Nuclear Texts & Contexts

Fall 1991 **No. 7**

Annual Meeting of the International Society for the Study of Nuclear Texts and Contexts

ISSNTC President Dan Zins would be pleased to meet with members and other interested parties attending the Modern Language Association meeting in San Francisco. The gathering will take place in his room in the Mark Twain hotel (check with the desk for his room number) on Saturday, December 28, at 6:00 pm.

What's Happening to *Nuclear Texts & Contexts?*

This issue of *Nuclear Texts & Contexts* is being published further behind schedule than any other for one simple reason: I didn't have enough material on hand until now. For quite obvious reasons interest in issues related to nuclear war and weaponry has fallen drastically in recent months, though the spectacle of a disintegrating, still-armed Soviet Union is stirring considerable debate about whether its nuclear arsenal can be destroyed before it is seized by nationalist leaders within the republics or dispersed to third world nations looking to become instant superpowers.

Thanks to several of our members, we at long last accumulated enough material to fill what I think is an interesting issue. Dan Zins, President of the International Society for the Study of Nuclear Texts and Contexts, of which *NT&C* is the official newsletter, has contributed a thoughtful essay on the role of nuclear activism in relation to the environmental movement. Although it does not deal directly with the issues of language and literature which are the ordinary subject of these newsletters, I decided to print it to stimulate discussion of the future course of ISSNTC and this newsletter.

I have been studying nuclear war in fiction for ten years now. I have been very pleased with what we have been able to do with *NT&C,* but it has been difficult, time-consuming work. So long as we had a sizeable readership, I considered the work well worth while; but a glance at the membership directory accompanying this issue will show that there has been a drastic decline in our readership over the past couple of years. Meanwhile, I have been shifting my own scholarship away from nuclear war in fiction to third world literature written in English. Because this field is demanding more and more of my time, I regret to announce that I will be editing only one more issue of *Nuclear Texts & Contexts.*

Zins suggests that perhaps ISSNTC can continue as an organization with a broader mandate, including environmental issues; and he would like to continue publishing the newsletter as well. We invite letters and responses to Zins' article for publication in the next issue. Do you think we should redefine the focus of our organization (and newsletter)? Please let us know.

If *Nuclear Texts & Contexts* is going to continue, we will need a new editor as of issue no. 9. If you would like to volunteer, please write Dan Zins, President ISSNTC, 2347 Cortez Way, Atlanta, GA 30319. Issue no. 8 will carry details of our future plans.

After conferring with the ISSNTC Board, I have decided that there should be a year's hiatus before no. 8 is published. At the reduced pace that scholarship and fiction is appearing, it seems that an annual publication is more appropriate than a twice-yearly one. Everyone receiving this issue will also receive the next (probably next December or January), subscriptions being tied to issue numbers rather than calendar years.

There are a number of interesting forthcoming publications which I would like to review in the next issue; but they will not be ready soon enough for a Spring issue. Whenever it appears (and it *will* appear), I promise to make no. 8 an outstanding issue. Your submissions are warmly invited.

Paul Brians

Review

Nancy Anisfield, ed. *The Nightmare Considered: Critical Essays on Nuclear War Literature.* Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State Univ. Popular Press, 1991. Cloth, $35.95; paper, $18.95. 201 pp.

At this moment the U.S. and what was once called the Soviet Union are beginning negotiations that might dramatically reduce the stockpiles of nuclear weapons and enable us to draw back from the stand-off we have maintained for more than forty years. With this in mind, what place remains for the study of nuclear texts? This question also bring to mind other, related questions: how can we extend the study of nuclear texts beyond simply listing more post-holocaust tales? What other issues and methods can nuclear criticism claim and develop so as to retain its relevance? In her introduction to this collection of essays Nancy Anisfield acknowledges the swift changes in political circumstances and their effect on nuclear studies. Fortunately, many of the essays in this useful volume help to answer these questions and even point the way for future nuclear criticism.

The book is divided into two parts: Issues and Overviews—general essays dealing with several texts or themes—and Specific Texts—essays treating only one or two texts. Part two is superior, not only because the quality of the essays is consistently higher, but also because their arrangement often produces stimulating dialogue.

Opening the volume is H. Bruce Franklin's succinct and illuminating precis of his superb *War Stars;* like that book, this essay exposes the dangerous fantasy of the superweapon and its influence on the U.S. decision to use atomic weapons on Japan. Like the book, the essay is lively and forcefully argued; however, since it basically summarizes points developed more completely in a previous work, *NT&C* readers may find little new in it, for all its virtues.

Several of the essays in part one are plagued by overambitiousness: in trying to engage so many texts and such large issues they never generate a coherent argument, and thus ultimately fail to deal adequately with any. This is especially true of the second essay, Jacqueline Smetak's piece on sex and death in nuclear literature of the '50s. Sloppily edited, awkwardly written and unconvincingly argued, it is the weakest essay in the volume. Assertions masquerade as evidence, sentences ramble, *non sequiturs* abound. The importance of the topic and Professor Smetak's fine previous work in the field make the failure of this essay doubly disappointing. Because it comes so early in the collection, it undermines our confidence in the editor and halts the momentum begun by Franklin's essay.

Happily, the rest of the essays in Part One are better, though some of them fall victim to similar problems. Merritt Clifton contributes a history of anti-nuclear writing in the alternative journal *Samizdat,* which he edited for many years. An intellectual biography of Clifton's awakening to the nuclear threat, this piece constitutes an exemplary history of the baby boom generation's awareness of this issue, and is sure to resonate with the experiences of many readers. Clifton also introduces several little-known poems with nuclear themes; as one might expect, these vary widely in quality. Unfortunately, this piece suffers from loose organization and excess length, and despite its touching final description of *Samizdat* readers and contributors as "mice," its focus on a single journal and the author's experiences make it seem a bit self-regarding.

The next essay reprints Michael Dorris and Louise Erdrich's "Novelists at Armageddon," first published in the *New York Times Book Review* three years ago. Though concise and elegantly written, it is little more than a superficial survey of texts already familiar to specialists in the field. Given the fairly specialized appeal of most of the essays, I wonder why the editor included this piece, geared as it is to a mass audience.

Fortunately, the next two entries, Jane Caputi's analysis of psychic numbing and sexual violence in nuclear films and William J. Scheick's "Post-Nuclear Holocaust Re-Minding," are the highlights of the collection; indeed, Scheick's piece is among the best I've seen in the field. Caputi's bracing essay more successfully treats the issues in Smetak's piece, and she extends the ambit of nuclear criticism to films such as *River's Edge* by tracing the anomie of their characters directly to the sense of futurelessness that characterizes nuclear-age consciousness. I found her dissection of George Romero's *Night of the Living Dead* to be especially invigorating. Although many of her insights about the affinities between sexual and nuclear violence in *Dr. Strangelove* were made many years ago by George Linden and F. A. Macklin (neither of whom she cites), her essay remains an important contribution to the criticism of nuclear cinema, and deserves to be in the bibliography of every serious nuclear critic.

Scheick's remarkable piece is even better. A virtual primer on the themes and strategies of nuclear fiction and criticism, it contains brief but enlightening treatments of such neglected texts as Martin Amis's *Einstein's Monsters,* James Morrow's *This Is the Way the World Ends,* and Denis Johnson's *Fiskadoro* (which, judging by the number of times it is mentioned in this collection, is neglected no longer). Scheick attempts—mostly successfully—to recuperate the mimetic and moral value of non-realist nuclear fiction, arguing that their condition as self-consuming artifacts deconstructs conventional habits of reading and forces readers to reevaluate and reconstruct their epistemological and political assumptions. Though he neglects to demonstrate precisely how the experimentalism of nuclear texts differs from that of other postmodernist fictions, his argument persuasively illustrates the significant contributions nuclear texts have made to the phenomenon of postmodernism. Scheick's essay, to my mind the highpoint of the volume, makes Jan Barry's sketchy survey of nuclear poetry (which ends the section) seem anticlimactic, even though Barry does present several fine nuclear poems that deserve more attention.

Part Two is more consistently strong, not least because the editor's arrangement of the essays often creates stimulating dialogue. The first piece, a striking essay by Jim Schley, creates dialogue of its own by juxtaposing four different kinds of texts—an encyclopedia entry on nuclear science, a *Newsweek* article on future wars, a political speech by a Brazilian presidential candidate, and Denise Levertov's powerful poem "Watching *Dark Circle.*" Schley's sensitive reading of the poem weaves these disparate strands together as he reveals how, in appealing simultaneously to readers' compassion and their reason, it contains elements of all four genres.

This is followed by another excellent entry, Jack Branscombe's "Knowledge and Understanding in *Riddley Walker,*" which outlines the themes and structure of that difficult text about as lucidly as I've seen it done, while also offering valuable insights about the language and groupings

of characters. Indeed, if anything Branscombe ties up the loose ends too neatly, since (as he himself admits) the novel's linguistic indeterminacy is a major component of its critique of the semiotics of power, both nuclear and political. After Branscombe's excellent piece, Millicent Lenz's contribution (which, despite its misleading title, contains a fairly lengthy section on *Riddley*) seems a bit redundant. Though her reading of *Fiskadoro* is sound enough, again she smooths out too many of its enigmas, misses some opportunities to explore Johnson's mythic pairing, and fails adequately to integrate her theoretical remarks with her explication of the novel.

The next three essays are valuable in scrutinizing what were to me less familiar texts. Understandably, perhaps, English-language critics have devoted little attention to Japanese writings on atomic issues, a gap that Richard Minear's short piece on Hara Tamiki's haiku is designed to fill. But although we can be grateful to Minear for introducing these poems, his treatment of them remains superficial, never getting much beyond such vague evaluative words as "impressive" and "effective." Daniel Zins then offers a thoughtful and persuasive treatment of deterrence theory in Arthur Kopit's satiric play *End of the World.* Though his analysis of strategic "thought" is on target, the earnest tone of the essay seems incongruent with the play's dark comedy, and its focus on deterrence makes it one of the few here that seems dated (admittedly, through no fault of the author). It is followed by Nancy Anisfield's incisive explication of the ethical concerns in Rick DeMarinis' "Under the Wheat," (about a man who repairs sump pumps in missile silo sites), a fine story that merits more attention. Anisfield's long introduction, however, does not clearly set up her reading of the story, and she misses the chance to return to some of the other texts mentioned at the beginning. Nevertheless, all three of these essays help to expand the canon of nuclear criticism, and the latter two make important contributions to the field.

Feminism and female authors and filmmakers are the subjects of the next several pieces, beginning with H. Wayne Schuth's short exegesis of the film *Testament* and Paul Brians' "Nuclear Family/Nuclear War." Though Schuth's well-written piece rarely delves much beneath the surface, it does contain some perceptive observations on the film's Pied Piper motif. Brians' excellent comparative article, reprinted from the special nuclear issue of *Papers on Language and Literature,* will already be familiar to most ISSNTC members. Drawing from his awesome erudition in the field, his contribution discovers numerous illuminating affinities and contrasts among *Testament* and two novels of the fifties, Helen Clarkson's *The Last Day* and Judith Merril's *Shadow on the Hearth.* Still, I question the value of including this piece—barely more than a year old—in a volume directed at a fairly specialized audience.

Helen Jaskoski's contribution compares Martin Cruz Smith's *Stallion Gate* and Leslie Marmon Silko's *Ceremony,* deftly exposing the masculine, rationalist ideology behind the pursuit of military and technological superiority. In treating two novels by and about Native Americans, she offers Native American religious philosophy and ecofeminism as alternatives to the metaphysics of exploitation that typifies Western science and technology. Though occasionally her comparisons seem mechanical, Jaskoski's essay, like all the best ones here, goes beyond mere analysis of postholocaust stories to mount a critique of the habits of thought that have created the possibility for such a holocaust. Similarly, Lee Schweninger's illuminating reading of Tim O"Brien's *The Nuclear Age* finds an ecofeminist viewpoint at the heart of O'Brien's novel of nuclear paranoia. Though I think Schweninger exaggerates the ecofeminist message in the novel, nonetheless his essay fits well with Jaskoski's as both persuasively show that a revolution in thought must occur before we can hope for meaningful changes in the political or technological status quo.

The last two pieces in the volume take radically different approaches to Kurt Vonnegut's imagination of disaster. Tom Hearron explores the theme of guilt, while Jerome Klinkowitz examines Vonnegut's "ultimate;" the pairing produces a lively debate about the extent of Vonnegut's pessimism: Hearron presents it uncritically, whereas Klinkowitz's more subtle reading teases out ways that Vonnegut contradicts himself. Even if it is true that, as Hearron argues, Vonnegut believes human beings are "too hilariously stupid to survive," the critic has an obligation to challenge or at least interrogate this view. But I'm not convinced that even Vonnegut truly believes that human beings are totally at the mercy of implacable and malign forces beyond our control, as Hearron contends. Such a philosophy is morally repugnant because it sanctions precisely the quietism and despair that might bring about nuclear cataclysm: it's nobody's fault, and it's destined to happen, so why fight it? In any case it would seem pointless to keep reminding us of our stupidity and destructiveness if we can do nothing to change these flaws. As Klinkowitz argues, however, Vonnegut's persistence implicitly rebuts his overt pessimistic determinism: he does, after all, keep on writing, as if someday he will force us to see our errors and thus help us to correct them. Klinkowitz suggests that in fact for Vonnegut stories help us make sense of our world and may even prompt us to try to change it. Unfortunately, neither essay can rescue Vonnegut from his own failures. Can we finally take seriously a writer who claims that all human problems can be blamed on having brains that are too large? Even if one grants its metaphoric pertinence as a critique of rationality, obviously the problem is not the size of our brains but how we use them. Nevertheless, these two essays, in presenting dissenting views on a single writer, bring the collection to a stimulating conclusion.

I have two general complaints about the volume. First, the editing is erratic: the form of the Works Cited pages varies from essay to essay, and the copy editing is sometimes sloppy. Second, I question the editor's inclusion of so many reprints of fairly recent articles: surely most readers interested in a volume about nuclear texts will have already read the pieces by Brians, Franklin and Dorris-Erdrich, and some will have read Caputi's. These two problems reduce, though they don't obviate, the volume's readability and value.

In most ways, however, this is a valuable collection that brings a broad range of approaches to a number of important and familiar texts, while also bringing to our attention a number of less familiar texts. The essays by Branscombe, Jaskoski, Caputi, Brians and Franklin are worthwhile; Scheick's is indispensable. Perhaps most importantly, nearly all of them explicitly or implicitly address the question I raised at the beginning of the review: what role can nuclear criticism play in a post-Cold War world? As several of the contributions here fruitfully remind us, nuclear weapons are merely the ugliest and most dangerous manifestation of our obsession with finding technological solutions to moral and politi-

cal problems, of our love of violence, of our carelessness about our place in the natural world. Scheick's final description of the operations of the best nuclear texts thus bears quoting: "In deconstructing our comfortable reliance on the nature of language...time (memory), and reality (mimesis)," authors of the most valuable nuclear texts "create fantastical fiction as self-consuming artifacts designed to disorient and then to provoke reconstructive thought in their readers" (82). These remarks also imply that nuclear critics must construct new methods that will keep nuclear criticism relevant in the post-Cold War world and thereby help to make that world more livable.

Mark Osteen
Loyola College in Maryland

New Scholarship

Brians, Paul. "Fiction for Learning About Nuclear War." *COPRED Peace Chronicle* 16: 3&4 (June/August 1991): 11-12. An annotated bibliography published by the Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development.

Caputi, Jane. "The Metaphors of Radiation, Or, Why A Beautiful Woman Is Like a Nuclear Power Plant." *Women's Studies International Forum* 14 (1991): 423-442.

___ . "The New Founding Fathers: The Lore and Lure of the Serial Killer." *Journal of American Culture* 16 (1990): 1-12.

Eisenberg, Anne. "Quantum English." *Scientific American* 265 (October 1991),p. 134. A brief, informal essay on the popular use of scientific terminology, including comments on nuclear language.

Gery, John. "The Sigh of Our Present: Nuclear Annihilation and Contemporary Poetry." *World, Self, Poem: Essays on Contemporary Poetry from the "Jubilation of Poets."* ed. Leonard M. Trawick. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1990. Pp. 72-93.

Royle, Nicholas. "Nuclear Piece: *Memoires* of *Hamlet* and the Time to Come." *Diacritics* 20:1 (1990): 39-55. An intertextual reading of Derrida's *Memoires: For Paul de Man, Hamlet* and the 1984 "Nuclear Criticism" issue of *Diacritics,* focussing on ghosts, memory and mourning.

Schwenger, Peter. "Circling Ground Zero." *PMLA* 106:2 (1991): 251-261. Derrida, *Riddley Walker,* and the image of ground zero. An excerpt from his recently completed work *Letter Bomb: Nuclear Holocaust and the Exploding Word.*

___ . "Nuclear Critics and the Monstrous New." *Dalhousie Review* 70:1 (1990): 56-67. Themes of mutation and monstrosity orient a discussion of Spencer Weart's *Nuclear Fear* and J. Fischer Solomon's *Discourse and Reference in the Nuclear Age.*

Forthcoming Scholarship

Clarke, I. F. *Voices Prophesying War.* Oxford University Press. A new, revised, expanded and updated edition of this classic bibliography of future war fiction, due out around September, 1992.

Hugh Gusterson: "Nuclear War, The Gulf War, and the Disappearing Body." *Journal of Urban and Cultural Studies.*

___ . "Ending the Cold War Narrative." *Tikkun.*

___ . "Nuclear Weapons and the Other in the American Imagination." *New York University Center for War, Peace, and Media Studies.*

Larabee, Ann E. "'Hiroshima, U.S.A.': The City in Nuclear Discourse." *Canadian Review of American Studies,* Fall 1991.

Calls for Papers

Indians and the Bomb

Call for contributions to *The Heart of Knowledge: Indians on the Bomb.* edited by Jane Caputi and Paula Gunn Allen.

The atom bomb was built and developed on Indian lands in New Mexico. Uranium mining and milling on Laguna and Navajo lands soon followed. Those at greatest risk from the toxicity of the Hanford weapons plant are the members of the 8 tribes who depend upon the Columbia River, now "the most radioactive river in the world," for food and water. Reservations continue to be targeted for test sites and waste dumps.

Clearly, American Indians have been on the front lines of nuclear development and this legacy is reflected by a marked attention to nuclear themes in American Indian thought and literature. There we see that Native Americans have approached the bomb not only in resistance to exploitation, but as philosophers, drawing upon tribal thought and tradition to discern the metaphysical meanings of the nuclear age (an intellectual resource almost unilaterally ignored in Euro-American discussions of nuclear technology and culture).

Tribal traditions teach that in order to find an antidote to a poison, one must look in its immediate vicinity, for nature places the harm in close proximity to a cure. The premise of this anthology is that American Indian thought and literature provides a heart of knowledge, with essential insight into what might constitute a "cure" for the nuclear dilemma as well as what might be the beneficial implications of the advent of nuclear technology for world consciousness and culture. We are soliciting all types of expression: poetry, short stories, essays, graphic arts, songs, etc. Until we make arrangements with a publisher, we are not able to say what fees we can pay for materials. Please send inquiries or submissions by August 1991 to Jane Caputi, American Studies, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131 and Paula Gunn Allen, English Dept., UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90024.

Film and the Bomb

A special issue of the *Journal of Popular Film and Television* is now being planned around the topic of "Nuclear Film and Television." Guest editor for the issue is Jane Caputi.

It is commonly accepted that many of the science fiction films of the 1950s were about "the Bomb." Going beyond this, it is the premise of this issue that popular film and television since about the late 1930s and across all genres continually have engaged with nuclear issues, both overtly and subtextually, in love, hate, fear, awe, mockery and all shades of political statement.

We seek articles that cover that wide range of political, intellectual, emotional, and critical perspectives, addressing any asect of nuclear technology, consciousness, or culture in any genre of fiction and non-fiction film and television.

Papers should be MLA style (first edition) with end notes, double spaced, from 2,500 to 5,000 words in length, and written for an interdisciplinary audience. There are no esoteric distinctions between "television," "video,", "network television," "public television," "cable television," or "independent video" controlling the editorial policies of the *Journal of Popular Film and Television.*

Address any questions and send three copies of manuscripts with a self-addressed stamped envelope to:

Jane Caputi, American Studies, University of New Mexico, Alburquerque, NM 87131 by January, 1993.

New Fiction

Agawa Hiroyuki. *Citadel in Spring: A Novel of Youth Spent at War* (Orig. *Haru no shiru.* Tokyo: Shinchosha, 1949). Trans. Lawrence Rogers. Tokyo & New York: Kodansha International, 1990. An autobiographical first novel by the author of *Devil's Heritage* (1957). A young man from Hiroshima stumbles into a career in cryptoanalysis for the Japanese military during World War II. Chapters 10 and 11 depict the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and its aftermath in graphic detail, but with more detachment than *Devil's Heritage.*

Ballard, J. G. "The Secret History of World War 3." Originally published in *Fantasy & Science Fiction,* 1988. In *War Fever.* London: Collins, 1990. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1991. A brief satire in which everyone is so mesmerised bycontinous reports on the health of the senile third-term President Reagan, that they fail to notice that he has launched and nuclear strike against the Soviet Union, starting a war which ends in just four minutes with nuclear explosions in deserted parts of Alaska and Siberia.

Beam, Alex. *The Americans Are Coming!* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991. The novel begins with the U.S.S.R. lauching a surprise nuclear attack on the U.S. which is defeated by American S.D.I.-style defences. The Soviet Union is conquered, though no military damage is described. What follows is a comic novel about futile U.S. attempts to impose Western market and democratic values on Soviet citizens. The author assumes that Gorbachev will be forced from power by hard-liners.

Clancy, Tom. *The Sum of All Fears.* New York: Putnam, 1991. A varied group of terrorists tries to transform a damaged Israeli nuclear bomb into a usable weapon which will trigger a holocaust.

Drake, David. *The Jungle.* New York: Tor, 1991. A war story set on Venus after Earth has been destroyed by a nuclear war. A sort of sequel/tribute to Henry Kuttner's *Clash by Night* (1943), which it reprints.

Emecheta, Buchi. *The Rape of Shavi.* London & Nigeria: Ogwugwu Afor, 1983. A group of Europeans use a specially shielded plane to flee what they (mistakenly) think is the outbreak of nuclear war and crash-land in a remote area of Africa, near a village named Shavi which has never encountered whites before. The results are disastrous for the Africans. The author is a well-known Nigerian woman writer.

Files, Meg. *Meridian 144.* New York: Soho Press, 1991. A woman survives World War III while scuba-diving off a tropical island modelled after Guam. She muses at length about her past life, including a string of loveless affairs; and is finally drawn to a fantatical survivalist who seems to promise hope. But when she discovers that he is bent on killing all other survivors except herself she realizes that he represents the sort of thinking that caused the nuclear war in the first place. She kills him and prepares to settle in with a kind Japanese man and her faithful dog. A woman's survival novel with much emphasis on male destructiveness and rape.

Gery, John. "Speech for a Possible Ending." (poem) *Verse* 7:2 (Summer 1990), 86.

Henrick, Richard P. A series of near-war nuclear submarine thrillers published by Zebra Books, with titles like *Silent Warriors* and *The Phoenix Odyssey,* evidently aimed at cashing in on the *Hunt for Red October* market.

McQuinn, Donald E. *Warrior.* New York: Del Rey, 1990. A dozen cryogenically preserved military personnel awake in a shelter five hundred years after a devastating bacteriological and nuclear war has plunged a largely depopulated America back into barbarism. The tribespeople call toxic hot spots "radpads," and tell legends of the cursed giants who built the ancient cities. Mathematics and writing are rejected. Women are subordinate, but dominate religion.

Peters, Ralph. *The War in 2020.* New York: Pocket Books, 1991. A World War III scenario with the Soviet Union plunged into civil war, the U.S. siding with Russia. A fanatical coalition has destroyed Israel with nuclear and chemical weapons at some point in the past, leading to a world-wide ban on nuclear weapons. The U.S. nevertheless uses a "small-yield nuclear weapon" against Pretoria; but South Africa's allies, the Japanese, successfully defend them and dominate the rest of the world with their monopoly on high-tech weapons. American guts and will finally prevail over Japanese technology. A warning against trust in Soviet reform and nuclear disarmament.

Robinson, Kim Stanley. "A Sensitive Dependence on Initial Conditions," in *Remaking History.* New York: Tor, 1991. An experimental meditation on the consequences of the bombing of Hiroshima.

Silman, Roberta. *Beginning the World Again: A Novel of Los Alamos.* New York: Viking, 1990. The story of the wife of a fictional scientist who is working on the Manhattan Project. Focusses on her love affair with another scientist and the attempts of a Niels Bohr figure to prevent the use of the bomb against Japanese civilians. Cf. Pearl Buck: *Command the Morning* (1959).

Note: Collier Nucleus has published new editions suitable for classroom use of two classic novels relating to nuclear war: Kate Wilhelm's *Where Late the Sweet Birds Sang* and Edgar Pangborn's *Davy.* **PB**

Other Fiction

A few nuclear war novels not previously mentioned in *NT&C:*

Bradley, John. *Illustrated History of World War Three.* London: Omega, 1982. Depicts Russian attack on NATO. French erase Kiev with nuclear weapons; Russians retaliate on Lyons. There is a pause, then the Russians propose an armistice. A world disarmament conference follows. The author is a an expert on Soviet politics.

Brady, Michael. *American Surrender.* London: Michael Joseph, 1979. An on-the-brink story of Russian plot to force the President into total surrender. Ends with first lady reading Russian statement: "On the stroke of midnight we shall saturate your country with nuclear bombs."

Guha, Anton-Andreas. *Ende: A Diary of the Third World War.* (Originally *Ende.* Taunus, 1983). Trans. Fred Taylor. London: Corgi, 1986. Account of an East/West confrontation; nuclear exchanges wipe out most of Germany.

Wagar, W. Warren. *A Short History of the Future.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989. A lively, interesting history of the future. The first book ends with "The Catastrophe of 2044:" nuclear war, universal devastation etc. Remaining two books devoted to restoration of humankind and the coming of a utopian world state. **I. F. Clarke**
Milton Under Wychwood

Films & TV: New and Forthcoming

According to *Variety*, as of 4 November, *Terminator 2: Judgment Day* had a world-wide cumulative box-office of US $375 million, more than half of which ($200M) came from US and Canadian sales. With further international release dates ahead *T2* is (pre)destined to be one of the most successful films of all time. [*It also contains the most vivid and accurately filmed scenes of nuclear devastation to ever come out of Hollywood, and can be seen as James Cameron's anti-nuclear answer to his own earlier surivalist message in the original* Terminator. *Like James Cameron's preceding progressive thriller,* The Abyss, Terminator 2 *should be seen by every person concerned with nuclear war imagery, since it is reaching a far larger audience than any previous film on the subject, probably including* The Day After. **PB**]

The following dramas were either recently released or are currently in production/awaiting release.

Films

August Rhapsody (Dir. Akira Kurosowa). An old woman recounts her Nagasaki A-bomb experience to shocked grandchildren.

The Bergen Conspiracy (Dir. Leidulv Risan). Drama about a nuclear coverup. *Godzilla vs King Ghidorah* (Dir. Kazuki Omori). "Transcending time to wreak destruction! Past, present and future. Godzilla battles the evil three-headed monster... and tramples humanity!'

Blue Sky (Dir. Tony Richardson). Officer's wife finds herself in the middle of a military coverup of nuclear tests.

Bullseye! (Dir. Michael Winner). Crooks posing as nuclear fusion scientists plan a major diamond heist. *Class of Nuke'Em High Part II: Subhumanoid Meltdown* . Accident prone nuclear plant creates mutants amongst students and squirrels.

Neon City (Dir. Monte Markham). Post-nuclear(?) holocaust tale set in the American desert.

Night of the Assassins (Dir. Ted V. Mikels). Nuclear detonators are stolen for international blackmail from the US by Third World weapons dealers.

TV Movies

Black Angel (Dir. John Mostow). Jet pilot tries to stop a psychotic student flyer from dropping his nuclear payload. *By Dawn's Early Light* (Dir. Jack Sholder). Russia and the US approach the brink of nuclear war from a runaway B-52.

TV Series

Action Theater: Warlords. In a post-nuclear, radioactive future, two youths team up to eliminate an evil warlord.

Captain Planet and the Planeteers: Year II. Environmentally aware superhero fights nuclear contamination and other disasters.

Back to the Future. Cartoon spin-off from film trilogy features time-tripping adventures aboard a nuclear fusion-powered De Lorean.

Superboy. Weekly series follows the adventures of the adolescent nuclear superhero.

Toxic Crusader. Animated adventures of deformed superheroes combating toxic and nuclear contamination.

Triple Play II: Peacemaker. In the 1950s a child fears an atomic attack from Russia will arrive at any moment.

Mick Broderick
Australian Film Commission
North Sydney

Seventeen Minutes to Midnight

"Daniel Zins—there's another one!" This, Ira Chernus informed me at last August's COPRED conference, was his reaction upon learning that I would be giving a COPRED workshop on "Achieving Environmental Security: The Role of Ordinary Citizens." What he meant, of course, was that here was yet another individual who, preoccupied with the problem of nuclear weapons during the 1980s, was now turning his attention to the possibility of *environmental* holocaust.

Rejoining that I had by no means already "forgotten" about the tens of thousands of genocidal weapons that had not yet been beaten into plowshares, I explained to the author of *Dr. Strangegod* (and two other books on the bomb) that I would continue to grapple with the nuclear predicament (and the larger problem of militarism) even as I would also be redoubling my efforts to become more knowledgeable about environmental issues. I added that not only most ordinary citizens, but far too many educators as well, appeared to have little awareness that the problem of nuclear weapons and militarism, and the widespread poisoning of our air, land, and water, are in many ways indissolubly linked.

I realize, of course, that this is hardly a novel insight. Even before nuclear winter theorists promulgated their startling (and still controversial) findings, it should have been obvious to anyone who gave the matter more than a modicum of thought that the large-scale use of thermonuclear weapons would cause catastrophic environmental damage. What has been much less axiomatic is that—even if they are never again used in actual "warfare"—nuclear weapons have already been responsible for enormous environmental devastation. Assessing the extent of the military's damage to the environment, writes Michael Renner,

> is akin to opening Pandora's box: the number of U.S. sites on which problems have been spotted mushroomed from 3,526 on 529 military bases in 1986 to 14,401 on 1,579 installations in 1989. In addition, more than 7,000 former military properties are being investigated. Some 96 bases are so badly polluted that they are already on the Superfund National Priorities List. But Gordon Davidson, deputy director of the Federal Facilities Compliance Task Force of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), believes as many as 1,000 military sites may eventually be added to the priorities List. "Cleanup" is proceeding at a snail's pace, and appears designed primarily to preclude any further deterioration. Meanwhile, new wastes are generated each day, though the Pentagon has said it wants to cut the volume in half by 1992.1

It is not merely armed conflict itself, then, but also the relentless *preparations* for it, that should concern everyone who cares about the health of the planet's ecosystems. In 1978 Elaine Douglass observed the most people did associate the nuclear power industry with potential radiation hazards, and also feared the possible theft or diversion of its weapons-grade nuclear materials. "But the environmental and security dangers of the U.S. nuclear weapons programs," she added, "are at least as serious."[2] Nearly another decade would elapse, however, before most Americans would begin to find out just how serious these dangers truly are.

It was Dwight Eisenhower who warned that "the problem in defense is how far you can go without destroying from within what you are trying to defend from without."[3] Eisenhower, of course, was somewhat belatedly sounding the tocsin about the perils of the "military-industrial complex," which continues to undermine

American democracy in fundamental ways. But only during the past few years have most Americans become cognizant of yet another malignant repercussion of the nuclear national security state, namely, the military's "war on the environment," which has already destroyed a not insignificant portion of the very nation it has ostensibly been defending.[4]

More than a few individuals who have written about the nuclear arms race have acknowledged, however cursorily, that even if we manage to avoid nuclear war, it is entirely possible that we could still destroy ourselves by other means. In her preface to *Living With the Bomb* (1985), Dorothy Rowe asseverates that

> the rate at which we are despoiling the planet, cutting down the trees on which our oxygen supply depends, polluting the oceans, killing the life that exists in our rivers and lakes, disrupting the delicate network of life on earth, means that if we do not come to our senses and seek to preserve rather than destroy, then this planet will be unable to continue to support human life for much longer. Meanwhile, as our population increases so does the devastation by natural disasters, created or aggravated by the stripping of the forests and the poverty which forces more and more people to live in disaster-prone areas.[5]

A.G. Mojtabai concludes *Blessed Assurance: At Home with the Bomb in Amarillo, Texas*, her illuminating and beautifully written account of fundamentalist Christians and others who have managed to live with the bomb in Amarillo—the final assembly point for all U.S. nuclear weapons—with a brief commentary on the city's 1976 *Environmental Assessment Report.* Looking at the listing for mammals, Mojtabai could find only one—the black-footed ferret—marked as an endangered species. Oddly omitted from this list, of course, is the human species, *homo sapiens.* The literal meaning of *sapiens* (from *sapere*), Mojtabai notes, is to taste. But the transferred meaning is "to discern, to think, be sensible, be wise."[6] *Blessed Assurance* is an eloquent reminder that in our time—when the planet's species are being decimated at a rate perhaps 1000 times faster than in evolutionary history—the beginning of wisdom is not serene confidence in divine rescue from nuclear or environmental holocaust, but rather taking personal responsibility for the well-being of the planet and ail its life-forms.

Near the end of another disturbing study, *The Genocidal Mentality: Nazi Holocaust and Nuclear Threat*, Robert Jay Lifton and Eric Markusen observe that the "species awareness" which will be necessary to prevent future holocausts

> inevitably extends to the habitat of all species, to the earth and its ecosystem. Our relationship to the sun, to the oceans, to the earth's resources of food, energy, and materials of every kind, to all animals and plants—becomes intensified as both we and that ecosystem are simultaneously threatened. We experience a deepened respect for all animals that inhabit the greater ecosystem with us, and we question assumptions of human entitlement that permit us to abuse these fellow inhabitants of ours.[7]

During the 1980s, we began hearing with greater and greater frequency that, with the exception of the threat of nuclear war, the possibility of environmental collapse constituted the greatest peril to the future of humanity. In "The Greening of International Relations," Jim MacNeill reports that after four days of deliberations, a 1988 international conference in Toronto, on "The Changing Atmosphere: Implications for Global Security," concluded that humanity "is conducting an unintended, uncontrolled, globally pervasive experiment whose ultimate consequences could be second only to a global nuclear war."[8] In their recent book on the population problem, Paul and Anne Ehrlich cite the following 1988 warning from Club of Earth (whose members all belong to both the U.S. National Academy of Sciences and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences):

> Arresting global population growth should be second in importance only to avoiding nuclear war on humanity's agenda. Overpopulation and rapid population growth are intimately connected with most aspects of the current human predicament, including rapid depletion of nonrenewable resources, deterioration of the environment (including rapid climate change), and increasing international tensions.[9]

Yet, inexplicably, we are still hearing very little about overpopulation as a crucial national security issue. One exception to this pervasive silence was a special 1989 CNN presentation based on *Time* magazine's "Planet of the Year: Endangered Earth." "We have become a population bomb," CNN warned, "more insidious than any Hiroshima, exploding across the planet." Silent explosions, unfortunately, are easy to ignore.

When it became clear that the Cold War was indeed over, more and more commentators began to argue that the prospect of environmental holocaust was now to be taken *at least as seriously* as the specter of nuclear war. The introductory essay in the 1983 edition of Lester Brown's annual anthology *State of the World*, for example, asserted that the extraordinary pace of global climate change could "be compared with nuclear war for its potential to disrupt a wide range of human and natural systems, complicating the task of managing economies and coping with other problems."[10] In an April, 1990 *Harper's* symposium, "Only Man's Presence Can Save Nature," Gaia theorist James Lovelock warned that if present trends continued, humans will have razed 70 percent of tropical rainforests by the year 2000. Because the remaining trees will be unable to sustain the region's climate, additional trees will die, and "a billion people will be facing death and starvation. We will have a refugee problem and a political crisis as bad as a thermonuclear war."[11] Fearing that human beings may be extirpating as many as 100 of their fellow species a day, Mustafa Tolba, director-general of the United Nations Environment Program, has concluded that this loss of genetic material and concomitant environmental devastation has reached the point where "we face, by the turn of the century, an environmental catastrophe as complete, as irreversible as any nuclear holocaust."[12]

Such dire warnings, now being uttered with dismaying frequency, are finally beginning to influence our national security discourse, and also the thinking of at least some of our national security analysts. At least the *rhetoric* of national security discourse now not infrequently concedes that the very real possibility of environmental collapse has superseded the threat of nuclear war as the cardinal danger facing the human species. In the summer of 1989 *New York Times* columnist Tom Wicker wrote that "[t]he earth's capacity to support a rapidly expanding population is declining ominously," and thus ''environmental and population dangers...threaten humanity's well-being more certainly than nuclear war."[13] Reminding us that military security is irrelevant if our planet is unable to sustain human life, Patricia Mische contends that threats to Earth's life-sustaining processes, and thus ultimately to human survival, are now "as grave or even graver than those posed by the prospect of military invasion, including the prospect of nuclear conflagration." [14]

If many who have written primarily on nuclear weapons issues over the years have made it clear that they are also cognizant of the possibility of environmental holocaust, it is not uncommon to

encounter in environmental texts at least some discussion of the nuclear threat; not only because nuclear war obviously would be the ultimate environmental catastrophe,[15] but also because the mere building and testing of weapons of mass destruction causes extensive environmental damage, we do not have the luxury of forgetting about the bomb as we attempt to heal the planet's ecological wounds. In an essay originally published more than twenty years ago, Gabriel Rackre wrote: "'It is one minute to midnight on the ecological clock.' Some wonder whether it will be the sounds of nuclear explosion or the silent spring that will end it all—the bang or the whimper.''[16]

A significant number of the voluminous environmental writings which have appeared in the last several years allocate at least some attention to the threat of nuclear war. The most recent edition of a reader in conservation history, edited by Roderick Frazier Nash (author of the classic *Wilderness and the American Mind*), includes a chapter on nuclear winter. In his introduction to this essay, Nash notes that "only recently have we begun to grasp the catastrophic effect of nuclear war on nature.''[17] The penultimate chapter of an excellent interdisciplinary introduction to environmental studies is devoted to "Nuclear 'Defence'—or Conflict Resolution," an examination of the arms race, technological fixes like Star Wars, and the truly new modes of thinking which will be necessary if we are to devise more sensible, genuinely effective, non-nuclear alternative security systems.[18]

Similarly, the final chapter of Jonathan Weiner's *The Next Hundred Years: Sharing the Fate of Our Living Earth* warns that "[w]e are conducting an experiment as fateful as the one that took place half a century earlier near Alamagordo, New Mexico." But unlike the Trinity test in the desert, this experiment "is the most public experiment in history. It is a slow-motion explosion manufactured by every man, woman, and child on the planet.''[19] Other allusions to the bomb in environmental writings are not difficult to find. One of the poems in William Heyen's *Pterodactyl Rose: Poems of Ecology* is titled "Trident II: 720,000 Hiroshimas."[20] Two important anthologies on ecofeminism have made a number of references to the nuclear predicament. Ynestra King's essay in Judith Plant's *Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism* argues that because nuclear weapons do not "exist apart from a contempt for women and all of nature, the issue of disarmament and threat of nuclear war is a feminist issue. It is the ultimate human issue, and the ultimate ecological issue."[21] And a chapter by Susan Griffin in Irene Diamond and Gloria Orenstein's *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism* juxtaposes *three* different holocausts: Nazi, nuclear, and environmental.[22]

Rather than abruptly shifting our own concerns from nuclear war to global warming, tropical (and Pacific Northwest!) deforestation, and sustainable agriculture, perhaps we, too, can help our students to discover the manifold *connections* between and amongst various holocausts and our pressing social problems. Given the stunning improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations and the ominous pronouncements of many of our most respected ecologists and environmental scientists, this abrupt shift is certainly understandable. And it is hardly unreasonable. But if many environmentalists—even with the ending of the Cold War—clearly still do appreciate the urgency of confronting militarism and nuclear weapons, it would be more than a little ironic if those of us who have long grappled with this issue now complacently forget about the bomb as we turn our attention to environmental matters. Unbridled militarism has damaged, and continues to damage, the environment in countless ways, and efforts to restore the planet's ecosystems which at the same time ignore or minimize the global reach of the military's continuing war on the environment seem to me myopic, and ultimately doomed to failure.

The permanent war economy's costs to the environment, and to the disenfranchised, were pointed out more than two decades ago by Norman J. Faramelli in his discussion of the distrust of the "ecology fad" by the urban poor. For those living in America's ghettos, he wrote, ecology "has more to do with saving a certain marine species than eradicating rats from infested ghetto apartments!" Reminding Americans that environmental organizations, like the federal government itself, were almost totally neglecting the needs of the poor, Faramelli added that over 60 percent of every federal tax dollar was being squandered to finance past or current wars, or to to plan new ones. Faramelli also cited this challenge to environmentalists, proffered at a Harvard University Teach-in by Dr. George Wiley, Executive Director of the National Welfare Rights Organization:

It is going to be necessary to have substantial governmental expenditures for the programs of environmental control—that means you will be directly competing with poor people for very scarce government dollars. And if you are not in a position to mount a confrontation with the military-industrial complex, if you are not prepared to join with the poor people in saying that the war in Vietnam has got to end, that we've got to stop military imperialism around the world, that we've got to cut out the wasteful military expenditures...quite clearly poor people will pay the cost of your ecology program.[23]

It is becoming increasingly clear that the costs of environmental deterioration and pollution, like innumerable other burdens, are not borne equally by all members of our society, a disproportionate share of toxic waste dumps, for example, are located in poor and minority communities. Even more opprobriously, the United States and other voracious consumer cultures have begun shipping their surfeit of refuse to various impoverished nations in exchange for badly-needed capital.[24] Combating both environmental racism and toxic imperialism should be no less of a priority for environmentalists than reducing extravagant military budgets which, even after the end of the Cold War, continue to squander hundreds of billions of dollars desperately needed for social justice concerns and environmental restoration. If most of us who only a few short years ago evinced such deep concern about the bomb no longer feel compelled to confront global militarism, but choose instead to devote our energies to environmental concerns merely, the ironic result might very well be that millions of the planet's most vulnerable human beings—not to mention billions of its even more defenseless flora and fauna—will become the next victims of the military's war on the environment.

Anna Bramwell, in her *Ecology in the Twentieth Century: A History*, vituperates the German Greens "for most unecological behavior—donating part of their public funding to antinuclear groups, Third World causes, and immigrant workers, as opposed to using it for 'tree-planting or river cleaning [where] the ecological stance would have been more convincing."'[25] Similarly, we might recall that many civil-rights activists excoriated Martin Luther King, Jr., for having the audacity to condemn U.S. military involvement in Indochina. King, of course, was painfully aware that racism, poverty, and militarism were inseparable components of a larger problem—the terribly misguided priorities of his society—and that Mississippi and Vietnam were much closer than not only most Americans, but also many of his fellow civil rights workers, cared to admit.

"The failure to make connections," the narrator of E.L. Doctorow's novel *The Book of Daniel* insists, "is complicity."[26] Will we choose to remain oblivious to the deadly connections between the continuing militarization of our planet and its rapidly deteriorating ecological health? Or will we, like Martin Luther King, insist on a much more

inclusive and holistic analysis and vision? This question has been addressed by Denis Hayes, chairman of Earth Day 1990:

> Just as Martin Luther King was told to stay out of the war issue, we have well-intentioned friends and allies cautioning us to stay out of the battle over the defense budget. They warn us that we will dilute our impact if we spread ourselves too thin, and that defense is not an environmental issue. They also argue that we will alienate many potential supporters who have conservative military views if we attack the defense budget as bloated and misdirected. We must quietly, but firmly, reject that advice. We can never save the planet if mankind spends $1 trillion a year on instruments designed to destroy it.[27]

In his essay on the challenge of formulating a political strategy which would effectively link security and environmental concerns, Donald Snow observes that an increasing number of peace and environmental organizations are beginning to forge alliances based on a new vision, one that sees that "militarism, poverty, racism, the loss of homelands, and planetary environmental destruction have common roots."[28] If peace activists and educators are unable to discern these common threads, not only will it be far more difficult to solve any of these (seemingly discrete) "individual" problems, but it is quite possible that many or even all of them will be exacerbated.

The end of the Cold War notwithstanding, I submit that the demilitarization and democratization of global politics must remain one of our top priorities. If we fail to attend to this task, I fear that the nineties may very well turn out to be an environmental decade in name only.[29] In his excellent 1990 essay, "Nature in the Nuclear Age," Robert Finch observed that "[s]peeches and articles on the nuclear threat have acquired a sudden air of irrelevance, even quaintness.[30] The recent announcement by the editors of *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*—that they have moved the hands of their famous doomsday clock all the way back to seventeen minutes before midnight—will undoubtedly make such speeches and articles seem even more irrelevant and quaint. But for the countless denizens of our planet—human and non-human—who are still suffering and dying from the baleful effects of nuclear weapons production and testing, and the unrestrained global arms trade, the problem of militarism is anything but irrelevant or quaint. None of us should complacently assume that we, too, might not some day become yet another one of its unwitting victims.

Notes:

[1] Michael Renner, "Assessing the Military's War on the Environment," in Lester R. Brown et. al., *State of the World 1991* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1991), 143.

[2] Elaine Douglass, "Atom Bombs Also Pollute," *The Nation* (October 14, 1978), 361. On the military's war on the environment and environmental politics, see Renner, 132-152; John W. Birks and Anne H. Ehrlich, eds., *Hidden Dangers: Environmental Consequences of Preparing for War* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1990); Gareth Porter and Janet Welsh Brown, *Global Environmental Politics* (Boulder, Co.: Westview Press, 1991); the special issue of the Canadian magazine *Peace* 5:3 (June/July, 1989) devoted to "Militarism and the Environment"; Thomas F. Homer-Dixon, "On the Threshold: Environmental Changes as Causes of Acute Conflict," *International Security* 16:2 (Fall, 1991), 76-116; Thane Grauel, "Dishonorable Discharges: The Military's Peacetime War on Planet Earth," *E Magazine* 1:4 (July/August, 1990), 43-45, 64-65; Alan AtKisson, "Beating Swords into Solar Collectors: An Interview with Michael Renner," *In Context* 25 (Spring, 1990), 38-41; and Dick Russell, "In the Shadow of the Bomb: Cleaning Up After DOE," *The Amicus Journal* 12:4 (Fall, 1990), 18-31.

For an illuminating essay on possible conflicts between demilitarization and environmental restoration, see Trevor Findlay, "Green vs. Peace?: The Johnston Atoll Controversy," *Pacific Research* 3:2 (May, 1990), 3-7. (This journal is published by Australian National University.)

[3] Renner, 132.

[4] And, unfortunately, significant portions of many other nations as well. See Dan Grossman and Seth Shulman, "Over There: The U.S. Military's Toxic Reach," *Rolling Stone* (November 28, 1991), 39-40.

[5] (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985), viii.

[6] A. G. Mojtabai, *Blessed Assurance: At Home with the Bomb In Amarillo, Texas* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1986), 226.

[7] Robert Jay Lifton and Eric Markusen, *The Genocidal Mentality: Nazi Holocaust and Nuclear Threat* New York: Basic Books, 1990), 275.

[8] Jim MacNeill, "The Greening of International Relations," *International Journal* 14:1 (Winter, 1989-90), See also Dennis Clark Pirages, "The Greening of Peace Research," *Journal of Peace Research* 28:2 (1991), 129-133.

[9] Paul R. Ehrlich and Anne E. Ehrlich, *The Population Explosion* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1990), 18. In the introductory essay of his anthology on the links between military devastation and environmental exhaustion, Arthur Westing writes: "1945 ushered in the most momentous period in all human history for two basic reasons. The first of these—the dawn of the atomic age—was impressed upon the world by a brief series of cataclysmic events: the explosions at Alamogordo, Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The second of these was an occurrence of more subtle and diffuse, though equally grave,nature: an increase in human numbers that for the first time went beyondthe global carrying capacity. " ("Constraints on Military Disruption of the Biosphere: An Overview," in Westing, ed., *Cultural Norms, War and the Environment* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1988]).

[10] Lester Brown, Christopher Flavin, and Sandra Postel, "A World at Risk," in Lester Brown, ed., *State of the World 1989* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1989),.

[11] Only Man's Presence Can Save Nature," *Harper's* (April, 1990), 44.

[12] Quoted in John Seed, "Introduction: 'To Hear Within Ourselves the Sound of the Earth Crying,"' in John Seed et. al., *Thinking Like a Mountain: Towards a Council of All Beings* (Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 1988), 6.

[13] Tom Wicker, "Reality at the Summit," *The New York Times* (July 14, 1989), A29.

[14] Patricia M. Mische, "Ecological Security and the Need to Reconceptualize Sovereignty," *Alternatives* 14 (1989), 391.

[15] See Michael Allen Fox, "Nuclear Weapons and the Ultimate Environmental Crisis," *Environmental Ethics* 9:2 (Summer, 1987), 159-179.

[16] Gabriel Fackre, "Ecology and Theology," Ian Barbour, ed., *Western Man and Environmental Ethics: Attitudes Toward Nature and Technology* (Reading, Ma.: Addison-Wesley, 1973), 130. I should point out that Fackre immediately added that these were not the only possible futures.

[17] Roderick Frazier Nash, ed., *American Environmentalism: Readings in Conservatlon History*, third ed. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1990), 268.

[18] Mary E. Clark, *Ariadne's Thread: The Search for New Modes of Think*(New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989).

[19] Jonathan Weiner, *The Next Hundred Years: Shaping the Fate of Our Living Earth* (New York: Bantam Books, 1991), 241. Catherine Keller makes a similar observation in her essay on "born-again Christian apocalypticism and military-industrial consumerism." For Keller "the nuclear and ecological threats are twin manifestations of the same source: the unchecked power of the military/industrial establishment, subliminally inspired and justified by apocalyptic assumptions of an end of history." In her essay Keller emphasizes "that form of doomsday annihilation that is already well underway: in the moment-by-moment 'end of the world' proceeding through the tangible, cumulative, daily destruction of the physical environment." Catherine Keller, 'Women Against Wasting the World: Notes on Eschatology and Ecology," in Irene Diamond and Gloria Orenstein, *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1990), 250-1.

[20] (St. Louis: Time Being Books, 1991), 28-9.

[21] Ynestra King, "The Ecology of Feminism and the Feminism of Ecology," in Judith Plant, ed., *Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism (*Santa Cruz: New Society Publishers, 1989), 27.

[22] Susan Griffin, "Curves Along the Road," in Irene Diamond and Gloria Orenstein, *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1990). For additional feminist writings which attempt to make visible the linkages between and amongst militarism, poverty, health, and environment see Leonie Caldecott and Stephanie Leland, eds., *Reclaim the Earth: Women Speak Out for Life on Earth* (London: The Women's Press, 1983).

[23] Norman J. Faramelli, "Ecological Responsibility and Economic Justice," in Ian Barbour, ed., *Western Man and Environmental Ethics: Attitudes Toward Nature and Technology* (Reading, Ma.: Addison-Wesley, 1973), 193, 194.

[24] See Center for Investigative Reporting and Bill Moyers, *Global Dumping Ground: The International Traffic In Hazardous Waste* (Washington, D.C.: Seven Locks Press, 1990).

[25] Robert Gottlieb, "The Hazards of Eco-chic," *Tikkun* 4:5 (September/October, 1989), 70.

[26] E.L. Doctorow, *The Book of Daniel* (New York: Signet Books, 1972), 243.

[27] Denis Hayes, "Earth Day 1990: Threshold of the Green Decade," *World Policy Journal* 7:2 (Spring, 1990), 302. Barry Commoner, one of our foremost environmentalists, has made a similar point. Urging a 50 percent reduction in worldwide military expenditures to help resolve the environmental crisis, Commoner underscores that "sharply reducing the present global commitment to militarism....is not only a matter of money, for military expenditures divert resources from constructive uses in particularly crucial sectors of the economy. One of these is research and development, services that are vital to the transformation of production systems. Although military expenditures represent only about 6 percent of total world production, military research and development has been growing at twice the rate of overall military expenditures. As a

result, the military has now commandeered the services of about one-half of the world supply of scientists and engineers. " (Barry Commoner, *Making Peace With the Planet* [New York: Pantheon Books, 1990], 240.)

It is instructive to recall that during the 1980s antinuclear activists were cautioned that they would lose valuable mainstream support (and the support of various powerful vested interests that supported the arms race) if they failed to circumscribe their concerns to superpower nuclear weaponry, and dared to mount a more searching critique of the fundamental assumptions of American foreign policy. Many activists, cognizant of a "deadly connection" between the nuclear arms race and interventionist foreign policies, chose not heed this advice. For an incisive analysis of this quandary, see chapter 10, "U.S. Foreign Policy and Nuclear War," in William A. Schwartz and Charles Derber, *The Nuclear Seduction: Why the Arms Race Doesn't Matter and What Does* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990).

[28] Donald Snow, "Ecology Wars," *Nuclear Times* 8:1 (Spring, 1990), 48. It is noteworthy that Snow's essay appeared in a journal which began in the early eighties and then suspended publication by the end of the decade. The editor's note to the Spring, 1990 issue, marking the recrudescence of the magazine, explains that "[n]uclear disarmament and the effects of the Cold War will remain the core concerns. But we will use a wider scope to view the emerging issues of global security: the environmental crisis, human rights and social justice, and economics will gain our attention." (2.)

[29] Because I am convinced that the question of secrecy vs. democracy and accountability is paramount, I would urge educators to peruse the following two special issues of the very important journal, *Index On Censorship:* 18: 6&7 (July/August, 1989), on "Our Right to Know About Our Environment"; and 20:10 (November/December, 1991), on "Secrecy and Arms: Uncovering the Weapons Trade."

[30] Robert Finch, "Nature in the Nuclear Age," *New England Review/Bread Loaf Quarterly* 12:4 (Summer, 1990), 500.

Correspondence

Extract from a recent communication from Ian F. Clarke:

In the course of research I had a long session with General Sir John Hackett [author of *The Third World War: A Future History*, 1978], who, it turns out, lives near the next town west of here, at an old mill outside Cheltenham. He is quite remarkable: a scholar-soldier of distinction, with top degrees in classics from Oxford and a spell as the Principal of King's College, London University after he retired. He told me his WW3 book had sold over two million copies, had gone into 10 translations plus one in Rumanian now in preparation plus one pirated edition in Taiwan. I went from him to the publishers of his book—Sidgwick & Jackson—where I got more useful information from their chief director, William Armstrong. He told me that they are still publishing future war stories, but these no longer take place in Europe or the U.S. They now go on far away in China, Japan, and areas east of Suez.

Correction

In Dan Zins' article in Issue no. 6, some words were omitted from the passage at the bottom of the first column. It should read, "After all, some 50,000 nuclear weapons are still extant in our world, and it is not impossible that some of them, or even many of them, could someday be used on human populations. With concerted human action, some nuclear dangers will undoubtedly diminish, or even disappear, in the coming decades."

Queries

For a forthcoming article on *The Terminator* films, does anyone know of a Nintendo game based on *Terminator 2* ?

Less frivolously, I am seeking help locating Helen Clarkson or members of her family. Some years ago, she lent me her personal copy of *The Last Day*. At that point she was living in Boston. I have lost touch with her and would greatly appreciate the help of anyone willing to try to find out what has become of her. Write Paul Brians, Department of English, Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164-5020.

Order Form

Please send me the following:

- ☐ Issue no. 1 of *Nuclear Texts & Contexts* ($1.00)
- ☐ Issue no. 2 of *Nuclear Texts & Contexts* ($1.00)
- ☐ Issue no. 3 of *Nuclear Texts & Contexts* ($1.00)
- ☐ Issue no. 4 of *Nuclear Texts & Contexts* ($1.00)
- ☐ Issue no. 5 of *Nuclear Texts & Contexts* ($1.00)
- ☐ Issue no. 6 of *Nuclear Texts & Contexts* ($1.00)
- ☐ James R. Bennett & Karen Clark: *Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and the Bomb: A Bibliography of Literature and the Arts* ($2.00)

Name_____

Address_____

_____

_____

Send check made out to ISSNTC to:
William J. Scheick, Treasurer ISSNTC,
Department of English, Parlin Hall 108,
University of Texas
Austin, TX 78712-1164

Nuclear Texts & Contexts is the official newsletter of the International Society for the Study of Nuclear Texts & Contexts

Editor
Paul Brians
Professor
Department of English
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99164-5020
BitNet: BRIANS@WSUVM1

Nuclear Texts & Contexts is published using the computer facilities of the Humanities Research Center, Washington State University.

First Printing