

## REMARKS

A SPECIAL CONVERSATION ON RESPONDING TO THE  
GREATEST THREATS TO HUMANITY

*Hon. Jerry Brown\* & Jonathan Granoff\*\**

## CHARLES MOXLEY:

Welcome Governor Brown. Thank you. Everyone, please meet Jonathan Granoff. Jonathan is President of the Global Security Institute and Senior Advisor and U.S. Representative of the Permanent Secretariat at the World Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates and Chair of the ABA Task Force on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and advisor to the Committee on National Security of the International Section of the ABA. Jonathan is going to have a dialogue now with Governor Brown, after first introducing Governor Brown. Thank you. Jonathan, take it away.

## JONATHAN GRANOFF:

Well, this is a real honor because, a little full disclosure, I'm a bona fide fan of Governor Jerry Brown. Three times governor of California and not only a terrific administrator who helped turn the economy around and made California, I think the sixth largest economy in the world, but he's been a visionary and he's been a thought leader and yeah, I didn't realize he even had a deep background in law. He actually clerked for the Supreme Court of California.

So Governor Brown, Jerry, I want to start out and ask you, how did you come to be seized of the issue of the threat of nuclear weapons? I know that now that you're no longer governor, you're chairman of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, you're on the Board of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, and you're a passionate advocate along with the rest of us. So how did that come about?

---

\* Former Governor, State of California; Executive Chairman, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists

\*\* President, Global Security Institute; Senior Advisor, Permanent Secretariat of the World Summits of Nobel Peace Laureates

JERRY BROWN:

I just have to correct one little factoid. You said that I did something to make the California economy better. Well, I certainly didn't hurt it, but governors don't really affect the economy. And even presidents, in the short term, don't affect the economy, even though everybody thinks they do. And they get mad at politicians when the economy goes sour, but it's one of those widely shared misbeliefs that is rampant. I had to correct that.

Now, how I got interested? Well, it goes back to law. I was at Yale Law School during the Cuban Missile Crisis, and it scared the hell out of me. I thought this guy, Kennedy, we're going to blow the damn world up; where the hell can I go? And I was thinking of going to some remote place in Vermont, but then, I had to go to class, so I never got around to it. But that was quite frightening to live through those days from Senator Smathers releasing pictures about the missile in placements in Cuba, then going forward.

Then fast forward to my time in California, the Nuclear Freeze Initiative was put on the ballot when I was governor. It passed, barely, I might say, by about one point and as governor, I was to write a letter to President Reagan and President Gorbachev to freeze nuclear weapons. But as we all know, the freeze was stigmatized very effectively by the powerful people to say that would create a great disadvantage for America as distinguished from Russia. And here we are, with the same kind of dangerous mythologies, corrupting our understanding of the true danger of a nuclear weaponry.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

The Cuban Missile Crisis also got me involved. I was interning for Congressman Henry Helstoski of New Jersey in the late 1960s, and then Senator Kennedy, Robert Kennedy from New York, took a small group of interns out for lunch and told us very literally how close we came to ending civilization. And I will never forget his closing remarks were two things. One is if we get every other issue right, and don't get this right, it won't matter. And two, that he considered how we deal with nuclear weapons the moral and practical litmus test of our time. But since then, we have another threat that's hit us on the horizon, that you've been a thought leader and a practical leader in as well: the climate. You convened

a summit in California before you left office to address slow burn. Do you see a relationship between slow burn and fast burn?

JERRY BROWN:

What about slow burn? Is that how you describe global warming?

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

Yeah. That's slow burn. Slow burn is climate change.

JERRY BROWN:

Okay. There are so many new terms that as I live my long life, I marvel at how the language is constantly transmogrified with all new shiny phrases and terms. But I get your point. Yeah, climate is different, but it has devastating impacts and has irreversible impacts. I don't want to get off into the climate because we want to talk about nuclear. But it is something that is of great concern.

California led the Western hemisphere in taking real action. That's big. And hopefully, maybe if we can wrap this aspect up, we're in a world where nationalism continues to run amok. Nationalism is burning very brightly in the heart of Joe Biden and the Congress and the New York Times and all these other people. So I think we got to deal with the fact that there are threats – nuclear climate, pandemic – that are of common threat, of common interest, and of common vulnerability.

And that's why, my vision is one that I call "planetary realism." The realism of Hans Morgenthau and Reinhold Niebuhr and Henry Kissinger, but the planetary aspect that we're all in it together and it isn't just balance of power, but it is understanding that we're mutually vulnerable. And therefore, we have a profound reason to collaborate together, despite our differences on human rights, on separation of powers and all the other issues that separate China, Russia, America, North Korea, Iran, and all the rest. So, that consciousness that I call "planetary realism" is still marginal. It is still deviant to the dominant culture in Washington, DC., and I would assume in Moscow and Beijing. So you folks at the American Bar Association, New York Bar, you have your work cut out for you because as far as I'm concerned, we are still in the Dark Ages.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

You're addressing the paradigm of nationalism and militarism as the pursuit of security as a flawed paradigm of security. Your thinking on this goes back many years. I read an article of yours, a brilliant article called *Nuclear Addiction: A Response* from 1984, and you ended it so prophetically. "The shared threat to our common existence may yet provide a new foundation and old paradigms may be transcended in a world that can destroy itself. Morality at a minimum requires truth." I would say realism too. "The truth is, in this case, that Russia and the U.S. are embedded in a neurotic relationship that progressively grows less stable. Soon, we shall either use our new weapons and die or rejecting the outworn logic of war, find change in some form of mutual trust."

I would say that vision—a moral, spiritual vision—is embodied in the law of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and implicit in the Charter of the UN. Heeding that vision is also a practical necessity now. If we don't cooperate and see the shared realism of protecting the phytoplankton so we can breathe and the climate so we can live and cooperatively address pandemics and persist in these excessive expenditures for nuclear weapons, we won't survive. You wrote in that essay, way back in the 1980s, that nukes are a kind of addiction. What do you mean by that? I mean, that's a different framework from what is usually used to address nuclear weapons.

JERRY BROWN:

Sure. That's based on the anthropologist Gregory Bateson who really developed the thought, the addictive character. And he said, "Addiction in the nuclear arms race is like an addiction in that, as the heroin addict takes the first jolt, shoots it into his arm, he gets a certain sense of wellbeing."

He analogized that to building our weapons systems. We built a nice MX missile or whatever the case may be and then Russia does the same thing. But after we take that injection, we need another one, and then another one, because we're addicted. And the key to addiction is that you become tolerant to the dosage and you have to increase the dosage. So the dosage increases. The analogy to nuclear arms race is the lethality has to increase, lethality by the precision of the weapons, by the magnitude of the impact, by the numbers of places from which they're deployed.

All of this increases the horror, when it finally occurs a very important part in this race, is this addictive competition that is deterrence. The fundamental doctrine of the modern nuclear world is that we will stop you from hitting us by threatening to destroy you. And it's all based on creating fear and threatening.

Now, the trouble with that threat is when you create that threat, the reaction is not confidence or trust, but it's fear.

So the other side, Russia, builds more weapons. And then when it builds a new weapons system or a variation on their old system, then America says, "Oh my God, we have to do something different." And then we do something more, but we do something a little different than the Russians. And so the Russians say, "Oh, they've got something a little different. We'd better copy that, but it'll be a little different and therefore we have to respond."

It's a constant escalation in nuclear innovation, in differentiation and a constant increase in lethality, all held together by human minds – not one, but hundreds across the nuclear regimes of Russia and the U.S. – and held together with software that can fail. And in fact, it has failed in the past when we've gotten false alerts. This is what a former Secretary of Defense Bill Perry calls the danger of nuclear blunder: not that deterrence fails, but rather we get an accident, we get a false alert and the president, having only 20 minutes to decide, decides wrongly and fires one of these weapons, ICBM's that are on hair-trigger alert. It's false.

And then Russia fires back and we're off to the races, and maybe human civilization is gone. Now that idea is not accepted. It is marginal to the Washington Establishment – Democrats, Republicans. All the big people feel very comfortable in the world we now live. I do not feel comfortable. Bill Perry doesn't feel comfortable. We're in an extremely dangerous position that all we have is this big threat that progressively becomes less stable.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

We should not ignore how many near misses, near devastations we've had, based on human and mechanical error. We humans make mistakes. Even the Cuban Missile Crisis was based on the false premise that the weapons in Cuba were not operational.

JERRY BROWN:

Right. And the key point here is not that we've had mistakes. We all know that. That's been published. We know the names of the people, the Russians, and the Americans who saved us. Bill Perry, by the way, was told in the middle of the night, when he was Secretary of Defense, that the Russians had launched a missile attack. And he didn't wake the president up because he just intuitively thought, based on his experience, that it wasn't right. It turned out to be correct. So did Petrov, over in Russia. He did the same thing. They fired him.

Look, the accident, the dangers are there. The big problem is, why doesn't the president say something about it? Where is the leader who's going to tell us? Did Ash Carter ever say anything about this? Does Pompeo ever talk about it? Does the New York Times want to write about it? The Washington Post? No. This is like a secret. The danger through accident is minimized and marginalized. I've talked to key generals; they're not worried. Some are, but a lot of them aren't. So, that's our biggest problem: getting general consensus that we've got a problem. And remember the astronauts, they said, "Houston, we've got a problem."

Well, I'd say to Washington: "Washington, we've got a problem, wake up." And I think that is our challenge. How do we as non-members of the priesthood in Washington and Moscow get people saying, "Oh my God, we've got to take care of this, we've got to do something about it. Reduce the damn threat now"? And yet the main problem now is what more sanctions can we lay on Russia? What new misdeed can we identify and vilify on the part of Putin? Stipulate. Putin's got a list of a hundred faults. By the way, the U.S. has a nice list of its own.

That's not the point. The point is, like in World War II, we've got a threat, certainly as great as the threat of the Nazis. And what do we do? We didn't go point out the human rights violations of Joseph Stalin. We said, "Let's join together and beat the Nazis." We did. Well, we have to join together to beat this threat of a nuclear blunder by accident, by miscalculation, by software failure. That's the way I see it.

The number one question is, getting through to people that we can handle and reduce this nuclear danger without compromising all these other things, which they now call, "core values." I remember when they used to just talk about "values." Now they put

“core” in front of it and that almost becomes like, well, we better go to war over that. This reminds me of 17th century Germany, when the Lutherans and the Catholics killed one-third of their country over the difference between transubstantiation and consubstantiation and, of course, the authority of the Pope.

So we are in a highly pseudo religious fervor, and we’ve got to knock it off and get back to some realism, and I would say, planetary realism – recognizing the common interest to common vulnerability that the Russians and the Americans and the Chinese and the whole planet shares together. And that is, don’t say nationalism is going to go away. No. But we have to go transnationalism, planetary realism, or we’re going to extinguish humanity. It’s just that simple.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

I’m involved in a project to advance the principles of Human Security, which is exactly the same as your planetary realism. It’s an initiative of the World Academy of Arts and Sciences and the United Nations to try and mainstream Human Security as the paradigm to address the global threats we are discussing.

JERRY BROWN:

Jonathan, I’ve got an objection here. Security – they all talk about security. What’s wrong with a good old world “peace”? That’s too soft. It’s too wimpy. But security implies a military. It implies weaponry. It implies war. And then they always put the word, “national,” in front of it. We’re always talking about “national security.” I think we have to talk about realism and truth and shared interests. Remember Eisenhower? He said, “If all that Americans want is security, they can go to prison.” I listened to Eisenhower. He said some very important things with his final address to the nation, and elsewhere.

So I do have to, at least, hang a red lantern on the word, “security.” I want to say, how do we get some trust? Not naive trust, but just trust that the other side is not stupid, that they can calculate these risks, realize the consequences and adopt measures that will reduce, as close to zero as we can, the nuclear risk that we’re now exacerbating. Everybody’s talking about the number one problem is what new sanctions can we put on the Russians? That’s not the number one problem. The number one problem is,

how can we and Russia together recognize the mutual suicide pack that we've implicitly committed ourselves to.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

I really like your emphasis on realism and juxtapose it with two major myths that are leading us over a cliff. One myth is the myth of the Roman maxim, prepare for war, receive peace- peace through absolute strength, which has proven to be absurd. It didn't do anything in Vietnam or Afghanistan, and it just leads to arms racing and it's not realistic. Where the other is-

JERRY BROWN:

Oh, wait. I think, I don't want to say we want to be strong through weakness. We can be strong, but what is strong? The Chinese have 300 to 400 nuclear missiles; they feel pretty strong, and they're not scared of us when we got 7,000 nuclear warheads. How much do you need? The question is not strength versus weakness, but a clear definition of in what does strength consist. That's what we're missing because it's the arms industry, the propaganda, the nationalist ideology, the fear, all combined to have this Congress totally head-over-heels in trying to buy more and more weaponry.

In fact, the Armed Services Committee run by the Democrats at a 14 hour-hearing two months ago on the \$740 billion budget. There was no coverage to speak of anywhere in major press, and there was not much dissent. And they voted out the budget, including a new nuclear weapon system, including the modernization program that's going forward. There still is a lack of insight, understanding, honest confrontation with the facts, the technology and the world we now find ourselves in.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

They are completely ignoring the science, which has discovered that, if less than 1% of the arsenal were to go off, it would throw approximately five million tons of soot into the stratosphere and render the agricultural base of the planet dysfunctional.

JERRY BROWN:

All right. I want to underscore that point. So we get into a little nuclear exchange – we do 50 bombs, the Russians, or Pakistan or India, do 50 – and now you got the nuclear winter, which Carl Sagan talked about 20 years ago. Now, there's been more research, more validation that we're not 100% sure this would happen, but 10% sure would be good enough for me to do everything to avoid it.

The whole concept of deterrence is: if you hit us, we're going to hit you back. Yet our defense system – a \$300 billion defense program that we've developed – can't stop missiles. It can barely hit one, if they know where the missile is going to be in practice. So here we are, our only threat is: if you hit us, we'll hit you. Therefore, you won't do anything. But what if they send missiles? Are we going to then send missiles back and then ensure this nuclear winter effect?

The whole concept of nuclear deterrence needs to be really looked into because it has some fundamental flaws at its very essence. Now, I'm not saying we're going to get rid of deterrence tomorrow, but we all ought to understand, are we really saying, "Russia, if you do this, we're going to hit you back with nuclear warheads?" And if we do, does that lead to nuclear winter? If we do, does that lead to mass starvation? Is that our program? Or shall we take some other risk, far less, to work something out with the Russians, just like we did with Stalin, what we've done with other people. I won't get into all the other unholy alliances that we've been part of, but we certainly ought to be able to form an unholy alliance, to make the world less prone to a nuclear accident.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

It's also a legal requirement that both Russia and the United States have, pursuant to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, where a set of steps to lead us to that more secure world has been promised in the review processes of the Treaty.

JERRY BROWN:

Yeah, Jonathan, the trouble is, if you read Article Six of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty carefully, it talks about negotiating in good faith *on* the steps that lead to disarm it. It's got some weasel words that allow a lot of backsliding or a lot of shilly-shally. The current nonmovement towards nuclear disarmament is so gross, and even the weak words of Article Six are in fact being

violated. I'd agree with you, but it's a pretty weak read on which to bottom our nuclear disarmament talk.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

Well, in the review processes pursuant to the agreement for the indefinite extension, they agreed to an entry into force of the Test Ban Treaty, on a fissile material cutoff treaty, lowering the salience of nuclear weapons in policies, strengthening safeguards, and other security enhancing steps. These are the kind of things that you put in your article recently in Politico. These are the framework that they've agreed to and they're reneging on it. And when the big players renege on treaties, how can we possibly gain the confidence of the rest of the world?

JERRY BROWN:

The big question – you have a lot of smart people looking in here, so I raised the question – how come? Does Joe Biden or his advisors or the New York Times, do they not get this? Why is there a virtual silence with respect to this issue? And I spent a lot of time looking at the media. I've been around, my first political office I took over on July 1, 1969. Okay, that was a long time ago. I've been reading the press ever since. And I don't see much on nuclear danger, whatsoever. And when I talk to people – and I talk to a lot of the biggies, I can get through to these people, I've run into them at the various Zoom conferences – there seems to be such confidence in the status quo. There seems to be a child-like belief that all this complexity can be managed to avoid one of these catastrophic risks.

I don't see it that way. I have a darker view, maybe from my Catholic seminary training on original sin. We used to have this doctrine of eternal damnation. Well, if you think that's even a plausible possibility, certainly nuclear annihilation is not that far afield. So I'm worried, but I don't see the group of powerful people very worried. They're more worried about getting tough, getting more sanctions, more this, more that. That to me says, we have a lot of consciousness raising and we have a lot of educational work to do. And we need to have a lot of blunt conversation because we're not teeing up even the first step or idea in moving us toward a safer world.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

Absolutely. And there's a total lack of recognition of the hazard of the tension between India and Pakistan, where if there is a computer error, like the one you described, they don't have five minutes or 10 minutes; they have 300 seconds. And there's a danger of somebody creating the perception of a launch, a computer hacker, not to mention madness or other miscalculations. We now know scientifically, we're all downwind. And yet, this obsession with power of the national state, has taken I think, mythic proportions. It's almost like a religious doctrine that has to be addressed. But during the Cold War, the United States and the Soviet Union behind the scenes, cooperated with science, addressing polio and smallpox, and actually we've eliminated them, but they never told the public of that cooperation.

It's very odd that our political class commerce in fear rather than in success stories. How do you think we can change this? How do you think we can break the spell? It's almost like it's a spell. How can we bring some realism to the discussion, to bring some sense of proportionality to our military budget, to bring some sense of the possibility of recognizing our shared interests to the international political class? What do you think we need to do next?

JERRY BROWN:

I have no idea.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

Well, I'm very much in the same-

JERRY BROWN:

That's why I'm on this program, I figured all you smart lawyers, all of you New York lawyers would have some answers that haven't filtered out to California, other than the obvious. But just from the presidential campaign, there wasn't much talk about this.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

None.

JERRY BROWN:

The approach has been that we'll call one of these leaders, thugs – and they may well be thugs – and then they can call us thugs. Fine. But I remember, back in the battle days of detente, Henry Kissinger and Dick Nixon went – and Nixon brought his wife, Pat – and they stayed overnight at the Kremlin. Can you imagine the American president taking his wife and spending the evening over there in the Kremlin talking about, what do we do? And is Putin worse than Brezhnev?

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

No.

JERRY BROWN:

I don't know. That takes scholars. It's more complicated than I can take time to figure out. But we are in a very bizarre, unprecedented period. I think, to be more serious about your question, I think we have to shock people, wake them up with the bizarre quality of our current focus. I'm not saying what we're focused on doesn't have importance, but it is marginalizing these more fundamental issues – profound threats to the world's wellbeing. But they don't fit into the nationalist paradigm, the nationalist meme that we've got to thump our chest here and say, "We're tough." We're back into that kind of thing.

C. Wright Mills coined the phrase, appropriate for our time: "crackpot realism." We've got to get off of that and go from *crackpot* to *planetary* realism. Not utopianism, not liberal interventionism, not the ideal that we're all going to be Boy Scouts, because we're not. If you look at the kind of narrative going on in America about systematic, structural racism. Now that itself needs to be put in proper context, but if you take that at the very least, it means we are deeply flawed. And we have so many things that we have to get right, and we've gotten wrong in the past, that we should be really focusing on ourselves. "Physician, cure thyself." Don't look at the little dot in the other guy's eye and not see the beam in our own.

We have to have much greater self-awareness, and if more intelligent, prominent people started talking about that, maybe we could make some progress, but I can tell you it's not easy. The big people are not interested in nuclear. On nuclear issues, it's basically "shut up." Now they'll talk about climate change. Five

years ago, that was verboten to talk about. Well, we've got to get this issue in the mainstream.

It's got to be in the Congressional hearings in the mainstream media. That's what I think is missing. If any of you New York people who know anybody at The Times, keep pushing. I've gone to the editorial board, pounding on the table, talking about the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists' Doomsday Clock and how we're 100 seconds from annihilation, but it's very hard to get a response.

You must be in the club. And the club is not really thinking about nuclear accident right now. And that's where if you want to make any progress, knock on the door of the club and wake them up. Get the foreign relations organizations talking about this. Get the transition team talking. That's what I think we've got to do. I think we can do that.

Joe Biden's a decent guy. He's been around forever. He got into politics in '73 – four years after I did, I might say – and he knows a lot. He's got bright people. I think people on the outside, have to make inroads with the people on the inside. Wake up, and I think there's a way without compromising our beliefs, or even our myths, that we can make the world a lot safer than it currently is.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

I can tell you, Jerry, that the Global Security Institute, where I'm the president, the World Summit of the Nobel Peace Laureates, where I represent the group at the UN, and the Task Force on Nuclear Nonproliferation of the International Law Section of the ABA- we want to work very closely with you to make this reality of the wake-up call heard because I think that the myths that we're living under are actually the myth of Thanatos. It's a death myth.

And it's absolutely horrendous that we could be pledging trillions of dollars on a venture wherein the more we perfect the weapons, the less security we obtain. It's exactly the wrong direction. So it's a venture that's as morally corrupt as slavery was. You can't fix slavery by having better housing for slaves. The venture of putting the entire future of the planet at risk is fundamentally morally flawed.

Now, as we look at the pandemic and we look at climate, and we look at the oceans, we're compelled to find a new paradigm. And I think this idea of planetary realism has to include, and I'll let you get the final word here, has to include the tool of the rule of

law. It is a sort of the guard rail necessary to bring us to the application of that realism. Because if we continue shredding treaties and generally working on an ad hoc basis, there's no possibility of having the stability and trust needed to get to where we need to get to. So the rule of law has got to be an element of this.

JERRY BROWN:

It does. And the rule of law is based on underlying shared beliefs – on a consensus. That's why law pertains to a jurisdiction and a jurisdiction has common values, common beliefs, common sense about things. I do want to say one more thing, though, of what we're up against that is implicated in the common law in the Western legal tradition. And that is this concept of the individual. It's me against you. It's us against them.

It's we against the environment. That perspective, which is deeply embedded into the paradigm of Occidental thinking, has to be transcended because we're in a world of interaction. It's not just that I am an autonomous being. I am in response to everything I encounter in my past and in my present. And so is everyone else. And so is every nature. And so are all species. There's a web of life. There's a mysterious interconnectivity. And that means that there isn't autonomy on the part of the individual. There's some autonomy, yes, but the autonomy is deeply shaped and affected by the surrounding forces, beings and ideas.

We're in this web, or this ocean, of interacting parts and ideas and feelings. We have to find a way that we get over, it's me against them. It's us within the natural order of things. And right now, we're fighting nature, attempting to dominate it. And we're learning that we have to get on the side of nature instead of trying to conquer it. That's a deeply mistaken belief. Well, just like we can't conquer nature, we have to work with it, we have to work with other human beings, and those other human beings are acting like us out of a fear.

And we have to find some way, which I guess to date throughout all human history, we haven't found. We've never had before the capacity to extinguish not only human civilization, but a good part of the rest of the species. We are at an inflection point or a time in our history when the power that has created all this modernity – all the wonderful things that allow us to even be on

the Zoom call – also has a corollary, or as an entailment has this dark power of destruction.

So power is neither good nor bad. It can be used for good or bad. And that can be in the context of Russia, America and China, seeing the commonality – or not. And I would say the virus is a very bad indicator. We should have united to deal with the virus because there's going to be another virus and another one. All of a sudden, it's a big race.

Who's going to get the patent? Who's going to make the big bucks, and who are we going to blame? Is it China for the virus? The Russians are cheating on their vaccine. Whatever the hell it is, it's not going to work. And I think we need to use and understand through the virus, through climate change – which affects everyone on the planet and all the other species – and the threat of nuclear weaponry, that there is a new order.

It isn't just yesterday, but increasingly in recent decades, in the last century at least, that we are at a totally new stage. And it's going to be a stage where we either shift to some basic trust based on our understanding of what we have to do, or we're going to make the mistake, and we can blow ourselves up. A good part of us. It may sound a little bit cataclysmic, but there it is. This is where we are, and we better wake up to it.

And I think that's our job as lawyers, as people in public life. Let's see if we can't open our eyes and open the eyes of others to the kind of existence that we have, which is, yes, individualism, but embedded at the very level of our structure, in a collective, in a common web of life. And if we do that, I think we open the door to more intelligent, wiser use of weaponry. And hopefully, its reduction to make the world continue as it has for tens of thousands of years.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

That is a visionary note and the proper compass for us. Every other breath is given to us from the phytoplankton. Our very breathing depends on the health of the oceans. And I want to quote you, Governor Brown, in which you said, so presciently, "I believe that with humility and grace . . ." Maybe that's the key to what we got to get to get the answer, you said it then, ". . . we can discern right from wrong and discover what peace requires."

This idea of a sense of humility in the face of the majesty of nature, a sense of humility that we are one human family, a sense of limitation, and a sense of grace that it is graceful to live. That it's not just surviving, but that we can have something a little bit better than simply being consumers and that we can call ourselves to a higher purpose.

JERRY BROWN:

When I ran for president in 1992, I had something called the humility agenda.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

Oh God, you're so good.

JERRY BROWN:

I had the humility agenda, and now here we are all these years. I think we're going backwards. I've not perceived humility as being much of an issue among my colleagues. Maybe even myself. I like to get a lot of attention to myself. So, I haven't even mastered the rudiments of humility, but there is a truth there. And the truth is to get an accurate portrayal, understanding, insights into who we are – who we are as individuals, who we are as a nation, who we are as humanity. And I think that humility is closely aligned with truth, and that's what's going to make us free. If we can just pursue the truth, that will lead us to humility. And if we do that, we'll get off the excessive chauvinism that is leading us right over the brink as we talk.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

God bless you. Thank you so much, Governor Brown. The absolute note to tune the orchestra to. Thank you.

JERRY BROWN:

Call upon me anytime. We've got a lot of work to do.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

Charlie?

CHARLES MOXLEY:

Jonathan, Governor Brown, thank you, a wonderful discussion. Jonathan, you're up again.

JONATHAN GRANOFF:

It was really more than wonderful. It was absolutely visionary and outstanding.