

Bruce Kent
*Campaign for
Nuclear Disarmament*

Eugene Williams
*University of
Massachusetts*

David Barash
*University of Washington,
Seattle*

Modes of Thinking: The question of awareness

Abstract

Human thinking about war, weapons, and peace is still pre-nuclear. To get this thinking up to date, societies have to modify some very basic psychological images and symbols that activate their thinking. Three of the speakers at the Conference, whose ideas are summarized below, have identified some of these symbols and images, have followed up with the kind of thinking they generate, and have pointed out the inappropriateness of this way of thinking in the nuclear age. All three authors are speaking in the context of Einstein's familiar quote: "The splitting of the atom has changed everything except our modes of thinking, and thus we move towards unparalleled disaster."

Bruce Kent
*Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament,
London, England*

Misapprehension and Misrepresentation

I clearly realize that there are almost no lengths to which those who have power will go to denigrate and marginalize those who challenge that power with new ideas. I also realize that the construction of a more peaceful world and the problem of ending the arms race is not just a matter of polite rational discussion. It touches on deep fears, loyalties, traditions, and assumptions – all of which have to be understood and explained. It could not be otherwise. Human beings are not actually irrational creatures, and yet, in the name of reason and in the name of security, we have managed to

construct alleged systems of defence, which provide no security, but which, on the contrary, make us daily more and more insecure. The price of any substantial failure of this system, which is supposed to provide defence, is the destruction of our civilization, and most of creation. In the process of getting to this absurd position, and in our collective determination not to take such perfectly possible steps as we could take to get ourselves out of our present mess, the evidence of both misrepresentation and misapprehension is there for all to see.

Misrepresentation

Let me give you a quotation from Lord Northcliffe: "The members of the public are like a flock of sheep; they are easily led. You only have to go on repeating a thing long enough and consistently enough, and they will believe it."

Quite deliberately the public have been pushed in a certain direction. Those working for peace are said to be agents of Moscow, dupes, fools, liars, etc. To be patriotic is to be pro-bomb. To oppose it is to be disloyal. We can be regularly denied any opportunity to make a rational case in or on the media for our position. Misrepresentation is propagandistic in nature. It is a deliberate attempt to make the public accept certain ideas that have no basis in fact. It requires a very obstinate mind, and a very contrary nature not to become one of Northcliffe's sheep. But thank God that this special breed of independent, un-sheep-like sheep is multiplying rapidly. If the shepherds are not willing to produce peaceful pastures, then we had better find them ourselves.

Misapprehension

What then of Einstein and misapprehension? Here I move into the world of what I hope is honest misunderstanding, and of inherited dogmatic ideas which carry a weight beyond their worth. I am concerned about the frameworks of ideas because, if we are to survive at all, it is the framework which will have to change. Our vision must move away from the fixation with national military security to the vision of that common security so clearly put before us in 1982 by the late Olof Palme. There is no other form of security today. Not only have we to move away from the military solution, understood as being the normal solution to world problems, but we have even to reintroduce into the world of the military the ideas of international law and international responsibility which were so clearly expressed at the Nuremberg Tribunal.

If there is a misapprehension about the nature of security in today's world, there is also a major misapprehension about the proper focus for our loyalty. It has become, for some reason, the nation state. How is it that we

have become so uncritically nationalist? Less than fifty nation states formed the United Nations in 1945. There are now over one hundred and sixty of them. In their different ways they nearly all try to pursue an illusion: national independent sovereignty and security in a world of inevitable interdependence. It is a fundamental misapprehension that the present framework can continue forever. The world is too small. "The age of nations is past," said a great French thinker. "The task before us, if we would not perish, is to build the earth." Such a new vision is clearly essential. Yet nationalist fixation (quite different from loyalty and love of language, culture, country, and tradition) is deep within us all. Toynbee once said that 90% of the real religion of 90% of the people consists of nationalism.

I am more concerned about the numerous misapprehensions which prevent moves which might lead from present to future. There are very many of them and I will mention only a few. They continue as misapprehensions partly because they are now part of our general culture pattern, and partly because they are quite carefully renewed and reinforced by those who do not want our world to change in any kind of direction.

Balance or parity

This is a very dangerous misapprehension. It affects people of all political perceptions. The Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury, and a variety of Western and Eastern leaders, have given it credibility. It is certainly not as dangerous as Mr. Weinburger's 1984 statement in which he "urges preparations for winning an extended nuclear war against the Soviet Union and for waging war effectively from outer space." But the obsession with balance is bad enough. It means endless comparisons of military oranges with military apples – of unlike with unlike. It produces a concentration of finding gaps, windows of vulnerability and the like, which have to be eliminated by yet further deployment. Worst of all, perhaps, the public comes to believe that our security rests on some delicately poised seesaw, and that any change of weight at one end must at once receive its compensation at the other.

All this is a major misapprehension. If what is being sought is the capacity to deter nuclear attack by the knowledge that there exists an invulnerable retaliatory capability available, then that point was passed long ago. George Kennan, in a speech to which far too little attention has been paid, once said that the West and the East together had achieved "in the creation of these (nuclear) devices and their means of delivery, levels of redundancy of such grotesque dimensions as to defy rational understanding." Unless one happens to believe that a limited nuclear war is possible, and in that case nuclear weapons are seen as having a different function, deterrence today only requires a few submarines on each side. Any state which would not be deterred by the possible loss of most of its major cities is not

rational and there is no point trying to play the deterrence game with those who are not rational. That is one of the game's many, many weaknesses.

Unilateralism

Unilateralism and the misunderstandings related to it constitute the next major misapprehension. This is, I fear, one that has been carefully induced, though that again may be further evidence of my creeping paranoia. Unilateralism was actually the subject of a serious 1984 United Nations report which was endorsed by one hundred and twenty six states, and opposed by only one – the United States of America. It said: "There is no either/or choice between unilateral and negotiated measures of disarmament. Both are needed in view of their complementary nature." No surprise really. The same theme ran through the report of the United Nations' 1978 First Special Session on Disarmament. It is no more than common sense. The arms race, which moves forward by a series of unilateral steps, can also in part, reverse the process in the same way. No treaty would ever come to successful completion unless someone took the first step. The argument ought never to be unilateralism versus multilateralism but, rather, which unilateral steps are appropriate for a particular country at a particular time.

Soviet capabilities and intentions

The rationale for the whole arms race is that if we don't keep going, the Tartar hordes are going to sweep over Europe and then presumably over the rest of the world. The problem is that though capabilities can be assessed with some certainty, intentions are never so clear. That the Soviet Union could blow up the world, if it so wishes, is perfectly true. The motivation would be obscure. It is often claimed that the Soviet Union deploys such massive conventional forces that, but for nuclear weapons, they could cross Western Europe at any time. There are sober voices with other points of view. A 1983 report from the Independent Union of Concerned Scientists, stated that "NATO's forces are of sufficient size and quantity to make an attack an expensive, risky, and hence unattractive option for the Warsaw Pact." It would of course also depend on the reliability of the forces of the other countries of the Warsaw Treaty organization. The most optimistic Soviet military leader might have just a few doubts about relying on the Poles and the Czechs, for instance. Their enthusiasm for such an adventure might just be a little less than whole-hearted.

The reality is that worst case: analysts on both sides are removed from political reality, do nothing to help either side understand the perceptions of the other, and fuel the arms race. Once more, misapprehensions can be very dangerous.

The stability of mutual assured destruction

Here again, a whole set of misapprehensions prevent peaceful progress although, in their eagerness to promote their Star Wars project, many of the propagandists for it are arguing that Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) is far from secure or stable. They are of course quite right, and new converts are always welcome. It is their solution to the problem that is quite wrong. MAD is unstable for a variety of reasons. It excludes the possibility of human error, foolishness, panic, miscalculation, or accident, of which there have already been far too many. The claim that they have given us peace assumes that without them there had to be war, and that the long list of superpower conflicts fought out in proxy wars in other countries since 1945 are somehow detached from the central relationship of mistrust expressed primarily in threats of nuclear mass murder. Those who try to make a case for MAD have to ignore the progress of technology if, in this context, progress is the right word. We all know that submarines will not remain invulnerable for very long. Technology is moving us towards First Strike perceptions, however irrational First Strike would be – granted nuclear winter and all that goes with it. Misapprehensions about security have been, though it less and less remains so, a reason for the docility of many of the world's people for too long.

Nuclear weapons only to deter nuclear attack

I am quite sure that this is a major misapprehension which, once understood as such, produces very different reactions. To our surprise, in Britain, when we took a survey about possible First Strike strategies, over 75% of those asked opposed them, and over 60% did not want to belong to an alliance which adopted them. But the misapprehension is quite simple. Too many people simply do not know that such are the strategies of NATO. The splendid Cruise Missile brochure which was handed out by our Ministry of Defence before Cruise arrived, makes it all quite clear. "The aim of using them," said our Ministry, "would be to persuade the Russian leadership – even at the eleventh hour – to draw back."

Hiroshima and Nagasaki

I do not need to say too much about these ghastly episodes. They were only part of the whole process of abandoning any distinction between combatant and non-combatant which marked the "progress" of the Second World War. The major misapprehension which still exists, and will probably go on forever, is that the two bombs had to be used, since only if they were used could the war come to an end. That the peace wing of the Japanese Government was trying to open negotiations via the Russians to bring the war to an end early in July 1945 without an invasion is just not

known. That American bombing surveys have declared that the war would have had to come to an end by November 1945 without an invasion is just not known. Few are aware that what must be called the Soviet dimension played a major part in the decision. The Soviets had to be kept out of Japan and out of the Far East post-war settlement. Even Churchill, who went along in the end with Truman's decision, thought that something less than unconditional surrender, which would save the position of the Emperor, was desirable. One must ask the question why the Americans, who did not need to do so, and who even had to keep selected cities free from conventional bombing to make sure that suitable targets were available, decided to go ahead with August the 6th and 9th.

Eugene Williams
University of Massachusetts

The Third Dimension of Peace: Power and powerlessness in the nuclear age

I would hope that one outcome of the process of which this gathering is a part is the movement of at least some of this planet's citizens from a position of powerlessness and non-participation to a point of empowerment, of action and reflection leading to the formulation of issues and strategies to forever end the threat of nuclear war. To be in a position to consider these possibilities implies not only a great responsibility on our part, but also a great privilege. We must be aware that to even think about actions to end the arms race is a luxury available to very few of this planet's inhabitants. Unhappily, I feel secure in predicting that there will be very few people of color, few poor people, few citizens of non-industrialized nations, and few working-class participants at this conference. I say this without any desire to blame. The people who would truly represent the population of this planet, truly represent the people who would die as a result of a "nuclear exchange," are not here for very good reasons. They are far too busy surviving from day to day, finding enough food to feed their families, fighting for liberation from economic exploitation and social repression, to be with us in person. Many are too physically and psychically exhausted to feel more than a passing chill at the threat of imminent extinction as a result of a nuclear war between the Superpowers or their allies. But they are here in spirit, and it is our duty to include them in our work today.

Several of the speakers at this conference are effectively pointing out and working to end the "psychic numbing" and feelings of powerlessness that inhibit the citizens of the industrialized countries from acting to free

themselves from the specter of nuclear war. But I would suggest that this freedom will remain an illusion to be pursued and never attained as long as the current inequalities in the world economic order are allowed to exist. The Emperor Haile Selassie, of Ethiopia, stated:

Until the philosophy which holds one race superior and another inferior is finally and permanently discredited and abandoned; until there are no longer first-class and second-class citizens of any nation; until the color of a man's skin is of no more significance than the color of his eyes; until the basic human rights are equally guaranteed to all without regard to race; until that day, the dream of lasting peace, world citizenship and the rule of international morality will remain but a fleeting illusion to be pursued but never attained.

And I believe the racism and injustice condemned in this statement to be the necessary product of a systematic exploitation of one group of humanity by another. Or to put it more personally, of some of us acting against our brothers and sisters.

This exploitation began in the fifteenth century. Financially bankrupt as a result of the Crusades and morally bankrupt as a result of the Inquisition, Europe turned to Africa, Asia, and the New World for an infusion of resources and hope. As the emerging capitalist process transformed these resources and hopes into wealth, a system of selective exploitation and industrialization took hold. And this exploitation continues until this day. It exists as a reality supported by myths, information control, and ideology.

Why is this happening, and what can we do about it? And what does any of this have to do with ending the threat of nuclear war? I would like to believe that only part of the reason is our selfish reluctance to stop exploiting the rest of the world in order to maintain and improve our standard of living. The other part is that we are mystified and misinformed into accepting the ideological world views of our leaders and rulers. And what is the reality behind this cruel myth that serves to create so much suffering and insecurity? I believe that no one has stated it more directly than George Orwell in his classic *1984*.

To understand the nature of the present war...one must realize in the first place that it is impossible for it to be decisive. None of the three superstates could be definitely conquered even by the other two in combination. They are too evenly matched, and their natural defenses are too formidable...Between the frontiers of the superstates, and not permanently in the possession of any of them, lies a rough quadrilateral with its corners at Tangier, Brazzavill,

Darwin, and Hong Kong, containing within it a fifth of the population. It is for the possession of these thickly populated regions, and of the northern ice cap, that the three powers are constantly struggling . . . All of the disputed areas contain valuable minerals, and some of them yield important vegetable products . . . But above all they contain a bottomless reserve of cheap labor. Whichever power controls equatorial Africa, or the countries of the Middle East, or Southern India, or the Indonesian Archipelago, disposes of the bodies of scores of hundreds of millions of ill-paid and hard working coolies. The inhabitants of these areas, reduced more or less openly to the status of slaves, pass continually from conqueror to conqueror, and are expended like so much coal or oil in the race to turn out more armaments, to capture more territory, to control more labor power, to turn out more armaments, to capture more territory and so on indefinitely.

Given the power of nuclear weapons, I do not believe that Orwell, if he were alive today, would retain his confidence that the superstates would not attack one another. Certainly, the horror of a "war without winners" has not stopped the strategic planners from creating scenarios of limited nuclear wars. But I believe the analysis of the exploitation of the non-industrialized peoples by the industrialized peoples must go farther. In doing so, we can discover an underlying reason for the arms race, and why it will not end without a radical shift of consciousness on our part coupled with actions based on our new consciousness. Again, quoting Orwell:

The primary aim of modern warfare is to use up the products of the machine without raising the general standard of living . . . Goods must be produced, but they need not be distributed. And in practice the only way of achieving this was by continuous warfare. The essential act of war is destruction, not necessarily of human lives, but of the products of human labor. War is a way of shattering to pieces, or pouring into the stratosphere, or sinking in the depths of the sea, material which might otherwise be used to make the masses too comfortable, and hence, in the long run, too intelligent. Even when weapons of war are not actually destroyed, their manufacture is still a convenient way of expending labor power without producing anything that can be consumed.

Now I'm not asking you to believe Orwell, or to believe my analysis of exploitation or the dependency theory it is based on. I am suggesting that the arms race and the threat of nuclear war that goes with it is irrevocably linked with world hunger, hopelessness, unemployment, illiteracy, disease, and political and psychic oppression. I believe it cannot be ended while ignoring these problems, at home or abroad. And I believe that too many of us here are a little too selfish and quite a bit too mystified and misinformed to act on all these problems as coming from a main root, or to put it in dialectic terms, a central contradiction.

John Gaventa defines the third dimension of power as "the influencing or shaping of consciousness of B (by A) about inequalities (through myths, information control, ideologies, etc.)." Gaventa goes on to say:

In addition to these processes of information control or socialization, there may be other more indirect means by which power alters political conceptions. They involve psychological adaptations to the state of being without political power... A sense of powerlessness may manifest itself as extensive fatalism, self-deprecation, or undue apathy about one's situation... The sense of powerlessness may be found with, although it is conceptually distinct from, a second example of the indirect mechanisms of power's third dimension. It has to do with the inter-relationship of participation and consciousness... those denied participation – unable to engage actively with others in the determination of their own affairs – also might not develop political consciousness of their own situation or of broader political inequalities.

This relationship of non-participation to non-consciousness of deprived groups is developed by Paulo Freire, one of the few writers to have considered the topic in depth... In situations of highly unequal power relationships, which he terms 'closed societies', the powerless are highly dependent. They are prevented from either self-determined action or reflection upon their actions. Denied this dialectic process, and denied the democratic experience out of which the 'critical consciousness' grows, they develop a 'culture of silence'. Mueller similarly writes... "Since they have been socialized into compliance, so to speak, they accept the definitions of political reality as offered by dominant groups, classes or government institutions." (Gaventa, pp. 16-18.)

In the context of decision-making about the manufacture and use of nuclear and conventional weapons, we at this conference are a deprived group. In taking a step towards breaking our culture of silence, we have only begun to reject others' definitions of political reality. In the context of one global society, we oppress our brothers and sisters by supporting our standard of living on their lives and deaths. We would do well to recognize that our struggle is their struggle, and that none of us will succeed without the others.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Freire, Paulo. (1983). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.
- Gaventa, John. (1980). *Power and powerlessness; Quiescence and rebellion in an Appalachian valley*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Orwell, George. (1961). *1984*. New York: New American Library.

David Barash
University of Washington, Seattle

A New Perspective on the Psychology of the Arms Race and Nuclear War

There are, I believe, two particular messages we can derive from Einstein's oft-repeated observation about the splitting of the atom. First, it is not just the hardware – the nuclear weapons – that constitutes the problem, but something in what we might call the software: our "way of thinking," and all too often, not thinking, in the Nuclear Age. Second, part of this software problem derives from the fact that human culture and human biology are dangerously out of synchrony. (For a more general treatment of the culture/biology interface, see D.P. Barash, *The Hare and the Tortoise*, 1987, Penguin). When it comes to nuclear weapons, there can be no doubt that the bombs, warheads and so-called "delivery systems" are much to blame, but I submit that the greatest problem of all lies in the discordance between such hardware and our own mental habits.

I would like to propose a new way of looking at our nuclear dilemma. The crux of it is that the world changed dramatically in 1945, which was after all barely two generations ago – a long time by the standards of a human lifetime, but merely a drop in the bucket insofar as evolution recognizes these things. The human pedigree is far longer, and indeed, our ancestors spent more than 99.00% of our evolutionary past in a distinctly prenuclear world. But thanks to the work of physicists such as Einstein, we have all been thrust into a new world, one of our own making to be sure, but nonetheless one in which we are all fundamentally strangers. Our behavioral responses were honed during prenuclear times; hence, we carry a kind of "caveman consciousness" or what psychologist Charles Osgood called a "Neanderthal mentality" into the nuclear age. (Note that this term is not anthropologically accurate; however, it carries the useful connotations of primitive and widespread, and is also appropriately pejorative.)

In our book *The Caveman and the Bomb* (1985, McGraw-Hill), Judith Lipton and I developed this approach to understanding our nuclear dilemma. In this limited space, I shall focus on four different clusters of concepts that should exemplify our perspective.

The perception of danger or risk

For our primitive ancestors, dangers were perceptible when real: another caveperson with a club, a herd of stampeding mastodons. In most

cases, threats that could not be readily perceived likely did not exist. We still retain a gut-level sensitivity to dangers on a human scale; for example, if a knife-wielding homicidal maniac were loose in this hotel, or if the building were afire, all of us would almost respond in ways that are deep-seated, biologically engendered through thousands of generations and probably quite appropriate to the situation: the "flight or fight" response. But in a world with over 50,000 nuclear weapons, although we are at much greater risk than if this building were burning, or if a murderer were loose, we tend to ignore our peril. The peril is that the primitive cavewoman within us is not aroused because, as psychiatrist Jerome Frank has pointed out, nuclear weapons lack "psychological reality". They cannot be seen, or heard, or felt, or smelled; therefore, to the prenuclear primitive within each of us, they are easy to ignore.

Moreover, the intensity of nuclear phenomena is such that our ability to perceive such events, and make sense of them, is greatly limited. Hot water, boiling water, a wood fire – all these things are within human experience, and so, we have a good sense of what they mean. But if I tell you that a thermonuclear explosion generates 100 million degrees, I could as well be asking you to respond to cosmic rays.

Even when we break through our perceptual limitations, another fundamental human tendency operates against nuclear awareness: the basic animal inclination to avoid pain. After all, pain can be emotional no less than physical, and all living things are following good biological advice when they avoid painful stimuli. And so once again, behavior traits that were adaptive in prenuclear times serve, ironically, to endanger us in the Nuclear Age. Similarly, just as we are unable to appreciate the meaning of millions of degrees, we are also hopelessly lost in contemplating millions of deaths . . . even though we will likely find a single death to be a moving personal tragedy.

It is essentially for this reason that Roger Fisher has proposed (only partly in jest) that the Emergency Action Message for nuclear holocaust should be carried in a capsule inserted next to the heart of a Presidential aide. To start World War III, the President would have to kill the aide, rip the code from his or her beating heart and then, only then – with blood on the Oval Office carpet – could he issue the orders. Perhaps this would bring home the horror of his acts, to even the most Presidential Neanderthal.

Getting one's way in a highly competitive world

Consider the "more is better syndrome." It has probably worked for much of our evolutionary past: having more weapons – more spears, bows and arrows, guns, tanks, bombers – meant a degree of security. But suddenly, with the advent of the Nuclear Age, this simple equation has

changed. Having more nuclear weapons only stimulates a similar response by other nations, and in any event, we have long ago reached the point at which additional firepower only diminishes our security. Nonetheless, the American public (and for all I know, the Soviet public as well) has regularly been panicked by phony, trumped-up claims of imminent nuclear inferiority, "The World According To Gap." By the time each gap – bomber gap, missile gap, spending gap, ABM gap, civil defense gap – and is revealed to be bogus, the arms race has been ratcheted up yet another notch, powered by our primitive, all too human fear of having fewer weapons than the other side.

Closely related to the "more is better" syndrome (and its obverse, "fewer is worse"), is the assumption that we can make ourselves more secure by making our opponent less secure. As has been pointed out, it is analogous to claiming that we shall make our end of a rowboat more stable by making their end more tippy. In a nuclear world – unlike the pre-nuclear world of our ancestors – our security is irrevocably within us and persists in seeking security at the expense of our opponents.

A final aspect of this cluster is simply the reliance upon war. Anthropologists are increasingly agreed that primitive war among non-technological societies was adaptive – that is, beneficial for the participants, in helping to obtain prestige, mates, food, living space. After all, the mortality rates were low and the battles were infrequent. But now we have Joint Chiefs of Staff, not chiefs, and the game can never be worth the nuclear candle . . . although the glimmer of war being "worth it" still flickers within many of today's would-be warriors.

Group identification

For most mammals, group association is absolutely critical for success and survival. And *Homo sapiens* is no exception. Beginning with infancy, a group of two is the minimum. With growth and development, that group expands to include siblings, other relatives, peers, and tribe and village members. Presumably, larger groups were more successful in competition with smaller ones, and it is not unlikely that human beings developed a tendency to identify with large and imposing social solidarities.

At present, the group to which identification is most intense appears to be the nation-state, which ironically is too large to be biologically meaningful and yet simultaneously too small since it does not encompass the entire human species, or indeed, the biosphere. National slogans and anthems seek to mimic kinship patterns, playing upon such concepts as fatherland, motherland, Uncle Sam. And human beings, by the millions, identify with this increasingly perilous and downright meaningless entity, the nation-state, and in its name they stand ready to destroy not only their own lives, but the entire planet.

Another component of the group identification cluster is "dehumanization." Among many non-technological peoples, the same word is used for "human being" as for the name of the local tribe. This is no simple, verbal trick; rather, when people from other tribes are effectively dehumanized, permission is given to treat them as game animals, and to kill . . . something that is typically prohibited within the tribe. Even so-called civilized peoples use dehumanizing terms such as pigs, dogs, or vermin, and we must be on guard when the Other is called an "evil empire," or when a national leader (Khaddafy) is reviled as the "mad dog of the Middle East." Socrates urged: "Know thyself". In the Nuclear Age the saying is: "Know thy group." It includes us all.

Impediments to action

In their primitive, adaptive wisdom, living things make decisions (conscious or not) as to how to invest their time and energy. We tend to avoid over-sized opponents, and to concern ourselves with day-to-day activities that offer human-sized rewards. Certainly, in the past we have profited biologically and socially for living this way. And nuclear war is the over-sized enemy *par excellence*, both in the enormity of its horror and in the size of the physical and bureaucratic forces arrayed on the side of the war-makers. It is a daunting opponent.

Moreover, we also want immediate success. Even when we bestir ourselves and write to our MP or senator, part of us yearns to receive a reply indicating that our communication has caused that benighted soul to see the light at last. And so, having failed to eliminate the nuclear threat, overwhelmed by the task and frustrated by a feeling of insignificance, many of us have stopped trying . . . if we ever started.

Finally, in closing, I do not want to leave the impression that our predicament is all prefigured in our genes, and the situation is hopeless because it is biologically predetermined. Let me emphasize that we are the most adaptable, most flexible animals on this planet. We, alone, of all living things, can say "No" to our biological tendencies, for our genes whisper; they do not command. The Roman gladiators, before combat, used to face the audience and say, "We, who are about to die, salute you." And 2,000 years later, W.H. Auden updated this to, "We, who are about to die, demand a miracle." It would indeed require a true miracle, in the theological sense, to transcend individual death. But nuclear war is different; it is a man-made problem, with man-and woman-made solutions – a comprehensive test-ban treaty, a nuclear freeze, an end to Star Wars, confidence building measures of all sorts. These and more can all be accomplished once we free ourselves from our primitive, prenuclear mental habits, vestigial behavioral traits that we would do well to identify – and denounce – within our leaders, and also within ourselves.