreement to eliminate all nuclear weapons.

www.wagingpeace.org

At THE NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION website, sign up for THE SUNFLOWER, a free monthly newsletter on nuclear weapons issues, and join the Turn the Tide Campaign to receive regular action alerts on nuclear dangers.

www.nti.org

THE NUCLEAR THREAT INITIATIVE was founded by Senator Sam Nunn in 2001, NTI aims to strengthen global security by decreasing the risk of the use and proliferation of nuclear weapons.

www.paxchristi.org

PAX CHRISTI USA works to make the gospel imperative of peacemaking a

priority in the Catholic Church in the United States. This includes promoting nuclear, conventional and domestic disarmament

www.peace-action.org

PEACE ACTION, the merger of SANE and the Nuclear Freeze, has effectively mobilized for peace and disarmament for nearly fifty years.

www.prop1.org

PROPOSITION ONE is a grassroots movement for disarmament of nuclear weapons and the conversion of nuclear and other arms industries to provide for human and environmental needs. Prop 1 aims to replicate the victory of DC Initiative 37, which lead to the introduction of H.R. 1653 into Congress starting in 1994, into Voter Initiative Campaigns across the entire country.

www.psr.org

PHYSICIANS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY has been a longtime advocate for nuclear disarmament. The national office monitors nuclear weapons issues carefully, and local chapters are excellent allies and

resources.

www.sojo.net

SOJOURNERS is a progressive Christian community that focuses on faith, politics and culture. Their monthly magazine and weekly news updates provide a refreshing Christian commentary on public policy.

www.umc-gbcs.org

THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH, GENERAL BOARD OF CHURCH AND SOCIETY is an agency within the UMC that seeks to bring the whole of human life, activities, possessions, use of resources, and community and world relationships into conformity with the will of God.

www.wand.org

WOMEN'S ACTION FOR NEW DIRECTIONS empowers women to change our government's priorities by taking action for peace and security.

WAND's new set of study guides, FAITH SEEKING PEACE, addresses issues about nuclear weapons, military spending and terrorism.