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Most of the British media made a nod to the start of the state-sponsored First World War centenary in January. The Guardian was first off the mark on 1st January with an article by Michael Morpurgo. Morpurgo is a much-lauded writer whose book War Horse became a world wide theatrical sensation. ‘Someone’, he writes, ‘once called it "the greatest anthem to peace" ever seen on stage. His article was quickly followed by Michael Gove Education Secretary venting spleen in the Daily Mail on all who thought that the war was anything less that glorious or just. Two days later Tristram Hunt, historian and MP, tore into Gove for maligning ‘left wing’ academics. This tit for tat sets the pattern for the next few years. A tale full of sound and fury, signifying nothing as Macbeth might have said. Macbeth’s nemesis was coming over the hill but ours is already here but we cannot seem to see the forest for the wood.

How much should we be concerned about these public spats? Of course truth about major events in the past is important but no more so than facts about the present. These are mostly passing us by all the while creating the conditions for a less attractive future. The British ‘influence industry’ is worth some £2,000,000,000*. It operates under our noses and affects every aspect of our lives from the food we eat to the weapons our money is spent on. Unknown by most this ‘silent’ lobbying drowns out public interest. Even the government employs lobbying companies to promote its unpopular projects. The spats about what kind of war the 1914–1918 was also have their political dimension and meld with stories about the dangers facing Britain crafted to suit political and financial agendas. It’s hard to know what to believe.

Despite all this effort the MoD believes that the public has become ‘risk averse’ and might be unwilling for Britain to go to war. They worry that some of their pet projects – things that make a bigger bang and offer opportunity for some action might be a hard sell. In its discussion paper* the MoD looks at ways to minimise the public’s emotional engagement with Britain’s wars.

---

* www.peacematters.org.uk   spring 2014

COMMENT

no more war  Jan Melichar

join us on
International
Conscientious
Objectors
Day
15 May
12 noon
Tavistock Sq
London
for a short ceremony to remember the men who said no
Recent acquisition of Boston Dynamics whose US army’s funded ‘Big Dog’* offers a terrifying vision of the future.

The military and their friends in high places may have short term worries, in the long term however they have little to worry about the public’s continuing and deeply ingrained support for killing people if the ‘price is right’. That’s putting it a little crudely but that is what it amounts to. Michael Morpurgo’s article in The Guardian was despite name checking reconciliation, pacifism, the white poppy, no glory and inviting us to read all that anti war poetry and ‘to make the world a place where freedom and peace can reign together’ is none the less a gentle version of conventional war acceptance.

*No more war* may be easy to say but in this charged and politicised centenary few lips seem able to utter it. Its problem is that unlike ‘no glory’ it is an insistent and clear order to those with the capacity to start war (a handful of men usually and certainly in the case of WW1) it also asks the question: How do we ensure that there are no more wars? No easy answer of course but being armed to the teeth or to the knees in the case of Britain is while living of the fat of arms sales that destabilise conflict prone areas is surely not the way to go.


War

The victories of mind
Are won for all Mankind,
But war wastes what it wins,
Ends worse than it begins,
And is a game of woes,
Which nations always lose,
Though tyrant tyrant kill,
The slayer liveth still.
*Ebenezer Elliott
1781 – 1849*
news from ppu

**may 15**

In the run up to the centenary of the First World War the PPU jointly with a number of peace groups will be remembering the Conscientious Objectors and the women peace campaigners who said No to the war.

Descendants of some 30 First World War Conscientious Objectors and women peace campaigners from all over the country will be coming to London to commemorate the lives of their relatives and the stand taken by all those who opposed the war.

As part of a wider project the PPU will be launching a new website - remembering the men who said no - later in the year. In the coming months (years) we will not only list the names of WW1 COs but also provide short biographies with photographs and related documents where possible. All will be supplemented with contextual material giving a clear and vivid picture of the varied attitudes and experiences of the COs and the society around them. The PPU is in effect carrying on the work of these men and women many of who later became PPU members. The new site together with the archival material we have and are now vigorously collecting will ensure that their stand is not only not forgotten but that many of their values are vigorously advocated and advanced.

As always you help is important. In particular we would like information about any family member that was a WW1 CO. We now have an active research group in London (see P6) and a few supporters are beavering in archives around the country but more help is needed to uncover a fuller story of the CO and anti war activities during the war. Contact jan@ppu.org.uk

**another centenary**

Benjamin Britten, a conscientious objector in the last world war was a PPU member till his death. 2014 is the centenary anniversary of his birth and various events relating to this are taking place. An exhibition in Aldeburgh will feature his involvement with the PPU and a recent radio program which explores the social and political background to the pacifism which was central to his creative vision and that of his fellow composer Michael Tippett. You can listen to it at http://goo.gl/lkDbWp

**active for peace: 1960s and the Present**

In 1966, a young peace researcher from Sweden, Herman Schmid, approached the PPU with the idea of conducting a survey of its members. Schmid had already completed a survey of activists of the world’s oldest peace group, the Swedish Peace and Arbitration Society, founded in 1883. The plan now was to extend this approach to other peace groups in Norway and the UK. | continues p15
objecting to war in london

As we begin the centenary year of the outbreak of the First World War, it's to be expected that the conflict will be increasingly in the public consciousness. By only the second of January, the First World War was back as a point of debate in the media, with politicians, historians and even actors weighing in on the legitimacy of the war. On the Objecting to War project, it can often feel like we have the definitive, debate-ending evidence: the testimonies of men who stood up to be counted as against the war. Unfortunately, it's not enough to simply state an opposing view - we must be active in telling the story of conscientious objection in the first world war.

The Objecting to War project is busy telling that story in as many ways as we can. One of the fortunate side effects of the increased attention on the First World War has been the number of volunteers that have made contact with us, as people from all over London are turned away from the “Official” pro-militarist interpretations of the conflict. Individuals and historical societies have now started work on uncovering some of the forgotten experiences of conscientious objectors - adding many more names, and much more detail to our database. I've also been spending much of my time in archives and libraries searching through Tribunal records, census information and newspapers and have already begun to unearth some fascinating stories of defiance and resistance to the Military Service Act. One such story has been that of Charles (Carl) Titford; a Tottenham CO who flatly defied the decision of his tribunal, flatly stating: “I have no other choice but to refuse obedience to the law of the land and to take the consequences”. Carl's story has been incredibly interesting to explore - an ordinary man who faced repeated punishment for standing up for his own moral principles, enduring cycles of military punishment, prison and court martial for three years, only being released in 1919. Biographies like these are the main focus of the Objecting to War project in this early period of 2014. By collecting the stories of men as they lived them, rather than as statistics, we can remind people that the decisions to become a CO, and the almost equally difficult decision to support COs through the war years, were made by people just like them - ordinary men and women from...
London who, in whatever capacity, resisted war.

While our volunteers have been busy gathering stories, I’ve been busy finding ways to communicate them to the general public. Many organisations around London have asked to be involved and we have provided information and supporting documents to sculptors, artists, theatres, film producers, historians, museums, archives and libraries from Enfield to Croydon. We will be exhibiting our material alongside both local and central London museums and virtually every borough of the Greater London area will be hosting a supplementary exhibition on Conscientious Objection in the First World War. At this point, most of our collaborations are in their early stages - helping groups find inspiration in the stories we have collected and designing ways we can work together in the coming year. Others have progressed very quickly and the results will be made available very soon. Video discussions and interviews and volunteer-written articles are already available to view and more will be added in the coming months.

The main result of all the meetings we’ve had as part of the project, every collaboration, discussion and idea has been to show me something about Conscientious Objectors that has provided a constant source of inspiration for the project. The more information we gather and the more stories we collect, the more it is clear that COs weren’t just resisting war, or dissenting to it’s operation, aims and results, they were providing an example of the alternative. I think this provides an opportunity for Objecting to War in the centenary years - 100 years after the outbreak of war our challenge is to show that Conscientious Objection provides both a challenge to the militarism of the centenary “celebrations” and an alternative way to remember the First World War.

Ben Copsey

“I have no other choice but to refuse obedience to the law of the land and to take the consequences”

Charles Titford
I suppose I am here to speak this morning because I am known as somebody who criticizes nationalism. In particular I’ve argued that nationalism and racism are linked especially in this country because—rather than all human life being valued the same, our lives become more precious, more important than the lives of others. That discrepancy is most readily apparent when nations are at war. It is important for our understanding of Human Rights and their limits.

For a long time Britain’s combination of racism and nationalism meant that people like me had our belonging challenged. We were told continually to go back to our own countries.

But I had nowhere to go back to. I was born in London and grew up in the shadow cast by world war 2. We played on the bombsites and in the old shelters. We listened, petrified, when the old air-raid sirens opened up—not knowing if it was a test or the end of the world.
Vancouver Peace Poppies in Canada had a very successful campaign with over 4000 poppies distributed and good radio and press coverage. The group felt they made a small breakthrough when a ‘padre’ at one local legion wore both white and red poppies while giving the readings and sermon at one of the official Canadian legion sponsored Remembrance Day Ceremonies in Vancouver. He ‘dared’ to speak of civilians as well as military casualties. It seems that slowly and steadily they believe they are making a difference in Canadian’s thinking.

The group has partnered with teachers to apply for a grant to purchase extra poppies for a province wide school campaign next year.

Increasing numbers of schools in Britain get white poppies from us but there is always scope for more.

Can you help promote white poppies to schools in your area?

We lacked the concept of post-trauma which helped to explain why some of our teachers gibbered and shook and why others boasted of their scars and talked incessantly about the good war they had had.

Certainly, my sense of the value of peace was determined by those experiences. It was enhanced by the fact that my broken great uncle was a survivor of WW1 and above all by the fact that my father had been a conscientious objector—some-

thing that even in the 1960s was sometimes a source of embarrassment and hostility.

At that time, the shadows of the 39–45 war were so deep that, knowing nothing about Cyprus, Aden and Malaya to say nothing about Ireland we thought we were at peace. Our idea of peace was an effect—an inversion if you like—of what we understood about the war. It was imagined only as war’s opposite—its negation.

I think that idea of peace isn’t much help these days.

The idea of a clear distinction between being at war and being in peacetime has faded away. War is now endless, apparently permanent.

Peace is found at the grave of your enemies—the export of war to distant unseen places. Indeed, as Orwell feared, war is
peace. It becomes peace when it can be justified by the idea that it makes us secure and protects our freedoms even while that very security and the securitocracy that creates it, chip away at those freedoms and a tidal wave of propaganda—PR—is deployed to modify the meaning of being English, being British.

When 30 years ago, I wrote a book called Ain’t no Black in The Union Jack, I put an image of a be-medalled, black ex-serviceman at the Cenotaph on the cover because I thought that drawing attention to the sacrifice of colonial and commonwealth soldiers could be used as a kind of leverage: to make citizenship rights deeper and to compel recognition of our presence, our belonging. The time for that is also passed.

The belligerent excesses of the nationalist PR machine are evident all around. Building up to the commemoration of WW1 which we’re told is going to be a celebration of Britishness and national values. This is what the Americans—who are increasingly influential in our government’s view of how we should relate to what they have started to call “The Military”—would describe as a “Pep Rally”.

This year the most offensive and insidious aspect of this has been the Royal British Legion targeting children, dressing them up in T-shirts that say things like “Future soldier”—I say this as somebody who walked proudly in remembrance day parades wearing my scout’s uniform and meditating on the horror and futility of war rather than panting for a chance to join in one.

The grotesquery continues in the idea that the arms trade will lever this country out of recession. Rolls-Royce, Serco, BAE, EADS, Thales, Atkins, Cobham, JCB, Strongfield Technologies, MBDA, Ultra Electronics involved in selling weapons and related technology to new economies like Brazil and India, to the Gulf states and to the important markets for killing and torture equipment in places like Kazakhstan.

In these new circumstances, being for peace requires more than an abstract repugnance towards the futility of war. It requires an active opposition to the ways in which our coun-
Country is being reconstituted as a warfare rather than a welfare state.

Whichever government functionary has been dispatched to keep an eye on us here today, will no doubt produce a report that says this square was all but empty this morning. They’ll say that there is nothing to worry about here. That the mass movement against the wars of a decade ago is over and perhaps that it is now nothing to be concerned about because it represented a new sort of phenomenon in politics in that it could appear to be enormous and then, a few moments later, disappear entirely.

The PR operation announces “lest we forget” but requires that national History must be clean and the impossible quest for that clean history involves forgetting and filtering—patterned amnesia. We forget Marine A’s crimes of last week or the torture and abuse of prisoners in the Kenyan emergency.

But war and its recurrence—often in the same old colonial places—means that a clean story will never be secured.

The line between loving our hero soldiers even if we loathe what the government asks them to do, is, in the medium term, unsustainable.

War can never be a friction free, costless, playful activity like the computer game that the propaganda machine requires it to be.

Those discrepancies run deep in Britain. They're older than the C20 opposition to warfare’s industrialisation. They go back into the ancient stories and songs of impressment and forced military labour.

Like the history of feminist resistance to war that Jane Grant will speak about in a moment, that dissenting seam in England’s national sensibility is inviting us to become reacquainted with it. That is what must not be forgotten.

Those overlooked histories alone provide the key to building a movement that will overflow this space. A movement not only against war and for peace but one that operates in a new spirit: firmly against the militarization of our lives our society and our culture.
refusing to be enemies

Refusing to be Enemies is a book that comes at an opportune time when the US Secretary of State John Kerry is making a concerted effort to present a framework within which Israeli and Palestinian mediators might discuss. As Dore Gold, president of the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs and former Israeli negotiator has said “There is a consensus in Israel favoring a Palestinian state, but not along the 1967 borders (as the Palestinian leadership insists); not with East Jerusalem as its capital (a cornerstone of every Palestinian plan); and not without maintaining an Israeli military presence in the Jordan Valley (which Palestinians reject as a challenge to their sovereignty).” Gold could have added that there is no consensus within Israel about a “Palestinian right-to-return beyond not discussing it.

Moreover, the Israel-Palestine issues are only part of a wider Middle East picture. As Ursula Franklin points out in the Foreword “Ours is a complex global society, in which unforeseen and unforeseeable instruments of power, control and interaction are emerging at rapid rates. These new power structures are frequently superimposed on traditional arrangements and habits of political and social conduct. Such new developments, often related to modernization and globalization, are altering individual and collective behaviors and a society’s sense of belonging and responsibility.”

Her insight is elaborated in the Israel-Palestine context by the Palestinian activist Elias Rishmawi who says “The world, with globalization, is becoming a small village, then the whole Middle East is what? Israel/Palestine is what? We are talking here about a small land and a small population. We need to come up with a certain vision that will help both of us to think that without having peace, justice, and equality, there will be no solution.”

Maxime Kaufman-Lacusta has developed through interviews and quotations from talks given at conferences on non-violent action in Israel-Palestine a fascinating book — an extended evaluation session on tactics and strategies among Palestinians and Israeli activists along with “internationals” — Europeans and Americans usually associated with International Solidarity Movement to which
belonged Rachel Corrie who was killed in a house demolition protest. Maxime is interested in how people became involved in non-violent action, in their family history and their beliefs, how they evaluate the overall situation and the effectiveness of the aims and the tactics. However, the emphasis is on improving the effectiveness of action by asking about individual’s evaluation of the overall situation, the aims, the strategy, the tactics, the effectiveness of the actions and the value of cooperation between Israelis, Palestinians and internationals. “Despite its relative marginality and other impediments to its successes, the non-violent movement has chalked up some notable victories over the years. And even if these have been relatively small when compared to the magnitude of the task, they provide a good entry point for a foray into some speculation on the potential for non-violent struggle in the future.”

For most, Israel Occupation means the land and processes put into effect after the 1967 war with the occupation of the “West Bank” which had been under the control of Jordan, Gaza and Sinai under Egyptian rule and the Golan Heights, part of Syria — thus 46 years of “Occupation”. For some, especially Palestinians, occupation begins in 1948 and the Arab refugee flows from villages now in the State of Israel. Discussions on the implementation of the “Right to Return” — an important Palestinian demand — concerns if a return should be to the Israeli areas which the Palestinians had left or rather a return to the potential Palestinian State — basically the West Bank and Gaza Strip, or rather monetary compensation for property lost.

The first working title of the book was to have been “From Beit Sahour to Bil’in”, but the title would have been understood only by those who recalled the town of Beit Sahour’s sustained tax strike in the late 1980s and the continuing weekly protests at Bil’in against the “Separation Wall” which would deprive Palestinian farmers of access to their lands and land confiscation.

The title Refusing to be Enemies may give the impression that the focus will be on attitudes, on the refusal to make the Other the Enemy. However, there is relatively little emphasis on psychology. Gene Sharp is the spiritual “godfather” with some extended quotations of his talks at seminars in Palestine with Mubarak Awad as the person who had translated into Arabic and distributed widely Sharp’s list of potential actions — until Mubarak Awad was deported in 1988 from Israel to the USA. However Mubarak Awad had planted many of the seeds which later flowered in part through his nephew Sami Awad of the Holy Land Trust whose observations are often quoted stressing that “Nonviolence is not just weapons to resist the occupation; it is how to build the community of the future, how to resolve internal problems, how to unify the different factions and different ideas that you have in your community, which is a very big problem for us today.”

Originally in much of the Palestinian community non-violence was considered as submissive, as a way for Israel and the West to pacify the Palestinian people. However, little by little, the main thrust of Gene Sharp’s non-violent strategic action which is the power to say “No” has progressed so that now many Palestinians see non-violence as an active tool to resist and end the occupation. The key to Sharp’s approach is the fundamental
Howard Clark died in November, ending a life of radical pacifism. At university, involvement in student politics led to sending reports to Peace News, and on graduating he was offered a job on the paper. With the editorial group he advocated the 1974 changes from weekly newspaper to fortnightly magazine and from London offices to Nottingham. Howard was also a member of the British Withdrawal from Northern Ireland Campaign, using entirely non-violent means but publicly communicating with soldiers; he was not among the BWNIC 14 tried in 1975 at the Old Bailey and famously acquitted, but he was charged with assisting a soldier absent without leave, and fined. After leaving PN in 1976 Howard was much involved in the anti-nuclear power movement, research, the Alternative Defence Commission, and writing Preparing for Nonviolent Direct Action (1983). He was appointed by the War Resisters’ International in 1985 to oversee preparation of the Triennial Conference in India over New Year 1985-86; he remained on the staff until 1997, working on conscientious objection and other issues as widely as South Africa, former Yugoslavia and Latin America, as well as managing the office’s move to the building where he first worked for

“We should be able to learn more about the views of activists in the late 1960s and come to a better understanding of what motivated people at the time to become engaged in peace work.”

Active for Peace - continued

The PPU at that time had about 3,500 members. Schmid mailed a long questionnaire with more than 100 questions to a random sample of 354 members in late 1966. 241 valid responses were received, a response rate of 68%. However, despite the successful completion of the survey, the results were never published. Peace research in the late 1960s had suddenly taken a different turn, focusing on theoretical debates sidelining empirical research.

About ten years ago, I became part of an international research group that sought to analyse protest against the war in Iraq. After completing surveys of participants in the largest ever demonstration in Britain on 15 February 2003, I started to search for the results of previous surveys that could serve as a comparative reference point. How had the social background and the political attitudes of peace activists changed over the years? As part of these searches, I established contact with Herman Schmid who told me about the various surveys he had conducted in the 1960s. Moreover, while he had never been able to analyse the data and publish the results, he had preserved all the original questionnaires and associated documentation which were deposited in a cellar at the University of Roskilde in Denmark.

For a social scientist, the opportunity to rescue and restore survey data from the 1960s is a very rare event as most researchers at that time did not archive their data. With the help of a small grant from the British Academy, I have been able to recover all the material from the cellar in Denmark and started the process of restoring the data from the 1960s. Once this is completed, we should be able to learn more about the views of activists in the late 1960s and come to a better understanding of what motivated people at the time to become engaged in peace work.

Beyond that, I would also like to conduct a new survey of members of the same organisations to see what has changed or remained the same almost 50 years later.

After the mobilisation against the Iraq war, the peace movement appears to have entered a quieter phase in its development, and this may be a good time to reflect on its past and consider the future. I hope that my project can make a contribution to this task, and I hope you will be able to take part in a new survey of PPU members later this year.

Wolfgang Rüdig
School of Government and Public Policy, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow.

We will keep you in touch with developments.
A SONG OF MORE THAN SIXPENCE.

Sing a song of Europe,
Highly civilised;
Four and twenty nations
Wholly hypnotised.
When the battles open
The bullets start to sing;
Isn't that a silly way
To act for any King?
The Kings are in the background
Issuing commands;
The Queens are in the parlour,
Per etiquette's demands.
The bankers in the counting-house
Are busy multiplying;
The common people at the front
Are doing all the dying.

(Demand your members of Parliament to advocate an immediate armistice, and a speedy and honourable peace by negotiations.)

In January 1917 The Tribunal, the paper of the No Conscription Fellowship received 'an interesting communication in the shape of a postcard'. Its text and the Tribunal's added comment appear above.

Donations toward printing this as a postcard are welcome
http://www.ppu.org.uk/donate/