

Inauguration Day
January 1973
Peace Rally
Houston, Texas

AN INAUGURATION IS A BEGINNING, AND IF IT IS TRUE THAT THE VIETNAM

WAR HAS ENDED, THEN WE ARE GRATEFUL FOR THE BEGINNING OF PEACE.

GRATEFUL BUT NOT JOYFUL. FOR THE CEASE-FIRE HAS COME NOT BECAUSE OUR GOVERNMENT IS WISE OR MERCIFUL, BUT BECAUSE IT HAS NO OTHER CHOICE.

A MONTH AGO THE UNITED STATES WAS BOMBING HANOI WITH A FURY GREATER THAN THE GERMANS BOMBED LONDON. BUT IT BECAME APPARENT THAT AFTER 10 YEARS OF KILLING AND LIES, THE CONGRESS HAS HAD ENOUGH OF THE WAR.

THE PEOPLE HAVE HAD ENOUGH. OUR ALLIES AND THE WORLD HAVE HAD ENOUGH.

OBVIOUSLY, AMERICANS ARE NOT CELEBRATING THIS AS A NATIONAL

VICTORY. WE ARE TOO EXHAUSTED. IN 10 YEARS WE HAVE PASSED FROM ^{mess of us} ~~indefinite~~ CONFUSION TO OUTRAGE TO NUMBNESS. AND WE ^{can only hope} KNOW THAT THE END OF THIS

WAR MAY ~~NOT EVEN~~ BE THE BEGINNING OF WISDOM. FOR PRESIDENT NIXON.

~~HAS RESISTED PEACE AT EVERY TURN. FOUR YEARS AGO HE ANNOUNCED~~

~~HIS "SECRET PLAN" TO END THE WAR -- A PLAN SO SECRET THAT EVEN HE DIDN'T~~

KNOW WHAT IT WAS. HE PROMPTLY EXPANDED THE WAR INTO CAMBODIA AND

LAOS; AND WHEN THAT ONLY DUPLICATED PREVIOUS FOLLIES, HE DECIDED TO BOMB OUR OPPONENTS INTO SUBMISSION. THE BOMBS HE HAS DROPPED IN VIETNAM EQUAL FIVE HIROSHIMAS A MONTH. IN FOUR YEARS 20,000 MORE AMERICAN TROOPS HAVE DIED. OVER ONE MILLION MORE ASIANS HAVE BEEN KILLED OR WOUNDED. SIX MILLION PEASANTS HAVE BECOME REFUGEES BECAUSE OF AMERICAN MILITARY OPERATIONS.

THE RESULT OF ALL THIS BLOODLETTING IS NOW BEFORE US, AND IT IS CALLED "PEACE WITH HONOR." IT IS APPARENTLY THE KIND OF COMPROMISE WE MIGHT HAVE GAINED YEARS AGO IF WE HAD NOT PURSUED THE PHANTOM OF OF TOTAL VICTORY. THE GREATEST IRONY IS THAT THIS COM PROMISE,

[WHICH WAS SOUGHT SO DISHONORABLY] WILL NOT EVEN GUARANTEE PEACE.

THE TERMS WHICH HAVE BEEN PUBLICLY DISCUSSED WILL DO NOTHING TO SOLVE THE PROBLEMS THAT CAUSED THE WAR IN THE FIRST PLACE. THE SAIGON GOVERNMENT WILL REMAIN AN UNPOPULAR DICTATORSHIP. THE COMMUNIST GUERILLAS WILL REMAIN IN PLACE AND ARMED. THE ORIGINAL SOCIAL IN-EQUALITIES WHICH DIVIDED THE VIETNAMESE WILL REMAIN, AND THE STRUGGLE WILL CONTINUE.

SO VERY PROBABLY THIS CEASE-FIRE WILL NOT BE PEACE, ONLY ANOTHER POSTPONEMENT IN A CIVIL WAR THAT HAS LASTED 30 YEARS. "PEACE WTH

HONOR" MEANS ONLY ONE THING: THAT THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
FAILED IN VIETNAM, BUT WAS TOO PROUD OR TOO BLIND TO ADMIT FAILURE,
AND SO PROLONGED THE WAR RUTHLESSLY UNTIL IT FOUND A WAY TO SAVE
FACE. RARELY IN HISTORY HAVE SO MANY HUMAN BEINGS SUFFERED FOR
THE SAKE OF A GOVERNMENT'S PRIDE. [OF COURSE, EVEN MORE PEOPLE MAY
DIE, FOR THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION HAS NOT ADMITTED THE MISTAKEN
FOLLY THAT ORIGINALLY GOT US INTO THIS QUAGMIRE. NOR HAS NIXON
RENOUNCED OUR "RIGHT" TO INTERVENE IN A CIVIL WAR IN A SMALL, POOR
COUNTRY 8,000 MILES AWAY.]

SO I AM AFRAID THAT WE MAY NOT BE CELEBRATING THE INAUGURATION
OF PEACE. I AM AFRAID THAT OUR SOCIETY IS STILL CONTROLLED BY THE
[POLITICIANS] THE BELIEFS, AND THE INTERESTS THAT EMBROILED US IN WAR.

FOR SOME OF US VIETNAM HAS BEEN A KIND OF HISTORICAL ESCALATOR,
^{by the} RAISING US TO ^{changing} HIGHER AND HIGHER LEVELS OF UNDERSTANDING. YEARS AGO
WE THOUGHT THE WAR WAS SOMEHOW AN ACCIDENT. THEN WE BLAMED CERTAIN
LEADERS. NOW WE SUSPECT THAT THE CAUSES OF THIS WAR ARE ROOTED IN
OUR SOCIETY ITSELF.

THE UNITED STATES NOW STATIONS ALMOST ONE MILLION TROOPS IN
OVER 2,000 OVERSEAS BASES AND INSTALLATIONS. SINCE 1945, WE HAVE

④

CONDUCTED A MAJOR MILITARY CAMPAIGN OR A PARAMILITARY CIA OPERATION IN A FORMER COLONIAL OR DEPENDENT COUNTRY ON AN AVERAGE OF ONCE EVERY 18 MONTHS--IN GREECE, IRAN, GUATAMALA, INDONESIA, LEBANON, LAOS, CUBA, THE CONGO, BRITISH GUIANA, THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, AND OF COURSE, VIETMAN. ONCE, WE COULD BLAME ALL OF THIS ON THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY; BUT SINCE NIXON BEGAN DRINKING CHAMPAGNE IN MOSCOW AND PEKING, THAT EXPLANATION ISN'T QUITE AS AWE-INSPIRING AS IT USED TO BE. NO, WE HAVE HAD TO LOOK HARDER, AND WE HAVE COME TO SOME DIFFICULT CONCLUSIONS: IT SEEMS THAT OUR GOVERNMENT CAN ALSO LIE TO ITS OWN PEOPLE. IT SEEMS THAT AMERICAN POLICY, LIKE THAT OF OTHER NATIONS, IS OFTEN IMMORAL, DANGEROUS, AND IGNOBLE.

WE HAVE LOST OUR INNOCENCE ABOUT OURSELVES. I CAN THINK OF ONLY TWO PREVIOUS PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATIONS SO FILLED WITH DOUBT AND UNCERTAINTY AS TODAY'S. ONE WAS LINCOLN'S IN THE MIDST OF THE CIVIL WAR, THE OTHER WAS FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT'S IN 1932. IN BOTH CASES THE STATUS-QUO HAD DISINTEGRATED, THE SYSTEM HAD BROKEN DOWN, AND THE PEOPLE WERE BITTER AND DIVIDED. AMERICA SURVIVED THOSE CRISES-- LARGELY BECAUSE THE TWO PRESIDENTS CANDIDLY ADMITTED THAT THE TIMES DEMANDED NEW AND RADICAL MEASURES. IN CERTAIN WAYS THEIR DELIMMAS

WERE NOT UNLIKE OURS' TODAY.

LINCOLN'S GREAT PROBLEM WAS MORAL. SLAVERY WAS ^AFUNDAMENTAL HYPOCRACY IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY. IT LAY AT THE HEART OF THE REPUBLIC AND POISONED RELATIONS BETWEEN STATES AND MEN. LINCOLN FOUGHT THE WAR TO PRESERVE THE UNION, BUT BY 1864 HE KNEW THE NATION COULD NOT BE RECONCILED OR ENDURE "HALF-SLAVE AND HALF-FREE." IT MAY TAKE GENERATIONS TO SOLVE OUR RACIAL PROBLEMS, BUT THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION WAS THE FIRST, ESSENTIAL BLOW AGAINST THE TYRANNY OF COLOR.

WELL, I THINK WE MIGHT PROFIT BY LINCOLN'S MORAL HONESTY TODAY, FOR IN OUR WORLD THERE IS A BASIC CONTRADICTION BETWEEN AMERICAN IDEALS AND PRACTICE. WE CANNOT REMAIN A FREE REPUBLIC AT HOME AND AN ARROGANT EMPIRE ABROAD. IN VIETNAM OUR FOREIGN POLICY WAS A LICENSE

TO KILL. VILLAGES WERE DELIBERATELY DESTROYED, CROPS POISONED, PROVINCES DEPOPULATED, CITIES BOMBED TO RUBBLE, OPPOSITION LEADERS IMPRISONED OR ASSASSINATED. THERE IS NO DOUBT OF THESE THINGS. THE PENTAGON PAPERS REVEAL THAT OUR GOVERNMENT WAS FULLY AWARE OF THEM, EVEN PLANNED THEM. *who in afteradown will admit them-* BUT NO ONE, LEAST OF ALL PRESIDENT NIXON, WILL ADMIT THEM.

RATHER, WE HAVE BEEN SYSTEMATICLY LIED TO. WE WERE TOLD WE FOUGHT

FOR FREEDOM, THOUGH SOUTH VIETNAM WAS A DICTATORSHIP. WE WERE TOLD WE FOUGHT TO CONTAIN THE CHINESE, THOUGHT THE GOVERNMENT KNEW THE CHINESE HAD NO CONTROL OVER THE VIET CONG. WE WERE TOLD WE WERE NOT BOMBING, WHEN IN FACT WE WERE.

THE LIES WERE ENDLESS. THE TERRIBLE LESSON OF THE PENTAGON PAPERS IS THAT GOVERNMENT PLANNERS DELIBERATELY DECEIVED THE PEOPLE, PRESS AND CONGRESS. WE INTERVENED IN VIETNAM, NOT BECAUSE OUR SECURITY WAS IN PERIL, BUT BECAUSE IN THE ARROGANCE OF OUR POWER WE GAVE OURSELVES THE RIGHT TO USE FORCE AT ANYTIME, ANYWHERE--NO MATTER HOW SLIGHT OUR INTERESTS MIGHT BE.

SOMEHOW WE MUST REGAIN SOME SENSE OF LAW AND PROPORTION. OTHERWISE WE CAN ONLY COLLIDE WITH OTHER NATIONS AGAIN AND AGAIN--RISKING WORLD WAR BY USING SAVAGE AND UNLIMITED MEANS TO GAIN UNNEEDED AND UNWORTHY ENDS.

BUT EVEN MORE THAN HONEST^y, WE REQUIRE BASIC REFORMS IN OUR POLITICS AND SOCIETY. ^{Social} REAL REFORM--LIKE HONESTY--IS APPARENTLY AN ALIEN CONCEPT TO THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION. (JUST AS HE PRETENDS THAT ALL GOVERNMENT POWER IS JUST AND PERFECT,) SO THE ^{HE} ~~GOVERNMENT~~ DENIES THE NEED FOR

8
7

FUNDAMENTAL SOCIAL CHANGE.) YET OUR SOCIETY IS IN TERRIBLE DANGER
FROM SOCIAL UNREST AND DISTRUST, DECAYING CITIES AND POISONED LAND-
SCAPES, PERSISTENT POVERTY AND DECLINING HEALTH STANDARDS. ONE
REASON FOR THIS IS THAT IN THE PAST GENERATION WE SPENT OVER ONE AND
A HALF TRILLION DOLLARS ON WAR, AND OVER \$150 BILLION ON VIETNAM
ALONE. [EVERY UNNECESSARY DOLLAR IN THE WAR BUDGET WAS STOLEN FROM
US AND OUR CHILDREN.)

AGAIN, OUR PRESENT ADMINISTRATION MIGHT PROFIT FROM PAST EXAMPLE.
IN 1932, IN THE DEPTHS OF THE DEPRESSION, FDR FACED THE COUNTRY. HE
DID NOT SALUTE OLD MYTHS. HE TOLD THE TRUTH: THE COUNTRY WAS IN
BAD SHAPE, THE ECONOMIC SYSTEM HAD FAILED, DRASTIC ACTION WAS NEEDED,
IN 1973 I THINK ^{a for thought} ANY HONEST PRESIDENT ^{would} SHOULD TELL THE AMERICAN
PEOPLE THAT TO AVOID WAR, ~~WE~~ WE MUST REFORM ~~OUR~~ OUR OWN SOCIETY. FOR
THERE ARE ENORMOUSLY POWERFUL FORCES WHICH PUSH US CONSTANTLY TOWARD
MILITARISM. IN A WAY, THE RISK OF WAR IS A PRODUCT OF OUR SYSTEM
ITSELF.

THERE EXISTS IN AMERICA TODAY A SORT OF UNHOLY ALLIANCE BETWEEN
PATRIOTISM AND PROFITS, HUGE, INTERNATIONAL CORPORATIONS INFLUENCE

GOVERNMENT POLICY, AND THEIR INTERESTS ARE TOO OFTEN ADOPTED BY THE ^{office holders} POLITICIANS THEY SUBSIDIZE. OUR ECONOMY IS ADDICTED TO THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX. THIRTY-SIX PERCENT OF ALL DURABLE INDUSTRIAL GOODS ARE PURCHASED FOR MILITARY OR MILITARY RELATED PURPOSES. ALMOST TEN PERCENT OF THE COUNTRY'S LABOR FORCE WORKS DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE. BUSINESSMEN AND LABOR UNIONS ALIKE HAVE BEEN TAUGHT THAT THEIR LIVLIHOODS DEPEND ON THE WAR MACHINE. UNIVERSITIES ARE HEAVILY SUBSIDIZED BY PENTAGON CONTRACTS, AND WHOLE SOCIAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENTS ARE HIRED TO INVENT NEW WAYS OF PERSUADING SOUTHEAST ASIAN PEASANTS NOT TO VOTE SOCIALIST.

I THINK THAT THIS PERMANENT WARFARE ECONOMY IS DESTROYING THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC. WE MAY BECOME A PERMANENT WARFARE STATE. THERE ARE SIMPLY TOO MANY INTERERESTS CONTINUOUSLY JUSTIFYING NEW WEAPONS, NEW VIOLENCE, NEW INTERVENTIONS. OUR INSTITUTIONS ARE BEING CORRUPTED AT THE ROOTS; AND IN PURSUIT OF POWER WE ARE LOSING OUR OWN FREEDOM.

HAVING EXPERIMENTED WITH SPYING IN OTHER COUNTRIES, THE ^{present} NIXON ADMINISTRATION HAS BEGUN SPYING ON ITS OWN POLITICAL OPPONENTS AT

HOME. ^{Perhaps} HAVING LEARNED THE ADVANTAGES OF CENSORSHIP FROM GENERAL THIEU, OUR OWN GOVERNMENT SYSTEMATICALLY UNDERMINES THE INTEGRITY AND FREEDOM OF THE AMERICAN PRESS. SINCE IT HAS GROWN CALLOUS IN ACTING IMMORALLY ABROAD, THE WHITE HOUSE ABUSES ITS AUTHORITY WITH INCREASING VIGOR AT HOME.

TODAY PRESIDENT NIXON AND VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW HAVE MADE DISSENT SOMETHING VERY CLOSE TO TREASON. ^{BUT} ^{DISSENT} ^{CONTINUES} IT IS A TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN CHARACTER THAT SO MANY CITIZENS HAVE HAD THE COURAGE TO SPEAK AGAINST THEIR OWN NATION'S POLICY. AFTER ALL, ^{By & large} THEIR CRITICISMS COME NOT FROM A HATRED OF AMERICA, BUT FROM A PROFOUND LOVE.] THEY MARCH AND SPEAK AND RISK THEIR REPUTATIONS AGAINST THE WAR BECAUSE OF A DEEP CONVICTION THAT THEIR NATION, ABOVE ALL OTHERS, DESERVES HONOR AND DECENCY IN ITS GOVERNMENT. AND THEY HAVE BEEN GREATER PATRIOTS THAN ALL THE GENERALS AND ADMIRALS COMBINED, FOR THEY KNOW THAT AMERICANS OWE THEIR FINAL OBEDIENCE NOT TO THEIR RULERS, BUT TO THE DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES THOSE RULERS ARE EXPECTED TO DEFEND. ■ LAW IS LARGER THAN GOVERNMENTS, AND IN THEIR HEARTS I THINK THE PEOPLE KNOW THAT.

IN FOUR YEARS OUR COUNTRY WILL BE TWO CENTURIES OLD, AND ANOTHER

We know to DAY THAT THE
 PRESIDENT WILL BE INAUGURATED. WE DO NOT KNOW WHO IT WILL BE, BUT WE
 of leaving the rhetoric aside we do not see have
 KNOW WHAT THAT PRESIDENT MUST DO. AND WE KNOW WHAT WE MUST DO TO
 not seen

ASSURE OURSELVES OF A GOVERNMENT OF RESPECT. WE MUST NEVER BE SILENT,
 AND NEVER STILL. WE ARE ALL TERRIBLY TIRED. WE HAVE FOUGHT AND LOST
 SO OFTEN BEFORE, BUT WE SHALL RETURN TO THE STRUGGLE AGAIN; AND IF
 WE ARE BEATEN, WE SHALL RETURN AGAIN AFTER THAT. IN THE END TRUTH
 WILL OUTLAST THE LIES, AND WE SHALL HAVE PLAYED OUR PART IN THE
 CONTINUING DRAMA THAT BEGAN IN 1776.

IT WAS SAID THIS MORNING
 a time to recommit our nation
 to the ideals of liberty and peace.
 And a sad commentary on
 our times that we could not
 find ^{that recommitment} it in the chronicles. This
 morning & that is why we are here.

AFTER THREE MILE ISLAND - WHAT?
FRANCES T. FARENTHOLD
PRESIDENT
WELLS COLLEGE

LAKE ERIE COLLEGE
COMMENCEMENT
JUNE 10, 1979

I HAVE BEEN ASKED TO SPEAK THIS AFTERNOON ON THE PARTICIPATION OF THE CITIZENRY IN PUBLIC POLICY. I WANT TO DIRECT MY THOUGHTS TO THE MOST COMPLEX AND PRESSING MATTER OF PUBLIC POLICY AND ONE THAT HAS GONE TOO LONG UNATTENDED BY THE PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY. I AM SPEAKING OF NUCLEAR POWER AS A DOMESTIC ENERGY SOURCE.

MY MIND GOES BACK TO ANOTHER ~~SPRING~~ AFTERNOON IN ANOTHER STATE IN ANOTHER SETTING, WHERE I SHARED THE PLATFORM AT ANOTHER COMMENCEMENT WITH THE THEN CHAIRMAN OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION. WE WERE BOTH BEING AWARDED HONORARY DEGREES. I LISTENED AWED AT THE SCIENTIFIC CREDENTIALS OF MY COLLEAGUE AS THEY WERE BEING READ. HOWEVER, A THOUGHT PERSISTED IN MY MIND THAT I COULD NOT ERASE. I WONDERED DURING THAT RECITAL OF ACHIEVEMENT AND HIGH HONORS IF THE WORD HUMANITARIAN WOULD EVER BE MENTIONED. IT NEVER WAS. OF COURSE THE RECITATION EXPRESSED THE PREVAILING SPIRIT OF OUR SOCIETY, SCIENCE-ALL POWERFUL, AND UNRELATED TO OTHER VALUES.

IN 1896 HENRI BECQUEREL DISCOVERED RADIOACTIVITY IN URANIUM. IN 1902, MARIE AND PIERRE CURIE ISOLATED RADIUM. IN 1934, USING NEUTRON BEAMS, ENRICO FERMI AND JOLIOT-CURIE MANAGED TO SPLIT THE ATOM BUT THEY DIDN'T KNOW IT. IN 1938, HAHN AND STRASSMANN BOMBARDED URANIUM WITH NEUTRONS AND PRODUCED BARIUM. IN 1939, HITLER HAD SEIZED CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND THE ALLIES FEARED THAT THE NAZIS WOULD CREATE THE FIRST ATOMIC BOMB. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BOMB WAS CONSIDERATED A MATTER OF UTMOST URGENCY AND HIGHEST PRIORITY. IT'S CODE NAME WAS THE MANHATTAN PROJECT. ON DECEMBER 2, 1942, THE FIRST SELF-SUSTAINED CHAIN REACTION WAS ACHIEVED IN CHICAGO, AND ON JULY 16, 1945 THE FIRST ATOMIC BOMB WAS TESTED IN THE DESERTS OF NEW MEXICO. ONE MONTH LATER ON AUGUST 6TH AND ON AUGUST 9TH WE DROPPED ~~THE~~ ^{ATOMIC} BOMBS ON JAPAN. THIS IS HOW NUCLEAR POWER AS A WEAPON SOURCE CAME INTO BEING AND THE NUCLEAR AGE WAS BORN.

IN THE 1950'S THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL CADRE ESTABLISHED TO PRODUCE THE ATOMIC BOMB WAS READY AND EAGER TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE ATOM'S DESTRUCTIVE FORCES COULD BE USED FOR "PEACEFUL PURPOSES." THE CORPORATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS WERE ALREADY IN PLACE TO CONCENTRATE ON URANIUM ENERGY. EXISTING ENERGY COMPANIES COULD MINE AND MILL URANIUM ORE, AND PREPARE IT FOR FURTHER PROCESSING. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S URANIUM ENRICHMENT PLANTS, LEFT IDLE AFTER THE WAR, WERE AVAILABLE TO CONCENTRATE FISSIONABLE URANIUM FOR USE AS REACTOR FUEL. ONCE THE REACTOR FUEL WAS PRODUCED, URANIUM FIT EASILY INTO THE ELECTRIC UTILITY SYSTEM; HEAT FROM URANIUM FUEL RODS BOILED WATER TO PRODUCE STEAM, WHICH COULD DRIVE A TURBINE TO PRODUCE ELECTRICITY. URANIUM NEEDED ONLY TO REPLACE COAL OR OIL AS A HEAT SOURCE; THE STEAM SYSTEM AND TURBINE COULD REMAIN RELATIVELY UNCHANGED. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES WERE ALREADY IN PLACE TO EXPLOIT THE ATOM. IN 1946, FOLLOWING THE EXPLOSIONS ON HIROSHIMA AND NAGASAKI BOMBS, CONGRESS HAD ESTABLISHED THE A.E.C. *Atomic Energy Commission*

SOLAR ENERGY HAD NONE OF THESE INSTITUTIONS TO FOSTER ITS DEVELOPMENT. IN FACT, WITH ITS ABILITY TO BYPASS ENERGY CORPORATIONS AND ELECTRIC UTILITIES BY PROVIDING ENERGY AT INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS AND SITES, SOLAR ENERGY COULD REDUCE THE INFLUENCE OF EXISTING COMPANIES. THE ENERGY ESTABLISHMENT WAS UNINTERESTED IN SOLAR TECHNOLOGIES.

IN THE EARLY 1950'S THIS NATION REACHED A CROSSROAD: IT COULD HAVE CHOSEN NUCLEAR POWER OR SOLAR ENERGY, AS REFLECTED IN THE MATERIALS POLICY COMMISSION REPORT. THIS COMMISSION WAS HEADED BY WILLIAM PALEY OF CBS. FROM THE PALEY REPORT I QUOTE: "EFFORTS TO HARNESS SOLAR ENERGY ECONOMICALLY ARE INFINITESIMAL. IT IS TIME FOR AGGRESSIVE RESEARCH IN THE FIELD OF SOLAR ENERGY- AN EFFORT IN WHICH THE UNITED STATES COULD MAKE AN IMMENSE CONTRIBUTION TO THE WELFARE OF THE FREE WORLD." SOON THEREAFTER THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BEGAN A PROGRAM TO DEVELOP ATOMIC ENERGY AND SEALED THE NATION'S ENERGY FUTURE FOR THE NEXT 30 YEARS.

✓
AT LEAST

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SET THIS POLICY. POLICY DETERMINES A DIRECTION AND THEN THE DIRECTION APPEARS INEVITABLE. THE DECISION TO PURSUE NUCLEAR POWER INSTEAD OF SOLAR POWER WAS A POLICY DETERMINED BY THE GOVERNMENT IN PART AS AN OUTGROWTH OF WORLD WAR II TECHNOLOGY. NUCLEAR WEAPONRY REQUIRES NUCLEAR ENERGY.

THIS POLICY DECISION TO DEVELOP NUCLEAR POWER WAS NOT DEPENDENT ON ANY ONE POLITICAL PARTY NOR ANY PUBLIC DEBATE. ^{President} TRUMAN'S POLICY WAS CONTINUED UNDER ^{President} EISENHOWER WITH THE PUBLIC RELATIONS SLOGAN OF "ATOMS FOR PEACE." THIS INFANT INDUSTRY NEEDED A CUSHION AND THE GOVERNMENT OBLIGED WITH A SERIES OF ACTS DESIGNED TO ENCOURAGE NUCLEAR POWER DEVELOPMENT. FIRST, CONGRESS APPROVED THE PRICE-ANDERSON LEGISLATION OF 1957, LIMITING THE NUCLEAR INDUSTRY'S LIABILITY PROBLEMS ARISING FROM THE RISKS OF CATASTROPHE ASSOCIATED WITH NUCLEAR POWER GENERATION. SECOND, THE GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIZED OR PERMITTED THE INDUSTRY TO IGNORE THE COSTS OF CONSTRUCTING FUEL ENRICHMENT FACILITIES, OF REGULATION, OF WASTE DISPOSAL AND HEALTH COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH INCREASED ENVIRONMENTAL RADIATION.

THERE ARE THREE PERSISTANT PROBLEMS WE FACE WITH NUCLEAR ENERGY AND EACH REQUIRES IT'S OWN ANALYSIS. THEY ARE THE COST FACTOR, SAFETY FACTOR IN THE OPERATION OF PLANTS, AND NUCLEAR WASTE.

THE COST IS JUST OUT OF SIGHT. TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION CHAIRMAN LEWIS STRAUSS PREDICTED THAT NUCLEAR POWER WOULD BE "TOO CHEAP TO MEASURE". THE NUCLEAR INDUSTRY CONTINUES TO SPEND MILLIONS OF DOLLARS EACH YEAR TO CONVINCING CONSUMERS THAT NUCLEAR ENERGY SAVES THEM MONEY. IT DOES NOT. NUCLEAR CONSTRUCTION COSTS ARE INCREASING SO RAPIDLY THAT ACCURATE ESTIMATES ARE DIFFICULT TO MAKE. IN 1967, THE A.E.C. PREDICTED THAT REACTORS WOULD COST \$134 PER KILOWATT OF GENERATING CAPACITY. BY 1976, CONSTRUCTION EXPENSES INCREASED TO \$645 PER KILOWATT AND CURRENT ESTIMATES ARE APPROXIMATELY \$1,000 PER KILOWATT.

THE DRAMATIC INCREASE IN NUCLEAR CONSTRUCTION COSTS CANNOT BE EXPLAINED BY INFLATION; SINCE 1964 NUCLEAR COSTS HAVE INCREASED MORE THAN TEN TIMES FASTER THAN THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX. THE ONLY EXPLANATION FOR THESE SKYROCKETING COSTS IS THAT NUCLEAR REACTORS ARE DANGEROUS AND COMPLEX.

IN 1974, CARL J. HOCEVAR RESIGNED FROM THE AEROJET NUCLEAR CORP., THIS COMPANY PERFORMED REACTOR SAFETY RESEARCH FOR THE A.E.C. (NOW THE N.R.C.). HIS LETTER OF RESIGNATION STATES, I QUOTE: "IN SPITE OF THE SOOTHING REASSURANCES THAT THE A.E.C. GIVES TO THE UNINFORMED, MISLED PUBLIC, UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS ABOUT NUCLEAR POWER SAFETY ARE SO GRAVE THAT THE UNITED STATES SHOULD CONSIDER A COMPLETE HALT TO NUCLEAR POWER PLANT CONSTRUCTION UNTIL WE SEE IF THESE SERIOUS QUESTIONS CAN SOMEHOW BE RESOLVED."

IN SEPTEMBER OF 1975 A DISTINGUISHED PANEL OF 60 CITIZENS, INCLUDING 15 NOBEL LAUREATES AND 26 MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, NOTED THAT THE USE OF PLUTONIUM FUEL WAS AND I QUOTE: "MORALLY INDEFENSIBLE AND TECHNICALLY OBJECTIONABLE."

IN JANUARY OF 1976 ROBERT POLLARD, AN ELECTRICAL ENGINEER, RESIGNED FROM THE N.R.C. HE LEFT BECAUSE HE FELT THE N.R.C. WAS AND I QUOTE: "BLIND" TO UNRESOLVED REACTOR SAFETY ISSUES.

IN DECEMBER OF 1976 RONALD FLUEGGE, AN N.R.C. ENGINEER WHO RESIGNED IN OCTOBER WROTE ^{that} THE N.R.C. AND I QUOTE: "COVERED UP OR BRUSHED ASIDE NUCLEAR SAFETY PROBLEMS OF FAR REACHING SIGNIFICANCE. WE ARE ALLOWING DOZENS OF LARGE NUCLEAR PLANTS TO OPERATE IN POPULATED AREAS, DESPITE KNOWN SAFETY DEFICIENCIES THAT COULD RESULT IN VERY DAMAGING ACCIDENTS."

THESE RESIGNATIONS SHOULD HAVE BEEN STRAWS IN THE WIND TO US, THE CITIZENRY, BUT WE CHOSE TO IGNORE THEM.

TIME DOES NOT PERMIT US TO DEVELOP A DISCUSSION OF NUCLEAR WASTE THIS AFTERNOON- SUFFICE IT TO SAY AT PRESENT WE HAVE LEFT A LEGACY OF DEATH TO FUTURE GENERATIONS.

nuclear regulation commission

ON MARCH 28TH THE ACCIDENT AT THE THREE MILE ISLAND PLANT IN MIDDLETOWN, PENNSYLVANIA NEAR HARRISBURG, RAISED CONSIDERABLE CONCERN. FINALLY PUBLIC ATTENTION WAS RIVETED. AND THERE WAS A CONVERGENCE AND SPOTLIGHTING OF ALL THE PROBLEMS OF THE MUCH TOUTED TECHNOLOGY, INCLUDING THE CONFUSION, MISREPRESENTATION AND SECRECY; THE HAZARDS AND HARM LATENT IN THE OPERATION. LET ME CITE AN EXAMPLE:

AT THREE MILE ISLAND THE EVIDENCE WAS RAISED THAT THE PUBLIC WAS BEING LIED TO ABOUT THE ACTUAL LEVELS OF RADIATION IN THE HARRISBURG AREA DURING THE ACCIDENT. DR. ERNEST J. STERNGLASS IS A PROFESSOR OF RADIOLOGICAL PHYSICS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH MEDICAL SCHOOL WHO WAS AT THE SITE AND TOOK HIS OWN READING OF RADIATION LEVELS. HE CLAIMS THAT THE PUBLIC WAS ONLY TOLD HALF OF THE STORY. HE SAID, I QUOTE: "THEY LIED ABOUT THE INTERNAL DOSES TAKEN IN BY THE 10 TO 20 MILE AREA - THE INHALED RADIATION." ^{I do not} WITHOUT PRETENDING TO BE AN EXPERT ON THIS SUBJECT. ^{gamma rays + beta rays} THERE ARE TWO KINDS OF RADIATION: THE ELECTROMAGNETIC (GAMA RAYS), AND THE PARTICULATE (BETA RAYS). THE ELECTROMAGNETIC IS USED BY THE MEDICAL PROFESSION FOR THERAPY AND X-RAYS BECAUSE IT CAN PENETRATE THE SKIN AND THE BODY TISSUE. THE PARTICULATE IS MORE DIFFICULT TO DETECT AND CANNOT PENETRATE THE SKIN. HOWEVER, IF THE RADIO-ACTIVE PARTICLES GET INSIDE THE BODY THROUGH INHALATION THEY CAN BE JUST AS DANGEROUS AS THE ELECTROMAGNETIC. THE POINT DR. STERNGLASS WANTED TO MAKE WAS THAT ONLY THE GAMA RAYS WERE MEASURED, MEANING THAT THE LEVELS OF RADIATION REPORTED BY THE OFFICIALS WERE INCOMPLETE.

Dr. STERNGLASS CLAIMED THAT THE ACTUAL DOSE PEOPLE IN THE AREA AROUND THE THREE MILE ISLAND PLANT RECEIVED WAS 100 TO 150 TIMES GREATER THAN WHAT THE PUBLIC WAS TOLD. WHEN THE EXPERTS THEMSELVES DISAGREE, WHAT IS THE PUBLIC TO THINK?

WHAT WAS ONCE VIEWED AS A LIFE SAVING FORCE FOR OUR SOCIETY CAN NOW BE SEEN FOR THE DEATH DEALING FORCE THAT IT ALWAYS WAS. FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONERY AND THE "PEACEFUL" USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY ARE TWO SIDES OF THE SAME COIN. AFTER THE WAR WE HAD

FIRST THE TESTING OF EVEN MORE POWERFUL BOMBS IN THE PACIFIC WITH TOTAL DISREGARD FOR HUMAN LIFE. THEN IN THE UNITED STATES- WITH VERY LITTLE CARE OR ATTENTION GIVEN HUMAN LIFE, THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW ENERGY SOURCE WITH UNQUESTIONED ZEAL, RATHER THAN WITH CARE AND RESPONSIBILITY WAS COMMENCED.

THIS IS TO YOU THE CLASS OF 1979- IT WILL REQUIRE MASSIVE EFFORT ON THE PART OF THE CITIZENRY TO STRIP AWAY THE WALL THAT WAS ERECTED TO CONCEAL THE RAMIFICATIONS OF NUCLEAR POWER FROM THE CITIZENRY.

WE CANNOT RUN AWAY FROM THE WORLD OF NUCLEAR POWER, WITH ALL OF ITS SHATTERING IMPLICATIONS. WE CANNOT SHUN IT BECAUSE OF ITS COMPLEXITY, OR BECAUSE OF ITS ENTRENCHED, POWERFUL SUPPORTERS. AS JONATHAN SCHELL SAID IN HIS BOOK, THE TIME OF ILLUSION : " THE QUESTIONS ARE UNPRECEDENTED, THEY ARE BOUNDLESS, THEY ARE UNANSWERED, AND THEY ARE WHOLLY AND LASTINGLY OURS."

PEACE & JUSTICE COALITION

1022 W 6th • Austin Texas 78703 American Federation of Teachers • American Friends Service Committee • Austin Women for Peace • CISPEs • Citizens Party
Committee on Central America • Democratic Socialists of America • Episcopal Peace Fellowship • The Farm • Gray Panthers • Interfaith Peace Network
Interfaith Task Force on Central American Refugees • Lawyer's Alliance for Nuclear Arms Control • Libertarian Party • Lutheran Peace Fellowship
Methodist Peace Fellowship • Mobilization for Survival • Montopolis Neighborhood Association
Maslem Iranian Students Society • National Lawyers Guild • Network • November 29th Coalition • Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign
Pax Christi • Physicians for Social Responsibility • Unitarian Social Action Committee
United Campuses Against Nuclear War/UCAM at UT • University Mobilization

October 25, 1983

Dear Sissy,

Last night I read your speech again, and I got re-inspired.
It was very good, and the clips of it on television and in the
New York Times were very effective.

We're lucky to have you in our midst. Your presence
Saturday was an important part of the march. Thank you for
helping us make it such a huge success.

Yours,



Nina Butts



ADDRESS:

No to the Euro missiles

FRANCIS I. PARENTHOUD

OCT 22

Austin

nuclear

Eighteen months ago we gathered on the steps of this capitol to mobilize for survival. Today we return, mobilized again, to say no to the Cruise missile, no to the Pershing II, and no to the administration which has sanctioned the destruction of this planet. Eighteen months ago we stood some distance from this destruction. Today we stand in the very shadow of death.

We gather here because as our chances to survive have decreased, our will to survive has increased, and again we will proceed, whatever the obstacles before us. We proceed as outraged citizens of this democracy, in solidarity with the outraged citizens of European democracies, and as the collective conscience of a world on the eve of annihilation. We cannot do less.

The danger we face is the danger of a whole new and deadly generation of missiles. The Cruise, fifteen feet in length, has fifteen times the destructive power of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. It is so tiny it can be hidden behind a couch, so mobile it can be launched from a truck, and so accurate it can strike within feet of its target. . . . →

It can fly just above trees, and well below radar. A missile so mobile, so accurate, and so undetectable is virtually impossible to verify, and thus, once deployed, will practically eliminate any chance for successful arms control negotiations.

The Pershing II is not a defensive weapon, but rather "a missile in search of a mission." It is designed for "decapitation" -- to wipe out the Soviet complex of communication, control, and command -- and the Pershing II can do it in 350 seconds. Thus the Soviets, six minutes from destruction, will be tempted to employ a first-strike against us. And of course, with virtually no warning time, the possibility of a Soviet attack launched by computer error becomes a grave probability.

Since the resolution of the Cuban missile crisis of 1963, neither the U.S. or the U.S.S.R. has possessed land based missiles outside its own territory with the range to reach the other's territory. But with our deployment of the 572 Euromissiles - both Cruise and Pershing -- the United States would unilaterally break this 20 year de facto moratorium.

We live in a world armed with 50,000 nuclear weapons. In the last 12 years the U.S. and the Soviet Union have added over 5,000 strategic nuclear weapons each to their arsenals. The nuclear weapons arsenal of the world now represents 6,000 the firepower of all the weapons used in World War II, including the two atomic bombs dropped on Japan. With no end to this escalation in sight, most Americans have felt that the fate of the earth is beyond our control. We have been overwhelmed with confusion and horror and helplessness. This psychic numbness is the understandable result of raising our nuclear consciousness.

But we must move beyond this awesome awareness of the danger before us. We must break through this mental paralysis to formulate alternatives, and implement action. We must convince others that the Stone-Age emotions of the Ray-gun administration are incompatible with the Space Age technology of the modern world.

We must realize finally and immediately that the security of our country does not exist in a vacuum. Our security is dependent upon Soviet security. We will not feel safe unless we allow them to feel safe. We cannot survive unless they survive.

Nuclear strategy is in a hole which is getting deeper every day. There may be many possibilities for getting out of it, but above all, we need time to find these solutions. So we should adopt the first law of holes: STOP DIGGING. The first step out must be to abandon the deployment of the Pershing and Cruise missiles.

Ten years ago this week we witnessed an incredible display of American democracy in action. In the infamous Saturday Night Massacre Richard Nixon ordered the attorney general to fire the Watergate special prosecutor. Rather than fire Mr. Cox, Mr. Richardson resigned, and both the White House and Congress were flooded with telegrams of public protest. We are now presented with a similar opportunity to rise above our complacency.

On Tuesday, The House will vote on the Sabo-McKinney Amendment to the military appropriations bill. If passed, this amendment would cut off funding for the maintenance, support, and transportation of the Cruise and Pershing missiles for six months. Hundreds of thousands protest today in Canada, Europe, Australia, and Japan, but because these missiles are our missiles, ours is the protest that can make the real difference.

I call upon all of you to translate your action in coming here today into one which will have a monumental impact tomorrow. I urge us all to stop talking to each other and to begin talking to others.

We must reach our parents and our children, our brothers and sisters, our co-workers, our neighbors, and our friends. If we advocate the cause of peace, if we believe in the future of this planet, we must act, and prompt others to act - not this year, not this month, but NOW.

The one thing we can be sure of with all politicians is that they want to be re-elected. They count their mail. When you leave this place, send a telegram or mailgram to your House representative urging him to support the Sabo-McKinney Ammendment. Call and visit your friends and relatives and convince them to do the same.

On the anniversary of the Saturday Night Massacre, let us once again demand a voice in the policy of this nation; let us once again refuse to be deceived by a calloused administration; let us once again rise up to preserve this democracy, and in so doing, do our best to preserve the world.

Call or cable your Representative. Tell him to support the Sabo-McKinney Ammendment. Tell him to stop the missle deployment. Tell him to adopt the first law of holes and stop digging - now.

WOMEN'S SEARCH FOR PEACE

For twenty years, we have been exhorting women to plan their education, enter the professions, and participate fully in society. But, basically, there was little examination of gender roles in the issue of war and peace. Such an analysis of those gender roles, which are society's underpinnings, offers us a beginning rather than a panacea to the most pressing issue of our time—one that is seemingly the most abstract, yet the most personal. Will we as a species and life system remain extant or become extinct? For me, these subjects have converged in the international peace movement.

It was not until I heard Helen Caldicott speak in 1979 that I moved past what has been called "psychic numbing," the reaction many of us have to the subject of nuclear war. We can't do anything about it, so we leave it to the experts and hope for the best.

Caldicott was speaking about the impending deployment of cruise and Pershing II missiles in Western Europe. She had the facts, and she used them. For example, the cruise, 15-foot pilotless aircraft, would have the capacity to destroy 15 towns the size of Hiroshima. But she went behind the euphemisms to describe these deadly new weapons. It was not an abstract rational presentation. It was clearly an example of feminist logic that utilized intuition and imagination to expose reality.

At the time, I was president of Wells College, having been ensconced as the first woman president in the 112-year existence of that woman's college. Some

changes had come; women were now in all but one of the top administrative positions, and women were being promoted in the faculty, pay scales were being made more equitable, etc. But what I wasn't aware of at the time was that patriarchal structures were in place and in part I adapted to them. More than adapting, I had been trained to adapt, as we all have. Later, I found in the peace movement the same pattern as in academia. First, women are ignored; once recognized, denigrated and trivialized; and then sometimes grudgingly accepted.

Before speaking more of the international women's peace movement, perhaps we should pause for some definitions:

The definition of feminism I will take from *Winston Simplified Dictionary*, (1930):

The belief that men and women are mentally and socially equal and that women should be given every social freedom, advantage, and opportunity enjoyed by men.

Patriarchy we have accepted without question, for it has defined our society. When I speak of patriarchy, I am speaking of a system we are all part of—a system that is as harmful to one sex as to the other. The underlying problem is not man as a sex. The root of the problem lies in a social system in which the power of force is idealized, in which both men and women are taught to equate true masculinity with violence and domination, and to see men that don't conform as soft.

Patriarchy describes any kind of group organization in which males hold dominant power, in which males determine what part females shall and shall not play, and in which the capabilities assigned to women are relegated generally to the mystical and esthetic, excluding them from the practical and political.

In examining that definition, we can see that it has been somewhat eroded in the recent past. However, the habits of thought that are basic to our functioning as a society have not been dislodged. We can see this in four areas of our lives that are fundamental to our functioning and pivotal in the making of peace that have not changed a great deal. Each of these areas of life, when dominated by the male ethos, serves against peace. The four areas are language, logic, power, and relationship. I will come back to this later.

Some of the most exciting scholarship of the last twenty years has been done by women and about women. It has entailed building on women's experience, history, and insights. It is called women's studies, and women scholars in all fields have struggled to gain academic recognition for it.

Among other subjects, it has instigated a discussion of patriarchy.

Personally, I have found the writings of women very helpful in sorting out my experiences in the peace movement. It is the research and creativity of women's studies that have made it possible now to analyze our society. In turn, that offers us an awareness and then hope for its transformation.

Not unlike other fields of women's endeavors through the ages, women's protests and peace activism have suffered from historical amnesia. Before one dismisses the protestors and non-violent resistance of today, let us recall our foremothers who permitted themselves to be arrested and endured hunger strikes to gain access to family planning, birth control technologies, and the right to vote; who brought women from warring countries together at the first International Women's Peace Congress in 1915 and later mobilized against nuclear testing in the 1960s and during the Vietnam war.

The contact I have had with the international women's peace movement has challenged many of my own patterns of thought and assumptions. My personal encounters are not intended as a travelogue. But where else do we question and learn, but from our own experience?

In 1979, NATO made the decision to deploy a new generation of weapons in Western Europe—the Pershing II, which had first strike capability, and the cruise missiles, which I mentioned earlier. Protests erupted across the continent and in the United States as well.

In 1982, I had occasion to visit Comiso in Sicily, where cruise missiles were to be deployed at a World War II air base. The deployment was opposed by many, but there had been no local discussion of this deployment. Rather, the edict had come from above—from NATO to the Italian government, and then to the local townspeople. There was great distress; over a million signatures had been

collected from Sicilians opposing the deployment of the missiles, but all to no avail.

The Sicilians were concerned about more than just the presence of the missiles. Comiso and the surrounding area had for years had a land policy that discouraged the presence of the Mafia. There had been no incentive for the Mafia to come to Comiso, but there was fear that the rapid expansion and construction called for by the establishment of a missile base would bring the Mafia in. Comiso was a small village, little known even in Italy, but its fate was being determined by the policies of our country. I learned something about how it looks from below. Where nuclear weapons are involved, democratic processes and self-determination are the first casualties.

I left Comiso, but I returned the following March. En route to Comiso in March 1983, I stopped for a few hours in Greenham Common in England, an RAF base used by the United States. NATO had announced that it was to be a cruise missile base. A group of women were camped outside the base protesting the planned deployment of the missiles. A few months earlier, 30,000 women had joined the protestors. In Europe, much was being written about Greenham Common and the women protestors there.

I arrived as the sun was rising at Greenham Common on a miserably cold and wet day. It was a foreboding place. There were women of all ages, and they were getting up from a night's sleep. They had little only sleeping bags and plastic sheets for protection from the weather. They had already been arrested

numerous times; and, each time, they had been enjoined by the court from using tents.

The mail came, an event that seemed to be a high point of the day. One woman began reading some of the letters aloud. Women were writing from all over the world, thanking the protestors at Greenham Common and wishing them well. Some of the letters enclosed money.

Many of their practices, rituals, and dances puzzled me then, but I was to learn that not only was their presence a protest, but many of their actions were life affirming and celebratory of life. As one woman said to me, they had to leave home to have a home. As another said to me, "Men have always left home for war. We have left home for peace."

I remember vividly seeing across the fence a young service woman in her pressed uniform with a red ribbon in her hair. Such a contrast to the weather worn protestors—one very much a part of the system, the others challenging it.

I was humbled by what I saw. Life for the women at Greenham Common was very difficult, and I realized that their deprivation was suffered for us all. Some of us will always remember Greenham Common. However, at the time of the signing of the INF treaty, the women of Greenham Common were not even treated as a footnote.

On March 7, 1983, the first women's demonstration ever held in Comiso took place. A young woman had been raped in Comiso; but rather than her

assailant being prosecuted, she had been condemned. No women of Comiso took part in the demonstration. Patriarchal tradition there is unbending. However, hundreds of women from around the world marched in solidarity with this victim. For many feminists, violence toward an individual is a microcosm of war. I had never made that connection.

On the next day, March 8, International Women's Day, I visited the base that was soon to be activated. A group of 20 or so women from different countries, including Italy, were protesting by standing in front of the gate. All seemed to be peaceful. One minute, the police were joking with the women protestors. The next minute, the scene turned ugly, and women were being rough-handled by the police. I was standing near a woman whose arm was broken as it was twisted by a policeman. I heard the snapping of the bone. And I still hear it. What was just under the surface, the violence toward women, quickly appeared. This was actually my first experience with unprovoked official violence. I did not have the gentleness of the Franciscan nun I was with. I was angry, but powerless.

Soon after, a women's peace camp was established at Comiso. The harassment was intense, but there was little publicity. Of all the women's peace camps established in the early eighties, this was the one least heard of because of its isolated location.

There is a sequel to the Comiso story. When the INF treaty was signed by Gorbachev and Reagan, the Mayor and town fathers broke out the marching

band for a parade of celebration over removal of the missiles. At last, democracy exploded in Comiso, but only on signal from the males. The joyful parade appeared on U. S. television.

After Comiso, I had occasion to visit other women's peace camps in Geneva, near the site of the United Nations meetings and where, again, the women were harassed by the police; in Seneca Falls, site of the Seneca Army Depot, from which nuclear weapons are shipped abroad; in Amarillo, where all U.S. nuclear weapons are assembled; and the desert site in Nevada, where nuclear weapons are tested. The women at all of them shared a common perception, that the roots of violence lie in patriarchy itself. And that nuclearism that constantly creates, makes, tests, trusts, and plans to use these weapons of annihilation is the ultimate violence.

As I traveled in 1983 and 1984, I heard a great deal about the upcoming women's meeting in Nairobi under U.N. auspices. Although many of us do not realize it, the United Nations has particular significance for women. The U.N. is frequently maligned in the U.S. and considered by some to be inconsequential, but in other parts of the world, the imprimatur of the U.N. carries great weight. In many countries, women have the opportunity to participate in U.N.-sponsored gatherings where they would not be able to do so without that sponsorship.

1985 marked the end of the U.N. Decade for Women, which began in 1975. World-wide conferences had been held in Mexico City, in 1975, and in Copenhagen, in 1980. The 1985 official conference and the NGO Forum were

held in Nairobi and were attended by 17,000 women. The official conference adopted unanimously "The Forward Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women," which, among other issues, called for greater women's participation in the promotion of peace and disarmament. However, the official conference was composed largely of women delegates who were under the constraints of their respective government. So duty-bound, many delegates harbored thoughts they did not feel free to express.

So a group of us organized the Peace Tent, a place where women of all nations could meet. In that tent, the First Amendment flourished, and peace was a feminist issue.

The Peace Tent statement was formulated by members of Feminist International for Peace and Food and became an integral part of every program in the Peace Tent. It states succinctly the purpose of the Peace Tent, and it set the tone for conflict resolution:

The Peace Tent is the international feminist alternative to men's conflict and war. It is the place where finding peaceful solutions to conflict, both in personal lives and in the public arena, is the priority. The opportunity is offered for every woman's voice to be heard.

It is important that women whose countries are locked in conflict meet and communicate to expose the patriarchal

barriers to peace. Patriarchal values and logic constitute the roots of violence: men against women, men against men, race against race, nation against nation, religion against religion, and rich against poor. This logic and its values create hunger and death for millions.

The Peace Tent offers the opportunity to all women at the Forum to share life experiences and information on common causes, and a place where women can celebrate differences and rejoice in similarities. The Peace Tent creates the space for women to demonstrate their skills and knowledge of human relationships for use in the public sphere which has been denied them. In the Peace Tent, women can substitute women's truths for patriarchal myths through dialogue, films, and exhibits; women's joy for patriarchal pessimism through song, dance, and art. The aim of the Peace Tent is to bring women's peacemaking will and consciousness to the world, which so desperately needs it.

At the Peace Tent, we heard. The victims of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the victims of the Pacific nuclear testing, the women of the Third World who are victims of poverty, militarism, revolution, and wars of intervention. All spoke. My distress grew as I listened; my reaction was visceral. How had the world

reached this level of terror and pain? Once, Margaret Mead had said that war was invented and can be uninvented. Further, it was clear that there will be poverty, starvation, and injustice as long as the world arms itself. Our resources are finite. The link between disarmament and development became clear.

Since the 1985 meeting in Nairobi, international conferences for women have proliferated. I have participated in some, only some. Since we are in the midst of Summit IV, I will limit my remarks to Women for a Meaningful Summit.

Before 1985, summits were limited to heads of state and their entourages. However, beginning with the 1985 summit in Geneva, citizens have been present, not as participants but as observers and, yes, demonstrators.

In the fall of 1985, an ad hoc group of women from various U.S. women's organizations organized Women for a Meaningful Summit. It has grown since then and now has two elements—WMS USA and WMS International. WMS International is headed by Margarita Papandreou, wife of the Greek premier, and Sarah Hayder, the former president of the American Association of University Women. It has broadened its agenda to make contact with women from the Eastern bloc and NATO nations. This group met in April of this year, agreed on a statement, and has taken it to Moscow, where they are meeting today.

Each of the earlier summits have had its memorable events. In Geneva, in addition to our meeting with Mr. Gorbachev, I remember especially the ecumenical gathering of representatives of the world's religions and lay people,

who joined together in prayer the night before the summit.

In Reyjavick in October 1986, a candlelight prayer vigil was held in the town square. It was bitter cold; little children were bundled up, sitting on the shoulders of their fathers. The scene was infused with great solemnity and hope. For the next two days, several of us stood outside the meeting house in the bitter cold with a banner reading "U.S. citizens for a CTB." During this time, the sky would change in a few minutes from dark clouds to rainbows, and then to sleet and snow.

During the December 1987 summit in Washington, WMS was joined by World Women Parliamentarians for Peace, representing seventeen countries, where we held our own hearing with women arms experts.

Earlier, I mentioned four areas that are pivotal to our making peace: language, logic, power, and relationship. At the outset, let me say I am indebted to feminist writers for this analysis. Such scholars as Carol Gilligan, Sister Juliana Casey, and Riane Eisler, among others.

I would like to illustrate the problem of language dominated by patriarchy. For the sake of time, I will not dwell on the exclusionary quality of English, but I will go to the more pressing concern of what I call the language of nuclear arms and war.

This language accomplishes the opposite of what language is meant to do. Instead of communicating, illuminating, and revealing meaning, nuclear language

obfuscates and disguises meaning. The unending list of acronyms applied to these weapons conceals the gruesome facts of the peril of nuclear weapons. It privatizes language and keeps the average non-scientific, non-military from what is being discussed: PK (probability of kill); MARV (maneuverable re-entry vehicles); MIRV (multiples independently targetable re-entry vehicles; and the only apt acronym, MAD (mutually assured destruction).

New terms that signify new distinctions also disguise devastating new theories such as the seemingly innocuous distinction of combatant and non-combatant—instead of military and civilian. Combatant is a much more inclusive term than military and includes civilians around military operations. In effect, this language sedates the understanding that the killing of many more persons is contemplated. This new language has been described as a “constellation of deception and self-deception.”

In patriarchal logic, logic and reason are honored for their own sakes, with no question as to their relationship to flesh and blood reality.

The cult of the rational, of provable facts of elaborate theories of logic combined with a profound mistrust of emotion is not a new phenomenon. It has been an essential aspect of the male ethos for centuries. What is new is the risk involved today in acting on the basis of abstract theories. This risk is life itself, for everyone and everything on earth except the cockroaches. It is, as one former Secretary of Defense agreed, “the rationalization of insanity.” Yet, it continues.

Patriarchal power has three characteristics. It seeks to control and dominate; it does so by relying on secrecy; and it is intensely rigid. Power is equated with strength and force.

When power controls by relying on secrecy, only a few possess the facts necessary to make correct decisions. When secrecy is used by those in possession of power, it displays a disturbing tendency to transform itself into paranoia.

Patriarchal power is power by domination, It not only legitimatizes violence, it encourages it and relies upon it. Power that functions as control must be able to overpower that which—or those who—threaten it.

Where dominance prevails, almost all forms of relationship are hierarchical, that is, ordered in terms of rank, grade, or class. In the development of the male separateness and autonomy are priorities. These traits encourage competitiveness. Competitiveness encourages an adversarial relationship. In this continuum, the most significant relationship is that of the enemy.

Language, logic, power, and relationship all profoundly affected and colored by a masculine world view are inadequate in our world today.

There are many new voices among us these days. They are saying new things. As I said earlier, a massive amount of work has been done in the past twenty years covering women's experience, moral development, feminine psychology, and spirituality. Let us return to the four areas of language, logic, power, and relationship, and view them in terms of women experience. We will

find much to think about.

To change language is to change the world view expressed therein. It is a fundamental and radical shift in perspective and in values. Language can exclude. In the past, language was used to make one-half of our society—the female—virtually invisible, and as long as any group remains hidden, it can be ignored. If language cannot make oppressed groups disappear, it is often used to discredit and insult. Questioning sexist language inevitably leads to questioning the language of nuclear arms.

Once it is recognized that the language system is structured by the dominant group. Feminists must test that language against their own lived experience and those of other non-dominant groups. Words and expressions are no longer taken at face value; the bias from which they come is critically examined.

Critical interpretation of the language of nuclear arms is important. It dares to say that the patriarchal, hierarchical, abstract vocabulary is disfigured language. For example, when the Pentagon says more bombs are necessary for our national security, many people look beyond those words and realize they do not feel safer. They question the meaning of “national security” and offer alternatives.

Suspicion characterizes how one hears the myriad of euphemisms. Both “collateral damage” and “counter-value targeting” mean killing civilians. Are any human beings collateral? Yet, this is the description of the 100,000 killed at Hiroshima. Is that chilling phrase, “final solution of the Jewish problem,” any

more concealing than “collateral damage” and “counter-value targeting”? Language makes possible the living of double lives. Feminist efforts to transform the language have met with enormous resistance.

One of the most important functions of feminist language is the challenge it poses to the absolute supremacy of abstract logic. Feminine logic does not deny the importance of clear, rational, objective thought, nor does it dismiss scientific theories and hypotheses. It values these, but does not idolize them. Primary to feminine logic are persons and relationships. Feminist logic expands the meaning of logic in that it involves persons and the human context in its knowing. It also honors such non-logical faculties as imagination, vision, and emotion. There is a woeful lack of imagination in U.S. foreign policy. Imagination invites one to envision possibilities other than the status quo. We have had the expansion of “respectable thought” to include imagination and vision. Actually, they offer the world peace in the only place it can begin: the heart, the mind, and the dream.

Public and private display of emotions are taken as a sure sign of weakness, intellectual inferiority or demagoguery in the male-dominated world. But as Ron Dellums, Congressman from Oakland, California, says,

A generation which does not get angry about its future is a generation preparing to die.

Fear, despair, and sorrow are other emotions involved in nuclear terror.

Feminist logic, far from being inferior to the objective, abstract,

emotionless thought system of the male-dominated culture, is broader, wider, and deeper. It does not allow for the separation of the mind from the person or the person from the human reality. It claims value for all that is human.

As logic has been transformed, so has power as women found their voices. The accepted understanding of power has been questioned. Rather than reject power per se many begin to redefine it and discover the true meaning of power as energy and movement.

The central value of Western society is power expressed as control and domination. Feminist power is non-hierarchical and non-controlling. It values collaboration rather than control. Patriarchal power functions in secrecy, rigidity, and from strength. Feminist power chooses openness, fluidity, and vulnerability.

Feminist power eschews violence even as it continued to name it in all of the manifestations. In doing so, women actively seek to undermine a fundamental prop of patriarchal power and thus opens it to profound transformation.

In the growth of women is the centrality of relationship. In the development of males, the focus is on separation and autonomy. A feminist world view focuses on interrelatedness and interdependence as primary values of life.

Relationship and networking are keys to women's growth. They are also a key to peacemaking. Even a brief overview of language, logic, power, and relationship from the perspective of women's studies reveals a strikingly different world view from that proposed in the "real" male-dominated world. Language is

inclusive, imaginative, and celebratory of the feminine. Logic is expanded beyond the limited horizon of abstract, objective rationality to include creation, imagination, and vision. Power is not domination, control, power over, but, rather, energy that grows in relation, which enables and informs others. Relationship is fundamental to development, It enables caring .

One would ask where do we begin? First, we need to retrieve and protect our own nature and openly value it. And that means not rejecting feminist theory, but exploring it.

1. We can step behind the facade of language and test it. The corruption of language has been a pervasive and dangerous development. For example, a silo is no longer a place to store grain, but storage for deadly weapons. Mushroom cloud is not some benign mist, but deadly radiation.

2. Question the supremacy of wooden logic that functions in a vacuum. When it is carried to idolatry, we have our present situation.

3. Challenge domination and hierarchy as the only model of relationship. Be open to other types of power.

4. As to relationship, look critically at the concept of “enemy” and beware of its psychological underpinnings.

A recognition of our interconnectedness with our own species as well as other species as well as the planet itself is of greatest urgency. Nor will these weapons disappear until we begin to recognize the world views and the pattern of

behavior that makes their existence not only possible, but logical. Such recognition has come to us in large part as a consequence of a growing movement among women and men, a movement that seeks not merely to give women their due, but, more importantly, to transform the culture.

Frances T. Farenthold

June 2, 1988

Federation



*Four Decades of
Unconventional
Wisdom*

Director

John Cavanagh

Board of Trustees

Ruth Adams
Harry Belefonte
Robert L. Borosage
Elsbeth Bothe
John Cavanagh
Adrian De Wind
James Early
Ralph Estes
Frances T. Farenthold
Lisa Fuentes
Saul Landau
Nancy Lewis
Clarence Lusane
E. Ethelbert Miller
Marcus Raskin
Lewis M. Steel
Katrina vanden Heuvel
Daphne Wysham

January 7, 2003

For Immediate Release

Interviews with Council Members and Cities For Peace Organizers Available
Contact: Karen Dolan, Institute for Policy Studies, 202-234-9382 x228

kdolan@igc.org

Amy Quinn, 202-234-9382 x238

a-quinn@mindspring.org

<http://www.citiesforpeace.org/>

American Cities Say "NO" to War in Iraq
Across the US, City Councils – representing millions of American
citizens -- pass anti-war resolutions, with many more on the way.

Washington, DC – At least 29 City Councils from Baltimore to Seattle, from Philadelphia to Kalamazoo, have passed resolutions opposing war in Iraq. Anti-war resolutions are pending in many more communities, from Chicago to Houston and all points in between. Faced with crushing budget deficits, safety concerns about urban terrorist attacks that might accompany a strike against Iraq, and the prospect of their constituents fighting a costly and bloody war, growing numbers of City Councils have passed public resolutions that express mainstream American concerns about a possible war in the Middle East and its domestic repercussions.

The effort to give voice to millions of American citizens through these resolutions is being organized and facilitated by Cities for Peace, a coalition that includes the Institute for Policy Studies, the Education for Peace in Iraq Center, the National Priorities Project, chapters of the American Friends Service Committee and other grassroots organizations, student groups and faith-based organizations, which are facilitating the drafting and passing of the resolutions. Similar resolutions are being passed by student council bodies, faculty senates, major labor unions and church boards around the country.

While the resolutions differ in emphasis and wording from city to city, all highlight how taxpayers, city and state budgets, and critical social services will be hard hit by the costs of a war with Iraq. The resolutions note the link between U.S. foreign and domestic policies, and assert that citizens have the right and responsibility to speak out on all issues that affect America. "Foreign policy can no longer be just the purview of a secretive clique in the White House and Defense Department," says Karen Dolan, coordinator of Cities for Peace at the Institute for Policy Studies.

For interviews with council members who have been successful in getting resolutions passed or are sponsoring pending resolutions, or with spokespeople for Cities For Peace, please contact Karen Dolan at 202-234-9382, ext. 228. For further information on Cities For Peace, visit www.citiesforpeace.org. For information about the diverse and growing anti-war movement in the United States, visit www.UnitedforPeace.org.

Institute for Policy Studies, 733 15th Street, NW, Suite 1020, Washington, DC
20005-2112 Phone (202) 234-9382, Fax (202) 387-7915

KPFT News, January 22, 2003

Activists try to get City Council to vote for peace

STORY: Today a coalition of Houston anti-war groups proposed a resolution at City Council to add Houston the other forty-three cities that have passed resolutions against the war in Iraq.

Peace activists filled the council chambers this morning taking turns to encourage the city council to pass the resolution condemning a war in Iraq.

[Houston] City Council Member Michael Barry opposed the resolution brought to the city by Francis Farenthold.

[. . .]

Berry: *I would suggest that we stick to the issues that affect this ci[ty] ...*

Farenthold: *Then what you might stick to is the economic consequences of this war on homeland security and on your own budget. This isn't any hare-brained idea that comes from a little group in Houston, Texas ...*

Berry: *I'm not speaking to the merits of your point, I'm speaking to the issue of whether we should be advising the White House or Congress on international matters when our job, when we were elected to deal with issues within this city, and that's what our City Charter commissions us to do ...*

Farenthold: *Let me say this: You will be dealing, and you are dealing with issues of homeland defense ...*

Berry: *But Ms. Farenthold, we are not commissioned to speak with any greater voice than you are, so I would encourage you to speak as you wish, but for us to not to speak as a body when that is not what we were elected to do.*

Farenthold: *That's your opinion, Councilmember Berry, and I will stick with 43 city councils that have spoken on this issue.*

Berry: *"...and I will try to make sure that it's not 44."*

Ada Edwards spoke in favor of the resolution saying why it is important for the city.

"But I think that we do have a responsibility to at least discuss this because it will be our sons and daughters in Houston, Texas and our clinics and so forth that will be affected by this in Houston, Texas."

Economists at the National Priorities Project place the cost of a war at \$100 billion and in Texas the war would cost taxpayers \$5.5 billion. Houston announced last week a \$67 million budget shortfall and Texas also faces a budget deficit.

The coalition of peace groups needs a majority of council members to propose a vote on the resolution. City Council sources say that this could take one week or several months.

David Stiles and Ellen Simonson, KPFT News, Houston.

DRAFT

A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE UNITED NATIONS INSPECTORS IN IRAQ

WHEREAS, Americans have always risen to the need to protect our freedom and security, as well as the freedom and security of nations around the world, when a clear danger is demonstrated; and

WHEREAS, this Council supports the men and women serving in the armed forces and honors their commitment to our nation's safety and security; and

WHEREAS, the United Nations inspectors have said they need more time to complete their work; and

WHEREAS, a unilateral preemptive strike risks international destabilization by encouraging other countries to engage in unilateral attacks; and

WHEREAS, most American cities and states are suffering fiscal crises that threaten funds for basic services and endanger programs that benefit working people and the poor; and

WHEREAS, military action against Iraq would cost billions of dollars at a time when the American economy is struggling and at a time when the federal government is operating with a deficit; **NOW THEREFORE**,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HOUSTON:

That the Houston, Texas City Council goes on record with over 70 other American cities as opposing unilateral preemptive military action against Iraq.

Continued on page 2

Page 2

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That the Houston City Council supports granting United Nations weapons inspectors in Iraq the time they seek to complete their work.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That the Houston City Council calls on the federal government to continue working through the United Nations Security Council towards a diplomatic resolution that brings disarmament in Iraq.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to our Senatorial and Congressional delegation.

ADOPTED: