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Abstract

This thesis is an ethnography of the contemporary nuclear disarmament movement. It describes some of the ways in which participants symbolize, articulate and act on their belief that human survival is seriously endangered by the existence and proliferation of nuclear weapons. Illustrations are given of the manner in which participants invoke the authority of scientific, military and technical "experts" to substantiate their claims of the imminence of catastrophe. Also depicted is the participants' practice of posing alternatives for humanity, the most basic formulations being: "disarmament or annihilation," and "transformation or catastrophe." They insist that humanity has an urgent choice to make: to achieve nuclear disarmament or face annihilation. They warn that a nuclear holocaust is inevitable unless steps are taken immediately to prevent it. Some participants believe that the steps necessary to avert catastrophe involve the complete transformation of the existing world order.

In this thesis I focus on those who believe that disarmament and human survival demand a complete transformation of the existing world order, and who have adopted a strategy based upon an ideology of "nonviolence" to accomplish this. Two events organized by participants are described which are part of an overall nonviolent strategy to achieve nuclear disarmament and a transformed world. A case study is made of the world view and approach to nuclear disarmament of a well
known proponent of "nonviolence," who had a great deal of input in the planning and organizing of one of these events. My concerns and interests as a new participant in the disarmament movement in Vancouver, and more especially in the Trident campaign, have to a large degree informed which facets of the nuclear disarmament movement are described in this thesis. The Trident campaign is an on-going series of protest activities organized with the goal of halting the deployment of the Trident submarine nuclear weapons system, and the construction of the Trident base at Bangor, Washington.

I begin the introductory chapter by providing an autobiographical sketch which is intended to "set the scene" for the following ethnographic description of certain aspects of the nuclear disarmament movement. A brief summary of each of the chapters is provided, followed by a discussion of methodology. This discussion considers: my purposes in choosing this topic; my role as both researcher of, and new participant in, the movement; data collection procedures; and some of the cognitive and ethical difficulties which arose in producing this ethnography. The data collection activities which are the basis for this ethnographic description of the movement are: fieldwork; taped in-depth interviews; and the collection and examination of various kinds of written and audio-visual materials produced primarily by movement participants in Canada and the United States. Fieldwork experience was mostly with Canadian and American participants in the Trident campaign.
The second chapter, entitled "Millennial Dreams and Apocalyptic Nightmares," draws attention to a few of the symbolic themes evident in participants' call for a new and better social order, and their warning of imminent catastrophe. I observe that frequently participants draw upon Judaeo-Christian images, symbols, themes and values embedded in the Western cultural tradition to express their longing for a new world of universal peace, justice and prosperity, and also to express their terror of the cataclysmic destruction of human civilization.

The third chapter, entitled "Mobilizing for Survival," describes two events or "demonstrations" which took place at the time of the first United Nations Special Session on Disarmament in May 1978. The first was held in the vicinity of the Trident base. The climax of this demonstration was a carefully staged trespass action onto the naval facility which resulted in the arrest of 265 people. Participants referred to their illegal entry of the base as an "action of civil disobedience." The second demonstration took place in New York City near the site of the United Nations buildings. Both events are viewed as attempts to symbolize, proclaim, and somehow bring into being a new world: a world without war.

The fourth chapter, entitled "The Choice: Kingdom or Holocaust," is a case study which examines the world view and approach to nuclear disarmament of which Jim Douglass is a well known proponent. Douglass has had considerable
input in the group process of planning and organizing the Trident campaign. His most recent book, *Lightning East to West*, outlines his vision of the spirit and strategy of this campaign. Greatly influenced by the Trappist monk and writer, Thomas Merton, Douglass' approach to nuclear disarmament incorporates elements of Christianity along with Gandhian principles of nonviolence.

In the concluding chapter I briefly review some of the main themes depicted in the ethnography, and finish with some personal reflections.

The appendix provides the trial statements of three persons who committed civil disobedience at the Trident base in Bangor, Washington.
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Chapter One  Introduction

And the train
the train made of nothing but boxcars
jammed with three billion people
still stands in the station
trembling.

Lawrence Ferlinghetti,
"White on White"

I was born in Vancouver in 1954, a child of the Cold War and the first decade after Hiroshima. Like others of my generation, I was aware from an early age that there was a danger of my familiar world, and perhaps the whole world, being destroyed by "the Bomb." Memories from elementary school years include the eerie wail of air raid sirens being tested, and a neighbour building an underground fallout shelter. In a high school English course, we read John Hersey's book *Hiroshima*, which in a matter-of-fact style presented the accounts of six survivors of the atomic blast which devasted that city on August 6, 1945. We also read John Wyndham's *The Chrysalids*, a fictional story about conflict over genetic mutations arising in an isolated community located in Newfoundland, centuries after a nuclear war had destroyed most of human civilization and left vast areas of the world contaminated by radiation. Phrases like "countdown to Armageddon" and "nuclear holocaust" were common in the plays and "science fiction" novels we read in those years.
When I was 16, I travelled with students and teachers from my high school on a youth hostel tour of Japan. One of the stops was at Hiroshima. We were met at the train station by a small delegation which presented our group with a huge bouquet of flowers and welcomed us to the "city of peace." I remember that my friends and I were overwhelmed by a sense of guilt, even though we had not yet been born at the time of the blast, nor did we come from the country which had dropped the bomb. I don't think that we were even aware that the uranium in the bomb had come from Canada. But we were very conscious of being North American and white and felt guilty, somehow complicit in that act which had produced such horrible suffering.

On our first night at the Hiroshima youth hostel, our tour group was shown two films which disturbed us deeply. The first was taken soon after the atomic blast, and showed with gruesome detail the immediate destruction, death and injury caused by the bomb. The second film had been made 25 years after the first. It was a documentary of the gradual death of a young woman who had been a baby at the time of the blast, and who was one of the many survivors to develop cancer and other "atomic bomb" diseases years later. The film brought home to us the grim fact that in our own lifetime people were still dying as a result of a bomb dropped 25 years before. We were all in tears, and one girl was hysterical and outraged at our hosts for showing us these films.
The next day we toured the Hiroshima memorial museum. The permanent exhibit at the museum is a collection of photographs and artifacts methodically displayed as evidence of the effects upon human beings and the physical environment of a uranium bomb, which produced an explosive force equivalent to 13 kilo-tons of conventional TNT explosive and a fireball which attained a maximum temperature of several million degrees Celsius. We saw the rock about which Sidney Lens said years later,

At Hiroshima there's a museum, and outside that museum there's a rock, on that rock there's a shadow. That shadow is all that remains of the human being who stood there on August 6, 1945 when the nuclear age began.

In the most real sense of the word, that is the choice before us. We shall either end war and the nuclear arms race in this generation, or as certain as we are here tonight we will all be shadows on the rock. (1978:5)

We visited a small park behind the museum. There was an archway from which were hanging many long streamers comprised of thousands of tiny paper (origami) cranes made by Japanese high school students in memory of students who had perished in the blast. Some Japanese students came over to talk to us. It was so easy to talk. They were eager and so were we, to promise each other that we would try, in our own countries and in our own lives, to ensure that never again would human beings suffer the fate of the atomic bomb victims of Hiroshima. In the ensuing years, the memory of that trip and that promise faded.

But "the Bomb" was not the only threat to humanity's continued existence with which we were presented in our high school years. A couple of teachers told us about Rachel
Carson's book *Silent Spring*, which predicted ecological disaster resulting from continued pollution of the environment; Paul Ehrlich's *The Population Bomb* which warned of global famine resulting from "the population explosion"; and the Club of Rome's studies which forecast the collapse of the industrial world through depletion of the world's resources. We also encountered Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, George Orwell's *1984*, and some of Ayn Rand's books -- all of which provided alternate nightmare versions of dehumanized societies of the future. All these "scientific" and "fictional" accounts were presented as projections of what the authors saw as current trends in our society.

Woven into our understanding of the world was the possibility of the end of the world through nuclear holocaust; or the extinction of humanity through overpopulation, pollution or exhaustion of the material resources of the planet. Also possible was the extinguishing of the human spirit through genetic or social engineering. Thus our world view included assumptions in basic contradiction to the "natural attitude" which takes the world for granted and thereby assumes that what has proved valid will continue to do so, and that the world will go on as before (Schutz, 1970:80). Our world view contained assumptions that the world would not, indeed could not, go on as before -- if the world continued along in the same course, a possible, perhaps inevitable consequence would be self-destruction.
This account of a segment of my life is provided with E.H. Carr's (1962) caveat that history is a construction and interpretation of the past in the eyes of the present. I provide the account for two purposes. First, to give the reader an indication of some of the understandings and experiences I bring to this study, since these will inevitably affect the kind of ethnography I write. Second, and more importantly, to provide the reader with an indication of some of the ideas and experiences available to a Canadian growing up in an upper middle class suburb in the 1950's and 1960's. These are the kinds of ideas and experiences which contribute to a world view which can render comprehensible, and even plausible, Jim Douglass' assertion that:

We have only a few seconds left. Tens of thousands of thermonuclear missiles poised around the globe provide the context of our age: an eschatological context, a final context, a time of ultimate significance for every human thought and action because any of our actions can contribute to a chain of events, to a karmic circle, which will end in the end of humanity. Whether our end be by nuclear war or the related dangers of global famine, exhaustion of resources, and the death of our environment, we have only a few seconds left. (circa 1972:1)

It is my intent that this autobiographical sketch will "set the scene" for the following ethnography of a social movement which has emerged in recent decades in response to a pervasive sense that humanity is on the brink of nuclear annihilation. Jim Douglass is a well-known figure in the movement, which will be referred to as the "nuclear disarmament movement."
This ethnography of the contemporary nuclear disarmament movement describes some of the ways in which participants symbolize, articulate and act on their belief that humanity is living in the shadow of an imminent nuclear holocaust -- an impending Doomsday. They assert that humanity has an immediate choice to make: to proceed to disarmament, and the adoption of conciliation as the way to solve international disputes, or face annihilation. Using a variety of means, including mass demonstrations and civil disobedience, they are trying to alert their fellow citizens to the urgent reality of the choice before them. They are also trying to put pressure on those in positions of power to halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament.

There is a wide range of opinion within the movement as to how disarmament can actually be accomplished, and the kinds of changes in the social, political and economic order this would require. In this thesis I focus on those who believe that disarmament and human survival demand a complete transformation of the existing world order, and who have adopted a strategy based upon an ideology of "nonviolence" to accomplish this. I examine the world view and approach to disarmament of Jim Douglass, a proponent of a spiritually based ideology of nonviolence, who characterizes the choice before humanity to be between "kingdom or holocaust." Douglass is a founder of two groups involved in organizing a campaign of "nonviolent resistance" to the American Trident submarine nuclear weapon system. Some
believe that this campaign may significantly contribute to averting a nuclear holocaust and achieving disarmament.

The contemporary nuclear disarmament movement is comprised of dozens of groups with diverse origins and histories. Included, for example, are pacifist Christian churches such as the Mennonites and Society of Friends (Quakers), which have for centuries rejected warfare. The roots of the spiritually eclectic Fellowship of Reconciliation and the more secular War Resisters' League can be linked to the activities of Quakers working for peace and the establishment of a "conscientious objector" status around the time of World War I. Groups of women working for disarmament, such as the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom which was founded in 1915, have their origins in the struggle for equal rights and decision-making power for women. The more recent environmental or ecology movement has spawned numerous "anti-nuclear" groups which are active in opposing both nuclear power plants and nuclear weapons. The current nonviolent campaign to prevent the deployment of Trident has attracted participants from groups emerging from these, and other, traditions.

The tradition which informs Douglass' approach to disarmament, and that of numerous other participants, is a relatively recent amalgam of Gandhian nonviolence and radical Catholicism. This tradition informed the activities of Douglass and a few hundred others in an earlier movement.
opposing American involvement in the Indochina war. Douglass, through his writings, was considered a spokesman of this earlier movement, which was dubbed by the media the "Catholic Left." Other well-known figures associated with this movement were Daniel and Philip Berrigan, Thomas Merton, and Dorothy Day (founder of the Catholic Worker movement). The current Trident campaign could be considered, in part, an outgrowth of this earlier movement. It is clear that Douglass, the Berrigans and many other members of the "Catholic Left" view their present involvement in the nuclear disarmament movement as a logical progression from their anti-Vietnam war activities. They refer to lessons learned in this earlier movement, and use similar symbols and actions in their attempts to communicate their conviction that nuclear weapons must be abolished. The world view and approach to disarmament of Douglass, as depicted in this thesis, are provided as an example of the way in which some participants symbolize, articulate and act on their belief that humanity's continued existence is threatened by the total death of nuclear incineration.

In this first introductory chapter I provide a brief summary of each of the chapters in the thesis, and then discuss the methodology of producing this ethnography. The discussion considers some of the cognitive and ethical problems which arose in the course of research and writing.
In the second chapter, entitled "Millennial Dreams and Apocalyptic Nightmares," I note there have been movements in many societies throughout history which have warned of some sort of imminent catastrophe, and called for a new and better social order. In anthropological literature various terms are used to refer to these phenomena, including "millenarian" or "revitalization" movements. I provide some of the assertions which nuclear disarmament movement participants use to articulate and justify their belief that a nuclear catastrophe is imminent, and that a new social order is necessary. I also provide a brief description of some of the features they hope to be manifested in the new world they are trying to realize. I observe that frequently participants in the nuclear disarmament movement draw upon Judaeo-Christian images, symbols, themes and values embedded in the Western cultural tradition to express their longing for a new world of universal peace, justice and prosperity, and also to express their terror of the cataclysmic destruction of human civilization.

The third chapter, entitled "Mobilizing for Survival," describes two events organized by the movement, which took place at the time of the first United Nations Special Session on Disarmament in May 1978. The first, which I attended, was held in the state of Washington, near and at the site of a military facility scheduled to become a base for the Trident submarine. The climax of this event was a carefully
staged trespass action onto the naval base which resulted in the arrest of 265 people. Hundreds of supporters, soldiers, police and media representatives were present to witness the illegal entry onto the base, which movement participants referred to as "an action of civil disobedience." The second event occurred during the same week in New York City near the site of the United Nations buildings. The climax of this event was a dramatic enactment of a nuclear attack, in which an estimated 15,000 persons participated. Both events are interpreted as ritual occasions in which through oratory, song, procession and group dramatization, participants articulated both their understanding of and dissatisfaction with the existing social order, and their conceptions of and commitment to a better social order. The events are viewed as attempts to symbolize, proclaim and somehow bring into being a new world: a world without war.

The fourth chapter, entitled "The Choice: Kingdom or Holocaust," is a case study which examines the world view and approach to nuclear disarmament of which Jim Douglass is a well-known proponent. Douglass is one of the founders of both the Pacific Life Community and Ground Zero Centre for Nonviolent Action, two groups which have been prominent in organizing opposition to the construction of the Trident submarine base at Bangor, Washington. Douglass has had considerable input in the group process of planning the
on-going series of protest activities referred to by participants as "the Trident campaign." His latest book, entitled *Lightning East to West*, outlines his vision of the "spirit and strategy of the Trident campaign." This vision employs as its central image the biblical millennial prophecy from Matthew 24:27 that, "The coming of the Son of Man will be like lightning in the east flashing far into the west." Douglass contends that the choice before humanity is annihilation by the lightning fire of nuclear holocaust, or nonviolent transformation by the lightning fire of a spiritual force of "Truth" and Love which can unite all of humanity in a "kingdom of oneness."

In the concluding chapter I briefly review some of the main themes depicted in the ethnography. I finish by sharing some personal reflections on the Ferlinghetti verse which introduces this piece of work.

The appendix provides the trial statements of three persons who committed civil disobedience at the Trident base, by climbing a fence and illegally trespassing on the naval facility. As is usually done at the Trident civil disobedience trials, defense lawyers were present merely in an advisory capacity, and the defendants represented themselves. These statements will be referred to several times to illustrate the manner in which some participants symbolize and articulate their belief that humanity's existence is threatened by nuclear holocaust.
Methodology

The impetus for writing an ethnography of the contemporary nuclear disarmament movement derived largely from my own peripheral role in the movement as a rather ignorant newcomer and a somewhat hesitant participant. It was my hope that in the process of research and writing, I would develop an understanding of the groups, the ideas, and the activities which constitute the movement — an understanding which would help in deciding about the nature of my own future involvement in the movement. Simply stated, my intent was to use my thesis as a way of educating myself about, and coming to terms with, a movement for social change in which I was becoming involved. It was also my hope, of course, that this study would contribute to a reader's understanding, perhaps even appreciation, of the message and purpose of the nuclear disarmament movement.
The following kinds of data collection activities are the basis of this ethnographic description of the nuclear disarmament movement:

(i) fieldwork

(ii) taped, in-depth interviews

(iii) the collection and examination of various kinds of written and audio-visual materials, produced primarily by movement participants in Canada and the United States.

(i) fieldwork

My entry to the fieldwork context occurred before I contemplated this research. In the spring of 1977, I attended a meeting at a friend's home to view a slide presentation concerning the Trident submarine nuclear weapon system. Shelley and Jim Douglass, as representatives of the Pacific Life Community, gave the presentation and responded to questions. It was the first time that I had met people in the Vancouver area who were actively working to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons. I became interested in the protest against the Trident submarine base under construction in Bangor, Washington, and that summer attended a week-long "nonviolent training session" held near the base. The purpose of the training session was to prepare participants for, and facilitate their engagement in
"non-violent resistance to Trident." At that time, terms which will be later discussed in this thesis, such as "non-violence," "civil disobedience," and "affinity group" were unfamiliar to me.

In Vancouver in the fall of 1977 I began attending weekly meetings of the Pacific Life Community. At these meetings were discussed plans for an eight-month project of public education to culminate with an "occupation" of the Trident base on the eve of the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament. I also began attending meetings of the newly formed Ad Hoc Coalition for Disarmament, which was composed of approximately sixteen groups in the Vancouver area. The Coalition was formed for the purpose of cooperating in activities to focus public attention on the upcoming U.N. Special Session on Disarmament, and to put pressure on the Canadian government to take a strong pro-disarmament position at the Special Session. I was unfamiliar with most of the groups represented in the Vancouver based Coalition, and was surprised to find that, unlike the Pacific Life Community, most of the people in the other groups were middle-aged and elderly. Out of my own interest to find out about these other groups and their approach to nuclear disarmament, I volunteered to be the Pacific Life Community representative to the Ad Hoc Coalition for Disarmament. It was at this early point of my involvement in the nuclear disarmament
movement that I decided to write some sort of ethnography of the movement for my M.A. thesis. Over the next eight months from October 1977 to May 1978, I participated as a "working" member of both the Pacific Life Community and the Ad Hoc Coalition for Disarmament. I was at the same time working on a thesis proposal.

From February to May of 1978, I participated in the work of organizing, publicizing and facilitating training workshops for the demonstration and civil disobedience action held in May 1978 at the Trident base. This event is described in the third chapter of this thesis. I attended the demonstration as a member of an affinity group comprised mostly of young Mennonites, whom I had met when I showed the Pacific Life Community slide presentation concerning Trident to their Bible study group. No one in this affinity group engaged in the civil disobedience action, but most of us participated in the candlelight vigil and were present to witness the civil disobedience action. I subsequently attended part of the week-long trial of trespassers held in Seattle, Washington in December of 1978.

In December of 1978, I attended a non-violent training session at Ground Zero Centre for Non-violent Action. Two of the facilitators at the workshop were Shelley and Jim Douglass, who had left the Pacific Life Community house in New Westminster, British Columbia to live near the Trident base and
work as members of the Ground Zero collective. Part of the workshop time was spent helping two persons, who wished to do civil disobedience in the near future, prepare for their action. I volunteered to become a support member of their affinity group, which included a Catholic priest, nun and campus minister, and a graduate student in evangelical theology. As a "support member," I assisted in planning the details of their action, and in writing and distributing a leaflet to personnel at the Trident base which explained the reasons for their action. I provided moral and physical support when it came time for them to climb the fence to enter the base. I also was responsible for contacting the press and lawyers at the time of their arrest, and was present for the subsequent appearances in court for arraignment, trial and sentencing proceedings. Their trial statements are the first two statements provided in the appendix of this ethnography.

Throughout 1979, while writing this ethnography, I attended various meetings and workshops with persons associated with Ground Zero. Many of those in attendance were Christians, especially Catholics, whose faith seemed to be ecumenical, and radical in political implication. To date the most recent workshops I attended were in August of 1979. The first concerned preparations for a large demonstration and civil disobedience action at the Trident base, being planned for October 28, 1979. The second featured Daniel Berrigan discussing the spiritual dimension of resisting
preparations for nuclear warfare.

All these experiences which I have described have informed the writing of this ethnography, and have provided the material for a process of what might be termed "retrospective participant-observation." A summary of these experiences would include attendance at or participation in:

(a) numerous public activities or events in the Vancouver area, in Seattle and near the Trident base. These events include public lectures, benefit concerts, marches, demonstrations, vigils, civil disobedience actions, and subsequent court appearances;

(b) many organizational and planning meetings and preparatory workshops which precede these events;

(c) regular meetings of a few groups;

(d) several special conferences to discuss movement goals and strategies, or specific disarmament issues.

Since the summer of 1977 I have had occasion to meet representatives of most of the disarmament groups in the Vancouver area, however the greater part of my involvement has been with Canadian and American participants in the Trident campaign.

(ii) interviews

In-depth, taped interviews were conducted with three participants living in the Vancouver area. The intent of the
interviews was to explore the following dimensions of their experiences and understandings:

(a) how, when, why they became involved in disarmament work, identifying influential experiences, ideas, people;
(b) what they are working against and what they are working for. If they are working for a new world order, what are some of its features?
(c) whether they are or have been involved in other movements, "struggles," or social issues, and if they see these as being related to their work for disarmament;
(d) their approach to achieving disarmament.

Interviewees were chosen on the basis of rapport already developed in the fieldwork context, their familiarity with the movement internationally, nationally and locally, their deep commitment to disarmament as evidenced by their extensive work in the movement, and their articulateness.

(iii) examination of written and audio-visual materials

Several kinds of written materials produced in Canada and in the United States were collected and examined:

(a) Pamphlets, brochures and newsletters were gathered from various groups in order to gain an understanding of their history, aims, principles, general orientation and organizational network. Many of these groups are active in the Vancouver area, as well as nationally and internationally. The newsletters are the primary means for many
of the groups to communicate with their members and sympathizers, and are the repository of much of the "folklore" of the movement. Following Reich (1975), I use this term to refer to verbalized expressions (oral or written) of collective belief, which are repeated and shared by all members. This term includes scraps of information, rumour, gossip and stories everyone believes to be true. Reich notes that in "revitalization movements," folklore can operate in the actual creation of an ideology for change. It also "is used to explain the movement to adherents, to justify new forms of belief and action, and to fortify the newly formed tenets" (Reich, 1975:243).

(b) The written statements of a few movement participants were examined with special attention given to symbolic themes, and formulations of "the problem" to which they are responding in their work for nuclear disarmament and "the solution" they are trying to bring about. The statements were in the form of unpublished and published books, articles, transcripts of public speeches, and transcripts of speeches made in civil disobedience trials.

(c) Scholarly works were read which provided information on the history of the disarmament movement in North America, and the origins of a few of the groups active locally. These works include: Allen (1973), Chatfield (1973),
Conlin (1968), Meconis (1977), Moffatt (1969), Randall (1964), and Wittner (1969). Moffatt's is the only study I have found which is specifically concerned with the history of the Canadian peace movement.

I have also had occasion to view films, and several slide and tape presentations used in efforts to organize popular opposition to the production and deployment of nuclear weapons. These materials are intended to convey an understanding of the extreme urgency of achieving nuclear disarmament, and ways in which people can act to avert nuclear holocaust.
The ethnographic account of the contemporary nuclear disarmament movement provided in this thesis reflects the understandings I have gained as both participant in, and researcher of, the movement. My concerns and interests as a new participant in coalition activities in Vancouver, and more especially in the Trident campaign, have to a large degree informed which facets of the movement I have focused on in writing this thesis. Writing about a movement in which I have been involved both as a new recruit and as a researcher, has presented certain cognitive and ethical difficulties, and has unavoidably shaped the account provided here. The challenge has been to write an ethnography of the movement which resonates to the experiences and understandings of at least some members, and yet is not totally imprisoned within their mental horizons such that it resembles what Geertz (1976:223) refers to as "an ethnography of witchcraft written by a witch," which would be unacceptable as an anthropological account.7

It has been observed that the meaning and value of data generated in the fieldwork process is related to the on-going, mutual negotiation of roles by the researcher and the actors (Olesen & Whittaker, 1967). My entry to the fieldwork context and my introduction to Jim Douglass occurred in the spring of 1977. It was another five or six months before I contemplated treating the nuclear disarmament movement as a thesis topic, and more than a year before I asked Douglass for permission to discuss in my thesis
Lightning East to West. He had originally given me the manuscript to read and comment on, as an interested participant not as a student writing a thesis on the disarmament movement. Thus I initially met the actors portrayed in this thesis, not as an anthropological researcher, but as an ignorant "newcomer," a sympathetic, but somewhat critical recruit.

In this initial role of newcomer, I had a wide latitude to ask some kinds of questions which a participant-observer might ask. Like the participant-observer, I was trying to make sense of the actions and utterances of an unfamiliar group of people, and trying to discern the "taken-for-granted's" or world view assumptions which underlay their actions and utterances. Also, like the participant-observer, I did not feel myself to be, nor was I immediately accepted as, a full participant. However, unlike a researcher who adopts a traditional "detached" or "objective" stance, it was clear from the start that I agreed with their commitment to nuclear disarmament, though I was ignorant, uncertain, even at times skeptical of their approach to achieving it. Thus my role precluded fundamentally questioning the goal of nuclear disarmament, and restricted me to questioning the various approaches to accomplishing it.

In a movement which is constantly seeking new recruits, I was welcomed with none of the questions or suspicion which might have arisen had I originally come to do research. When I eventually did announce my intention to write an
ethnography of the nuclear disarmament movement for my M.A. thesis, the rationale was couched in terms of informing myself about the movement so that I could better decide on the exact nature of my continued participation. Many of the participants with whom I spoke had undergraduate or graduate degrees, and seemed to readily confer legitimacy to my thesis enterprise. They seemed confident that I had no intention of purposefully producing an account which could be detrimental to the movement.

I was very conscious throughout the writing phase, that movement participants, especially those who had assisted me with my research, would be reading my account of their activities. Since I expected that my involvement with these people would continue after I had completed the thesis, I was concerned that I not offend them. Although I did not expect all of them to be in complete agreement with my characterizations of various aspects of the movement, I was hopeful that no one would have strong objections, or feel that I had seriously misrepresented the movement.

As a newcomer, I went through a socialization process of becoming acquainted with participants, learning the jargon, and joining in the work of planning, organizing, publicizing and staging various events. In this process, I experienced what anthropologists term as "going native," whereby one loses a stance of cognitive aperception, as the "native's" categories of thought become one's own. It has at times been very difficult to maintain a reflective perspective on the data.
One way of attempting to distance myself from the data has been to focus on certain "millenarian" features of the nuclear disarmament movement. This has helped in making more visible some assumptions, which over time, I was coming to adopt as my own "taken-for-granteds." However, in striving to regain a naive, "Martian point of view" so important to the anthropological endeavour, I was in danger of violating the understanding I had given to movement participants about my research intentions. In conversation and interviews with participants, I gave the impression that I was taking their concerns seriously. I did not suggest to them that I might refer to a theoretical framework or an interpretive metaphor which could imply that they were participating in "just another" movement of people crying that the world is coming to an end, or that the kingdom of heaven is at hand.

Anthropologist Elvi Whittaker has observed that seldom does the researcher reveal to actors, or ask their permission for, the kind of theoretical or interpretive frame or set of analogies they intend to use. Seeking consent from actors is usually limited to the data collection phase of research. Actors often assume that their version is being taken at face worth and seriously, and are concerned that the researcher "get her facts straight." If they ever read the researcher's interpretation of their actions and statements, one might expect them to feel betrayed or insulted by an anthropological
transformation which in explaining, subtly belittles or "explains away," their deepest concerns.

I have felt constrained to avoid relying heavily upon any theoretical or interpretive frame, which though accepted and even expected within the anthropological ambience, might be objected to by actors who had cooperated with my research enterprise. This has resulted in what some within the discipline of anthropology might consider an excessively light-handed treatment of "millenarian" features. I have also felt constrained to satisfy the implicit expectation that "their story will be told." To do this I have displayed what some might consider an inordinate number of quotes by persons many movement participants regard as "experts."

Another problem deriving from the ambiguity of my role is that as a newcomer, I was granted access to both "front-stage" and "back-stage" activities and conversations, which a stranger in a clearly defined role of researcher might not have been granted. It has been my concern not to betray confidences or use information which over time was made available to me as a friend or fellow participant, not as a student writing an M.A. thesis.

A concern in researching a movement which is working for radical social change has been to avoid collecting or presenting information which in any way could be misused by police or other agencies committed to the maintenance of the existing order. My decision not to keep field notes of
the many meetings I attended had originally been made on the grounds that they did not seem necessary for the kind of ethnography I intended. Also, due to continually fluctuating attendance at meetings, it would have been impractical and difficult to obtain consent at every meeting without using a significant amount of meeting time to explain my research concerns. The decision not to keep notes of meetings was later bolstered by Cohen's (1976) article which warned anthropologists of the danger of their data being usurped for nonresearch purposes by government agencies. Also sobering was Meconis's (1977) account of how fanciful statements made in a "Catholic Left" meeting were recorded in a report of the meeting which was later intercepted by the F.B.I. These statements were purportedly twisted to serve as the basis of fabricated conspiracy charges against those attending the meeting and other members of the "Catholic Left."  

For these various reasons, much of the data presented in this thesis comes from written sources already in the public domain, or from "front-stage" events in which all participants anticipated the presence of "observers," including the press and police. From my participation experiences and in-depth interviews, I gained a familiarity with the movement which assisted me in selecting recurring themes in the "front-stage" or public domain. The trial statements found in the appendix display many of these recurring themes. They also reflect the ideology of that segment of the movement with which I have become most familiar.
In this thesis I am examining some of the ways in which participants in the nuclear disarmament movement respond to the perceived threat of imminent global catastrophe. Their response includes attempts to articulate and communicate the nature and source of the threat, and to marshal those forces which they believe could avert catastrophe. For many participants an essential thrust of their efforts to avert catastrophe is transformation — the social, political, economic, moral, and some would add spiritual, transformation of the existing world order. They are endeavouring to prevent the total destruction of the existing world order by transforming it and creating a new and better one.

The most fundamental value they hope to be manifested in the new order is that all human beings are equal members of one human family, and are deserving of love and respect. They are opposed to any ideology or practise which assumes that any person is "expendable," or an "enemy" deserving to be eliminated. Their moral order is one which affirms the right of each human being to live with what they see as dignity, freedom, and a decent quality of life. They are seeking a political order which will be regulated by principles of participatory democracy and international law, and will serve the interests of all humanity, not the interests of a particular class, nation, race or sex. They are opposed to any form of imperialism, whether by capitalist, socialist or communist
states. They envision a new economic order in which inequalities of wealth and consumption will be reduced; the exploitation of one sex, class, race or nation by another will be eliminated; and the earth's resources will be utilized not in the production of weapons, but rather in the fulfilling of basic human needs in ecologically sound ways for the long-term benefit of all humanity. They are trying to create a world in which all humanity lives free from war, injustice and poverty.

Anthropologists have observed in many societies, contemporary and past, attempts to realize a new and perfect moral, political and economic order. Various terms have been used to refer to these phenomena, including "revitalization movement" and "millenarian movement." What is common in the use of these terms is dissatisfaction with the existing system, and deliberate, organized attempts to bring into being a new way of life, a new cultural system. Burridge suggests that millenarian activities can be regarded as "new-cultures-in-the-making, or as attempts to make a new kind of society or moral community" (1971:9). He notes that these phenomena tend to occur when there is a change in a society's material or moral environment, whereby new powers are experienced which do not fit with traditional assumptions about the systematic ordering of different kinds of power, especially those seen as significantly dangerous or beneficial. This relates to Cohn's observation that two circumstances favouring the rise of millenarian movements are: catastrophe or fear of catastrophe,
and the supposed defection of authority traditionally responsible for regulating relations between society and the powers governing the cosmos (Cohn, 1962:40).

These two circumstances are certainly evident in the case of the nuclear disarmament movement. The feared catastrophe is often referred to as "nuclear holocaust." This term refers to the massive, perhaps even complete, destruction of human life which they believe would result from the intentional or accidental triggering of nuclear weaponry. It is often stated that this threat to the ongoing existence of humanity has arisen because of "irresponsible," "undemocratic," and some say even "insane," actions of leaders in science, government, the military and private industry. These men in positions of traditional authority in our society have discovered the method of releasing the tremendous power contained in the "atom," and have thereby unleashed what Carl Jung refers to as "the devil" of our epoch.

In 1945 the American Secretary of War described the fission bomb dropped on Hiroshima as not merely a new weapon, "but as a revolutionary change in the relations of man and the universe" (Lens, 1977:3). One of the prime tasks of participants in the nuclear disarmament movement is to alert human beings to the implications of this revolutionary change in their relationship to the universe -- to their altered material and moral environment. In speeches, pamphlets and newsletters, they frequently repeat a quote attributed to Einstein, that "The unleashed power of the atom has changed
everything. Thus we are drifting toward a catastrophe beyond conception." They also often tell of the "doomsday clock" set at nine minutes to midnight which is featured on the cover of a periodical entitled Bulletin of Atomic Scientists. Commenting on this doomsday clock, a movement participant wrote in a group newsletter, "The minute hand warns that we are already approaching the doomsday hour in coming to terms with our immense and growing capacity for self-destruction" (Pacific Life Community/War Tax Resistance, 1978:5).

Besides vesting authority in the statements of atomic scientists convinced of the urgent necessity of nuclear disarmament, participants attribute significance to similar statements made by retired high-ranking military officials, such as Canadian General Burns (author of Defense in the Nuclear Age), and Rear Admiral Gene La Rocque of the United States Navy. The latter is quoted in an article (1978) distributed for free by the disarmament group Promoting Enduring Peace:

Nuclear war is a growing threat to all humanity. World War III with nuclear weapons can, and almost certainly will happen unless governments confront this reality. . . . Many people believe nuclear weapons will never be used. But as someone who has been directly involved in U.S. nuclear planning, I can state that my country has plans and forces for actually fighting nuclear war. . . . Nuclear war is an integral part of American military policy and the U.S. is prepared to use nuclear weapons anywhere in the world, right now in many contingencies.

La Rocque is currently director of the American Center for Defense Information, a non-governmental research organization which is a project of the Fund for Peace.
Participants also accord "expert" status to American aerospace engineer Robert Aldridge, who worked sixteen years for the Lockheed corporation and was the head of the advance research and design team for the Trident missile. Aldridge resigned when he became convinced that the Trident missile was being designed for a nuclear weapon system with pre-emptive first-strike capability. With his family he helped form the California arm of the Pacific Life Community, which over the past few years has organized an on-going series of demonstrations and civil disobedience actions at the Lockheed facility. He has appeared several times as an "expert witness" on behalf of demonstrators arrested at the Trident base at Bangor, Washington. His writings analyze and condemn American development of first-strike nuclear weapons systems, such as the Trident submarine, the Missile-X, and the cruise missile, and are circulated widely by movement participants. In one such article, he argues

All of these weapons systems required to launch a disarming first strike should be in place by the mid-1980's. It is utter folly to rest our future on the hope that once the Pentagon has these weapons ready for use, it will resist the temptation to use them in a first strike. Furthermore, all of our past experience indicates that when the United States achieves a new military capability, the Soviet Union seeks to match it. With both superpowers at a standoff in first-strike weaponry, the slightest spark could trigger nuclear cremation.

We may already be beyond the point of no return, or there may still be hope. But any hope depends on an informed public motivated to put the brakes to this deadly momentum. At present we are moving rapidly toward the outbreak of World War III, and it could very well be the war to end all wars, all peace, and all human life on this planet. (1978a:4)
It seems that in the eyes of disarmament movement participants, La Rocque's and Aldridge's earlier participation in helping to plan and design nuclear weapons systems, gives greater credence and authority to their statements warning of the terrible consequences of developing those systems. It is interesting that in justifying their belief that catastrophe is imminent, participants quote like-minded people who have authoritative scientific, military or technical credentials according to the criterion of the larger society and the very institutions whose activities movement participants condemn.

In trying to convince their fellow citizens that the danger of nuclear disaster is real and present at all times, movement participants cite instances involving American nuclear weapons, in which they claim catastrophe has almost occurred. They assert that there have been 125 accidents involving vehicles carrying American nuclear weapons, such as planes crashing or submarines sinking; 13 accidents involving false alerts, such as misreading the radar screen; and eight occasions in which the United States has seriously contemplated using nuclear weapons. 6

Movement participants argue that the probability of nuclear warfare is increasing due to recent quantitative and qualitative changes in nuclear weaponry. Increasing numbers of countries, such as South Korea, Pakistan and Argentina are acquiring the capability of making nuclear weapons through the acquisition of nuclear power technology. An example of this phenomenon is the development of an atomic bomb by India,
through the use of a nuclear power reactor, sold to it by Canada. It is believed that as more countries are able to make nuclear weapons, the likelihood of these weapons being used increases. A statement reflecting this belief is one frequently quoted in pamphlets and speeches, and attributed to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. They purportedly claimed in the late 1970's, "About 35 countries will be able to make atomic weapons within nine years . . . and nuclear war will become inevitable." Participants also worry about increased danger resulting from qualitative progress in nuclear weapon technology as represented by the first-strike capability of the MIRV missiles and by the neutron bomb. The latter, developed for the N.A.T.O. arsenal, is considered a "mini-nuke" which breaches the firebreak between conventional warfare and nuclear warfare. Movement participants are concerned that military strategists who might normally stop short of using regular nuclear weapons, might be tempted to try to wage a "limited nuclear war" with such a weapon. Both these quantitative and qualitative developments are cited as significant factors in the formulation of apparently scientific predictions about the high probability of a nuclear disaster by the year 1990 or 2000.

Movement participants employ images based upon linear concepts of time and motion to express their belief that the probability of nuclear cataclysm is steadily increasing, and that if the trend is not reversed, it will become inevitable. An example of this kind of image is Sidney Lens's warning,
We are headed at 100 miles per hour against a stone wall and I know that if you turn away from that stone wall there are dangers, but if you keep going ahead you are certain to be incinerated. We have to end the arms race. (Lens, 1978:7)

Participants frequently use phrases, such as "time is running out," and "we are approaching the point of no return." But they all express hope that it is not yet too late to try to change the course of events presently leading to disaster.

They continually make and quote statements which insist that human beings have a choice to make: to allow the catastrophe to happen or to prevent it. Two statements frequently quoted are: From paragraph 129 of the Final Document of the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament:

Removing the threat of a world war -- a nuclear war -- is the most acute and urgent task of the present day. Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation.

and from a speech to the United Nations by John F. Kennedy who said, "Mankind must put an end to war or war will put an end to mankind." The positing of this kind of choice implies assumptions that catastrophe is inevitable unless certain steps are taken soon enough to prevent it, and that sufficient numbers of informed and active persons could exercise or invoke the power necessary to prevent it. The choice, articulated in placard slogans and speeches, is characterized by various binary opposites: survival or annihilation; transformation or catastrophe; co-existence or non-existence; a world without war or no world; non-violence or non-existence; the kingdom or the holocaust.
This manner of posing alternatives for one's society is reminiscent of what Fromm terms "the language of prophetic alternativism." He explains that the Biblical prophets did not predict a determined future, but rather expressed what possibilities for the future they saw in the present reality. They showed the people the alternatives and warned them to change their ways, or to remain deaf and blind, and suffer. The alternative was always one of choosing personal and social transformation or suffering the catastrophic consequences of their present way of life.

Prophetic language is always the language of alternatives, of choice, and of freedom, it is never that of determinism, for better or worse. The shortest formulation of prophetic alternativism is the verse in Deuteronomy: 'I put before you today life and death, and you choose life.' (Fromm, 1968:15)

It seems that some participants believe that the choice before their society, and all of humanity, is to realize the world without war and violence which in the Judaeo-Christian tradition is anticipated near or at the end of history, or to perish in a final holocaust. The name "Project Ploughshares," chosen by the recently formed working group on Canadian military policy, a round sung by demonstrators at the Trident base, and a slide in the Mobilization for Survival slide show are all direct references to the "end-times" vision found in Isaiah 2 and Micah 4, that

It shall come to pass in the latter days ... that they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning forks nations shall not lift up their sword against nation neither shall they learn war any more but they shall sit every man under his vine and fig tree and none shall make them afraid.
The use of this kind of imagery to describe the world they are trying to create is not restricted to participants espousing a Jewish or Christian faith. Frequently statements are made suggesting that "we are at a moment of truth in history," or that "we are at the crossroads" with one road leading to a New Age, a Millennium, a utopia, total life — and the other leading to Armageddon, Doomsday, annihilation, total death. For example, the following statement by Martin Luther King was read at a recent War Resisters' League Conference:

I'm happy to live in this period in which we're going to have to grapple with the problems that men have been trying to grapple with through history but the demand didn't force them to do it. Survival demands that we grapple with them. Men for years now have been talking about war and peace. But now, no longer can they just talk about it. It is no longer a choice between violence and non-violence in this world. It's a choice between non-violence and non-existence.

Watson Thomson, a participant in the nuclear disarmament movement in Vancouver in previous decades wrote:

... mankind needs and must make a new and different kind of revolution, more radical than any hitherto. For we are confronted with the supreme and ultimate choice: total death (most obviously in the thermo-nuclear holocaust) or total life. What do we mean by 'total life?' We mean life oriented everywhere towards inclusiveness, fulfillment, exuberant affirmations. (1966:164)

It seems that many participants in the nuclear disarmament movement have derived their hope and vision for a new world of universal peace, justice and prosperity from Judaeo-Christian themes and values embedded in their cultural tradition. This same tradition provides many of the symbols and motifs used by participants to express the possibility of the
end of the world. In the history of Western societies there have been numerous occasions in which groups have symbolized and anticipated the realization of millennial or utopian dreams, and feared the imminent materialization of apocalyptic nightmares. The suggestion that the contemporary nuclear disarmament movement is playing out age-old symbolic themes does not exclude the possibility that they may be right in their assessment of the present reality and the choice before humanity.

Participants in the nuclear disarmament movement are continually challenging their fellow citizens' assessment of the present world situation and the future. They argue that those who believe that nuclear weapons will never be used are fooling themselves by trusting in scientists, militarists and politicians who are talking of peace while preparing for nuclear war with exquisite precision. They also disagree with those who believe it is already too late, that humanity is powerless to prevent a few from blowing up the world. In the face of what they see as overwhelming odds, movement participants nevertheless express hope that disarmament and a new world order can be achieved, because they must be achieved for humanity's survival.
This chapter examines two events, loosely termed "demonstrations," which took place during the week of May 21-27, 1978 on opposite coasts of the United States of America. The first was held at Bangor, Washington and the second was held in New York City. In the first section of this chapter, I briefly comment on data collection methods employed in writing this account; I provide some background information concerning the groups which organized the events, and concerning the preparation of participants for the demonstration at Bangor; and I offer some speculative comments as to what these events were intended to accomplish and how they might be interpreted. The last two sections are descriptive accounts of the two events.

The statements made in this chapter concerning the demonstration at Bangor are derived: from my own participation in the event and preparatory activities; from other participants' accounts, which were available to me in conversations, local newspapers and groups' newsletters; from literature advertising, explaining and evaluating the event which was written and distributed by the organizing coalition and its constituent groups.

As indicated in the Methodology section of Chapter One, I had become peripherally involved with the Pacific Life Community almost one year prior to the May 1978 demonstration. During that year I became increasingly incorporated into the
group as a working member. But I was never present for discussions to plan or work out the logistics of the demonstration. These usually took place at various locations in the state of Washington, and included persons from several groups which were collectively organizing the demonstration. In the months prior to the demonstration, I took part in several workshops which had been designed by the coalition organizing the event to prepare people for participation in the demonstration. My role in the last few workshops changed from "trainee" to an assistant "trainer." During this time I also helped publicize the demonstration, and arranged several small meetings at which I showed the Trident slide presentation, and encouraged persons to participate in the upcoming demonstration. One of these meetings was with a bible study group of a local Mennonite church. Most of the members of this group decided they would attend the demonstration, and I agreed to become part of their affinity group. At that time I had not yet resolved my own position on whether civil disobedience was a suitable means for me to work for disarmament. The other persons in my affinity groups were also not willing to do civil disobedience, though they did want to support, through their presence, other demonstrators who chose to do civil disobedience. We decided to participate as a group in the legal rally, march, and candlelight vigil, and to witness but not participate in the civil disobedience action of illegally trespassing onto the base.
Statements made in this chapter concerning the New York demonstration are derived from a few participants' accounts, and from slides, photos and a tape recording of the event. I did not attend the event. I interviewed Irene McAllister, a movement participant who had attended it as a press representative from the British Columbia branch of the Voice of Women. McAllister showed me slides which she had taken, and kindly provided me with an edited tape recording of the event. Excerpts of speeches and songs appearing in this chapter have been transcribed from that tape. Newsletters and other publications of several disarmament groups were the source of other participants' accounts and pictures of the event.

Both events were organized by coalitions of groups trying to focus public attention on the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament beginning the same week in New York City. The Special Session was considered significant by some participants because it was the first time since the establishment of the United Nations and since the dawn of the nuclear age, that government leaders and representatives of the 149 member countries were assembling to discuss ways of bringing about nuclear disarmament, and an end to the "arms race." It was the hope of many in the movement that the Special Session would raise public awareness about the precarious position of humanity. It was also hoped that demonstrations of public support for nuclear disarmament
would put pressure on government officials meeting at the
Special Session to take concrete steps towards disarmament.

The coalition which organized the event at Bangor was
formed in the fall of 1977 and was known simply as the May
22nd Coalition, indicating the ad hoc nature of the organi-
ization. The clearly defined, short-term, ad hoc character
of the coalition seemed to enable persons from various groups
to work together in spite of underlying philosophical or poli-
tical differences. The coalition included Pacific Life Com-
munity, Greenpeace, Live Without Trident, Crabshell Alliance,
and other groups from British Columbia and Washington. Out-
lining their goals for the event in a booklet entitled
The May 22nd Handbook, the coalition stated:

By mass demonstration and celebration on May 21
and civil disobedience on May 22, we seek to:
--call attention to the United Nations Special Session
on Disarmament scheduled to convene May 23, 1978
in New York City.
--stop the production of the Trident Nuclear Submarine
and cease preparation of any and all bases.
--move the world's superpowers toward attaining total
nuclear disarmament.
--alert the people of North America to the real and
present danger of Trident and the arms race.
--follow through our civil disobedience actions to arrest,
causing a moral crisis on the base, and an economic

crisis in the courts and jails.
--empower continually growing numbers of people to
participate in mass resistance.

The more permanent coalition which organized the demon-
stration on the east coast is named the Mobilization for
Survival, and includes more than 300 organizations. Primarily
an American network, the Mobilization also has affiliated
groups and contacts throughout the world. A War Resisters' League newsletter asserts that the Mobilization was formed in the spring of 1977 largely through the efforts of Sidney Lens and War Resisters' League chairwoman Norma Becker. A movement participant wrote the following description of the Mobilization:

Bringing together in a loose alliance peace, religious, environmental, labour, community action and consumer groups, the Mobilization has as its rallying point a four-program platform: zero nuclear weapons, ban nuclear power, stop the arms race, and fund human needs. (The Disarmament Times, 1978:3)

At each of the two events, speakers made reference to the event organized by the other, and it was apparent that the two coalitions were well aware of the other's demonstration plans. Prior to the demonstration, the May 22nd Coalition announced that they had received endorsement from the Mobilization for Survival. It seemed as though the Mobilization was a national and international umbrella organization under which could fit regional coalitions like the May 22nd Coalition.

Elements of these events organized by the two coalitions may remind readers of civil rights and anti-Vietnam war demonstrations in the 1960's. The demonstrations of these previous movements often included a procession of placard-carrying demonstrators, and a rally where speakers reminded demonstrators of the issue at hand, and singers entertained or led demonstrators in well-known songs. Sometimes the demonstrations culminated with some sort of civil disobedience action.
such as a "draft card burning" or a "sit-in" (an illegal occupation of a government or corporate facility). It seems that some of the organizers in the May 22nd Coalition and in the Mobilization for Survival had taken part in these earlier demonstrations, as had some of the singers and speakers, such as Pete Seeger and Dave Dellinger, and many of the participants. Speakers at the Bangor and New York rallies made references to these earlier "struggles" and suggested that they are related to the "struggle" for nuclear disarmament.

A difference from these earlier demonstrations was the increased preparation of participants for the demonstration at Bangor. In the demonstrations against the Vietnam War, a small proportion of participants were trained to act as "marshalls," for crowd control. With the event organized by the May 22nd Coalition, some participants had trained as "peacekeepers," but many more participants had attended day-long workshops to prepare for the demonstration. At these workshops, referred to as "non-violent training workshops," participants received brief instruction in "the history and goals of the Trident campaign," in the "theory of non-violence," and in the "scenario" and "guidelines" for the demonstration scheduled for May 21 and May 22.

The implicit purpose of preparing participants for the events seemed to be to teach them appropriate behaviour, apparently on the assumption that certain kinds of behaviour at the demonstration would be more effective than others in achieving the goals of the demonstration.
The first guideline established by the May 22nd Coalition was the maintenance of nonviolent discipline, which they acknowledged was for some in the coalition (such as Jim Douglass) a moral or spiritual commitment, and for others a pragmatic, tactical decision. Nonviolent discipline had been a guideline for all previous demonstrations and civil disobedience actions at the Trident base organized by the Pacific Life Community. In The May 22nd Handbook, which was distributed to participants at the training workshops, it was explained that nonviolent discipline attempts to educate and communicate with people by appealing to their consciences and showing understanding of their situations. It calls for action based on the refusal to do bodily harm and the willingness to take personal risks for what one believes to be right. There is a fundamental recognition that the realization of worthy goals cannot be separated from the means used for their achievement. Using nonviolence, we seek to build a society in which people aren't forced, physically or mentally, to do things they don't want to do. The real causes of oppression which we hope to remove are: the economic and political institutions and practices which support injustice, not the individual human beings who are often trapped into carrying out the destructive purposes of these systems.

As one "trainer" at the workshops put it, "nonviolence is moral ju-jitsu." Participants were urged to treat police, soldiers, base guards and neighbours -- anyone whom they confronted in the course of the demonstration -- with all the respect deserved by any human being, and to refrain from any kind of physical or verbal abuse. An emphasis was placed on developing rapport and dialoguing with these people, making it clear that the demonstration was "against Trident and not
against them.⁴ It seems that demonstrators were being urged to distinguish between the evil of the Trident weapon system, and the inherent human worth of the people building and guarding it. It was explained that a goal of the campaign was to try to win these people over to the demonstrators' viewpoint that Trident should not be built, and that it was more of a threat to their lives and all of humanity than a source of security for them and their nation. It was also made clear that these people — especially the police, guards and soldiers — might respond with hostility to the demonstrators' presence and their message. It was suggested, however, that the demonstrators' power to convince these people and the public about the wrongness of Trident ultimately lay in their ability to refuse to return the hostility, and to steadfastly maintain "the truth about Trident" regardless of the risk to themselves. Anticipated risks included: being arrested and serving jail terms; being subjected to teargas and beatings from guards; perhaps even being shot at, as occurred at a demonstration at Kent State University a few years earlier.

A main component of the nonviolent training workshops was roleplaying problematic situations which demonstrators might face during the event, and evaluating the emotions and responses evoked by the situations. Specific situations chosen for the roleplays were those giving people practice in responding "nonviolently" to provocation or hostility from police, security guards, soldiers, "agents provocateurs,"⁴ other demonstrators or bystanders.
Workshop participants also roleplayed the civil disobedience action scheduled as the climax of the two-day long demonstration. It seemed that by civil disobedience was meant an action which involved breaking a law in an action of obedience to a higher law, and thereby raising a moral issue. Voluntarily submitting to arrest and jail in a non-violent fashion were considered integral to civil disobedience. In the case of the Bangor demonstration, the civil disobedience action involved trespassing onto the naval base by climbing over a six-foot high chainlink and barbed wire fence which separates the military facility from the public road. In trespassing onto the base, demonstrators would be breaking a federal trespass statute (Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 1382), and would be liable for a sentence of up to six months in jail, a fine of $500, or both. It was the Coalition's goal for trespassers to be arrested and go to trial. In this way they would have a forum for arguing the immorality and illegality of the Trident submarine as a "first-strike" weapon system, and as a weapon which will cause indiscriminate suffering among a civilian population. Such weapons are condemned by international law and treaties, such as the Hague Conventions, the International Tribunal at Nuremberg and the United Nations Charter. In the United States, international law is supposed to be binding on domestic courts, such that treaties signed by the federal government are part of the supreme law of the land.
It was apparently believed that the demonstrators' willingness to spend time in jail to protest the construction and deployment of nuclear weapons would be an indication to base personnel and the public of the sincerity of their convictions and would unsettle the consciences of these groups. They would also be causing great expense to the government because of the costs of jailing and bringing to trial hundreds of demonstrators. In the training workshops a story was circulating that the jail and court costs of a large civil disobedience action at the Seabrook nuclear power plant site had caused a fiscal crisis for the New Hampshire government.

The May 22nd Coalition explained that in trespassing onto the base, demonstrators would be "opening up the premises for productive rather than destructive purposes." By "productive purposes" was meant activities which demonstrators would view as contributing to the well-being of all humanity. These activities were sometimes symbolized during previous entries of the base by planting a vegetable garden or sowing grain seeds, which suggest a "swords into ploughshares" vision. The construction of a weapon system capable of killing millions of humans in order to protect "national interests" was viewed as being "destructive" and contrary to the interests of all humanity.

Realistically the "reclamation" of the base would only be symbolic and quite brief, if accomplished at all. The many acres of naval base were guarded by a civilian security force employed by Pan Am on the periphery, and by United
States Marines on the interior of the base. Demonstrators would attempt to climb over the fence directly beside the main gate of the base, in full view of the guards' office and the base administration buildings, and then proceed a few hundred yards to a slope referred to as the "grassy knoll," where they would stop and wait to be arrested. It was recognized that the base personnel, well aware of the plan for a "nonviolent civil disobedience action," had several options. They could attempt to physically prevent demonstrators from entering the base by the use of tear gas, clubs or other violent means. They could refrain from taking any action against the trespassers and wait for them to tire of the occupation and leave. They could forcibly remove trespassers without laying charges against them. They could allow demonstrators to enter the base and immediately arrest them, et cetera. Some of these different anticipated responses provided the "situation" for roleplays in the training sessions. Participants practised coming to quick group decisions about how to respond to the base's strategy for dealing with them.

Anyone intending to participate in or be present for the civil disobedience action was required to have participated in a nonviolent training workshop and be a member of what was referred to as an "affinity group." An affinity group consisted of seven to fifteen persons organized to act as a unit during the event. Members volunteered for roles they would take during the demonstration. Those intending to participate in the civil disobedience action of trespassing onto
the base were referred to as "c.d.-ers." For every c.d.-er in an affinity group, there was supposed to be at least one "support person." The role of the support persons was to provide the c.d.-ers with moral support and various kinds of practical assistance. They were to help c.d.-ers climb the fence. They would phone lawyers and families after the c.d.-ers were arrested, they would care for children, plants or pets if the c.d.-ers were kept in jail, and would pick c.d.-ers up when released. Every affinity group was also supposed to have: a "medic" to handle rudimentary first aid, a "peacekeeper" to be on the alert for disruptive situations in the vicinity of their affinity group, and a "spokesperson" to respond to questions from the media and consult with spokespersons from other affinity groups.

There were several reasons given for the affinity group structure of the event. The structure was supposed to provide emotional and practical support for persons risking arrest and jail in the civil disobedience action. It was also supposed to contribute to the maintenance of an orderly and peaceful demonstration, by making participants responsible for one another. It was a task of all affinity group members to make sure that only those in their affinity group who had trained to do civil disobedience actually went over the fence. They were to prevent anyone from impulsively doing civil disobedience who had not properly prepared for it. Affinity group members were also responsible for the maintenance of non-violent discipline within their group. It was expected that
The organizational structure of the affinity groups was supposed to facilitate communication among participants, especially in situations which required quick decisions. Decisions were to be made by consensus within affinity groups, and then the spokespersons were to consult with each other and come to a common decision. It was explained in one group's newsletter that ideally, the affinity group structure is to take the organizational and decision-making responsibility away from a few leaders and disseminate it to everyone.

As previously indicated, one of the goals of the May 22nd Coalition was to "empower continually growing numbers of people to participate in mass resistance." They wanted to communicate to other persons in their society and around the world, their belief that military, governmental and industrial institutions which engaged in a process of producing nuclear weaponry must be resisted, if a nuclear disaster is to be averted. For this reason I would speculate that it was important to them that the mass media convey their message. But as Molotch and Lester (1974:57) point out, access to the media by groups questioning basic socio-political structures is limited. Since they lacked the funds to buy advertising time for television or radio, or space in newspapers, and
since they did not have the resources or connections to produce radio or television shows, their only alternative might have been to attract media attention by making themselves "newsworthy."

The demonstrations at New York may have been deemed "newsworthy" because it assembled large numbers of people and featured "big names" like Pete Seeger, Daniel Ellsberg and physicist Helen Caldicott. The May 22nd Coalition gained substantial media coverage of their event, perhaps because they made themselves "newsworthy" by assembling demonstrators "in an inappropriate place at an inappropriate time" (Molotch, 1974:57) in organizing a large trespass action. They also gave the media sufficient advance notice that a "newsworthy" event was going to take place, so that the media could arrange for camera crews and reporters to travel to the location which was off the beaten track of "newsworthy" events.6

However, a display of inappropriate behaviour to get media coverage must be very carefully managed so that newsmakers and viewers do not simply respond to the inappropriateness of their actions, rather than the reasons for it. It seems reasonable to speculate that the nonviolent training of participants and the affinity group structure may be ways of managing the inappropriateness of the display so that a "newsworthy event" is accomplished, with the only incident of inappropriate behaviour reported being that which clearly raises the issue the demonstrators are trying to raise.
If newsmakers and viewers notice the peacefulness, orderliness, integrity and 'good citizen' demeanour of the protestors, then it might be more difficult for them to dismiss the message of the protestors. It might also make them more sympathetic to the demonstrators in the eventuality of authorities using violent tactics against them.

From the perspective of participants trying to bring about a new social order through a kind of "nonviolent revolution," nonviolent training might be a way of preparing people for prosecuting conflict with existing social institutions. The demonstrations at Bangor and at New York could be considered part of a strategy of accomplishing social change using tactics which undermine in the minds of the public the authority and legitimacy of certain institutions and their practices. The goal of such a strategy is that eventually a significant proportion of the public will join in mass non-cooperation with these institutions and in a mass mobilization for a new society. This strategy as propounded by the Movement for a New Society, the War Resisters' League and other groups, seems to be a further development in the tradition of movements for "nonviolent social change" in which Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. have been prominent figures.  

It has been suggested that Gandhi and King "built social movements around the idea of the power of socially organized withdrawals of consent" (Pickus & Woito, 1970:149). The events at the Trident base and at New York City are
occasions for participants to express or "demonstrate" in various ways the withdrawal of their consent to the activities of governmental, military and industrial institutions which are producing technology capable of accomplishing the death of human beings on a massive scale. This withdrawal of consent is explicit when demonstrators at the New York rally chant a chorus of "No! No! No!" as a speaker shouts,

   It's time to say "no" to all of that. "No" to nuclear weapons. "No" to conventional weapons. "No" to nuclear power. "No" to the multinational corporations. And finally "no" to the whole system of greed and power for power and profit that is bringing these things upon us. . . .

and when demonstrators trespass onto the Trident base stating that they are "reclaiming the premises for productive rather than destructive purposes," and wait to be arrested.

In New York, demonstrators dramatize their reason for withdrawing consent through a "die-in," which is described by an announcer at the rally as a "symbolic action" which "may be for some a straight-forward envisioning of catastrophe, for others a prayer, for others a bearing witness against human suffering by vigiling . . ." The catastrophe they are envisioning and dramatizing is that of a nuclear holocaust. 8

Speakers at both the Bangor and New York rallies suggest various factors which are leading to this kind of catastrophe: leaders who have lost their instinct for survival and could be considered insane; 9 leaders who place more value on power, profit and property than on people; a social order which unjustly gives governments and corporations the power of life and death, and allows them to perpetuate crimes against
humanity; a social system diseased by greed, by fear and oppression, and by patriarchy.

In oratory and in song, declarations are made that, "We must eliminate every single nuclear weapon on earth," that, "We ain't gonna study war no more," and that, "We are here today to say that we want a sensitive world, a world that cares about people."

These two events are occasions for participants to symbolize and communicate their conceptions of the nature and source of imminent catastrophe. They are also occasions for participants to try to marshall forces which they believe could avert catastrophe. Dolgin et al., (1977:35) observe that, "Within the symbolic perspective it has been suggested that rituals develop in reaction, and encapsulate a cultural retort, to socially menacing objects and meanings." The demonstrations at Bangor and New York could be considered a "cultural retort" to what might be referred to as the "nuclear menace." They are expressions of dissatisfaction with -- and for some, a rejection of -- the social order which has created the menace. They are manifestations of commitment to the realization of a new and better social order.
The Events

(i) Bangor, Washington

On Sunday May 21st, 1978, several thousand people converged on a 20-acre farm in Kitsap County, a short ferry trip across the Puget Sound from Seattle, Washington. The farm was located a couple of kilometers south of the main entrance gate to the United States Naval Torpedo Station, Bangor Annex -- commonly referred to as the "Trident base" because it was being equipped to function as home port for the Trident nuclear submarines. Karl Sturmanis of the Vancouver Greenpeace Foundation provided a description of the Trident submarine as an explanation of his own presence there:

The reasons for my being at Bangor came crashing back to mind. The Trident submarine, pride of the U.S. navy. More than 550 feet long, four storeys high and weighing 18,700 tons, it is probably the single most deadly weapon of war yet developed. Its arsenal includes 24 missiles, each equipped with 17 nuclear warheads that can be independently targeted. That is 408 nuclear bombs per submarine. A total of 29 subs are scheduled to be built; the first slated to arrive at Bangor around 1981. Price: more than 2.5 billion dollars each.

The U.S. already has the nuclear capability to destroy all of Russia's urban and industrial centres 34 times over. So why spend $80 billion on Trident? It appears that the Pentagon has changed its tactics. A line from an old school team coach comes to mind: "The best defence is a good offence."

In other words the Trident missile system has been designed as a first strike weapon: to home in on 'hard' targets such as underground missile silos. And so the weapons race continues to escalate. . . . (Sturmanis, 1978:A6)

Like Sturmanis, many people seem impressed by what they see as the enormous size of the submarine, especially when they
learn that the submarine will be navigating in a narrow strait used by fishing and pleasure craft, just south of Vancouver Island. They are also often awed by the recent technological development giving missiles the capability of directing warheads to numerous different targets, such that one submarine could launch missiles to destroy 408 different cities. Sturmanis is countering government statements that Trident is necessary because of the "Soviet threat;" by noting that the U.S. has sufficient nuclear weapons to destroy all of the Soviet Union's urban and industrial centres 34 times. Another figure frequently quoted by opponents to the "arms race" is that the combined Soviet and American nuclear arsenal is sufficient to kill everyone on earth 20 times. The use of awesome figures is a common way for movement participants to try to convince others of the terrible power of these weapons, and of the disastrous consequences of a continued "arms race."

As a convoy of shuttle buses and vans transported people from ferry terminals to the farm, hundreds of others parked their cars along the sides of country roads and wandered down the farm's driveway to the large pasture which was to serve as rally site and campground. Near the entrance to the pasture were lean-to shelters for first aid and information booths, and a large wooden stage which had been erected for the rally. Along one side of the pasture was a line of portable toilets and further on, the flags of many nations
were flying on short poles. Further up the pasture, some people were pitching tents and teepees in small clusters which were marked by cardboard signs bearing words like, "Rainbow," "Infinity," "Baleuga," "Vancouver Island," "Pine Tree People," "Satyagraha" (Gandhi's word for a spiritual truth-force), et cetera. These words were the names which affinity groups had chosen for themselves. The names sometimes referred to the geographic area where the group members lived, such as Vancouver Island. Other times they suggested a group's commonly shared sentimental attachment to entities in Nature, such as pine trees, rainbows and baleuga whales. Occasionally the names suggested a commonly shared ideological commitment, such as "More With Less."

There was a festive atmosphere as people introduced themselves -- usually asking where they had come from, to which group they belonged and whether they were intending to do "c.d." the following day. Friends greeted each other with shrieks and hugs. Enthusiastic comments were exchanged about the numbers of people arriving for the rally.

In the early afternoon, speakers, singers and musicians assembled on the stage. Soon hundreds of people were gathered around the stage and were singing songs like "Oh Freedom," "We Shall Overcome," "Ain't Gonna Study War No More," and "Roll On Resistance Roll On."

Lyrics were frequently adapted to the theme of Trident and nuclear disarmament. Sometimes
lyrics to the songs articulated the dream of a world without war and affirmed commitments to work relentlessly for the realization of that dream. Other times the lyrics made fun of government leaders who were "pro-nuke," that is, in favour of Trident, nuclear weapons, and nuclear power plants.

Various speakers addressed the crowd reminding them of the purposes of the demonstration. The variety of reasons given to oppose Trident was an indication of the diversity of the groups encompassed by the Coalition. Some of the reasons given were: to support the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament which might be pressured into positive action by a public outcry for nuclear disarmament; to save the Earth for humans, whales and all living beings; to prevent another Hiroshima; to resist patriarchy which the speaker described as "the socialized consciousness in all of us that supports the violence of Trident and the violence against women and children"; to end poverty in the U.S.A. and throughout the world by insisting that the $400 billion spent annually on armaments be spent on meeting human needs; to act on the belief that the power of people acting together can stop Trident and create a peaceful and just world. One speaker described Trident as the most deadly weapon invented which threatens the survival of humanity, and which is symptomatic of "a society of fear and domination which needs to be healed and made whole." An implicit theme at the rally, which has been evident throughout the campaign, was that in working to stop the deployment of the Trident submarine weapon system,
participants were simultaneously helping to eliminate all the evil and violence in the world. "Trident" is occasionally employed as an all-encompassing symbol of violence, such that participants sometimes talk about getting rid of the "Tridents" within themselves as well as the "Tridents" in their society. Robert Aldridge (the aerospace engineer who was head of the advance research and design team for the Trident missile before he resigned his job with Lockheed and helped form the California arm of the Pacific Life Community) has been quoted as saying,

Trident symbolizes the malignancy that is consuming North America. It is a manifestation of corporate glut and Pentagon ambition. It is coming into existence because of our personal greed. Its philosophy is the non-caring that causes poverty, crime and other social sicknesses. The soul of North America is being destroyed.

At the end of the rally, instructions were given for people to walk from the farm down the road to the main gate of the naval base, and then further on to the property referred to as "Ground Zero." A police car was waiting on the road to lead off the long column of people walking twelve-abreast down one side of the road. Many more police on motorcycles and in cars were waiting to drive alongside demonstrators. Media people with cameras, microphones and tape-recorders walked with demonstrators or drove slowly alongside the procession.

At the front of the procession was the United Nations flag, followed by a line of women holding a banner which read, "Women Working for Peace. Our Resistance Grows Strong."
Demonstrators were holding flags of many countries, and placards and banners emblazoned with slogans or names of their groups. Some of the placards and banners, such as "Voice of Women," "Mennonites Against Trident," "Kitsappers say No to Trident," and "Womyn who love Womyn Against Trident," served to identify various contingents of the demonstrators. They seemed to be abbreviated messages saying: "We are from the organization called the Voice of Women and we are opposed to Trident," "We are a group of Mennonites opposed to Trident," "We are a group of residents of Kitsap County (the county in which the base is being built) and we're opposed to Trident," or "We're a group of radical feminists and we are opposed to Trident."

Other slogans, such as "Help to stop nuclear war" and "Stop Trident" seemed to be exhortations. "Bread not Bombs" and "Zukes not Nukes" implied "Let's make bread or food to feed the hungry, not make bombs," and "Let's grow zukes (zucchini vegetables) and not build nukes (nuclear bombs or nuclear power plants)." These suggested "swords into ploughshares" imagery. There were references to the United Nations Special Session and pleas for government leaders meeting there to agree on nuclear disarmament "so that our children will live." Some slogans suggested a Christian orientation. There were several placards reading "RepenTrident" with the "T" drawn like a cross. Another which quoted from the Gospel of Matthew, "Blessed are the
Peacemakers." One placard proclaimed, "God's Arms Are Not Nuclear!"

There was a sense of exhilaration among the demonstrators. Occasionally people started singing and clapping, or chanting a slogan, and like a wave it spread up and down the column. Excitement increased as the procession drew close to the main gate of the base. The demonstrators could see on the other side of the barbed wire and chainlink fence enclosing the base, a few dozen uniformed men, standing silent and still, watching them. They were evenly spaced in a line which stretched across the grassy expanse between the fence and the base buildings. The procession stopped and a few people approached the guards standing at the gate and handed them a written statement on behalf of the demonstrators. The statement probably reiterated the Coalition's reasons for opposing Trident. The procession then continued, but while passing the fence on either side of the main gate, many people carefully leaned their placards, like wreaths, against the fence.

Further down the road, the procession turned into a driveway marked by the sign of "Ground Zero: Centre for Nonviolent Action." The property consisted of a small house and a few sheds on a 3.8 acre lot which had been cleared of most of the trees, but had not been landscaped. As the lot filled with several thousand people, the procession dispersed into a crowd of persons milling about, finding places to sit, or exploring the property. When a few people climbed an
embankment at the back of the lot and proceeded down the other side, there were shouts for them to come back because they were approaching the base's property line and were near to a high security ammunition storage area, perhaps housing some of the base's nuclear weapons. In the shouts, there seemed to be a note of fear, perhaps deriving from a sense that the explorers might inadvertently startle guards hidden behind trees, and provoke a response from them which would somehow mar a well-orchestrated civil disobedience action the next day.

Announcements were made that the march was over and the people should proceed in an orderly fashion back to the farm. If they were not staying for the next day's civil disobedience action, they were instructed to go to vehicles which would take them out of the county. About half of the people returned to the farm, to cook supper over campstoves, eat and visit in small groups, scattered over the damp pasture. Towards evening there were frequent announcements over the loudspeaker for meetings of people in the various roles for the civil disobedience action the next morning: c.d.-ers, spokespersons, medics, support people, and peace-keepers.

Karl Sturmanis of the Vancouver Greenpeace Foundation arrived just as darkness was closing in. He recalls,

We parked our cars off the main road. As we stepped out we heard the sound of a large gathering -- people singing and cheering a mile away, across a wooded area. The scene at the Peterson farm where the main contingent of protesters was camped was unforgettable. The full moon that had been playing hide and seek with clouds finally had broken free, reflecting brilliantly
in the starry night sky. In the distance, a cluster of small tents and a larger white teepee. The glow of the moon infused the landscape with a magical quality.

People had linked their arms together to form a large circle by the teepee and were singing in a soft melodic tone. The effect was one of unbelievable tranquility, yet with a deep sense of strength.

The circle dispersed; different affinity groups going off to talk and prepare before the fence crossing the next morning. I found myself talking with the affinity group from Greenpeace Seattle. We joked about the upcoming arrests and sang songs about whales and peace. Underlining everything we were doing was the pervasive feeling that we were saving ourselves. We knew Trident was a threat to all our lives. (Sturmanis, 1978:A6)

When most people retired to the warmth of sleeping bags and tents to sleep, dozens of others walked, or were transported by shuttle bus, down the road to the main gate area to maintain what was termed "a candlelight vigil." Huddled on the ground in the cold, damp night, people sat holding candles in their hands or with candles beside them on the ground. Sitting solemnly in small circles, many silently gazed at the flickering flame while others talked quietly with persons nearby. A few Catholic priests and nuns sitting together murmured liturgical prayers. Sturmanis remarked that a burning candle appeared to him that night "as a sign: a strong light of hope against the darkness of imminent destruction" (1978:A6). Periodically a small Asian gong was struck.

Before midnight a television news crew arrived with floodlights, cameras and microphones, and remained a short while filming and recording. Although media coverage was considered valuable by participants, there was nevertheless a sense that their presence wasn't entirely appropriate at
this solemn, contemplative gathering. Occasionally a few guards would leave their small building near the main gate and wander near the fence, where they would exchange cordial comments with vigilers. The vigilers had a chance to practise their "nonviolent principle" of treating the guards "as persons," not as "the enemy," and the guards seemed willing to respond in a similar fashion.

Later in the night some vigilers gathered in a large circle and sang to the accompaniment of guitars and flutes. The volume and tempo of the music rose and fell as the dark hours passed. Sturmanis recounts that around three o'clock there was a half hour lull in activity when

... everyone was either too exhausted or too chilled to sing or play anymore. It was just at that moment that I thought something was going to happen that I heard a guitar warming up.

Within minutes people had uncurled and crawled out of their sleeping bags and were dancing enthusiastically on the road. We were all caught inside the harmony of the music. It was simply a feeling of oneness with everyone and everything around us. (1978:A6)

After sunrise vigilers began to move about, rolling up sleeping bags and ground sheets, and shaking the stiffness out of their limbs. They formed a large circle, and with arms around each other, swayed as many sang a round which seemed to affirm the commonly-shared belief that all human beings are members of one human family, deserving of love. They sang, "Love, love, love, love/ People we are made for love./ Love each other as yourself/ For we are one."

Vigilers then left the area alongside the base fence and crossed over the road, lining themselves along the shoulder.
Several dozen media people with cameras and sound equipment, and green-uniformed sheriffs began arriving. Base guards were assembling again on the grassy area inside the fence, but there were many more than on the preceding day. Almost hidden by trees a few hundred yards behind the Pan Am base guards, were standing soldiers, who were quickly identified by vigilers as "Marines." There was excited speculation as to what the presence of the Marines might mean.

Quiet excitement and tension mounted to explode in a cheer as vigilers saw a long procession of demonstrators approaching. And then silence again descended as vigilers, media, guards, and soldiers watched the procession of hundreds of people stop in the area by the main gate, which had been occupied by the vigilers just a short time before. After a few very quiet minutes in which everyone seemed motionless, there was a signal, and dozens of people began to climb over the six-foot high base fence with the help of ladders and support people. Once over, they clustered in affinity groups and walked with an air of jubilance up a grassy slope, where they unfurled the United Nations flag, and sat down. The guards and soldiers remained in their positions until about 300 people had entered the base, and there did not appear to be any more climbing over the fence.

The minutes passed as the crowd quietly waited and watched. Soon buses appeared from behind large brick buildings on the base, and guards approached the small groups sitting on the "grassy knoll." In some groups, the members held hands and
followed behind guards to the buses. In other groups, some of the members went limp and were dragged or carried to the buses. Eventually the grassy knoll was emptied of its occupiers.

The hundreds of demonstrators standing on the public road observing the departing buses were left to speculate where the c.d.-ers were being taken: to a base building to be issued a "barring letter" and released, to a court house or jail in one of the nearby cities? Or would they be simply taken to another gate on the far side of the base to be released? Those in support roles remained to wait until they knew the fate of the c.d. members of their affinity group, while others left for home. Hours later word came that all but five had been given "barring letters" which prohibited them from returning to the base, and had been released without charge in a nearby city. The five had received this kind of barring letter in a previous demonstration, and so were arrested for re-entering the base, and were charged with trespassing.

Foiled in their attempt to be charged for their civil disobedience action, the rest of the c.d.-ers returned to the Peterson farm, and the next morning went over the fence again. This time 265 people, including approximately 90 Canadians were taken to courts in nearby cities, were charged with trespassing, and were released until the time of the trial. Charges against many were subsequently dropped because of
inadequate administrative records of the arrest at the base. In December 1978, 176 persons including 25 Canadians, were brought to trial in what was reported to be one of the largest trials in United States history.
(ii) New York City

A series of events in New York City organized by the Mobilization for Survival began a few days after the rally, march and civil disobedience action at Bangor, Washington. These events included: an International Religious Convocation for Survival on May 25 and 26; a march, rally and die-in on May 27; an International Mobilization for Survival conference on May 28 and 29; and a "sit-in" at the United States Mission to the United Nations on June 12 which resulted in the arrest of 400 people. As with the activities at Bangor, one of the main purposes of these events was to publicize and enliven the discussion of the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament convening in New York.

Participating in some of the Mobilization's events were persons from many countries and disarmament groups. Representatives from more than 200 non-governmental organizations had come to New York to observe the Special Session, to lobby diplomats, and to report on the Special Session to groups in their home countries. Present were Canadians from groups such as Project Ploughshares, the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace, the Voice of Women and the Vancouver Ad Hoc Coalition for Disarmament. Five hundred Japanese, many of whom were members of the Japanese Congress Against A and H Bombs, had brought with them a petition calling for nuclear disarmament which had purportedly been
signed by 20 million Japanese, and weighed twelve tons. Representatives of the World Peace Council had also brought a petition called the "Stockholm Peace Appeal" which they claimed had been signed by 500 million people around the world. The petitions were presented to the Special Session and placed in the United Nations vault. The mayor of Hiroshima brought with him an exhibit of photographs depicting the devastation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The exhibit was entitled "Hiroshima and Nagasaki - A Photographic Record of an Historical Event," and was displayed in the main lobby of the General Assembly of the United Nations during the Special Session. (After the Special Session this same display was exhibited in Vancouver and throughout Canada.)

Also present were persons highly esteemed within the disarmament movement. One of these was Rebecca Shelley, a 93 year old member of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, who has been working for a world without war since World War I (Randall, 1964:218). Another renowned woman in attendance was Mairead Corrigan who recently won a Nobel Peace Prize for her work in Ireland. In a speech before movement participants gathered in New York, she expressed sentiments shared by many in the movement when she implored government officials,

Put down your arms. You're not protecting us. Disarm. We are prepared to take the first step to reach out the hand of friendship. Don't dare take a life to protect me. Life is sacred; let no man raise his hand against it! (Hoffman, 1978:7)
Approximately fifteen thousand people participated in the Mobilization's march, rally and "die-in" on Saturday, May 27. The march began at Bryant Park and wound its way through the streets of New York towards the Dag Hammarskjold Plaza by the United Nations complex. Two members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR) reported that the marchers were in a festive mood -- "exhilerated by the sense of comradeship in an important exercise: to witness to life against the forces of destruction." They described "the parade":

Huge cloth cranes, men on stilts and instrumentalists from the Bread and Puppet Theater led the parade, followed by several hundred Japanese, including hibakusha (A-bomb survivors) and chanting, drumming Buddhist monks. Banners proclaimed participation from near and far... and from countless causes: Women for Racial and Economic Equality, National Association for Social Workers, and the New England Whale Society. (Two hundred and thirty FOR members -- individuals and groups from across the country -- walked behind a large FOR banner. Members of Quaker, Brethren and Mennonite groups mingled with 'main-line' Protestants and Catholics.) The garb ranged from levis to vestments, the coiffures from bearded to bald. Children rode on the shoulders of their parents; the elderly matched strides with their younger counterparts... (Brown and Myers, 1978:9)

At the plaza there was a large stage, around which were placed huge photographs of Hiroshima after the bombing. For several hours the crowd listened to musicians, singers and speakers. As at the Bangor rally, in the speeches and songs were transmitted elements of what anthropologists might term the "folklore" of the movement. Following Reich's definition, folklore refers to the "verbalized expression of collective belief" (1975:236), and implies no pejorative connotation
concerning the factual basis of the beliefs. Reich has observed that in revitalization movements, "folklore is used to explain the movement to adherents, to justify new forms of belief and action, and to fortify the newly formed tenets" (1975:243). In the following speeches and songs, movement participants were taught or reminded that they must act to realize a world without war and to prevent the nuclear annihilation of humanity. They were also told that those in positions of power must not be entrusted with matters which concern the life and death of all humanity.

Pete Seeger was introduced as "one of the sweetest and strongest voices for peace in a liveable world." He was greeted with enthusiastic applause, whistles and shouts of approval. He was soon joined by many in the crowd as he sang a song which expressed the longing of many that the first United Nations Special Session on Disarmament would result in a treaty which agreed on concrete steps to disarmament and an end to war. Together they sang,

Last night I had the strangest dream
I'd ever dreamed before
I dreamed the world had all agreed
to put an end to war.
I dreamed I saw a mighty room
all filled with women and men
And the paper they were signing said
they'd never fight again.

And when the paper all was signed
a million copies made
They all joined hands and bowed their heads
and grateful prayers were prayed.
And the people in the streets below
were dancing round and round
And swords and guns and uniforms
were scattered on the ground.
Helen Caldicott, an Australian physician currently working at the Boston Children's Hospital, addressed the crowd. While in Australia, Caldicott had been active in the movement against French A-bomb tests in the Pacific, and she was instrumental in organizing nation-wide protest against uranium mining. Since moving to the United States, Caldicott has been educating and organizing physicians to oppose nuclear weapons, nuclear power plants, and uranium mining. In an impassioned speech, Caldicott insisted

We have to eliminate every single nuclear weapon on earth. (Applause from crowd) There's more and more countries buying nuclear power plants. They can make atomic bombs because a nuclear power plant makes plutonium, which is the most dangerous element I, as a pediatrician, have ever read about. It only takes one millionth of a gram, an amount you can't even see, if you breathe it into your lungs to give you lung cancer. One pound, if you could put it into every person's lung on earth, one pound would be enough to kill every man, woman, and child on earth with a lung cancer. It only takes ten pounds to make an atomic bomb. And every nuclear reactor makes 500 pounds of it every year. And it has a half-life of 24,400 years. It is active and dangerous for half a million years. We, by the year 2020, will have 30,000 tons of it. Enough for a lot of bombs. India made an atomic bomb when she bought her reactor from Canada. Argentina, Brazil, South Korea, Taiwan are all building nuclear power reactors. And you see, that destabilizes the balance of terror. The major powers have a balance of terror called by the Pentagon, Mutually Assured Destruction. You notice what that abbreviates to: Capital M, Capital A, Capital D. (Applause)

Caldicott is arguing that there is a connection between the spread of nuclear power technology and the proliferation of nuclear weapons. This apparent connection has contributed to the formation of an unprecedented alliance between environmental groups opposed to nuclear power technology because of the environmental hazards in trying to dispose
of nuclear waste, and disarmament groups opposed to nuclear weaponry. A slogan emerging from this new alliance is "No Nukes," referring to both nuclear power and nuclear weapons. The Mobilization for Survival includes both in its simply stated four-point platform of "zero nuclear weapons, ban nuclear power, stop the arms race, and fund human needs."

Similarly in Canada, the Voice of Women and the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility is working to eliminate both nuclear power plants and nuclear weapons. In Canada and the U.S.A. it seems that many, but not all disarmament movement participants are opposed to the spread of nuclear power technology. Nevertheless, some fear that it would hinder their group's work for disarmament if they came out publicly against nuclear power, because of widespread support for nuclear power at the present time. They feel that they should concentrate their efforts on convincing the public of the extreme urgency of achieving nuclear disarmament. It seems that in Japan and in Communist block countries, there are many more proponents of nuclear disarmament, who are also ardent supporters of nuclear power.

Caldicott then questioned the wisdom, moral integrity, even sanity of those in positions of power whose actions and decisions have led to the building of atomic bombs and nuclear power reactors. She exclaimed,

What has happened to the scientists and the politicians? Why have they done this to our world? It is not their--It is our world just as much as it is their world. Who told them they could build atomic bombs? Who told them they could build nuclear reactors?
Who told them they could put satellites into space with nuclear reactors in them, all of which will burn up in the atmosphere and the radiation will fall down to give our children leukemia and cancer. We didn't tell them. Those politicians and they are in the U.N. and in the Congress and in Russia and every country of the world, have lost their basic, most primitive instinct and that is for survival. It is stronger than sex or appetite. Survival. They have lost touch with it. If you were sitting on Mars psychoanalyzing the leaders of the world you'd have to say that they were insane. (Applause) And they should be locked up in lunatic asylums for the preventive or for the public health of the citizens of the world. (Applause and cheers)

Our Prime Minister from Australia, Malcolm Fraser, is here at the United Nations to provide disarmament. He is about to sell all the Australian uranium on the open market, all of which can be used to make atomic bombs. He is a prime example of a hypocritical, powerful, selfish, greedy politician. (Applause)

Has any of those politicians ever seen a child die of leukemia? Have they ever seen a beautiful 12 year-old boy come into a hospital with a few bruises. He has a blood picture done. He's got leukemia. He's put in a room all by himself. Nobody can see him unless they wear a gown and a mask. He's given poisonous drugs which make him feel sick. Everyone smiles at him to make him feel better. He lives in a state of abject terror for two weeks till one night in the middle of the night, he dies bleeding from his mouth and his nose and his rectum into the bed. Has any politician seen a child die? Have they supported his parents in their grief?

As is so often done by movement participants, Caldicott is calling attention to those seen as the victims of decisions and actions taken by scientists, militarists and politicians. She is graphically describing the individual human suffering which is considered to be the consequence of decisions made by those in positions of power. There is an implicit assumption that those persons engaged in activities with life and death consequences for others are far removed from the human suffering they are supposedly causing. Also implied is that this distance is an important factor in understanding how
these people can continue to make decisions which cause the suffering of others. Caldicott seems to be saying that if they would only come face to face with the human beings who are suffering as a result of their decisions -- for example, a child dying of leukemia, perhaps caused by increased radiation in the atmosphere -- they would not so easily make those kinds of decisions. In demonstrations, in courtrooms, and in civil disobedience actions, participants continually try to make the "victims" more visible. Sometimes they do this by displaying pictures of the terrible injuries caused at Hiroshima, or by asking Hiroshima survivors to talk about their suffering. Other times they do this by sprinkling ashes (sometimes the ashes of cremated cancer patients), or pouring their own blood at places, such as the Pentagon, where decisions are made or technology is built, which they believe will ultimately cause human suffering.

Condemning a moral order which designates some persons as "expendable," Caldicott repeated the widely shared conviction that,

Every life is valuable. Every single human life.

(Applause) And we are talking about every single life on earth. We are a magnificent species. We are capable of such great love, such creativity, such art, such music. Yet we're so brilliant we have learned to kill ourselves all with a press of a button, controlled by a computer. We are the curators of all life on earth at this point in time. We are at the turning point of the human history. We hold life on earth in the palm of our hand. And unless we eliminate every single nuclear weapon on earth and every single nuclear power plant, I predict, that we won't be here by the year 2000. This is the start. There have been rallies for disarmament time and again. This has to work. There is no alternative.
Caldicott's concluding statement elicited long applause, whistles and shouts of agreement.

Daniel Ellsberg, who achieved fame during the Vietnam war for making public classified documents which became known as the "Pentagon papers," was scheduled to speak at the rally, but was not present. The explanation given for his absence was that he was appearing in court for a civil disobedience action at a Colorado factory which produced triggers for nuclear bombs. Dave Dellinger spoke in his place.\textsuperscript{12} Dellinger was introduced as,

\dots someone whose name is history. His name is history and his name is current events. He's a pacifist and an anti-war activist and a civil rights activist whom you all know. Defendant in the Chicago Conspiracy trial in '69, active in the July 4th Coalition, the People's Alliance, and now produces \textit{Seven Days}, an independent news magazine in New York, most of you I'm sure have heard about it. \dots

In his speech, Dellinger called out

\dots Who says the people don't care anymore? that they're apathetic and grasping for purely personal solutions leaving the status quo intact? Here's the answer today. And we're giving the Pentagon and the press and the people who wish we were dead, we're giving them answers all over the place at Rocky Flats, Barnwell, Seabrook, Trident in Washington (Applause) and some of us are going to be back on June 12th to sit-in at the United States Mission. \dots and some of us are going to be at Seabrook on the 24th of June to give them still another answer. (Cheering and applause)

Rocky Flats, Barnwell, and Seabrook are all American sites of large anti-nuclear demonstrations and civil disobedience actions in recent years. Rocky Flats, 16 miles northwest of Denver was begun in 1951 and is the site for producing all of the plutonium triggers for the American nuclear arsenal. According to a Pacific Life Community
newsletter (June 1978), the plant regularly allows emissions of low level ionizing radiation into the atmosphere, and has been the site of many accidents which have resulted in the permanent radioactive contamination of 11,000 acres. Radioactive wastes from Rocky Flats purportedly have found their way into streams, and in one reported case contaminated the water supply of a Denver suburb. Barnwell is the site of a nuclear waste plant in South Carolina. On April 30, 1978, 2,000 persons calling themselves "a human petition" demonstrated there and 280 people were arrested. Seabrook, New Hampshire is the construction site of a nuclear power plant. Several very large civil disobedience actions there have become a model for similar demonstrations throughout North America. "Seabrook" has become the topic of films, videotapes, and booklets in the "anti-nuke" movement.

Dellinger continued,

You know that since World War II there have been 6,000 meetings by the government to talk about disarmament. Sid Lens figured that out. And you know that the end result of that is the greatest escalation of destructive power in human history . . .

It's time for the American people to do what we did in the Vietnam war, and that is to take the question of life and death away from the governments and the hypocrites and the multinational corporations. (Applause and cheering) It's time to say that the power is here in the streets not over there where they're meeting again. (Applause) It's time to say that the experts are the people who live and suffer and bleed and struggle, not the people who are the so-called experts who brought us the war in Indochina, who brought us Watergate, who brought us the C.I.A., who brought us Chile, the list goes on and on . . .

It's time now to say No to all of that. No to nuclear weapons. No to conventional weapons. No to nuclear power. No to the multinational corporations and finally No to the whole system of greed and power . . . that is bringing these things upon us.
Dellinger paused for a few moments as the crowd applauded and shouted "no! no! no! no! no! . . . " and then continued with his speech.

The speakers following Dellinger were two men who were Dellinger's kind of expert: people who had "suffered and bled." The first, named Masuto Higasaki, was an 83 year-old survivor of the Hiroshima bombing, whose wife and child had died in the blast. The second, named Ron Kovic, was a paraplegic Vietnam war veteran, and author of *Born on the Fourth of July*. Addressing the crowd through an interpreter, Higasaki vividly described the human suffering resulting from the atomic bombing which he experienced and observed all around him. Kovic, completely paralyzed from the waist down, spoke from his wheelchair. He began his speech by crying out slowly, in a powerful and emotional voice,

Auschwitz
Hiroshima
Nagasaki
Vietnam
crimes against humanity
victimization of the peoples of the world

"Auschwitz" and "Hiroshima" in the most literal sense are the place names of two human settlements. However certain events which occurred in these places more than three decades ago have rendered the names highly emotive and charged with meaning. These names have become symbols of "holocaust," and are repeatedly evoked by movement participants dedicated to preventing a "nuclear holocaust." These earlier "holocausts" are referred to over and over again at demonstrations, civil disobedience actions and trials. Geertz has observed that
symbols have a double aspect: they are models of reality and models for reality. In this way, "they give meaning, that is, objective conceptual form, to social and psychological reality both by shaping themselves to it and by shaping it to themselves" (Geertz, 1973:93). The names "Auschwitz" and "Hiroshima" are now used to encapsulate and summon an array of understandings, images, emotions and moral judgements about the intentional killing of tens of thousands of human beings which occurred in these places during the last world war. They are also employed by movement participants to express the concept that in the present reality are operative the same processes which led to the victimization of many thousands of people at these two places, and which may again lead to the victimization of millions, perhaps billions, more.13 Robert Jay Lifton has said, "What Hiroshima does convey to us — indeed press upon us — is the realization that it actually happened and the implication that it could happen again" (1967:13).14 Auschwitz and the Nazi program of genocide hold a similar terror. For persons such as Kovic and Dellinger, who were involved in the movement opposing American involvement in the war in Indochina, "Vietnam" is also a highly emotive symbol laden with moral judgements about the use of American soldiers and technology to kill persons in that place.

With his compelling voice, Kovic declared,

Masuto Higasaki and I stand before you today symbols of living death symbols of crimes committed against humanity
We are here today to solemnly commit ourselves in front of the whole world to peace, and an end to crimes against humanity. (Applause)

We are angry and righteous and just in our commitment today.

For the last ten years I've been sitting in this wheelchair paralyzed from the waist down.

For the last 25 years victims of Auschwitz, Hiroshima and Nagasaki have suffered also.

We are here today to say that we want a sensitive world. A world that cares about people.

We are here today to not only say that we are for peace, but brothers and sisters, we are here today to hold the leaders of this country accountable. (Applause and cheers)

We are here today— We are here today to tell President Jimmy Carter and Andy Young that if they don't give us our human rights, if they don't put people and human life before profit, then we are going to fill the streets and universities of this country once again.

We are going to commit ourselves to peace today, and if they don't think about peace, if they don't listen to the voice that is crying throughout this country, if they don't listen to us then we are going to fill the jails, we're going to picket and march in thousands

Kovic was drowned out by whistles, cheers and applause.

Today as a whole nation, we begin a new movement, a new era in this country.

We are going to shake the foundations of this system until they hear our human cry. (Clapping and cheering) Peace. Peace. Peace. Peace. . .

The crowd also began to shout out "Peace. Peace. Peace. . . ." As they continued to shout, Kovic called

Let them hear it in Washington.
Let them hear it all over the world.
In Auschwitz. In Nagasaki.
Louder! Louder! Louder!

Kovic reached out from his wheelchair and embraced Higasaki as the crowd continued to clap and shout "Peace! Peace! Peace!"

Over the tumultous shouts an announcement could be heard, "Now the die-in. Now the die-in will begin as soon as the sirens sounds."
Instructions for the "die-in" had been given earlier in the rally. Describing the "die-in" as a "symbolic action," the announcer had explained,

... I want to say that there are many levels of experience in this action. It may be for some a straightforward envisioning of catastrophe; for others a prayer; for others a bearing witness against human suffering by vigiling. This experience may arouse feelings which increase our own sense of urgency and dedication. . .

The air raid siren wailed for ninety seconds, as thousands standing in the plaza slowly fell and lay lifeless, sprawled on the ground. Two participants described their experience,

... Thousands of persons -- many of them wearing tags declaring them to be 'nuclear victims' -- sank to the ground. They remained in a prone position while others stood vigil. An awe-inspiring silence fell over the huge crowd, punctuated in a moving counterpoint by the quiet chanting and slow, rhythmic drum beat of the Buddhist monks.

The sounding of a chime brought the 'victims' to their feet; they and the silent vigilers interlaced hands. Pete Seeger stirred us into song and the renewed affirmation that "I Ain't Gonna Study War No More." (Brown & Myers, 1978:10)

The statement by the announcer concerning the "symbolic action" of the "die-in" is similar to anthropologist Edmund Leach's observation that, "symbolic behaviour not only 'says' something, it also arouses emotions and consequently 'does' something" (1967:78). Undoubtedly it was the hope of the "die-in" organizers that the emotions aroused during the experience would sustain and reaffirm participants' determination to do all in their power to prevent a nuclear holocaust. The "die-in" and more especially, the civil disobedience action at Bangor, may be examples of what Gerlach (1970) terms "bridge-burning acts." By this, Gerlach means
actions in the context of a social movement which increase the actors' commitment to new attitudes, to a new identity, and to a new sense of themselves in relation to the established order. It would be interesting to see if subsequent to the Bangor civil disobedience action and the New York "die-in," the activities of participants displayed a deepened commitment to achieving disarmament and a new world order.

One indication of a deepened commitment might be if, subsequent to being granted a suspended jail sentence, participants in the civil disobedience action broke the conditions of their probation by re-entering the Trident base. The cost of such an action would be automatic incarceration to serve the original 45-day sentence, as well as an additional trespass charge, bearing a possible maximum sentence of six months in jail and a $500 fine. The next major civil disobedience action following May 22nd, 1978 is being planned for October 1979, and will be the most obvious opportunity for people to break probation. Up to the present time, there have been several small group civil disobedience actions at the Trident base since May 22nd, 1978, and some of these have involved persons breaking probation. After serving 45 days in jail for the first civil disobedience action, they appeared in court for trial and sentencing for the second action. A statement made in court by one of these defendants does suggest that the experience has deepened his commitment to continue resisting the activities of those institutions which
prepare for the destruction of human life. He declared,

... I want this Court to know that I do not stand before it penitent, but triumphant! To remind it of the ultimate futility of punishment for those who choose to affirm nonviolence and life. I cannot be deterred by any sentence of the Federal Court. Place me in jail and I grow strong from the support of a community of friends from around the world. Place me in jail and my commitment to nonviolence is renewed by my readings and reflections. Place me in jail and I find my actions affirmed by the lives and sacrifices of all who have gone before me to such places for affirming life — for living peace. How can we be punished — or deterred — who believe that the power of this Court, based on violence and ultimately supporting that ultimate profanity towards human life: Trident and nuclear holocaust, is itself powerless over all but our most physical condition. The Court, I hope, must sense the irony of finding itself limited to punishing us by a means that puts our lives, our values, in such a dramatic and profoundly appropriate place as jail. Know, Judge, that each time you place one of us in jail, no matter for how long, a hundred of us come out... It remains to be seen how many other participants in the civil disobedience action of May 1978 share this person's strengthened resolve to work relentlessly to prevent a nuclear holocaust.
Participants in the nuclear disarmament movement are attempting to prevent an imminent catastrophe of nuclear holocaust and to create a new social order. They contend that catastrophe is inevitable unless enough people choose to prevent it, and act soon enough in the right ways. However, the questions "how many is enough people?" "how soon is soon enough?" and "what are the right ways?" elicit different, seldom precise responses. Underlying these responses are assumptions about the nature of: the cosmos, "good" and "evil," different kinds of power, human beings, the social order and social change. These assumptions, which can be considered world view assumptions,\(^1\) inform the participant's analysis of the causes of imminent catastrophe, and their choice of strategy and tactics in endeavouring to prevent it and at the same time realize a new world. Controversy in the movement, and especially in coalitions, often erupts in discussions of analysis, strategy and tactics, but seldom is time taken to articulate the differences in underlying assumptions which frequently seem to be the basis of the controversy.

In this chapter I examine the approach to disarmament advocated by Jim Douglass, and the underlying world view assumptions which inform his approach. Douglass could be labelled as a Catholic theologian, as a proponent of Gandhian nonviolence and of feminism, as a participant in the American
"Catholic Left" resistance to the war in Indochina, and as a participant in the current campaign against the construction and deployment of the Trident submarine. He is a rather controversial figure among movement participants not involved in the Trident campaign because of his insistence that nonviolent direct action and civil disobedience must be the "cutting edge" of work for peace and a new world. Within the Trident campaign, he also is somewhat controversial because of his emphasis on a spiritual basis for nonviolent action.

In his latest book Lightning East to West, Douglass outlines his vision of "the spirit and strategy of the Trident campaign" -- a campaign in which he and his wife Shelley have had a great deal of input. In this book, Douglass articulates what he perceives to be the nature and source of imminent catastrophe, and he outlines his basis for hope that human beings could exercise or invoke the power necessary to avert catastrophe, and at the same time transform the existing order.

It is necessary to emphasize that many participants in the Trident campaign do not share Douglass' vision, as he readily admits (1978:Ch.5:20), and that he is not viewed by himself or others in the campaign as their leader, their organizer, or their spokesman. Such a view would be considered highly objectionable, and possibly sexist, because it contradicts principles of equality, concensus decision-making and shared responsibility which Douglass and others
value. Many participants, including Douglass, call themselves "feminists," and a great deal of attention is given to avoiding traditional patterns of male leadership or domination in group discussions and decision-making.

Nevertheless, through his writings, his public speaking engagements, his personal contacts, and the example of his own life, Douglass has achieved a reputation throughout North America. He has inspired or challenged persons to commit themselves to preventing a final holocaust by "stopping the world of violence which makes Trident possible, and beginning a new one." The final chapter of Lightning East to West is entitled "Invitation." It seems that most of Douglass' writings issue an invitation to struggle and suffer for a new world of peace and justice through engagement in a process he calls "resistance and contemplation." Douglass displays some of the characteristics of a millenarian movement prophet, who "externalizes and articulates what it is that others can as yet only feel, strive towards and imagine but cannot put into words or translate into action..." (Burridge, 1971:155), and who

... specifically attempts to initiate, both in himself as well as in others, a process of moral regeneration. Both he and his audience are caught between opposed conditions of being. But whereas the prophet has travelled some way along the road toward synthesis, and in himself represents it, his audience has to be persuaded into taking the same path. (Burridge, 1971:162)

It is not my intent to label or focus on Jim Douglass as the prophet of the Trident campaign, let alone the whole nuclear disarmament movement. I merely wish to point
out that in articulating a choice between personal and social transformation or catastrophe, Douglass is employing the "language of prophetic alternativism." Also, in calling people to a new way of life in a manner which often strikes a responsive chord, Douglass is displaying qualities associated with a prophet-figure.

Before proceeding with a discussion of Douglass' approach to nuclear disarmament, as articulated in Lightning East to West, I will provide some biographical information concerning ideas, persons and experiences which have been influential in the formulation of his world view and his approach to nuclear disarmament. This information comes primarily from two sources: Douglass' own account in Lightning East to West, and a doctoral dissertation by Charles Meconis (1977), entitled "Religion and Radicalism: The American 'Catholic Left' as a Social Movement, 1961 - 1975."
Dorothy Day, Thomas Merton and the "Catholic Left"

Douglass was born in the late 1930's. He spent his childhood in Hedley, British Columbia, a small mining town in the Kootenays. Because of the American citizenship of his parents, he is able to claim dual citizenship in both countries. He has spent most of his adult years in the United States, but has periodically returned to his home in Hedley, where he has written numerous articles and several books on the topic of "nonviolent resistance." In Lightning East to West he writes

My world over the past ten years has really been two worlds, a world of resistance and a world of contemplation. The two worlds exist on opposite sides of a border, dividing the United States and Canada, the two countries in which I am a citizen.

On the U.S. side of the border, my life has been one of resistance -- resistance to the war in Indochina, to the global policies the war expresses, and to a deeper spirit of death in America. . .

The other world I have known, on the Canadian side of the border, has been a world of contemplation. I have always returned to my original home in Canada in order to write -- or more exactly, to work through questions of evil, violence, and nonviolence which have opened to truth only through a sustained period of struggle, and of writing through the stages of the struggle.

Douglass recalls that he first became concerned about nuclear disarmament more than twenty years ago while he was a student at the University of Santa Clara.

The end of the world, nonviolence, and the Catholic Worker were all introduced to me one morning in the spring of 1957 in a freshman English class. . . . our professor passed out an article about a group of people in New York City who had refused to take shelter during a compulsory civil defense drill. Instead of going underground, these people, 29 of them as I recall, went into Central Park where they awaited arrest for being
in the open. They said that to go into a shelter, assuming a hydrogen bomb was about to explode overhead was not only futile but immoral: it was to say yes to the sin and crime of preparing for nuclear war. Better to go to jail, and they did. (Douglass, 1978:Ch.1:7)

All the students in the class, including Douglass, argued against their professor's contention that these people were right in their disobedience to the state. Douglass continued to brood over these people's disturbing action, and finally came to believe that "the refusal to go underground had been sane, moral and Christian" (Meconis, 1977:15). In changing his mind on this issue, Douglass describes "a sudden burning awareness of a two-sides reality: That humanity in the nuclear age was living at the end of time, and that a life based on conscience was a real possibility" (Douglass, 1978:Ch.1:8).

Douglass learned that the people who had refused to go underground included Dorothy Day and some members of the Catholic Worker community. Day had founded the Catholic Worker movement in New York City in 1933, along with Peter Maurin, a Frenchman and a former Christian Brother. Meconis explains that the movement espouses a form of Christian utopian communism and pacifism, and that it is orthodox in terms of doctrine and piety, but radical in its social and political views (1977:12). The movement has established throughout the United States numerous houses of hospitality, where the homeless receive free food, shelter and clothing. It also publishes a monthly newspaper, entitled the Catholic Worker, which for decades has featured writers influenced by a radical strain of
French Catholicism embracing nonviolence along with some form of communitarian lifestyle (Meconis, 1977:274).

Douglass began to read the Catholic Worker and to write on the question of nuclear war, which he perceived as a major challenge to the Christian faith. Meconis writes that by 1961 he was a regular contributor to the Catholic Worker. Reflecting on the significance of the Catholic Worker movement in his life, Douglass relates

That first encounter with Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker put me in living contact with a tradition whose richness has deepened for me over the years — the tradition of faith and suffering love, at the center of the Church and extending through centuries of martyrs ("witnesses") to the cross of Christ. As I began reading the Catholic Worker, I recognized a community living out the Gospel, whose professions of nonviolence represented the life of Christ in the America of the 50's: a life of voluntary poverty in service to the involuntarily destitute, a life of following Providence, of practicing the works of mercy, of resisting a warfare state with nonviolent civil disobedience; a life and way corresponding to Jesus' cross. My introduction to nonviolence, through the Catholic Worker, was therefore an experience embodied in a community of faith, within the global context of an impending nuclear end of time. (Douglass, 1978:Ch.1:9)

In 1961 Douglass read in the Catholic Worker one of Thomas Merton's earliest published statements on the issue of nuclear war. Merton was a Trappist monk in a contemplative Catholic order in Louisville, Kentucky. He wrote numerous essays, and more than two dozen books of prose and poetry on topics of prayer and meditation, Eastern and Western philosophy and mysticism, and contemporary moral and political issues. He died in Bangkok in 1968 while on a "journey to the East" which brought him into conversation with Eastern
spiritual masters. Meconis contends that Merton familiarized American Catholics with two Gandhian concepts: nonviolence and resistance, and that Merton saw Gandhi as an important source for a renewed Christianity (1977:27). Merton's influence on Douglass was profound.

Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker had introduced me to nonviolence in a community of faith. Tom Merton, in his intense essays on war, peace and nonviolence, showed the contemplative dimension of nonviolence, that dimension of inner unity which made deep sense of the fact that a Hindu, Gandhi, could be the greatest modern example of the way of Christ, the way of suffering love to the point of death and transformation. (Douglass, 1978:Ch.1:9)

In the ensuing years, Douglass corresponded and met with Merton until the latter's death in 1968. Merton's life and writings continue to be a source of insight and inspiration for Douglass.

Douglass subsequently became involved in a movement of "nonviolent resistance" with other persons who were greatly influenced by Merton, and deeply challenged by his early writings on the issue of nuclear war. Two of these were Jim Forest (presently the coordinator of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation) and Father Daniel Berrigan. Forest was a recent convert to Catholicism and was working on the editorial staff of the Catholic Worker when Merton's "The Root of War is Fear" appeared for publication in their October 1961 issue. In that article, Merton declared,

The duty of the Christian in this crisis is to strive with all his power and intelligence, with his faith, his hope in Christ and love for God and man, to do the one task which God has imposed upon us in the world today. That task is to work for the total abolition of war. (Forest, 1978:14)
Forest explains that Merton was arguing that,

"There can be no question that unless war is abolished, the world will remain constantly in a state of madness and destruction in which, because of the immense destructive power of modern weapons, the danger of catastrophe will be imminent and probable at every moment everywhere." (1978:14)

Berrigan recalls that soon after the publication of that article, he resumed correspondence with Merton after a lapse of a decade.

I wrote him saying that I found it impossible to live alone with what he was saying and within a week there was a letter back "Come on down and we'll talk about it." And we started all over. (Meconis, 1977:14)

Douglass travelled to Rome to study theology and observe with keen interest the great Ecumenical Council in Rome, usually called "Vatican II," which convened in 1962. In the summer of 1964, an official with the Fellowship of Reconciliation who hoped to instigate a Catholic wing of his organization, arranged for Douglass, Jim Forest and Daniel Berrigan to attend a peace conference in Prague. While travelling together to the conference, the three decided to start the Catholic Peace Fellowship, to supplement the work of the Catholic Worker's established peace witness. Forest explains,

"... there was an obvious need for much more to be done in providing support for Catholic conscientious objectors and draft resisters, and in encouraging non-violent direct action to impede our society's more murderous institutions... America's involvement in Vietnam was much more in view in the French press than in our own..." (Meconis, 1977:28)

The three returned to the United States in the fall of 1964 and received help from Merton, Phil Berrigan and Gordon Zahn (a Catholic pacifist and sociologist who wrote extensively..."
on the Nazi program of genocide) in establishing the Catholic Peace Fellowship. They all watched with deepening dread the war in Vietnam, a war of which few Americans were yet aware. A few years later Douglass, Forest, Daniel and Philip Berrigan and many others in a loosely organized network dubbed by the media the "Catholic Left," were appearing in court for their widely publicized activities protesting that war.

Meconis describes Douglass as exemplifying the second of two types of "agitators" in the "Catholic Left." The first type, of which he cites Phil Berrigan as an example, was "restless, dynamic, likely to act with dramatic gesture, able to infect others and make them dissatisfied and restless." The second type was

... the calm, quiet, dignified person capable of saying very caustic, incisive things that get under people's skins and force them to view things in a new light. Daniel Berrigan, Thomas Merton and Jim Douglass would be prime examples of this type. (Meconis, 1977:298)

Douglass' articles and books were read widely in this new social movement, and Meconis states that his writings articulated the ideology of nonviolence of the "Catholic Left." He reports that one participant commented concerning Douglass' first book The Nonviolent Cross, "... at last we've got some literature that sort of reverberates to our whole action community," and another said that the same book had become his Bible (Meconis, 1977:140).

In his fascinating study of the American "Catholic Left," Meconis reports that this movement consisted of approximately 230 core members who engaged in roughly 60 "actions" to
protest American involvement in the war in Southeast Asia in the 1960's and early 1970's. Many were intellectuals who were marginal to the labour force. Active or former Catholic nuns, priests, brothers, and seminarians comprised 31% of core members. The term "actions" was used by participants to refer to felonious acts of nonviolent civil disobedience against government, military or corporate facilities. Most frequently this meant a small group of people -- an "action community" -- raiding a local draft board and defacing, destroying or removing hundreds of files necessary for the drafting of soldiers to Vietnam, and then "standing by" until police came to arrest them. They usually defended themselves in dramatic trials in which they tried to prove the illegality and immorality of American involvement in that war. In terms of tactics -- small group, nonviolent, civil disobedience actions -- they differed both from the mass demonstrations typical of the larger anti-war "Movement" and from the anonymous bombings by groups like the "Weatherman" faction of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).

Speaking about the "Catholic Left's" origins in the Roman Catholic Church, Meconis states

... its early members were virtually all Catholics, its early leaders were mostly members of the institution's clergy, its early development was made possible by change occurring within that institution and even its radical views were initially formed through contact with liberal and radical thought within the Catholic Church. The movement's early "stand-by" actions were replete with explicitly religious symbolism such as the use of blood and fire as purifying agents, the invocation of God through prayer during raids and in the courtroom and the acceptance of suffering (imprisonment) as a way to salvation. (1977:366)
Nearly all members used the analysis provided by the "New Left" to make sense of American military involvement in Indochina. But prior to 1969, they relied upon Merton, Gandhi and their experiences with nonviolence in the civil rights movement to fashion their response to that involvement. Meconis maintains that,

Until the summer of 1969 the great majority of the movement's members adhered to and were motivated by several articles of the Catholic form of the Judaeo-Christian tradition, the most important of which were the prophetic obligation to denounce injustice and aid the poor, and the salvific nature of voluntary suffering. (1977:366)

However, in 1969 recruitment patterns changed such that there were increasing numbers of non-Catholic core members. By 1973, 46% of all core members (that is, those who had committed felonious acts of nonviolent civil disobedience, whether or not they were indicted) were non-Catholics. With the increase in non-Catholic members, there were at the same time trends towards secularization and increased militancy. There was greater concern expressed about the effectiveness of nonviolence as a strategy and less willingness to "stand-by" for arrest and accept imprisonment. Thus, Meconis locates the origins of the "Catholic Left" within the institution of the Roman Catholic Church, but he traces the movement's increasing alienation from that institution and from traditional "conscientious" Gandhian nonviolence as expounded by Merton, Douglass and others.

Meconis reports that after the disintegration of the "Catholic Left" as a social movement in 1973, most members continued to work for social change. However, the form and
content of their activism varied tremendously. In ideological terms, he noted people going in three distinct, but not mutually exclusive directions: Feminism, Marxism, and community based nonviolent resistance. The last direction represents a return to a spiritually-oriented ideology of nonviolence, of which Douglass was a proponent.

While Jim and Shelley Douglass began experimenting with community based nonviolent resistance to nuclear weapons — especially Trident — within the context of Pacific Life Community on the west coast of North America, Liz McAlister and Phil Berrigan began engaging in a similar process within the context of the Jonah House community on the east coast. Since the end of American military involvement in Vietnam in 1975, the Jonah House community has focused on the nuclear weapons race in their nonviolent civil disobedience actions, which have included "blood-pouring's" and "die-in's" at the Pentagon, and symbolic "grave dig-in's" at the White House. Meconis (writing before the founding of Ground Zero) suggested that these communities of resistance — Pacific Life Community, Jonah House and the Community for Creative Nonviolence — were the most direct descendants of the "action communities" of the "Catholic Left" (1977:263). He suggested that they represent an attempt to reverse the shift toward a more secular, pragmatic strategy of social change, and return to the religious, nonviolent strategy and tactics (such as stand-by civil disobedience of the early "Catholic Left") in a way that incorporates the lessons learned the hard way in that movement. (1977:356)
The lessons concerned the problems of sexism, elitism, and focusing too much on effectiveness and too little on the inner dimension of nonviolence. In a 1975 interview with Meconis, Douglass commented on "effectiveness":

"... it is a peculiarly Western problem, and is one that we as Americans and Canadians have a terrible difficulty in overcoming. From the standpoint of nonviolence, or a religious perspective, it's a false issue. We simply have to concentrate on the truthfulness of the means... and the rest will take care of itself. ... I'm not sure how well we've understood it in terms of the community you're interviewing ("Catholic Left"), because we tried in a lot of ways to escalate the resistance to correspond to the war -- which falls quite easily into the trap of "effectiveness."" (Meconis, 1977:357)

In *Lightning East to West* Douglass writes of these lessons learned from involvement in this community of nonviolent resistance to the war in Indochina. In particular, he draws upon experiences surrounding a nonviolent civil disobedience "action" in which he participated as a member of "catholic (sic) Action of Hawaii." (He had moved to Hawaii in 1971 after completing the book *Resistance and Contemplation: The Way of Liberation -- The Yin and Yang of the Nonviolent Life.*

This group conducted a campaign against the Hickam Air Base which was the center of planning for the Indochina war. Douglass asserts that the "action" in which he participated during the 1972 Lenten season was very significant for the community, because they were able to "break through the public silence of Hawaii's militarism during the most intense bombing of Indochina" (1978:Ch.1:14).

The "action" involved Jim Douglass and Jim Albertini "miraculously" gaining entry to the electronic warfare wing of the Hickam base, and pouring their blood on top secret files
containing information on Laotian bombing sites. They were
indicted for conspiracy and destruction of government property,
charges bearing a maximum penalty of 15 years imprisonment and
a $10,000 fine. Witnesses at their trial included Father
Daniel Berrigan and experts on international law and anti-
personnel weapons. The defendants acted as their own attor-
neys, but two former prosecutors at the Nuremberg War Crimes
Tribunal (Mary Kaufman and Benjamin Ferencz) worked with them
as co-consul. Douglas reports,

... Hundreds of spectators heard what Nuremberg
lawyer Mary Kaufman called the most startling testimony
ever given in a U.S. courtroom on the war in Indochina. It
included the sworn testimony of a former Air Force
sergeant who said that while he was stationed at
Hickam Air Base he had witnessed the deliberate tar-
getting of a Laotian hospital for obliteration bombing,
as well as the targeting of numerous other civilian
objectives. Our trial was given headline media cover-
age in Honolulu for the week it was in progress, in
spite of Hawaii's militarism. The symposium led by
our witnesses at the University of Hawaii, in an
auditorium packed every night, received an audience
response whose intensity Dan Berrigan said he would
never forget. (1978:Ch.2:16).

As happened in the earlier trials of draft board raiders
and in the subsequent trials of Trident protesters, the
court ignored their arguments that the "action" was justi-
fied because it had been done in order to "draw attention to
and hinder an enormous crime against life, defined clearly
by international treaties incorporated into the U.S. con-
stitution" (Douglass, 1978:Ch.2:12). But because the military
refused to release the blood-stained files for examination as
evidence, charges were reduced to a misdemeanour. They were
found guilty and were sentenced to a year's probation and
fined $500 which they refused to pay.
Jim Douglass travelled to Copenhagen where he presented some of the fine money to Indochinese victims of American bombing, at an International Commission of Inquiry into United States War Crimes in Indochina. He met a young Laotian woman named Nang Oun Kham. She had been severely injured during an American bombing raid on the very same day that Douglass and Albertini had poured their blood on the files of Laotian bombing sites. Douglass interpreted their meeting as a "synchronistic" event — that is, a meaningful coincidence in time which serves as a visible sign of the unity of God, humanity and the universe. Relating this incident in Lightning East to West, Douglass said of Nang Oun Kham, "... she remains deeply present, a presence of the kingdom of oneness which is the world in its innermost Reality" (1978:Ch.3:8). Douglass suggests that this "synchronistic" event is an indication of the responsiveness of God to actions of truth and self-sacrifice.

In 1973, Jim and Shelley Douglass returned from Hawaii to British Columbia. Living once again in Hedley, he began to struggle with the central problem to be presented in Lightning East to West: "the question of humanity's nonviolent transformation in our end-time, when there is little time left for the radical changes needed in spirit and society for the world to be preserved" (1978:Ch.4:14). In particular, he reflected on experiences surrounding the "Hickam action," believing that in that year, in the Lenten campaign at Hickam and in the trial and non-cooperation with the sentence,
they had explored and experienced what Gandhi termed "experiments in truth." It was during this process of reflective struggle and writing that Douglass heard "that the most destructive weapons system in history, the U.S. Trident submarine, was in the beginning process of being based just south of our B.C./Washington state border, a short space from Hedley on the road map" (1978:Ch.4:21). He attempted to relate what he could learn from the "experiment in truth" represented by the Hickam campaign, to the threat to humanity represented by Trident. The results of these efforts toward a "contemplative vision" have to some degree been manifested in the Pacific Life Community established in 1975, and in Ground Zero Centre for Nonviolent Action established in 1977. **Lightning East to West** is an exposition of this vision.
World View Assumptions

In the preceding section were discussed some of the persons, ideas and experiences which have been influential in the formulation of Douglass' approach to nuclear disarmament. His approach could be encapsulated in the assertion, "A lived faith will stop the Bomb" (1978:Ch.5:6). By faith Douglass means, "a commitment to the world's transformation through God to a kingdom of peace and justice." Underlying this approach are particular world view assumptions. In summarizing a few of these assumptions, one can begin with the metaphysical assumption of the existence of a cosmic, spiritual force. Douglass describes this force writing, "I believe there is a loving, caring will at the center of reality which is as objective and concrete as a physical law" (1978:Ch.1:3). He symbolizes, perceives and engages this force or "will" from a Christian perspective which places primacy on "nonviolence" as a basis for morality, ontology and epistemology, and which can accommodate insights into "nonviolence" from other spiritual traditions. Merton was an exponent of this interpretation of Christianity.

This will, variously termed "God," "Truth-force," "Love-Force," "Life-force," "Satyagraha," is believed to be accessible to human beings who, like the Hindu Gandhi, follow the "way of Christ," "the way of nonviolence," "the way of suffering love to the point of death and transformation." The Catholic Worker community demonstrates some of the
practices involved in following "the way": "A life of voluntary poverty in service to the involuntarily destitute, a life of following Providence, of practicing the works of mercy, of resisting a warfare state with nonviolent civil disobedience" (Douglass, 1978:Ch.1:9). This interpretation of "the way of Christ" is, according to Meconis, common to a Catholic form of the Judaeo-Christian tradition which emphasizes a prophetic obligation to denounce injustice and aid the poor, and an acceptance of voluntary suffering as the way to salvation.

It is assumed that in following "the way of Christ" as summarized by the two commandments: love God with all your heart, mind and strength, and love others as yourself, persons can experience prime reality, which is unity with God and all other human beings. This unity is manifested in meaningful coincidences of events which have no causal relationship to one another -- a phenomenon termed by Jung "synchronicity."13

It is assumed that human beings should confront "evils" of injustice, oppression, poverty and violence, and act to transform the social order for the realization of justice and peace (which are considered manifestations of the oneness of God and humanity at the "centre of reality."). But in attempting this, they should not focus on the effectiveness of particular strategies and tactics for the overthrow of existing institutions or power elites, but rather they should focus on the "truthfulness of the means" or the "nonviolence of the means." A paradox in this approach to social change is the assumption that persons can be most effective in achieving
a more perfect social order by adopting a strategy based not on "effectiveness" but on "faith." This strategy based on "faith" involves a "renunciation of the fruits of action, in simple obedience to God's will, a loving, unifying will which in a world of injustice took one inevitably to one's cross" (Douglass, 1978:Ch.1:10). Taken seriously is Merton's warning against looking for results in one's work for peace and justice. He cautioned, "All the good that you will do, will not come from you, but from the fact that you have allowed yourself, in the obedience of faith to be used by God's love" (Forest, 1978:18). This is reminiscent of what Weber terms, "the active asceticism that is a God-willed action of the devout who are God's tools" (Weber, 1973:325).

This "active asceticism" is balanced by a mysticism which through silent prayer and contemplation seeks an "inner unity," that is, a state in which the person undergoes a change of heart, a metanoia experience, whereby they are sufficiently humbled as to surrender themself to be used by God's love. It is this kind of inner change as a pre-requisite for accomplishing social change to which Dan Berrigan was referring when he said, "We cannot induce change until we have undergone change" (Meconis, 1977:321). Similarly Douglass writes, "the world can and will be transformed only and exactly to the extent that I undergo transformation in myself" (1978: Ch.3:12). He draws upon concepts from Merton, Jung, quantum physics and relativity theory to support his argument that the individual can change the external social world by
undergoing change in themself, such that they become an instrument of God's transforming love. He notes that Merton and Gandhi rejected nonviolence as merely a political tactic and emphasized the spiritual dimension of nonviolence. He concurs with Merton's declaration that, "nonviolence in deed was nothing more than a living out of a nonviolence of the heart, an inner unity already experienced in prayer" (1978: Ch.1:9). Douglass characterizes the process he advocates for transforming the world as one of "resistance and contemplation" which seems to correspond to Merton's dual concepts of "nonviolence in deed" and "nonviolence of the heart," and to Berrigan's concepts of "inducing change" and "undergoing change."

The assumption that human beings have some responsibility for transforming the world, for bringing about "the kingdom" or "heaven on earth," contrasts with the more popular Christian approach to the Millennium, which assumes that God alone, through the returning Christ, will finally bring justice and peace to the world. The faithful can simply watch and wait for the "Second Coming" when God will abruptly strike an end to history and inaugurate the reign of heaven on earth. Both approaches are based on faith in a God, "... who will finally transform the world as we know it, filled with violence and suffering, into a new heaven and new earth where love and truth will reign in people's hearts and be embodied in a global community!" (Douglass, 1978:Ch.5:21). However, the former
approach which Douglass has adopted, emphasizes the role of the faithful individual and community in surrendering themselves to be instruments of "God's transforming love," and in working for the realization of "the kingdom" in their contemporary social world.
In *Lightning East to West* Douglass points to specific historical trends in the contemporary world as evidence that humanity exists in the shadow of imminent catastrophe. These trends in world population growth, pollution, resource depletion, and the worldwide proliferation of nuclear technology, are the basis for his contention that humanity exists in an "end-time." By "end-time" he means "a time in which the political and technological structures of the world make it probable that the human race will soon cease to exist" (1978: Ch.1:4). He concurs with U Thant's insistence that the only species sustaining choice open to humanity is a global partnership "to curb the arms race, to improve the human environment, to defuse the population explosion, and to supply the required momentum to development efforts" (1978:Ch.2:2). However, perceiving the deeper causes of the world's imminent end in our time to be humanly and technologically heightened forms of violence, Douglass argues that a commitment to nonviolence is essential to bring about this new global partnership or world community.

Douglass suggests that "lightning east to west" can be adopted as the image of our end-time. He contends that it captures the essence of the choice before humanity: to be consumed by the lightning fire of nuclear holocaust, or to participate in a process of nonviolent transformation by the lightning fire of a spiritual force of truth and love which
can unite all of humanity in a "kingdom of oneness" -- a "kingdom of Reality." As mentioned in the Introduction, this image is derived from the biblical millennial prophesy from Matthew 24:27 that, "The coming of the Son of Man will be like lightning in the east flashing far into the west."

Douglass bases his hope that humanity can avoid holocaust and experience the Kingdom, on a belief that there is a spiritual equation corresponding to Einstein's physical equation $E=mc^2$, which if discovered and experimented with seriously enough, could release sufficient spiritual energy to unite all of humanity in a force of love and truth. Just as Einstein pointed out the possibility of a previously inconceivable physical energy contained in any particle of matter, so, claims Douglass, did Carl Jung suggest the possibility of a tremendous spiritual or psychic energy within human beings. Douglass refers to Jung's suggestion of the possibility of an ultimate agreement between psychic and physical forms of energy as the basis for his argument that there is a psychic or spiritual reality for change in humankind equal in energy to the physical reality of a nuclear explosion. He suggests as an hypothesis that just as "Einstein discovered a law of physical change: the way to convert a single particle of matter into enormous physical energy," so there must be "an equally incredible and undiscovered law of spiritual change, whereby a single person or small community of persons could be converted into an enormous spiritual energy capable of transforming a society and a world" (1978:Ch.1:6).
Douglass contends that Jesus Christ and Mahatma Gandhi had discovered and were experimenting with such a law. It is a law about which Gandhi said,

*When the practice of the law becomes universal, God will reign on earth as God does in Heaven. Earth and Heaven are in us. We know the earth, and we are strangers to the Heaven within us.* (Douglass, 1978: Ch.2:32)

Douglass suggests that in their experiments with this law, Jesus and Gandhi were becoming channels for the release of an objective force of truth and love which exists at the centre of reality, and were thereby transforming the society around them. Douglass argues that

*... every living person is capable, through a particular process, of creating the conditions for the expression of an objective love-force in history, a power of Reality beyond any of us, which can raise humankind from the global death of our time.* (1978:Ch.2:9)

The process is that undergone by Gandhi as he became a "satyagrahi," by Jesus as he became the Christ -- a process which Douglass contends created the conditions of spiritual-political explosions across the world through the deliberate giving of their lives while confronting evil.

The process is one of prayer and service exemplified by the two commandments, "love God... love your neighbour."

It requires

*... a form of being in prayer in which the person becomes ever-more-one with Reality in an inner wholeness... a form of being through service in which the person becomes ever-more-one with Reality in a communal wholeness.* (Douglass, 1978:Ch.2:30)

Through this process of "purification," the individual is remembering or re-establishing in consciousness and action
the unity of all life. Douglass suggests that an individual is not likely to sustain the discipline of this process of prayer and service without the encouragement and challenge of others who are similarly attempting to live this process. Thus he places an emphasis on the individual as a member of a "community of satyagrahis." As they begin to live the prayer of Jesus: "Thy will, not my will be done" in confronting evil, and holding fast to the truth of the unity of all life, so they are creating the conditions for releasing a transforming "love-truth-life" force in their world.

He suggests as an analogy, the purification of uranium for use in an atomic bomb, whereby the uranium "remains matter but edges closer and closer to the critical mass at which point its earth-shattering energy will suddenly and overwhelmingly take over" (1978:Ch.2:29). So can the lives of a community of satyagrahis be purified through a process of prayer and service at a critical depth of "ultimate sacrifice," at which point a self-acting truth-force might take over and fill the horizon with a lightning spirit. He uses the image of the hydrogen bomb (which releases a self-acting energy and heat from a purified core substance to create a fireball in which billions of hydrogen atoms are fused into combinations of a new substance: helium) to suggest that human beings acting in the right ways might release an equivalent spiritual energy. They could create "a force of truth and love powerful enough to fuse billions of individual psyches into a global realization of essential oneness" (Ch.2:31).
Douglass acknowledges that,

The experience of such a spiritual force of fusion is unimaginable, and the mere hypothesizing of it, as in this essay, as a psychic and historical possibility will go beyond any but the most willing suspension of disbelief. But I see no demonstrable reason why the same psyche which, when turned outward, was able to create the conditions for a self-acting force of over 100 million degrees of heat, thus realizing an inconceivable thermonuclear fusion, cannot some day turn sufficiently inward to create the conditions for an inconceivable (but nature-balancing) fusion in its own psychic reality. (Ch.2:31)
The Trident Campaign

Douglass views the Trident campaign as an "experiment in truth" — an experiment in the law of spiritual change, the existence of which he has hypothesized. He calls it, "a communal experiment in faith and hope which can help open up a new world or confirm the inevitability of our old one's destroying itself" (1978:Ch.5:6). Given the high priority of Trident in the Pentagon's military strategy, it was felt that if Trident could be stopped through a campaign of nonviolent resistance, then any destructive force could be turned around, perhaps even the nuclear age itself. He suggests that, "if a community can experiment deeply enough in a nonviolent life-force, the power of the Pentagon will crumble" (1978:Ch.5:3).

Douglass describes Trident as "the end of the world," because the fleet of nuclear submarines will possess sufficient nuclear capability to destroy all human life on earth. Each submarine has 24 missiles, and each missile is equipped with 177 independently targetted warheads. The explosive force of each warhead is five times that of the blast which devastated Hiroshima. Thus, he asserts, one Trident submarine is equivalent to 2,040 Hiroshimas. A fleet of 30 submarines is planned. To grasp the destructive potential of Trident, Douglass suggests,

Begin with a meditation: To understand Trident say the word "Hiroshima." Reflect on its meaning for one second. Say and understand "Hiroshima" again. And again. And again. 2,040 times. Assuming you're able to understand Hiroshima in one second, you'll be able
to understand Trident in 34 minutes. That's one Trident submarine. To understand the destructive power of the whole Trident fleet, it would take you 17 hours devoting one second to each Hiroshima. (1978: Ch.5:2)

Douglass makes an analogy between the Nazi's "final solution" undertaken at extermination camps like Auschwitz, and the nuclear "final solution" represented by Trident. This sort of analogy is frequently made by defendants at Trident civil disobedience trials. It is argued that both "solutions" depend upon the population's massive silence, acceptance and complicity, as their governments issue propaganda and prepare for genocide. Douglass charges that those living in the Pacific Northwest live alongside the steady preparation for nuclear holocaust as unseeing as were the onlookers of Nazi genocide. He contends

... the act of nuclear war can't be identified with the specific commands and pulling of levers which will launch the missiles. That would be like identifying the genocide of the Jews with the specific action of turning on the gas in the extermination camps. The act of genocide, whether in Nazi Germany or in nuclear war, begins much sooner than the final turning of levers.

The act of nuclear war has two major steps: the building of inconceivable weapons systems; the indoctrination of an already apathetic citizenry. Those two steps are occurring now. The technology of first-strike weapons is proceeding quickly in the United States. At the same time, a propaganda war against "the Soviet threat," justifying our first-strike missiles, is being given very little rebuttal. Once the first-strike technology protected by propaganda has reached a certain momentum, nuclear war will be inevitable no matter what anyone does -- in the same sense that people had no power to stop their being murdered once they were standing naked in gas chambers. Nuclear war, like the earlier genocide, can only be stopped when the technology for it is being built. The building of that technology, and the lies sustaining it, comprise the very act of nuclear war. The missile launch completes it in horror. (1978a:2)
Douglass calls for civil disobedience at the Trident base in steadily increasing numbers in order to obstruct construction of the base, to break through public apathy and silence, and to challenge the criminal assumptions upon which Trident is being built. He believes that it is necessary "to act on conscience and international law, and stop the weapons with our bodies and spirits before the weapons stop all life on earth" (1978:Ch.5:9). It is his hope that if the civil disobedience actions are firmly grounded in a spirit of nonviolence, they will lead to a moral crisis at the base and in the general population, and eventually to a political crisis.

Douglass argues that the Pentagon and all other violent institutions are based on an illusion which denies the fundamental unity of all human beings. He insists that no one "believes in" Trident. It is being built out of fear, profit, and passive cooperation. It is being built out of a sense of no alternative and a sense of separation from the unity of all life. He believes that "everyone feels at the deepest level something of our living unity. An experiment in life-force is meant to touch that level in everyone" (1978:Ch.5:20). Encounters and conflicts with Trident's builders and defenders, if carried out with gentleness, humility and a love which absorbs violence, should contribute to "a realization of oneness in the world." Douglass summarizes his vision of the spirit and strategy of the Trident campaign: "a life-force of loving resistance toward a moral/political crisis," in the following manner,
Trident with its thousands of Hiroshimas is the end of the world. The Trident campaign is meant to re-discover a new world, one world, the only world remaining. The campaign can be seen as both spirit and body: Seeking first the kingdom of a deepening, widening community — in and through tactics of nonviolent direct action. Renouncing any fixation on the fruits of action — while trying to choose actions which in themselves carry the seeds of a moral and political crisis. Discovering life — through resistance. (1978:Ch.5:20)

Douglass seems able to accommodate the paradox in his approach of "renouncing any fixation on the fruits of action" while at the same time "trying to choose actions which in themselves carry the seeds of a moral and political crisis." Nevertheless this tension between not using effectiveness as the main criterion for choosing tactics, but still trying to choose tactics which lead towards the goals of the campaign, may give rise to increasing discussion and controversy within the campaign. The Trident campaign currently seems to encompass persons on both ends of the effectiveness-faith continuum. Many participants do not believe in a cosmic spiritual force of truth and love whose power can be evoked to stop Trident. Their approach to choosing tactics is much more pragmatic and more clearly based on effectiveness. Some of these view 'nonviolence simply as a political tactic which is most effective at this stage of the campaign. It seems possible that in the future they might decide that it is no longer the most effective tactic. On the other end of the continuum are a small number of Christians, primarily from an evangelical orientation. They view prayer as their most effective weapon against Trident, and explain their participation in the Trident campaign in terms of trying to display
a faithful witness to the sinfulness of Trident. They seem to hold little hope that their participation will contribute to stopping Trident from being deployed or used. Many others from a more ecumenical Christian orientation seem to recognize and accept as a continuing problem the tension between effectiveness and faith in choosing tactics. They seem to share, in varying degrees, Douglass' hope that a lived faith will stop the Bomb.

It is possible that with Lightning East to West, Douglass may once again fire the hearts and articulate the ideology of a segment of a larger social movement dedicated to resisting preparations for war. A decade ago, Douglass' book The Non-Violent Cross was a source of insight and inspiration for a segment of those protesting American involvement in the Indochina war. Meconis (1977) suggested that Douglass' writings articulated the ideology of that segment of the anti-war movement referred to by the media as the "Catholic Left." It seems that within the contemporary nuclear disarmament movement, there is developing a loosely organized network of Christians in the United States and Canada which incorporates members of the earlier "Catholic Left" movement, as well as other Christians with backgrounds ranging from evangelical Protestant to Roman Catholic. Included in this network are Phil Berrigan and Liz McAlister's Jonah House community in Baltimore, Daniel Berrigan's community in New York, the Sojourners community in Washington, D.C. (which
produces *Sojourners*, a publication from a radical Christian perspective distributed widely throughout Canada and the United States, the Bartamaeus Community in California, persons associated with the Trident campaign at Bangor, and many others. Increasing numbers of persons involved in this network are engaging in civil disobedience actions at the Pentagon, and at other facilities associated with the production and deployment of nuclear weapons. It remains to be seen if this network will continue to grow and become an increasingly visible component of the larger nuclear disarmament movement.
Chapter Five Conclusion

This ethnography has described some of the ways in which participants in the contemporary nuclear disarmament movement articulate, symbolize and act on their belief that humanity is on the brink of nuclear annihilation. Illustrations have been given of the manner in which participants invoke the authority of scientific, military and technical "experts" to substantiate their claims of the imminence of catastrophe. Also depicted has been the practice of posing alternatives for humanity, the most basic formulations being: survival or annihilation, and transformation or catastrophe. They maintain that humanity has an urgent choice to make: to achieve nuclear disarmament immediately or face extinction. They warn that a nuclear holocaust is inevitable, unless certain steps are taken to prevent it, but that it nevertheless can be prevented if sufficient numbers of persons act soon enough in the right ways.

Within the disarmament movement there is diversity of opinion on questions of how many people would be sufficient to prevent catastrophe, and what the right ways are for them to act. Differences in choice of strategy and tactics derive in part from differences in analysis of the ultimate causes of imminent catastrophe, and from differences in formulations of the alternatives to catastrophe.
In much of this thesis I have described those for whom "nonviolence" is a moral or spiritual commitment. This conditions their choice of strategy and tactics. They view nuclear weapons as a logical consequence of the individual and institutional violence which they consider endemic to the prevailing moral, political and economic order. An essential thrust of their efforts to avert catastrophe is transformation on the individual and societal level. They are endeavouring to prevent the destruction of the existing world by transforming it and creating a new and better one. The most fundamental value they hope to be manifested in the practices of transformed individuals and institutions is that all human beings are equal members of one human family, and deserve to be treated with love and respect.

Biblical millennial and apocalyptic imagery, which pervades the Western cultural tradition, is employed by both Christians and non-Christians in their attempts to depict the alternatives of the cataclysmic destruction of human civilization, or the emergence of a new age, a new world order based upon the recognition of the brotherhood and sisterhood of humanity. Closely examined has been one formulation of the choice before humanity, which explicitly employs this sort of biblical imagery. The choice of "kingdom or holocaust," as articulated by Jim Douglass, encapsulates an approach to nuclear disarmament which incorporates elements of Christianity along with Gandhian nonviolence in its strategy for social change, and for transformation on an individual and global level.
Two events have been described in which participants demonstrated their lack of support for governmental, industrial and military institutions engaged in practices which they believe will result in the victimization of human beings on an unprecedented scale. In speeches, songs, group dramatization, and civil disobedience, participants expressed both their commitment to the preservation of human life, and the withdrawal of their consent to institutions which are preparing for nuclear war. Implicit in organizing these events seemed to be the assumption that human beings can exercise or invoke the power to prevent global catastrophe, by collectively withdrawing their consent to certain institutional practices which they believe will, if continued, result in a nuclear disaster.
Before setting aside this piece of work, I feel I must go back to the beginning, back to Ferlinghetti's verse from "White on White" which introduced this ethnography:

And the train
the train made of nothing but boxcars
jammed with three (now six) billion people
still stands in the station
trembling.

This simple verse evokes images of holocaust which emerged from the last world war, which haunt the minds and trouble the hearts of many persons in the world today. Somehow Ferlinghetti renders conceivable and real a tragedy whose enormity and evil are, in the mundane reality of everyday life, too overwhelming to even contemplate, let alone believe.

We all know about and are sickened by the evil of Auschwitz and the other Nazi extermination camps.

No need to describe Auschwitz, the two death camps about three miles apart, the guard towers, the high barbwire fences charged with thousands of volts, the barracks, the gas chambers, the furnaces burning day and night. The evil-smelling smoke. The glare in the night sky visible for miles. The ramp where the long freight trains arrived, the "transports" jammed with prisoners, men, women, children, from all parts of Europe. (Merton, 1971:152)

We know that this process of extermination required the active cooperation and passive acceptance of many, many people, and that few if any of these were insane, were diabolical monsters. Indeed the people who built the camps, who ran the camps, and more especially, the people who knew the camps existed and remained silent -- these people were probably not very different from ourselves, not more or less "sane" than ourselves, not more or less "evil" than ourselves.
The awful lesson we have been taught from Auschwitz and the Nazi program of extermination is the capacity of ordinary humane beings to engage in, rationalize and accept, acts of unspeakable cruelty, especially when these are sanctioned by authority. We know that "given the right situation and another Hitler, places like Auschwitz can be set up, put into action, kept running smoothly, with thousands of people systematically starved, beaten, gassed, and whole crematories going full blast" (Merton, 1971:159).

We all know about the destruction of the city of Hiroshima which occurred when an atomic bomb was dropped on that city on August 6, 1945. We know that this bomb, small by today's standards, created a fireball 18,000 feet across which had a temperature at the centre of 100 million degrees. That 70,000 persons were killed instantly or within a few hours. That thousands more died in the following months and years from atomic bomb diseases. And that children born in the first and second generations after the bombing have severe genetic defects and are dying at a young age from leukemia and cancer. We know that there are scattered around the world nuclear bombs equivalent to more than one million Hiroshimas, enough to kill everyone on earth within a few hours.

We know, and yet who can believe this?

Who can believe that all of humanity might in the near future be victims of holocaust, as were those systematically murdered at Auschwitz?
Who can believe that millions, perhaps billions, of persons might suffer the fate of the victims of Hiroshima? I confess that much of the time I do not believe this. But in the moments that I do, in the moment that these possibilities become not merely words, but become deeply real -- in those moments I feel impelled to step out of the comfortable routine of my everyday life to climb a fence, to go to jail, to somehow cry out "this must not happen!"

I suspect that a key to understanding the nuclear disarmament movement is to understand the power of these recent experiences of holocaust in motivating individuals to act to prevent another holocaust, a final holocaust.
FOOTNOTES

Chapter One  Introduction

1. David Aberle (1966:315-333) suggests an interesting classification scheme for social movements, based upon reference to two dimensions: the dimension of the locus of change sought, and the dimension of the amount of change sought. For future study, it would be useful to employ this classification scheme in examining the range of diversity within the nuclear disarmament movement.

2. See Conlin (1968) and Chatfield (1973) for a discussion of the origins of these groups.

3. See Randall's (1964) biography of Emily Greene Balch, who was one of the founders of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and a Nobel Peace Prize winner. Randall's study discusses the origins of the League.


5. An article by Sidney Lens (1978) listed in the bibliography coincidentally bears the same title.

6. I quoted from Lightning East to West, with the author's permission when it was still in the form of an unpublished manuscript. Page references refer to this manuscript. It has recently been accepted for publication by Sunburst of Portland, Oregon, and should be available in 1980.

7. This article by Geertz is insightful and a delight to read. For an interesting discussion of similar issues, see Elvi Whittaker's (1978) article, "The Ethnography of James Agee: The Moral and Existential Accountability of Knowledge." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 1978:15(4)

9. My understanding of this incident is that someone at the meeting half-jokingly suggested that they should place a high government official under citizen's arrest and bring him to trial for war crimes in Indochina. Someone else commented that the only person who they could get near to would be Henry Kissinger, because with all his girlfriends he probably wouldn't have bodyguards around all the time. The idea for such an action was quickly dismissed because it clearly would contradict the group's nonviolent principles. On the basis of a written account of the meeting made by one of the persons present, those attending the meeting and others were later charged with conspiring to kidnap a high government official, and Kissinger's name was mentioned as the target of such an attempt. These charges carried the possible sentence of life imprisonment. In the ensuing trial, it became apparent that the conspiracy charges were fabricated, and they were all acquitted. Nevertheless, the arrests and trials were a heavy blow to the movement.

Chapter Two  Millennial Dreams and Apocalyptic Nightmares

1. Anthony F.C. Wallace (1956:265) coined the term "revitalization movement" to cover a wide range of phenomena, commonly referred to by labels such as "reform movement," "utopian community," "nativistic movement," "messianic movement," et cetera. He defined "revitalization movement" as a deliberate organized conscious effort by members of a society to construct a more satisfying culture. Revitalization is thus, from a cultural standpoint, a special kind of culture change phenomenon: the persons involved in the process of revitalization must perceive their culture, or some major areas of it, as a system (whether accurately or not); they must feel that this cultural system is unsatisfactory; and they must innovate not merely discrete items, but a new cultural system, specifying new relationships as well as, in some cases, new traits.

2. Kenelm Burridge uses the term "millenarian movement" to cover a similarly wide range of culture change phenomena, as Wallace proposed for his term "revitalization movement." Burridge (1971:13) suggested that,
... millenarian movements involve the adoption of new assumptions, a new redemptive process, a new politico-economic framework, a new mode of measuring the man, a new integrity, a new community: in short, a new man. A precondition of this regeneration is a dissatisfaction with the current system.

3. The definition of "holocaust" in the American College Dictionary is "great or wholesale destruction of life, especially by fire."

4. The following quote by Jung appeared in the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility newsletter (March, 1979, 3(3):4), under the title "In the Hands of Man."

   The devil nowadays is something quite frightful! If you look at our situation, you just cannot see where it will end. Things will go on like this as if by force. All the divine powers in creation are gradually being placed in man's hands. Through nuclear fission something tremendous has happened: tremendous power has been given to man. When Oppenheimer saw the first test of an atomic bomb, the words of the Bhagavad Gita flashed into his mind: "Brighter than a thousand suns." The forces that hold the world together have got into the hands of man, so that he even has the idea of making an artificial sun. God's powers have passed into our hands, our fallible human hands. The consequences are inconceivable. The powers themselves are not evil; but in the hands of man, they are an appalling danger -- in evil hands. Who says that the evil in the world we live in, that is right in front of us, is not real! Evil is terribly real, for each and every individual.


6. Sidney Lens's (1977) book *The Day Before Doomsday* documents many of these incidents. Lens is considered an expert by many in the movement. He is frequently featured as a guest speaker at conferences and public lectures throughout North America, and his writings are often recommended.

7. The lyrics to this song are: "And everyone neath their vine and fig tree, shall live in peace and unafraid./ And into ploughshares beat their swords, nations shall make war no more."
8. "The Last Slide Show" was produced for the Mobilization for Survival by Packard Manse in 1977. Slide #128 shows the Isaiah Wall monument across the street from the United Nations complex in New York City. The monument reads, "They shall beat their swords into ploughshares. And their spears into pruning hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation. Neither shall they learn war any more." The slide show was bought by the Coalition for World Disarmament in Vancouver on the recommendation of Project Ploughshares, and is shown for educational purposes.


Chapter Three Mobilizing For Survival

1. It was the B.C. Voice of Women who first alerted the public in British Columbia to the dangers of Trident, and raised the issue in the B.C. Legislature and in the Canadian Parliament. For an account of the early history of the Trident campaign, see Robert Aldridge's article in The Nation (February 1, 1975).

2. Very occasionally, a few words in the taped speeches were muffled, so I was compelled to make an intelligent guess as to what was being said. I feel fairly confident that the speaker's intended meaning has not been violated.

3. In Vancouver in the fall of 1977, more than a dozen groups agreed to form an ad hoc coalition to focus public attention on the Special Session, and to put pressure on the Canadian government. After the first Special Session in May 1978, the ad hoc coalition constituted itself as a more permanent organization, called the Coalition for World Disarmament. Its activities include preparation for the Second Special Session on Disarmament scheduled for 1982.

4. It was suspected that government intelligence agencies, such as the F.B.I. or the C.I.A. might plant an undercover agent who, posing as a demonstrator, would try to provoke violence between guards and demonstrators, in order to disrupt the demonstration and discredit the peaceful image of the demonstrators.

5. It was rumoured that the Marines in high security areas guarding nuclear weapons had orders to shoot to kill unauthorized intruders.

6. For a further discussion concerning "the geography of news," as it relates to gathering and producing news
For American network television, see Edward Epstein's (1974) "News from Nowhere."


8. The "die-in" was re-enacted later that summer in demonstrations in Vancouver and in Japan on August 6, 1978. It has become a common symbolic action in demonstrations for nuclear disarmament throughout North America.

9. Thomas Merton (1971:160-62), in his essay "A Devout Meditation in Memory of Adolf Eichmann," turns this image on its head and suggests that it is the very sanity of the architects of the arms race which is to be feared. Excerpts of this essay were distributed to workers at the Trident base at Bangor by participants at Ground Zero, who leaflet the base every week as base personnel arrive for work. In this essay Merton states,

One of the most disturbing facts that came out in the Eichmann trial was that a psychiatrist examined him and pronounced him perfectly sane. I do not doubt it at all, and that is precisely why I find it disturbing...

... We rely on the sane people of the world to preserve it from barbarism, madness, destruction. And now it begins to dawn on us that it is precisely the sane ones who are the most dangerous.

It is the sane ones, the well-adapted ones, who can without qualms and without nausea aim the missiles and press the buttons that will initiate the great festival of destruction that they, the sane ones, have prepared. What makes us so sure, after all, that the danger comes from a psychotic getting into a position to fire the first shot in a nuclear war? Psychotics will be suspect. The sane ones will keep them far from the button. No one suspects the sane, and the sane ones will have perfectly good reasons, logical, well-adjusted reasons, for firing the shot. They will be obeying sane orders that have come sanely down the chain of command. And because of their sanity they will have no qualms at all. When the missiles take off, then, it will be no mistake.

... Those who have invented and developed atomic bombs, thermonuclear bombs, missiles; who have planned the strategy of the next war; who have evaluated the various possibilities of using bacterial and chemical
agents: these are not the crazy people, they are the sane people. The ones who coolly estimate how many millions of victims can be considered expendable in a nuclear war, I presume they do all right with the Rorschach ink blots too. On the other hand, you will probably find that the pacifists and the ban-the-bomb people are, quite seriously, just as we read in Time, a little crazy.

... perhaps we must say that in a society like ours the worst insanity is to be totally without anxiety, totally "sane."

10. The interesting definition of "sanity" is that proposed by Daniel Berrigan at a Ground Zero workshop in August 1979. He suggested that "sanity" could be defined as "consistent, compassionate activity on behalf of life."

The location of Ground Zero is significant because the land shares 300 feet of common fence with the Trident base. The piece of property was purchased with donations in December of 1977 by a collective of people, and is incorporated as a land trust. Its stated purposes in Ground Zero newsletter Vol.1. No.1 (February 1979) are:

1. to establish a Center for Nonviolent Action which seeks the goal of a world free from nuclear destruction and unjust divisions in humanity;
2. to hold the land on which the Center is located in an environmentally sensitive and responsible manner;
3. to develop at the Center for Nonviolent Action specific means toward a nuclear-free world based on the principle of truth in thought, word and action, the principle of unity of all beings, and the principle of transforming love in resistance to war and injustice;
4. to explore at the Center strategies and tactics for nonviolent campaigns incorporating the end-means vision;
5. to use the Center as a training site for participants in nonviolent action;
6. to encourage and foster at the Center a continual reflection on, and deepening in, nonviolence as a way of life.

11. The nuclear power accident at the Three Mile Island facility in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania in the spring of 1979, coinciding with the release of "The China Syndrome" (a feature length movie starring Jane Fonda which portrays the dangers of nuclear power), may have substantially reduced public confidence in the nuclear power industry and thereby made an "anti-nuclear power" position less controversial for disarmament groups to adopt.
12. In the 1979 War Resisters League Peace Calendar, Dellinger is described as a "militant nonviolent organizer who served two prison terms for World War II draft resistance; an organizer of the Mobilization for Survival coalition currently, and of the antiwar coalitions of the Vietnam period."

13. For examples of how these symbols are used to express this concept, see the three trial statements found in the appendix of this thesis.

14. One wonders why the bombing of Hiroshima receives more attention and evokes more of an emotional response than does the World War II bombing of London, Dresden or Tokyo. All are examples of the human capacity or inclination to inflict mass death and destruction upon other humans. However Lifton suggests that there is something more involved with Hiroshima (and her neglected historical sister, Nagasaki), and that is "a dimension of totality, a sense of ultimate annihilation -- of cities, nations, the world" (1967:13). This sense of the possibility of ultimate annihilation was not possible with the blockbusters or the fire bombs which destroyed other cities. The development of the atomic bomb has brought with it new dimensions of thought about life and death. It has shaken confidence in the immortality of the human species, and in individual immortality through the continuity of one's children, one's society, one's species.


Chapter Four The Choice: Kingdom or Holocaust

1. Geertz (1973:89) defines world view as "the picture they have of the way things in sheer actuality are, their most comprehensive ideas of order."

Sire (1976:17) states, "A world view is a set of presuppositions (or assumptions) which we hold (consciously or subconsciously) about the make-up of our world." He suggests that a world view includes basic answers to each of the following questions: What is prime reality, that is, the really real? Who is man? What happens at death? What is the basis of morality? What is the meaning of human history? Who or what (if anything) is in charge of this world?
2. Burridge (1971:12) suggests that other terms synonymous with prophet are: leader, prime mover, star or central personality.

3. For a discussion of the language of prophetic alternativism, see the latter part of Chapter Two in this thesis.

4. Douglass kindly granted me permission to quote from Lightning East to West when it was still in the form of an unpublished manuscript. Page references in this thesis refer to the manuscript. It has just recently been accepted for publication by Sunburst of Portland, Oregon, and should be available in 1980.

5. This dissertation has been accepted for publication in the United States by Seabury, and will be published under the title: With Clumsy Grace: The American Catholic Left, 1961 – 1975.

   Meconis became involved with the Catholic Left in 1968 after hearing a talk by Fr. Daniel Berrigan at Stanford University. His most intense involvement began in 1971. He states as one of his reasons for writing about the Catholic Left: a desire to preserve the history of the Catholic Left, and to present its failings so that others may avoid them in the future. Meconis currently lives in Seattle, Washington, and works as the director of the Seattle Ecumenical Religious Action Council. On May 22, 1978, he was arrested for trespassing on the Trident base at Bangor, Washington, while participating in the civil disobedience action which is described in the third chapter of this thesis.

6. Meconis explains that the Council's aims were reform and renewal of the Church, and its message was a new "social gospel," urging Catholics to become more involved "in the world" on behalf of their fellow humans. Pope John's 1963 encyclical Pacem in Terris called Roman Catholics to work for social justice and peace. Some Catholics interpreted two statements in the encyclical as a call to pacifism and civil disobedience. Many American Catholics responded to the encyclical by increasing their involvement in liberal programs of social reform introduced by President Kennedy, and in "social justice" issues, especially the civil rights movement. Witnessing first-hand the extent of poverty and racism in their own country was frequently a shocking and disillusioning experience. Following Pope John's death, this disillusionment broadened to include the Church itself, when Catholic liberals were confronted by strong conservative reaction to their involvement in "social justice" and "peace" issues.
7. Meconis explained that his list of 232 core members and 60 actions was completed solely from public documents and is therefore incomplete. He did this so as not to place anyone in legal jeopardy. He states that, The criterion for full or 'core membership' employed here was the movement's own, namely, participation in some form of 'serious' (e.g. felonious) nonviolent direct 'action' to protest the war in Indo-China. In some instances, such as the matter of refusing to testify before grand juries, an equivalent risk was considered sufficient. (1977:375)

8. Daniel Berrigan transformed the transcript of one such trial into the script for a play and feature length movie titled The Trial of the Catonsville Nine, which were shown widely in North America in the early 1970's.

9. The institutional change to which Meconis is referring is the liberalization which occurred under Pope John XXIII and the Second Vatican Council.

10. Many early members of the Catholic Left were well acquainted with the liberal and radical thought of French Catholicism as a result of attending institutions of higher education run by Religious Orders headquartered in Europe. Also the American Catholic publication Commonweal had for decades featured writers of the liberal school, while the Catholic Worker had featured the radical school. Meconis clarifies that, By 'liberal' is meant that school of French Catholic theology that called for dialogue and involvement with "the world," rather than condemnation and withdrawal, as the way to salvation. This movement was exemplified by such French theologians as Cardinal Suhard, Teilhard de Chardin, Henri Perrin, Emmanuel Mounier and Yves Congar. Its concrete form of expression was the priest-worker movement of the Forties and early Fifties in France. By 'radical' is meant that strain in French Catholicism that embraced pacifism or nonviolence along with some form of communitarian lifestyle. Peter Maurin, co-founder of the Catholic Worker Movement, which influenced so many early members of the Catholic Left, and Pere Regamey, a Dominican priest and follower of Gandhi, were among the most influential advocates of this radicalism. (1977:274)

11. The Community for Creative Nonviolence was founded by Edie Guinan in Washington, D.C. Meconis writes, While its members also engaged in confrontations with the government, including the dumping of concrete to block an entrance to the Pentagón, CCNV put more emphasis on offering a variety of services to the poor of Washington's ghettos, operating a
soup kitchen, free health clinic, pre-trial and halfway houses for convicts, as well as publishing a quarterly magazine on "Catholic pacifism" called Gamaliel. (Meconis, 1977:263)

By 1975, the community numbered forty full-time members living in eight residences.

12. Mary Kaufman has testified on behalf of defendants in several trials of Trident protesters. Most recently, on August 6, 1979, she testified in Seattle at the trial of ten Canadian protesters. She argued that Trident was illegal under international law, and that the defendants were justified in breaking the law in order to avoid the greater harm of a nuclear war. In an unprecedented statement Judge Takasugi commended the defendants for their commitment to save human life, and told them not to be discouraged by the verdict. He said that he was "frustrated" and "uncomfortable" that he was not free to rule on the larger issues surrounding the case. He said he had no choice but to find the defendants guilty of trespass, and gave them a suspended jail sentence, with one year probation on condition of the performance of 100 hours of community service work.


15. For example, see the trial statements in the appendix of this thesis.

16. I would suggest that the trial statements found in the appendix were made by persons who could be considered part of this informal network.
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Appendix  Trial Statements

The following three trial statements were made by persons charged with trespassing on the Trident submarine base at Bangor, Washington. In illegally entering the naval facility, they broke a federal trespass statute (Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 1382) and were liable for a sentence of up to six months in jail and/or a fine of $500. All three referred to their trespass action as an action of civil disobedience. The three represented themselves at their trials.

The first two, Boerger and Leonard, trespassed together on December 28, 1978. They chose that date because of its significance in the Christian liturgical calendar. It is remembered as the day that Herod ordered the slaughter of all male children under the age of two in Bethlehem. (The Jonah House Community in Baltimore often chooses this day for an action of civil disobedience at the Pentagon.) In the leaflet explaining their civil disobedience action to base personnel, Boerger and Leonard included a poem written by Daniel Berrigan to mourn the "massacre of the holy innocents," entitled "May The Future Be Better Because The Present Is Resisted." They were sentenced to a 45 day suspended jail sentence with three years probation.

The third trial statement was made by William Stalder, who participated in the large civil disobedience action on May 22, 1978 described in the third chapter of this thesis. Like the others who were found guilty for that action, Stalder
received a 45 day suspended jail sentence, and three years probation. On January 29, 1979 Stalder and Lutheran minister Reverend John Nelson broke the condition of their probation by re-entering the Trident base. They were immediately incarcerated to serve the original suspended 45 day sentence. The trial statement in this appendix was made at Stalder's trial for the second trespass charge. Like Nelson, he was sentenced to an additional 45 day jail sentence. At the time of their release from the second jail term, they were met at the jail by what one newspaper account referred to as "one of the largest gatherings of clergy in Seattle's history."

Representing the church hierarchy were a Roman Catholic Archbishop, a Lutheran bishop, a United Methodist bishop, and an executive of the United Presbyterian Church. Along with 200 other clergy and lay representatives, they accompanied Stalder and Nelson on a procession from the jail through the streets of downtown Seattle to a nearby church for a "thanksgiving service."
Statement made in court by Jeff Boerger on February 12, 1979, Seattle, Washington.

I would like to begin with a poem from Michiko Ogino who was 10 years old at the time of the Hiroshima bombing. This statement of the misfortune of one family represents in microcosm what the Trident submarine base is preparing to do to millions and millions of others:

Under a fallen house my sister was madly crying.  
The beam would not move a bit.  
Even a soldier had gone, saying  
"Nothing can be done! Nothing can be done!"

I noticed a person coming like an arrow:  
Like a woman it looked.  
She's naked; she's discoloured.  
"Why! Mamma!" Now I felt free from danger.

Our neighbor tried with all his might,  
But the beam would not move a bit.  
"You must give up! Nothing can help it."
So saying, he too went away pitying us.

The flame flared up!  
Mamma's face went ashy pale;  
Mamma looked down at my sister,  
Sister's small eyes looked up from under.

Mamma's eyes followed the beam,  
She fit her right shoulder to the beam:  
"Yo-heave-ho, Yo-heave-ho!"  
She endeavoured with might and main.

"Crack! Crack! Crack!"  
Free did legs of my sister become,  
But down did mamma drop  
Never to get up.

Mamma was bombed at noon  
When getting egg-plants in the field,  
Short, red, and crisp her hair stood,  
Tender and red her skin was all over.

Peeled off was the skin over her shoulder  
That once lifted the beam off my sister.  
Constant blood was spurting  
From the sore flesh appearing.

Soon -- Mamma began to struggle  
With pain and agony,  
With pain and agony.  
She left the world for Heaven that very evening.
We see many parallels between Trident and the death camps of Nazi Germany. You cannot identify the holocaust with the final act of gassing Jews or pushing the button to release the missiles. Holocaust begins much sooner. It begins with false propaganda and citizen cooperation with the lies and builds from there. Albert Speer, the chief architect for the Third Reich, expressed this well when he said, "Things that were unpalatable to us in 1935 became acceptable and even normal by 1942, because we, too had become so much a part of the problem." What Speer means is something like this. The Jews were not immediately exterminated when the Nazis took office; their death came by degrees. First the Aryan clause barred them from all civil service, then their shops were boycotted and sometimes destroyed, then they wore yellow stars and were segregated into ghettos, then came the "work" camps, and finally the death camps — the logical conclusion of the ideology of the "master race." This was made possible as citizens all over Europe digested swallow after swallow of the propaganda. When the "final solution" to the Jewish problem began to be carried out, very few raised any sort of protest. There was too much fear: fear of losing jobs, privileges, even lives. Better be quiet. Better not ask questions. The Fuhrer is responsible — we're just doing our duty and obeying the state, being faithful citizens.

This is exactly what has been and is now happening in North America. We first believed the propaganda that there ever was such a things as a just use of a nuclear weapon. Having believed that lie, it was easier to believe and support the next: that only by building more and better nuclear weapons could we maintain "peace" and a "balance of terror." We believed this lie for so long that when in early 1974, James Schlesinger publically announced our "counterforce" or first strike nuclear policy, hardly anyone batted an eye at the "final solution to the Russian problem."

And there is another frightening parallel with Nazi Germany — (besides a total and unconditional obedience to the state and its aims and goals), another thing that made the Nazi holocaust possible was the fact that the vast majority of German citizens, Europeans, Allies, and even the Jews themselves refused to believe that the mass murders were actually taking place. How else could the Jews go passively to the slaughter by the thousands except that they did not really believe the Germans would do such a thing? And of the few people who could believe that this was truly happening, very few chose to show compassion, resist or come to the aid of the suffering victims.

The only purpose of a nuclear weapon is the mass murder of millions of men, women, and children — an act recognized the world over as the most unspeakable criminal atrocity when the truth of the Nazi camps became known. Will we merely build and build and stockpile and stockpile and never, never use our nuclear weapons? Can we believe that lie?! It has never been true in the history of the human race that we have built weapons which we merely
stored and did not use. Will our nation be any different? And if we do use our weapons, Adolf Hitler and the Third Reich will look like small town, punk hoodlums compared with the kind of holocaust we are in grave danger of unleashing.

And that is why I am here before you today, your Honor. It has not been an easy decision for me to make — to break the law. Having been in Europe and having visited some of the scenes of the Nazi crimes, having read many first hand accounts I had to ask myself, "Would I have hidden Jews in my own home?" I hope I would have said, "Yes." But the technological concentration camp, the nuclear weapon, does not allow me to hide anyone. And that is why I'm here today: to try to stop Trident before it is built.

Believe me, you honor, if I really believed that I could do this through legal channels, I certainly would. But I no longer have any faith in our "democratic" process. As Susie has already told you, Eisenhower saw clearly that our weapons system takes food off the plate of the poor and yet his administration worked on the hydrogen bomb and stepped up military spending; John Kennedy said, "Man must put an end to war or war will put an end to mankind" and proceeded to get us into the Cuban missile crisis, the Vietnam War and more nuclear weapons; Johnson got us firmly entrenched in Vietnam and after saying that he was serious about limiting nuclear weapons took four years to get a single meeting together with the Russians -- nothing came out of those meetings except more nuclear weapons; Nixon said he wanted "peace with honor" and we got "peace" without honor and a first strike nuclear weapons policy under his administration; Ford continued the tradition, and then Carter said he wanted "zero nuclear weapons" and drastic cutbacks in military spending. Now we have the highest military budget in human history and the approval of the most lethal weapons systems in history -- Trident, cruise missiles, the MX, and neutron bombs. So, I don't have faith in this democratic process.

But more than that, the people who make all the crucial decisions about what kind of weapons will be made, where they will be placed, and when they will be used are not elected officials at all! They are Pentagon officials and we have absolutely no say in anything they do. We've had no say throughout this whole arms race.

That's why I'm here in court -- to try and bring about law and justice in this land and not merely law and order. For the fence around Trident has no more right to be defended by a court of law than the barbed wire fence around Auschwitz or Dachau or Buchenwald or Treblinka or any of the other death camps.

The defense rests, your honor.
Statement made in court by Susie Leonard on February 12, 1979
Seattle, Washington.

Your Honor, the decision to go over the fence at the
Trident base was not an easy one. I have always respected
law, but even more so, I respect the moral basis that legal
law is founded upon. As you already know, law should not be
considered morally neutral. There are many points where law
and morality intersect.

One of the most important purposes and intentions of law
is to uphold and protect basic human values. The most funda­
mental of all human values is the right to life.

Trident threatens the most basic value of life -- both
in intent, as well as when it is used. As President Eisenhower
said: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every
rocket fired signifies, in the final sense theft from those
who are hungry and are not fed, and those who are not clothed."

Trident is also in violation of the Nuremberg principles,
particularly under the sections entitled "Crimes Against Peace
and Humanity." It is my belief and understanding that Trident
is a crime against peace because of its first-strike capabil­
ities. We are preparing to wage a war of aggression.

I particularly call your attention to the expert witn'ess
account of Robert Aldridge, a former Trident Missile System
designer who testified at the December 26-29 Trident trial,
saying that Trident did have first-strike capabilities and
thus was in violation of international law.

But even if Trident did not have first-strike capability,
I would still be against it. It is a crime against humanity.
That each Trident sub carries 24 missiles each having 17 re­
entry rockets capable of being individually targeted, and a
capacity to destroy hundreds of thousands of people living in
408 different cities or targets, is a crime. Truly, with each
blast being 5 times more powerful than the bomb that destroyed
Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it will make the past seem pale in
comparison.

Our trust in the Trident Missile System is like an
idolatory. I oppose Trident because its existence says that
we put our trust in the power to threaten and blackmail others
-- to compel them to do what we want them to do. I will not
accept violence as the ultimate way to resolve conflicts.

No matter how high the ideals, or good the intentions,
the damage caused by the use of such a powerfully destructive
system is too high a price to pay. As Pope Pius XII said:
"When the damage caused is disproportionate to the values we
are seeking to safeguard, it is better to suffer injustice
than to defend ourselves."

What it is wrong to do, it is also wrong to intend to
do. There are already too many weapons -- enough to complete­
ly destroy the world 12 times over. It is insane to believe
that one more additional system (such as Trident) will act as
a deterrent. When do we say with our actions as well as our voices, "Enough is Enough"?

Recent history shows us that the arms race, despite talks to disarm, has not only continued, but newer and more accurate weapons have been developed on both sides. History shows us that whatever weapons man has conceived of he has built, and whatever weapons he has built, he has used. I am afraid that we have learned nothing from history. Unless we make some very radical changes soon I feel that we will be doomed to repeat our past mistakes.

A few years ago I read an article by a newspaper reporter referring to Dachau. He must have thought that some of his readers wouldn't know what Dachau was, because in parenthesis he had to explain it. Are our memories so short that we would have forgotten what happened to 6 million Jews and the other millions who were exterminated in the death damps?

Unfortunately, I see a lot of parallels between the preparations for war, the building of death camps in Germany, and the Trident missile system just outside Seattle. What must the neighbors and workers have thought as they built the ovens -- that they would never be used? No! I think that they were likeable and reasonable people with good hearts, but that they were unwilling to really deal with what they were building and how it would be used. They didn't want to know. Was their ignorance bliss? To refuse to help carry through Hitler's schemes involved great risks and consequences. I'm sure that most people thought that the risks were too great and so they allowed the extermination of the "enemy" (even though they were often neighbors and acquaintances) to be carried out.

Is the Trident Missile System much different from the death camps? The only major difference that I can see is that Trident is awesomely even more destructive than the death camps and is indiscriminate in whom it wipes out. It will make the death camps seem like child's play in comparison. Your Honor, I refuse to remain silent, or to let barbed wires stop me, while I see such an oppressive weapons being built.

Yes, I climbed over the fence at the Trident base. Why did I commit civil disobedience? Well, Your Honor, unfortunately sometimes there are differences between morality and law. I believe that I was acting on moral conviction -- a conviction that says that people and the protection of human life are more important than property laws. I believe that while law must be respected it is limited to particular places and situations whereas, moral rules are without boundaries, and that moral laws have a higher level of obligation than legal law.

As a Christian I have chosen to take Jesus' two great commandments, which are universal moral laws, as my guide. It is written in Matthew 22: 37-39: "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, soul, and mind and you shall
love your neighbor as yourself." It doesn't just say Americans -- it includes everyone, even the Russians. Thus, Your Honor, I can not call myself a Christian unless through both my words and actions, I seek to uphold the basic human value of life, even if it means that I must transgress man-made laws.
Your Honor, I hope to make clear that my action of January 29 was not one of defiance of the law or of this Court. Rather, reentering the Bangor Submarine Base was based on my understanding of the law's complicity in supporting the development and deployment of the Trident Missile System. Further, my action was based on my technical understanding of this system as a first-strike weapon: a frightening piece of evidence that, quietly and with little public debate, our government is initiating a drastic shift in nuclear strategy away from the defensive policy of deterrence to an aggressive policy of surprise attack or first strike. This capability is a threat to our own national security, to global peace, and to the lives and health of future generations.

Rather than reiterate all the arguments that have been presented before this Court and others over the past several years, I would ask that the testimony from CR 78-155V and CR 78-394M be entered into the record as evidence regarding my state of mind leading to my reentry into the Naval Base.

These past days in King County Jail, resulting from our actions of May 22-23 and our subsequent action of January 29, have been a time of study, reflection, and preparation. I think it appropriate to share with you and with my friends some of the fruits of that time in jail.

Judge, you and I are "citizens" of two different worlds: the "rule of law" on one hand and the "life of faith" on the other. It is good at this time and here in this Court to consider these two worlds.

You, and by extension the whole judicial system, represent this "rule of law," that is, the reasonable process of law as an abiding and cohesive force for the good of the whole community. Such a process derives its mandate, in its daily life, from the ability of the State to enforce such decisions as are made by the courts through an implied and inherent threat of violence.

It is not my purpose here to question this framework in regard to its utility, though my 45 days already spent with men upon whom the law has been made manifest, is a source of grave doubt regarding the fair application of such laws.

The "life of faith," and here I speak directly of a Christian faith that is rooted in biblical tradition, looks to power other than violence as the basis for right relationship and integral living among all members of the community. It should be equally clear that this faith community is nourished in resisting the premise that violence is an appropriate means of solving conflict between individuals or among nations.
Judge, we are here presented with a masquerade of evil: Trident and the nuclear arms race, which has played havoc with all our ethical concepts. That this evil is being made to appear as reasonable, to be a basis for human security, and to become a model of governance among nations is a cause of profound concern for the Christian community. It confirms the fundamental wickedness of evil.

There are moments in the human community when the force of the demonic so threatens to destroy the fabric of society, indeed seeks to destroy in a mindless way the lives of millions of people, that the very substance of our faith demands an active prayer that strikes at the root of evil, and by necessity, at the root of law.

Nazi Germany and the holocaust which consumed six million Jews was not an isolated incident; it cannot be set aside as an act of an irrational dictator. Rather it was a logical extension of national policies established by the German government of that period and ruthlessly carried out by members of its judicial, police, and military institutions.

Judge, I submit before this Court that a missile system designed to destroy hundreds of millions of lives, established by national policies of our American government, and supported by the judicial, police and military institutions of our government is, in substance, no different from the ovens of Nazi Germany. We are creating the instruments for another more deadly Final Solution.

My past, your Honor, has been a silent witness to evil deeds. I have lived quietly and walked with averted eyes in the midst of a society that has established a policy of global destruction as a means of providing security. Your Honor, I have lived mutely, as have so many others, in the presence of an insanity. A biblical faith calls us to speak clearly -- sanely -- to those institutions that seek to destroy human life through political will or economic policies.

This Biblical faith also demands a radical disassociation from these institutions. This disassociation does not allow noninvolvement. People responsible to such a life of faith will find themselves more intimately involved in the actions and policies of such institutions. Resistance is not a withdrawal, but an active dialogue with the very heart of evil.

It is herein that the "rule of law" lacks the will to resist or enter into dialogue with this evil. The institutions which provide a framework for the law of the State to exist, most obviously the police and penal institutions, themselves depend on the structural and systematic application of violence in the resolution of conflict within the State itself and among the larger community of nation-states. We cannot, and do not, expect such a legal system to undermine its own source of strength by attacking the very premise of those institutions.

In a statement made before Judge McGovern a week ago, Reverend Nelson made reference to presenting his case and these issues before a "higher Court." His allusion to a higher Court is very important; those within the religious community at least (and certainly the metaphor is valid for
many who take courage from other sources) must constantly keep the issue of obedience to a created order greater than the rule of law and violence present before this Court. I want this Court to know that I do not stand before it penitent but triumphant! To remind it of the ultimate futility of punishment for those who choose to affirm nonviolence and life. I cannot be deterred by any sentence of the Federal Court. Place me in jail and I grow strong from the support of a community of friends from around the world. Place me in jail and my commitment to nonviolence is renewed by my readings and reflections. Place me in jail and I find my actions affirmed by the lives and sacrifices of all who have gone before me to such places for affirming life — for living peace. How can we be punished — or deterred — who believe that the power of this Court, based on violence and ultimately supporting that ultimate profanity towards human life: Trident and nuclear holocaust, is itself powerless over all but our most physical condition. The Court, I hope, must sense the irony of finding itself limited to punishing us by a means that puts our lives, our values, in such a dramatic and profoundly appropriate place as jail. Know, Judge, that each time you place one of us in jail, no matter for how long, a hundred of us come out. The Creator is able to raise from the very rocks not an army, but a community of people faithful to the vision that we are all called to be peacemakers.

I did not come here seeking justice, or expecting it. It is not something that you can give or withhold. It is my belief that my life, lived faithfully to the biblical call to a love of the created order which does not allow for its wanton destruction, is itself a sign of the Creator's justice towards us all.