

No Business As Usual '86

FOCUS: STAR WARS!



\$1.00

No Business As Usual '86

FOCUS: STAR WARS!

Regional Actions October 20, 1986:

Atlanta, Cleveland, San Francisco Bay Area and Washington, DC.

(for exact times and locations call 415-549-3077, Mon.-Fri., Between 10am & 2pm PST.)

Despite the hopes of millions, the last year has been marked by relentless political and military preparations for world war. Cosmetic summit talks and reassuring words from politicians and pundits cannot conceal the crumbling of arms control treaties, the tightening of military alliances, the deployment of new weapons systems, and the fine-tuning of preemptive war plans. Behind a thin facade of normality, nuclear war is closer today than many of its opponents or even planners realize. The arsenals and carefully-honed target options are ready. Only the unexpected crisis is needed to turn the seeming stability of deterrence into instant global incineration: fire, and radiation...followed by the long winter.

A major feature of this escalating dynamic in the United States is the Star Wars program. Star Wars is certainly not a "Peace Shield" against war. The central issues are not whether it will work, whether it will break the ABM treaty, or whether it is "cost effective." The central fact is that Star Wars is being created for fighting a nuclear war, not preventing one. Its military mission is to knock out the Soviet satellite system and to destroy the Soviet missiles that would survive a U.S. nuclear first strike. Thus even its "defensive" functions are a component of an offensive attack plan. Its political and economic mission is to further mobilize U.S. scientific and productive forces for war, in the guise of creating a new "defensive" technology. The propagandists for Star Wars cite the Manhattan Project that built the atomic bomb as their model, from a time when national will and Yankee ingenuity won The War. It serves to offer a placebo in the form of the Big Lie, an illusion that something "positive" is being done about the nuclear threat. U.S. nuclear war preparations have long gone under the public cover of MAD: the Mutually Assured Destruction of an inevitable retaliatory strike. The government's public rejection of MAD, supposedly due to its new-found abhorrence of immoral nuclear retaliation, while MX missiles and Trident submarines roll

speedily off the assembly lines, now speaks clearly to the intention of the U.S. not to be the side that shoots second.

Events of the real world have continued to confirm the No Business As Usual slogan, and to demand heightened mass struggle to change the course of events:

**They Won't Listen to Reason,
They Won't Be Bound by Votes,
The Governments Must Be Stopped from
Launching World War III,
No Matter What It Takes!**

Building on this realistic assessment and spirit of open defiance, the NBAU Action Network now calls for two days of nationwide actions: on April 21, 1986, a day of diverse local actions, and on October 20, 1986, a day of concentrated regional actions. Both days will focus on key installations of the Star Wars program and will deliberately disrupt and shut down, through mass political action, as much as possible of the government's flagship for war preparations.

The issue is not, and never has been, one of this or that weapons system. The issue is complicity versus responsibility, as open preparations for nuclear world war intensify, with Star Wars playing a central role. Only the independent action of millions taking the stage of history to resist can realistically confront the threat that looms before us. We will NOT play the role of "good Germans" who passively cooperated with their government. Because we see what is happening, we are faced with the opportunity and responsibility to act: can we dare not to seize it?

The NBAU Action Network, with local groups in: Atlanta, Baltimore, Baton Rouge, Bay Area (CA), Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas, Hawaii, Houston, Indianapolis, Kent (OH), Lawrence (KS), Los Angeles, Miami, New Orleans, New York, Portland, St. Louis, Seattle, Washington (DC)

And joined by: (Partial list of signatories; institutions and organizations for identification only)

Dr. Judd Allen, Sloan-Kettering Memorial Cancer Center
Susan Anspach, actress
Daniel Berrigan, S.J., Plowshares
Karl Bissinger, peace activist
Scott Bohning & Paul Gentry, Stanford Action for Nuclear Disarmament
Terry Boawell, Prof. of Sociology, Emory University
Julie Bowers, Young Activist Party and NBAU, Indianapolis
Don M. Bryant, peace activist
Ralph J. Caro-Capolungo, gerontologist
Rebecca M. Claco, co-president, MSAC Alliance for Survival
Kevin Coffee, artist, Columbia College
David Cohoes, Ann Lehman and John Upton, attorneys, NYC
Melanie Collins, program producer, "Leather Jacket", WRFG Radio
Dennis Dalton, prof. of political science, Barnard College
Stephano DeZerega, Berkeley H.S. Youth Peace Council
Carl Dix, Revolutionary Communist Party, USA
Henry Duke, Students Against Intervention in Cent. Amer., Berkeley
Nell Dunsetz, Chicago antiwar activist
Harold Egel Jr., NY SANE coordinator
Rev. Keith D. Farnham, Grand Ave. Congregational Church, U.C.C.
Maria Feller, Berkeley grad. student against the militarization of physics
Diane F. Finn, Greenwich Village Coalition Against Nuclear Arms
Lee Francis, medical student, Univ. of Illinois at Chicago
John Gerassil, prof. of political science, Queens College
Norman K. Gottwald, prof. of biblical studies, N.Y. Theological Seminary
Jan Grover, feminist critic and art historian
Anthony Guarisco, International Alliance of Atomic Veterans
John Haag, Peace & Freedom Party candidate for state controller, CA
Danforth R. Hale, retired Assoc. Professor of Physics, Kent State U.
Robert S. Hall, veteran 24th Div., South Pacific, WWII
Clabe R. Hangan, director/producer, Mixed Company
Ed Hasbrouck, anarchist and draft resister
Jonathan Heller, Univ. of Washington, SAUSIES
Jeff Hillier Jr., Vice Commander, VFW Post 5588, Santa Cruz, CA
Rev. Bill Hogan, Chicago Peace Council
Vernon Huffman, member, Puget Sound SANE
Rich Hutchinson, Rock Island Arsenal Shutdown organizer
Alan M. Jacobson, Chair, Metro Chicago Socialist Party
John Jankowski, IMPACT (youth group) and NBAU Chicago
Jason, "Armistice" band, Palo Alto
Tom Keough, graphic artist and Catholic activist
C. Clark Kissinger, contributing writer, *Revolutionary Worker*
Paul Krasner, editor, *The Realist*
Peter Lacques, Alliance for Survival, So. Calif.
Agustin Lao, Asociacion Comunal Dominicana Progresistas
Randy Martin, Prof. of Sociology, Rhodes College, Memphis
Lewis McCammon, state chair, Calif. Peace and Freedom Party
Rev. Richard McSorley, S.J., Georgetown University, Wash. DC
Kevin Mattson, student activist, Washington, DC

Charles A. Meconis, Seattle Clergy and Laity Concerned
Michael Miro, publisher, *BraveEar* magazine
Sarah Jane Moening, Uptown Religious Task Force on Central America
Mary K. Moore, Bohemian Grove Action Network
Jay Murphy, editor, *Red Bass* magazine
Richard Navles, dept. chair, African-American Studies, Berkeley H.S.
The National Lawyers Guild, NY City Chapter
The New York City World War III Vets
Charles Nissim-Sabat, chair, Physics Dept., Northeastern Ill. Univ.
Francis O'Dowd, guitarist, "Why Think" band
Patrick O'Neill, Pershing Plowshares
Orlando, "Special Forces" band
Paul Owings, student, NY Theological Seminary
John A. Pasurka, electrical engineer, defense industry
Don Paul, world record holder 50k run and author
James D. Phillips, physicist, Stanford University
Conception Piccolotto, Eric Parker and Jeanne Wood,
White House Anti-Nuclear Vigil for Peace, Washington, DC
Michael Polsinelli, co-chair, Youth United to Oppose Apartheid, OH
Leonard Post, litigation director, Western States Legal Foundation
Rush Rehm, Prof. of Classics & Theatre Studies, Emory Univ.
Kyle A. Reniche, Barringtonian, U.C. Berkeley
Mark Rogness, Kindred Community, Des Moines
Simeon A. Sahaydachny, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy
Rev. Fernando Santillana, Pico Rivera United Methodist Church
Peter A. Schey, exec. dir., National Center for Immigrants' Rights, Inc.
Rebecca Schroeder & Mari Jo Marchnight, artists, Axe St. Arena
Mary Alleen Schmel, Christian feminist and author
Charles Schwartz, prof. of physics, U.C. Berkeley
Joe Sehee, assoc. director, Campus Ministry, Univ. of San Francisco
Peter Shimo, Shimo Underground and Repub. War Chest tourist
Ann Simonton, Media Watch, Santa Cruz
Dr. Sheridan Speeth, Emma Goldman Society, Cleveland
Benjamin Spock, M.D.
Malcolm Stuart, film producer
Students for a Democratic Society, Plymouth State College
Ron Stief, Cir. for Ethics and Social Policy, Graduate Theological Union
Sherry Studley and Nancy Welliver, "Weinberger 4" defendants
Tom Swan, U.S. Student Association
Stephanie Tang, NBAU National Office staff
Daniel Thompson, president, Poetsbank, Cleveland
Dean Tuckerman, anarchist, NBAU San Francisco Bay Area
Rodney Ward, member, Campaign Against Apartheid, U.C. Berkeley
Dr. Roderick Wallace, Public Interest Scientific Consulting Service
Leonard Weinglass, attorney
Gloria Welniak, president-elect, WILPF, Madison Branch
Rev. Farley W. Wheelwright, Sepulveda Unitarian Universalist Society
Steve White, Orange County CISPES
8 activists, U.C. Berkeley Shanty Town

To sign this call and contribute important needed funds to spread this campaign, write or call: N.B.A.U., 3309 1/2 Mission St., #127, San Francisco, CA 94110.
Phone (415) 549-3077, Mon.-Fri., between 10 am and 2 pm, PST.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STAR WARS, PREPARATIONS FOR WORLD WAR, AND THE OPPOSITION

I. Why We Focus on Star Wars C. Clark Kissinger.2
II. On War Preparations, Resistance, and the Role of Scientists
Charles Schwartz.3
III. Why No Business As Usual ? Ed Hasbrouck.3
IV. Plenary Discussion. 19

WE CAN'T GET ENOUGH OF NBAU !

I. From the 60's to the 80's two World War III Vets. 14
II. You Have to Really Keep Your Eyes Open !
Lily of the World War III Vets. 15

STAR WARS OR HOLOCAUST IN THE HEAVENS. . . . Phillip Berrigan. . . . 24

A LETTER FROM THE NBAU NATIONAL RESPONSE COMMITTEE TO THE
NBAU ACTION NETWORK. May 26, 1986. . . . 26

NBAU ACTION NETWORK DIRECTORY. 28

**Star Wars, Preparations for
World War, and the
Opposition
Plenary Session, NBAU
Western Regional Conference,
June 21, 1986
Three Presentations and
Conference Discussion**

I. Why We Focus On Star Wars

C. Clark Kissinger

Clark Kissinger is a contributing writer to the Revolutionary Worker. He was a National Secretary of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), and organizer of the first national anti-Vietnam War march on Washington, D.C.

NBAU came into existence because of our understanding of developments in the real world. First was our shared perception of a specific dynamic toward world war. That is, the threat we face is not from an abstract arms race, in which an accident might some day trigger an unintended nuclear holocaust, but rather the urgent threat is one of conscious motion toward world war by competing military blocs.

Second was our shared perception of the utter futility of seeking to avert world war by appealing to the so-called "humanity" or the so-called "enlightened self-interest" of war makers themselves, or by working through their rigged institutions. Someone once mentioned the futility of appealing to the humanity and common sense of people who have neither.

At a time when so much of the existing peace movement had retreated into shell-shocked passivity bemoaning the "rise of the right", or had itself become openly conservative, NBAU burst into existence like a ray of sunlight in the storm.

Our slogan, "They Won't Listen to Reason, They Won't Be Bound By Votes, The Governments Must Be Stopped From Launching World War III, No Matter What It Takes!" shocked some people and inspired others with its unvarnished statement of the truth. Thousands of people, and especially younger people, were galvanized by its message that there *is* in fact going to be a nuclear war unless millions of ordinary people like ourselves decide to do something about it and wrest their future out of the hands of the warmakers.

Yet as powerful and inspirational as this slogan has been, it cannot by itself answer the programmatic question: what exactly should be done? The world being a complicated place, the answers don't come easy, and there are tugs and pulls in many directions. We issue a call to focus on Star Wars, and the U.S. goes and bombs Libya. We gear up on Libya, and U.S. starts to do a number on Syria. In an overt step toward the brink, the U.S. renounces the SALT II arms limitation agreement, yet at the same time the possibility of U.S. military intervention in South Africa or Central America remains all too real.

So the question for us is: how does this all fit together? How do we avoid chasing after each and every event on the one hand, while avoiding a kind of blind and narrow concentration on the other hand? And why are we focussing on Star Wars, anyway?

The answer, I think, is found in what all these things have in common: that is, concrete motion toward a looming world war.

Look at Libya for example. Here we are deeply indebted to Eugene Rostow, an architect of the Vietnam War and a member of the U.S. foreign policy establishment, for laying out the reality of the situation so clearly in the New York Times of April 27. Rostow writes:

"The U.S. has finally begun to supplement the Truman Doctrine on containment by undertaking a policy of more active defense against the process of Soviet expansion. In this context, the bombing of Libya is a breakthrough of incalculable psychological and political importance.

"It has been obvious for some time that a Western policy of active defense against Soviet expansion is inevitable and overdue. For nearly 40 years, the West has carried out the Truman Doctrine, sometimes well and sometimes badly, and waited patiently for Soviet policy to mellow under the benign influence of Russian high culture, in accordance with George F. Kennan's 1947 prediction.

"But the West can no longer assume that Soviet policy will mellow through natural causes alone. The Soviet thrust for power has gone far beyond what the limits of Western tolerance should be. America and its allies confront the problem that dominated British foreign policy for 400 years — the occasional bid of a strong power for mastery rather than for security within the equilibrium of an effective balance-of-power system.

"Unless the Truman Doctrine is rejuvenated, modernized and supplemented by a prudent and effective strategy of counterattack, we shall lose whatever chance there may be for true detente...

"Libya, a Soviet client state if not a true satellite, is a cautiously chosen first target in President Reagan's campaign of active defense. The Soviet Union would have preferred an American attack on Cuba and Nicaragua. Such moves, the Russians could hope, would involve the U.S. so deeply in Western Hemisphere affairs that it would withdraw troops from Europe and neglect its interests in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East..."

II. On War Preparations, Resistance, and the Role of Scientists

Charles Schwartz

Charles Schwartz, Professor of Physics, has been on the faculty at the University of California at Berkeley since 1960. He is an outspoken opponent of Star Wars and nuclear weapons.

Let me introduce myself first, and then spend a little time responding to some things Clark said before I go into the particular areas Ed described.

I'm a physicist, I've been on the faculty here at Berkeley since 1960. For almost two decades I've been fairly active on questions of politics, science, and war, with the arms race being a particular focus. And so I've had a lot of experience learning about these things, teaching about them, doing public talking and working with a lot of political groups. That should certify me as someone *not* to listen to, because of such a manifest record of absolute failure at gaining any measure of sanity, let alone an end, to the madness of the nuclear arms race. What I've seen over these twenty years is continuous progress towards war.

cont. pg. 6

III. Why No Business As Usual?

Ed Hasbrouck

Ed Hasbrouck, editor of Resistance News, is a pacifist and anarchist. He was one of the first draft resisters singled out to be prosecuted for refusal to register for the draft in the 1980's, and was imprisoned in 1983-84.

I think one of the great successes of No Business As Usual at this point — realizing that at this point it has been very small and very marginal, as part of the overall organized peace movement and the overall "what's going on" in political agitation about war — that its most overwhelming success is in having raised questions for debate, and in having made a number of questions debatable. And, given its small size, that it's even been able to make them questions within the larger peace movement, that is a very important thing to have done, and an important success that would in many ways justify in itself the amount of work that's been put into NBAU: the fact that it has raised very serious discussion among a very large percentage of those actively doing peace work. Even those who disagree fundamentally with NBAU are aware of it, are thinking about it, and are having to try to formulate their own rationales and think about whether what they're really doing is enough. And what tactics (even if they don't agree with some of the tactics used in some NBAU actions) are appropriate.

cont. pg. 10



from page 2

What do we learn from all this? The first thing is that the attack on Libya had absolutely nothing to do with "terrorism," but had everything to do with a policy of global military confrontation with the Soviet bloc. The second is that the ruling circles carefully choose their targets and how they are explained to the public. Note how the Democrat Rostow compliments the Republican administration for having the moxie to choose Libya rather than Nicaragua or South Africa for U.S. military action. Why? Because on the one hand he has a global view of the key and central strategic points in the world. And second, because it will arouse less opposition while paving the way and setting the precedent for future and greater military action.

Turning to Star Wars we see precisely the same methodology, only on a grander and more deadly scale. First is the Big Lie. Just as the world "terrorism" was used to obscure the reality of the attacks on Libya, so "defense" is used to obscure the reality of Star Wars. For the central reality of Star Wars is that from its inception it has been developed as a component of the nuclear first strike strategy adopted by the United States in the late 1970's. It is not a move toward stability based on defense, as its proponents claim.

This is a point we will examine in detail in our Star Wars workshop this afternoon, but it's the central and overarching point we need to grasp. I was talking to Ed (Hasbrouck) before we started, and one thing we remarked on about Star Wars is that you don't have to know everything to know enough. One of the things we learned out of the Vietnam War was that what's important is what side you're on and what the principal issue is that's involved.

Second is the careful *political* preparation of the premiere program of war preparations. Star Wars, Star Wars, everybody's talking about Star Wars. Notice how they put Star Wars on the cover of Time magazine, not the MX or the Trident II. Why? Because it's "*defensive*." Because "it kills weapons not people." Because it's the program they feel exposes their actual war plans the least, and provides the best opportunity to mobilize the country and the scientific community behind the program for war.

But why then should we focus on it? After all, we know — or we certainly should know by now — that weapons don't cause wars. Similarly, simply opposing weapons doesn't prevent wars. Nor is the actual outbreak of war contingent on the military acquiring specific weapons systems.

Why then is Star Wars such a big deal? Here's why:

First, Star Wars represents a major political turning point on the road to world war. For the nuclear war planners of both blocs, the realities of nuclear weapons today place a premium on pre-emption — that is, on striking first. No serious military planner in Washington or Moscow today considers just sitting around and letting the other guy strike first to be a serious option in a crisis. Yet no first strike, however successful, can hope to destroy all the nuclear weapons on the opposing side. Some, at least, are bound to survive.

And this is where Star Wars comes in. Writing in the New York Times magazine, former Carter administration official Leslie Gelb put his finger on the nub of the issue:

"If a potential attacker could calculate that he could strike first, knock out most of the other side's weapons, and destroy the remaining ones with missile defenses as they approached, then the whole calculation of nuclear risks is transformed."

Therefore any serious nuclear war plan consists of *two* central components: The first is a decapitating nuclear first strike aimed at paralyzing the command, control and communications of the opposing side. The second is a ballistic missile defense against the surviving missiles from the other side. The U.S. already has the capability for the first. In announcing the Star Wars program, the U.S. is announcing its intention to go for the second. And that is a very serious step.

The 1983 call for the Star Wars program was thus an open call to arms, an announcement to the world that the U.S. was indeed going to "go for it." Seen in this light, and taken together with the scrapping of the SALT II treaty, it is historically similar to Japan's 1934 renunciation of the Washington Naval Arms Agreement, or Germany's 1935 renunciation of the military restraints on Germany's power by the Versailles Treaty. It represents the decision to cut through the problems faced by U.S. imperialism globally with the sword of war.

Listen to Reagan's own words in his 1983 speech:

"After careful consultation with my advisers, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe there is a better way. Let me share with you a vision of the future which offers hope. It is that we embark on a program to counter the awesome Soviet missile threat with measures that are defensive. Let us turn to the very strength and technology that spawned our great industrial base, that have given us the quality of life that we enjoy today..."

Then he goes on to call on the scientific community to rally to the flag once again, as they did in the Manhattan Project:

"Tonight, consistent with our obligations of the ABM Treat (CK: ha ha) and recognizing the need for closer consultation with our allies, I'm taking an important first step. I am directing a comprehensive and intensive effort to define a long term research and development program, to begin to achieve our ultimate goal of eliminating the threat posed by Soviet strategic nuclear missiles.

"My fellow Americans, tonight we're launching an effort which holds the promise of changing the course of human history. There will be risks, and the results take time. But I believe that we can do it. And as we cross this threshold, I ask for your prayers and your support."

Do you hear what the man is saying? "Eliminate the Soviet missile threat," "mobilize the industrial base," "achieve our ultimate goal," "change the course of human history," "there will be risks as we cross this threshold." Why do you think that speech caused such a sensation around the world? Because he was plainly talking about preparing for war, and governments all over the world read the message loud and clear.

Second, the Star Wars program, while it is not the cause of war, *will* sharply accelerate the military moves toward war. This is because it challenges the Soviet Union with an intolerable grab for strategic superiority by the U.S. It is a challenge to which they must respond qualitatively. Does anyone think the Soviets, out of the spirit of good sportsmanship, will simply sit back and allow the U.S. to deploy a fleet of satellite battle stations over their territory? This means that the Star Wars program has the concrete effect of pushing events toward a military confrontation.

Third, "Star Wars" has become the code word among the rulers of this country for their broader nuclear war plans. It represents the preferred and dominant war fighting strategy of those holding power. Yet the risks inherent in it are awesome. This is why it has taken on such significance in these circles, and why it has become the object of such intense yet veiled debate — a debate in which neither side will admit publicly what's actually being debated!

Thus Star Wars has become a litmus test of loyalty, both among the rulers in this country and among the U.S. allies abroad. To be for Star Wars is to be for the bigger program of war preparation. To be against it is to "flinch" in the face of the enemy. "You're either with us or against us."

Sometimes particular programs come to embody a significance greater than their own content. That's because they have become political symbols and rallying points. Star Wars is such a case in point, because it has come to concentrate both the military and the political preparations for World War III. It is, as NBAU says in its Call, "the government's flagship for war preparations." And that is why NBAU has chosen to focus on Star Wars for its 1986 offensive.

You know, there's an old principle in judo, "when your opponent pushes, you pull." They have now picked Star Wars as their chosen ground. So I say, let's pick up the challenge and throw them on their ass. Because in fact, their positions are frankly not that strong.

They only look strong, because they have enjoyed what every ruling class preparing for war desperately needs: an opposition that is loyal. Such loyal opposition to Star Wars begins by accepting the government's principal claim, namely that the *only* threat of nuclear war emanates from the Soviet Union, and they proceed to restrict the debate to technical questions such as "will it work? and is it "cost-effective?" Thus, the current Time magazine cover story on Star Wars boasts: "Even SDI skeptics like Sidney Drell believe that the U.S. should maintain a vigorous — and very purposeful — research program in strategic defense..."

But the truth is that the war planners are extremely vulnerable on this question of Star Wars. As long as no one seriously challenges the real purpose of the program and the only opposition to it is loyal opposition, everything goes fine. But when the fig leaf gets ripped off, when people grasp the horrible truth of what it's really about, and how they are being lied to, their former credulity turns into anger and then into active resistance.

Make no mistake about this. This is a critical battle in the realm of ideas, trust and loyalty, and the importance of such battles must never be underestimated. We saw that in our experience with the war in Vietnam. When you break the faith that people have in their government about what it is they're really doing, the floodgates are unleashed. As NBAU says in its Call,

"The issue is not, and never has been, one of this or that weapons system. The issue is complicity versus responsibility, as open preparations for nuclear war intensify, with Star Wars playing a central role."

It is a struggle to determine whether millions will follow blindly like sheep down the road to World War III, or whether they will revolt against that, and for a different future. It is a critical battle in the opposition to war.

And why is it that NBAU has a history of taking up the toughest battles, of going right up in the man's face, and going for the heart of the issue, ripping away illusions? Mao Tsetung put it rather well back in 1958:

"Ever since ancient times the people who founded new schools of thought were all young people without too much learning. They had the ability to recognize new things at a glance and, having grasped them, they opened fire on the old fogs."

NBAU's great strength is that we are Uncompromising, Unpatriotic, and Unrestrained in our opposition to the war makers!



In 1970 I started talking publicly about how the new MIRV missile indicated that our government was consciously moving toward preparations for fighting a nuclear war. That was a bit premature, but it's not only been proven true but reinforced by the government in 1974, in 1979, in 1980, and on. So the problem gets worse and sharper. All I can say on the good side is that more people seem to be recognizing that things are bad in the direction they're going, but it's still a very small minority.

Let me make some general political comments and distinguish a little bit from Clark's particular view. He spoke a lot about the conscious moves toward war on the part of the superpowers. My own view is that there is, objectively and truthfully, a very strong move toward war on the part of the U.S. and the Soviet Union, with in my view the U.S. being the leading force toward war. The moves being combinations of technological moves, political moves, the whole complex of policies. I want to make a few comments on that.

First of all, these tendencies are certainly highlighted under Reagan, but by no means unique to Reagan. There's a long history of continuity.

But the question I want to ask is, is it a conscious and deliberate move toward war? I think only in the minds of a very small number of people, who didn't use to exist in the higher levels of government at all, and now there are a few of them around. I think only a small number of people at the top actively and consciously believe they are moving toward war. Not that they desire war, but that they have a view that it's inevitable and necessary, given their view of their purpose in life here and everywhere. I think for the great majority of people at many levels of policy planning and policy making, and in the ancillary parts of the Pentagon and the defense industries, there has to be quite a different set of beliefs at work. I think for these individuals there's an absolute religious conviction that there will never be nuclear war.

I've heard it so many times from people at various levels of involvement in the government, and I think they believe it truthfully; it makes sense for most of them, on rational and psychological terms, to say No, the war will never happen. Because they understand what the consequences of a nuclear war will be — absolutely awful. That doesn't mean that they in any way want to get rid of nuclear weapons. Their view of the world is that nuclear weapons are how you express power, strength. What Clark referred to as "the perpetual search for advantage" is the crucial part, the central thing. If you're in the weapons laboratories, you're always trying to develop new weapons that'll give you some kind of an imagined technical advantage over the adversary. If you're in the defense industries or the Pentagon, you're pursuing that through manufacturing or implementation of war plans to give you an imagined advantage. Not that you expect to carry it through, but somehow by doing it, preparing, you're making the country stronger. And then for the people in the policy planning fields, this taking of these new technologies and developing them into new plans, new doctrines, new postures, new negotiating positions — taken with the Congress, the public, or with the Soviets in Geneva — are part of how to gain advantage. Advantage here is usually thought of in terms of political pressuring: how to browbeat the Soviet Union or coerce them, threaten them; how to browbeat and coerce our allies in Europe; how to browbeat and coerce the opposition in Congress,

how to browbeat and coerce the general public to go along with their plans. Now I say *objectively* their plans are leading towards war, and that is the essential issue that all of us need to find ways to communicate to everyone who isn't here today. That's the hardest part of this political work, to get that consciousness across — not just abstractly: "Nuclear war is a threat and these weapons make it more dangerous," — but that things are converging in the sense of weapons on both sides, in the sense of postures which make nuclear war almost unavoidable in a conflict situation where escalation will be on the minds of both leaders. They are building themselves into a nuclear trap, and I think most of them blind themselves to that. But I think most other people also fail to realize this very unpleasant reality.

So the consequences are the same, the real situation is the same, but the difference between Clark and myself is in terms of motives that we ascribe to the people in leadership positions.

It's important *not* to try to decide who's right: whether it's a conscious move towards war or a delusory move — it nevertheless goes towards war. I think it's important to discuss the many different possible theories, because when you try to communicate with other people and convince them that this is an imminent and really awful problem, you have to think what kinds of arguments and analyses those kinds of people will respond to. Some people may believe, find plausible, and respond to, the idea that these are conscious moves towards war. To many other people, that notion automatically is unthinkable, and so another set of rationales are more believable for them. So I think the concept of having many different theories that all illuminate the same situation is important, to broaden the kinds of interpretations we give towards what's happening.

As for Star Wars, I also have some different views on how it came about. I really don't believe that Star Wars as presented by Reagan in 1983 was a deeply and well-thought-out plan to achieve the things that Clark described. I think that it's *become* that, I think objectively everything he says is true. But I don't think it was deliberately and consciously planned. There are many different reasons that came into it, none of them well-thought-out. A lot of it had to do with "gaining the moral high ground," responding to the Freeze movement and the Catholic bishops. The Star Wars proposal came very shortly after the height of the Freeze movement in this country; it was a way for Reagan to say, "Hey, we're on the right side, follow our way."

SDI is of course a weapons system that does aggravate the likelihood of war as Clark described it; these things are true. It has gained very large sets of support — in the aerospace industry, in the Pentagon, and in those sectors of the economic strata that have bought into it as the new wave of high technology for the future. And it has proved to be a very effective political weapon for the Pentagon, the Reagan and Weinberger people who are interested in building up their active war-fighting capabilities. If they're a little bit honest with themselves they know Star Wars is not going to do much in terms of making nuclear war more survivable. But it's a very good cover for other activities. When people debate about Star Wars they're no longer debating MX missile. When they decide to throw away SALT II, all the loyal opposition moves to protecting SALT II and stops fighting Star Wars. The Reagan people have been brilliant in manipulating the opposition in this way. The first move when you heard about junking SALT

It was people in Congress saying "Well then, maybe we won't give you all the Star Wars budget!" So I predict what you're going to see is that Reagan will back off and say, "OK, I'll observe SALT II for another year, but give me my full Star Wars budget." And some of the Congress will go for that.

I think really the hardest job is to take this fact that we are moving towards war, and get people to recognize it and find ways positively to act upon it. And that's of course what NBAU is trying to organize.

We're supposed to talk about the NBAU slogan, I'll just give my little caveat. I always interpret it to mean, "by all nonviolent means necessary." That of course encompasses an enormous spectrum of very, very active things that people do and can do.

So I'll talk a little about what I try to do as someone who's politically active, as a scientist and in the scientific community, as well as with other groups and in public, in terms of organizing something. And then very closely related is what I, as an individual, with a certain conscience, decide to do with myself. This is, in different forms, a problem that everyone has to face, depending upon your conditions and your different options.

Now I have a very particular position as a tenured faculty member. I get away with quite a lot of stuff and still have a quite nice salary. I can do things that other people can't, and I take it as my task to do those. Within the last few years I've noticed an increase in concern among physics students and particularly graduate students about the increasing militarization of science. Now, it had been that up until 1970 if you look at the federal budget for scientific work, research and development, 50% of that was devoted to military purposes. I used to point out to my students what a horrible, awful shame this was, that half of all our national resources for science and technology were devoted not to making life better but to building weapons. Since 1980 that figure has increased to 73%, showing the Reagan period shift in priorities. There is increasing emphasis on Pentagon funding for research at the universities. Much more seriously: when students in physics, in mathematics and certain areas of engineering, finish school and are ready to look for a real job, then a crushing reality comes upon them. I've heard from a number of students coming back from the campus placement center saying, "I can't find any jobs outside the weapons sector." So there's a certain number of students who are aware and are concerned, and have decided for themselves they didn't want to work on weapons; but then when they leave school there is almost no job market — particularly among physicists.



This of course is a matter of personal pain, and perhaps shame, and it's something that's usually treated quietly, and the person just goes on and their career disappears. One thing that a group of students here has started working on, which I'm working on now, is to find out that this is a widespread and a serious community problem. So I'm working actively now on getting facts and data on the job market for scientists and engineers, and putting that information first of all before my colleagues, other teachers, and saying "We have an obligation to tell the students about this." The implication of course is that if you let students know early enough about this, it may discourage some from going into these fields. A kind of act of organized resistance, at a certain level.

I've been using words like this: "Scientists and engineers are the front-line soldiers in the preparation for World War III." And borrowing the imagery of draft resistance, saying "Resistance is something to be thought about. And if you don't want to get into that, maybe you want to get away from that field early." I also speak to some of us who've been in the field for a long time, about conscientious objection: "I'm in this field, and have been for a long time, but certain things I won't do."

Again, to a lot of people that has harsh economic consequences. In my position I've been able to take the following posture (at least temporarily): I've decided (and this my colleagues think is very upsetting) that I will no longer teach most of the regular physics courses, which has been the main part of my job here. The reason is that the people I'm teaching are going to be making weapons. Most of my colleagues say this is absurd; we just teach pure physics, we don't get involved in weapons. "This science can be used for good or for evil." That's "out there," and, "You wouldn't want to stop Science, would you!? That's such a gross anti-intellectual thing to do."

The real question, though, is the choices being faced by the students. Increasingly the reports I'm hearing, and more people are beginning to talk about it, is that there are no jobs out there using these skills unless you want to work on weapons. Many of them do. But many of them do it with a considerable amount of unhappiness at being forced to do that. The question is, by abdicating on this issue, can we get over the threshold from where it's the *private problem* of a few people "out there", and others close their eyes to it — or is it a *community problem* that everyone must acknowledge. When people start getting angry about it, professors may have to listen; and when it becomes noisy enough... And then exactly what happens next, I don't know. But as will all such resistance movements once they catch fire, it's hard to know what happens next. It's an area that needs opening up. That's a large priority for me because that's my work, my career, what I do.

It's not a question that science can be used for good, I know it can. I want it to be used for good, and I think most of the students do. When I teach a class of 300 freshmen going into physics and chemistry and engineering, most of them (of course they love to solve problems and are looking for nice creative work with a good salary) have a notion that science can contribute to human betterment. But the facts are that the way this country orders its priorities, they'll be working on weapons. That's how the job realities are. And building up high-tech weapons is the cutting edge of our present foreign and military policy. That's the way our leaders think to gain advantage in the world, and these are the moves that are going to push us into war. That's the central issue here today.

So what I'm doing by teaching these people is performing a very loyal function; I support the Pentagon by training the essential raw material in preparation for the next world war, training the scientists and engineers. So I've decided to withdraw my collaboration with that and not teach those courses anymore. Now I've had to go thru some delicate maneuvers with my chairman, OK I'll teach this course to biology majors, and liberal arts students, and a course on the arms race.



I don't know how well it's going to go; I don't expect too much from it. I certainly don't want to put out a message that you and your friends should relax and trust the scientists to take care of it; that's the last piece of advice that you should imagine. Scientists — the ones you do hear about — are people who are well-situated, enjoying a lot of privilege and status within the system, are well-treated by the government directly and indirectly; they love to just get on with their work and will make all kinds of excuses for why they don't want to do anything that's really political. Now many of them are very unhappy with the present situation. And so I try to work there, that's my social responsibility. And there are some interesting new developments.

The most publicized thing has been the pledge not to take Star Wars money. And the most extreme proposal I know of is something I formulated about a year and half ago. It's a very detailed, careful, analytical, completely logical document that concludes that we physicists have to organize an international strike. It's just so obvious: if we all get together and stop building weapons and stop training more people to build weapons, that will force at least a major confrontation at the political level. I've been able to give this talk at physics colloquia in Berkeley, at UCLA, at Riverside, and even at the Livermore Lab. The project of course gets nowhere; I've found about 6 people who tentatively might want to sign up for this project. It's just absurd, outrageous, and entirely logical, both from the point of view of where the world is going and what the social responsibilities of physicists are. It would be politically terrific — if only you could convince enough people to get together and do it. But that's the difficult part of all political work — once you've convinced enough people to do it, then it's practically done and it almost takes care of itself. And whatever it is that gets people over some threshold of inertia and fear, to decide that things are really bad enough that we have to do this, that's the hardest part.

So my proposal for an international scientists' strike is getting absolutely nowhere. But you know, it's something to talk about.

Now this anti-SDI petition program, invented by a couple of graduate students at Cornell and a few faculty at Illinois, has been a fantastic success, of course on much more modest terms. It says, the Star Wars program is ill-conceived, it's a technical hoax, and it's going to reduce the national security, therefore we are not even going to participate. This petition was drafted and getting an enormous number of signatures from faculty and research people at the biggest schools in the country. Now the first reaction of many activists is, sure great, thanks — we're used to having academics putting their names on pieces of paper, putting ads in the NY Times; that's the liberal way to do things. And much of this is in that vein.

Except the people signing were actually saying, not just "Please Mr. Government stop this" — but "I won't take money to participate." For scientists to say this is quite unusual; I don't think it's ever been done before. Most people in the world live at least fairly close to the words of that wonderful song, "Take This Job and Shove It." When things are bad enough you quit and do something else. But for people like me, academics, that's just not the way things are at all. We are used to being in a comfortable position, we work for big institutions where the money flows in and everything is taken care of. The notion that you might have to face a crisis of conscience, that you have to act on something you believe in, is just foreign. It's not in the

culture at all. It's thoroughly weeded out; you do your work, your work is fascinating, you're treated quite generously and softly; you have an illusion of great liberty and freedom and independence and morality and all that. But you're doing very important work in a larger integrated system. So the notion of refusing money — which you've lived on all your life, thank you sir for the money and please send some more — is a significant break. And it's happened.

So this petition is worthy of some note; it's gotten a lot of notice in the newspapers partly because the newspapers recognize these are respectable people, so it's OK to publicize them, and so it's a kind of respectable opposition — but it has a little biting edge. People really saying "I won't participate," is non-collaboration as distinct from passing a moral judgement. So it has some interesting significance. But the hard question is, what happens next?

This effort has been very successful in getting a lot of vocalization, giving data to people in Congress so they can argue against SDI. I think the people who organized it understand, OK we've done that. But it's certainly not going to stop Star Wars. And what scientists can do next is a very, very hard question. Because while the petition implied a little bit of commitment — for some people, giving up certain kinds of research funds, but they'll adjust to that — the next step will be much harder. It may mean things like quitting your job entirely, fundamentally changing the direction of your work or organizing in some large-scale way. This is mostly unthinkable to established scientists. But to the students, people just getting out and looking for a job, the question is clear and imminent, because there's the job choice and it's not a question you can evade, you have to make those choices. That's the cutting edge among scientists: generating (and not only in the colleges but even back into the high schools) the question of "science and engineering: for what?" Making that a front-line discussion, and letting people act and make their choices and commitments early on, not waiting till they've gone all thru college and then look for a job.

So within the scientific community at least, that's the direction I'm trying to push and agitate. And I think we're just at a point of a bit of breakthrough. It's like certain social diseases or non-conformist behaviors which you keep in the closet, and then at some point people begin talking to each other — saying, "Oh, you too?" And then something political starts developing. Again, I don't know what. But I hope this rambling discussion has been interesting to you in seeing different ways you have to work with constituencies, whatever they are. And I'm sure most of you have quite different constituencies from me, but you have to think of a variety of strategies. Including some very harsh positions, which require somebody taking a position, not just advocating it. And then others being a bit more palatable, but still having a cutting edge. And then challenging people to make choices and to become active.

Thank you. ■



So in that spirit I'd like to bring up what I think are some of the strengths and accomplishments of NBAU, what we can continue to build on and what continue to be questions for our organizing and outreach. And since we are a group whose success has largely been based on bringing questions into the open, to bring up some of the issues and criticisms that have been raised about NBAU — which I'm sure some of you here are bringing to these discussions, questions and skepticisms you may have — and those of us who've been more involved with NBAU have been frequently confronted with. To try and suggest some answers to some of those questions.

To start with, the Call for NBAU — which originated a little over a year ago — is an effort to focus attention on several things. The central features of the Call were its focus on world war and the threat of world war; not a focus on weapons technology or on disarmament, but a focus on the reality of the risk of war. Secondly, a focus on the need for direct action against the government, rather than working thru channels — and indeed, a specific critique of the possibility of ultimate success for the anti-war movement thru working thru channels. And third, "no matter what it takes," which I'm sure all of you are aware is a question which has overwhelmed most of the other discussion of other aspects of NBAU.

The Call for NBAU is rather lengthy and detailed, but the essence of it is in its final words:

"Events of the real world have continued to confirm the NBAU slogan, and to demand heightened mass struggle to alter the course of events: They Won't Listen To Reason, They Won't Be Bound By Votes, The Governments Must Be Stopped From Launching World War III, No Matter What It Takes!"

All of that is very important, and fits in very much with my own perspective.

I was initially very skeptical about NBAU, both as to the meaning of what's said in that statement and also as to the potential for actually organizing successful actions around it. So I'd like to talk about why I am involved now.

I think it's critically important, if we're to address the question of world war, to get people first to realize and then to take seriously the risk. There are a lot of people who would say they're concerned about nuclear war, about world war, yet whose real lives and actions bear no relationship whatsoever to any meaningful level of concern. Even though I consider myself an activist and an organizer, I feel like my own life bears very little relationship to that level of concern. And I'm not sure I have a clear answer as to what I'm doing today, being here rather than being out hammering on the warheads trying to make them unusable.

Because I really do feel at a fundamental level, as an anarchist (though I don't think one need be an anarchist to believe this, though certainly a substantial amount of support for NBAU has come from the anarchist community), that disarmament is going to have to come from ordinary people. The people who are involved in war have a vested interest in it. While in some sense they're more aware of what's really going on, they're also, realistically, the people who can least be expected to lead the opposition. Because they are the people whose power, wealth, and prestige is dependent on it. There's an eternal optimism among some of my friends in the peace movement, particularly some of the more spiritually-oriented non-violent activists — an emphasis on appealing to those who do the war work, and a belief that we're going to have to reach and communicate with them if we're going to prevent war. While I think that's an admirable goal and I'd like to see it happen, I also think that it's fundamentally flawed as a strategy. And that it is a strategy being taken by altogether too much of the peace movement.

My vision of how we might perhaps survive (and my vision is that we will all die in a nuclear war, and that there's very very little we can do to even slightly reduce that possibility), is that we have to focus on and do whatever we can do that has some slight chance of enabling us to survive. We have to make that a very high priority, and take that seriously. My vision of how we might perhaps survive is that if we are eventually going to survive, people are going to have to go en masse and dismantle, or plow over, or bury the silos — and disable the missiles. My vision of the best possible future is of a future where for the next hundreds of thousands of years, some of those who do survive struggle over the prevention of world war will have to engage themselves in taking care of the nuclear mess we've already made, and when a number of people will probably still die from that radiation — but my vision of the best possible future, still involves the necessity of (at some point), that we'll have to go by perhaps the hundreds of thousands, and tear the Pentagon apart. Brick by brick.

And I do not think we can realistically expect other than that there will probably be some of the most unregenerate generals shooting at those of us who are doing this. And killing a great number of us.

But I think that, realistically, that is what it will take. The government is not going to disarm itself. We're going to have to disarm the government. And so we're going to have to begin to build now, even if we know that that's no more a possibility to happen tomorrow, than an international scientists' strike or war production workers' strike. What can we do now that will actually maximize that becoming a possibility?

If that doesn't happen, we're not going to survive. I rely strongly on the words of Frederick Douglass, who said over a century ago:

"Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did, and it never will. Those who want change without struggle, want the ocean without the roar of its waters. They want the rain without thunder and lightning. This struggle may be a moral one or it may be physical one. But it must be a struggle."

And I think that lesson is fundamentally true. It's one of those fundamental problems in organizing for political change in America: because most Americans at some level do have a material vested interest in U.S. imperialism, and do in fact profit from U.S. domination of the world, equality in the world would mean that most Americans are

going to lower their standard of living. Even the American masses are going to lower their standard of living in a just world. And it's very difficult to organize for change a group of people who, in the most selfish sense, are going to get worse off because of that. But that's the reality of it.

In any case, we need to work towards a situation in which the people can disarm the governments. The prospects of disarmament in that direct sense began six years ago this spring, when 8 people (including the best media-known figures, Daniel and Phillip Berrigan), went to a factory making nosecones for the MX missile in King of Prussia, Pennsylvania, and began smashing missile nosecones, successfully destroying several. I think that in a real sense was the first act of nuclear disarmament, since the first act of nuclear armament. While that has not become a mass movement, the fact that since then about 15 similar actions have taken place, that it's grown from one affinity group to several — that there are now several dozens of people serving in some cases many-year sentences (the most draconian being 23 years if you can believe that, for non-violent acts of property destruction against the weapons system) — and that they have continued in the face of this kind of truly brutal and exaggerated repression, is an important sign of at least the beginnings of a consciousness.

But I think that we need a much broader consciousness of the need for action against the government. And we need to begin by making it possible for people to disassociate themselves from the government. I think given the necessity for disarming the governments, and the fact that the government's single enterprise is preparing to destroy the world, one of the biggest barriers to peace work in this country, which we need to get people to look beyond, is this idea that the government is part of ourselves. That it's "our" government. Just to begin to be able to see the government's interests as something separate from our own, and to compare and evaluate it. And I think the kind of confrontation that NBAU has been involved in, is critical in reinforcing those few people who are beginning to question, in their recognition that, yes — the government is our enemy.

I think the other success of NBAU has been in reaching out to young people. I say this as someone who's been involved for the past 6 years in one of the few expressions of young people's unwillingness to participate in war: the draft resistance movement. Some of you, particularly older people, may not be aware, given the propaganda about the conservatism of young people, that resistance to draft registration is now substantially higher than it was even at the peak of the resistance to the Vietnam War. That the majority of those who've been supposed to register for the draft have broken the law, in one or another or several ways. And that the last time the Selective Service tried to test out their ability to implement and reinstate the draft, they tried to send out mailgrams to a sample of people who even had registered and found they were only able to reach less than a quarter of people they would have wanted to draft. In a very real sense the only reason we don't have a draft — and it's so-called volunteers (that is to say, victims of the economic draft), rather than conscripts who are having their lives put on the line in Libya, in Lebanon, and so forth around the world — is this direct action of young people. It's the success of that resistance which inspires me to think that other kinds of popular direct action against the government, the assertion of the power that lies in the people if they're willing to use it, has some real potential for influencing the course of national and world events. And I think NBAU has been uniquely successful among organizations in the peace movement, in drawing in young people — and in drawing in people, not recruited away from other political groups, but people who weren't involved at all before.

I think that if we're truly interested as older people (and I'm now growing older — which I've had to think about after getting out of prison, after I did my time in '83 and '84), we have to see that we can't "support" young people on our own terms. We are no more capable of setting the agenda for the liberation of youth than I am capable as a white man of setting the agenda for the liberation of women or people of color. So if we're truly interested — as many people in the peace movement, including many liberals, profess to be — in there being a younger generation of people concerned about peace issues, we have to support those issues and movements and tactics that young people are choosing themselves to be involved in, and we have to take our leadership from them. It is false, hypocritical, and ageist to profess a concern for peace work with young people or for peace education and youth outreach — and then to distance oneself, as most of the established peace movement has, from the one sector of the peace movement that has truly drawn in young people. That needs to be said very strongly.

And that's one of the things that really draws me, in spite of some serious questions and criticisms, to support and work with NBAU.

I'm also very excited by the focus of NBAU on world war, on direct action, and on Star Wars. The particular target of the last NBAU action in this area, and of the regional action in October — the complex in Sunnyvale, Silicon Valley, involves every one of the significant components of Star Wars to which Clark and Charlie alluded. Clark spoke of the two-pronged first strike strategy, first decapitation of

Soviet communications and intelligence facilities. The largest part of what goes on in Sunnyvale at Lockheed Missile & Space Co., is the construction of the Trident II missiles, the next generation of submarine-launched ballistic missiles.

These are going to replace the existing Trident I missiles. What distinguishes them from the earlier generation of missiles is that they have a longer range and are more accurate. The main, and only, usage for this upgrade, is for striking at hardened targets deep within the Soviet Union from submarines off the coast. This kind of capability has nothing to do with deterrence or retaliation. If one wishes to have retaliatory capability, to let the Soviets know they can't strike the U.S. without having their cities wiped out in return, then missiles with this kind of accuracy are of no particular use. Existing ones are quite good enough, you can get them within a few miles here or there, and you're still going to wipe out most of the people in the city. The only need for missiles with this kind of accuracy of the Trident II, is to be able to decapitate Soviet nuclear war-fighting capability. These are strictly first strike weapons. The upgrade from Trident I to Trident II missiles has no relation whatsoever to any other defensive posture. It is a purely offensive move.

30,000 Lockheed workers, the largest workforce of any company in the Bay Area, are actively involved in building those missiles every day in Sunnyvale.

The second prong of the first strike strategy which Clark spoke of, is a ballistic missile defense. Something capable not of defending against a Soviet first strike — which could easily overwhelm it or itself knock out the critical facilities in the U.S. communications system — but a defense capable of mopping up what they call in the defense industry the "ragged retaliation" that might still follow if we got only 90% of the Soviet silos because a few of our first strike missiles missed. A defensive system capable of knocking out those missiles, either in a follow-on second strike or in retaliating against them as they were launched.

The other major facility at Sunnyvale is commonly known as the "Blue Cube" (actually the Sunnyvale Air Force Station, although it's run by the Air Force for the National Reconnaissance Office, an organization the government does not admit exists, and tries to evade discussion about). It's an important theme, that the government attempts to control what is thinkable and what can be talked about by what it classifies as secret. As though calling something "secret" could make it a secret, and at least with the press it's been largely successful. People believe they can't talk about some things even if they know about them. There's been a lot of critical talk about South African press censorship recently, as though it were something dramatically different from what happens in the U.S. But we have very similar laws in this country, in fact the most stringent censorship law on the books in this country is specifically limited to information about communications and intelligence facilities such as the Blue Cube, and specifically forbids publication of information even if it's obtained from unclassified public sources.

Having recently thought about this and reading over this and being somewhat shocked by it, for all I know if the government wanted to, even though all the research I've done has been from public sources and I'm no technical expert on it, probably what I'm telling you now is theoretically actionable under U.S. criminal law. So we're really not the kind of free and open society the government would have you believe.

The role of the Blue Cube is as the ground station and control center for U.S. surveillance satellites. Like Star Wars, it's usually portrayed as being "defensive." Its purpose is to detect a Soviet attack so we can retaliate. In the first place, it's one of if not the most vulnerable facility of any U.S. military facility. It is not underground in a bunker, it is sitting above ground in literally a glass house. It is very near the coast where it could be hit by a submarine-launched missile from very close onshore, with almost no lead time; it has no shielding or protection against any of the radiation blast or EMP effects of a Soviet attack. The implication of all of this is that, despite all the talk about killing satellites, there'd be no need for the Soviets to blind our satellites. It would be much easier just to blind the one ground station that processes all the signals from those satellites. So, while the Blue Cube is talked about as a defensive facility it would probably be the first thing wiped out, and would be gone before any defense could be called for or mobilized. Some of you may have noticed an article in this week's Bay Guardian pointing out that a study of the vulnerability of control facilities such as the Blue Cube has been awarded the prize as the most-censored story of the last year, after the government report about it was so highly classified that even its author can't read it.

An interesting point, since the government is usually very active to publicize what it sees as real defensive deficiencies. We hear about the missile gaps, and the pace at which the government has suppressed knowledge of the vulnerability of these communications facilities, reflects their unwillingness to talk about them. Lest it become too obvious that their vulnerability is indicative of their real use. That their real use is happening now, in preparing for a U.S. first strike, and since their work will be done before the war begins, they don't really care that they're vulnerable. The real role of these satellite sensors, and this too is reflected in the kind of satellites they're now putting up, with much more accurate capabilities than would be needed merely to detect a Soviet strike (the current generation of warning satellites focusses on the ability to detect which individual silos have launched and which haven't — which is clearly related primarily to aiming a U.S. first strike or a mop-up strike). So the Blue Cube is a critical offensive facility whose work is being done now as the work of preparing for a U.S. first strike. In a real sense, since that information needed to aim the missiles is the first step to having a missile defense, the Blue Cube is now and has already become, the first operational (not "research") Star Wars facility.

The final thing about Sunnyvale, is that this whole complex is adjacent to Moffet Field. Which houses the NASA research facility, and primarily functions for liason with all the other military contractors. Its presence there is to

coordinate the whole military role of Silicon Valley, and serves as an impetus for all sorts of other bizarre little start-up military companies choosing to locate there. And as a symbol of the overall role, something often not talked about when you hear about Silicon Valley, comes and still comes from military spending. And Clark has dug up for me a variety of examples of smaller military and Star Wars work being done there because of this base provided by the larger facilities. There's some fairly frightening things such as proposals to base nuclear reactors perpetually in space as power sources for Star Wars weapons.

I won't belabor this, but in very real ways more than just as a "local" military contractor, there are things going on in Sunnyvale that are central in a national and an international way. It provides, as does perhaps no other facility that I know of in the country, an example of every fact of the evil of what's going on in war work.

I would like to bring up some of the issues of "no matter what it takes," both what that does and doesn't mean. I call your attention to a Statement of Intent issued by the NBAU Response Committee. It clarifies what's really meant by "no matter what it takes." I think many who have questions about the tactics of NBAU may have those questions answered by that statement and it deserves to be more widely recognized. Part of what it says is this:

"...When people act in the spirit of non-violence to dismantle nuclear weapons, that's no business as usual. When people act together to shut down and interrupt different elements of the infrastructure that supports war and injustice, that's no business as usual. When high school and college students cancel classes to participate in teach-ins about war and social injustice, that's no business as usual. When church and synagogue members publicly contest Reagan's claim to be serving God by getting ready for the battle of Armageddon, that's no business as usual. Whenever people take intentional and well-reasoned risks with their comfort and personal freedom, in order to challenge the organized insanity of geo-political power-mongering of governments, that's no business as usual. And when everyone understands and refuses to accept the movement toward world war on a broad scale, everywhere, then there will surely be no more business as usual!"

There's a widespread but false perception that needs to be combated — I hope the diversity of people here today will help in itself to combat — that No Business As Usual means only the kind of street demonstrations and tactics that the press - in its spirit of red-baiting, black-baiting, violence-baiting, and hysteria-mongering — has played up, at the expense of all the other things that have continued to happen as part of NBAU. There's been a belief that those street demonstrations and certain tactics were NBAU's only tactics. It needs to be understood that there is nothing in the Call for NBAU, and no desire from those organizing it, to impose a particular set of tactics. One of the strengths of NBAU is that it sets forth a perspective and framework that encourages people to do whatever they believe will be best. While the willingness to take risks and experiment with different tactics is one of the strengths of NBAU, that is far removed from an effort to impose any particular tactic or style of demonstrating or action. I hope all of us here

We Can't Get Enough of NBAU!

Speeches by World War III Vets

The World War III Vets are youth in the NBAU Action Network who first appeared marching, dying-in, and dancing through NBAU actions in New York and other cities in 1985. "We're the Vets of World War III, Martyrs to Stupidity — Won't You Come and Join Our Crew? 'Cause You're All World War III Vets Too!" and other spirited "jodies" ring out as they confront the war machine, demanding their medals and body bags now ("since we won't be here to get them after the war").....

I. From the 60's to the 80's

Delivered by two World War III Vets at the NBAU Western Regional Conference, June 1986.

The 80's are sharp times: people being thrown into the vortex of political life, like it or not. We see the need for change, and world war screams from the daily papers. So what is it going to take to prevent world war, and why does NBAU embody the cutting edge of the 80's?

World war is on the leaders' agenda. To realize this, it only takes opening your eyes and picking up the New York or L.A. Times. Points of confrontation between the great powers (and their proxies) bum like fuses capable of igniting world war. We can hop from Central America to the Middle East and see world war on the horizon. We can see these new weapons being developed, we can see the wave of national chauvinism coming in and attempting to flood the scene on July 4th. Now unless you're thoroughly brainwashed into believing that the root of all this is "terrorism", you're going to see it all coming together and moving quickly to world war.

You can see all the leaders hopping on the bandwagon: homefires, victory gardens, Chevrolet, apple pie, and dog tags — the American way. The ranks of NBAU have no blinders, we realize that it's going to take the independent action of millions stepping onto the stage of history and resisting, to realistically speak to the enormity that looms before us. To our cynics who proclaim we can't do it, we say it must be done, and we will do it! Many youth who once took up the slogan, "No Future" are out in the streets chanting "We're the Future, Not the Bomb!".

The World War III Vets were birthed from this reality and vision. We are youth and others who see world war so clearly and vividly that we demand our medals now. The vets are made up of people who can't get enough of NBAU. A lot has been said about our tactics, our wild guerrilla theater, and that's very important. But our politics are in command — so let's get into this: **NO MATTER WHAT IT TAKES!** is the known NBAU slogan. It speaks to our determination and willingness to evolve and change and it allows different opinions on what it will take to prevent World War III. But for the cutting edge, we need our whole slogan:

**THEY WON'T LISTEN TO REASON
THEY WON'T BE BOUND BY VOTES,
THE GOVERNMENTS MUST BE STOPPED FROM
LAUNCHING WORLD WAR III,
NO MATTER WHAT IT TAKES!!!!**

The core of this is: we are not going to appeal to the governments, by lobbying or voting. We see they are all part and parcel of the coming war. We're not talking flowers in bayonets.

Our political outlook and our attitude towards the leaders and the strength of the people is very sharp in our slogan. That's one thing about NBAU. I remember in New York at a World War III Vets meeting, a new person came in and we immediately wanted to know what ideas he had. It wasn't, "Ah, a new person, give him our write-your-congressman-form 034," it was "what does he know that we don't?" That's the attitude we have to take, because the youth especially are grappling with these questions. And what's more, they are finding solutions.

Our attitude takes a very distinct political outlook. We do outreach that really very few organizations do. Going out to youth who are not connected with any organizations. Going to hangouts, hitting the schools. There are so many ignorant notions about the youth. There was one discussion that a World War III Vet had with someone in the peace movement. This was just after the first NBAU action, and this movement person had never read the Call but had heard about the hundreds of youth who took to the streets chanting "1, 2, 3, 4, WE DON'T WANT YOUR FUCKING WAR!!!!" He asked the Vet, "How did you get all these youth to realize, how did you write down to their level?" The Vet just laughed and said, "We wrote UP to their level."

We rely on the people to build our organization, to take up the slogan and struggle over answers to all the questions we face. The whole sense of this Conference is, What answers do you have? What are you proposing? All forces of society: the youth, the religious community, peace movement, workers, students, revolutionaries. We need to come together and unite to say NO! — not so that the leaders can finally hear us, but to drown their voices out.

II. You Have To Really Keep Your Eyes Open!

Speech at a New York NBAU meeting,
April 1986

Lily of the World War III Vets

I guess they would call me a "rebel youth." What I have to say, a lot of people might disagree with, but I'm exercising the right of a person in No Business As Usual to express how I feel about what's going on in the world today, and what I think youth can do about it. If you have any disagreement with what I have to say, we'll have a question/answer period, that's what so great about NBAU; there's no dogma.

The question of world war is especially important to the youth of today. President Reagan claims that the present generation of kids, people under 25, might be the ones to see the end of it all: the oncoming threat of Armageddon. We shouldn't be so blindly obedient. I mean, Reagan has this "good Christian" excuse to sit back and let everyone be done for. But what does he care, he's gonna go to heaven anyway, right? But we heathen scum don't have such a rosy future, so we have to act now to protect what we have here.

NBAU is really great because it's a break from "No world war please, if you have time to think about it between your fine cocktail lunch and your next business meeting." A lot of people are really fed up with that approach. When you introduce the idea for a protest to them, they say, "Well what the hell is it gonna do, I'm not in the mood to march in a straight line around a building with little signs and pickets." That's not what NBAU represents. There's no false illusions. We're not trying to get the government to say "Sure, we'll listen to you, and do everything you say," because that's not what the world governments, especially the U.S. government, are in the frame of mind to do right now. Not that they ever were. A lot of what NBAU stands for is just people coming out, being in-your-face with it, "Hey man, we know what's going on, and we're not gonna take any more of this bullshit!"

Everyone knows the consequences of a nuclear war. If you're lucky you're going to be vaporized right away. If not, you'll die a real slow, painful death. But the end result is not the only reason why we have to prevent another world war.

War has been going on since man fell from the trees, and now that we're faced with the threat of world destruction, I think it's time we found a better way to deal with our differences! The concept of war revolves around the idea that it's better to eliminate your problem than deal with it.

It's not uncommon to hear someone under the age of 20 talk about the future and, as an afterthought, add: "...if we're still here." For instance a lot of friends that I know talk about where or when they want to go to school or work. And then they add, "...if we still have a planet." It's a legitimate fear that you may never live to be 30 — or 21, for that matter — the way things are going. It's a modern world and everything is a lot faster-paces. And people really wonder why the suicide rate is so high?

I think a lot of kids don't think they have a future. It is legitimate to think, "What's the point in living when you're only going to be fried, because some idiot doesn't care about your life?" But with a little perseverance I think we can really build a better vision for ourselves. A world without war is gonna take a lot of work, but it can start within yourself. The first step is to accept yourself, and accept the differences in others; conflict can be resolved a lot easier once you realize that. Also if you realize that what we're up against is really important.

It's true more kids than adults are more concerned about the arms build-up and the escalating war preparations. But some adults are concerned as well. Especially with things like the bombing of Libya, and the consequences of stuff like that. A lot can start happening if we disregard the idea that our fate is in the hands of this government and these older people who we can trust. If you examine history, that really is an incredible statement.

People have a lot of different opinions as to how we're gonna work in the anti-war movement, as well as against the other troubles of this strife-ridden planet. The important thing to remember is that everyone is gonna feel different; no one is gonna have all the answers, and it's not necessary that they do. A lot of times when you present your opinion, you can be knocked off guard by somebody who says, "Well, but what about this, and what are you gonna do about that?" But it's really important to think about what they're saying and then about what you feel, and then you can compromise and work together.

That's where the beauty lies with NBAU, because it allows for all kinds of political and ideological differences, but it's still able to progress. It's the perfect opportunity for youths to vent their frustrations about what's going on in the world today, and the threat of world war and Star Wars, and it can also show that you can make a difference. A lot of attitudes from young kids today is that they have no chance, there's nothing they can do to change what's going on. A lot of people do care, but think they're alone in how they feel. We have to let people know that they're not alone and let that spread.

Just to draw from my own experience, I went to a pretty straight school, pretty Republican, but a lot of kids were really concerned about what's going on. If they'd been better-informed about Star Wars and foreign relations, they would have been more eager to take a stand against what's going on.

A lot of kids today feel their fate is in the hands of the superpowers. But NBAU proves this is not necessarily true. Because on April 29 (NBAU Day 1985), most of the actions were done by the youth. A lot of authorities were really shocked to find so many of the activists were very young, and not wrapped up in the TV-drugs-Rambo attitude. What really surprised me was that this year (April 21, 1986, NBAU national day of actions under the Focus: Star Wars! call) the youth were so strongly opposed to, as well as informed about, Star Wars itself.

A lot of publicity has been given to SDI, it kind of makes the U.S. appear like the ultimate Rambo. Excuse my language but, "Don't fuck with us, man, 'cause we're gonna be one step ahead and we're gonna be able to kick you down no matter what. Just try to get through this barrier, I dare you to knock it off my shoulder," you know. So the U.S. is projecting this overwhelming power trip into space. The final frontier. Great. It's just this gigantic wall. That's how they present it, as a "defense". But if you present a defense, you're probably also making an offense — you're building a wall. Somebody's gonna damn well find a way to get around it. So you're just inviting that kind of trouble. It just represents that age-old solution, keeping everybody scared of the big bully. I think everybody, especially the youth, has got to get together to combat Star Wars, world war, and to build a better future. Or just a plain future, period.

In March (at an NBAU meeting in New York) we were talking about the mainstream peace movement. Now a lot of what that's about, is the government OK-ing certain ways to protest, because it never gets out of hand and doesn't pose a threat. Being really polite, staying within the police barricades. Letting the government say, "Look, we're of higher authority, we know more than the people, so it's out of your hands, and we'll take care of it from here." This is really dangerous. We have to have a lot more perseverance to say, "OK, you're going to do it. But we're gonna be right beside you every step of the way, and we're gonna see how you do it." You know how things got really messed up for the government in the 60's when they televised what was going on in Vietnam. That just fueled the opposition. So what they're doing now is much more seductive.

They're starting with the media: Rambo, Top Gun, and all these wonderful Real Men. They have this well-rounded guy who is basically just a wonderful guy, but he still sees the need to defend his country. So they plant these seeds in all these young men about 17 or 18 to say, "Hey, maybe that's what I want to do. I can express myself and get money for college, but I can still kick some motherfucker's ass."

And then there's also the other side, the bleeding-heart stuff like Hands Across America. "We're gonna end hunger," says Coca Cola and ITT. (Every time I drink a Coke I feel like I'm swallowing the blood of some small South African child!) All these wonderful peace-loving things being funded by these corporate whores. All their stuff about "We Care!" Think about who cares, how they get their resources, where they get the lumber to make the paper to put out this publicity! Leveling all the forests in Central America, let alone all the people down there.

You have to really keep your eyes open. You can see parallels between the pre-World War II propaganda and what they have out now, especially the Liberty Festival (July 4th, 1986 in New York). It's disgusting. Whole issues of magazines contributing to what's going on. All these wonderful humanitarian performers coming. Indian fan dancers at the Festival, African stilt walkers. To say, "Don't you remember 200 years ago how we licked the Indians off their land and killed them?" and "Remember the Africans brought over complimentary chains to help us," all those who "volunteered" to build this great empire. Every nation we've exploited is being celebrated for 3 days, and then it'll just go backwards all over, and get even worse.

In the 60's they came out with it but made a mistake because it fueled the opposition, so now you won't see that stuff on TV. Though if you watch PBS you do see stuff going on in Central America. Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo protesting their kids disappearing for standing up against the governments that this country supports. And you see bodies thrown into the town square. I mean, they're not even bodies anymore, just pieces of flesh. But they're human. You might never see that on Nightline, but it's still there.

But they want to keep it from you. To put forth this image of "We Care," to placate the people and draw their attention away from war preparations, which is actually a war preparation in itself.

All I can see is, "See through their bullshit, man. Because if everyone's a 'Good German,' we're all gonna go up in one big mushroom cloud." Actually a couple of mushroom clouds, you know, for ultra-dramatic effect. If you want to see what it's gonna be like, go to the July 4th fireworks and see what it's like. A taste of what it's like to be blown up in a mushroom cloud. Just imagine that's what it is. Because in a way, that's just practice for what's really going to happen if we don't do something about it.

To wrap this up, I'd like to say — especially to the youth, but to everybody — that these people are taking your future in their hands and they don't give a shit about your life. All they care about is their own status and money. When you put that over human life, what the fuck good are you? Now let's do some brainstorming on how to fight this monster.

And that's it. ■



can begin to explore some of the diversity of things that can happen as ways of stepping out of the normal framework of business as usual.

A criticism has been raised, and again I think that it's a widespread but false belief, that "no matter what it takes" implies that it takes violence. First, most of us working around NBAU do not personally believe — I certainly don't believe as a pacifist and anarchist — that it takes violence, or that violence is even useful in achieving change. Though I would rather see people acting, even violently, than acquiescing passively. And non-violence is often used as an excuse for acquiescence.

There is nothing in the Call for NBAU to suggest that anyone has to believe that it takes any particular tactic. In fact, continuing with the Statement of Intent:

"The history of resistance to war and social injustice in this country has taught us that incidents of isolated violence or inflammatory behavior on the part of infiltrators or agents provocateurs have been employed to corrupt and discredit actions of authentic mass resistance. At the same time, we recognize that political and moral actions which have gone beyond the boundaries of the accepted norms of dissent, have often been discredited with labels like "violent." We repudiate these tactics of "distancing" and violence-baiting. It is not the purpose or intention of NBAU to incite acts of terrorism, of riot, or of gratuitous violence. Our actions will be principled, and will be carried out with a willingness to communicate, and with appropriate restraint. We are calling for a Day when those who see the urgency of trying to stop the madness seize every opportunity wherever they may be to disrupt the business as usual of accepting and supporting our global race toward annihilation."

This is the official position of the Network as enunciated by the Response Committee, including the people who drafted the Call.

My final question to pose — to those here and those not here, thru you — to those who have questions about willingness to work with NBAU because as a broad-based coalition it is open to those who might think that at some times, certain kinds of violence might be an appropriate tactic — among many other tactics. I think there are many people who raise these kinds of criticisms, including people who raise them to me: "How dare you work with people who are violent?", as an excuse for other political disagreements; for red-baiting, or other issues they don't find it acceptable to raise and which would not stand up to open discussion. Many of those same people fail to ask those questions about violence, about coalition work, even when they work in coalition with groups that collaborate with the violence of the state.

I think it's essential to recognize that groups which do not explicitly disown collaboration with the electoral process, groups which implicitly, by working with and thru the electoral process lend legitimacy to the state which depends on violence — and which carries out violence and preparation for violence as its fundamental modus operandi and purpose — I think one must ask the same questions there. If we are willing to use those tactics, knowing their risk (that is, we think that at times there is enough to be accomplished thru electoral politics to make up for the damage we do, and the impression that people might falsely draw from that that we think fundamental change can be accomplished thru the electoral process, and the endorsement to its violence and institutional violence we give thru that) — then I think we have to apply the same standards. I encourage other pacifists to think seriously about applying the same standards to their willingness to work with violent revolutionaries, and to make common cause with them where we can work commonly together.

My final point, which again is something that needs to be confronted in the next two days, is the question about structure and authority in NBAU. I think there's a real opportunity to work together; part of the purpose of this Conference is to find a structure, a participatory structure in which people can work together and all have a joint role in planning what will happen on October 20. If people have questions and ideas about how this can happen, I encourage them to put them forward. This needs to be a working conference, at which that kind of participatory structure can be brought about. For those who raise questions about whether NBAU is going to become a front group for this or that group, or be dominated by this or that group — the remedy for that, for those like myself who had skepticisms or questions about NBAU yet who think it's raising important issues that other groups are not raising and want to work with it — the way to have it reflect our desires is to join and participate, and to move forward together for actions of NBAU on October 20.

I realize I'm preaching to the converted, in talking to people who have been willing to come here, and I appreciate those of you who've come here in spite of questions and being skeptical. And I welcome those of you who are here in part to find out if NBAU is a group that can reflect your ideas and that you'll feel comfortable working with. I encourage you to spread that word about the openness of the structure and the participatory nature of these meetings, and to bring other people who have questions here to raise them over the next two days. I really hope we can go out of this Conference tomorrow night with some concrete work toward a collective structure that can make these October 20 actions the kinds of mass actions they'll have to become if we're to prevent world war.

Thank you very much. ■

IV. Plenary Discussion

QUESTION: My question is about whether this drive towards world war is conscious or not. How many people in the government really think this war is winnable, when you consider things like their preparations for civil defense and so forth — is that a reflection of them thinking the war is winnable, or are they just kidding themselves, or what?

CHARLES SCHWARTZ: In my opinion, there may be a few who think it's winnable, but they're regarded as nuts by most of the people around them. The overall strategy is to act as if you think such a war is winnable; a conscious deception, which is believed to have political utility. If you can make the Russians believe that the U.S. leadership is capable and willing, and on the road to doing these awful things, then the Soviets will back down and make concessions on various sets of ambitions the U.S. may have. But the tool is nuclear threat. And escalating threats. And increasing the instability all the time, and keeping the pressure on. I think this has been the "containment" or "roll back" or whatever you want to call it, that's meant 40 years of Cold War. But it becomes increasingly more perilous as the Soviets build up their own arsenal, and the U.S. leaders feel they have to go one step more, and then one step more — and at some point, the whole thing explodes. That's my best way to analyze it, to say these people are insane. They are doing actions that are very likely to provoke war, in an uncontrolled way. That is just totally irresponsible. But once they get into those games, they manage to define those possibilities as non-existent; they deal only in short-term manipulations, and they lose all sense of longer-term reality. Now those people say, "THIS is real politik." My view is that the Soviets have learned to play the very same game over these past years. I see more and more similarities between the ways we and the Soviets behave. In arms negotiations, public statements, and weapons building. It's unhappily very similar. This doesn't make it better for either party. And again it emphasizes the need for not relying on either of those two governments. So I'd certainly stand behind the NBAU slogan on that.

QUESTION: You don't find the idea for a nuclear test ban moratorium workable?

SCHWARTZ: It's a very nice idea. It's certainly a good propaganda ploy, and I think there is at least a component within the Soviet leadership that is somewhat scared of the U.S. military push, would like to back off somewhat to make things a little bit more secure for themselves, and to relieve them of certain economic pressures. The Reagan Administration is determined not to allow that, but to keep the pressure on. Now if you ask me to do a balancing, I would have to give a little extra credit to the Soviets. They're being a little bit more intelligent over the last couple of years. But for the most part, their behavior is more similar to that of the U.S. than it is different.

QUESTION: I'll ask the same question of Clark, I know your opinion on whether it's conscious is different. I'd like to hear a debate!

CLARK KISSINGER: That's good! When I was preparing my remarks before I came here, I got to that sentence about this and I thought, "Should I put that word 'conscious' in there?" And I thought yeah, I'd better do that. Because I think it's an important question. Actually, the difference between Charlie and myself is not as large as it might appear to be. Also there is a significant kernel of difference there, which also sheds light on all this. When we get into these questions, it's like peeling an onion, layer on layer. This kind of question gets us into one of the innermore core questions that's extremely important for us.

If you go talk to people in Washington, as I have, in government, military planners, and "defense analysts" as they're called, and ask them: "Do you think there's going to be a war, would you like to have a war?" they all say, No. Subjectively they make that judgement. In part that's a judgement saying, "We would like to go on dominating the world without having to go thru the threat of a war." They're *not* saying, "We're prepared to give up our position in the world, prepared to let our colleagues lose, to allow the people of South Africa be free," or any of those things. But would they like to go thru the experience of a nuclear war? No they wouldn't, because when you get right down to it, that's a very iffy game. The question is not what they subjectively think *will* happen, not what they *want* to happen. The question is: what will they feel compelled to do when certain types of situations arise in the world, which I think there's underlying economic and political motion towards, that will put them in a situation where they feel must take certain military moves or risk an irreversible loss of strategic position internationally. And when that happens, that's when you get into a war crisis situation, and a dynamic of war moves sets in, in which one side takes certain actions which the other side respond to, and so on. War has its own dynamic that takes place. But it takes place because there's an underlying compulsion towards it, in terms of the rivalry that exists economically, politically, globally.

Now within that, there's yet to peel the onion one more time. Are there not some people in the political leadership of both blocs who have some rudimentary understanding that this is in fact the case? What I'm arguing is that yes, there is. That there *are* people who understand that. And when you look at the things the government has done: the weapons systems they've developed, the doctrines they've developed — there are certain things that are explicable only in terms of someone near the top feeling that if not inevitable, it is certainly likely that there will be a world war. And in the lower levels, if there are people who *don't* want to see it happen, and/or are scared shitless, part of the historical analogy I give people is this:

When Hitler decided to occupy the Rhineland, which they were forbidden to by the Versailles Treaty, it was right around 1936. The generals in the German army almost shit in their pants. Because they knew that to take that step, France and Britain would respond militarily, and they were not in a position to fight and win a war. They went ahead and did it anyway. And when Germany got ready to attack Poland there was a group of generals who made contact with the British and said, "If you will just make sufficient guarantees to Poland we will stage a military coup against Hitler," and Britain refused. The point is, if you argue that there was not somewhere in the upper hierarchies of all these governments, people who understood the general motion that is happening, and were consciously preparing, building arsenals and consciously preparing for war — that's what I don't buy. And the problem comes down to when they have to make a decision. you know, they're not gonna go around the Pentagon and take a poll. They're not going to take a survey of all the writers for Foreign Affairs magazine to ask what their opinion is to vote it up or down. There's going to be a very small group of people who meet in the situation room at the White House, and they're going to make the decision to push the button or not. And so it's those people who hold that power — and there is a state, there *are* people who hold that political power — and all kinds of arguments going on about whether to do this or not, in part this debate over "what's the function of Star Wars: to be an area defense of the whole country, or a point defense of their second-strike capability?" — this is part of the veiled debate I was talking of earlier. The debate among people who see this program as part of a conscious preparation for world war, and people who want to draw back from that precipice because they're shitting in their pants like German generals in the 1930's. The problem is, that the people who see it more consciously and clearly as motion towards war, the people arguing that Star Wars should be an area defense of the whole country and not a point defense, happen to be the people who are the President, the Secretary of Defense, etc. The people who in fact hold political power right now. So that's how I see that question of the interpenetration between consciousness and underlying motion that's taking place.

ED HASBROUCK: I'll put in my two cents. One thing is that the technology is making that group of people who'll be involved in that real decision smaller and smaller. Thus making it more and more likely that the small group at the core who really believe this, will be the ones making the decision. That's because of the increasing shortening of warning time; this was one of the criticisms raised of the U.S. basing of missiles in Europe, that it would provoke the Soviets likewise to have very little warning time. And also the increasing automation of the control system of the two major projects going on now in conjunction and alongside Star Wars, to greater centralization for the capacity to control the missiles. One is a ground wave radio system involving towers all over the country (and there's some organizing going on around that), the other is a project of fibre optics, which will be immune to the effects of bombs falling on them, to link the MX missiles. But the point is, fewer and fewer people will be involved with less and less time to make the actual decision. So these deep-seated attitudes on the part of the people at the core, even if they are only a few and taking a poll of others would result in calling it off, that they're less and less likely to do that.

But the other lesson that's important on the willingness of at least some people to deliberately and consciously plan for nuclear war, or of a larger number of people who are willing to risk that, is this lesson for us: No Matter What It Takes!

Dave Dellinger has pointed out that we're really going to have very little success as nonviolent activists if we're working against people who believe in violence and are willing to punch someone out, knowing he might punch back, yet they're willing to risk serious physical injury even in a rather minor scuffle. If they use violence seriously, they're certainly willing to take those kinds of risks, we are not going to effectively counter their power if we're afraid to risk looking a little weird, holding unusual opinions, losing a few friends, getting arrested, getting hit on the head with a club, risking serious injury, death, long term imprisonment. Those are kinds of risks which people who believe in violence take all the time over very casual issues. And if we take nonviolence seriously, we have to take those risks and be willing to take them ourselves. To me, that's part of what's meant, and an important lesson of "No Matter What It Takes!"

SCHWARTZ: And we are all taking much worse risks, right now. Because our leaders choose to play this enormously risky game, and we are their bargaining chips. So it's not as if we have to put ourselves in jeopardy — we *are* in jeopardy. But we can choose to exercise it in a slightly different direction.

QUESTION: Charlie (Schwartz) mentioned the idea for an international physicists' strike. And you sort of downplayed it as a kind of dreaming. But I thought it was a great idea! In the local NBAU committee, we were writing up our vision statement for the Fall action, and working on this Conference, and on the Libya Forum. You sort of struck against this idea of "is it a dream?" But NBAU tends to shoot for the sky. How do you feel about our dreaming? Do you think we should go for those things, or should we more just "see what's happening now?"

SCHWARTZ: I think everyone working in whatever community of people they're trying to move should absolutely not feel restrained or modified by "what's going to sell well." A number of things need to be said, and said repeatedly. Because people need to hear them. Although I don't know if it's worth NBAU trying to convince my colleagues in the Physics faculty that they should do such and such. I'm not even sure it's worth much of my time to try to do that. But of course I put in some effort there. I do think we're going to have to find ways to speak to a much wider audience, and may want to make some general statements about scientists and their complicity, and what ought to be done. That's fine. But I wouldn't want to suggest that you should make that a major focus of your efforts.

RON STIEF: I'd like to answer that from the perspective our work in Witness for peace around Nicaragua (which I'll be talking about later). When we first came up with the idea of large numbers of people from this country taking the kinds of risks people take in going to war, but taking them for peace, meaning going into the war zones of Nicaragua — there were a number of people saying that we were crazy. That no-one would ever do that, no person from the U.S. would choose to go to a war zone. And yet we've pursued that strategy and have found that people are willing to take that risk. So they can understand what's going on there. And I think it's important to see that movement in this context of something people thought was "a crazy dream", but has since become a reality that has grown and expanded. We've got 30 people now living there permanently, giving up their position of living in a relatively safe country, to go live in a war zone to gain that experience. I think it's important to pursue visions for peace, no matter how "crazy" they sound.

QUESTION: This is a question for Clark. You were talking about Star Wars being a critical battle for "ideas, trust and loyalty," how do you see the vulnerability of the government on that? Specifically, with our perspective on Star Wars we don't criticize it because "it won't work" or "it will cost too much money." How do you see us taking advantage of what can be said beyond that?

KISSINGER: I'll answer quickly and let others on the panel answer also. There's two aspects to your question. One, the significance of these battles in the realm of ideas, or ideology, or whatever you want to call them. I see that as a very important thing for NBAU to grasp. We've been popularly identified with going out in the streets, making our message, and going right into the face of the warmakers and trying to shut them down, which I think should continue to be a focus of our work and the style in which we operate. Because we want to stop them, no matter what it takes, we have to stop them. But part of stopping them from doing that, is carrying on this *political battle*. My experience in the movement against the Vietnam War was that we never got anywhere unless there were people out there a little further out, saying things that in fact most people were *not* prepared to accept spontaneously. If you restrict yourself to what people are prepared to accept spontaneously, you basically restrict yourself to the mood and ideology and things that are set forward by the people who control and make ideology in this country, through control of the media, the schools, the churches, and so on.

So we had people for example in the Vietnam War period who got up and said, "We should stop the war in Vietnam so we can spend that money to fix up the cities, the ghettos, and so on." And I said, "I don't think we should say that because if we stop the war in Vietnam, they are not going to spend that money to fix up the cities, because that's not the way imperialism works: 'Oh good, now we can spend this money to build day care centers,' is just not how these guys work." In fact it would be more important for us to tell people how it really works, even if they say, 'Nah!' Because what happens is that after another six months or a year of experience they are going to come to see that in fact that's the case. So by going up against the ideas that are spontaneously acceptable to people, and really focusing in on: what is the truth?, this is a critical component of this battle over ideas.

Now at the same time you can't do that in such a way that you'll *never* get a hearing, or there's never any connection between you and broader numbers of people in motion. This is what Charlie addressed on this example of the physicists' petition, which didn't go "all the way." It framed itself in the disgusting framework of "preserving the national defense." But on the other hand, it brought thousands of people into an act of actual non-cooperation and non-compliance. That was important.

They wage battles in the realm of ideas all the time! Why do they have anti-Soviet hamburger commercials on television every night? What are Rambo movies? And now they're having this whole big deal over the Old Witch statue in the harbor on July 4th. Every goddamn day these guys are waging battles in the realm of ideas, trust, loyalty, and that's what we have to go up against, because it's such a critical arena.

Now what I meant about them being vulnerable is this. Charlie pointed out this aspect of Star Wars where they started thinking they had a slick way to get over, calling it "defense" instead of "offense". They tried to say, "Look, we're more moral than the rest of them. Because we want to prevent people from being killed by nuclear weapons, as opposed to the immoral policy of threatening massive nuclear retaliation." They trotted out the Catholic Bishops' statement to buttress their position. "Hey, worried about Nuclear Winter? Not to worry — Star Wars will protect you from Nuclear Winter." They did all that stuff. But it's a short-sightedness. These guys' castle is built on sand. When the figleaf gets ripped off, when people see what in fact is the operational strategy of the U.S. war-fighting machine — not its declared policy, but its operational strategy — when they see why these weapons are being built, and the dynamic that's in motion — then, it's like what happened around Vietnam. An enormous change takes place; the floodgates are opened. It opens up that possibility.

I don't think these guys are as strong as they think they are on this issue. I don't think they picked such a hot one to go down on. And I'm more than willing to take up their challenge on it. We're taking this up *not* like the ordinary every-day Oreo-cookie, Twinkie-loving mainstreamer who's going out to get Congressman Z to vote against this particular weapons system. What we're trying to do is pull off that fig leaf, peel the onion open, and expose what is really going on. And when we do that, the warmakers will have suffered an incredible setback and defeat.

QUESTION: What *did* you tell people about Vietnam instead of saying the money could be spent for schools and hospitals?

KISSINGER: I told them this was an imperialist war being conducted by the U.S. for the purpose of demonstrating that it could, through military power, stop a war of national liberation, conducted by People's War in the Third World. And for them at that time, that was the key political task on their agenda, because the main problem facing U.S. imperialism in the 1960's was the wars of national liberation breaking out all over the world. They set out to make Vietnam a test case, to show people that "You have no hope thru this avenue. No matter what you do we can crush you." And they got their ass kicked, it was great!

SCHWARTZ: The analogous thing about nuclear weapons is the fact nuclear weapons are not made to protect us or keep peace. They are a way to allow the rulers to dominate the world. That is what they've always been for, and continue to be for, and why they're always escalating them. And once you can get people to see that's what the weapons are for, then I think they can put together why something's wrong. It is very much as Clark said a battle for the hearts and minds of the people. That's what the anti-Vietnam War resistance was all about, and that's what this movement has to be about.

The only other thing I think is very important, is that I'm always afraid of talking too much about Star Wars because then you stop talking about MX and Trident II, and all the rest of it..

HASBROUCK: I'm a shameless propagandist, I think there needs to be more real thought about the engineering of what we're doing as propaganda. To me part of believing in nonviolence is that if you believe that force isn't necessary you believe that given the opportunity to see the facts and see the information, people will come to agree with me (or I'm wrong in the first place). If I think coercion isn't necessary then I have to believe in that. So the question is, how can we shape what we do in such a way that the message that gets out — through this incredibly warped and distorting amplifier of the media, which has very bizarre properties of distortion over which we have little control — to try consciously to shape what we do so that what comes out to people will be the kind of message and information that will somehow be the catalyst for them becoming willing to think about and act on these questions.

NATIONAL OFFICE STAFFPERSON: Since we're going to break soon, I want to advertise one thing in the Conference packet so people can look it over for later. It's a letter from the National Response Committee which points in the same direction you're speaking on: what work do we have to do in order to accomplish our goals? And it specifically points out that for NBAU as a political force, a group, a network, we have certain experience to bring to bear, and certain plans which we have to figure out here how to make real. You speakers have put out a lot for discussion, both on the focus on Star Wars this year, and also some of the basis, background, and controversy over NBAU. Ed emphasized that this weekend we'll be doing a lot of education, forum-type debate, and getting out questions and answers, but that this needs to be a working conference. At some of the earlier conferences elsewhere people found it extremely important to spend enough time talking to each other about what we have done so far, about what plans and conditions exist in different places — both in terms of our actual action plans for the chosen sites, but also to develop plans to go out and build October 20 as a massive political event: one that hits the front pages of the national press, that draws in thousands of people actively and thousands more in support. And thousands more criticizing us so we can get into it some more. So maybe we can keep that in mind over the break and get more into it when we come back.

HASBROUCK: Some of the local NBAU committee people stayed up all night to draw up a draft of a vision for what the action might be, which we can use to bat around and get more input, and adopt out of this conference.

QUESTION: This is one more question for Charlie. Because a lot of the opposition to Star Wars originated among the scientists, what has been the response of the government? Given there's a lot of different kinds of that opposition.

SCHWARTZ: The response from the government has been to shovel out more money. Coupled with some vague threats, like Mr. Hicks, the Undersecretary of Defense, who said, "Of course we have a policy that defense research contracts are handed out on a non-discriminatory basis, but personally I wouldn't want to give my money to people who oppose our policy." Which is absolutely correct and honest. But it offends academics!

Basically the government has been doing excellently well at selling Star Wars in spite of the overwhelming opposition from the most respectable scientific community. Anyone with any understanding of strategic sense knows that it's a bad thing to do. But the program has a political utility within various sectors, and it has a marvelous salesman. And as Clark said, a conjunction of many different things going for it. "Hey American people, we're going to save you. We're going to do it the high-tech American Way," and they have this great salesman. So it's been enormously powerful and successful politically. The scientists' criticism of it has been useful — it contributes to the debate and the opposition — but it's hardly going to win. What it takes to win it, I don't know. Now NBAU is trying to take a completely different approach, and it's absolutely essential that there be this very vigorous fighting reaction.

The question is how will things ferment off of that, and will Star Wars get separated from the other things? Well that's beyond our control. So again, don't rely too much on the scientists — make use of them — there are a lot of scientists who *want* to be politically useful, and you should help them do that. But I think the initiative has to come as people here are trying to formulate it.

KISSINGER: I want to call attention to one point Ed made in his presentation on how he considered working with NBAU and the whole approach that's needed. He pointed out that "We have to focus on what we have to do now in order to maximize our possibilities." And that's the spirit in which we ought to see this working conference. That's the concrete political task before us this weekend.

QUESTION: I'd like to add a bit, as someone who's been engaged in complicity for the last 35 years, on what the scientists can do about this. One way is to do what scientists generally do, to tell the truth about technical matters. It was very effective in the early 60's when one of the first elements of the strategic defense gaggle of weapons was considered. There was a project called BAMBI, Ballistic Missiles Boost Intercept. It was studied at a couple of places, one was SDL where I happened to be working. It turned out to be a fairly humorous project. The idea was to put several million orbiting objects in space, each of which would be autonomous, would have its own sensor, and when it detected the booster plume over Russia, it was to direct itself with its own propulsion motors to that point, and when it got into the neighborhood to explode its own atomic bomb, to destroy the booster. That's one of the few things still being seriously considered as a complement of SDI. At the time, the way this project was quickly put to bed, was in that institution to compute that the annual maintenance costs for such a cloud of devices would be somewhere-between 4 and 10 GNPs per annum. So it was clearly impractical, and wasn't heard from again — until recently when SDI let it rear its head again. But that's one thing scientists can do, and can do without any external participation or appearance whatsoever, from right within the defense industry.



Star Wars or Holocaust In The Heavens

Philip Berrigan

As a priest during the 1960's, Philip Berrigan took part in the first public destruction of Selective Service files and spent several years in prison for such actions against the Vietnam War. In 1980 he was one of the original Plowshares Eight who carried out an action of direct dismantling of war materiel in production at G.E.'s King of Prussia (Penna.) plant. He combines such actions with extensive speaking and writing, exposing U.S. war-making and preparations, calling for people of conscience to resist these deadly moves.

"There will be great earthquakes, plagues and famines in various places — and in the sky fearful omens and great signs." Luke 21:11

In this section, just prior to the account of the Passion, Luke writes with a double thrust: first, to describe the events attending the destruction of Jerusalem around 60 A.D., and then, to predict the signs of rebirth in creation as it throws off chains of sin, injustice and death. So that Christ as Lord might restore it to God.

Terrible physical and spiritual convulsions mark both events: natural uproar like "earthquakes, plagues and famines," "signs in the sun, moon and stars," "roaring of the sea and of the waves," and profound moral and political strife — "wars and insurrections," the clash of "nation against nation, kingdom against kingdom," persecutions, manhandling, trials, prison, betrayals by relatives and friends, executions. Indeed, says Matthew of the same phenomena, "because of the increase of evil, the love of most will grow cold." Matthew 24:12

They (commentators) say that Satan is the ape of God, an evil mimic, a perverse marionette whose service of evil God both guarantees and restricts. The thirteenth chapter of John's Revelation contains a striking example of the demonic anti-Trinity, and its complexity of egotism and slavishness.

The Dragon imitates the Parent in creation; the Sea Beast imitates the Son and his redemptive work; the Land Beast imitates the Spirit of God as pseudo-comforter and advocate.

Without attempting to wring from the text meaning that isn't there; without claiming either that this sign is of God and that sign is of Satan; without the risky business of sifting metaphors — if "fearful omens and great signs" will usher in a liberated creation and Christ accepting it for God, then Satan will compulsively fashion his own "fearful omens and great signs" in the sky.

Star Wars seems to meet a number of devilish criteria — it is masterful in deceit (defensive system?) and it is omniscient (with Counterforce weaponry) in design. It comes as a monstrous culmination to five decades of terror — fifty million WW II dead, saturation bombing, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Korea, Indochina, Lebanon, Central America, Counterforce Policy, Euromissiles, Trident, MX, B-1, intensified testing (despite the Soviet Moratorium). The insanity has reached such a numbing crescendo that mere human evil no longer offers explanation. What we witness today is the possession of the major bureaucracies — empires, nation/states, multinationals, corporate media, education and church by demonic forces which the bureaucracies themselves are the last to understand and the last to name. How else to explain their deranged compulsion to curse the heavens with the most unnatural of human activity — war?

Nor can I resist observing that I could not imagine two more classic dupes for demonic manipulation than Edward Teller (the Father of the H-Bomb) and Ronald Reagan (the mouthpiece of the imperial bosses), the first who fantasized Star Wars and the other who hawks it to the "Free World."

II.

"The Lord said to Israel: 'The relationship between yourselves and me is always that of strangers and settlers. If you will live in the world like strangers, remembering that you are here but temporarily, then I will be a settler in your midst; I will dwell with you permanently. But if you regard yourselves as settlers, as permanent owners of the land on which you live, when the land is actually not yours but mine, I will be a stranger and not dwell in your midst. In any case you, O Israel, and I cannot be strangers and settlers at the same time. If you act the stranger, I will be the settler, and if you act the settler, I must be the stranger.'" (Anon.)

The reader might find "stranger" misleading. Perhaps custodian, steward, shepherd, caretaker, protector or defender would serve better.

Why does the Lord love the "stranger," promising to remain as friend? Because of truth; because the "stranger" renders to God what is God's. The "stranger" reverences what is God's — children, the poor, women, the land, one's talent of spirit, mind or body. The "stranger" possesses a vision that is no less than insight into God's order of justice and peace, employs means consistently non-violent with the vision, and has the audacity to share with God's Spirit the re-creation of the world. The life of the "stranger" is best epitomized by the life of Christ.

In contrast, the settler is at heart an idolator, a thief, a slave who will step on other bodies to own and control. The settler robs — first from God, or from the poor, or from those who have what he covets. Then the settler defends his loot — with the law and behind the law, the bun and bomb.

Both the U.S. and Israel are classic settler states. Both profess the God of the Bible; both have driven out, even exterminated the original inhabitants of the land they now occupy; both possess the Bomb; both claim to be guardians of democracy, human rights and freedom; both are stupefying in their pretension, hypocrisy and fraud.

Americans should familiarize themselves with the settler mindset — we have it luxuriously available to us in our history. More recently, American settlers split the atom for war; settlers atomized Hiroshima and Nagasaki; settlers led the Arms Race for forty years, under the twin buzzwords of enemy and deterrence; settlers escalated out of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) into First Strike policy and weaponry; settlers loose their "freedom fighters" against the Nicaraguans; settlers both plan to fight and to win a nuclear war. Settlers envision the Strategic Defense Initiative (Star Wars), not in defense as they claim, but in offense — to ratify a disarming First Strike by protecting command centers and missile silos (not people) from retaliatory or second strike.

Star Wars is the apex of settler hypocrisy and arrogance. In a March 23, 1983 speech, President Reagan called upon the scientific community "to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete." Weinberger echoes the same unequivocal emphasis, "what we want to try is to get a system which would develop a defense that is thoroughly reliable and total."

In that same speech, Reagan openly broke with MAD doctrine: "I have become more and more deeply convinced that the human spirit must be capable of rising above

dealing with other nations and human beings by threatening their existence." While Teller, who borrowed the Star Wars fantasy from a Whiz Kid of the Lawrence Livermore Laboratories, or dredged it up from his sublime imagination — he met with Reagan four times prior to the speech — wrote the President that Star Wars "would end the MAD era and commence a period of assured survival on terms favorable to the Western alliance."

An impenetrable defense, however, despite the huckstering of Reagan and Weinberger, is no longer a rational goal of Star Wars. General Abrahamson, who heads up the Star Wars organization, admits this: "A perfect astrodome defense is not a realistic thing. Star Wars, if perfectly efficient, can stop intercontinental ballistic missiles, but not jet bombers, cruise missiles, or suitcase bombs."

Pretty much everyone in the war establishment has given up on the idea of protecting the American people. Perhaps for quite a long time, they have been captivated by the illogic of the obscenities they serve. Consequently, they see Star Wars as protection for command posts and missile silos. One Congressman, Jim Courter, of the House Arms Services Committee, says Star Wars is "a point defense system to protect the MX missile." Which seems a reality somewhat removed from the devious sales pitch of Reagan, Weinberger, and the Pentagon.

Now, protecting missile silos and command posts seems a resurrection of MAD doctrine. But Star Wars is much more. Listen to Robert Aldridge, the ex-Lockheed engineer: "If Soviet missiles which survive a first-strike attack could be intercepted in flight, that would remove any threat of retaliation and there would be no restraining force on U.S. aggressive behavior. The concept of deterrence, for all its faults and ambiguities, would be nullified and the U.S. could attack the Soviet Union with impunity." One scientist, Frank von Hippel, asserted this: "Such a system makes much more sense as an adjunct to a first-strike capability than as a shield from a first-strike."

Star Wars bears a celestial similarity to Navy's ASW (anti-submarine warfare) campaign, with its presumptuous aim that in the event of an American first-strike, the Navy will wipe out the Russian submarine fleet and its retaliatory capacity. Both Star Wars and ASW are feverish gropings for a technological breakthrough that would allow a disarming first-strike with acceptable consequences to the American mainland.

The Soviets have about 6,000 land based ICBM's. If the American warmakers initiated a disarming first-strike against them that was 95% effective, 300 missiles would remain, enough to devastate the U.S. But if the Star Wars shield was 90% effective, only 30 would penetrate, or even less, supposing the first-strike hits Soviet command and control functions.

These grisly calculations grievously tempt U.S. strategists, making a sneak attack and nuclear war much more attractive.

Both Superpowers go ape at the thought of the empty silo syndrome — they would rather have an empty silo than one caught in a first-strike. As the saying goes, "You don't build 'em to lose them that way." (What happens on the other end of the trajectory is a matter of no concern.) In any case, both are tempted to strike first. If the Soviets struck first, they would lose 5,400 of their missiles to a 90% effective Star Wars. Six hundred would atomize the continental U.S. In a word, 600 missiles getting through is better than 30, according to the logic of the madmen playing nuclear roulette on both sides. Given the deployment of Star Wars, "the incentive to cut one's losses by striking first in a crisis will be even greater than it is now," claim a brace of scientists writing in the *Scientific American*.

Star Wars is equivalently war — everything warlike short of nuclear exchange. It is being engineered to protect itself as it wheels through space to destroy the Soviet C3I vehicles (command, control, communications, intelligence), and to engage any ICBM's that escape first-strike. Already, the Soviets have begun measures to saturate the Star Wars shield, or to avoid it altogether. It violates the 1972 ABM Treaty, and it destroys the miniscule hope associated with the Geneva talks. Moreover, the scope of this lunatic project is so vast — some claim that deployment of an effective system would cost \$1 trillion — that it will radically alter this society into a Space Wars, Star Wars one, accommodated more and more to the politicians, generals and arms profiteers — to the opportunists, parasites and hucksters of death.

Star Wars is emphatically a settler's adventure. It indicates, to a shocking degree, the lengths of blindness, cruelty, waste and greed to which the settler dogma can take one. The settlers have desecrated the planet with war, poison and famine, driving god from God's earth. Their vainglory and arrogance is limitless and it is now transferred to the heavens, intending to desecrate them in turn. As the poet writes, addressing God, "Now our rebellion is at your gate."

III.

"The world and all that is in it belong to the Lord,
The earth and all who live on it are God's."

Psalm 24:1

I will not close with moral exhortations to Biblical conversion or to non-violent resistance. It suffices to say that we will go mad if we don't resist the nuclear madness; we will become lawless if we don't resist the lawlessness; we will become hateful if we don't fight the systemic hatred and cruelty; we will become a settler if we don't become a stranger. We can't be ransomed by Christ and bought by Caesar.

There are no spectators, no neutrals, no impartial audiences. To be a spectator is an imperial illusion, and the system itself is a colossal, murderous illusion. We ought to shed ours.

I will close with a section of Psalm 19:

"The heavens declare the glory of God, And the firmament proclaims God's handiwork. Day pours out the word to day, And night to night imparts knowledge; Not a word nor a discourse Whose voice is not heard; Through all the earth their voice resounds, And to the ends of the world, their message."

(Originally published in "Year One", from Jonah House, Md., February 1986. Reprinted with permission of the author.)

This letter first circulated at the four Regional NBAU Conferences in May and June, 1986.

A Letter from the NBAU National Response Committee to the NBAU Action Network May 26, 1986

Dear Friends:

In the weeks just before the April 21 NO BUSINESS AS USUAL, FOCUS: STAR WARS! actions, the U.S. government committed a series of major military attacks against Libya, striking first in the Gulf of Sidra and again in mid-April with massive bombing raids against Tripoli and Benghazi. These acts of sheer state terrorism were responded to with massive political protest in countries around the world.

During these same weeks, the U.S. was also strenuously working to more firmly establish the political pretexts and military footing for direct U.S. intervention in Central America, and telegraphing real possibilities for that in a military and media campaign reminding many of the Gulf of Tonkin incident.

In both instances we have witnessed the actions of this government and been outraged not only by the murder and lies at hand, but by the dramatic escalation these assaults represent in the heightening of international tensions and interlinked crises, pushing the world toward the brink of a nuclear World War III. Going into our April 21 actions, NBAU not only responded by including resistance to U.S. attacks against Libya in the actions, but also stepped forward to initiate and join with others in demonstrations, press conferences and forums in several cities.

As we approach October 20 and our next national day of actions, NBAU faces a serious challenge. At the Regional NBAU Conferences now meeting to plan and build through the coming months, we urge everyone to recognize how sharply the recent U.S. moves in the Middle East have intensified the world situation our Pledge describes, presenting our movement with new challenges. How are Star Wars and recent military aggressions in the Middle East or elsewhere part of the same process of world war preparations we oppose and resist? What do these new events mean for the work of NBAU and others in the anti-war movement?

We must continue to do everything we can to build, expand, and strengthen a movement based on our main slogan, in a world situation which is rapidly shifting and presenting dramatic new events with each passing week. The Middle East crisis neither happens in a political vacuum, nor did it end with the April bombing and propaganda blitz to date. Similarly, the government's effort to utilize Congressional voting on aid to the Contras, diplomatic maneuvering, and calculated repression of the Sanctuary movement and other resisters to its role in the region, all signal an unrelenting program of defending U.S. strategic interests in "America's own backyard."

It is clear that the summer and fall of 1986 will see no abatement of the Middle East crisis nor of the speed of world developments toward global war. Therefore the movement of genuine opposition which NBAU seeks to build must continue to aim at the actual developments of war preparation, including not only the Star Wars program and related questions, but all new U.S. moves of political and military aggression in the Middle East, as well as in Central America. While NBAU and others did respond with protest and opposition to the U.S. attacks on Libya, there was a sharp contrast between the level and strength of opposition that erupted everywhere else in the world, and within this country. It seems to us that one reason behind this problem is the hesitation of many in the movement who need to be calling for and building for mass actions to oppose outrages like this to do so when it means "targeting our own government." Many people are already active in political movements focussed on many urgent issues, yet were not quick to see that the severity of events in the Middle East demanded that all of us have a responsibility to speak out and step forward to oppose major escalations by the war makers, whether it happens in the Middle East, Central America, or anywhere else. Any narrowing of political focus to "separate issues" and "separate movements" limits our efforts to a very Business As Usual approach. The events of this spring have underscored NBAU's point: not only is the government pushing the Star Wars program ahead with great haste — it also will not hesitate to go to war before the Star Wars weaponry is in place!

The Regional Conferences are an important launching pad for NBAU's nation-wide activities moving toward October 20. We urge everyone in the Network to spend plenty of conference time collectively struggling over these questions, to forge ambitious plans for truly "putting NBAU's politics on the map" on a national scale, and to unite even more widely with all the diverse groupings and forces who can add strength to the impact of our message:

**THEY WON'T LISTEN TO REASON,
THEY WON'T BE BOUND BY VOTES
THE GOVERNMENTS MUST BE STOPPED FROM
LAUNCHING WORLD WAR III,
NO MATTER WHAT IT TAKES!**

Given what we've already achieved with the Focus: Star Wars! campaign, and in light of the new developments in open war preparations with U.S. escalations in the Middle East and Central America now underway, we propose these initial points for discussion, debate and education, and as signposts for the plans to be made for the rest of NBAU '86:

1) The gravity of the current Middle East crisis, in particular the U.S. government's campaign to promote its pretext of "a war against terrorism" for its military acts of aggression against Libya, only reiterates the point that "They won't listen to reason, they won't be bound by votes." New escalations seem likely; they may again involve direct aggression by the U.S. itself, or could take the form of Israel as U.S. proxy attacking Syria. While we don't think NBAU as a broad Network needs to adopt a political position that supports or opposes any of the political forces involved in the region, we feel that it is necessary for NBAU to oppose any and all further U.S. aggressions there.

Further, it is entirely consistent with our Pledge to oppose attempts by governments in the Middle East and beyond to oppress the Palestinian people. We will not wait for the next bombs to start falling to initiate and encourage mass political activity to condemn and oppose all new U.S. war moves in the Middle East. Such "Business As Usual" crimes must be resisted not only in and of themselves, but because they are part of a rapidly escalating dynamic that moves international conflicts in any regional confrontation point between the great powers closer to the brink of world war.

2) At the Regional Conferences, we urge everyone to discuss and sum up the activities of NBAU in response to the bombing of Libya. How did different April 21 actions incorporate the events in the Middle East, and what were the results? In several cities, such as Chicago and Cleveland, NBAU activists took initiative very quickly to contact other groups and call for actions opposing the bombing. What can we learn from their approach and experience; can we build off this beginning, how can we be more effective and timely at responding to critical new war moves like the Libyan crisis? We see an important responsibility for the NBAU Action Network to step up our efforts along many avenues locally and nationally to work for stronger and broad united opposition to these war moves with a diverse range of other organizations, movements, and individuals; what are the best ways to do this in an urgent, ongoing way?

3) We stated from the outset of the Focus: Star Wars! campaign that:

"The issue is not, and never has been, one of this or that weapons system. The issue is complicity versus responsibility, as open preparations for nuclear world war intensify, with Star Wars playing a central role."

Star Wars has continued to occupy the role of "the government's flagship for war preparations." NBAU's campaign of protest and exposure has made a vital contribution to the struggle, involving and reaching large and broad numbers of people. Our teach-in, media outreach, public speaking and especially the April 21 actions around the country, are having a real impact on the Star Wars debate in the broadest public arena, and on the struggle of the anti-war movement to press forward. Moving toward October 20, this work should continue and spread.

Because we have been insistent and visible in raising our point that Star Wars offers hard evidence that the government really is planning now to launch, fight and win a nuclear war, we have aided in breaking debate open beyond the limits acceptable to the war makers (who would prefer to keep it on the terms of "but will it work?" and "how much will it cost?"). And because we have been insistent, visible, and growing as a movement that targets war preparations as a whole rather than isolating any one component, we are raising a healthy challenge to the movement and the public: the NBAU slogan is not just words, it must be translated into mass political action to oppose every new step in the preparations for world war if there's to be any chance of stopping this war. This is a contribution which the whole NBAU Action Network should continue to make, through the rest of NO BUSINESS AS USUAL '86 and beyond.

Yours in the struggle to prevent World War III,

Norm Gottwald, Rich Hutchinson, Lily of the World War III Vets, Leonard Post, Tracie Stein, Stephanie Tang, and Ed Hasbrouck*

* Ed Hasbrouck joined the Response Committee in July after this letter was first published.



**NO BUSINESS AS USUAL ACTION NETWORK
DIRECTORY LIST AUGUST 1986**

NBAU National Office
3309 1/2 Mission St. #127
San Francisco, CA 94110
415/549-3077 (office)
415/550-8506 (messages)

NBAU Nat'l Office is open 11 am to 2 pm, Mon. thru Fri.

EASTERN REGION

NBAU NEW YORK / WW 3 YETS
P.O. Box 1730
Stuyvesant Station
New York, NY 10009
212/713-5536 (messages)

NBAU WASHINGTON, DC
c/o Washington Peace Center
2111 Florida Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20008

NBAU BALTIMORE
P.O. Box 33127
Baltimore, MD 21218
301/243-8224

NBAU BOSTON
617/579-2765

SOUTHERN REGION

NBAU ATLANTA
P.O. Box 8278
Atlanta, GA 30306
404/642-3214

NBAU HOUSTON
1713 Westheimer #5640
Houston, TX 77098-1698

NBAU MIAMI
P.O. Box 16396
Plantation, FL 33318-6396
305/447-7874 (messages)

NBAU DALLAS
c/o Weiss
P.O. Box 901202
Dallas, TX 75390-1202

NBAU BATON ROUGE
c/o A. Waguspack
Combined Effort
228 W. Chimes
Baton Rouge, LA 70802

NBAU NEW ORLEANS
c/o J. Golding
3121 Annunciation
New Orleans, LA 70115

WESTERN REGION

NBAU BAY AREA

c/o NBAU Nat'l Office
3309 1/2 Mission St. #127
San Francisco, CA 94110
415/550-8506 (messages)

NBAU LOS ANGELES

P.O. Box 3261
Los Angeles, CA 90051

NBAU PORTLAND

c/o S.M.
P.O. Box 12346
Portland, OR 97212
503/288-1927 (Meche)

NBAU HAWAII

c/o D. Birch
P.O. Box 2499
Honolulu, HI 96804
808/524-5411

NBAU SEATTLE

219 First Avenue #192
Seattle, WA 98109-4893

MIDWESTERN REGION

NBAU CHICAGO

P.O. Box A3510
Chicago, IL 60690
312/427-2533 (Rich Hutchinson)
312/663-1600 x381 (Kevin Coffee)

NBAU ST. LOUIS

P.O. Box 2973
St. Louis, MO 63130

NBAU KANSAS

c/o Dan Parkinson
926 West 24th St. #6
Lawrence, KS 66046

NBAU WESTERN MICHIGAN

c/o Chris Fechner
16325 Bloem Dr.
Spring Lake, MI 48456

NBAU CLEVELAND

P.O. Box 411
Cleveland, OH 44107-0411
216/451-3427 (M,T 12-4; Th 12-8)

NBAU CINCINNATI

c/o C. Trask, WAIF-FM
2525 Victory Parkway
Cincinnati, OH 45206
513/861-0266

NBAU KENT

c/o S. Jeffers
Rm. 6, Stopher Hall
Kent State University
Kent, OH 44243

NBAU INDIANAPOLIS

P.O. Box 30125
Indianapolis, IN 46230

