

UC San Diego

Conference Proceedings

Title

MEND: A Nurturing Voice in the Nuclear Arms Debate, Working Paper No. 13, First Annual Conference on Discourse, Peace, Security, and International Society

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/80k1f2kq>

Authors

Mehan, Hugh
Wills, John

Publication Date

1988



University of California
Institute of Global Conflict
and Cooperation

MEND: A Nurturing Voice in the Nuclear Arms Debate

by

Hugh Mehan and John Wills

Working Paper No. 13

Series edited by James M. Skelly

First Annual Conference on
Discourse, Peace, Security and
International Society

Ballyvaughn, Ireland

August 9-16, 1987



**MEND: A Nurturing Voice
in the Nuclear Arms Debate**

Hugh Mehan and John Wills

Department of Sociology
University of California, San Diego

Working Paper No. 13
First Annual Conference on
Discourse, Peace, Security and
International Society

Ballyvaughn, Ireland
August 9-16, 1987

University of California
Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093-0068
1988

The conference held at Ballyvaughn, Ireland, in August 1987 was the beginning of an on-going international intellectual interchange on topics related to the discourse of peace and security and international society. It will include annual meetings, the second to be held in summer 1988, again in Ballyvaughn. Sponsored by the University of California Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation, the conferences are intended to foster general inquiry into these scholarly topics and to stimulate research and teaching that incorporates these perspectives at University of California campuses. This year's series of working papers comprises the writings which seventeen authors submitted to their colleague-participants in preparation for the 1987 conference. Some have been updated somewhat before publication here. Some have been published elsewhere and are reissued here by permission. The Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation hopes that these working papers will help to interest even more scholars in pursuing these lines of thought.

James M. Skelly
Series Editor

These papers are available at the IGCC printing and mailing cost of \$2.50 each. For air mail delivery to an address outside North America, add \$2. California orders add 6.5%.

The Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation is an interdisciplinary Multicampus Research Unit of the University of California, established by the Regents in June 1983. The mission of the IGCC is to promote research and teaching on international conflict and cooperation, with particular emphasis on threats and avoidance of nuclear war. The IGCC Central Office is located at the University of California, San Diego.

MEND: A Nurturing Voice in the Nuclear Arms Debate

Acknowledgements:

This research was funded by a grant from the University of California's Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation. We express our appreciation to IGCC and to MEND (especially Valerie Sacks and Jonna Faulkner) for allowing us to participate in and observe their activities. We also appreciate the assistance of our colleagues in the UCSD Discourse Group: Aaron Cicourel, Chuck Nathanson, Jim Skelly, Jim Wertsch and Sharon Hays.

Note about transcript conventions:

*// point at which the following line interrupts
[3] pause of [3] seconds
() something said but not transcribable
(we'd like to see it): probably what was said
how MEND began: heavy accent or stressing
= speech which is right on top of previous speech e.g.,
that you'll find// =wouldja alright*

* * *

Competing for the Meaning of Nuclear Weapons

... I would like to start by telling you how MEND began. Ballard's and my four daughters [1] and I took a very short trip to Washington D.C. on April seventeenth. It was an impromptu trip. On that [1] tour of Washington we stopped at the Vietnam War Memorial. And I was [1] not prepared for what I experienced there [1] what I saw. It was just your run of the mill day. Walked over from the Lincoln Memorial to the Vietnam War Memorial. Stood in front of this statue of these three men [1] a statue by Fredrick Hart. This is before I walked the wall with the fifty-eight thousand names on it and touched the names etched out. This [3] statue blew me away. Well what happened back there was that [1] I began to cry looking at the faces of these young men [1] thinking about Vietnam, just a gush of feelings, ran over me [2] and entered my my body. And my daughters looked at me crying and then they looked at the faces of the statue. And I could see that they were trying to figure out what it was that I was crying about. Why would mother be crying looking at these three men, these soldiers? I was struck that moment very powerfully by the realization, that I had **no explanation** for these children about what Vietnam was. Indeed I had no explanation about what war is.

On the flight home I decided I had to express my concern about the rapidly growing threat of nuclear destruction. I thought the best place to start would be with a march for peace in San Diego on August 6, to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima.¹

¹ Linda Smith interviewed by reporters at Hiroshima Day Rally, Balboa Park, August 6, 1985, recorded on MEND video, 1986; cf. *Los Angeles Times*, Sept. 22, 1985.

This experience was the inspiration which led Linda Smith, daughter of Joan Kroc, to organize an anti-nuclear group. Standing before the statue of the three men who represent the 58,000 American lives lost in the Vietnam war, Smith experienced an emotional response she was not prepared for. Out of this deeply felt personal experience, an educational organization whose long-term goal is multilateral, verifiable nuclear disarmament was born.

With statements like these (and others to be presented below), MEND ("Mothers Embracing Nuclear Disarmament") is struggling to redefine the meaning of nuclear weapons in U.S.-USSR relations. As part of a larger project mapping the discourse in the argument about nuclear weapons (Cicourel et al., 1987), we are studying the discourse and organization of MEND, a relatively new voice in the nuclear arms debate. From a stance outside of but acquainted with the organization (through observation, interviewing, and analysis of publicly available documents) we are asking:

- what is MEND's way of framing nuclear weapons and the arms race?
- what is the audience of MEND's message about nuclear weapons and the arms race?
- what rhetorical devices does MEND use to influence its audience?
- where can MEND be positioned in the conversational space of the nuclear arms debate?

Our ethnography of this new voice in the nuclear arms debate will enable us to say something about the kinds of interactions that are possible among competing voices and specify the moves that are successful in convincing or silencing opponents as one voice becomes dominant.

Before presenting details about the MEND frame; its nurturing language, its intended audience and rhetorical devices, we will provide a brief history of the group.

A Brief History of MEND

While MEND is by no means responsible for the creation of nuclear arms as a public problem--as Linda Smith says: "This is an issue that found me"²--MEND is an organization seeking "ownership" of the nuclear arms issue.

The concept of "ownership of public problems" is derived from the recognition that in the arenas of public opinion and debate all groups do not have equal power, influence, and authority to define the reality of the problem. The ability to create and influence the public definition of a problem is what I refer to as "ownership" (Gusfield, 1981: 10).

² *Los Angeles Times*, June 18, 1985.

The name of the group, Mothers Embracing Nuclear Disarmament, was chosen from a recognition that mothers could be a potent force in society:

I suspected there were many mothers who shared my feelings and countless others who would come to do so once they became aware of the danger under which we're living. I also knew mothers could be a potent force for change, as evidenced by the success of organizations like MADD, Mothers Against Drunk Driving. The name for our group evolved naturally from these ideas, and I liked the acronym, MEND, that resulted. It represented the nurturing, healing quality that mothers and fathers symbolize throughout the world.³

To position itself in the nuclear arms debate, MEND has established offices in San Diego and Washington, D.C., is establishing local chapters in other cities and working to build a national constituency. Persuading the public that the way MEND is framing this public issue is the correct one, as well as convincing the public that MEND is the organization capable of making a difference in this area, is a crucial first step in competing for ownership of the nuclear arms issue.

The first meeting of MEND was held in San Diego on May 1, 1985, and consisted of fifty of Linda Smith's friends. It was at this meeting that the work of organizing the Hiroshima commemoration "Walk for Peace" began. Eventually, more than 350 people became involved in these efforts, and the walk itself drew some 10,000 people and was considered a great success.⁴ The first chapter of MEND was established in San Diego on November 17, 1986. The guest speaker was Dr. Frank Garland, a member of the executive committee of Physicians for Social Responsibility. Leaders of other local anti-nuclear groups were also in attendance.⁵ Approximately 400 people attended the establishment of MEND's first chapter. Currently, MEND reports a local membership of 300 people, a national paid membership of 1,000, and a mailing list of 10,000. The organization plans to have 15 operational chapters by March 1988.⁶

MEND opened an office in Washington in May 1987. The Washington office will serve as a base for research and analysis of the government's activities which affect arms control and foreign policy, as well as a base for networking with other national peace groups.

Nuclear Discourse

The relations between the U.S., the Soviet Union, anti-nuclear groups, the "cold war lobby" and other participants in the Cold War take the form of a conversation, albeit one that

³ *Los Angeles Times*, Sept. 22, 1985.

⁴ *Los Angeles Times*, Sept. 22, 1985.

⁵ MEND Newsletter, Fall 1986.

⁶ MEND Newsletter, Summer 1987.

unfolds on a broader scale than the one we think of when 2 or 3 people get together for a chat. For example, the moves of a "Soviet General Secretary" provoke a response from a "U.S. President" which in turn engenders a response from "peace groups," "NATO allies," etc. Quotation marks were placed around "NATO allies" and the others in the previous sentence to indicate that these are simultaneously speakers in immediate events (e. g., across a conference table, in a news conference) and speakers in a broader socio-historical frame. These "voices" (Bakhtin, 1981; Voloshinov, 1986) respond to moves in the conversational past and project possible moves into the future. The process is essentially dialogic. Even though people may not be in the same room at the same time, they are still mutually influencing each other and reciprocally reacting to each other.

The moves that speakers make in nuclear discourse are aimed at defining the reality of the situation. The reality, "the social fact," being defined concerns the relations among the superpowers in the "Cold War" and the place of nuclear weapons in that system of relations.

Ever since the advent of nuclear weapons in the 1940s, competition for the definition of the nuclear situation has been evident. Some of the voices competing for the preferred definition of the nuclear situation are "preventative first use," "disarmament," "arms control." While this argument has been fluid and dynamic for the past 40 years, it is fair to say that at the present time in American history, the prevailing definition of the nuclear situation is "deterrence policy" (Brodie, 1946). A fundamental premise of this rhetoric is the idea that nuclear weapons are designed to deter the Soviet Union from launching an attack on the U.S. or its allies. Nuclear weapons are able to play this peace-keeping function because both the U.S. and the USSR are mutually assured of each other's destruction should either side launch an attack on the other. A fundamental principle of deterrence is retaliation. If one side uses nuclear weapons, then the other side will respond. The response will be so devastating in cost of lives, damage to political infrastructure, the economy, and the environment, that a nuclear attack would not be worth the price. In short, the cost of retaliation is greater than the benefit of aggression. The rhetoric of deterrence, then, makes nuclear weapons the centerpiece of U.S. national security because they have been perceived as sufficient to deter the Soviet Union's aggressive impulses. It is because the U.S. possesses nuclear weapons, is capable and ready to use them, that the Soviet threat is neutralized.

Deterrence policy is presented in a technical language which emphasizes the strategic implications of nuclear war. An example of this technical-strategic way of legitimating claims about nuclear weapons is provided by the late Herman Kahn, whose book *On Thermonuclear War* (1960), has had a great influence on nuclear strategy and strategic thinking. Kahn grounded his propositions about nuclear war in a highly technical language of kill ratios and throw weights while pitting the U.S. against the USSR in a distrusting war of democracy against godless communism:

The major quality that distinguishes this book from most of the other works in this field is the adoption of the Systems Analysis point of view--the use of quantitative analysis where possible....It is necessary to be quantitative. For example, in describing the aftermath of a war it is not particularly illuminating to use words such as "intolerable," "catastrophic," "total destruction," "annihilating retaliation," and so on...(pp. viii-ix).

Kahn translated deaths, destruction, even chromosome damage into columns of numbers, added those on one side, compared them to those on another, and in a burst of comprehensive rationality, decided who came out ahead. This "decontextualized" form of reasoning (Wertsch, 1987) allowed Kahn to argue, contrary to Brodie (1946), that under certain conditions, nuclear wars were winnable.

The MEND Frame: A Nurturing Discourse

There is no place for emotional pleas concerning the terrible consequences of nuclear war and the threat it poses for people in this frame. The way in which MEND is framing nuclear weapons and the arms race stands in stark contrast to this technical-strategic language. As we see in the quote attributed to Linda Smith above, MEND invokes images associated with motherhood and nurturance to kindle people's interest in nuclear issues:

The acronym MEND represented the nurturing, healing quality that mothers and fathers symbolize throughout the world.

Or consider the following:

I feel like I'm uh giving birth possibly to one of my daughters uh its not unlike that experience and indeed we are giving birth tonight to a new peace movement [1] called MEND, Mothers Embracing Nuclear Disarmament. We are here tapping maternal instinct, tapping maternal instinct, of all human beings, for the survival of our children and our planet.⁷

"Giving birth," "tapping maternal instinct," "overwhelmed by loss," this is vocabulary from a motherhood script. in which nurturance is depicted as a quality, a trait that all people possess. The biological and spiritual language of motherhood is reinforced by testimony such as the following:

Women have a very unique role and it must come into a new light and an entirely new perspective at this hour. Traditionally, as women and as mothers uh we have been conditioned to remain in the background. That must no longer be the circumstance. We are the source from which life has come [1] we must be the source which at this hour will prevent its extinction. MEND is an organization directed toward that cause. It's an amazing thing too how easy communication between mothers is. And how the communication in in say the United States can

⁷ Linda Smith addressing Hiroshima Day Rally, Balboa Park, August 6, 1985.

reach all over the world. Because motherhood is a common language. If you look into the face of a mother whose child has died in Vietnam look into the face of a mother in China who has lost a child through death. Someone in Africa through starvation. The language is immediate. The communication is instant. So MEND, Mothers Embracing Nuclear Disarmament, is uniquely designed to be a group that will carry this message through this language which is a common biological and spiritual thing, with mothers all over the world.⁸

This speaker is appealing to mothers to discard their traditional passive roles and take assertive action because motherhood is a common language. Mothers have the ability to change the world because they share a common biological and spiritual bond. Communication among mothers cuts across national and cultural boundaries, especially among those who have suffered in war or through disease or disaster.

The Audience of MEND's Message

Why should mothers be concerned about nuclear issues? MEND tells mothers that their children, their families, their futures are threatened by the possibility of nuclear war:

... there may not be a future. There may not be a world for our children to inherit. There may not be children.⁹

The threat of nuclear war is very real and very pressing. We all need to take action to preserve the world for our children and for generations to come.¹⁰

MEND was born of a desire to make the world a safer place for my daughters and for other children.¹¹

To secure a future for our children.¹²

Nuclear weapons should be a concern of families, then, because nuclear war can destroy families. Because of this potential destruction, MEND actively seeks the participation of parents in its organization, and portrays itself as an organization concerned with the welfare of families.

By framing the arms race in emotive, personal terms, MEND stresses the effects the threat of nuclear war has on parents, children, and families. By participating in MEND, mothers are provided not only with a vehicle through which they can act to change the nuclear reality, but also

⁸ Eva Garaglinio, Lector, Mary Star of the Sea Catholic Church, at MEND's Peace March, Balboa Park, August 6, 1985.

⁹ *Los Angeles Times*, February 23, 1987, Section II: pp. 1-4.

¹⁰ MEND Newsletter, Fall 1986: Maureen King, MEND National Development Program.

¹¹ Linda Smith, as quoted in the *Los Angeles Times*, Sept 22, 1985.

¹² Headline on the invitation to the establishment of the first MEND chapter in San Diego, California, Nov. 17, 1986.

with information or techniques geared to help them, as parents, and their children deal with their fears of nuclear war in their everyday lives.¹³ MEND is asking people to get involved in its organization for the sake of their children, to help create a more secure future in which their children can live. "Involvement" is couched in educational terms; members of MEND will "raise their awareness" of nuclear issues and "gain the information" which will help their children cope with living under the threat of nuclear war today. As MEND's 1986 brochure puts it:

Mothers Embracing Nuclear Disarmament (MEND) is an educational organization working to raise awareness of this threat and involve people in creating a safer world for our children.

MEND's Educational Message

Why do parents and children need to heighten their awareness, gain this information? MEND provides not one but two answers to this question. The first answer is to assume power in stopping nuclear war:

When parents can tell children that people can vote, that people can write their leaders, that people can be a part of peace groups in their communities and churches, they let a child know that the situation is not totally out of control. Children can learn to use actions in a positive way to help themselves feel less anxious.¹⁴

This brochure tells members the course of action they are to take once they have been educated about the issues: influence their leaders. A statement from Linda Smith, delivered to a group of recruits, reinforces MEND's commitment to this strategy:

And we're hoping for a statement from the public That's the goal [1] and it's very important for you to be informed first. But really, the essence of the walk will be a statement to the leaders of the world. We feel very uncomfortable, very insecure [1] about everyone having these bombs [1] that could destroy your life [1] your world [1] your planet. Our silence will kill us.

I'm also here to offer you a message of hope. We're in a dangerous time, and I really feel, more recently than ever, that we have a chance to be heard on the nuclear issue and that through our outcry that we will be heard from the leaders of the world. And they will **know** they must respond to our pleas for

¹³ Valerie Sacks, the Communications Coordinator for MEND, stated that at least 50% of the letters they receive asking about MEND are from concerned parents saying something to the effect that "I'm scared for my children" [about nuclear weapons]:

. . . at least fifty percent of our letters probably more, are "I'm scared for my kids." Or: "I'm pregnant and I'm scared for my kid" (okay) "or my grandkids," that is what's reaching people. (V. Sacks interview, February 26, 1987):

¹⁴ Children Wish For Peace brochure, no date.

disarming **all** of the nuclear weapons [2] that we have on the face of this earth multilaterally, mutually and verifiably. [1] It can be done, people. ¹⁵

Smith speaks in a similar voice to a group at a San Diego church:

If we remain silent about this [1] destruction is at hand. We no longer can. I am convinced that the only way this is going to turn around I use the term 'beyond absurdity,' if there is such a thing. We have to [1] have a public [1] international outcry on this. We're gonna have to band together people [2] we're gonna have to to stand up and scream and shout for our survival.¹⁶

Smith's emotional appeal exhorts people to take action, albeit a diffuse action: "cry out," "scream" and "shout." The response she expects is also diffuse: leaders will "respond" to the people's pleas. Details are not included in this invocation; she describes neither the specific actions that people are to take to influence their leaders nor the specific actions that leaders are to take once they have heard the people's pleas.

The diffuse nature of this appeal underscores the educational and establishment nature of the group. MEND is educational in that its mission is to educate citizens, who in turn will try and influence their leaders. MEND is traditional in that it is working within the system, through established channels of communication; it is not the kind of protest movement that exhorts its followers to sit-in at Livermore, withhold taxes for military spending, or put their bodies in the front of a weapons train. MEND is establishment in another sense: its organizational policies enable busy people (those with careers and families) to carry on their complex lives and join the movement: "**another** good thing about this organization is that there are numerous opportunities for very busy people to give just a little bit of their time, that joining MEND does not entail a full time commitment."¹⁷

The second answer to the question of involvement is less political and more personal, more familial. MEND tells parents how to help children cope with their fears of nuclear war. The following dialog occurred between volunteers at a task force meeting working on what was to become the Children Wish For Peace brochure:

15 Linda Smith at a recruitment coffee, MEND videotape.

16 MEND videotape.

17 Interview with woman, MEND videotape.

Woman 1: These are the notes that I took uh and it and it all still holds true.

Woman 2: Before you came to the first meeting?

Woman 1: When that first call you gave me

Woman 2: oh uh huh

Woman 1: Apolitical, August sixth, Tuesday, mothers, peaceful march, nuclear disarmament (general laughter) and that still all holds true here (awww) (a lot of jumbled laughter and talk)

Woman 3: Really (garbled) so moved by all these different committees that I am working with 'cause everybody is so, **terrific** and so **dedicated** and so **inspired** that I am just, I think for me personally one of the benefits of this is all the people that I've been working with they are just incredible. Now what this is two people, devoted hours to working together to come up with a copy for a potential brochure or just a giveaway sheet on how to help their children cope with the fears [1] of nuclear war[1] and I I'm not gonna bore you and I'll just skim it real fast but I think that you'll find // =(jumbled), we'd like to hear it)// =would ja alright. Children are particularly vulnerable to frightened feelings about nuclear war. All of the fears of childhood are stirred up for them when they begin to learn about nuclear war. Most children can **handle their fears** about nuclear war if **parents** will let them feel **free to talk** about their feelings and answer their questions. In simple words parents should ask their children what they are afraid of and listen to their concerns. Parents should **reassure** a child that adults are trying to keep their world safe.¹⁸

It is clear from this scene, and the brochure which emerged from the discussion, that at least a part of MEND's message is directed to parents and how they should deal with their children's fears about the threat of nuclear war. Parents are encouraged to discuss these traumatic issues and to encourage their children to do the same. Open discussion will relieve fear.

Commentary from a mother of five reinforces the image of MEND as a useful and helpful organization in relieving family fear about the threat of nuclear war:

It really serves a great purpose for us because and our children by the way we have five children, and they feel that as long as we're in agreement about what we're doing, then they are more comfortable about the issue at large because they feel that first of all we're doing something and secondly we're agreeing about what we're doing and so it's a very powerful combination.

¹⁸ MEND videotape.

Getting involved in MEND makes your children feel more comfortable with the nuclear reality because they will know you are trying to do something to prevent it.

Clearly, MEND is appealing to mothers and parents because of the threat nuclear war poses to families. There is another audience for MEND's message, as exemplified by the location of Linda Smith's inspirational experience. The Vietnam generation as audience for MEND's appeal was described on the MEND Videotape by Jack Wheeler of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund. According to Wheeler,

th the main thing that MEND is doing is is it's giving an effective channel for the sense of stewardship that those who are in our generation feel. And that generation has a name. You can think of it as the baby boomers but perhaps more accurately the Vietnam generation. We came of age, we made many wonderful things happen but also many terrible things happen. The point is, that after taking ten or twelve years of rest, of reflection, of starting our families, the most important urge that runs among all of us, that's gradually beginning to dawn on us and it's surfacing, it's surfacing in work like Linda's doing in MEND, is a sense of stewardship for our country.

MEND's Rhetorical Devices

To this point we have characterized MEND's maternal discourse, its bifocal educational message (become informed to influence leaders and become informed to relieve children's fears) and the audience of its message. Now we will turn attention to some of the rhetorical devices which MEND has used to address its audience.

MEND featured Kaz Suyeishi, a member of the executive committee of U.S. Atomic Survivors, at its Peace March. Ms. Suyeishi described her recollection of the bombing of Hiroshima:

As a (garbled) survivor like myself, it's not just because after the forty years every single year single month single days, pray for the peace. I wish I could forget about my horrible experience, but believe me no matter how I try it's impossible to forget. There was the day of the August sixth, it was a beautiful blue sky then I saw the silver colored angel. There was a B-29. I called it angel. It was a heaven. And just, one second, from heaven and a peace turned to be the hell. I saw the many people die, injured including myself, I was nearly died. That time I was eighteen years old, and my life was a (garbled). (But God gave me that the second life?). I don't wanna anybody to happen like we went through. No more Hiroshima, no more Nagasaki, no more Hibaksha [?]. Just peace.¹⁹

This speech is important because it is a personal, emotional statement by an ordinary citizen about the horrors of nuclear war. Defining nuclear war as a horrible unforgettable experience, as hell, privileges personal experience rather than the technical features of nuclear war as did Kahn (1960).

¹⁹ Kaz Suyeishi, at MEND's Peace March, Balboa Park, August 6, 1985.

The people who attended MEND's peace march were also treated to the comedy of Robin Williams, who is listed as a member of MEND's National Advisory Board:

God, I guess it's a very very special reason you're all here today 'cause [1] we all believe that we can by being here say "excuse me, excuse me, we uh we do care and, oop maybe not there (laughter) maybe we're a little too late." (garbled) gathered here people going noo, we do have time because, even even the people who run the missiles are going " 'scuse me uh it scares us too I don't wanna admit it but hahaha we don't know how these things work. We just they're they're so damn big "Come on down hi, I'm Casper Weinberger come on down to Weinberger's House of Missiles look at some of these wonderful missiles that you can have. This incredible multi entry vehicle, do you want to just launch a missile and have it get there on time this has " I know it's odd this little baby in the front is going "no more, no more." It's okay (responding to baby's scream) (laughter) Okay here's a fairy tale. There's no more war, all right? He's going "yes, and then what?" And there'll be no Veterans Day after World War Three. It'll just be one guy with three heads going "we won!" [4--laughter] So we all know that that's why we're hear we've got to spread the word because you know, you know if there is a nuclear war there'll just be one reverend reading from the *TV Guide* going "I'm going to read to you from the book of beaver again," so you got to know there'll be no more advent screens no more VCR just little people with shadow puppets going "look, there's HBO," no no. So you got to believe you're doin' something special can I get an amen? (Amen). Thank you power you know to put your hands together, out there you know the power's in your hands. Right now Billy Graham's going "well you makin' fun of me?" I'm just saying you're doing a good good thing and thank you very much for showing up today, it's for your children, it's for your own ass you know that too (laughter), and take care maybe we can do somethin' else again real soon. God bless you all. (Applause).²⁰

A number of important images are projected in this routine. One is the shared fear of nuclear weapons, the understanding that members of the audience are not alone in their fears of nuclear weapons. Robin includes members of the defense establishment among the fearful: "even even the people who run the missiles are going 'scuse me uh it scares us too.'" A second is Robin's portrayal of the absurdity of the arms race, both in his caricature of Casper Weinberger (and all the other pro-nuclear people he represents), and his portrayal of the aftermath of World War III, including the man with three heads saying "we won!" and the TV Evangelist reading from the *TV Guide*. This caricature serves to soften his just presented message of fear and reinforce MEND's position on the absurdity of the arms race. (Recall Linda Smith's statement to the group in the church quoted above: the nuclear arms race is "beyond absurdity".)

Finally, his routine reinforces the intended audience of the MEND message. Shots of the crowd laughing often show parents and their small children; he interacts with a baby in the audience: "I know it's odd this little baby in the front is going 'no more, no more.' It's okay" [responding to the baby's scream]. He ends with: "I'm just saying you're doing a good good thing

²⁰ Robin Williams, addressing MEND's Peace March, Balboa Park, August 6, 1985.

and thank you very much for showing up today, it's for your children." He is performing for everyone in attendance, to be sure, but he concentrates on the parents in the audience.

Ordinary citizens recalling personal experiences of nuclear war, Hollywood comedians mocking the absurdity of nuclear war, MEND reinforces these "humanistic" appeals with an auditory image of the destructive power of nuclear war, "a war without winners," by retired admiral Eugene Carroll, Jr., of the Center For Defense Information. After dropping one metal pellet into a bucket, the bing representing the total firepower of WWII fought from the air, then dropping two pellets into the bucket, the bing bing representing the total explosive power of WWII fought on the ground, he then **poured** enough pellets into the bucket to equal the total explosive power of the world's nuclear arsenal, the constant stream lasted for a deafening eighteen seconds. This very powerful demonstration portrays the destructive capability of existing weapons in easily understood visual imagery, which reinforces the "ordinary citizen" aspect of MEND's message.

MEND's Position in the Nuclear Arms Debate

Gusfield (1981:15) has noted the reflexive power of social movements, i.e., their ability to open areas of ambiguity in the social reality. Alternative ways of thinking and talking about particular areas of social life become available to individuals, where before there was only unquestioned belief in the facticity of the social reality:

The structure of public problems is then an arena of conflict in which a set of groups and institutions, often including governmental agencies, compete and struggle over ownership and disownership, the acceptance of causal theories, and the fixation of responsibility.

While MEND's framing of nuclear issues should be clear, the simple existence of this framing is not enough to make a useful prediction about the probable success of MEND as a voice in the nuclear arms debate. At the present time MEND is a very young organization, still much involved in refining its message and building a constituency. But if MEND's message continues to appeal to parents, it is possible that MEND may in fact capture ownership of the nuclear arms issue.

Before MEND can translate this public support into changes in American nuclear policy however, it will be challenged by groups which do not agree with its framing of nuclear issues. Up to this point, MEND has really only been in dialog with the voices of other anti-nuclear groups. If MEND does attract a large segment of the public, it will then find itself challenged by groups that do not view the nuclear arms race as a problem at all, but as our only salvation from the Soviet threat. To gain an understanding of this future opposition, it is useful to situate MEND in the conversational space of the nuclear arms debate.

Wertsch (1986) has identified two of the major dimensions of this conversational space. The first, "scope of identification," is concerned with the population identified by a voice in the debate. While the scope of identification can, logically, at least, extend from an individual to all beings in the universe, in the nuclear arms debate, one usually finds a contrast between identifying with one's own nation in opposition to other nations and identifying with all of humankind. The former, a "particularistic" scope of identification, invites an "us vs. them" stance. The latter, a "universalistic" scope of identification, typically engenders an attitude of "we're all in this together." The second axis concerns "modes of legitimation," i.e., the way of speaking to substantiate one's claims. Here a basic distinction is made between decontextualized and contextualized modes of legitimation. A decontextualized form employs abstract, formal (often technical) reasoning to validate positions, while a contextualized form invokes concrete particulars, emotional and other "human" factors.

There is considerable evidence in the materials we have reviewed in this paper that MEND is adopting a universalistic scope of identification²¹ in the competition over ownership of the nuclear arms race, i.e., the right to define nuclear reality. MEND frames the nuclear arms race primarily in the language of nurturance; nuclear war is the enemy of parents and their children. Furthermore, this focus on children could imply that MEND is rising above the particulars of nationality to a plane on which "we're all in this together" and the bomb is the enemy. Viewed in the context of recent MEND statements, however, particularly those concerned with "strong national defense,"²² the new thrust of MEND's message suggests a shift from a universalistic to a particularistic scope of identification. At first, MEND stressed people are united and the bomb is the enemy. Now it seems to say nations are pitted against each other and the USSR is the enemy of the United States.

While occupancy of the particularistic space in the nuclear arms debate has its significant strengths in recruiting the public, it will pose definite problems for MEND if it becomes a recognized, important voice in the nuclear arms debate. One problem is that the particularistic/contextualized frame can just as easily be used to support the arms race and a continued weapons buildup, including support for SDI, as it can be used to oppose it. In fact, this was done in a fund-raising form letter sent out by High Frontier, a private organization promoting

21 For example, in the first scene of the MEND video, Linda states that "having these bombs [3] that could destroy your life, your world [1] your planet" implies nuclear weapons affect all people. Likewise, in another scene "[w]e have to [2] have a public [1] international outcry on this."

22 "MEND recognizes the need for a strong defense, but believes that human survival depends on taking a new approach to national security" (MEND brochure, 1986). "It's also important to note that MEND supports the military; we believe we must have a strong defense" (*Los Angeles Times*, Sept. 22, 1985).

the development of SDI.²³ It was written in the form of a personal letter from Ruth Graham, wife of retired lieutenant general Daniel Graham, head of High Frontier. She "just had to write a letter to you before she and her daughters started doing the Thanksgiving dishes." This letter was brought to our attention by MEND staff people, who were very angry over it. Here are a few of its most relevant points:

That's what Dan always says--whenever people ask him why he works so hard and long for SDI and High Frontier.

He says, I do it for my grandchildren so that one day soon they may live secure from the devastating threat of nuclear war.

Our children and grandchildren are the reason we must have SDI!

Do you have a family? Do you too have a personal reason why you're so strongly involved in SDI?

That's why supporting High Frontier and SDI is so important now. It's our hope for a better future for our children and grandchildren.²⁴

In some ways, this is a more traditional presentation of a family frame than any contained in MEND's public statements; nuclear weapons and SDI are necessary to defend families. This position points out the difficulty MEND will face if it is to become a strong voice in the nuclear conversation: who is the more authoritative, legitimate voice in the particularistic space, one which supports nuclear arms, or one which opposes them?

At the basis of the competition for this conversational space is a disagreement over the nature of the Soviet threat. While MEND does accept that we are "at odds" with the Soviets, they feel that we can trust the Soviet Union to act in its best interest, just as they can expect us to do the same. They want to avoid a war and they know that they cannot outstrip us militarily. They lost over 20 million people in World War II and know the horrors of war first hand. They have selfish reasons for wanting arms control; they need the money for their economy and food and they do not want to have their civilization extinguished.²⁵

MEND may lose its legitimacy over this point. The view that the Soviets can be trusted is not popular in American society. Neither is the belief that the Soviets want to avoid a war. Nor is the belief that they know that they cannot outstrip us militarily. Therefore, while MEND's language

²³ MEND does not support SDI because they see it as an offensive, not defensive weapon (*MEND News*, Spring 1987, pp. 1-4).

²⁴ *Washington Post*, Dec. 21, 1986.

²⁵ *MEND Positions on Key Issues*, 1987.

of nurturance does seem to be attractive to the general public, their call for multilateral, verifiable nuclear disarmament may not be persuasive in the face of the widely perceived Soviet threat. As a result, MEND may in fact recruit a large constituency because they emphasize educational ways to help parents and children cope with their fears about the threat of nuclear war, but have little effect in changing nuclear policy.

The other major opposition to a particularistic/contextualized frame are the various voices in the decontextualized/particularistic space. An example of the decontextualized form of legitimation is provided by the late Herman Kahn, whose book *On Thermonuclear War* (1960), was discussed briefly earlier in this paper. Emotional pleas concerning the terrible consequences of nuclear war and the threat it poses for children are ruled out by Kahn's technical consideration of nuclear war. While the technical-strategic mode of discourse has gained a large measure of credibility from its unquestioning belief in the Soviet threat, a weakness of this frame is that its decontextualized approach to the horrors of nuclear war is not a popular way of talking among the general public. Technical-strategic language says very little to people who understand nuclear war in relation to personal losses. As a result, while this way of talking is preferred by some members of the government and nuclear strategists, it doesn't seem likely that ordinary people will invest in it.

Because the nuclear arms race has become a public problem, and the general public is becoming involved in this issue more and more every day, the future of the nuclear arms debate seems likely to be fought within a particularistic/contextualized frame. Anti-nuclear groups such as MEND, and pro-nuclear groups such as High Frontier, both lay claim to this territory. We can not predict at this time which voice will actually capture ownership of the space and therefore the right to define nuclear issues.

Conclusions

Our investigation of MEND's framing of the nuclear issue enables us to reflect on the relationship between language and political action, examine the current status of the way in which MEND is framing or representing nuclear issues and gauge our sense of MEND's future as an alternative voice in the nuclear arms debate. Since MEND ("Mothers Embracing Nuclear Disarmament") is a relatively new voice in the nuclear arms debate, our ethnography of their entrance into the debate is, of necessity, incomplete. This, then is a "progress report." The following are tentative conclusions, subject to revision in the light of new information; they suggest the lines of investigation we will follow in the future.

The Politics of Representation In the Nuclear Arena

Events in the world are ambiguous; we struggle to understand these events, to imbue them with meaning. The choice of a particular way of representing events gives them a particular meaning. There is often a competition over the correct, appropriate or preferred way of representing objects, events, or people. In fact, while there are many possible modes of representing the world and communicating them to people, the course of history can be envisioned as successive attempts to impose one mode of representation upon another. As in other conflicts waged in and through discourse, proponents of various positions concerning nuclear weapons attempt to capture or dominate modes of representation. They do so in a variety of ways, including inviting or persuading others to join their side, silencing opponents by attacking their positions. If successful, a hierarchy is formed, in which one mode of representing the world (its objects, events, people, etc.) gains primacy over others, transforming modes of representation from an array on a horizontal plane to a ranking on a vertical plane. This competition over the meaning of ambiguous events, people and objects in the world has been called the "politics of representation" (Holquist, 1983; Shapiro, 1987).²⁶

For example, there are many ways in which a certain group of people can be formulated: "guest workers," "potential citizens," "illegal aliens," "undocumented workers." Each formulation or way of representing this group of people does not simply reflect their characteristics; each mode of representation defines the speaker and constitutes the group of people, and does so in a different way. To be a GUEST worker is to be an invited person, someone who is welcome and in a positive relationship to the employer; to be a guest WORKER is to be someone who is contributing to the economy, productively, by laboring. The formulation POTENTIAL CITIZEN invokes similar positive connotations, but does so within the realm of citizenship and politics rather than in the realm of market economics, as the guest worker formulation does. The "potential citizen" is not yet a complete citizen, but is on the path of full participation in the society. The ILLEGAL ALIEN designation invokes many opposite ways of thinking; "illegal" is simple and clear: a person outside of society, an idea reinforced by the "alien" designation--foreign, repulsive, threatening. Finally, representing this group as UNDOCUMENTED WORKERS implies a person or persons who contribute economically, but do so in an extra-legal capacity.

A similar competition over the meaning of ambiguous events in the world was played out recently in the so-called "surrogate mother case." The case turned on the issue of whether the baby's mother had the right to retain the baby after the mother had agreed to hand her over to the

²⁶ Holquist and Shapiro on the politics of representation should be compared to the discussion of the "politics of experience" by Laing (1967), Pollner (1987), and Mehan (1987).

(artificially inseminating) father. Those who favored her right to do so resisted the use of the "surrogate mother" designation in favor of "natural mother" term. Drawing the analogy between the case and adoption or custody after divorce, they made "Baby M" an instance of the relationship involving parents and children. Those who favored the (artificially inseminating) father's claim to the child (and therefore opposed the "surrogate" mother) invoked language associated with contracts and legally binding arguments. This mode of representation led one commentator to say "it made the Baby M case bear an uncanny resemblance to the 'all sales final' style of the used car lot" (Pollitt, 1987: 682).

President Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative" is a continual topic of the politics of representation. Talking about SDI as "a protective shield" encourages thinking about it as a defensive weapon, deflecting the blows of an aggressor. Talking about it as "an umbrella" invokes even more neutral thoughts about passive protection. If, however, it is discussed as a "bargaining chip," then the defensive frame is replaced by a gambling one, with the implication that this system could be traded or negotiated for something from the Soviet side.

The introduction of MEND's voice into the nuclear arms debate exemplifies the politics of representation in the nuclear arena. Ever since the invention of nuclear weapons in the 1940s, competing definitions of the nuclear situation have been evident. Some of the voices competing to provide the preferred and accepted definition of the situation are deterrence theory, preventative nuclear war, internationalization, disarmament. Although this argument is by no means settled, it is fair to say that one voice has dominated the debate. That voice has been deterrence theory. A fundamental premise of this rhetoric is the idea that nuclear weapons are designed to deter the Soviet Union from launching an attack on the U.S. or its allies. Nuclear weapons are able to play this peacekeeping function because both the U.S. and the USSR are mutually assured of each other's destruction should either side launch an attack on the other. This argument is presented in a technical language which emphasizes the strategic implications of nuclear war.

MEND is entering this debate and countering the technical and strategic claims of deterrence theory with a rhetoric focusing attention on humanistic issues. Challenging the equation in deterrence theory that large stockpiles of nuclear weapons equals security, MEND is calling upon the citizenry to substitute the equation: nuclear weapons are a threat to families and the future. At the core of this struggle over the meaning of nuclear weapons is the ownership of the entire nuclear arms issue.

Thus, this short description of MEND's nurturing voice in the nuclear arms debate illustrates the relationship between modes of thought, modes of discourse, and modes of action. The choice of a way of representing people, events, and objects in language influences, first of all, the way we think about the things represented, and, second of all, the way we act toward these

things so represented. Modes of representation, then "frame" (Goffman, 1975) our experience of the world. A shift of frame, e.g., from the technical-strategic rhetoric of deterrence theory to the nurturing rhetoric of MEND, leads to a shift in the meaning of nuclear weapons. Shifts in meaning, in turn, lead to changes in ways of thinking about nuclear weapons (e.g., from "weapons which are necessary for national defense," to "tools which are a threat to civilization") and acting toward them (e.g., from supporting them to lobbying for their elimination).

The perspectival dimension of the politics of representation has implications for our conception of language itself. Language does not passively reflect or merely describe the world; instead, different modes of representing the world constitute different versions of it. This means that the world and the language used to represent it are not separate and distinct entities. "Real action" and "consequential policies" do not take place in one part of the world and discussions of them in another. Instead, modes of thought, modes of discourse, and modes of action mutually constitute each other.

Some Ambiguities and Antinomies in the MEND Frame

Linda Smith's closing speech to the Walk for Peace crowd which characterizes the walk as "a **path** which can become a **superhighway**, as others join in our **effort** to achieve a **safe, secure world for our children**," coupled with the visual image of the MEND children's choir, singing "With Enough Love," acts to frame MEND's activity in a particular way: MEND is a family movement, convinced that nuclear war will destroy families, children, the future.

Although MEND is appealing to mothers and parents because of the threat nuclear war poses to families, there is another audience for MEND's message: the Vietnam generation. While the ties that bind MEND to the Vietnam Memorial and the Vietnam War are very strong (it was, after all, the location of Linda Smith's inspirational experience), the role that association will play in MEND's message is still ambiguous. To be sure, many of the parents in MEND's potential audience are of this generation (simply because this cohort is currently raising their families); but many others are not. Perhaps more importantly, not everyone in the MEND audience will be able to make the connection between the Vietnam War (an unpopular war, fought in a far-away place with conventional weapons) and nuclear war, which motivated the founding of MEND in the first place, or will be able to link the anti-establishment tactics of the peace and civil rights movements of the '60s with the establishment tactics of MEND in the '80s. While the Vietnam imagery is an important feature of the MEND frame, its interaction and possible contradiction with the family representation in the MEND frame bears watching.

While MEND speaks forcefully to mothers in a voice which emphasizes nurturance and invokes the maternal instinct of protective motherhood, that very force raises questions in other members of the audience. Men, for example, ask: if this organization is aimed at women and

mothers, then what role do I play; what am I doing here?²⁷ MEND has responded to this ambiguity by extending the maternal metaphor to include "other nurturers." Linda Smith did this explicitly when she introduced speakers at the D.C. Reception.

Smith: MEND's mission, therefore, is to inspire mothers, and other nurturers, with the hope, the means and the belief in their own ability to take action which moves their leaders to reduce and eventually eliminate nuclear weapons.²⁸

The clumsiness of this formulation was made clear a few moments later when Charles Robb, former Governor of Virginia spoke:

Robb: Thank you, Linda. I'm delighted to be able to join and welcome you to Washington, and to all of you who are working with the organization. . . . I'm very pleased to join some of you other nurturers as well as those of you who qualify in a more direct way (laughter). And again, I don't have four daughters, but Linda and I, Linda Robb and I have three daughters (laughter), but Linda spent the night, this is the first time I've met Linda (LAUGHTER). Normally you wouldn't even have to clarify that (Laughter).²⁹

Robb was engaged in a classic rhetorical ploy: establishing co-membership with the group being addressed. The laughter drawn from the audience by the way Robb tried to establish his credentials (emphasis on **other** nurturers and the ensuing confusion about his relationship to Linda, compounded by the then recent furor over presidential candidate Gary Hart's adventures) indicates the ambiguity surrounding the membership of MEND's audience.

MEND has had ordinary citizens, military experts, medical experts, Hollywood personalities, Washington politicians, peace activists speak on its behalf. In the early stage of MEND's development, this diversity of voices is not surprising. It will be interesting to trace the trajectory of these voices through later stages of development. Will this calliope continue? Or will some devices predominate while others recede in importance?

There are some indications that a shift is already underway. The reception celebrating the opening of the Washington office featured members of the Washington political establishment (Robb, Senator Albert Gore, a presidential aspirant), noted members of the anti-nuclear movement (Carl Sagan and Admiral Carroll), an actor (Griffin Dunn), and a writer/producer (Ann Druyan). But there were no "ordinary citizens" and only two women speakers.

While the language of nurturance continues to dominate the MEND frame, it is not the only language MEND is speaking; a less conspicuous language, but increasingly important one is

²⁷ Observations made to Mehan at Washington, D.C. Reception, May 12, 1987, by a member of Physicians for Social Responsibility, a Washington area priest, and others.

²⁸ Reception for MEND, Washington DC, May 12, 1987.

²⁹ Ibid.

technical. Its voice is Natalie Goldring, who joined MEND as the director of its Washington, D.C., office with a degree in political science from MIT. It made its appearance in the Spring 1987 *MEND News*, in the form of a technical description of the capabilities of Star Wars and in "A Concerned Citizen's Introduction to National Security," a primer on nuclear war. It is quite possible that the entry of a technical language into MEND's discourse will drown out the maternal, and cause MEND to be absorbed by the discourse which dominates the nuclear arms debate, deterrence policy.

Another indication of a shift in MEND's voice concerns MEND's position on nuclear war. While clearly defined as an educational organization channeling information between the citizenry and the government, MEND has established substantive positions on nuclear weapons. At the outset, MEND called for multilateral, mutually verifiable nuclear disarmament. More recently (and not coincidentally since Goldring has joined the staff), MEND has modified its position. In her introductory remarks at the Washington reception, Smith added "eliminating the risk of nuclear war and the need for a strong defense" to the mission statement of MEND (emphasis in original). It will be interesting to see MEND's response if it receives challenges to the details of its position from other voices in the nuclear arms debate. Will it respond in highly contextualized, emotional and personal terms? Will it respond in technical and military terms? Or will it blend the two, e.g., use strategic-technical language to deconstruct the dominant discourse while promoting nurturance as the alternative mode of representation?

The Future of MEND

Because of the frame MEND has chosen to construct and the language it has adopted to talk about the nuclear arms race, it is possible that MEND's message will have wide appeal. Because of MEND's organizational resources and the status or "cultural capital" (Bourdieu, 1977) of its membership, it is possible that MEND will be able to generate a large following.

MEND is by no means a "fringe" group; it is composed of well-educated, well-to-do women (and men to a lesser extent). The methods of MEND are not disruptive (letter writing campaigns, peaceful marches, education of the public, communication with government officials). The membership of MEND is composed of just those status or class groups that regularly vote and share a similar lifestyle and outlook as those in the government. For all these reasons, MEND's efforts will be much harder to dismiss or sidestep than those of more radical anti-nuclear groups, whose membership and behavior--occupying nuclear test sites, infiltrating missile silos, blocking access to nuclear facilities--are likely to be less acceptable to the public in general.

Yet there is a down side to their future. Since the beginning of the Cold War, Americans have been taught that the Soviets are a treacherous, ruthless, unyielding threat to our national security. This belief is today firmly ingrained in American culture, and it will be no easy task to

persuade Americans that the Soviets are anything other than we know them to be. This type of campaign would most probably be the death knell for many anti-nuclear groups which have to maintain a fragile balance between actively challenging public perception of the Soviets while not upsetting the public so much that they lose public support (in very practical, monetary terms). People resist having their basic beliefs challenged yet MEND members have the time and resources to wage a long persistent battle in changing public perceptions of the Soviets. And they are not alone in this enterprise. As a result, while we cannot predict at this time the long term success of MEND as a voice in the nuclear arms debate, MEND does have the potential to recruit a large constituency and have a real effect on changing present nuclear policy.

This potential may be threatened, however, by the possible tension between the nurturing and technical languages within the MEND frame. Previously, MEND could be seen as occupying a contextualized and "weak" particularistic space in the nuclear arms debate. Their "scope of identification" (Wertsch, 1986) was weak in the sense that negotiation with and trust of the Soviet Union was seen as a real possibility:

We can trust the Soviet Union to act in their best interest, just as we can expect us to do the same. They want to avoid a war and they know they can not outstrip us militarily. They lost over 20 million people in World War II and know the horrors of war firsthand. They have selfish reasons for wanting arms control; they need the money for their economy and food and they do not want to die.³⁰

In conjunction with their call for multilateral, verifiable nuclear disarmament, MEND has the potential to become a peace group: calling for an end to the arms race and the beginning of true politics with the Soviets. If the technical language continues to gain power within the MEND frame, and the particularistic scope of identification (the U.S. vs. the USSR) of their discourse is strengthened, then MEND will shift from a potential peace group to just another arms control group. Recent documents from MEND illustrate this tension. Rather than reaffirming their previous statement that "we can trust the Russians to act in their self interest," MEND now declares that "we are not naive"³¹ and goes on to emphasize their belief in the necessity of a strong defense to protect American national security:

It is MEND's main objective to inspire mothers and other nurturers with the hope, the means and the belief in their own ability to take actions which reduce the risk of nuclear war. While we cannot quantify this risk, we feel it is unacceptably high, and the potential consequences are too great to continue along our present course. We recognize the need for a strong defense, but believe that our survival depends on taking a more comprehensive approach to national security.

³⁰ *MEND Position on Key Issues*, 1987, page 3. Cf. Goldring, N., "A Concerned Citizen's Introduction to National Security," MEND, 1987, p. 3.

³¹ MEND letter, Spring 1987.

By "national security," we mean both the goal of protecting our society and our way of life (literally "securing our nation") as well as the means of reaching that goal, which includes military expenditures and arms control treaties or negotiations.³²

While the nurturing language still introduces the MEND appeal ("inspire mothers and other nurturers"), shifts toward the technical-strategic language are evident. MEND didn't mention multilateral, verifiable nuclear disarmament in this pamphlet. Instead, MEND is interested in "eliminat[ing] the risk of nuclear war" and "arms control treaties" and emphasizes their belief in the necessity of a strong defense to protect American national security.

This tension in the MEND frame shows the difficulty confronting popular attempts to enter the nuclear arms debate. In its attempt to be taken seriously, MEND is flirting with the technical language that is so widely used by the dominant voice in the nuclear arms debate. But the particular conception of deterrence and the Soviet threat contained within the technical-strategic language precludes a critical stance. If MEND adopts this language completely they may be unable to continue to call for nuclear disarmament and politics with the Soviet Union. "Not being naive" means accepting the reality of the Soviet threat; accepting the Soviet threat uncritically makes it difficult for any anti-nuclear group to become a true peace group.

³² Goldring, N., "A Concerned Citizen's Introduction to National Security." MEND, 1987.

Citations

- Bakhtin, M.M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.
- Brodie, B. 1946. *The Absolute Weapon: Atomic Power and World Order*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Co.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cicourel, A., H. Mehan, C. Nathanson, J. Skelly, and J. Wertsch. 1987. Proposal for the study of the discourse of the nuclear arms debate. La Jolla: University of California, San Diego.
- Goffman, E. 1975. *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Gusfield, J. 1981. *The Culture of Public Problems*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Holquist, M. 1983. The politics of representation. *The Quarterly Newsletter of the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition* 5(3): 4-12.
- Kahn, H. 1960. *On Thermonuclear War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Laing, R.D. 1967. *The Politics of Experience*. New York: Pantheon.
- Manhoff, R. 1986. Comments. *The Nation*, December 6, 1986, p. 635.
- Mehan, H. 1987. Oracular reasoning in a psychiatric exam: the resolution of conflict in language. In A.D. Grimshaw (ed.), *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic Investigations of Arguments in Conversation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nathanson, C.E. 1984. The social construction of the soviet threat. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Antonio, Texas.
- Pollitt, K. 1987. The strange case of Baby M. *The Nation*, May 23.
- Pollner, M. 1987. *Mundane Reasoning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shapiro, M. 1987. *The Politics of Representation*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Skelly, J.M. 1984. The minute man is a missile, not a soldier. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of California, San Diego.
- Voloshinov, V.N. 1986. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wertsch, J. 1986. Modes of discourse in the nuclear arms debate. Working paper #8. Chicago: Center for Psychosocial Studies.

**Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation
Ballyvaughn Conference Papers - 1987**

1. Todd Gitlin
The Greatest Story Never Told
2. William A. Gamson and David Stuart
Cartoon Discourse on Nuclear Arms
3. R. B. J. Walker
The Concept of Security and International Relations Theory
4. G. M. Dillon
Defence, Discourse and Policy Making: Britain and the Falklands
5. Aaron Cicourel
Cognitive-Linguistic-Organizational Aspects of Field Research in International Negotiations
6. Donna Gregory
Clausewitz: A Mind Under Arms
7. Paul A. Chilton
Critical Discourse Moments and Critical Discourse Analysis: Towards a Methodology
8. Carol Cohn
Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals
9. Michael J. Shapiro
*Representing World Politics: The Sport/War Intertext
With a Postscript on the Nuclear Question*
10. Charles E. Nathanson
The Social Construction of the Soviet Threat
- *11. Pertti Joenniemi
Decoding Nuclear Winter; Has War Lost Its Name?
- *12. Hugh Mehan and James M. Skelly
Reykjavik: The Breach and Repair of the Pure War Script
13. Hugh Mehan and John Wills
MEND: A Nurturing Voice in the Nuclear Arms Debate
- *14. Kay Richardson
The Mikhail and Maggie Show: The British Popular Press and the Anglo-Soviet Summit
- *15. Rudiger Zimmermann
Selling 'SDI' to Europeans: Arguments, Metaphors and Adversary Images
- *16. Glenn Hook
Roots of Nuclearism: Censorship and Reportage of Atomic Damage in Hiroshima and Nagasaki
- *17. Jeff Connor-Linton
Stylistic Analysis and Authors' Assumptions in Nuclear Discourse

*These papers also appear in *Multilingua* (January/April 1988).