## *On Killing*. Dave Grossman. New York: Back Bay Books, 1996.

Soldier’s options: Fight, Flight, Posture, Submission [5-6]

General S.L.A. Marshall’s post-war research found only 15-20% firing rates of U.S. soldiers in WWII. [15]

Civil War (Gettysburg): “The obvious conclusion is that most soldiers were *not* trying to kill the enemy. Most of them appear to have not even wanted to fire in the enemy’s general directions.” [21-22]

“…an average regimental hit rate of one or two men per minute in firefights of the black powder era.” [24]

“…only a small percentage of the musketeers in a regimental firing line were actually attempting to shoot at the enemy while the rest stood bravely in line firing above the enemy’s heads or did not fire at all.” [24]

“The simple fact appears to be that. . . the vast majority of the rifle- and musket-armed soldiers of previous wars were consistent and persistent in their psychological inability to kill their fellow human beings. Their weapons were technologically capable and they were physically quite able to kill, but at the decisive moment each man became, in his heart, a conscientious objector who could not being himself to kill the man standing before him.” [27]

“This indicates that there is a force in play here. A previously undiscovered psychological force. A force stronger than drill, stronger that peer pressure, even stronger than the self-preservation instinct.” [27]

“This lack of enthusiasm for killing the enemy causes many soldiers to posture, submit, or flee, rather than fight; it represents a powerful psychological force that is discernible throughout the history of man. The application and understanding of this force can lend new insight to military history, the nature of war, and the nature of man.” [28]

Marshall: “The average and healthy individual. . . has such an inner and usually unrealized resistance towards killing a fellow man that he will not of his own volition take life if it is possible to turn away from that responsibility.” [29]

In WWII less than 1% of fighter pilots accounted for 30-40% of all enemy aircraft destroyed. [30]

“…when it came time to kill, they looked into the cockpit at another man, a pilot, a flier, one of the ‘brotherhood of the air,’ a man frighteningly like themselves; and when faced with such a man it is possible that the vast majority simply could not kill him.” [30]

“Looking another human being in the eye, making an independent decision to kill him, and watching as he dies due to your action combine to form the single most basic, important, primal, and potentially traumatic occurrence of war. If we understand this, then we understand the magnitude of the horror of killing in combat.” [31]

Soldiers don’t talk about this. Deception/forgetfulness – not only individually, but institutionally. [31-32]

“If a soldier would not kill in combat when it was his duty and responsibility to do so, would he let that be common knowledge?” [32]

“A belief that most soldiers will not kill the enemy in close combat is contrary to what we want to believe about ourselves, and it is contrary to what thousands of years of military history and culture have told us.” [33]

Military history traditionally presents a myth, not social reality. [33-34]

While there has been “a conspiracy of silence” about this, the military took it very much to heart and “a number of training measures were instituted.” [35]

“…a form of classical and operant conditioning.” [35]

A 90-95% firing rate was achieved in Vietnam. [35]

Peter Main: “’a massive unconscious cover-up in which society hides itself from the true nature of combat.” [35-36]

Psychological language: the ‘stress’ of battle, as if talking about an executive’s overwork. [36]

“…a cultural conspiracy of forgetfulness, distortion, and lies that has been going on for thousands of years.” [36]

“Could it be that Eros, the life force, is much stronger than ever before understood? What if there is within each person a force that understands at some gut level that all humanity is inextricably interdependent and that to harm any part is to harm the whole?” [37-38]

“Perhaps this is why we avoid this truth. Perhaps to truly understand the magnitude of the resistance to killing is also to understand the magnitude of man’s inhumanity to man.” [38]

“We may never understand the nature of this force in man that causes him to strongly resist killing his fellow man, but we can give praise for it to whatever force we hold responsible for our existence. And although military leaders responsible for winning a war may be distressed by it, as a race we can view it with pride.” [39]

Richard Gabriel: “Psychotic breakdown remains one of the most costly items of war when expressed in human terms.” [41]

WWII study – “after sixty days of continuous combat, 98 percent of all surviving soldiers will have become psychiatric casualties of one kind or another.” [43]

The other 2% are “aggressive psychopathic personalities.” [44]

“… it is only in this century that our physical and logistical capability to sustain combat has completely outstripped our psychological capacity to endure it.” [45]

Manifestation of Psychiatric Casualties; Fatigue Cases; Confusional States; Conversion Hysteria; Anxiety States; Obsessional and Compulsive States; Character Disorders. [45-49]

Military is considering preventive pharmaceutical treatment, which Larry Gabriel believes could result in “armies of sociopaths.” [49]

“But clinical studies that tried to demonstrate that fear of death and injury are responsible for psychiatric casualties have been considered unsuccessful.” [52]

In fact, “combat experience decreases fear of death or injury.” [52]

“…it is instead the fear of not being able to meet the terrible obligation of combat that weighs most heavily on the minds of combat soldiers. “ [53]

People (and society) are comfortable with fear. “And few people are comfortable when dealing with such powerful alternative explanations as guild. Fear is a specific yet brief and fleeting emotion that lies within the individual, but guilt is often long term and an belong to the society as a whole.” [53]

“Fear, combined with exhaustion, hate, horror and the irreconcilable task of balancing these with the need to kill, eventually drives the soldier so deeply into a mine of guilt and horror that he tips over the brink into that region that we call insanity. Indeed, fear may be one of the least important of these factors.” [54]

“In most circumstances in which mankillers are faced with the threat of death and injury in war, the instances of psychiatric casualties are noticeably absent.” [54]

“Having studied psychiatric casualties of WWI, in WWII “strategic bombing of population centers was motivated by quite reasonable expectation of mass psychiatric casualties resulting from the strategic bombing of civilian populations. But they were wrong.” [55]

“Indeed, bombing seemed to have served primarily to harden the hearts and empower the killing ability of those who endured it.” [56]

Studies from World Wars One and Two “show that prisoners of war did not suffer psychotic reactions when they were subjected to artillery attack or aerial bombardment, *but their guards did*.” [57]

“The prisoners… had no personal capacity or responsibility to kill, and they had no reason to believe that the incoming artillery or bombs were a personal matter. The guards, on the other hand, took the matter as a personal affront. They still had a capacity and a responsibility to fight, and they were faced with the irrefutable evidence that someone was intent on killing them and that they had a responsibility to do likewise.” [58]

Unlike previous eras, in the twentieth century, psychiatric casualties during naval warfare had been nearly nonexistent.” [58]

Why? “… most of them don’t have to kill anyone directly; and no one is trying to specifically, personally, kill them.” [59]

Dyer: “… the intervention of distance and machinery between them and the enemy.” [59]

“instead of killing people up close and personal, modern navies kill ships and airplanes… Intellectually these naval warriors understood that they were killing humans just like themselves and that someone wanted to kill them, but emotionally they could deny it.” [60]

A similar change has occurred in aerial combat.

Reconnaissance patrols are exceedingly dangerous, but they are relatively free of psychiatric casualties: “It is an operation completely free of any obligation to directly confront or kill the enemy.” [60]

Those “natural soldiers” (Dyer” most capable of killing are most likely to be in Special Forces.” [61]

Medics also suffer fewer psychiatric casualties. [62-63]

The medic “runs the same or greater risk of death and injury, but he, or she, is given over on the battlefield not to Thanatos and anger, but to kindness and Eros.” [63]

“… when it comes to the psychological well-being of its avatar, Thanatos is a far harsher master.” [63]

Officers suffer fewer psychiatric casualties. They “direct the killing but very seldom participate in it.” [64]

“… a far smaller burden of individual responsibility for killing.” [64]

Exhaustion and its impact on the psyche. [67-73]

Intense *sensory* experience of combat. [74]

These yield intense *memories* which “seem to have a much more profound effect on the combatant… The combat soldier appears to feel a deep sense of responsibility for what he sees around him.” [75]

“The trauma of rape, like that of combat, involves minimal fear of death or injury; far more damaging is the impotence, shock, and horror in being so hated and despised as to be debased and abused by a fellow human being.” [77]

Combat suicides “would rather die… that face the aggression and hostility of a very hostile world.” [78]

Re: Nazi Death Camps: “… victims of these camps had to look their sadistic killers in the face and know that another human being denied their humanity and hated them enough to personally slaughter them, their families, and their race as though they were nothing more than animals.” [79]

“Victims of this horror had to look the darkest, most loathsome depths of human hatred in the eye.” [79]

“The potential of closeup, inescapable, *inter*personal hatred and aggression is more effective and has greater impact on the morale of the soldier than the *presence* of inescapable, *im*personal death and destruction.” [81]

“The opposite of courage is cowardice, but the opposite of fortitude is exhaustion. When the soldier’s well is dry, his soul is dry.” [84]

“One key characteristic of a great military leader is an ability to draw from the tremendous depths of fortitude within his own well, and in doing so he is fortifying his own men by permitting them to draw from his well.” [85]

Victory/success replenishes individual and collective wells – there is “a paying in as well as a paying out.” (Moran) [85]

*[Je: relate to indulgences and the treasury of the Church.]*

“Depletion of the finite resource of fortitude can be seen in entire units.” [85]

Thus, it is sometimes better to rely on green units than experienced ones. [85]

Ignoring the above, military engagements can deplete an entire society (which is what Moran saw in England in WWI). [86]

“The resistance to the close-range killing of one’s own species is so great that it is often sufficient to overcome the cumulative influences of the instinct for self-protection, the coercive forces of leadership, the expectancy of peers, and the obligation to preserve the lives of comrades.” [87]

“The soldier in combat is trapped within this tragic Catch-22. If he overcomes his resistance to killing and kills an enemy soldier in close combat, he will be forever burdened with blood guilt, and if he elects not to kill, then the blood guilt of his fallen comrades and the shame of his profession, nation, and cause lie upon him. He is damned if he does, and damned if he doesn’t.” [87]

“Grossman’s experience of asking old veterans about their kills: “These memories were the scabs of terrible, hidden wounds in the minds of these kind and gentle men.” [89]

The intense bonding between men in a unit intensifies the fear/guilt of letting them down. [90]

“Even the language of men at was is full of denial of the enormity of what they have done. Most soldiers do not ‘kill,’ instead the enemy was knocked over, wasted, greased, taken out, and mopped up. The enemy is hosed, zapped, probed, and fired on. The enemy’s humanity is denied, and he becomes a strange beast called a Kraut, Jap, Reb, Yank, dink, slant, or slope. Even the weapons of war receive benign names – Puff the Magic Dragon, Walleye, TOW, Fat Boy, and Thin Man – and the killing weapon of the individual soldier becomes a piece of a hog, and a bullet becomes a round.” [92]

“The dead soldier takes his misery with him, but the man who killed him must forever live and die with him.” [93]

“The language of war helps us to deny what war is really about, and in doing so it makes war more palatable.” [93]

Proverbial blind man and elephant applied to war: “But the whole beast is far more enormous and vastly more terrifying than society as a whole is prepared to believe.” [95]

“A culture raised on Rambo, Indiana Jones, Luke Skywalker, and James Bond wants to believe that combat and killing can be done with impunity – that we can declare someone to be the enemy and that for cause and country the soldiers will cleanly and remorselessly wipe them from the face fo the earth. In many ways it is simply too painful for society to address what it does when it sends its young men off to kill other men in distant lands.” [95]

Forgetfulness – Glenn Gray: “The great god Mars tries to blind us when we enter his realm, and when we leave he gives us a generous cup of the waters of Lethe to drink.” [96]

“Peter Marin condemns the ‘inadequacy’ of our psychological terminology in describing the magnitude and reality of the ‘pain of human conscience.’ As a society, he says, we seem unable to deal with moral pain or guilt. Instead it is treated as a neurosis of a pathology, ‘something to escape rather than something to learn from, a disease rather than – as it may well be for the vets – an appropriate if painful response to the past.’” [96]

VA psychologists are often unwilling to deal with problems of guilt. [96]

Glenn Gray: “With every foot of distance there is a corresponding decrease in reality.” [97]

“… there is a direct relationship between the empathic and physical proximity of the victim, and the resultant difficulty and trauma of the kill.” [97]

Distance factor in modern warfare….. Firebombing (Dresden/Hamburg) and Hiroshima/Nagasaki compared to sieges of cities when distance could not mitigate in previous eras. [99-106]

“The difference is the difference between what Lieutenant Calley did to a village full of Vietnamese, and what many pilots and artillerymen did to similar Vietnamese villages.” [104]

Artillerymen keep firing. “… the intervention of distance and machinery between them and the enemy.” [108]

No refusal to fire; no psychiatric trauma. [108]

“… protected by the same powerful combination of group absolution, mechanical distance, and … physical distance.” [108]

Artillery accounts are “strangely depersonalized.” [109]

‘Stages’ re: midrange kill: automatic / euphoria / remorse. [111-112]

Close range: “The undeniable certainty of responsibility on the part of the killer.” [114]

“… At this range the screams and cries of the enemy can be heart, adding greatly to the extent of the trauma experienced by the killer.” [116]

Richardson: “… it is a touching fact that men, dying in battle, often call upon their mothers. I have heard them do so in five languages. [116]

Often a victim does not die instantly – “and the killer finds himself in the position of comforting his victim in his last moments.” [116]

E.g., soldier and dying Viet Cong sharing a cigarette.; [116-117]

*[je: sacramental communion]*

Grossman, listening to soldiers: “The close-range kills… appear to be something these veterans wanted to get off their chests.” [117]

Non-killing occurs most often at close range. [118]

“As men draw this near it becomes extremely difficult to deny their humanity. Looking in a man’s face, seeing his eyes and his fear, eliminate denial. At this range the interpersonal nature of the killing has shifted. Instead of shooting at a uniform and killing a generalized enemy, now the killer must shoot at a person and kill a specific individual. Most simply cannot or will not do it.” [119]

“To reach out and penetrate the enemy’s flesh and thrust a portion of ourselves into his vitals is deeply akin to the sexual act, yet deadly, and is therefore strangely repulsive to us.” [121]

McKenna: “… the ‘intimate brutality’ of bayonet kills.” [121]

“… wound statistics from nearly two centuries of battles indicate that what is revealed here is a basic, profound, and universal insight into human nature. First, the closer the soldier draws to his enemy the harder it is to kill him, until at bayonet range it becomes extremely difficult, and, second, the average human being has a strong resistance to piercing the body of another of his own kind with a handheld edged weapon, preferring to club or slash at the enemy.” [123]

“… a circumstance with tremendous potential for psychological trauma.” [124]

“… there appears to be a chase instinct in man that permits him to kill a fleeing enemy.” [127]

Physical proximity is “negated when the face cannot be seen.” [128]

“The eyes are the window of the soul, and if one does not have to look into the eyes when killing, it is much easier to deny the humanity of the victim.” [128]

An old World War II veteran: “The horror associated with pinning the man down and feeling him struggle and watching him bleed to death is something that he can barely tolerate to this day.” [130]

“Man has a tremendous resistance to killing effectively with his bare hands.” [132]

“… into the area in which killing becomes like sex and sex like killing.” [136]

Vietnam veteran: “… carrying a gun was like having a permanent hard-on.” [136]

“The force of darkness and destruction within us is balanced with a force of light and love for our fellow man. These forces struggle and string within the heart of each of us. To ignore one is to ignore the other. We cannot know the light if we do not acknowledge the dark. We cannot know life if we do not acknowledge death.” [137]

Authority: “… the influence of leadership is enabling killing of the battlefield.” [143]

Factors: - Priority of authority figure to the subject; - killer’s subjective respect for the authority figure; - Intensity of the authority figures demands for killing behavior; - Legitimacy of the authority figure’s authority and demands. [143]

“Never underestimate the power of the need to obey.” [146]

Grossman: “I have not yet had any success at getting a leader to confront his emotions revolving around the soldiers who have died in combat as a result of his orders. In interviews, such men work around reservoirs of guilt and denial that appear to be buried too deeply to be tapped, and perhaps this is for the best.” [148]

Many know the story of a World War II battalion that continued to fight and suffer horrendous casualties without surrendering. Their commander was given the Medal of Honor. “What they don’t know is that Whittlesey committed suicide shortly after the war.” [148]

“… a powerful sense of accountability to his commander” is the primary factor enabling killing.

At 50% casualties, group cohesion tends to slip “into a form of mass depression and apathy.” [149]

“The degree to which the soldiers have bonded or developed a sense of accountability to the small number of men they will be fighting with…” [150]

Crowd = “diffusion of responsibility.” [152]

“… a strange and powerful interaction of accountability and anonymity.” [152]

The chariot was the “first crew-served weapon.” [153]

In World War II, firing rates were nearly 100% for crew-served weapons, but only 15-20% among riflemen. [153]

“… that haunted, thousand-yard stare I’ve seen in so many vets when their minds and emotions return to the battlefield.” [157]

Photographs found on bodies killed by soldiers: “a crack in the veil of denial that makes war possible.” [158]

Killing-enabling distance: cultural, moral, social, mechanical. [160]

“If your propaganda machine can convince your soldiers that their opponents are not really human but are ‘inferior forms of life,’ then their natural resistance to killing their own species will be reduced.” [161]

“The adolescent soldiers against whom such propaganda is directed is desperately trying to rationalize what he is being forced to do, and he is therefore predisposed to believe this nonsense.” [161]

Regarding cultural distance: Among World War II soldiers, 44% really wanted to kill a Japanese soldier; 6% a German.

“It can be easy to unleash this genie of racial and ethnic hatred in order to facilitate killing in time of war. It can be more difficult to keep the cork in the battle and completely restrain it.” [163]

Moral distance: condemnation of the enemy’s guilt; affirmation of the legitimacy of one’s own cause. [164]

The need to punish/avenge is a fundamental justification for violence. [165]

“American wars have normally been characterized by a distinctive tendency toward moral rather than cultural distance.” [166]

Danger associated with moral distance: “… every nation seems to think that God is on its side.” [167]

“The social class structure that exists in the military provides a denial mechanism that makes it possible for leaders to order their men to their deaths. But it makes military leadership a very lonely thing.” [168]

“Night-vision devices provide a superb form of psychological distance by converting the target into an inhuman green blob.” [169]

Israeli soldier: “You see it all as ‘if’ it were happening on a TV screen.” [170]

“Modern training uses what are essentially B.F. Skinner’s operant conditioning techniques to develop a firing behavior in the soldier.” [177]

Anger – “loss of comrades can enable killing.” [179]

“…there is 2 percent of the male population that, if pushed or given a legitimate reason, will kill without regret or remorse.” [180]

Common denominator of World War II aces: “they had been involved in a lot of fights as children.” [182]

“There is undoubtedly a division in humanity between those who can feel and understand the pain and suffering of others, and those who cannot.” [183]

“The presence of aggression, combined with the absence of empathy, results in sociopathy.” [183]

Sheep – wolves – sheep dogs….. Jung’s warrior archetype. [183]

“… in times of danger a nation needs them desperately.” [185]

Hohns: “Without the creation of abstract images of the enemy, and without the depersonalization of the enemy during training, battle would become impossible to sustain.” [186]

“Killing comes with a price, and societies must learn that their soldiers will have to spend the rest of their lives living with what they have done.” [191-192]

“There are many benefits reaped by those who tap the dark power of atrocity.” [206

“… death from twenty thousand feet is strangely impersonal and psychologically impotent. But death close up and personal, visiting the manifest intensity of the enemy’s Wind of Hate upon its victims, such death can be hideously effective at sapping the will of the enemy and ultimately achieve victory.” [208]

“Those who command atrocities are powerfully bonded by guilt to those who commit atrocities, and to their cause, since only the success of their cause can ensure that they will not have to answer for their actions.” [210]

“The psychological trauma of living with what one has done to one’s fellow man may represent the most significant toll taken by atrocity. Those who commit atrocity have made a Faustian bargain with evil. They hade sold their consciences, their future, and their peace of mind for a brief, fleeting, self-destructive advantage.” [222]

Stages of Killing-Response 9similar to Kübler-Ross): concern about killing / actual kill / exhilaration / remorse / rationalization and acceptance. [231]

“… generally sequential, but not necessarily universal.” [231]

Most actual killing in combat is “reflexive without conscious thought. It is as though a human being is a weapon.” [233]

Exhilaration can lead to “combat addiction” (Thompson)….. Fighter pilots are “particularly susceptible.” [234]

Vietnam veteran: “Viet Nam is the benchmark of all my experiences. The remainder of my life has been spent hanging around the military trying to recapture some of that old-time feeling. In combat I was a respected man among men. I lived on life’s edge and did the most manly thing in the world: I was a warrior in war.” [236]

“Whether the killer denies his remorse, deals with it, or is overwhelmed by it, it is nevertheless almost always there. The killer’s remorse is real, it is common, it is intense, and it is something that he must deal with for the rest of his life.” [237]

Rationalization/Acceptance = life-long process which “may never truly be completed. The killer never completely leaves all remorse and guilt behind, but he can usually come to accept that what he has done was necessary and right.” [237]

“Sometimes the rationalization can manifest itself in dreams.” [240]

“But a good portion of the subsequent remorse and guilt appear to be a horrified response to this perfectly natural and common feeling of exhilaration.” [243]

“…when you have cause to identify with your victim 9that is, you see him participate in some act that emphasizes his humanity, such as urinating, eating, or smoking) it is much harder to kill him, and there is much less satisfaction associated with the kill.” [244]

“… subsequent kills are always easier, and there is much more of a tendency to feel satisfaction or exhilaration after the second killing experience, and less tendency to feel remorse.” [244]

“… that is the objective of this study: no judgment, no condemnation, just the remarkable power of understanding.” [245]

‘Improved’ firing rate in Viet Nam “comes with a hidden cost. Severe psychological trauma becomes a distinct possibility when psychological safeguards are overridden. Psychological conditioning was applied en masse to a body of soldiers who, in previous wars, were shown to be unwilling or unable to engage in killing activities. When these soldiers, already inwardly shaken by their inner killing experience, returned to be condemned and attacked by their own nation, the result was often further psychological trauma and long-term psychic damage.” [252]

Post World War II – “… psychology has had an impact as great as that of technology on the modern battlefield.” [251]

Psychological methods:

1. Densitization [251] – Boot camp “deification of killing as almost unheard of in World War I, rare in World War II, increasingly present in Korea, and thoroughly institutionalized in Viet Nam.” [252]
2. Conditioning – Pavlovian and Skinnerian: “behavioral engineering” (Skinner). [252]

“The method used to train today’s – and the Viet Nam era’s – U.S. Army and USMC soldiers is nothing more than an application of conditioning techniques to develop a reflexive ‘quick shoot’ ability.” [253]

“Every aspect of killing on the battlefield is rehearsed, visualized, and conditioned.” [254]

“Snipers use such techniques extensively.” [254]

“But the military is not, as a rule, a particularly introspective organization, and it has been my experience that those ordering, conducting, and participating in this training do not understand or even wonder (1) what makes it work or (2) what its psychological and sociological side effects might be.” [255]

1. Denial Defense Mechanisms

“… unconscious methods for dealing with traumatic experiences. Prepackaged denial defense mechanisms are a remarkable contribution from modern U.S. Army training.” [255]

“Basically the soldier has rehearsed the process so many times that when he does kill in combat he is able to, at one level, deny to himself that he is actually killing another human being.” [255]

A process of “manufactured contempt” (Jordan). [256]

“… they had been taught to think the unthinkable.” [260]

“This program of desensitization, conditioning, and denial defense mechanisms, combined with subsequent participation in war, may make it possible to share the guilt of killing without having even killed.” [260]

“… statistically there is no greater a proportion of violent criminals among veterans that there is among nonveterans.” [260

Dyer: “… the most important qualities teenagers bring to basic training are enthusiasm and naivete…” [264]

“… the American combatants in Viet Nam were significantly younger than in any war in American history.” [265]

“… a real-world reenactment of *Lord of the Flies* with guns, and destined to internalize the horrors of combat during one of the most vulnerable and susceptible stages of life.” [265]

“… when you have to kill women and children, or when you have to kill men in their homes, in front of their wives and children, and when you have to do it… up close where you can watch them die, the horror appears to transcend description or understanding.” [266-267]

“The standard methods on on-the-scene rationalization fail when the enemy’s child comes out to mourn over her father’s body or when the enemy is a child throwing a hand grenade.” [267]

“The innocence of childhood, soldiers, and nations, all lost in a single act reenacted countless times for ten endless year until a weary nation finally retreats in honor and dismay from its long nightmare.” [267]

“In Viet Nam there were no rear lines to escape to, there was no escape from the stress of combat, and the psychological stress of continuously existing at ‘the front’ took an enormous, if delayed, toll.” [268]

Viet Nam as “a war of individuals” – soldiers came in country as individual replacements, not as part of a group – and had a clear tour of duty (one year). [269]

Record low number of psychiatric casualties in Viet Nam on the battlefield, but at a high long-term price. [269]

:All but the best of units became just a collection of men experiencing endless leavings and arrivals, and that sacred process of bonding, which makes it possible for men to do what they must do in combat, became a tattered and torn remnant of the support structure experienced by veterans of past American wars.” [270]

The first pharmacological war: tranquilizers and phenothiazines. [270]

Legal and illegal “drugs combined with the one-year tour… to submerge or delay combat-stress reactions.” [271]

“… if drugs are given while the stressor is still being experienced, then they will arrest or supercede the development of effective coping mechanisms, resulting in an increase in the long-term trauma from the stress.” [271]

“At their best these drugs only served to delay the inevitable confrontation with the pain, suffering, grief, and guild that the Viet Nam veteran repressed and buried deep inside himself. And at worst they actually increased the impact of the trauma suffered by the soldier.” [271]

Arthur Hadley: “… *all* warrior societies, tribes, and nations incorporate some form of purification ritual for their returning soldiers, and this ritual appears to be essential to the health of both the returning warrior and the society as a whole.” [271-272]

“Only the veterans of Viet Nam have endured a concerted, organized, psychological attack by their own people>’ [280]

Viet Nam veterans with PTSAD: .5 to 1.5 million. [291]

“… they are four times more likely to be divorced or separated (and those not divorced are significantly more likely to have a troubled marriage), they represent a large proportion of America’s homeless population, and as the years go by they are increasingly more likely to commit suicide.” [291]

“We can, and have, conditioned soldiers to kill – they are eager and willing and trust our judgment. But in doing so we have not made them capable of handling the moral and social burdens of these acts, and we have a moral responsibility to consider the long-term effects of our commands.” [291-292]

Violence in society – what is new/different “is the systematic process of defeating the normal individual’s age-old, psychological inhibition against violent, harmful activity toward one’s own species.” [304]

“The same tools that more than quadrupled the firing rate in Viet Nam are now in widespread use among our civilian population.” [304]

Navy psychologist: “… techniques he was developing for the U.S. government in which classical conditioning and social learning methodology were being used to permit military assassins to overcome their resistance to killing.” [306]

Desensitizing “when we allow increasingly more vivid depictions of suffering and violence to be shown as entertainment to our children.” [308]

“Our society has found a powerful recipe for providing killing empowerment to an entire generation of Americans.” [309]

“If we had a clear-cut objective of raising a generation of assassins and killers who are unrestrained by either authority or the nature of the victim, it is difficult to imagine how we could do a better job.” [310]

“We are reaching that stage of desensitization at which the inflicting of pain and suffering has become a source of entertainment: vicarious pleasure rather than rebellion. We are learning to like it.” [311]

“But today there is a new kind of hero in movies, a hero who operates outside the law. Vengeance is a much older, darker, more atavistic, and more primitive concept than law, and these new antiheroes are depicted as being motivated and rewarded for their obedience to the gods of vengeance rather than those of law.” [320]

“We are most assuredly on the road to ruin, and we need desperately to find the road home from this dark and fearful place to which we have traveled.” [324]

“Technology has leapfrogged in a variety of ways that change the context of violence in our society.” [326]

“… our society is trapped in a pathological spiral with all vectors pulling inward toward a tighter and tighter cycle of violence and destruction.” [327]

“Each act of violence breeds ever-greater levels of violence, and at some point the genie can never be put back in the bottle.” [330]

“Every destructive act gnaws away at the restraint of other men.” [330]

“… we do have a choice about how we think about war, about killing, and about the value of human life in our society.” [331]