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Editors’ Introduction

This issue of Social Alternatives is devoted to ending war and other related forms of violence and to building structures and values that will strengthen peace. Its major theme embraces the notion of declaring Anzac Day, April 25th, 2015, the beginning of a ‘Year of Peace’. The idea took root in the Anzac Day address delivered in 2014 by the late Governor Peter Underwood of Tasmania. His message was that ‘until we find the truth (of what causes wars), we cannot begin to pay proper homage and respect to those who fought in that terrible conflict 100 years ago and to the many others who have subsequently fought in other wars.’ Instead of glorifying war with the deeds of our soldiers ‘enthusiastically and unflinchingly carrying the torch of freedom in the face of murderous enemy fire’, we can best honour their sacrifices by embarking on studies to eliminate the custom of war and its practice of killing and being killed.

The full address of the Governor, delivered from Hobart’s cenotaph at last year’s Anzac Day ceremony, appears as this issue’s first article. It inspired a group of five former academics who have continued our long commitment to peace studies and action to respond to the Governor’s call to be among those offering more than just ‘remembrance and honour’. Two of us opted to focus on peace action at the community level. The other three turned to the Social Alternatives Collective with a proposal to edit a special peace issue in accordance with the spirit and process set out in the Governor’s speech. Our proposal was supported enthusiastically by the Collective, so we contacted the Governor for his endorsement to publish the entire speech. He pointed out that his permission was not required since the address had become part of the public domain but he considered it thoughtful to have been asked. He said he was unfamiliar with the journal, so we told him it is widely available in university and government libraries. In a second exchange he indicated that he had found a copy and would now like to take out a yearly subscription.

Sadly, that was the last time we had the opportunity to talk with this delightful and very approachable man. He died suddenly on 7 July, a month after surgery to remove a tumour. He had wanted the centenary year of the beginning of World War I in August 2014 to coincide with the launching of a Year of Peace. However, Social Alternatives was committed for the next two issues, so we prepared for a late January 2015 publication date. Supporting Governor Underwood’s proposal for the Year of Peace we focused the publication of this issue towards the centenary of the landing at Anzac Cove on 25th April, 1915.

Governor Underwood called for the establishment of an ANZAC ‘centre for the study of peace, conflict and war’. Along the same lines, he declared that ‘some of the millions of dollars that will be spent on the “Anzac Festival” should be diverted to support for the University of Sydney’s Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies’. He clearly recognised the value of strengthening existing peace centres, establishing new ones, and introducing peace studies in universities and schools as well as peace methods in the communities. These comprise long-term and effective ways to create the peaceful society he envisaged as the true outcome of national sacrifice in World War I and subsequent wars.

There are also a host of critical immediate issues to be dealt with. These include the impacts of fundamentalist-inspired terrorist acts such as the lone-wolf murders in Sydney’s Martin Place on 16 December, 2014, the expansion of the arms trade, the rising of the mean world temperature toward the critical tipping point of a 3.6 degrees increase and the ongoing violence and discrimination against women around the world. It is sobering to bear in mind the imminent dangers of nuclear war that can end all human hopes of survival. The symbolic indicator of the Doomsday Clock was set by the Science and Security Board of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists on 14 January, 2014 at three minutes to midnight suggesting, according to the Board, that ‘the risk of civilisation-threatening technological catastrophe remains high’. Unless we take heed of the dangers we confront, Richard Wagner’s operatic fantasy Götterdämmerung may well become our reality.

The various contributions in this issue explore alternative approaches to war and violence. The emphasis is on sharing constructive cross-disciplinary ideas. Necessarily, they are but a beginning. They are intended as a starting point for further research and constructive dialogue. The collection of articles in this Peace Issue of Social Alternatives comprises three overlapping strands or themes.
Strand One

The first strand invites wide-ranging discussions on critical issues of ‘untold’ histories of nonviolent activism, anti-militarism, and of peace movements. In the Australian National War Museum, there is no exhibition space devoted to the history of nonviolent opposition to war, including peace movement activism and the role of anti-war feminists. There is no space, for example, given to the Women’s Peace Army formed in Australia with people like Vida Goldstein as leading figures in the anti-conscription campaign in World War I, or the formation of anti-militarist, international nongovernmental associations, such as the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) which celebrates its hundredth anniversary this year. Addressing these gaps, Hilary Summy’s article investigates some significant aspects of the history of the League of Nations Union (LNU), and looks at how the United Nations Association Australia (UNAA) built on this tradition of global civic engagement.

Lawrence Wittner’s paper takes such issues further in his historical study of peace movement nonviolent activism in the United States. Emphasising the success stories of anti-war movements through the 19th and 20th centuries, such as averting nuclear conflict during the Cold War years, Wittner identifies some of the key features that enabled these campaigns to achieve peaceful social change away from militarism.

John Hallam examines the deplorable history of accidental wars and events that have brought the world to the edge of catastrophes, particularly of the nuclear kind. He cautions, moreover, against certain current trends that continue to raise the risk of nuclear conflicts and gives an account of ongoing efforts internationally to lessen the risks to human survival from nuclear arsenals. Drew Hutton examines how the peace movement might respond to current conflicts and argues for what he sees as a credible ‘foreign policy’ stance for the contemporary peace movement, including applying ‘just war’ threshold criteria and the evolving notion of ‘responsibility to protect’. Richard Jackson critiques the ‘realist’ assumptions of conventional International Relations theory, drawing extensively on the theory and practice of nonviolence. Marty Branagan’s article on the activities of non-violent resistance movements in Germany at the time of the Second World War challenges stereotypes many people hold about the passive internal society in Germany under the fascist tyranny.

On the Australian front, Margaret Reynolds’ article recounts her years of involvement in the peace movement in the later decades of the 20th century. Her commentary is not so much a lament for the recent decline of activism but a declaration that conviction and community solidarity can achieve great goals towards building peaceful societies and she asks some searching questions on contemporary politics, power, and challenges to peace.

Strand Two

The second strand welcomes research and reflection on critical issues of ‘untold’ histories of nonviolent activism, anti-militarism, and of peace movements. In the Australian National War Museum, there is no exhibition space devoted to the history of nonviolent opposition to war, including peace movement activism and the role of anti-war feminists. There is no space, for example, given to the Women’s Peace Army formed in Australia with people like Vida Goldstein as leading figures in the anti-conscription campaign in World War I, or the formation of anti-militarist, international nongovernmental associations, such as the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) which celebrates its hundredth anniversary this year. Addressing these gaps, Hilary Summy’s article investigates some significant aspects of the history of the League of Nations Union (LNU), and looks at how the United Nations Association Australia (UNAA) built on this tradition of global civic engagement.

Lawrence Wittner’s paper takes such issues further in his historical study of peace movement nonviolent activism in the United States. Emphasising the success stories of anti-war movements through the 19th and 20th centuries, such as averting nuclear conflict during the Cold War years, Wittner identifies some of the key features that enabled these campaigns to achieve peaceful social change away from militarism.

John Hallam examines the deplorable history of accidental wars and events that have brought the world to the edge of catastrophes, particularly of the nuclear kind. He cautions, moreover, against certain current trends that continue to raise the risk of nuclear conflicts and gives an account of ongoing efforts internationally to lessen the risks to human survival from nuclear arsenals. Drew Hutton examines how the peace movement might respond to current conflicts and argues for what he sees as a credible ‘foreign policy’ stance for the contemporary peace movement, including applying ‘just war’ threshold criteria and the evolving notion of ‘responsibility to protect’. Richard Jackson critiques the ‘realist’ assumptions of conventional International Relations theory, drawing extensively on the theory and practice of nonviolence. Marty Branagan’s article on the activities of non-violent resistance movements in Germany at the time of the Second World War challenges stereotypes many people hold about the passive internal society in Germany under the fascist tyranny.

On the Australian front, Margaret Reynolds’ article recounts her years of involvement in the peace movement in the later decades of the 20th century. Her commentary is not so much a lament for the recent decline of activism but a declaration that conviction and community solidarity can achieve great goals towards building peaceful societies and she asks some searching questions on contemporary politics, power, and challenges to peace.

Strand Three

The third strand raises critical issues about learning for peace and the nonviolent transformation of conflicts. To see future horizons as those of repeated, large-scale lethal conflicts is to do a deep disservice to the many who have lost their lives in battle. There has been far too often a neglect of the tragic legacies of war. Critical inquiry and dialogue on alternatives to war, militarism, and violence are vitally important. They are ways of remembering and respecting the lives lost in wars. Arguably, we owe it to future generations to continue to search for nonviolent alternatives. Thus we present several articles that promote approaches to preventing wars and building more peaceful societies.

Two commentaries by Keith Suter present creative but possible socio-political options for establishing a Ministry of Peace and subverting the destructive military-industrial complex with a new alliance of a peace-industrial complex. Indeed, such trends are underway as major corporations begin to recognise that peace is good for business. Brian Martin examines the possibilities of social defence, while Frank Stilwell discusses the economics of reallocation, redistribution and revival as key pillars of peaceful societies. Stilwell sketches out what a transition to a peace economy from a ‘permanent war economy’ might look like. Peter Herborn introduces readers to the emergence of Peace Museums and the exciting possibilities for establishing peace museums in Australia. Focusing on peace-promoting social institutions, Colin Power discusses the emergence and meaning of peace education within UNESCO and its ripple effects into peace education programs around the world, while Linda Groff presents an intriguing examination of how grassroots communities can draw on local human, environmental and spiritual resources to build peaceful societies through the organisational frameworks of Peacewheels that serve to build cohesion in establishing viable cultures of peace. Finally, Richard
Hil places his satirical lens over some conflicts of recent times and subverts the self-important blunders of some of the key persons who tugged their countries with them into lamentable wars.

All of these articles serve to inform, inspire and challenge readers into believing that there are always peaceful alternatives to violent wars and other conflicts. In its modest way, this issue of Social Alternatives serves to reflect on peaceful means that have been successful in the past and vigorously declares a range of approaches that can serve to protect and secure our societies towards peaceful futures.

In addition to the articles, recognition must go to the poetry that has been selected for this issue. The verse selections speak to questions of moral imagination, contemporary environmental challenges and peace, and to the value of language of nonviolence. In their own artistic way, each of these poems brings us to celebrate the peaceful heartbeat of human life that sustains us through all wars and distress.
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The Last Marked Bedouin

By now she thought wars
would be over
like the tattoos on her face
tradition not to be passed on.

The gunfire is in the west
over the soft red rocks
and in the sandy north, and east
where map lines chart ownership.

She shakes her head
at the un-tented
squabbling over water and oil
survives selling
trinkets to tourists.

She’s got it off pat
a touch of leather hand
on a white woman’s arm
a flash of gold teeth
questioning origin
and bidding them, welcome.

Kate Noakes, Paris, France
The First World War began one hundred years ago when Britain and Germany went to war in August 1914. According to the Australian War Memorial, ‘Prime Minister Andrew Fisher’s government pledged [this country’s] full support for Britain. The outbreak of war was greeted in Australia, as in many other places, with great enthusiasm’ (AWM 15 March 2014).

That war remains the most costly conflict in terms of deaths and casualties. From a population of fewer than five million people, nearly half a million Australian men enlisted, of which over 60,000 were killed and 156,000 were wounded, gassed, or taken prisoner (AWM 15 March 2014).

In his Remembrance Day speech last year, former Prime Minister of Australia, Paul Keating, described the start of that war in these terms … ‘the horror of all ages came together to open the curtain on mankind’s greatest century of violence — the twentieth century’ (Keating 2013).

What a terrible indictment on those of us who have lived the majority of our lives in the twentieth century. Despite the fact that the last 100 years have been witness to huge technological advances, incredible scientific discoveries and great artistic achievements — all of which bear witness to the ingenuity, skill and capacity of humankind — a Prime Minister of our country describes the last hundred years as ‘mankind’s greatest century of violence’. If Mr. Keating is correct when he says that — and there is a great deal of evidence to support what he said — what do we say at this centennial commemoration of the start of World War I to all those who were killed or wounded in what was ironically called ‘the war to end all wars’?

On 16 December 1918, just a few weeks after the Armistice that marked the end of that war, the English statesman and architect of the Gallipoli campaign, Sir Winston Churchill, said:

We must look forward one hundred, two hundred, three hundred years to the time when that vast continent of Australia … will look back through the preceding periods of time to the world shaking episode of the Great War, and when they will seek out with the most intense care every detail of that struggle; when … every family will seek to trace some connection with the heroes who landed on the Gallipoli Peninsula, or fought on the Somme, or in the other great battles in France (Churchill 2003).

Well Mr. Churchill, 100 years have passed and we are now, as you forecast we would be, looking back through the preceding periods of time and what do we see? Former Prime Minister Keating can see a 100 years of the greatest violence, no doubt having in mind the fact that a mere 20 years after the end of ‘the War to end all Wars’, the world plunged into World War II that raged for two years longer than the First World War; to be followed, within a mere five years, by the Korean War, and then there was Vietnam, which saw Australian combat troops being killed and physically and psychologically wounded during ten long horrific years. And there have been others since then; the latest in Iraq and Afghanistan. The latter turned out to be Australia’s longest war and the most favourable view of it, as articulated by the current Prime Minister [Tony Abbott], is that it ended ‘… not with victory, not with defeat, but with, we hope, an Afghanistan that is better for our presence here’ (The Australian 16 March 2014).

Mr. Churchill’s exhortation to us was to seek out on this anniversary, with the most intense care, every detail of that struggle. Implicit in that exhortation is that we seek out the truth; the truth of the causes of that war; the truth of what happened in that war; and the truth of what we have done to avoid there being another war like it. Until we find the truth, we cannot begin to pay proper homage and respect to those who fought in that terrible conflict 100 years ago and to the many others who have subsequently fought in other wars when called upon to do so by their country.

As we look backwards to try and find the truth, we would do well to bear in mind the opening sentence in Professor Joanna Bourke’s book, An Intimate History of Killing:
should be spent examining and talking about the causes

In the spirit of true remembrance, the Year of Peace... Anzac Day, the centennial anniversary... in order to give us peace and freedom. But remembrance and honour will neither bring nor preserve the peace for which they thought they died. That is not enough. We must actively strive for peace on a daily basis and I think that we could best begin that process, and thus properly honour and remember those who were killed or wounded while their country engaged them in the business of killing, by declaring this centennial year of the start of the War to end all Wars, the Year of Peace.

In the spirit of true remembrance, the Year of Peace should be spent examining and talking about the causes of war and how we got involved in wars. We should spend less time studying Simpson’s donkey and more time looking at why we were fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan for so long. All this is not in order to criticise past decision makers, but in remembrance of the dead, to help us avoid doing it again in some other place, simply because we failed to examine all the alternative means of resolving conflict.

In this Year of Peace, Australia should establish an Anzac Centre for the Study of Peace, Conflict and War. This is not an original idea of mine, but was a recommendation made by the National Commission on the Commemoration of the Anzac Centenary set up by Prime Minister Kevin Rudd’s government to look at options to mark the Centenary of the First World War (Anzac Centenary/National Commission, March 2011: 28).

The idea was that the proposed Centre be a high-profile initiative to honour the memory of the original Anzacs in the best way possible — by working towards understanding conflict and focusing attention on how the risk that future Australians will have to take part in war might be reduced (The National Commission of Anzac Centenary, March 2011: 28).

Unfortunately, the Advisory Board appointed to implement the Commission’s recommendations rejected the idea (Anzac Advisory Board: 32). Well, if that can’t be done, perhaps in the Year of Peace it might be possible to divert some of the millions of dollars that will be spent on the ‘Anzac Festival’ to provide proper support for the University of Sydney’s Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, which after 26 years of operation is still heavily dependent on membership subscriptions and volunteers to continue its work (Centre for Peace And Conflict Studies, Annual Report, 2013).

It has been estimated that about 16 million people were killed in World War I (Princeton edu, 18 March 2014). The next World War was worse. The estimated number of human beings killed in World War II range from 60 to a staggering 70 (worldwar2.org.uk) or even 85 million (Wikipedia World War II casualties, 18 March 2014), making it the deadliest war in world history. So the killing got worse as the century wore on.

Surely, now that the curtains have closed on mankind’s greatest century of violence, the least we can do is start the next century with a Year of Peace and commit to setting up and maintaining, or otherwise fully financing, a centre that is dedicated to the study of the nature of social conflicts, causes of violence and definitions of peace, as well as engage in research into new approaches for resolving conflicts. That would be a fitting call to remembrance. Lest We Forget.
Celebrating Australia’s First Birthday

HENRY REYNOLDS

Australia celebrated the birth of the federal state on the first of January 1901. The celebrations themselves illustrated many of the contradictions which ran through the new polity. There was the complex relationship between colonial nationalism and loyalty to Queen and Empire. There was also the fact that the new nation was at war both in South Africa and China. Underlying the contemporary enthusiasm for war was the important question of how democracy and militarism would be able to co-exist.

A New Nation

The first of January 1901, the opening day of the twentieth century, was an important moment in many parts of the world but nowhere more so than in Australia. The birth of the new Federation was celebrated in all parts of the country while Sydney hosted a week of processions, dinners, concerts and conferences. The hotels were overflowing with politicians, judges, senior bureaucrats, bishops, military officers and business leaders from all parts of the continent. It was the ideal occasion for the new federation to display itself to the world, to reflect on the past and speculate about the future. Hyperbole flowed in the torrent of speeches. But there was much to be reasonably proud of. Late nineteenth century Australia was a remarkably successful society.

Australia and New Zealand had the highest global per capita income, and wealth was more evenly distributed than in comparable societies in Europe. The literacy rate was among the highest in the world and the courts, parliaments and bureaucracies worked efficiently. Male suffrage had been implemented in the major colonies for many years and federal female suffrage was impending. Precocious trade union development had stalled during the depressed 1890s but by 1900 organised labour had successfully forced its way into the colonial parliaments. The Federal Constitution had emerged from a series of conferences and had been approved by referendum. It merged the traditions and customs which had grown from the experience of the six colonial parliaments and the federal system of the United States. The process of referendum was adopted from Switzerland. But, the borrowing notwithstanding, the Constitution was above all a home grown product and a political achievement of the highest order.

The failure to refer to Aboriginal Australia during the week of celebrations was only one of what, in retrospect, appear to be strange and even portentous anomalies. Australia’s achievements were above all those of nation building, of creative political development and social and economic progress. They were the cumulative result of several generations of colonists, and increasingly of Australian born men and women. They often looked overseas for guidance but the institutions, enterprises and customs that emerged were distinctively Australian. But in all the public events, which were held to mark the first weeks of the federal state, the national was overwhelmed by the Imperial and the civil by the martial. The cavalcade of celebration provided dramatic evidence of this disturbing metamorphosis.

Extensive newspaper reports allow us to gain some idea of the reaction of the milling crowds. The leading inter-colonial politicians who had been involved in the federal movement and the constitutional conventions were unknown and were greeted with scattered clapping. The marching trade unionists received what the Sydney Morning Herald described as modest encouragement. Sydney based politicians George Reid and Edmund
Barton were recognised and applauded. But when the carriage of the new Governor General, the aristocratic seventh Earl Hopetoun, appeared the ‘enthusiasm was limitless, and was renewed again and again’. As his carriage passed St. Mary’s Roman Catholic Cathedral a choir of school children sang an ode which concluded with the question:

What does the future hold
For the land of the Golden Fleece?
Lord, in whose hands the nations lie
Lord, let Thy gift be Peace!

Later, in a prayer for the new Commonwealth, Cardinal Patrick Moran renewed the references to peace. Australia, he declared, ‘in the freshness of freedom and the vigour of youth … sets out today on her peaceful career of Empire’. In one hand, he hoped, it would ever wield ‘the sceptres of Christian civilization’, and in the other ‘firmly grasp the gospel of peace’. He hoped, that the ‘crowning mission of Australia’s Commonwealth would be to erect a glorious temple of abiding concord and long-enduring peace’ (SMH 1901).

But peace did not stand a chance in the new Commonwealth. Each of the six colonies had soldiers fighting in South Africa. While the State Premiers were still in Sydney for the inauguration of the Commonwealth, they met and agreed to send new contingents to the war totalling 2500 men accompanied by their horses. The Sydney Morning Herald was ecstatic, writing:

We accept the request of the Imperial authorities for more Australian troops as a distinct compliment. It adds an official acknowledgement to those we have already received respecting the real merits of our men. It proves beyond cavil that they have won a reputation as soldiers of the Queen, and it amounts to a generous admission of the value of our contingents and their services (SMH 1901).

But as well as the war on the Veldt, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia had sent a combined contingent of 500 sailors to China to help the European powers to put down the Boxer Rebellion. South Australia dispatched its gunboat, the Defender, which returned to much applause at the end of the first week in January. The Adelaide Advertiser reported that her ‘gallant crew’ were disappointed. They did not have the ‘brush with the Boxers that they desired’ (Advertiser 1901).

No one reading the Australian papers during the first weeks of January could escape news about war. There were regular telegraphic reports about the contingents in South Africa and about soldiers who had died or been wounded. Longer reports from Australian correspondents gave detailed accounts, three or four weeks old, of skirmishes involving local troops. Returned soldiers arrived in Melbourne and Sydney to official praise and adoring crowds. The Herald observed that the returned men were just in time to ‘add lustre to the Commonwealth celebrations because they had made for themselves a reputation which all may well envy but none will judge’. Suburbs and country towns held their own celebrations to welcome back their local veterans. Mayors delivered patriotic addresses, local bands responded with martial tunes, gold watches and cigar boxes were handed to the heroes. There were sufficient veterans already in Sydney to march in the great parade. The Herald’s reporter in George Street recorded that at the sight of them ‘many still bearing the traces of exposure to all weathers and the ardent rays of a veldt sun’, the crowd raised a prolonged cheer in which there was ‘an unmistakable ring of admiration and affection’ (SMH 1901).

But for all the affection for the local boys neither the reporter nor the crowd could contain their enthusiasm for the large contingent of British and Indian troops. In a move of calculated brilliance the Imperial Government had sent over 1000 representatives of six cavalry regiments and four artillery detachments as well as almost 500 members of 19 of the most famous infantry regiments. The reporter was swept away, describing how the officer commanding the Imperial troops, Colonel Wyndham, declared at the end of the march that he was encouraged to think that the army was popular in Australia. The crowd cheered in assent. Warming to his task he observed:

They are in fact our blood relations, our brothers in arms, brothers in suffering and brothers in death. We think that in the next campaign Australia will claim it as a right to fight side by side with their English comrades (SMH 1901).

But military spectacle did not end with the grand parade on the first of January. Even grander in the minds of the public was the military review held on Thursday the fourth at Centennial Park. Ten thousand troops paraded before the Governor General watched by a crowd estimated at between 125,000 and 150,000. The correspondent for Brisbane’s Courier Mail observed that the popularity of the military and naval forces had never been more greatly exemplified. He went on to note that:

It used to be popular to speak slightingly of the military forces, but the prowess of the British arms in South Africa, and the display of the natural fighting ability of our Australian soldiers, have given the army such a strong hold in the hearts of the people that it is now one of the most, if not the most cherished idols among the deities of the populace. More than ever the Queen’s uniform is irresistibly attractive even to staid, sober citizens (Courier Mail 1901).

With the purported success of the Australian troops in
South Africa it was not to be wondered that they were received with ‘a welcome and enthusiasm which has many of the elements of worship’ (Courier Mail 1901).

Clearly, the great political and social achievements of the new federation were upstaged by the glamour and excitement of war, which was far enough away to obscure the horrors of battle and the brutalisation of the Afrikaner civilian population. In a similar way, Australian national interests were swamped by Imperial loyalty and devotion to the old Queen. There was confusion in many minds about the character of the nation itself. Did it encompass residents of the continent or did it extend to all members of what was called the British race wherever they lived? Writing on the second of January, the editor of the Adelaide Advertiser (1901) declared that Australian patriotism was ‘founded on race-affinities’. It was not a matter of dependence or subordination but Australia’s own ‘sincere and spontaneous profession of unutterable loyalty and devotion to Throne and Empire’. And it was so much easier to find ways to celebrate the monarchy, the Empire and the military than the Constitution, the franchise, or the labour movement. The symbols were ready to hand, the ceremonies known and rehearsed, the rhetoric well seasoned. And behind it all towered the Empire, which had every reason to encourage colonial militarism and pour praise on the soldiers of communities particularly susceptible to offshore flattery. The Imperial political elite found little reason to admire Australian democracy, working class political clout, or egalitarian manners. The wild colonial boys were much more acceptable when uniformed, officered and disciplined.

There were critics of the involvement in both the Boer War and the Boxer Rebellion, but they often faced political attacks and social opprobrium. Even so there was less anti-war sentiment than in Britain itself. Perhaps the most significant opponent of the military adventures was Henry Bourne Higgins who spoke against the dispatch of contingents to South Africa in both the Victorian and Federal Parliaments. His concern reached beyond the immediate engagements to the impact of militarism on Australian political life. He expanded on his ideas in an article entitled ‘Australian Ideals’ published on 1 January, 1902, exactly a year after the great procession in Sydney where the Imperial regiments stole the show (Higgins 1902).

Higgins posed the question of whether ‘militarism and titular distinctions’ entered into Australian ideals. He recalled how some of the finest of the nation’s youth had been persuaded by the lure of loyalty to ‘seek distinction in the battlefield in a distant country’. The local newspapers and many public men had ‘seriously put before us as a worthy aim’ that young Australians should fight side by side with the regular army of the mother country, ‘whatever might be the cause of the war. What do we gain’, he asked, what do we gain, what do our children gain, by military parade, or by mixing in the world’s quarrels, from which the remoteness of our island continent happily exempts us? We, in Australia, have no participation in the acts, no voice in the negotiations which precede war. We have no representation in the councils of the Empire. Our true ideal is peace – peace and internal development (Higgins 1902, 15).

Beyond the question of becoming involved in wars overseas, Higgins worried about Australia itself and the impact of militarism on the habits and customs of the colonial democracies. He clearly saw that armies are not democratic institutions and that hierarchy and authority were antithetical to the best features of Australian political life. He explained to his readers:

There has been lately evident an effort to make use of the excitement of the South African war to drag Australia under the control of the military martinet. There is, to weak minds, something attractive – meretriciously attractive – in the gay uniforms, the plumes, the sashes, the clanking swords, the gleaming rifles, the martial stiffness of regular troops. Yet this whole system of padding, and pipe-clay, and plumage, the parade stalking of soldiers, is intensely vulgar, is absurdly untrue. Australia must make her choice between the two ideals – the ideal of militarism, and the ideal of equality. I have no doubt what the ultimate choice of Australia will be (Higgins 1902, 16).

Looking back a hundred years later we cannot easily share Higgins’s confidence that democracy would necessarily trump militarism and the attraction of foreign wars.
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The Urge to War in Federation Era Australia

MARK CRYLE

This paper seeks to understand the enthusiasm with which the outbreak of war was greeted in Australia in August 1914. To do so, it provides a genealogy of the idea that true nationhood would only be realised after a blood sacrifice had been made and that war would provide a moral and spiritual awakening for the nation. This idea of blood sacrifice is demonstrated to be a powerful, recurrent thematic in the decades leading up to 1914, and was thus a key factor in making possible the mass horror of World War 1.

How was it that so many educated, ‘civilised’ men and women welcomed the prospect of modern warfare in the early months of 1914? Why did so many volunteer for the slaughter? There are no simple answers. Certainly most Australians, even the soldiers, were naive about the capacity of industrialised warfare to produce the carnage that it did, but there were other factors too. The war, Gallipoli, the Anzac legend, ‘the birth of the nation’ were all prefigured in significant ways in Australia in the decades prior to that iconic landing on the Turkish coastline on 25 April 1915. The analysis that is set out below traces this prefiguring and its consequences for Federation-era Australians.

There is no doubting that 1914 saw many Australians, swept up as they were in war fever, rushing to the colours and enlisting. Likewise, many politicians, clergymen, journalists, poets and educators greeted the outbreak of war in August 1914 with enthusiasm. On 6 August, for example, the Sydney Morning Herald trumpeted the opportunities for Australia in the conflict:

'It is our baptism of fire. Australia knows something of the flames of war, but its realities have never been brought so close as they will be in the near future, and the discipline will help us to find ourselves (SMH 1914: 6).

A few days later, in the same newspaper, the prominent children’s author Ethel Turner (Seven Little Australians) rejoiced that the ‘iron hand [of war] had suddenly clutched at the crumpled silly scroll of women’s lives and is beginning to straighten it out.’ (SMH 1914: 13). In similar vein, Brisbane Anglican Archbishop, St Clair Donaldson wrote to another clergyman in October, noting that he had been ‘stung by the intense sense of opportunity’ that the outbreak of war had brought (cited in Kidd 1996: 198).

Just a few months later, the news of the Australian landing at Gallipoli would be greeted with euphoria and heralded widely in the press and the pulpits, despite the fact that the publication of the first casualty lists had pre-dated the ‘eyewitness’ reports. So clearly, within a short space of time, the events of 25 April 1915 and the performance of the Australian soldiers during the Gallipoli campaign, were invested with a national significance well in advance of their military or strategic import. Gallipoli became and remains, a defining moment in our history – characteristically expressed as the ‘birth of the nation’, a major cornerstone of the Anzac legend.

It would be inaccurate to assert that all Australians were enthusiastic about the war. Many were apprehensive and anxious. Some labour leaders were equivocal about committing to the struggle and many socialists and pacifists denounced it from the outset. Nonetheless, there is ample evidence that sentiments were commonly expressed which transcended simple patriotism, facile jingoism or even pledges of unanimity around the perceived need to protect the nation and the British Empire against German aggression. The notion prevailed, in the minds of many, that the war would somehow be ‘good’ for Australia. To seek to understand the origins of this idea – that is, the reasons why so many well-educated and informed Australians greeted the declaration of war with such alacrity, it is necessary to examine more closely the Federation period of history (1901-1914). An analysis of selected writings and speeches of the time can yield useful insights into the way that the war’s perceived effects and outcomes were foreshadowed in Australian discourse in the decade leading up to Gallipoli. It provides some explanation of why war, when it came, was welcomed by these writers as a nation-building opportunity and a form of moral redemption as well as a test of that rather ill-defined, but very prevalent rhetorical phenomenon, the national character.

War as ‘Agent of National Cohesion’

In 1905, in the monthly journal, Review of Reviews, Clarence Northcott, posed the question ‘Is Australia a Nation?’. Northcott was, at that time, a school teacher in Sydney who was also studying sociology, a course of study which he completed in the United States. He became a pioneer author in the field of management studies and spent much of his career as an executive in the British confectionery company, Rowntree. Northcott
Judging from analogy, we must conclude that a war in defence of our own land, or of the Empire, a war based on some great principle, would be the most effective agent of national cohesion that our land could have. Historians trace the nationhood of England back to the days of the Spanish Armada. And were we called upon to defend this sparsely-peopled land of ours, with its empty parts tempting the foreigner, or to resist an attack made on us as a part of the British Empire, we should be as brothers fighting in a cause sacred as death. This war would, further, be a star of warning or of glory to which the Australians of later days could turn, and in the light of which they could continue their necessary work of creating a nation (1905: 567).

War, then, would do for the national spirit what Federation could not. While Federation had brought the colonies of Australia together as a formal political entity, many believed that there was little evidence of anything approaching a sense of national esprit de corps. Federation had produced little in the way of dramatic rhetoric – empowering narratives of heroism and struggle against adversity – to stir the nascent nation from its seeming contentment about its progress or place in the world. There remained, among some commentators, a need to cultivate a distinctly Australian national spirit which distinguished itself from Britain with such concerns more often finding expression in newspapers sympathetic to the politics of the left, or even in reformist publications like Review of Reviews, than in more conservative journals and newspapers.

The notion that Australia would be 'made' through blood sacrifice in some future military struggle and forged in the furnace of war had a powerful hold on the consciousness of many Australians well before the war. Indeed, the proposition that nationality would only be realised through the test of war had been a recognisable trope in Australian writing from the 1890s, as Henry Lawson’s 1895 poem, The Star of Australasia, illustrates:

> And this you learned from the libelled past,  
> though its methods were somewhat rude–  
> A nation’s born where the shells fall fast,  
> or its lease of life renewed (in Lawson 1900).

Of course, there had been an Australian presence in wars prior to 1914. More than 2,000 Australians volunteered to fight in the Waikato War in New Zealand (1863-64); in 1885 the New South Wales Contingent sent 700 troops to assist British forces in suppressing a rebellion in the Sudan; at the behest of the British government ships from the Royal Navy’s Australian squadron sailed to China in 1900 to assist with the suppression of the Boxer Rebellion. Australian involvement in the Boer War (1899-1902) in particular had created expectations about national self-realisation. In February 1900, Flashes, a popular Brisbane magazine, predicted in February 1900, that ‘from the landing of Australian troops on African soil will date the true birth of Australian nationhood’ (cited in Evans 1987: 8). Yet while there was an air of self-satisfaction around the achievements of colonial troops, the Boer War failed to capture the national imagination in the way that Gallipoli later did. Troops were organised on colonial and not national lines, and there was no defining major engagement with the enemy that featured Australian soldiers. Moreover, after the anxieties over Boer military successes at the start of the fighting had been allayed, it had been a rather one-sided affair, with relatively fewer men involved than in 1915 and with a more contested and controversial rationale for the war itself.

Australians characteristically saw their country as a vulnerable British outpost within easy reach of Asia. The result was the construction and promotion of social and defence policies underwritten by an ideology based on fear and anxiety. Thus, despite the failure of the Boer War to maintain its hold on the popular imagination, the idea of a coming war and the disposition towards military preparedness remained a national preoccupation. The imagined war was typically a race war with Asia – China or Japan or some combination of the two. Such anxieties were central to the constitution of Australianness at this time. Dystopian fictional accounts of invasion, such as Kenneth MacKay’s The Yellow Wave (1895) and C.H. Kirmess’s The Australian Crisis (1909), painted gory scenes of an Australia overrun by Asian hordes as a consequence of apathy, selfishness, a lack of military preparedness and an abject national moral flabbiness. The spectre of non-white immigration, even invasion, served to conflate the perceived threat to Anglo-Saxon ethnicity, with the challenge of becoming a nation.

In returning to Northcott’s words, quoted earlier, we can see that he expressed the same anxieties and expectations voiced by many at the time in seeking an ‘effective agent of national cohesion’ and arguing that war would serve such an end. Ironically, when the war came, it did not unite. Rather it created vast fissures in Australian society. By 1918, the nation was torn by political, sectarian, industrial and economic divisions in the wake of the failed conscription campaigns and war weariness. While Northcott had pointed to the ‘empty parts tempting foreigners’ (Northcott, 1905), there would be no foreign invasion of Australia during World War 1. Rather, Australian soldiers would ‘give birth to the nation’ by invading another country [Turkey] on the other side of the world at the behest of the British Empire. Such was the twisted logic permeating the justifications of the pro-imperial rhetoric being peddled by policy makers who sought to advance the nation’s status within the empire. Northcott’s predictions were not entirely inaccurate though. In predicting that the war would be ‘a star of warning or of glory to which the Australians of later days could turn’, Nostradamus-like, he did foretell the Anzac legend and its annual re-consecration.

So strong was the urge towards militarism in Federation-era Australia, that untimely proposals like that from...
the Peace Society to celebrate ‘Peace Day’ on 9 November, were held to be at best infelicitous and at worst, transgressive (Register, 11 May 1911). Australian militarism had been developed around the precept of a supposedly democratic citizen army, as evidenced by the instigation of compulsory military training from 1911. Such training would reap benefits not just for the physical tone of the nation but also for its moral tone. The nation’s leaders may have sought to distance themselves from association with anything that evoked the crusty military cliques of the European powers, yet this was militarism nonetheless. As Humphrey McQueen (1986: 83) suggests, it appears to have required a major war ‘before it could reveal its logic’, but such was its discursive power that it became something of a self-fulfilling prophecy. By the time Gallipoli occurred, the battles had been fought out many times on the page and in the collective imagination, albeit with different enemies and with different results.v

The parallels between Buchanan’s and Austin’s thinking are clear. Both stressed the need for a higher purpose. The Real Australia, published in 1907, journalist and lawyer Alfred Buchanan insisted that ‘Australia must develop some variation in the pleasure-seeking, money-making, work-shifting propensities that represent the greater part of social life’.

The Australian [he wrote] must be prepared, in the event of great emergency, to die for something or somebody ... Australia badly wants an ideal. At present it has none worthy of the name. It is not looking for one; at least there are few indications of a search. What is everybody striving for? Unto what altar is the mysterious priest of nationhood leading his followers? (pp.22, 38).

Two years later, an Adelaide accountant named H. H. Austin, a spokesman for the Australian NATives Association, told a public reception in Adelaide:

From our position as representing the national and patriotic association comes an insistent call to resist and oppose to the uttermost every trend in the national character that makes for decay. We are cowards and utterly fake to the trust reposed in us if we do not stem the tide to the extent of our ability. It will mean much obloquy, misrepresentation, and cheap sneers from that section (and a large section) whose motto seemingly is let us eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we die. But the hour has not arrived when we must abandon our country to these cowards and utterly fake to the trust reposed in us. We are up against the shedding of blood for a national cause.

In considering the origins of such thinking, it is clear that there had long been anxieties in the nation that the Australian climate and topography would impact adversely on their ‘British stock’. Under the influence of Darwinian science, forecasts were being made about the development of the Australian ‘national type’, many of which were decidedly pessimistic (White 1981: 64-66). This discourse of anxiety had been fuelled by such social trends as growing urbanisation and a reduced birth rate; trends which had been evident since the late nineteenth century. Moral guardians of the period voiced alarm at shifting public standards: mixed bathing at beaches, ragtime music, a preoccupation with sport, the fact that a man walked down Pitt Street Sydney in March 1907 without a hat on his head! (Clark 1981:279, 315). Such trends were seen as symptoms of the rapid onset of moral degeneration in Australian society, with conservatives lumping the growth of organised labour, an increasingly influential working class political voice and first-wave feminism into the same corrupting mix.

Such a worldview made little distinction between physical and moral wellbeing. A crisis, such as war, would test both a nation’s physical strength (however that might be defined) as well as its moral fibre. Thus the nation’s redemption lay in its potential to demonstrate its prowess in both spheres within the context of war. There was little consideration given to military training, industrial resources or even strategy. Rather, the Roman Empire’s rise and fall was evoked as the classical example of the potential for imperial collapse from within, unless the appropriate moral buttressing was applied. Ironically, the expression Lest We Forget – the mantra of Anzac Day commemorations, derives from Rudyard’s Kipling’s poem ‘The Recessional’, a warning in verse against imperial hubris. Though it would come to represent an invocation to remember the loss of those who died in war, that was not the initial intent. Like much high-minded rhetoric of the time, it was pressed into the service of something much less glorious.

Concerns about moral and physical degeneracy – the collapse of civilised society from within, as well as its vulnerability to invasion from without – were linked in this discourse of anxiety. Nor were these ideas unique to Australia. They reflected an empire-wide trend to moral campaigning during the late Victorian and Edwardian periods. Many such campaigners, like Brisbane medical practitioner Thomas Pennington Lucas, threw down the gauntlet to public figures to model appropriate behaviours and to lead the country from the moral malaise in which it found itself: ‘The moral tone of the nation is the national barometer’ he wrote (1907: 313). For Lucas, governments had to take responsibility for the
building of national character through the inculcation of healthy notions of citizenship.

For others, such as James Barrett, another medical practitioner, national character, like the human physique, could only be forged in adversity. Writing on the Victorian national character a decade before Gallipoli, Barrett prophesied chillingly: ‘[T]he only doubt remains as to whether she [the state of Victoria?] has the right quality; that is to say whether the Victorian character will be complete until a few tens of thousands of native-born have been mown down with Maxims [an early machine gun] and 4.7 inch guns’ (Barrett, cited in Davison 1983: 149). It was war which was the ultimate test of the nation, or the race. Prophesies such as Barrett’s were not merely evidence of this mindset, but also an indicator of the powerful psychological urge to warfare building up during the Edwardian era. The nation’s redemption at Gallipoli was being prefigured and, in one sense, predetermined in such appeals to build ‘the right quality’ through a baptism of fire, ten years before the event took place.

In summary, war was perceived by many as the cleansing fire which would rid the nation of its indifference and lift it out of its moral malaise. Divine judgement for moral rectitude would, it seems, be wrought from the mailed fist of the nation’s enemies. In 1905, Northcott had welcomed war in a ‘sacred cause’. The question posed by Buchanan in 1907: ‘Unto what altar is the mysterious priest of nationhood leading his followers?’ was answered during the horrific carnage of the campaigns of 1915-1918. This was a sacrificial altar – and a bloody one at that. Yet Austin’s concerns about Australia’s preoccupation with self-gratification were not silenced by entry into the war. They continued to be voiced throughout it, from the pulpit, the politicians’ platform and from the pens of journalists, as pro-conscriptionists and loyalists flailed an increasingly war-weary and traumatised Australian public towards greater commitment to the struggle. Those who opposed the war were vilified as selfish, immoral ‘shirkers’.

Clearly, ideas about the ‘value’ of war to nationhood were being expressed in the years leading up to 1914. Northcott, Buchanan and Austin were not intellectual leaders in Australia, nor were they necessarily influential in their own right. Rather, their views represent a discursive orthodoxy which was manifest in newspaper editorials, sermons, political speeches and elsewhere. Prior to its beginning and in the early months, the conflict could still be couched in what Paul Fussell has called the ‘high diction’ of war, with its rhetoric of honour, loyalty, patriotism, courageous deeds and the like (2000: 22). These words, and the mindset which produced them, enabled and endorsed great enthusiasm for the war, even if they didn’t directly cause it. It was only once the bloody carnage had started that a new language began to be minted. Futility, trauma, horror, tragedy and waste became the watchwords of significant numbers of the generation who lived and died in the inferno itself. There are salutary lessons here for peacemakers in the present to resist the rhetoric which seeks to reframe war as a ‘sacred cause’ or high ideal. It should be called for what it is.
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Countering War: The role of the League of Nations Union

HILARY SUMMY

This article discusses the formation of the League of Nations Union (LNU) as a reminder of those who have resisted war in the past and for those who seek to do so in 2015. Emphasis is placed on the Victorian branch of the LNU which played a leadership role in the Australian peace movement after the LNU's formation in 1921 until the onset of WWII. The LNU has been a neglected area of research and is often dismissed as irrelevant since its existence was attached to the failures of the League of Nations, a world body instituted at the end of WWI to prevent future wars. During WWII, a handful of members remained faithful to LNU principles and goals until its dissolution and conversion into its successor, the United Nations Association of Australia (UNAA). This article seeks to shed some light on the LNU's general legacy to peacemaking in Australia.

Introduction

The League of Nations Union (LNU) was a voluntary organisation that originated in Britain. It was formed by liberal peace advocates towards the end of WWI to promote the creation of a world organisation for the securing and maintenance of world peace. The new world organisation, the League of Nations, came into existence at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 to ensure that war would never occur again. Thereafter the LNU's goal was to mobilise mass support for the League of Nations and to pressure government leaders to uphold the principles embodied in its Covenant. The movement spread to the Dominions, and LNU branches were established in each of the Australian capital cities.

This article focuses on the Victorian branch in Australia. For purposes of clarity, the League of Nations Union is shortened throughout to the LNU, while the League of Nations is sometimes referred to as ‘the League’.

Much of the anti-war effort of the LNU in the first decade of its existence was devoted to the disarmament cause. Europe was still in a state of post-war economic and political dislocation, and the European powers were less than enthusiastic about the new diplomatic methods of the League to resolve conflicts. They were especially concerned that the League’s agenda for disarmament would jeopardise their national security. After the breakdown of the 1932 World Disarmament Conference sponsored by the League, the LNU in Australia, as in Britain, turned its attention to education in the hope of bringing about a shift in attitudes towards peace and international understanding. During the mid-thirties, growing fears of another world war mounted. Last-ditch attempts to confront the threat of war and fascism led to a combined effort by the broader peace movement to form the International Peace Campaign, in line with the movement in Britain. After the outbreak of WWII, a reduced LNU membership focused on post-war reconstruction and a more effective world organisation to prevent future wars. In conclusion, the article considers the LNU’s relevance for today.

Formation and Activities of League of Nations Union (LNU)

Is it beyond human capacity to advance from international barbarism to an intelligent means of settling international disputes? The hope of mankind in this direction lies in the League of Nations (John Latham c1921).

At the inaugural meeting of the Victorian branch of the LNU, its first president John Latham (leading lawyer and later Attorney-general, Opposition leader, Deputy Prime Minister and Chief Justice of the High Court) explained that ‘During the war the people had been led to believe that the object of the war was to end war; that victory would usher in a new era of civilisation and humanity’. While victory was won, Latham insisted the only practical measure that would guarantee the future peace of the world was the League of Nations. And in order for it to succeed, it needed mass support because it would never be a ‘perfect’ organisation with the backing of governments alone (Argus 13 April 1921).

Like the British LNU, membership in Australia included a number of prominent establishment figures, particularly in the Victorian branch. This unprecedented upper/middle class constituency represented a new social stratum within the peace movement and can be partly...
explained by the searing experience of the recent war. Most members had not been anti-war proponents pre-1914. However, for even the most imperial-minded, if the League could guarantee a world without war and safeguard liberal democracy (that is, within the Empire) then it was worth supporting. Significantly, the LNU was able to secure government support with an initial subsidy (Moore 1949: 81).

LNU activities comprised public meetings, lectures and debates, as well as lobbying politicians, especially on the issue of effective Australian representation at League of Nations Assemblies in Geneva, including the appointment of women. The issue of disarmament was high on the agenda from the very beginning, although opinions varied on the topic. Educating school children about international affairs and the role of the League also received a high priority with the hope of instilling a culture of peace in the younger generation. Nevertheless, support for the League from the general public was indifferent on the whole, while the government was inconsistent, taking its cues from its British counterpart (Summy 2007: 62-65). Essentially, Australia maintained its allegiance to the British Empire and saw little need for a League of Nations.

Disarmament

During the 1920s and early 1930s, disarmament was a central issue for the broader peace movement both in Australia and overseas. Former British foreign secretary and the first British LNU president, Edward Grey, warned that before the Great War, ‘The enormous growth of armaments in Europe, the sense of insecurity and fear caused by them – it was these that made war inevitable’. He considered this to be:

> the truest reading of history, and the lesson that the present should be learning from the past in the interest of future peace, the warning to be handed on to those who come after us (Grey, 1925).

The peace movement in Australia rallied to the disarmament cause in line with the British movement. Lord Robert Cecil – then British LNU president and a leading participant in the creation of the League of Nations – emphasised the power of public opinion to pressure governments to support disarmament. His words, ‘... if the peoples want disarmament, disarmament they can have’, became the slogan for the World Disarmament Movement (WDM). At a meeting in the Melbourne Town Hall in July 1928, Judge Henry Bournes Higgins, a vice-president of the Melbourne Peace Society, referred to Cecil’s statement as ‘a trumpet call to action’. A committee of twenty was elected with Higgins as president, with the objective ‘To promote worldwide demonstrations in favour of world disarmament and permanent peace on the tenth anniversary of Armistice Day’. The Armistice Day meeting took place with some eighty-nine organisations participating, including the LNU as well as the Trades Hall, the Council of Churches, the Women’s Christian Temperance Union and the Workers’ Educational Association (Saunders and Summy 1987: 18-19).

The Victorian LNU assumed a degree of control over WDM proceedings when LNU member Douglas Copland (also dean of the Faculty of Commerce at the University of Melbourne) succeeded Higgins as WDM president following Higgins’ death. Copland’s inclusive approach helped pave the way for cooperation between League supporters and the socialist wing of the peace movement. Most socialists had earlier spurned the League as an agent of imperialism (Summy 2007: 89). The WDM continued to grow and by 1930 there were 112 cooperating bodies across Australia (Moore 1949: 87). A significant factor was the mounting peace activity of women’s organisations and church groups, as well as growing support from the labour movement.

A highpoint of the campaign was a disarmament petition organised in 1931 by the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) in conjunction with other international women’s groups. The WDM cooperated with WILPF in the campaign, publishing leaflets and collecting the names of prominent Australian signatories to the petition (Moore 1949: 90). The campaign climaxed with a meeting on 30 November 1931 in the Melbourne Town Hall where the petition forms were presented to Prime Minister Scullin. The meeting was preceded by a march from the War Memorial to the Town Hall. The march was later hailed as ‘the biggest peace demonstration ever held in Melbourne’ (Peacewards, 1 January 1932). The petitions were subsequently sent to Geneva to be presented to the Disarmament Conference along with declarations from around the world. In the view of WILPF’s secretary Eleanor Moore, ‘For the first time the voice of the peoples was heard by the League of Nations’ (Quoted in Peacewards, 1 April 1932).

The LNU and the WDM worked vigorously on a publicity campaign in the lead-up to the long-anticipated Disarmament Conference, convened by the League of Nations and scheduled for 2 February 1932. Optimism was bolstered by incremental improvements to strengthen the League. The admission of Germany to the League in 1926 was considered a major breakthrough, although the United States still had not joined. Also encouraging was the signing in 1928 of the Kellogg-Briand Pact in Paris (though not a League-sponsored initiative), outlawing aggressive wars among the signatories that included the United States. Significantly, the League had demonstrated its effectiveness in resolving a number of conflicts (though there were some failures) and had made great strides in
the area of humanitarian concerns. Within ten years, the world body had achieved a position of unprecedented authority in international affairs (Summy 2007: 100-102).

The opening of the 1932 Disarmament Conference represented the culmination of more than a decade of planning by the League of Nations. In attendance at this unprecedented gathering were fifty-nine delegations from nations around the world, including Australia (headed by John Latham), as well as two major non-League members, the United States and the Soviet Union (Hudson 1980: 107). The largest representative gathering of the world’s nations had finally come together to resolve their differences.

Unfortunately the Conference was fraught with obstacles from the start. Economic, political and social upheavals in Europe created conditions that were not conducive to disarmament. German nationalism was already on the march and a Sino-Japanese conflict was unfolding in the East. For peace movements around the world it was a bitter blow indeed when the Disarmament Conference failed to reach agreement and finally collapsed by 1934-5. The world’s nations were more interested in re-arming a deeply troubled world. With the withdrawal of Germany from the League in October 1933 and escalating German aggression, the WDM in Australia lost its momentum as ‘public interest and hope ebbed together’ (Moore 1949: 95). For the LNU it was time to take stock. The power of public opinion, which according to LNU ideology would ensure the League’s success, had failed.

Despite this disturbing turn of events, LNU members actually believed there was no alternative to the League for the maintenance of international order. Prominent LNU member P.D. Phillips insisted, ‘To declare that the League has failed is to give up the task when it is most necessary to go on’ (Australian League of Nations Union (Victorian Branch), c1934, 1).

In the opinion of another member, Fred Riley, the inefficiency of the League was due to general apathy, making the main task ahead to boost public sentiment (LNU minutes, 26 May 1933).

The appointment in 1934 of Judge Alfred Foster as LNU president provided new leadership during difficult and troubling times. He had presided over the WDM from 1932, taking over from Copland, and now offered a more forthright approach to the LNU leadership. Around the same time Constance Duncan, who had worked in the area of international relations both at home and abroad, took on the role of secretary. Duncan and Foster were well-placed to inject new energy and direction into a flagging LNU. They directed much of their energy to peace education with an emphasis on school children and young adults.

**Educating for Peace**

Previous efforts had been made regarding peace education in schools. The Victorian Department of Education had cooperated with the LNU by periodically inserting in its government publications articles about the League and its activities. The topic of the League of Nations was included in the civics syllabus in most Victorian schools (*Australian Educational Quarterly*, 1927: 32). Due to LNU efforts, a joint committee was set up consisting of members of the LNU council, the Teachers Association of Victoria and the State School Union, although initial enthusiasm from teachers was short-lived (LNU minutes, 7 October 1927). Another LNU initiative was the formation in 1932 of a Schools International Affairs Centre to consider effective teaching methods to promote international understanding.

Constance Duncan was able to build on these efforts. One of her first priorities in 1934 was the establishment of a Schools Committee which encouraged collaboration between teachers and the LNU. The linking of teachers with the LNU on a firmer basis created an opportunity for closer cooperation with the Department of Education. For example, following a visit to the Director of Education by the Schools Committee, the establishment of a League of Nations Day was approved for all government schools throughout Victoria, to be held on the nearest Friday to the anniversary of the outbreak of the 1914-18 war (Report of Secretary 1935). The following year, a League of Nations Day was celebrated by over 300,000 Victorian school children with activities that included mock assemblies, debates, lecturettes, folk exhibitions and pageants (Harrison-Matley 1972: 14).

The formation of Junior League of Nations Unions in schools was another project promoted by Constance Duncan. This movement had been initiated by the LNU in 1930 but was boosted by the formation of the Schools Committee. Activities included lectures, debates, poster displays, competitions and games relating to world peace, and correspondence with schools in other nations (Lloyd and Merlo 1934: 27-9). By 1936, forty Victorian schools had formed Junior branches (Harrison-Matley 1972: 14).

Duncan reported ‘some thousands’ of Junior members in Victoria in 1938, but the numbers had begun to decline. The following year she reported:

The decrease in the League’s prestige has had its ill effects upon the work in schools, and several Junior Branches have either lapsed or changed their names to a Current Problems Club, or something similar (Australian League of Nations Union (Victorian Branch) 1940: 10).
Last-Ditch Effort: The International Peace Campaign

Other priorities had emerged for the LNU in Australia when, once again, it joined forces with the left-wing section of the peace movement – this time in 1935 to promote the concept of collective security through the League. Collaboration between a large segment of the socialist and liberal wings had become possible when the Soviet Union joined the League of Nations in 1934.

An International Peace Campaign (IPC) was formed in Australia in 1936 under the influence of the socialist-inspired Popular Front movement in France and the broad peace movement in Britain, headed by the British LNU under Lord Cecil’s leadership. Constance Duncan was appointed the IPC’s honorary secretary. The campaign culminated the following year in a four-day Congress in Melbourne that attracted huge crowds and media attention (Rasmussen 1980: 25).

The apparent success of the campaign provoked unprecedented anti-communist sentiment by the public and government. Duncan herself suffered from the repercussions. She had given regular talks on the ABC but was informed that her sessions were to be discontinued (Summy 2008: 40). The ABC expressed blatant bias in banning any public support for the League. When Judge Foster submitted a talk on freedom of speech for ABC approval, he subsequently refused to deliver the speech since ‘the suggested deletions and alterations would have the effect of nullifying his main points’ (H. Burton, quoted in Judge Foster’s Banned Speech 1938: 2).

Despite a flurry of activity following the Congress, the IPC was short-lived. As well as problems with censorship and having to contend with accusations that it was a communist front, the IPC expressed views that did not coincide with those of the democratic governments which favoured appeasement over collective security through the League. A lack of cohesion within the IPC was also a factor in its demise. The German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact of 23 August 1939, followed by Germany’s invasion of Poland nine days later (triggering WWII), terminated the possibility of association with the Soviet Union. The final blow for the liberals’ relationship with the IPC’s left occurred when the Soviet Union invaded Finland on 30 November 1939.

Endings and Beginnings

With the onset of war the LNU found itself bereft of a policy since its existence was attached to a League of Nations that had failed in its main purpose, that is, the prevention of future wars. LNU members finally accepted the need for fascism and Nazism to be defeated and made the painful decision to support the war effort. With a diminished membership, a small and dedicated core group remained committed, if not to this League then to a new and more effective international organisation. They held small group discussions and conferences to consider the necessary conditions for a lasting peace. The issue of post-war reconstruction gradually became their main focus. It was also an issue that converged in due course with Government policy.

During the 1930s the LNU had found itself out of step with the Government on international policy. However, from late 1941 it found favour once again, this time with a Labor Government that had emerged from its previously entrenched isolationist position. The Ministry for Post-War Reconstruction was established in December 1942 and by late 1943 an emphasis was given to the post-war situation both nationally and internationally (Hasluck 1952:371-2, 443). LNU members undoubtedly played an important role in this development. Included in the Australian delegation at the United Nations Conference on International Organisation in San Francisco in 1945 were three Victorian LNU members, William Macmahon Ball, Kenneth Bailey and Frederic Eggleston, as well as Jessie Street from the New South Wales LNU.

The League of Nations, the first great experiment as an instrument for world peace, was officially terminated at a final Assembly in April 1946 at the Palais des Nations in Geneva. Robert Cecil, one of the principal creators of the League idea, proclaimed: ‘The League is dead; long live the United Nations’. (The United Nations had officially come into being on 24 October 1945.) The overriding sentiment at the Assembly was that the League had not failed; rather, government leaders had failed the League (Cecil 1949: 240). In his address, LNU member Kenneth Bailey pointed out a critical lesson to be learned from past experience: ‘We have been trenchantly reminded that a written constitution like the Covenant [of the League of Nations] and the Charter [of the United Nations] is not self-executing. Man’s hope of peace depends on his will of peace’ (The Advocate 1945: 10).

The LNU in Australia changed its name to the United Nations Association of Australia (UNAA) in October 1945, with its headquarters in Canberra. Like the LNU in its early days, the UNAA received the support of the federal government. A substantial annual subsidy was approved.

Relevance for Today

Since the LNU appears to have failed in influencing government policy and mobilising mass support for the League of Nations, it is pertinent to ask what relevance it has for today’s world. First, a study of the LNU is relevant for contemporary peace activists because it is important to understand their heritage and to learn from past experiences. It is especially relevant for the UNAA which
is able to build on the efforts of its forebear, the LNU, and to become the vibrant organisation that it is today.

Second, the LNU has been an overlooked and an underrated component of the peace movement by scholars and the peace movement itself. The LNU was a unique organisation in that its leadership consisted of high profile, establishment figures, unlike any other Australian anti-war organisation. Moreover, its members crossed the divide between the establishment and grassroots support at the height of its influence – that is, during the Disarmament Campaign and the International Peace Campaign – which helped create a broad-based movement.

Third, it is necessary to set the historical record straight. On the basis of available evidence some sixty years later, it appears that the LNU succeeded in certain areas. For instance, it initiated the development of peace education in schools and set up an International Affairs Centre to assist teachers. The formation of a significant number of Junior LNUs indicates considerable enthusiasm by school students and teachers. Due to the LNU’s persistence, the Victorian Government inaugurated a League of Nations Day. Although these achievements counted for little with the approach of another world war, they nevertheless demonstrate what can be achieved, even under the most unfavourable circumstances.

Fourth, it is significant that LNU members moved in intellectual circles and were well placed to influence a Labor government from 1941 that endorsed liberal internationalism (the concept of maintaining peace through international cooperation rather than through Realpolitik). Undoubtedly, a handful of LNU members played a significant role in influencing government policy in its support for a new world organisation in the form of the United Nations.

The fifth and final point is that in today’s perilously armed world – now fortified with vast stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction – the previous quote of Edward Grey, written ninety years ago, assumes even greater significance, namely, ‘The enormous growth of armaments in Europe, the sense of insecurity and fear caused by them – it was these that made war inevitable’.
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‘In peace, sons bury their fathers. In war fathers bury their sons’.

Herodotus

‘Peace on earth would mean the end of civilization as we know it’.

Joseph Heller
A Foreign Policy for the Peace Movement

DREW HUTTON

In the contemporary world, the Australian peace movement should respond to the growing challenges of terrorism, crimes against humanity, genocidal conflict, massive human rights abuses and humanitarian disasters that characterise international politics today and analyse how well the contemporary movement is placed to present effective responses to these events and to our governments’ response to them. The doctrine of responsibility to protect, emerging from some of the worst post-Cold War crimes against humanity and refined as it was scrutinised by the United Nations, will undoubtedly be a key standard against which 21st century conflicts are measured, but the peace movement is encumbered by its history and ideology from addressing the concept. Similarly, the Anzac legend has been regarded by the peace movement as a bulwark for militarism; however, given its deep roots in Australian culture, perhaps this is the time for the movement to engage with that legend more positively.

The year 2014 saw a dolorous centenary: the opening shots of the Great War in August 1914. Since then, the rest of the twentieth and the first fourteen years of the twenty-first centuries have been marred by a string of big and small wars unprecedented in their levels of technology and scale. The peace movement has responded in every case to wars or threats of war sometimes effectively, as with the conscription referenda of 1916 and 1917, and sometimes with confusion as in the rise of fascism leading up to the Second World War. This essay will look at how the Australian peace movement should respond to the growing challenges of terrorism, crimes against humanity, genocidal conflict, massive human rights abuses and humanitarian disasters that characterise international politics today and analyse how well the contemporary movement is placed to present effective responses to these events and to our governments’ response to them.

The first point to note about the Australian peace movement is that it lacks coherence and is an amorphous entity at the best of times. In a crisis its numbers can swell to the hundreds of thousands, while at other times it consists of very small groups holding a watching brief on issues of peace and conflict, often in conjunction with other issues that are their concern (cf. Saunders and Summy 1986). Philosophically, those organisations tend to fall into two main streams – the left and pacifists. The left tends to mobilise if it perceives significant social justice issues associated with a conflict or if it sees Western imperialism playing a role, while pacifists condemn all violent responses by the state and the larger the conflict, the more they are likely to mobilise.

The left-pacifist alliance is often tenuous and easily breaks down. During the inter-War period of the 1920s and 1930s, pacifists tended to place their faith in the peacekeeping efforts of the League of Nations while the left diverted from this course when the rise of fascism threatened either the Soviet Union or other left forces (as in the Spanish Civil War). The pro-Soviet left then had to do some quick about-turns when Stalin and Hitler signed their non-aggression pact in 1939 which further alienated them from the pacifists. With the pacifists unable to respond adequately to the rise of a super-militant fascism and the left hamstrung by the commitment of many to the Soviet Union, the peace movement in the 1930s folded with the outbreak of war in September 1939, a war which to most was a just and justifiable war.

A similar dynamic prevailed with the left during the Cold War, with organisations like the World Peace Council blaming Western imperialism for aggression against the Soviet Union and pacifists tending to place blame on both sides for conducting an out-of-control nuclear arms race. The Vietnam War in the sixties and early seventies raised the same issues with the newly-energised Marxist left that advocated support for the National Liberation Front (NLF) of South Vietnam and the Communist North Vietnamese government, while non-Communists and pacifists kept their arguments firmly fixed on ending the war and conscription.

With the end of the Cold War and the increased threat of Islamist terrorism the focus of Western governments has shifted from the threat from the Soviet Union and Communist-inspired insurrections to the threat from terrorist states, terrorist movements and home-grown terrorism as well as potentially genocidal intra-state conflicts, such as the Balkans in the early 1990s, several African countries, East Timor and now the Ukraine. It is fair to say there has been a disturbing lack of knowledge
about all these conflicts among the Australian public and the peace movement (with the exception of East Timor) in contrast to movement divisions in the past, which were usually based on a reasonable knowledge base. The base for terrorist activity switches, at least in the mind of the actors, from Afghanistan to Iraq to Iran, to Lebanon, to Gaza and to Syria, each with its own historic background and particular set of circumstances. Non-terrorist crises, crimes against humanity and humanitarian disasters are often even more complex in their origins and sometimes it is almost impossible to find the places involved on a map. The debate, both inside and outside the peace movement, is often lacking in coherence and descends into irrelevance or prejudice. Pacifists decry any military action against states practising or protecting terrorists or committing genocide while radical leftists, motivated by a hatred of their own society, often support anti-democratic and potentially terrorist forces like Hamas and Hezbollah.

So, pacifist arguments can be irrelevant and unacceptable in situations where the domestic population believes (for good or bad reasons) that military action is necessary and the arguments of the left are unacceptable when they involve support for an undemocratic entity using immoral means to pursue its objectives as well as an intrinsic cynicism about the motives of one’s own government. The answer lies in the development of a set of criteria that are based squarely in a humanitarian and just view of the world, the preparedness to set those criteria rigorously against the particular conflict situation and to ensure there is a comprehensive understanding of the facts surrounding the conflict. Just war theory (Walzer 1977; Walzer 2004) and its more recent offshoot, the responsibility to protect (R2P), provide the best basis for this, especially since it would seem that we are more likely to be faced in the coming period with a multitude of small, ‘dirty’ wars and humanitarian disasters rather than larger scale wars or potential wars involving, among other things, the use of ‘unthinkable’ technology such as nuclear weapons.

The doctrine of responsibility to protect, developing from the earlier notion of ‘humanitarian intervention’, evolved during the 1990s, and was given extra impetus by the 1999 NATO bombing of Yugoslavia which occurred outside the framework of the United Nations. The ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity committed mostly by Serbian forces during the conflict and the inability of the UN to bring about an end to this murderous conflict persuaded NATO, with the support (it should be pointed out) of radical democrats like the German Greens’ foreign minister, Joschka Fischer, to intervene. The subsequent bombing sought to pressure the Serbian leadership into withdrawing from Kosovo and this tactic proved to be successful. Subsequently, the International Criminal Court prosecuted several members of the Serbian leadership. The UN then debated the extent to which it would support the responsibility to protect doctrine. It reached agreement on the principle in 2005 and broad agreement on its implementation in 2009.

The responsibility to protect, therefore, involves the setting of criteria for those who may wish to undertake such action. Firstly, it would apply only to situations where genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing or crimes against humanity are being committed (and not necessarily all cases). It does not necessarily involve military intervention and, before any such measures are considered, political, diplomatic, social and legal measures designed to achieve an amelioration of the situation should precede them. It should also be pointed out that the War on Terror is considered differently from R2P in that it is more of a conventional war against an enemy than an intervention to prevent genocide, crimes of war, ethnic cleansing or crimes against humanity. Therefore, the doctrine of responsibility to protect could not be used to justify the US intervention in Iraq in 2003 in spite of the Bush administration’s attempt to do so and can be used currently in Iraq only if the military intervention intends to protect populations against wholesale massacre. The prosecution of war must be both legal and legitimate, have a good chance of success and be able to leave behind a country with effective governance (Evans 2008: 79-174). The UN and other bodies looking at R2P have clearly decided on a narrow rather than broad interpretation of R2P and this is appropriate given the potential for its misuse. However, the need for such interventions, whether military or otherwise, is omnipresent in today’s world and arguments about how it is implemented and under what conditions it is to be carried out are where the popular debate should focus, with humanitarianism as its guiding principle.

These debates, however, are likely to bypass the peace movement which is locked into its traditional approaches of distrusting either capitalism/imperialism or military action. This is a pity because it would be useful to have radical democratic critiques of R2P in the current international climate. In Australia, the Abbott government has made it clear it likes the idea of a ‘khaki election’ and is keen to line up behind the US in taking on the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), using the arguments and even the processes of R2P. This is not necessarily illegitimate on Abbott’s part. ISIL is undoubtedly a threat to large sections of the Iraqi people who don’t share its narrow, totalitarian, murderous view of the world. Even a strong advocate for R2P like Gareth Evans has thrown his support behind military intervention against ISIL saying it meets all the criteria (The Australian 2 September 2014:12). This would undoubtedly be correct if the coalition of countries carrying out military actions against ISIL, with the support of the Iraqi government, were there to ensure the safety of religious groups threatened by the terrorists. However, the attraction of extending the fight to the physical elimination of ISIL in both Iraq and Syria, with all the unknown and unintended consequences probably associated with such a broad military adventure, makes this a dangerous step and one that could quickly and easily move beyond the parameters of the responsibility to protect.² Having said all that, the responsibility to protect has been invoked by the
US, Australia and the other coalition partners and it would seem reasonable for the peace movement to give cautious approval to the military intervention in Iraq to prevent what would, otherwise, be widespread massacres and human suffering. In any event it is difficult to see peace movement claims about US imperialism or militarism carrying much intellectual weight or influence on public opinion.

It is also necessary for a peace movement, wishing to contest the arena of foreign policy, to identify itself with what it sees as those elements of the national culture and history that have engaged in foreign policy issues with life-affirming, humanitarian values. While some social movements have to operate very much in the margins of their society, as there is little in the mainstream culture with which it can easily identify, most social movements try to make connections with as many parts of the dominant culture as they can so they can point to the dissonance between the assumed values and the widespread oppressive or destructive practices being employed. Martin Luther King did this brilliantly by constantly referring to the ‘American Dream’ from which black Americans were excluded. Galtung (1989) calls these sorts of connections ‘the great chain of nonviolence’.

An important part of most countries’ cultural heritage is their military traditions and it is this part of the cultural heritage which bears so heavily on the development of foreign policy. In Australia, a major element of this is the Anzac tradition. The main debate around this tradition has been between the nationalists, represented by many historians and, most spectacularly, by former Prime Minister, Paul Keating on the one hand; and the imperialists, also represented by many conservative historians and former PM, John Howard, on the other. This debate formed part of the so-called Culture Wars which have taken place in Australia, on and off, since the early nineties. Each side extols the virtues of ‘courage, loyalty, mateship and sacrifice’, but the nationalists do acknowledge that Australian governments have, at times, sent Australian soldiers off to fight in unjust wars. Keating (2013), for example, in a 2013 address at the Australian War Memorial spoke of the First World War as ‘a war devoid of any virtue. It arose from the quagmire of European tribalism’ while, at the same time, recognising the courage and sacrifice of Australian soldiers involved in that war. Keating, though, is at pains to point out that World War II was a just war and Australia’s participation was necessary for our self-defence and attempted to place Kokoda at the centre of our military tradition. The symbolic debate came down to Kokoda championed by Keating the nationalist, and Gallipoli by the conservative Howard.

The peace movement has played little part in this debate and this is unfortunate because it goes to the heart of the key issue of Australian relations with other countries; whether or not Australia develops a foreign policy more in tune with the region and less dependent on great powers. The conservative side has always advocated for dependence on a great power, either Britain or the USA, emphasised the importance of Gallipoli and built up Anzac Day as a patriotic celebration of Australians’ courage in standing side-by-side with its imperial friends. The nationalists have not been backward in building military mythologies but have been generally critical of military ventures like World War 1 and Vietnam and the praising of leaders like Curtin who prioritised national defence over the defence of Empire and Whitlam who pulled troops out of Vietnam and ended conscription. Even former conservative Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser, says:

> With the break-up of the Soviet Union … the world started to change substantially … The opportunity for a more independent Australian policy became a reality, a possibility, even a necessity, that we should have seized avidly (Fraser 2014: 4).

The peace movement cannot have it both ways. It cannot condemn the Anzac tradition as ‘militarist’ and, at the same time, identify with an expanded, more compassionate and humane interpretation of that tradition. There is even some evidence to suggest that younger Australians are identifying with such a view of Anzac (Stephens 2012: 90-98). In fact, I think the peace movement should go further and I agree with Henry Reynolds (2014: 231-239) that those indigenous Australians who fought for this country against colonising Europeans should have their courage and their patriotism celebrated as part of the legend.

This whole debate, then, is not merely one for tribal supporters of either the ALP or the Liberals. It is also important for the peace movement, which needs to spell out how building on and undoubtedly modifying the nationalist tradition as well as other parts of our cultural heritage, can help to develop an independent, just, humanitarian direction for Australian foreign policy that also acknowledges Australia has responsibilities as a global citizen to protect vulnerable communities. As Michael Walzer (2014, online) said, ‘Political intelligence and moral sensitivity work much better than ideology, and it is these two that should guide our choice of comrades and our decisions about when and how to act abroad.’

### End Notes

1. It is noteworthy that the Abbott government is enthusiastic about sending Australian military forces to a risky venture like the actions against ISIL but refuses to send medical staff to West Africa to help with the fight against Ebola on the grounds it would be too difficult evacuating personnel infected with the disease. Cuba, on the other hand, a country with far fewer resources, is sending 400 doctors to West Africa.
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‘That a man be willing, when others are so too, as far forth as for peace and defence of himself he shall think it necessary, to lay down this right to all things; and to be contented with so much liberty against other men as he would allow other men against himself’.

Thomas Hobbes

Her Lovely Stepping Out

To the tune of Percy Grainger’s ‘Molly On The Shore’

Then I’ll step if you step
and hair will sting our faces
where sea-blue darkens cloud-blue,
for we dance in breezy places.

So are your fingers in my hair?
Have I got skilful feet?
Why is the sand between our toes
so cold despite our heat?

Wé stép, gáles blów
from Reykjavik to Derry
And fingers dance on ivories
where quickness is not hurry.

Tresses sting and feet are white
where melody is devious,
Can I step ín where you step óut
or will my steps be previous?

Wé stép, clóuds shréd,
tides are on the shove
and melody must track its shift,
in ebb-and-flood of love.

Susurrus and susurrurs,
the North Sea kicks its spray
to dance when time is clock work
and to dance when time’s away.

The wind rears up its curlyhead,
there’s pattern in a shell,
and toes that squeeze in sand have got
brief footholds that will tell

of melody’s insouciance
to cast itself away
within the very sorcery
where it’s habitué.

Alan Gould,
Ainslie, ACT
Peace Activism Has Stopped US Wars

Lawrence S. Wittner

Although the US Government has fought numerous wars over the course of American history, it has also been confronted by a vigorous peace movement that, on some occasions, has halted US wars and, on others, has prevented wars from occurring. Thanks to their ability to mobilise public opinion and substantial numbers of public officials against war, peace activists played a key role in ending US wars in Mexico, Vietnam, Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Iraq, as well as in ending the Cold War. They also were remarkably effective in averting war with Mexico and in preventing the outbreak of nuclear war.

Introduction: Peace Activism: A Powerful Force

Has peace activism been able to halt US wars or to avert their occurrence? There is considerable evidence that it has. The Mexican War of 1846-1848 serves as an early example of a conflict cut short by anti-war activism. Viewed from the start as a war of aggression and as a war for slavery, the Mexican War stirred up strong opposition in the United States. On a military level, the war went very well for the US Government and, accordingly, the rabidly expansionist US president, James K. Polk, pressed to annex all of Mexico. Although when Nicholas Trist, Polk’s diplomatic negotiator, disobeyed his instructions and signed a treaty providing for the annexation of about a third of Mexico, Polk felt trapped. In the face of fierce public criticism of the conflict, he did not believe it possible to prolong the war to secure his goal of taking all of Mexico (Merk 1970: 35-63). He confided to his diary:

If I were now to reject a Treaty made upon my own terms . . . the probability is that Congress would not grant either men or money to prosecute the war. Should this be the result, the army now in Mexico would be constantly wasting and diminishing in numbers, and I might at last be compelled to withdraw them (Schroeder 1973: 163-164).

As this scenario would forfeit the more modest territorial gains secured by Trist, Polk reluctantly backed Trist’s peace treaty and the war came to an end.

The Peace Movement and the Vietnam War

The peace movement also had a major impact upon the US Government’s ability to wage its war in Vietnam. With the United States torn by tumultuous protest against the war, top officials cracked under the strain. By late 1967, recalled President Lyndon Johnson, ‘the pressure got so great’ that Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara ‘couldn’t sleep at night. I was afraid he might have a nervous breakdown’ (Schlesinger 1978: 823). Johnson himself grew obsessed with the opposition his war policies had generated. Conversations with Cabinet members began: ‘Why aren’t you out there fighting against my enemies?’ (Goodwin 1988: 410). After McNamara resigned and Johnson was driven from office by a revolt within his own party, it was the Nixon administration’s turn to be caught, as Henry Kissinger lamented, ‘between the hammer of antiwar pressure and the anvil of Hanoi’ (Kissinger 1979: 261). Kissinger recalled that by 1970, ‘the very fabric of government was falling apart. The Executive Branch was shell-shocked’ (Kissinger 1979: 513). The war and the peace protests, he observed, ‘shattered the self-confidence without which Establishments flounder’ (Kissinger 1979: 297). A careful and well-researched historical study of the peace movement’s efficacy during that conflict concluded that ‘the antiwar movement and antiwar criticism in the media and Congress had a significant impact on the Vietnam policies of both Johnson and Nixon’, pushing them toward de-escalation and, ultimately, withdrawal from the war (Small 1988: 225-226).

Yet another example of the peace movement’s effect upon public policy occurred during the 1980s, in the context of the Reagan administration’s determined efforts to use military power to overthrow the Sandinista-led government of Nicaragua and to defeat a leftwing insurgency in El Salvador. Despite the immense military advantage the US government enjoyed over small, poorly armed peasant nations, it was unable to employ it effectively. Popular pressure blocked direct US military intervention in Nicaragua because the administration feared that such action would trigger a mass antiwar revolt in the United States comparable to the tumultuous Vietnam era protests (Leo Grande 1998: 588-599). A tentative US invasion plan drawn up by Lieutenant Colonel Oliver North in 1985 did not list the Sandinista army but, rather, domestic opposition as the first obstacle.
to be overcome (Peace 2012: 5). Consequently, the Reagan administration was forced to turn to aiding US surrogates (the Contras), who, it turned out, lacked the muscle to overthrow the Nicaraguan government. Furthermore, in 1984, Congress—strongly affected by peace movement pressure—cut off US aid to the Contras and, although funding was restored, Congress pared it down soon thereafter to ‘nonlethal aid’ (Peace 2012: 4-5).

Ultimately, then, the new administration of George H.W. Bush was forced to accept a Central American peace plan that it had earlier opposed (Leo Grande 1998: 582). Bush recalled that he and his advisors ‘had inherited a battle with Congress over Central America’ that ‘had tied the hands of the Reagan Administration policy there’ (Bush and Scowcroft 1998: 135). Recognising that it lacked the votes in Congress to secure further aid to the Contras, the Bush administration supported a compromise—a diplomatic solution to the Central American wars forged by Central American leaders and signed in 1987 at Esquipulas. Secretary of State James Baker personally favoured the military approach to Nicaragua via support for the Contras, but recognised that this had become politically impossible (Baker 1995: 42, 47-60). The administration also turned to the diplomatic route in El Salvador, where the US Government, fearing domestic opposition to directly employing US military might, had settled for funding the Salvadoran military forces. But when an antiwar Congress slashed US aid to the Salvadoran government by fifty percent in 1991 and threatened to cut it even further in 1992, the Bush administration reluctantly accepted the peace settlement agreed to at Esquipulas (Leo Grande 1998: 584).

Ending the Cold War

There is also considerable evidence that the peace movement played a key role in ending the Cold War. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, the movement's struggle against the nuclear arms race and its clearest manifestation, nuclear weapons testing, stirred up a great wave of opposition to nuclear tests, in the United States and around the world. In response, uneasy governments, including those of the United States and the Soviet Union, groped toward a test ban treaty, but without success. Finally in early 1963, Norman Cousins, founder and co-chair of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, America’s largest peace organisation, was authorised by President John F. Kennedy to meet with Soviet party secretary Nikita Khrushchev and smooth the path toward a nuclear test ban. Consequently, Cousins conferred at length with Khrushchev and convinced him of Kennedy’s sincerity in seeking a treaty. Then he met with Kennedy and proposed that the American president deliver an audacious ‘peace’ speech to signal the US Government's willingness to curb its confrontation with the Soviet Union. As a result, Kennedy delivered his American University address, partially written by Cousins, that June. This action prompted successful negotiations for the Partial Test Ban Treaty, the first nuclear arms control agreement in history, and began Soviet-American détente (Wittner 1997: 29-41).

When the hawkish Reagan administration revived the Cold War and escalated the nuclear arms race, these actions sparked the greatest outburst of peace movement activism in world history. In the United States, the Nuclear Freeze campaign (NFC) secured the backing of leading religious denominations, professional groups, trade unions, and the Democratic Party. The NFC organised the largest political demonstration up to that time in US history, and drew the support of more than seventy percent of the public. In Europe, much the same thing occurred, and in the autumn of 1983 an estimated five million people took part in demonstrations against the planned deployment of intermediate range nuclear missiles (Wittner 2003: 130-252). Enormous anti-nuclear demonstrations also erupted throughout the Pacific. Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau remarked: ‘Only the deaf cannot hear the clamor arising all over the world against the arms race’ (Burkhardt 1983: 5). Reagan, in fact, was stunned. In October 1983 he told US Secretary of State George Shultz: ‘If things get hotter and hotter and arms control remains an issue, maybe I should go see [Soviet Premier Yuri] Andropov and propose eliminating all nuclear weapons’ (Shultz 1993: 372). Shultz was horrified by the idea, but agreed that ‘we could not leave matters as they stood’ (Shultz 1993: 464).

Consequently, in January 1984 Reagan delivered a remarkable public address calling for peace with the Soviet Union and for a nuclear weapons-free world (Reagan 1984). This speech was designed to signal to the Russians his willingness to end the Cold War and reduce nuclear arsenals (McFarlane 1999). But the Soviet leadership was not interested in following up on Reagan’s peace proposals until the advent of Mikhail Gorbachev in March 1985. Unlike his predecessors, Gorbachev was ready to take action for he was a movement convert. His ‘New Thinking’ — by which he meant the necessity for peace and disarmament in the nuclear age — was almost a carbon copy of the peace movement’s program (Thompson 1991: 16-17). As Gorbachev himself declared: ‘The new thinking took into account and absorbed the conclusions and demands of . . . the movements of physicians, scientists, and ecologists, and of various antiwar organisations’ (Washington Post 1988). Not surprisingly, Reagan and Gorbachev, spurred on by the peace movement, moved rapidly toward nuclear disarmament treaties and an end to the Cold War.

Iraq and the Recent Middle-East Conflicts

Although it would be premature to draw definitive conclusions about the impact of peace activism on the US Government’s 2003 military invasion of Iraq and subsequent occupation of that land, it did affect
government policy. Admittedly, the administration of President George W. Bush launched the invasion of Iraq in the face of enormous worldwide demonstrations against looming US military intervention (Chrisafis 2003; Cortright 2008: 171-172). Also, despite continued protests, the administration stubbornly maintained the US military occupation and combat role. Nevertheless, Bush viewed public support as ‘essential to funding and fighting the war’ and consequently, felt stung by the anti-war demonstrations, Congressional criticism and loss of popular backing for his Iraq policy (Bush 2010: 260, 269, 358, 367, 371-372, 378-379, 392). As early as September 2003 administration officials began to discuss setting a firm date for the end of the occupation – preferably before the 2004 elections. A Pentagon official explained that a long, indefinite occupation would be a political disaster, as ‘the American people won’t tolerate it’ (Woodward 2006: 250-251). Although the Republican president squeaked through to re-election in 2004 without setting a withdrawal date, he delayed another US military offensive in Iraq (‘the surge’) for years thanks to his fear that it might ‘have created a rift that would have been exploited by war critics’ (Bush 2010: 393).

With antiwar activism continuing and the US military role in Iraq growing increasingly unpopular (Craighill and Clement 2013), the Democrats donned the mantle of the peace party. In 2006, when eighty-eight percent of Democrats opposed the war (Gallup News Service 2006), their party campaigns against it and recaptured control of both houses of Congress. In 2008, Barack Obama’s ability to edge out Hillary Clinton in the scramble for the Democratic Party nomination for president and to defeat John McCain in the election for that office reflected, in part, his relative ‘dove-like’ position on the war. Although Obama, after entering the White House, disappointed his many peace movement backers by the slow pace of US military withdrawal from Iraq (Barakat and Beh 2010), he did ultimately end US combat operations and the US military occupation.

Thanks to peace movement activism there were also wars that did not occur. For example, in 1916, during a dangerous US government confrontation with revolutionary Mexico over the alleged ambush and slaughter of US soldiers at Carrizal, the American Union Against Militarism (AUM) played a crucial role in countering demands for war from business interests, some religious organisations, and hawkish newspapers. Publicising the true story of the incident (which revealed that US troops had attacked first), the AUM mobilised an anti-war coalition among influential US groups, established links with the Mexicans for information and mediation, and successfully convinced President Woodrow Wilson of the need for a peaceful settlement of the conflict (Chambers 1991: xx, xlix-i, 76-87; Patterson 2008: 199-206). How many wars, it might be asked, were prevented through the implementation of the many ideas and proposals that originated with the peace movement and leading peace proponents, among them: international arbitration; international law; decolonisation; the League of Nations; disarmament treaties; the United Nations; and nonviolent resistance (De Benedetti 1980; Cortright 2008)? We shall probably never know. We do know, however, that the peace movement played a central role in preventing one kind of war since 1945: nuclear war.

By the 1950s, the peace movement had done such an effective job of stigmatising nuclear weapons that the US government – which, immediately after its development of atomic bombs, had employed them to annihilate two Japanese cities – no longer felt able to use them. In 1956, Henry Cabot Lodge Jr., the US Ambassador to the United Nations, complained to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles that the atomic bomb had acquired ‘a bad name, and to such an extent that it seriously inhibits us from using it’ (US Department of State 1990a: 20:273). Later that year, when the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other administration officials called for greater flexibility in the employment of nuclear weapons, President Dwight Eisenhower rebuffed them, observing: ‘The use of nuclear weapons would raise serious political problems in view of the current state of world opinion’ (US Department of State 1990b: 19: 203-204). In 1957, brushing aside ambitious proposals for nuclear war-fighting, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles told a National Security Council meeting that ‘world opinion’ was ‘not yet ready to accept the general use of nuclear weapons’ (US Department of State 1990c: 19: 499-500).

This belief continued to haunt US officials during the military struggle in Vietnam, when, in the words of former Secretary of State Dean Rusk, the Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon administrations deliberately lost the war rather than “win” it with nuclear weapons’ (Rusk 1990: 457). McGeorge Bundy, who served as the National Security Advisor to two of these presidents and as a consultant to the third, maintained that the US government’s decision not to use nuclear weapons in the war did not result from fear of nuclear retaliation by the Russians and Chinese, but from the terrible public reaction that a US nuclear attack would provoke in other nations and especially in the United States (Bundy 1988: 536-537).

Even during the hawkish Reagan administration, public officials came to regard the employment of nuclear weapons as politically impossible. Entering office, they talked glibly of fighting and winning a nuclear war (Wittner 2003: 112-123). However this position quickly changed when a massive popular outcry and mobilisation arose against it. Starting in April 1982, shortly after the introduction of Nuclear Freeze legislation in Congress, Reagan began declaring publicly and repeatedly that ‘a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought’. He added, on that first occasion: ‘To those who protest against nuclear war, I can only say: “I’m with you” ’ (Reagan 1983: 487-488).
This article has discussed a number of important examples of the way the peace movement has been able to influence the process of war-making in the USA. Thus, although the US Government has engaged in numerous wars over the course of American history, it seems likely that it would have waged war longer, more frequently, and more destructively were it not for the restraining influence of the peace movement. In a wider sphere the actions of the US peace movement have inspired and supported the mobilisation and strategies of peace movements in other nations around the world, including Australia, particularly during the times of the Cold War and the Vietnam War.
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‘Peace is the virtue of civilization. War is its crime’.

Victor Hugo

‘When the power of love overcomes the love of power the world will know peace’.

Jimi Hendrix
I first encountered the idea of ‘war by accident’ or an ‘accidental apocalypse’ forty years ago as a twenty-one year old third year history student in 1974 while writing a term essay on the origins of WWI, at a time when WWII was (as it is arguably once again in 2014) on the agenda. The history of war made a deep impression on me as I made my first foray into real historical sources (French and German diplomatic documents), and into the massive scholarship of Luigi Albertini’s hefty tomes on the July 1914 crisis, that still form the basis for contemporary scholarship.

Most persuasive however, was A.J.P. Taylor’s ‘War by Timetable’ (1969) in which he argued, I believe fundamentally correctly, that what ultimately tipped Europe into war in July/August 1914 was the interaction of a series of highly complex systems. These were the military mobilisation plans of Germany, Austria, Russia and France. Once put into motion these ponderous plans could not be stopped nor could they be changed. Worse, that fact seemed to be quite unknown until far too late by key policymakers such as the Tsar and Kaiser.

This vital point, so applicable to subsequent events, was that the full implications of the interactions of these complex systems were not, and seemingly could never have been, evident to decision makers until it was too late. The contemporary implications of that insight to strategic nuclear systems, and also to financial, cyberspace, electrical, and other complex networked systems in 2014, are evident.

All this led me over the years and decades to a concern with an ‘accidental apocalypse’, with heightened possibilities in 1974 and 2014 of a potential WWII. This was a connection that A.J.P. Taylor himself made very clearly. Further, it is a connection spookily foreshadowed in the language of WWI mobilisation plans themselves – ‘to push the button’. The problem was that ‘once the button is pushed there’s no running away’ to paraphrase Barry Maguire, in the 1965 song Eve of Destruction written by P.F. Sloan.

The ‘accidental apocalypse’ thesis, whilst it has prompted General Assembly resolutions at the UN, has not gone unchallenged in more doctrinaire nuclear disarmament and left circles. This is on one hand, because it is argued (both from the left and even more from the nationalist right) that ‘failure to blame is a failure of nerve’ that lets everyone off the hook and inhibits investigation. Precisely the opposite is true: once we ‘blame’ somebody, analysis stops. There is no more ‘whodunnit’ because we know ‘whodiddit’: it was the evil and perfidious Germans or the Russians or the French or the English. Therefore, further investigation is stopped dead. We see exactly the same process happening right now with the vilification and demonisation of Putin. We don’t need to ask what we ourselves might do to prevent WWII because it’s all Putin’s fault and there is no more to be said.

The second reason for the occasional rejection of the ‘war by accident’ hypothesis in some ‘progressive’ circles is a tendency (in my view a paranoid one) to view world events as somehow ‘fixed’ by an all-powerful (and omniscient) global shadow elite who somehow know with perfect clarity and precision exactly how to act to further their own interests. On the contrary, there is no evidence whatsoever that the global elite are either unified in purpose (there are many elites rather than a single elite), or even sufficiently in touch with reality to know what its own interests really are, especially over the long term. Blind Freddie (in whose judgment I have much faith) is quite able often to tell them what is what, but by and large they are too blinded by ideology to listen. The events of WWI, the 1929 crash, the GFC, the Euro-zone crisis, Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, and Fukushima, not to mention the over a dozen occasions on which nuclear false alarms have come within minutes and seconds of literally ending the world, give no reason to believe that global elites are blessed by any more prescience than anyone else. Indeed, the elite have an interest in precisely not being prescient.

There is one final wrinkle: many global techno-systems have already become simply so complex that they persistently give rise to outcomes that are unpredictable in principle because to predict them would be to change them (see Hallam 2013). Examples of contemporary complex systems are the global strategic nuclear weapons command and control systems, the global financial system, and cyberspace. All of these share the characteristics of being ‘tightly-coupled’ and a glitch in one system can bring down many interconnected systems.
At the forefront of these considerations are the computerised, space-based, nuclear command and control and surveillance, systems. These systems all share the property of being so complex that no one, or very few people (and all too often not those who supposedly manage them), can fully understand them or predict the outcome of their interactions. And part of my argument is that the first of those systems to bring forth an unexpected and unpredictable outcome was the complex and inflexible mobilisation systems of 1914 whose interactions are disturbingly similar to those predicted for strategic nuclear command and control systems today. There have been a disturbingly large number of events in which computer glitches, high clouds directly over North Dakota, and a Norwegian weather research rocket have brought the world within minutes and seconds of the launch of thousands of nuclear armed intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs). General Lee Butler, after having his finger on the metaphorical ‘nuclear button’ for over 20 years, remarked at the beginning of this century that we really should not be here – the only reason we are here, he opined, was ‘blind good luck and divine providence – actually I think almost entirely divine providence’ (see Hallam 2013).

Without necessarily buying into General Lee Butler’s theology, the bottom line of this is that we have frequently been ‘saved’ by rather unlikely coincidences. Can we continue to rely, essentially, on outrageous good luck? We have an unlikely series of ‘saviours’ from the apocalypse including the unknown advisor to President Boris Yeltsin who, as the Norwegian weather research rocket was mistaken for an incoming US First Strike, uttered the immortal words ‘Mr President, let’s wait another minute’. Then there was the US Launch control officer who, as a practice launch sequence for ten Minuteman missiles each with ten warheads in 1980, turned into the real thing that ran out of control caused heavy military vehicles to be driven on top of silo doors to prevent them from opening (see Hallam 2013).

Finally there was Colonel Stanislav Petrov, who amid wailing sirens on 26 September 1983 (now designated by the UN as International Nuclear Disarmament Day), took decisions that resulted in a flashing red button that would have initiated the computerised launch of between five thousand and fifteen thousand warheads not being pressed because ‘I had a feeling in my gut that there was a mistake somewhere ... I didn’t want to make a mistake’. Col Stan notes in the just released movie about him, that ‘I am not a hero ... I was just in the right place at the right time’. It is no Hollywood fancy, but in fact reality based, that all doomsday movies assume, almost as a given, an ‘accidental apocalypse’ as their starting point (see Hallam 2013).

It is worth asking just where are we now with reference to what, should it ever take place, will be the end of what we call civilisation (at a minimum this can be accomplished by an electromagnetic pulse with as few as five warheads in space), and is more likely to be the end of either most humans, or possibly all humans via decades of sub-zero temperatures and darkness resulting from the smoke of burned cities?

The recalculations of nuclear winter from 2006 onwards by Robock and Toon (for instance, see Robock, Oman and Stenchikov 2007; Toon, Robock and Turco 2008), that are now the subject of a series of three intergovernmental meetings on Catastrophic Humanitarian Consequences of Nuclear Weapons Use (the third meeting is scheduled for December in Vienna – author will be attending), make it clear that agriculture as well as most land-based living species would be unlikely to survive a multi-decadal period with temperatures lower than the last ice-age. The survival of humans as a species might be problematic.

The recent warnings by President Putin that ‘we have nuclear weapons’ serve to put WWII back on the agenda. It has been argued that the participants in recent US and Russian nuclear force exercises ‘do not see them in apocalyptic terms’. This may be so, but in fact decidedly apocalyptic statements have been made (notably by the Ukrainian government) that ‘this is WWII’ and such statements are, or tend to be, self-fulfilling. In dealing with governments and groups of governments that field large numbers of nuclear weapons and that pointedly emphasise that fact in media statements, the worst case possibility does remain large scale nuclear weapons use – i.e. ‘the apocalypse’. That is not to say that this is what will definitely happen, but it remains the worst case possibility and a non-zero probability.

The danger in the above is that if the NATO-Russia confrontation worsens, there is increasing room for miscalculation/malfunction in those complex systems to bring about an accidental apocalypse. There remains also the possibility of a creeping escalation to bring about, almost imperceptibly, an event sequence not too dissimilar to what took place in 1914 – except that the final inexorable act instead of taking days and weeks, would take less than an hour. Already, US and Russian nuclear forces have (back in March) conducted their ‘rehearsals for Armageddon’ (large scale exercises) within days of each other. Russian forces are scheduled to do further large scale exercises at the end of this month. In addition, Russia has in the last week (October 12) deployed an additional one hundred warheads on its Borei class submarines.

There are, however, ways in which an ‘accidental apocalypse’ can be avoided. Back in 2008, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists ran an article whose title really says it all: ‘Minimising the Risk of Human Extinction’ (Sandberg, Matheny and Ćirković 2008). The article contained a somewhat consequential ‘laundry list’ of things that would help to minimise the risk of human extinction, including items such as programs to scan
the skies for large incoming asteroids, watching briefs on physics experiments that could conceivably make the entire galaxy vanish in a flash of exotic particles (hopefully reasonably unlikely), watching briefs on nanotechnology ... and topping the list:

- the lowering of the ‘state of alert’ of nuclear missiles, now held at less than a minute to launch, to hours and days to launch; and

- the abolition of nuclear weapons.

This article’s author has been responsible for an appeal, signed by forty-four former Nobel-prize winners in 2005, that persuaded six governments (NZ, Switzerland, Sweden, Malaysia, Nigeria and Chile) to sponsor the ‘Operational Readiness of Nuclear Weapon Systems’ resolution in the UN General Assembly, in 2007. It was most recently adopted 162-4 votes, in 2012. The resolution is on the agenda once more this year.

The author works with Professor Peter King of the University of Sydney to coordinate the Human Survival Project (HSP) jointly with People for Nuclear Disarmament and the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies (see http://sydney.edu.au/arts/peace_conflict/practice/human_survival_project.shtml). HSP holds workshops at United Nations meetings (e.g. First Committee and Non Proliferation Treaty meetings) on accidental nuclear war and its consequences. We have already had a noticeable impact on outcomes and on the language in multilateral joint statements such as the most recent statement on catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons use.

One hundred years ago in August, a series of miscalculations and the ghost of General Von Schiefflen bought us WWI with its four years of trench warfare and its seventeen to thirty-five million body count (depending how you count the influenza epidemic at its end). If we blow it once more, one hundred years later, the minimum cost will be what we call ‘civilisation’. The more probable cost will be the greater part of the human population, and perhaps all of it.
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The Olive Tree

Nobody knows how long it takes to kill an olive. Drought, axe, fire, are admitted failures. Hack one down, grub out a ton of mainroot for fuel, and next spring every side-root sends up shoots. A great frost can leave the trees leafless for years; they revive. Invading armies will fell them. They return through the burnt-out ribs of siege machines.

Only the patient goat, nibbling his way down the ages, has malice to master the olive. Sometimes, they say, a man finds a dead orchard, fired and goat-cropped centuries back. He settles and fences; the stumps revive. His grandchildren's family prosper by the arduous oil-pressing trade. Then wars and disease wash over. Goats return. The olives go under, waiting another age.

Their shade still lies where Socrates disputed. Gethsemane’s withered groves are bearing yet.

MARK O’CONNOR, O’CONNOR, ACT
This paper attempts to counter the common misconception that nonviolence would not have worked against Nazi Germany. It adds to the literature showing that nonviolence against Nazism did occur, and although it was mostly ad hoc, poorly coordinated and under-resourced, it was widespread, diverse and sometimes remarkably effective. If it had been better coordinated, planned and resourced, such nonviolence could have been formidable. The paper also examines foreign corporations that were economic and military-industrial pillars of Nazism, and suggests that an international campaign of boycotts, divestments and sanctions against those collaborator corporations – as used successfully against the similar pillars of apartheid South Africa – could have been highly effective.

Militarism has long been recognised for its social and economic costs (Guerlain 2013), and increasingly for its environmental costs (Thomas 1995; Wareham 2009; Branagan 2013). Nonviolence – the use of peaceful means, rather than violence, to gain political or social objectives – has long been proposed as an alternative mechanism for national defence and regime change. However, the widespread adoption of nonviolence is hampered by a common perception, including by ‘world leaders’ such as Barak Obama, and many historians, that it would not be effective against ruthless opponents such as Nazi Germany (Stoner 2009). This is despite ample evidence of numerous overthrow of dictatorships and authoritarian regimes (Clark 2009; Schock 2005; Zunes et al. 1999).

Nazi Germany was undoubtedly one of the most murderous regimes in human history, with its number of victims – approximately 21 million – exceeded only by Mao Zedong’s China and Stalin’s USSR (Dougherty 2005). Contrary to popular opinion, however, nonviolence against Nazism did occur. Although it was generally ad hoc and unresourced, it was remarkably effective, as discussed in Social Alternatives by Brian Martin (1987, 1990) and Ralph Summy (1987, 1995, 2000), and elsewhere by this author (2013: 44-50) and Ackerman and Duvall (2000: 207-239). This paper builds on those findings in a further effort to show the extent of nonviolence against Nazism, and how effective it can be even against an extremely brutal regime.

German Resistance

This article summarises some of the (primarily German) opposition to Nazi Germany. Many Germans had a complex and dynamic relationship with Nazism. Some supported aspects of Nazism while expressing dissent or opposing (usually quietly but in some cases openly) other aspects. Some, like the Scholl teenagers of Ulm (see below), were initially enthusiastic but later became vehemently opposed. Although the Nazi regime attempted total state control, this was not achieved (Mallman and Paul 2005), and there was a diversity of opposition ranging from communists to priests to students. Those who resisted included ordinary civilians, unionists, social democrats, military personnel, youth and religious adherents, as well as conservatives and Jews (Stokes 1990; Pauker 1990; Jonca 1990; Stratford 1987: 54-5). Nazi reactions to this resistance were diverse and unpredictable.
These resisters also had a complex and dynamic relationship with nonviolence (which is itself a contested term). Some of the opposition, such as most religious resistance, was entirely nonviolent, usually based on pacifist beliefs. Other resistance involved both nonviolence and violence, such as socialist resistance which used underground media and, towards the end of the war, partisan fighting. Some resisters fed information to the Allies, which resulted in airstrikes and other violence. Many engaged in sabotage, which some believe is (‘pragmatic’) nonviolence, although others disagree (Branagan 2013: 54, 134-5). Apart from some Danish resisters, there is little indication that they had read of Gandhi or any nonviolence theory. They resisted however they could, and this often involved ‘duragrahic’ methods of nonviolence – such as strikes – commonly used in Western labour struggles (see Bondurant 1964), rather than ‘satyagrahic’ or Gandhian nonviolence (which many people misconstrue as the only form of nonviolence). Some resistance was purely local; other resistance was international, such as diplomatic moves by religious leaders, information-sharing by military personnel, and union solidarity actions.

A possible reason for the popular dismissal of nonviolence against Nazism is how historians have viewed the period. There is plenty of contemporary scholarship on German resistance to Nazism, but usually from a perspective that misunderstands nonviolence and its efficacy, often incorrectly equating it with pacifism and inaction. For example, Michael C. Thomsett (1997: 2, 37), like Richard Hanser (2012: 167), argues from a traditional perspective that military involvement was necessary to overthrow Hitler. Thomsett calls nonviolence ‘passive resistance’, a popular misnomer as it is rarely passive, and claims that once the Nazis were entrenched, nonviolent opposition was out of the question (1997: 3). John S. Conway too feeds this common misconception – that the only options for concerned Germans were pacifism or patriotism (1990: 87).

Military Resistance

These historians tend to focus on military resistance to Nazism, with some arguing that German Army personnel formed the backbone of resistance in Germany, and that high-ranking military officers such as Beck were the leaders of the resistance movement (Thomsett 1997: 37-40). Military resistance included the questioning of orders and refusal to obey them, slow execution of duties, resignations, and the leaking of intelligence to church hierarchies and the Allies by groups such as the ‘Red Orchestra’ (Thomsett 1997: 60; Hanser 2012: 197). This non-cooperation may have hurt the Nazi war effort and contributed to the Allied victory, although the German armed forces for the most part supported the remilitarisation of Germany, as did much of the workforce (Thomsett 1997: 39).

These histories of military resistance primarily focus on attempts to assassinate Hitler, of which there were forty-two (Moore 2014: 60). Some attempts involved groups of soldiers such as in Claus von Stauffenberg’s failed ‘Valkyrie’ coup, but numerous others involved lone assassins such as Johann Elser, who planned meticulously and went to extraordinary lengths (Thomsett 1997: 94-102). Obviously, none of these attempts succeeded. As a consequence however, thousands of servicemen and their families were arrested. After the Valkyrie attempt, for example, approximately 7,000 were rounded up, including many innocent people, and 4,980 were executed (Thomsett 1997: 234-6). Law and order were cited as the reasons for the arrests and executions. Many Germans were horrified at what they considered treasonous and cowardly attempts on their leader’s life, leading to increased support for the regime and its police powers. A myth of Hitler’s invincibility emerged and contributed to his status. The assassination attempts also had a negative propaganda value internationally, with New York newspapers critical of Valkyrie (Thomsett 1997: 230).

This begs the question: What if all that energy, ingenuity and forethought involved in the assassination and coup attempts had been devoted to covert or even overt nonviolence, in addition to the resistance tactics discussed below? Much military resistance was secret or merely involved resignations from office rather than open defiance.3 Though understandable, imagine if all those high-ranking officers involved in assassination and coup attempts had instead expressed opposition, openly or via underground radio and newspapers, and, if necessary, hidden or fled abroad, and coordinated more resistance. Far fewer people may have died, and the propaganda effect would have been considerable as opposed to the counter-productive effect of the assassination attempts.

A careful examination of histories of military resistance to Nazism shows that the more successful examples tended to be overt, while the repercussions were much less than one would expect from such a regime. In 1942 in Przemyśl in southern Poland, German army lieutenant Dr Albert Battel used his troops against the SS to save several hundred Jews from death camps, and despite SS chief Himmler’s threat to arrest him, he was merely reprimanded and later even promoted (Kitterman 1991: 250). Johann Punzel refused to follow orders to execute eighteen firemen and a woman in Differdange, Luxembourg in 1940, instead putting them into two trucks and allowing them to drive away to safety; he survived the war (Olney 2013:169). There were ‘at least 100 documented cases of German soldiers, policemen or members of the SS refusing orders to kill Jewish people, other unarmed civilians or POWs’ (Kitterman 1991: 249). Surprisingly, not one of these Germans was killed for refusing to obey orders. In only eight percent of these cases were there serious consequences, with two men
court marshalled and sent to concentration camps, and others forced to participate in atrocities in a minor way, such as digging graves. In approximately a third of cases, they were transferred back to Germany or to another unit; some of these were demoted but later promoted, or they suffered verbal or written reprimands or slower promotion. In fifty-eight percent of cases there were no negative consequences at all. Despite fear, indoctrination and peer pressure it was possible to resist the Nazi will:

Contrary to popular belief, there was not an effective automatic system of ‘terror-justice’ operating against those who refused to cooperate with Nazism. Instead, the coercive powers of the wartime Nazi system proved to be impotent or ineffective in nearly every documented case of refusal to murder unarmed people (Kitterman 1991: 251).

In a different example of nonviolent resistance by military personnel, in Colditz prison camp. Allied prisoners-of-war (POWs) engaged in strikes, hunger strikes, noncooperation and dialogue. They resisted Nazi propaganda broadcast over loudspeakers by playing musical instruments at top volume as soon as it began. There were also many attempted escapes, some of them successful (Reid 2001).

**Labour Opposition**

Successful nonviolent campaigns have generally consisted of widespread, diverse movements rather than just military resistance, so let us now turn to other groups who resisted Nazism. Labour opposition included strikes and even blockades in Denmark, which slowed war production for the Nazis and drew soldiers away from the fronts (Ackerman and Duvall 2000: 207-239). Norwegian teachers successfully resisted Nazi edicts, and there was widespread use of forgery and underground press, including by emigrants (Thomsett 1997: 70-1).

In Germany, 500,000 were imprisoned for political crimes (Thomsett 1997: 2), and they continued to organise in prison. In Buchenwald concentration camp, there were communist-organised strikes and go-slows. Underground newspapers were smuggled into Oranienburg concentration camp. Allied airmen and two Catholic priests were smuggled out of Dachau concentration camp to urge the approaching US soldiers to liberate the camp. Concentration camp returnees reported details of crimes widely, including to leading Nazis in Hamburg, while labour unions collaborated internationally to provide underground assistance to refugees (Thomsett 1997: 71-82).

**Youth Resistance**

The Nazi Party strove to be the party of youth but many youth resisted, such as the ‘DJ youth movement’ (Hanser 2012: 62), the Edelweiss Pirates (McDonaugh 2001: 15-18), and the ‘swing movement’ which made fun of the Nazi slogans, for instance making ‘Swing hiël!’ their rallying cry (Broughton 2011). Swing music was regarded by the Nazis as degenerate, so listening to it was a form of cultural resistance, leading to some, such as Günter Discher, being sent to youth concentration camps.

Youth insubordination and cultural rejection led to absenteeism and go-slows at work, which affected the war effort (Peukert 1989: 162-3, 173). Some youths attacked Nazis and the Hitler Youth, and established contact with communist and other armed resistance groups. In Denmark, youth were among the first resisters, engaging in sabotage, while a seventeen-year-old schoolboy, Arne Sejr, produced an early manifesto of resistance, ‘The Ten Commandments for Danes’ (Ackerman and Duvall 2000: 211-215).

The White Rose movement, consisting mainly of students such as siblings Sophie and Hans Scholl (see Figure One), began a ‘moral protest’ to start eroding German people’s faith in Hitler. They concentrated on underground media, distributing thousands of leaflets around Germany, urging sabotage, non-cooperation and refusal to fund the Nazi Party (Dumbach and Newborn 2011: 127-33; Thomsett 1997: 75). Part of their strategy was to give the impression of a much larger opposition (Hanser 2012: 212), a tactic which was later very successful for the 1990s Otpor movement in Serbia. At a time of declining German military morale, the widespread White Rose leaflets were ‘creating the greatest disturbance at the highest levels of the Party and the State’, probably including Himmler and possibly Hitler (Dumbach and Newborn 2011: 126). They inspired other student resistance, which included a riot, street march and graffiti, while their movement was reported internationally, inspiring German POWs to write leaflets that were duplicated and airdropped by their Russian captors. Although the White Rose members were arrested, their trial inspired clergymen and lawyers (Hanser 2012: 274), and their executions did ‘great and long-lasting harm to the regime’ (Thomsett 1997: 77).

An international nonviolent movement against Nazism could have actively garnered youth support by use of music and information broadcast into Germany and occupied countries by international broadcasters such as the BBC. Later movements such as anti-Vietnam war protests, for example, were very much driven by youth counterculture.

**Religious Resistance**

A Papal encyclical in 1937 alarmed and embarrassed the Nazis, although many later criticised the mainstream churches for not resisting enough. Church personnel
passed on intelligence to the Allies, attempted diplomacy and helped smuggle Jewish people to safety. There was even vocal protest in Buchenwald by Pastor Paul Schneider (Thomsett 1997: 57-66).

One of the most prominent cases of religious resistance is that of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, a pastor, theologian and ecumenical leader of the Confessing Church, who encouraged church leaders in their resistance to Nazism. A highly moral man, a conscientious Christian, and dedicated to both pacifism and nonviolence (two very different things), he is another example of historical revisionism, being often cited by critics of nonviolence as a classic case for the necessity of violence against ruthless dictators. He is usually portrayed as having decided that assassinating Hitler was a justifiable moral choice for him. He had a supposed conversion to realism, purportedly modelling:

the kind of responsible decision-making, freed from literalistic scruples, that is the starting point for the just-war tradition, [a tradition which] attempts to explain why, as a practical matter, this one aspect of Jesus’ teaching should be qualified, bracketed out or suspended until the Second Coming (Moore 2014: 59).

Nation, Siegrist and Umbel (2013), however, find no evidence that Bonhoeffer either abandoned his pacifism or joined an assassination plot (although he knew about five such plots). They argue that such a move would have been inconsistent with his writings. Contrary to popular belief, Bonhoeffer was not arrested as a conspirator, but for trying to help fourteen Jewish men and women to escape Germany. When indicted, he was charged with misusing his position in the Abwehr (military intelligence) to avoid conscription for himself and others.

In all, about 5,000 German clergy were arrested, and most were released after protests, or survived the war. Many, such as the popular Bishop Galen, were warned but left unharmed, leading one to wonder what effect they could have had if they had been bolder and louder. In later examples of effective religious resistance, the Catholic Church played a major role in the overthrow of both the Filipino dictator Ferdinand Marcos and the repressive communist regime in Poland (Ackerman and Duvall 2000: 113-174, 369-395).

Other Resistance

Other resistance ranged from the small scale, such as a nude protest against food rationing in Holland, and the cord to Hitler’s PA system being cut during a speech in Ulm (Hanser 2012: 35), to symbolic and musical resistance on a national scale in Denmark. There were individual actions, such as the mayor of Leipzig, Carl Guerdeler, protecting Jewish businesses, and there were active groups, such as the Kreisau Circle of social leaders who rejected assassination, and focused on political and social plans for the future in their clandestine meetings (Thomsett 1997: 87-8).

Humour gave cabaret artist Werner Finck (see Figure Two) scope for critical comment. His ridicule of living conditions in the dictatorship through puns, gestures and double entendres were exhilarating for his audiences, and the way he presented his jokes made it difficult for authorities to pin him down. Finck would seem lost for words, and the audience, playing along, concluded his sentences. He even defied authority by daring Gestapo informers in the audience to take down every word he said, and once innocently asked one: ‘Am I speaking too fast? Do you follow me – or do I have to follow you now [to the police station]?’ Finck was eventually arrested and interned in Esterwegen concentration camp, but later released. His actions made him an international legend, such that after the war Allied journalists were astounded to meet him, as they had believed that the ‘Werner Finck’ who mocked the Nazis was a myth (Berghaus 1996; German Resistance Memorial Center 2014; ‘Werner Finck’ 2010).

Clearly, there was a great diversity of opposition to Nazism. Their motives, objectives, methods, intensity and dedication all differed, as did the effectiveness of their resistance, although overall it clearly saved many people from death or incarceration, undermined the Nazi regime and aided the Allied war effort. If it had been united, coordinated, better planned and resourced, all this resistance could have been more formidable. If it had been supported by an international movement of nonviolent resistance, such as a British campaign to undermine the German people’s support for Hitler, which the Labour politician Stephen King-Hall unsuccessfully tried to initiate (Martin 1987), it could have been even more powerful,
Let us examine just one element of what this international campaign could have involved.

**Boycotts, Divestment and Sanctions**

One nonviolent technique, little used in WWII, was that of economic boycotts, divestment and sanctions (BDS) from countries and corporations. It is a technique involving minimal risk to exponents outside the country, but some risk to exponents inside the country trying to access and communicate information. It is an example of the ‘dispersed’ nonviolence usually required against authoritarian regimes, as opposed to ‘concentrated’ forms such as rallies, which are easier to repress (see Schock 2005: 51-2).

There were numerous foreign or international corporations who supported Nazism, in some cases supplying war material to both the Nazis and the Allies. In all, for example, American investments in Nazi Germany equalled an estimated $475 million (Higham 1983: xv). These corporations could have been forced to withdraw their German operations by the Allied governments and/or by an international BDS movement. Let us identify a few such corporations and demonstrate their importance for the Nazi regime.

Financed by the Bush family’s Union Banking Corporation, the Rockefellers’ Standard Oil of New Jersey and Standard Oil of New York (later Exxon-Mobil) supplied IG Farbenindustrie (the corporation which manufactured Zyklon B, the poisonous gas used to exterminate Jews) with essential technologies and high-grade aviation fuel for use by the Luftwaffe (Sutton 2010:35-37, Jeffrey 2009; Gellately 2002: 215). International Telephone and Telegraph (ITT) part-owned Focke-Wulf, which constructed the planes that bombed Allied forces, and also supplied advanced communications equipment, radar, fuses for artillery shells, high frequency radio equipment and vital components of the V1 and V2 rockets which the Nazis used against London (Black et al. 2003; Higham 1983: 99).

The Chase Bank did ‘millions of dollars worth of business with the enemy with full knowledge of the head office in Manhattan’ (Higham 1983: xv), while Barclays Bank, the Bank of England, J.P. Morgan and Warburg Manhattan Bank also supported business dealings with Nazi Germany (Quinn 2013; Barnett 1999; Sutton 2010: 31). Allianz, whose CEO was one of Hitler’s advisers, aided the Nazi expropriation of Jewish insurance assets (Feldman 2001).

Ford built approximately a third of the 350,000 trucks which the motorised German army possessed in 1942 (Billstein 2004: 115), repairing them in supposedly-neutral Switzerland. Prior to and during WWII, General Motors’s subsidiary Opel built thousands of bomber and jet fighter propulsion systems for Nazi Germany, including for the Messerschmitt 262M, the first jet fighter in the world, 160 kph faster than its nearest rival, the US’s piston-powered Mustang P150 (Billstein 2004: 34; Higham 1983: 154). Ford and Opel were ‘the two largest tank producers in Hitler’s Germany; General Electric and Dupont were also ‘intimately involved with the development of Nazi Germany’ (Sutton 2010: 31).

Random House’s parent company Bertelsmann published anti-semitic works (Booth et al. 2007), while Hugo Boss’s factories, with the aid of forced labour, produced the intimidating uniforms of the SchutzStaffel (SS) and the Hitler Youth (Galster and Nosch 2010). Kodak employed slave labour, provided markets and foreign currency for the Nazis, and manufactured triggers, detonators and other military hardware (Galiher and Guess 2009; Friedman 2001). IBM’s Hollerith punch-card machines were essential for the Nazis’ cataloguing and dispatching of their millions of victims; IBM also helped coordinate Nazi Germany’s railroads and war effort (Black 2012; Pearse 2012: 182-4).

Bayer, BMW, Daimler-Chrysler, Volkswagen and Nestlé employed slave or forced labour (Silverstein 2003: 130; König and Zeugin 2002: 297-303; Olson 2001; AP 2000). Coca Cola (see Figure Three) sold to both sides of the conflict and was virtually ‘part of the Nazi state’ (Jones and Rixmann n.d.). Shell, Continental, Daimler-Benz and Dunlop supported the Nazis by putting advertisements in their newspapers, such as Volkscher Beobachter (Turner 1985: 267, 270).

The Allied governments were warned of these treasonous arrangements, but did very little to stop them. After the war, not only were the corporations not punished or had...
to pay reparations, they were actually compensated by the Allies for damage done to their factories. This damage was less than it could have been anyway, as the facilities owned by ITT, Alcoa, Ford and General Electric were very lightly targeted, if at all; this was so obvious to Cologne inhabitants that they used the Ford plant as an air raid shelter (Galiher and Guess 2009: 172; Sutton 2010: 64, 66; Parenti 1997: 19). This was probably due to the influence of the corporate executives on the US Committee of Operations Analysts, which decided on bombing targets (Yeadon and Hawkins 2008: 215-9).

Given the size of these corporations and their importance for Nazi military expansionism, what impact would a campaign of boycotts, divestments and sanctions against them have had? Examination of the struggle against South Africa’s apartheid regime can suggest an answer. A major part of this struggle was an international BDS campaign against some of the same corporations implicated in Nazism, such as ITT, Coca Cola, IBM, General Electric, Ford, General Motors and Chase Manhattan Bank (see Figure Four). All of the above eventually withdrew from South Africa or curtailed their activities there (York 2000; Clark 2008; Broyles 1998). While US students pressured Harvard University to divest (Seidman 2007: 55-6), tens of thousands of UK students boycotted Barclays Bank until it too pulled out, leaving South Africa struggling for finances (Nerys 2000). Meanwhile, internal boycotts by black Africans (such as in Port Elizabeth) shut down white-owned businesses and, along with international sanctions, and sporting and cultural boycotts, created pressure for regime change (Ackerman and Duvall 2000: 339-368). Although the effectiveness of sanctions is disputed, the removal through boycotts of numerous economic pillars which had provided financial and moral support for the regime likely accelerated its decline. We can surmise that Nazism too would have been seriously weakened and their war effort considerably hampered if a similar campaign had forced collaborator corporations out of Germany.

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to add to the literature showing that nonviolence is possible and sometimes effective against even the most murderous of regimes such as Nazi Germany. Nazi attempts at total state control proved impossible, and although historians tend to focus on military opposition to Nazism (some of which was counter-productive), resistance was diverse although largely ad hoc, coordinated poorly, and developed incrementally, for example when Danes realised that strikes were a more effective strategy than sabotage, and less costly in terms of repression. Surprisingly, Nazi reactions were unpredictable and not uniformly repressive of resistance. Drawing from successful movements such as the anti-apartheid movement, we can speculate that an international, large-scale, well-planned and well-resourced nonviolent or nonkilling movement, including BDS campaigns against collaborator corporations, may have succeeded in overthrowing Nazism or at least considerably reducing its impact, particularly if it had occurred early enough. For example, while nonviolence could probably have done little to stop Luftwaffe planes which were en route to bomb London, it may have prevented those planes from being financed, built, fuelled and armed in the first place.

End Notes

1. Militarism is the complex social, cultural and discursive phenomenon responsible for directing people’s and organisations’ responses towards violent pathways, including the preparation for, and waging of, war.
2. In fact, according to Stephan and Chenoweth, ‘... major nonviolent campaigns have achieved success 53 percent of the time, compared with 26 percent for violent resistance campaigns’ (2008:8).
3. The thesis of Kurt Vonnegut’s novel Mother Night is that during WW2 too much good was done in secret and not enough done openly.
4. Some sources for this section are web-based. This author’s experience is that, in a cycle of silence, book publishers are reluctant to name these names without other books to reference them. See Paige 2009.
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**Letter to Ukraine**

How’s the arm, uncle, I hope you can repair the house without it: this winter is the coldest for one hundred years.

I saw you on the news picking through the wreckage before the militia shot you to keep their secret ─fat chance─ but that plane sure burnt up your wheatfield.

Unbelievable even in Ukraine a passenger plane downed and if you found a passport no-one will condemn you for using it to escape the violence the owner would understand. You can come here, uncle, even with another name, shorter, older and we will know who you are your rough village smile.

*John Synott, Brisbane, QLD*
A Ministry for Peace: Bringing peace to government

KEITH SUTER

This article recommends that countries create ministries for peace. Governments already contain institutionalised ‘military’ and ‘financial’ perspectives drawn from the defence and treasury ministries; there is a similar need for a ‘peace’ perspective. Among the ministry’s initial tasks would be creating a ‘culture of peace’, negotiating disarmament treaties, and preparing for the conversion of military facilities to peaceful purposes. The first such proposal was made eight decades ago and it was resisted by the Australian Government. It continues to be resisted but the idea has not died. It would require only a few governments to create such ministries for the idea to catch on (much the same way that governments all now accept the need for a ministry for the environment – which few had as recently as five decades ago).

The Proposal in Brief

There is a need to embed more peaceful perspectives in government. There are various perspectives already in government, for example, a ‘treasury’ perspective guarding against government expenditure and a ‘social welfare’ perspective in favour of extending the government’s mantle of care over its citizens. However, there is not a distinctive ‘peace’ perspective. There is no cabinet minister specifically engaged on peacebuilding activities.

The creation of a Ministry of Peace does not mean that the peace movement would become redundant. The establishment of environment ministries around the world has not made the environment movement redundant. Instead, the ministries have enabled the movement to do its work more effectively, not least by providing a cabinet minister as a focal point for some of its campaigns.

Government is organic: it responds to issues. For example, before the eighteenth century no government had a department of education. Education was seen as a private matter and of little concern to government. Now education is seen as very important. The expectation is that a ministry for peace would over time acquire the same high status.

Learning from History

The proposal for a Ministry of Peace is based on lateral thinking drawn from two experiences. First, there is the military-industrial complex. This phrase was coined in President Eisenhower’s 1961 Farewell Address to Congress. It was derived from his experience of seeing how the US Army had moved from being a small force in the inter-war period to becoming a large permanent factor in post-1945 American life, not least in politics and the economy.

The complex is now much larger than he could have imagined. For example, in July 2014 there were reports from the US Inspector-General for Afghanistan Reconstruction that US companies had supplied more weapons to Afghani forces than they could ever use. The complex has in effect acquired a life of its own, with its own inexorable expenditure patterns, all motivated by the desire to make profits.

Second, there is the permanent influence of the public service. Ministers are rarely a match intellectually for the leading bureaucrats. Candid politicians have admitted in their memoirs how they were under the influence of public servants. Politicians come and go; bureaucracies remain. There is strength in longevity and permanence that enables the bureaucracy to maintain its momentum.

Taking this factor into account, my proposal is for a permanent department staffed by public servants who have a vested interest in maintaining their careers – working for the betterment of humankind.

Tasks for the Ministry

Three immediate tasks for the Ministry of Peace would be, firstly, creating a ‘culture of peace’; secondly, negotiating disarmament; thirdly, preparing for the conversion of military facilities to peaceful purposes.

The UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) launched the concept of a culture of peace at an international congress in 1989 at Yamoussoukro, Ivory Coast (I was a member of the organising committee). Since that time ‘Peace’ is no longer just seen as the absence of conflict. Rather, ‘Peace’ is recognised as more than just passive: it is an active, continuous endeavour. In a culture of peace, dialogue and respect
for human rights replace violence; inter-cultural understanding and solidarity replace enemy images; the free flow of information replaces secrecy; and egalitarian partnerships and full empowerment of women succeed male domination.

The Ministry of Peace would publicise UNESCO’s Seville Statement (Adams 1989). In 1986, an international meeting convened in Seville by the Spanish National Commission for UNESCO, adopted a ‘Statement on Violence’. This statement refuted the notion that organised human violence is biologically determined. Humans are not genetically programmed to do violence to each other.

The Seville Statement contains five propositions. They all set out what does not cause war: war is not acquired from humankind’s animal ancestors; war is not inherited from our forebears, therefore we cannot blame our parents or ‘human nature’ for our warlike activities and, indeed, some societies have no tradition of warfare; war is not necessary to ensure a better standard of living. Humans can gain more from cooperation; war is not due to the biological composition of the brain and that humans need to be trained for combat; war is not due to some basic ‘instinct’ or any other single motivation.

It is necessary to gain international acceptance of the Seville Statement. At the end of World War II, UNESCO produced a statement on race, challenging the then fashionable notion that white people were genetically superior to black people. That statement, by receiving international endorsement and publicity, helped reshape attitudes to race.

The intention is to build a similar momentum in favour of the Seville Statement. People may still say that war is inevitable because it is somehow part of human nature – but they will not have the scientific arguments to support their opinions. Ministries for Peace would have the responsibility to do this work.

Second, the Ministry of Peace would absorb existing arrangements for disarmament negotiations and implementation. Disarmament should not be part of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs because the danger is that this issue is then subordinated to the many other concerns of foreign affairs and so not be treated as an important objective in its own right. For example, the negotiations are coloured by the need not to embarrass one’s own allies, while also looking for opportunities to criticise one’s opponents. Disarmament negotiations can easily become a form of warfare by other means.

The Ministry of Peace would also be the focal point for the creation and maintenance of a country’s peace research institutes. The institutes would not be government controlled. But, as governments provide research funds for science and technology, there should be more money for peace research and this could be allocated via the ministry.

Third, the ministry would oversee the conversion of military facilities to peaceful purposes. This should include the introduction of conversion over a planned period of time so as to ease the transition of military personnel into the civilian sector. For example, if the USSR had paid more attention to it, then present day Russia would have been spared many of the problems arising from just dumping military personnel and their equipment on the civilian employment market. Russia emerged from its communist era with little planning for peace. The US would have an even larger challenge.

The Proposal for the New Ministry

One of the world’s first attempts to create such a ministry was made in 1937, when the Australian branch of Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) recommended its creation to the Australian Government. The Government refused, arguing that it would duplicate the work of the then Department of External Affairs and, besides, the ‘publicly declared policy of the Australian Government was the promotion of harmonious relations with all countries’ (Suter 1984: 117) hence such a proposal was unnecessary. In 1982, the UN Association of Australia, of which I was the National President, again raised the issue and received much the same reply.

Meanwhile, it was unfortunate that the UN Association’s campaign received little support by the peace movement. The peace movement saw it as very low priority and somewhat ‘boring’ because it was grounded in ideas of public administration.

Attempts have also been made in the US, such as in 2001 by then Congressman Dennis Kucinich of Ohio, who introduced legislation to create a US Department of Peace. This department would have become a cabinet-level agency dedicated to peacemaking and the study of conditions conducive to both domestic and international peace. There is also a UK campaign.

The architect of the revived Australia campaign in the 1980s, the late Dr Stella Cornelius, often told me in conversations that people in later decades will wonder how governments thought that they could be serious about the quest for peace without having an organisation for it. Her imagination and dedication continue to inspire the campaign.
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Victory’s Arch

[El Arco de la Victoria in Madrid was built by order of the dictator Francisco Franco to commemorate the victorious rebellion known as the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939)]

What to make of this edificio imposed where old trenches scarred Universitaria and tore through Parque del Oeste down to the banks of the Manzanares? Neglected by Michelin, it’s noted in guides favoured by curious students.

A lesser sight, hardly top ten, handy for an uncommitted hour, a diversion from high culture in Paseo del Prado.

Yet here too we find art of a kind: lofty Minerva cast as charioteer hallows a triumph over abstractions, dignifies a despot's posturing, graces a cruzada to purify the savage soul of Spain, no word squandered on losers or thousands dumped in meant-to-be-forgotten graves. Besieged by screaming traffic, it hulks over barrios of the vanquished. Approach at your peril. Dead language swaddles a conqueror's boasts. Patria lies in beds of quarried stone. It stands Por Espana though not for broken Spain, voices choked with fear, strangled by decree. Concealed atop a column is a lookout never opened. What could it be observers are not allowed to see? Might we prove incapable of discerning 'them' from 'we'?

B. N. OAKMAN,
BENDIGO, VIC

Bones

This comes back in dreams
Face down in sour black earth
Where are they a mother’s fingers
Dig rumble of tanks the crack of
Sniper’s gun echo in her ribcage

Ear to ground she thinks about
Continental drift feels the plates
Trembling below shifting scarred
With age and repeated collision
She would move mountains

In the darkness a memory nursing
A newborn its sweet brain pulsing
Flash of bayonet the walls too thin
Too thin her fingers rake the soil
Where are the bones

LORRAINE McGURGAN,
BALLARAT, VIC

[WITH PERMISSION FROM THE AUTHOR, FROM BLOOD PLUMS 2014]
Preparing for Peace: A political economic perspective

FRANK STILWELL

A political economic perspective on preparing for peace emphasises these aspects: reallocation: shifting resources from military to peaceful purposes; redistribution: redressing the material economic inequalities that underpin so many social conflicts; and revival: harmonising economic, environmental and social goals to enable more fulfilling lives in a peaceful society.

Introduction

That matters of war and peace have an economic dimension is widely recognised. Would the USA and its allies, including Australia, have invaded Iraq in 2003 if Iraq’s main export was asparagus or bananas, rather than oil? Whether the military intervention was ‘all about oil’ is debatable, as Doran (2012) emphasises, but there is little doubt that it has been a major factor in the awful sequence of events that is still unfolding in the region.

The political dimension of conflict is even more obvious. Indeed, where there are economic interests there is always politics. Powerful people seeking personal advantages – such as ‘corporate welfare’ or low tax rates on high incomes – commonly influence the political institutions and policy processes. That influence can take many forms, ranging from the funding of political parties and ‘think tanks’ to outright corruption of politicians. The democratic political system of which modern societies boast is thereby subverted. The connection between capitalism and democracy, commonly posited by ideologues of the political right, looks ever more shaky. The formally egalitarian political principle of ‘one person, one vote’ becomes subordinated to the market economic principle of ‘one dollar, one vote’. It also bodes ill for peace because, wherever powerful sectional interests dominate over broader public interests, social conflict and its manifestations, including violence, are endemic.

Bringing together these economic and political considerations takes us onto the terrain of political economy. It gives us a lens – or multiple lenses – through which we can understand how societies use their resources for better or worse, for war or peace. It gives us a basis for understanding the inequalities of wealth and power that underpin so many ongoing social problems. Further, it gives us tools for considering different political economic arrangements that would be conducive to creating a more equitable, sustainable and peaceful society. It gives us another avenue for preparing for peace.

This article develops these themes by looking briefly at three political economic dimensions of the challenges that we currently face in a dangerous world – reallocating our resources to more peaceful purposes, creating greater social cohesion through the redistribution of wealth and fostering harmony between economic, environmental and broader social goals. These three political economic challenges may be summarised as (1) reallocation, (2) redistribution and (3) revival. As a prelude to their consideration in this article, we need to recognise the flaws in the ideological underpinning of the current arrangements, particularly the economic ideas that are used to defend the status quo.

Challenging Conventional Theories

People whose primary concern is with promoting peace may be forgiven for shying away from the study of economics. Understandably, they may regard that subject as not directly relevant to the necessary personal and social transformations. It may even be dismissed as part of the problem, not part of the solution. This is a view with which I have some empathy, based on seeing how economics is normally taught and applied. University research studies show that young people who are predisposed to selfish, competitive and materialistic behaviours are those most likely to be attracted to the study of economics. Other evidence shows that these personal behaviours – the characteristics of homo economicus – become yet more pronounced as a result of studying the subject. A mutually reinforcing process of selection and inculcation is evident – chicken and egg – irrespective of the intentions of the teachers and students. Maybe better not to go there, one may infer. Paradoxically, however, that is all the more reason for people concerned with the promotion of peace to venture forth, but by studying economics from a critical political economic perspective. Therein lie major insights.

First and foremost is the recognition that there is no one economic ‘truth’. On almost every conceivable issue –
certainly including questions about the relationships between economic conditions, social conflicts and the potential for peaceful solutions – there are competing theories. Economics has always been characterised by rival currents of thought that 'frame' the issues in different ways. Classical, neoclassical, institutional, Marxian, Keynesian and post-Keynesian perspectives are among the most well developed. That is why I titled my textbook on the subject ‘Political Economy: the Contest of Economic Ideas’ (Stilwell 2012). Everything is contestable. So proponents of peace should not be deterred by spurious claims about what is or is not ‘economically viable’.

Second is the recognition that values are deeply embedded throughout almost all economic inquiries and policy prescriptions. Notwithstanding the historical quest to structure economic inquiry as a ‘science’, the subject has never been value free. Some conventional economic analyses focus only on the efficiency of resource allocation, implying that the central concern of society should be with the avoidance of waste in achieving specified economic outcomes: on this reasoning, economics is all about means and is neutral as to the ends that efficiency serves. Other currents of political economic analysis focus more on equity, drawing attention to unevenness in the distribution of incomes and the inequality of opportunities. Yet other political economic currents focus explicitly on how well existing economic arrangements relate to broader social concerns with personal and community development, wellbeing, harmony and peace. One symbol of these different value-laden approaches is what economists measure – the total income generated by an economy (GDP) or a ‘genuine progress indicator’ (GPI) that provides a broader assessment of socio-economic wellbeing, taking account of the content of what is being produced and consumed. Making more armaments is a plus in the former calculation: it is a minus in the latter.

The third general lesson of political economy is the essential interconnectedness between economic, social, political and cultural phenomena. Because mainstream economics has become divorced from these broader concerns, it gives a partial, and often distorted, view of reality. Political economists are more comfortable with an interdisciplinary approach, drawing insights from other disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, geography, and environmental science, rather than imposing narrowly defined mainstream economic models onto complex social and ecological phenomena. This broader, more critical and challenging approach is particularly helpful in peace studies. An understanding of the complex interests and processes involved in shifting from a warlike to a peaceful society requires a political economy of conflict and peace.

### Reallocation

Perhaps the most obvious illustration of this political economic approach is in assessing the public benefits that would result from reallocating resources from military to peaceful purposes. The standard economic notion of ‘opportunity cost’ is relevant in this context. The opportunity cost of using resources in one way is the social benefit that would be generated by using them in a different way. So the opportunity cost of the Australian Government’s annual military expenditure is the dozens of schools and hospitals – or whatever would be the most socially preferred alternative – that those funds could have paid for instead. In this example the opportunity cost is ongoing, embedded in the government’s annual budget which specifies the financial commitment that is made to each broad category of public expenditure.

In 2014 this resource reallocation issue is particularly pertinent. Claiming the existence of a ‘budget emergency’, the Liberal-National coalition government led by Tony Abbott sought to introduce major expenditure cuts into its budget for 2014-5. The proposed cuts included unemployment benefits and family benefits, lowered indexation for age pensions, less tertiary education spending and the termination of universal free access to general medical practitioners’ services. Military ‘defence’ spending, on the other hand, was exempted from cuts. Many critics saw the budget as a clear expression of an extreme neoliberal agenda, seeking to introduce ‘the politics of austerity’ to Australia. Sixty-three Australian economists publicly castigated a budget of this type as unnecessary and inappropriate (The Australia Institute 2014), adding their voices to the countless Australians who had already criticised it as both dishonest and unfair. Meanwhile, the Abbott government has been cutting taxes – for corporations in general, for mining companies in particular and especially for the major generators of carbon emissions. In further contradiction to its claim of a budget emergency, it has also committed to expensive warfare.

In September 2014, without any prior parliamentary deliberation and with no apparent regard to costs or opportunity costs, the Abbott government committed the nation to renewed warfare in the Middle East. Its stated case for so doing was based on atrocities committed by Islamic State separatists in Iraq but, in a broader historical view, this ‘need’ for further military intervention is itself substantially the product of previous foreign incursions that have fuelled deep hatreds. It is hard to imagine that a new round of bombing will not create more of the same.

Political economists describe processes like these that have the characteristics of a vicious cycle as ‘circular and cumulative causation’ (Argyrous 2011). This contrasts...
with the mainstream economists’ common use of the ‘equilibrium’ concept when representing the economy as essentially stable, even in the face of ‘shocks’. No such equilibrium possibility exists in the current breakdown of social order in the Middle East. Rather, an endless cycle of violence results from the sequence of external intervention, anti-imperialist resentment, retaliation, terrorism, more intervention, and so on ad infinitum. Meanwhile, economic costs are evidently no significant constraint on the military adventure. So the opportunity costs cumulate, as public investments in the things that really matter for creating peaceful, productive and fair societies – both at home and abroad – are further neglected. A particularly potent symbol of that is the cutting of the budget allocation for foreign aid. Does the Abbott government expect that spending more on waging war and less on foreign aid will be conducive to producing long-term regional and global stability, development and peace?

Redistribution

Equity is a second key element in a political economy of peace. Inequity creates social and political tensions, sometimes erupting in military conflict and perpetually underpinning social problems with enormous costs. Consider the evidence on the relationships between inequality and crime, for example. As the epidemiologists Wilkinson and Pickett demonstrate in The Spirit Level (2009), there are strong statistical links. Wilkinson and Pickett’s book assembles data on the incidence of criminal activities and convictions per head of population in an array of OECD countries. Comparing this with data on the extent of economic inequality in those same countries shows a high degree of correlation. At the top of both distributions comes the USA, a country of glaring economic inequality and notoriously high rates of crime. At the other end of the distributions are more cohesive societies like Japan and the Scandinavian nations with much less inequality and lower crime rates.

Evidence on violence and prison incarceration shows similar correlations with economic inequality, as does evidence on mental and physical health, obesity, drug abuse and teenage pregnancies. The causal connections cannot be read directly off the statistical correlations, of course, but there are plausible social and psychological explanations. In the case of criminal behaviour, for example, a large gulf between ‘haves’ and ‘have-nots’ in any society can be expected to create an economic environment conducive to a high incidence of larceny – what one may wryly describe as ‘do-it-yourself’ redistribution. The ethos of fairness and social responsibility is further eroded where the super-rich are seen using legal loopholes to minimise their tax and/or engaging in political corruption. Social cohesion is the casualty and violence is one of its manifestations.

These pervasive social costs of economic inequality are increasingly widely recognised. The Pope of the Catholic Church has recently proclaimed that ‘inequality is the root of social ills’ (Bone 2015). In the more academic sphere, French political economist Thomas Piketty has rocketed to international fame as a result of his book Capital in the Twenty-First Century (2014) which charts the changing patterns of wealth inequality, drawing particular attention to the steeply rising inequality in the last four decades. Prominent US economist Joseph Stiglitz (2013) has also highlighted the corrosive social and political consequences of this increased economic inequality. Research in the flourishing field of ‘happiness studies’ confirms that, beyond escaping from material poverty, there is a poor correlation between increased income and greater personal happiness. Indeed, as pointed out in a previous contribution to this journal (Stilwell and Jordan 2007), there are strong reasons to expect increased inequality to give rise to lower standards of social wellbeing and contentment.

To extend the reasoning to more explicit consideration of the prospects for peace takes little leap of imagination. If extreme economic inequality intensifies social problems and reduces happiness, an inverse connection with social cohesion and social harmony is quite predictable. It creates the context in which conflict, violence and warfare flourish. It is also a context in which international agreements are hard to establish and maintain. The current problem of securing effective cooperation on policies to combat climate change is a case in point. Unless there is a perception of all being ‘in the same boat’, international agreements are difficult to create, especially where ‘equality of sacrifice’ is required by people in different nations with vastly different material living standards. Although it would be unacceptably time-delaying to require radical redistribution as a precondition for policies towards peace and sustainability, they must necessarily be co-requisites. Peace or sustainability without social justice is simply unobtainable.

Revival

Turning from reallocation and redistribution to revival signals a yet more comprehensive agenda. It directs our attention to the broader array of political economic changes, especially in relation to work and economy-environment interactions, that would make conflicts less likely in the first place. These are changes with potentially ‘win-win’ characteristics for all sections of society. As with any reallocations and redistributions, of course, some people may well be short-term winners or losers: but it is the longer-term perspective that redirects the focus to areas of mutual benefit where troublesome trade-offs are less pronounced.

The analysis of James O’Connor (2011) provides us with a framework for considering some political economic
aspects of these challenges. Following Marx, O'Connor identifies the primary tension of the capitalist economy – its first contradiction – as that between capital and labour. Capital employs labour, not vice versa. It is from this power asymmetry that the possibility of exploitation arises. Indeed, exploitation is a systemic requirement of capitalism, because creating an economic surplus over and above the wages paid to workers is necessary for businesses to make profits. And it is because those profits are the driving force of capitalism that an inherent class conflict is embedded in its normal working. Not surprisingly, industrial relations problems are pervasive wherever that class conflict overshadows the potential benefits of more cross-class cooperation. Struggles over wages, working conditions, and the distribution of the fruits of productivity improvements are recurrent.

Yet, that is not all there is to the economic roots of social conflict. O'Connor identifies a second seam of conflict that is of equal importance – what he calls the second contradiction of capitalism. This arises from the tension between capital and nature. Capitalist businesses use natural resources of various kinds – minerals, water and air. Correspondingly, profits increase when payments for the use of these resources are low. Moreover, it is not only natural resources that may be plundered: a similar capitalist logic relates to the private appropriation of any community resources, such as urban land, infrastructure or social services. Hence the broader array of tensions over public goods and private interests, supplementing the pervasive capital-labour conflicts, that is evident in modern capitalist societies. These are the political focus of many progressive social movements pressing for change.

Much follows from this political economic analysis. It is helpful analytically, but also prescriptively. For people concerned with creating a more peaceable society, indicative policy areas include: cooperative strategies for improving industrial relations through workers’ involvement in business decision making; creating better balance between working time and time for creative leisure; extension of community control over public goods; improved land use and urban planning; and policies to create more harmonious and sustainable economy-environment relations. Expressed in these very general terms, these may indeed seem to be ‘pie in the sky’ aspirations. The task for progressive political economists, and for others motivated to develop a shared progressive agenda, is to spell out the policy priorities in more detail and to develop strategies for their effective pursuit.

The concept of a ‘steady state economy’ (Daly and Cobb 1994; Czech 2013; Washington 2014) has strong resonance in this context. It is because capitalism is geared for perpetual growth that many of the societal and environmental problems have intensified. Prioritising profits and capital accumulation go hand-in-hand with increasing inequality, privatising public goods and degrading nature. Particularly in the current era, as people come to understand the inevitable stresses resulting from resource depletion, climate change and other environmental disasters, there is growing recognition that the current economic system is unsustainable. Transitioning to a steady state economy is necessary if further international conflicts and resource wars are to be avoided.

There is necessarily an anti-capitalist element in this sort of alternative political economic agenda. However, there is nothing novel nor insurmountable about that. Progressive economic and social reforms have sought, in many countries and with considerable success over two centuries, to temper the profit-seeking character of capitalism with other social concerns relating to equity, civility and participatory democracy. It need not be all or nothing. ‘Radical reforms’ – to use the terminology of the French social scientist Andre Gorz (1999) – can pave the way for longer-term transformations. It is a matter of pushing for progressive ideas, behavioural change and public policy reforms that can counter and progressively displace the prevailing neoliberal policies, ideologies and interests. Drawing from the experience of social democracy in Sweden, Higgins and Dow’s Politics Beyond Pessimism (2013) shows what can be done if there is sufficient determination and organisation. An important political implication arising from O’Connor’s analysis is that both organised labour and progressive social movements need to be working together in this process of seeking progressive political change.

Conclusion
Changing track is seldom easy. Individuals have to deal with sometimes difficult consequences of their commitments when making decisive life choices, such as becoming vegetarian, abstaining from alcohol, migrating to another country, or investing time and money in further formal education. The challenges are many times greater for whole societies trying to change track, because of the vested economic interests, prevailing ideologies and institutions that inhibit the changes – and even try to render them ‘unthinkable’. Yet when on an unsustainable trajectory, change is essential. That indeed is the current state of play. We have a society based on a political economic system that is conflict-prone, insecure, inequitable and unsustainable. It is one that must fundamentally change; and should do so in a way that fosters more cooperative and peaceful outcomes. While political economists cannot claim a privileged place in analysing the processes, problems, policies and prospects for that transformation, they can contribute to a more collective understanding of the challenges and options. Considering the peaceful
possibilities for reallocation, redistribution and revival is a start.
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I was a junior clerk, young enough to have escaped the barrel roll of Gorton’s conscription marbles, when word went around the 15th floor a pod of bleeding hearts with jungle drums was chucking on a demo outside, demanding we save East Timor from Suharto’s goons.

Myself and a few other juniors, giggling and jostling, pressed our noses against the government glass and peered down at the Lego drummers and their handful of placards that were flapping and flailing, like dying sails in the wind tunnels of Chiffley Square, when I smelled him behind my back.

Old Pearson, the office zombie, pulling the pin on his Mills bomb past.

I was 20…First lieutenant…

…Signals …semi-fluent in Japanese …. 

He mumbled on in baritone recall of comrades beheaded or trucked away, long lost moss-man faces in bamboo; his transmitter fading…

somewhere south of Dare not a drink all day a criado crawled ha half a mile at least didn’t know me from Adam canvas bag on his Bony back to pass across stale water. It filled my throat like bloody snow.

Just then, the chief clerk sneaked up behind us. Red-faced, we pin-balled desk-ward. But not old Pearson.

Mind Les if I take an early?

And he went.

I was the Chief Clerk myself when the next demo came around. Surrounded by my contract casuals I watched them press their noses against glass, trying to penetrate the canopy of banners below. Tim something, a corporal in the Reserves, dropped down in a snipers’ crouch and began parting the office ferns.

Like co-observers in a Black Hawk hatch, we peered down and saw banner poles hammering against soft asphalt as the war chants: Come on down! Send in the Troops! Come on down! rose up in jungle Morse.

When we descended the stairs I could hear the transmissions shift and scrap against our walls, like marbles mixing down the barrel of a new millennium.

ROGER VICKERY,
FRESHWATER, NSW
Building a Culture of Peace to Replace the Culture of War

COLIN POWER

This article argues that we must re-engineer national systems of education, replacing education for a culture of war with education for a culture of peace, as a fundamental aspect of laying the foundations for creating alternatives to war. The article examines what this implies for early childhood, schools and higher education, the obstacles to be faced and the progress made, with a particular focus on the work of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

Introduction

'Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed' (UNESCO 1999). The first sentence of the Constitution of UNESCO reminds us that war and violence are learned behaviours. As a song in the musical South Pacific puts it: ‘You have to be taught, you have to be carefully taught to hate all the people your relatives hate. You have to be carefully taught’. To create a culture of peace, all citizens need to be carefully taught throughout their lives to respect the dignity of others, to resolve conflicts peacefully, and to live together in peace and harmony. This article draws on the analyses of the contribution made by UNESCO and its university partners to promote international understanding and solidarity through education for peace, human rights and democracy and the sharing of research and experience (UNESCO 1997; Power 2015).

From Revising Textbooks to Education for a Culture of Peace

Each national system of education reflects the type of political system and society that its government seeks to maintain or to create. The allied leaders who founded the UN system at the end of World War II were well aware of the extent to which totalitarian regimes had misused schools, colleges and universities to build a ‘culture of war’, while grudgingly admitting that their education systems and media had played an important role in support of their own position and war effort (UNESCO 1997).

UNESCO’s first steps in seeking to create a culture of peace focused on the revision of the history, geography and civics textbooks being used in schools and universities. The pressure to eliminate stereotyping, racism and bias in textbooks, educational policies and practices has ebbed and flowed, peaking in the immediate post-World War II years, again as the former colonies of European powers gained their independence and again in the countries of Eastern Europe and the former USSR as they moved towards democracy. The revision of textbooks and school curricula has proved to be a politically sensitive, even explosive, issue. Genocide, mass slaughter, torture, rape and other crimes committed by dictators, the military or secret police are often conveniently ignored or camouflaged in the educational programmes and materials produced or authorised for use in schools by the government of the offending country (UNESCO 1997).

Under the determined leadership of Federico Mayor (UNESCO Director-General 1988-1999), the creation of ‘a culture of peace’ to replace the dominant ‘culture of war’ became a key priority for UNESCO throughout the 1990s. The multi-disciplinary, inter-sectoral project ‘Towards a Culture of Peace’ provided a framework for action in countries torn apart by armed conflict. In countries like El Salvador, Congo, Burundi, Sudan and Rwanda, Forums for Education and Culture of Peace set about the task of reforming and reconstructing the education systems of countries ravaged by war. Priority groups included refugees and displaced persons, demilitarised soldiers (including child soldiers), girls and women, the disabled and traumatised children. UNESCO supported government and non-government programmes providing training for peace managers, the military, police and teachers in conflict management and working with traumatised children, as well as the establishment of UNESCO Chairs on Peace Education (Power 2015).
greater emphasis in education programmes to national and international ‘heroes’ of peace, human rights, culture and the environment.

In 1999, the UN General Assembly adopted the Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace to ensure that children from an early age onwards benefit from ‘education on the values, attitudes, modes of behaviour and ways of life to enable them to resolve any dispute peacefully and in a spirit of respect for human dignity and of tolerance and non-discrimination’. Neither democracy nor peace can be imposed from above. They grow from the bottom up. UNESCO’s long term objective has been to develop a complete system of education and training for peace, human rights and democracy, tolerance, nonviolence and international understanding aimed at all population groups and encompassing all levels of education (Power 1998, 2011).

Basic Education

A start must be made in early childhood to develop the essential values and behaviour patterns if we are to learn to live together in peace. A child’s education begins in the home. Parents play a critical role in laying the foundations for human development. In both the home and early childhood centres, children need to be given opportunities to learn how to relate to others and to resolve conflicts peacefully. They also need to learn that resorting to violence is unacceptable as a way of dealing with conflicts and difficulties (Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding (APCEIU) 2009; Power 2007; UNESCO-EFA 2007).

When families or communities are under severe stress and conflicts often lead to violence, the message conveyed to children is that one deals with conflicts by aggression. The problem is compounded if the role models for dealing with competition and conflict in the community and the media use aggressive or coercive means to achieve their goals. We need both parent education and more regulation of the media in homes and communities where violence is a way of life (APCEIU 2009; Power 2007; UNESCO-EFA 2007).

Children need not only love and security, but also opportunities to learn how conflicts can be resolved peacefully. Both primary and secondary schools can play an important role in helping children to learn to live together and to resolve conflicts peacefully. UNESCO Associated Schools Project and APCEIU publications (see www.unesco.org: www.unescoapceiu.org) provide a rich source of practical examples, stories, community projects, games, dramatisation, simulation activities and films designed to develop the values and behaviour patterns embedded in a culture of peace (e.g. reciprocity, equality, respect, fairness, nonviolence). There is now a growing literature on the pedagogy of education for a culture of peace at the school level. Lim and Deutsch (1996) analysed the experience in different parts of the world to overcome youth violence through school-based programmes. They found that all such programmes used role playing and most used real conflicts, simulations, games, group discussions and demonstrations. The evidence suggests that students who participate in these programmes develop better social skills, more self-esteem and a sense of self-control over their lives. However, most evidence is anecdotal and there has not been enough high quality research to determine the precise conditions under which programmes and strategies are effective in reducing levels of violence. More recent work on conflict resolution (Deutsch and Coleman 2000), learning and moral development (Renshaw and Power 2003), and peace education (Page 2010; Patti, Semeno and Martin, 2008) provide further insights into the effectiveness of alternative approaches to educating for peace, human rights and international understanding. These have served to inform efforts to promote learning to live together (UNESCO-IBE 2003).

Education plays an important role in empowering citizens with the knowledge, skills and values needed for them to play an effective role in creating a culture of peace and the prevention of violence. But as we know it, schooling is not the same as education. Some educational systems and institutions are disempowering; some fuel conflicts rather than helping to resolve them. The sad fact is that systems of education and schools can be manipulated negatively, as they were in Nazi Germany, Serbia and Rwanda. Ways in which education has been manipulated include:

- denying education to certain groups
- using education to suppress language and cultural values
- segregated education that maintains inequality
- destruction or forced closure of schools
- manipulation of textbooks and curricula for political purposes
- inculcation of attitudes of superiority

These characteristics have all been present in the education systems of countries that have been wrecked over the past decades by terrible civil wars – Algeria, Angola, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Congo, Ethiopia, Haiti, Guatemala, Lebanon, Mozambique, Northern Ireland, Rwanda, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Syria. UNESCO has constantly battled against each and every one of the ways in which education has been abused and misused, its objective being to promote inclusive quality education; an education that empowers the oppressed and helps to ensure their rights are protected. It works...
at dismantling the diverse ways in which education has been manipulated by authoritarian regimes in their quest for power and to eliminate dissent.

To ensure that education plays an effective role in combating terrorism and building a culture of peace, one needs the kind of education that simultaneously improves the quality of life of both individuals and the wider society; an education that is empowering in the sense that it promotes learning to live together and the peaceful resolution of conflicts (Power 2015; Rosenberg 2010). Some education systems and schools follow an explicit educational philosophy based on active participation in community life aimed at peace, tolerance, respect for diversity and international understanding. The education systems of nations ranked highly by Freedom House (2013) in terms of the extent to which civil liberty and human rights are respected by their governments are good examples (predominantly the Scandinavian countries). At the school level, Quaker, Waldorf, Steiner, Montessori, International Bureau of Education (IBE) and Buddhism-oriented schools are good examples, as are schools designated as ‘Schools of Peace’ that are part of UNESCO’s Associated Schools Network.

Higher Education

By definition, higher education is primarily concerned with the transmission and development of knowledge at the most advanced level. However, building a culture of peace and nonviolence through higher education has had a chequered and difficult history. Deemed to be important immediately after World War II, peace education was often seen as a front for communist propaganda by the US and some of its allies. Certainly, peace featured prominently in the rhetoric of the Soviet bloc during the Cold War, while the West put more emphasis on freedom, human rights and democracy. UNESCO’s concept of education for international understanding tried to accommodate the two positions, and is reflected in the 1974 Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (UNESCO 1974). Revised in 1994, this instrument defines education for peace, human rights and democracy as a key component in all stages and forms of modern education (UNESCO 1994).

The peace education programmes provided by universities draw on a broad spectrum of fields of study: analysis of theories and changing conceptions of the nature of peace, war and conflict; conflict resolution; human rights and democracy; peace-keeping, peace-building and the prevention of violence at the international, national, local and domestic level (Danesh, 2006; Harris, 2008). In addition, elements of education for peace and international understanding can be found in a wide range of university courses, but as yet we have no clear picture of the extent to which building a culture of peace is embedded in the mainstream of higher education teaching programmes (Power 2011).

The research being undertaken in university peace study centres plays a crucial role in deepening our understanding of the educational, social and political contexts conducive to the creation of a culture of peace. It also yields insights into the processes leading to violence, terrorism, genocide and war (Bara 2014; Taydas and Peksen 2012; Toohey 2014). Contemporary research expands our understanding of the mindset of fundamentalist groups, the pedagogy of indoctrination and psychological processes leading to extremism and acts of terrorism. For example, Moghaddam (2005) reminds us that very few of those who feel they have been unfairly treated end up being recruited into a terrorist organisation. Having set out the steps on the ‘staircase to terrorism’, he elaborates on four principles that need to be borne in mind when responding to the challenges posed by extremism and terrorist groups:

- Prevention must come first
- Support contextualised democracy through procedural justice
- Educate against categorical ‘us versus them’ thinking
- Promote objectivity and justice.

The evidence on conditions that heighten the risk of ethnic, religious and political violence in specific contexts needs to be considered when national and international policies directed at building inclusive institutions and a culture of nonviolence are being forged and implemented. To serve the ‘common good’, universities with expertise in peace education have a key role to play in contributing to the development of policies aimed at reducing the risk of violence.

Towards the end of the twentieth century, the dominant forces driving national policy agendas were the economic ideologies underpinning globalisation. Higher education came to be valued inasmuch as it has been seen to serve as the engine of economic growth and innovation (UNESCO 1998). Priority is given in higher education to areas deemed by governments and institutions to be important in improving productivity in a highly competitive global economy (Marginson 2007). Thus, in most higher education systems, peace and international understanding tend to be supported only to the degree that aspects of them contribute to economic growth, while other aspects are marginalised (Power 2015). It is vital that higher education institutions play a proactive role in demonstrating how their teaching, research and community engagement activities contribute to peacebuilding and security, and thus to development.
Prospects for Creating a Culture of Peace

There is a remarkable scarcity of resources for the promotion of a culture of peace in comparison with the immense amounts spent on arms, ‘defence’ and military interventions. The cause of human rights, peace and inter-religious understanding has suffered even more in the aftermath of September 11. A number of powerful heads of government have inflamed old religious prejudices and ethnic stereotypes to justify their political objectives. Recent conflicts, as well as the war against terror, confirm that the culture of war continues to dominate the thinking of governments and the military. They still often bypass the UN as a mechanism for resolving conflicts and ignore international conventions. They still hide inconvenient truths, the magnitude and human cost of the arms trade, war crimes, blunders, civilian casualties and the environmental footprint. To legitimate armed intervention and acts of violence, governments and their spin-doctors often resort to the politics of hatred to dehumanise and demonise the ‘other’ (Goldhagen 2009).

As the Fundación Cultura de Paz (2005) in Madrid points out, not enough effort has been made by governments and higher education institutions to create a culture of peace, or to encourage the acquisition by all learners of a basic level of knowledge and understanding of the world’s main cultures, civilisations and religions. The situation is not all black. For example, the Spanish parliament approved a law in 2005 on Education for a Culture of Peace. The law recognises the decisive role that education must play in replacing the culture of violence with a culture of peace. The World Report on the Culture of Peace (Fundación Cultura de Paz 2005) documents the active role played by some seven hundred civil society organisations from one hundred countries during the first five years of the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World. Today, slowly but surely, the global movement for a culture of peace is beginning to advance once more as concerns within civil society about the human cost and futility of wars mount, and the international community begins to understand the magnitude of the threats posed by global warming, the dark side of globalisation, racism and violence within states.

Apart from self-defence in response to an armed attack, just war theory holds that it can be lawful to intervene when regimes commit crimes against humanity (Robertson 2006). The Responsibility to Protect Framework (Evans 2008) argues that humanitarian interventions are legitimate provided that:

- There is a just cause, defined as systematic and large-scale loss of life
- There is a Security Council resolution conferring the authority to intervene
- The intentions of those intervening are honourable
- Proportional means are exercised
- There is a likelihood of success
- States intervening assume responsibility for rebuilding the country after hostilities have ceased

In practice, the above conditions are rarely met, and thus the legality of many of the armed interventions in recent times is questionable. The UN Security Council also has all too often fallen short for the reasons set out by Annan (2005), Robertson (2006) and Goldhagen (2009). The issue of the ‘veto power’ currently enjoyed by the five permanent members of the Council has to be tackled head-on, the major difficulty being the refusal to allow a strengthening of the role of the UN by the world’s most powerful nations. Much also remains to be done to put in place a serious international prevention, intervention and legal system capable of resolving armed conflicts and humanitarian crises.

Goldhagen (2009) argues that the mass annihilations and eliminations are more deadly and horrific than wars. In the twentieth century, estimates of the numbers perishing through mass political murder, genocides or other means of elimination are about one hundred and seventy million — almost three times the number killed (sixty-one million) in the two world wars. The most brutal wars now are being waged within states, rather than between states. With that, the rules of war as set out in the Geneva and other UN Conventions are also being questioned and circumvented, for example, under the guise of the ‘war on terror’ or the blanket of sovereignty (Robertson 2006).

What UNESCO is trying to do in promoting education for a culture of peace poses a political threat in the sense that it challenges the structures of authority, dominance and control that support authoritarian governments or leaders. Educating for peace, human rights and freedom is particularly difficult when those in power maintain that power by force. In such cases, ‘education’ is an inherently ideological instrument. Re-engineering education systems, transforming school programmes and correcting injustices is, therefore, a slow and difficult process.

Conclusion

of the Commonwealth Commission on Respect and Understanding’ 2007). Humankind has struggled for freedom, justice and peace for centuries. Progress may be slow and uncertain, but the cause of education for peace, human rights and democracy is not lost (Power 2011, 2015). It is part of the education of children, youth and adults in the majority of countries of the world. Recent acts of terrorism, mass murder and torture are all the more reason why we must continue to strive to build a culture of peace, and to work at eradicating the deep-seated causes of violent conflicts: intolerance, prejudice, greed, discrimination and indifference to the suffering and slaughter of others. ‘Be sure,’ La Fontaine and Delors reminded us, ‘not to sell the inheritance our forebears left us: a treasure lies concealed therein’ (UNESCO 1996). Education, everything that humanity has learned about itself, is that treasure. Slowly but surely, the peoples of the world are learning that we must educate for a culture of peace to replace the dominant culture of war if we are to build a better world for our children.
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The Curve of Forgetting (for Wilfred Owen)

We escaped down a dull tunnel, down the curve of forgetting.  
We slid a hundred years in the mud of amnesia and re-remembering  
the war that chlorined our nerves to shreds,  
the war in the air and the scientific production of the inglorious dead.

Now we celebrate the centenary of its unfolding  
with abundant sentiment for the longevity, the accumulation, the bodies: numberless as stars.  
It’s sales time in the department store of history. Bring your flags, your wallets, your tears  
all airbrushed in nostalgic sepia, not unlike mustard gas in the sunrise,  
as noted in the diaries from the trenches; funny how the stench of death sharpens the senses.

Or we can map it on the curve of forgetting.  
$R = E - t/s$ where $R$ is memory retention, $S$ the strength of memory and $T$ is Time.  
But what is $E$? $E$ is the event, the birth  
of the world, the big bang, God, the uncertainty, the big E.

And what when $E$ means wars? Real soldiers do not speak of them, lost for words, still getting home.  
But the war museums know all about them, their causes, the archives of the perpetrators,  
the campaigns meticulously researched, the laser displays and public monuments;  
and the book publishers love them, so many editions could pave a battlefield;  
and the moviemakers keep bums on seats with the deeds and damage of heroes.

The memory of war bends; the closer to the Event we search, the more dust we find.  
Memories burn in the flames, there are nothing but holes to sift. Ask the survivors of Hiroshima. Ask the napalmed villagers, the foxholed, the gas chambered, the tortured,  
the raped, to give us their memories. Don’t they owe us?  
Their nightmares are not memories. We want the eyewitness.

And then the blockade was over. What happened, you were there. Were you alone?  

Time. Time will tell. Time will lie.  
Eyewitness accounts are famously unreliable.  
Fifteen minutes after the event we forget 20%  
After one day 40%, after two days 60%.  
Then it’s an open field for demagogues and the memory peddlers.

We were all dying of our own hands, the weapons we made with science worked so well they barely needed us except as targets to kill, such easy targets our little skins and bones in motion.  
Only one of us, Owen, a soldier shot on a raft in the Sambre-Oise Canal, called for compassion  
but we buried the pity of war with him before we left on the curve of forgetting.

John Synott,  
Brisbane, QLD
Margaret Reynolds reflects on her experiences as a peace activist and parliamentarian 1966-1999. In this commentary she traces her personal journey within the Peace Movement as a young mother opposed to conscription, a peace activist, councillor and parliamentarian. She contrasts her own experiences with the more limited role of peace advocates today and asks why there are so few voices of dissent as Australia yet again embarks on an overseas military campaign.

Is Today's Silence Consent?

It is not easy to focus on a theme of peace at this time when Australians are being urged to fear the ongoing risks of terrorism. News broadcasts remind us daily that Australia is again embroiled in overseas conflict, yet there are few people questioning this national preoccupation with military solutions.

I recently searched the internet for detail of an emerging new peace movement but sadly discovered there was very limited debate and even less organisation. There is commentary from individuals, church based groups and the ever vigilant Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom but, as yet, there is little evidence that the Australian community will mobilise against another military campaign that is distant from our shores. Yet Australia has a strong tradition of peace activism and in the current climate it is depressing that so few voices are raised in opposition.

The Anti-War Movement in the 1960s

It was not my experience when, in 1966, as a young mother I set up a branch of the anti-conscription organisation Save our Sons and joined the Townsville Peace Committee opposing Australia’s participation in the Vietnam War. We were part of a national movement bringing together a broad coalition of individuals, church groups, trade unions, politicians and students opposed to the government’s policy of committing conscripts to war. The Vietnam Moratorium grew in influence, contributing to a change of national government in 1972 when newly elected Prime Minister Gough Whitlam announced the end of conscription and the withdrawal of Australian troops.

Later in the 1970s the Townsville Peace Committee was vocal in opposing United States military bases on Australian soil and the visits of nuclear war ships and B52 bombers. By this time, as an elected city councillor I was part of the campaign to oppose uranium mining at Ben Lomond west of Townsville and our Council of all ALP-endorsed candidates declared the city nuclear free. During this period, ‘People for Nuclear Disarmament’ was extremely active organising regular meetings, marches and rallies. These activities were closely scrutinised by the Queensland Special Branch and information about us was passed on to ASIO, but we maintained this level of activism because we believed in the strength of our arguments.

Working for Peace within the Parliament

In 1983 I was elected to the Australian Senate as a member of Bob Hawke’s Labor Government and found myself lobbied by certain influential members to accept the mining and export of uranium. Despite a policy shift that endorsed this approach at the Labor Party National Conference in July 1983, there remained within the Labor Caucus a vocal group of parliamentarians committed to peace and disarmament. When, in Washington, Prime Minister Hawke indicated some interest in the US Star Wars program and the MX missile, there was an outcry from a number of government parliamentarians and peace activists and Australian involvement in those programs did not eventuate.

During the mid-1980s, there were few women parliamentarians but, as members of the Hawke Government, we worked in solidarity with a number of groups where women were especially active, including Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, the Union of Australian Women and Women for Survival. Women were protesting against the establishment of US military bases in Australia and especially the operation of joint facilities at Pine Gap. There was a large Women’s Peace Camp set up for a week on the lawns outside Old Parliament House in 1984. Labor members and senators offered women and their children opportunities to use the Parliamentary facilities. This earned the ire of several of our opposition sisters who made indignant speeches in the Senate against such supportive action!
In the same year, I was able to visit the Women’s Peace Camp at Greenham Common in Berkshire, England, where campaigners lived through many wintry months in opposition to the launching of Cruise Missiles from the adjacent military base. We maintained the link between these different women’s peace groups for several years and some of us met again many years later in 1995 at the United Nations World Women’s Conference in Beijing.

By 1989, as a minister in the third Hawke Government, I welcomed 300 delegates from around the globe to the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom Congress in Sydney. The theme ‘Women Building a Common and Secure Future’ gave me an opportunity to outline some of the peace-building efforts of the national government.

As a Labor Government we had appointed the first Ambassador for Disarmament to represent Australia at multilateral disarmament meetings. The government was closely involved in nuclear arms control through membership of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. We were actively opposed to all nuclear testing and, especially, French testing at Mururoa Atoll in the Pacific. The government played a leading role in negotiations for developing an international Chemical Weapons Convention.

I was proud of the Australian Government’s efforts in peace-building but continued to be wary of the implications of the relationship with the United States. Therefore when, in 1991, Prime Minister Bob Hawke committed Australia to the American led Gulf War I was one of nine government members who refused to support this decision. Earlier, we had drafted a statement urging the United Nations to focus on the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait and advocated demilitarisation of the Middle East.

Our stand for conflict resolution was not appreciated by the ALP National Executive which wrote us letters of reprimand for not following the majority decision. However, in contrast, we received hundreds of letters and messages of congratulations from around the country reminding us that not all Australians automatically line up to fight in distant wars.

During my last six years in the parliament, I represented a group called Parliamentarians for Global Action at a number of international conferences. The key aims of that organisation, representative of some fifty parliaments, coincided with my background as a peace advocate because we focused on the nuclear test ban, non-proliferation, and United Nations peace keeping. On a number of occasions I was quizzed by overseas colleagues about the close relationship between Australia and the US because, clearly, they were confused about Australia not confining itself to policies of independence and peace keeping. It is the fundamental issue that haunts our foreign policy yet no government to date can resist those calls from Washington.

It is not surprising that after my own experiences and subsequent monitoring of national politics I now ask myself, ‘Where have all the peace activists gone?’

**We Need to Celebrate our Tradition of Peace-Making**

Not only is the current national debate about ‘terrorism’ so blinkered, but Australians are encouraged to glorify past military exploits with such fervour that a new generation must assume that war is the only way to attract recognition.

As we approach the Anzac Centenary, the nation is being bombarded with propaganda about the virtues of this and other military campaigns. Naturally, the personal trauma of military personnel and their families must be remembered but the current level of official enthusiasm for war memories contradicts the views of many returned service men and women who know only too well that there have to be alternatives to military solutions.

It is ironic that, at the very same time as this glorification of wars is underway, the centenary of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom celebrates its first meeting in The Hague, in April 1915. Over the years, thousands of Australians have worked for peace and conflict resolution. Together with women peace activists like Vida Goldstein, Eleanor Moore, Stella Cornelius and Jo Valentine, they have urged their governments to find another way to resolve conflict. But it seems unlikely the Australian Government will match its preoccupation for remembering war to also recognise those who have strived for peace.

**Author**

Margaret Reynolds has been a committed peace activist for nearly fifty years since the Vietnam War years politicised her and led her to question why Australia was so preoccupied with war.

'I am not only a pacifist but a militant pacifist. I am willing to fight for peace. Nothing will end war unless the people themselves refuse to go to war'.

Albert Einstein
Whatever Happened to Social Defence?

Brian Martin

A potential alternative to military defence is nonviolent action by civilians, using methods such as protests, strikes, boycotts and winning over opponent troops. In the 1980s there were groups in several countries advocating and promoting this option, but subsequently it faded from view even within the peace movement. Meanwhile, nonviolent action has become a more prominent and acknowledged method, especially for challenging repressive governments, as illustrated by the events in Serbia, Georgia, Tunisia, Egypt and elsewhere. Why has nonviolent defence disappeared from the agenda while other uses of nonviolent action have thrived? One explanation is that challenging particular rulers is less threatening to the systems of state and corporate power than is an alternative that empowers the people. Converting military defence into civilian-based systems potentially undermines all types of rule and is thus far more radical.

Introduction

Imagine a country where the people decide to get rid of military forces. Instead, they organise themselves to defend their freedoms without any weapons, by using methods such as protests, boycotts, strikes and sit-ins. They develop skills in foreign languages and persuasion to be able to talk to any foreign troops and win them over. They develop secure communication systems to be able to interact with each other as well as internationally. They prepare factories and farms so they can be shut down if an invader tries to take them over. They adopt decentralised systems of energy and water so the population cannot be held to ransom. They make strong connections with anti-war and pro-democracy groups in other countries, encouraging them to prepare to oppose any aggressive actions by their own governments.

The idea of defending a population without using violence was sparked by examples of popular nonviolent resistance to oppression. In the 1850s and 1860s, Hungarians used a range of methods of noncooperation to resist domination by the Austrian empire, and eventually succeeded (Csapody and Weber 2007). From 1898 to 1905, Finnish people used nonviolent means to resist Russian domination (Huxley 1990). In the first half of the 1900s, Gandhi led struggles in South Africa and India that inspired people around the world about the possibilities for opposing oppression using methods of nonviolent action (Brown 1987; Dalton 1993). If government repression can be successfully resisted without violence, then why not defend against military attack using the same sorts of methods?

Bertrand Russell wrote about defence without violence in 1915, and others expressed similar ideas (de Ligt 1937). Beginning in the 1950s, several writers, researchers and pacifist groups developed these ideas more systematically (e.g., Boserup and Mack 1974; Ebert 1968; Galtung 1958; Roberts 1967). For example, Stephen King-Hall, a former British naval officer, proposed that Britain, to defend parliamentary democracy and the British way of life against a possible Soviet invasion, get rid of its own military forces and instead prepare to defend nonviolently (King-Hall 1958).

In the 1980s, in response to an increased threat of nuclear war in Europe, a massive peace movement emerged and became influential in much of the world. The nuclear threat also inspired greater interest in nonviolent alternatives to military systems. The Green Party in Germany took up the concept promoted by Theodor Ebert (1981) and made this part of its platform. Activist groups in several countries studied and promoted nonviolent defence. In the Netherlands, there were a dozen groups, some of them looking at specific contributions to resistance, for example by public servants. In the US, the Civilian-Based Defense Association promoted nonviolent alternatives to the military. In Australia, Canberra Peacemakers interviewed tradespeople, public servants and others about methods for resisting a coup or attack (Quilty et al. 1986). The Swedish and Norwegian peace movements were active on the issue (Johansen 1990), and the Swedish government included social defence as part of its system called ‘total defence’, which includes military, civil and psychological defence. Significant works were produced by writers such as Robert Burrowes (1996) in Australia, Antonino Drago (2006) in Italy, Johan Niezing (1987) in the Netherlands and Gene Sharp (1985, 1990) in the US, among others.
It seemed, during the 1980s, that the momentum towards finding nonviolent alternatives to military systems might continue to grow. But instead of growth, interest in such alternatives went into serious decline in the 1990s, along with the rest of the peace movement. Today, nonviolent defence is the primary interest of only a few researchers (e.g., Drago 2006) and activist groups (e.g., in Germany, Bund für Soziale Verteidigung). In Europe, where there was little prospect of military attack from neighbouring countries, those interested in alternatives have looked instead at nonviolent interventions and uprisings.

The rise of nonviolent action

Although interest in nonviolent defence has dwindled, interest in the methods underlying it — namely, nonviolent action — has skyrocketed. In 1986, massive numbers of citizens went to Epifanio de los Santos Avenue in Manila in the Philippines to protest against the authoritarian government of Ferdinand Marcos, eventually leading to him vacating office. This anti-government uprising was called people power, a new term for nonviolent action. In 1989, Eastern European communist regimes — previously seen as impregnable to anything except force — collapsed in the wake of sustained protest. In the same year, students challenged the government of China in dramatic pro-democracy protests. Although the movement failed, it showed the huge capacity of citizen protest in the face of a powerful regime.

In 2000, Serbia’s ruler Slobodan Milošević tried to remain in office by using electoral fraud, but was ousted by protests, strikes and a massive mobilisation of citizens from around the country in Belgrade. This road to change was repeated in the so-called colour revolutions in Ukraine, Georgia and Lebanon. Then in 2011 came the Arab spring, in which the longstanding dictators of Tunisia and Egypt were overthrown using people power.

Terms Used in Social Defence

Terms referring to nonviolent community resistance to aggression as an alternative to military defence

*Note: each term has slightly different connotations*

- Civilian-based defence
- Civilian defence
- Defence by civil resistance
- Nonviolent defence
- Nonviolent popular defence
- Social defence

Terms referring to rallies, strikes, boycotts, sit-ins and other methods of social action that are non-routine and do not involve physical violence

- Civil resistance
- Nonviolence
- Nonviolent action
- People power
- Satyagraha

*Passive resistance* was a commonly used term until the early 1900s, when it was rejected and replaced by satyagraha and then other terms.

*Civil defence* means protection against military attack, especially bombing.
while those in several nearby countries were destabilised.

Behind the scenes in most of these major events, activists had been preparing the groundwork for years. For example, in the Philippines prior to the 1986 people power revolution, nonviolence trainers had been running workshops. Following the toppling of Milošević in Serbia, activists from the opposition group Otpor distilled the key ideas behind their campaign (Popovic et al. 2007) and took them to post-Soviet states and elsewhere. The US-based International Center on Nonviolent Conflict has also played an important role in disseminating ideas about nonviolent struggle in many countries.

Rapid and dramatic instances of regime change captured increasing media and popular attention, and also led to greater interest in nonviolence by researchers. Indeed, nonviolence research, previously a narrow and marginalised area, has been growing rapidly. Of many significant contributions (e.g., Nepstad 2011; Schock 2005; Stephan 2009), the study with the greatest impact has been the book Why Civil Resistance Works by Erica Chenoweth and Maria Stephan (2011). It provides statistical evidence that nonviolent struggle is more likely to be successful against repressive regimes than armed struggle.

Meanwhile, with less media attention, there has been a significant shift within social movements in western countries, with supporters of violence increasingly marginalised. For decades during the Cold War, supporters of Marxist parties mainly used parliamentary and conventional protest methods but sought to gain state power to promote socialism. In their view, overthrowing the capitalist state might require violence, if only in defence, and hence many Marxists were not receptive to ideas about nonviolence. Even within the peace movement, many socialist activists were more opposed to capitalism than to violence.

The rise of the feminist and environmental movements led to a different emphasis, in which armed struggle seemed implausible as a road to liberation. Understandings of oppression have broadened and now encompass patriarchy, racism, domination of nature and other systems of exploitation and unequal power.

A new context for nonviolent struggle

After 1991, the Soviet threat dissolved, and with it much of the perceived danger from global nuclear war that had been used for decades to justify western military systems. Many people expected a ‘peace dividend’, namely a decline in military expenditures and a concomitant increase in expenditures on human needs, but this did not occur. Military and security organisations floundered to find a new enemy to justify their existence. The attacks of 11 September 2001 provided an ideal pretext: terrorism became the rationale for the military-industrial complex. Although non-state terrorism, unlike nuclear war, provides neither a serious threat to the survival of populations nor any realistic prospect of overthrowing governments, it offered a plausible justification for a vast expansion of the security state.

This is the context for understanding the trajectory of nonviolent struggles. Challenges to authoritarian states are sometimes welcome to western governments, especially when, as in former Soviet states, people power movements usher in neoliberal economic systems and representative governments. On the other hand, some anti-authoritarian-government movements are less welcome to western governments, such as those in the Philippines in 1986, Indonesia in 1998 and Egypt in 2011, where longstanding strategic alliances were threatened.

Developing skills in nonviolent struggle contain the seeds of wider transformation. If people learn about their own agency to collectively challenge repression, then what is to stop them using their skills and commitment against other targets, such as neoliberalism?

This has been the agenda of the global justice movement, which gained worldwide visibility through protests against the World Trade Organisation in Seattle in 1999 and at subsequent meetings of economic leaders. It has also been the agenda of the occupy movement that has highlighted economic inequality and popularised the idea of the 99% who need to challenge systems and policies that mainly serve the wealthiest 1%. Groups such as Food Not Bombs — providing free food to the needy with a political message — show how challenges can be made to multiple forms of oppression (Crass 2013).

In the face of this threat to neoliberal hegemony, governments have been bolstering their surveillance and coercive powers, under the guise of protecting the population against terrorism. Governments have adopted a seemingly strange combination of welcoming (at least in retrospect) popular challenges to autocratic governments but cracking down on grassroots action within western societies. The neglect of social defence can best be understood in this context.

Implications for social defence

Getting rid of the military, and instead preparing the population to be able to defend against external threats, would help empower citizens with the understandings and skills to tackle oppression at home. Furthermore, getting rid of the military means removing the ultimate defender of the state.
If workers are able and prepared to shut down their workplaces against an external aggressor, they can use their capacity equally against an exploitative employer. If community members are able and prepared to survive a cut-off of oil, electricity or water supplies — something an aggressor might threaten to force compliance — then they are better able to resist government demands. If people can communicate easily without being subject to surveillance, they are better able to organise against government oppression. If government employees are given training in refusing unjust orders that an occupier might issue, they will be better able to refuse unjust orders by their own political leaders. Every capacity that can be used to deter or resist a foreign occupation can be used against employers and governments.

The radical potential of social defence suggests why it has been neglected. Governments do not want to empower their own citizens in ways that might be used against governments themselves. Corporate leaders would have similar concerns, and military commanders do not want to be made redundant. There seems to be no major government, corporate or professional organisation that has a particular interest in promoting a people’s alternative to the military.

Thinking of social defence as empowering people to be able to challenge unjust rule helps explain the trajectory of nonviolent movements. Skills in nonviolent action have a radical potential. How can an empowered population be controlled, if at all?

It is useful to identify four crucial features of nonviolent action.

1. Nonviolence. Not threatening or using physical violence is of course a defining feature of nonviolent action. It is important for several reasons, including respecting the opponent, minimising harm, fostering changes in loyalty by opponents, and enabling greater participation.

2. Participation. In general, the more people who participate in nonviolent campaigns, the more successful they are likely to be (Chenoweth and Stephan, 2011). Participation also has an empowering and democratising effect. People, when they join an activity, become more committed to it.

3. Direct involvement. In nonviolent action, members of the public are directly engaged in the action: they do not depend on leaders or representatives to act on their behalf.

4. Nonprofessional. In nonviolent action, most or all of those involved are unpaid and unsponsored. They participate voluntarily, without obligation or inducements. This is unlike military forces, in which members are coerced or paid for their services.

These four features, when combined, involve a significant challenge to the usual operations of dominant political and economic systems. Looking at the four features helps to identify ways that current campaigns have limited the potential impact of nonviolent action.

Nonviolent action is sold as a means of challenging governments somewhere else: against oppression in other countries. This has been an emphasis in attention to people power movements since the 1980s. It is like saying ‘Nonviolent action is okay when it is used against those nasty rulers. They are the bad guys. We are the good guys, so you don’t need to use it here.’

The emphasis in people power movements is on changing governments. People stay on the streets until the ruler resigns, but then return to their homes as if the country’s problems are solved. Essentially this means that direct involvement is only for the purpose of regime change, not in subsequent negotiations, campaigning, elections and high-level machinations. It is like saying, ‘You’ve done your job, now leave government to the professionals’.

Direct involvement in political and economic activities is commonly called participatory democracy and workers’ control. It can take many forms, for example citizen involvement in local budgeting, popular assemblies of citizens, workers’ councils and randomly selected citizen representatives on policy-making bodies. Participatory processes can be seen as extensions or parallels to nonviolent action: they are direct, participatory, and involve non-professionals.

What often happens in people power movements is along the lines of saying to citizens, ‘Thank you for overthrowing the dictator. Now go back to your homes and jobs and leave the business of running the country to the new leaders. We’ll let you know when it’s time to cast a vote.’ In such scenarios, people power is seen more as an event than as an ongoing process.

Defence by civil resistance is normally presented as national defence, against a foreign invader. For example, in Gene Sharp’s books advocating civilian-based defence, he argues for replacing military defence systems with civilian-based ones (Sharp 1985, 1990). The implication is that decisions about this process will be taken by government and military leaders based on their judgement that civilian-based defence is more effective. However, this approach to promoting civilian-based defence does not take into account the commitment of government and military leaders to their own power and positions. Rational argument is unlikely to get anywhere.
Implications

It might seem that because people can use nonviolent action to topple a repressive ruler, it can be used for just about anything. In a general sense this is true, but history shows that toppling repressive rulers is easier than dissolving and replacing the systems of organised violence — namely military and police forces — that protect and sustain rule in general. To be sure, it is a great advance to replace a dictator with an elected leader, but this is only a partial step in the struggle to create a world without organised systems of violence.

Social defence, namely defending a community using nonviolent methods, is unlikely to be introduced or promoted by governments, because governments use police and military forces to maintain their existence. From an activist point of view, social defence needs to remain on the agenda so that nonviolent action retains its radical edge, its vision of a different world, both as method and goal (Martin 1993).

An important implication is that nonviolent campaigners need to think beyond immediate goals, such as policy or regime change, to long-term empowerment of the population. This means building understanding, motivation and skills to use nonviolent action against all forms of injustice. Regime change is a worthwhile goal, but activists also need to find ways to retain popular involvement in political decision-making, rather than assuming representative government is the end-point. Gandhi’s constructive programme, namely building just political, economic and social systems, needs greater attention (Chabot and Sharifi 2013).

None of this is likely to be easy. Government and corporate power depend on police and military forces, and the police and military themselves have considerable power. Not least, a large proportion of the population believes in the need for systems of organised violence: they believe they need to be defended by professionals in the use of violence against external dangers — namely against other such professionals.

Social defence is one way of thinking about alternatives. It implies new ways of organising security systems, economics and politics. It deserves to be reinserted on activist agendas.
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from breaking – 1918
- after Virginia Woolf

talk of peace
a tremor of hope cries to the surface
subsides then swells again. one may wake
to find the covered murmur proclaimed
from all the papers. but another infernal
wet day & home to tea alone. now i fear
my fire is too large for one person.

ice
walking across the park a troop of horses
run from one side to the other. the gilt statue
is surrounded by a thin layer of ice which i break
with the tip of my umbrella. through the windows
i see great vellum folios full of italian history
an image which wont survive tea at atkinsons.
suffrage bill
the pipes burst in the sudden thaw
from sharp frost to mildness in an hour
so now no baths. then comes the news
that the lords have passed the suffrage bill.
i feel important for a moment but then
the printer takes me for an amateur. finally
a round by the river & home to cold tea.

the war effort
one small joint of beef to last a week
no fat to be had
no margarine
& no butter
sunday dinner
of sausages
& bread
& dripping
dogs of war
no hope of peace this month. policies
have taken a run in every directions
like the dogs near the river
on a vile windy day

armistice day
then, watch as rooks
fly slowly in circles, or
how a cloud spreads itself
towards the horizon in wisps.
travelling into the city
for lunch with a friend,
factory walls rise
sheets of grey. & how
sirens hooted on the river.
smoke
toppling heavily over
to the east.
so far neither bells nor flags
but the wailing of sirens & intermittent gunfire.

** **

MarK roBerts,
s ydNey, Nsw

Sharp, G. with the assistance of Jenkins, B. 1990. 
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Making Peace with the Earth

A war fought by oil pollution,
by aluminium sludge,
by exhausting rivers,
plundering seas and forests
is the ‘carbon for ever’, ‘oil not soil’
barrage from those who believe
their is the infinite progress.

As dawn comes, awareness grows
that love for life
means respect for the planet,
and with it a wisdom
to fight back instead of gearing up
up to drive faster and faster
towards extinction.

Some visionaries are sharing
their conserving-preserving
future fuelled by power

to produce fewer casualties,
no more monuments for extinguished species
or dead life systems,
and so easily achieved
by making peace with the earth.

Stuart Rees,
Sydney, NSW

** **

Mark Roberts,
Sydney, NSW
A Peace-Industrial Complex

KEITH SUTER

In 1961 President Dwight Eisenhower warned his fellow Americans of the rise of the ‘military-industrial complex’ – in effect a network of political, military and commercial interests (the mass media should also be added) that benefit from preparing for war. The participants were not necessarily warlike; it was simply they could make a lot of money out of defence preparations. In a 1986 doctoral dissertation I argued that there should be a ‘peace-industrial complex’, drawn from organisations that make money out of peace, to create the necessary political will to encourage a reduction in weapons and to find alternative ways of settling disputes. In this article I revisit this proposition for a Peace-Industrial Complex.

Introduction

American presidents leaving office deliver a ‘farewell address’ to Congress and the nation. Most addresses are quickly forgotten. But Eisenhower’s 1961 address has lived on. The most famous phrase (not least because it came from a moderate conservative politician with a military career) was a warning about the creation of a ‘military-industrial complex’. Eisenhower had seen in his lifetime how the US had been transformed from a country with a small standing army to one then having the largest permanent military force in world history.

The complex has gathered momentum. Defence contractors are scattered across the US so that any attempt to reduce military expenditure would affect the constituency of a member of the House of Representatives (who are elected every two years) and so provide an incentive to that politician to lobby to retain the contract. The mass media are also conscripted to provide periodic ‘scares’. For example, there was the 1959-1960 speculation over the Soviet-US ‘missile gap’ in which the US was said to be behind the USSR in developing missiles; it was not.

In 1986 I argued in my doctoral dissertation that there should be a ‘peace-industrial complex’ to reply to the other complex (Suter 1986). It would be drawn from the peace movement and companies that make money out of peace. An example comes from the life of Joan Kroc (1928-2003), widow of the McDonald’s CEO Ray Kroc. She was a supporter of the US peace movement (and Australian peace activist Dr Helen Caldicott) and in her will left US$50million to the University of Notre Dame, Indiana, USA for the Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace Studies. Her argument and concerns were that in the event of World War III there would not be a market for fast food.

Hence, it was necessary to tap into other businesses that also benefit from peace. It is the case that not every company makes money by preparing for conflict; indeed most companies benefit from peace. An example comes from the life of Joan Kroc (1928-2003), widow of the McDonald’s CEO Ray Kroc. She was a supporter of the US peace movement (and Australian peace activist Dr Helen Caldicott) and in her will left US$50million to the University of Notre Dame, Indiana, USA for the Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace Studies. Her argument and concerns were that in the event of World War III there would not be a market for fast food.

My earlier research also addressed the fears that many people had for their defence-related jobs. People working in the military-industrial complex were not necessarily violent war-loving people; they just wanted employment. Therefore, the proposed peace-industrial complex

Arguments for a Peace-Industrial Complex

My research examined the failure to end the military arms race between the US and Soviet Union and went on to provide some alternative proposals to that arms race. In the early part of the dissertation I examined how the arms race could be negotiated via a graduated reciprocal reduction in tension (that is, the opposite process to how the arms race increased) and I provided some basic ideas for general and complete disarmament (first proposed in McKnight and Suter 1983).

The problem, it seemed to me, was not so much a lack of ideas for disarmament but a lack of political will to disarm. I therefore saw the creation of a peace-industrial complex as a way of generating political will. Various claims have been made about the role of money in shaping (if not corrupting) US politics and so I thought that perhaps that same reasoning could be applied to ending the arms race: corporations could use their influence in the interests of peace.

Not all companies make money by preparing for conflict; indeed most companies benefit from peace. An example comes from the life of Joan Kroc (1928-2003), widow of the McDonald’s CEO Ray Kroc. She was a supporter of the US peace movement (and Australian peace activist Dr Helen Caldicott) and in her will left US$50million to the University of Notre Dame, Indiana, USA for the Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace Studies. Her argument and concerns were that in the event of World War III there would not be a market for fast food.

Hence, it was necessary to tap into other businesses that also benefit from peace. It is the case that not every company has military contracts – in fact most do not. Therefore, there were many potential allies for the cause.
would need to campaign to ensure that as defence jobs declined, there was a compensatory rise in the non-defence employment sector (health, education, welfare and public transport were very labour intensive). The dissertation also argued for the peace movement to stop focusing so much on ‘nuclear winter’ and instead focus on ‘nuclear spring’: what could be achieved by spending all that money elsewhere, such as in building infrastructure throughout Africa.

The PhD thesis I wrote in 1986 was framed around the issues of its time. The nuclear issue was very much front of mind and there were speculations over some form of ‘limited’ nuclear war, as if such a thing was feasible. The peace movement was at its peak membership. The dissertation also benefited from a great deal of United Nations research on the economic and social consequences of the arms race.

Lack of Progress

Looking back almost three decades later, I am intrigued by the lack of take-up of the peace-industrial complex idea. Firstly, the peace movement (with which I had been associated since the 1960s) was not interested. Indeed, I remember one conversation with a leading UK peace activist (who shall remain anonymous) who claimed that the best way to confront the nuclear menace was via demonstrations and direct action. He was not interested in building coalitions with other organisations (and companies) that were, in effect, outside his comfort zone.

Secondly, the business communities were also not interested. Their main position was that peace was not their business; it sounded ‘political’ and therefore out of bounds. Knowing what we now know about how some businesses behave (such as the role of the coal industry and the debate over climate change), this sounds naïve. But it is likely that political lobbying was seen by business as valid providing it benefited profits. The nuclear weapons issue seemed to be too far removed from such interests. Few businesspeople could think in the same terms as Joan Kroc.

There was also the problem of ‘peace’ being a suspect word, with left-wing connotations. A small sign of progress in recent decades is that ‘peace’ has been de-contaminated and is no longer quite so suspect. For example, Rotary, traditionally seen as a movement for moderately conservative businessmen (and latterly women) now has many ‘peace’ activities (King, MacGill and Wescombe 2013). Similarly the RSL has the ANZAC Peace Prize. ‘Peace’ has become respectable.

Thirdly, this topic was outside the scope of the conventional economics profession. The late Professor Ted Wheelwright (1921-2007) of the Economics Department at Sydney University was a sympathetic examiner but alas, he was an exception to his more conventional colleagues in the profession. The PhD topic was interdisciplinary (blending politics and economics) and so offended the more conventional economists, who were therefore not interested in this issue.

Finally, there was the overall change in perception about the dangers of the arms race with the end of the Cold War and collapse of the Soviet Union. The peace movement has since shrunk and there is a general perception that nuclear weapons are no longer such a problem.

There has been some reduction in the level of nuclear armaments (not least between the US and Russia) but nuclear weapons are still very much around and the world continues to spend record amounts on defence (particularly since ‘9/11’ and the so-called War on Terror).

In conclusion, the world can still find money for war – but not for peace. I think there is still a need for a peace-industrial complex.

References


Author

Dr Keith Suter is an economic and social commentator, strategic planner, conference speaker, author and broadcaster. As a broadcaster, he appears on Australian radio an average of once a day. He is the TV Channel 7 ‘Sunrise’ foreign affairs editor and a foreign policy analyst for Sky TV Australia. His first degree is from the University of Sussex (international relations/ international law). His first doctorate (University of Sydney) was on the international law of guerrilla warfare (a study of the two 1977 Additional Protocols to the four 1949 Geneva Conventions). His second (Deakin University) was on the economic and social consequences of the arms race. His third (University of Sydney) is on scenario planning. He teaches politics at the Sydney international campus of Boston University, USA. He has been a member of the international think tank The Club of Rome since 1993. In 1986: International Year of Peace, he was awarded the Australian Government’s Peace Medal.
Bringing Pacifism Back into International Relations

Richard Jackson

Inherent to international relations (IR) thinking about war and security is an unquestioned and widely accepted assumption that military violence can be employed neutrally as a rational tool of policy. The reflexive military response by Western powers to the rise of Islamic State (IS) in late 2014 is illustrative of this kind of normalised thinking. This article questions this assumption on both empirical and theoretical grounds, reviewing some of the recent literature which demonstrates that such means-ends distinctions are untenable, that just war theory is flawed and that nonviolence is potentially more effective than military violence. It argues that our current state of knowledge about the means-ends connection, as well as the inadequacies of just war theory, the success of nonviolence and the functional alternatives to violence, suggests that it is time to bring back pacifism as one of the central political theories of IR.

Introduction

It is unquestionable that pacifist and nonviolent approaches to politics have been greatly marginalised in international relations (IR) since at least the late 1930s. Instead, in both the realist and liberal camps of IR, military violence has been viewed as both inevitable in international politics, and necessary for national security and deterrence, humanitarian intervention, responding to terrorism, and the like. In large part, this is because early IR scholars like Hans Morgenthau, E.H. Carr and others argued that the rise of Nazi Germany and World War II had completely discredited the idea of military disarmament or a peaceful community of nations. Today, it continues to be argued that groups such as al Qaeda or Islamic State (IS) mean that military force continues to be an inevitable and necessary part of international politics and global security. Importantly, inherent to IR thinking about war and security is an unquestioned assumption that violence can be employed neutrally as a rational tool of policy – a tool which can simply be put back into the toolbox once its purpose has been achieved.

This article questions such widely-held assumptions about the inevitability and necessity of employing violence on both empirical and theoretical grounds, reviewing some of the recent literature which demonstrates that such means-ends distinctions are untenable, that just war theory is flawed and that nonviolence is more effective than military violence. Overall, I argue that our current state of knowledge about the means-ends connection, as well as the inadequacies of just war theory and the functional alternatives to violence, suggest that it is time to bring back pacifism as one of the central political theories of IR.

The Failure of Violence in IR

It is something of a puzzle that IR scholars and political actors continue to believe in the necessity and efficacy of violence when the empirical record of its use as a policy tool clearly demonstrates its perennial failures. From a historical perspective, there is little doubt for example, that the unprecedented violence of World War I and its unequal settlement laid the basis for the outbreak of World War II (and many other conflicts continuing today in Palestine, Kashmir and elsewhere), which in turn set off the Cold War. For its part, the Cold War (and World War II which gave rise to it) directly resulted in a series of proxy and post-colonial wars which killed an estimated 40 million people in Africa, Asia and elsewhere (Krause 1996: 173). The War on Terror has, for its part, been a self-fulfilling prophesy which has spawned two major wars, around six to eight new al Qaeda organisations and a continuing cycle of terrorist and counterterrorist violence (see Zulaika 2009). The invasion of Iraq spawned al Qaeda in Iraq (AQI), which in turn led a few years later to the rise of IS – which has in turn resulted in the start of a new war in Iraq in late 2014.

In short, the historical record clearly demonstrates the complete and utter failure of military violence to create stability, peace and security: instead, in the vast majority of cases, violence most often lays the foundation for further outbreaks of violence requiring new bouts of military intervention. Over 100 million people have died in wars in the last century, and the number of ongoing wars has remained consistently high over the whole period – although some claim that there has been a slight decline in war over the past few years. Nonetheless, if war worked to bring peace and stability, the number
of wars would have dramatically decreased over time and regions of peacefulness and stability would have expanded and consolidated around the world. And yet, this record of the persistently abysmal failure of military violence is rarely acknowledged or seriously discussed in IR.

Other forms of evidence similarly reveal the failure of violence as a tool or mode of politics. For example, there is a large body of empirical literature which demonstrates that previous violent conflict is one of the strongest predictors for future outbreaks of conflict in states experiencing civil unrest (see, among others, Walter 2004). In other words, violent political conflict almost always leads to further political violence later on down the line, whether it is from coups, rebellions, insurgencies or civil wars. The vicious civil war in South Sudan, following its secession from Sudan after decades of insurgency, is a potent example of this process at work.

Directly related to this, there is strong evidence from a growing number of studies that if dissidents and rebels employ violence to overthrow an oppressive regime or win independence for their group, that within a few years, there will be further violence and instability, a lack of democracy and poor standards of human rights (see Celestino and Gleditsch 2013; Stephan and Chenoweth 2008). The ongoing violence and instability in Libya after the violent overthrow of the Gaddafi regime is a case in point; other examples include Angola, Nicaragua, Zimbabwe, Kosovo, and Yemen. Other evidence clearly shows that the spread of military weapons increases the likelihood of conflicts becoming violent (Krause 1996). At the individual level, there is a great deal of evidence to show that soldiers who participate in war suffer moral injury and have high levels of post trauma stress disorder (PTSD), even if they have behaved according to all the prescribed rules of combat.

From a more theoretical perspective, it has been argued by Clausewitz and others that war is perhaps the most mimetic and most unpredictable human activity of all (see Freedman 1998/99; Van Creveld 1991). In other words, the use of violence most often provokes violent resistance, dehumanisation and brutalisation, and consequently, almost always has unpredictable outcomes. This explains in part why the use of military intervention so often results in unforeseen humanitarian and political disasters and, in many cases, the need for further intervention to try and correct the initial use of violence. The instability in both Afghanistan and Iraq in recent years, particularly with the proliferation of al Qaeda branches and the rise of IS, is illustrative of such unpredictable outcomes that resulted from an initial violent invasion.

Related to this, we know from a number of different theoretical perspectives that social action, including violence, can never be undertaken without having an effect on the actor who uses it. That is, the way we think and act functions in large part to constitute us as individuals and groups (see Demmers 2012). From this perspective, it is impossible for any human actor, including states, to simply pick and use violence as a doctor would a scalpel and then put it down and remain unaffected (see Jabri 1996). Instead, employing violence has a number of effects on the user. At the very least, it dulls their sensitivity to the suffering of others and makes using violence in the future easier. From another angle, this suggests that there is no real distinction between means and ends: violent means cannot produce peaceful ends (Schock 2013: 279; see also Arendt 1969). Charles Tilly’s (1985) notion that war makes the state is an expression of this perspective.

Finally, it can be reasonably argued that theories of just war or humanitarian interventions have failed to regulate war or make it less likely. In fact, it can be argued that they have actually made war more likely, if the number of wars seen in the past few years is anything to go by. In addition, a number of scholars have demonstrated that just war theory is inherently flawed and makes little sense as a moral theory or guide for the use of military force (see McMahan 2012). At the very least, it relies on a dubious means/ends distinction. Most often, today it is simply invoked by states to justify military interventions they wish to undertake in any case, often for their own selfish geopolitical reasons.

The Success of Nonviolence

In contrast to the myriad failures of employing violence, important recent research by Erica Chenoweth and Maria Stephan and others (see Chenoweth and Stephen 2011; Ackerman and Duvall 2000) has demonstrated that nonviolent movements are overall twice as successful as violent movements in achieving their goals. More importantly, peaceful movements that are successful go on to produce more peaceful societies as a consequence. This provides more evidence for the means/ends connection: using peaceful means helps to achieve more peaceful ends, while violent means tend to produce violent ends. Other research from conflict resolution and peace studies has consistently demonstrated the effectiveness of negotiation, diplomacy and dialogue for settling conflicts, including mediation, and the key role of reconciliation processes for breaking cycles of violence (among many others, see Bercovitch and Jackson 2009). There is even important research demonstrating that dialogue with terrorists is effective at ending terrorist campaigns (see Toros 2012; English 2009; Sederberg 1995). Other important empirical findings show that unarmed peace forces can be effective in responding
to civil wars and violence against civilians (see Schirch 2006; Mahoney and Eguren 1997; Schweitzer, 2001; Weber 1996), and that states can exist securely without a military (Boserup and Mack 1974; Salmon 1988).

Finally, in contrast to the flawed just war theory which most states and international organisations adhere to, recent research has shown how Gandhian pacifism, along with other pacifist theories, can provide a foundation for thinking about how to construct peaceful politics which does not rely on military force as the final back-up to the failure of dialogue (Mantena 2012). Theories of agonistic democracy, for example, have explored ways in which radical disagreement and difference can nonetheless be accommodated and form the foundation of nonviolent, peaceful polities (see Schaap 2006; Shinko 2008; Ramsbotham 2010).

More specifically in terms of international politics, pacifist political systems have the potential to mitigate the so-called security dilemma, one of the primary characteristics of the international system which creates uncertainty and is linked by some scholars to the outbreak of interstate war. That is, states without military forces by definition do not threaten their neighbours or other states, which means that their offensive intentions cannot be misinterpreted and there is no likelihood of dangerous arms races occurring.

**Conclusion: Bringing Pacifism Back into IR**

Given the record of the failure of military violence in IR, and the cumulative arguments about the flaws of just war theory, the means/ends connection and the impossibility of ever employing violence as a neutral tool, and given all the evidence and arguments for the success of nonviolence, the existence of functional alternatives to war and the legitimacy of pacifist political philosophies, it remains something of a puzzle as to why pacifism and nonviolence continue to be considered naïve, idealistic and unrealistic by most IR scholars and public officials. It is also a puzzle as to why pacifists and peace activists are often reticent about speaking up more forcefully in public and academic debates about these issues. The reality is that the proponents of military violence could be reasonably seen as the unrealistic idealists: in the face of the accumulated evidence summarised above, it is they who are naïve to believe that the application of more violence will finally work to create peace and security, and not simply create the necessary pre-conditions for further outbreaks of political violence.

From this perspective, it is clearly time to bring back pacifism into IR. There is every reason to consider it a legitimate political philosophy and a realistic, necessary basis for thinking about how to create a more peaceful, stable and just international system. Obviously, scholars and practitioners who seek to more forcefully argue for pacifism and nonviolence will need to take account of some of the primary obstacles they currently face: an entrenched set of public and political beliefs in militarism and violence; an unwillingness by officials to admit their failures; fear and uncertainty rooted in the violent international order in which most states possess military forces and threaten their neighbours; and an entrenched military-industrial system in which war generates employment for many and vast profits for some. However, pacifists and nonviolence proponents now have the cumulative evidence and arguments they need to struggle against the hegemony of the dominant belief in military violence. They should not hold back, but instead forcefully take the argument into the academic and public spheres. It is time to start working to make the belief in the legitimacy and efficacy of military violence exactly what it really is – an historical anachronism.
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The Peacebuilders Shanty (to be shouted in unison)

Where there are children wanting to learn, Where people are trapped in poverty, Refugees crossing borders to freedom And First Peoples deprived of dignity 

Let's open our kit and take out our peace tools!

Wherever women join in solidarity And soldiers lay down their weapons To turn swords into ploughshares And enemies decide nobody wins 

Let's open our kit and take out our peace tools

International Peace Research Association

trumpets of war

trumpets of war attend to this city soon I will be soil

and reader it's true for you too

so soon we're gone why grieve for kings?

hours mar the mountain heights

the shadows of arrows fall over the farms

Kit Keelen, Markwell, NSW and Macao
World War I was supposedly the ‘war to end all wars’, but it ushered in a century characterised by more destructive warfare. This article argues that the time is ripe for an institution devoted to the study of resistance to war, the civil society peace movement and reconciliation. Australia does not have a fully dedicated and focused peace museum. We can learn from the experience of peace museums overseas and we can organise abundant material already available in Australia. The Sydney Peace Prize, for example, could be a starting point. By building a peace museum we can enrich the imagination of the next generation and promote alternatives to war.

‘A time for peace, I swear it’s not too late’. This was the closing line of *Turn! Turn! Turn!* performed by the late Pete Seeger and others in the sixties. The lyrics of the song are words from the Book of Ecclesiastes in the Old Testament/Tanakh. Australia in early 2014 enjoyed a time of relative peace. It was relative peace compared with over a decade of involvement with war in Iraq and Afghanistan, but not peace in a fuller sense of the word. Australia is now, by contrast, embarking on a well-funded four-year program of war remembrance. At the official level there is little attention to peace-building. As I write, the Abbott government is sending defence force personnel back into Iraq.

‘To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under heaven ... A time to love, a time to hate; a time of war, and a time of peace’. In the ancient world the seasons influenced the cycle of planting and reaping. To some extent they still do in the contemporary world but industrialisation, world trade and globalisation dampen the influence of the seasons. Cyclic rhythms are constructed on the basis of the calendar and multiples of years. During the Anzac Centenary, the First World War will be remembered through many different public and community events. The risk in this enterprise is that war will be naturalised. War and peace are not natural seasons. The spring of peace is not inevitable. The descent into war and the achievement of peace are the result of human agency and cultural change.

The Anzac Centenary is an opportunity to reflect upon the changes that have occurred in the last hundred years and to learn how to make wise decisions for the next century. At the official level the emphasis appears to be on memorialisation and ‘preserving the legend’. At the community level, however, there is interest in alternative narratives. Anzac is being put back into its historical and political context and Australian militarism is being critiqued by peace groups such as Pax Christi (Pax Christi 2014).

Time is both cyclic and directional. In the ancient world change was relatively slow and the cyclic aspect of time was incorporated into culture. In the contemporary world change, irreversible change, is very evident. Geologists now speak of the Anthropocene to recognise the agency of humankind in changing the face of the earth. These changes are observable from space and are experienced through species extinctions, resource depletion and climate change. In the twenty-first century our species, *homo sapiens*, numbering seven billion, puts enormous pressure on the whole of the biosphere. The maintenance, or gradual reduction of, such a population requires the achievement of sustainability and environmental repair. ‘Business as usual’ and militarisation are eroding the global life support system and doing irreversible damage to our planet.

A Time for Peace

Twenty-first century technology and anachronistic thinking form a deadly cocktail. We delegate tasks to technologies but this is not without cost. Technologies constrain behaviour and have far-reaching social consequences. Warfare has tended to stimulate the production of increasingly destructive technologies.

The wars and conflicts of the 20th century killed an estimated 231 million people, perhaps 85 percent of them civilians. By contrast, the wars recognised by the Australian War Memorial took about 100,000 Australian lives during that century, all but a handful of them enlisted service men and women. Every single one of those 100,000 deaths was a tragedy but are there in the world any 100,000 deaths so much commemorated as these? (Stephens 2014).

How many millions will be killed in wars and other armed conflicts of the twenty-first century? Should we aspire to lead the world in military commemoration? Peace, or at
least the rapid and effective curtailment of war, is now a survival issue for humanity. The checks and balances of the ancient world no longer exist. The sheer firepower of modern conventional warfare exceeds anything dreamt of by ancient generals and the possibility of nuclear war both accidental and intentional remains. *Homo sapiens* is capable of causing its own rapid extinction. Yet in Australia, the rosy glow of nostalgia tends to prevail over the critical awareness of the need for disarmament. It is indeed a time for peace.

Peace will not simply happen in the twenty-first century. It will require at least the same level of commitment of moral and physical resources as did the wars of the twentieth century. William James, the famous psychologist and philosopher, wrote about the peace movement needing ‘the moral equivalent of war’ (James 1966: 179-190). Peace-keeping, peace-building and peace-making in the twenty-first century will provide plenty of scope for the adventurous and idealistic. There will be no shortage of humanitarian work in dangerous environments. The moral resources of civil courage will be required in resisting oppression. Volunteering to work as a human shield in a war zone will test ‘ordinary courage’ (Mulhearn 2010).

The improvement of literacy and life expectancy requires investment in education. Likewise, peace will require investment in education which develops conflict resolution skills, cross-cultural communication and critical thinking. War has consumed and shredded the bravery and idealism of millions in the twentieth century. Now, in the twenty-first century, we need alternatives to perpetual war. Peace museums are a small but important part of a new paradigm: a culture of peace with justice. Here and now we can start making small changes to bring about cultural change by acting on world poverty (Singer 2009) and getting to know people with different cultural and religious backgrounds.

In the twenty-first century, peace with justice will require genuine dialogue between religious believers and non-believers. The Abrahamic religions: Judaism, Christianity and Islam, espouse the goal of peace, but they have all been implicated in so-called ‘holy wars’. Since September 11 in 2001 much attention has been given to violent verses in the Qur’an. Similar verses of equal or greater violence can be found in the scriptures of Judaism and Christianity. Philip Jenkins argues that such violent verses should not be ignored, but they are able to be transcended.

If the founding text shapes the whole religion, then Judaism and Christianity deserve the utmost condemnation as religions of savagery. Of course they are no such thing; nor is Islam (Jenkins 2012: 13). Respectful inter-faith dialogue and cross-cultural communication should be part of peace education and the subject matter of peace museums.

Museums provide interpretative frames for artefacts and events. Peace museums are likely to frame things differently from museums that accept war as inevitable. For example, September 11 was framed by the Bush Administration as an act of war requiring a military response. An alternative frame is a crime against humanity requiring international cooperation and the strengthening of international law. The toppling of Saddam Hussein by nonviolent people-power in Iraq would have been preferable to ‘regime change’ by outsiders. Ackerman and Duval (2000) give many examples of dictators removed by nonviolent resistance. The prosecution of Osama Bin Laden by an international court would have set a better example than his extrajudicial execution. A culture of peace means the serious exploration of alternatives to war and the expansion of the rule of law.

**Museums for Peace in Australia**

Some museums in Australia contribute to peace education but there are major gaps and shortfalls. Australia does not have a major museum for which peace is the primary focus.

The National Museum of Australia (NMA) is listed as a peace museum (Hiroshima Peace Media Center). Like many other museums in Australia it certainly contributes to the exploration of peace but it does many other things as well. It is a broad social history museum, not a specialised peace museum. The NMA thus illustrates a significant distinction between peace museums and museums for peace. Australia needs both kinds of museums. The word ‘peace’ does not appear in the latest two annual reports of the NMA. However, the museum does contribute to peace education, especially through its indigenous collections and exhibitions. The process of reconciliation with the indigenous people is essential to the building of a peace culture in Australia and the NMA is well positioned to make a major contribution.

One of the main functions of museums is to provide an immersive quiet space in which we can explore the question of national identity. If we start with Benedict Anderson’s concept of a nation as an ‘imagined community’ (Anderson 1991) and Richard White’s view that national identity is a construction (White 1981), then we can clear the ground for the examination of an evolving Australian identity. The Australian identity, like that of any other country, is complex and it changes over time. In 1974, Australia officially discarded the ‘White Australia Policy’, but the task of removing racist structures and building an inclusive society remains unfinished. The Cronulla Riots of 2005 (Noble 2009)
are reminders of the lingering influence of ‘White Australia’. The Australian identity was not forged in the cauldron of Gallipoli and set for all time. Gallipoli and Anzac need to be rescued from mythology and restored to critical historical scholarship. This is already happening; notably with the work of Marilyn Lake, Henry Reynolds, Mark McKenna and Joy Damousi (Lake and Reynolds 2010), the Honest History (Honest History) group and other scholars. The Australian identity now includes the descendants of former enemies and the dispossessed indigenous inhabitants. The evolving imagined community of Australia needs to be inclusive of people who have been marginalised in the past. Neglected, ignored and suppressed narratives need to be recognised as part of the complex fabric that makes up diverse Australian identities.

Like many thousands of Australian schoolchildren I first visited the Australian War Memorial (AWM) on a school excursion. That occasion and subsequent visits helped me understand the wartime experience of my own family and to gain some appreciation of the enormous human cost of war and the effects that are felt for generations afterwards. As an Australian of European ancestry, however, I learnt nothing at the AWM about the ‘The Forgotten War’ (Reynolds 2013) and the dispossession of the indigenous people behind the privileged position I occupy in this country. Like New Zealand, Canada, the United States, South Africa and Israel, Australia is a settler society and as a nation we need to face up honestly to the dispossession of our indigenous people. Paradoxically, the AWM will recognise Aborigines who fought overseas for King and Empire but not those who fought for their own people on their ancestral land.

Sydney’s Powerhouse Museum is about technology and design but underlying that is a focus on innovation and the future. Its 125th Anniversary was marked by ‘Yesterday’s Tomorrows’ (Davison and Webber 2005), a history of visions for the future realised in innovation, technology and design. While it can contribute to an understanding of peace it can also be seen as an analogue of a peace museum. A more peaceful world starts with the development of a moral imagination. It is realised through commitment to innovation and the soft technologies of reform, social change and institution building. The United Nations, for example, is both a social innovation to which Australians contributed at its foundation, and a massive international institution to which Australians contribute today.

Historically, some Australians have been able to articulate a vision of a world without war and a society based on justice; as attested by social movements which have challenged the status quo and have led nonviolent social change and institution-building. Unlike other combatants in the First World War, Australia had female suffrage and its soldiers were all volunteers not conscripts. Over the next hundred years there was growth and diversification in social movements concerned with peace, gender equality, social inclusiveness, nonviolent conflict resolution, environmental conservation and social justice. A peace museum is needed to tell this story and to explore visions for peace in the twenty-first century. Many Australian museums are able to become museums for peace, but there are no peace museums for which peace research and education is a raison d’être and prime responsibility.

**Peace Museums Overseas**

Australians interested in building a peace museum do not need to reinvent the wheel. There are many examples overseas which can provide models for emulation and adaptation. An Australian peace museum should have local content but should also relate to universal perspectives on peace.

Japan has a unique experience of war as a perpetrator and victim, but it has also recovered and has become a generally peaceful country. Peace museums have helped Japan make sense of its past, even confronting material such as the sexual slavery of ‘comfort women’ (Yamane 2010), and move confidently and peacefully into the future. History need not have happened this way and there are real reasons to be concerned about a recent resurgence of nationalism and a more aggressive posture in regional and world affairs.

In 2009, the author visited the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum and the Nagasaki Atomic Bomb Museum. These museums were opened within a decade of the nuclear holocaust and have current visitation rates in the order of a million per year (Hiroshima Peace Media Center). Exhibitions and installations in the museums and in the surrounding parks and landscapes powerfully affected me. I was confronted by realisations of what had happened there. I became resolved in my conviction that it should never happen again. The museum at Nagasaki includes an exhibit which is simply a stream of photographs of the victims, people from all walks of life dressed for work or a special occasion. Such exhibits bring home the awful realities behind the statistics. The museums and landscapes of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the contrasts of a living hell in 1945 and contemporary beauty, engage the emotions of visitors. Those emotions can lead to empowering actions. The Hiroshima-Nagasaki Process (Kodama 2010: 36) is a roadmap for the abolition of nuclear weapons; it is mainly led by nuclear-free countries and international non-government organisations (INGOs). Australians can make the government’s involvement with the nuclear strategy of the United States a political issue.
Japan was a loser in World War II but it enjoyed remarkable economic development in the post-war period. Constrained by its ‘pacifist constitution’ (Article 9), Japan has explored alternatives to war in its dealings with other countries. It now has a mature peace museum culture extending from grassroots initiatives to world class institutions (Yamane 2014a, b). It has museums able to challenge historical revisionism driven by the current government. Australia, by way of contrast, was on the winning side in World War II and has followed the United States into wars in Korea, Vietnam, Iraq and Afghanistan. Australia has a grassroots peace movement and a strong museum culture, but no dedicated peace museum.

Europe is studded with historical battlefields but contemporary Europe also has a strong peace culture and good peace museums. In 2008, the author visited Le Memorial in Caen and the Red Cross Red Crescent Museum in Geneva. Le Memorial has arranged exhibitions to represent movement from war to peace. Exhibits start with World War II and move to present day hopes for a peaceful future. An iconic peace image, the revolver with its barrel tied into a knot, is actually a sculpture in the forecourt of Le Memorial. Le Memorial contains military artefacts and photographs but the interpretative frame differs from a conventional war museum. The message at Le Memorial is the need to resolve conflict peacefully, unlike a conventional war memorial which can foster the view that war is an inevitable fact of nature. Le Memorial has a gallery devoted to winners of the Nobel Peace Prize – people who have faced difficult dilemmas but have found a peaceful alternative.

The humanitarian work of the Red Cross and Red Crescent is presented with great skill in the museum in Geneva. Respect for human rights is a cornerstone of peace-keeping. The original document of the 1864 Geneva Convention is on display in the organisation’s museum. The Geneva Convention lays the foundation of international humanitarian law. It is a heritage that we must preserve and at the same time exhibit, so that people may learn about and appreciate it. This is a core function of a museum.

Towards an Australian Peace Museum

Museums by their very nature are selective. They curate and interpret selected materials. Ample raw material for an Australian peace museum already exists. It needs to be curated and exhibited in a dedicated building and it needs to be supported and grown by an organisation with museum expertise and professional relationships with other museums and cultural institutions in Australia and elsewhere. Such an institution would provide a dynamic focus and a level of cohesion not currently in evidence. Australian history provides abundant material for a peace museum. Australians have opposed war and worked for peace before and after Federation. Australians have largely rejected racism and have started a reconciliation process with the indigenous people. There is a growing awareness of the connections between social justice, human rights, environmental sustainability and peace. At the present time there are many people studying peace and working for peace in a very wide array of institutions and groups. However, this peaceful side of Australia is poorly represented in official school curricula, the media and museums. It is a counter-narrative.

The Sydney Peace Prize is Australia’s major international peace prize. Since its inception in 1998 there have been sixteen winners. Recipients come from all over the world and they reflect the diversity and universality of the cause of peace (refer table 1).

Many people in Australia have been to war museums and battlefield pilgrimages, but they struggle with the concept of a peace museum. The work and lives of the Sydney Peace Prize winners are tangible examples of peacemaking. At present the Sydney Peace Prize is an event hosted in Sydney each November. However it has the potential to form the basis of a permanent exhibit in a dedicated peace museum as well as becoming a travelling exhibition in museums throughout Australia.

Discrete exhibitions for peace already occur, albeit in a sporadic fashion, in Australian museums, art galleries and libraries. An Australian Peace Museum could consolidate a process that is already happening. Sydney’s Museum of Contemporary Art (MCA) recently hosted Yoko Ono War is Over: If You Want It. There has been a peace and postcolonial dimension to a number of other exhibitions there. However, the MCA is a broad remit and has many other unrelated interests. The Museum of Sydney recently had an exhibition called Celestial City: Sydney’s Chinese Story. It is an example of the type of exhibition that could feature in a peace museum. The exhibition examined the demonisation of Chinese immigrants but ended with an appreciation of the way the city has been enriched by the Chinese-Australian community. There is quite a lot happening in terms of exhibitions but it is activity on the fringe with no hub in the centre.

Places upon which dramatic events occur also need to be memorialised appropriately. Battlefields are such places, but there are also sites of conscience where peace has been achieved. Australia’s only international Peace Bell was awarded to the small rural town of Cowra, New South Wales in 1992. The award was earned on the basis of the way in which the Returned Services League and local community worked towards reconciliation with Japan, a process starting in the aftermath of the Cowra
Breakout on 5 August 1944 (Herborn and Hutchinson 2014). What began as a suicidal breakout by prisoners of war culminated in the creation of commemorative and cultural sites that honour the dead and forge bonds of reconciliation between Australia and Japan. The Japanese War Cemetery, and the Japanese Gardens and Cultural Centre now host annual remembrance and reconciliation ceremonies. Such events for peace are a vital part of community peacebuilding processes and are most powerful when linked to sites of significance.

Other sites of conscience include Myall Creek near Bingara in northern New South Wales where a massacre of Aboriginal people took place in 1838. This was a rare instance of the perpetrators being tried and punished. The trial was an indication of conscience, the recognition of wrongdoing. The current memorial, dedicated 162 years later, is an indication of the slowness of the reconciliation process. This memorial is now a place of ongoing social learning and commemorative ceremony.

A peace trail in Canberra could start with the SIEV-X Memorial in Weston Park on the shore of Lake Burley Griffin. A boat carrying asylum seekers, a ‘Suspected Illegal Entry Vessel’ in the government’s terminology, sank in October 2001 drowning 353 men, women and children. What has emerged is an example of a grassroots peace memorial where persistence in the face of government hostility and opposition finally paid off. Each person drowned is represented by a white pole decorated by an artwork and sponsored by a community group. Support for the memorial came from schools, churches and a wide range of other community groups from all over Australia. The trail could include Reconciliation Place, the Peace Garden near the National Library and the statue of Gandhi in Glebe Park. It is a very modest itinerary in comparison to the war memorials of Canberra, but it may grow in the future.

An Australian Peace Museum should not be just a building. It needs a building to store collections and present exhibitions, but it should primarily be an organisation with strong links to other museums for peace, universities and communities. An Australian Peace Museum should be a free public peace education centre, a key node in a network of sites of conscience, peace trails and events. It should be a public facility, but it may need to be privately and independently funded.

An Australian Online Living Peace Museum proposal (Living Peace Museum) is in progress, spearheaded by a group in Melbourne. In a country as widely scattered as Australia, a peace museum must have an online presence. In our highly digitised society this certainly fulfills a need. However, the need is for much more than just another website. An online peace museum could complement a more conventional physical museum, but only a physical museum or site can provide a truly immersive experience which both informs and affects the visitor. It is the convergence of information and effect that most powerfully moves and shapes us, our ideas and attitudes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Julian Burnside</td>
<td>Human rights lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Dr Cynthia Maung</td>
<td>Co-minister for Reconciliation Healing and Integration in Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Naom Chomsky</td>
<td>Social scientist and human rights campaigner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Dr Vandana Shiva</td>
<td>Indian physicist, philosopher, environmental activist and eco feminist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>John Pilger</td>
<td>Australian journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Patrick Dodson</td>
<td>Chairman Lingiari Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Hans Blix</td>
<td>Swedish diplomat, international human rights lawyer, weapons inspector and disarmament campaigner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Irene Khan</td>
<td>Secretary General of Amnesty International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Olara Otunnu</td>
<td>United Nations Under Secretary General for Children and Armed Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Arundhati Roy</td>
<td>Author and human rights campaigner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Dr Hanan Ashrawi</td>
<td>Founder and Secretary general of the Palestinian Initiative for the Promotion of Global Dialogue and Democracy (MIFTAH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Mary Robinson</td>
<td>UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, former President of Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Sir William Deane AC KBE</td>
<td>Former Governor General of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Xanana Gusmso</td>
<td>East Timorese leader, later elected President of East Timor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Archbishop Desmond Tutu</td>
<td>Chairman, South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Professor Muhammad Yunus</td>
<td>Founder, Grameen Bank of Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is the Time Ripe for a Dedicated Peace Museum in Australia?

The central argument of this paper is that in the twenty-first century, peace and sustainability are imperative survival issues. Peace however, is poorly understood. Peace is not merely the cessation of war, and war is not a necessary prelude to peace. Like other public goods such as literacy and longer life expectancy, peace requires a clear idea of the goal and the investment of moral and physical resources. While Australia has a strong museum culture and a sophisticated and diverse grassroots peace movement it lacks a dedicated focused peace museum. Peace-related exhibitions already occur in an ad hoc fashion in a variety of museums. The Sydney Peace Prize, an event with a sixteen-year history, could become a permanent exhibit in a dedicated peace museum. Peace museums overseas provide models that can be adapted to the needs of Australia.

An Australian Peace Museum would contribute a great deal to learning from the last one hundred years and preparing for the next hundred. It would provide ongoing engagement and social learning; develop a moral imagination and promote a culture of peace. The stakes are now perilously high. Time is ripe for an institution devoted to the study of resistance to war, the civil society peace movement and reconciliation. We can no longer afford to repeat the mistakes of earlier generations. It is indeed the time for peace and a dedicated peace museum is integral to this process in Australia.
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‘When I was in the White House, I was confronted with the challenge of the Cold War. Both the Soviet Union and I had 30,000 nuclear weapons that could destroy the entire earth and I had to maintain the peace’.

Jimmy Carter
Building Cultures of Peace via Community Peace Wheels: The Los Angeles/Southern California experience

LINDA GROFF

Community peace wheels are an effective tool for involving different sectors of the community in the peace-building process. They facilitate the integration of community activities in the goal of creating cultures of peace in the community and around the world. This commentary provides examples of peace wheels, and discusses a Peace Convergence Process involving a peace wheel that took place in a Los Angeles, California, community in 2012 to illustrate how peace wheels can contribute to the peace-building process at the community level.

Introduction

Promoting cultures of peace around the world involves a range of peace-building practices such as developing visions and goals for a peaceful society and the world, with nonviolence as the means used in bringing about needed associated socio-political change. An approach that has been developed to integrate community activities in the goal of creating cultures of peace is ‘peace convergence processes’ where the peace wheel is at its heart. Peace wheels are not widely known within the peace studies community, yet they are an effective tool for involving different sectors of the community in the peace-building process. This commentary provides examples of peace wheels, and discusses a Peace Convergence Process involving a peace wheel that took place in a Los Angeles, California, community in 2012 to illustrate how peace wheels can contribute to the peace-building process at the community level.

Some Examples of Community Peace Wheels

The diagrammatic form of a peace wheel is a circle with a central hub that is divided into different sectors. What is placed in the hub and the sectors varies according to circumstances. This section will discuss three different peace wheel examples to illustrate their variety, referring to those devised by Avon Mattison, Barbara Marx Hubbard, and Leland Stewart.

Avon Mattison is President and Co-Founder of the group Pathways to Peace. In 1983, this group worked with the previous UN Assistant Secretary General, Robert Muller, to develop the Culture of Peace Initiative, including an annual International Day of Peace on 21 September of each year. Avon first developed a version of a community peace wheel with eight ‘sectors’, where she saw each sector as reflecting an aspect of the community necessary to create the ‘pathways to peace’. Her eight sectors are science and technology, religious/spiritual teaching, environment, culture, government/law, education, economics/business and health/relationships.

Another example of a peace wheel is that devised by Barbara Hubbard. Barbara Marx Hubbard is a very well known futurist and co-founder of The Foundation for Conscious Evolution, who also proposed the creation of a Peace Room in the White House as a counter to the War Room. She is also well known for doing Syn-Cons (or Synergistic Convergences), beginning in the 1980s, with alternate peace wheels being created at different times. Just one version is shown here as an example (see Diagram 1). Different goals can be placed at the centre of the hub depending on what the engaged persons would like to put there, and the sectors can be re-developed in relation to their chosen goal.

Diagram 1: Barbara Marx Hubbard’s Wheel of Co-Creation
In her peace wheel, the notions of Co-Creation ‘Worldview’ and ‘Whole Systems Design’ are at the centre of the hub, surrounded by the following twelve sectors: justice, health, spirituality, infrastructure, environment, media, governance, social relations, arts, economics, science and education.

Barbara Hubbard’s Syn-Con Process brought together people from all twelve sectors of her wheel. People from each sector could propose ideas and projects that would benefit the community. The Syn-Con would take place for several days and a newsletter announced ideas from each sector. To help the implementation of the ideas proposed, project idea proposers for each sector could note both ‘needs’ (what it needs from other sectors to implement its ideas and projects), as well as ‘resources’ (what it could provide to help other sectors/areas meet their needs for a project they were proposing). Another aspect of the Syn-Cons is that as they progress, the boundaries between different sectors begin to merge through brainstorming occurring in ever-larger groups, leading to proposed projects on increasingly larger cooperating group levels.

More recently, Barbara has worked to create an online version of her Syn-Cons. In this format, people who are not physically present with each other could still experience brainstorming ideas with others, firstly within, and then across different sectors. They could also share their ‘needs’ and ‘resources’ across the sectors to help everyone implement their proposed ideas and projects.

Another version of a community wheel comes from Rev. Dr Leland Stewart of Los Angeles (see Diagram 2). He was the founder of Unity-and-Diversity World Council (UDC) (formerly called International Cooperation Council, 1965-1980). Leland is the grandfather of interfaith in Los Angeles, having brought together for many years people from different faith traditions as well as different sectors of the community to focus on different global and local issues under the auspices of UDC (and ICC before that).

The UDC Community Wheel has ‘Unity’ at the centre with twelve sectors around it, organised under four quadrants. The first quadrant represents Researching Universal Principles, including Nature of the Individual, Nature of Society and Nature of the Universe. The second quadrant represents Developing Universal Persons, including Health and Healing, Inter-Personal Relations and Spiritual Awareness. The third quadrant represents Communicating New Realities, including Education, Media and The Arts. The fourth quadrant represents Implementing a New Civilization, including Cultural Understanding, Community Involvement and Global Solutions.

UDC used its Community Unity Wheel as the foundation to organise several one to two-day convergences, including several retreats, based on this wheel. Two-day retreats tended to follow the following format. Saturday morning would be a general introduction, then in the afternoon people would meet in twelve different sectors. On the Sunday, people would converge to meet in four quadrants and then in the afternoon they would all meet together in the unity hub. The goal of these convergences and retreats was to launch ongoing activities and projects for the upcoming year. Some of the proposed activities continued for the year while some did not, as it can be difficult to get people already committed to their own organisations to commit to new ones.

The Creation of a Community Peace Wheel for Ongoing Los Angeles/Southern California Activities and Events

In 2012, a new UDC Community Peace Wheel was created (see Diagram 3). It has become the foundation for at least four ongoing Los Angeles/Southern California activities aimed at supporting the creation of Cultures of Peace in our community. After first discussing the peace wheel, these four activities will each be briefly discussed.

UDC has had a Peace Sunday event every year for many years. In 2012, UDC decided to create a three-day Peace Fest weekend for that year’s event. Preparation for the all-day Peace Convergence process, which would form part of the Peace Fest, included a new UDC Community Peace Wheel. This effort was carried out by the four-member organising committee: Dr Leland Stewart, Founder of Unity-and-Diversity World Council in Los Angeles; Stephen Fiske, longtime peace activist, poet, and musician; Joanie English, head of the large Agape Church Peace Ministry; and Dr Linda Groff, longtime California State University professor of Peace Studies, Futures Studies, and Intercultural/Interfaith Dialogue. Their peace wheel placed ‘Peace’ at the centre. The next step was to determine the twelve sectors which were most important in creating a culture of peace for the community, and how these twelve sectors could best be organised under the four quadrants of the traditional UDC community wheel.

The resulting Community Peace Wheel, with twelve sectors organised under four quadrants, was as follows:
The key dimensions of this Peace Wheel can be explained thus:

**Living By Universal Principles includes**

Science, Technology and Spirituality: The wise use of science and technology based on universal spiritual values and principles that benefit the whole of humanity and environmental sustainability.

Peace with the Earth: Stewardship, sustainability, dealing with threats to the environment, reversing global warming, understanding our sacred inter-relationship with all creation.

Nonviolence: A way of living based on Satyagraha (truth or soul force), and methods of action, strategy and tactics for social change based on Ahimsa (love and respect for the sacredness of all life).

**Becoming Whole Persons includes**

Health, Healing and Nutrition: Individual and collective wellbeing, eradicating disease, feeding the global population, providing healthy organic methods of growing and raising food, issues of healthcare, medicine, and pharmaceuticals.

Interpersonal/Gender/Family Relations: Validating and balancing the roles of all genders within the fabric of society and family, considering the rise of the Divine Feminine and the empowerment of women.

Inner Peace/Spiritual Awareness: Looking at the cultivation of inner peace and how it helps to create peace in the world. Also the experience of spirituality in connecting each individual, as well as their respective faiths and belief systems, to life’s ultimate nature.

**Communicating New Realities includes**

Education: Refers to peace education in particular, based on understanding that peace is a subject worthy of inclusion in our educational curriculum on all levels. How we educate people impacts how they see and experience the world.

Media and the Arts: The way peace is portrayed and projected through the arts, and the use of various media to communicate real-world problems, as well as peaceful alternatives for humanity’s future.

Intercultural/Interfaith Dialogue: Here, the cultures and faiths of the world come together to interact with each other in respectful dialogue, to create deeper understandings, areas of common ground and collective collaboration.

**Building a New Civilization includes**

End War/Sustain Peace: Transformation from war-making to peace-building. Creating institutions to keep the peace. Ending war and reducing military spending as a prerequisite for a peaceful and sustainable future.

Social Justice/Human Rights/Government: Establishing human rights and social justice, upheld by governments, is critical to establishing and maintaining a culture of peace. There can be no peace without justice.

Alternative Economics/Business: Searching for an ethical basis for economics and business that is based upon sharing for the common good and a concern for the wellbeing of all people and the planet.

**The Peace Convergence Process in Los Angeles**

The Peace Fest weekend began on the night of Friday 21 September 2012 with a kick-off event. An all-day Peace Convergence Process then took place on the Saturday, and an Interfaith Service for Peace on the Sunday morning. On the Sunday afternoon the Peace Sunday event was held, with keynote speakers, music, and booths by different community peace and interfaith organisations.

The Saturday Peace Convergence Process was based on the new Community Peace Wheel. It provided an opportunity for people to connect with other individuals and organisations involved in different aspects of peace-building, with the goal of creating ongoing cooperative relationships and projects. To facilitate this, the Convergence began with participants divided into twelve sectors, which later converged into four quadrants, and finally into one central peace hub. People shared their work to date in each area of peace, as well as their visions, ideas, and proposed projects for future cooperation and collaboration towards creating a Culture of Peace.

The spirit of the Peace Convergence Process included recognition that many of our institutions are dysfunctional and not meeting people’s needs, and that we are in a great transition period on the planet where change is needed, especially in the grassroots. It maintained the principle that we can do more together rather than separately. It endorsed the strategy that peace education is essential to this process, and will enhance cooperation and collaboration in our community. Finally, it held inherently to the belief that spirit must guide our process and joint efforts.
The Peace Convergence Process, based on the community peace wheel, identified a large number of possible community projects. These included the creation of a Peace Directory of organisations, the foundation of a People’s United Nations, and the establishment of a Peace Institute and Speakers’ Bureau to promote ongoing peace education efforts in our community.

Various follow-up events also proved successful. One of these was a monthly Culture of Peace Education Series, where panels from each sector took a turn each month in presenting. Dialogue followed each presentation, with discussions about how other sectors of the peace wheel related to the sector focused on each month. Through this process people could begin to see how the different aspects of peace interrelate, and also see ways in which people can cooperate in building a culture of peace across different sectors of the wheel.

We were fortunate to have the IMAN Center in Los Angeles provide a meeting space for most of our monthly Culture of Peace Series. A vegetarian meal was provided before each monthly presentation. Going forward, we will be asking all presenters in the Culture of Peace series to write an article for a forthcoming book on peace. Videos were also made of a few of the Culture of Peace presentations, which we might be able to include in a proposed book.

The four-member organising committee for the Peace Convergence and the Culture of Peace Series decided they would like to award ‘Culture of Peace’ certificates. The aim was to recognise the contributions of those who attended a significant number of the monthly Culture of Peace Series as well as all those who presented on a Culture of Peace panel and also, all the sector facilitators of the earlier Peace Convergence Process. The presentations were conducted at a celebratory event that was open to anyone who attended any of these previous events or any other interested persons from the community. The turnout was impressive! We saw this as a great opportunity to bring together, recognise, and celebrate all those people working on various aspects of peace in our community, while also announcing our next step, which is the Culture of Peace book.

The process is underway to put together a book of articles by all the presenters on panels in our monthly Culture of Peace Educational Series, as well as by sector facilitators of the earlier Peace Convergence. We also plan to include selected ideas from the Peace Convergence Report in an appendix to the book. We are also asking for contributions on peace prayers, meditations, affirmations, and poetry to include in the book.

Conclusions and Policy recommendations

The examples discussed above show how community wheels can be an effective tool in the peace-building toolbox that enables any community to create their own wheel, with whatever focus they want in the central hub of their wheel, along with identifying and bringing together different sectors of their community to share current projects and ideas for future collaboration. These work in support of co-creating cultures of peace, greater understanding across sectors, and efforts at building friendships and future collaboration in creating a better world. Each community must adapt this tool, like any tool, to the particular needs of their community at any given time. But if one wants to bring different sectors of one’s community together, for whatever purpose, then this is a good tool for doing that.

Hopefully, what we have done in Los Angeles/Southern California, with a series of activities and events based on the community peace wheel that we generated here, will inspire other communities to explore how they might apply this peace-building tool to the particular needs of their own communities. Peace is not a final end state, but an evolving concept. As the world evolves and changes, so too must our peace-building efforts.
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Dawn of the Planet of the Crazies

By this stage showing signs of extreme delusion, the Amnesia crazies lauded the military campaign of ‘smash and grab’ which in no time at all left Iwreck in ruins. On 1 May 2003 Emperor Shrub declared ‘we did it’ aboard an Amnesia aircraft carrier. As time passed, and much to the consternation of the crazies themselves, there were no Armageddon Bombs (ABs) to be found in Iwreck – one of the many early pretexts for the troubled invasion. In a few short months Iwreck descended into extreme violence and chaos. The crazies, however, continued to insist that ABs were present in Iwreck, possibly hidden in a chicken pen, suitcase, or underneath a rock. Even so, the infamous known-unknown, Donald Dunderhead, was not about to recant on his wreckless adventurism, insisting in the face of mounting evidence that Iwreck was a peaceful country — a shining example of democracy and freedom. Tired of the whole Iwreck thing, Emperor Shrub eventually retired to his fortified ranch to take up another hobby — portraiture.

Despite all the obvious setbacks, the crazies seemed to perk up in the wake of the 2010 Iwreck national elections. With the help of almighty God, and fingers crossed, the great sacrifices in Iwreck might have been worth it after all. Despite such optimism, Iwreck slid into further violent chaos. The situation was not assisted by Amnesia’s favoured Prime Minister, Nouri al-Malfuction, who thumbed his nose at the country’s minority religious groups who, in turn, responded with mounting anger and violence.

The virus that began in the 1980s had morphed into a Rabies-like killer. No one seemed able to stop it, and once another band of darkly clad religious devotees took control of large parts of northern Iwreck there seemed little prospect of peace. Back in the heart of empire, a new group of radical crazies known as the Pea-Brain Party, pushed for a return to global military dominance. Yet amid howls of protest from his opponents in Congress, the new Emperor Odrama had withdrawn the bulk of US troops from Iwreck. The Amnesia electorate was tired of war, and the empire simply couldn’t afford another incursion into Iwreck or anywhere else for that matter. This left Iwreck dangerously exposed.

Meanwhile, the now semi-reclusive crazy, George W. Shrub, had his own portrait hung in the empire’s palace and the crazies continued to claim a job well done. Shrub, had his own portrait hung in the empire’s palace and the crazies continued to claim a job well done. Another incursion into Iwreck or anywhere else for that matter. This left Iwreck dangerously exposed.

The symptoms were devastating: severe cuts to public services, increased inequality, attacks on trade unions and other political opponents, and the erosion of civil liberties. Bad as these symptoms were, an even more virulent strain of the virus was incubated by an extremist group of politicians in the United States of Amnesia. Known as ‘the crazies’, this clandestine mob of ideological fundamentalists was advised by academic economists and rogue political scientists. Following a number of secretive meetings held in dark corners and alleyways, the crazies drew up a dastardly plan to fuse NLT with the virus WDZ (World Domination and Zomibification).

No longer satisfied with propping up dictators, assassinating democratically elected leaders and funding death squads, the crazies employed the virus to create ‘The Project for a New Amnesia Century’: a florid manifesto aimed at demonstrating to the world exactly who was boss. Cleverly, the crazies bided their time. Once their anointed leader, George W. Shrub, was sworn in as emperor in January 2001 the dye was cast. All that was needed was a pretext for action. Emperor Shrub had a lot on his mind in the early days of his reign, not least the vulnerability of oil supplies to his beloved empire. He became obsessed with his shadow crazy, a moustached brute-dictator in faraway Iwreck. Despite having been ejected from a neighbouring country by Shrub senior, the moustached one continued to pose a threat to the empire’s oil supply. But the question was how to dislodge this crazy who was prone to gassing his own people. An unrelated opportunity arose in late 2001 when three planes filled with passengers and kerosene ploughed into military and financial centres in the heart of Amnesia. Amidst the shock and horror the crazies set about concocting yet another plan to invade Iwreck, a country that posed no direct military threat to the empire. The idea was to create a ‘new Iwreck’ that would ensure the spread of the hybrid virus across the troubled region. The invasion proceeded in April 2003 even though Iwreck had no links, as claimed, with other volatile crazies around the world.
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citizens. By mid-2014, Iwreck had become a lightning rod for more darkly clad folk from around the world.

Amid much head scratching and hand wringing the empire’s leadership seemed happy to consign Iwreck to violent oblivion. Emperor Odrama seemed bereft of ideas, and eventually resorted to the tried and failed tactic of bombing the crap out of the darkly clad ones. Meanwhile, the Pea-brain crazies sought to develop an even more powerful strain of the NLT-WDZ virus.

But, just when all hope seemed lost, an antidote was discovered in the form of a peace with justice serum. This amazing concoction was trialled successfully in various laboratories in the southern hemisphere. Slowly, with repeated doses, patients began to show signs of recovery: appearing more equitable, peaceful and cooperative, and less prone to delusions of grandeur and muscular militarism. Unfortunately, some victims of the virus – especially those ensconced in the empire’s palace and at some universities, institutes and think tanks — were simply too far gone.

Nothing could be done to save them.
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‘True security is based on peoples’ welfare – on a thriving economy, on strong public health and education programmes, and on fundamental respect for our common humanity. Development, peace, disarmament, reconciliation and justice are not separate from security; they help to underpin it’.

Ban Ki-Moon

---

mantra for getting beside myself

peace in the world
peace in me
to spirits abroad
as well my spiriting within

say
peace in the world
peace in me

let saying
make so

say
peace in the world
make
peace in me

in the worlds in me
say peace

Kit KeLEN, Markwell, NSW and Macao

my father’s manions

news of a new war
shapes the soul’s obsessions
in my dream the house
never twice the same
but I have always
been before
glass valley
full fog mountain brow
storm trees awash
all green
every morning
see the night heal over
day come piecing itself
from memory
light chases the blood
through its storms
like hands that hold
the prayer and parting

Kit KeLEN, Markwell, NSW and Macao
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