SYRIA AND THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT

‘What you do with what you’ve got’ by Si Kahn

You must know someone like him – tall and strong and lean
Body like a greyhound and a mind so sharp and keen
His heart just like a laurel grew twisted round itself
Till almost everything he did brought pain to someone else.

It is not what you’re born with
It’s not the fight you dreamed of
It’s not the fight you really fought
It’s not what you’re given
It’s what you do with what you’ve got.

What’s the use of two good legs if you only run away
What’s the use of two good ears if you can’t hear those you love
And what’s the use of two good ears if you can’t hear those you love
Between those who run to evil and those who cannot run
Tell me which ones are the cripples and which ones touch the sun.

This song by the American singer, Si Kahn is a fierce moral statement and a rare one in songs. It takes the responsibility of channeling anger into creed. It transcends every kind of border, geographical and mental. Everyone knows someone who not only wastes the well of talent he/she was born with, but turns it to evil. It is about an ordinary person but could equally be taken as a national leader or, indeed, a political party. Ultimately it leads to the heart of darkness where words fail.

In the last issue we included an abridged version of an essay by John Gray entitled ‘Geopolitics’ in which he argued that by a circuitous route, the world has returned to something like the condition just before WWI, when the risk of war is always present. The US can no longer claim an all-round pre-eminence. Instead, we are entering a period in which no great power is predominant. For the foreseeable future, no one will rule the world, as it faces immense problems associated with declining resources, rapid population growth and global warming.

Now, listening to the media debate around the Syrian crisis, there are the rumblings of something even more worrying. The action of the national players involved suggests that global solidarity is in retreat, at this crucial time in human history, when many thought the UN had established a minimal sense of international responsibility. Comparisons are being made with the failure of Britain, France and the United States to respond in the 1930s to resurgent German militarism. Some observers even say that this is a ‘Munich moment’ and that the Syrian government’s use of gas to kill innocent civilians is an echo of the Holocaust. This brings to mind ‘What to do about Hitler’, a question often asked of pacifists.

This opening article is a controversial one. We hope it will encourage debate among our members. Although most are bound to agree that any weakening of the pacifist position is unacceptable, it is valuable to rehearse the issues involved if nothing more than to see where the boundaries lie.

The pacifist view on Syria could be expressed as follows. There is certainly a responsibility to protect civilians in the country. Dialogue is the only way forwards towards an end to the violence and military action is unacceptable. The use of chemical weapons is condemned and the nations of the world should recognise the responsibility and authority of the UN Security Council to address this violation of international law and morality. Urgent diplomatic efforts should be made to stop the flow of...
The world community has failed the Syrian people.

The reality of the situation

Limited and well defined military action made in a way which gives the adversary time to consider, as, for example, the threat Kennedy maintained during the Cuban crisis could be important. Perhaps we have seen this to be the case with America’s threat over the Syrian use of chemical weapons. The Russian initiative that began with the remarks of Secretary of State John Kerry is clearly very important [Kerry suggested that the US would not intervene in Syria if Assad gave up his chemical weapons to international control and Russia picked up on it]. As stated by IPB’s triennial conference (see page 4), we can hope this was a rare moment of clarity which will lead to a wider dialogue and eventually lead to peace. This could be applied not just to Syria, but to the region generally including the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. As an aside, you might pick up the little irony in the IPB statement – that a peace organisation should welcome a development which is almost certainly the result of the threat of American missile strikes. Perhaps your immediate reaction is to think of another reason for Russia’s initiative. But quite honestly, it does seem as though the threat has been a persuasive factor; and we ought to be willing to acknowledge this when all else seems to have failed in bringing about negotiations.

The peace movement does seem to have a knee-jerk reaction when the US threatens to use its armed forces; while being much less vocal in this case, about Iran and Russia who are both deeply involved. But the conflict goes beyond these considerations. As Ban Ki-moon, UN Secretary-General said at the 2012 General Assembly, “The world community has failed the Syrian people”. The recent history of the Middle East and western military interference has destroyed any fantasies about the smooth creation of harmonious democracies. In Syria, we are left with only a grim sense that every other option has been exhausted. But at the same time, history tells us that leaving tyrants free to kill and displacement of people in Syria, should the anti-war movement consider taking a position more appropriate to the situation? We are not talking about a potential threat to innocents, as was the case with Hitler in the 1930s; it is ongoing tragedy taking place before the eyes of the world. Some of the arguments are muddled, especially the parallels being drawn with the Iraq invasion. That was an unprovoked attack on a country at peace, justified with lies, ignoring the UN and putting the whole region’s stability at risk. But in Syria, weapons of mass destruction have actually been used; the UN process is effectively stymied; the Middle East is rapidly being destabilised already; most of the Arab world supports some form of action. It is important for us pacifists to understand the political realities and the unpalatable decisions that sometimes have to be taken if the process of negotiation is impossible. We may not be able to endorse any military action but we could admit that calls for negotiation are not working. We could perhaps urge caution, call for more information and a road map for any military action which might lead ultimately to a negotiated settlement. And then insist that all necessary resources are made available for Syria’s recovery, making humanitarian aid and reconciliation our key roles.

Changing the international political system within which R2P operates

So what about President Obama’s strategy on the Syrian conflict? His thinking about foreign affairs seems to be reflective and nuanced, and not without moral compass, as shown in the speech he made in Oslo when accepting the Nobel Peace Prize. But his attempt to reconcile a broadly liberal world-view with a realist understanding of the limits of American power has left him with an increasingly frayed and incoherent strategy in the Middle East – perhaps no strategy at all.

In 2007 he told the New York Times: “One of his favourite philosophers was Reinhold Niebuhr, a theologian (once a pacifist below) and a subtle commentator on foreign policy who advocated US intervention against the evil of Nazism. Niebuhr later became a supporter of ‘containment’ during the Cold War. ‘God grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change,’ he wrote in 1943, ‘the courage to change the things I can and the wisdom to know the difference.’ What Obama claims to have learned from Niebuhr are two core notions that might be taken as bookends to his present approach to the war in Syria – beginning with his strongly held position of non-intervention and culminating in the military response that the US has taken. On the one hand, Obama argued, Niebuhr recognised ‘the compelling idea that there is serious evil in the world, and hardship and pain’ but thought that ‘we should be humble and modest in our belief that we can eliminate these things’.

On the other hand, however; he has stated his conviction that ‘we shouldn’t use that as an excuse for cynicism and inaction’. The sense one takes away from Niebuhr that we have to make these efforts knowing they are hard and not swinging from naive idealism to bitter realism. This makes for a sophisticated doctrine which, as we have seen, is very messy in practice. It is particularly difficult in a conflict that is amazingly complex, grounded in centuries of history and fuelled by sectarian and regional divisions.

US policy and actions
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A church which seeks to prevent war

FROM THE CHAIRPERSON, NAT REUSS

The Revd Jim Wallis was one of the key speakers at this year’s Greenbelt Festival. The founder of Sojourners magazine and the community of the same name, Wallis is a highly respected author, speaker, activist and one of a number of spiritual advisors to President Obama. Aside from his main talks at Greenbelt, Wallis was also interviewed by Clare Baling on Radio 2. Whilst not speaking directly on war and peace issues, his main message was an exposé on the policy making process within US politics (but applicable to the UK) and how ordinary people should mobilise to affect policy change. Wallis said, ‘...It’s easy to tell who the Senators are in DC, they are the ones walking around with their fingers in the air; then they lick their finger to see which way the wind is blowing. You only change them when you change the wind’.

‘So people of faith are not lobbyists but wind changers...And all the change to world history comes through our personal commitments...Social movements are what change politics, the common good comes last to Washington DC and London...Believe that your commitments can change the world.’

In August, a changing wind reached London as MPs voted down a plan for military intervention in Syria; an historic vote which may have huge repercussions for Britain’s future involvement on the global political stage. It reflected well the views of MPs’ constituents and already has implications for Britain’s identity. Chancellor George Osborne rightly commented on Radio 4’s today programme that there would be “national soul searching about our role in the world” in the wake of the vote.

Both the US and Britain may claim they have legitimate claims to intervene under R2P, but I would argue that this is ill equipped to guide when the conflict is a civil war. Intervening militarily will only serve to inflame the conflict with unknown consequences. So what can ordinary people do? There is a great contrast now in the British government proudly hosting the world’s largest arms fair when the public have voted against military intervention in Syria. DSEI’s opponents hope it can be stopped like Australia’s arms fair. This would be a great success, but the problem is much deeper and is one that is linked to the way Britain sees itself as world leader in weapons manufacture and export. In 2013, around £1.2 billion of UK arms have been exported to 27 countries which the Foreign Office has classified as “of concern” because of their human rights records, some of which may well have reached the Syrian rebels. This is where the groundswell must begin. But what are we to do? As each generation is faced with war, we need to listen carefully to those who have gone before us, learning from their insights. Jurgen Moltmann, a theology professor at the University of Tubingen, Germany, survived the ravages of World War 2. While in captivity, he encountered Christians whose witness helped him discover hope in God. This gave him a new strength of life, a new power of survival and a slow building up of faith in his heart. During a time in world history when the Church was largely silent, Moltmann returned to Germany with a will to work for renewal for both Germany and the Church.

Moltmann’s work is behind many positive movements. His development of a ‘political theology’ with Johann Baptist Metz, was concerned with trying to lead Christian theology and existence out of the ghetto of ‘private religion’ and into people’s public, political and economic lives as well. The Anglican Church’s silence on Iraq, Libya and Syria – apart from Archbishop Whelby’s gentle warning against military intervention - suggests that Christian theology and existence is still in the same ghetto today.

Moltmann’s words here are instructive, “Before religious communities can contribute anything to world peace, they must themselves become religions of peace and overcome tendencies in their own traditions to hostility and the destruction of enemies.” He writes that “the Sermon on the Mount stands in the light of the dawning of God’s Kingdom and must, to be consistent with the deity of this God, be understood as universal and all-encompassing. It may not be reduced to the life of a believer. It may not be confined to the private life of the peacemakers. It questions this entire godless and violent world and places it under judgement, for it says that the Kingdom of God is coming to redeem the whole creation.”

What is needed then is a Church that not only repents of its own collusion with wars, but a Church that seeks to prevent wars from breaking out by speaking out against the military industrial complex that fuels such wars. This is to move the Church from a mode of sacramental service to one of prophetic speech and action - a wind generator. Both forms of Church are necessary, the latter more than ever.

For Christians in the West, it is all too easy to fall for the propaganda that dehumanises dynastic rulers in the East, believing the myth that our future safety and our interests rest in their defeat. We rarely heed the voice of Christians in Middle Eastern counties who find security and protection under these very same leaders Western nations desire to topple. We seek the false comforts and promises offered by our citizenship to the state forgetting that our citizenship in the Kingdom of God provides our ultimate security whilst at the same time, demanding our whole life. We cling to the power of violence used by the state that brings death when we ought to be calling for our leaders to seek nonviolent ways of conflict resolution that bring life.

The US and Britain have often been portrayed as the world’s policeman but what if our nations operated more like this simple Russian woman instead. In a story told heard by Moltmann shortly after WWII, “She (a simple Russian woman) distributed bread to a line of German prisoners of war, who were being driven through her village. When the Russian soldiers wanted to forbid her to give enemies bread, she answered: “I give bread to everyone who is hungry. When the German soldiers drove Russian prisoners of war through our village, I gave them something to eat; and when the secret police drove you through our village, I will give you bread as well.”

Moltmann’s quotations are taken from The politics of discipleship and discipleship in politics.
A time of conferences and reflection

FROM THE GENERAL SECRETARY
TONY KEMPSTER GIVES HIS REPORT

IPB’s triennial conference in Stockholm

My six-year term as a vice-president of the International Peace Bureau ended at this conference in September. It has been an exciting and inspiring time when I have been able to link APF (an IPB member organisation) with the work of other member organisations around the world. IPB’s main project has been Disarmament for Development and the initiation of the Global Day of Action on Military Spending which coincided with the release of world military spending (reported in previous issues of TAP).

IPB triennial conferences bring together its members and supporters, to discuss its programme of work and the challenges facing peace movements in an unstable and over-militarised world. This year the conference explored the inter-relationships between military intervention and the economy of war.

I chaired the session on ‘Alternatives to intervention: a culture of peaceful conflict resolution’ which included a paper on ‘Peace monitor: a report on positive examples of peaceful conflict resolution’ and papers on activities in Colombia and Somalia. The last was a reminder of my work in an earlier life, while working in agriculture on British Council projects.

The conference was held at the critical moment when the balance in the Syrian chemical weapons drama shifted from possible US-led military strikes to a super-power deal to eliminate the Assad regime’s arsenal. On the other hand, the continuation on a daily basis of brutal killings in Syria, Afghanistan, Iraq was underlined by news reports of bombings, shootings and kidnappings. Each country was the subject of a session at the conference. The discussion highlighted the tendency of political leaders to choose direct intervention instead of conflict prevention, peace-building and civilian-protection approaches. The discussion was preceded by a wide-ranging keynote speech from Joseph Gerson looking at the continuing imperial role of the USA in today’s multipolar world.

In addition to the congress meeting and conference, a peace evening was held at the Nobel Museum. Surrounded by the colourful panels of the IPB photo-exhibition, ‘Making Peace’, a packed audience heard presentations from three distinguished speakers. Two Peace Nobel Laureates spoke: Jody Williams, an American activist known around the world for her work to ban anti-personnel landmines and her defence of human rights; and Mairead Maguire awarded the prize for her extraordinary actions to help end ethnic/political conflict in her native Northern Ireland. The other speaker was Terumi Tanaka from the only nation-wide organisation of A-bomb survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki (Hibakusha).

A highlight of the conference was the presentation of IPB’s annual Sean Macbride Peace Prize named after the distinguished Irish statesman who was both chairman and president of IPB at different times. This year’s prize was awarded to Chelsea (Bradley) Manning, the US whistleblower recently convicted in a much publicised court-martial. The acceptance speech was given by Ann Wright, a retired US Army Colonel and former US diplomat, who resigned in 2003 in opposition to the Iraq War. She is now a peace activist.

An abridged version of the statement prepared at the end of the conference is given below. The full statement and more information on the conference can be read at www.ipb.org.

PUTTING AN END TO MILITARISM

“The world is over-armed and peace is under-funded”
Ban Ki-moon, UN Secretary General

There was a new hope expressed at the IPB Triennial Conference, welcoming the agreement between Russia and the USA on chemical weapons in Syria. Hopefully this will lead to negotiations to put an end to the terrible civil war. The forming of international coalitions for military intervention is now much more difficult as public opinion against war has become so strong. People are weary of war and the deceit and rhetoric that go with it. They are suspicious of double speak and are tired of ‘humanitarian’ statements which end with actions that simply generate more human suffering. We demand that our voices are heard and our desire for peace taken seriously!

Military intervention and the culture of war serve vested interests. They are extremely expensive, escalate violence, and can lead to chaos. They also reinforce the idea that war is a viable solution to human problems. The money being fed into the military would be far better spent eliminating hunger and poverty, providing education and stimulating culture, reversing climate change and improving social justice.

Now is the time to end the era of militarism!

Mairead Maguire
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CCADD’s international in Berlin on its 50th anniversary year.

I have been a member of the Council on Christian Approaches to Defence and Disarmament, and involved in the planning and management of its events, bringing a pacifist perspective to these. The organisation which was founded at Lambeth Palace in 1963 and this is its 50th anniversary year. Note that Rowan Williams is giving CCADD’s anniversary lecture at Kings College London in December (see page 8 for details).

CCADD’s annual international conference was held in Berlin in September, a fitting event to celebrate its 50th anniversary. Members of the conference had a variety of backgrounds, academia, government service, the diplomatic arena and UN, military and military chaplaincy, education and a range of peace movements and clergy of different denominations. Delegates were drawn from Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Netherlands, Poland, UK and US.

In the first after-dinner session, Robert Gessert (US) and Lord Harries (CCADD UK’s president) took on the task of recalling the history and founding events of free and open respectful discussion and debate.

The discussions and the places delegates visited during the conference put them in touch with some great events that shaped our times, and the significant actors. A poignant visit to the city included the Kaiser-Wilhelm Memorial Church, the German Resistance Memorial Centre and the site of the Potsdam Conference. The Wansee Conference, which decided on the final solution for the Jews in January 1942, was held in a villa across the lake from the conference centre. The villa now houses the holocaust memorial centre.

The protestant Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Church is a memorial to peace and reconciliation. And it also stands for the will of Berliners to rebuild their city during the period after the war.

This is seen by the fact that the church not only consists of the ruins of the church which was destroyed during World War II but it also includes contemporary church architecture. It is thus a living contrast between modernism and history.

Among the different conference sessions, the immediacy of this particular moment of the Middle Eastern conflict gave added urgency to the main theme which emerged as a conversation around the interlinking of Just War and Just Peace. The relative merits of two different approaches were discussed in the opening session by Michael Haspel and David Fisher. In the concluding evaluation session there was agreement that some language of the WCC document – An ecumenical call for Just Peace was unfortunate and, in particular, the claim that Just War concept had now become ‘obsolete’. A just peace had always been recognised as the aim of Just War, while there are benefits in setting discussion of just war in the wider context of just peace and the search for a comprehensive concept of security.

The discussions on international law found an important place in the context of the present crisis, with the topic addressed from several angles. It was notable that the concerns of previous CCADD meetings e.g. what we might bracket as ‘Cold War issues’ are fading from the scene, and the urgent need was underlined to work out what is possible as a moral stance at the present time, while not losing sight of the underlying intractable issues, such as nuclear disarmament.

At times, some pessimism arose in the face of the intractability of issues, as the conference addressed current challenges, including those in Syria and Somalia. Particular concern was expressed over the future of R2P. The importance but also fragility of this key moral principle was stressed.

One after-dinner discussion reminded delegates of the ambiguities surrounding policy makers (as also the local Church and ordinary Christians) when great minds and influential thinkers such as Karl Barth, had controversial if not ambiguous views, vigorously opposing Nazism, but not the Marxist ideology that succeeded it across Eastern Europe.

All the papers from the conference will be made available on www.ccadd.org.uk.

A year of transition for The Peace Museum (Bradford)

APF past-chair and counselor, Clive Barrett is chairperson of The Peace Museum (Bradford). As a member of the museum board, I have been pleased to have been able to work with him during a period of transition, A period of substantial growth has occurred with a major change of staff – Diane Hadwen supplemented her role of Learning and Outreach Officer to be appointed Head of Museum.

The museum has now become a significant and unique provider of education for peace, citizenship and community cohesion, modelling locally in and around Bradford what could be achieved regionally and nationally. Initially focussed in the Peace Pod, a designated area in Culture Fusion premises (Bradford YMCA), and in partnership with the Schools Linking Network, the Museum’s engagement with young people became centred increasingly on the Museum’s rejuvenated premises. The Museum’s substantial resources, in its collection and exhibitions, give a unique way into these subjects, examples being a display on Joseph Rotblat, atomic scientist and Nobel Peace Laureate and an Olympic Torch (on long-term loan).

The increase in the number of people who have engaged with the Museum has been considerable. In the twelve months since the Museum was refurbished, there have been 1025 general visitors, 5300 school pupils (40 schools) and 960 people from other organisations.

The Museum’s collection has grown, with over 6000 artefacts now accessioned. The international dimension was enhanced recently by a set of items related to the Nobel Peace Prize,
The christian responsibility to protect

An ecumenical study day organised by the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, the New Zealand Christian Network and Pax Christi was held in Auckland on 14 September 2013. Its aim was to examine the UN’s Responsibility to Protect (R2P), recognising the complexity of the concept and seeking to establish a dialogue between the different disciplines involved in order to progress our understanding and to seek a solution which was compatible with the Christian faith. Speaker details are given at the end.

Critique and alternatives to R2P

Richard Jackson made the point that the status of R2P was politically unclear. It was neither a law nor fully a norm. Faced with the new nature of conflict the UN developed a system of peacekeeping by national military units. Such operations were initially mainly of a military nature and designed to stop the fighting. But, since 1990, the nature of peacekeeping has been changing in recognition of the need to include pro-active conflict prevention as well as peacemaking and peace-building.

The humanitarian tragedies such as Bosnia and Rwanda and the limitations of national sovereignty led to a new response to deal specifically with the major issues of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. Styled initially as “humanitarian intervention”, this response is now known as R2P. Peaceful means were to be employed but if the state failed in its obligations, the international community might take coercive measures but only under the UN Charter and with approval of the Security Council. R2P, though approved in principle by the UN, involves certain precautionary principles before military force is authorised. These are right intention, a just cause, a legitimate authority, appropriate or proportional means, reasonable prospect of success and use of force only as a last resort.

Aid not arms - development as peace-building

Kevin Clements called for new thinking beyond the paradigm of the Weberian state, which sees violence as the only political realism. Instead he saw war and violence as an aberration in human relations and put forward principled non-violence as an alternative. Principled non-violence was based on the recognition of the value of each person and it sought the transformation both of oneself and one’s opponent. Aid and development when recognised this principle and was directed to empowering people was a vital part of peace-building.

Responding to genocide – reaction or prevention?

Charles Butcher showed how accurate forecasting of genocide by helping to focus attention on countries most prone to genocide would enable preventive measures to be taken earlier and thus prevent far more expensive commitment of resources both during and following an actual genocide. It would also enhance the possibility of successful prosecution by the International Criminal Court and thus act as a deterrent to future criminals. Accurate forecasting would also facilitate short-term intervention. Firstly, at-risk states could be the focus of extensive monitoring for “triggers, catalysts or indicators” which occurred close to a genocidal event. Key risk indicators are previous genocides, state-led discrimination, the percentage which occurred close to a genocidal event”. Key risk indicators are previous genocides, state-led discrimination, the percentage of the population in the military and the lack of executive restraint on the military. These factors had led the authors of the report to identify the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Chad as the most likely countries for genocide in the next three years.

Human security versus national security

Dr Katerina Standish differentiated between national security referring to the defence and foreign interests of a country and human security describing the defence and personal interests of people. There was a need for a new paradigm where the interests of people rather than the state became the focus and where humanity was seen in a multi-dimensional and interconnected perspective rather than from an exclusively national standpoint.

She referred to The Human Development Index instituted by economists Mahbub ul Haq and Amartya Sen which was valuable as a predictor of potential violence in societies. Computing various social and other problems, it gave the opportunity to take preventive action before outbreaks of violence occurred. Human security in those cases was dependent on the successful non-violent management of threats to social, cultural, economic, and environmental processes.
Max Hastings (2013)
Catastrophe: Europe goes to war in 1914
William Collins

With the centenary of the war almost upon us, the next 12 months will see a deluge of First World War histories. But this book, which begins with the murder of Archduke Ferdinand in Sarajevo in June 1914 and ends on Christmas day, will take some beating.

This book is important because it offers some answers to the huge and fascinating question what happened to Europe in 1914, through Max Hastings’ accustomed blend of top-down and bottom-up accounts from a multitude of statesmen and generals, peasants, housewives a private soldiers of seven nations. His narrative pricks myths and offers some striking and controversial judgements.

The overriding impression of the narrative is the sheer confusion, the utter chaos of the wars opening months. If the generals conducted themselves like headless chickens, their political masters were equally adrift. Indeed it was a sign of the war’s dizzying impact that few statesmen seemed to grasp the seriousness of the conflict they had unleashed.

The book addresses the two key questions: was it all worth it and who bears most responsibility for the carnage? Hastings examines the published work and concludes with a trenchant argument about Germany’s responsibility and Britain’s commitment. He also argues that the war was worth it in saving the empire and loss of sovereignty to Germany.

Duncan Sandbrook in a Sunday Times review challenges this conclusion. He says that in the long run we lost our empire anyway, having exhausted ourselves in two world wars, and in the meantime tens of millions were killed. Had we stayed out in August 1914, allowing the Central Powers to win a relatively quick victory, the world would surely have been spared the horrors of Nazism, the agony of the holocaust and the tyranny of Stalin. The Kaiser’s Europe might not have been much fun at first, but it would probably have evolved into something more tolerable. In any case could it really have been worse that what happened?

Peter Oborne and David Morrison (2013)
A dangerous delusion: why the west is wrong about nuclear Iran
William Collins

This is an interesting little book written by two political commentators who have analysed the west’s case against Iran on the nuclear issue and find it unconvincing. The book goes beyond the myths and misinformation perpetuated about Iran to reveal what is really going on. Accusations and counter-accusations rage, but the authors remind us of a certain basic fact since 2007, the US National Intelligence Estimate on Iran has judged “with a high degree of confidence” that Iran does not have a programme to develop nuclear weapons.

The authors examine why western politicians and media seem so intent on portraying Iran as an aggressive and malevolent power on the verge of acquiring nuclear weapons, despite strong evidence to the contrary.

Hastings’ accustomed blend of top-down and bottom-up accounts from a multitude of statesmen and generals, peasants, housewives a private soldiers of seven nations. His narrative pricks myths and offers some striking and controversial judgements.

The overriding impression of the narrative is the sheer confusion, the utter chaos of the wars opening months. If the generals conducted themselves like headless chickens, their political masters were equally adrift. Indeed it was a sign of the war’s dizzying impact that few statesmen seemed to grasp the seriousness of the conflict they had unleashed.

The book addresses the two key questions: was it all worth it and who bears most responsibility for the carnage? Hastings examines the published work and concludes with a trenchant argument about Germany’s responsibility and Britain’s commitment. He also argues that the war was worth it in saving the empire and loss of sovereignty to Germany.

Duncan Sandbrook in a Sunday Times review challenges this conclusion. He says that in the long run we lost our empire anyway, having exhausted ourselves in two world wars, and in the meantime tens of millions were killed. Had we stayed out in August 1914, allowing the Central Powers to win a relatively quick victory, the world would surely have been spared the horrors of Nazism, the agony of the holocaust and the tyranny of Stalin. The Kaiser’s Europe might not have been much fun at first, but it would probably have evolved into something more tolerable. In any case could it really have been worse that what happened?

S E V E N

A history of democracy: a history of democracy in crisis from World War I to the present
David Runciman (2013)
Harper Press

This book focuses on the problems democracies have in reacting to international crises. They tend not make such decisions easily in time or with one voice. And, for better or worse, they often change their minds.

He discusses how their weaknesses conceal strengths and how these strengths inadvertently generate potentially fatal weaknesses. He takes his cue from Runciman who was deeply troubled by his discovery that democracies are “caught between their impulse to precipitate action and their instinct to wait”. For Runciman, the trap lies exactly here: “Their experience of crises is more likely to make democracies complacent than it is to make them wise: what democracies learn is that they can survive their mistakes. This is the confidence trap.”

Runciman sees this as a game of chicken. “When things get really bad, we will adapt. Until they get really bad, we need not adapt, because democracies are adaptable. Games of chicken are harmless, until they go wrong, at which point they become lethal.” He tests his hypothesis about democratic entrapment by studying seven moments of major crisis faced by democracies in the past 100 years. These include, 1918 and the dramatic and unexpected victory of the Allies, 1947 and the onset of the Cold War with the Cuban missile crisis, and the Sino-Indian war.

His primary message is that the strengths of democracy should not blind us to the dangers that arise – not least as a result of its own successes in the last century – and entrap us in a kind of optimism that would be really be tantamount to a form of fatalism. To that extent, his main argument is not only plausible but also extremely important. It is tempting to see autocratic regimes such as China (or “hybrid” regimes such as Russia) as having major advantages over democracies of today, and in one sense the book gives cause for concern. While exhibiting the follies and mistakes of democracies, however, he also highlights their flexibility, resourcefulness and resilience.
**DIARY OF EVENTS**

**LOCAL AND NATIONAL**

**13 October**  Week of Prayer for World Peace Interfaith gathering of prayer and peace at the London Interfaith Centre, 2.30 at 125, Salisbury Road, London NW6 6RG.

**15 October**  Council on Christian Approaches to Defence and Disarmament (CCADD) 50th anniversary lecture at Kings College, London to be given by Professor Sir Adam Roberts, a leading world authority on international relations and law and former President of the British Academy. His title is ‘Ethics, law and security’. 6pm in the Great Hall.

**10 November**  Movement for the Abolition of War’s annual Remembrance Day Lecture entitled ‘The nonviolence challenge – changing the culture of war’. It will be given by Alastair McIntosh, a well-known Quaker, campaigner for social justice and the environment. 3pm at the Imperial War Museum (London). Entry to the lecture is free and everyone is welcome. It will follow the MAW AGM which begins at 1pm.

**2 December**  Concert at Christ Church, Oxford – start of the Fellowship of Reconciliation centenary. www.for.org.uk for information.

**10 December**  Second CCADD 50th anniversary lecture at Kings College, London to be given by Lord Williams, Master of Magdalen College, Cambridge and former Archbishop of Canterbury. His title is ‘War – a changing moral map’. 6.45 pm in the Great Hall.
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**Obituary for Anne Spalding**

Anne who died aged 101 was a devout Christian and a long-time member of APF. Many of us remember her from our conferences. She had a love of red wine and life. She grew up in Lyme Regis where her artistic talents were first fostered, later moving to Oxford. She studied at Ruskin School of Art in Oxford and learned a lot from Barnett Freedman who became a close friend. During the Second World War she ran her parents house in Oxford and took in several lodgers, including Charles Williams with whom she became close friends and through whom she met the other ‘inklings’, a group whose number included CS Lewis and JR Tolkien. Anne painted and drew portraits (several are in the National Portrait Gallery), still lives, landscapes and series of pictures of the London Underground. Her sources of inspiration were all around her including Kenya, Tanzania, Arizona and anywhere else she found herself in her much-travelled life. She exhibited widely: in London, including through Sally Hunter Fine Art, at the Museum of Modern Art, Oxford and at the Woodstock Museum. She was very modest about her talents and completely unostentatious.

---

If you would like to join the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship and are in agreement with the pledge:

“We communicant members of the Anglican Communion or Christians in communion with it, believing that our membership of the Christian Church involves the complete repudiation of modern war, pledge ourselves to renounce war and all preparation to wage war, and to work for the construction of Christian peace in the world.”

Then please I/one box one in the form below.

If you are sympathetic to the view expressed in the pledge but feel unable to commit yourself to it, you may like to become an associate of the APF and receive the Fellowship’s newsletter and notice of our various open events, then please I/two box two.

Send your completed form to the Membership Secretary: Sue Gilmurray, 1, Wilford Drive, Ely CB6 1TL.

☐ I am in agreement with the pledge and wish to become a member of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship.

☐ I wish to become an Associate of the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship.

Name and designation (Revd, Dr, Mr, Mrs etc):

please print clearly and give your Christian name first.

Address

Year of birth

Diocese

I enclose a cheque for …………. as my first subscription (makes cheque payable to the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship)

Please ☐ if you are a UK-income tax payer and want your donation to be treated as a Gift Aid donation. APF can then reclaim income tax paid on the donation.

Please ☐ if you want to make a regular monthly or annual subscription using a Standing Order

I heard of APF through …………. Signed Date
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Hannah Arendt was one of the 20th century’s greatest political philosophers, and her books Eichmann in Jerusalem and The origins of totalitarianism remain fascinating. Hannah Arendt is best known for coining the phrase “the banality of evil” in her coverage for The New Yorker of the 1961 trial of former Nazi Adolf Eichmann in Jerusalem. Eichmann infamously adopted the ‘Nuremberg defence’, arguing that he was only following orders, and that he could not possibly be charged with war crimes.

Arendt, a former German Jew who had fled to America from Nazi tyranny, argued that far from being maniacal sociopaths with ungodly desires, the Nazis were mainly a bunch of pen-pushing bureaucrats, intent on furthering their careers rather than being devoted to some sort of supreme fanatical ideal. As such, the atrocities committed against European Jews during the war took on a far more horrific and universal meaning; appropriately motivated, all humans were capable of inhuman acts. For her, it was in this shabby and insidious mediocrity – emblematic of a nation of administrators obediently carrying out the Holocaust - that true evil resided.

Faced with a ferocious media campaign and social hostility that her conclusion provoked, Arendt is exceptionally strong-willed, highly articulate and confident in her response. She was even more viciously denounced by for concluding ‘for whatever motive’ that the transportations to concentration camps had depended on the assistance of Jewish leaders.

Van Trott’a film is not so much interested in Arendt’s political theories, preferring to view her as an embodiment of the strength and wisdom of the Jewish survivor.

Rebellion (2003)
Directed by Mathieu Kassovitz
This is a colonial military drama based on a 1990 memoir by Philippe Legorius, a captain in the GIGN (Groupe d’Intervention de la Gendarmerie Nationale), an elite unit of the armed forces charged with counterterrorism and hostage negotiation who took part in the brutal repression of an insurrection by inhabitants in the French overseas territory of New Caledonia. Legorjus is torn between doing what is right and fulfilling his duty as a military man.

Legorjus instructs his team to treat indigenous inhabitants (Kanaks) with respect as human beings and French citizens. He and we, of course, know how easily the military can disregard such matters when danger threatens and national pride is at stake. The American media have seen it happen in Vietnam and then again in Iraq and Afghanistan. The British have been compromised by bitter colonial wars in Palestine, Kenya and Malaya.

The story is complicated because on his arrival he learns that he has not been entrusted with a personal role that would involve the establishment of trust with the articulate Kanak leader, followed by patient negotiation. Mitterand’s government is involved in a general election at home, and to pacify opponents gather votes, he has sent in an army shock force to deal with the situation. And behind it all, as it has for years, lies nickel that is mined in abundance in the islands.

The insurrection is thus blown out of all proportion, and the civilian population becomes deadly enemies of the state. Legorjus is presented with a moral dilemma which leads to his court martial.

500 FEET (2013)
Directed by Omer Fast
‘IWM Contemporary’ is a new programme of exhibition and events at the Imperial War Museum (London) by leading artists and photographers whose work is a response to war and conflict. It has begun with this film by Omer Fast.

The film takes its name from the optimum operational flight altitude of a US Air Force Predator drone. Based on a series of interviews conducted in a Las Vegas hotel room with a former drone operator, Fast presents a 30-minute film on the subject of drone warfare.

The film opens with an interview with the drone operator, as he recounts his combat experiences of flying over Afghanistan and Pakistan. Speaking mostly off-camera, the drone operator details the psychological impact of engaging an enemy from thousands of miles away. As the film progresses unsettling flashbacks and re-imagined scenarios expose the psychological impact of his experiences.

Fast creates a multifaceted and unstable sense of reality. Combined with surreal shots of suburban Nevada, the film offers a subtle exploration of how the use of drones is rapidly changing the politics, principles and personal experience of contemporary conflict.

Homeland (2003) and US foreign policy
Channel 4
We are into another series of ‘Homeland’ which now bears little reality with the America’s sudden loss of diplomatic coherence and effect. But the comparison is interesting.

For the America depicted in ‘Homeland’ the moves in Syria after 2011 would have been obvious: set up shop in Lebanon to arm and train the secular, democratic and pro-western elements among the rebels; create and interim government in exile; lean on allies and the Muslim world to stop arms getting to jihadists, and to stop jihadists getting to Syria in the first place. Meanwhile use the west’s intelligence gathering capabilities to assemble evidence of Assad’s atrocities: the massacres, tortures, chain of command, the chemical weapons.

It is just what Hillary Clinton and former defence secretary Leon Panetta and former CIA director David Petraeus reportedly told Obama to do. But they were overruled and we know now how the real story has evolved since then.
Accounts for the year ended 5/4/2013

Treasurer’s comments

These accounts have been prepared wholly on a receipts and payments basis in accordance with the requirements of the Charity Commissioners. As expected expenditure greatly exceeded income due to the 75th anniversary works. General subscriptions include the previous years tax refunds but not this tax year. Member subscriptions produced over 90% of total income.

The reserves are now not sufficient to meet the policy requirement to maintain more than one years normal expenses. But notice of a significant legacy will bring correction.

A copy of the Independent Examiners report is available from the Treasurer.

Roger Payne

NOtes to accounts

1. Receipt & Payments Account (General Purpose Fund)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012/2013</th>
<th>2011/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>9438.78</td>
<td>9471.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations &amp; Legacies</td>
<td>197.00</td>
<td>834.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Activities</td>
<td>224.50</td>
<td>44.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from Assets</td>
<td>99.20</td>
<td>122.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>258.15</td>
<td>230.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receipts</strong></td>
<td><strong>10217.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>10703.20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payments</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>3393.62</td>
<td>3289.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature &amp; Publications</td>
<td>10644.27</td>
<td>7207.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliations &amp; Grants</td>
<td>390.00</td>
<td>990.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Payments</strong></td>
<td><strong>14727.89</strong></td>
<td><strong>11486.72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Net Receipts/(Payments)</strong></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-4510.26</td>
<td>-783.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cash Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012/2013</th>
<th>2011/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12799.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>17309.94</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Receipt & Payments Account (NZ Literature Fund)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012/2013</th>
<th>2011/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from Assets</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature &amp; Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Receipts/(Payments)</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-36.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cash Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012/2013</th>
<th>2011/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Statement of Assets and Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monetary Assets</th>
<th>2012/2013</th>
<th>2011/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBF Deposit Fund</td>
<td>9973.34</td>
<td>13973.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Westminster Current Account</td>
<td>3973.14</td>
<td>3195.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paypal Account</td>
<td>153.20</td>
<td>200.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Monetary funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>12799.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>17309.94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debtors</th>
<th>2012/2013</th>
<th>2011/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income tax recoverable</td>
<td>1411.63</td>
<td>1352.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal of Fuji Laptop</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1411.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>1352.49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>2012/2013</th>
<th>2011/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creditors</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Monetary Assets</th>
<th>2012/2013</th>
<th>2011/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature stocks</td>
<td>2521.45</td>
<td>2753.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office furniture and equipment</td>
<td>2023.19</td>
<td>2023.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INDEPENDENT EXAMINERS REPORT

I have examined the relevant books and vouchers and am satisfied that the above account is correct.

An Independent Examiners report has been submitted to the Governing Body.

Signed Richard Harries

Registered Charity
No. 209610
Although it sounds clear, there is little agreement in practice on how to implement these propositions, a point which is developed in the report of our New Zealand APF conference on page 6. The crucial questions is what, if anything, can be done to strengthen this emerging international consensus that there is a responsibility to protect innocent civilians from the ravages of war, the brutality of dictators, and the organised violence of international terrorist groups?

Answering the question is particularly difficult given the lack of clarity. What does protection mean? Exactly who are we protecting and against whom? What kinds of responses will achieve protection? What is the threshold of violence that would trigger an international response? Is R2P limited to genocide and ethnic cleansing, or does it have broader implications for terrorism and other uses of state violence and power against its own people? What are the implications for traditional state sovereignty? Who can authorise the use of diplomacy or military force to achieve the desired protection given the likely paralysis of the UN Security Council? Does the doctrine of R2P imply or lead to regime change? And finally does action taken unilaterally or multilaterally to protect, result in a subsequent responsibility to fix (R2F), to create new institutions in which systematic violence and human rights abuses will not or cannot recur?

**Just peace**

The notion of just peace is important here. It is defined and discussed in the An ecumenical call to just peace (World Council of Churches, 2011). Just peace goes beyond the Just War criteria which are increasingly inadequate in dealing with the complexity of today's conflicts. The WCC report has two paragraphs which are particularly relevant here:

21. Transforming conflicts is an essential part of peacemaking. The process of transforming conflicts begins with unmasking violence and uncovering hidden conflict in order to make the consequences visible to victims and communities. Conflict transformation aims at challenging adversaries to redirect their conflicting interests towards the common good. It may have to disturb an artificial peace, expose structural violence or find ways to restore relationships without retribution. The vocation of churches and religious communities is to accompany the victims of violence and be their advocates. ‘The rule of law’ is a critical framework for all such efforts.

22. Yet there are bound to be times when our commitment to Just Peace is put to a test, since peace is pursued in the midst of violence and under the threat of violent conflict. There are extreme circumstances where, as the last resort and the lesser evil, the lawful use of armed force may become necessary in order to protect vulnerable groups of people exposed to imminent lethal force. Yet even then we recognise the use of armed force in situations of conflict as both a sign of serious failure and a new obstacle on the Way to Just Peace.

It follows that to be effective the doctrine of R2P needs to be more than a doctrine of moral persuasion. Hectoring is not an adequate substitute for most robust responses. The international community needs an enforcement strategy. [Then finally, there must be a clear and well-defined strategy of how the societies/nations that are to be protected will be rebuilt and internal stability re-established. If R2P is more than a rhetorical doctrine, it should include clearly accepted and articulated responsibility to fix (R2F) plan. The international community has an obligation.]

**Experience on the frontline**

Major Josh Wineera described how the political and legal language of a UN Security Council Resolution was difficult to translate into action on the ground. The limits of military power were recognised and the non-use of force was often a counter-intuitive yet right approach. Moreover, when the objectives were not clear; other actors on the scene might not understand their part and relations between the locals and the security forces might be affected. In Bougainville he was a member of a 1997 truce-monitoring team helping to educate people about the process which the leaders had agreed. He was unarmed and felt safer than when he was armed in an earlier operation in Bosnia because the responsibility was thrown on the locals to uphold this stand. In Iraq he was part of a special UN Political Affairs group which was monitoring human rights issues in Detention Centres. He was given U.S. protection, though New Zealand did not officially support the invasion of Iraq. This protection created a dilemma for the independence of what was meant to be a non-partisan mission.

Colonel Martin Dransfeld stressed the desirability of more integrated teams with civilian, military and police components. He spoke of the need to be versed with the culture and language of the local people who had a strong loyalty to their culture and religion. He considered that it was not just the weapons that were important but the method of engagement with the people.

Both officers stipulated that, while they were both serving officers, each spoke in a personal capacity and did not necessarily represent the views of the NZ Defence Force or the NZ Government.

**God’s world - staking the claim for theology.**

Anthony Dancer described how the Bible takes a realistic view of the human condition yet shows how we are to live together and how God’s gift of compassion directs and enables us to love our neighbour. Pacifism might be seen as the practice of living life where peace was normative and interdependence was a condition of our creation and our wellbeing. In other words we had a need to be in communion with one another. Though evil existed, Christ through his cross has given us the means of facing and overcoming it. We were to love our enemies and through our love and forgiveness God could change their hearts and transform their lives.

The forces of evil represented by the powers and principalities took possession of corporate bodies such as the State so that they and their agents committed terrible crimes. But this evil could be resisted through Christ and by our prayer. Anthony believed in the Church, that it had the power through the Holy Spirit to act in this way.

**This summary of the study day is by Chris Barfoot.**

**Speakers**

Dr Kennedy Graham, Green Party List M.P. and former NZ Foreign Service
Professor Richard Jackson, Deputy Director of the National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies at Otago University.
Dr Katerina Standish, lecturer in the National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies
Dr Charles Butcher, lecturer in the National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies
Professor Kevin Clements, Director of the National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies
Major Josh Wineera, NZ Defence Force, a major who has served in peace-keeping missions in Bougainville and Iraq
Colonel Martin Dransfeld, NZ Defence Force who has served in East Timor Leste and Afghanistan
Anthony Dancer; Former Social Justice Commissioner of the Anglican Church in New Zealand

---
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P J Harvey in Guantanamo protest song

Singer-songwriter P J Harvey has released a new track in August to draw attention to the case of a British resident detained in Guantanamo Bay. Following the dark, politically charged vein of 2011’s ‘Let England shake’, the track entitled ‘The cure at Troy’ is a verse adaptation of Sophocles’ play, ‘Philoctetes’ by Seamus Heaney who died in August. It is about a nation coming home from war. After the long war in Troy, the Greeks sail home, taking with them their equipment, their hostages, and their wounded hopes. Was the war a victory or not? They put in to an island, where they re-encounter one of their own who was abandoned during the rush to war. He carries an agonizing wound. In the play’s great encounters between this man and Odysseus, the mastermind behind the war, emerges the war’s real story. How does a family heal itself after war? What burden is carried forward by those who fought the war? And for the nation they destroyed in war... is there a cure at Troy? Some of Seamus Heaney’s most quoted lines come from a section of this poem (below). they were quoted by Bill Clinton in his remarks to the community in Londonderry in 1995 during the Northern Ireland Peace Process.

For the past few months, Lucy Ellinson has been living inside the mind of an American drone pilot. She’s performing Grounded, a monologue by the playwright George Brant about a former US fighter pilot turned drone operative, trying to reconcile her long, dull shifts waging war on Iraq from thousands of miles away with her off-duty life as a wife and mother.

During rehearsals, Ellinson interviewed two RAF fighter pilots, and she is in email contact with a US drone pilot, whose description of operations is in accordance with Brant’s script. This is war as soul-crushing shift work. “It sounds like a call centre,” Ellison says. “The hours are long, the toilet breaks are designated, the snack machine is a highlight of the day, and they’re pretty bored a lot of the time.”

The play proved a hot ticket at the Traverse theatre in Edinburgh last month, and has just transferred to the Gate theatre in Notting Hill, London.

Remembering war to promote peace

On the 23 May, actors and writers came together to launch a statement which condemns David Cameron’s plan to mark the centenary of the First World War with “truly national commemorations” which aim to stress our “national spirit” in a similar way to the “Diamond Jubilee celebrations”. The statement, which was read out by Stop the War convenor Lindsey German said “instead we believe it is important to remember that this was a war that was driven by powers’ competition for influence around the globe, and caused a degree of suffering all too clear in the statistical record of 16 million people dead and 20 million wounded.” Outside of poet Siegfried Sassoon’s house, Jeremy Corbyn MP introduced Brian Eno who read a chosen passage on the suffering of a First World War soldier and actor Janie Dee read Power Laureate Carol Ann Duffy’s Last Post, a poem to mark the deaths of Henry Allingham and Harry Patch, the two longest surviving soldiers of the war. Author Michael Morpurgo read Siegfried Sassoon’s ‘Soldiers declaration’. The statement, which was published in The Guardian and is signed by Jude Law, Sir Patrick Stewart and Antony Gormley amongst others, can be read at www1.stopwar.org.uk.