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I. GOALS FOR THE SESSION

- Introduce and apply core principles and approaches in the field of negotiation and mediation to critical questions of nuclear risk-reduction

- Examine key lessons from the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis—“the most dangerous moment in human history”—to drive home certain core lessons of negotiation and mediation. Include role play exercises.
  - partisan perceptions,
  - negotiation under stress, uncertainty, high stakes;
  - moving from confrontation to collaboration without accommodation/appeasement

- Review lessons from early 1980s creation of Nuclear Risk Reduction Centers

- Role of people-to-people diplomacy. Role of a “Third Side” coalition in 1980s.

- Examine how these historical lessons can be applied to reduce current escalating nuclear risk
  - Consider points in August 2018 article “The Dawn of a New Armageddon”
  - Role of people-to-people diplomacy and role of a “Third Side” coalition today.
  - Analyze possible steps that can be taken to reduce current nuclear risk:
    - Consider the 10 steps in the “Nuclear Playbook” from 2018 article
ROLE OF CRISIS IN PUSHING CONFLICTING SIDES TO FIND A MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE RESOLUTION
Case Study: Resolution of the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis

Гром не грянет - мужик не перекрестится
2018: THE “DAWN OF A NEW ARMAGEDDON”
“Today, the danger of some sort of a nuclear catastrophe is greater than it was during the Cold War and most people are blissfully unaware of this danger...Because we don't understand the dangers, we make no attempt, no serious attempt, to repair the hostility between the United States and Russia. And so we are allowing ourselves to sleepwalk into another catastrophe.

We must wake up.”

- William J. Perry, former U.S. Secretary of Defense

“The nuclear threat is again real. Our relations have been going from bad to worse. We must break out of this situation. We won’t survive if someone loses their nerves in the current tension.”

-Mikhail Gorbachev
1962--“The most dangerous moment in human history” --until now

Core themes for then and now

• Partisan perceptions, empathy—putting oneself in other side’s shoes
• negotiation under stress, uncertainty
• high stakes
• moving from confrontation to collaboration without appeasement
Каждый видит со своей колокольни
Khrushchev: Sitting at his dacha looking across Black Sea toward Turkey, where US nuclear missiles were based, he affirmed: “We have a legal right to put missiles in Cuba like they have in Turkey right on our border. We must defend our young ally Castro from U.S. invasion.”

JFK: “It is politically impossible for me to allow those missiles to stay in Cuba. Gromyko lied to me and Khrushchev tried to put the missiles in Cuba secretly. This is absolutely unacceptable.”

Castro: “We just had our “April Crisis” last year—the U.S. invasion at the Bay of Pigs in April 1961. The CIA is trying to assassinate me. We face an existential threat. We need the missiles to prevent the US from invading to change our regime.”
CRITICAL ORAL HISTORY PROJECT:
FACILITATED DIALOGUE TO ENGAGE ALL SIDES
For the First Time, All Three Sides Were in One Room

Three breakthrough dialogues—small, facilitated, no press:
• 1987 Harvard
• 1989 Moscow
• 1992 Havana

We developed the “Critical Oral History” method
“Be Soft on the People, Hard on the Problem”
Separate personal dynamics from substantive issues
--Don’t concede on facts or substance.

The result of the meetings was the telling of a new story, which transformed the memory in public consciousness of one of the most traumatic events in human history.
Gromyko and Dobrynin with JFK in 1962 ...and 1989 Moscow Meeting
Fidel Castro at Havana Conference in January 1992
Georgy Shakhnazarov, Presidential Aide, on the goal of the Cuban Missile Crisis retrospective meetings:

“This is not just a ‘detective story’ to learn the facts of history. Such a process of learning is rare and extraordinary—as if leaders from Rome and Carthage gathered after the Punic Wars to reflect on what sparked the conflict, exchange information and come to a shared view of how to prevent such conflicts in the future.”
“So vivid I almost felt as if I were there: in 1992, when Robert McNamara, Fidel Castro and their colleagues met in Havana to discuss the missile crisis; and in 1962, when they, along with the Soviets, led the world up to, and back from, the brink of nuclear war. Fascinating and chilling...

—Lawrence S. Eagleburger, former U.S. Secretary of State

“This book shows the human dimension of the Cuban Missile Crisis as never before, especially in its vivid portrayal of the relationship between Fidel Castro and my father, Nikita Khrushchev. Cuba on the Brink captures the drama and dangers of leaders, countries and ideologies on a collision course with nuclear catastrophe. A marvelous book!”

—Sergei Khrushchev, son of Nikita Khrushchev and editor of his father’s secret memoirs

“Fascinating...essential reading for any serious student of international affairs.”

—Foreign Affairs
THE LESSONS FOR PRODUCTIVE NEGOTIATION AND DIALOGUE: What We Learned by Going “Back to the Brink”

“...top-level participants in one room spoke openly, revealed very old secrets, discovered shockingly mistaken assumptions, and came to a new shared understanding that provided inspiration for those striving at the end of the Cold War to overcome decades of confrontation. A wonderful contribution.”

RONALD A. HEIFETZ, founder of the Harvard Center for Public Leadership

The Edge of Armageddon tells for the first time the behind-the-scenes stories of how Bruce Allyn and his colleagues worked to convene former enemies to talk together about the past in order to create a more peaceful future.”

SERGEI KHRUSHCHEV
KEY LESSON FROM CONFERENCES

Demonstrate Empathy

Proactively acknowledge validity of certain elements of other’s perspective

Goal: Assist each side to gain detached perspective on its own position, beliefs and assumptions, and emotions and understand the viewpoint of the other side.

Result: Decrease the risk of reflexive thinking, emotional reaction and destructive conflict.
THE “THIRD SIDE”

The Third Side is a way of looking at the conflict not just from one side or the other—not just from one’s own “bell tower”—but from the larger perspective of the surrounding community of stakeholders, those whose interests are also at stake—as if you “go to the balcony,” see the players on a stage from a higher perspective.

You can have natural sympathies for one side or the other and still choose to take the Third Side.

Taking the Third Side means seeking to understand both sides of the conflict, encouraging a process of cooperative negotiation, supporting a process of truth and reconciliation, a fair and wise solution – one that fairly meets the essential needs of both sides and the larger community.

Examples to consider: Cuban Missile Crisis, South Africa 1990-93 “Negotiated Revolution” (vs. “Marriage of Convenience”), others?
Empathy is a capacity based on perception.

Empathy is “the ability to take the perspective of others and understand their cognitive and affective states without necessarily sympathizing with them.”

The capacity for empathy can be developed.
Head of US Delegation Robert McNamara puts himself in the Cubans’ shoes...

For decades, the world believed that Dobrynin had lied when told JFK that there were no missiles in Cuba... (but he was never told)

McNamara comments on Cuba’s achievements in infant health care. Castro’s response...

Castro welcomes and accepts pen from former CIA Deputy Director Ray Cline...

US delegate gives Castro a baseball signed by NY Yankees...
LESSON ON HUMAN FALLIBILITY AND CATASTROPHIC RISK IN NUCLEAR CRISIS

Russian general’s confirmation of presence of the Luna tactical nuclear weapons and local authority to launch –McNamara’s astonished reply

--the U.S almost invaded based on a catastrophic false assumption

--Play video of General Gribkov
EXCOMM MEMBERS WHO KNEW RUSSIA WELL WERE AGAINST A MILITARY STRIKE IN 1962

Charles Bohlen, US Ambassador to Soviet Union (succeeded George Kennan)

Lewellyn “Tommy” Thompson, US Ambassador to Soviet Union

And also those with major diplomatic service:

Alexis Johnson, Diplomat in Asia

Adlai Stevenson, Ambassador to UN

George Ball, Under Secretary of State

Those American former ambassadors to Russia, who knew Russia deeply--George Kennan, Jack Matlock--were against expansion of NATO in 1996, as was William Perry, who had worked closely with Russian colleagues and has extensive knowledge of the country, culture and people.
THE ROLE OF CREATIVE DIPLOMACY: KENNEDY'S SECRET BACK CHANNEL APPROACH TO CASTRO TO REDUCE RISK OF NUCLEAR ARMAGEDDON

The Kennedy Administration sought secretly to find an accord with Cuba that would remove the Soviet missiles in return for a modus vivendi between Washington and Havana.

During an Excomm meeting on October 26, Kennedy approved a message to be sent to Castro, disguised as a Brazilian peace initiative sent by the government of populist president Joao Goulart, rather than one from Washington.

The draft cable instructed the Brazilians to carry the message to Castro that his regime and “the well-being of the Cuban people” were in “great jeopardy” if he did not expel the Russians and their weapons. If he did, however, “many changes” in the relations between Cuba and the Organization of American States (OAS) and the US could follow.
THE ROBERT KENNEDY-AMBASSADOR DOBRYNIN BACK CHANNEL

In their critical meeting on the evening of Saturday October 27, Kennedy and Dobrynin made a skillful move in their agreement to treat Kennedy's *de facto* ultimatum [to give an answer by the next day] as "*a request, and not an ultimatum.*"

This move was a deliberate attempt to defuse as much as possible the hostility that Kennedy's request for an answer by the next day was likely to provoke in Moscow.

Dobrynin explicitly wrote in his message to Khrushchev: "I noted that it went without saying that the Soviet government would not accept any ultimatum and it was good that the American government realized that."

Prior meetings between Dobrynin and Kennedy had sometimes degenerated into shouting matches. On this occasion, Dobrynin notes, the attorney general kept his emotions in check and took the ambassador into his confidence in an attempt to cooperate on the resolution of the crisis. This strategy succeeded where an effort to compel Khrushchev to respond through an ultimatum might have failed.

It gave Khrushchev positive incentives to remove the Soviet missiles and *reduced the emotional and political cost to him of the withdrawal*. He responded as Kennedy and Dobrynin had hoped.
MCGEORGE BUNDY’S EXPLANATION OF THE PRIVATE BARGAIN
—THE MISSILE TRADE DEAL—
...and reasons for deceiving the public for over two decades

“Concerned as we all were by the cost of a public bargain struck under pressure at the apparent expense of the Turks, and aware as we were from the day's discussion that for some...even this unilateral private assurance might appear to betray an ally, we agreed without hesitation that no one not in the room was to be informed of this additional message.

Robert Kennedy was instructed to make it plain to Dobrynin that the same secrecy must be observed on the other side, and that any Soviet reference to our assurance would simply make it null and void.

.. There was no leak. As far as I know, none of us told anyone else what had happened.

We denied in every forum that there was any deal, and in the narrowest sense what we said was usually true, as far as it went.

When the orders were passed that the Jupiters [missiles in Turkey] must come out, we gave the plausible and accurate—if incomplete—explanation that the missile crisis had convinced the president once and for all that he did not want those missiles there....”
TED SORENSEN’S “CONFESSION”

“...the president [Kennedy] recognized that, for Chairman Khrushchev to withdraw the missiles from Cuba, it would be undoubtedly helpful to him if he could say at the same time to his colleagues: ‘And we have been assured that the missiles will be coming out of Turkey.’ And so, after the ExComm meeting [on the evening of 27 October 1962], as I'm sure almost all of you know, a small group met in President Kennedy's office, and he instructed Robert Kennedy to deliver the letter to Ambassador Dobrynin for referral to Chairman Khrushchev, but to add orally what was not in the letter: that the missiles would come out of Turkey.

Ambassador Dobrynin felt that Robert Kennedy's book Thirteen Days did not adequately express that the "deal" on the Turkish missiles was part of the resolution of the crisis. And here I have a confession to make to my colleagues on the American side, as well as to others who are present. I was the editor of Robert Kennedy's book. It was, in fact, a diary of those thirteen days. And his diary was very explicit that this was part of the deal; but at that time it was still a secret even on the American side, except for the six of us who had been present at that meeting. So I took it upon myself to edit that out of his diaries, and that is why the Ambassador is somewhat justified in saying that the diaries are not as explicit as his conversation”.

“BLACK SATURDAY”

“I didn’t think I’d live to see another Saturday night”
--Robert McNamara

U-2 Shoot-down

Kennedy’s Ultimatum/Request to Khrushchev
--“24 hours or else”

--Show Video excerpts

Castro’s Secret Cable to Khrushchev
U-2 SHOOT-DOWN
PROFOUND LESSON OF KENNEDY-KHRUSCHEV NEGOTIATION

How to move from confrontation to collaboration without accommodation/appeasement

• JFK refused to approve an invasion supported by Joint Chiefs and many in ExComm. He maintained a “Positive No” to defend his core values.

• Reputation for strength/weakness has consequences for foreign policy. So Kennedy and Khrushchev made use of a back channel and secret agreements.

• Khrushchev recognized the risk of unintended escalation, prioritized the larger interests of avoiding a devastating nuclear war even though it had a high political cost. He knew the devastation of war, as did Kennedy.
CASTRO’S CABLE TO KHRUSHCHEV CALLING FOR PREEMPTIVE NUCLEAR STRIKE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Castro’s Cable to Khrushchev, October 27, 1962:

“If the imperialists actually carry out the brutal act of invading Cuba in violation of international law and morality, that would be the moment to eliminate such danger forever through an act of clear and legitimate defense, however harsh and terrible the solution would be, for there is no other.”
KHRUSHCHEV’S RESPONSE TO THE CABLE

"This is insane...not only is he preparing to die himself, he wants to drag us with him.

Only lunatics or suicides, who themselves want to perish and to destroy the whole world before they die, could do this.”
KHRUSHCHEV THEN WENT ON OPEN RADIO TO ANNOUNCE THE REMOVAL OF THE MISSILES
“...and we are all mortal.”
CRITICAL NEED FOR INTROSPECTION

“Our attitude is as essential as theirs...”
“Every thoughtful citizen... should begin by looking inward.”
“No nation in the history of battle ever suffered more than the Soviet Union suffered in the course of World War II.”
“What will it take for us to get to a point where we have more introspection, where we approach the relationship as a result of an interaction where each side bears some responsibility?

Each side blames the other for where we are now. They see the essence of the problem as the essence of the other side...

When are we going to get at least to where John Kennedy was in 1963?”

--Robert Legvold, March 2017
JFK was shaken and enlightened after Cuban Missile Crisis. It widened his circle of compassion

...led to quick agreement on Test Ban Treaty

...promoted introspection, and to put ourselves in other’s shoes. He honored Russian “acts of courage,” achievements in culture, science

...reminded that we are all one community, all inhabit one small planet, all mortal

...that we must seek practical agreements based on our shared interests.

...that we can make a difference—that our destiny is not beyond our control
At our conference in 1992, Castro spoke for the first time of his mindset when he called for the preemptive nuclear first strike.
CASTRO ADDRESSES HIS CABLE TO KHRUSHCHEV FOR THE FIRST TIME

... on that night of the 26th, we saw no possible solution. We couldn’t see a way out. Under the threat of an invasion, of an attack, with the enormous propaganda using all the mass media, and an international campaign talking about this very serious problem, we really couldn’t see any solution.

And I asked myself, “What is still to be done? What remains to be done? What can I do? What is the last thing I can do?” And I dared to write a letter to Nikita, a letter aimed at encouraging him.

That was my intention. The aim was to strengthen him morally, because I knew that he had to be suffering greatly, intensely. I thought I knew him well. I thought I knew what he was thinking and that he must have been at the time very anxious over the situation.

... Actually, I was recalling the events of the Second World War and what had happened during the Second World War. As you all know, during the Second World War, Soviet troops were taken by surprise ...
CASTRO’S EXPLANATION OF HIS CALL FOR FIRST USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS:

“If an invasion took place in the situation that had been created, nuclear war would have been the result.

Everybody here was simply resigned to the fate that we would be forced to pay the price, that we would disappear.

Before having our country occupied — totally occupied — we were ready to die in defense of our country. I would have agreed, in the event of the invasion that you are talking about, with the use of tactical nuclear weapons. You’ve asked me to speak frankly and, in all frankness, I must say that I would have had that opinion.

If Mr. McNamara or Mr. Kennedy had been in our place, and had their country been invaded, or if their country was going to be occupied ... they would have used tactical nuclear weapons.”
What Fidel Castro said at end of Havana meeting:

“I must say with absolute sincerity that I have learned a great deal at this meeting. ... I believe the spirit with which we have discussed this here has been excellent — the respect for each other’s opinions, the sincerity, the honesty. I think I have been witness to a method that is very suited to debating very complex and difficult issues.”
In 2010, 48 years after the Cuban Missile Crisis, nearing death, facing his own mortality, Castro had a change of heart and came around to the Third Side:

"After what I've seen, and knowing what I know now, it wasn't worth it all."
WHAT DOES IT TAKE FOR A PERSON TO ADOPT THE “THIRD SIDE”?

Unfortunately, to shaken and awaken us to the “Third Side” Perspective
To remember *what is at stake*
To recognize *what is most precious*
it can often take:

• Living through a crisis like CMC 1962

• Or recognition of a clear shared threat. Reagan was shaken by the film “The Day After.” Gorbachev was shaken by Chernobyl and danger of inadvertent nuclear war (Reagan at one point asked Gorbachev if they would cooperate “if aliens invaded Earth…”)

• And/or recognition of our mortality (Castro, Rabin)

Гром не грянет - мужик не перекрестится
BUT THERE ARE MANY WAYS TO SHAKE PEOPLE UP, TO PERSUADE, TO INSPIRE, TO ADOPT ROLE OF THE “THIRD SIDE”

CRISIS/SHOCK (CMC 1962)

INSPIRATION
A great leader like Lincoln, Gandhi, MLK, Mandela – JFK Speech in 1963

SOCIAL CAMPAIGN/”THIRD SIDE” COALITION
Like Civil Rights Movement, Freeze Movement...

PUBLIC EDUCATION/MEDIATION TRAINING
Training to “look inward” – introspection – and adopt the perspective of the Third Side

MEDIA—to present all sides to a conflict and the Third Side

Ищите и обрящете
CAN WE ACTUALLY LEARN AND BENEFIT FROM THE LESSONS OF HISTORY?
CAN WE CREATE A GLOBAL HISTORICAL WISDOM BANK?

What if we created a kind of “Global Historical Wisdom Bank,” a new institution, that would bear witness to the past, keeping alive the lessons bequeathed to us by those who lived through critical points in history?

Like a new Delphic Oracle, a repository of wisdom, to commemorate not Apollo slaying a dragon but real human beings defusing conflict for the sake of the future.

What if this new institution regularly sent our social media messages and sponsored events to remind us of the lessons? Could it make any difference?
LESSONS ABOUT NEGOTIATION UNDER STRESS IN CRISIS

Do not mistake decisive action under pressure for leadership.

Create time to invent options, avoid immediate reaction.
There is more than one option. Initially the idea of a blockade was criticized as inadequate and foolish. But it was the eventual wise choice.

Move from confrontation to collaboration without appeasement.

JFK gave a “Positive No” to invasion: He stood against action that could lead to unprecedented catastrophe for humanity (“Positive No” to defend core values).

Reputation for strength/weakness has consequences for foreign policy. Use of “back channel” and secret agreements.
Zone of Possible Agreement

US Alternatives
BATNA

US military removes Soviet missiles from Cuba

US blockades

Negotiated Agreement

Negotiated Soviet withdrawal of their missiles from Cuba

US pledge not to invade Cuba

+ US withdrawal of missiles from Turkey

Unilateral, later & secret
Agreed, now & public

Not fire them
Fire them

1st strike

Unilateral, later & secret
Agreed, now & public

Berlin
Reta- liation

USSR Alternatives
BATNA

USSR retains its missiles in Cuba

CUBA
Khrushchev-Castro Letters
U.S. Secret Backchannel to Castro
CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS ROLE PLAY:
PUT YOURSELF IN THE SHOES OF KHRUSHCHEV, KENNEDY, CASTRO
CASE STUDY II: NUCLEAR RISK REDUCTION CENTERS 1983-85

Case study of effective Third Side roles and impact on government policy

Role of shared threat in moving from positional bargaining to realizing shared interests

Role of individual leaders—official and unofficial—in catalyzing large-scale social and political change
In early 1980s, negotiating initial agreements to reduce shared nuclear risk opened the path to arms control agreements

Lessons of this approach for today?
WE USED THE GETTING TO YES APPROACH IN THE EARLY 1980s...

• 1979 Afghanistan  Some warned that the invasion was a deliberate strategic step to take control of Middle Eastern oilfields

• 1980 Boycott of Olympics  Cut off all cultural exchanges

• 1983 Ronald Reagan “Focus of evil in the modern world”

• KAL 007

• Soviet leader fearful of first-strike. Danger of inadvertent war. (cf. NATO exercise “Able Archer”)

“We are back to 1983, and I don’t enjoy being thirty-four years younger in this way. It’s frightening.”

---Sergei Rogov
First Meeting
Florida Keys
1983
(Spouses, families, were invited)
Every day we scheduled an hour for a mutual recrimination session.

We put it on the agenda for 5 a.m.

Somehow no one ever made it...
CURRENTLY PERCEIVED CHOICE

Case Study: Joint Nuclear Risk Reduction Centers 1983

Background

Context: Euro-missiles, SDI, Able Archer, KAL 007

Analysis: Four factors in crisis:

Little time
High stakes
High uncertainty
Few usable options

Shared Interest: Reduce shared threat with high stakes

Means: Share information, create lines of regular, direct communication, develop a working relationship
**HOW DOES EACH SIDE PERCEIVE ITS CHOICE?**

Joint Nuclear Risk Reduction Centers 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOVIET</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reagan is pursuing SDI, a massive military build-up, and you are asking us to tinker with technical nuts and bolts, with measures like risk reduction centers, allowing you to legalize the arms race, to have a “safety valve” to make the world safer for crises that you are provoking in pursuit of hegemony.</td>
<td>Moscow is willing to let the world blow up through unintended accidents and miscalculation while it sits back and talks about pious abstract declarations of “Basic Principles” of the relationship, asking us to first normalize relations, return to détente, before we can act on risk-reduction measures that may save us from disaster.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At their first summit in 1986, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan agreed on the creation of nuclear crisis risk-reduction centers.
HOW WAS THE AGREEMENT REACHED?

• Created concepts along with other specialists – Betts, Blechman, others. Looked at models like Incidents at Sea

• Built personal relationships through informal channels in both countries (Senators Nunn-Warner, Soviet colleagues)

• Circulated informal draft, asked for criticism not acceptance

• Framed the choice as not “either/or” but as parallel, a “package”

• Sessions to brainstorm options

• Helped develop a winning coalition in each country

• Signed by Presidents Reagan and Gorbachev
ROLE OF THIRD SIDE

Reagan shaken after seeing the film “The Day After”

Media—Ted Koppel, coverage of nuclear threat

People-to-people citizen diplomacy

NGOs –IPPNW, Nuclear Freeze Movement

Religious leaders -- Bishops’ Pastoral Letter

...and more
APPLYING HISTORICAL LESSONS TO CURRENT SITUATION 2018
“DAWN OF A NEW ARMAGEDDON”
FIRST, A LOOK BACK: WHAT WENT WRONG SINCE THE 1980s?

IMAGINE A “THIRD SIDE” SPEECH THAT A VISIONARY AMERICAN PRESIDENT MIGHT HAVE GIVEN IN 1991-92 COMPARABLE TO JFK 1963 ADDRESS?

From Russian perspective, to realize Russian interests, write the shared “victory speech” that George H.W. Bush should have given in January 1992

(Rather than “By the grace of God, America won the Cold War”)

What might be some themes?
Let us not try to rebuild Russia in our image—we have different histories, political cultures. Let us make world safe for diversity
Honor Russian acts of courage as JFK did
Empathize with epic task of rebuilding devastated economy, creating a new national idea and vision
In the 1990s, the inertia of past prevailed...

Привычка – вторая натура

Many in U.S. thought of America as sole “superpower”

“Pause” from George H.W. Bush Administration

Clinton kept pushing pliant Yeltsin...

The result has been catastrophic affects on the U.S.-Russian relationship, and global stability more broadly
HOW DID WE GET INTO CURRENT ACTION-REACTION CYCLE OF CONFLICT?

William Perry: In the first instance, the deterioration of relations is a result of actions taken by the United States.

• Under US leadership NATO expanded to Russian border
• Second: ABM  Russia sees as threat to deterrence
• Third: Regime change and color revolutions

AND THEN hostility was stimulated by Russian reactions

The US followed Putin’s lead in modernizing nuclear arsenal

Both sides see themselves as reacting to other’s provocations
Both countries have their divisions...

In Russia, current perspectives draw upon historical Slavophiles vs. Westernizers

In US...

Realists/Isolationists

John Mearsheimer:
“The only reason we have problems with Russia is because we have pursued liberal hegemony which called for running our alliance structure right up to their border.
A self-created problem.”

Interventionists – Liberal Democrats and Republican (Con and Neocon)

John McCain:
We are in a battle with Putin’s Russia to “preserve the post-war, rule-based, world order built on American leadership and the primacy of our political and economic values.”
THE NEGATIVE IMPACT ON U.S.-RUSSIAN RELATIONS

• Neocon 2003 “Shock and Awe” Invasion of Iraq, growth of ISIS, instability
  Cut off head of the snake--like myth of Hydra, it grows two more
  Сила есть, ума не надо.

• Liberal interventionists--Libya, Syria
  “Moralism” “Responsibility to protect”
  Дорога в ад вымощена благими намерениями

• 2014 Russian Annexation of Crimea

• Rebel war in Donbass
SLAYING THE HYDRA (c 500 BC)

Cut off Saddam head, get two more—Al Qaeda, ISIS

Cut off Gaddafi head, get more ISIS, militias, chaos

Что посеешь, то и пожнёшь
US VIEW
Liberal-democratic values appeared triumphant and free of significant ideological competition.

At the same time:
U.S. power was unrivaled
U.S. control of global institutions was strong
There was a broad perception that a U.S.-led liberal world order would continue to set the rules, standards, and norms for international interactions.

RUSSIAN VIEW
We ended the Cold War together
It was not a victory of one side over another...
We must integrate together into an emerging multipolar world
SELECTIVE PERCEPTION, MUTUAL BLAME

DEADLOCK: U.S. and Russia each now blame the other side for the deterioration in relations.

How did we get here?

Few people look at historical antecedents to a conflict. It is easy to choose whatever time frame you want to determine *kto vinovat*.

US looks primarily to Ukraine
Russia looks primarily to NATO expansion...
WE SEE FROM OUR OWN BELL TOWER…
AND WE HAVE UNCONSCIOUS BIAS

Human beings have unconscious mechanisms that lead them to err when assessing the other side in a negotiation, especially in adversarial situations.

We portray ourselves as “more honest and morally upright”

…and the other side as “untrustworthy, dishonest and seeking to win”
The Russians, being cunning and devious, hide their country behind the curve in the earth, so we can't see. We, on the other hand, are right out in the open on the flat part.
В чужом глазу соринку видим,
а в своём - бревна не замечаем
# US-RUSSIAN PARTISAN PERCEPTION CHART - 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUSSIA</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are a military threat to us.</td>
<td>You are a military threat to us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You interfered in our elections.</td>
<td>You interfered in our elections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You interfered in the former Soviet states on our border.</td>
<td>You interfered in the newly independent states on your border.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You launched military invasions of sovereign states.</td>
<td>You launched military invasions of sovereign states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have no real democracy.</td>
<td>You have no real democracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your economy is based on inequality</td>
<td>Your economy is based on inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You violate human rights</td>
<td>You violate human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You don’t keep your agreements</td>
<td>You don’t keep your agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your actions are provoking a new arms race...</td>
<td>Your acts are provoking a new arms race...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXERCISE
THERE IS ALSO THE FACTOR OF PSYCHOLOGICAL BIAS AND THE “SECURITY DILEMMA”

Defensive actions by one state to increase its security can make other side more insecure, trigger a reaction, creating a self-fulfilling prophecy, an action-reaction dynamic and arms race.

When there is uncertainty about the other side’s motives and, even if they are ambiguous, we tend to emphasize danger and exaggerate the hostility of the other.
NATO ABM Aegis Ashore system in Eastern Europe

Dmitri Peskov: “The president himself, let me remind you, has repeatedly asked *who the system will work against*...

U.S. Position: The ABM system would protect only against “rogue” states, particularly Iran.

Russian Response: “It is a direct threat. Measures are being taken to ensure the necessary level of security for Russia.”

Additional threat to Russia: The Aegis Ashore launch pad is “practically identical” to Aegis Warship system capable of launching Tomahawk cruise missiles.
U.S. defensive missile system THAAD for South Korea has a powerful radar capable of penetrating Chinese territory.
“We are both caught up in a vicious and dangerous cycle in which suspicion on one side breeds suspicion on the other, and new weapons beget counter weapons.”
Suspicion and negative perceptions can easily become self-fulfilling prophecies

They can shape our behavior.

If you cling to the idea that one’s negotiation counterpart is extreme and hostile, you can trigger exactly that behavior.
Defensive actions by one state can also lead the other side to react and undertake military invasion to seek greater security by expanding its territory.

Questions for future historians:

*Had the West not expanded NATO, would Russia have ever have acted to make Crimea once again part of Russia?*

*Was Post-Soviet Russia a “greedy” power or a defensive power?*
US-RUSSIAN RELATIONS SINCE 1989:  
Action-Reaction Spiral or Greedy Russia?

Those who saw Russia as a power like the Soviet Union, an expansive state that could only be deterred by military force (a “greedy” power), feel vindicated by Russia’s belligerence today.

They think it was the right course of action to absorb Moscow’s former clients into NATO and the EU while Russia was weak and disoriented after the Soviet collapse.

For those who think the independent new Russia was not a threat in 1991, they see it as a classic action-reaction spiral, a human failure to negotiate skillfully, to build a collaborative relationship and realize shared interests.
OUR PERCEPTION IS ALSO INFLUENCED BY PAST TRAUMA

У страха глаза велики
Обжегшись на молоке, дуешь и на воду
Пуганая ворона собственной тени боится

RUSSIA
• WWII (History of invasion)
• Trauma of Soviet collapse
• Nuclear fear

U.S.
• Red Scare – take over the world and take away our freedom
• Nuclear fear
The collapse of the Soviet Union led to trauma for tens of millions
The trauma of the Soviet threat, Red Scare, preparation for nuclear war, still has its affect on current U.S. perceptions.
RESOLVING COLLECTIVE AND INTERGENERATIONAL TRAUMA

*Question*: How to resolve, heal, lessen influence of collective and intergenerational trauma?

...how do we begin to heal these wounds so trauma does not result in endless cycles of violence? (cf. US-Russia, US-North Korea, status of Jerusalem...)

...how do we begin now to resolve trauma so we can break out of *negative repetitions*?
Studies in negotiations and psychology show that empathy is critical in

- overcoming biases
- transcending long-held enmities
- increasing the likelihood of cooperation
RELEVANT RESEARCH IN FIELD OF POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Keren Yarhi-Milo, Princeton

Todd H. Hall, Chicago

Deborah Welch Larsen UCLA

Nicholas J. Wheeler, U of Birmingham

Jan Ruzicka, Wales
2018: THE “DAWN OF A NEW ARMAGEDDON”
Imagine...

• You are a student here at MGIMO
• You awaken in your dormitory on a Saturday morning
• What is your routine on Saturday morning?
• What do you usually do for the first hour or two on Saturday morning?
• Where are you located?
• Take yourself there in your mind’s eye right now
You are in the middle of your Saturday morning routine when... you get a text message on your cell phone that looks something like this:

Except instead it says:

BALLISTIC MISSILE THREAT INBOUND TO MOSCOW. SEEK IMMEDIATE SHELTER. THIS IS NOT A DRILL.

You are told that government officials have confirmed that everyone should seek immediate shelter.
Exercise (5 minutes)

So you have received this nuclear alert...

• What do you do? What do you do first?
• Who do you contact? How?
• What do you say?
• Where do you go?
• What do you take with you?
• The alert lasts 38 minutes before you find out it is a false alarm – with all you know about nuclear risk, where does your mind take you during these 38 minutes?
• What are your greatest concerns? Fears? Hopes?
• What is most important to you during these 38 minutes?
• You get a text message saying it was a false alarm. Is your life changed after these 38 minutes? If so, how is it different than before?
• What action(s), if any, do you think you might take after this experience?
NUCLEAR WAKE-UP CALLS
7 NUCLEAR WAKE UP CALLS

Khrushchev’s Nuclear Wake-Up Call was the Telegram from Castro Calling for a Pre-emptive Nuclear Strike

McNamara’s Nuclear Wake-Up Call Was the Events of Black Saturday – October 27th

The Cuban Missile Crisis was JFK’s Nuclear Wake-Up Call Shaking and Awakening Him to Give His Famous “Strategy for Peace” Speech 7 months later

Castro’s Nuclear Wake-Up Call was Facing His Own Imminent Death

Reagan’s Nuclear Wake-Up Call Was *The Day After* film and Risk of Inadvertent Nuclear War

Gorbachev’s Nuclear Wake-Up Call Was Chernobyl and the Risk of Inadvertent Nuclear War

Hawaii’s Nuclear Wake-Up Call Was the 38 Minutes
January 13, 2018
Nuclear Wake-Up Call for Hawaii

Nuclear war was unimaginable to us until we went through those 38 minutes.
January 13, 2018
Nuclear Wake-Up Call for Hawaii

The alert was false but the nuclear threat is real and more terrifying than anything that comes across your newsfeed.
A Near-Death Experience, They Say Changes You Forever...

• The fear led us to reach out. We all called those dearest to say, “I love you.”

• The experience of feeling that you are about to be hit by a nuclear missile makes it absolutely clear what is most precious.

• Having lived through the Hawaii false ballistic missile alert, I have confronted in real time, my own death, the death of my children, the possibility of the end of human civilization, the mass extinction of life on Earth. I have been shaken to the core of my being.
“DAWN OF A NEW ARMAGEDDON”
Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists
August 6, 2018 – Hiroshima Day

This is why I wrote the article.
And this is why we have started www.nuclearwakeupcall.earth
NuclearWakeUpCall.Earth
Mission Statement

Our mission is to catalyze efforts to realize our shared interest in US-Russian relations to reduce the escalating nuclear danger.

Through collaborative community engagement, education, film, mediation, indigenous wisdom, music and cultural exchange,

we are encouraging the peoples of the US and Russia – the two countries with over 90% of the world’s nuclear weapons –

to act now to compel their political leaders to take concrete steps that will immediately reduce the nuclear risk

and at the same time work with all countries towards a world without nuclear weapons.
NuclearWakeUpCall.Earth
Adopt The Nuclear Playbook

THE NUCLEAR PLAYBOOK

Ten Steps We Must Take Immediately to Avert a Nuclear Catastrophe
NUCLEAR PLAYBOOK

1. Agree with Russia to take nuclear missiles off hair-trigger alert. If the United States and Russia begin to take their nuclear weapons off launch on warning, this will immediately reduce the time crunch—the impetus toward use of nuclear weapons—in moments of crisis.

2. End the sole, unchecked power of any US president to launch a nuclear attack. No one person— in any country— should have the power to launch nuclear weapons. Support Congressional legislation to prohibit a US President from launching a first-use nuclear strike without a declaration of war by Congress that expressly authorizes such strike. (Ted Lieu/Ed Markey bill, cities, states)
3. Reaffirm the declaration made by Reagan and Gorbachev that a nuclear war between the US and Russia “cannot be won and must never be fought.” A nuclear exchange that involves even a small fraction of the massive US and Russian arsenals is not survivable: it would be the end to both countries as we know them. A large-scale nuclear exchange would have drastic effects on climate—sending billions of tons of soot into the atmosphere — and, though scientists disagree on the predicted impact, it would put the lives of billions of people in jeopardy due to crop failure—a “nuclear famine”— beyond the hundreds of millions who would die due to the blast, firestorms and radiation.

4. Maintain a dialogue on nuclear risk reduction no matter what. We must at all times keep open channels of communication in US-Russian relations on nuclear risk reduction, a safe space insulated from our political differences, as we did during the old Cold War. Restart a dialogue aimed at reducing the nuclear danger, on strengthening strategic stability, including rules of the road for cyberweapons and other emerging technologies. We had one round of strategic stability talks with the Russians last September. It’s time to schedule the next.
5. **Resurrect US-Russian arms control negotiations.** Agree on New START and work out our differences on the Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. The United States has high confidence that the Russians are violating INF. The Russians are still angry over the US pullout from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. But Reagan and Gorbachev reached agreement in the 1980s when the divisions were at least as deep. There are ways for both sides to protect their interests and reach a new agreement.

6. **Reopen military-to-military channels of communication with nuclear powers.** We have managed to talk with the Russians and avoid major incidents in Syria, even though we are on opposite sides. There is no reason both countries can’t do the same for strategic, global conflict.

7. **Cooperate with Russia on preventing nuclear terrorism.** A nuclear terrorist attack in New York, Moscow, or any of our large cities would not only result in hundreds of thousands of lives lost but would also have profound effects on world security and economics. Efforts should include cooperation to reduce the danger of cyber interference in strategic systems and command and control.
8. Agree with Russia to adopt a no-first-use policy for nuclear weapons. A no-first-use pledge would demonstrate that the United States views its weapons as deterrents to nuclear warfare, not as tools of aggression. Critics in the US argue that this policy will reduce the security of our allies and that the credible threat of the first use of nuclear weapons is a powerful deterrent against a range of significant nonnuclear threats—chemical, biological, cyber. But others argue that the US has sufficient conventional forces to deter or respond to such attacks and that the policy creates more risks than its alleged benefits—including heightening the risk that Russia or China might miscalculate in crisis leading to a devastating unintended nuclear war. China has maintained a No First Use policy for decades.

9. Cooperate with Russia and other nuclear powers on nuclear nonproliferation. We need a multilateral approach to negotiations with emerging nuclear powers which is more likely to succeed— with Iran, North Korea and elsewhere.
10. **Take a strong, sensible step: eliminate ICBMs.** Former US Secretary of Defense William Perry and others, including General James Cartwright, former head of US Strategic Command, argue that the United States should do away with its land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles. They are the weapon system most likely to be fired in response to a false alarm and cause an apocalyptic, accidental nuclear war. And they are no longer needed to deter a nuclear strike from Russia, which can be achieved by the two other elements of the nuclear triad—submarines and bombers.

We are keeping ICBMs only because of vested interests— from defense companies that produce them and from states that get jobs and revenue from having them on their territory. This can be a first focus in challenging the $1.7 trillion US spending plan to enhance our nuclear arsenal. Instead, we should focus on eliminating some types of nuclear weapons, refurbishing the remaining weapons where possible, and making any replacements without enhancing capabilities.
“Politicians need to be compelled by people whose lives are in jeopardy.”
--Dr. Bernard Lown

Dr. Evgeny Chazov and Dr. Bernard Lown
Co-Founders IPPNW
Nobel-Prize Winners 1985
We need to compel our politicians to adopt
The Nuclear Playbook because our lives are at stake.
Build a bipartisan, grassroots coalition to compel our elected political leaders in the U.S. to make major reductions in our nuclear arsenal without reducing our security.

Both the US and Russia possess massive nuclear overkill. China has just 300 nuclear weapons and has long considered that sufficient. The US and Russia now have over 90% of the world’s nuclear weapons - 13,000 nuclear warheads and about 8,000 active weapons.

Both countries share responsibility to move toward low numbers of nuclear weapons, take them progressively off launch-ready alert, renounce their first use, and otherwise reduce, as much as possible, nuclear weapons as a source of fear, tension, and confrontation.

Nuclear Security expert Bruce Blair argues that the US can act now to reduce its nuclear stockpile by 75%, including elimination of land-based ballistic missiles (ICBMS), cancellation of most enhancement measures in the current $1.7 trillion modernization program--and still maintain a deterrent (a highly survivable second strike force) through 5 new strategic submarines and 40 heavy strategic nuclear bombers.
What’s It Going to Take?

A Global Reawakening to the Existential and Escalating Nuclear Threat – through education, media, outreach at all levels.

A mass global movement that brings together people of all ages, from all backgrounds and all walks of life to act now to reduce the threat of nuclear war, to work to create a more peaceful world and eliminate nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth.

A “Third Side” for the 21st Century, a coalition that comes together to serve the shared interests of the larger community, like the global movement in the 1980s, that transcended gender, racial, ethnic, religious, cultural, socio-economic and partisan divides, and unified to change history with one overarching common goal in mind: preventing a nuclear war.
WHAT DID IT TAKE IN THE 1980s?

THE THIRD SIDE

A Mobilized Community
Acting Systematically
Motivated by a New Story
THE THIRD SIDE IN CITIZEN DIPLOMACY, SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND CAMPAIGNS

- Uses the power of *peer pressure* and the force of *public opinion*. It uses the power of persuasion. It appeals to interests and to community norms.

- Organizes into a *coalition*.

- From this third perspective, the truth of each competing point of view can be appreciated.

- Shared interests often come to loom larger than the differences.

- People remember that they all, in the end, belong to the same extended community.

- Support a process of *dialogue* and *nonviolence*.

- Find a resolution that satisfies the legitimate needs of the parties and at the same time meets the needs of the wider community.
prevent

provider
What is needed here?

teacher
Here’s another way.

bridge builder
I’d like to introduce you to . . .

resolve

mediator
Let’s work it out.

arbiter
What’s fair here is . . .

equalizer
Let’s level the playing field

healer
Let’s make amends.

contain

witness
Hey! Look what they are doing!

referee
No knives! No guns!

peacekeeper
OK! Break it up!
State of US-Soviet Relations in Early 1980s Action-Reaction Cycle

- Soviets Invade Afghanistan Dec 24, 1979
- President Carter:
  - Cuts off all cultural exchanges and high level contacts with Moscow
  - Requests Senate postpone action on SALT II Treaty
  - Bans Export of Grains and Technology to SU
  - Issues Ultimatum – Feb 20\textsuperscript{th} deadline for Withdrawal from Afghanistan – Threatens Olympic Boycott
  - Announces Olympic Boycott on March 21, 1980 – Calls on World to Join – 62 countries join US
Election of Ronald Reagan, 1980
“Peace Through Strength”

- Increases military spending to “close the gap” with Soviets
- Embarks on massive nuclear buildup
- Escalation of Arms Race
- East-West Tensions Worsen
“Focus of Evil” Speech
March 8, 1983
KAL Flight 007

September 1, 1983
Mass Recognition of Shared interest in Avoiding Nuclear War

- 1981 NBC/AP Poll: 76% of Americans think nuclear war likely...
- Support for Nuclear Freeze grows to 72% of Americans by 1983
- Bipartisan support for Freeze grows in Congress
Individuals Adopt Third Side Roles
Take Initiative and
Catalyze Mass Change

• People from all ages and backgrounds
• Become teachers, bridge builders, providers, healers, mediators, witnesses
• New models of leadership and diplomacy
• New coalitions
Third Side Role: Teacher, Bridge Builder

Moscow School #45

• Be Open to Doing Things You Have Never Done Before
• Individuals Make A Difference
• Seek out and build trust and relationships with points of light/early adopters/mentors
• Official vs. unofficial contacts
• Protect those who need protection
• Dreams co-created and seeds planted for future cooperation
Third Side Role: Teacher, Bridge Builder

Betty Bumpers
Founder, Peace Links
Third Side Role: Teacher

Addie Wyatt
Labor & Civil Rights Leader, Pastor
"It dawned on me, like an arrow through the heart, that humans, our culture, our economy, could destroy the world."

Joanna Macy
Therapist, Author, Activist
Third Side Role: Teacher, Bridge Builder, Healer

Brought doctors together to form a Third Side Coalition
Dr. Bernie Lown, Cardiologist, Founder IPPNW
Third Side Role: Teacher, Bridge Builder, Healer

Dr. John Mack, Professor of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School, Pulitzer Prize-Winning Author, Childhood Trauma Specialist, Activist
Third Side Role: Teacher, Bridge Builder

*What Soviet Children Are Saying About Nuclear Weapons - IPPNW Project*

Broadcast nationally in both countries 1983
Third Side Role: Filmmakers as Teachers

High Profile Films, Both Academy Award Nominees, Women, Academy Award Winner
Third Side Role:
Journalists as Witnesses, Teachers

Educating for the Public Good
Acting on their ethical responsibility to inform the public about the clear and present existential nuclear danger.

Extensive Coverage, Awareness Pervasive, Inescapable, Affecting People of All Ages - Children
Third Side Role: Teacher, Bridge Builder

Samantha Smith & Media – Spring & Summer 1983

Individuals Taking Initiative, Making a Difference, Model Citizen Diplomat
Third Side Role: Teacher

Pastoral Letter:

- Condemns nuclear war
- Calls boldly for nuclear freeze
- Questions morality of deterrence: deterrence only morally justifiable if seen as temporary and pursued at the same time as disarmament

National Conference of Catholic Bishops
Pastoral Letter on War and Peace
May 3, 1983
Third Side Role: Teacher, Bridge Builder

• Unprecedented form of collaboration

• Joint effort among visionaries from both countries, led by Esalen

• Broadcast in USSR to over 100,000,000

US-Soviet Spacebridge
US Festival - Memorial Day 1983
Third Side Role: Teacher, Bridge Builder, Healer

Alexei Leonov, Cosmonaut
Rusty Schweikart, Apollo Astronaut
Co-Founders, Association of Space Explorers
Third Side Role: Bridge Builder, Teacher

- “Enough is Enough”
- Individuals take matters into their own hands
- Individuals take initiative - become Citizen Diplomats
- Citizen Diplomats form new coalitions and make a difference: the movement grows

People-to-People
Third Side Role: Teacher, Bridge Builder

- Build bridges to redefine “it’s impossible” – turning no into yes.
- Five years from seed – patience
- Demonstration of cooperation to be replicated – IPPNW, Project RAFT, COBS
- Catalyst: “Our goal is to make ourselves unnecessary.”

National Broadcast
November 18, 1985
Third Side Role: Bridge Builder, Teacher

John Denver Concerts in Moscow and Leningrad
Third Side Role: Teacher

“We share the same biology regardless of ideology”

Sting, “Russians”
Third Side Role: Teacher, Bridge Builder

Peace Child Spacebridge
December 2, 1985
Third Side Role: Filmmakers as Teachers, Bridge Builders

“
The screen should be used not as a wall separating our countries but rather as a bridge connecting them.”

Elem Klimov, Head, Soviet Union of Filmmakers

Sidney Pollack, Director

Entertainment Summit
March 1987
Third Side Role: Filmmakers/Media as Teacher

- US Audience: Over 100 million
- Game-changing Broadcast
- Screened at White House Nov 5th
- National broadcast in USSR - 1987

Educating About the Effects of Nuclear War

November 20, 1983
Geneva Summit, November 19-20, 1985

Leaders Adopting Third Side Role      Track II Becoming Track I
Third Side Role: Teacher, Bridge Builder

First Government-to-Government Space Bridge
September 22, 1987
WHAT WILL IT TAKE?

THE THIRD SIDE

How Do We Mobilize Community Today?
Acting Systematically
Motivated by a New Story
What is Our New Story in 2018?
“...THE FATE OF THE WORLD AND THE FUTURE OF THE HUMAN RACE, IS INVOLVED WITH PREVENTING A NUCLEAR WAR.”

John F. Kennedy, Third Nixon-Kennedy Presidential Debate, October 13, 1960