As a public service,

THE LAUCKS FOUNDATION

From time to time calls attention to published material that might contribute toward clarification or understanding of issues affecting world peace. The accompanying reprints constitute Mailing No. 44.

(Mrs.) Eulah C. Laucks, President
Post Office Box 5012
Santa Barbara, CA. 93108

January 17, 1983

"The Pentagon is an enormously inefficient nationalized industry. Its decisions are less the implementation of a coherent strategy than a matter of three services dividing a patronage pie."

(Quoted from the editorial "A Great Defense Debate?", The Wall Street Journal, Nov. 11, 1982.)

EXCERPT from "Halting the Momentum of Nuclear Armaments: Challenge and Response"
by Marek Thee, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo.

(Reprinted from The Bulletin of Peace Proposals, Vol. 13, No. 4, December, 1982, pp.286-87, by permission of the author)

However potent the impulses to the arms race may be from the external environment, since World War II the center of gravity of armaments dynamics has decidedly moved to the *internal* scene. A major cause of this shift is the growth and increased influence of socio-political forces which have vested interests in armaments. It was former President Eisenhower who in his farewell address first drew attention to this phenomenon – 'this conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry', the 'military-industrial complex', whose 'total influence – economic, political and spiritual – is felt in every city, every state house, every office of the federal government'.[10] This powerful complex includes the state political bureaucracy, which is interested in armaments as a key instrument of policy and diplomacy; as well as the scientific-technological community employed by the military research and development (R&D) – half a million of the world's best qualified scientists and engineers, 85 percent of them working in the US and USSR – which plays a critical role in the process of armament.[11]

The most crucial and sensitive link which internally impells the arms race is military R&D. This is the machinery and engine working incessantly on the improvement of old and the invention of new weapon systems. It is the goal-setting, the mode of operation and institutional setup of military R&D which generates the technological momentum behind the arms race.

The development of new weapon systems requires long gestation periods: 10 to 15 years are needed for the conceptualization, prototype production, repeated testing and perfection of the new arms. This factor invests military R&D with constancy and permanency. Its operation tends to transcend ephemeral and volatile political processes in the external environment, including arms control and disarmament negotiations. Its innovation rate tends to outpace these negotiations, relegating them to debates on obsolete weapons and making their outcome largely irrelevant.

Reinforcing this 'permanency trait' in the operation of military R&D is the routine to follow-up automatically each innovation in defense with an effort to complement it with counterdevices in offense, and vice versa, in a constant spiral chain-reaction of offense and defense. Perpetuity is thus inherent in the operation of military R&D. In the process, military R&D grows and expands. Its functioning is greatly actuated by inner impulses. Knowing less about the performance of the adversary and more about its own achievements, its expansion and growth propensity is fuelled largely by its own exploits. It ends up racing against its own achievements. A kind of square action-reaction-overreaction phenomenon comes into being, fed both by outer and inner impulsion.

The technological momentum produced by military R&D exerts a pervasive impact on the ways in which problems of peace and war are approached. New weapon systems serve as an inspiration for new political departures. The moment they enter the production line and become available, these start to figure high in the political-military game. They corrupt the political process. In the end, the whole architecture of international politics is affected by the race in military technology.

SCIENCE
29 October 1982, Volume 218, Number 4571

Efforts to Decrease Nuclear Tensions

So far we have been spared from nuclear war, but year by year the number and accuracy of nuclear weapons have increased. Should the present race continue indefinitely, the ultimate mutual destruction of the superpowers seems guaranteed. The United States and the Soviet Union now have about 25,000 warheads each. Only about 200 on target would destroy all U.S. cities with populations greater than 100,000. Russian casualties would be comparable. In addition, the Soviet Union has some special problems of its own. The European Russians (Caucasians) constitute an unloved minority. One Kremlinologist told me that if a bomb were dropped on Moscow, there would be dancing in the streets of Tashkent. Following a nuclear holocaust, how much help could Russians expect from their neighbors? According to another Kreminologist, "The Soviet Union is the only major power in the world almost totally surrounded by hostile communist powers." Though the country's intrinsic position is flawed, the Russians are a proud people and their leadership acts tough and brutal. Another Kremlinologist has said, "The Russians are not 20 feet tall, but neither do they have a 10-foot yellow streak down their backs." An attempt by this country to overawe them is not likely to succeed. The contrasting policy for us—unilateral disarmament—has no future. Realism demands a middle course between the two extremes. Increasingly, important voices have been calling for just that.

In this issue of *Science* is printed a Declaration on Prevention of Nuclear War that was presented to Pope John Paul II by an assembly of presidents of scientific academies and other scientists. Circumstances of the drafting of the declaration indicate that its recommendations will be adopted, entirely or in large part, by the Catholic Church. A crucial comment made in the declaration is that "All disputes that we are concerned with today, including political, economic, ideological, or religious ones, are small compared to the hazards of nuclear war." This statement is true, but are our people prepared to modify firmly held beliefs to lessen tensions?

The declaration calls on all nations "never to be the first to use nuclear weapons; . . . to abide by the principle that force or the threat of force will not be used against the territorial integrity or political independence of another state; . . . [and] to renew and increase efforts to reach verifiable agreements curbing the arms race." A commitment by the United States not to be first to use nuclear weapons would represent an important change in policy that might leave our NATO allies feeling abandoned. At present, the Russians have a large superiority in tanks and other conventional weapons. To neutralize this threat would require a substantial buildup of Western conventional forces or partial disarmament by the Russians.

The other two cited recommendations also call for a change in the behavior of the Soviet Union. Would they be willing to curtail their activities in Afghanistan and elsewhere? The matter of verifiability is also sticky. The historical refusal of the Russians to agree to some form of inspection casts doubt on their reliability and sincerity.

Despite the many obstacles to lessening the threat of nuclear war, efforts must be made. Scientists can help, as they have done in advising Pope John Paul II. But the major impetus must come from the politicians. In this regard there have been some encouraging developments. Four former hawks, McGeorge Bundy, George F. Kennan, Robert S. McNamara, and Gerard Smith, have called for a change in policy on the use of nuclear deterrents in Western Europe.* Senators Jake Garn (R–Utah) and Paul Laxalt (R–Nev.) have said, "The U.S. should make every effort to negotiate an equitable and verifiable strategic nuclear offensive arms reduction agreement." Senator Barry Goldwater (R–Ariz.) said that it is time to sit down with the Russians and say, "We're both in trouble. We're spending too damn much on things we don't need. Let's talk."—PHILIP H. ABELSON

*"Nuclear Weapons and the Atlantic Alliance," reprinted from *Foreign Affairs*, Spring 1982, by the Albert Einstein Peace Prize Foundation, 1430 West Wrightwood Avenue, Chicago 60614.

SCIENCE 29 October 1982, Vol.218, No.4571

Declaration on Prevention of Nuclear War

On 24 September 1982, this statement was presented to His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, by an assembly of presidents of scientific academies and other scientists from all over the world convened by the Pontifical Academy of Sciences to consider the issue of nuclear warfare.

I. Preamble. Throughout its history, humankind has been confronted with war, but since 1945 the nature of warfare has changed so profoundly that the future of the human race, of generations yet unborn, is imperilled. At the same time, mutual contacts and means of understanding between peoples of the world have been increasing. This is why the yearning for peace is now stronger than ever. Mankind is confronted today with a threat unprecedented in history, arising from the massive and competitive accumulation of nuclear weapons. The existing arsenals, if employed in a major war, could result in the immediate deaths of many hundreds of millions of people, and of untold millions more later through a variety of aftereffects. For the first time, it is possible to cause damage on such a catastrophic scale as to wipe out a large part of civilization and to endanger its very survival. The large-scale use of such weapons could trigger major and irreversible ecological and genetic changes, whose limits cannot be predicted.

Science can offer the world no real defense against the consequences of nuclear war. There is no prospect of making defenses sufficiently effective to protect cities since even a single penetrating nuclear weapon can cause massive destruction. There is no prospect that the mass of the population could be protected against a major nuclear attack or that devastation of the cultural, economic, and industrial base of society could be prevented. The breakdown of social organization, and the magnitude of casualties, will be so large that no medical system can be expected to cope with more than a minute fraction of the victims.

There are now some 50,000 nuclear weapons, some of which have yields a thousand times greater than the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima. The total explosive content of these weapons is equivalent to a million Hiroshima bombs, which corresponds to a yield of some 3 tons of TNT for every person on earth. Yet these stockpiles continue to grow. Moreover, we face the increasing danger that many additional countries will acquire nuclear weapons or develop the capability of producing them.

(Continued)

Participants in the Conference on Nuclear Warfare included: E. Amaldi, Italy; I. Badran, Egypt; A. Balevski, Bulgaria; A. Bekoe, International Council of Scientific Unions; F. Benvenuti, Italy; C. Bernhard, Sweden; O. Bikov, Soviet Union; B. Bilinski, Poland; C. Chagas, Brazil; E. De Giorgi, Italy; B. Dinkov, Bulgaria; G. Hambraeus, Sweden; T. Hesburgh and H. Hiatt, United States; D. Hodgkin, International Pugwash Conference; S. Hsieh, Taipei; A. Huxley, England; S. Iijima, Japan; S. Isaev, Soviet Union; P. Jacquinot, France; W. Kalweit, German Democratic Republic; M. Kazi, Pakistan; S. Keeny, United States; K. Komarek and F. König, Austria; J. Labarbe, Belgium; J. Lejeune and L. Leprince-Ringuet, France; R. Levi Montalcini, Italy; M. Lora-Tamayo, Spain; T. Malone, United States; G. Marini-Bettolo, Italy; M. Menon, India; G. Montalenti, Italy; M. Peixoto, Brazil; J. Peters, Belgium; G. Porter, England; F. Press, United States; G. Puppi, Italy; B. Rifai, Indonesia; W. Rosenblith, United States; P. Rossano, Italy; P. Rudomin, Mexico; B. Rysavy, Czechoslovakia; I. Saavedra, Chile; V. Sardi, Venezuela; T. Shin, Korea; E. Simpson, South Africa; J. Sirotković, Yugoslavia; L. Sosnovski, Poland; A. Stoppani, Argentina; J. Szentagothai, Hungary; S. Tanneberger, German Democratic Republic; C. Townes, United States; E. Velikhov, Soviet Union; W. Watts, Ireland; and V. Weisskopf, United States.

0036-8075/82/1029-0448$01.00/0

There is today an almost continuous range of explosive power from the smallest battlefield nuclear weapons to the most destructive megaton warhead. Nuclear weapons are regarded not only as a deterrent, but there are plans for their tactical use and use in a general war under so-called controlled conditions. The immense and increasing stockpiles of nuclear weapons, and their broad dispersal in the armed forces, increase the probability of their being used through accident or miscalculation in times of heightened political or military tension. The risk is very great that any utilization of nuclear weapons, however limited, would escalate to general nuclear war.

The world situation has deteriorated. Mistrust and suspicion between nations have grown. There is a breakdown of serious dialogue between the East and West and between North and South. Serious inequities among nations and within nations, shortsighted national or partisan ambitions, and lust for power are the seeds of conflict which may lead to general and nuclear warfare. The scandal of poverty, hunger, and degradation is in itself becoming an increasing threat to peace. There appears to be a growing fatalistic acceptance that war is inevitable and that wars will be fought with nuclear weapons. In any such war there will be no winners.

Not only the potentialities of nuclear weapons, but also those of chemical, biological, and even conventional weapons are increasing by the steady accumulation of new knowledge. It is therefore to be expected that also the means of nonnuclear war, as horrible as they already are, will become more destructive if nothing is done to prevent such a war. Human wisdom, however, remains comparatively limited, in dramatic contrast with the apparently inexorable growth of the power of destruction. It is the duty of scientists to help prevent the perversion of their achievements and to stress that the future of mankind depends upon the acceptance by all nations of moral principles transcending all other considerations. Recognizing the natural rights of humans to survive and to live in dignity, science must be used to assist humankind towards a life of fulfillment and peace.

Considering these overwhelming dangers that confront all of us, it is the duty of every person of good will to face this threat. All disputes that we are concerned with today, including political, economic, ideological, and religious ones, are small compared to the hazards of nuclear war. It is imperative to reduce distrust and to increase hope and confidence through a succession of steps to curb the development, production, testing, and deployment of nuclear weapons systems, and to reduce them to substantially lower levels with the ultimate hope of their complete elimination.

To avoid wars and achieve a meaningful peace, not only the powers of intelligence are needed, but also the powers of ethics, morality, and conviction.

The catastrophe of nuclear war can and must be prevented. Leaders and governments have a grave responsibility to fulfill in this regard. But it is humankind as a whole which must act for its survival. This is the greatest moral issue that humanity has ever faced, and there is no time to be lost.

II. In view of these threats of global nuclear catastrophe, we declare:

- Nuclear weapons are fundamentally different from conventional weapons. They must not be regarded as acceptable instruments of warfare. Nuclear warfare would be a crime against humanity.
- It is of utmost importance that there be no armed conflict between nuclear powers because of the danger that nuclear weapons would be used.
- The use of force anywhere as a method of settling international conflicts can entail the risk of military confrontation of nuclear powers.
- The proliferation of nuclear weapons to additional countries seriously increases the risk of nuclear war and could lead to nuclear terrorism.
- The current arms race increases the risk of nuclear war. The race must be stopped, the development of new, more destructive weapons must be curbed, and nuclear forces must be reduced, with the ultimate goal of complete nuclear disarmament. The sole purpose of nuclear weapons, as long as they exist, must be to deter nuclear war.

III. Recognizing that excessive conventional forces increase mistrust and could lead to confrontation with the risk of nuclear war, and that all differences and territorial disputes should be resolved by negotiation, arbitration, or other peaceful means, we call upon all nations:

- Never to be the first to use nuclear weapons;
- To seek termination of hostilities immediately in the appalling event that nuclear weapons are ever used;
- To abide by the principle that force or the threat of force will not be used against the territorial integrity or political independence of another state;
- To renew and increase efforts to reach verifiable agreements curbing the arms race and reducing the numbers of nuclear weapons and delivery systems. These agreements should be monitored by the most effective technical means. Political differences or territorial disputes must not be allowed to interfere with this objective;
- To find more effective ways and means to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. The nuclear powers, and in particular the superpowers, have a special obligation to set an example in reducing armaments and to create a climate conducive to nonproliferation. Moreover, all nations have the duty to prevent the diversion of peaceful uses of nuclear energy to the proliferation of nuclear weapons;
- To take all practical measures that reduce the possibility of nuclear war by accident, miscalculation, or irrational action.
- To continue to observe existing arms limitation agreements while seeking to negotiate broader and more effective agreements.

IV. Finally, we appeal:

1) To national leaders, to take the initiative in seeking steps to reduce the risk of nuclear war, looking beyond narrow concerns for national advantage; and to reject military conflict as a means of resolving disputes.

2) To scientists, to use their creativity for the betterment of human life, and to apply their ingenuity in exploring means of avoiding nuclear war and developing practical methods of arms control.

3) To religious leaders and other custodians of moral principles, to proclaim forcefully and persistently the grave human issues at stake so that these are fully understood and appreciated by society.

4) To people everywhere, to reaffirm their faith in the destiny of humankind, to insist that the avoidance of war is a common responsibility, to combat the belief that nuclear conflict is unavoidable, and to labor unceasingly towards insuring the future of generations to come.

August/September 1982

Traditionally, women's organizations have not addressed national security issues. But fears of nuclear war, combined with a network in place from the Equal Rights Amendment campaign, may bring a new collective political force to bear on these issues.

ROSEMARY CHALK

Women and the national security debate

The national security issue, and the assumptions that provide the momentum for our escalating defense budget, have become hot items on the agenda of women's organizations traditionally associated with local civic affairs. Groups such as the League of Women Voters and the American Association of University Women are informing themselves about the basic policy questions surrounding the arms race, the strategy of deterrence, and the motivations and objectives of the government officials who shape U.S. military strategy.

This critical review of military policies has the potential of producing an informed and active grass-roots constituency committed to questioning further investments in military hardware as a means to enhancing national security. These groups are also seeking new definitions of the elements that promote world order and reduce international tensions. Because of their large memberships (the League numbers about 110,000; there are about 190,000 women in the Association) and regional structure, women's organizations may become one of the most important new factions committed to developing an arms control strategy for the 1980s. This is particularly significant since these groups have historically chosen not to express their concerns through national political action.

A recent conference in Washington, D.C., sponsored by the Committee for National Security (a private educational group committed to "promote a change in the direction of national security policy"), assembled 300 women leaders to discuss defense budgets and arms control concerns. In addition to representatives from the League and American Association of University Women, conference participants included women who work in organizations ranging from the Democratic and Republican National Committees to the General Federation of Womens Clubs to the Girl Scouts.

The conference organizers had four objectives:

- to provide up-to-date national security information to enable women to join the national security debate;
- to provide a forum for a discussion on the range of national security issues;
- to provide for an exchange of resources, including materials and speakers;
- to encourage local and national organizations to integrate national security issues into their own activities.

Anne Cahn, the director of the Committee for National Security and the key organizer of the conference, provided some perspective:

"We want to focus upon the issue of national security as an important issue for women and their organizations. We want to draw upon the things that concern women most deeply and build on their convictions and their own resources. Women are viewed as the peacemakers, and they care about important and fundamental principles, such as preserving the family."

In discussing feminine participation in the national security debates, the popular media have focused primarily upon the role of *individuals*. The New York Times, for example, published a feature article last May titled "3 Women and the Campaign for a Nuclear Freeze." It featured Helen Caldicott, president of the Physicians for Social Responsibility; Frances Farley, Utah State Senator who opposed the MX proposal; and Randall Forsberg, organizer of the Campaign for a Nuclear Freeze.

But translating individual commitment into collective action is a formidable task. One participant in the women's leadership conference was writer Elizabeth Janeway, author of *Powers of the Weak*, who commented that although women's political behavior in the past has not significantly differed from that of men, the national security issue could become one of the first major political tests in which women's votes may make a difference. She noted that this is not just because women are more deeply concerned than men about the destructive effects of modern warfare, but also because women have acquired a stronger sense of relying upon their own experiences and insights in the 1970s and are poised to funnel their own perspectives into political action. If this is true, groups which represent women's concerns will capture the attention of congressional candidates and other political figures who have in the past looked upon arms control issues as of only tangential importance to their own constituencies. Indeed, one of the rallying cries at the conference was "Remember - November," in reference to the upcoming congressional elections.

The forces that have pushed national security concerns onto the

(Continued)

Attendees at the Washington conference sponsored by the Committee for National Security: (left to right) Julia Walsh; Frances Farenthold; Anne Cahn, director of the Committee; and Mary Grefe.

agenda of traditional women's organizations have diverse roots: arms control groups such as the Committee for National Security and the Nuclear Freeze Coalition are eagerly seeking new constituencies to broaden opposition to the Reagan Administration's defense policies. At the same time, established women's groups are seeking issues which can be directly linked to national political initiatives. Building upon the experiences, resources and networks established among professional women in the campaign to support the Equal Rights Amendment, women's organizations are welcoming new projects that will maintain them as an active presence in shaping national policies.

But there are forces more fundamental than organizational self-interest which fuel this new coalition. Women as a whole tend to oppose increased defense spending, and several polls have illustrated increasing concern among women about current government policies. The Committee for National Security, for example, commissioned a series of questions which were included in a national poll conducted by the Roper organization last year. Results of the poll suggested that in general women were significantly more open to a broader definition of national security than were men. The New York Times-CBS News Poll, conducted in October 1980, indicated that 36 percent of the women polled, as opposed to 26 percent of men, said they were afraid that Ronald Reagan, if elected, would involve the country in war. By March 1982, 52 percent of the women polled said they thought the President might do so, as opposed to 44 percent of the men. The same New York Times-CBS poll indicated in April 1981 that 63 percent of women surveyed said they approved of Reagan's stewardship, as against 71 percent of men. By March 1982, however, only 39 percent of the women approved, against 48 percent of the men.

It is difficult to determine the underlying causes for this statistically significant difference. An important element may be the social and psychological effects of twentieth-century warfare. Adele Simmons, the president of Hampshire College, in her opening address to the conference, cited the alarming trend of increased civilian casualties as a percentage of the overall deaths resulting from major armed conflicts. She reports that beginning with a fairly insignificant ratio of 5 percent in World War I, the escalating curve of civilian deaths climbed to more than 90 percent of the total resulting from the Vietnam War. Confronted with these figures, one realizes that women no longer experience war only as widows or nurses. Women and their children have joined, and may outnumber, soldiers as battlefield victims.

Many women at the conference also spoke of the difficulties of communicating with their own children about the appropriate way to deal with the persistent threat of nuclear war. Numerous references to adolescents' visions of a world without a future and children's nightmares about nuclear bombs were cited.

To develop a woman's perspective on national security issues requires unravelling several knotty questions: Do women really respond to war in a different way than men? Is the woman's perspective on national security that of women who are strongly influenced by their male counterparts? Or is it linked to the sources of feminism, providing a unique and different approach to the problems of war and peace?

The answers to these questions are not immediately apparent. Women, in general, respond more emotionally to human problems than do men. Providing a woman's viewpoint on national security means integrating the emotional effects of war and nuclear weapons into public debates on national defense policies. It also means translating women's traditional compassion for the problems of the individual into caring about the problems of society as a whole.

Yet this approach has met with the criticism that nothing useful is to be gained by "hysterical women" complaining about the effects of war, and that rational, abstract—that is, male—reasoning is the constructive avenue toward peace and societal well-being.

Both approaches are necessary. If the people are poorly served when alarmed by the graphic depiction of nuclear warfare, they are also deceived when the arms race is translated into a column of numbers without providing some sense of the human cost of suffering and deprivation that these weapons and soaring military budgets can create. An emotional commitment to peace, as well as a rational assessment of the best means to obtain it, are both critical elements in incorporating women's views into the current national security debate.

(Continued)

The national security issue could become one of the first major political tests in which women's voices may make a difference.

On the question of whether women are simply imitating the arms control strategy of their male colleagues and friends, I believe the answer is not yet certain. Women are clearly in a transitional state in all walks of life, and national security is no exception. The arguments and logic of the speeches delivered at the Women's Leadership Conference did not present a radical feminist perspective on the issue of national security, such as one that might be proposed by Women's Strike for Peace. Discussions were very much like those that might be sponsored by any educational group exploring arms control or foreign policy concerns. Many of the principal speakers were men.

Why, then, sponsor a conference solely for women? One answer is that women have been traditionally excluded from such meetings because of their lack of visibility in associations or government offices which address such issues as well as their own lack of interest. They have thus been denied first-hand exposure to the facts and information needed to educate themselves on these policies. The goal of the conference was to provide women with these facts so that they can independently assess what policies best serve our national security objectives. This approach, however, is based on the notion that women want access to power but don't necessarily want to change the rules of the game. Interestingly enough, there was no discussion regarding the make-up of the U.S.-Soviet delegations currently engaged in arms control negotiations in Geneva. Apart from translators and secretaries neither delegation has any women participants.

At the same time, another important objective expressed by many conference participants was that of redefining the purpose of national security in a global context. While some women supported the deterrence policy by arguing that the only way to avoid conflict was to maintain military strength, a majority of the participants urged that social and economic interests need to be woven into the government's definition and the public's understanding of national security. Adele Simmons argued that national security must be measured in terms of the well-being of the nation and the health of a national economy as well as military might. A study proposal adopted by the League of Women Voters seeks "to define the nature of national security and its relationship to military spending," and also "to assess the impact of U.S. military spending on the nation's economy and our ability to meet social and environmental needs."

Women's emphasis on broadening the definition of the national security issue has also been noted by sociologist Elise Boulding in her earlier work on the perceptions of women researchers in the field of disarmament studies.* Boulding, having surveyed responses from 40 women scholars professionally active in 17 countries, commented that "all respondents agree that security must be redefined." She also found that "almost every respondent proposed research on the concept of national security itself" and that "most scholars want questions to be asked about the political, economic and social conditions that would make disarmament possible" as a replacement for the currently excessive focus on technical curbs. It is in this search for new definitions that feminism will have its greatest influence.

Redefining the terms of the debate, however, is the long-range focus of the women's groups now moving into this area. Their immediate goal is to become active participants in translating their members' emotional convictions into educated political action. This means taking positions on the terms of the debate as it is currently structured.

We wish them well. At the same time, one cannot conclude that the women participants in the conference, or the membership of the League and American Association of University Women represent a truly democratic cross-section of feminine interests in the United States. Blue-collar and minority women were invited but were few in number. The housewives and mothers with little or no political or professional connections were not present either. Also absent was Equal Rights Amendment-opponent Phyllis Schlafly, who was recently quoted as stating that "The atomic bomb is a marvelous gift that was given to our country by a wise God." The aspirations of the conference organizers were based largely on the assumption that the elite network of professional women's organizations which has served as an important communication link among like-minded women can now provide a cornerstone for generating a broadly-based educational effort.

If the national security issue takes root in the women's clubs of the United States over the next few years, a new variety of informed citizenry may blossom forth into political action. And if these women could link with those who are frozen into the politics of fear produced by unemployment and recession, they may be able to transform the political agenda of the nation. □

*Elise Boulding, "Perspectives of Women Researchers on Disarmament, National Security and World Order," *Women's Studies International Quarterly* IV, 1 (1980), pp. 27-40.

Rosemary Chalk, a science policy analyst, is with the Program on Science, Technology and Society at MIT in Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139.

MANAS

VOLUME XXXV, No. 48 Thirty Cents DECEMBER 1, 1982

A LOOK AT INTELLECTUAL PROCESSES

COMMENTING on the demise of the *Saturday Review*—once deservedly known as the *Saturday Review of Literature*—Norman Cousins, long its editor (until six years ago), begins with a practical explanation. It has to do with the policies of the Post Office. In his article in the *Christian Science Monitor* for August 31, he says:

> In the early years of this nation's history, magazines and newspapers were considered part of the country's circulatory system, along with interstate roads, and the postal rates were nominal. The development of subscription magazines was largely the product of this low-cost delivery system.
>
> About 20 years ago or so, however, government policy toward periodicals radically changed. As a result, it now costs about 12 times as much to send a magazine through the mails as it did less than a generation ago. No other factor involved in publishing a magazine, even allowing for inflation, has seen such an increase. When you take into account the fact that a magazine also has to use the mails for obtaining and renewing its subscribers, you can see how the economics of publishing a magazine can be unhinged by present-day postal costs.

The Post Office decision to raise the rates for magazines could be interpreted as saying that only market forces should determine whether a magazine survives or not, just as, more recently, modern medicine, through the greatly enlarged fees doctors charge for their services, has been saying that market forces should determine whether or not a sick or injured person should have professional help in getting well. In any event, submission to market forces by publishers and other "cultural" enterprises is part of Mr. Cousins' account of why the *Saturday Review* could not survive. Then, speaking of "the sleaziness that has infected the national culture in recent years," he says:

> There seems to be a fierce competition, especially in entertainment and publishing, to find ever-lower rungs on the ladder of taste. . . . The annihilation of taste has not spared language. There is the curious notion that freedom is somehow synonymous with gutter jargon. At one time people who worked in the arts would boast to one another about their ability to communicate ideas that attacked social injustice and brutality. Now some of them seem to feel they have struck a blow for humanity if only they can use enough four-letter words. The trouble with this kind of verbiage is not just that it is offensive but that it is trite to the point of being threadbare.
>
> The decline of language has been marked by a corresponding rise in incoherence. The words "you know" or "I mean" are strewn like loose gravel through everyday communication. I don't believe in raising taxes, but I would happily support a bill that would tax the bejeebers out of people each time they use "you know" or "I mean."
>
> The debasement of language not only reflects but produces a retreat from civility. The slightest disagreement has become an occasion for violent reactions. Television has educated an entire generation of Americans to believe that the normal way of reacting to a slight is by punching someone in the face.
>
> On every hand, there is evidence that people are losing the art of reasonable discourse. My friends in Congress tell me that in recent years the tone of letters from constituents has drastically changed. At one time, most letters tried to state a position reasonably. Today, people seem to feel that denunciation is the standard form.

What is going wrong? Any reply to this question is likely to be inadequate and incomplete. The fact of the decline in language and the way it is used is notorious. Seven years ago, in the *American Scholar* (Autumn, 1975), Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., spoke of words divorced from their objects which become "instruments less of communication than of deception." What are the circumstances which not only permit but encourage this change? Schlesinger wrote:

> The rise of mass communications, the growth of large organizations and novel technologies, the invention of advertising and public relations, the professionalization of education—all contributed to linguistic pollution, upsetting the ecological balance between words and their environment. In our own time the purity of language is under unrelenting attack from every side—from professors as well as from politicians, from newspapermen as well as from advertising men, from men of the cloth as well as from men of the sword, and not least from those compilers of modern dictionaries who propound the suicidal thesis that all usages are equal and correct.

To dramatize what has happened to our language, our speech—indeed, our thinking—Prof. Schlesinger recalls the writing of the Founding Fathers, as it appeared in the *Federalist* nearly two hundred years ago. They used a language that was lucid and felicitous, "marked by Augustan virtues of harmony, balance and elegance."

> People not only wrote this noble language. They also read it. The essays in defense of the Constitution signed Publius appeared week after week in the New York press during the winter of 1787-88; and the demand was so great that the first thirty-six Federalist papers were published in book form while the rest were still coming out in the papers. One can only marvel at the sophistication of an audience that con-

(Continued)

sumed and relished pieces so closely reasoned, so thoughtful and analytical.

Why are there not readers of that sort—to say nothing of such writers—today? Mass communication and the competition in vulgar appeal would be one explanation, but we need a more fundamental account, and call upon Emerson, in the section on Language in "Nature," for help. Originally, he says, we developed our language from the analogy of nature with our lives. Nature supplies the encyclopedia of the raw materials of meaning. "All the facts in natural history," he says, "taken by themselves, have no value, but are barren, like a single sex. But marry it to human history, and it is full of life." He continues:

> As we go back in history, language becomes more picturesque, until its infancy, when it is all poetry; or all spiritual facts are represented by natural symbols. The same symbols are found to make the original elements of all languages. It has moreover been observed, that the idioms of all languages approach each other in passages of the greatest eloquence and power. And as this is the first language, so is it the last. This immediate dependence of language upon nature, this conversion of an outward phenomenon into a type of somewhat in human life, never loses its power to affect us. It is this which gives that piquancy to the conversation of a strong-natured farmer or backwoodsman, which all men relish.

On this foundation Emerson gives his theory of decline:

> A man's power to connect his thought with its proper symbol, and so to utter it, depends on the simplicity of his character, that is, upon his love of truth, and his desire to communicate it without loss. The corruption of man is followed by the corruption of language. When simplicity of character and the sovereignty of ideas is broken up by the prevalence of secondary desires, the desire for riches, of pleasure, of powers, and of praise,—and duplicity and falsehood take the place of simplicity and truth, the power over nature as an interpreter of the will, is in a degree lost; new imagery ceases to be created, and old words are perverted to stand for things which are not; a paper currency is employed, when there is no bullion in the vaults. In due time, the fraud is manifest, and words lose all power to stimulate the understanding or the affections. Hundreds of writers may be found in every long-civilized nation, who for a short time believe, and make others believe, that they see and utter truths, who do not of themselves clothe one thought in its natural garment, but who feed unconsciously on the language created by the primary writers of the country, those, namely, who hold primarily on nature.

The way back:

> But wise men pierce this rotten diction and fasten words again to visible things. . . . The moment our discourse rises above the ground line of familiar facts, and is inflamed with passion or exalted by thought, it clothes itself in images. A man conversing in earnest, if he watch his intellectual processes, will find that a material image, more or less luminous, arises in his mind, contemporaneous with every thought, which furnishes the investment of the thought. Hence, good writing and brilliant discourse are perpetual allegories. This imagery is spontaneous. It is the blending of experience with the present action of the mind. It is proper creation. It is the working of the Original Cause through the instruments he has already made.

There are passages in Richard Goodwin's *The American Condition* (first published in the *New Yorker* in January and February of 1977) which seem worthy of extending Emerson's insight. Goodwin wrote:

> Communities originated as enclaves of the natural world. Since the connection with nature was established through the senses rather than by ideology or authority, the individual's perception of himself was strengthened—but within the framework of a shared experience that helped to sustain the bonds of community. . . . The elimination of nature from our daily life loosens the ties of community through its effect on our emotional capacities and by removing a traditional bond of shared experience.
>
> The fragmentation of social existence, having destroyed previous forms of authority, also makes inconceivable the establishment of an accepted system of values and moral conduct. . . . The united will that is required to regulate the social process is necessarily transferred (alienated) to an external authority.

In the passage from the medieval communities to the modern age, Goodwin says, the web of life broke down. The cash nexus took the place of human relationships and obligations.

> As money took on independent value, personal obligations could be fulfilled through payment—cash instead of services, gold instead of horses and bowmen. Deeply personal ties, which had extruded the consciousness of the age, a mode of thought, and a structure of values and perceptions, metamorphosed into commercial bonds. You no longer owed yourself; you owed money. The spirit of commerce gradually infiltrated extensive regions of social life which had not received the benefits of increasing wealth. . . . This invasion came armed with the powerful, liberating idea of value. Once obligations had value, once they could be priced, then the fact of payment overshadowed, and ultimately displaced, the identity of the debtor. The new kind of debt was impersonal, even transferable. . . . The earth was transmuted into capital, its produce into income, and income into goods—not only to maintain life but to bring comfort, pleasure, luxury, beauty. The powerful sought ownership in addition to power and, finally, as a source of added power.

With this as our psychological environment, we have no difficulty in understanding why, if you stir it all up and then let it settle, what comes to the surface as the most frequently used metaphor of the time is "the bottom line." We should add, however, the contribution of the mechanist scientists and engineers. The prestige of machines is surely responsible for the phrase, "I was turned on," or "off," as the case may be. People think of themselves as passive gadgets, variously caused to respond to external stimuli. How else could such language become popular?

In one place in his essay on language, "Standing by Words," Wendell Berry gives several illustrations of the impoverishment of speech by scientistic assumptions and outlook, then says:

> As industrial technology advances and enlarges, and in the process assumes greater social, economic, and political force, it carries people away from where they belong by history, culture, deeds, association, and affection. And it destroys the landmarks by which they might return. Often it destroys the nature or the character of the places they have left. The very possibility of a practical connection between thought and the world is thus destroyed. Culture is driven into the mind, where it cannot be preserved. Displaced memory, for instance, is hard to keep in mind, harder to hand down. The little that survives is attenuated—without practical force. That is why the Jews, in Bablyon, wept when they remembered Zion. The mere memory of a place cannot preserve it, nor apart from the place itself can it long survive in the mind. . . .

8 (Continued)

(Continued)

The enlargement of industrial technology is thus analogous to war. It continually requires the movement of knowledge and responsibility away from home. It thrives and burgeons upon the disintegration of homes, the subjugation of homelands. It requires that people cease to cooperate directly to fulfill local needs from local sources, and begin instead to deal with each other always across the rift that divides producer and consumer, and always competitively. The idea of the independence of individual farms, shops, communities, and households is anathema to industrial technologists. The rush to nuclear energy and the growth of the space colony idea are powered by the industrial will to cut off the possibility of a small-scale energy technology—which is to say the possibility of small-scale personal and community acts. The corporate producers and their sycophants in the universities and the government will do virtually anything (or so they have obliged us to assume) to keep people from acquiring necessities in any way except by *buying* them.

Small wonder, then, that, as Norman Cousins says, there is a fierce competition among publishers "to find ever-lower rungs on the ladder of taste." The very basis of taste has been excluded from both thought and action.

Well, we have made something of a catalog of the various avenues of self-defeat by which "modernity" has been reached. Those big institutions are all out there, attempting with some success to confine our lives within the patterns they elaborate, making us increasingly dependent on the structures they are erecting, and seeming to leave criticism and dissent no choice for hope except in nostalgia for the past. Yet an examination of history suggests that industrialization is something that we—we and most of the world after us—had to go through. It is natural to wonder why, since if we could grasp the drive behind such a historical necessity we might be able to exhaust its energies and get on to better ways.

This is a philosophical question. It might take the form of asking: What are we human beings doing on the planet? Are we functional to some universal meaning in the drama of existence, or is the world a merely accidental place brought into being by atoms bouncing around at random in the void?

What can we accept as evidence bearing on the answer to such a question?

We are looking for axioms on which to build a system of self-explanation, but the inquiry may prove too vast, the reference-points inaccessible. Conceivably, the myths around which countless people in the past organized their lives will be of help. We are thinking, here, of the story of Prometheus—Prometheus as the type of mankind. Prometheus was both thinker and inventor, both technologist and visionary. By bringing to the bemused and apathetic tribe of humans the fire of mind, he imposed on them the obligations of moral decision growing out of their self-awareness. Beings who make moral decisions are able to go wrong. For reasons which are not entirely clear, it is easier to go wrong than right. Moreover, those who know what is right are not convincing to the rest when they explain what they know. They are called myth-makers, "idealistic," and said to be impractical. Plato's story of the Cave applies here. There is considerable cost in doing right, and the cost exacts high interest from those who attempt to do right merely as followers, without understanding why.

Ultimately, it seems, we learn only from experience. Yet we have minds, and one of the abilities of mind is to penetrate to the principle underlying forms of experience, making it unnecessary to go through every last episode in the ranges of experience now before us.

The present moment of history seems a time when we need to expose the principle underlying the urge to develop an absolutely controlling technology. What makes us want this? We need to know in order to prevent ourselves from building a machine which will destroy itself after making our lives totally dependent on it.

More than two thousand years ago, Socrates walked the streets of Athens trying to persuade his countrymen that it was better to suffer than to do wrong. By this and other doctrines he antagonized enough Athenians to bring about his own death. They could not see the forthcoming evil that he predicted for them, and were indifferent to his final warning:

> If you expect to stop denunciation of your wrong way of life by putting people to death, there is something amiss with your reasoning. This way of escape is neither possible nor creditable. The best and easiest way is not to stop the mouths of others, but to make yourself as good as you can. This is my last message to you who voted for my condemnation.

Today we are not so fortunate as to have a Socrates among us, but at least there are those able to point to the inescapable effects of our collective wrong-doing. Not from the mouth of Socrates, but from the relentless response of nature—including human nature—are the most emphatic warnings coming. And there are among us at least a few who give expression to Promethean vision, who are able to point out, as Norman Cousins and others point out, the effects on ourselves of what we are doing. The project to which they invite is learning the laws of life—of intelligent life—as thoroughly as we have learned the laws of matter and motion.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

1 Year $10 2 Years $18 3 Years $25

Students and others with low income who find it difficult to keep up with rising costs may subscribe at the rate of $7.50 for one year, and $14 for two years.

Issued weekly, except during July and August, by the

MANAS PUBLISHING COMPANY

P.O. Box 32112, El Sereno Station, Los Angeles, Calif. 90032

THE GUARDIAN; October 24, 1982

(Reprinted by permission from
The Manchester Guardian Weekly)

COMMENT

Paths back from assured destruction

THERE are no new arguments in the nuclear debate. There are merely old and familiar arguments, endlessly permutated. Thus any freshly packaged contribution — like the one this week from the Church of England Study Group — must soon subside. Ebb and flow of conflicting scenarios may, in the end, produce notable erosions in particular positions — indeed, over the last decade, have produced a profound erosion in Western public opinion — but the process, of its nature, is slow and uncertain.

There are none of these scenarios in what follows. Here, trembling at square one, we simply wish to consider the need for nuclear disarmament, not the means to that end. And to draw one basic distinction.

By far the most influential and widely read book about the arms race in the last few years — certainly in the United States, where it forms one of the underpins of the Freeze campaign — has been Jonathan Schell's "The Fate of the Earth". It has suffered in Britain by trailing a reputation for both Manhattan chic and for selling more copies than is strictly decent. It is fundamentally no more than a re-writing of old ideas and old data, yet the effect is remarkable. Schell takes one stock sentiment from every political speech on the subject ever uttered — that nuclear war is unthinkable, that it would be a disaster for mankind — and proceeds, thinking hard all the way, to attempt to quantify that disaster: from Hiroshima to the impact of modern nuclear war between the Super-powers, using an atomic armoury one million times that unleashed on Japan. We move, with recognition, but also with horror, through the areas of instant incineration, physical devastation and radiation to the destruction of the ozone layer, and the real possibility that nuclear conflict on this level would do more than destroy the aggressors and the defenders: it would destroy the earth as a habitable planet, capable of sustaining human or plant life. Not merely no more communism or capital; no more cathedrals, art, philosophy, literature: no remembered generations past or generations to come. Nothing. The end. The unthinkable is the extinction of life on earth. The disaster is total and final.

As ever with the nuclear debate, assembled experts have trundled forth to challenge Schell's own experts, to examine probabilities, to gloss the dimension of the holocaust. We are dealing with the unquantifiable frontiers of reality. Perhaps they are right. Who can say for sure? But there is no disguising the crucial nature of the question. What is at stake here is the whole rationale of warfare from time immemorial: the prospect that the objectives of war — territory, ideology — any longer possess relevance. For if there is even a chance that Schell's glimpse of Armageddon is right, then the framework of strategy and doctrine that locks together conventional and nuclear war is shot to pieces.

Mr Weinberger, the US Defence Secretary, is profoundly anxious that such a framework holds. He now has a plan to fight a nuclear war for six months — a plan filled with fine calculations in the midst of unimaginable destruction. But, at least that, bizarre Pentagon scenario was hatched knowingly as a propaganda response to the efforts of the American Freeze movement. In Britain it sometimes seems that no distinction is realised or understood. Take one paragraph from Mrs Thatcher at Brighton a few days ago. "I want to see nuclear disarmament. I want to see conventional disarmament as well. I remember the atomic bombs that devastated Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I remember too the bombs that devastated Coventry and Dresden. The horrors of war are indivisible. We all want peace, but peace with justice and freedom."

Within a few sentences, all the questions are begged. Are the horrors of war indivisible? Did Coventry and Dresden suffer the same fate as Hiroshima and Nagasaki? Even granted that, do Hiroshima and Nagasaki together — one 10,000th of the horror that a modern nuclear war would unfold — bear any logical relationship to future nuclear conflicts? Is the ritual invocation of justice and freedom relevant in a post-nuclear war world where (at best) civilisation lies bleeding and (at worst) has ceased to exist, along with life itself?

To put such problems is neither to specify the means nor an unchallenged end. It is to pick no sides in the unilateral or multilateral arguments — indeed, the possibility of obliteration for Britain, whether or not the bomb is on our soil, removes one strand of public support for Unilateralism — the thought that we could opt out for safety. But if there is no specified path away from the apocalypse, there is also a greater emotional urgency to the quest for such a path. Nuclear weapons, Mrs Thatcher added, have kept the world at peace for 37 years. That is a pimple on the face of history. Can they so work for millenniums to come? If human frailty, miscalculation, or dementia puts the logic at risk, then how can that risk be diminished?

The multilateralists have, in practical terms, the best of the arguments. What they lack, with increasing desperation, is evidence of any progress. The world has been seeking multilateral disarmament for decades. It has witnessed only more escalation. Two decades ago we could have merely destroyed our enemies and ourselves. Today we can, perhaps, destroy all mankind.

This perception, slow dawning through the ebb of debate, is a perception that, in a hundred ways, is beginning to alter the nature of the debate itself. And, in time, one may hope that it will bring a political response. But the first and necessary response is commitment in the West positively and urgently to pursue nuclear disarmament, rather than to stockpile and to pay lip service. On the stump this Autumn, Mr Reagan paused in a defence town and told the workers that the Democrats, with their apostles of the Freeze, would throw hundreds of rockets and missile men onto the dole queues. That curdles the blood. Everyone who writes about disarmament — from Church study group to Nato commander-in-chief — is trying, in different ways, to edge back from ultimate calamity. The operative word is "trying". The most deadly condition is not to imagine, not to think, and not to try.