Those of us involved in campaigning against Britain’s wars and nuclear deterrent are apt to forget that the nature of wars has changed. Most wars are now fought within state, caused by poverty and injustice; and fuelled by ethnic and religious differences. We perhaps need to reflect on these issues when arguing the pacifist case or campaigning for the abolition of war. To what extent are these positions tenable for those who suffer injustice and oppression, or those that have to compete each new day for the basics of survival in brutal circumstances.

Our theme centres on human security. What kinds of military interventions into failing states can be justified ethically; and if mistakes are made, what should be done when a military counter-insurgency has run its course as in Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan and elsewhere? The opening article considers the approach proposed by Shannon D. Beeb and Mary Kaldor in their new book, The ultimate weapon is no weapon. Their title could be a motif for pacifism, and, indeed, their approach might be regarded as a significant step towards that ideal.

Tony Kempster

Fewer than ten percent of contemporary wars are between states. Wars of independence from a colonial power are almost completely a thing of the past, though there are many wars of secession, in which the leaders of one region or ethnic group in a state try to break away from it. People do not take up arms easily. The decision to go to war is generally complex and involves many different factors. Only two things are necessary for war to occur – disagreement, and the means with which to fight it. But, the nature of the disagreement and the factors that tip it over into violence are extremely varied.

A major long-term cause of war is found in the combination of poor economic conditions, and lack of political openings through which to seek change peacefully. The more a country’s resources are stretched, the sharper is the competition for them, and the weaker is the state’s ability to meet people’s needs. This gives rise to grievances, to a sense of injustice and frustration. It is fertile soil for ambitious political leaders, articulating grievance, voicing a sense of injustice, whether or not they share in the feelings of their followers.

People commit themselves to these leaders because they believe that doing so offers a chance to redress the injustice they see in their own lives. If they are lucky, their leaders will manage to avoid leading them to war. Too often, especially in poor countries, and where democracy is uncertain, the people are often unlucky in their leaders.

IPB’s ‘Making Peace’ exhibition (see p4)

‘Premonition of civil war’ Salvador Dali

THE ULTIMATE WEAPON IS NO WEAPON: HUMAN SECURITY AND THE NEW RULES OF WAR AND PEACE

Article based on the discussion at the launch of the above book by its authors, Shannon D. Beebe and Mary Calder. Andrew Cayley was also a member of the panel. The launch was at the Frontline Club on 27 May.

Lieutenant Colonel Shannon D. Beebe served as the senior Africa analyst at the Pentagon and in Luanda, Angola, where he worked for the US Embassy. He played an instrumental role in the development of the newly formed unified command for Africa, AFRICOM. Professor Mary Kaldor is director of the Centre for the Study of Global Governance, London School of Economics and Political Science. Andrew Cayley is a war crimes ambassador and recently appointed as international prosecutor for the Khmer Rouge war crimes tribunal in Cambodia.

It is clear from the lesson of conflicts in places like Bosnia, Somalia and Iraq that security is no longer achievable – even for nations with massive militaries – by traditional military strength. High-tech weaponry is often a distracting, superficially comforting, illusion. Meanwhile, warlords, militias, pirates, mercenaries, or criminal gangs are expanding these areas of insecurity. Beebe and Kaldor were drawn together from distant points of the political spectrum by their
shared concerns about the repercussions of violent conflict on people’s everyday lives. Their basic argument is that a thorough overhaul of military priorities and tactics must be matched by a transformation in civilian organisations. NGOs, charities, and others whose work abroad is a vital part of the developing security in troubled regions must accept that the division between military and non-military personnel in most cases no longer exists, and accept the help of military which should be trained in new ways to protect rather than to kill. The principles for human security define the new landscape and offer a positive and realistic frame in which to address the challenges of a century whose security is more chaotic than anything in our recent experience.

Condoleezza Rice famously declared that it was “not the job of the 82nd Airborne Division to escort kids to kindergarten”. The authors suggest that, in fact, it is; and one of the chapters of the book is titled in this way. For armies and peacekeepers alike the new world requires a radical rethinking of how we increase security and encourage a more responsive politics.

Human security

The authors give the much-abused term “human security” a major makeover starting from the premise that it took General Stanley McChrystal and the US armed forces six years to realise in Afghanistan that ousting even a decidedly abusive government will not succeed without robust and genuine protection of the local population’s human rights. First, human security is about the everyday security of individuals and the communities they live in rather than the security of states and borders. It is about the security of Angolans, not the security of Angola. Second it is about not being killed or robbed or forcibly expelled from your home – the sort of insecurity experienced in violent upheavals such as those Afghanistan or Cabinda. But it is also includes not losing your home in a hurricane or a forest fire, having enough to eat and drink, and being able to go to a doctor if you are ill. It is about freedom from fear and freedom from want. Human security also recognizes the interconnectedness of security in different places. Violence and resentment, poverty and illness – in places such as Africa, Central Asia, or the Middle East – travel across the world through terrorism, transnational crime, or pandemics. Instead of allowing insecurity to travel, we need to send security in the opposite direction. The kind of security that Americans and Europeans expect to enjoy at home has spread to the rest of the world.

Human security is also about the security of the individuals and the communities they live in rather than security of states and borders. It is about the security of Angolans, not the security of Angola. Second it is about not being killed or robbed or forcibly expelled from your home – the sort of insecurity experienced in violent upheavals such as those Afghanistan or Cabinda. But it is also includes not losing your home in a hurricane or a forest fire, having enough to eat and drink, and being able to go to a doctor if you are ill. It is about freedom from fear and freedom from want. Human security also recognizes the interconnectedness of security in different places. Violence and resentment, poverty and illness – in places such as Africa, Central Asia, or the Middle East – travel across the world through terrorism, transnational crime, or pandemics. Instead of allowing insecurity to travel, we need to send security in the opposite direction. The kind of security that Americans and Europeans expect to enjoy at home has spread to the rest of the world.

Human security

The authors give the much-abused term “human security” a major makeover starting from the premise that it took General Stanley McChrystal and the US armed forces six years to realise in Afghanistan that ousting even a decidedly abusive government will not succeed without robust and genuine protection of the local population’s human rights. First, human security is about the everyday security of individuals and the communities they live in rather than the security of states and borders. It is about the security of Angolans, not the security of Angola. Second it is about not being killed or robbed or forcibly expelled from your home – the sort of insecurity experienced in violent upheavals such as those Afghanistan or Cabinda. But it is also includes not losing your home in a hurricane or a forest fire, having enough to eat and drink, and being able to go to a doctor if you are ill. It is about freedom from fear and freedom from want. Human security also recognizes the interconnectedness of security in different places. Violence and resentment, poverty and illness – in places such as Africa, Central Asia, or the Middle East – travel across the world through terrorism, transnational crime, or pandemics. Instead of allowing insecurity to travel, we need to send security in the opposite direction. The kind of security that Americans and Europeans expect to enjoy at home has spread to the rest of the world.

We can no longer keep our part of the world safe while expecting to enjoy at home has spread to the rest of the world. The world is interconnected through social media, transportation and basic sympathy. We can no longer keep our part of the world safe while expecting to enjoy at home has spread to the rest of the world. The world is interconnected through social media, transportation and basic sympathy.

There is no such thing as international security – there is just domestic security. The world is a phone call away, 10 digits to destruction. We must talk about security in 21st century terms. It is not the kinetics – it is about the conditions that create the problems. Take, for example, the three recent catastrophes – 9/11, Katrina and now the BP oil spill. How well prepared were we for these despite the massive spending on security?
How can people do this?

FROM THE CHAIRPERSON, MARY ROE

Dear Friends,

"...where every prospect pleases, and only Man is vile!"

So wrote Bishop Heber in his missionary hymn, “From Greenland's icy mountains...” The pleating prospect was the islands of Java and the valieness of its human inhabitants appears to have been the fact that they were not baptised Christians. But his words came to my mind recently while I was on holiday in Croatia, with its spectacularly beautiful scenery, the cleanest, translucent sea to be found anywhere and a well nigh ideal climate. The Croatian people, too, were friendly, humorous and helpful, but the valieness of “man’s inhumanity to man” was evident at every turn in the road: a gateway standing open in welcome to a burnt out shell of a family home, shell marks covering the walls of the ancient buildings of Dubrovnik, including the Cathedral and, in the countryside, abandoned olive groves where enemy forces had camped and destroyed the ancient trees. However, at the local village church, before the joyful folk dance festival, the Mass was standing room only inside the vast building and another hundred or so people were packed on the wide steps descending from the West door; all joining in with the well-known chants such as the Veni Creator. No pagans, ignorant of the good news of the Gospel, here!

I still don’t understand what that war was really about: territorial envy? some long-held sense of injustice on the part of the administration? I suspect there are many people, including some who were involved, who are no wiser than I am as to the cause of that terrible blood-shed. I pondered the question aloud one day on the bus, wondering how neighbours could kill each other in cold blood, and my companion’s reply was that it was because they were neighbours. “Family feuds can be the most vicious”, she said, and I suppose, bearing in mind the story of Cain and Abel, she was right. But that doesn’t answer my question: How can brothers and sisters in Christ shoot their next door neighbour’s three-year-old as he plays on the step of his home? Or bearing in mind the third group involved, the Muslims, how can children of the One God massacre harmless civilians, made, like them, in His image? But the question you may be asking by now is, “How has it taken this long and a visit to a far country for these problems to surface so starkly in a woman of my age?” Have I not thought and prayed about Northern Ireland, over the years? Of course I have. I am also deeply disturbed, as you know, about the situation in Palestine where the virtue of Faith seems to be perverted into nationalism. Hope is receding further into the distance every day, and Love is narrowed down to self interest and mutual advancement of those with power.

Perhaps the answer to your question lies in the fact that however much we imagine we are involved with what we see on television or hear and read in the news, nothing affects us as much as what we can see with our own eyes, feel with our hands and hear from the lips of a living person standing next to us. (Cue here for a sermon on the Eucharist.) The answer to your question has to be that we have ignored the commands of our scriptures and “followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts” — in every continent of the world. The solution will be found only when we obey the commandment, “Thou shalt not kill”, and when we love God with every aspect of our being and our neighbour as ourselves... and that includes, as Jesus tells us, loving our enemies. Let us pray not only for Peace, but for more peacemakers among all faiths, especially those who call themselves the “People of the Book” — the book in which we are told how to fulfil our Creator’s purpose for us human inhabitants of the beautiful prospect which he has given us, if only we would heed his words and act upon them. I wish you all a summer of refreshment of body, mind and spirit, and perhaps some new insight to guide your steps in future.

THE BALM IN GILEAD

A reflection by Donna Hicks, member in the USA and regular visitor to the Middle East

4 June marks North Carolina’s day to offer prayers for peace in Israel and Palestine and the Middle East. It will mark the end of a week of prayer, education, and advocacy through the World Council of Churches’ Joint Action for Just Peace. The week of joint action had hardly begun when Israeli military forces attacked the Freedom Flotilla — carrying tons of humanitarian aid to Gaza in another effort to break the Israeli blockade — in international waters. The general secretary of the WCC said, “The call to be peacemakers is a holy call. This year the World Week for Peace in Palestine and Israel (WWPPI) is once more timely...with people seeking to show the need for humanitarian aid going to Gaza being killed this morning... This year again we need even more than before to point to how settlements and occupation are real obstacles to a just peace. All parties must stop violence and find the way forward.”

The Heads of Churches in Jerusalem invite us to prayer:

We believe that every human being is created in God's image and likeness and that every one’s dignity is derived from the Almighty...that God created us not so that we might engage in strife and conflict but rather that we might come and know and love one another, and together build up the land in love and mutual respect.

In the absence of all hope, we cry out our cry of hope. We believe in God, good and just. We believe that God’s goodness will finally triumph over the evil of hate and of death that still persist in our land. We will see here “a new land” and “a new human being,” capable of rising up in the spirit to love each one of his or her brothers and sisters.

As we seek ways to speak truth to power in the aftermath of Israel’s actions against the Freedom Flotilla, let us remember all those in Israel and Palestine and around the world who are working towards the vision of “a new land and a new human being”.

The WCC Joint action for just peace proclaims “It’s time for the healing of wounded souls.” The Heads of the Churches in Jerusalem cry out their cry of hope. I want to roar out a prophet’s call for justice. I end up calling for the balm in Gilead which heals the wounded soul. Perhaps that’s what we need to carry it on.
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Nobel Peace Laureate Mairead Corrigan-Maguire who sailed on the aid ship MV Rachel Corrie
Blood rights and celebrations

FROM THE GENERAL SECRETARY
TONY KEMPSTER GIVES HIS REPORT

Bloody Sunday inquiry

The report of the Saville inquiry has been published at long last. It concludes that a number of the fatal shootings of 12 civilians by British soldiers were unlawful killings which puts severe pressure on the Public Prosecution Service in Northern Ireland to prosecute them. The cost of the 12-year inquiry has been criticised but we must remember that it was political in a different way from the earlier discredited reports. It was part of the peace process; it helped to pave the way to the Good Friday agreement a few months later. It is being published in a transformed environment to which its very existence contributed. It had to become something of a truth and reconciliation commission, an attempt to get an honest account of an event that marked the climax of a terrible chapter in Northern Ireland’s Troubles, and by revealing it, helped to make reconciliation possible.

The process and its findings resonate with our opening article on human security. A key factor to emerge was the way in which the troops were pumped by their commanding officers “to get in and get in hard”. The Parachute Regiment were trained as “shock troops” and has a certain ethos, not suited to the delicate issue in Derry at the time. Senior British army officers with experience and its problems said that the paras should not get “sucked into the Bogside” but their views were ignored.

Afghanistan: all in the mind

Time and reflection are supposed to induce a sense of clarity in warfare. Not in the current Afghanistan conflict though, which has now been running longer than the WWII. Nor is there any clarity to be found about the end result of nine years of warfare. Thinking back to our opening article, the aim should be security for the Afghan people not winning and it is interesting that US Central Command is now talks not of victory or success but more modestly about progress. General McChrystal talks of “the rising tide of security”. But the press reports from the country indicate that the gap between the narrative as the general tell it and the war as it is experienced by the Afghans in Helmund is showing no signs of narrowing.

The Gaza flotilla incident: another own goal

Supporters of Israel have long argued that the country is singled out international opprobrium and held to a different standard from its neighbours. There is some truth in this. But Israel is different: it is a western-style democracy, armed and funded by the USA, and the beneficiary of a web of preferential agreements with the EU. It should in so many ways be a source of hope and democracy in a part of the world where tyranny and injustice hold sway.

The Obama administration worked hard to soften UN criticism of the Israel raid on the flotilla carrying aid to the Gaza Strip in which nine people were killed. But the damage to Israel in global public opinion is done. How could a country with such a keen sense of public relations have allowed commandos to board a flotilla of aid ships flying the flag of its closest ally in the Muslim world, Turkey, and which had on board the bestselling crime writer Henning Mankell, the Nobel Peace Laureate Mairead Corrigan-Maguire and the young film-maker Hassan Ghani, as well as legislators and peace activists from across Europe and North America?

Polls show that even a majority of Israelis believe the flotilla could have been stopped from reaching Gaza through other, less belligerent means. One of Israel’s leading novelists, David Grossman, whose soldier son was killed in the Lebanon war of 2006, wrote: “No explanation can justify or whitewash the crime that was committed, and no excuse can explain away the stupid actions of the government and army.”

So, once again, the Israelis, misled by their bellicose prime minister, Binyamin Netanyahu, have scored another own goal. The other debacles include the assassination of a Hamas commander in Dubai in January and the provocative announcement, during a visit to Israel by the US vice-president, Joe Biden, in March, that Tel Aviv intends to build an additional 1,600 homes for Jewish settlers in occupied East Jerusalem.

Then there is the cruel Gaza blockade itself. We must all join the rest of the world, including the new British government, in repeating the urgent call to lift this; and pray that such happens (see “The balm in Gilead” on page 3).

IPB’s centenary celebration

APF is a member organization of the International Peace Bureau and I am a vice-president of the bureau.

IPB launched its “Making Peace” outdoor exhibition in Geneva on Sunday 6 June. The exhibition was the key feature of a day to celebrate the centenary of the Nobel Prize awarded to the organization in 1910, and continues until 4 July. (Since its founding in 1891, 13 IPB leaders have also been recipients of the Nobel Peace Prize.)

IPB’s big day was a part of a larger event, a joint International Weekend co-organised with the United Nations in Geneva, and notably the UN Environment Programme and the World Intellectual Property Organisation.

The exhibition presents the international movement for peace in its broadest sense and how the people and organizations involved have influenced the course of the 20th century. It is composed of 120 photos by renowned photographers on 100 panels, displayed along the promenade in front of the Palais Wilson (original seat of the League of Nations). Despite two world wars and many bloody conflicts, there have been significant triumphs, such as the ending of the Cold War and the apartheid regime in South Africa, the banning of antipersonnel landmines and the creation of the International Criminal Court (ICC) which in large part were the result of civil society efforts.

The exhibition was formally opened by Mr Pierre Maudet, Vice-President of the Administrative Council of the City
of Geneva. The city’s Mayor and many other officials were present at the evening Garden Party. There are many meanings and definitions of peace. The IPB believes that there are five main elements that go together to form peace. It is by bringing together these five elements that we create a sustainable peace. The exhibition photographs are grouped under these:

- Disarmament and non-violence
- Conflict prevention and resolution
- Economic and social justice
- Human rights, law and democracy
- Environment and sustainable development

On the day of the launch there was peace village on the quai with stands, exhibitions and films linked to the photo-exhibition and involving other peace organizations. At the nearby Centre for Human Dialogue debates were held on “Environment and peace”. “Women and peace” and the IPB’s main project, “Disarmament for development”. There was also a music and a garden party at the Palais Wilson at which prizes for young photographers were presented. IPB is now starting to explore other possible locations around the world for the exhibition to be shown.

Continuing its celebrations, IPB will hold a special international conference in Oslo on 23-26 September; under the title ‘A Climate of Peace’. Topics: Disarmament for development, Nuclear abolition, Peace education, Peace history, Conflict prevention, Women in peacemaking. Afghanistan, Norway as a peace nation, and more (see Diary of Events, page 8.)

**APF annual conference, “Peacemaking in a time of global crisis”**

Our conference in March at the Hilfield Friary, Dorset was a fascinating meeting of minds, including as it did pacifist and non-pacifist, religious and non-religious participants. More than 50 attended over the weekend.

I spoke on the theme; “War in the 21st century: why and where”. General Sir Hugh Beach set out the Just War theory, and some of its successes and failures in practice. Lesley Docksey challenged some of our preconceived ideas about how the law applies to war. Local people, including a group of sixth-form students, joined in some sessions. The “Women peacemakers” exhibition from the Peace Museum (Bradford) was displayed during the weekend.

Our vice-chair, Sue Claydon introduced this and spoke in detail about several of the posters from her experience of peacemaking. The services organised by the Hilfield community were a delight, particularly the “Service of light” on Saturday evening which was followed by music and song led by Sue Gilmurray with a local folk group.

**Movement for the Abolition of War’s Peace History conference**

The conference, held in April at the Imperial War Museum was stimulating in a number of ways. The League of Nations and the UN, the arts and the media, all came under scrutiny and there was plenty of questioning and debate. There was also film, drama and music.

The Conference was opened by Christine Blower, General Secretary of the National Union of Teachers reflecting MAW’s interest in education, and speakers included Victoria Britain (author and journalist) who related a history of manipulation in war reporting, and Sir Richard Jolly who spoke about the UN vision of world peace 1945 to 2010.

A group of school students from Woldingham School which won the Pax Christi European Contest this year showcased their work, a dramatization of the story of Vera Brittain at the conference and we watched Colin Steven’s excellent short film, “Conscientious Objector”. “Nonviolent response to terrorism”, a new exhibition created by The Peace Museum (Bradford) was on display during the conference.

**A celebration in memory of Adrian Mitchell**

A highlight of the Peace History Conference was a special evening event to celebrate the poet and author Adrian Mitchell who died in 2008. Adrian was a MAW supporter and we are receiving the proceeds from a new anthology, dedicated to him by Scottish artists and published after his death.

The celebration included poetry and song read and performed by his family and friends. The first part focused on the book, ADRIAN: Scotland celebrates Adrian Mitchell with readings by contributors including Michael and Adam Horovitz and Bernard Kops. MAW’s vice-president Susannah York read two pieces including “A child is singing” which was one of Adrian’s favourite poems from Poems for disarmament. It was distributed by pamphlet at the Aldermaston marches in the 1960s.

The second part focused on the peace collection of poems for THEWORD07 to which Adrian and several of the poets present contributed. His wife Celia read a Michael Rosen poem and a piece from Adrian’s unpublished work about war and the failure of imagination. His daughter, Sasha who is a jazz singer sang “15 million plastic bags” about the Government’s preparation to store the bodies of people killed in a nuclear war; and as a finale piece with Mathew Prendergast “Bad Friday”.

Sue Gilmurray performed her song “Faslane” and a song written specially for the occasion, “Go down fighting”. The latter was accompanied by jazz saxophonist, Tim Whitehead who performed several times during the event.

The celebration of poetry and music was dedicated to the memory of one of the Grand Masters of poetry, a principled and compassion man who lived and breathed the values he advocated.

**“Vaulting ambitions: peace and conflict in sport”**

I reported last year that our counsellor, Clive Barrett has been appointed chair of The Peace Museum (Bradford). Under his leadership I have been working with David Kennedy, another PM board member to set up a major project related to the 2012 Olympics. This will involve indoor and outdoor exhibitions, events, dramatization of the lives of people involved with the Olympics and online resources for education in schools. Partners for the project include the British Library, the Royal Armouries in Leeds and museums in Bradford and London. The consultancy company, Alchemy Anew has been appointed to assist with the project and applications for funding have been made to the Heritage Lottery Fund and to the Arts Council.
Military spending

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute has just published its 2010 Yearbook, Armsments, disarmament and international security.

The far-reaching effects of the global financial crisis and economic recession appear to have had little impact on world military expenditure. Worldwide military expenditure in 2009 was up again and has now reached an estimated US$1.53 trillion. This represents a 5.9% increase in real terms compared with 2008 and an increase of 49% since 2000. A major increase in military spending occurred in the Asia and Oceania regions (8.9%).

US military spending is continuing to rise under the Obama Administration, partly due to the escalating conflict in Afghanistan. The USA accounted for 54% of the total expenditure in 2009. Spending is budgeted to rise further in 2010, and military spending is exempted from a general squeeze in discretionary spending. The 2010 budget saw some refocusing of priorities, with cancellation of some major weapons systems and increased focus on information and communications technology, but no major strategic shift.

BAE Systems, which has been embroiled in allegations of bribery and corruption, has topped the list of the world’s largest arms producing company with annual sales in excess of US$32 billion. It is the first non-US company to do so. Its record performance was largely due to increased sales by its subsidiaries in the US which accounted for more than half of its business.

CofE draws a new line on money from arms

As pacifists we know very well that there are few areas of ethical debate more challenging to Christians than war and violence. A wide range of views about defence are held across the Church of England, and arguments about these issues become more pointed where policies for investment of the Church’s resources are concerned.

In response to this, the Church of England’s national investing bodies this month agreed a new ethical policy on investments in the defence sector, on the advice of the Church’s Ethical Investment Advisory Group (EIAG). The report says the decisions were much influenced by considerations of the Just War.

The new policy involves a complete bar on companies involved in the production of indiscriminate weapons – landmines, cluster munitions, nuclear weapons and the processing, supply, or storage of weapons-grade nuclear fissile materials. In Just War thinking, prosecuting a legitimate war means using weapons that are capable of discriminating between combatants and non-combatants.

This is not a judgement on the ethics of maintaining a nuclear deterrent which the General Synod has accepted. It reflects the fact that many Anglicans now find the question of nuclear weaponry morally challenging. The EIAG decided that the proper response was to recommend a precautionary approach. For companies involved in conventional weaponry, the EIAG has now recommended a threshold for turnover from military sales, which, once exceeded, should make a company an inappropriate investment for the Church national investing bodies.

This is ten per cent of turnover from strategic military sales. “Strategic” sales are those that are essential for military operations and enhance military capability. Non-strategic military sales are parts or services that are either not material to military capability, or are regular parts also widely used for non-military purposes. Independent external advice will be taken on whether a company’s sales are strategic or not.

The use of this threshold acknowledges that, while many Christians accept that recourse to war may be justified, they are uncomfortable about war, and uncomfortable about the appropriateness of investing in and deriving profit from products purposefully designed to destroy human life.

The ten per cent threshold bars investment in companies involved solely or substantially in arms, such as BAE systems.

The Ethical Investment Advisory Group would welcome feedback on its new policy, which is at www.cofe.anglican.org/info/ethical/policystatements. APF is considering a response.

More on Zimbabwe

In previous TAPs we have discussed the plight of the Anglic Church in Zimbabwe. For those who are interested in further reading on the subject, we recommend Zimbabwe: years of hope and despair by Philip Barclay (2010, Bloomsbury). This British diplomat’s account of Mugabe’s Zimbabwe is a chilling portrait of a nation mired in horror and injustice. To continue to work for peace and reconciliation against the horrendous human rights abuses perpetrated by the regime, attests to the courage and commitment of those involved.

In May, Membership Secretary Sue Gilmurray sent a letter of support and APF peace literature to Mr Cloud Mabaudi, a member in Banket, Zimbabwe. Here is part of Mr Mabaudi’s letter received in response:

“We feel very much secure when we receive gifts and messages of encouragement from fellow workers for peace. We are now receiving more attention from different people from all walks of life, among them politicians, vulnerable people and human rights activists. Distribution of the literature has brought about discussions on prospects of peace and reconciliation. We are making preparations for the Day of the Girl Child to be held on 19th June in Chin hoyi. Fortunately the current batch of APF literature will be exhibited.” Girl children are among those particularly affected when there is poverty and repression as in Zimbabwe and the present time. The Day of the Girl Child emphasises the rights and importance of female children, and works for their protection from abuse.”

International Conscientious Objectors’ Day

This is a reminder that the day really is international. For over 20 years, 15 May has been celebrated. It is a tradition of struggle spearheaded by groups affiliated with War Resisters’ International. Each year activities are focused in a country where COs and objectors are harassed or persecuted. This year the international focus was on the United States’ denial of the right of soldiers to object to war.

NOTICE: Courage to Resist is calling for groups, organizations, and individuals around the country to take up May 15th as a day of action in support of conscientious objectors and war resisters!

There are actions currently scheduled in Washington D.C., New York City, and the San Francisco Bay Area. In the San Francisco Bay Area, there will be two days of events.
Barbara F. Walter (2009) Reputation and civil war: why separatist conflicts are so violent
Cambridge University Press

It is well known that separatist movements often but not always lead to bitter and prolonged conflict, but until now it has been a mystery as to what explains the variation. Walter shows that much of the answer lies in whether a state is faced with multiple potential challenges and therefore has to defend its reputation for holding firm. Rarely has such an important puzzle been so well explained. Of all the different types of civil war, it is well known that disputes over self-determination are the most likely to escalate into war and resist compromise settlement, leading to bitter and prolonged conflict. Barbara Walter shows that the low rate of negotiation is the result of reputation building, in which governments refuse to negotiate with early challengers in order to discourage others from making more costly demands in future.

Jakarta’s wars against East Timor and Aceh, for example, were not designed to maintain sovereignty but to signal to Indonesia’s other minorities that secession would be costly. Employing data from three different sources – laboratory experiments on undergraduates, statistical analyses of recent history in Indonesia and the Philippines – Barbara Walter provides some of the first systematic evidence that reputation strongly influences behavior, particularly between governments and ethnic minorities fighting over territory.

This follows an earlier book by the same author which altered our thinking and our politics about peace, democracy and justice have to be home programme in which you live the alternative. As being what Ghandi called the ‘constructive conflict resolution activity’. "I see the best kind of conflict resolution activity as being what Ghandi called the ‘constructive programme’ in which you live the alternative. Peace, democracy and justice have to be home grown not imposed from outside. This is why I like working with ‘ordinary’ people: because they are doing on the ground the things that you are trying to bring about at the systems level. That not only matters in itself but also proves that change is possible. People who know what they believe and go on saying it despite the threats against themselves. That kind of personal commitment and clarity of purpose that refuses to be displaced by power”.

Surprisingly early in the Second World War – long before an Allied victory was assured – people began to plan for its aftermath. They were haunted by memories of what happened a generation before – when the millions of soldiers killed on the battlefields of the Great War had been eclipsed by the millions more civilians carried off by disease and starvation after the war ended. They were determined that this time around the ceasefire would not be followed by a civilian disaster. Confronted by a whole continent starving and uprooted, and with the help of a new UN body to aid the populations of Europe and Asia, Allied planners did not single out victims of the Nazi death camps for particular attention, but devised strategies to help all “displaced persons” – as they had become known by 1943. Most of the fifteen million foreign labourers in Germany were speedily repatriated. But a million-and-a-half people – Jews, Poles, Ukrainians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians and Yugoslavs – refused to go home. It took the Allies seven years to resolve this problem: they had to create the state of Israel, alter the basis of their immigration policy and let thousands of war criminals go free. This is a radical reassessment of the aftermath of the WWII. Unlike most recent writing about the aftermath of the WWII, it assesses the events and personalities of that decade in terms of contemporary standards and values, showing in particular that the tragic consequences of the war were understood not in terms of genocide, but of displacement – of millions of people deprived of their homes and forced to work for the Germans. According to Evelyn Waugh, post-war planning and propaganda was effectively defined by the idea of the displaced person. An estimated eight million people had to be rehabilitated after the war; what to do with the tide of human misery? Shepard praises the UN Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) for mobilising over $40 billion of food, medicine and humanitarian aid for those displaced by the conflict. Whitehall agreed to accept about 70,000 refugees from Nazi-occupied territories.

In this excellent history, Shepard unforgettable conveys the post-war refugee crisis and its aftermath. Even today, thousands of DP’s remain unaccounted for or, in the Red Cross parlance, ‘dispersed’. What emerges most strikingly is the intricate mixture of motives behind the rescue of post-war Europe. The Allies were by no means pure altruists. At first they were terrified of famine and a pestilence that would sweep across the world as Spanish flu had after the Great War. Later, as the Cold War began, they were intent on restoring Europe to act as a bastion against Communism. This meant letting Germans take charge of their own affairs, a development alarmingly accompanied by a recrudescence of anti-Semitism: a Stuttgart cinema audience cheered when a newsreel mentioned the murder of six million Jews.

Shepard also demonstrates how Ben Gurion used the Holocaust survivors as a means towards the establishment of Israel. Thus a British offer to take Jewish orphans from Germany was rejected on the grounds that it would be a ‘moral victory’ for the nation restricting the entry of Jews to Palestine. No easy path was afforded to the refugees from hell. Long Road Home speaks for them by proxy and with proper sympathy.

Diana Francis (2010)
From pacification to peacebuilding: a call to global transformation
Pluto Press

Does conflict transformation work? In this book, Diana Francis reviews developments in the field over the past twenty years. She recognises that it has helped those engulfed in violent conflict to respond constructively, but also warns that the real requirement for peace is a global rejection of militarism. In an original and radical analysis, Francis argues that the dominant culture of power, resting on coercion and violence, must be displaced by the principles of interdependence, kindness and nonviolent solidarity. This is the only way that pacification - efforts to dominate and control - will be replaced by genuine peacebuilding. She calls upon peacemakers worldwide to embrace and develop the practice of nonviolent power; rejecting the culture and institutions of war and working with movements around the world for global demilitarisation and ‘positive peace’. Talking about her work, Diana says she feels there is genuine action for change at the “ground level”.

"I see the best kind of conflict resolution activity as being what Ghandi called the ‘constructive programme’ in which you live the alternative. Peace, democracy and justice have to be home grown not imposed from outside. This is why I like working with ‘ordinary’ people: because they are doing on the ground the things that you are trying to bring about at the systems level. That not only matters in itself but also proves that change is possible. People who know what they believe and go on saying it despite the threats against themselves. That kind of personal commitment and clarity of purpose that refuses to be displaced by power.”

What can militarism do? It can destroy people and nations in the face of almost certain death. That kind of personal commitment and clarity of purpose I find very inspiring the people who are doing on the ground the things that you are trying to bring about at the systems level. That not only matters in itself but also proves that change is possible. People who know what they believe and go on saying it despite the threats against themselves. That kind of personal commitment and clarity and courage I find very inspiring the people who come up against armies and refuse violence in the face of almost certain death. That kind of power goes beyond any other sort of power. What can militarism do? It can destroy people but it can’t actually make them think differently. So that power that refuses to be displaced by military force is what keeps me convinced and motivated."
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A prayer for the APF by Meg Hartfield, member in New Zealand

O Lord hear our prayer

our agonised prayer –
not again Lord, ever.

But the relentless killing goes on

Vietnam – Rwanda – and on and on

Kosovo – Iraq – and on and on.

O Lord hear our prayer

our agonised prayer

How long, O Lord? How long?

I am one. But I with God, am invincible

We are few. But we, with God will not be overcome.

Here is the line in the sand.

We will not step over it.

War and preparations for war are on the other side of the line.

O Lord, hear our prayer;

our heartfelt, believing prayer

and keep our minds alert to peace-making

our hearts aflame with peace-making

our hands active in peace-making

our feet moving always in paths of peace

O Lord Jesus, Prince of Peace
done on both sides to human beings both dead and alive. It was a case of “We hate these people” – not “We’re going to liberate this island”. Most of the time on those islands, there was nothing or nobody to liberate. It was like a large industrial version of what many future wars were going to be like – between different races of people with different theologies they thought were the absolute truth. The best thing you can say is that the wars are now smaller.

As a result, “The Pacific” is almost unbearable to watch. Soldiers slip and slide across mud through dense jungle. They machinegun rank upon rank of attacking Japanese troops, whose banzai-charge tactic worked on the principle that if you hurl enough men forward, you will eventually win. The marines’ guns glow red-hot as they rake these suicidal assaults.

And unlike most war films, the emotional damage inflicted by winning is exposed in unflinching detail. Soldiers shoot themselves to escape the extreme and often morally problematic violence, which doesn’t exist except through the crosshairs of their gunsight. Moaz has hit upon an almost unbearable metaphor for the combat mentality. It is June 1982, the beginning of the first Lebanon war. A platoon is manoeuvring its tank into a town that has recently received a visit from the Israeli air force. It is really no more than a little house-cleaning,combining the area for anything that the bombs didn’t flatten. Any obstacles can be removed with the squeeze of a trigger. Moaz, who based the script on his own time as a gunner in Israel’s tank corps, doesn’t bother with a plot. The momentum of the vehicle and our dread of what it will find drives the film forward. Inside the hulking metal shell are four soft young men. It is night when the tank starts moving, and the instructions are to head across a banana plantation. And then the horrors begin. In the context it is no wonder the military constructs a euphemistic vocabulary. Dead bodies are referred to as “angels”. Phosphorus has been banned, but its use is permitted as long as it goes by the name of “exploding smoke”. As the soldiers unravel, the close ups of them become tighter, but also more abstract. The camera lends their sweat-and-oil-streaked faces a new intensity. The film gives spatial confinement a new intensity.

Coriolanus (2010)
Directed by Ralph Fiennes

It seems appropriate here to include reference to Shakespeare’s most bloody play. As his directorial review, Ralph Fiennes has picked a contemporary war-zone version of Coriolanus, the character who has been described as Shakespeare’s least sympathetic tragic hero; and also plays the character. Banished from Rome, Coriolanus turns renegade and joins Aufidius and the Volsci army to march on the city. The play has been elastic to political interpretations, left and right, over the years. In Nazi Germany was a Hitler-like hero, and after WWII, the occupying Americans banned it. Brecht wrote on a Marxist adaptation in the last years of his life. Yet it is also a play that works today with resonances in wars and protests around the world: Athens, Burma, Somalia and Iraq.

The version of Rome can be seen as a power state and the Volscians as an older community struggling to retain autonomy. In interviews, Fiennes has mentioned Israel/Palestine and Russia/ Chechnya in this sense.
CELEBRATING WOMEN CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Address given by Tony Kempster at the International CO’s Day ceremony held in Tavistock Square, London on 15 May

Mothers, daughters, wives

The song by Australian songwriter, Judy Small says so much about this subject. In “Mothers, daughters, wives” she writes about the generation of women who saw their fathers called up to fight in WWI, their husbands in WWII, and their children in the Vietnam war; and shrewdly questions the traditional roles played by women in time of war.

The refrain is the same after each verse:

The first time it was fathers, the last time it was sons,
And in between, your husbands marched away with drums and guns,
And you never thought to question, you just went on with your lives,
’cause all they taught you who to be was mothers, daughters, wives.

The last includes the exclamation: But, we are learning! This could be the leitmotif for this little address. Women in the peace movement and generally are becoming more aware of their potential role in anti-militarism.

Quaker Tapestry exhibited in Kendal

One of the tapestry panels shows a male CO facing a conscription board during WWI while at the side there are three women proffering white feathers. In the 2009 book, Conscientious objection: resisting militarized society, Cynthia Enloe refers to the panel and asks where are the women peacemakers in this depiction. To answer this question leads to an investigation of women’s relationships to men, to ideas of manliness and to soldiering and militaristic cultures in general.

The young British man stands alone in the panel. But this is an inadequate portrayal of the narrative. It does not show how the social dynamics of any young man’s CO appeal would operate. We need to ask with whom this young man would have discussed this decision to ask for CO status. Which other women are offstage in the Quaker Tapestry. Reading the testimonies of COs, it is quite clear that wives and mothers are involved and often play a more significant role than fathers.

We must also remember that the families and friends of COs were also often vilified and experienced the social exclusion and financial hardship that conscientious objection often incurred. Maybe we should also remember these at today’s event.

Other artwork

While talking about the tapestry may I also refer to the special witness of ordinary women around the world who have sewed their emotions and experiences into quilts and arpilleras, and other art works.

Last November, the MAW organised an exhibition of quilts at various venues in London, entitled “The human cost of war.” It was curated by Roberta Bacic and comprised 22 quilts and arpilleras made by women in Chile and a number of European countries. Many of these tell of how their lives were affected when their husbands and sons were taken away to be tortured or killed because they spoken out against militarism or military dictatorships.

Examples of women’s action in support of conscientious objection

And, of course, women have taken a strong lead in campaigning against recruitment. Good examples are the Women’s Peace Army in Australia which campaigned successfully against conscription for overseas service in 1916/17. Then there is The End Conscription Campaign (resistance to apartheid militarism) in South Africa.

In Russia today, a nationwide group of women who call themselves, “The Mothers of Soldiers” has caused much anxiety in the government as its members have not only exposed the military’s physical abuse of young male conscripts. They also hold seminars to teach women how to gain exemption for their sons when they receive their military service notices. All this is so important because it projects an alternative narrative to militarism and male attitudes to war. Government military strategists and planners are always worried about women: can they be relied upon to uphold a militarized standard of acceptable masculinity.

Then there are the stories some told so beautifully in the newly published book by WRI: Women conscientious objectors: an anthology. WRI decided to publish this book in order to give a voice to the women who declare themselves to be COs.

‘Some of the stories are told beautifully in the newly published book by WRI: Women conscientious objectors: an anthology.’

The feminist perspective

A CO movement in any country might be even more prone to privileging masculinity and leaving patriarchal movement tendencies unquestioned than other forms of peace movement organizing. After all only two countries have compulsory military service for women. It is men as individuals, therefore, who have to take the risk of applying for CO status. Men who take this risk are likely to be seen – by both men and women – as the heroes of the movement. Furthermore, those who have the greatest stake in correcting any state policy’s flaws or injustices are, not surprisingly, seen to be the natural leaders of any movement challenging that policy.

In Turkey today, a small group of feminist women who have been particularly active in the CO movement supporting men in prison have begun to explore how they can pry apart conscientious objection from the privileging of masculinity. They have crafted a declaration that a woman not subject to a state’s military conscription can personally make which enables her to declare herself to be a conscientious objector.

This is a political innovation: to declare oneself a conscientious objector even though one is not called upon by the state to state’s military conscription can personally make which enables her to declare herself to be a conscientious objector.
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women as well as men – it is a system of economic, social and cultural oppression. Israel and Eritrea are the only countries which conscript women. Both have recently been involved with wars and both have introduced military service for women in the name of gender equality. But there are many differences between them. In Eritrea, there is not recognition of conscientious objection at all, forcing all objectors to leave the country. The WRI book includes harrowing stories of two women COs. In Israel, pacifists can obtain exemption from military service because of their beliefs and, although marginalised, conscientious objectors raise a voice in the public debate. It has, however, become more difficult for women to gain exemption and women objectors are beginning to face the same hard conditions as men.

And finally nearer to home
Female conscientious objectors actually faced conscription in Britain during WWII. Some of these women were called absolutists, what we today would call total objectors, since they refused to accept alternative service. Mitzi Bales has an excellent chapter in the new WRI book detailing some of their stories. She ends this with the following words. Unknown women COs carried the banner for peace in their time, along with the women whose names and stories are known. They can all be acknowledged in our thoughts for their strength and principled stand against war.

Application to Iraq and Afghanistan
The book journeys through various regional conflicts and tries to show the limitations of twentieth century approaches to the kinds of security challenges that we believe will characterise the current era. So how would such a human security paradigm apply to ongoing conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan? In particular, how would a human security approach fit in with the alternatives that are being proposed, at the time of writing, by the Obama Administration? These wars were conceived (in 2003 and 2001) as conventional military conflicts and they remain substantially affected by the initial conception. In both places, the level of violence is much higher as a consequence of the way force was used in the early stages. It is very difficult half way through an as yet incomplete war, to shift direction if for the previous several years you have been shooting at the people you are now offering to protect. It lacks credibility. Local populations are deeply sceptical of such claims – and with good reason. The book is aimed at helping to end conflict, but much more, at preventing the future misuse of ineffective twentieth century militarism without denying the fact that the world’s democracies need to be engaged in the politically and economically needy insecure parts of the world. So bearing that qualification in mind, what would a human security strategy for Afghanistan entail? Above all the goal would be to protect people using what is known as hard power. But militaries must work together with civilians – police officers, health workers, development experts, and others – and their role is very different from traditional war fighting.

Filling the security gap
Millions of people in the world live in conditions of intolerable insecurity. They risk being killed, robbed, tortured and/or raped; and they risk dying from disease or lack of food, clean water; and/or sanitation; they risk dying in storms, floods and famines, which are increasingly common because of climate. Wars within failed and failing states are part of this and require a linked solution. Yet our security forces are designed to fight twentieth century wars. Europe has 1.8 million men and women under arms, but only a fraction of them can be deployed to areas of insecurity, where they find themselves inappropriately equipped. The problems should be addressed by employing a combination of military and civilian capability, a set of principles about how they should be used, and a new legal framework. Absolute state sovereignty, war mentality, territorial inviolability, and aspects of superpower rivalry are remnants of the industrial and imperial age. But hard power is hard to shift. The twentieth-century wars established huge embedded institutions in our societies, both in the west and among the newly emerging great powers like Russia, China and India. Dictators oppose interference. The left fears imperialism. Organisations don’t like change. Statesmen, soldiers and civil servants naturally think the way they have always done things is the right way to do things. Moreover, the identity of the state is often bound up with a militarised notion of security. Thus the war on terror was a popular policy because it reflected popular assumptions about the nature of American power; however out of date. In the same way it is helpful for Iran, China and Russia to have a Western enemy.

But these are old battles and old wars, and there’s no virtue in fighting them again. Traditional military power no longer works as a way of dealing with potential spoilers like Russia, China, Iran and North Korea; indeed, perceiving them as military threats may have the opposite effect of what is intended – legitimising the build up of armaments as well as domestic repression. Instead such states need to be embedded in an interconnected global framework aimed at protecting the human security of all citizens.

Traditional ways of thinking about security need to be reformulated. Sovereignty is no longer absolute; today states are members of an international system that operates on behalf of the human community and in which all lives are considered equal. Energy security is a global problem. Deterrence, which is an unprovable strategy until it fails, need to be recast as prevention since a nuclear war is the worst imaginable cataclysm. Above all, war itself needs to be reframed as a human catastrophe, along with natural disasters, famines and pandemics. Human security is about the prevention and avoidance of human catastrophes rather than protecting us against the after effects. This is not an argument that armies should turn their swords into ploughshares. There is an essential role for force in human-security operations: sometimes you need to be able to protect people using what is known as hard power. But militaries must work together with civilians – police officers, health workers, development experts, and others – and their role is very different from traditional war fighting.

The identity of the state is often bound up with a militarised notion of security.
The Art of Peace

Music • poetry • arts

“Picasso: peace and freedom” at Tate Liverpool

This provocative exhibition, which continues until 30 August, examines Picasso’s political beliefs. Its starting point is WWll when Picasso was the only significant modern artist to remain in Paris during German occupation. His presence there was heroic because as a notorious exponent of “decadent” art, he ran the daily risk of arrest protected only by his fame, he was constantly under surveillance.

The exhibition begins with a series of dark and scary still life paintings done during these war years. Most of them feature a madly staring human skull: hungrily sizing up a plate of sea urchins; crazily grinning from the side of a misshapen dice; lustily eyeing up a voluptuous jug. It is now believed that these are symbolic reflections upon human hopelessness, madness and mortality; and much influenced by the war in Europe and the cruelty of human nature that this exposed.

The most disturbing of them — and the most brilliant — is a bronze disfigurement, cast in 1943, so crude and lumpy that it cannot be read immediately as a human head.

As well as paintings and sculptures, there are many posters, photos and texts. The famous dove of peace he designed for the global peace movement is there. It was a huge popular success but its initial choice appears to have been an accident. The poet, Aragon popped into Picasso’s studio looking for something to put on the poster for the inaugural World Peace Congress in Paris in 1949, and a handy pigeon happened to be leaning against the wall. Once chosen though, the pigeon-turned-dove of peace quickly grew wings and multiplied.

It is now believed that these are symbolic reflections upon human hopelessness, madness and mortality; and much influenced by the war in Europe and the cruelty of human nature that this exposed.

The most disturbing of them – and the most brilliant – is a bronze disfigurement, cast in 1943, so crude and lumpy that it cannot be read immediately as a human head.
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An angry look at the aftermath of the Iraq invasion

In May the Cannes film festival welcomed back one of its favourite sons, and it was Ken Loach, as he is best known and loved: gritty, uncompromising and very angry.

His film, “Route Irish”, named after the hazardous road that links the green zone in Baghdad to the airport was an entry for this year’s Palme d’Or.

Loach said he has wanted to address the elephant in our sitting room for some time but the actual event was so appalling that it takes a long time to see it in perspective.

The film is a mixture of issue-led drama and conspiracy thriller. The movie examines the difficulties experienced by ex-servicemen who cannot get used to living as civilians, and who often decide to go back to Iraq to work as commercial contractors. The film asks what are we doing being involved in privatised war?

A stitch in time

On 15 May, the world’s longest keffiyeh, or scarf was made in Lebanon to commemorate the 62nd anniversary of the naqba, the Palestinian “catastrophe” that was the creation of the state of Israel. The Guinness World Records formally announced that the chain of scarves measured more than 6,500 metres. This was the first large-scale naqba event commemoration event in Lebanon what was not organised under the auspice of any political faction. It was a civil and independent project, initiated by the Campaign for the Protection of the Right to Return. Its founder, Walid Taha, was aiming to draw attention to the plight of Palestinian refugees all over the world, whose right of return, enshrined in UN Resolution 194 still has not been implemented. The Keffiyeh was laid out in Beirut’s Sports City football stadium in the shape of number 194.

Besides drawing attention to Resolution 194, Taha had a secondary aim to fight for social and civil rights for Palestinian refugees in their host countries.

The presentation of the Guinness World Record certificate was greeted by cheers from the crowd which consisted mostly of children from many of the 12 UN camps in Lebanon.
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Score from the film (Josh Barrett)