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The Peace and Justice Studies Association (PJSA) is a non-profit organization that was formed in 2001 as a result of a merger of the Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development (COPRED) and the Peace Studies Association (PSA). Both organizations provided leadership in the broadly defined fields of peace, conflict, and justice studies. We are dedicated to bringing together academics, K-12 teachers and grassroots activists to explore alternatives to violence and share visions and strategies for peacebuilding, social justice, and social change. PJSA serves as a professional association for scholars in fields including (but not limited to) peace, justice, and conflict studies, and is the North American affiliate of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA).

Our Mission
The PJSA works to create a just and peaceful world through:
- The promotion of peace studies within universities, colleges and K-12 grade levels
- The forging of alliances among educators, students, activists, and other peace practitioners in order to enhance each other's work on peace, conflict and non-violence
- The creation and nurturing of alternatives to structures of inequality and injustice, war and violence through education, research and action.

Who We Are

The Peace Chronicle is published by PJSA three times a year, and is circulated to current and potential members. The Chronicle features new scholarship and literature, the latest developments in peace research and education, discussion of central issues in the peace and justice movement, book and film reviews, and other important resources for scholars, educators, and activists. On the web: www.peacejusticestudies.org. To submit an article or announcement, or to inquire about advertising or networking opportunities, email: info@peacejusticestudies.org.
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FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

The PJSA Relocates to Georgetown University!

The Peace and Justice Studies Association (PJSA) is pleased to announce the relocation of its bi-national headquarters to Georgetown University. As the North American affiliate of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), the PJSA serves as a leading professional association for scholars, educators, activists, and practitioners in the broad fields of peace and justice studies. In housing its base of operations at Georgetown University, an internationally acclaimed institution with roots in the Jesuit tradition, the PJSA will continue its work in alignment with the university’s mission to pursue the common good in a spirit of service to others and their diverse communities.

“This is a natural partnership, one that will bear fruit in many ways in the years to come,” said Dr. Randall Amster, executive director of the PJSA and director of the Program on Justice and Peace at Georgetown. “Being housed at Georgetown University will raise the profile of the PJSA and enable a deeper engagement with the pressing issues of our time, and will likewise serve to provide many professional development and networking opportunities for students and faculty in the areas of peace and justice.”

The PJSA holds an annual conference, publishes a member newsletter, maintains a directory of peace and justice studies programs, jointly edits an academic journal, and in recent years has developed initiatives including a speakers’ bureau, a syllabus exchange, a program evaluation system, and a book series. At its annual conference, the PJSA gives awards for undergraduate and graduate excellence, social courage, education and scholarship, and lifetime achievement in the field.

“As co-chair of the PJSA, I’m delighted to enter into this relationship with Georgetown University, with its long history as an exceptional institution of higher education fostering leaders and social change agents for today’s world,” said Dr. Richard McCutcheon. “We believe that locating the PJSA offices on the Georgetown campus will open still more doors for students to engage with topics of vital importance in North America to the mutual benefit of both Georgetown students and the membership of the Peace and Justice Studies Association. We look forward to a positive and productive relationship built on mutual respect and concern to advance the goals of a more just and peaceful society in both the United States and Canada.”

A DIRECT PLEA FOR YOUR ONGOING SUPPORT

Like many nonprofits, the PJSA has been challenged to maintain the resources necessary for the business of providing professional opportunities and support for our members. Make no mistake: we are committed to you and the work that you do in the world, and have no plans of going anywhere any time soon! Still, in recent years we have seen an uptick in costs, and we are in the midst of developing new initiatives that will enhance our work yet also require resources.

Our members are the lifeblood and raison d’etre for the PJSA. Please help with a gift today, or recruit a new member tomorrow! Consider leaving a legacy to support the work of peace. And continue participating in this effort, in these ways:

MAKE A DONATION TODAY (securely online, tax-deductible): http://www.peacejusticestudies.org/donation.php

KEEP YOUR MEMBERSHIP CURRENT: http://www.peacejusticestudies.org/membership/

RECRUIT NEW MEMBERS; HOST AN UPCOMING CONFERENCE; SERVE ON THE BOARD; AND MUCH MORE!

The PJSA is an important component in our mutual work as educators, activists, and peacebuilders. If it didn’t exist, we would surely have to invent it! We ask for your reinvigorated support to maintain this collegial shared space that we call the PJSA...

DO YOU HAVE A VEHICLE THAT YOU’D LIKE TO DONATE?

The PJSA is now able to accept vehicle donations. Visit our donations page today: http://www.vehicle-donation.com.org?id=840615479

ANNOUNCING THE PJSA SPEAKER’S BUREAU!

New for 2012, we are initiating an exciting new venture that will highlight the incredible work of our members, and advance the workings of the “peace and justice” field as well. The primary intention of the Speaker’s Bureau is to help carry the mission and values of the PJSA to a broader audience. Understanding that various groups and organizations are often seeking trainers, workshop facilitators, presenters, keynote speakers, and the like, the new PJSA Speaker’s Bureau will allow us to address these needs while showcasing the many talented scholars, educators, and activists among our membership...

More information is available on our website. Queries may be addressed to: speakers@peacejusticestudies.org
Announcing our 2014 conference...

COURAGEOUS PRESENCE:
SHIFTING STORIES AND PRACTICES OF PEACE

The Peace and Justice Studies Association
invites you to our annual conference

October 16-18, 2014
at the
UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, USA
Open to all academics, activists, students, artists, educators, practitioners, and peace professionals

To work for peace and justice from a place of hope, compassion, and persistence requires courage -- not only to face conflict, suffering, and violence, but also to claim one’s own share of the trouble and thereby disrupt the cycle of disowned projection that creates the Other. Such courageous presence invites spaciousness, creativity, and inclusivity. In this spirit, the 2014 PJSA conference invites proposals that tell new stories, shift perspectives on old ones, include participants who are not commonly at the table, and develop transformation and emerging possibilities.

Our conference will be held on the beautiful campus of the University of San Diego on a mesa overlooking the Pacific Ocean. Taking advantage of its location only 20 minutes from the busiest international border crossing in the world (San Diego/Tijuana), we expressly welcome proposals from Mexican and Latin American colleagues, as well as on border and indigenous issues. We also encourage proposals from the area of disability studies, as well as those from the broad range of fields comprising the conjoined areas of peace, conflict, and justice studies.

For more info, and to register, please visit:
www.peacejusticestudies.org

WE LOOK FORWARD TO SEEING YOU THERE IN OCTOBER!
Daryn Cambridge (Social Media Chair) works at the United States Institute of Peace where he leads curriculum development for their Academy Online for Conflict Management and Peacebuilding. He is also Peace Educator in Residence and an Adjunct Professor at American University, a Senior Advisor for Learning and Digital Strategies at the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict, and an independent education and training consultant. He has done consulting work for organizations such as One World Education, LearnServe International, the One World Youth Project, and the United States Association for the University of Peace. He served for three years as Assistant Director of the Democracy Matters Institute and then Director of Youth Programs at Common Cause, designing and facilitating trainings for youth and young adults. He has also been a Program Supervisor and Instructor with the Close Up Foundation (civic education and engagement non-profit); a teacher for Putney Student Travel’s Excel Program at Amherst College; and an urban crew leader with the Student Conservation Association. He also serves on the boards of the Democracy Matters Institute and the Institute for Technology and Social Change. Daryn has a B.A. from Middlebury College and a M.A. in International Training and Education from American University, and a professional certificate in International Peace and Conflict Resolution, also from American University.

Steve Gelb (Conference Chair) teaches in the Departments of Learning and Teaching and of Leadership Studies at the University of San Diego. In collaboration with USD’s Institute for Peace and Justice, he co-directs the university’s graduate Peace and Global Education certificate program. He is a credentialed mediator through the National Conflict Resource Center and currently serves as a volunteer on the Center’s community mediation panel. He recently completed the Alternatives to Violence program facilitation course at California’s Donovan State Prison and has co-facilitated a workshop there.

Randy Janzen (Academic Liaison) is associated with the Mir Centre for Peace at Selkirk College and teaches in undergraduate peace studies. Randy’s current research interest is focused on Unarmed Civilian Peacekeeping, and Randy is a founding member of the newly formed Unarmed Civilian Peacekeeping Applied Research Group (UCPARG). Randy holds a PhD in Social Sciences from Tilburg University in the Netherlands, and has spent the majority of his career working in health care and education, holding a bachelor degree in nursing and a masters degree in Epidemiology. He has worked and volunteered in numerous areas, including inner-city outreach, remote northern communities in Canada, as well as Guatemala and Kosovo.

Mark Lance (Nominations Chair) is professor of philosophy and professor of justice and peace at Georgetown University. He co-founded the justice and peace program 18 years ago at Georgetown and has served as director on several occasions. He served as board co-chair of COPRED before the merger that formed PJSA and was a member of the interim board that drew up the PJSA constitution. Academically, he works primarily in philosophy of language, philosophy of mathematics, and moral and political philosophy. Lance has also worked as an activist and organizer in numerous anti-war, social justice, and international solidarity movements over the last 25 years. He is currently on the national advisory board of the US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation, and helped facilitate the relocation of the PJSA office to Georgetown.

Ellen Lindeen (Fundraising Chair). Assistant Professor of English, begins her 14th year of teaching at Waubonsee Community College in Sugar Grove, IL this fall. She holds a BS in English Education from the University of Wisconsin-Madison and an MA from Northwestern University, Evanston, IL. In January of 2009, she offered her college’s first Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution course after two years of work on a Certificate in Peace Studies at UW-Milwaukee and institutional and curricular preparation. She is especially interested in growing the teaching of peace in the nation’s community colleges.

Karen Ridd (Awards Chair) has been effectively using alternative teaching methodology while teaching in the Conflict Resolution and International Development Studies programs at Menno Simons College of the Canadian Mennonite University and a college of the University of Winnipeg for the last 16 years. She is a mediator, facilitator, teacher, and public speaker with over 25 years of experience. Her community development and human rights work with Peace Brigades International in Central America was recognized with the 1992 Governor-General’s Award: Government of Canada 125th Anniversary of Canadian Confederation Medal, the 1990 Canadian YM/YWCA Canada Peace Medal and the 1989 Manitoba International Human Rights Achievement Award. Karen is also an associate of Training for Change (Philadelphia) and Mediation Services (Winnipeg). Karen has worked extensively with communities in international settings, including El Salvador, Guatemala, Cambodia, Thailand, First Nations Territories, the United States and Colombia.

**FOLLOW THE PJSA NOW ON TWITTER**
Stay up-to-the-minute with news and events: @PJSAtweets

**AND VISIT THE PJSA FACEBOOK PAGE**
“Like” what you see? Visit: www.facebook.com/peacestudies
Once again, I awaken to the realization that the only constant in life is change. With apologies to Newton, Planck, Bohr, and Avogadro, I am increasingly convinced that only Heisenberg (who gave us the eponymous Uncertainty Principle) had the right idea, with its implicit emphasis on the limits of knowledge due to an inherent unpredictability in nature. This, I think, expresses a deeper truth about the nature of life, namely that there is more than meets the eye to the world around us, and that our knowledge of that world — no matter how seemingly unimpeachable — is but mere approximation and thus subject to eternal revision.

The dilemma, both individually and societally, is whether to resist this sense of perpetual change — oftentimes in the name of tradition, order, or stability — or give ourselves over to it, perhaps even coming to revel in it. I would ask rhetorically how many of us truly opt for the latter (myself included), despite thinking of ourselves as open-minded, go-with-the-flow, it’s-all-good sort of people. Indeed, as peacemakers we’re expected to be flexible, tolerant, and non-judgmental on some level. But how far does that ethos extend? Consider for a moment some of today’s profound instabilities:

Climatic systems spiraling chaotically; professional positions of increasing vulnerability; rapid technological and cultural alterations; war continuing to “paint over the years.”

The list could go on, but I can’t. Not all changes are created equal, and it’s not always clear which ones are to be embraced and which are to be resisted. I gather that age is supposed to bring with it a nascent wisdom that helps us to discern such things, yet it seems to be more the case today that moving ahead chronologically brings mostly more obligations, fewer resources, and less time to reflect. Whatever bargain existed between the elites and the workers in a bygone day now appears to be supplanted by a model that gives less and takes more. This is not a state conducive to wise insights.

Still, I recall reveling while “on the road” at many points in life, and keep trying to come back to that sensibility even while being generally domiciled. I want things to change, just not always in the way that the world imposes its changes upon us. Ironically, the work of striving for “social change” sometimes feels more like a quest for social stability in a time gone mad with information overload, deficient attention spans, and nouveau quick fixes. I used to scoff at the notion of becoming more conservative as one ages — but at this juncture, a little more conservation doesn’t seem all that bad.

I merely raise all of this here in a moment of self-indulgence during a personal and professional maelstrom. In the last year, life has brought a cross-country move, a major change in employment, an expansion of the family unit, and more — with all the growing pains one might expect from such a litany. Those youthful travels with nothing but a backpack seem far removed from the middle-aged ones with a family, career, and other responsibilities on one’s back. Despite this, I am determined (note to self) not to capitulate or become a cliché. The road ahead may be uncertain but some of the signs along the shoulder still appear positive, if only to remind us of the immutable nature of change.
Jonathan Martin – the player for the Miami Dolphins who left football, at least temporarily, as a result of relentless locker room bullying – has prompted some voluminous soul-searching. (Whether it leads to meaningful action remains to be seen.) I want to suggest that there have been two profoundly wrong assumptions made in most coverage of this case, and end with a conclusion about how we, and he, should think of Jonathan’s Martin’s own behavior.

First mistake: this is not primarily an issue about Richie Incognito, the Miami Dolphins, or the culture of the NFL. Sure, Incognito sounds like a world-class asshole, the Dolphins have institutionalized abusive male culture to record setting extremes, and toxic masculinity is probably more deeply rooted in the NFL than in any other institution of society. Let’s stipulate all that. But if we look at the general categories of what went on - demeaning someone for not being strong enough; suggesting that lack of strength or physical prowess implies being either gay or feminine which are, of course, bad; using misogynist insults of women close to a man to challenge him; etc. - they perfectly well characterize the boy-culture of a typical middle school or high school in America. These are not distinctively NFL categories of socialization; they are standard operating procedure for teaching boys to be men in our society.

I certainly experienced all these categories of abuse on numerous occasions growing up. If I didn’t take part in misogynist discourse about girls, I was a “pussy” or a “fag”. If I did not succeed in athletics, or displayed my masculinity in the wrong way, I was physically assailed. At times, my mom was the target of abuse as a test to see if I was “man enough” to stand up for her. (At 5’11”, 135 lbs, awkward and not very fit, I most certainly was not.) Those who are perceived as being biological male are systematically, forcefully, consistently, and often violently trained to be sexist assholes. Yes, it is not entirely consistent; there are alternative schools that manage to institute different practices. Yes, there are ways to resist; and some do so heroically. Yes, there is support; anti-bullying campaigns and the like. But all this is sporadic and unevenly distributed. (There is a reason why there is any doubt about how Mr. Rhoden stands on the right way to deal with bullies, we get this adulatory vignette from the world of male socialization: “We all have our stories about learning to cope with bullies. My mother responded to my complaints about a bully next door by giving me an impromptu boxing lesson in our kitchen. (Her brothers were boxers.) Her advice to me was to punch Billy Boy in his face the next time he got in mine.” Note the lesson on how to be a good mother: teach your boys to be tougher than the bully.

Well, not to belabor the obvious, but what exactly would have been gained by punching Billy Boy or Richie Incognito in the face? If successful, the bully will stop terrorizing you. He will be humiliated in the process, and so in all likelihood be even more bullying to someone else, someone less able to punch him in the face. (And let’s be honest, some of us are just not going to be able to successfully punch some of you in the face. Us 135-lb. band nerds are not going to punch young Richie after young Jonathan humiliates him.) Nor is the harm of this strategy limited to the fact that it merely moves the violence over to the next victim. Rather, it reinforces precisely the toxic masculine ideals that led to, and are a function of, the bullying in the first place. You confront bullying designed to construct a particular sort of violent masculinity by proving that you are, in fact, a good violent man, and by humiliating your bully, so that he has to find a new way to prove this of himself.

Lest anyone think to object, I am not here arguing that violent self-defense is always wrong. Sometimes, the threat of immediate harm is so great, and the options so limited, that it might be the best available option to defend oneself with violence. But be clear: punches, cops, court cases, and academic firings are bandaids. At best they prevent particular cases of violent masculinity by particular people against particular victims. They do not address the root causes of our society’s most dreadful social invention - violent masculinity. Indeed, punching bullies in the face, even if it is the best option in a bad situation, is always a form of complicity in the system that constructs this. If we actually want to change the systems that make so many of us into “men” in this sense in the first place, we better find other ways of responding and other ways of intervening. Which brings me to my final point.

There was another option available to Jonathan Martin: namely the very option he embraced. He found himself a part of a vicious, aggressive, violent, misogynist cultural practice. He could not survive in that practice without adopting the behavior and attitudes at work around him. His options in this NFL locker room were embrace the violent masculinity, or be humiliated. Instead, he left. And it seems to me completely clear that this was the right thing to do. In a forced choice between this and participation in profound evil, one must leave, refuse, withdraw. Jonathan, you’ll probably never read this, but I see you as a conscientious objector to a system of vicious misogynist enforced masculinity. You are a conscientious objector to an unjust war on women and boys, just as surely as anyone who lays down their gun rather than massacre civilians. You did the right thing – you ripped this behavior from the locker room to the New York Times; there would be no discussion of this systematic brutalization without your refusal to be involved. You did the brave thing. You did the human thing. You sacrificed your career rather than your humanity. Be proud of that.

Mark Lance is professor of philosophy and justice/peace studies at Georgetown University, and a member of the PJA Board. This commentary was originally published on the APPS blog.
NEWS AND VIEWS: Straight Talk on Ukraine

By Stephen Zunes

It has been interesting to observe the large numbers of people who suddenly think they’re experts on the ongoing crisis in Ukraine—both those on the left who blame it on Obama for intervening too much and those on the right who blame it on Obama for not intervening enough.

As someone who has spent his entire academic career analyzing and critiquing the U.S. role in the world, I have some news: While the United States has had significant impact (mostly negative in my view) in a lot of places, we are not omnipotent. There are real limits to American power, whether for good or for ill. Not everything is our responsibility.

This is certainly the case with Ukraine.

Delusions of Grandeur

On the right, you have political figures claiming that Obama’s supposed “weakness” somehow emboldened Moscow to engage in aggressive moves—citing Crimea—and Ukraine. Sarah Palin, for example, claims that Obama’s failure to respond forcefully to Russia’s bloody incursion into Georgia in 2008 made Russia’s “invasion” possible, despite the fact that Obama wasn’t even president then and therefore couldn’t have done much.

Even some Democrats, like Delaware senator Chris Coons, claim that Obama’s failure to attack Syria last fall made the United States look weak.

In reality, there seems to be little correlation between the willingness of Moscow to assert its power in areas within its traditional spheres of influence and who occupies the White House. The Soviets invaded Hungary in 1956 when Eisenhower was president; the Soviets invaded Czechoslovakia in 1968 when Johnson was president; the Soviets successfully pressed for martial law in Poland in 1981 when Reagan was president; the Russians attacked Georgia in 2008 when Bush was president. In each case, as much as these administrations opposed these actions, it was determined that any military or other aggressive counter-moves would likely do more harm than good.

Washington cannot realistically do any more in response to Russian troops seizing Crimea in 2014 in the name of protecting Russian lives and Russian bases than Moscow could do in response to U.S. troops seizing Panama in 1989 in the name of protecting American lives and American bases.

There is an equally unrealistic view of supposed American omnipotence from some segments of the left in their claims that the United States was somehow responsible for the popular uprising that toppled the Yanukovych regime last month.

First of all, it’s not true that the United States government “spent $5 billion to destabilize Ukraine,” as some agitators have claimed. That figure is the total amount of money provided to the country since independence in 1991, which includes aid to pro-Western Ukrainian administrations (which the United States presumably would not have wanted to destabilize). Like most U.S. foreign aid, some of it went for good things and some for not so good things. There was also some funding through the National Endowment for Democracy and other organizations to some opposition groups that were involved in the recent insurrection, but this was in the millions of dollars, nothing remotely close to $5 billion. And this aid went primarily to centrist groups, not the far right, so claims that the United States “supported fascists” in Ukraine are without foundation.

It’s also unfair to imply that such aid was somehow the cause of the uprising, thereby denying agency to the millions of Ukrainians who took to the streets in an effort to determine (for better or worse) their own future. To claim that U.S. aid was responsible for the Orange Revolution of 2005 or the more recent revolt is as ludicrous as President Reagan’s claims in the 1980s that Soviet aid was responsible for the leftist revolutions in Central America.

The uprising that overthrew Ukrainian president Viktor Yanukovych and his allied pro-Russian oligarchs was not a classic nonviolent pro-democracy uprising like those that have toppled scores of dictatorships in recent decades. Yanukovych was democratically elected, and the forces that ousted him included—though were not dominated by—armed, neo-fascist militias. At the same time, Yanukovych’s rampant corruption, repression, and divide-and-rule tactics had cost him his legitimacy in the eyes of the majority of Ukrainians. The protesters were primarily liberal democrats who engaged in legitimate acts of nonviolent resistance against severe government repression, many of whom spent months in freezing temperatures in a struggle for a better Ukraine dominated by neither Russia nor the West.

To label them as simply puppets of Washington is as unfair as labeling peasant revolutionaries in El Salvador as puppets of Moscow.

At the same time, given that the new government includes corrupt neo-liberal oligarchs along with representatives of the far right, it would be equally wrong to assume that the change of government represents some kind of major progressive democratic opening. And the refusal of the opposition to abide by the compromise agreement of February 21, which called for early elections and limited presidential powers, and seize power directly raises questions regarding the legitimacy of the new government. Whether for good or for ill, however, and despite whatever attempts Western powers have made to influence the outcome, the change of government is ultimately the responsibility of Ukrainians, not the Obama administration.

(continued on next page)
NEWS AND VIEWS: Straight Talk on Ukraine

(continued from previous page)

While the United States and the European Union no doubt want to lure Ukraine in a pro-Western direction and the Russians even more desperately want Ukraine to stay within their orbit, Ukrainians themselves—given the country’s centuries of subjugation—are strongly nationalistic and do not want to be under the control of Russia or the West. With a population of 45 million and significant agricultural and industrial capacity, they are not a country that would passively accept foreign domination.

Just as U.S. military action in the greater Middle East in the name of protecting Americans from Islamist extremism has ended up largely encouraging Islamist extremism, Russia’s actions in the name of protecting Russians from right-wing Ukrainian ultra-nationalists will likely only encourage that tendency as well. The United States, therefore, needs to avoid any actions that could encourage dangerous ultra-nationalist tendencies among either Russians or Ukrainians. Polls show most Russians are at best ambivalent about the Kremlin’s moves in Ukraine. Provocative actions by the United States would more likely solidify support for Russian president Vladimir Putin’s illegitimate actions.

One factor that may have partly motivated Russian moves in Ukraine could have been talk by U.S. officials of incorporating Ukraine in the NATO alliance, a move which—given the history of foreign invaders conquering Russia through the Ukraine—would be completely unacceptable to the Kremlin. However, Russia’s moves in Crimea may make such a scenario more likely rather than less likely. To ease such tensions, even such hawks as former U.S. National Security Advisers Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski acknowledge the limits of American power in such a situation and have proposed a compromise whereby Ukraine, like Finland during the Cold War, would be prohibited from joining any formal military alliance, and the Russian-speaking areas would be granted a degree of autonomy. Should President Obama consider such a compromise, however, he would almost certainly be attacked not only by Republicans but by hawkish Democrats as well. Indeed, Obama’s former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, in comparing Putin to Adolph Hitler, has contributed to a political climate making the Obama administration’s ability to accept such a compromise more difficult.

U.S. Leadership

Thousands of Russian troops have fanned out from Russian bases in Crimea and, under Russian control, the Crimean parliament—dominated by ethnic Russians—has unilaterally declared independence and called for a snap referendum to reincorporate the peninsula into Russia. This is a clear violation of the 1994 Budapest Treaty—signed by Russia, Ukraine, the United States, France, Great Britain, and China—guaranteeing, in return for Ukraine giving up its nuclear arsenal inherited from the Soviet Union, the country’s territorial integrity and security assurances against threats or use of force.

As a result, there does need to be a strong international response to Russia’s aggrandizement. Unfortunately, the United States is hardly in a position to take leadership on the matter.

For example, Secretary of State John Kerry has chastised Putin’s actions in Crimea on the grounds that “You just don’t invade another country on phony pretext in order to assert your interests,” adding that Russia’s actions constituted a “direct, overt violation of international law.” While this is certainly a valid statement in itself, it’s ironic coming from a man who so vigorously supported the illegal U.S. invasion of Iraq on the phony pretext that Saddam Hussein had “weapons of mass destruction.” Indeed, while Obama, to his credit, opposed the Iraq War, the fact that he appointed so many supporters of that illegal invasion and occupation to major foreign policy positions in his administration has severely weakened the United States’ ability to assume leadership in challenging the Kremlin on its own unilateral excesses.

Similarly, in 2004, Kerry, Joe Biden, and other members of Congress who later became key Obama administration officials unconditionally endorsed then-Israeli prime minister Ariel Sharon’s plan to incorporate large sections of the occupied West Bank into Israel, a proposal denounced by international legal authorities worldwide as an illegal annexation. This makes it very difficult for the Obama administration to be taken seriously when it denounces the illegality of the proposed referendum to have Crimea incorporated into Russia.

There is also the fact that the Obama administration appears willing to accept Morocco’s illegal takeover of occupied Western Sahara (under the autocratic monarchy’s dubious “autonomy” proposal) in defiance of international law, a landmark 1975 World Court decision, and a series of UN resolutions. While illegitimate, the Russians are at least willing offer the people of Crimea a choice in a referendum. By contrast, the United States has effectively abandoned the United Nations’ insistence that there be a referendum in occupied Western Sahara, apparently in the recognition that the vast majority of Western Saharan would vote for independence.

In short, given the history of U.S. support for its allies’ land grabs and its own history of illegal invasions, this leaves the United States with little credibility to take leadership in this crisis. This in no way justifies or minimizes the seriousness of Russia’s aggression, of course. However, it underscores the fact that international leadership is not just a matter of being “tough.” It means being willing to abide by and defend the same international legal norms for yourself and your allies as you demand of your adversaries. Until there is such a change in policies, there is little the United States can do.

Stephen Zunes is a professor of Politics and coordinator of Middle Eastern Studies at the University of San Francisco. This article originally appeared in Foreign Policy in Focus, and is reprinted here by permission.
K-12 RESOURCES: Teaching Peace in Every Relationship

Having been a K-12 educator, I firmly believe that one of the most important things we can teach our children and youth is how to engage in peaceful and uplifting relationships. There has been a lot of emphasis in recent years on bullying, which is a positive step. Yet oftentimes anti-bullying programs are focused on how not to be a victim rather than on how to be a good friend. And, there remains far too little emphasis on other relationship issues that are deeply problematic for peacemakers—that is, the building of peaceful interpersonal relationships with dating partners. Because dating violence is so prevalent, it is imperative that K-12 educators find ways to raise awareness about the warning signs of abuse and help youth identify the characteristics of healthy relationships that feature love, trust, and empowerment.

I am fully aware of how busy our K-12 educators are, trying to fulfill the exhausting list of duties they are now assigned. Information on dating violence and healthy relationships, however, can quite easily be integrated into a number of disciplinary areas and can be presented through a variety of teaching methods. Great interactive exercises, arts-based activities and videos can help students see the scope, extent, warning signs and dynamics of abusive relationships. Even more, students can engage in service activities at or with local domestic violence centers or take on a social change campaign in their school or community.

Addressing these issues in classrooms helps youth who may be enduring abuse, or even witnessing it at home, see that they are not alone. It tells them that their educators truly care about peacemaking at every level. Youth will know that, were they to need assistance, their teacher is someone to whom they can turn. And, teaching about healthy (and unhealthy) relationships is a significant component of creating a school culture that values dignity and respect.

As K-12 Education Liaison for PJSA, I have a file of great suggestions for activities and lessons about healthy relationships at all educational levels. I invite PJSA’s members, and in particular its K-12 educators, to contact me and I am happy to share.

Laura Finley, Ph.D., is the K-12 Liaison for the PJSA Board of Directors, and coordinator of the Speakers Bureau. Email: lfinley@barry.edu
“The new millennium finds humanity situated at critical crossroads. While there are many hopeful signs of cross-cultural engagement and democratic dialogue, it is equally the case that the challenges of warfare and injustice continue to plague nations and communities around the globe. Against this backdrop, there exists a powerful mechanism for transforming crises into opportunities: the philosophy and practice of nonviolence. The expert authors brought together in this volume collectively deploy the essential teachings of nonviolence across a spectrum of contemporary issues.”

From considering principles of the French Revolution and encouraging peace through natural resource management to exploring multiculturalism and teaching peace in the elementary classroom, this work is broad in scope yet detailed in its approach to the fundamental principles of nonviolence. Co-edited by Randall Amster (Georgetown University) and Elavie Ndura (George Mason University), this volume features an Introduction by Matt Meyer and a Foreword by Michael Nagler.

More info: http://syracuseuniversitypress.syr.edu/fall-2013/exploring-power-nonviolence.html

CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS: JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF PEACE AND CONFLICT

The Journal for the Study of Peace and Conflict, the peer-reviewed, multidisciplinary journal of the Wisconsin Institute for Peace and Conflict Studies, ISSN 1095-1962, publishes a variety of scholarly articles, essays, teaching notes, and poetry on topics such as war, peace, global cooperation, domestic violence, and interpersonal conflict resolution; including questions of military and political security, the global economy, and global environmental issues. We wish to promote discussion of both strategic and ethical questions surrounding issues of war, peace, the environment, and justice.

The Wisconsin Institute is committed to a balanced review of diverse perspectives. Submissions are welcome from all disciplines. Our intended audience includes scholars from a wide range of interests within the university community and educated members of the larger public. The format allows the publication of original, previously-unpublished works of sufficient length to give authors the opportunity to discuss a particular topic in depth. Other forms of creative writing are invited. Contributors should avoid submissions accessible only to specialists in their field. The Journal for the Study of Peace and Conflict also includes book reviews. Persons interested in reviewing should contact the editor at wiinst@uwsp.edu.

Deadline for submissions is May 1, 2014

Please e-mail submissions to Kathryn Blakeman at wiinst@uwsp.edu.

Format and Length: The editors accept research papers, teaching notes, and creative writing for the peer-review process. We also accept book reviews. Manuscripts should be no longer than 10,000 words and should conform to the Chicago Manual of Style, 16th ed. Please submit an “anonymous” manuscript with a 100-150 word abstract and 5-6 keywords, and, in a separate document, the submission category and contact information for the author(s). The editors are the final arbiters of length, grammar, and usage. Authors are responsible for obtaining permission to use copyrighted material and submitting proof of copyright permission. For more details, see the style sheet at: http://www.uwsp.edu/cols-ap/WIPCS/Pages/journal.aspx.
FEATURE: Unsettling the Settled Concepts...

By David Ragland, Ph.D., Bucknell University

My recent studies of Betty Reardon’s work, alongside critical race/civil rights literature compel me to question if Galtung’s (1969) conceptualizations of negative and positive peace outlived their usefulness. Although these concepts have much utility, our field’s notion of peace often focuses on its negative conception. A cursory survey of peace-related syllabi suggest a to be on war and negative peace. Justice, which conceptually comprises is rarely described systematically (Ragland, 2012, 2013). Positive peace is understood as global justice (DeBie, 2006; Harris and Morrison, 2013; Reardon, 1988 Snaauwaert, 2011), transcending but including negative peace (Snaauwaert, 2010). In reopening this line of inquiry, there is a need to reconsider the ideas attributed Galtung (1969).

Although important to discern the source of ideas, the more vital project remains understanding how the construction of peace is related to structural violence inherent in this and past eras in which King, Galtung and others articulate these concepts. My discussion hinges on these lines of inquiry: How do we define peace, the nature of its definition, and the importance of race to this discussion.

First, as Reardon (1988) states, “we seem to know far more about what is not peace than about what it is” (p.13). It is problematic to defining a thing by the absence of the thing. Cox (1984) agrees when he writes that the term negative peace “violates Aristotle’s criterion for a good definition which requires that it tell us what a thing is rather than simply what it is not” (p. 104). Reardon (1988) writes: “The definitional problem seems to be one of achieving conceptual clarity without closing off a continued open inquiry into what constitutes peace, how it can be achieved, and how we can educate students to work for it and to live in it as the normal state of human society” (p. 11).

Rather than closing the conversation, Reardon’s definition suggests an anti-definition. A closed definition is not productive, as opening exploration into the nature of peace is imperative for every generation.

Second, the dualistic negative and positive distinctions function as an end point in terms of who conceptualizes peace. Boulding (1977, 1978) offers an alternative conception of this dualism in his articulation of stable peace. Boulding (1977) suggests that Galtung’s positivist articulation of negative peace diminishes its positive nature. For Boulding, the categories of negative and positive peace are too dichotomous, oversimplifying the concept of peace. Boulding (1977) writing about Galtung suggests that there “seem to be a certain underlying tendency for a structuralist to think in rather deterministic terms... The expression ‘negative peace’ of which he is very fond seems to me a complete misnomer. Peace is a phase of a system of warring groups. It is not just ‘not-war’ any more than water is ‘not ice’” (p. 78).

Boulding (1977) argues that Galtung’s dichotomous categorization is structuralist, hierarchical and rigid, where it should be evolutionary and organic. The Cartesian dichotomy closes discussion about negative and positive peace. We might see this construction of these ideas in terms of the dominant, positivist Western, White worldview, which often discounted, by default, ideas attributed to women and people of color.

Peace is a holistic - ecological conception. Defining peace in this way places value on face-to-face interactions and authentic relationships. A holistic conception of peace posits dignity and equitable relations, in each individual, their community and the natural world. An ecological - holistic view moves away from an anthropocentric perspective, which often informs development, where the living environment as a means to human (and elite) good only (Lynn, 2004; Snaauwaert, 1996).

Reardon drawing on Boulding’s (1978) notion of stable peace, proposes the terms organic and foundational peace as more appropriate as the latter involves the creation of institutional and living conditions making (organic) positive peace possible. Foundational peace includes an end to war and the creation of institutions, that work alongside and support organic approaches to peacebuilding, e.g. communities who continue to work for peace without the support of institutions (The women of Veiques, PR, Indigenous movements in Canada to prevent fracking on sacred land, and students and teachers in NYC working against stop and frisk policies).

Lastly, does a focus on Galtung’s dichotomy miss out on Martin Luther King’s notion of negative and positive peace as a metaphor for the urgency of social justice and the elimination of all violence? And does this failure to place King (and others like Rustin Bayard) in the center of peace and justice discourse minimize the breadth and depth of our research? Race, especially in this country, must be at the center of peace and justice, as it conceptually, historically and practically, constitutes our frame of reference. According to King (2003), “so long as the Negro maintained this subservient attitude and accepted the place assigned to him, a sort of racial peace existed. But it was an uneasy peace in which the Negro was forced patiently to submit to insult, injustice and exploitation. It was a negative peace. True peace is not merely the absence of some negative force - tension, confusion or war; it is the presence of some positive force - justice, good will and brotherhood” (p. 137).

Here King is describing peace within the context of the denial of basic humanity. He also points out that true peace is not an absence, but involves a positive force. King continues “This new self - respect and sense of dignity on the part of the Negro undermined the South’s Negative peace, since the Whiteman refused to accept the change”(p.6). Peace involves justice rooted in human dignity and self - respect. King’s metaphoric articulation embodies the context of the Southern oppression and de-humanization of blacks.

An organic and foundational understanding of peace is focused on human dignity and closely connected to a critical race approach as they both intersect in the practice of justice and the inquiry into structural violence (Thompson, 2003). The implications of excluding of King and others in our discourse on the conceptual frameworks of peace and justice go to the core of the need to explicitly theorize to connect to critical race approaches, which have relevance beyond any one racial group and U.S. borders.
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FEATURE: Salt and Terror in Afghanistan

Recently entering a room in Kabul, Afghanistan, I joined several dozen people, working seamstresses, some college students, socially engaged teenagers and a few visiting internationals like myself, to discuss world hunger. Our emphasis was not exclusively on their own country’s worsening hunger problems. The Afghan Peace Volunteers, in whose home we were meeting, draw strength from looking beyond their own very real struggles. With us was Hakim, a medical doctor who spent six years working as a public health specialist in the central highlands of Afghanistan and, prior to that, among refugees in Quetta, Pakistan. He helped us understand conditions that lead to food shortages and taught us about diseases, such as kwashiorkor and marasmus, which are caused by insufficient protein or general malnutrition.

We looked at UN figures about hunger in Afghanistan which show malnutrition rates rising by 50 percent or more compared with 2012. The malnutrition ward at Helmand Province’s Bost Hospital has been admitting 200 children a month for severe, acute malnutrition -- four times more than in January 2012.

A recent New York Times article about the worsening hunger crisis described an encounter with a mother and child in an Afghan hospital: "In another bed is Fatima, less than a year old, who is so severely malnourished that her heart is failing, and the doctors expect that she will soon die unless her father is able to find money to take her to Kabul for surgery. The girl's face bears a perpetual look of utter terror, and she rarely stops crying." Photos of Fatima and other children in the ward accompanied the article. In our room in Kabul, Hakim projected the photos on the wall. They were painful to see and so were the nods of comprehension from Afghans all too familiar with the agonies of poverty in a time of war.

As children grow, they need iodine to enable proper brain development. According to a UNICEF/GAIN report, "iodine deficiency is the most prevalent cause of brain damage worldwide. It is easily preventable, and through ongoing targeted interventions, can be eliminated." As recently as 2009 we learned that 70 percent of Afghan children faced an iodine deficiency. Universal Salt Iodization (USI) is recognized as a simple, safe and cost-effective measure in addressing iodine deficiency. The World Bank reports that it costs $.05 per child, per year.

In 2012, the World Food Programme (WFP) and the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN) announced a four-year project which aimed to reach nearly half of Afghanistan’s population - 15 million Afghans - with fortified foods. Their strategy was to add vitamins and minerals such as iron, zinc, folic acid, Vitamin B-12 and Vitamin A to wheat flour, vegetable oil and ghee, and also to fortify salt with iodine. The project costs 6.4 million dollars.

The sums of money required to fund delivery of iodine and fortified foods to malnourished Afghan children should be compared. I believe, to the sums of money that the Pentagon’s insatiable appetite for war-making has required of U.S. people. The price tag for supplying iodized salt to one child for one year is 5 cents. The cost of maintaining one U.S. soldier has recently risen to 2.1 million dollars per year. The amount of money spent to keep three U.S. soldiers in Afghanistan in 2014 could almost cover the cost of a four year program to deliver fortified foods to 15 million Afghan people.

Maj. Gen. Kurt J. Stein, who is overseeing the drawdown of U.S. troops from Afghanistan, has referred to the operation as "the largest retrograde mission in history." The mission will cost as much as $6 billion. Over the past decade, spin doctors for U.S. military spending have suggested that Afghanistan needs the U.S. troop presence and U.S. non-military spending to protect the interests of women and children. It’s true that non-military aid to Afghanistan, sent by the U.S. since 2002, now approaches 100 billion dollars.

Several articles on Afghanistan’s worsening hunger crisis, appearing in the Western press, prompt readers to ask how Afghanistan could be receiving vast sums of non-military aid and yet still struggle with severe acute malnutrition among children under age five. However, a 2013 quarterly report to Congress submitted by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan shows that, of the nearly $100 billion spent on wartime reconstruction, 97 billion has been spent on counter-narcotics, security, "governance/development" and "oversight and operations." No more than $3 billion, a hundred dollars per Afghan person, were used for "humanitarian" projects - to help keep thirty million Afghans alive through twelve years of U.S. war and occupation.

Funds have been available for tanks, guns, bullets, helicopters, missiles, weaponized drones, drone surveillance, Joint Special Operations task forces, bases, airstrips, prisons, and truck delivered supplies for tens of thousands of troops. But funds are in short supply for children too weak to cry who are battling for their lives while wasting away.

A whole generation of Afghans and other people around the developing world see the true results of Westerners’ self-righteous claim for the need to keep civilians “safe” through war. They see the terror, entirely justified, filling Fatima’s eyes in her hospital bed.

In that room in Kabul, as my friends learned about the stark realities of hunger -- and among them, I know, were some who worry about hunger in their own families -- I could see a rejection both of panic and of revenge in the eyes of the people around me. Their steady thoughtfulness was an inspiration. Panic and revenge among far more prosperous people in the U.S. helped to drive the U.S. into a war waged against one of the poorest countries in the world. Yet, my Afghan friends, who’ve borne the brunt of war, long to rise above vengeance and narrow self-interest. They wish to pursue a peace that includes ending hunger.
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Overall for the year, we took in revenues just over $67,000 against expenses of just under $58,500. This was largely due to the success of the conference, although the numbers are a bit deceiving since we have incurred a number of expenses associated with our relocation (see p. 3) that will not show up until 2014, including shifts in tax requirements, insurance costs, and other accounting needs. Still, we remain on very solid ground as we move toward implementation of a host of new initiatives and projects (see p. 25). Please help by keeping your membership up and recruiting others to join!
FEATURE: Community Colleges, Future Peacebuilders

By Katie Zanoni

How often are we invited to consider the dominant paradigm of thinking that has shaped the reality that we live? When I engage in the exercise to zoom outside of my own reality to consider the vast world we live in, I return with a set of dichotomies that I am embedded within. The dichotomy of peace and war is one that if given space and time to explore can inhabit discussions around everything in between: nonviolence, justice, human rights, conflict, sustainability and so much more. What would emerge if additional academic environments were offered to consider what might be beyond this binary? Would our future peacebuilders discover a world that is neither utopian in nature nor bellicose in spirit? As a peace educator, I was invited to delve into similar questions through my role of co-creating a new Peace Studies Associate degree at San Diego City College (SDCC), a community college in southern California.

An opportunity to engage in the reflexive exercise of curriculum development presented itself and opened the door to peer into the structures of higher education. Together with four seasoned faculty members representing different disciplines we developed a rigorous curriculum for this new major. This experience allowed us to sow seeds of institutional change to ensure a curriculum that would engage in critical pedagogy, explore foundational concepts, and create courses to awaken our moral imagination and surpass our existing understanding of peace and war. (According to John Paul Lederach (2005, ix), the moral imagination is the “capacity to imagine something rooted in the challenges of the real world yet capable of giving birth to that which does not yet exist.”)

Today, the germination of these seeds has resulted in two crucial accomplishments. The first is the creation of the only approved Peace Studies Associate degree in California. The second is that Peace Studies is now a recognized discipline as authorized by the California Academic Senate for Community Colleges. According to research conducted by David Smith, author of Peacebuilding in Community Colleges (2013), SDCC is one of twenty-one campuses with a similar program (pps. 247-249). As Smith points out, there are close to 1,200 community colleges in this country (p. 6). With almost ten percent of those colleges housed in the state of California, these achievements could serve as a viable path for other colleges to institute a similar initiative. To this end, I offer a brief summary of the process we took at SDCC. The following steps highlight how we gained campus, district and statewide support for our Peace Studies Associate Degree.

Peace Studies Program at San Diego City College

Required courses from other disciplines include:
- Issues in Environmental Biology; Introduction To Philosophy; Values; Introduction to Cultural Anthropology; Contemporary International Politics; and Introduction to Literature.
- New Peace Studies courses include: Introduction to Peace Studies; Nonviolence and Conflict Resolution; Environmental Sustainability, Justice and Ethics; and Field Experience in Peace Studies

http://www.sdcity.edu/PeaceStudies

Step 1: Create an interdisciplinary Peace Studies Curriculum Advisory Committee.

Our team represented faculty from an Anthropological, Philosophical, Biological, Literary, and Peace Studies perspective. In 2001, the faculty initiated the development of this program and drew on the strength of an inter-departmental curriculum committee. In addition to establishing an authentically interdisciplinary program, our committee members supported this budding initiative during critical budget cuts and promoted the program among their colleagues within their respective departments. This unified voice was applauded by the campus President and resulted in a multilateral effort to launch the program.

Step 2: Survey existing courses at four-year institutions of higher education and community college campuses.

This process offers multiple outcomes including the establishment of sound curriculum, the creation of a network of peace educators, and a survey of where similar courses might articulate into four-year academic institutions. Articulation is essential to the success of a newly developed program at a community college. Our curriculum committee was advised that 80% of the courses in our proposed major should articulate with at least three four-year institutions. While all of the abovementioned outcomes are equally valued, the last point regarding articulation invites more discussion among educators in higher education to collaborate on the development of rising Peace Studies programs.

(continued on next page)
FEATURE: Community Colleges, Future Peacebuilders

(continued from previous page)

As our committee designed the content for the courses, we carefully considered existing courses and researched our own disciplines to engage in rich discussions about what would be included. We considered the lack of four-year institutions in California that promised a path of articulation during that time. This was especially true for the course entitled, Environmental Sustainability, Justice and Ethics. After being informed by administrators that this course was more appropriate as an upper level class and belonged to the four-year institutions, we questioned what it meant to originate new content and our ability to do so as a community college. Infusing issues of ecology, sustainability, and environmental ethics was crucial to our committee and when this course was criticized based upon the premise that it may not articulate, we were faced with a difficult decision. Do we follow the academic trends of our receiving institutions or do we generate opportunities for our students to engage in content that we feel is relevant and crucial to the program? This conversation deserves more attention and is a critical area of exploration in connecting four-year institutions to community colleges to create more transfer pipelines and engage in a deeper pedagogical inquiry about generating new curriculum in higher education.

Step 3: Institutionalize the program, courses and the discipline.

Each semester I heard frightening statistics of classes being cut and concerns that our program would be among the other “luxury programs” to be included on the chopping block. Our committee took great lengths at promoting our program among our student body, within our community, our campus and our state. However, a paradoxical issue arose that further threatened our program. According to some, one with a Masters Degree in Peace Studies was not eligible to teach Peace Studies due to the fact that it was not a recognized discipline as determined by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. In 2010, our committee proposed a resolution to the Academic Senate to have Peace Studies added to the discipline list to avoid further confusion. After this initial proposal was denied, we revised and resubmitted our proposal in 2012. While our first proposal fielded great criticism, our revised language received overwhelming support and the discipline was approved in April 2013.

This step represents a significant success for several reasons. In 2012, there were at least seventeen colleges in California offering courses with the term “peace” included in the title. With a new Peace Studies discipline, faculty can now freely hire academics with a graduate degree in Peace Studies or the equivalent to teach these courses. The benefit of this development is that the creation of a new discipline does not preclude a college from hiring a Political Scientist to teach a Peace Studies course housed in the Political Science department. In the contrary, it offers the freedom to increase the hiring pool to include professors with a Peace Studies graduate degree. A second benefit is that community colleges hoping to design similar initiatives can lean on the credibility that comes with establishing a stand-alone discipline. Graduates from Peace Studies can continue to be recognized as experts in the field thus resulting in a broader range of peace educators in the academy. Lastly, if Peace Studies is further ingrained into the structures of additional community colleges, academic spaces can be fostered to awaken the moral imagination and question what it truly means to be at peace in this world.
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@atie Zanon is currently pursuing a doctorate at the University of San Francisco in International and Multicultural Education with a concentration in Human Rights Education. Email: atiezanon@gmail.com.
The Geneva Agreement of 1954 ended the French colonial rule of Vietnam. However, the Eisenhower administration subverted the idea of a united and independent Vietnam. It funded a puppet government in Saigon to resist Hanoi, thus precipitating a twenty-year American War in Indochina.

In 1961, president John Kennedy approved the use of herbicides to defoliate the dense jungles of Vietnam. This decision turned a bitterly fought war into an illegal, immoral, and humiliating contest for the United States and an ecological catastrophe for Vietnam.

The Americans sprayed the forests and rice fields of Vietnam with Agent Orange, a concoction of 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D, two exceedingly toxic weed killers. One of them, 2,4,5-T, was contaminated by TCDD-dioxin, the most potent molecule in the industrial world’s chemical arsenal. The chemical warfare lasted until 1970 when president Richard Nixon renounced the first use of “incapacitating chemical weapons” and “any use of biological and toxin weapons.”

In 1977, the Linnean Society of London published a study on the “Ecological Effects of Pesticides.” Arthur H. Westing, a dioxin expert working for the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, authored a chapter about the “Ecological effects of the military use of herbicides.” Westing theorized that it would take centuries to undo the ecological damage the Agent Orange inflicted on Vietnam. He suggested that more than 200 pounds of TCDD-dioxin “was injected into the South Vietnamese environment as a concomitant of the military spraying.”

Westing concluded that “chemical warfare with anti-plant agents (herbicides) is pernicious because its ecological and social ramifications are unavoidably widespread, long-lasting, and severe.”

Fred A. Wilcox, professor of writing at Ithaca College, expanded the insightful work of Westing. He spent about 30 years studying the effects of Agent Orange. He started with the fate of the American soldiers who sprayed the Agent Orange over Vietnam. His 1983 book, Ailing for an Army to Die, denounced the deception of the Pentagon and the industry that ignored the Vietnamese veterans until most of them died. They simply did not want to implicate the manufacturers of Agent Orange with the dioxin harm of their weed killers, which were also sprayed in the United States for decades. Indeed, 2,4-D is still in the American farmers’ armory.

His Scorched Earth (Seven Story Books, 2011) completes the story of why, in fact, the spraying of the Agent Orange was pernicious, especially to Vietnam and its people. He visited Vietnam where he interviewed soldiers who had been sprayed by Agent Orange. “I wanted to listen to their stories,” he said, “and to hear if their accounts were similar to those of American veterans.” That process led him to Vietnamese who have been trying to survive “serious illnesses” and the “sorrow of knowing that their plight, their destiny, is irrevocable.” He also talked to medical doctors trying to cope with the monstrous health effects Agent Orange left on its victims.

In 2008, one of those doctors, Nguyen Trong Nhan, sent a letter to the American Studies Association in which he reported the following: Agent Orange destroyed more than six million acres of forest. This ecocide had deadly effects on farming and food. “Vietnamese women,” he wrote, “have experienced disorders and complications during pregnancy, including miscarriages, still births, premature births, and severe fetal malformations.” But the worst thing of all, he added, was that the dioxin harm lasts for generations. Finally, Dr. Nhan said, it was a pity the American courts dismissed the 2004 Vietnamese lawsuit against the Agent Orange companies. That, to Dr. Nhan, was disrespect for “truth and justice.”

Another witness to the painful story Wilcox tells is Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, commander of all American naval forces in Vietnam. Zumwalt used Agent Orange along the banks of rivers and canals. However, Zumwalt changed when he returned home. The death of his son from cancer, which the admiral connected to his son’s service in the spraying of the herbicides, set him on course to discovery. He accused the government and the industry of covering up the truth about the effects of Agent Orange. Wilcox is showing that Agent Orange is responsible for harming more than three million Vietnamese, including 500,000 children. He says the veterans of Vietnam and America suffer from the same deformities and cancers. Vietnam, he adds, is enduring the “aftermath of a chemical holocaust.” The story of Wilcox is revealing. Yes, Vietnam is in great pain, but Vietnam is also opening its doors to its former enemy.

Read Scorched Earth. It is eloquent, thought provoking, absorbing, daring, moral, and necessary. It is a jolt to historical amnesia. It tells what chemical warfare did to Vietnam -- and, to a lesser degree, America.

Time has come for both the American government and the industry to admit responsibility for the harm of Agent Orange. Such an admission would lead to better environmental protection -- in this country and the world. It may even strengthen international law and human rights.

Evaggelos Vallianatos is the author of five books, including Poison Spring, and more than 160 articles.

Ever since 18 scientists gathered at Seville in 1980 to produce the hard-hitting Seville Statement on Violence (also known as the Declaration of Seville) for the express purpose of refuting the absurd and then highly popular doctrine of "innate aggression"—that we are doomed to violence by our genes—there has been a revolution among scientists that has opened up fields like empathy and compassion to scientific study, as well as work like that of Erica Chenoweth and Maria Stefan on the efficacy of nonviolence. All of this work taken together—amounting as it does to nothing short of a revolution in attitude and perception—is potentially of vast benefit to peace scholars. I say "potentially" because peace scholars, not to mention the general public, have yet to make full account of it, doubtless because it simply does not fit into the prevailing paradigm about human nature and life in general. Of the most immediate relevance for peace research in all this work is the post-Sevillian research that serves to refute ideas of inescapable aggression and human helplessness before the forces of a brutally competitive nature.

The towering work under review, comprising 27 chapters from 32 main contributors (and many more in the rich bibliographies) can be considered a culmination of that effort. Peace scholars and teachers can greet it as an encyclopedia of the most expert evidence available from across nearly every relevant field of behavioral science—primatology, archeology, ethnography, and (some) psychology—which, speaking as it is with one voice, should lay to rest what philosopher Mary Midgley called the "swashbuckling" theory that we are unescapably violent because of our evolutionary heritage. To produce the most interesting chapter by Brian Ferguson, a conclusion that is echoed throughout the volume on those modern studies to give a disaster of "innate aggression," as in Chapter 17 by Darcia Narvaez, "The 99 Percent—Development and Socialization Within an Evolutionary Context." Narvaez shows that for 99 percent of human and pre-human history we lived as "Small Band Gatherers-Hunters" where "cooperation was common among groups that often held relatives" and even others "lived together surprisingly well, solving the problems among themselves largely without recourse to authority figures and without a particular propensity for violence." (347) The data simply does not support the "Hobbesian" view that has largely run unquestioned for so long. And why has enabled it to outlive its usefulness and defy the evidence? Because, as Gandhi pointed out as early as 1909, "history" (and the news, and until recently science) report the breakdowns of the natural process, not the far greater process itself (another 99%). The result is that "Through an emphasis on consumption and materialism, U.S. cultural narratives and societal practices have denigrated close maternal, familial, and individual responsibility, at the expense of individual autonomy and the self-development necessary for confident social being." (350) So and so reach a state where “More than ever, culture has exterminated the moral foundations for our sociality and our relationship with nature.” (353)

Several writers cite the prominence of PTSD (including the shockingly high rate of suicide) among military personnel as indirect evidence for the advesion to violence in human nature, along with the type of evidence collected by Lt. Col. Dave Grossman who coauthors Chapter 22. This has now been formalized in Ray Dalby, J. MacNair’s presentation of Perpetration Induced Traumatic Stress (PITS). I have mentioned that peace scholars are a bit behind the scientific revolution; they have been too overwhelmed by the more aggressive rhesus, they taught them aspects of their nonviolent culture. To compound the amazement, this pacification among the rhesus colony lasted for quite a while even after their stumptail mentors were removed.

No one who reads this book can come away still clinging to the convenient superstition of "nature red in tooth and claw"—unless, of course, they scoff at science and are impervious to reason. And there’s the rub. For today, the people who most need to be convinced by the well-documented and impressively learned arguments in this book are the least able to be convinced by it, or pretty much anything. Yet we cannot believe that this contribution will not have its effect. We know enough about tipping points and little enough about when they will actually happen, and through which triggers, to hope that the careful work that went into this book will make a real difference. What we need, ultimately, is to go beyond the successful Statement of Seville to address not just one superstition but the whole paradigm of materialism, separateness, and competition that is threatening to end the human experiment. When Darcia Narvaez, following Colin Turnbull, makes reference to “a sense of Spirit…that allows us to discern the ultimate unity of all living things” she does exactly this.

War, Peace, and Human Nature is a major contribution not only to peace studies, but to the eventual discovery of peace as a defining characteristic of the human species.

Michael Nagler is president of the Metta Center, and former PVA Co-Chair.
No matter how bad it gets, we can look inside ourselves and find hope, possibility … the future. And when we find that, we know what it means to build peace.

“It’s like I’m in a never-ending battle with my brain,” Kayla said. “They called me Crazy Kayla. I have anger problems. Someone messes with me, I lose it. I was molested, raped, physically and mentally abused. I was in 127 different homes. I have a 3-month-old baby…”

Peace isn’t the avoidance of difficult topics but their thorough, un stinting examination, not with cynicism and despair but with the certainty that salvation is mixed into the pain. All we have to do is find it.

This is precisely what a good documentary film does for us, and there are so many of them out there these days. Thirty-one such films were showcased at Chicago’s sixth annual Peace on Earth Film Festival, an event I’ve been associated with since its beginning. The four-day festival, which was held March 6-9 (free of charge, as always) at the Chicago Cultural Center, takes on a melange of provocative subjects: Fukushima, agribusiness, gun violence, forgiveness in the wake of violence, hospice care for prisoners, childhood mental illness, and much more.

The festival’s mission, which it accomplishes every year, is to “raise awareness of peace, nonviolence, social justice and an eco-balanced world.”

This is no small feat. To do so, its films need to push against the cynicism and inertia of the world we live in, and challenge the special interests that profit from the inertia. We can only raise our awareness by looking squarely at what we’d prefer to avoid, or rather, what the 24-7 media that surrounds us and shapes our world would prefer to avoid. The films at this festival take risks.

So, welcome to Kayla’s world, Jasmine’s world, Lexie’s world, Shawn’s world…

These and other young people are part of “Hear Our Voices: Transforming the Children’s Mental Health System,” one of the festival’s documentaries, directed by David and Patricia Earnhardt. The film takes us into the darkness of childhood mental illness and the system that deals with it. It gives us real-time tears and anguish as the kids, and their parents, cope with suicidal impulses, anger, despair and frustration. It gives us raw honesty and vulnerability — and hope.

While mental illness remains a condition permeated with stigma and stereotype, not to mention institutional foolishness, the young people in “Hear Our Voices” have a lot going for them, and the professionals who weigh in with their perspective, framing the young people’s candid stories, bring insight and wisdom to bear on the state of being emotionally lost.

The driving force of the film seems to be the importance of focusing on the young people’s strengths, not their misbehavior: helping them discover what they can do to help themselves. For instance, in one attention-grabbing interview, Karl Dennis, founder of a Chicago-based child welfare agency called Kaleidoscope, told the story of a troubled 13-year-old boy who kept running away — once actually stealing a semi and driving it for several miles until he crashed it into a ditch.

Speaking with an almost impish wonder, Dennis explained that the authorities “didn’t see it as a positive! How many kids can drive a semi?” The boy may have been acting with breath-taking foolishness, but what skill, what potential, he displayed. The boy had absolutely no use for school, but, Dennis asked him, “What if it was close to a truck stop?” Maybe a real trucker would be his mentor. “If he let you spend a couple of hours handing him tools, would you go to school?” The boy said yes.

The film doesn’t present quick fixes, but it conveys a sense of awe about what’s possible. Part of the strength that young people have, as they struggle with their lives and the demons of their pasts, is one another. Much of the documentary takes place inside conversation circles, as the teens share their life stories amid tears and hugs and solidarity.

“You black out, you’re not yourself,” Shawn says at one point, explaining what it’s like to be bipolar.

Another young man tells him, “I’m bipolar too.” He knows, he knows. And so do we, as we watch their lives unfold in real time.

Part of the film’s dramatic narrative, for instance, is about Kayla’s attempt to attain “emancipation” from her current foster-care situation and be able to live as an adult, making life decisions for herself and her young son, Eli. We see her addressing the juvenile court judge and, ultimately, holding her disappointment in check when the request is denied until she turns 18.

Despite the setback, the vibrancy of her personality animates the film. Kayla’s voice throughout the film is reassuring and supportive to the other vulnerable young people. At one point, near the end, she explains herself: “My God-given talent,” she says, “is to go through things, experience the worst — and help other people.”

And this is a voice worth hearing.

Robert C. Koehler is an award-winning, Chicago-based journalist and nationally syndicated writer, and a Contributing Author for New Clear Vision. His new book, Courage Grows Strong at the Wound (Xenos Press) is now available. Contact him at koehlercw@gmail.com, visit his website at commonwonders.com, or listen to him at Voices of Peace radio.
Review: The Complaint of Peace

Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus, who lived from October 27, 1466, to July 12, 1536, faced censorship in his day, and has never been as popular among the rich and powerful as has his contemporary Niccolò di Bernardo dei Machiavelli. But at a distance of half a millennium, we ought to be able to judge work on its merit — and we ought to have regular celebrations of Erasmus around the world. Some of his ideas are catching on. His name is familiar in Europe as that of the EU’s student exchange program, named in his honor. We ought perhaps to wonder what oddball ideas these days might catch on in the 2500s — if humanity is around then.

In 1517, Erasmus wrote The Complaint of Peace, in which Peace, speaking in the first-person, complains about how humanity treats her. She claims to offer “the source of all human blessings” and to be scorned by people who “go in quest of evils infinite in number.” The Complaint is not a contemporary twenty-first century piece of thinking; its outdatedness in any number of areas is immediately obvious. But that’s to be expected in an essay written 500 years ago in Latin for a readership made up of what we would call creationists, astrologers, monarchists, and Eurocentric bigots. What ought to amaze us is the extent to which the Complaint does address the same troubles we face today and the same bad arguments used today in defense of wars. The Complaint offers rebuttals to such arguments that have never been surpassed. Its text could serve as the basis for dozens of important sermons were some preacher inclined to favor peace on earth.

Peace, in her complaint to us, begins by imagining that humans must be insane to pursue war instead of her. She does not complain out of indignation, but weeps over people who actively bring so much harm on themselves and are incapable of even realizing it. The first step, Erasmus/Peace says, is recognizing that you have a problem. Or rather, “It is one great step to convalescence to know the extent and inveteracy of a disease.”

War was deemed to be the supreme international crime at Nuremberg following World War II, because it includes all other evils within it. Erasmus defined war in that manner a good four-and-a-half centuries earlier, calling war an ocean “of all the unified plagues and pestilences in nature.”

Erasmus (in the voice of Peace) notes that many other types of animals do not wage war on their own species. And he notes the universal presence of love and cooperation among humans, animals born unarmed and obliged to find safety in numbers. Erasmus proposes that we think of ourselves as humans, and thereby become unwilling to make war on any of our brother and sister humans anywhere. Admittedly, 500 years may be a little rushed for some people to catch on to that idea.

On a search for peacefulness, Peace hunts in vain among seemingly polite and amicable princes, among academicians whom she finds as corrupted by war as we find ours today, among religious leaders whom she denounces as the hypocrites we’ve come to know so well, and even among secluded monks. Peace looks into family life and into the internal mental life of an individual and finds no devotion to peace.

Erasmus points Christian readers toward the words supporting peace in the New Testament. One might accuse him of handpicking his quotes and avoiding those that don’t support his goal, except that Erasmus quite openly says that’s what he’s doing and advises others to do the same. The vengeful God of the Old Testament should be ignored in favor of the peaceful God of Jesus, Erasmus writes. And those who can’t so ignore Him, writes Erasmus, should re-interpret him as peaceful. Let “God of vengeance” mean vengeance “on those sins which rob us of repose.” Solomon the peace-maker was more worthy than David the war-maker, Peace says, despite David’s war-making being at the bidding of God. So, imagine, Peace argues, if David’s divinely commanded wars rendered him unholy, “what will be the effect of wars of ambition, wars of revenge, and wars of furious anger” — i.e. the wars of Erasmus’ day and our own.

The cause of wars, Erasmus finds, is kings and their war-hungry chickenhawk advisors. The term in Latin is not exactly “chickenhawk” but the meaning comes through. Erasmus advises addressing the causes of war in greed and the pursuit of power, glory, and revenge. And he credits Jesus with having done the same, with having taught love and forgiveness as the basis for peace. Kings, writes Erasmus, start wars to seize territory when they would be better off improving the territory they have now. Or they start wars out of a personal grudge. Or they start wars to disrupt popular opposition to themselves at home. Such kings, Erasmus writes, should be exiled for life to the remotest islands. And not just the kings but their privileged advisors. Ordinary people don’t create wars, says Peace, those in power impose wars on them.

Powerful people calling themselves Christian have created such a climate, says Peace, that speaking up for Christian forgiveness is taken to be treasonous and evil, while promoting war is understood to be good and loyal and directed at a nation’s happiness. Erasmus has little tolerance for Orwellian propaganda about “supporting the troops” and proposes that clergy refuse to bury convalescence or repose. “The unfeeling mercenary soldier, hired by a few pieces of paltry coin, to do the work of man-butch, carries before him the standard of the cross; and that very figure becomes the symbol of war, which alone ought to teach every one that looks at it, that war ought to be utterly abolished. What hast thou to do with the cross of Christ on thy banners, thou blood-stained soldier? With such a disposition as thine, with deeds like thine, of robbery and murder, thy proper standard would be a dragon, a tiger, or wolf.”

“If you detest robbery and pillage, remember these are among the duties of war; and that, to learn how to commit them adroitly, is a part of military discipline. Do you shudder at the idea of murder? You cannot require to be told, that to commit it with dispatch, and by wholesale, constitutes the celebrated art of war.”

Peace proposes in her complaint that kings submit their grievances to wise and impartial arbiters, and points out that even if the arbiters are unjust neither side will suffer to remotely the extent that they would from war. Perhaps peace must be purchased — but compare the price to the cost of a war! For the price of destroying a town you could have built one, Peace says. For arbitration to replace war, Peace says, we will need better kings and better courtiers. You can’t get any more timely and relevant than that.

David Swanson is author of War Is a Lie and Daybreak: Undoing the Imperial Presidency and Forming a More Perfect Union.
The PJSA Supports the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Their Nonviolent Protests Against Governmental Intrusion and Neglect

The Peace and Justice Studies Association, a bi-national organization devoted to the promotion of peace and justice and to the creation of a better world through scholarship, education, and activism, unequivocally implores the governments of Canada and the U.S. to adhere to their treaty agreements with indigenous groups, which in international law have the same status as any other treaty agreements between sovereign countries. We deplore the horrific treatment of indigenous peoples in these and other countries and call on activists, advocates, and allies everywhere to support the land and resource rights of indigenous peoples.

Despite centuries of negotiating hundreds of treaties with indigenous groups, the governments of the United States, Canada and other countries continue to usurp native lands, pollute the air, water, and soil with deadly contaminants, disrespect the vibrant cultures of these peoples, marginalize them through policies and practices, and demonize those who seek to challenge this misuse of power. In direct violation of international human rights treaties and domestic legislation, these governments have negotiated and then reneged on treaty agreements.

United States governments have negotiated some 600 treaties with Native people, most of which have been violated. As just one example, were it to have adhered to its own agreement, the Lakota Nation would have encompassed much of the Midwest, with the vast resources offered by the land and water in that region. Instead, many Lakota live on reservations (or prisoner of war camps, as many indigenous groups call them) like Pine Ridge, which is annually one of the most impoverished places in the United States. Unemployment rates run around 70 percent, almost 50 percent of Pine Ridge residents live below the federal poverty line. Compared to a developing country, life expectancy rates hover in the later 40s and early 50s, in stark contrast to the rest of the U.S., where the average woman lives to be 81 and the average man to 76. But, when Native peoples have organized, like the American Indian Movement did in the 1960s and 1970s, they are presented as a threat, not as part of the solution. AIM was a major target for the FBI’s COINTELPRO, a mass surveillance and infiltration effort that, under the guise of breaking up subversive threats to national security, decimated much of the native activism in the U.S. Canada has done no better. Instead of honoring its agreements to indigenous peoples, the Canadian government has stolen the land and poisoned the water, soil, and air in which many from the First Nations live. Here, too, indigenous peoples often live in third-world conditions. The unemployment rate of the Elsipogtog, for instance, hovers around 80 percent. On October 15, 2013, United Nations Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples James Anaya issued a scathing report, noting that twenty percent of aboriginal peoples in Canada live in homes in need of serious repairs and that the suicide rate among aboriginal youth is five times greater than that of all Canadians. Anaya called the situation a “crisis,” and, among other factors, traced it back to Canadian government policies that broke up homes and destroyed indigenous cultures by sending indigenous youth to horrific boarding schools where they were forced to become as White as possible.

But, instead of critically reflecting on Anaya’s report, the Canadian government elected to further oppress this already marginalized group. Just days ago, when indigenous peoples and their allies organized to protest fracking in New Brunswick (a natural gas extraction process that devastates the land) the RCMP responded with force. Instead of listening to the voices of indigenous peoples about the Tar Sands pipelines, the Canadian government has criminalized their voices and continues to plunder on. Some 40 indigenous protesters were arrested and six were held in jail for a weekend out of fear that they would exercise their right to peacefully assemble. The six face a total of 37 charges: including mischief, threats, and obstructing a peace officer, in relation to a clash between police and protesters. The RCMP, aided by media coverage that reinforced traditional stereotypes of violent natives, has claimed it was justified in its response. Actual reports show that the protest was peaceful before it was invaded by approximately 200 RCMP, officers, some heavily armed and in army-style camouflage, with their dogs, tear gas, and assault rifles. In fact, SWN Resources had been losing $60,000 per day because of the nonviolent protest that began in 2010. While a court injunction prohibiting anyone from obstructing the shale gas fracking site was denied on October 22, 2013, to the great joy of the many members of the Elsipogtog First Nation who had been protesting there, the issue is far from over.

In another example, the Canadian Supreme Court ruled in 1999 that the Mi’kmaw had the right to fish for a living because in an 1871 treaty they never surrendered the land. But, when the Mi’kmaw attempted to exercise their right to fish, government officials blocked them and spread faulty information that instigated non-native fishermen to destroy their equipment. That same issue applies with the Elsipogtog who still own what SWN Resources is now using. The Elsipogtog remain ready to protest at any shale gas extraction site. “It is our responsibility to protect Mother Earth, to protect the land for non-natives too,” says Susan Levi-Peters, the former Chief of Elsipogtog. “My people are speaking up for everyone.”

The U.S. and Canada are two of the wealthiest nations in the world, and both should bear the responsibility and pay the price for becoming rich through the extraction of resources and land that did not and does not belong to them.

A Call to Action

Indigenous people and their supporters have not and will not be silent about these issues. Groups like Idle No More and the Indigenous Environmental Network have organized, taken to the streets, and used traditional indigenous dance and culture as well as teach-ins and other nonviolent direct action to organize communities to speak out about the repressive policies. Similarly, Honor the Treaties uses art to amplify the voices of indigenous peoples and their allies and to call on governments to honor the treaties they negotiated. PJSA stands with indigenous activists everywhere who are using peaceful methods of nonviolent resistance to protect government oppression and neglect. We call on all members of the peace and justice community to support nonviolent indigenous activism aimed at protecting ancestral lands and ensuring safe and healthy environments for future generations. As allies to indigenous activists, PJSA advocates for deeper understanding of the challenges faced by these peoples and promotes the need for listening to the voices of those whose voices are too often silenced and marginalized.

We also implore the governments of the U.S. and Canada to respect the treaties they negotiated, as they are the supreme law of the land. Governments must also adhere to the rights spelled out in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, both of which specifically recognize the ways that colonialism and imperialism have impacted indigenous peoples and require the recognition of sovereignty and land rights, the equal treatment of all, and the prohibition of cultural genocide.

Notes:

IN REMEMBRANCE: Lessons from Professor Falcón

On March 10, Puerto Rico’s leading intellectual — sociologist, educator, lawyer, author, organizer, and Independentista — passed away at age 84. A world renowned authority on colonialism, repression, and Puerto Rican history, Dr. Luis Nieves Falcón was founder/director of the University of Puerto Rico’s Department of Latin American and Caribbean Studies, founder of the Committee on Human Rights, president of the International PEN Club, and a member of the International Advisory Board of the PJSA. He was also this author’s mentor, godfather to my son, and a great friend; it was an honor to be the only non-Puerto Rican to deliver a eulogy at his March 12th funeral. This essay is based on my remarks.

We were driving, late at night, in the middle of Manhattan — Alejandro Molina of Chicago-based National Boricua Human Rights Network and me in the back seat. In the front seat was Puerto Rico’s legendary Luis Nieves Falcón, our boss. In the driver’s seat was Dr. Manny Rosenberg, beloved upper west side activist and dentist who daughter Susan was doing hard time for her involvement with the anti-war and anti-imperialist movements of the 1970s and early ’80s. We were brought together by the plans for the 1990 International Tribunal on Political Prisoners/POWs in the USA, but we were held together and pushed forward by the dynamic vision and steel hand of Nieves Falcón. It was the first major public symposium of the current generation which made the issue of political imprisonment in the USA a widespread, central focus throughout left and progressive circles, beyond the movements whose leaders were the ones behind bars. Close to one thousand people attended that momentous event, but the ragtag coalition of individuals and groups who were responsible for it would never have survived without the leadership of Nieves Falcón.

Coalition-builder: He understood like few others in modern times that all great united fronts must be broad enough to reach large and diverse sectors, masses and masses of people, while still being controlled and coordinated by a clear and principled center. This concept is different than old-fashioned democratic centralism and more complicated than social democracy: grassroots initiatives must be allowed to spring up, take a shape of their own, and develop organically in ways appropriate to different communities. In this way, Nieves Falcón took a page from the book of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., who noted that “true leadership is not the search for consensus, but the molding of consensus.” Nieves Falcón taught us how to provide strong leadership while allowing large coalitions to flourish.

Internationalist: Without for one moment giving up an inch of his proud Puerto Rican identity — his passion for his homeland and the beauty of its people — Nieves Falcón was a true man of the world. He could and did converse with leaders from every continent, earning respect for the cause of Puerto Rican freedom and for the full recognition of the great Puerto Rican socio-cultural contributions to world history. He did this with great knowledge and appreciation of global dynamics past and present, centering Puerto Rico in an internationalist perspective which holds no place anywhere for empire, militarism, capitalism, or greed.

Master strategist: Few could argue that, as the architect of so many successful campaigns — bringing home the prisoners, working against the Navy in Vieques, working for expanded higher education and legal rights — Nieves Falcón was one of our greatest experts at sizing up situations and figuring out how best to achieve victories. That success might take more years or more money than we could ever imagine was no excuse or deterrent; that we would have to work harder than we ever imagined was a given — but together and focused we would find a way to win. Reforms were understood in calculated fashion as part of the larger efforts for more radical and revolutionary social change. And his eyes, and all of the campaigns he led, were always set on the goal of full freedom and liberation for the Puerto Rican people, and for all people.

Master teacher: The way in which Luis told stories, with his whole body and with every nuance of every language he so expertly crafted, one was bound to listen and learn. Whether talking to a group of young people with little consciousness, or to experienced professionals, Nieves made you want not just to comprehend, but to act. His teaching was always in the service of social justice and action, with an aim to move forward in new ways which would enable each of us to fulfill the best of our potential. Education, for Professor Falcón, was based on the need for collective understanding to lead to lasting change.

Defender of the people: In San Juan, it is the stuff of legend — on March 23, 1972, a twenty-three-year-old Luis Nieves Falcón, was the type of lawyer who always comprehended that, in working for freedom, legal struggle must be coordinated with political struggle; no courtroom or negotiation at any time could substitute for the door-to-door, grassroots campaigns which would mobilize a nation to call for the freedom of its prisoners, to call now for the immediate release of Oscar López Rivera. Nieves Falcón was much more than just a lawyer; he was a true defender of the people.

We love Luis Nieves Falcón, and the true, loving comrade that he was to so many of us. We understand that, like all people, he had faults and shortcomings, and could be a master pain in our sides! But as we mourn the loss of Dr. Luis Nieves Falcón, we understand that today’s message — Nieves Falcón’s message — is, more than ever: Don’t mourn, organize!

Matt Meyer is a founding chair and long-time PJSA Board Member, currently serving as the Liaison to IPRA.
ASSOCIATE RESEARCH SCHOLAR  
Earth Institute, Columbia University (NY)  
The Advanced Consortium on Cooperation, Conflict and Complexity (AC4) seeks an Associate Research Scholar (ARS) to conduct applied research on social and environmental sustainability and environmental conflict resolution. AC4 is the Earth Institute’s multidisciplinary research center aimed at addressing complex global problems related to peace, conflict, violence, and sustainability. In addition to conducting primary research and practice, AC4 provides the support needed to enable innovative trans-disciplinary and cross-department collaboration across Columbia University and elsewhere.  
Responsibilities: The ARS will provide intellectual and academic leadership and guidance for all research activities that the center conducts to ensure that research activities contribute directly to the center’s focus on peace, violence, conflict and sustainability. The ARS will maintain and expand the center’s existing portfolio of field-based practice in cooperative environmental management and applied conflict resolution. The ARS will work with AC4 personnel to create linkages across other centers and departments, and expand the external network of peace, conflict and sustainability partners.  
Qualifications: PhD in Conflict Analysis and Resolution, Peace Studies, Psychology, Sustainable Development, or an equivalent social science. Minimum of 2 years practical experience designing and conducting interdisciplinary research on social-ecological system dynamics, practical conflict resolution, conservation and land management, and/or sustainable development. Experience conducting field-based data collection, conflict resolution training, and/or stakeholder workshop facilitation. Proficiency required in quantitative, qualitative, or geospatial research methods. Experience working with or consulting for US and foreign government agencies and/or private sector clients desired. The applicant should also have a demonstrated history of successful fundraising and grant writing. The position is full-time with full benefit package. One year; possibility of renewal.  
https://academicjobs.columbia.edu/applicants/Central?quickFind=58976

FACULTY POSITIONS (ASSISTANT, ASSOCIATE, FULL) IN NEGOTIATION, CONFLICT RES., AND PEACEBUILDING  
Cal State University, Dominguez Hills  
The faculty of the Negotiation, Conflict Resolution, and Peacebuilding Program at California State University Dominguez Hills invites applications for assistant, associate, and full professor positions in the Program. Employment will be effective fall semester 2014. Salary commensurate with experience. Information on the Program: www.cah.csudh.edu/ncrp.  
Responsibilities: Teach graduate-level as well as undergraduate-level courses on campus and online in the field of negotiation, conflict resolution, and peacebuilding, and maintain a respectable output of peer-reviewed publications.  
Qualifications: The successful candidate will possess the teaching, scholarship and professional experience needed to teach courses in domestic and international peacebuilding and conflict resolution. Expertise in communication, negotiation, conflict resolution and peacebuilding; and either a professional or research doctoral (terminal) degree in one of the social sciences or a closely related field such as education, law, social work, or communications. Applicants must be prepared to teach graduate-level as well as undergraduate-level courses on campus (day/evening) and online (distance learning); demonstrate a promising scholarly research agenda and excellent service including multicultural experience. Knowledge of theory and research methods, as they relate to the field of communication, negotiation, conflict resolution and peacebuilding, is required. Preferred: Practical experience in communication, negotiation, conflict resolution and peacebuilding; knowledge of computer applications; online experience.  
The position will remain open until filled. Review of applications, consisting of a current C.V., cover letter and a list of 3 references will begin upon publication of this announcement. Applicants should request references to submit reference letters directly to: Dr. Rudy Vanterpool; Emeritus Professor and Interim Program Director; rvanterpool@csudh.edu. Applications should be submitted online at: www.csudh.edu/site/employment.

OPEN LECTURER POOL  
University of California - Santa Cruz  
UC-Santa Cruz maintains an ongoing pool of qualified, temporary instructors to teach sections of the College Ten Core Course, and/or regular college courses related to the college’s theme, Social Justice and Community. Courses address topics such as discrimination, poverty, education, and environmental and nuclear policy. Regular courses ones introducing key aspects of nuclear policy, one addressing the making and influencing of nuclear and environmental policy, and one on nonviolent communication. Master’s degree or equivalent experience in a discipline relevant to social justice is required. Successful past experience in university-level teaching is also required.  
To apply, submit a letter of application, curriculum vitae, three letters of recommendation, and teaching evaluations to: College Ten Lecturer Search, College Ten Administration, University of California, 1156 High Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95064. PLEASE REFER TO POSITION T06-25 IN YOUR REPLY. This is an ongoing recruitment; applicants will be asked to update their CV periodically to stay in the pool.  

JOB AND INTERNSHIP LISTINGS: ONGOING RESOURCES  
Organization: The Kroc Institute for Int’l Peace Studies, University of Notre Dame  
Website: http://kroc.nd.edu/alumni/career-resources/jobs  
Description: Comprehensive list of websites and resources for openings in peace studies, conflict resolution, international affairs, public policy, human rights, international development, NGOs, the UN, and other international organizations.  
Organization: Fresno Pacific University, Center for Peacemaking/Conflict Studies  
Website: http://peace.fresno.edu/rjjobs.php  
Organization: American University, School of International Service  
Website: www.aupeace.org/jobs
Notices and Resources

**PJSA Notes: New Projects, Plans, and Initiatives**

With our recent relocation back east to Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., the PJSA is poised to launch a number of new projects in the months ahead. We’ve already rolled out our Speakers Bureau, and have begun to issue position papers on critical issues of peace and justice (see, e.g., the statement on indigenous rights on page 22 of this issue). We have also been adding levels of teacher support and professional development, with a particular track for teachers at our annual conferences and a running section on K-12 resources in the Chronicle (see page 10 of this issue). On tap in the near future are a PJSA Book Series, a Syllabus Exchange program, and a Program Review service, among other initiatives. We have been applying for various grants and developing fundraising opportunities in order to be able to provide you with these services and forms of support. With our new website and data system set to be rolled out in short order, we are excited about the prospects for the near future. Stay tuned!

**Call for Papers: Class, Race, and Corporate Power**

Class, Race and Corporate Power is an open-access, online academic journal examining the politics of corporate power. This includes an analysis of capital, labor, and race relations within nation-states and the global economy. We encourage contributions that explore these issues within holistic frameworks that borrow from a range of scholarly disciplines. We will be publishing three issues each year. We want broad conceptualizations of these themes that engage important theoretical debates, as opposed to narrow case studies. Our "Articles" section includes 25-35pp contributions that go through a double-blind peer review process with a month turnaround for reviews. We also encourage shorter contributions to our non-peer-reviewed sections, "The Politics of Culture" (review essays) and "Perspectives" (short opinion pieces). For more information visit: digitalcommons.fiu.edu/classracecorporatepower. Or contact Editor-In-Chief: Ronald W. Cox, Associate Professor of Politics and International Relations, Florida International University, at coxr@fiu.edu.

**Announcing the 2014 Canadian School of Peacebuilding**

Come this summer to learn with peacebuilders at the annual Canadian School of Peacebuilding (CSOP). Participate in your choice of five-day courses for personal inspiration, professional development, or academic credit. The CSOP, a program of Canadian Mennonite University, will be held in Winnipeg, MB, June 16-20 and 23-27, 2014. Two 5-day sessions, each with three courses running concurrently, will be offered for training or for academic credit. The CSOP is designed to be an environment characterized by (a) education for peace and justice, (b) learning through thinking and doing, (c) generous hospitality and radical dialogue, and (d) the modeling of invitational community. The CSOP is for people from all faiths, countries and identity groups. More information is available at csop.cmu.ca or emailing: csop@cmu.ca.

**New Peacebuilding Journal Issues Call for Papers**

The Asian Journal of Peacebuilding (AJP) is a new peer-reviewed journal publishing original research on the topics of violence, conflict, and peacebuilding around the world. AJP welcomes papers written by scholars around the world, both within and outside the Asian region. Exemplary topics on which AJP focuses include, but are not limited to: reconciliation in divided societies (or nations); migrants and refugees; WMD developments; development and ecological destruction; historical and territorial disputes; peacemaking or mediation in instate conflicts; violence and transitional justice; anti-nuclear weapons (or anti-nuclear plants) movements; women in wars; democratic transition and human rights; post-conflict institutionalization; humanitarian assistance and protection. For queries, please contact the editorial office at: peacejournal@snu.ac.kr.

**Peace Review Seeks Contributions**

Peace Review is currently soliciting theme ideas for future issues, as well as Special Editors to coordinate those themes. We are also currently soliciting authors for the “Peace Profile” section of the journal, which describes the peace or human rights work of an individual or group. This journal’s Peace Profiles have a limit of 3500 words. For more information, please visit: www.usfca.edu/artsci/peace_review/. To contact us: Robert Elias, Editor, eliasr@usfca.edu; Erika Myszynski, Managing Editor, emyszynski@usfca.edu.

**Journal Seeks Book Reviewers**

The Journal of Peace Education (JPE) is seeking reviewers for a number of current books in the field. Reviews should be from 800-1000 words in length. Submission date to suit busy schedules can be negotiated once the reviewer has received a review copy. If you are interested or need more information, please contact: Anita L Wenden, Book Review Editor, Journal of Peace Education. wenden@rcn.com.

**Peace and Change Seeks Articles and Contributions**

Peace and Change (P-C) publishes scholarly and interpretive articles on the achievement of a peaceful, just and humane society. International and interdisciplinary in focus, the journal bridges the gaps among peace researchers, K-12 and post-secondary educators, and activists. P-C seeks articles that explore the expansion of frontiers through new and innovative ways to promote both the practice and the culture of peace in a divided world. P-C welcomes submissions on a wide range of topics, including: peace movements and activism, conflict resolution, nonviolence, peace education pedagogy and practice, internationalism, multiculturalism, human rights, religious and ideological conflict, race and class, LGBTQ and homophobia, economic development, ecological sustainability, the legacy of imperialism, structural violence, and the post-Cold War upheaval. More info at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1468-0130.  

25
Distributed three times a year to members and friends of PJSA, this newsletter is a very cost effective way to reach a dedicated audience. Cost of advertising is $100 for a quarter-page, $200 for a half-page, and $300 for a full page. Exchange offers will be considered as well.

To inquire about specs, or to place an ad, please contact us at:

info@peacejusticestudies.org

## Canadian School of Peacebuilding

**AN INSTITUTE OF CANADIAN MENNONITE UNIVERSITY**

### JUNE 16–20 and 23–27, 2014

Come this summer to learn with other peacebuilders – local and international, young and old, students, practitioners, and those new to peacebuilding – at the sixth annual Canadian School of Peacebuilding. We invite you to participate in your choice of five-day courses for personal inspiration, professional development, or academic credit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEACE SKILLS PRACTICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>EXPLORING INDIGENOUS JUSTICE AND HEALING</strong></td>
<td><strong>RESTORATIVE JUSTICE WITH YOUTH AND SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td><strong>DE-COLONIAL THEOLOGY: THOUGHT AND PRACTICE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors: Natasha Mohammed and Marlius Brand</td>
<td>Instructors: Rupert Ross</td>
<td>Instructors: Catherine Bargen and John R. Wiens</td>
<td>Instructor: Terry LeBlanc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD, FARMING AND FAITH:</strong></td>
<td><strong>LIVING IN GOD’S CREATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>STRATEGIES FOR TRAUMA AWARENESS AND RESILIENCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>ARTS APPROACHES TO COMMUNITY-BASED PEACEBUILDING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors: Norman Wirzba</td>
<td>Instructor:</td>
<td>Instructor: Elaine Zook Barge</td>
<td>Instructor: Babu Ayindo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**csop.cmu.ca | csop@cmu.ca | Ph: 204.487.3300 | Fax: 204.837.7415**

---

Want to advertise in *The Peace Chronicle*?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center for Conflict Management, 5th Int’l Conference</td>
<td>April 10-12, 2014</td>
<td>Kennesaw State University, Kennesaw, Georgia, USA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kennesaw.edu/conflict/2014conference/negotiation.html">http://www.kennesaw.edu/conflict/2014conference/negotiation.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Studies Association, 16th Annual Conference</td>
<td>May 29-31, 2014</td>
<td>Towson University, Towson, Maryland, USA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.justicestudies.org/">http://www.justicestudies.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian School of Peacebuilding</td>
<td>June 16-20 and 23-27, 2014</td>
<td>Canadian Mennonite University, Winnipeg, MB, Canada</td>
<td><a href="http://cmu.ca.csop">http://cmu.ca.csop</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and Justice Studies Association Annual Conference</td>
<td>October 16-18, 2014</td>
<td>University of San Diego, San Diego, California, USA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.peacejusticestudies.org/conference">http://www.peacejusticestudies.org/conference</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Join Colombians During Their Peace Process
Sembrandopaz (Sowing Peace), a community organization on Colombia’s Caribbean coast, is now sponsoring study tours to come to Colombia. After nearly 60 years of conflict, the Colombian government and largest guerrilla group are sitting down to negotiate the end to the conflict. Having peace talks is a great start, but creating peace on the ground will be a long and complicated endeavor. We invite you to join us!

There has been no better time to learn about Colombia’s historical reality. Join us as Colombia embarks on the long, but hope-filled, road to peace. This is a unique opportunity to learn about Colombia’s struggles, dreams and the search for its future.

Visit and hear the testimonies of displaced Afro-Colombian and indigenous communities, church leaders, human rights workers, peasant leaders, women’s groups, victims groups, and demobilized guerrillas. These trips provide a unique educational opportunity for students in Latin American Studies, Africana Studies, Peace and Conflict Studies, Community Development, Human Rights, among others.

For more information or a sample itinerary please contact: sembrandopazcolombia@gmail.com
Visit us on Facebook: Sembrandopaz.
In 2005, BCA entered into a partnership with PJSA to promote peace and justice through education, research and action and to engage students, faculty, and college and university staff members in international programs focused on peace, justice and other issues of mutual concern. Through this partnership, PJSA Institutional members' students and PJSA student members will receive special consideration for BCA’s distinctive educational programs all over the world. BCA will waive application fees for peace studies students from PJSA member institutions who want to attend BCA peace and justice studies programs abroad. For more information about BCA or applying to a program, e-mail inquiry@BCAabroad.org or visit the BCA website at www.BCAabroad.org.

Since April 2005, PJSA and the Higher Education Consortium for Urban Affairs (HECUA) have been working together to provide opportunities for students to participate in academically rigorous, experiential learning programs focused on social justice and social change. Undergraduates enrolled at PJSA member institutions receive special benefits when they enroll in HECUA programs: a discount of $500 on the non-consortium fees for semester programs, and a discount of $150 on the non-consortium fees for short programs. PJSA members also receive annual mailings of HECUA materials, and there is a PJSA liaison to the HECUA Board of Directors. Program sites include Bangladesh, Ecuador, Northern Ireland, Scandinavia, and the southern U.S. Complete program materials can be found at www.hecua.org.

In November 2008, PJSA partnered with the Center for Global Education (CGE) at Augsburg College to add another scholastic membership benefit. This new partnership will offer discounts to individual members and member institutions alike, including $500 off fees for undergraduate students going on the Center’s Mexico or Central America semester programs, or $100 off fees for faculty, staff, or students going on the Center’s international travel seminars or professional development programs. Since 1979, the CGE has been a pioneer in peace and justice studies abroad, and working towards a just and sustainable world has been central to their mission. Program details can be found online at www.CenterForGlobalEducation.org.