

# Quitting the Nuclear Labs

**A Scientist's Plea for World Peace**



**Andreas Toupadakis, Ph.D.**

# Table of Contents

## Part I Autobiographical Reflections

### Immoral Science and My Nuclear Odyssey: The World behind the Security Fence

This chapter describes the events of my professional life with some details from the time I received my Ph.D. from the University of Michigan, through my work at Los Alamos National Laboratory, Dow Corning, and the University of Crete, until I again returned to Los Alamos. It explains why it was necessary for me to move to Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and how scientists unintentionally get drawn into working with nuclear weapons. It directs a beam of light on the world behind the security fence, a world that the scientists who join these labs are not told about when they are hired. Next, it gives a detailed account of the events that took place during my resignation from Lawrence Livermore, and it tries to describe the emotions and thoughts that ran through my head during those days of my liberation and transition, and the effects on my family.

## Part II Essays and Speeches

### The Freedom to Speak My Mind

July 21, 1999 was a landmark date in my life. It was the day that my very first article was published in a newspaper, the *Rethymniotika NEA*, in the town of my birth, Rethymno, Crete. The title of the article was "Communication for Social Change." Looking back after almost five years, it seems almost unbelievable to me that I had such fear of speaking my mind because of the place where I was working. I went through a great struggle within my soul until I broke loose from my mental prison. I could not wait any longer. I had to *speak* my mind in order to *keep* my mind. That first act of publicizing my thoughts even in a general form was a catalyst for accelerating my decision to resign from the nuclear labs five months later.

1. The peace movement: First impressions.
2. Are 'Full Spectrum Dominance' and Pax Americana compatible? You decide.
3. Soldier, can you hear?
4. Living without the labs.
5. Questions and answers on achieving peace and a journalist's response.

6. Wisdom and compassion need to become action.
7. Nuclear weapons; abolish or perish.
8. Dissecting the meaning of terrorism.
9. Is there Western racism?
10. It starts with us.
11. The real face of the empire.
12. Power without ethics or common sense.
13. The lethal trap.
14. No, we will not; A pledge of resistance and nonviolence.
15. Crisis in science.
16. Scientists' moral obligations in the nuclear age.
17. Nuclear power for peaceful purposes? Questions and Answers.
18. There is no safe radiation threshold.
19. The responsibility of scientists for the survival of the human species.
20. Civilization is for making peace, not war.
21. From nuclear extortion to nuclear war and the coming omnicide.
22. Scientists, secrets, and corporate slavery.
23. Personal responsibility of scientists in the nuclear age.



## **Part III Letters**

### **A Call for Personal Responsibility**

There are some scientists as well as people from other professions that have stood up to various forms of abusive or violent authority saying no more of this. It is unfortunate that most of the cases involve people who do so after they retire. Very few speak up before retirement. There is no possibility of seeing a better world for ourselves and our children unless we take personal responsibility for what we are doing at our workplace. It is great that some people take a stand after they retire. Most do not. But unless a great number of people take a stand against wrong while still working, even at personal risk, we will not see any change for the better. This part of the book is an effort to call for personal responsibility.

1. The reasons for my resignation from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; an open letter to the director.
2. Mr. Bush, soon it won't be a choice; an open letter to the president of the United States of America and the reply.
3. Open letter to Nobel peace prize winner Professor Joseph Rotblat and his reply.
4. The world's people ask you: Why? An open letter to the leaders of all nations.

# **Part I**

## **Autobiographical Reflections**

**Immoral Science and My Nuclear Odyssey:  
The World behind the Security Fence**

## Immoral Science and my Nuclear Odyssey: The World behind the Security Fence

*This is a revised version of the speech given at the University Of Notre Dame on March 31, 2000 at the conference titled "Averting Nuclear Anarchy: The Current Crisis In Arms Control."*

On January 31 of this year, I resigned from a permanent, highly paid, classified position in the Stockpile Stewardship Program at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) in California. I went to LLNL believing that I would be useful in helping to dismantle nuclear weapons and in disposing of their deadly byproducts. That was my desire. Instead, very soon, I found myself expected to work on the maintenance of nuclear weapons. When I realized that within the Lab, environmental or nonproliferation work was but an illusion, I decided to resign. My conscience simply does not allow me to work for the development or maintenance of nuclear weapons. I believe that if a foundation or institution is corrupt you must wash your hands and withdraw from it. Today I would like to tell you my story.

I was born and raised in Rethymno, a city of Crete, one of the many beautiful islands of Greece. My ancestors were Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. I learned from them my first lessons, that "Science without virtue is immoral" (in fact it is a fountain of evil) and that I should know myself. I received my Ph.D. in Chemistry from the University of Michigan in 1990. Since then I have spent my career as a chemist in two national labs, in industry, and in academia.

After receiving my Ph.D., I began my search for a job. I was invited for an interview by Amoco in Naperville, Illinois and was impressed that they had a limousine to bring me to my hotel. That is called corporate luring. There were other interviews by Dow Chemical and by Dow Corning in Midland, Michigan, and by some other smaller companies around Ann Arbor. A trip to the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LLNL) to interview for a post-doctoral position was fascinating. First of all, the landscape was extraordinary. I had never seen the sky so big and blue, and the unique green color of the little green that there is there. During this trip, I also met Dr. Gregory Kubas, whose work in sulfur dioxide and hydrogen had fascinated me when I had read his papers before meeting him. His unique combination of child-like character and great intelligence made me think for the first time in my life that it is possible for an educated man, especially in the sciences, to still maintain a child-like heart even at the age of 50. I felt that I could work with him forever.

Next there was a fellowship announcement from the Michelson Laboratory in China Lake, California for which I applied by writing a proposal on organometallic cadmium and mercury species, although I knew nothing about their use for night-time war plane sensors. At that time, we had taken out a lot of loans because I was a graduate student and my wife was only working part-time in order to take care of our two small children. I thought industry could provide the best solution to our financial problems. Also, getting into academia was not easy at the time even though I had excellent letters of recommendation. I received two offers from my applications and to my amazement both were post-doctoral government jobs. From Michelson laboratory I received pamphlets with warplanes on the covers and I lost any desire to do basic research for them, so I did not accept their offer. I finally had no choice but to accept the LANL offer with Dr. Gregory Kubas. I was glad because I liked Greg very much as a person and as a scientist. The work was purely basic research with no connection to weapons programs, but I had no idea what the future would

hold for me eight years later because of my association with Los Alamos National Laboratory. Looking back I know now that these purely academic projects are sustained in order to lure young scientists into the national labs. I heard this in plain language one Thanksgiving afternoon, sitting around the table with senior weapons scientists: "We need new blood to carry on our weapons research; we need new post-docs in purely basic research". It was not a surprise that at that time a post-doc in academia was making around \$18,000/year, but at Los Alamos National Lab I started with \$35,000, certainly good bait to attract new scientists.

We arrived in Los Alamos in the summer of 1990. The family settled and I started working. My working experience with Dr. Gregory Kubas was the best I have ever had. But the system was not working. Despite his continual efforts to obtain a hood for me, I never got one during my entire stay in Los Alamos as a Post-Doc. I did all my work on the bench with a vacuum line and I breathed a lot of organic solvents and sulfur dioxide, an extremely noxious gas. I had to use glassware that other researchers were using for radioactive chemistry, even though I myself was not working on radioactive chemistry. One day I left the door of my lab open in order to be able to breathe when a staff member passing by said: "Close your doors, don't you see the sign?" I did not argue because I already knew that she did not have much sympathy for those below her, especially for foreigners. I had talked about this with a lab-mate from another country and he had felt the same way.

Someone suggested that I work in a nearby hood, but I did not take their advice because radioactive waste was stored there. A few months later, I noticed a spill on the floor next to that hood and I talked to my roommate. He brought a device and found that it was radioactive. He called the decontamination service and they came and put yellow ribbons around the area until they cleaned it up. Technical area 21 (TA21) in Los Alamos was as old as the first atomic bomb. One day the room where basic research was done on radioactive elements was flooded because of some failure overnight. Our desks were in rooms next to rusty drums holding radioactive waste. No one would speak because everyone was hoping for a permanent position. The work environment was totally unacceptable even though there was much talk about safety. In addition to all the other problems, almost every time I wanted to run a reaction, the cooling water system was down. I could not do much work. Eventually I left, with only one publication.

During that period the Iraq war was going on, and seeing the insanity of the action, I wept at my desk, hiding my eyes from my roommates because I was embarrassed. At that time, I could not connect the mission of the national labs with the brutality of the war. I accepted an offer from Dow Corning in the spring of 1991 and left LANL. During my two years with Dow Corning I lived in the place of proprietary information and secrecy for profit. The breast implant issue was on the news almost daily and the word about bankruptcy and likely layoffs was going around, and in fact Dow Corning did file for bankruptcy later after I left. I realized that everything there was done for profit and not for the wellbeing of humans. The vision of the company was to put a deodorant in the hand of every African and Asian citizen. I was shocked to recognize their plans while at the same time they talked about integrity. By then, I was really disappointed about being a chemist. I was providing my skills to immoral science, helping the company make profits at the expense of the uneducated public.

At that point, we decided to go back to my native country to be closer to family and to give my daughters the opportunity to become more familiar with their roots, their second language, and their grandparents and relatives. My wife and I taught at the University of Crete for two years, which we enjoyed greatly, even though the salary was quite low according to American standards. Eventually, after 2 1/2 years, we decided to come back

to the USA, however, because we missed living in a multicultural society where open-mindedness and original thought were more common. After having lived in the U.S. for fifteen years at that point, I had grown used to that aspect of life here.

I used my previous connection with Dr. Kubas and I obtained a six-month contract as a visiting scientist at LANL. I did basic research on hydrogen chemistry, and published a paper. The working conditions at this time were many times worse, even though I now had a hood. After another radioactive flooding incident, they began demolishing radioactive rooms in the building we were still working in. After the six-month contract period, I would again be without a job. At that time, I had an interview with the Nuclear Materials Technology Division and I was offered a contract job to evaluate data on the chemistry and properties of plutonium-containing residues produced at Department of Energy nuclear weapons production facilities during the cold-war era. This was the so-called "94-1" project. My official work assignment was: "Work on defining storage criteria for actinide materials and residues. This work will include, but will not be limited to, adsorption/desorption phenomena, kinetics of gas solid reactions in actinide materials and possibly include theoretical modeling of the above." Formally I belonged to the Pit Disassembly Team in the Weapons Component Technology Group, NMT-5, but my work was strictly on environmental issues. I was given a security clearance because it was more convenient to be inside the plutonium facility than outside.

When I was hired for the 94-1 contractor job, two technical people, Dr. Dove and Mr. Hawk interviewed me. Mr. Hawk told me that Dr. Dove was a very good actinide chemist and that he would be my mentor. From Dr. Dove I was able to learn very quickly the special chemistry of the project. Dr. Dove was extremely knowledgeable about actinide chemistry and a very meticulous scientist with integrity. I had fun working with him. With Mr. Hawk, I hardly had any technical discussion because he was more interested in running the program than dealing with its technical aspects. After several months, I was shocked when Mr. Hawk told me not to talk to Dr. Dove anymore and that he did not want Dr. Dove's name in the reports anymore. I had the sense that if I did not obey his command, I could lose my job overnight. It made me think about many things. I continued writing my reports.

One day Mr. Hawk came into my office and when he saw me working on a graph he commented, "So you are doing some science!" From a few conversations that I had with him, I could see that he was not aware of the basics on the project as Dr. Dove was; in fact he seemed to care only about seeing the project go his way, no matter what the facts were. We frequently had meetings at Sandia Labs in Albuquerque with DOE representatives, and in these meetings I was asked to give presentations. Several times, I was asked by Mr. Hawk to present falsified results. In order to avoid telling lies, I delayed my arrival at the meetings. When I talked to a man from a different DOE site about my problem, I could see that he understood but he could not do anything about it. I could see that the whole project was led by a small number of people driven by personal ego and politics. The DOE people from headquarters seemed knowledgeable and wise, but the DOE people from Albuquerque appeared to be driven only by ego. Several times in these meetings the exchange of words between these groups became explosive and preposterous.

I was working in a windowless basement room with two other people. Dr. Victim was a post-doc working in the plutonium facility and was doing work in the steel boxes. One day it happened. He forgot about a tiny opening for a few seconds and that was it. He inhaled a small dose of radioactive material and was brought to the hospital by the group leader for treatment that night. It was on the local news. Dr. Victim was fired within one month and was gone: contaminated and without a job. I never heard of him again. The

contaminated room had to be cleaned up quickly, before it spread to other rooms of the building. Teams of people from our group were formed to go in and clean it up. They took turns because it was dangerous to stay for too long. I kept getting e-mail messages urging me to participate but I had made up my mind not to because I was not trained and I had never gone into these rooms before. They told me that they would train me within hours but I kept silent. The next day I heard that someone had fallen from a ladder and had been contaminated. That made me more determined not to participate in the cleanup effort. Because of the contamination, all the computers and some very expensive instrumentation had to be disposed of. The culture was such that it made you think that if you were not a hero in the cleanup effort, you would not have a chance to get a staff position. One night at about the same time in a different building, there was a large explosion followed by fire. It was said that if people had been around they would have been killed. Apparently because of the extreme secrecy of the project involved, samples had been mislabeled and put in the wrong ovens.

The rumors at this point were that money for environmental work was not coming in and that I could be without work overnight. We had just bought a house and my wife had only a part time job. I was advised that my chances for work would be much better if I would be trained as a radioactive materials handler and start working in the plutonium facility. I could see where I was going but felt that I had no other choice. Once again, it was like being in hell. I took all the training in order to be able to work in the boxes. After many hours of training, I was astonished at the deception. The reading materials that every worker had to read and be examined on stated that radiation is just like the sunlight; in fact airline stewardesses could get higher doses than plutonium workers could. But if this was true, why had there been such a commotion after the little accident with Dr. Victim?

I started working in the plutonium facility. I could not believe how I had found myself in that position, having to handle radioactive waste in a place worse than hell because of the hundreds of regulations about safety and security concerns. I was in a state of despair. I started believing that I was getting physically sick and I had panic attacks that I would die. I could not talk to anyone, not even to my wife, because I did not want to make her worry. This went on for months, until my many efforts to secure a permanent position had failed. In one way I was relieved; on the other hand, I was again in a state of nowhere to go. I had applied to every college and high school in Los Alamos, Santa Fe and even in Albuquerque. I could not get hired in public school because I did not have teaching certification. I had only one offer from a community college in Albuquerque with a very small salary. We decided we could not afford to make ends meet with that salary and we would have to move to a place we really did not like.

My team leader came to my rescue when she told me that someone in Livermore was looking for a chemist and that I should write to him. I did. I was given an interview and I was offered the job after a few weeks. I would have a starting salary of \$7200 per month, a one-time hiring bonus in the amount of \$10,000 payable within 30 days of my start date, and the best benefits you could get. I was never told what I would be working on and I assumed that it would be similar to what I had been doing in Los Alamos, working in the environmental area. When I was writing my cover letter I wanted to state the code number for the job and I called the Lab. I got the code # and I went on the web to read the job description. I saw that it was not really environmental and it was not a good match with my background, so I called again and expressed my concern. I was told that it did not really matter because the Lab was planning to change the description anyway, so I assumed that all this was just a formality and that I did not have to pay much attention. But when I arrived, I soon realized that I was working in the Stockpile Stewardship Program,

maintaining the nuclear arsenal. What exactly is the DOE Stockpile Stewardship Program? Here are two quotes that show very clearly the aggressiveness of the program and its incompatibility with the nuclear weapons nonproliferation treaties signed by the USA government:

- *The Department of Energy will ensure the safety, security and reliability of the enduring stockpile, without nuclear tests... through the vigorous implementation of the integrated Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program, a scientific and technical challenge perhaps as formidable as the Manhattan Project.*  
-- Testimony of Dr. Victor Reis, (former) DOE Assistant Secretary of Defense Programs to the Senate Armed Services Committee, March 19, 1997.
- *Our tools under stockpile stewardship are working so well today that we are not only able to certify safety and reliability... but we are also able to meet new military requirements.*  
-- Interview with Undersecretary of Energy Ernest Moniz in Air Force Magazine, February 2000.

The Stockpile Stewardship Program has many facets, one of which is to analyze the aging processes of the materials used in nuclear weapons, such as high explosives, uranium, plutonium, organic materials, and polymers. I belonged to the Chemistry and Materials Science Directorate, to the Chemistry and Chemical Engineering division and to the Weapon Materials Compatibility and Aging Group (WMCA). I was trapped once again. During the first months I traveled to several DOE production-sites, I met many people, and I did a lot of reading; I found myself again in a state of despair. By the end of the year, I was asked to write proposals for the Stockpile Stewardship program and that was it. I knew I would never do that. I started looking for a different job, perhaps in environmental or nonproliferation work. My supervisor, a very good person, could see my struggle and I was told that I was free to decide to either stay with him or look for a different job. I remembered his words during my interview: "If it turns out you do not like the job, there are many other opportunities here at the lab." It was at about that time that he came in my office and told me that effective immediately I would have a 4% salary raise. At that moment I felt that I had to finish the "story."

I started to feel pressure to begin writing the proposal for the new fiscal year and I started talking with a colleague. That colleague told me that he had gone through the same struggle but that eventually he had convinced himself that working on weapons was for the benefit of humanity. I told him that I could not do that. When my supervisor came back I told him that I wanted to find a different job and that I did not want to do nuclear weapons work. He said he had to talk to his superiors because he had never experienced a case like this. He came back, very strict this time, telling me that I was hired to do a particular job and that if I refused, I would be on my own. I was told that I would have a hard time finding a different job at LLNL. Now the statement: "If it turns out you do not like the job there are many other opportunities here at the lab" did not match with the way I was being treated.

Several days later I was approached again and I was asked if I had any family problems. I said I had no family problems but I had to find a different job. Now my supervisor sat down and told me step by step what would happen to me after he initiated the process. He asked: "Do you know what you are doing? Do you realize what you are doing? Do you really want to do this?" I responded in a very calm way that I had made my decision. I left and went home. I told my wife what I had done. She asked me: "But you said that you would wait until you find a different job; now what will happen?" My

reasoning was that if I could not do the job I was expected to do, I would not have the support from my supervisor to find a new job anyway, so why I should wait? To ease her distress I went into the house and I called my supervisor to ask if we could talk again the next day. He had left for a trip and I could not reach him. This time was perhaps the most agonizing time in my life to this day. The next day, 9/15/99, our group leader came to my room first thing in the morning, closed the door, and asked me the question: "Do you want to work on nuclear weapons?" "No," I said. "I came to do environmental work." He left without a word.

On 9/20/99 my supervisor was back from his trip. He explained to me that going to Employment-Between-Assignments status (EBA) would not be good for me. A week later he came to my office again and he said that for security reasons I had to move the next week into a cubicle on the first floor, and in October I would be supported by his program only 45%. After October, zero support. I asked how I would be supported. He said: "It will not be my problem; management will look into that." He also said that someone from AVLIS, (the recently terminated Atomic Vapor Laser Isotope Separation program) without a job wanted to work on nuclear weapons and that he would take my place. In a conversation I had with a colleague, I asked why such an over budget was observed with the NIF project (National Ignition Facility). The answer was so clear. He said: "To secure funding you ask for less than what the project will cost; otherwise you will not be funded. After you start and a lot of investment has been put in place, then you ask for more. Most likely they will not refuse because they do not want to waste all the money that has been spent."

Down in the cubicle I started having interviews with people from different divisions, but I soon realized that I was fooling myself. I realized that all work in LLNL is directly or indirectly related to weapons. At the same time, I spoke out at two public hearings, one about mandatory polygraph tests planned for lab employees, and one about the National Ignition Facility (NIF), where I publicly resigned, calling LLNL a place of insanity. The next day it was on the air through KPFA, a Bay Area radio station. The polygraph tests were planned for 13,000 workers across the DOE complex. After the outcry of a few scientists, they finally decided that only 800 people had to take the test. That reduction from 13,000 to 800 was additional proof to me that something very wrong was going on at my work place, not to mention that some months before we were brainwashed by many hours of lectures given by FBI agents that Dr. Wen Ho Lee was a great spy. Immediately after that, a culture of mistrust fear and terror was placed around everyone. We had to turn our computers off for many weeks, both classified and unclassified computers, and they were giving us lectures everyday about security. Again, after my own investigation from outside sources, I concluded that this man was most likely being used for some purpose I could not understand at that time. But I did find a huge report, the Cox report: "U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY AND MILITARY/COMMERCIAL CONCERNS WITH THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA". I looked at it and I could not understand why there were people spending their time writing all these volumes:

<http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/house/hr105851.html/>

It became obvious to me that the purpose of the report was nothing else but to demonize China. Then I started wondering why a Chinese scientist was accused as a spy even without any evidence of espionage. I could not understand the logic of anything taking place around me. I realized I was working in a mad place. Later on at my press conference in San Francisco, the local Chinese TV channel 66 took me aside at the end of my speech in a different room and asked me what I thought about Lee's case. I told them

that I didn't think this man should not be in prison. He must be released immediately. The same night they broadcast our conversation.

I was also interviewed by National Ignition Facility (NIF) managers and scientists during my search for a different job. In a conversation with one of them, I asked him about the rumors that there are serious technical problems with the NIF project. He said, yes there are but we are working on them. Again I could not understand why a multibillion project was given the OK while even its own scientists were not sure that it would work. During my search for an environmental position, I was trained for a day and was asked to work on a project that had to do with the verification process for documents about the storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain. I experienced a very hostile environment and I quit after a few days.

On January 13, I found a note on my chair telling me to go and see the division leader. I will refer to him as Dr. Leader here. That day, I was planning to submit my resignation letter to the lab director's office. I took that letter, along with the open letter I was planning to give out to the press, and I went to see Dr. Leader. He was nervous and didn't seem to know what to say. I waited. After some effort he hesitantly told me that they had seen me on the local TV news a few days earlier and the way I talked they thought that perhaps I had family or personal problems because I seemed excited while speaking. Dr. Leader said that they had decided to ask me to see a counselor. In fact he said that the lab has a policy that if one of its employees talks about the end of the world then he should see a counselor. I asked him if that was a suggestion or a mandatory request and he said it was a suggestion. I told him that I rejected his suggestion and that I did not have any personal or family problems. In fact, I told him that since I had decided to resign, my family and I were happier than at any other time. Dr. Leader could see what I was talking about, but he was a man of the system. He had to follow orders. I forgot to tell him that many scientists love to have Einstein's picture on the wall of their offices, but that according to their policy, if Einstein was working today at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, they would suggest that he go and see a counselor. Einstein did, in fact, talk about the end of the world many times. Before I left, I did not forget to place in Dr. Leader's hand the Russell-Einstein manifesto:

<http://www2.vo.lu/homepages/fce/RUSSEINS.HTM>

I also gave him the open envelope with my letter of resignation for the director and I asked him to read it because after that he would not have any more concerns about me. He read it and said that it was clear. I asked him if he would like to hear my open letter and he agreed. I read all 8 pages to him. At the end, to my amazement he again asked me to see a counselor. And in a very subtle way I was warned that it would not be a good idea if I would be speaking out. This warning was not from him personally; it was rather a friendly reminder that seemed to say, "What can we do? An invisible hand is on the top of our head and we must not speak the truth otherwise the hand might eliminate us." I was also told at that time that the peace movement would take advantage of me and bring me troubles. Next I delivered my letter of resignation to the Director's office.

The next day at about 4:00 PM I again found a note on my chair, this time from Dr. Leader himself, not his secretary, telling me to go and see him. He told me that I had to move my things within an hour, and to give him my badge, and that he would walk with me until the gate. We had a very nice conversation for about ten minutes, and since I could see that he was nervous and afraid, I told him that he did not have to be afraid of me. But I also told him that in the future, most likely, they would call someone else crazy. That

person, without a job and perhaps without a family, might not be as kind as I was. I explained to him that no matter how much security they had within the lab, an angry man could find his adversaries anywhere if he really wanted to. I concluded that in view of the current policies of the lab and in general of the nation, the future would bring an increase of violence. I told him that I had resigned for that very reason. If national labs build more powerful weapons every day, then the only thing they bring to smaller nations and to the world is fear. Fear brings violence and I do not want to be a part of it. In a few minutes I was outside of the concentration camp, the prison of scientists, where scientific principles are used to build the grave of humanity.

I began working with new friends in the peace movement, and on February 16, we held a press conference in San Francisco, where I released to the media my Open Letter to the Director of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, explaining the reasons for my resignation. The letter is also an appeal to every secretary, technician, custodian, scientist, engineer, and any other person whose participation supports the world war machine to withhold their skills from weapons work and from activities that support or enable weapons work. I also made three specific recommendations:

- *Establish informed consent hiring practices at national weapons laboratories and all other scientific/military establishments.*
- *Stop bringing high school and college students into the weapons labs.*
- *Encourage and help scientists to withhold their skills from weapons work.*

At this time, I would like to express my sincere thanks to Jackie Cabasso executive director of Western States Legal Foundation and the rest of the staff for their caring and professional support during my difficult times. They have been like brothers and sisters.

I encourage the scientists of every nation to join positions where their work uplifts humanity instead of destroying humanity. After all, it would be to their advantage to stay away from secrecy. Very interestingly in a commentary in the Wall Street Journal of November 3, 2000 titled, "It's No Secret. This Is a Bad Bill," R. James Woolsey, director of the CIA from 1993-95 speaks in this way regarding jobs behind the security fence: "If you were formerly in the government, remain silent about such issues. If you are already in government, consider a mid-career change to get away from classified material before you expand your exposure any further. And if you are trying to decide about beginning a career or accepting a stint in government, think again."

## **Part II**

### **Essays and Speeches**

#### **The Freedom to Speak My Mind**

## 1. The Peace Movement: First Impressions

*"Disobedience to be civil must be sincere, respectful, restrained, never defiant, must be based upon some well-understood principle, must not be capricious and, above all, must have no ill will or hatred behind it."*

-- Mahatma Gandhi --

After I resigned from LLNL on January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2000, naturally I found myself in the activities of the world peace movement. During one of these early activities in the United States, someone came to me and asked me, "Do you plan to be arrested today?" For a moment I was lost, and I did not know what to answer. I thought being arrested for speaking out about what I believed was a possibility, but I thought it would be quite remote if not impossible. No, I answered in confusion. Soon after, I realized that the peace group had instructed its members about what to do during the "planned-arrests," as they are called. I realized that even the different authorities, police, administration, etc. had been notified days before about the intention of some to be arrested. I was there watching the whole procedure during the arrests, but I did not know what to make out of it. I was simply confused. After a few hours the "arrested" were back with the group, happy and telling their stories.

The time went by and during other activities, I again was asked the same question, "Will you be arrested today?" Some of those asking me happened to be friends close to my heart and not being able to understand them, I felt uncomfortable. During the same period that all these activities were taking place, I had been enjoying reading Gandhi's activities in South Africa. I was new in the peace movement and I wanted to know the truth about the new world I found myself in by just doing the common sense thing, simply resigning from a job that was preparing unspeakable agony and death to humanity. I read that many times Gandhi and his followers did invoke arrest, but interestingly enough, I read that many times when released they commented, "We were disappointed upon our release." And this they said when victory had not been achieved. I continued reading about Gandhi's efforts for the rights of Indians in South Africa and in India. Here are some statements I read which made me think a lot about the peace movement today.

"I can boldly declare and with certainty that so long as there is even a handful of men true to their pledge, there can be only one end to the struggle – and that is victory." And this he said because he knew that soul force did not depend on numbers but on the degree of firmness. He said, "The real road to happiness lies in going to jail and undergoing suffering and privations there in the interest of one's country and religion."

At one time he asked his followers, "Are you prepared to share the fate of those of our countrymen whom the cold stone is resting upon today?" And when the people answered yes he continued, "I hope that every man, woman, and grown-up child will not consider their salaries, trades, or even families, or their own bodies." He then went on to explain to them that civil resisters hope to convince the brain and conquer the heart by self-suffering and sincerity without hurting, humbling, or embittering the adversary.

At the same time that these planned-arrests here in the US were taking place around the country during different peace demonstrations, hundreds of people from around the world were jailed, violently beaten and even prosecuted for murder charges in Genoa. The first death of an anti-globalization demonstrator in history was also recorded.

In my mind, I was trying to put into perspective the importance of the abolition of war in the nuclear age, the Genoa and other heroic struggles against the global empire of capital, the climate problem, and the direction of the peace movement today.

There are shiny examples of individuals as soldiers of peace within the peace movement. But apart from that fact, as a movement we need to evaluate the methods we use and the firmness we carry. To finally accept the cost in our hearts, we need to pay for the abolition of all weapons, whether of mass destruction or conventional, to finally abolish war itself before war abolishes us.

### **The Problem**

For some people today, perhaps more in the West, it has become difficult to understand the difference between nonviolence and cowardice and the difference between violence and non-compromised spoken truth. In other words, while they are practicing cowardice they believe they are practicing nonviolence. And when people speak truth without compromise, they are labeled as violent. We need to realize that passive resistance is not active non-violent resistance. The former is of the weak; the latter is of the strong.

It is interesting that people have always been more or less confusing the difference between the two. For this reason Gandhi said to his followers that "where there is a choice between cowardice and violence, I would choose violence." Nonviolence requires much more courage than violence. In violence there is always the seed of fear, and in cowardice there is always the seed of violence.

The struggle for world peace is not easy. There are many activists who have found that out who they feel discouraged and exhausted. They feel that their efforts have not gained the momentum they had hoped and they know without any doubt that doomsday is ten minutes away.

Any sincere soldier of peace today knows that we as humanity have almost lost the chance for survival. Many seriously wonder if we have even passed the turning point. These feelings rise in our hearts when we make a small effort to talk to everyday citizens. Most of the time they will look as if they are listening to a fairy tale, or they will change the discussion, or they will simply walk away.

How can this change? When we talk to them about other issues like pollution, or cancer, or taxes, they will listen. Why? Because these topics to them are real; they have heard about them over and over again. They have been educated about them since a young age.

I wonder if there is still time for universal education about the urgent need to abolish war. It has not happened now for so many years. What makes us think it will happen before a global catastrophe unfolds in front of our eyes?

Certainly the governments are not contemplating the abolishment of war. They have plans to make war. Some of them even plan to make nuclear war under certain circumstances. Our friends and relatives are trained to push the button, even the nuclear button. That is a fact. And the governments feel that it is to their advantage to protect their positions, and they do not hesitate to plan and use war. Governments are not inspired to support peace education. Therefore, it has to be done with extremely few resources, preferably worldwide, and it must be done now. That sounds like a huge task. Any down-

to-earth person knows it is almost impossible for this to happen. But of course, if the peace movements in those most powerful countries achieve the abolition of war, then the weaker will follow. What is the problem with that?

The problem is that the stronger the nation, the greater the obstacles to bringing peace education to its schools starting from kindergarten. Why? It is obvious that the nation has become strong not by compassion towards other nations, but by using war as the tool to achieve domination over the weaker. It wants to maintain its colonies to extract their resources, using their people as free slaves. Would the government of such a nation be willing to adopt a foreign policy of no war? But that is not the only obstacle. The greatest obstacle comes from its own people. If the people are willing to pay the cost, they will have what their soul is thirsty for. It is well known that victory is for those who are ready to pay the price. But the people of a rich country, and also its peace movements, are used to comfort and security, and it is not easy for them to sacrifice their jobs, salaries, houses, boats, stocks, and health insurance. How much more if you ask them to stay in jail indefinitely or even to die! Nevertheless, we know that without birth-pains there is no birth.

In 1921, Einstein speaking on his first impressions of the U.S.A. described a state of affairs that is identical or perhaps even worse today. Is it not because the United States is the country of plenty? He said during an interview for *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*:

*"The United States is the most powerful among the technically advanced countries in the world today. Its influence on the shaping of international relations is absolutely incalculable. But America is a large country and its people have so far not shown much interest in great international problems, among which the problem of disarmament occupies first place today. This must be changed, if only America's own interest. The last war has shown that there are no longer any barriers between the continents and that the destinies of all countries are closely interwoven. The people of this country must realize that they have a great responsibility in the sphere of international politics. The part of passive spectator is unworthy of this country and is bound in the end to lead to disaster all round."*

When time is running out and the well-fed are not capable of pressing hard for peace because of their comfort, and on the other hand, the underfed of the world are not capable of doing so either because of their discomfort, what should we do? When you talk to someone who is dying of hunger about nuclear weapons, you will hear this: "I wished it had happened yesterday."

We ask again, "What should we do?" Should we write more proposals and submit them to foundations to receive financial help for peace activities? Should we continue with more planned arrests? Should we increase our trips to different countries to talk to politicians and give lectures about peace? Should we have more frequent peace meetings in New York at the United Nations on peace? Should we try to increase the membership of our peace groups? Should we try to write more articles in the press and speak on television?

All these activities are good, but are they enough to bring the change? If we were only honest with ourselves, we would know that all these actions alone, no matter their intensity, will never be able to bring an end to the threat of annihilation.

How can a peace movement that cannot tolerate non-violent lectures accept a nonviolent war? A lecture with passion that calls for immediate and sincere action for the abolition of weapons of mass destruction is called violent and ineffective. How can this kind of movement finally give birth to change? Change comes only after war, a non-violent war against violent governments that move from violence to violence on order to defend their

interests. This kind of non-violent war brings a permanent change, in contrast to a violent war that brings peace only temporarily.

Why are we waiting? What are we waiting for? If we did not have the blue prints for how to see victory, then there would be some excuse, but we do have them. Why have we then been satisfied all these 55 years with lectures and speeches when we know that we are ten minutes away from universal catastrophe? When will the nonviolent conscience of humanity declare its own war against the violent conscience of humanity?

On December 14, 1930 Einstein extemporaneously delivered a speech at a meeting in New York's Ritz-Carlton Hotel, under the auspices of the New History Society. Among other things he said:

*"When those who are bound together by pacifist ideals hold a meeting they are usually consorting only with their own kind. They are like sheep huddled together while wolves wait outside. I believe that pacifist speakers face this difficulty: they ordinarily reach only their own group, people who are pacifists anyhow and hardly need to be convinced. The sheep's voice does not reach beyond this circle and is, therefore, ineffectual. That is the real weakness of the pacifist movement. ... Deeds, not words, are needed; mere words get pacifists nowhere. They must initiate action and begin with what can be achieved now. ...The aim of all pacifists must be to convince others of the immorality of war and rid the world of the shameful slavery of military service."*

The peace movement has been in labor pains in order to give birth to permanent world peace for 55 years. Through these pains, several important outcomes have been accomplished, some of which are:

- (1) The illegality of nuclear weapons. In 1996, the World Court voted that the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is illegal.
- (2) The Nonproliferation Treaty. In this treaty, all NATO members are signatories and require all states to move quickly to abolish nuclear weapons.

Nevertheless, not only have we not yet seen the birth, which is their abolition, but ironically, NATO's official military doctrine, with our tax money's blessing, reserves for itself the right to use nuclear weapons. Why?

The peace movement desires to see our scientists and engineers give up their work on weapons. How does the peace movement plan to encourage them? Are the established pledges by some peace groups for no work on the war machine enough? In 1930 Einstein spoke on behalf of war resisters and said:

*"I suggest that pacifists of all countries start raising funds to support those who would want to refuse military service but who cannot actually do so for lack of financial means. I, therefore, advocate the establishment of an international organization and an international pacifist fund to support the active war resisters of our day."*

He did not only suggest this idea for war resisters, but also for German scientists in order to help them leave from Germany so that they would not serve in Hitler's military preparations.

Promoting and signing pledges is education, and it is an excellent step towards the goal, but it is only theory. To organize and finance the campaign for the establishment of a "Help Scientists and Engineers Fund" is practice. We will see scientists give up their war-science when we practice our theories; when we perform the experiment, we will see the

result. Most scientists are incapable of the sacrifice of non-cooperation with the war machine. But our own sacrifices in a measure proportional to our abilities will induce their sacrifices and give birth to victory. Even if they temporarily differ from our ideas about how to bring peace, they will look upon us as colleagues of high ideals and of noble life, and they will be reformed.

If we had really understood the peril we are in, then all of us who claim to be knowledgeable of it would constantly be on peace walks instead of primarily giving proposals and lectures on peace in closed rooms. We would be on the streets walking in silence and mourning. We would not pay our taxes for making weapons of mass destruction. Is there an easier way so the world could take notice? There is no need for any resources except the will of the brave. Word of mouth is the best media of information and will always be. If an act which truly uplifts humanity is done, it will circle the globe even without the media. The media is not the problem; it is our fears and our clinging to security and comforts. Let us work our ideas out, not just think them out. Henry David Thoreau said it all:

*"There are a thousand hacking at the branches of evil to one who is striking at the root."*

How does this sound? Tuesday August 14, 2001 SAN JUAN, Puerto Rico (Reuters) - A U.S. magistrate on Tuesday sentenced the mayor Damaso Serrano of the disputed Puerto Rican island of Vieques to four months in prison for trespassing on restricted land during protests against U.S. Navy war games. Serrano said before being sentenced that he was standing trial "because of the right of my people to be free." This is action and it is a nonviolent war on an unjust and violent government. When will the leaders of the world peace movement take the responsibility in leading the people into action before the unthinkable takes place? We also read that Actor Edward James Olmos, environmental attorney Robert F. Kennedy Jr. and New York labor leader Dennis Rivera were among others sentenced to jail time for Vieques protest activities. They were protesting in order for the USA government to stop war games at the island of Vieques.

Does anyone really believe that weapons of mass destruction will be abolished only by speeches and proposals and by talking to the politicians?

Any honest human being knows that it will take a lot of sacrifices, a lot of pain to avert the unthinkable. The prisons will have to be filled with millions of people, and that would not be enough. Are we ready to pay the cost so that our children and the future generations can live? I would say that if anyone has to put his or her life down, it must be us not them. They did not produce this death; we did. It would be wise for us to take care of the hell we created out of our greed and fear for survival, before our children look at us straight in the eyes and ask us why we have done it. And they will if there is a local nuclear war before a global one takes place. Let us throw our masks away. It is time to look at what we have given our children to live with all their lives. It is time to tell our children the TRUTH. It is time to destroy our hypocrisy and the rotten philosophy of deterrence, which says that you can have peace by preparing for war. Only unhealthy and corrupted minds could ever have put such words in our hands and minds. Will the people of the world cease to exist because of these minds? What will the lovers of this world do when the alarm goes off? What music will the governments play on their national radios and TV if they are able to when the cloud of death covers the whole earth? What will they say then? Now they receive high salaries and are called the protectors of humanity. What will they do when the deadly gases and germs cover the earth? What will they say if anyone is left? "Nuremberg trials" will have no meaning at this time.

When someone with courage and vision arises to lead the soldiers of peace in non-violent action, their anguish and despair will at once be turned into joy. What has today become a hopeless and lifeless campaign will be turned into an active and determined stand presented to a fearful and dehumanized world. They will serve the world and prove their title as members of the peace movement, while scoring a lasting victory over the conscienceless decision-makers of our days.

We find when we seek, and we find that which we are searching for. What kind of leaders are we searching for today? That is the question that the citizens of every country must answer for themselves. The answer to this question today will determine the fate of our world tomorrow. Paraphrasing Einstein's words while speaking on Mahatma Gandhi, we should be searching for leaders unsupported by any outward authorities. Politicians whose success will rest not upon craft, nor the mastery of technical devices (the recent vote counting problem should alert the public), but simply on the convincing power of their personality, fighters who will always scorn the use of force. Individuals of wisdom and humility armed with resolve and inflexible consistency that they will be willing to devote all their strength to the uplifting of their people and the betterment of their lot. Individuals who would confront without fear the brutality of war with the dignity of the simple human being, and thus at all times rise superior.

When a universal catastrophe is ten minutes away, our leaders must be independent of the moods, opinions, and criticism of others. Mr. Yeltsin wrote in his memoirs regarding his relationship with Mr. Gorbachev, "the motivations for many of my actions were embedded in our conflict." We know that this is taking place within the American government and within every other government of the world. Should our world be burned forever because so it happened that two world leaders hated each other?

Many times within the peace movement, people come with a great vigor to change the status quo, but the elite of the peace movement interfere, tying the new activist's hands and feet so their agenda will not suffer. Many times new activists, usually of a young age, embrace chastity, poverty, and truth, and as a result become fearless and full of wisdom and compassion for others. In such cases, the new activist should stay independent and not allow anyone to dictate direction. Direction should be seriously considered only from those who have also embraced such ideals. There are a number of people in the peace movement who have embraced such ideals to the full. These beautiful souls live only in order to serve others by thought, word, and action.

In the peace movement there are three islands; the Island of Thought, the Island of Word, and the Island of Action. The Island of Word is the most populated one and the Island of Action the least populated. Lovers of humanity all start from the Island of Thought and as their desire grows for serving others, they move onto the Island of Word, and finally, some move onto the Island of Action.

The trip from the Island of Thought to the Island of Word involves some treacherous waters. Nevertheless servants make the trip because of their love for others. Several people make this trip because the trip can be done in a boat and they can carry all their belongings with them, but not so with the trip to the Island of Action. They cannot bring any of their belongings from the Island of Word to the Island of Action because they can reach it only by swimming in waters, which are very cold. Even though servants smell the fragrance coming from the Island of Action, which is actually almost next to the Island of Word, they cannot actually see what is on it unless they land on it. For these reasons, only

a few of the servants decide to swim to and live on the island of the greatest beauty, the Island of Action.

The citizens of these three islands are all servants of humanity in their own way because they have set their hearts to serve others.

Anyone, who is in a hurry for anything, in the long run accomplishes nothing. But when someone moves from word into deed, we should not call him/her someone in a hurry, but instead someone who has done the right thing.

There are many who are talking, and we need the talkers as much as we need the doers. We arrive at action after we have finished talking, like we arrive at word after we have finished thinking. But there are only a few servants who decide to land on the third island. When we see performers we must hold them as models and strive to follow their example.

The citizens of the Island of Action always encourage the citizens of the other two islands to migrate to their own island.

The citizens of the Island of Word always encourage the citizens of the Island of Thought to migrate to their island, and they are never afraid that their island will become overpopulated. Since they have never been on the Island of Action they cannot encourage anyone to migrate to it. The best they can do is never discourage anyone from their island from migrating to the Island of Action.

The citizens of the Island of Thought, since they have never been on the other two islands, cannot encourage anyone to migrate to them. The best they can do is never discourage anyone from their island from migrating to the other two islands.

### **The Solution: From the Classes to the Masses**

The peace movement will see the success it desires when it will take its message from the classes to the masses. Since we know that we most likely do not have much time left before annihilation, the peace movement should ask the question, "What kind of fire spreads faster, the mind-fire or the soul-fire?"

#### **Mind-Fire**

What is mind-fire? Anything from great speeches to writing proposals, from begging the politicians to "prayers" to governors, from paper contributions to classroom education to local demonstrations. All these actions shake the mind but not the heart. No amount of speeches will make us see world peace; it is only our conduct. The wise counselor of nonviolence has instructed us to strip ourselves from possessions. In his own time he did not expect that people with comfort would do it, that is why he turned to the farmers. In the same way, the peace movement needs to turn to the poor because the rich servants of the scientific establishment, the church, and the stock market cannot and will not secure peace.

#### **Soul-Fire**

What is Soul-Fire? It is inner freedom, which comes from an inner revolution of the heart, a psychological metamorphosis. When the people become uplifted, see their worth, discover their true identities, they will take back their individual dignity and then they will

demand a life for themselves and for their children free from the threat of annihilation. They will see then that the governments cannot hold them in nuclear bondage anymore.

All protests against nuclear weapons since the time of their construction have been ignored. Peace activists count for nothing in the eyes of the governments, and peace leaders are ignored. What to do? "Last night the idea came to me in a dream that we should call on the country to observe a general strike;" that was the suggestion by Gandhi for obtaining civil rights in India. He was suggesting suspending all economic activity to bring the people into action. I can hear many people protest from within the comfortable corners of the peace movement. That is too radical they will say. But they should ask themselves how radical it is to see our whole world being brought into chaos, death and unspeakable agony forever in a matter of ten minutes. Our world would be no more. How radical is that? The question is not therefore if that is what has to be done, but how it will be done.

Very intelligent leaders of the peace movement are unfortunately missing the point. They try to rationalize with the members of Congress, Senators and other political figures. They are sending essays and appeals to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. They hope that by using rational arguments they will be heard. But they are wasting their time, and time is getting short before big troubles start.

Bevin Chu, an American of Chinese descent, speaking on the demonization of China by China Threat Theorists, prompts us to recall 'Aesop's Fable in which the wolf unreasonably accuses a lamb of muddying his drinking water. When the lamb protests, "But I'm drinking downstream from you," the wolf promptly devours him. The wolf was never the slightest bit concerned with facts, logic, fair play, or "rights." The wolf merely needed the flimsiest of pretexts to do what he fully intended to do all along, prey on the weak.' Clearly the strong governments are keeping their weapons of mass destruction in order to be able to prey on the weak.

History has taught us that widespread important social changes, which would affect the wallet of the rich to a great extent, never take place by applying logic. They take war. Some advocate violent war, and the only thing they bring is the same regime but with a different name, a regime of exploitation of the weak. We must start a nonviolent war against legal terrorism, consumerism, and the exploitation and dehumanization of the people of the earth.

The leaders of the peace movement must finally decide to cross the line into the uncomfortable state of affairs, that is, **THEY NEED TO TAKE THE PEOPLE OF THE WORLD ON THE STREETS AT ALL COST.** They need to tell them that unless they sacrifice their conveniences and security, they will envy the dead soon.

The leaders of the peace movement need to convince the citizens first of the eminent danger they face so that the citizens can take their fate into their own hands; then the politicians will hear what they need to hear from the citizens. They will hear and see that they are ready to go to jail, to suffer all kinds of troubles, in order that their governments destroy the war machine before it destroys them.

Only the soul-force of voluntary suffering will abolish weapons of mass destruction. No other method will abolish them; it is time to come out of our cocoons if we want to save our world and see our children have a future.

In regard to the abolition of weapons of mass destruction, so far, we are doing a good job of describing and whining about this evil and that evil. Most published books are descriptions of evil, destruction, and death, or an analysis of why it happened and who did it. Seldom do we see a book that gives us a vision for the future and the steps for how to accomplish it. Scientists at well-known institutions are using statistical methods and high level mathematics to prove that it is very probable we will all die tomorrow in agony and sorrow. They invent new terminology as they invent new technology. Nuclear Winter is a term unheard of before 1945. They perform billion-dollar experiments to find out how we will be incinerated tomorrow. They publish their results, thus obtaining tenure by describing the power of evil. And what do many active members in the peace movement do? They obtain grants from this and that institution to write more books, to give more speeches, to travel around the world describing what the university professors found out and reported and what the experiments revealed and what the rogue government is doing. Many of them in this way build a career supported by government grants, humanitarian institutions, and membership fees, a career which they feel they need to protect. In this way, they become ineffective towards their original vision for world peace. Often we even see a leader from an NGO move into a government position.

The time has come for all peace groups to initiate a global civil disobedience campaign. Will they take the challenge and see it is their duty? Or will they continue to sit in comfortable chairs writing hundreds of proposals and speeches, exchanging honors and medals while the finger is poised on the button? Why should people continue to pay taxes to build their own graves and invite agonizing death for the whole world? Why should they continue to pay taxes for the high salaries of scientists and engineers who provide them with horror?

In order to achieve self-government, the Indians in Gandhi's time were imprisoned by the thousands, rich attorneys quit the British courts forever, university students left their classrooms, teachers and students went to the villages to teach non-cooperation. And this was done in order to achieve self-government. What then should we do today in order to save our world from annihilation? Do we believe it will take less sacrifice? When will we see the urgency of the immediate action? Should we wait to see millions being turned into ashes like in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and millions more dying in agony first in order to see the peril before us?

The answer is that the world needs a peace-nucleus, a small nonviolent group of people willing to accept any degree of possible suffering, even willing to die for world peace. Then the world will take notice. The movement will spread. Perhaps the prisons will overflow but the message will be brought to those who have not heard it. We will realize that our own governments, who have proven themselves to be the most ruthless terrorists in recent human history, have put us ten minutes away from global catastrophe legally and with our own sweat and tears, with our own taxes. How can this peace leaven be made? Where will its headquarters be? When will it act?

### **The Making of the Peace Leaven for a Nonviolent War**

Our youth today open their dictionary and they read that war is the absence of peace, but they know and we know that peace is more than the absence of war. They know this well by just looking at what is happening at their schools. They read on the dollar bills that we trust in God, but they know that their parents are paying taxes to build weapons of terror. We teach them that in order to survive they must carry two faces, one for themselves and a second one for the world. How can we promote peaceful living within

such a contradiction? Our youth carry within themselves the leaven of peace but we take it away from them piece by piece every day.

Fighting a nonviolent war requires courage and faith just like a violent war does. Courage and faith in order to fight a nonviolent war becomes part of people's soul only after strenuous inner training. In every culture around the world, the seeds for inner training have existed for thousands of years. It is these seeds that need to be watered and nourished in order to see the peace leaven spread over the face of the earth.

World peace can only be realized by personal suffering. Again and again, I have heard from many in the peace movement that it can be done without suffering. These people live in illusion. Not only do they live in illusion, but they also practice hypocrisy. There are millions of ordinary people around the world that never speak publicly on world peace, nor are they members of peace organizations, but they are the real peacemakers. They are people who have made peace with others and their physical environment, mostly unnoticed, living in silence, never in a hurry, waiting for the trumpet to gather them for action. They are never in a hurry to do things and more things, because they know change takes time. They are not spending their days to figure out what to do for world peace; instead they spend their time figuring out what to be. They know that if they take care of the question "What should I be?" the question "What should I do?" has already been answered. These people from every nation constitute the peace leaven. And as the days turn darker and darker, they will come together in order to shape a new direction to be followed by those who will be willing to pay the price for serving the truth.

How did these people reach the shores of wisdom? What kind of discipline were they willing to take, what did they have to give up in order to realize that the sacrifice of self is infinitely superior to the sacrifice of others, that service to others is infinitely superior to service of self. Gandhi said that 'chastity is one of the greatest disciplines without which the mind cannot attain requisite firmness.' He said that 'someone who is unchaste loses stamina, becomes emasculated and cowardly. He whose mind is given over to animal passions is not capable of any great effort.' Choosing such a path brings a lot of questions but he admitted that those who wish to take part in a great work are bound to solve these puzzles.

Should a nonviolent resister care about money? Can profit ambition and nonviolent resistance go together? Gandhi again said that 'Those who have money are not expected to throw it away, but they are expected to be indifferent about it. They must be prepared to lose every penny rather than give up nonviolent resistance.'

Should a nonviolent resister lie sometimes if necessary, for example to save his life, or does truth have to be followed at any cost? A real nonviolent resister follows the truth at any cost. And because of that he is fearless; his very glance withers the opponent. Nonviolent civil disobedience cannot proceed without fearlessness. Gandhi again instructs us that 'Those alone can follow the path of nonviolent resistance who are free from fear, whether as to their possessions, false honor, their relatives, the government, bodily injuries or death.' If there is any hope for the future, it is embedded in a global nonviolent revolution in a war without violence.

*"The time has come, or is about to come, when only large-scale civil disobedience, which should be nonviolent, can save the populations from the universal death which their governments are preparing for them."*

*-- Bertrand Russell --*

### Old and New Objectives of the Peace Movement

- Organize a global civil disobedience. Yes, organize a global civil disobedience!
- Strengthen the link between the campaign for peace and the anti-globalization campaign.
- Create nuclear weapon AND nuclear energy-free zones.
- Strengthen the use of the World Court.
- Support appropriately anyone who refuses military service or refuses paying taxes for war.
- Support scientists and engineers in staying away from war-science.
- Mobilize within the universities against the Academic Military Industrial Complex.

### World Peace and the anti-Globalization Campaign

We need to ask the question, "Why do our leaders live in fear for their lives? Why do they hide behind steel and high technology glass?" It is generally accepted that only dictators seize power without the will of the people. But we know that today even the leaders we call democratic hold power that has not been given to them by the people, but has been taken away from the people in very insidious ways. They inevitably live in fear. In order to protect their power, they impose harder controls. People, in turn, become more fearful and therefore violent, which brings even harder controls. Finally the situation escalates beyond control, and the people rebel. In our modern days, this is taking place in front of our eyes but in such a way that we do not see it. Unless seized power now held by the giant economic organizations is given back to the people, people will rebel and they will rebel soon. This rebellion would be very dangerous when weapons of mass destruction are pointed at each other by all sides. The duty of governments today is to transfer this stolen power back to the people from the hands of the G8 and any other group of power. It is therefore also the duty of the peace movement to advocate this power transfer and provide methods and action for it to happen.

### Promoting International Law for the Attainment of Peace

"The Institute for Law and Peace seeks to promote respect for the universal right of civilians to seek protection by law from indiscriminate attack and weapons of mass destruction. Since 1945, at least 25 million people have been killed in over 100 conflicts. In modern warfare 95% of casualties are ordinary civilians; innocent men, women and children."

### Obstacles to the Peace Movement

- Lack of physical resources
- Attachment to the corporate world methods for change
- Fear of Social Marginalization

### Lack of physical resources

Besides the most important resource, the foundation we should say, which is the indomitable will of its people, a movement uses physical resources such as services, products, or money to obtain them. A weak movement begs for these resources before it acts. It always aims for large memberships and always calculates like in the corporate world. If we have this much money, then we can do this. But the strong movement acts on faith no matter how small and insignificant the first step-act seems to be at the beginning.

And if the work is sincere, then the gates of resources will surely open, as Gandhi's work demonstrated.

*Attachment to the corporate world methods for change*

Looking around us, we see people rushing in everything, even while they worship their time and labor saving devices. Should this be the case within the peace movement? Peace can come to the world not by working for it, but by being peaceful ourselves. We need to remind ourselves of this constantly. When we take time to share our humanity – our vision, our hopes, our doubts, with one another we give the opportunity to ourselves to become all that we can be.

*Fear of Social Marginalization*

Speaking truth to power can result in part time employment, early retirement, not living in the "gated community" anymore, and more. There are those in the peace movement that speak truth without fear and those that count every word so that they will not be marginalized. This state of affairs needs to be changed. Fear of social marginalization is a strong force keeping people from making the right decisions and saying the needed words within the peace movement.

I can hardly claim to have touched upon every important issue concerned with the peace movement. My hope is that others from the peace movement will further discuss these issues in order to make the peace movement more effective in these urgent times.

January 31, 2002

## 2. Is 'Full Spectrum Dominance' and Pax Americana Compatible? You Decide

The Chinese embassy was bombed during the Kosovo bombing. The US said that it had old maps and apologized. That was forgotten in the West very soon. Then the US media was daily criticizing the stealing of US nuclear technology by China. Then there was the incident of the planes bumping into each other above China's coast, not the USA's coast, by the way. Immediately, the first words of the West were: "We are running out of patience." The world was lucky that there were some people on both sides with cool heads. And next we were hearing threat after threat in regard to the Taiwan situation. There have been several government reports, one of them at:

<http://www.house.gov/coxreport/pref/preface.html>

that virtually try to demonize China. How many military bases does China have on the soil of other countries, and how many does the USA have? Why then is the West looking at China in that way?

The answer can be found in history. History can teach us that which we do not understand today. Will we learn from history? To understand American foreign policy, we do not have to go very far; we just have to look at Britain's foreign policy of the recent past.

Historians in the Western universities are talking extensively about the yoke of British rule in the past, but they fail to teach about the hard-to-recognize yoke of American rule today. Even though we learn a lot about the glorious days of Pax Romana and Pax Britannica, we fail to extrapolate it to our own days of Pax Americana and to predict where we really are headed. History is repeated.

We learn that in those glorious days of Pax Britannica, there was 'a conviction in every Briton that he belonged to a race which God has destined to govern and to subdue.'

Author Eknath Easwaran in his book *Nonviolent Soldier of Islam* writes, 'Trade, not property, was the official policy of the East India Trading Company when it was formed in 1599, inaugurating Britain's long association with India. Slowly the company's officers turned from merchants to imperialists and very soon one hundred million people were being ruled by the board of directors of a private company. By the mid 1850's the East India Trading Company had become what amounted to a sovereign power.' Slowly but steadily the company passed into history and the new responsibilities were handed over to the queen-empress herself. India had become a British colony and poverty was to rule all over India.

And this is exactly what the non-Westernized countries of the East feel today. They see that the World Trade Organization will bring the same tyranny to their people that the British trading company brought to India hundreds of years ago.

Why do people have to apologize every time they try to find and understand the causes of the 9/11 evil acts? Why do they have to repeat that they do not of course approve of terrorism every time they search to answer the most important question 'Why did it happen?' The mainstream media are devoting their time almost exclusively to how it happened and who did it. But the Americans are just like any other people, they do have common sense, and now they have started to ask the question, "Why did it happen?" And

the rulers of the West will soon find themselves in the very difficult position of explaining the truth to their people. The sooner the better.

In 1806, the British started colonizing South Africa by using war. They were happy to discover that they could grow sugar cane, tea, and coffee, but they did not want to work; they wanted someone else to do the work for them. They asked the natives, but the natives did not want to work for them. They were just happy to live on what they grew on their land.

The British then brought Indian laborers from India under contract to do the job for them, but they could not foresee what would happen. The Indians slowly established themselves in South Africa and became competitors with the white farmers because they were content to live a simple life and spend little. Eventually, they established a near monopoly in dealing with the native population. What happened after that? The whites became afraid that the Indians would swamp them, and they started to pass laws in order to control them and send them back to India. Gandhi's work was rooted in this injustice.

The white's fear of the past is echoed again today. The "Northern Industrial Alliance," which is being referred to today as the G8, stands for the British of the past, and the eastern "alliance," China and the Arab nations, stands for the Indians. The Chinese are not spoiled yet like the Westerns, asking for this and that insurance and retirement plan and high salaries. Therefore, the Chinese produce cheaply and as a result, win the markets all over the East. The Western white is in panic because he cannot compete for the simple reason that he is spoiled. He is asking too much in order to produce and so has lost the monopoly. What can he do now?

The ruling class of the US uses Chinese people to manufacture goods at an unprecedented rate because of higher profits. Who cares if there are millions of Americans who have to have three to four jobs in order to make ends meet and without any medical insurance or other benefits? The stores of America are full of products made in China. Thus the ruling class of the US is happy with this arrangement. But why then would it call China an enemy and demonize it and try to encircle it militarily, thus taking the risk of a global war in trying to do so? The answer is simple. If China produces cheaply and is affordable to the Americans, it is also affordable to anyone else on the planet. Thus China is displacing Western markets and taking new ones in Africa, Asia and even Europe. That is a great threat to the G8, with US as the leader. The ruling classes of the G8 are not just satisfied with inexpensive Chinese labor for products they consume themselves; they also want to control and maintain a monopoly around the world. The West, in its thirst for power, would even risk global chaos to accomplish it.

Within the USA, there is a system, which is called freedom. When you need to move to another place, you invite a few moving companies for a free estimate and you make your choice according to the price and quality of service. That sounds like democracy and freedom, and it is. The other moving companies do not drop bombs on the headquarters of the other companies they compete with; they simply try to improve their service and compete that way. If they cannot then they go out of business and find something else to do, but they will not bomb their competition.

The problem today is that the west preaches freedom but it uses double standards: 'freedom' at home but extortion towards the neighbors. You take over our markets and we will bomb you so we can take them back. With such a foreign policy, will we be surprised to see a bloody world at any moment?

Who says that the cold war is over? If you believe that, then you need to go and read what the plans of the West by 2020 are. You need to know that which almost every Western citizen is incapable of understanding or believing, simply that the USA government with its allies plans to dominate the world by 2020 through space. It has plans to place weapons and high-energy lasers in space with the ability to pinpoint and even eliminate any undesirable individual or even country. I have found during my speaking engagements that people almost exclusively cannot grasp the fact that these documents are real, not fake as they try to argue. We see the execution of these plans developing before our eyes and we deny what we see. See at:

<http://www.dtic.mil/jv2020/>

<http://www.russfound.org/Enet/FSD.htm>

[http://www.russfound.org/Enet/enemy\\_system.htm](http://www.russfound.org/Enet/enemy_system.htm)

<http://www.greenpeaceusa.org/features/kyotonotext.htm>

Very interestingly people do not want to research the matter any further; they simply feel comfortable keeping their heads under the sand. But until when?

- Let the so-called democratic governments drop food instead of war-rhetoric and bombs, and see how terrorism will stop.
- Let the so-called free countries give to the starving millions, and see what the world will be like.
- Let the so-called first and second-world countries find out why there are third-world countries.
- Let the so-called developed countries develop their humanity rather their technology.
- Let the blind nations of arrogance and riches be healed in their hearts so that they can see their error.

How can well-fed nations have peace when their brothers and sisters are dying without any food or water, while they aim to conquer the stars and the world? Forty billion dollars from the USA government was allocated just to increase military spending because of the 9/11 attack, money that could bring the whole unfortunate world out of hunger and disease and illiteracy for a whole year. These are crimes against humanity, and yet we dare to speak about retributions?

“Civilized” nations need to remember the suffering of the rest of the world always, not just when they create a crisis. Will they wake up out of their lethargy and see that poverty is the cause of terrorism, poverty that they have created by accumulating power and riches? Will they have to reach a global war, in order to see and hear what they have done to the rest of the world?

Let them move fast towards world peace. Omnicide is becoming more and more a future possibility not by the terrorists, but by the death they have created and are ready to unleash on the face of the earth by their own hands.

The nations of hypocrisy know very well that the weapons of terrorists are no match for their own stored weapons of terror. They are ready to incinerate the earth many times over and thus themselves and their own children, and yet they dare to speak about terrorism? Sadly they have lost their humanity. Will they find it again before the unthinkable? This is the time to decide.

October 17, 2001

### 3. Soldier, Can You Hear?

**Y**ou were dreaming last night of your wife and your little daughter and you felt a great desire to hold them in your arms and tell them how much they meant for your life and happiness. You finally called them and told them "I will be back soon, in just a few weeks, until we finish the job, then I will see you and we will have a good time." You hung up the phone and you could not forget the weeping of your wife. Your daughter was giggling; she would weep too if she knew, but she is just a little baby. You know your wife is weeping because she does not know if she will see you again.

You say to yourself; "My country has given me such a miracle plane, and anyway, I have orders to fly thousands of feet high. I will drop my load and no doubt I will come back. At that altitude, there is nothing that can touch me. I will be back." And with that conviction, the next day you climb your beloved hawk, which has never been used in combat yet. You are anxious to try the real job and finish it, to restore peace in the world. You enter your plane with confidence and you feel proud of your country. It never crossed your mind that you are high above someone else's country, ready to kill citizens that never did anything to any one of your country's citizens or to your family. Again you feel the urgency to hold your family in your arms.

You wonder what they are doing or thinking at this moment as you are ready to push the button. Well, what else would they be thinking? They will be thinking what you have always told them. "We serve the world. We are the world's watchers. We restore peace in every troubled spot on earth. That is our job and we are proud of it." In a second, you have pushed the button. The load is descending and now you are ready to come back. The job is done. You tell yourself, "I have done my duty; I have served my country and peace. I have not died either, and I can do this again and again if I am asked to. I offer justice and peace and in this way, people like me can now enjoy what I will enjoy in a few days, my wife and my daughter, their smiles and their warmth.

You return to the base and you are saluted as a hero. "Job well done" you hear from your lieutenant, and you feel proud and happy.

Oh, Soldier! Your work is anathema to the powers of the universe, to anything that has to do with beauty and life and joy, to everything that you yourself love and desire to enjoy. What you have done is distasteful to your family. If they could see what you have done, they would be horrified. They would not have the strength to touch you, to hold you in their arms. Soldier, what have you done?

If they had seen the hell you created in that village, the different parts of human and animal bodies scattered under the trees on the grass of the earth, the blood everywhere, the agony of that little boy weeping for the family that is gone forever. Yes, over there is the head of his little sister and over there is the hand of his beloved mother, the same hand that touched his hair a moment before. He remembers the words of his mother, "Do not be afraid, everything will be okay. There are some good people in their government and they will stop it." But now it happened. The mother is no more, only her pieces can he see scattered around, and such a force comes out of him. The little boy is devastated. The first thought comes, "When I grow up, I will go and find those who took my mother's kind smile away. I will kill them all the same way they killed my mother and my family. I will turn them into pieces." Then after the prolonged weeping, silence comes and out of these strong feelings and terrible vision, the kind smile of the mother comes back and her words sound kind and clear, "There are some good people." The boy finds peace in his soul; his mother hasn't really died.

And if your family, soldier, had seen the beautiful eyes of the 15-year-old girl in the hospital, unable to speak because of weeping, her body, her legs full of metal pieces, metal pieces from your load, soldier. And a few of them hit her spine. She will be in a bed forever. And if your family, soldier, could see the man without any legs in the hospital, what would your wife think of you? And the man is a brave man. Listen to what he said, soldier, "Life is beautiful; I feel that I can still live on." And does your daughter know? Will you tell her when she grows up that a little girl with soft hair and as innocent a smile as your daughter's was lying on a pile of rocks and wood, a lifeless body, because you served peace, as you said?

You never really wondered why you dropped your load from so high, 'bombing from fifteen thousand feet above the victims.' You thought it was to save your life and that was a good reason not to question it further. You think that you are not a coward; you are a brave soldier, as you were told. But it never occurred to you, and you were never interested enough to find out, that the political agenda of your government was, "Never again will we bring body bags back to the country. We need the public to be quiet. Therefore, do the job with whatever it takes but with no casualties on our side." And this agenda serves you, soldier, because now you are not dead, you can go and see your family again.

You come back and yellow ribbons are all over the airport and the city, and your family and friends are now calling you a hero. You accept all this and after you have touched your wife and daughter and you have enjoyed their smiles, now you again feel that you are not the same as the enemy. You think that they murdered, but you brought peace. What makes you think that you are not doing the same thing as the enemy? Because you pushed the button and you saw no hell? Your government has the power to justify what you have done around the world and present it as just and noble, and so the years go by.

And one day it happens. Your daughter, now a college student, has become an activist and has invited you and your wife to a lecture by a pacifist, and after the speech you cannot walk away from the room. You come forth and you say to the pacifist, "I understand what you are saying," and you break into tears before the crowd of the people. Your wife now pulls you away. "Let's go home, let's go." But now you feel like speaking; you must speak; otherwise, it remains a real hell for you."

Soldier, now that you have heard, now that you have understood, will you tell the others?

May 2001

## 4. Living Without The Labs

**D**espite the fact that we live in a world of increasing violence in every walk of life, humans still have not lost hope; they talk about peace as they have done since the beginning of time.

Some advocate peace by preparing for war; others advocate peace by preparing for peace.

I thought I could do peaceful work inside this nation's nuclear weapons labs, but I learned I was wrong; so, I resigned, and now I urge others to do the same.

If scientists stop developing the instruments of mass destruction, the government will be powerless to continue developing them.

There are thousands upon thousands of reconciliations taking place among people everyday around the world, but the mainstream media never talk about them. Instead they talk about violence and its results.

We cannot deny the fact that the magnitude of death and sorrow from a violent act is proportional to the degree of technological sophistication employed in the act: Wars with spears in the past cannot compare with the electronic, atomic wars of today. In past wars, mostly soldiers would die, but today mostly civilians die. The technology separates and dehumanizes us from the actual act of killing.

In the past, a soldier could see the expression on the face of his opponent as he died. Today, however, thousands of people can be vaporized instantly, while others can languish in pain for years, and future generations can be affected. But the person who launched the initial weapon will have seen nothing of this but possibly some words on a computer screen.

Scientists and engineers have always served society for the good, but we can not deny that scientists and engineers have also played the greatest role in violence committed against life, and this is true throughout history.

It was science and technology that contributed to the human tragedy of the past two world wars. It is science and technology that has prepared such an unthinkable war machine today, which, if used, will abolish it all. Scientists have penetrated the microcosm and the macrocosm to a great degree, but they have failed to penetrate the self.

### **Nuclear weaponeers**

These days, more than ever, the scientists and engineers working at New Mexico's Los Alamos National Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratories and at California's Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory - and at all other Department of Energy research and manufacturing centers for weapons of mass destruction - are being called upon to re-evaluate their positions and beliefs.

The natures and roles of these laboratories is well hidden behind the names of the operators: the University of California and Lockheed Martin. The labs also hide their true

natures behind an insignificantly small number of non-weapons research programs that are heavily promoted.

Almost everyone in these laboratories tries to put such facts in a dark corner of their consciences, as denial is the only way to live comfortably with this knowledge.

These laboratories have prepared and still are developing more nuclear weapons of indiscriminate death and suffering to all life. These weapons are so catastrophically potent that the only name appropriate for them should be "satanic weapons."

I ask the scientists working on them to lift up their eyes from their books and take their hands away from their computers for awhile and look at the big picture - the big picture which most of them ignore.

The fact is that they work for a government that increasingly has isolated itself from the rest of the world, through a foreign policy that is despised by many other nations and that is destabilizing the world. It is a policy that aims to accomplish world domination, even if it is necessary to use weapons of mass destruction to achieve this goal.

We comfortably judge Hitler and his army of scientists and engineers who brought blood and tragedy to the world, but we feel uncomfortable in judging our own leaders and scientists. Yet a miscalculation today by them would be the end of civilization, and, deep down, we know that.

### **A selfish foreign policy**

Let us look at some of the U.S. government's recent actions for which no American citizen, and especially scientist, can be proud of:

- The United States has rejected the Kyoto Protocol to start reducing the carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuel burning that are responsible for global warming. On July 23, with the United States holding out, 178 countries negotiated rules for implementing the hallmark global greenhouse treaty within a United Nations framework to combat Climate Change. The United States meanwhile objected to the treaty's possible impact on its economy and judged it "fatally flawed." Yet other nations hailed this agreement as "a major breakthrough."
- The United States has rejected the germ-warfare accord, putting the entire agreement in peril. Negotiations had been ongoing for almost seven years to find a way to ban biological weapons, but the United States sent the effort into a tailspin because of "long-standing concerns." The U.S. position has put the fate of future talks in doubt.
- The United States has rejected the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which it and its NATO partners had helped negotiate, to ban all nuclear test explosions and thereby prevent the development of new nuclear weapon types. Despite the rejection, NATO allies are urging the United States to continue to provide its share of financial support for treaty's International Monitoring System, which is vital to U.S. national test-monitoring goals as well. However, the Bush administration continues to project a negative position: It will not seek Senate approval for U.S. ratification in its current session and, at the same time, wants the Nevada Nuclear Test Site readiness pushed up. Yet officially, "It does not see any need for a resumption of test explosions in the foreseeable future."

- Various government documents show that the United States plans to control the world militarily by 2020, specifically through the domination of space. War planners anticipate "conflict involving employment of strategic forces and weapons of mass destruction, major theatre wars, regional conflicts and smaller-scale contingencies." U.S. military documents predict that "we will win - but we should not expect war in the future to be either easy or bloodless"
- U.S. policy aims to deceive the world, its adversaries and allies alike, as well as its own citizens. In his commentary titled, "Media are sadly misguided in missile-defense tests," in the Aug. 26 issue of The New York Times, Thomas A. Halsted writes: "For years, the Pentagon and its Ballistic Missile Defense Organization have engaged in a continuing effort to delude the public and Congress into believing the United States is well on its way to developing a workable defense against ballistic missiles." He asks, "Who benefits from such a deception?" And he lists the missile-defense system's principal contractors: Boeing Co., Raytheon Corp., TRW Inc. and Lockheed Martin Corp.

But scientists are the pillars for this deception, and MIT scientist-professor Ted Postol spoke about this fraud in CBS "60 MINUTES II" in an interview, saying: "When I talk fraud, I'm being careful about the use of the word. I'm not saying there are people who have made a mistake, and I disagree with them. . . . I'm saying that there are people who know that this system will not work and are trying to cover it up. That's what I'm saying here. So I am making a serious charge; I know that."

### **The scientist-government deal**

In all of these policies, the U.S. government derives power directly from science. It is the scientists and engineers who make it possible for the government to act with such arrogance. Therefore, scientists could and should influence the government against these destabilizing policy choices, if not for the rest of the world, then for this country's own sake.

Let us not forget Einstein's words for Americans, which are still valid today. Speaking on his first impressions of the United States in 1921, the famous scientist described a state of affairs that is identical or perhaps even worse today. He said in a news interview for Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant:

*"The United States is the most powerful among the technically advanced countries in the world today. Its influence on the shaping of international relations is absolutely incalculable. But America is a large country, and its people have so far not shown much interest in great international problems, among which the problem of disarmament occupies first place today. This must be changed, if only in America's own interest. The last war has shown that there are no longer any barriers between the continents and that the destinies of all countries are closely interwoven. The people of this country must realize that they have a great responsibility in the sphere of international politics. The part of passive spectator is unworthy of this country and is bound in the end to lead to disaster all round."*

Such is the case for nuclear weapons, because the American public has been totally and deliberately excluded from policy decisions, which are vital if we are to change. Einstein said in 1947 that:

*"Unless Americans come to realize that they are not stronger in the world because they have the bomb but weaker because of their vulnerability to atomic attack, they are not*

*likely to conduct their policy at the United Nations or in their relations with Russia in a spirit that furthers the arrival at an understanding."*

### A way out

Judging from my own experience at two U.S. laboratories of weapons of mass destruction, I know that many scientists desire to leave these places of war science. However, they have been trapped by the attractive high salaries and benefits.

We Americans are paying high salaries to scientists and engineers to do what? To prepare for the death, even by mistake, of our whole planet. Now our government is taking away our taxes to put these weapons in space.

Therefore, here is a proposal to help scientists extricate themselves from this dilemma. I call it the "Help Scientists and Engineers for Peace Fund." It would provide money, here and around the world, to help scientists and engineers give up war science for worthwhile civilian research.

There are thousands of environmental and peace organizations around the world that can help make this happen. With the contribution of an insignificant amount from each of their members and funding foundations, a fund of millions of dollars could be created to help scientists and engineers of conscience abandon the weapons work. With the end of the Cold War, the time has arrived for such a fund to support scientists and engineers in disengaging themselves from war research and development. We are running out of time. The atomic clock is always near midnight.

Organizations, such as the following, have advocated peace since their creation and have the resources and other capabilities to organize such a fund. They include:

- Los Alamos Study Group at: [http://www.lasg.org/hmpgfrm\\_a.html](http://www.lasg.org/hmpgfrm_a.html)
- Nuclear Watch of New Mexico at: <http://www.nukewatch.org/index.html>
- Western States Legal Foundation at: <http://www.wslfweb.org/index.htm>
- Abolition 2000: A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons at: <http://www.abolition2000.org>
- Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs at: <http://www.pugwash.org/>
- International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility at: <http://www.inesglobal.org/>
- Physicians for Social Responsibility at: <http://www.psr.org/>
- Union of Concerned Scientists at: <http://www.ucsusa.org>
- Tri-Valley CARE (Communities Against a Radioactive Environment) at: <http://www.igc.org/tvc/>

Scientists at Los Alamos and the other nuclear weapons labs should be motivated to reconsider the culture of their own workplace, given the extraordinarily ill treatment and astonishing release from a nine-month jail confinement of former Los Alamos Lab physicist Dr. Wen Ho Lee. The same can be said in regard to the proposed polygraphy testing and its disturbing history since it was proposed.

Humanity's hope is that the scientists and engineers will be motivated by such a fund to take the courageous, principled path and to work on behalf of something they feel is meaningful, something that they believe in.

## A hard path out

On the other hand, I feel morally and ethically bound to reveal to my weapons labs colleagues the risks inherent in following their conscience. Many of these scientists did not have full and complete knowledge of the future use and results of their research on humanity and Earth at the time that were they were hired. It is appropriate that they have knowledge of the risks involved and make an informed decision before they take the principled path out of the labs.

Depending on their personal circumstances and their future plans, their economic security could be fleeting. It is possible that the scientist who will stand apart from the crowd could be abandoned and even attacked by friends and foes.

Scientists must examine their consciences, and only if the inner voice assures that they have the required strength to carry them through should they break away from war science, then and only then will their action bear fruit.

On Jan. 31 of 2000, I resigned from my permanent, highly paid, classified position at Livermore. I went to Livermore believing that I would be useful in helping to dismantle nuclear weapons and in disposing of their deadly byproducts. That was my desire and intent. Instead, I found myself expected to work on the maintenance of nuclear weapons as part of the Stockpile Stewardship program. I had not been informed properly about the nature of my future work because of security reasons.

When I realized that within the lab, environmental or non-proliferation work are illusions, I decided to resign. My conscience simply did not allow me to work for the development or maintenance of nuclear weapons. I believe that if a foundation or institution is corrupt, you must wash your hands and withdraw from it.

But to do so is not an easy matter. We all know deep in our hearts that the path we were meant to travel is the one that supports us not just financially but also, most importantly, emotionally.

It has not been easy for my family and myself since my resignation. Circumstances have led us to virtually give away our house because of the present bad housing market and move to a different, less expensive city. If we do not do this, we will not be able to make mortgage payments. This is not easy on the social lives of my children, who will be changing schools and friends.

By having part-time jobs or no jobs, we have been without medical insurance, and our income is far less than that needed to make ends meet. One of our cars has just given out and is not worth repairing; yet we cannot replace it at present. We hope our other one will hold out until circumstances improve.

The response of peace-seeking associations to the distresses of the future "breakaway" scientists will be an indication of whether they have a true desire to keep the peace message alive and to supply the logistical support necessary to promote it.

I believe it is the hope of most people of the Earth that scientists and engineers will be motivated to abandon their war-enabling ways before a world tragedy strikes.

We need to publicize and hold as role models future scientists who will renounce weapons work. Students at all levels of education should know about them. Let us start

glorifying peace instead of war, to give a chance to our children to live their lives in peace and harmony. They do not deserve what we have prepared for them. Being ten minutes away from a universal catastrophe at any given moment, we have an obligation not just to abolish weapons of mass destruction but also to abolish war as a national policy.

September 1, 2001

## 5. Questions and Answers on Achieving Peace

-- Can you believe it?



-- What?

-- Just think about it. An overwhelming number of governments have sent their condolences to the US government for the horrendous tragedy that struck the United States on September 11, 2001. At the same time, a few of those governments are keeping thousands of weapons of mass destruction on hair trigger alert and pointed toward the Pentagon, White House and every large city of the USA. They have been doing it for dozens of years now. They know that even by accident, the whole world could be gone forever. These same governments are pledging to support the USA to fight what the USA calls the War on Terrorism.

Now, can you believe this one?

-- What?

-- Just reflect on this simple thought. The US government has also thousands of weapons of mass destruction on hair trigger alert pointed toward the citizens of thousands of cities around the world. The USA has been using nuclear blackmail in almost every military intervention around the world for 55 years. Not many people know that. Most likely other countries are doing the same thing. Meantime, the US government has declared War on Terrorism.

Now have you ever reflected on this with your heart, not just with your mind?

-- On what?

-- Think about this, will you? As a result of the September 11 suicide attacks, it is estimated about 3,000 people died. Just watch and see in how little time it will be history. People will once again worry about their bills and how to protect their income and properties. The elite has made sure, with the cooperation of the corporate media that the citizens will not be able to lift up their heads to see or hear. If a city is nuked, do you think they will not eventually forget about it? They forgot about Hiroshima and Nagasaki, didn't they? More than 200,000 people died in a few seconds and many more hundreds of thousands died in the subsequent years in great pain and agony before their last breath.

-- Wait a minute. You are wrong! Every summer, there are many events in Japan about abolishing nuclear weapons. Also, in many places on earth ceremonies and educational programs are organized and taking place. In fact, there is a large peace movement worldwide that works nonstop for the abolition of weapons of mass destruction. You are a pessimist; you are impatient; you are speaking too loudly; you are not using diplomacy; you need to seek counseling; you need your daily tranquilizer.

-- Many Japanese people know very well what it means to be nuked. Some of them work day and night for abolishing these satanic tools yet who has listened to their cry for all these 55 years? Pentagon officials just a few days ago proposed to Mr. Bush to use nuclear bombs and they even had the audacity to mention it publicly. The West has lost its soul. It is as dead as a dead fish. Why hasn't the peace movement driven the people to the streets

after the terrible events of September 11? I do not mean just for vigils and demonstrations but for CIVIL RESISTANCE. When will the peace movement speak truth to power? When the world is watching the nuclear bombs fall from the sky, it will be too late!

-- Wait a minute. The peace movement is talking to the government leaders and has made great progress toward the abolition of nuclear weapons. You are too critical. We should be thankful for what we have achieved. And anyway, I think someone from the peace movement could very well say the following: "Here he comes, he was just working on nuclear weapons yesterday, and now he is telling us we have not done enough to abolish them, while we have been working all our lives within the peace movement."

-- The peace movement is talking to the wrong people. It should talk to the citizens of the world, not to the governments, and when the people understand what has been prepared for them by their own governments, then the people will talk to the governments by their sincere personal sacrifices, not just by sending faxes and petitions. Faxes and petitions, prayers and vigils are good, but not good enough. Without personal sacrifice, NOTHING will happen! By the way, I never worked on nuclear weapons from my own will. I was fooled for a while, and when I realized what I was doing, I immediately stopped working. In any case, that is not the correct attitude to encourage other scientists to give up war science. We are all responsible for the weapons of Mass Destruction. The scientists would not be able to devise these weapons if the citizens of every nation stopped paying the taxes that support them. We are all responsible and we can abolish them only by working together for their abolition.

-- Why do you think the leaders of the mainstream peace movement are so eager to talk to the government officials?

-- Because it is easier. It does not require personal sacrifice. It even promises, and many times it offers, positions in government and many other organizations/foundations (NGOs) with a salary, medical insurance and even prestige. After a while, it becomes like any other job, like a job making weapons. Look at how Gandhi worked for peace. He owned nothing.

-- Why do you think we have not yet abolished the nuclear fire, and the chemical, biological and conventional fire?

-- Because we are just talkers, not doers; because we are not really serious. To become serious, we need to love one another, to trust one another, to help and serve our fellow beings even if they hate us. We must speak truth in love, fearlessly, even if we are to die at that moment. We must renounce ownership, to become masters of our minds and bodies. We must embrace all humanity and living things just as we embrace our own lives.

October 1, 2001

## Operation Infinite Love

By Sandy Leon Vest

October 2, 2001

(In response to the previous article: Questions and Answers on Achieving Peace.)

On behalf of my friend and colleague in peace, Doctor Andreas Toupadakis, I submit the following for consideration:

To those who complain that Doctor Toupadakis is overly critical, unpatriotic or "impatient," I would argue that, at this pivotal moment in global history, there is little time to pick apart the 'manners' of one who so candidly expresses the agony of a species on the verge of self-extinction.

I would further submit that what my friend may lack in 'diplomacy skills,' is far outweighed by a refreshing abundance of courage, spontaneity and integrity. These are undervalued attributes in American culture, sadly, even among the ranks of so-called 'progressives.' Today, more than ever, America sorely needs principled passion and 'impatience.'

I have shared breakfast, lunch and dinner with Andreas Toupadakis, his beautiful wife and daughters. He is not a perfect man. He does not have 'all the answers.' But (dare I say, "in my heart") I do know that, if the likes of CNN, CNBC or FOX News featured one Andreas Toupadakis among their guest lineup, for every ten corporate flacks with 'diplomacy skills,' those of us who fight political disillusionment on a daily basis in the interest of a better world might find reason to believe.

The advice of national leaders, pundits and CEOs in the face of the September 11th tragedy is nothing short of embarrassing. Their rhetoric reads like a capitalist mantra, aptly summarized in the words of one CEO who quipped (within a week after the WTC attack) that, "American consumers must begin to consume again."

But their attitude is predictable, perhaps trumped only by the lack of courage displayed by mainstream reporters, as they fall into lockstep with the State Department. It is heart sickening to witness still again the acquiescence of so-called 'journalists,' in the face of yet another massive pro-war propaganda campaign. It is torture listening to the glib refusal of spokespersons Ari Fleischer and Richard Boucher to answer questions 'that threaten national security.' This sorry scene, made necessary by a total lack of vision in the Bush administration's 'foreign policy.'

Sadly, the reasons for what might be called, "the military-industrial imperative," (on the part of the US and its allies) are all too obvious for those who understand the underpinnings of global capitalism.

In the face of such extraordinary lack of vision, Doctor Toupadakis is a breath of fresh air. There are surely many in the 'peace movement' who need, now more than ever, to believe that it's politically safe to voice their dissent - even from 'progressive' rhetoric. Doctor Andreas Toupadakis expresses that hope with unmitigated sincerity. He speaks with the uncensored innocence of a child, and with a passion that borders on eloquence. Doctor Toupadakis' words inspire me to believe again, as I once did, that there is still a glimmer of hope - that human beings still have time to redeem themselves in what often seems a god-forsaken world.

It is disheartening that some who call themselves 'peace activists' appear unnerved by my friend's sincerity. Where is the capacity for genuine creative reflection? How will we create a future worth living if even those who rally for peace lack the capacity to appreciate those who "think with their hearts?"

It is nothing less than a cultural tragedy that we in the West have *not* been taught to 'think with our hearts.' In fact, we have not even been taught to think with our minds; rather we are taught that as obedient 'consumers,' it is our patriotic duty to think with our pocketbooks.

Who will be left to question the wisdom of such advice if even those who call themselves 'peace activists' value diplomacy over courage? And who, if not for those few brave ones, will continue to challenge the status quo, to ask why - in a time of global crisis - we are told that the only way out is more of the same?

Who then will be left to question an economic model that has long outlived its usefulness, and who will have the tenacity to utter the "C" word (capitalism) without fear of being marginalized as a communist or an "enemy of the state," if not for the few brave ones?

Who will point out the sheer stupidity of consuming and killing our way out of a global catastrophe brought about by war and over consumption, if not the brave ones? Who will be left to illustrate the paradox, nay, the patent absurdity of endorsing such destructive behavior in the face of global deprivation, if not those few? Who will stand up and be counted among those who speak to the real needs of a people in decline? Who, if not the brave ones, will speak of the desperate need for creative solutions to global conflict and thoughtful conservation of diminishing global resources?

Who will be left to point out the irony of a culture that rhetorically endorses - even teaches its children - concepts of "conflict resolution" and "conservation," while simultaneously waging war and consumerism on the rest of the planet? And who will challenge the efficacy of an economic model whose very existence depends on that same destructive model, in a world of dwindling resources, if not for those few brave souls?

Now, perhaps more than at any time in global history, we dare not marginalize our own for asking the questions we are afraid to ask. For it is those brave ones, those courageous enough to question the basic tenets of this outdated economic model, who will save us - if we are to be saved.

If there is a glimmer of chance to create a new model for world peace, it will come from the likes of the pure in spirit; it will come from those, who, like my friend Andreas, have the courage to speak their hearts in the face of growing adversity and censorship.

Those, who, like Andreas Toupadakis, offer themselves without calculation or contrivance to the cause of world peace may offer a rare "eleventh hour" opportunity to construct, organize and mobilize a genuinely creative solution to the catastrophe that has befallen not just the US, but the entire planet.

Without the fearless drumming of such truly dissenting voices, we are doomed to recreating the future in the image of the past.

## 6. Wisdom and Compassion Need to Become Action

After the 9/11 events, many people suddenly became fervent authors and speakers about what other people should do. Politicians, militants, priests, peace activists, scientists, security experts, ordinary humans, they are all trying to make a statement for peace. I have been doing the same thing as I type this article. They are sending and forwarding e-mail messages back and forth, circulating petitions, writing articles, giving lectures, going to demonstrations, and finally going back home feeling good about the efforts they have given for world peace.

Statements of advice vary, 'Enhance security measures,' 'The perpetrators of these heinous crimes must be brought to justice.' But instead of searching to find the terrorists, why don't we search for justice? Why don't we search to find the starving millions and feed them?

Even though everyone's efforts are sincere to the measure of each one's capacity for compassion towards others, they simply remain empty words in the air.

When we say that we feel 'profound sorrow and compassion for all those who died' we imply that we know death is something to be avoided because it is worse than life. We fail to reflect for a minute, like the seers of the past, to realize what actually life is. Those who try to save their lives in the long run will lose all civil freedoms, and soon after they will lose their lives, too.

Nothing happens until our words turn into actions. The difficulty that our generation has is that when it comes to direct action, we stall. There is no solution to terrorism but one, no matter how much money the citizens of the world will invest to stop it. It will simply increase. Why? It is because terrorism is the result of the increasing gap between the rich and the poor. Humans with great offices and power in this world will tell you that the cause of terrorism is something else. Do not believe them. They are trying to protect their power, which has been accumulated at the expense of the starving millions of the world.

Personal responsibility is the only solution to stop terrorism and the lack of personal responsibility is the beginning of terrorism.

As long as people around the world are starving by the millions and other people around the world are living in a world of plenty, terrorism can not be stopped. Let the people of this world with their credit, stocks, saving accounts, and retirement plans to give a piece of bread to their starving brothers and sisters around the world and see what will happen. If they want to have peace and have a future, let them nonviolently force their governments to use all the immeasurable resources they use for bombs and spying on one another to give a clean cup of water to those who have none.

If you want to make a difference in our world and therefore to your own life, then you start with yourself. And what do you do? You renounce the securities of this world and you give them to those who have less than yourselves. Gandhi said:

*'You become the change you want to see in the world.'*

If any one of those who want to see a better world is sincere let him/her start with the self. If any kind of leader of this world desires to offer leadership for a better world let him/her renounce all material possessions like Gandhi did and follow his example. If citizens desire to see a future for their children let them follow the example of Gandhi's followers and the early Christians.

The leaders of this world are ready to stain the whole world with innocent blood again. It would not be the first time but the third and most likely the last one. Military force will intensify the hatred toward the countries using it and terrorism will continue to be a threat to everyone. We have become again the evil we deplore. We already have ignored the fact that biological, chemical or nuclear terrorism would be thousands of times worse. If the people of the world stay in the phase of just talking without using nonviolent civil resistance and direct action, we will soon see the global catastrophe that no one would like to see or can even imagine. If we choose to stay simply talkers, that day is not very far from us.

October 6, 2001

## 7. Nuclear Weapons: Abolish or Perish

*"The United States will continue to make clear that it reserves the right to respond with overwhelming force -- including through resort to all of our options -- to the use of weapons of mass destruction against the United States, our forces abroad, and friends and allies."  
-- US National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction, December 2002 --*

**A**s the new year of 2003 was founding humanity still confused and in fear because of continuous acts of terrorism, some of the world's leaders were taking steps to terrorize humanity even further. The US National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction document not only threatens nuclear retaliation to attacks on the U.S. but it goes even further to include preemptive strikes in so called appropriate cases.

*"Because deterrence may not succeed, and because of the potentially devastating consequences of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) use against our forces and civilian population, U.S. military forces and appropriate civilian agencies must have the capability to defend against WMD-armed adversaries, including in appropriate cases through preemptive measures."*

Retired Air Force General Lee Butler, former Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, in an address to the National Press Club on February 1998 stated:

*"I was responsible for war plans with more than 12,000 targets, many to be struck with repeated nuclear blows, some to the point of complete absurdity. ... And in the end, I came away from it all with profound misgivings and with a set of deeply unsettling judgments: That from the earliest days of the nuclear era, the risks and consequences of nuclear war have never been properly weighed by those who brandished it; that the stakes engage not just the survival of the antagonists, but the fate of humankind. ... Their effects transcend time and place, poisoning the Earth and deforming its inhabitants for generation upon generation. They leave us wholly without defense, expunge all hope for meaningful survival. They hold in their sway not just the fate of nations but the very meaning of civilization. ... At worst it invokes death on a scale rivaling the power of the creator. ... It is time to reassert the primacy of individual conscience, the voice of reason, and the rightful interests of humanity."*

(General Butler's address can be found in it's entirety at:  
[http://www.noetic.org/Ions/publications/review\\_archives/46/issue46\\_38.html](http://www.noetic.org/Ions/publications/review_archives/46/issue46_38.html))

Unfortunately, General Lee Butler spoke in this way only after he retired.

### Einstein

Today many people still speak of war as a method to resolve disputes. But they should be reminded of Einstein's words:

*"For there is no secret and there is no defense; there is no possibility of control except through the aroused understanding and insistence of the peoples of the world."*

Einstein says that there is no defense, no protection, for a world having nuclear weapons or in general, weapons of mass destruction, unless people understand the

enormous danger, and unless they insist on their abolition. We desperately need leaders to take a stand for world peace while they are discharging their duties, not after they retire. In order to help them take such a position, what is needed is what Bertrand Russell wrote in the Russell-Einstein Manifesto, which was signed by 11 prominent scientists, among whom was also Einstein:

*"A large-scale civil disobedience, which should be nonviolent..."*  
<http://www.pugwash.org/about/manifesto.htm>

These views are perhaps considered extreme. But how extreme is the reality of the possibility that we are ready to destroy all that we see around us and ourselves forever? Senator Alan Cranston, after he retired, wrote in 1999:

*"One super bomb could now loose more destructive energy than all that has been released from all weapons fired in all wars in all history. The power of self-extinction is now in our uncertain hands. ... It is more likely now than it was during the more stable days of the Cold War that weapons of mass destruction will be used."*  
<http://www.qsinstitute.org/archives/000028.shtml>

### **Within the next 10 years**

General Charles Horner, who commanded the Allied Air Forces in the Gulf War, says he expects that a nuclear weapon will be exploded in some city in the next 10 years. These weapons have cost U.S. taxpayers over \$5 trillion so far. They presently cost \$37 billion a year - diverting money from other needs. Is it worthy of a nation to base its security on terror, on the threat to annihilate millions of innocent humans, on the threat of genocide? Is the policy of Mutual Assured Destruction - a policy that puts the human race at risk of extinction- worthy of civilization?

Some advocates are saying, "Do not worry, we are in control. Weapons of mass destruction will never be used." But most people deny the fact that insiders speak of "when," while outsiders speak of "if." Which should we believe? We do not want to believe the insiders, but my destiny was such that I became an insider for a while. Now, therefore, I speak as an insider, as many others, and say that if we continue on the same path we are now on, it is just a matter of a short time until we see what people were talking about for thousands of years and have been truly afraid of for less than 60 years.

January 11, 2003

## 8. Dissecting the Meaning of Terrorism

**I**t seems that many writers today, even of the most eminent, are struggling to find an acceptable definition of terrorism. Many governments are doing the same. It is said that one nation's terrorist is very often another's freedom fighter, and many times one nation's terrorist of yesterday is seen as a hero tomorrow. But a little child knows that terrorism is any act that brings terror. It is as simple as that. Why are we lost in the semantics? And to any adult, terrorism is even something more than that; it can be any seemingly innocent act, which harbors, sustains, and promotes acts of terror.

We need to dissect the meaning of terrorism in order to put things into perspective. Every war in the past was fought by thousands of soldiers. The last large war reigned terror on most of the face of the earth. Today it is a fact that by pushing a few buttons, it is possible for the whole world to be over within 30 minutes. How did it happen that a few human fingers have accumulated such power to determine not just the fate of nations, but the very existence of life itself? How did a few individuals come to even challenge the very power of the infinitely great? As the unthinkable draws even closer every day, it would be prudent to finally come face to face with the full spectrum of terrorism instead of talking about this or that individual terrorist or nation.

### The Legal Immoral Terrorist

This is the soldier who tries to save his own life while at the same time killing and destroying others, not in order to save his life, but just for the sake of killing; this is the war criminal. He will even disobey state orders in order to kill and destroy on his own. When he returns, very often, the state protects him and many times he is even called a hero.

### The Illegal Immoral Terrorist

The Illegal Immoral Terrorist has a strong desire to destroy property and even to kill others, but does not want to die or suffer in jail. His resources do not come directly from tax money.

### The Illegal "Moral" Terrorist

The Illegal "Moral" Terrorist does not try to save his life; he is ready to die at any moment for his cause and sometimes he even plans to die, but people are killed or mutilated because of his acts. His resources do not come directly from tax money. When his country is under occupation by another country, he is considered a useless man, a terrorist in the eyes of the puppet government of his country and a good portion of his countrymen. After many years when his country becomes free from the hold of the empire, then the free government of his country and almost all his countrymen often call him a hero, a freedom fighter.

### The Legal Social Terrorist

This is the soldier who by the orders of the state goes to war knowing that he might die, and he kills and destroys by obeying orders from the state. To avoid jail, execution, or disgrace, he will go, taking the chance he may die even though he does not want to die or suffer. He obeys state orders but has no desire to examine them; he is a pawn of the system, ignorant and confused a tool of the rich who exploit the poor, perhaps like most of

the soldiers around the world. His family and the state call him a hero, and in truth he/she is a hero and a victim at the same time.

### **The Blind Citizen Terrorist**

In this category belongs a large number of people around the world and especially in the West who work day in and day out researching and making millions of weapons, some of which have unthinkable destructive power. They are people who say that they work for peace while knowing that any weapon, when used, brings terror, violence, death, and pain.

### **The Apathetic Citizen Terrorist**

Virtually every citizen in the world who supports with his/her taxes the war machine is in this category. When he/she hears that one fifth of today's military spending would suffice to ensure everyone a sustained basic supply of food, drinking water, education and public health services, he puts his head in the sand and says, "What can we do?"

### **The Religious Seed Terrorist**

Any citizen that will run away in the name of religion from any battle for a just world and hide in order to save his life or to avoid imprisonment is in this category. Representing the nonviolence of the weak, this is a coward.

And finally on the other end of the spectrum there are the real advocates of peace, the real fighters. Their actions could precipitate violence, but that is not their intent or plan.

### **The Legal Moral Fighter**

This is the soldier who is enslaved into the government system and is willing to die for his country and family, but who would not kill or destroy. Usually historians do not mention him.

### **The Real Mahatma Fighter**

The real fighter in his/her fight for peace does not try to save his/her life or avoid punishment, nor does he seek to give up his life or take any other life into his hands. And he will yield not even one inch to his opponent even if that means that he will die or spend his entire life in prison. He represents the nonviolence of the brave, a rare fighter like Gandhi, Badshah Khan, Martin Luther King, or Socrates.

Who is then outside of the spectrum of violence? It is the little children and the childlike adults who should be our teachers on nonviolence, but we almost completely ignore them, and we do not give them the podium to speak; instead, we keep it for ourselves full time.

Therefore the question we face today is this, "How long will the universe wait for the unthinkable to befall us?"

January 7, 2002

## 9. Is There Western Racism?

*I think if we are to feel at home in the world ... we shall have to admit Asia to equality in our thoughts, not only politically but culturally. What changes this will bring about I do not know, but I am convinced that they will be profound and of the greatest importance.*  
-- Bertrand Russell – *History of Western Philosophy* (1946)

**B**uried in the details, we have forgotten the most basic question. What are American soldiers doing in so many countries around the world? In several of them, Americans have recently again put their military bases, and in others they bomb, and bomb again, thousands of civilians. The unfortunate people are killed, mutilated, and displaced by the hundreds of thousands and millions from their houses to the frozen mountains. Their children lose their feet and hands for life. Where are the borders of the country called the USA? That is the question that a teenager has asked recently.

They have slowly but steadily come to believe together with their allies that they are better than others. They even call themselves First World Countries. And slowly they have made their youth accept and faithfully believe such an absurdity. That is very dangerous! It is a reminder of the infamous days of the late thirties and early forties. Many understand that all these so called humanitarian wars are all about resources, and most importantly, about encircling the "yellow dragon," as the westerners like to call China. But China does not drop cluster bombs on other nations, nor does it publicly suggest attacking weak nations with nuclear bombs, nor does it place military bases around the world, nor does it belong to an alliance that goes around the world and gathers members from the former Soviet Union. Not to say that China is innocent of wrong-doing, but we need to be fair in our observations and speak the truth.

The illegal terrorists can create some smoke on earth which is visible from a few miles away, but the legal terrorists are ready, even by mistake, to create such smoke that will be seen from the ends of the universe. And these legal terrorists have derived their power from every citizen that pays taxes to his/her own government. The terrorists are not over there; they are over here. They are us, the citizens of the world. Our governments are nothing but the faithful representation of our insecurities and greed. Our governments mirror our inability to imagine a future. We cannot just blame our governments; we should blame ourselves even more. Without our consent, they would not have any chance to become legal terrorists. We have paid and are still paying their salaries. They say that they provide peace to the world by murdering millions.

The world is going to receive the final bill very soon unless it wakes up. We need to gain again our lost sense of the meaning of life, the "inexhaustible meaning" of life that the Greek philosophers talked about.

And to make sure that we answer the question of if there is Western Racism, we need only look at one strange phenomenon, the most important of all. Western states are developing, maintaining, and threatening to use weapons of mass destruction against eastern nations while at the same time demanding that these Eastern nations not be able to acquire them; otherwise they will be bombed. Moreover, these Western nations are using bribery towards the governments of the rest of the Eastern nations that already have weapons of mass destruction to make them destroy their weapons. Allies of such Western states share the blame for whatever happens tomorrow.

February 13, 2002

## 10. It Starts With Us

The world's war and peace situation will never be addressed as long as the major powers continue to hold on to their weapons of mass destruction. Inspectors are not needed in countries like the U.S., Britain, France, Russia, and China in order for the world to know that they already possess these offensive and criminal nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and long-range missiles. Yet children in those countries are not dying from sanctions or bombing. Why is it a crime for Iraq and other nations to seek these weapons but not for the so-called "great powers"? But as someone once said, the world knows that they fail to match power with responsibility and have licensed themselves to be shepherds who prey on their sheep. We cannot grasp the fact that while most American, English, French, Russian and Chinese children enjoy their playgrounds in safety, children in other nations are mutilated and killed by American and English bombs and mines.

Permanent members (U.S., Britain, France, Russia, and China) of the security council are promising security to the world while their arsenals possess such destructive power that it is enough to destroy, even by mistake, what they claim to secure. Would it not be wise for the people of a planet tormented by fear and greed make a Security Council for themselves made up of countries that do not possess weapons of mass destruction? And would it not be wise for that Security Council to be a group of countries that represent all religions? Would a mature humanity still talk about crusades and holy wars? How objective could a world security council be when four out of five of its members are Christian nations? Would Pakistan, a Muslim country, be a permanent member of the Security Council if it had 6,000 nuclear bombs?

If today's authorities in every country were honest enough to entertain these thoughts, perhaps the world could be saved from the coming omnicide. But in reality, the politicians or the soldiers cannot save the world, only the ordinary peoples. Only when the people heal their fears and greed and give their extra money to relieve their neighbors, will omnicide be avoided. They will have to abandon the idea of stocks if giving their money away they do not know for certain who will finally get it and what they will do with it. If people cannot do that, then it seems like they will run to the caves soon. Their leaders will not be able to save them. They will realize that all writings and talks were in vain because they did not accept and practice the truth that "your brother is the same as you". Probably the very few who will survive will learn to share in the caves, and they will learn that we are all one.

In matters of conscience, numbers are meaningless. If we do not care for the beggar at our doorstep, we will not care for the thousands of people dying everyday in our world in agonizing death inflicted by our tax money. Only if we unconditionally care for our friends and family will we care for the suffering of the people on the other side of the globe. We need to start where we are. How many people practice the exhortation "if you have two, give one to the one who has none?" If we know the answer, then we know the future.

Do not judge this message as religious, atheist, political or propaganda. Just try to practice what you know is the only way to have peace on earth. You might say "But there is no hope because there is too much ignorance around ready to destroy life." That might be true, but do it anyway because that is our duty and that is the way we find true happiness and meaning in life. Socrates said: "An unexamined life is not worth living." How does the abolition of these terrible weapons start? IT STARTS WITH US.

December 9, 2002

## 11. The Real Face of the Empire

People worldwide need to decide soon what this global war without end, as described by the so-called superpower, is all about. Is it against terrorists or is it against humanity? Is it only against Muslims or is it against human dignity? Is it worth reacting or should we continue to go on with our everyday chores as usual? Is this not state terrorism? If it is not, then what is it? How ordinary people answer these questions in the coming months and years will determine how their life dreams unfold.

But if they knew their true condition and what will be coming upon them if they do not get up from their comfortable chairs, they would not wait even for a minute to fiercely resist their comfortable yoke. To move towards safety and freedom we need to redefine what civilization is. Do we have time to do that? Who knows?

Many writers and spokesmen of good intention almost exclusively present only a general large picture. But what is the small picture? There are many small pictures that make up the big picture. Will the man or woman who is working at the detention center or the weapons laboratory realize that she/he is serving a system, which is corrupted, bloodthirsty and deceiving? And if these people do understand, will they take the leap of faith and abandon it? And if they do, will more of their friends and co-workers follow their example? And will the people around these people support them until they stand on their feet? Can people around them support them even just in word when they themselves do not live a simple life because their livelihood depends on the system that destroys the earth and its people? Would it not then be a better direction for us all to move towards a sustainable way of living? These are the questions that we need to answer soon. We have forgotten that the clock hand has almost reached midnight. Should we remind ourselves of it or not?

Have the Europeans already forgotten the results of World War II? At that time, weapons of mass destruction were in their infancy. Now they have matured because of the work of our scientists and engineers trying to save the world by making the tool that can destroy it forever, even by mistake. Why do European leaders not see what is at stake? Why doesn't the majority of European citizens rise to demand life?

Why have not American citizens participated in world affairs so far? Why have they allowed their representatives to lie to them and work in secrecy? Why have they allowed their foreign policy to be a policy of murder and injustice for so long? Have they ever wondered who makes their foreign policy? Do they still believe in the American dream? Was the American dream about gated communities and millions of people working in more than one part time job in order to hardly make ends meet? Was the American dream about going to country after country and region after region and turn it into dust for more world control? How long do they think their tanks and smart bombs will support their unsustainable way of life?

How long will the other nations be deceived and bribed? Is this the kind of culture they want to export to every other country? Do they really believe that their country can maintain military bases on the soil of other countries around the world without building resentment and hatred in the hearts and minds of the citizens of these countries? Do they really believe that their war machine is about maintaining peace around the world and not

exploitation and misery? Have they ever realized that their country is the only one that has ever used nuclear weapons and what the social, political and military implications of this unspeakable murder are? Have they ever tried to find out why the second bomb was dropped?

Jacqueline Cabasso, executive director of the Western States Legal Foundation, a nuclear disarmament advocacy group in California has recently said:

*"Whether Iraq still has weapons of mass destruction remains to be seen. Meanwhile its chief accuser, the United States, is blatantly brandishing its own. The 'National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction,' released by the White House just last week, combines the worst features of the 'Nuclear Posture Review' and the September 2002 'National Security Strategy of the United States' by openly threatening the first use of nuclear weapons. This deadly international double standard is a recipe for endless arms racing and endless death and destruction. The Bush administration has turned the concept of non-proliferation on its head and made a mockery of international law. If having weapons of mass destruction and a history of using them is a criterion, then surely the United States must pose the greatest threat to humanity that has ever existed. Sustainable global security will require the elimination of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons -- without exception."*

And last, do they really believe that their country is about supporting democracy, education, and freedom around the world when the U.S. military budget tops the rest of the world by far? When while the rest of the world is cutting military spending, the United States is adding billions to its military budget? Reality has started to hit, and it will hit harder as the days go by unless the people worldwide find the courage to rise, and speak, and do their duty. The real face of the empire is manifesting itself at last to its own citizens and allies. The real face of the governments of the nations around the world is being recognized. It is not a pretty face. It widens the gap between rich and poor, and it sets brother against brother.

The question is not what are our leaders doing for our world? The question is what are we *not* doing for our world, what are we *not* doing for the earth, the people next to us, or ourselves.

December 31, 2002

## 12. Power without Ethics or Common Sense

*"When I look at mankind today, nothing astonishes me quite so much as the shortness of man's memory with regard to political developments. Yesterday the Nuremberg trials, today the all-out effort to rearm Germany. In seeking for some kind of explanation, I cannot rid myself of the thought that this, the last of my fatherlands, has invented for its own use a new kind of colonialism, one that is less conspicuous than the colonialism of old Europe. It achieves domination of other countries by investing American capital abroad, which makes those countries firmly dependent on the United States. Anyone who opposes this policy or its implications is treated as an enemy of the United States. It is within this general context that I try to understand the present-day policies of Europe, including England"*

-- Einstein acknowledging New Year's greetings from the Queen Mother of Belgium --

January 2, 1955

**T**he human species has not yet learned from history that war only creates conditions that beget further war.

The superpower's new policy of preventive war is destined to bring chaos on earth if it is allowed to be practiced. We might as well call it the policy of global terror. Why have we become so mad? Who is pushing the world to its total destruction along with unspeakable agony and fear? Would it be an exaggeration to say that madness rules the world? For those who know the facts about the number and nature of weapons of mass destruction, it would be a true statement.

Nobel Peace Prize winner Jimmy Carter, delivering his Nobel Lecture in the Oslo City Hall on Dec. 10, 2002, stated:

*"For more than half a century, following the founding of the State of Israel in 1948, the Middle East conflict has been a source of worldwide tension. At Camp David in 1978 and in Oslo in 1993, Israelis, Egyptians, and Palestinians have endorsed the only reasonable prescription for peace: United Nations Resolution 242. It condemns the acquisition of territory by force, calls for withdrawal of Israel from the occupied territories, and provides for Israelis to live securely and in harmony with their neighbors. There is no other mandate whose implementation could more profoundly improve international relationships."*

And while Mr. Jimmy Carter speaks the truth in the previous statement, surprisingly he continues: "Perhaps of more immediate concern is the necessity for Iraq to comply fully with the unanimous decision of the Security Council that it eliminate all weapons of mass destruction and permit unimpeded access by inspectors to confirm that this commitment has been honored. The world insists that this be done."

However, as much praise as the first statement deserves to receive for its truthfulness, the second statement deserves as much condemnation because of its egocentrism. No, the world does not "insist that this be done." The world insists that all nations disarm and the ones that have the most should start first. The responsibility of the United Nations is not to disarm a few nations and keep the rest armed to their teeth. The

responsibility of the United Nations and the Security Council is to make sure that the superpower starts first and then with inspections in place they make sure that all other nations follow. Surely, if they cannot do that, their existence is meaningless. Globalization is a fact, but how does the United Nations prevent economic exploitation of the small nations? How do they act when they see the doors closed to the media and to the weaker nations during the world economic conferences?

The world asks, 'Why can Israel have hundreds of nuclear weapons but Iraq and North Korea cannot? Why does Turkey still occupy the northern part of Cyprus and why does Israel still occupy Palestine?' Who is "the world?" The world is not the superpower and its allies. The world is all nations, an elementary grade student will tell us. How far the West has gone! Why is it a crime for Iraq, North Korea or any other nation to even think of making weapons of mass destruction when other nations have thousands in their arsenals? In fact, at the same time they threaten to enforce their absurd standards, they are making more weapons of mass destruction.

But the world knows the obvious. It is not about weapons of mass destruction and it is not about changing this or that regime. Virtually all people of the world know that it is about total world domination, which can only come by ensuring control of the oil and placing military bases on the soil of other nations. And this has been accomplished for many years almost exclusively by killing millions of innocent people, mutilating many more around the globe for life, and devastating the environment. If this is not terrorism, then what is it?

We fail to realize the obvious, that there is only one superpower manipulating politics and the economy, but there are many superpowers that have the capacity to bring the world to its knees at any moment, even by mistake. Any nation with weapons of mass destruction is a superpower. There really is no world king. And the so-called globalization and world government will be nothing but the most inhumane government ever devised on the face of the earth. It will be based on terror and extortion. What good will that do the world? But the people will revolt sooner or later as they have always done, and who will be able to bring order? Will the self-proclaimed builders of nations be able to rebuild the world? What can be built from ashes and without survivors? That is what we need to contemplate.

Unless we realize our hypocrisy, madness, and absurd logic, we will never see peace on earth. That is a given. Threats beget threats, and terror begets terror. Weapons beget weapons and hate begets hate. Has the world been transformed into a madhouse, giving praise to lies and condemnation to truth? If we have reached that kind of maturity, what remains? Should we expect a global Hiroshima in order to understand how blind we are? It would be too late.

Why do the United Nations and the Security Council enforce international law in places like Kuwait but do not in other places like Israel and Palestine or Turkey and Cyprus? Why do they have double standards? It seems then an obvious fact to any ordinary and honest observer that the dogma 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth' has taken dominion of the international institutions, which proclaim that they work for world peace. But what then? If such is our current condition, who will deliver the world from the coming catastrophic consequences? What will the nations do in order to avoid having such a calamity come from the practice of such a dogma? How long will the people of the world wait? Until they see their lives ruled by a minority of people with absurd desires? Until they see their world gone forever and their lives taken in agonizing death? Can't they see where they are headed?

Why did the United States of America long ago choose the path of threats and killing to serve the world? What would the result have been if only a fraction of the resources that have been used to create and support the awesome and simultaneously diabolical war machine had been given to poor nations? Those who have searched the numbers know well that our world would not be the same. But power corrupts. Power without ethics is destined to destroy not only the weak but also the strong. Nevertheless, physical power never broke the spirit of freedom, and it never will.

January 17, 2003

## 13. The Lethal Trap

*"We must make clear to the Germans that the wrong for which their fallen leaders are on trial is not that they lost the war, but that they started it. And we must not allow ourselves to be drawn into a trial of the causes of the war, for our position is that no grievances or policies will justify resort to aggressive war. It is utterly renounced and condemned as an instrument of policy."*

-- Supreme Court Justice Robert L. Jackson, Chief US Prosecutor at the Nuremberg Tribunal  
--August 12, 1945

**W**hat was often heard before the Iraq war II were phrases like: "We would support a US-led unilateral strike on Iraq only with UN endorsement." "We would support a unilateral invasion if clear evidence emerged that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction." "There should not be a war with Iraq because there is no proof that Iraq was involved with the 9/11 terrorist act." And the list was going on.

But all those people with good intention failed to see the lethal trap before their eyes. If the drivers of the war machine had decided to wage another aggressive war against another nation, they would sooner or later find a reason to justify the war if people were asking for one. At the end, if they would not find one, they would create one. And that would not be the first time. What if the United Nations Security Council had said that it is okay to go to war? What if the inspectors had found some nuclear material? Would one gram of plutonium or a ton of it would be enough to start the war? What if someone had come and said that there was a link between 9/11 and Iraq? (And of course that person most likely would be speaking "on condition of anonymity.") What then, should the war had started?

Ironically the war started even without any of these justifications. It started because the invisible government had decided so. It even gave the answer to the millions who were protesting against the war world wide through the lips of their representative. They said, "You people are irrelevant." But the informed people around the world know that Iraq was attacked not because it had weapons of mass destruction but precisely for the opposite reason. Iraq was attacked because the attackers were certain that Iraq did not have them.

We need to realize that there was absolutely no justification for the Iraq war. This war not only risked global catastrophe because it involved the boiling region in the Middle East, an area perhaps more unstable than any other in the world, but it was also immoral and illegal. It was immoral because it punished millions of innocent civilians who were punished unjustly in 1991, and had been punished continually since that time, and it punished and destroyed them again. It was illegal under domestic law because only Congress has the power to declare war under the US Constitution. Congress gave the illegal authority to the President of the United States to commit aggressive war. For this same kind of war, Nazi and Japanese leaders were held accountable at the Nuremberg and Tokyo trials following World War II. It was also illegal under international law because there was no evidence that Iraq planed to attack the US. Aggressive war is one of the most serious transgressions of international law.

Nothing but organized non-violence can check the organized violence of the American government for now and in the future. This organized state violence is exemplified with the following simplified facts.

US versus North Korea:

-- What do you have?

-- We've got nukes, germs, poison gas, missiles galore and a million tough troops. Just about what you have. The only difference is in amount but they still work very effectively even in small amounts. They can bring you down to your knees even in very small numbers.

-- Okay, let's negotiate.

US versus Iraq:

-- What do you have?

-- We have nothing of the sort you worry about.

-- There will be no negotiations, just war!

Since the Vietnam disaster, the US has attacked only small nations with little or no ability to defend themselves such as Grenada, Panama, Libya, Somalia, Iraq, and Afghanistan. Small nations observing this absurd phenomenon of double standards will do anything they can in the future to not just build WMD but also buy them from any place they can. That brings us closer to chaos. Which country is the greatest proliferator of weapons of mass destruction then?

If the possession or ability to make WMD is the "justification" for the US to go to war, then the governments which do not possess them would be quite rational in taking action (sanctions, etc.) against those states that already possess them and even manufacture them openly.

We still see today the same absurd mentality of the leaders of the west. They cry with a loud voice, "Iran and this and that nation do not obey their obligations under the non-proliferation treaty." Why don't they obey their own obligations? Why they do not abolish their own as it is stated in the non-proliferation treaty?

In the words of a former student of mine, "In today's post 9/11 context, there is a need for the American people to become aware of what they are capable of doing. In a way, the U.S. does shape the world's destiny today. Will America dare to vote for peace? Or will America trigger nuclear disaster? World citizens hope that the Americans' fear of terrorism does not blind them from the possibility of a peaceful future." I couldn't have put it better myself.

## **14. No, We Will Not; A Pledge of Resistance and Nonviolence**

**W**ill the day come when the people of the world will look their leaders straight in the eye and say:

No, we will not fight for your greed and fears. Send your own sons and daughters if you believe that the fight is worth dying for. If you go first, like real fighters, perhaps we will follow.

No, we will not go to war. War is not good for anyone. It is full of blood, pain, agony, sickness, fear and later, soul torment. You go to war, and we will sit in your comfortable chairs and watch how boldly you are dying. What great patriots you are.

No, we will not even join your military institutions anymore. Do not bother sending your agents to our schools. You promise us much comfort and an easier life, but our lungs have been filled with deadly chemicals and depleted uranium. We are dying, bleeding on the floor of our homes, and you even deny us medical help. Our friends and comrades in the field have died in great numbers since they came back from the Gulf War.

No, we will not be deceived by your lies anymore. We have understood that all wars have been fought for the sake of bullies. We are independent spirits; we do not belong to anyone, much less to you. We will not obey you.

No, we will not go to war. You can imprison us, you can torture us, you can even kill us, but you will not make us submit to your ideas. You are not above us, nor better than us.

No, we will not join your military in order to be able to go to college. We will not learn how to kill people in order to be able to finish college so that we can later serve people. You can keep your money and your scholarships and your loans. They are not of our taste. They are soaked in blood, the blood of our fellow beings.

No, we will not go to war. You brainwashed us to hate anyone who is not like us. We have discovered that we are all one. Your propaganda is over. It has no power over us. Your trained, brainwashed psychologists, military planners, and intelligence community have failed to convince us of the beauty of your ideals.

No, we will not go to war. We will not join your scientific institutions to prepare for war. There are other jobs that dignify the soul of humanity and do not destroy our world. We will not give you our knowledge and sweat anymore to use against our brothers and sisters in other countries who go to sleep every night thinking about how they can keep their children safe and fed the next morning. Your wars bring hunger and death. We prefer to keep our vineyards and olive groves, which give us wine and olive oil, rather than to have them be converted into cemeteries. The olive oil has healed our past wounds and the wine has given us a great heart to envelop the whole world in compassion.

No, we will not go to fight your wars. We prefer to keep our house with all of its members. You will not take our sons and daughters anymore in order to fight your dirty

wars. You do not like this or that regime? Well then, you go and fight. We will not follow you.

No, we will not speak against any people of any nation because they have the same dreams as we do. A warm home filled with sons and daughters dreaming of a beautiful world.

No, we will not go to war. We have discovered our true nature. We are not like the animals in the jungle. We have powers which when released will make the whole world dance the dance of life. What will you do then?

No, we will not go to join your violent institutions and controlled media. We will report truth even if you fire us, even if you torture us. We will not depend on your paychecks anymore. We have understood your tricks. We will trust our fellow beings and ask each other for support. No need for your loans and your interviews.

No, we will not spy on our brothers and sisters and report to you. Who are you? Have you taken the seat of the powers of the universe?

No, we will not spill anymore of our fellow beings' blood and mutilate them for life because we would not like them to do the same thing to us and our children. We would rather create and listen to music so that we can touch our true magnificent human nature. We will build more concert halls for our children; we will not pay you to build prisons and tanks anymore.

No, we will not be scared of your intelligence reports anymore. We will not exchange our freedom for security. We do not need your security. We will keep our freedom. We know you create much of this violence, and then you report threats in order to control us. You have no power over us. We love one another.

No, we will not be obedient to your orders anymore. We break our contracts because you deceived us. You told us that by waging war, we can have peace. You foolish ones. Does planting the seeds of cancer ever produce health and beauty. No, by waging war, we have gathered pain, agony and death.

No, we will not go to war. We do not believe in your motto that an eye for an eye will make the world buy. You want us to buy, but when you make wars, we are afraid to buy. We will not support your violent institutions anymore. Your militarism has damaged our environment forever. We know a better way, the way of trust and brotherhood. We reject your example of an eye for an eye. We believe otherwise, that an eye for an eye will make the whole world blind.

No, we will not accept vaccination unless we choose to do so, no matter how many threats you create in order to accomplish it. Our bodies are not your property. You can have power over them but you will never have power over our ideas and our souls. Our bodies will go away someday one way or another, but our ideas will stay forever.

No, we will not support your globalization under its current status. We understand that the existence of a superpower is not in harmony with world peace, democracy, and human dignity. This is a superpower with a military budget which tops that of the rest of the world's by far, and while the rest of the world is cutting military spending, it is adding billions to its military budget.

No, we will not follow you on your shameful trip of an endless war. You and your friends will be by yourselves. We will not harm you, but you will not conquer our beautiful dreams for a beautiful world, one which can include you. We will wait for your hearts to open and see that we are all the same.

No, we will not fight your wars anymore because your wars now kill mostly innocent and unarmed civilians, people who do not believe what you believe and have committed no wrong against you. Your wars are not about freedom, security, peace, or prosperity; they are about domination and power. We are holding you accountable for the death and mutilation of every unarmed civilian on earth. You are not excused in any way.

No, we will not clap our hands for your Nobel Prize winners. We have our own Nobel Prize winners. They have lost their legs and spent many years in prison just trying to tell you the indisputable truth. Unless you disarm, we will all perish in agonizing death. Disarm now. Stop playing games with words before it is too late.

No, we will not serve you anymore. You are merchants of weapons, you create and fuel divisions between nations, and then you say 'See, there is a threat.' You give the weapons to us to kill one another and then you say that you work for peace. Have you lost your sanity and common sense? We have not. If you cannot teach our children at your schools that there is another way, we will. We will reject your militarized schools. We love life. We will not destroy what we cannot create.

No, we will not believe in your institutions of world security anymore. You have clearly shown to us that you have taken total control of them for your own benefit to serve power, not us. Our security is our brotherhood, based on mutual respect and acceptance, something that your militarism cannot let flourish. Your militarism creates fear. We do not desire to live in fear. You can create violence to scare us but you will not succeed in the coming days. You will be the first to be terrified by the diabolic weapons you have allowed to be made. When chaos comes, you will use them and you will die by your own hands in agonizing death, as has happened in the past. Remember Hiroshima and Nagasaki; therefore, if you are wise disarm! Disarm! Disarm!

That day will come, but when and how, we do not know. Perhaps soon or perhaps after millions of years, after eons of great suffering and darkness. But that day *will* come.

January 15, 2003

## 15. Crisis in Science

*"Science is a good piece of furniture for a man to have in an upper chamber provided he has common sense on the ground floor"*

-- Oliver Wendell Holmes --

**W**hile millions of people around the world are fighting big battles with cancer in physical and emotional pain, science is still being glorified for scientific progress. It is no secret that in hundreds of thousands of homes around the world every day, there is a lot of indignation and despair because of what the wrong practice of science has done to people.

The human race has only one or perhaps two generations to rescue itself, according to the "2003 State of the World" report by the Washington-based WORLDWATCH Institute. The Guardian Weekly informs us that according to the report, "Global warming is accelerating, and carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has reached 370.9 parts per million, the highest level for 420,000 years and probably for 20m years. Toxic chemicals are being released in increasing quantities, and global production of hazardous waste has reached more than 300m tones a year. There is only a vague idea of what damage this does to humans and natural systems." The report also says, "Bird extinctions are running at some 50 times the natural rate due to habitat loss and other consequences of human activity. Each day 5,500 children die from diseases linked to polluted food, air, and water, and the global rate of ice melt has more than doubled since 1988."

The truth is that humanity will very soon have to ask itself the following question, if it is not already too late: Can it be that by trying to improve and lengthen our lives without being in harmony with natural laws, we are not only losing our lives but also our earth?

Michael N. Nagler, Professor Emeritus of Classics and Comparative Literature at the University of California, Berkeley correctly states in his new book Is There No Other Way? that "Science has every right to confine its attention to the physical, i.e. the outside world." It has no right to say, when it has done so, that it has given us the whole story."

It is almost impossible to convince the unaware citizen of the violence of science. Anthony Standen puts it this way: "Science has achieved so many things, and has been right so many times, that it is hard to believe that it can be wrong in anything, particularly for a layman, who does not have enough knowledge of the subject to be able to argue back." The magnitude of death that the wrong practice of science has brought on all of us is unbelievable. Silent Spring, the forty-year-old classic book in the environmental field by Rachel Carson, gave us a glimpse of the crime of science. It exposes the thoughtlessness of public institutions in spraying deadly chemicals like DDT on millions of acres of agricultural land. Also "Trade Secrets, a Moyer's Report," (see <http://www.pbs.org/tradesecrets/>) on PBS revealed an unbelievable story involving many large American and European chemical industries. The following is from that report:

*"The chemical industry long kept secret vital information about the potential health effects of some of its manufacturing processes and some of its products. When challenged by citizens' initiatives to reveal those secrets, it mounted extensive - and expensive - campaigns to defeat them."*

Whether the propellants or other ingredients in products we use today are safe or not is simply unknown. In some cases consumers cannot even find out what the ingredients are because they are considered trade secrets. The chemical industry contributes millions of dollars to help elect senators, congressmen, and presidents.

Could it be possible that science as a total has done more harm than good? People are burying their loved ones at an unbelievable rate, but they fail to understand why this is happening. What is the terrible truth? Scientists today have created powerful drugs to heal cancer, for example, but we know by the number of funerals in our communities that the success rate is not very high. They never mention to people what else they are producing at the same time they are making these drugs. They do not admit, thus they cannot explain that during the process of making the drugs, they also unavoidably produce deadly pollution. It is ironic that while human beings try to save their lives, they are further endangering their own families and even themselves by doing so. In other words, even if the sick person is healed, there is a high probability that he will again become sick from some other disease because of the pollution created while the pharmaceutical industry was making the medicine.

Science claims that research is done out of concern for humanity's needs and pain. Is this true? The citizens never asked for most of the materials that industry has produced. It is no secret that the chemical industry is one of the most profitable industries in the world, assisting other industries like the medical industry to gain astronomical profits out of the pain of the unfortunate people. In our industrial age, many large wars are fought for oil because for the most part, oil is the starting material of the chemical industry.

It is a well kept secret in the scientific community that no one knows how the body reacts to the hundreds of thousands of new chemicals that scientists have created, which never existed before in our environment. We know that there are chemicals, whether natural or man-made, that are deadly in a very small concentration. When we take medicine into our body, do we know what happens when it combines with so many other new chemicals in our food, water and air? There is an infinite number of combinations that can occur. All these chemicals can create new compounds in our bodies, and no one can ever know their effect on our health. All these facts are never mentioned.

The truth is that herbal medicine served the native people of every culture of the earth for thousands of years for FREE. When man started to make his own medicine with profit in mind, people started to die because of new diseases. Is there no other way? Greed and fear become barriers to our imagination in finding ways to use science without hurting nature, and ourselves.

Eminent scientists have the impudence to give lectures with titles like, "Biodiversity is threatened" when at the same time their very work is what threatens biodiversity. They will not admit their contradiction.

Life on our planet is threatened with extinction, not by the work of the farmers, shepherds, or the fishermen, the house builders or the clothes makers, but by the work of those who practice science for great profits, power, and prestige. How can we protect biodiversity when at the same time we are destroying it? This question needs an answer for the sake of our loved ones who are dying every day by the millions because of the unethical practice of science and technology.

Militarism has exploited science and many times scientists are the pillars of great deceptions. Fortunately, scientists of conscience have several times exposed the scientists

of deception. In his commentary titled, "Media Are Sadly Misguided in Missile-Defense Tests," in the Aug. 26, 2001 issue of The New York Times, Thomas A. Halsted writes:

*"For years, the Pentagon and its Ballistic Missile Defense Organization have engaged in a continuing effort to delude the public and Congress into believing the United States is well on its way to developing a workable defense against ballistic missiles."*

MIT scientist-professor Ted Postol spoke about this fraud on the CBS program "60 MINUTES II" in an interview, saying:

*"When I talk fraud, I'm being careful about the use of the word. I'm not saying there are people who have made a mistake, and I disagree with them. . . . I'm saying that there are people who know that this system will not work and are trying to cover it up. That's what I'm saying here. So I am making a serious charge; I know that."*

Many of our scientists have reached a point of great immorality and absurdity. Large multinational corporations send their scientists to different countries to talk to the native people about medicinal herbs. They take that information back to their labs and make the same or similar chemicals to the ones in these plants. Then they patent those drugs in order to gather astronomical profits by selling them to the people of the world who are in pain. They even have the audacity to buy the politicians to make laws so that the native population does not have the right to use and grow these same plants which they had been growing for thousands of years. Furthermore, scientists have created seeds that cannot reproduce themselves, and all this in the name of profit, under the pretext of serving humanity. Not many scientists would criticize this evil because most of them depend on a corporate paycheck. Science could benefit humanity only if it were practiced for serving others, not when it is practiced in secrecy and for profit and prestige.

As Gandhi said, *"Science without humanity is a blunder that leads to violence."*

December 17, 2001

## 16. Scientists' Moral Obligations in the Nuclear Age

On October 22, 2002 *The San Francisco Chronicle's* headline read, "Resurgence of Nuclear Labs: Scientists Design New Weapons for Terror War, Plan New Underground Tests."

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/c/a/2002/10/22/MN29299.DTL>

The next day, on October 23, 2002, *The San Francisco Chronicle* published an article titled "The Shame of the Politicians" by Daniel Ellsberg.

<http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2002/10/23/MN196415.DTL>

**W**hat is the ethical challenge for scientists in the 21st century?

As the Bush Administration was preparing for the war in Iraq, the use of nuclear weapons had been suggested again. The politicians are the ones who supposedly represent the voice of the people and who decide in times of unrest if the military people will have the green light to push or not the button of destruction and suffering. It is well known that after torturing humanity by war, the military people accuse the politicians, saying that they had just obeyed their command. History has taught the wise that neither military personnel nor politicians are able to escape the condemnation of humanity after the destruction of war. The Nuremberg trials have not been forgotten. But it seems that the arrogance of power blinds military personnel as well as politicians to plan to kill and torture thousands, if not millions, of innocent civilians once again, and to once again take the risk of global catastrophe.

In this disgusted scenario play, there is a very large number of citizens, among whom are some of our friends and relatives, who make possible the evil of war. They are the ones who build, maintain, and increase the war machine in every country every day. They are doing it silently in their laboratories and offices, completely absorbed with numbers and equations, most of them completely isolated from social responsibilities by choice. While they have always enjoyed high salaries and prestige from their societies, they have not been held accountable for the war crimes, the crimes against humanity that their bombs have committed. They are the ones who have created such a monster which when unleashed will consume the whole world. They are the ones who have built the biological, chemical, nuclear and conventional weapons. Many citizens completely ignore the medical consequences of today's wars (from depleted uranium in Iraq, Kosovo, Afghanistan) because they have been kept uninformed by their own governments. Please see some of the results of using weapons made with depleted uranium at:

[http://www.chugoku-np.co.jp/abom/uran/index\\_e.html](http://www.chugoku-np.co.jp/abom/uran/index_e.html)

Scientists and engineers have built thousands of weapons of unthinkable destruction and they still continue to design new weapons for state terror. Many of these scientists like to put Einstein's picture on the wall of their offices but have not been interested to find out Einstein's position on military research. They know Einstein more because of his scientific success than his ethical views. Einstein condemned war. On October 1, 1952, responding to questions about the atom bomb, he said:

*"You are mistaken in regarding me as a kind of chieftain of those scientists who abuse science for military purposes. I have never worked in the field of applied science, let alone for the military. I condemn the military mentality of our times just as you do.*

*Indeed, I have been a pacifist all my life and regard Gandhi as the only truly great political figure of our age."*

In a statement to the War Resisters International in 1931 he wrote:

*"I appeal to all men and women to declare that they will refuse to give any further assistance to war or to preparation of war" and later he wrote, "My pacifism is an instinctive feeling, a feeling that possesses me, because the murder of people is disgusting. My attitude is not derived from any intellectual theory but is based on my deepest antipathy to every kind of cruelty and hatred."*

On February 16, 1931, addressing several hundred students at the California Institute of Technology, Einstein said:

"If you want your life's work to be useful to mankind, it is not enough that you understand applied science as such. Concern for man himself must always constitute the chief objective of all technological effort, concern for the big, unsolved problems of how to organize human work and the distribution of commodities in such a manner as to assure that the results of our scientific thinking may be a blessing to mankind, and not a curse. Never forget this when you are pondering over your diagrams and equations"

Let the families and friends of those scientists and engineers working for the war machine ask them to consider the consequences of their work, and finally, to consider resigning, as I did on January 31, 2000, and as several other scientists have done. They should not ignore the results of their work anymore, and they should not continue working on the death machine without being disturbed by the unilateral threats of their government to use nuclear weapons or any other weapons against sovereign nations. They should know that according to the International Court of Justice, morally indefensible and legally impermissible war acts are about to be committed again. These acts would not be possible without the work of their hands and minds. They should know that it is time for them to be held accountable for any atrocious acts committed against humanity in the future. When there are no longer scientists willing to fill the laboratories of death, these laboratories themselves will disappear too.

On October 29, 2002, an article in *The Guardian* titled "US Weapons Secrets Exposed" shows that the U.S. is developing a new generation of weapons that undermine and possibly violate international treaties on biological and chemical warfare.  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/usa/story/0,12271,821306,00.html>

Michael Anastasio, the nuclear weapons designer who was named director of Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, said, "I actually had a fear for the future viability of the lab. It just feels very different now. It's a positive tone as opposed to a going out of business tone." It is time that the rest of the scientists outside of the weapons work area publicly condemn the work of their colleagues and their continuing involvement in promoting the proliferation of terror.

Knowledge without character and science without humanity leads to violence, to paraphrase Mahatma Gandhi. State violence, rather than terrorists, will lead our world into unthinkable agony and soon after, into extinction unless we soon match our knowledge and power with responsibility.

January 8, 2003



## 17. Nuclear Power for Peaceful Purposes?

### Questions and Answers

#### 1. In what ways nuclear energy could be used besides its use for the construction of weapons of mass destruction?

It is very unfortunate for the humans and all kinds of life on earth that nuclear energy is used at all. It is immoral; that's the least we can say. Recently, the advocates of nuclear energy have been presenting to the people a deceiving choice between nuclear power and global warming. It is basically a form of extortion by the nuclear establishment towards the people and it is in its highest form, especially in the USA today. The alternatives of solar power, wind power, geo-thermal power and conservation are just a few of the safe, non-polluting answers to our energy problem but they are ignored methodologically. Their development and finally their application will simply not contribute profits to the nuclear empire.

#### 2. If nuclear energy would be used, do you think that it is profitable or that we speak for a very expensive form of energy?

We speak of a very expensive form of energy. The most recent analysis regarding the cost of nuclear energy that comes to mind is the one from *Public Citizen*. Their analysis shows that states which use nuclear power to generate electricity have significantly higher electricity rates - on average 25 percent higher - than states that do not.

Cheney's May report called for the president to "support the expansion of nuclear energy in the United States as a major component of our national energy policy" but the findings call into question the viability of a key component of Vice President Dick Cheney's energy plan.

Wenonah Hauter director of Public Citizen's Critical Mass Energy and Environment Program said, "The administration is living in a dream world if it thinks that nuclear energy will be a panacea to our current and future energy woes." Hauter also said that "Nuclear power is not the energy of the future" and that "Increasing our reliance on it will only worsen conditions for consumers in years to come."

Reliance on nuclear energy will not only result in building new nuclear power plants but also relicensing existing ones. The peril of tragic accidents as we have already witnessed will be higher while maintaining plants that are decades old.

*Public Citizen* concluded that the higher a state's reliance on nuclear power, the higher electricity rates will be and that this is because nuclear plants are more costly to build, operate and maintain.

Another factor in the equation of the cost of nuclear power is public health. This factor many times is down played if it is not completely ignored in many cost analyses. Citizens, though, know that cancer is devastating their families and ask why.

Let's look at some facts about breast cancer, among so many other kinds. Breast cancer kills 46,000 women in the U.S. only, each year. It is well known that cancer rates depend on the degree of exposure to carcinogens. But what are the carcinogens that cause cancer?

Physician Dr. Janette D. Sherman a practicing physician who has treated 8000 patients over 30 years in her fully-documented book LIFE'S DELICATE BALANCE; THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF BREAST CANCER (New York and London: Taylor and Francis, 2000). ISBN 1-56032-870-3, asks a simple question; How can one explain the doubling, since 1940, of a woman's likelihood of developing breast cancer, and also increasing in tandem with prostate and childhood cancers?"

Dr. Sherman first explains the important role of hormones and the multitude of chemicals with hormonal action that the chemists have flooded the markets with. Next she talks also about the fully established cause of breast and other cancers: ionizing radiation from x-rays and from nuclear power plant emissions and the radioactive fallout from A-bomb tests.

How is it known that the environment, that is air, water, and food, and ionizing radiation plays an important role in causing breast cancer? It is because when women from their non-industrial homelands move to industrial countries, their breast cancer rate goes up. Clearly there is an epidemic of cancer that is sweeping the western world

In 1984, a study of Mormon families in Utah downwind from the nuclear tests in Nevada reported elevated numbers of breast cancers. Girls who survived the bombing of Hiroshima are also now dying in excessive numbers from breast cancer.

There are a number of ecological studies showing that women living near nuclear power plants suffer from elevated numbers of breast cancers. It is not a secret that all nuclear power plants leak radioactivity routinely into local air and water and that any exposure to ionizing radiation increases a woman's danger of breast cancer. Of course the only way to prevent this problem is to end nuclear power permanently.

It is so easy to make the public become lost using scientific rhetoric. It is this powerful tool that the advocates (high paid technocrats) of the peaceful atom have been using all these years. The public knows virtually nothing about the science of radiation and nuclear materials, but the public maintains common sense, which most of the time is absent from the "experts."

About forty years ago, questions on radiation and toxicity hazards were raised by at least three groups – the National Council on Radiation Protection (NCRP), the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP), and the Federal Radiation Council (FRC). The first two were NGO's. In 1959 the FRC was created to "protect" the public from radiation exposure by setting the so-called official guidelines, based on little experience and on not-well-developed statistical data. FRC was also created for another reason, to offset concern about the fallout from weapons testing. These actions did not answer the concerns of the public, nor did the scientists. The Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) then started a series of studies. The people of the AEC hoped that the chosen researchers would tell them what they wanted to hear. Unfortunately for the AEC but fortunately for humanity, the chosen researchers, John W. Gofman and Arthur R. Tamplin spoke the truth before a nuclear science symposium in October 1969. They plainly stated that radiation was a far more serious hazard than previously suspected, twenty times more deaths would occur from radiation-induced cancer and leukemia than had been previously believed, and genetic damage had been underestimated even more seriously.

They both experienced such professional condemnation that they both left their positions from the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory. In their book Poisoned Power, Gofman and Ramplin stated that the "entire nuclear industry had been developing under a set of

totally false illusions of safety and economy. Not only was there a total lack of appreciation of the hazards of radiation for man, but there was a total absence of candor concerning the hazard of serious accidents." After publication of Gofman's and Tamplin's findings in 1969, eminent scientists who joined the ranks of the critics included Nobel laureates James Watson, Harold Urey, chemist at the University of California; Linus Pauling, chemist at Stanford; and George Wald, biologist at Harvard University. Under this new pressure, the National Academy of Sciences in 1970 assembled the Advisory Committee on the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation (the BEIR Committee). After their studies, the BEIR report vindicated Gofman and Tamplin. Dr. John Gofman has reviewed 22 separate studies confirming unequivocally that exposure to ionizing radiation causes breast cancer.

But is breast cancer from nuclear power plants the only problem we face concerning the cost of nuclear power on public health? How about dozens of other illnesses and how about many other locations of radiation pollution? Nuclear power plants are just one point of the nuclear cycle. How about the hundreds of thousands if not millions of people that have died and suffered from the whole nuclear cycle?

Uranium mining has cost many lives and great suffering, not just on the workers but on all the communities around these mines. And how about the places where nuclear material is processed into forms of nuclear fuel? From "nuclear rocks" into nuclear fuel, thousands of people die in agonizing death, families are destroyed, deformed children are born, and many others are born dead. These are very well established facts around the world, in every place that nuclear material is present in one form or another.

On January 30, 2003 the European Scientific Committee of Radiation Risk headed by an adviser to the British Government published research results which show that pollution from nuclear energy and nuclear weapons programs up to 1989 will account for 65 million deaths. It claims that the previous figures massively underestimated the nuclear industry's impact on human life.

And what about nuclear accidents? Even if we just recall the Chernobyl accident and are willing to read the detailed personal stories, we will be horrified.

How about in the case of war? Do people think that nuclear power plants are not going to be targets? That is an illusion. In time of war, nuclear power plants will be hit and the outcome will be a hell on earth that will virtually last forever. But the individuals who profit from nuclear business have lost the capacity to even be human. They cannot even consider their own benefit or their children's benefit. Profit has blinded them and has made them less than human. It is not an exaggeration to say this.

Unfortunately, even some Nobel Prize winners are supporting this nuclear insanity. The public must resist with all its strength to abolish nuclear power from the face of the earth.

### **3. If we assume that more nuclear power plants are constructed around the world, can anyone guarantee that the nuclear accidents will disappear?**

That is impossible. Not only will they not disappear, but they will also happen in greater numbers if there are more of them. And let us not forget the unpredictability of earthquakes. Nuclear accidents will always happen just like any other accidents do. Assurances on safety are nothing but preposterous. The CHALLENGER was vaporized in seconds even though the scientists had done their best. That is something that the public

understands because that is common sense. No matter how much the uncaring scientists will try to convince the public, the public does not have a salary from working on nuclear business and so can maintain integrity and common sense.

In April 1964, a satellite with a plutonium power device burned-up during reentry. About 3 percent of the world's plutonium fallout are attributed to that burn-up. Shortly before the satellite burned up, an Atomic Energy Commission official had said that the chances of such an occurrence were "a million to one" or less.

Here are some of the most well known Nuclear Power Plant Accidents since 1952.

**1952**

Dec. 12, Chalk River, near Ottawa, Canada: a partial meltdown of the reactor's uranium fuel core resulted after the accidental removal of four control rods. Although millions of gallons of radioactive water accumulated inside the reactor, there were no injuries.

**1957**

Oct. 7, Windscale Pile No. 1, north of Liverpool, England: fire in a graphite-cooled reactor spewed radiation over the countryside, contaminating a 200-sq-mile area.

South Ural Mountains: an explosion of radioactive wastes at a Soviet nuclear weapons factory 12 miles from the city of Kyshtym forced the evacuation of over 10,000 people from a contaminated area. Soviet officials reported no casualties.

**1976**

Near Greifswald, East Germany: the radioactive core of a reactor in the Lubmin nuclear power plant nearly melted down due to the failure of safety systems during a fire.

**1979**

March 28, Three-Mile Island, near Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. One of two reactors lost its coolant, which caused overheating and partial meltdown of its uranium core. Some radioactive water and gases were released.

**1986**

April 26, Chernobyl, near Kiev, Ukraine: an explosion and fire in the graphite core of one of four reactors released radioactive material that spread over part of the Soviet Union, eastern Europe, Scandinavia, and later western Europe. There were 31 claimed dead. Total casualties are unknown and estimates run into the thousands. This was the worst such accident to date.

**1999**

Sept. 30, Tokaimura, Japan: uncontrolled chain reaction in a uranium-processing nuclear fuel plant spewed high levels of radioactive gas into the air, exposing 69 people, killing one worker, and seriously injuring two others. Japan's worst nuclear accident.

**4. If a nuclear power plant would be constructed in a country like Greece or Greece, what consequences could have on that country's economy and its citizens?**

I hope that it will never happen. If it does, then people would pay much more for electricity than they would for conventional methods of producing electricity, and the mainly foreign manufacturers that would service and maintain it would be the beneficiaries. In addition, cancer rates would go up and that country would be another radiation-polluted country in the world. It would be at high risk to lose all of her tourism and collapse economically overnight after a nuclear accident. Because Greece survives mainly from agricultural production and tourism, these would both be out of the market overnight. Greece and similar countries do not have colonies like other countries and so they would instantly die economically. Greece's leaders and of similar nations should never allow

nuclear power on their soil and must do everything they can to convince their neighbors that it is not to their advantage either.

**5. Do you believe that finally the balance will tilt positively or negatively towards nuclear energy?**

Have we really left a future for our children? I believe that if we do not abolish war soon as a policy, nuclear power plants will be blasted during future wars just as fossil power plants have been blasted during recent wars. We do not have much time left to see the balance for nuclear energy go one way or another. For those who can hear the voice of their conscience, nuclear power cannot be part of life. For those that cannot hear the voice of their conscience or who speak without knowing the facts, nuclear power is a way of death even though they believe it is a way for life.

**6. Do you think that countries like USA and other economically strong countries really need nuclear energy like some people advocate or is it simply a strategic-financial game like those that the strong of the world play?**

We could answer the question this way. Do we really need all these artificially man-made products we produce at an alarming rate, destroying everything around us and ourselves? Do we want to see another Chernobyl, Three Mile Island, Hiroshima or Nagasaki? Do we want to see only one country dominating the oil rich parts of the world by using nuclear extortion?

If someone looks honestly at all of the facts, it is obvious that nuclear power fuels the nuclear bomb, which in turn fuels world domination. It is the weapon of the strong to subdue the weak.

**7. Can a nuclear power plant that is constructed just for nuclear energy production to serve the citizens of a country with electricity operate also as a plant for the production of nuclear weapons?**

Yes, it can. It is because while the nuclear power plant is producing nuclear energy, it is also producing new nuclear materials called nuclear waste, which can be used after some work to manufacture nuclear weapons. In other words, when nuclear reactors produce electricity, they also produce plutonium at the same time, which can be used to make nuclear bombs. That is very important for people to realize.

In the United States, the Department of Energy finances and manages the nuclear weapons programs. In reality the Department of Energy is basically the Department of Weapons. The nuclear weapons programs need nuclear materials to make the bombs. Who provides them? The Department of Energy does, and the nuclear power plants are also contributing.

**8. According to your opinion is it true that nuclear energy is bad as some people say?**

I would not just call it bad; I would rather call it immoral and even criminal. But what the citizens of every country need to watch out for is the kind information that the advocates of the nuclear power are providing to them. They only care for material

progress; therefore they close their ears and eyes to anything that has to do with public health. They misinform and disinform the people. The examples are numerous.

On January 20, 2001, Dr. Alan Poletti, professor emeritus at Auckland University in New Zealand, published an article titled "Paranoia and plutonium" in the newspaper "The Dominion." His article was so full of misconceptions and misleading information that I felt compelled to let the public of New Zealand know the truth. I was glad that after some pressure from Peace Council Aotearoa New Zealand, a local peace group, they finally published my letter on February 13, 2001.

On July 28, 2001, in Providence Journal in Rhode Island, USA an article was published with the title "Nuclear power good for economy and safe for the environment" by Mackubin Thomas Owens. The author, a professor of strategy and force planning at the Naval War College came to the point of even blaming the environmental movement as responsible for the dangerous storage of nuclear waste throughout the country. It is hard to imagine that an intelligent professor and former appointee to the U.S. Department of Energy's nuclear weapons program would blame the environmental movement for the poisons and perils of the nuclear industry. But disinformation is a component of any propaganda. The highly paid technocrats and advocates of the peaceful atom increasingly use disinformation to repress and control public protest against pollution and environmental injustice.

**9. Finally we would like to tell us a few words about your experiences at Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories and if after all these experiences you are also an advocate of nuclear energy.**

As a former employee of two US national nuclear labs, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Los Alamos National Laboratory, and after having seen what I have seen, NO, I am NOT an advocate of nuclear power. Unfortunately, most experts on these issues talk in front of the blackboard, but that is not what nuclear materials are. They are not theory and calculations on paper, as most professors at different universities around the world think, but living, breathing beasts that kill people without any discrimination. Let them go and get dressed like astronauts with breathing masks and experience some nuclear accidents and get contaminated first hand, and see after that if they will still favor nuclear energy.

I was trained as a handler of nuclear materials, and I experienced how easy it is for contamination to occur and how difficult it is to clean up. I experienced the monstrous brainwashing and deception by the nuclear system lovers. During the training, we were told that nuclear radiation is just like the light from sun, but when a "little accident" occurred, my coworkers would be brought to the hospital immediately for treatment and then be fired from the job within one month. Technical equipment of hundreds of thousands of dollars had to be trashed due to contamination. I witnessed explosions, and virtually all instances were due to human error. I worked side by side with designers of storage cans for nuclear waste, I did research on the behavior of nuclear waste, and I have published a number of technical reports on MOX, Uranium and Plutonium. I have worked for hundreds of hours in two nuclear labs and my eyes have seen a lot.

A few months after I resigned, I received a letter from LLNL with the title: "BERYLLIUM MEDICAL SURVEILANCE TESTING FOR FORMER LLNL EMPLOYEES". In that letter, I am asked to voluntarily participate in blood screening for possible Chronic Beryllium Disease. I was shocked to read that the same letter was sent to 28,000 former LLNL

workers. The reason I was shocked is that last year one of my friends was trying to win his case of beryllium exposure against the lab, but the Department of Energy was refusing to accept his medical results, which were positive from outside testing. What happened since last year? Clearly a court decision has finally been made. That is the ethos of the nuclear industry. Contaminate people because of profit and then refuse to admit it until there is no other choice but to finally admit it.

**10. In light of the 9/11 events, what would the consequences be if a plane crashed into a nuclear power station?**

If an airplane hits a nuclear reactor or even a radiological waste storage site, it could result in a Chernobyl type disaster with the release of radioactive materials and all the subsequent results of death and health effects. In reality, nuclear power plants are potential radiological weapons.

**11. Can nuclear power plants withstand such a crash?**

Nuclear power plants can withstand the impact of small private planes but not the impact of planes like in the September 11<sup>th</sup> horrific event.

**12. Since the 9/11 events, many people have been afraid of the possibility of a nuclear war. What are the chances of such a war now?**

It is something that the people of the earth have not really realized yet. Nuclear war can start at any moment, even by mistake. Thousands of nuclear weapons are on hair trigger alert. Someone could say that these nuclear governments are the greatest terrorists and it would not be easy to argue against such a statement. Every day we are getting closer and closer to doomsday but the nuclear powers are holding on to their nuclear arsenals as never before. They do not plan to abolish them. They have been talking about it for fifty years now. Nuclear weapons will be used and they will be used soon unless the people of the earth demand their destruction by civil resistance, for example by global strikes that would have to last not for days but for weeks and perhaps for months. There is no other way for humanity to survive.

**13. Do you believe that nations like Russia, Pakistan, India, and China would use their nuclear arsenal?**

If they are pushed, they will. It is just a matter of a short time. NATO is expanding towards the East and therefore, it threatens the countries of the East. Unless NATO is dismantled soon, it will bring doomsday.

**14. Do you believe that terrorist organizations could make nuclear weapons if they could obtain the nuclear materials? How easy is it? Many advocate that they could make them only with the help of a government.**

Everything is possible. Nevertheless, it is not so easy to make the bomb even if you have the nuclear material. But I see it the reverse way, and the governments avoid discussing it because they know they will never be able to be sure. Nuclear materials do not have to go to the hands of terrorists and the terrorists do not have to make any bombs. We know that they did not have to make the 9/11 planes, did they? It is easier for the

terrorists to go to the nuclear weapons and to the nuclear power plants and work there just like anybody else. How does it work when agents of one country can take very high security positions in the government of another country to spy? We know it happens and we have several historical examples. It is impossible for any government to guarantee that no one will use nuclear weapons or nuclear power plants for his/her own purpose. Let us not forget that the Oklahoma disaster took place through the work of a US citizen trained in the US army.

Governments which possess weapons of mass destruction are worse than the terrorists. They forcefully extract taxes from their citizens to build them and then they use them to threaten weaker nations in order to exploit them. In other words, they are legal terrorists because we know them. The ones we do not know, we could call illegal terrorists. They both are terrorists. Imagine that there are countries which have thousands of weapons of mass destruction, and they go around the world telling other countries that they cannot have such weapons. Sometimes they even bomb them if they just think that they are making them. If the citizens of the world do not NONVIOLENTLY force those countries to abolish their weapons of mass destruction, those countries will bring the end of the world soon. We still have time to change our world.

February 15, 2003

## 18. There is no safe radiation threshold

### Questions and Answers

*The following is from an interview which was published in the Greek newspaper Ethnos (The Nation) in July 25, 2000, after the white house had given the green light for the construction of a nuclear power plant in Turkey.*

#### 1. **Dear Professor, what does President Clinton's decision about USA-TURKEY nuclear cooperation mean for Greece and the area around?**

President Clinton's decision about USA-TURKEY nuclear cooperation means very bad news, not just for Greece and the area around it, but for the whole world. First of all, we must remember that this decision is not really President Clinton's decision, as many people allow themselves to think. It is the decision of the global nuclear power industry. Second, and perhaps more important, we must understand that this decision is fully supported by the Pentagon strategic planners.

When we realize, especially in our "modern times", that the military does not exist solely to guard the geographical borders of a country, but to protect commerce, then we can start to understand the source of our troubles.

It is not a big surprise to see the nuclear industry moving into Turkey, and tomorrow trying to move into Greece, when nuclear reactors around the world are closing down (Germany, Canada, and other countries). This situation should remind us of the recent situation with the American tobacco industry which was killing its citizens by secretly introducing chemical additives to increase addiction. The tobacco industry advertisements on billboards along highways across the United States have disappeared overnight due to the courage of one chemist. His whistle blowing testimony, which exposed the deceptive activities of the tobacco industry (as shown in the movie **The Insider**) demonstrates the power of a single voice speaking out against corporate power. Immediately after that, the tobacco industry started a very intense campaign in overseas countries, among them Greece, using techniques unprecedented in Greek history. In the summer of 1999, I witnessed how cigarettes were advertised using boats, planes and helicopters, as well as pretty girls handing out free cigarettes in cafes and public places in Crete (sex sells tobacco). This example shows what lengths the tobacco industry will go to in order to develop new markets in other countries when they are losing markets in their own country. From this example we can predict how far the nuclear industry will go to further its own interest in creating new markets.

The powerful nuclear players are not the only stakeholders to benefit from this campaign to expand their own industry. Multi-national industries that construct the power plants also receive a piece of the pie. The hidden agenda of the power plant industry is to generate nuclear weapons materials, which are turned into weapons, and in turn protect commerce for further exploitation and neo-colonialism. One feeds the other in a perpetual cycle of expansion. Without expanding markets, they cannot continue to mutually benefit each other. This cycle introduces social problems and degradation of health and the environment in the countries where they operate. Countries, which have operated nuclear power plants now, are desperately fighting for ways to dispose of the nuclear waste. The proposed nuclear waste storage facility within sixty miles of Las Vegas at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, threatens the tourism of this world-renowned city. As a result, ongoing lawsuits

have been pending for over twenty years in Nevada courts attempting to block this facility. The reality of nuclear waste cannot be overlooked. Nuclear waste is forever and there is no way to guarantee safe storage of this toxic material in the short term, never mind the long term. The life of nuclear waste transcends time and space. No country with a nuclear power program has solved the waste disposal problem.

It is well documented that water and air releases from nuclear power plants are contaminated with radioactive material. Who will guarantee that the proposed plant in Akkuyu, Turkey will not contaminate the environment? In addition, it lies on an active fault, and has been subjected to many earthquakes during the past 100 years.

Nuclear power powers the bomb. Most people do not see the link between nuclear power and nuclear weapons. Every country that has nuclear reactors can build nuclear weapons. There are no secrets about how to make a nuclear bomb, when you have the bomb material from nuclear reactors. Building a nuclear power reactor in a country makes that country a stakeholder in the nuclear weapons game. Placing nuclear weapons in a country does not make them a stakeholder. The weapons can be removed at any time. According to the World Wide Nuclear Deployments Report, in 1975 Greece had 232 nuclear warheads kept "in custody" for their ground forces. Greece may now have only ten.

Pentagon planners have stated openly that they want to have complete space domination by 2020. Click at: Vision for 2020, see at:

<http://www.dtic.mil/jv2020>

Their vision is to force the eastern nuclear powers (like China and Russia) to cooperate with the agenda of the Western multinational corporations. By putting nuclear reactors in countries surrounding Russia and China, pressure is put on these eastern countries to intimidate them into submission.

The recent decision to put nuclear power plants in Turkey will have tragic outcomes in the near future. Solar power or other technologies are not promoted because they do not provide materials for nuclear weapons. The bottom line of these strategies is to accomplish world domination.

People must protest non-violently and passionately against these kinds of decisions, or it will not be long before we see the global catastrophe predicted by Einstein and others. The game is to get countries to buy in to nuclear power plants, to produce nuclear weapons, to create fear of neighbors, which escalates the proliferation of nuclear power plants and weapons globally. These policies will invite the eastern countries to respond. Finally the planet will be covered with weapons of destruction, which invite conflicts and accidents and can only result ultimately in a nuclear holocaust.

The environmental consequences and health affects are unspeakable. The public is intentionally kept ignorant of the terrible affects of radiation. There is no safe radiation threshold. If my countrymen knew the consequences of nuclear power, they would join with the Turkish people and those of European countries to go out into the streets and passionately demonstrate against this great fraud being perpetrated on less powerful countries by a small group of special interests. Have we forgotten the Chernobyl tragedy, and the downwind contamination of Europe? Sudden death by a gun is called murder, but the slow death of thousands of people exposed to low level radiation every day is not realized. The result of an earthquake, which is certain, will result in unprecedented and unnecessary suffering of the Greek people, the Turkish people, and eventually the global

population. Turkish tourism and tourism of the Mediterranean will be affected by certain radioactive contamination of the region.

Earth scientists know from the geologic record and atmospheric studies that complete global mixing of the atmosphere occurs in one year. We are all down winders. Cancer rates are going up! Low and premature birth rates, leukemia, thyroid cancer, breast cancer, and immune deficiency syndromes seem related to proximity to nuclear power plants and nuclear fallout patterns. In the fifty years since the commencement of the nuclear age, over 1.5 million women in the United States have died of breast cancer, a trend on the decline prior to 1945. The public of each country is kept out of the most important decisions for their lives, their health, and their environment. A small group of "experts" decide the fate of the global population, and their decisions are always based on greed. People must wake up. Even with the consequences for all people, a small group who themselves are affected are drunk with greed and will still want to profit from the health affects and suffering of the global community.

Nuclear power, promised as cheap and clean power, is neither. Nuclear materials must be mined, affecting the health and safety of miners and their communities. These materials must be refined and enriched for power plant use, exposing workers and communities nearby. These materials must be transported into and out of countries with power plants. The nuclear waste generated at nuclear power plants must be transported and stored in safe repositories, in the country of use, or returned to the country of origin.

The political issues surrounding the choice of a nuclear waste repository will follow the history for a suitable repository in the United States. The provinces and cities of Turkey, and any other country choosing nuclear power will fight with each other over who will be forced to take the nuclear waste. The final choice will be forced upon the voiceless and poor. The elite, who benefit most from the power, will not want the responsibility of storing the waste near their towns, but eventually they too will be affected by low level radiation.

Transportation of nuclear waste on roads and highways will expose motorists and communities along the routes to unknown levels of radioactivity. Accidents will result in the radioactive contamination of local areas, and eventually globally as has happened in so many countries already (Chernobyl, Three Mile Island, Hanford, Los Alamos and Japan). New studies have shown that exposure to low level radiation has severe health effects and is extremely dangerous. Major cancer clusters throughout the United States have been shown to be within a one hundred-mile radius of all nuclear power plants, nuclear weapons facilities, and nuclear enrichment plants.

## **2. Can Greece stop this cooperation?**

Everything is possible. When the people understand their tragic position, they can do the right thing, but they must be informed. Mobilization of the Greek and Turkish people together can bring a stop to this monster's appetite. I hope that my native countrymen will seriously consider the suffering of generations to come and the present consequences of choosing nuclear power. It takes the participation of every citizen and not just the participation of only the environmental groups.

## **3. Do you believe that after the USA-TURKEY agreement, Greece is obligated to do the same?**

From my statements above, I hope my position is clear. If the Greek government truly cares for the Greek citizens and not for the interests of those who sell weapons to her, they will avoid the Turkish example, and encourage the Turkish government and citizens to untangle themselves from the trap that is being placed before them. It is of grave importance now that we have the nuclear age for the first time in history, to realize the game that the superpowers are playing against the less powerful countries. Divide and conquer is their method of operations. It is imperative for Greece and Turkey to understand the strategy of divide and conquer, which the superpowers are so adept at playing, neighbor against neighbor. Let Turkey and Greece adopt a new motto, unite and live in peace, and let the superpowers respect their unity.

#### **4. What do you suggest to the Greek government to do?**

I am suggesting to the Greek government to seriously consider the health, environmental issues, and the wish for peace of its own citizens and to act accordingly in the face of these nuclear power negotiations between Turkey and the US. The establishment of nuclear power stations in Turkey will increase the possibility of a local nuclear war. Inviting peace in an area of conflict would be a far better strategy. This insanity must stop. While humanity is crying for peace and for the abolition of weapons of mass destruction, it is sad to see people in positions of authority making the decisions now being considered. I hope that the leadership of my beloved native country will take the path of wisdom of the ancient Greek civilization, and not the path of destruction, which is now being offered to harm all and benefit few.

Published in ETHNOS  
July 25, 2000

## 19. The Responsibility of Scientists for the Survival of the Human Species

*This lecture was delivered at the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference at the United Nations in New York in May 3, 2000.*

**L**adies and Gentlemen, my fellow Earth Companions,

From nearly every nation of the world we have gathered here for a single reason. Many of us have realized that the human species has become an endangered species. We are running out of time. What should each one of us do? How many more times will we be able to gather here together to reassess the progress we have made towards peace?

More than 55 years ago a physicist, Sir Joseph Rotblat, a member of the Manhattan Project, faced the same question, 'What should I do?' The project he was working on was intended to build something new, never invented before, and it would be so powerful that it would be able to bring about unthinkable destruction and suffering. The instant killing of about 200,000 innocent people and the suffering of even more to this day, had not taken place yet. But the question kept coming back to him. What should I do? Today we know that he resigned and he was not a part of the slaughtering and suffering of the subsequent mass murder.

For his act and his tireless work for peace, he was honored with the Nobel Peace Prize in 1995. He is the only survivor of the eleven signatories of the Russell-Einstein Manifesto of 1955. Its words are well worth recalling today: "We appeal, as human beings, to human beings: Remember your humanity and forget the rest. If you can do so, the way lies open to a new paradise; if you cannot, there lies before you the risk of universal death. The general public, and even many men in positions of authority, has not realized what would be involved in a war with nuclear bombs. The general public still thinks in terms of the obliteration of cities. People can scarcely bring themselves to grasp that they, individually, and those whom they love are in imminent danger of perishing agonizingly."

There are a number of people worldwide who have followed Dr. Rotblat's example since 1945. Some are well known, but there are probably many more whose names we'll never know. Two of the better-known examples are Dr. Theodore Taylor from the USA and Dr. Lev Feoktistov from Russia, former leading nuclear weapons designers from Cold War enemy nations who recognized the potentially disastrous consequences of their occupations, and who now devote their energies to the abolition of nuclear weapons.

At the dawn of the new millennium, I myself faced the same question, as a member of what should be called the "Manhattan Project #2." While many people were celebrating the dawn of the new millennium, I was going through the most agonizing time of my life. What should I do? I had a wife with a part time job with no insurance, and two children. What should I do? I followed the highest call, the call of my conscience. I saw the omnicide which is about to be committed against all forms of life on our planet. On January 31st of this year, 2000, I resigned from a permanent, highly paid position in the Stockpile Stewardship Program at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California, where I was working on the long-term maintenance of nuclear weapons. My act was an act of love for all humanity, all life.

Great thinkers of the past have commented on the meaning of life. "An unexamined life is not worth living," said Socrates. Einstein the physicist said: "Only a life lived for others is a life worth while." Since my resignation I have been poor, but happy. We do not

know how we will make ends meet, even with my wife and I teaching part time in four different colleges between us. But I believe that I have found my calling: to inform scientists and the public about the deceptive ways new scientists are lured into weapons work; to remind people that nuclear weapons are the perfect tool for humanity to commit suicide; and to call on each person to do his or her best to prevent that from happening.

My resignation has already created a great response. Many newspaper articles have appeared here and in Greece. Some articles even called me a hero. I've been interviewed on numerous radio shows, and have received invitations for speaking engagements across the country and around the world. Individuals I've never met have written to me from many nations to express their support and gratitude for my act. I believe that this excitement shows the aspiration of the human soul, which cries for peace despite the terrible plans of a few. Preparing for war in order to have peace is not the will of humanity. Trusting in bombs instead of the Creator is not the will of the people. Preparing for peace in order to have peace is the will of humankind.

"Science without virtue is immoral science," Plato said, yet, the scientists are at the heart of the new arms race. Therefore, I appeal to all scientists worldwide whose work supports the war machine to give up their jobs as I did, to follow my example. I also appeal to every secretary, technician, custodian, engineer, and any other person whose participation supports the world war machine. We have an obligation to our children and grandchildren. Every citizen must see to it that life will go on without unnecessary suffering. Mordechai Vanunu, a nuclear scientist and prisoner of conscience, has warned us: "Stop the train. Get off the train. The next stop: nuclear disaster."

Today I am appealing to you not as a scientist to scientists, but as a human being to human beings. Upon leaving this conference, I beg you to "remember your humanity and forget the rest;" to go back to the leaders of your countries and speak to them with determination and sacrifice. We have paid the price for war for too many years. Let us become willing to pay the price for peace.

May 3, 2000

## 20. Civilization Is for Making Peace, Not War

*This lecture was delivered at Waseda University in Tokyo on August 1, 2000 at the "2000 World Conference against Atomic & Hydrogen Bombs August 2-9, 2000 at Hiroshima and Nagasaki." The host for the lecture was the Japan Scientists Association and the theme was "For a nuclear free 21st century – Initiatives of scientists." The lecture was given the title "Refusal to cooperate with nuclear weapons development: Leaving the job and joining the peace movement" by the Japan Scientists Association.*

**M**y Dear Colleagues and Fellow Earth Companions,

I was born in Crete, a beautiful island of Greece, where even from a very young age, I had heard about the dreadful act committed against humanity during WWII in Japan. On a recent radio show in the USA, I was asked the question: How many more people would have been killed if the war had not ended? My answer was that we do not know. The host of the show was happy with my answer, believing many millions more would have died, which justified the use of nuclear bombs to end the war. Obviously, he understood precisely what he was conditioned to believe, not what I was trying to convey. My point was that the war was almost over and the abhorrent act was not necessary, while he saw it as a heroic act. It is what we see that we bring into our lives. What people think is eventually manifested in the world. And the world thinks of war when it prepares for war. We still continue with the same way of thinking. We have not learned the lesson.

I consider it a privilege to be here today, to feel your history first hand. There are some people who have realized that the human species has become an endangered species and that we are running out of time. What should scientists do? How many more times can we ask that question?

We scientists who have understood the seriousness of our human condition must act on behalf of those who have not. I am asking these scientists worldwide to come together and establish a relief agency for assisting those scientists who are still within but are ready to wash their hands of work that supports war, an agency that will support them in every possible way when they take the leap of faith to advocate for peace. Let us take the food from our storage houses and provide it for those who want to work for peace but do not have the faith to depart from their unsatisfying jobs. There are thousands in this condition who have no place to turn. They are trapped. A similar relief agency should be established for military officers and other occupations that promote violence in our lives. We scientists have created a monster and it is time to take responsibility for its abolition. Let us start talking about solutions and acting rather than just describing the problem.

Activists today are spending an incredible amount of resources to describe the hell we have created, fewer are working towards solutions, and even fewer are acting on the suggested solutions. We will not see any real change towards peace unless we start caring for one another and stop caring for our institutions. Let us give a hand to one another instead of to the institutions. Today I am appealing to you, a scientist to scientists. Let us make changes with determination to stop sacrificing life and instead, to support it.

For the first time in the academic history of the human species, we must consciously establish programs in our schools to promote peace. We must replace the culture of violence with a culture of peace. We must act now, each of us, to avoid the universal catastrophe that Einstein and others predicted. Our governments will not do this for us.

People around the world want to live in peace. They do not want to continue to be deceived and manipulated by their governments to accept war and devastation as a path to peace. Let us form global partnerships here in our new role as scientists of conscience, and leave Japan, committed to concrete solutions for a nuclear-free 21st century. We must bring the voices of indigenous people, communities, and NGO's to every scientific society. It is time to take responsibility for the harm we have inflicted upon the earth and its life.

We have over-emphasized the miracles of science and technology for the benefit of a few, and we know it. We cannot understand or find solutions to these global issues in the isolation of our laboratories and conferences. The interfacing of communities and science democratizes the process of public policy and decision-making, and demonstrates how science has served the public and how it has failed. The community knowledge perspective is necessary to improve science

Since my resignation I have envisioned a group made up of scientists and engineers, medical doctors, journalists, indigenous people and so forth, who will travel in a bus around the United States to talk to students about peace, the abolition of nuclear weapons, health, and environmental issues. The "Traveling Teachers Project", as I like to call it, has found support in the form of great enthusiasm from many activists, among them being Dr. Helen Caldicott, founder of Physicians for Social Responsibility. This can become a model for a similar group in every country.

It is time to take our fingers away from our calculators and talk about scientific ethics. Why can we not see our destiny? Why are we ignoring what we see? Our science policy is based on the irrational fears about survival driven by a tiny group of elite who shape public opinion. We scientists have to use our skills for humanity, not for a machine we have no control over. We are enticed into comfortable positions, grow dependent on the security, and then many of us are tormented, playing tricks with our own minds to justify continuing to work. When we start working consciously, then we can begin to change our lives.

Mainstream media in every country allow their governments to go unquestioned by citizens, while weapons of mass destruction labs stay busy. The opening of the doors of secrecy is desperately needed and long overdue. Interfacing communities and science is a new and simple solution that any of us can do. To those who believe that there is hope I say: "What are you waiting for?" Truth is the most powerful force in the universe. It is greater than the force of the atom.

Making weapons of mass destruction in the name of peace and possessing nuclear weapons is nothing but an act of murder waiting to happen. Humanity still thinks of war as a fight of many people against many people, but our times show that sooner or later it could be one man against the whole world. No nation is better than another. There are no rogue nations and nations of concern here and perfect nations there. There are people here and people there and they are expecting their leaders, who control the instruments of indiscriminate destruction, to renounce their use for permanent peace. If these elected officials will not accept this desire of the human race for the highest right, the right of survival, it will not be too long before people will begin to demand it. When the first serious miscalculation takes place, the public will react violently, either by panic or by revolt.

Worldwide the public is kept in ignorance of the facts about weapons of mass destruction. People have the right to know the truth about this thorn of humanity; they have the right to decide if they want to go on with this burden, which is already unbearable if they want to protect life for future generations. People in each nation have the right to

know. The preparation for and conducting of war is amounting to over \$1 trillion annually. Education worldwide is on the bottom of the list. Mikhail Gorbachev, addressing the International Physicians for Prevention of Nuclear War in 1987 in Moscow stated, "As a possessor of nuclear arms, our state will never be the first to use them". Today these statements are invalid. In the past, US presidents made good movements toward stopping nuclear tests. Today all these efforts seem to have been lost. At the same time, thousands of people worldwide are dying from cancer and suffering from pain due to past nuclear tests. People are being led like lambs to the slaughterhouse and they don't know why or how.

Do nations possess nuclear, chemical and biological weapons because of fear of attack from some other nation, or is it mainly because without them the stronger cannot otherwise exploit the weaker? Real disarmament cannot come unless the nations of the world cease to exploit one another. And nations will not stop exploiting one another unless we stop exploiting one another individually. It will take sacrifices by all of us if humans all over the earth are to avoid the unthinkable. If a foundation or institution is corrupt you must wash your hands and withdraw from it. As Gandhi said:

*"Replace greed by love and everything will come right"*

Our world is crying out for compassionate, wise, courageous, and skillful leaders to provide vision and direction. We as scientists should provide that leadership by taking the first step to form interdisciplinary partnerships and initiatives, by becoming scientist activists. We must invite indigenous and community voices to our conferences so that we can work together to do better science.

Japan is the nation with people who have suffered the effects of the atomic bomb. I feel your duty as my duty. I join you with all my heart, soul, and body to fly like birds around the globe to announce the choices we have.

I will not conclude my message without bringing attention to the root of our troubles. Let us not fool ourselves. So long as we invest in organizations of profit, nuclear weapons will never be abolished. Thus the choice is clear. If the people of the world choose to exploit each other with the clever mechanisms they have invented, then the dreadful day is waiting to happen.

Our societies are in chaos because those with power force their way by violence. Our duty is to realize who the ones who create this kind of power really are. We, the scientists, must take the initiative in educating people and arousing public opinion around the world to render the utmost priority to the grave issue of human survival. We must come together to seek solutions.

I would like to finish with the words of your citizen Nichidatsu Fujii: "Civilization is neither to have electric lights, nor airplanes, nor to produce nuclear bombs. Civilization is not to kill man, not to destroy things, not to make war; civilization is to hold mutual affection and to respect each other." Thank you. I will now take questions. August 1, 2000

## 21. From Nuclear Extortion to Nuclear War and the Coming Omnicide

*The following is adapted from a lecture delivered in October 12, 2000 at Tufts University.*

**A**lbert Einstein said:

*"This basic force of the universe cannot be fitted into the outmoded concept of narrow nationalisms"*

The splitting of the atom brought a new realization: that if war and science continue to coexist, life will not exist for much longer. What do we hear today in the news in regard to world peace? We hear about national secrets, national defense, national security, and national interests. We also hear about arms control. Who are the ones that must control their arms? Are they not the ones who build them and sell them? Let us put things into perspective; let us wake up before our leaders bring on us the agonizing death that many seers of the past talked about. War resistance does not mean rearmament; it means disarmament. That is especially what the last World War has taught humanity. Great thinkers and peace advocates in 1934, affected by fear, did not follow the path of wisdom, and they started advocating rearmament. The outcome is known.

At the 2000 Non-Proliferation Treaty conference in New York last summer, it became obvious that although everyone realizes that given the present state of affairs any military conflict can very well lead to universal destruction; governments still cannot adopt an attitude of good will and understanding. Instead, they continue to pursue a policy of domination and mutual threats. With regard to recent developments in the peace process in the Middle East, Einstein had emphasized that the Jewish people, who had themselves suffered so much from discrimination and oppression, should fully appreciate the necessity of pursuing a policy of freedom, democracy and equality for the Arab minority in Israel. On January 4, 1955 he wrote: The attitude we adopt toward the Arab minority will provide the real test of our moral standards as a people. What do we see today?

Most Americans do not know that their government has been using nuclear extortion to maintain and expand global influence and control since the nuclear age began. But there is no government in the world that does not know that a nuclear threat backs up every U.S. or U.S.- led military action anywhere in the world. On more than twenty occasions, beginning with Truman's threatened nuclear attack against the Soviet Union during the 1946 crisis over two northern Iranian provinces, U.S. presidents have prepared and/or threatened to initiate nuclear war during international crises. The most recent such case was during the 1996 Taiwan crisis when the U.S. responded to Chinese nuclear rhetoric by deploying two nuclear capable aircraft carriers in waters immediately adjacent to the Taiwan Strait. Other such nuclear threats during the Clinton administration have included North Korea, Iraq and Libya.

Many of us believed that after the cold war, the threat of nuclear war was over. But now, in the absence of another superpower, the U.S. is free to do whatever it wants with little real opposition: It sells weapons to countries involved in civil war, controls the United Nations decisions, bombs wherever it decides to, enforces sanctions and controls the lifting of them according to its own interests causing the deaths of thousands, and as the only country to ever use nuclear weapons, it tries to prevent other countries from developing them without diminishing its own. An attitude of greed like this cannot bring anything but hate from other countries and retaliation sooner or later.

But there is a new kind of colonialism much less obvious than the colonialism of the past. It enslaves weaker nations by investing capital, which makes those nations dependent on it. This is the policy of the United States today, and anyone who opposes this policy is treated as an enemy of the United States. If anyone desires to understand world events today, he cannot ignore this fact. Western corporate power today means nuclear war in the near future unless the other nations adopt appropriate measures in time to avert the danger. Efforts to urge the establishment of international peace through international law is difficult to accomplish at any time, and certainly impossible to achieve as long as corporations are in power. Corporate hunger will never be satisfied unless the people first understand who it really is that brings this corporate hunger into existence. When will we take responsibility for our actions? When will we citizens of the world come out of our hiding places? Unless we conquer our fears, "Armageddon" is inevitable! The only way to move towards enlightenment is to free our minds from the tyranny of greed. It is best achieved by adopting a simple style of living.

The ignorance of our leadership is horrifying. Plans to use missile defense as a trading bargain in negotiations with Russia is an extreme example when weapons of mass destruction can be carried in a suitcase to any place on earth, and the borders are porous and will always stay porous. Where is the wisdom of such actions? Honesty in speech, thought or action is as uncommon as ever. What good are "free" press and public debate if crucial facts pertaining to the citizens of the country are concealed by the rulers of the day? The transformation of political leaders into soulless parasites has been aided by the so-called national secrets. In the nuclear age, more than at any other time in the history of our world, national laws or family responsibilities cannot set personal moral responsibility aside. Presidential candidates are portrayed as humans like everyone else, with pictures showing them interacting with children and adults, showing that they are at the level of the people. But their finger is on the button for the annihilation of these very children and adults at their command tomorrow. That is the truth and we had better face it today in order to live tomorrow. Let those who spend their days in their comfortable offices take a leave of absence and do some manual work and watch the sunset and the birds and the trees while they support themselves with their manual labor; then perhaps when they go back to their offices to make policies, their eyes will be open.

When there are thousands of activities taking place everyday working for the end of the world and only a few people fighting to stop them, it seems logical to me that these fighters must divert their activities toward public education and nothing else. If there is a chance of saving our world, it will be accomplished by the people as a whole on earth, not by activists or by government laws. Thus I would suggest that all these scientific groups or activists working for peace must adopt immediate plans for public education rather than trying to convince the politicians for abolition or watching out if the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is followed.

Facing the greatest peril in human history, to speak of the protection of Americans or Russians or any other group of people is a crime against humanity. Let us not deceive ourselves; let us not be lost in the details; let us stop hiding. If we really want ourselves, our children, our grandchildren, and the future generations to have life as it is supposed to be on earth, then we must stop feeding the corporate hunger. Take greed and fear away; give your extra to the ones who have less instead of to the corporations, and when you give don't ask for interest and everything will be fine. But if we continue to feed the corporations with our fear and greed, then the horrible end is inevitable.

It is obvious that the international military force is a hostage to the corporate hunger of the West. Thus it is obvious that the international military organization is not an indispensable prerequisite to the abolition of war as it was thought to be in the past. We

need to move towards unilateral disarmament, and move fast. That seems to be the only way, the way of trust. The hardest way is always the best. This international military organization was envisioned as the antidote for the rearmament of individual nations. But it did not work because violence simply begets violence. Why has the entire civilized world failed to join in a united effort to bring an end to this modern barbarism? Can it be that the world does not see that the Western corporate hunger is dragging us into global catastrophe?

Einstein in 1933 hoped for peace after the rearmament of nations, after having an international court of arbitration whose judgment could be enforced, or after establishing an international police force. But very interestingly, after the horror of WWII, Albert Einstein in 1947 declared, "For there is no secret and there is no defense; there is no possibility of control except through the aroused understanding and insistence of the peoples of the world." This realization came only after the WWII horror. History has shown us that preparing for war has never worked for peace.

The gospel of force and repression, currently prevailing in the West, poses grave threats to the world and the independence of its inhabitants. This threat cannot successfully be combated except by moral means; it can be met only by organized civil disobedience. But we must recognize first that life is worth living even in the middle of Armageddon. Peace activists speak to peace activists. That is the real weakness of the peace movement. To espouse the ideals of pacifism, mere words get pacifists nowhere. Deeds, not words, are needed. If we accept in our hearts the risk to our careers, properties, and even our lives in working for peace, then and only then will we advance far on the road to a more peaceful world.

It is a temptation to suggest that pacifists of all countries establish an international organization and an international pacifist fund to support the active war resisters of our days. History shows though that this is not the most effective means for raising public awareness of the peril we face. Genuine pacifists know that only by personal suffering can world peace be realized. They are convinced that even if they one day find themselves against the whole world, they must never lose faith, and only then will the world take notice. Non-pacifists will then hear pacifists, and their message will reach the hearts of the non-pacifists. But by being restrained, they reach only other pacifists. Of what use is this?

What is needed is a social revolution, a nonviolent direct action of non-cooperation with the system of violence of our days. Organized action on a large scale is necessary. If only 1% of those claiming to be members of the peace movement were willing to detach themselves from the chores of everyday life and constantly protest against war, the whole world would join in. But it is easier to talk than act. Mahatma Gandhi had a number of children but he left them no mansions or business empires. We must place society and the welfare of others above our families, time is running out for the children of the earth. This is the last real test of our moral standards as people of the earth.

The desire for maintaining weapons of mass destruction and even building new ones marks a diplomatic defeat for the American government in the eyes of the world. Today the U.S. is the most powerful nation on earth, as it was even in 1930. Therefore, the success against violence and war depends very much on how Americans react to these concerns. The moral obligation of American citizens cannot be overemphasized in the struggle against militarism and war. The people of the USA have not shown much interest in the great international problems, most important of all, the problem of disarmament. Dollar hunger is the basic characteristic of government's foreign policy. More profit is the American dream today and where does this profit come from? It comes from the so-called allies. Quality of

life should not to be confused with convenience. As Mahatma Gandhi said, the world has enough for every man's needs but not for one man's greed. Americans have trusted their government to do it for them. More than 50% of them would not even bother to elect it. We must realize the great responsibility we bear for world peace. If not, in the long run, it will be disastrous to the whole world.

It is apparent that the struggle against armaments and the spirit of militarism cannot be safely left in the hands of governments or the peace movement. Pacifist organizations with large memberships will not bring us closer to world peace either. The only effective way is through non-cooperation with corporations and through cooperation among our selves. The evidence of the last disarmament conference in New York in the summer of 2000 showed that the governments are either unwilling or unable to achieve real disarmament. It is the people who must express their desire for disarmament if they really want it. Our moral duty as human beings in the world is to become conscious citizens of the world.

Although I was a pacifist before my arrival in the U.S. in 1978, I had never translated these sentiments into any form of organized protest. I had taken no stand on public issues, nor had I been engaged in civic affairs or political action. My latest work experience at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory clouded with the events of Wen Ho Lee, polygraph tests, the Nuclear Ignition Facility scandal, and the Kosovo war were the last birth pains to bring me publicly into the peace movement.

That spirit which was born in ancient Greece and which later spread to the whole continent of Europe – the spirit of personal liberty and respect for the rights of the individual -- is in great danger today. Few would deny that the basis of a dignified human existence is endangered by the present world situation. There are forces at work which seek to destroy freedom, tolerance and human dignity.

Modern leaders have at their disposal far greater technological means for inflicting violence, as well as psychological weapons such as TV, the internet, radio, press, schools, and the work place against which ordinary citizens are defenseless. And it is in the minds of people that the rise or fall of a nation begins. Einstein said that modern despotism does not lie in the fact that one man with virtually unlimited authority holds power, but society itself has become an instrument for enslaving the individual.

How are free humans converted into slaves by the state? An enormous number of laws in civil life and militaristic rules at the work place have reduced the citizens to helpless victims without a will of their own. They demand that citizens give automatic and unquestioning obedience to their superiors if they want to keep their positions. And the tragic outcome of this modern way of life brings total loss of personal liberty and human dignity.

Our destiny as humans will be determined not by our weapons of mass destruction but by our vision. We have looked around for leaders and we have found almost none. We have dreamed for them to be compassionate, wise, courageous, and skillful. We have looked inside and we recognized the enemy. We looked inside once again and we saw our leaders. They are you and I! I say, let's start talking about solutions and enacting them, rather than just describing the problems.

October 12, 2000

## 22. Scientists, Secrets, and Corporate Slavery

*The following is adapted from a lecture delivered in October 14, 2000 in Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.*

**T**he nuclear age began in great secrecy in 1942. A team of international scientists, supervised by General Leslie Groves of the Army Corps of Engineers, worked to develop the bombs that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki, brought instant death to more than 200,000 people like you and me, and brought an agonizing death to even more. Every summer, in Nagasaki, citizens mourn the death of about 5,500 pupils and teachers in the 1945 U.S. atomic bombing of their city. But even today, after witnessing the nuclear horror on humans in 1945, scientists still continue to be hostages to the military, the military to the governments, the governments to the corporations, and the individuals who elect their governments to their own fears for survival and greed.

Undoubtedly, the arms race is fueled in a large part by a number of scientists in government laboratories and in industries, and not only by the military. Boeing, Lockheed-Martin, Raytheon, and TRW, had split more than \$2.2 billion in missile defense research and development in the two years of 1998-99. In the current election cycle they gave over \$2 million in campaign contributions to 25 pro-BMD Senators.

On September 21, 2000, the US Department of Energy (DOE) published a list of more than 577 sites that may have been involved in nuclear activities. The DOE is examining each site for possible nuclear contamination. The list included more than 40 colleges and universities that may have conducted nuclear weapons research over the last 50 years. At the same time, the US Department of Defense (DOD) planed to award \$24 million to 35 academic institutions in the US in science and engineering fields to perform research "important to national defense." Proposals had been solicited by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, the Army Research Office, the Office of Naval Research, and the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization's Science and Technology Directorate. The average award will be approximately \$296,000. (DOD Press Release 2/16/00)

The National Academy of Sciences released a report commissioned by the Department of Energy on August 7, 2000 that states that most of the sites where the US federal government built nuclear bombs will never be cleaned up enough to allow public access to the land. The report also noted that the plan for guarding sites that are permanently contaminated is inadequate.

Confronted with the greatest dilemma in human history, to denounce war altogether or to abolish all life on earth, we still make plans to win wars. Air Force Lt. Gen. Ronald Kadish, director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, said, "Given our extensive toolbox and the 40 years of experience of the United States with offensive and defensive weapon systems, we know how to play the countermeasures/countercountermeasures game and we know how to win." (Associated Press by Robert Burns Sep. 10, 2000)

The U.S. government today does have physical power, but after it uses it, what happens? As a result, the other nations are filled with wrath and indignation, and their people are made angrier. And after the other nations find the first opportunity to pay the government back with violence and death, their violence will be delivered against innocent people. Governments are given power by the people to protect the people, not to put them at high risk and eventually destroy them.

The world is waiting for America's academic youth to zealously address the most important problem of our time, the preservation of peace. The purest kind of political life is always confined to student life. But as soon as the students leave their colleges and cease to be students, they sink into oblivion, they seek miserable employment, and carry on miserable tasks. They rise no higher in their aspirations. Fresh air and bright light, individual freedom and the empowerment that comes out of obedience to the Truth become more and more distant.

While most of the other nations of the earth are begging for peace, there are those few that persist in their nuclear hypocrisy and double talk, most notably today, the USA. At the NPT 2000 Review Conference, the U.S. delegation provided the following "double-talk" public relations statement,

*"As the United States reduces the numbers of its nuclear weapons, it is also transforming the means to build them. Over the past decade, the United States has dramatically changed the role and mission of its nuclear-weapon complex from weapon research, development, testing, and production to weapon dismantlement, conversion for commercial use, environmental remediation, and stockpile stewardship."*

We can not disarm while, at the same time, we are arming. How can the US government speak about fulfilling international treaties and disarming its nuclear arsenal while at the same time it is also transforming the means to build them? This talk is nothing else but insanity. How can we, the citizens, passively accept such insane statements? The West, in its blind arrogance states:

*"Although we are not likely to use them in less than matters of the greatest importance, or in less than extreme circumstances, nuclear weapons always cast a shadow over any crisis or conflict in which the U.S. is engaged. Thus, deterrence through the threat of use of nuclear weapons will continue to be our top military strategy."*

(U.S. Strategic Command, Policy Committee, Essentials of Post-Cold War Deterrence, 1995, obtained under the Freedom of information act by Hans M. Kristensen.)

Both the USA and Russia have changed their nuclear doctrines recently, mirroring one another. They both threaten to use nuclear weapons first for many reasons that were not considered before.

There are voices against this nonsense but unfortunately, they come out too late to be effective, only after the retirement plan is in place and family security has been accomplished.

The world, just like a nation or a family, can stand on its own only if there are members who are willing to always give, even when there are other members who always want to get. But when almost all of the members within the world, whether they are nations, families or individuals, want to always get, there is only one way they can ever be in harmony and balance, and that way is that they must share. And this self-evident principle for sustainability could be ignored without grave consequences before the nuclear age, but today unless it is embraced and practiced globally, our age will be the last one on earth. Our world, as it is, does not qualify for the coming globalization. And it does not qualify for globalization because the attempted globalization is fueled not by kindness but by greed for exploitation and control.

Do we have any difficulty predicting which nation will really be responsible for the end of the world? It will not be the one who fires first. It is the one that intimidates everyone else and proliferates weapons of mass destruction all over the earth, and while the

other superpower is in great trouble, instead of saying thank God, now at last we can start disarming, we talk about winning and we build more weapons. It was not then for peace that the West wished and accomplished the abolition of the Soviet Union, it was about control, exploitation, and world domination. We support the Russian nuclear scientists to withhold their skills but who will support the American nuclear scientists to do the same? It has been said that the cold war was won. Will the hot war be won? Have we won peace? Unless we embrace the ideal of universal brotherhood out of love and sharing instead of out of the desire to control humanity, we will face the horror of nuclear war and we will face it soon.

The west keeps inventing new adjectives. Sensitive nations, rogue nations, concerned nations. That is pure evil; it is white racism. Have we learned anything from our history as a human race? There is no lesson to be learned from a nuclear war. When there are no students around, there are no lessons to be learned.

I was taught that "Science without virtue is immoral" (Plato). I went to Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory believing that I would be useful in helping to dismantle nuclear weapons and in disposing of their deadly byproducts. That was my desire. Instead, very soon, I found myself expected to work on the maintenance of nuclear weapons. Part of my mission as a scientist is to make people everywhere, especially scientists, aware of the Einstein-Russell Manifesto, (<http://www.pgs.ca/pages/mem/russeinm.html>). It has been kept in the drawer for too long. Mostly, only activists know about it. The general public and scientists, for the most part, have never heard of it.

We urgently need an international organization to support nuclear scientists and nuclear workers to withhold their skills from weapons and power production, and instead use their knowledge and expertise to work towards 'clean-up' and the safe isolation of radioactive materials from the environment. Indeed, we need to educate our youth to prevent them from joining such weapons work in the first place. We must organize public hearings out in the open and 'nuclear truth commissions' around nuclear weapons and/or nuclear power facilities in our local areas. We need to stay informed about current nuclear debates and engage in public education to inform citizenry of the effects of the global nuclear trade.

And most important of all, we need to remember that strength does not come from funds and salaries and large memberships and speaking to the governments, but it comes from an indomitable will. If the people of the world do not take their voice for abolition on the streets with great passion and suffering, the omnicide is inevitable. Abolition will not take place by just writing reports about how bad things are, getting funds to write more reports, or increasing membership in the peace movement. It will take place after the education of the public and the willingness to trust one another instead of the great number of institutions we have created out of our fears and mistrust.

If there is a chance for avoiding the omnicide, then there is only one force that can prevent it. It is the greatest force of all; it is the force of suffering. Let each one of us decide today what part we need to play for the abolition of war and its tools. Most people are paralyzed by the inability to think of anything that could be done. We point out the horrors of nuclear war, but we tend not to suggest a practical way to prevent it.

Demonstrations on the days of military tests are great, but only being proactive rather than reactive will bring us closer to peace. The aim of the peace movement should be to bring the people of the earth on the streets for as long as it takes for the governments to realize their duty towards humanity. The aim of the peace movement should be to instill

the spirit of suffering in the people of the earth. This can only happen if those that lead the peace movement are willing to lose everything they have, even their own lives, for the sake of the world. Let's then be courageous and speedily perform the acts that must be performed in the spirit of nonviolence and suffering, for time is approaching faster than humanity can imagine.

Should we call what is wrong right because it is passively accepted by a society that is so busy with everyday life that it has no time to think deeply about anything? Should we call what is wrong right because thousands of people make their livelihood from it? Acid rain and atomic radiation do not need passports to travel the world. Nuclear winter will respect no borders. Our world is crying out for compassionate, wise, courageous, and skillful leaders to provide vision and direction. They are you and me. Let us start talking about solutions and enacting them, rather than just describe problems.

October 14, 2000

## 23. Personal Responsibility of Scientists in the Nuclear Age

*This lecture was delivered at the international conference, "The Child: a Victim of war and a Messenger of Peace" which took place at Megaron, the Athens Concert Hall, Greece in May 24-25, 2001. It was organized by the Foundation for the Child and the Family and the International Peace Bureau in co-operation with the Hague Appeal for Peace under the auspices of the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs.*

On December 11, 1978, I left my beloved family and island of Crete. My destination was the U.S.A. and my goal was to continue my studies in chemistry. In 1990, I received my Ph.D. degree in chemistry from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor and immediately after that, I accepted a one-year postdoctoral position at Los Alamos National Laboratory, the birthplace of the first nuclear bomb. My published research work on sulfur dioxide and hydrogen was purely academic, related to acid rain and energy. I had heard that Los Alamos National Laboratory was dismantling its tools of omnicide, so I had no moral concerns working at such a place. Little did I know at that time what kind of trap I was putting myself in or that I would later come to refer to Los Alamos and other National Laboratories as "Laboratories of Death". After a year at Los Alamos, I worked in industry at Dow Corning, and then I taught at the University of Crete for two years.

Though my heart remained in Greece, in 1996 my family and I moved back to the USA. This time I worked again in Los Alamos on state-of-the-art nuclear waste-related chemistry. However, funding for my position in Los Alamos was reduced after two years because the U.S. government was not interested in solving environmental problems, and so in 1998 I accepted a position at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in Livermore, California. I went to Livermore believing that I would be useful in helping to dismantle nuclear weapons and in disposing of their deadly components. That was my expressed desire and that was what I was told when I accepted the position. Instead, very soon, I found myself expected to work on the maintenance and increased destructive capabilities of nuclear weapons. I also found out that the academic programs were placed in these laboratories to attract new scientists, and later moving them into weapons work. What scientist would go to work for weapons of mass destruction?

Soon I realized that within the Lab, environmental or nonproliferation work or even academic was but an illusion. Thus, on January 31st of last year, I resigned from a permanent, highly paid, and classified position in the Stockpile Stewardship Program. My conscience would not allow me to work for the development or maintenance of nuclear weapons. I believe that if a foundation or institution is corrupt we must wash our hands and withdraw from it. Immediately, my resignation received media coverage worldwide, especially in the US, Japan, and my birthplace Greece.

"Any science without virtue is immoral," said Plato. But Western civilization unfortunately did not espouse every philosophical doctrine and teaching of the ancient Greek civilization. Its approach was unfortunately selective. The connection between science and ethics must be reestablished. War and science can no longer coexist. The connection between war and science must be dissolved before nuclear war brings the extinction of life on our planet. The governments of nuclear powers and their allies have no excuses for continued ignorance. We do not cause the danger to disappear by merely closing our eyes to it.

Nothing will abolish weapons of mass annihilation unless the scientists and engineers themselves refuse to build them and maintain them. Nothing will end war unless the people themselves refuse to go to war. The development of all new and "modified" nuclear weapons must stop. The U.S. and all other nuclear powers should withdraw all nuclear weapons from foreign soil and international waters and must ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The National Ignition Facility and so-called "Stockpile Stewardship Program" in the U.S.A. are incompatible with nuclear disarmament.

If NATO is not dismantled it will soon dismantle the world. Suspicion begets suspicion, and violence begets violence. Humanitarian wars are an absurdity, and conflict resolution by military means when at the same time millions of civilians are targeted, ready to be annihilated, is nothing but insanity. Making war on civilians is pure evil, and nuclear weapons cannot be used in a war situation without killing and injuring many innocent civilians - it is impossible. Violent institutions have no humanitarian lessons to teach the world. Hitler himself used a humanitarian justification for invading Poland and unleashing WW II. He claimed he was doing it to protect the German minority from oppression by the Poles. Would NATO have attacked Yugoslavia if it had even a small number of nuclear weapons? Thus weaker nations, in order to maintain their sovereignty, will keep trying to acquire weapons of mass destruction. Violent nations using military extortion should be held accountable for nuclear weapons proliferation.

For several years, the U.S. has helped the former Soviet Union dismantle thousands of their nuclear weapons through the Pentagon's Cooperative Threat Reduction Program. But who will help the U.S. and the other nuclear nations dismantle their own? We continue to base global security on the threat to incinerate millions of people, and we call this doctrine, nuclear deterrence when we should call it nuclear horror and terror.

While multilateral chemical disarmament proved workable, multilateral nuclear disarmament seems to escape our will. At the risk of pleasing almost no one, I declare with absolute confidence that unilateral nuclear disarmament is the only solution to our global security. It is the responsibility of the strongest nation, which claims itself to be the leader and the watcher of the world, to start the abolition first of all nations. Will it? It is also the responsibility of its allies to take the lead and send the weapons of mass destruction back. They will be called the glorious nations in universal history.

How can we make a difference? We need to take personal responsibility for our words and actions. "Speaking on condition of anonymity" should not be allowed any longer, especially for government officials in any country. Clearly, there is a trend all over the world to speak on condition of anonymity. Secrecy creates a global state of terror. Citizens should not accept any positions under confidential agreements. Free-trade talks should not be held in locked conference centers, but in public. And this is the greatest evil of all, to threaten the annihilation of millions of people in order to expand our markets.

Our thinking has to radically change. In the case of nuclear weapons, the public has been totally and deliberately excluded from policy decisions, which are vital for its very survival. Also, the time has come that the issue of the universities' culpability in the nuclear arms race be seriously discussed rather than swept under the carpet, as it has been for over fifty years.

We cannot grasp the fact that climate change will take food away, and as a result, nations will soon be forced to use weapons of mass destruction. We have difficulty in embracing voluntary simplicity as the only solution to the greatest problem of our times, and we cannot grasp the fact that peace and a healthy environment are incompatible with profit. We have become producers and dealers of knowledge, but we forget that it is not

enough to have more, or even to know more, but to live more, and if we want to live more we must love more.

It is the theory of some that the world economy is essentially military-based, and that therefore, those who call for world peace are enemies of economic stability. If our economy really is based on unilateral ever-increasing militarization, then the answer is not to continue participating in such a misguided, unsustainable charade, it is to restructure the world economy so that it is sustainable and not threatened by the simple, beautiful prospect of peace.

We still talk about secrets and defense. Publicizing the immediacy of the nuclear danger is of primary importance. To humanity's credit, the protests we saw in Seattle, Washington D.C., Okinawa, Prague and Quebec are the first tentative steps towards organization.

My good friend from New Zealand, Gerald O'Brien, former leader of the Labor Party and member of parliament, observed that children in countries like the U.S., Britain, and France are not dying from sanctions or bombing, even though inspectors are not needed for the world to know that those countries already possess these offensive and criminal nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and long-range missiles. Why was it ever a crime for Iraq and other nations to seek these weapons but not for the so-called "great powers"? But as someone once said, the world knows that they fail to match power with responsibility and have licensed themselves to be shepherds who prey on their sheep. We cannot grasp the fact that while some American children enjoy their playgrounds in safety, children in other nations are mutilated and killed by American bombs and mines. The "Principles of the Nuremberg Trials" accentuate personal responsibility in connection with the carrying out of orders entailing acts incompatible with international law. In regard to the attack on Yugoslavia, how is it that the Security Council, an organ of the UN, violates the fundamental rights of the entire population of a country - in the name of "peace and security?" It is a universal law that when the clouds and the earth become highly charged their discharge creates lightning which burns the forests. Should we allow our nations to be burned? The forests have no choice, but we do!

Arming and sending children to war is certainly a crime. What should we call the recruiting of high school and college students into nuclear weapons national laboratories? Children are not only victims of war, they are also victims of peace. Their schoolbooks glorify war and conceal its horrors. When we realize what is really at stake we will rewrite their textbooks. Mothers will instill the spirit of pacifism and not the spirit of militarism. Mother's Day does not stand for flowers and cards as we have been made to believe. In "Mother's Day Proclamation" by Julia Ward Howe about 100 years ago we read: "We women of one country will be too tender of those of another country to allow our sons to be trained to injure theirs. From the bosom of the devastated earth a voice goes up with our own. It says; Disarm, Disarm!"

Today out-of-control capitalism is backed by uncontrolled military power. Will linguistic negotiations be of any help to humanity next time there is a diplomatic showdown between nuclear powers? We beat our drums loudly. Will you, the leaders, listen to the drummers before it is too late?

We must support nuclear-free legislation in Greece and every country. It is vital to protect human life and the environment from nuclear accident, to remove the possibility of Greece becoming a nuclear target, and to advance the cause of nuclear disarmament. Every citizen of a free country has a duty to help rid the world of nuclear weapons, and no

country, no government, no political system is entitled to employ mass murder in order to maintain itself. Nuclear states still continue to maintain, improve, and threaten to use nuclear weapons despite the fact that 55 years ago, the UN called for their abolition, and the International Court of Justice has declared them illegal. Anti-nuclearism ought to have by now become a human instinct and a state policy. If we would just reflect on the words of the Sermon on the Mount, then perhaps, unerringly, we could relate our present condition as the result of the current world philosophy of greed. All social institutions should work together for achieving world peace. Human survival is above philosophical and religious differences and prejudices.

To the minister of education: Let us bring peace education in our schools in every grade. The horrors of a nuclear holocaust cannot be concealed any longer. The benefits of non-violence must be recognized. We need to establish nuclear free universities. To the Mayor of Athens: Let us declare Athens a nuclear free city with a nuclear free airport and port. The Hiroshima story must become known in detail in every city hall of Athens. To the minister of labor: Let us declare all our work places nuclear free. Accountability for the future cannot be observed as long as accountability for today is ignored. To the prime minister of Greece: Let us send our policy makers to Japan to see and hear the survivors; let us ask them to go there and see first hand what is at stake. To the peace movement: Let us establish relief agencies to facilitate the transfer of scientists and engineers to life affirming jobs. We need people working for peace not for war, life not death. If we do not have enough love for the unborn generations, don't we even have enough for our own children? The voices of the past and the voices of the unborn are loud and clear. Can we hear them? Abolish today or perish tomorrow!

May 24-25, 2001

## **Part III**

### **Letters**

#### **A Call for Personal Responsibility**

# 1. The Reasons for My Resignation from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

An open letter to the director of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

February 16, 2000

This letter is also an appeal to every secretary, technician, custodian, scientist, engineer, and any other person whose participation supports the world war machine to withhold their skills from weapons work and from activities that support or enable weapons work.

*The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything except our thinking. Thus, we are drifting toward catastrophe beyond conception. We shall require a substantially new manner of thinking if mankind is to survive.*

*Albert Einstein (1879-1955)*

**W**e have a moral obligation and duty to think, speak, and act first as citizens for a peaceful world, and next as scientists. The higher our education is, the higher our responsibilities are for a humane world. Should we talk about science before we even think about what our science is for? That is precisely what we are doing. And that is why I resigned from my position as a scientist in the nuclear weapons program at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) as of January 31, 2000.

Albert Einstein warned us about the unleashed power of the atom: "This basic force of the universe cannot be fitted into the outmoded concept of narrow nationalisms." The Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory's logo is: *Science in the National Interest*. I believe that if Albert Einstein were alive today, not only would he not be working at LLNL, but he would also be strongly condemning its mission. And what is the logo of Los Alamos National Laboratory? *Science Serving Society*. Do the national labs believe that they are serving society by endangering its very existence?

My purpose in writing this letter is to make known the reason for my resignation from LLNL. It is simply that my conscience does not allow me to work for the development or maintenance of nuclear weapons. In direct relation to this, I would also like to make known my concern about the hiring practices of the Lab. When I was hired by LLNL, I was not adequately informed about the specifics of my job responsibilities. After being hired, I found myself expected to work on weapons maintenance in the Stockpile Stewardship Program. I believe that I am not alone in having this experience of not being directly informed.

I find it quite curious that informed consent is common practice in our society, yet prospective employees at the US nuclear weapons laboratories are not asked to provide written consent to their job responsibilities before being hired. This attitude of indirectness is demonstrated in US Department of Energy Secretary Bill Richardson's own words on another topic during an interview with CNN on Jan. 29<sup>th</sup>. "Yes, there were exposures, the workers weren't actively lied to, but they were not informed of potential exposures, so it's not a direct lie, but it could be they were not leveled with." And in the New York Times

which reported the story first he said: "This is the first time the government is acknowledging that people got cancer from radiation exposure in the plants." A preliminary study by the White House and DOE cited elevated rates of 22 categories of cancer among 600,000 workers at 14 nuclear weapons plants, including Livermore Lab. For 50 years, workers in the DOE's nuclear weapons complex have suffered toxic and radioactive exposures resulting in illness and premature death. All these years the government spent millions of dollars to fight claims by sick employees or their widows. The US government's recent acknowledgment raises serious questions. If the workers had been informed of potential exposures, would they have joined the military complex to do nuclear weapons work?

I am asking DOE the same question: If many scientists knew that sooner or later they would find themselves entangled in nuclear weapons work, would they have joined the National Labs? I believe that we are dealing with unethical practices in not leveling with people and that serious questions are raised regarding the integrity of our leaders. The outcome, as in every similar case, is that no one individual by name is accountable, and eventually it is the taxpayers of the country who pay for all these wrong doings. Upon realizing on the one hand the obviously questionable practices in the workplace, and on the other hand, the real mission of the national scientific laboratories, I decided to withhold my scientific skills and resign. I cannot forget what my ancient Greek teachers taught me, which I now see being practiced worldwide:  
*"Science without virtue is immoral science."* -- Plato

On November 5, 1999 in NewsLine, a LLNL newsletter, Edward Teller addressed Livermore's citizens of the year 2100. He wrote, "This letter is written at a time of both great fortune and very real danger." He continued, "The United States has won the Cold War without any bloodshed. This victory was made possible by scientific advances and technical progress that sufficed to eliminate violent confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union." He expressed his confidence in the coming generations, saying that they will find a way to avoid the misuse of technology. He also mentioned brotherhood. Nevertheless, despite the hopes and confidence of the father of the hydrogen bomb for a safe future, many others know that the real world is headed towards new high-tech arms races and increasing dangers of global confrontations.

The Washington Post on December 9, 1999 reported, "The Tennessee Valley Authority approved a plan today to produce nuclear weapons material in a commercial reactor for the first time in U.S. history, breaching a long-standing wall between civilian and military nuclear power." In other words, the electricity producers will now be producing nuclear weapons. The December 10, 1999 Washington Post reports, "A blue-ribbon scientific panel, appointed by Congress to review the U.S. nuclear stockpile, has recommended that the Department of Energy design a new, billion-dollar plutonium weapons plant and organize teams at the nation's nuclear laboratories to design new warheads for the first time in more than a decade. But the Russian parliament still has not ratified START II, and the Russian government has warned that the U.S. rejection of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, along with America's efforts to amend the landmark 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty, could spark a new arms race." On the same day they also reported that "President Boris Yeltsin, visiting China to secure support for Russia's military campaign in Chechnya, launched a surprising verbal assault on President Clinton today, including a blunt reminder that Russia is a nuclear power."

How can we continue to go back home after work every day and look in our children's eyes and tell them that we are working for a safer world for them? Have our hearts become stones? Every person alive today, if we go deep enough into the

contradiction between one's conscience and one's outward life, is in a state of despair. We, the scientists, have tried to justify our involvement in building and maintaining nuclear arsenals by claiming that we are doing it for peace. How can we have peace when, by our work on weapons, we are raising fear in the hearts of those who do not have the same technology for killing? The latest news demonstrates how the situation has deteriorated in just a very short time. Reuters 1/19/00; English translation from Rossiskaya Gazeta, 1/18/00 reports that "Acting Russian President Vladimir Putin signed into law a new national security strategy that lowers the threshold on first-use of nuclear weapons. The National Security Concept of the Russian Federation allows the use of all existing forces including nuclear weapons to oppose any attack, nuclear or conventional, if other efforts fail to repel the aggressor and allows the first use of nuclear arms in case of a threat to the existence of the Russian Federation." The new military guidance proclaims Russia's intention to oppose American domination of the international arena. The doctrine states, "The Russian Federation must have nuclear forces capable of delivering specified damage to any aggressor state or a coalition of states in any situation."

Not surprisingly, the new Russian military doctrine mirrors current U.S. nuclear weapons policy: "Our nuclear deterrent posture is one of the most visible and important examples of how U.S. military capabilities can be used effectively to deter aggression and coercion, as reaffirmed in a Presidential Decision Directive signed by President Clinton in November 1997. Nuclear weapons serve as a hedge against an uncertain future, a guarantee of our security commitments to allies and a disincentive to those who would contemplate developing or otherwise acquiring their own nuclear weapons.... The United States must continue to maintain a robust triad of strategic forces sufficient to deter any hostile foreign leadership with access to nuclear forces and to convince it that seeking a nuclear advantage would be futile. We must also ensure the continued viability of the infrastructure that supports U.S. nuclear forces and weapons. The Stockpile Stewardship Program will guarantee the safety and reliability of our nuclear weapons under the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty." -- A National Security Strategy For a New Century, The White House, October 1998, p. 12

True peace is based on mutual trust. The argument that I have heard so many times from weapons scientists is this: Since the last big war, we have not had another one, so the invention of terrible weapons of destruction has put an end to war because, they say, everyone knows how terrible it would be if they dared to start one. This is an error. Who has led them to this amazing delusion? Who has led them to lose themselves in the temporary daily demands of their scientific careers and to forget about eternal demands of their conscience?

My fellow scientists and engineers, the national labs must change from labs of war to labs of peace if there is to be a chance to avoid the extinction of all life on earth. Environmental work is not the same as work on weapons, and environmental work is not environmental work when it creates space for more weapons. Does nonproliferation work advance the goal of nonproliferation when, at the same time, we are building more weapons? Who are we trying to fool? Many scientists are hired at the national labs to do environmental or other work, seemingly not directly related to weapons work. But because of budgetary considerations these scientists sooner or later find themselves being expected to work on the making or maintenance of nuclear weapons. I propose therefore the use of an informed consent document during these hires so such unwelcome surprises can be avoided.

Those who work on environmental projects or nonproliferation projects at the nuclear weapons labs have not realized that such a thing is an illusion. What environmental work?

What nonproliferation work? Last October 13 the U.S. Senate voted down the 40-years-in-the-making Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Now, through the deceptively-named "Stockpile Stewardship" program, not only are weapons expected to be tested, but new weapons are also to be made. In simple words: we are burying the waste so we can make more, and building more weapons so that other nations will follow our example.

It is apparent that DOE is also luring civilian establishments to participate in the development of a new generation nuclear arsenal and is seeking to incorporate the nation's leading universities into an effort to attract and train yet another generation of nuclear weapons designers. But I consider the most inexcusable DOE practice to be the luring of high school students into the world of weapons. Innocent and naive young people are invited every summer into the national nuclear weapons laboratories. They are taught the myth of keeping the world safe by building and maintaining thousands of constantly improved nuclear warheads. But their teachers fail to tell them that the fate of these weapons will ultimately be determined by the mood of a future dictator, and that it will be too late then for anyone to stop the great violence to be committed against humanity. It seems that the world has already forgotten the Cuban missile crisis. The survival of humanity hung on the decision of one man, Nikita Khrushchev: would he or would he not yield to the U.S. ultimatum? Prudently several years ago, Henry Bienen a political scientist and president of Northwestern University pointed out that even rational leaders can make very bad miscalculations.

Today's high school students are not told that nuclear weapons are designed to slaughter men, women and children by thousands, by millions. How much do they know about why these weapons are made and how and where they may be used? Undoubtedly, no young man or woman would agree to work on nuclear weapons if he or she had been on the ground in just one of the many wars that the U.S. or Russia or any other country has unleashed on so many poor people in the name of humanitarianism. If they had seen their mother being split into pieces, they would not only refuse to be associated in any way with weapons of mass destruction, they would also protest the existence of such establishments as the weapons labs.

Recently, a new treaty was signed banning child soldiers under 18 in combat. After six years of negotiations, governments agreed on January 22nd in Geneva to establish eighteen as the minimum age for soldier participation in armed conflicts. Are we going to continue luring our minor children into nuclear weapons laboratories? We must stop this practice immediately. Are we going to continue recruiting our youngsters into the military even before they graduate from high school? Wouldn't it be better for every one of us to recruit them to become soldiers for peace instead of war? Should we then be surprised that in our world there is not peace, but violence?

Recently, in the December 17, 1999 issue of NEWSLINE we read the headline, "Teachers Learn Lessons in Nuclear Materials Research." What is wrong with that? Read on: "A group of 13 teachers from six states are in Monterey today as a Critical Issues Forum learning how to conduct research with their students on issues related to the disposition of nuclear materials: suggested activities included researching the basics of radiation, the nuclear fuel cycle and weapons production, maintenance, storage and disposal." As the article says, the objective of the forum is to help teachers motivate the next generation of scientists, policy analysts and military officers required to manage the U.S. nuclear infrastructure.

We can not ignore these facts and go on with our science. Science, which ought always to be aiming at the good of humanity, is assisting in the work of destruction, and is

constantly inventing new means for killing the greatest number of people in the shortest amount of time. This twentieth century proved to be a century of inhuman slaughter. In the 1914 war, 15% of casualties were civilian; in 1939: 50%; in the 1950s: 75%; in the 1990s: 90% of war casualties were civilian. Science that is used to terrorize people, kill them, or make them invalids is immoral science. It must be abolished immediately. Those who participate in acts of violence against humanity by using, making, or servicing weapons in the name of human rights or under any other name, in every nation of our world, must remove themselves from their jobs today. Surely any one of us seeing one of our children killed or mutilated as a result of "collateral" bomb damage, as the pictures from every war show, would immediately resign from our job and condemn every act of violence. If we do not act now, we may very well see our own children become victims in ways we have never dreamed of and never expected. No matter how much we try to justify keeping a job which promotes violence, deep down we know that we must find a different job. We know there are thousands of jobs around us that do not necessitate making excuses to keep them. We spend the majority of our lives tirelessly working to ensure our own personal security, while at the same time we are blindly putting it at risk by our own thoughtless actions. The contradiction between what we love to do and what we are forced to do by our fears has brought us into a state of despair. When we make our work the centerpiece of our existence, then we will find happiness.

Einstein wrote: "Heroism on command, senseless violence, and all the loathsome nonsense that goes by the name of patriotism -- how passionately I hate them!" Now we have substituted the words "national security" for patriotism in order to fool ourselves. This is straight talk to every citizen of every nation that is involved with "legal" violence. Employees, like soldiers, are commanded to kill people whom they do not know. They kill and are killed, and none of them knows why or to what end. This letter is an appeal to every secretary, technician, custodian, scientist, engineer, and any other person whose participation supports the world war machine. It is a wake up call before tomorrow comes. Albert Einstein said, "I know not with what weapons World War III will be fought, but World War IV will be fought with sticks and stones." If there is any hope for the survival of humanity it is cooperative survival. It is not competitive survival. A military-oriented world economy must change soon to a people's needs-oriented world economy.

I know without any doubt in my heart that the people who work on nuclear weapons are as good as people who work anywhere else. I have met some people with such beautiful souls that I find it impossible to explain why they would work on weapons. The only way I can explain it to myself is that they are in a state of hypnosis. They are working on science in a detached way, not thinking about what will happen as a result outside of the laboratory.

Let's not comfort ourselves that someone else, man or God, is watching out for humanity. The train is now on the bridge and is going very fast. The first compartment is full of scientists and educated people who profess that they know what they are doing. The middle compartments are full of people, nearly six billion people! The last compartment is loaded with ammunition, violence and death. The compartments are being held together very tightly. I am appealing to all who read these words to come out of the train now. You will hear this appeal again and again, every time you look in the mirror of your soul, every time you look in the eyes of your children and in the eyes of the people you love, and yes every time you look at a flower and at a bird. Come out.

You will not be the first to come out. Many eminent scientists have seen the wisdom of such action. Joseph Rotblat who left the Manhattan Project in a courageous act of moral protest was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1995 for his tireless efforts on behalf of

nuclear disarmament. Theodore Taylor was a prominent designer of nuclear weapons at Los Alamos in the 1950's. He left his position and the lab and later came out as an ardent proponent of nuclear abolition. Now in his 70s, he is still an anti-nuclear activist. Worldwide there are thousands of anti-nuclear organizations, a fact that is often not known by many scientists or the public. Recently, Einstein was chosen as Time magazine's "Man of the Century." Most articles describe only his contribution to the discovery of nuclear energy; however, they fail to even mention that he was a strong advocate of anti-war movements, a peace activist. I wonder how many scientists and world citizens have ever read the Russell-Einstein Manifesto?

*We appeal, as human beings, to human beings: Remember your humanity and forget the rest. If you can do so, the way lies open to a new paradise; if you cannot, there lies before you the risk of universal death.*

*The general public, and even many men in positions of authority, has not realized what would be involved in a war with nuclear bombs. The general public still thinks in terms of the obliteration of cities. People can scarcely bring themselves to grasp that they, individually, and those whom they love are in imminent danger of perishing agonizingly.*

Russian President Boris Yeltsin speaking in China in December 13, 1999 said: "Clinton allowed himself to pressure Russia yesterday. He must have forgotten for a moment what Russia is. It has a full arsenal of nuclear weapons." We do not have the power to control the rhetoric of our world leaders, but we have the choice to work for peace and not for war. World wars have started with such rhetoric. What makes us think that our times are safer? The need for national security is so exaggerated and the public opinion of one nation is so excited against another that its not hard to imagine that a statement made in anger could bring about a world conflagration. Thus I appeal to you for introspection and serious consideration of your actions. If humanity has need for science, it is not for immoral science. How many scientists are necessary to change immoral science to moral science? A crime into a virtue? One man putting together some chemicals in a garage to make a bomb is breaking the law even though he may not kill anyone. If he does kill a fellow creature, he is tried as a murderer. If two men do so, they too, are called murderers. But a weapons laboratory, a government, or a nation can make thousands of nuclear bombs, threatening to kill as many people as it chooses, and that will not be called murder, but a great and noble action. As Tolstoy said, "The misdeeds of our rulers become our own, if we, knowing that they are misdeeds, assist in carrying them out." Our world cries out for compassionate, wise, courageous, and skillful leaders to provide vision and direction. The enemy is within us and keeps us from taking action.

In January 21<sup>st</sup>, President Clinton in his speech at California Institute of Technology said: "We have to do a better job of having an open debate about the responsibilities that all these advances and discoveries will clearly impose. Just because we can do something doesn't mean we should. It is incumbent, therefore, upon both scientists and public servants to involve the public in a great debate to ensure that science serves humanity -- always-- and not the other way around." But serious questions exist with respect to the effectiveness of the chain of command or the sincerity of these statements. There are too many instances in which the U.S. has not lived up to these proposed standards.

In his State of the Union Address, Clinton described a \$2.8 billion increase in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Research Fund, "the largest increase in civilian research in a generation." But again, what is "civilian research?" In the April 5, 1999 issue of Chemical and Engineering News for the cover story we read the title: "HIGH EXPLOSIVES, Supercomputers Harnessed

To Model Conflagrations In Detail.” Within this article we see pictures of graduate students posing together with their professors while holding models of the HMX explosive. The article states clearly that HMX is a well-known military explosive and that twenty faculty members from different scientific disciplines will be working with more than 50 graduate students in the next five years on similar projects. DOE is funding the projects, providing millions of dollars and access to the supercomputers housed at the U.S.’s three weapons labs. DOE apparently is using academic intellectual resources to do work on nuclear weapons. Here we see how civilian research and military research are losing their identity and becoming one. Universities even contribute leveraging funds for these experiments.

We urgently need an international campaign to help scientists and engineers see that they must withhold their skills from war-science. I hope that my letter of appeal will start this campaign and that individuals from every nation will offer their support for the idea. My letter is a wake up call to all those who can hear the call of their conscience. And for those of us who try to comfort ourselves while daring to call ourselves Christians, let it be known that Christianity is not compatible with war, with preparation for war, even for preparation to deter war. It never was. I wonder where the words on the dollar bill “IN GOD WE TRUST” came from? Until our warriors are disarmed and our armies disbanded, we have no right to say that we trust in God.

Having contemplated on these matters, and having recognized the real and misrepresented mission of the U.S. National Laboratories, I have decided to resign. I cannot live my life in a way that goes against my conscience.

These are some of the issues that concerned scientists and engineers should immediately start working on worldwide:

- Establish informed consent hiring practices at national weapons laboratories and all other scientific/military establishments.
- Stop bringing high school and college students into the weapons labs.
- Encourage and help scientists to withhold their skills from weapons work.

## 2. Mr. Bush, Soon It Won't Be A Choice

An open letter to the president of the United States of America.  
Sent on February 17, 2001

**D**ear Mr. Bush,

Everyone involved (i.e. scientists, military officers, politicians, medical doctors, journalists, etc.) in the monstrous cover up concerning the radioactive and toxic Uranium-238, also referred to as Depleted Uranium (DU), should be accountable for the past, present, and future deaths and suffering of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of innocent people. Many of these scientists and officials are ignorant about nuclear materials and their effects on human health. Most of them have not only never worked with nuclear materials, but have never studied them; nevertheless, they present themselves on TV screens boasting with their unfounded opinions and many times lying to an uninformed and unfortunate public. The establishment hires them, supports them, and calls them experts. They are self-recognized and promulgate lies and deceit for the benefit of a few at the expense of many.

Scientific corruption and fraud have reached their highest level, and all the scientific organizations within the peace movement who say that they are working for the people are unable to make any statements in the main media. Why is that? Why do they keep silent, or why are they not allowed to speak while they claim to care for the public? But these unfortunate days of humanity have brought something good for those that can see clearly. Now people can know who speaks the truth and who does not, and it is becoming clearer every day that a serious unrest is growing worldwide for life, dignity, and justice.

Those intoxicated in their own world, spending millions of dollars just for a night to celebrate their victory, make one statement only, one sentence on foreign policy, and that sentence is nothing but a threat to others. Is that world leadership? Should we expect a better world tomorrow after such threats to other nations? Thus, as the leader of the world, as many people call you, Mr. Bush, you make the following ominous statement during your inauguration: "The enemies of liberty should make no mistake, America remains engaged in the world, by history and by choice, shaping a balance of power that favors freedom."

Mr. Bush, I do not believe that most Americans think about enemies of liberty when they go to sleep at night. They do not have such anxieties and such explosive imaginations, creating enemies in their minds everywhere in the world. They worry about how to make ends meet and how to see their beloved ones healthy and happy. They try to envision a peaceful world for their children and grandchildren, with time to play with them and enjoy life. But many leaders worldwide are thinking of profit and power, and to acquire them they must create enemies and war. What happened to those in the past with the same vision? That is not the desire of humanity, Mr. President. The music will stop soon and the dance will be over. The world will be drawn into great misery and agony soon unless some people within your administration stand up and speak out for humanity. Will they?

All of the so-called "experts" and "officials" acting from self-interest, who so many times speak only on condition of anonymity, are putting millions of people in hospitals and graves and bringing great suffering and violence in the world. These acts of violence must stop. Those who continue to cooperate with this pure evil must come to their senses. These are crimes against humanity. How can they be forgotten? The great suffering is yet to unfold; we have seen nothing yet. If we do not act against this insanity, we might as well expect to see the unthinkable soon. If you do not unite with ALL world leaders and act soon, offering nonviolence to the world, we will be irreversibly headed toward fulfilling the

old prophecies of doomsday. Do we have to fulfill them? For the sake of our children, let us stop these senseless murders and our final destruction.

Mr. President, along with all of your advisors, people know how power can intoxicate humans and take them out of reality, but don't you see what is coming upon everyone on earth tomorrow because of such ambitions? I am sure it is very hard to see through the clouds of power. To think that we are better than others because we have more power is nothing else but arrogance. The power that placed humans and all life on earth will never allow any humans to control humanity by holding nuclear bombs in their hand. That will not happen; the New World Order will not succeed, not when it is based on violence and exploitation. Only compassion will make America be respected, loved, and followed by other nations in the world, and then it will be truly powerful.

Mr. Gorbachev, in his open letter to you on Christmas day just before the new millennium, correctly stated:

*"For while America's role is acknowledged throughout the world, her claim to hegemony, not to say domination, is not similarly recognized. For this reason, I hope, Mr. Bush, as the new American president, that you will give up any illusion that the 21st century can, or even should, be the "American Century." Globalization is a given - but "American globalization" would be a mistake. In fact, it would be something devoid of meaning and even dangerous."*

<http://www.newamericancentury.org/defensenationalsecurity.htm>

How can you and your administration speak about justice and democracy when the USA sells half of the world weapons? A government protected by nuclear extortion towards other nations cannot claim itself to be a democracy; we might as well call it oligarchy because that is what it is. Let us not deceive and brainwash the public.

Government scientists and experts have kept millions of people busy lately doing research to prove the obvious, simply that war with nuclear materials kills millions of people. Some suspect that this is a population control policy, or just a way of getting rid of nuclear waste from American soil, or both. Whatever it is, it will not last for too long because no nation can have authority over the people of the earth. Final authority belongs to the power that placed humans on the face of the earth.

By observing the tools that we have prepared, it is certain that unless world leaders stand up for humanity very soon, those who contemplate world domination will drag the whole world into unspeakable agony and suffering. We know these days have been predicted by many seers of the past. Has recent history taught us nothing? History records that those leaders with ambitions for world domination finally had to hide under the earth until they ended their lives with their own hands. We know of that tragedy, but we fail to realize the imminent danger we face, not from the East or this nation or that nation, but from our own attitudes, ambitions and foreign policies.

This time it will not be the same kind of tragedy. Burning fire, Hiroshima-Nagasaki fire will send the few remaining people of the earth back to the caves. There is not going to be a place for anyone to hide. The blunt truth will strike us that a top government official and a homeless citizen under a bridge share the same fate. They are both subjects to a higher power. The truth is "that the present situation of the United States, with a part of its population able to enjoy a life of extraordinary comfort and privilege, is not tenable as long as an enormous portion of the world lives in abject poverty, degradation and backwardness." These are words from the East but if they speak truth, why would we ignore them? It would be to everyone's advantage to reflect on them.

In one of your recent speeches, you mentioned that history has not recorded World War III because of the existence of NATO. But we have not grasped the fact that after World War III, most likely there will be no humans left to record history. The world knows that NATO stands for the expansion of Western power at the expense of world peace. With this attitude, the West demonstrates unequivocally that its desire is world domination by any means. The West in its blindness boasts that it won the Cold War. Immersed in comfort, we willingly deny what the wise of the past warned us about, "...and in those days people will seek death and death will flee from them."

The National Missile Defense System (NMD) has been criticized by many of the US's Nobel Prize winners as fundamentally flawed. Close U.S. allies have questioned the prudence of your administration's decision to deploy the NMD system and other major nuclear powers strongly oppose it. You have been closing every one of your major speeches mentioning the word God and I feel compelled to ask you to which god you are referring to, the God of peace or the god of war? You are surrounded by many religious leaders and I wonder, has any one of those Christian leaders holding the Bible in their hands told you what you are about to fulfill? Einstein warned us that unless we changed our thinking we would soon face the unthinkable.

I am sure most American citizens are not proud of their government when it threatens other nations. In fact, all desire freedom, peace and health, but these are being taken away piece by piece daily. Mr. Bush, we have heard and know that an eye for an eye makes the whole world blind. You and your administration, along with your families, are citizens of this earth. Your destiny is tied to the destiny of the earth, and its destiny appears to be in your hands and in the hands of those who advise you. Will you choose life or death for the world? Time will show. Soon it won't even be a choice unless your administration has the wisdom and courage to forge a new and peaceful path in our world.

### 3. An Open Letter to Nobel Peace Prize Winner

#### Professor Joseph Rotblat

December 8, 2001

*I met Professor Joseph Rotblat on March 31st, 2000 just exactly two months after my January 31st, 2000 resignation from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory at a conference titled "Averting Nuclear Anarchy: The Current Crisis in Arms Control" which took place at the University of Notre Dame in Indiana. I greatly enjoyed his company and personality, and I attended his keynote speech. Since listening to his speech that night, I have wanted to discuss some concerns I have with him. Since I thought that these concerns are also the concerns of millions of people around the world, I decided to write him an open letter.*

**D**ear Joe,

How are you? I saw that you were going to Athens last summer and I was planning to talk with you. Since it did not happen, here are my thoughts and concerns.

In view of current militaristic events, I am sending you my open letter related to my resignation from the nuclear labs. Considering the goal of your publications and especially Student Pugwash, I thought that your editors would be interested to let your readers know about why I resigned.

I would appreciate it if you could let me know if you would publish if not all the letter, at least extracts from it like THE SPOKESMAN #73 did in its last issue. I would think that a link to my letter, if not the entire letter, would be most appropriate in your web site for encouraging students to abstain from employment in the nuclear labs and for encouraging scientists to leave. Is it not that which we want to see? Also the same statement can be made about Issac Trotts's open letter as to why he also resigned from LLNL from a permanent high paying job while at the same time he had over \$40,000 in student loans to pay back. Has his example become widely known in the circles of student Pugwash?

I am surprised that so far, two whole years after my resignation, my letter has not made its way yet into your publications or web sites, nor into the publications or web site of the Union of Concerned Scientists, nor into the publications of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists even after I requested its publication. I thought that after meeting several key people from these organizations during these two years, they would definitely publicize my resignation as an example to be followed by other scientists, but it did not happen.

It is a disturbing observation because we have the same goal, which is to see the abolition of nuclear weapons. I want to believe that it was overlooked even though I sense that the world has not really weighed properly the Russel-Einstein manifesto, of which you are the last remaining in life of its eleven signatories. With direct action, we should let the scientists know that science is supposed to be practiced for the benefit of humanity, not for its total destruction.

It is my delight to mention that INES (International Network of Engineers and Scientists) not only let its readers know about my resignation, but also let them know about an interesting article encouraging scientists to think again. It appeared in their newsletter as it appears below:

E1] "Living Without the Labs"

This is the title of an article by Andreas Toupadakis, the nuclear scientist who quit his job at the US Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory on principle. In his latest article, published first in The Albuquerque Tribune, 19 Sept 01, Andreas Toupadakis is urging other scientists to do the same. But quitting is tough, and scientists who do so need an organization to support them, he says.

You can find the article at:

[http://www.abqtrib.com/archives/opinions01/091901\\_opinions\\_labs.shtml](http://www.abqtrib.com/archives/opinions01/091901_opinions_labs.shtml)

If I mentioned your web site and the Union of Concerned Scientists in the Albuquerque article, why has our resignation (Issac Trotts's and mine) not been mentioned in yours and theirs?

As a Nobel Peace Prize winner you could effectively encourage especially science students today to follow my example and Issac Trotts's example. Of course your example is widely known around the world, but I have realized that we have a tendency to look in the past and not at today.

It was the same attitude, if you remember, when we got together for first time during the editorial board meeting with the South Bend Tribune in Indiana in 2000. The board members and everybody else was going around and around the past and no one was willing to touch the burning issues of our times. When I made a comment on today's issues, a member from the editorial board said that the newspapers do not make policy. Of course the newspapers do not make policy, but unless they inform the people of what is happening, how will the people ask for the best policy for their country? I was shocked after that meeting to see such indifference at a time when we are ready to burn ourselves and the whole world in the nuclear fire we have prepared for ourselves and our children.

At your speech that day in Indiana, you predicted that nuclear weapons will be used and they will be used soon. I believe it myself and want to see our colleagues walk away from this crime of science. I would humbly disagree though with you in your comment during the same speech that the rich become richer and the poor become richer. That is not the picture that the majority of the world sees today. They see a very different picture and it is documented by United Nations reports that the gap is widening at an astronomical rate. Even the vulgarly stated USA policy of "full spectrum dominance" is referring to it in terms of a widening gap between the "have's" and "have not's". I am sure that you are aware of this strange, to say the least, document VISION FOR 2020 <http://www.dtic.mil/jv2020/>. My opinion is that if no cool heads find courage to stand up against such insanity for world domination, our world will most likely end before that date. But in order to see cool heads, we need to let people know about the facts. And the facts are that every empire is ruthless be it American, Russian, Chinese, English, Roman, or Greek. Emperors do not send their soldiers around the world to hand out candies to people as Arundhati Roy and Noam Chomsky have many times pointed out. They are there to divide the people in order to be able to exploit them. Has the Student Pugwash recommended to its members to read the two books by William Blum, Killing Hope: U.S. Military and CIA Interventions Since World War II. ISBN: 1-56751-052-3, and Rogue State: A Guide to the World's Only Superpower ISBN: 1-56751-194-5? Western racism, at its highest today, will end all life on earth unless it is checked by direct nonviolent action

worldwide. I am afraid that the time for lectures and writing books is up. We are very close to that horrible day. Let us pour our humanity into humanity, for that is the reason we were brought to walk on this earth.

What has gone wrong on this little planet of ours? Awards for peace are given to leaders that command armies and use force to bring freedom. How about those that have spent dozens of years in jail for the sake of world peace? These are the real heroes, not those of us who just did a common sense thing. How many know about Badshah Khan, who spent 15 years of his life in jail under the British and another 15 years under his own people the Muslims? In my opinion, Student Pugwash should have the life and works of Mahatma Gandhi as its Bible.

Dear Joe, am I correct that you advocate nuclear power? Can we forget the millions of victims around the world because of nuclear materials everywhere? Can we ignore the very well documented case of depleted uranium and its consequences to the lives of millions of people? Reading "Discounted Casualties: The Human Cost of Depleted Uranium" we cannot but be disgraced as scientists. What will happen tomorrow when wars break out and the nuclear power plants are targeted to be attacked? My dear friend Joe, we know very well what will happen because we have the book: "Voices from Chernobyl Chronicle of the future" by Alexievich, Svetlana. London; Aurum Press Ltd; 1999, first published in Moscow in 1997. In that book, we learn that the poor and unfortunate people are already calling the scientists with a new name. And that new name is a surprise to all of us. They have called the scientists demons! Should we be surprised if we first read the stories from that book? If you have not read it yet, I hope that you will. In fact, from the hundred stories in the book, we need to read just the first and the last, and then we will know what we will go through tomorrow unless we stop denying the truth about the attitude of the western governments and in general, the attitude of all governments.

I am of the opinion that if NATO is not dissolved soon, it will dissolve the world. We must speak the truth Joe; we do not have much time left to compromise when the whole world is at stake and the people are waiting to hear it from people like us.

I hope that you will change your position before you leave this world, which is in horrific danger. If I am mistaken about my understanding of your position on nuclear power please let me know.

I would appreciate it if you would let me know if your editor will publish my letter. For the editor's sake, I have also enclosed below some more information in order to introduce myself. Hope to see you sometime soon.

With my warmest regards and respect,

Andreas Toupadakis

## From Professor Joseph Rotblat

From: "London Pugwash Office" <pugwash@qmw.ac.uk>  
To: <atoupadakis@prodigy.net>  
Subject: Nuclear Power  
Date: Mon, 14 January 2002

**D**ear Andreas,

Please accept my apologies for not replying earlier to your open letter to me. It was simply a matter of keeping up with my correspondence and commitments. There is so much to do and so little time in which to do it.

You asked me whether you are correct that I advocate nuclear power? The answer is no, you are not correct, and I don't understand why you should think so.

I am against nuclear power becoming our source of energy for the future. Apart from the problem of dealing with the disposal of radioactive waste (though the possibility of finding a technical solution to it should not be excluded) and associated health hazards from the whole nuclear industry, my main objection is the danger of the diversion of nuclear weapon materials. In particular, if in the long run the fast breeder reactor is developed as a source of energy, it would become impossible to prevent plutonium from becoming generally available for military purposes.

The solution lies in the development of renewable sources of energy. The nuclear lobby is trying to rubbish these by saying that they will never be able to contribute significantly to our energy needs. This is not true. My reading of the situation leads me to a more optimistic outlook: the alternative sources could become a major contributor, if more efforts were made towards developing them. Anti-nuclear campaigns should concentrate on this.

In the meantime we have to deal with the fact that nuclear reactors operate in many countries, and are the main supplier of electricity in some. We must take steps to ensure that the plutonium manufactured in them is not accessible for use in weapons. The best way to ensure this is by a complete prohibition of the reprocessing of the fuel rods from reactors to extract the plutonium from them. There should be a strong campaign against reprocessing.

The other point on which you apparently disagree with me is on the disparity between the rich and the poor countries. You seem to have missed my main point. Some parameters, e.g. the GNP per capita, are still showing a decrease in the poor countries. But in other parameters, which measure the quality of life, the trend is towards higher standards even in the bottom ten per cent of the world population. I am speaking here about life expectancy, about infant mortality, about literacy, and above all about education. Education is the key to prosperity. And if the trend towards education is positive, as I believe it is, there is hope for the future. Our efforts - apart from campaigning against the negative aspects of globalization - should be directed towards providing the means of better education for the people in deprived countries, and this includes more computers for schools, and - yes - more access to the Internet.

Despite the apparent disagreement, we both pursue the same objectives, though proceeding along different routes. I extend my best wishes to you for success in your endeavors.

Yours sincerely,

Joseph

## 4. The World's People Ask You: Why?

An Open Letter to the Leaders of All Nations

*This essay was delivered as part of a lecture on nonviolence at the University of California at Berkeley, on February 7, 2002.*

**D**ear Sirs / Madams,

I am writing to you as a temporary citizen of the earth. Destiny has entrusted you for a short time with the future of your countries, and you work diligently to please the citizens of your own countries. Many people like you had similar titles and responsibilities in the span of thousands of years all over the world. They did their duty and history has recorded it. Some of them are remembered with peace and joy in humanity's soul, and some others are remembered with sadness and horror. They had a choice to make and they did.

Should the decisions you are making today be about pleasing only your own citizens, this military, that economic alliance, or the whole world? It is not a secret that we have been at the point of extinction for about 50 years now. Does anyone doubt that the world has recently entered a new extraordinary chapter? Only a dozen years ago there was a dynamic equilibrium between the deadly forces of the East and the deadly forces of the West, and the people of the world thought that they were in trouble. They were willing to pay taxes to strengthen the forces to keep a balance. We now know that was a horrific mistake. Now that this balance is no more, the people are in despair and fear that the worse is about to come. What should the people of the world expect to see in the near future?

It is therefore your responsibility, which is infinitely greater than that of any other people like you in the recorded history of human kind, to come together and finally abolish the weapons of mass murder. The people of the world deserve that you humble yourselves into immediate negotiations, no matter the cost. Later they will demand it. We cannot and we should not think anymore of the future of our countries alone, but of the future of humanity as a whole. Under these extremely dangerous conditions in order to combat terrorism, your governments are justifying any means, no matter how brutal. Why do all of you almost exclusively still support such a policy around the world that threatens to annihilate the whole of humanity? And why when there are procedures in place, according to UN charter, to bring specific terrorists to justice have you allowed massive military campaigns that wipe out innocent populations and destroy nations? Why are you allowing atrocities and crimes against humanity in the name of peace?

Over six billion people are asking every one of you personally. Have you ever read the Russell-Einstein manifesto? Have you offered your own citizens the chance to read it? Have you ever visited the museums of Hiroshima and Nagasaki while in office? Have your military officers heard the stories of the nuclear victims? How is it possible for the whole of humanity and the civilization of thousands of years to be 30 minutes away from extinction at any given moment, gone forever, and you have not weighed properly what is at stake? How can you continue discharging your duties as usual when global death is minutes away?

Military bases around the world trying to control the military, political, economic, and even social life of the people of the earth are devoid of meaning today. All fear dies when a nation does not threaten anyone. Doesn't everyone like to live among nations that no one

needs to be afraid of? We do. Then why threaten? Almost all of the people of the earth if allowed to know the dreadful facts would never pay taxes to support the building of the graveyard of humanity by their governments. They would revolt. They need no world government while there are weapons in storage. As long as these weapons exist, humanity will be oppressed. They need no empires and national interests when Damocles' nuclear sword hangs over their head.

Why is it okay in some places when international law is broken, but in others it is not? The citizens of the world demand an answer from you. They sense that their future and their children's is at stake because of the lack of your will or ability to resolve such issues. Will you be able to resolve a nuclear scenario tomorrow? Your predecessors proved that they did not have the capacity to avoid two global massacres. If you have the slightest doubt that you also do not have the ability, why then do you still keep weapons of mass murder around?

The desire for world domination is not new or a secret (<http://www.dtic.mil/jv2020/>). And let us be truthful, if it were not the USA today, it would be one of the rest of you. The question is what will each one of you do about it? Are you going to use your nuclear weapons to destroy our beautiful world and every one of us forever? Good, loving people who want to love and support their families and their nations are waiting to hear what your answer is.

We know the results of colonialism in the past. People see that your strong governments achieve domination of other weaker countries by investing capital abroad, which makes those countries firmly dependent on you, and anyone who opposes this policy or its implications is treated as an enemy of your states. The result is a growing discontent pervading the people of the world because of this unhealthy kind of globalization. More and more, as years go by the feeling of unrest is growing in the world. As economic interests are intermingled around the world, agitation spreads beyond borders and takes the form of definite demands in the form of terrorism. This state of affairs is unsustainable.

The anti-globalization movement and so many other similar movements are growing at an alarming rate; that is a fact. You claim that you act for people's interests, but the people are not convinced. Brussels on December 13th, 2001 saw possibly the largest ever demonstration across Europe. Well over 100,000 people took five hours (on a working day) to march through the capital with the slogan "people not profit." Your mission should be to help eliminate the mistrust between nations, and as a consequence, eliminate militarism and everything else that goes with it. We live in an age in which you have to make the great decision, to abolish or perish, soon, very soon. We have the capacity in the blink of an eye to destroy everything that we have put together in the span of thousands of years.

While the leadership of some of you seems unable to do anything but raise fear in people's hearts, the conscience of humanity will always hope. As fear sweeps the globe more often today than yesterday, let us not forget that "he who wrongs no one, fears no one. He has nothing to hide and so is fearless. He looks everyone in the face. His step is firm, his body upright, and his words are direct and straight" as S. Radhakrishnan, president of India once said.

The times are pressing for an immediate, serious consideration of what we want to see for the future of our children. Weapons of mass destruction do not provide any protection for our children, future generations, and us. Can you honestly look at your sons' and daughters' eyes and say to them that you work for world peace when some of you support with your words and actions the research and maintenance of an unthinkable

number of weapons of mass murder? You are very well aware that instead of the abolition of weapons of mass destruction, our world is headed for proliferation and nuclear anarchy.

Today your governments are developing, maintaining, and threatening to use weapons of mass destruction against nations that do not have them. Also you are demanding that these nations not be allowed to acquire them, or otherwise they will be bombed. Moreover, some of your governments are using bribery towards the governments of the rest of the nations that already have weapons of mass destruction to make them destroy their weapons. What has made some of you think that you are better than others, that you can hold on to your weapons of mass murder but others cannot have any of their own?

Governments embracing weapons of mass destruction need to understand that there is something much higher at stake than your private vested and national interests are. You derive the right to take the chance of a global catastrophe from nowhere. What you are doing is simply wrestling with the infinitely great. It will be a lost game for all. More power demands more responsibility, wisdom, and concern for others. Let us abandon all means of war that bring about murder and destruction in the name of national security and self-defense.

Having contemplated on these facts, I have decided to dedicate the rest of my life to bringing awareness to the world's people about our predicament. I would rather use my skills for world peace than for the annihilation of my fellow beings. Can lovers of life count on your help? It is our most sacred duty.

## AFTERWORD

I am looking back; it has been four years since my resignation. The hardships have been many during the transition and they still continue. Nevertheless, I have never regretted it, and I still feel the same way, free and happy. I realize more everyday that most of us miss the point of our life. If we were more interested in 'how to be' instead of 'what to do' and 'what and how much to have,' everything would be fine with us and therefore, also with the world.

On January 13, 2000 on my way to deliver my open letter of resignation to the director of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, I had the chance to exchange a few words with our division leader. It was of course before the 9/11 attack, and before the Afghanistan war and the second Iraq war. I had told him that in view of the current policies of the lab at that time and in general, those of the nation, the future would bring an increase of violence. I told him that I had resigned for that very reason. If the national labs build more powerful weapons every day, then the only thing they bring to smaller nations and to the world is fear. Fear brings violence, and I do not want to be a part of it.

That was not the only time that I had publicly made the point that violence would increase if the course of things did not change. Intuitively, I had also made a similar statement at the DOE Public Hearing on Polygraph Examination Regulation Proposed Rule in Livermore, California September 14, 1999, four months before my resignation.

[http://www.spse.org/Polygraph\\_comments\\_Livermo.html](http://www.spse.org/Polygraph_comments_Livermo.html)

And here is the most important point I would like to make. When I say intuitively, I do not claim to have any particular ability to predict future events that the average citizen does not have. Nor could I see what was coming because I was an insider. I could do this simply because one day I became interested in knowing what was happening beyond my equations and diagrams, what was happening in the world, my world.

My hope is that people who read my book or similar books will become interested in knowing more, as I did, and that they will themselves search to find the truth on these matters for a better future. The future of our world depends on how many people will seriously search for answers to the questions we face in regard to world survival. The governments are not going to change the course of events for the better; it is only the informed citizens who will be able to bring the change.

A person who is detached from the results of his research and the implications it has for the environment and the population is a dangerous man, a very dangerous man. However, that is the rule for most of us scientists. We play like little children with our toys and we enjoy doing it. But how about the implications of our work? Will the world be better or worse after we turn our research results over to people whom we do not know and whose actions we have no control over.

Thus a great responsibility is upon all people, but especially people whose work can bring dramatic changes in our world and in our lives.

February 17, 2004

## **Public Reaction to My Resignation**

The following lists contain a sample of the public reaction after my resignation. It is an encouraging sign that despite our confusion and apathy these days, a lot of people still do care about creating a better world.

- Titles of Newspaper Articles
- Invitations to Speak
- Peace Awards
- Public Comments
- TV and Radio Stations Reporting
- Documentary Interviews
- Interviews by Japanese and Greek Journalists

## **Titles of Newspaper Articles**

### **San Francisco Chronicle**

February 17, 2000

*Advocating Peace, Livermore Lab Chemist Quits in Protest*

<http://cndyorks.gn.apc.org/news/articles/livermore.htm>

<http://www.mothersalert.org/chemist.html>

### **San Francisco Examiner**

February 16, 2000.

*Chemist quits in protest of lab's nuke work: Says act of 'conscience' comes after shedding illusion about nature of Livermore job.*

### **EXPRESS The East Bay's Free Weekly**

March 10, 2000. Page 4, 5 and 31.

*Leap of Faith: The Scientist Who Became an Anti-Nuke Crusader.*

### **Los Alamos Monitor**

March 8, 2000

*Former scientist resigns in protest against nuclear industry.*

### **The Santa Fe New Mexican**

March 4, 2000 Page B1 and B-5.

*Nuclear Chemist resigns for conscience's sake.*

### **Tri-Valley Herald**

February 17, 2000

*Ex-lab chemist urges weaponeers to leave jobs.*

### **The Valley Times**

February 17, 2000

*Lab staffer quits over nuke arms.*

### **The Daily Californian**

February 17, 2000

*Scientist Resigns, Refuses to Work on Nuclear Weapons.*

### **oasisTV.COM**

March 03, 2000 Editorials

*Science without virtue: the horrors behind closed doors.*

<http://www.oasistv.com/editorials/3300-editorial-2.asp>

### **Fresno Bee**

February 17, 2000

*Livermore Lab scientist quits in weapons protest.*

### **Tri-Valley Herald**

February 15, 2000

*Lab weapons researcher quits to pursue anti-nuclear work.*

### **Inyo Register**

February 19, 2000

*National Scientist Quits in Nuclear Weapons Protest*

**ELEFThERIA** (Greek newspaper)

April 15, 2000

*Scientist, native of Rethymno gave up bright career refusing to work for nuclear weapons.*

**IMERISIA** (Greek newspaper)

July 25, 2000

*Professor Andreas Toupadakis "Sounds the Alarm of Danger"*

**Rethymniotika Nea** (Greek newspaper)

March 16, 2000

*Native of Rethymno shook the consciences of Americans.*

**ETHNOS** (Greek newspaper)

March 15, 2000

*Greek Antinuclear Hero.*

**TA NEA** (Greek newspaper)

March 9, 2000

*A Greek "hero" for the California Newspapers.*

**Shimbun Akahata** – August 2000. Sunday Edition. Tokyo, Japan.

**The Chugoku Shimbun.** August 2000. Hiroshima, Japan.

**The Mainichi Newspapers.** August 2000. Osaka, Japan.

**The Asahi Shimbun Newspapers.** August 2000. Tokyo, Japan.

**Akahata-Foreign Section.** August 2000. Tokyo, Japan.

**Kyodo News-Hiroshima Bureau.** August 2000. Hiroshima, Japan.

## Invitations to Speak

March 18, 2000

**Berkeley Fellowship of Unitarian Universalists.** California.

March 30-31st, 2000

**University of Notre Dame,** Indiana.

April 4-5, 2000

Guest of honor at a banquet given by

**Physicians for Social Responsibility.** Los Angeles, California.

<http://www.radio4all.net/proginfo.php?id=1857>

April 24, 2000

**San Francisco State University,** California.

<http://www.physics.sfsu.edu/events/collsp00/toupadakis.html>

April 28 - May 5, 2000

**United Nations Headquarters.** New York.

May 6-10, 2000

**The Alliance for Nuclear Accountability.**

**DC Days 2000.** Washington, DC

May 12, 2000

**Ohlone College.** California.

June 2, 2000

**Hayward Democratic Club.** Hayward, CA.

June 3, 2000

**Vieques, Puerto Rico.** (did not accept due to time conflict)

July 6, 2000

**Ventura College.** Ventura, CA.

July 16, 2000

**Northern California ACTIVE-FEST - 2000.**

<http://www.greenmac.com/Active-fest/Active-fest-3/Active-fest-3.html>

July 28-31, 2000

**Pax Christi USA's national conference.** Richmond, VA.

August 2-9, 2000

**2000 World Conference against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs.**

Tokyo, Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Japan.

August 9, 2000

**Peace Action New Mexico.** Santa Fe, New Mexico. (time conflict—did not attend)

Keynote speaker on the 55th anniversary of the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

October 12, 2000

**Tufts University.** Boston, Massachusetts

October 14, 2000

**MIT** Cambridge, Massachusetts

[http://www.boston.indymedia.org/display.php3?article\\_id=1231](http://www.boston.indymedia.org/display.php3?article_id=1231)

October 24, 2000

**Las Positas College,** Livermore, California.

January 14-16, 2001

**Ground Zero Center for Nonviolent Action.** Poulsbo, WA.

**Naval Submarine Base.** Bangor.

**Northwest Disarmament Coalition.** University Baptist Church,  
Seattle, Washington State.

April 7-9, 2000

**Humboldt State University,**

**Arcata Veterans Hall, and Humboldt Unitarian Universalist Fellowship.** Arcata,  
California

May 20, 2001

**Mendocino Coast Diversity Fair** Eureka, CA

College of the Redwoods

May 22-24, 2001

**San Francisco State University.** Nevada Desert Experience

Teach-In. San Francisco, California

May 24-25, 2001

**International Peace Bureau and Foundation for the Child and the Family.** Athens,  
Greece

July 10-15, 2001

**Amherst College.** Amherst, Massachusetts

July 15, 2001

**ACTIVE-FEST 2001.** Mendocino, California

July 15-17, 2001

**Peace Action New Mexico.** Los Alamos, New Mexico.

October 8, 2001

**Las Positas College,** Livermore, California.

Nov. 26, 2001

**Nevada Desert Experience.** "Monday Night Series". Berkeley, CA.

January 24, 2002

**Veterans Memorial Hall.** Garberville, California

January 25, 2002

Old Arcata Community Center. **Arcata, California**

January 26, 2002

**Redwood Peace & Justice Center.** Arcata, California

January 31, 2002

**University of California at Davis.** Davis, California

**February 7, 2002**

**University of California at Berkeley.** Berkeley, California

**February 8-10, 2003**

**University of Montana**

## Peace Awards

### **Alliance for Nuclear Accountability (ANA)**

Certificate of Honor awarded to Dr. Andreas Toupadakis  
"For moral integrity of the highest order in refusing to work on nuclear weapons research  
and encouraging his colleagues to renounce this work as well"  
Washington, D.C. May 9, 2000.

### **Santa Fe Living Treasures CELEBRATION OF THE HUMAN SPIRIT**

This is to certify that Andreas Toupadakis is hereby presented with the  
Muchas gracias award  
"by virtue of exceptional heart, grace & kindness. We recognize this person to be  
exemplary in living the essence of peace, gratitude & thankfulness. In the spirit of universal  
high humanity, we praise the above named as deserving of affection, admiration & honor"  
Santa Fe, N.M. May 2000

### **Berkeley City Council Resolution**

Adopted Resolution No. 60,548-N.S. by the Berkeley City Council on May 9, 2000.  
The Peace and Justice Commission honoring Andreas Toupadakis. Recognizing and  
supporting the contribution by Andreas Toupadakis toward world peace and nuclear  
disarmament by resigning from his \$91,000 a year job at Lawrence Livermore National  
Laboratory (LLNL); It was resolved to send a letter to the Regents of the University of  
California, President Bill Clinton, and Secretary General Kofi Annan of the United Nations;  
and to issue a press release publicizing the adoption of this Resolution and urging all  
scientists working for the nuclear industry to take similar actions to resign from their jobs in  
the service of world peace.

### **Award of Excellence Nuclear Watch, New Mexico**

is honored to recognize  
Dr. Andreas Toupadakis  
for commitment, energy, and heart in protecting this planet and our common future. In  
this spirit of universal high humanity, we praise your exceptional work on nuclear issues.  
As we work together toward a world of safety, justice, responsibility and peace, your  
contribution is especially appreciated. You make a difference for us all.  
February 2001 - Santa Fe, New Mexico

## Public Comments

### **West By Northwest Online Magazine**

"Your writings get hundreds of hits per month. You are one of our most popular writers."  
December 09, 2002.

### **Earth Island Journal. Summer 2000 Vol. 15, No. 2**

"Environmental Hero: Andreas Toupadakis"

[http://www.earthisland.org/eijournal/sum2000/wr\\_sum2000ecohero.html](http://www.earthisland.org/eijournal/sum2000/wr_sum2000ecohero.html)

### **TUC Radio: Newest Programs**

"No nuclear scientist has ever left his job at the height of his career and joined the peace movement. Dr. Toupadakis worked as chemist at Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore Lab.† He left when asked to work on what he calls Manhattan #2."

<http://www.radio4all.net/proginfo.php?id=1857>

### **Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety**

"According to anti-nuclear activists, Dr. Toupadakis' resignation is a rare and perhaps unprecedented case in which a scientist left the weapons program in mid-career to embrace the peace movement."

<http://www.nuclearactive.org/news/021700.html#scientist>

### **Institute for Public Accuracy**

"Scientist's Resignation Raises Questions about Nuclear Policy"

[http://accuracy.org/press\\_releases/PR022300.htm](http://accuracy.org/press_releases/PR022300.htm)

### **Common Dreams Progressive News Wire**

"Scientist's Resignation Raises Questions about Nuclear Policy"

<http://www.commondreams.org/news2000/0223-05.htm>

### **Western States Legal Foundation**

"A scientist in the prime of his career has never before left a high-paying permanent position in the nuclear weapons program to wholeheartedly join the peace movement."

### **Global Network against Weapons & Nuclear Power in Space**

"Congratulations on your decision to serve as a model for millions of Americans who are working in jobs that they know in their hearts are not life affirming. May the best come to your and your loved ones."

-- Bruce K. Gagnon, Coordinator

"I applaud Toupadakis. He was hired to work on environmental problems associated with getting rid of nuclear weapons. But our government's policy is not to get rid of nuclear weapons -- it is to perpetuate them through the euphemistically-called 'stockpile stewardship' program."

--Ted Taylor

An architect for decades of the U.S. nuclear program, including at Los Alamos, and now a critic of U.S. nuclear policy.

"Respected Dr. Toupadakis, ... you were perhaps the most inspirational speaker I met at Berkeley during my four years, and I would want others to have such a life-changing opportunity."

--Shayna Princess. Nov 12, 2002

"Dearest Dr. Toupadakis, ... I'm not saying I agree with all of your opinions. I'm saying that you helped bring back my idealism to life. Dr. Toupadakis, thank you for being my dream-catcher. Through your help, I have found a part of my soul that I thought was going to be lost forever."

--Gilbert Victor T. Basbas, Jr. UC Berkeley student.

" ... In the face of such extraordinary lack of vision, Doctor Toupadakis is a breath of fresh air. His words inspire me to believe again, as I once did, that there is still a glimmer of hope - that human beings still have time to redeem themselves in what often seems a god-forsaken world."

--Sandy Leon Vest/Managing Producer, West Marin Radio Project (WMRP), Host-Producer/Global NewsBeat KWMR Radio/Marin County, CA.

Oct 02, 2001

"Andreas: I repeat what I already have told you more than once. You are in the class of people with Mahatma Gandhi, Rev. Martin Luther King, Malcolm X, and other great people in the peace movement down through the ages. Your labor and commitment may not result in immediate change and may not be known to the majority of people. But it has a powerful influence on progressive people around the world. Your commitment to peace entitles you to be a leader as was Rev. Berrigan who died this past week. May God bless you with good health so that you can continue your activities for many years to come."

--Aaron Moss. December 11, 2002

"I am a voracious reader and I have always made it my business to seek out such types of writings - \*yet I had never heard of Dr. Andreas Toupadakis before logging onto your site....and for that alone I shall be forever in your debt!\*"

-- Anonymous

" Dr. Toupadakis is a prime example of a concerned soul who has been willing to pay a heavy price for peace. I suspect at times this bright and sensitive man finds himself speechless or more to the point horrified by the self-mutilating direction the world seems to be heading. At other times "Andreas" becomes explosive and fired with a spiritual zeal while fighting to make the people of the world aware of the insane destructive possibilities that the scientific community has evolved toward. Yes --it can no longer be denied that these are frightening times. Since first hearing about "Andreas" I felt he was about to embark on a difficult journey, a pleading for peace journey that was clearly going to be a costly choice to his sensitive soul. Andreas has started his journey up the mountain. It will be a challenging climb. I sincerely believe that Andreas' eventual decent from the mountain top will find him a more complete/fulfilled spiritual essence. I feel that Andreas will survive the personal trials that he is presently facing. I would suggest that he consider writing a book as soon as possible. His capacity to be an expressive and positive **energy** plus his knowledge about science would for certain prove to be an interesting, encouraging, and informative read. I sense that the man is in need of a catalyst from which to resound. At present -- in the scientific community and socially -- he may well be perceived as a rebel of sorts. He should not worry about the spiritual ignorance of others but stay his chosen (spiritual) course.

I'm grateful for the pleading voice of Dr. Andreas Toupadakis."

--Wm. Regis Mc Devitt. December 19, 2002.

"It occurs to me you are a modern-day Rotblat, and that it would be entirely fitting for you to speak at our conference: Averting Nuclear Anarchy, the current crisis in arms control."  
--Kevin Martin, Director, Project Abolition, Fourth Freedom Forum

"Greetings from a rainy city in America. I would like to just express my simple appreciation and admiration on your recent decision to sacrifice your position at Lawrence Livermore for the reasons of caring for your fellow human beings. It's when an individual takes responsibility for his own existence as "one" that encompasses the well being of everyone else around him/her that, that person loves & cherishes life here in this world with mind, body and soul. Sincerely, thank you."

"Andreas - Your exceptional sanity and courage aren't going unnoticed."  
--Ted Keller

"We are very proud of Dr. Toupadakis courage and conscience. We extend our solidarity and support to him. Convey our love and regards to him and his family. We welcome him to our country. Kindly get us his open letter and the open statement so that we can circulate it in our area. We would appreciate if you could forward this message to Dr.Toupadaki. Regards,"  
--K.Nandini, Mohammed Zaheer, 'Jagrithi' (Alert), India.

"Just a quick note to say that I applaud your stand against nuclear. Your leadership is to be applauded. May you be blessed with support from millions of people."  
--Jeff Hutner. Ojai, CA.

"A real hero. The Greek-American community should be proud of him."  
--Leon Lefson.

"I am not sure how many e-mails you are getting but thanks for your courage and spirituality. You surely are a light in the darkness of this world. Kathy and I are behind you and support you in so many ways not alone one being prayer. We are moving in to our new home in Half Moon Bay. I also heard you on the radio. Please feel free to visit or stay with us for a while if things get to stressful. Peace of 'Christ."  
--Mike and Kathy

"Bravo, I only wish more scientists were willing to take such a stand when they realize that their work is subverted or misrepresented for political means. Hopefully the media will notice your action and it's import."  
--Jonathan Peterson, Internet Conceptor BellSouth Internet and Advanced Technologies

"Thank you for taking a stand on the issue of nuclear weapons. It means a lot to me."  
Yours, JAMES.

"Dear Andreas, Ruth (my wife) heard a large part of your interview on KPFA the other night and said it was excellent. We also read the story in today's Chronicle. Keep up the good work. You will be a model for all people willing to make sacrifices for peace." Sto Kalo, Zeese.

"To Andreas Toupadakis & Family for having the too-rare courage and integrity to attempt to derail Bishop Berkeley's prophesy - you have committed a noble act of conscience which gives meaning once again to the Renaissance concept of 'the dignity of man' ".  
--Gray Brechin. Author of San Francisco Imperial:" Urban Power, Earthly Ruins.

"Dear Andreas, I applaud your bold, brave move. You remind me, each one of us can make a difference. I'm sure your courage and honesty will lure others out of the insanity, into love and compassion for humanity. Let me know if there's anything I can do to help the cause." Sincerely, Rebecca

"I congratulate you on your courageous decision and wish you the best of luck in your endeavors to educate the public and other scientists about the dangers of this nuclear madness." Sincerely yours, Nikos Diamantides

"Andreas, you are very special and heroic and as an ex-insider have a unique opportunity to act as a catalyst against the nuclear establishment. Please consider working full time on these matters. Many of us would support you and your family in this."

--Barry.

"I am writing to you with the greatest respect for your statement upon leaving Livermore Labs, to congratulate you on your public reckoning. Each day there is another reason to join the struggle, today you are the inspiration. Thank you for restoring faith in humanity for me today.

--Lilly Vallee (SFSU)

## TV and Radio Stations

<b>CH 4</b>	February 16, 2000.
<b>CH 5</b>	February 16, 2000.
<b>CH 20</b>	February 16, 2000.
<b>CH 66</b>	February 16, 2000.
<b>CH 77/29</b>	February 4, 2001
<b>CH 15</b>	July 5, 2000 Ventura County.
<b>ANTENNA</b>	March 15, 2000 (Greek TV).
<b>CH 30</b>	February 16, 2000. Pleasanton.
<b>KPFA</b> 94.1 FM	February 16, 2000.
<b>KCBS</b> 740 AM	February 16, 2000.
<b>KGO</b> 810 AM	February 16, 2000.
<b>Democracy NOW!</b> Host: Amy Goodman from New York. Guest: Andreas Toupadakis	October 11, 2001. New York.
<b>2MM Greek Radio, 1665 AM.</b> Host: Paul Theodorakopoulos. a77b@hotmail.com Guest: Andreas Toupadakis	July 26, 2001. Sydney.
<b>KALW 91.7 FM</b> Host: Maria Gilardin independent radio producer Guest: Andreas Toupadakis 8:30-9:00 pm	December 28, 2000
<b>Allston-Brighton Free Radio station.</b>	October 17, 2000
<b>WMBR 88.1 FM</b> MIT's radio station Mark H. Weaver journalist and radio producer	October 17, 2000
<b>89.7 FM.</b> Host: Mendocino Environmental Center. Speaker: Andreas Toupadakis	July 16, 2000
<b>KWMR 90.5 FM.</b> Host: Sandy Leon Guest: Andreas Toupadakis	July 11, 2000
<b>KZYX 90.7 FM</b> Host: Lynda McClure Guest: Andreas Toupadakis Mendocino County Public Broadcasting, CA.	July 10, 2000
<b>WBAL 1090 AM</b> Host: Bruce Elliott Guest: Andreas Toupadakis Baltimore, MD.	June 17, 2000
<b>KWAB</b> Host: Laura Flanders, Guest: Andreas Toupadakis and several others.	June 16, 2000

<b>BBC on SKY 100.4 FM</b> Host: Tasos Kokkinides Guest: Andreas Toupadakis 11:00 AM on Thursday. Rebroadcast in Greece and Cyprus.	May 25, 2000
<b>BBC (Greek in London)</b> Host: Tasos Kokkinides Guest: Andreas Toupadakis	May 24, 2000
<b>WORT, 89.9 FM Madison, WI.</b> Andreas Toupadakis for the second half-hour 10:30-11:00 discussing personal responsibility in the nuclear age. Host: Esty Dinur	May 24, 2000
<b>WBAI-PACIFICA RADIO, 99.5 FM</b> Host Amy Goodman in New York during NPT at the UN.	May 2, 2000
<b>KALW 91.7 FM</b> Dr. Andreas Toupadakis & Dr. Helen Caldicott <a href="http://www.radio4all.net/proginfo.php?id=1857">http://www.radio4all.net/proginfo.php?id=1857</a> Maria Gilardin independent radio producer	April 27, 2000
<b>KPFK 90.7 FM</b> In Los Angeles 12:00-1:00 AM with Roy Tuckman.	April 5, 2000
<b>WBEZ 91.5 FM</b> Chicago's public radio station, with Jerome McDonnell.	March 30, 2000
<b>WSND</b> University of Notre Dame's campus radio station, with Steve Kovatis.	March 30, 2000
<b>FLASH 9.61</b> (Greek radio station)	March 15, 2000
<b>SKY 100.7</b> (Greek radio station)	March 15, 2000
<b>KWMM</b> in Marin County 90.5 FM. at 6PM PST. Contact: <a href="mailto:globalnews@altavista.net">globalnews@altavista.net</a> Sandy Leon	March 14, 2000
<b>RADIOKRITI</b> (Greek radio station) 30 minutes on the air with Nicos Psilakis.	March 9, 2000
<b>KPFA</b> Berkeley Host: Chris Welch Guest: Andreas Toupadakis	March 1, 2000
<b>KWAB</b> AM 1490 Working Assets Radio Jenna Robbert	February 28, 2000
<b>WORT-FM Madison WI</b> Andy Miles	February 28, 2000

**WNUR 89.3 FM**

Northwestern University radio  
Chuck Mertz

February 26, 2000

**Full Logic Reverse KVMR-FM Radio**

Mike Thornton Nevada City, CA 95959

February 25, 2000

**American Urban Radio**

Vinson Stringer

February 24, 2000

**KQED 88.5 FM**

February 16, 2000.

## Documentary interviews

**DOCUMENTARY INTERVIEW** on the Hanford "cleanup."  
by David Shapiro, Director, ITV Productions, Topanga, CA. August 26, 2000.

**DOCUMENTARY INTERVIEW** by Helen Caldicott. Recorded L. A. 4/4/2000

**DOCUMENTARY INTERVIEW** by Akira Tashiro,  
Senior Staff Writer. Nov. 18, 00. The Chugoku Shimbun newspaper of Hiroshima City.

**DOCUMENTARY INTERVIEW** April 30, 2000 by CityTV, Toronto, Ontario. More  
participants. Aired on August 27th 2000.

**DOCUMENTARY INTERVIEW** "Kids, Violence and Corporate Culture."  
Nov. 2000. Host Sandy Leon.

## Interviews by Japanese and Greek Journalists

### **Interviewed by NHK Sasebo TV channel. Nagasaki, Japan.**

- Kazunori Sakata. Interview was shown on August 9, 2000.
- Kojiro Ishii Shimbun Akahata -Sunday Edition. Tokyo, Japan.
- Makoto Iwasaki The Chugoku Shimbun. Hiroshima, Japan.
- Hidetoshi Oshima The Mainichi Newspapers. Osaka, Japan.
- Masakazu Honda The Asahi Shimbun Newspapers. Tokyo, Japan.
- Yasuhiro Ban Akahata-Foreign Section. Tokyo, Japan.
- Michiko Tanaka The Chugoku Shimbun. Hiroshima, Japan.
- Tomoko Arima Kyodo News-Hiroshima Bureau. Hiroshima, Japan.
- Evriliki Bersi Daily (KATHEMERINI) June 2, 2001. Athens.
- Giannis Foskolos Nation (ETHNOS) May 31, 2001 Athens.
- Nikos Koliopoylos Unbound of Sunday (ADESMEYTOS THS KYRIAKIS) July 8, 2000. Athens.
  
- Xristos Xalazias The unbound (O ADESMEYTOS). Athens.
- Mixalis Psilos Greek TV Channel ANTENA. Athens.  
Interview was shown on the news in June, 2001.
  
- Nancy Biska TV channel ANTENA, Elliniki Agogi. Athens.  
Interview was shown on June 5, 2001 outside of Greece on Greek stations around the world.
  
- Mixalopoulos TV channel POLIS, Axonikos Tomografos. Athens.  
Interview was shown on June 5, 2001.
  
- Ilias Kavalieros TV channel, TILETORA, Eleftheri Ora. Athens. Interview was shown on July 2, 2001.
  
- Manousos Klados TV channel KIDON. Rethymno.  
On the news June, 2001.
  
- Staff TV channel KIDON. Chania. On the news June, 2001.
- Dimitris Kampourakis RADIO ANTENNA. Athens.
- Bitsakou RADIO FLY. Rethymno. 90 minutes.
- Rakitsis STUDIO RETHYMNO. Rethymno.
- Psilakis RADIO KRITI. Iraklio.
- Thanasis Penesakis KRATIKI RADIOFONIA 104 FM. Chania.
- Gianis Nikakis RADIO-MARTIRIA 95.5 FM. Chania.