Although we are fully into summer, the Peace History Society continues to be busy with its work. I am pleased to report that all of the awards committees have completed their deliberations and made their recommendations. I hope you will join me in thanking all the members of those committees for the important work they have done so well. This includes:

**DeBenedetti Prize Committee**: Rachel Waltner Goossen (Chair), Andy Barbero, and Erika Kuhlman

**Scott Bills Prize Committee**: Kevin Callahan (Chair), Chuck Howlett, and Elizabeth Agnew

**Elise Boulding Prize Committee**: Mona Siegel (Chair), Michael Clinton, Doug Rossinow

**Lifetime Achievement Award Committee**: Robbie Lieberman (Chair), Leilah Danielson, and Scott Bennett

In 2015 I served on the Scott Bills Prize Committee and two of the things I took away from that experience were, first, the conscientiousness and hard work that the committee members put into their considerations and second, the impressive array of work that is being done by many different scholars in furthering the study of peace. It gives me hope in a time when hope is sometimes hard to find.

The prize winners will be announced at our fall conference in October. This brings me to more good work that members of the Society are doing. “**Muted Voices: Conscience, Dissent, Resistance, and Civil Liberties in World War I through Today**” will take place October 19-22, 2017 at the National World War I Museum and Memorial in Kansas City, Missouri. This promises to be a stimulating and enriching event that includes a musical performance, keynote addresses, paper presentations, and a memorial service remembering...
conscientious objectors who died in Fort Leavenworth Prison as a result of standing up for their principles. We would like to extend special thanks to David Hostetter and Andrew Bolton for their hard work in helping to bring this program together. Registration is now open; the early bird registration rate is good until September 8 and special conference rates on hotels will be offered only through mid-September, so please register soon! All the details on the conference program, transportation and lodging can be found by going to the PHS website, www.peacehistorysociety.org, and clicking on “PHS Conferences” on the left, or by going directly to the conference website: www.theworldwar.org/mutedvoices.

Another project for the PHS is the collaboration with the Journal of American History about Teaching Peace History. Our thanks go to Chuck Howlett both for suggesting the idea in the first place and for taking on the leadership of this exciting project. Chuck has received a number of proposals that he will send to the co-editors of the JAH’s Textbooks and Teaching Section for their consideration. Submitted proposals so far include some very interesting teaching strategies, such as an overview of teaching the chronological dimensions of peace activism through drama, the challenges and opportunities associated with teaching the Vietnam Antiwar Movement, addressing the issue of partisanship through teaching peace and justice in the U.S. survey course, connecting students to peace history through role-playing simulation games, and teaching peace history through music. The ultimate result will be a special section theme about the pedagogy of Peace History appearing in one of the most important journals on American history today.

Finally, we are also co-sponsoring a film screening and panel discussion at the American Historical Association conference in January 2018. The film, In Our Son's Name: A Family Responds to 9/11, deals with Phyllis and Orlando Rodríguez, whose son, Greg, died along with so many others in the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001. The bereaved parents chose reconciliation and nonviolence over vengeance and embarked on a transformative journey that both confirmed and challenged their convictions. This is just a small sampling of the various work members of our Society are doing to promote the teaching and understanding of peace history. Although it is easy sometimes to dismiss what we do and assume that it does not matter, in fact it matters a great deal. Whether we see immediate results of our actions or not, our smallest acts contribute to making the world more peaceful and just.

If you have ideas for other things our society might be involved in, I would be delighted to hear from you. You can send me an email at dbuffton@uwlax.edu or call 608-785-8359.

I hope you enjoy the rest of the summer and I look forward to seeing many of you in Kansas City!

With warm wishes,
Deborah Buffton
University of Wisconsin-Lacrosse
President, Peace History Society
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Remembering Muted Voices:  
Conscience, Dissent, Resistance,  
and Civil Liberties in World War I  
through Today

October 19-22, 2017  
National World War I Museum and  
Memorial, Kansas City, Missouri

Sponsors:  
American Civil Liberties Union  
Peace History Society  
Plough Publishing House  
Vaughan Williams Charitable Trust

Endorsed by:  
All Souls Unitarian Universalist Church;  
American Friends Service Committee;  
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America;  
The Brethren Historical Library and Archives;  
Bruderhof;  
Community of Christ Seminary;  
Greater Kansas City Interfaith Council;  
Historians Against the War;  
John Whitmer Historical Association;  
Mennonite Central Committee;  
Mennonite Historical Society;  
The Mennonite Quarterly Review;  
Peace Pavilion;  
PeaceWorks, Kansas City;  
Rainbow Mennonite Church

Register on-line at:  
https://www.theworldwar.org/sympo  
sia/mutedvoices/register

Early registration rate -- $99 (until Sept. 8)  
Thereafter -- $125

Registration includes Thursday evening  
reception, and Friday and Saturday lunches  
Dinners at the museum are $10 (Friday) and  
$14 (Saturday)

The full conference program has not yet been  
announced, but the keynote and plenary sessions  
have been finalized.

Thursday, October 19, 7:00 pm:  
Ingrid Sharp, Leeds University: “Making a  
Stand: German Opposition to World War I”  
Also: Vaughan Williams's “Dona Nobis  
Pacem,” with the Conservatory Singers,  
University of Missouri-Kansas City  
Conservatory of Music and Dance and the  
Rainbow Mennonite Church Choir

Friday, October 20, 8:30 am:  
Erika Kuhlman, Idaho State University:  
“Mustering Support for War: Gender  
Conformity and the ‘Inevitability’ of the First  
World War”

Friday, October 20, 10:30 am:  
Plenary session: “Genesis and Persistence in  
Advocacy for Peace – Faith Organizations”  
Don Davis: AFSC  
James Juhnke: Mennonite Central Committee  
Jane Dawson: Quakers in Britain  
Kristin Stoneking:Fellowship of Reconciliation

Friday, October 20, 7:00 pm:  
Michael Kazin, Georgetown University:  
“War Against War: The American Fight for  
Peace, 1914-1918, and Implications for Today”

Saturday, October 21, 8:30 am:  
Plenary session: “Genesis and Persistence in  
Advocacy for Peace – Secular Organizations”  
Susan Herman, ACLU  
Joanne Sheehan, War Resisters League  
Mary Hanson Harrison, Women’s  
International League for Peace and Freedom

Saturday, October 21, 7:00 pm:  
Dora Maendal, Fairholme Hutterite Colony,  
and Duane Stolzfus, Goshen College: “On the  
Frontlines of Conscience: An Account of Four  
Hutterites Sentenced to Hard Labor at Alcatraz”

On Sunday morning a memorial service will be  
held at the Museum for conscientious objectors  
who died while imprisoned during World War I,  
and there will be a bus tour to Fort Leavenworth,  
where many CO’s were imprisoned.
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More on some of the conference keynote speakers:

Ingrid Sharp, Leeds University


Erika Kuhlman, Idaho State University

Kuhlman, who served as editor of *Peace & Change* from 2011 to 2015, has also written, in addition to the book above, *A to Z of Women in World History* (2002), *Reconstructing Patriarchy after the Great War: Women, Gender, and Postwar Reconciliation between Nations* (2008), and *The International Migration of German Great War Veterans: Emotion, Transnational Identity, and Loyalty to the Nation, 1914-1942* (2016), among other works.
...The Americans who struggled mightily to prevent their own entry into this, the most senseless of wars, must...have wondered how it was that they did not prevail.

After all, they seemed to have everything going for them, as Michael Kazin makes clear in his fine, sorrowful history, “War Against War.” Unlike most of Europe, which had sleepwalked into the conflict, Americans had almost three years to watch and absorb just how horrible and futile 20th-century warfare could be. Never had politics made stranger, or more numerous, bedfellows than the movement to keep us out of World War I.

Working actively against American intervention were the country’s growing Socialist Party, which had 1,200 members in elected office; key figures in Congress, including the great progressive Republicans George Norris and Robert La Follette, and the populist Democratic House majority leader (and white supremacist) Claude Kitchin; powerful industrialists like Andrew Carnegie and Henry Ford; revered social reformers such as Jane Addams and the liberal rabbi Stephen Wise; the peace-loving secretary of state, William Jennings Bryan; the publishing magnate William Randolph Hearst; Helen Keller, civil rights groups, labor unions, the women’s movement, Irish- and German-American groups, countless clergymen and assorted independent radicals. Even, for a time, the president of the United States himself, Woodrow Wilson. “Not until the movement to end the Vietnam War half a century later would there be as large, as influential and as tactically adroit a campaign against U.S. intervention in another land,” Kazin notes.

And yet we did go to war, and in just a year and a half over 116,000 young Americans — about twice the number of Americans killed over 20 years in Vietnam — would throw their own lives like so many more dead logs into the terrible fire. Kazin’s work is an instructive one, an important book in chronicling a too often neglected chapter in our history. Most of all, it is a timely reminder of how easily the will of the majority can be thwarted in even the mightiest of democracies...
PHS Joins AHA in Condemning Trump’s Executive Order Restricting Entry to the United States

The American Historical Association on January 30, 2017 issued a statement opposing newly-inaugurated President Donald Trump’s executive order banning travel (his words) to the U.S. by citizens of seven predominantly Muslim nations. The AHA invited other organizations of historians to sign onto the statement, and the Peace History Society, in an e-mail poll of its members, did so. The vote was unanimous among PHS members who voted. Here is the statement in full.

The American Historical Association strongly condemns the executive order issued by President Donald J. Trump on January 27 purportedly “protecting the nation from foreign terrorist entry into the United States.” Historians look first to evidence: deaths from terrorism in the United States in the last fifteen years have come at the hands of native-born citizens and people from countries other than the seven singled out for exclusion in the order. Attention to evidence raises the question as to whether the order actually speaks to the dangers of foreign terrorism.

It is more clear that the order will have a significant and detrimental impact on thousands of innocent people, whether inhabitants of refugee camps across the world who have waited months or even years for interviews scheduled in the coming month (now canceled), travelers en route to the United States with valid visas or other documentation, or other categories of residents of the United States, including many of our students and colleagues.

The AHA urges the policy community to learn from our nation’s history. Formulating or analyzing policy by historical analogy admittedly can be dangerous; context matters. But the past does provide warnings, especially given advantages of hindsight. What we have seen before can help us understand possible implications of the executive order. The most striking example of American refusal to admit refugees was during the 1930s, when Jews and others fled Nazi Germany. A combination of hostility toward a particular religious group combined with suspicions of disloyalty and potential subversion by supposed radicals anxious to undermine our democracy contributed to exclusionist policies. British Quakers worked on behalf of refugees from Nazism in the 1930s.

Graphic from “Quaker Strongrooms: A blog from the Society of Friends,” on-line.
administrative procedures that slammed shut the doors on millions of refugees. Many were subsequently systematically murdered as part of the German “final solution to the Jewish question.” Ironically, President Trump issued his executive order on Holocaust Remembrance Day.

Conversely, when refugees have found their way to our shores, the United States has benefited from their talents and energy. Our own discipline has been enriched by individuals fleeing their homelands. The distinguished historian of Germany Hajo Holborn arrived in 1934 from Germany. Gerda Lerner, a major force in the rise of women’s history, fled Austria in 1939. Civil War historian Gabor Boritt found refuge in the United States after participating in the 1956 uprising in Hungary. More recently, immigration scholar Maria Cristina Garcia fled Fidel Castro’s Cuba with her parents in 1961. The list is long and could be replicated in nearly every discipline.

We have good reason to fear that the executive order will harm historians and historical research both in the United States and abroad. The AHA represents teachers and researchers who study and teach history throughout the world. Essential to that endeavor are interactions with foreign colleagues and access to archives and conferences overseas. The executive order threatens global scholarly networks our members have built up over decades. It establishes a religious test for scholars, favoring Christians over Muslims from the affected countries; and it jeopardizes both travel and the exchange of ideas upon which all scholarship ultimately depends. It directly threatens individuals currently studying history in our universities and colleges, as well as our ability to attract international students in the future. It also raises the possibility that other countries may retaliate by imposing similar restrictions on American teachers and students. By banning these nations’ best and brightest from attending American universities, the executive order is likely to increase anti-Americanism among their next generation of leaders, with fearsome consequences for our future national security.

Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, like many of his colleagues before and since, did think historically in ways that should inform consideration of President Trump’s executive order. In a 1989 dissent (Skinner v. Railway Executives Association), Justice Marshall observed: “History teaches that grave threats to liberty often come in time of urgency, when constitutional rights seem too extravagant to endure. The World War II Relocation–camp cases and the Red Scare and McCarthy-era internal subversion cases are only the most extreme reminders that when we allow fundamental freedoms to be sacrificed in the name of real or perceived exigency, we invariably come to regret it.”

The Peace History Society thanks the following people, who completed terms as officers or board members at the end of 2016, for their service to the organization:

Harriet Alonso, City College of New York, emeritus
Sandi Cooper, College of Staten Island, emeritus
Ian C. Fletcher, Georgia State University
Kathleen Kennedy, Missouri State University
Robert Shaffer, Shippensburg University
Virginia Williams, Winthrop University

It’s never too early to mark one’s calendar! While the 2017 PHS conference is still some months away, the PHS Board has already arranged with Kent State University to hold our 2019 conference there. The conference will be one part of a series of 50th anniversary commemorations at Kent State during the 2019-2020 academic year of the May 4, 1970 killings.
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Two centuries of Peacemaking:
From the Peace Society to
Martin Luther King
Newcastle upon Tyne, June 7-8, 2016

By Mike Clinton, Gwynedd Mercy University
PHS Treasurer and Book Review Editor, Peace
& Change

Newcastle University and Northumbria University collaborated on an enlightening and inspiring two-day event in June 2016 that not only gathered scholars from Great Britain and the United States for a conference commemorating peace advocacy and nonviolent activism of the past but also featured a peace fair presenting opportunities to engage in peaceful change today. The year 2016 marked the bicentenary of the founding of the Society for the Promotion of Permanent and Universal Peace, more commonly known as the Peace Society, in London. Its founding, along with the peace societies formed slightly earlier in the United States, inaugurated the modern era of organization and action by citizens for peace, making the Peace History Society itself to no small extent an heir to the tradition it established.

The conference also looked forward towards a year of commemorations of Martin Luther King, Jr.’s visit to Newcastle University in 1967 to receive an honorary doctorate, an occasion that left a strong imprint on both universities’ commitment to researching the connections among poverty, war, and racism and addressing them through the Martin Luther King Peace Committee sponsored by the universities’ chaplaincies. For more information about Dr. King’s visit to Newcastle, including a video of his address, go to: http://www.ncl.ac.uk/congregations/ceremonies/honorary/martinlutherking.php. For more on the Martin Luther King Peace Committee, go to: https://research.ncl.ac.uk/martinlutherking/.

Several institutions from both universities supported the conference, including Newcastle University’s Institute for Social Renewal and Northumbria University’s Histories of Activism Research Group. The organizing committee consisted of faculty members Ben Houston (Newcastle), Daniel Laqua (Northumbria), and Nick Megoran (Newcastle), along with Northumbria graduate students Jon Coburn and Sarah Hellawell. I feel compelled to recognize Dan Laqua in particular for the remarkable attention, hospitality, and apparently inexhaustible energy he displayed, to the point of hovering around the table to pour water and wine for the score or so of us who met for a convivial pre-conference dinner at Café Vivo.

Four plenary addresses supplemented four concurrent sessions, each of the latter featuring two balanced concurrent panels, with one focused on a topic related to the Peace Society and its legacy and another on Dr. King and the themes he raised during his 1967 address. Martin Ceadel (Oxford), the eminent historian who has written extensively on the peace movement in Great Britain, delivered the first plenary address, a sweeping retrospective that covered the Peace Society’s founding all the way into the twentieth century. He ended with an epilogue describing Peter Brock’s intervention to help Ceadel gain access to the Peace Society’s records during the 1970s, by which time they had come into private hands. This was my first time meeting Martin Ceadel, whose work I had read decades ago as an undergraduate completing an honors essay on conscientious objection in Great Britain during the First World War—before I turned towards
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the French in graduate school. In fact, my own contribution to the panel titled “A Century of Transnational Peace Activism, 1820s to 1930s” during the first concurrent session explored interactions between British and French peace activists throughout the nineteenth century. Dan Laqua expanded the transnational perspective with an examination of the peace activism of the cosmopolitan Austro-Hungarian Leopold Katscher 1853–1939). In the neighboring room, an audience listened to another panel of scholars “Rethinking King” during the pivotal year of 1956 (Simon Hall, Leeds University), in relation to his performance of Gandhian nonviolence (Peter Ling, Nottingham University), and on his political construction as “Kingji” by American pacifists (Jake Hodder, Nottingham University).

An afternoon panel considered the Peace Society and its supporters in a more local context, complementing the transnational perspective offered in the morning session. The trio of Ben Houston, Nick Megoran, and Matthew Scott, all of Newcastle University, presented a history of the Peace Society’s auxiliary branch in Newcastle upon Tyne through 1850, and David Saunders, also of Newcastle University, described pacifism throughout the region of northeastern England throughout the nineteenth century until the outbreak of the First World War. Keith Edghill (University College London) and Richard Allen (University of South Wales) each examined the Christian foundations of British pacifism, in relation to the concept of defensive war and reactions to the prevalence of dueling, respectively.

A range of issues pertaining to nonviolence were studied by the afternoon session’s other panel. Sherrill W. Hayes, of Kennesaw State University in Georgia, depicted King’s push for the Fair Housing Act of 1968 as a case study of “peacejacking” in social policy—that is, an example of how outsiders can make change inside a system by creating a space for outcome-based dialogue that moves beyond polemics, positions, and posturing. Another scholar from Kennesaw State, Maia Hallward, referred to the case of academic boycott to explore the tensions and contradictions of nonviolence. Andreas Hackl (Edinburgh University) examined the difficult prospects of negotiating between “civility”—a form of adaptation necessary to attain a degree of success in an environment of inequality and separation—and the urge to resistance among Palestinians in Tel Aviv. More theoretically, if not less pragmatically, Roberto Baldoli (Exeter University) spoke about reconstructing nonviolence as a revolutionary ideology for freedom and plurality.

The first day culminated in a peace fair, with refreshments, music by the North East Socialist Singers, and stalls sponsored by fourteen different organizations, including the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) Northern Region, the Newcastle Conflict

One table at the conference’s peace fair

Resolution Network, and the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF). Kate Hudson, General Secretary of the CND and leading figure in the Stop the War Coalition, gave a public lecture that simultaneously served as the second plenary
address of the conference. Her remarks titled “Peace Activism in Twentieth-Century Britain” invoked the past as inspiration for sustaining present-day campaigns for peace and justice.

The next day kicked off with the third plenary address, by Thomas F. Jackson (University of North Carolina at Greensboro), which evoked the “jangling discords of Martin Luther King’s nonviolent strategy” at the time of his November 1967 visit to and address in Newcastle. Jackson then chaired a panel that explored themes of race, empire, and imperialism through the lens of the Pan-African movement and C.L.R. James (Christian Høgsbjerg, University College London) and through French academic activists during the Vietnam War era (Ellen Crabtree, Newcastle University). While the conference was ostensibly organized around two historical commemorations, the other session that second morning recognized yet another—the centenary of the First World War. The issues undertaken were diverse geographically and topically, with the first relating the varied experiences of conscientious objectors in Great Britain (Sabine Grimshaw, Leeds University), another analyzing the themes of war, peace, and revolution expressed through song, graffiti, and other means by French sailors mutinying in the Black Sea region in 1919 (Matt Perry, Newcastle University), and the last comparing experiences of the German Bund Neues Vaterland and the British Union of Democratic Control relating to the tensions between those groups’ peace activism and the environment for civil liberties (or not) in their home countries (André Keil, Durham University).

The final session of concurrent panels occurred that afternoon. In one, the theme focused on women’s international connections and engagements throughout the twentieth century. Laurie Cohen (Universität Innsbruck) and Helen Kay (an independent researcher) reviewed communications between German and British women through letters and reports published in women’s international peace and suffrage journals like London’s Jus Sufficient and the Amsterdam-based Internationaal. Ingrid Sharp (Leeds University) explored the difficult process of restoring the international community of women in the aftermath of the First World War, with a particular focus on the obstacles faced and strategies adopted by German women’s organizations. Laura Beers (Birmingham University) considered the accommodations reached by liberal and socialist women to look beyond their ideological differences and collaborate in WILPF during the twentieth century.

The other panel took up different ways of thinking about peace and war since 1945. Naturally, concerns about “the bomb” figured prominently in each of the papers, with Tom Bishop’s (Nottingham University) the most unique in its excavation of the commercialization of civil defense through the marketing of fallout shelters and the reactions of potential customers. Christoph Laucht (Swansea University) examined the use of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the transnational medical activism against nuclear weapons in Great Britain, West Germany, and the United States during the 1980s. Jon Coburn used women’s peace activist Ethel Taylor’s memoirs to argue that awareness of peace history can hearten and invigorate current activists.

Coburn ably summarized a truth made evident by the conference as a whole and the events connected with it, and he provided an apt lead-in to the final plenary address by David Cortright, who recounted his life as an activist and scholar since the 1960s. Now Director of Policy Studies at Notre Dame’s Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies and author of a book on peace history himself, Peace: A History of Movements and Ideas (2008), Cortright
emerged as a leader of the GI peace movement protesting the Vietnam War before accepting the position as executive director of the Committee for a SANE Nuclear Policy, and then as co-director of the merged SANE/Freeze movement. He continues his peace activism today, partly by telling his own story to educate and inspire.

The conference closed with participants assembling at the Renwick War Memorial located by the city’s Barras Bridge that features a striking sculpture by Sir William Goscombe John, “The Response.” Participants read excerpts from two reports of Newcastle upon Tyne’s Peace Society Auxiliary; a wreath was placed at the base of the memorial to commemorate the Peace Society’s bicentenary.

The Rothermere American Institute at the University of Oxford hosted a conference on June 2, 2017 on “Voices of Dissent: Social Movements and Political Protest in Post-War America.” Speakers came from universities in the United Kingdom, Australia, France, and the United States. There were two keynote addresses: Simon Hall (University of Leeds) spoke on “The anti-Vietnam War movement: a successful failure,” and Michael Foley (Université Grenoble Alpes) addressed “Every creative method of protest possible’: political intelligibility and voices of dissent after the 1960s.” Panel presentations ranged from the connections between rock and roll and race relations (Sage Goodwin, University of Oxford) to dissent within John F. Kennedy’s administration on foreign affairs (Christopher Hurley, University of Kent) to the legacy of the civil rights movement’s sit-ins on Reagan’s South Africa policy (Dominic Barker, University of Oxford). The conference was in part timed to coincide, loosely, with the 50th anniversary of Martin Luther King’s historic April 1967 speech at Riverside Church against the Vietnam War.

The officers and board members of the Peace History Society offer our sincere condolences to long-time PHS member Brad Simpson and to his family on the death of their son, Elijah Simpson-Sundell, this past spring.

Commemorating the Peace Society’s bicentennial, at the Renwick War Memorial
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United States Foreign Policy: History & Resource Guide (A Website) – Update
By Roger Peace

The online “United States Foreign Policy, History and Resource Guide,” at http://peacehistory-usfp.org has five completed sections, covering the War of 1812, U.S.-Mexican War, War of 1898 / U.S.-Filipino War, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War. Written for non-history major students and the general public, the essays, or parts thereof, may be assigned by teachers and professors who want to expose their students to alternatives to nationalistic histories.

The most recent addition – the Vietnam War, 1954-1975 – is authored by John Marciano, Jeremy Kuzmarov, and myself, with contributions from Howie Machtinger, who is working with the Veterans for Peace Full Disclosure Project: http://vietnamfulldisclosure.org/index.php/peace-history. The book-length essay, with over 200 images, includes additional sections on associated wars in Laos and Cambodia, and on protest music of the Vietnam War. It is designed in part as an alternative to the Pentagon’s 50th anniversary commemoration of the war, authorized by Congress, which began in 2012 and will last thirteen years. It may also be of benefit in critiquing the virtues and deficiencies of Ken Burns’ documentary film on the Vietnam War, to be released in September 2017.

I am looking for assistance in completing other entries. If interested in helping in some way, please let me know.

Contact Roger Peace at Rpeace3@embarqmail.com

Visit the website at: http://peacehistory-usfp.org

From the website’s section on the War of 1898/U.S.-Filipino War. Note that the scroll the woman is holding is labeled “HISTORY.”

From the website’s section on the Vietnam War
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People Power: 
Fighting for Peace, 
An Exhibition at the Imperial War Museums, London

Nigel Young, editor of the Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace, reports that the Imperial War Museums of London (yes, the Imperial War Museums) have mounted an exhibit on antiwar movements. Here’s a description from the museum’s webpage:

Take a journey from the First World War to the present day, exploring how peace movements have influenced perceptions of war and conflict in this major exhibition.

From conscientious objectors to peace camps and modern day marches, Fighting for Peace tells the stories of passionate people over the past one hundred years and the struggles they have endured for the anti-war cause.

Over three hundred objects including paintings, literature, posters, placards, banners, badges and music reveal the breadth of creativity of anti-war protest movements, reflecting the cultural mood of each era.

Our London museum tells the stories of people’s experiences of modern war from World War I to conflicts today.

For those who cannot get to the exhibit in person (it closes August 28, 2017), check out its webpage: http://www.iwm.org.uk/exhibitions/iwm-london/fighting-for-peace

The New York Times Book Review also took note of this exhibit, in its June 25, 2017 issue, under the heading “Duck and Cover”:

The Imperial War Museums in Britain have reissued “Protect and Survive,” a booklet originally published by the Central Office of Information in 1980 on how to survive a nuclear attack…The reissue is in fact timed to coincide with an exhibition on peace movements, and the booklet is as good an antiwar tract as any, with its blast-radius diagrams and its terrifying, matter-of-fact prose. Most of the booklet consists of checklists for survival (canned food is useless without a can opener), but some of the instructions are so spare and open-ended that they read like prose poems for the end of the world: “The longer you spend in your refuge the better. Listen to your radio.”
Elise Boulding:
Namesake of PHS’s Newest Prize
By Robert Shaffer

The newest prize to be awarded by the Peace History Society is for a scholar’s second (or subsequent) book. The prize has been named in honor of Elise Boulding, a pioneering peace studies practitioner who died in 2010. The Washington Post chronicled Boulding’s extraordinary life and work in an obituary (below, page 17, slightly edited), and Boulding has already been the subject of a biography, by Mary Lee Morrison: Elise Boulding: A Life in the Cause of Peace (McFarland, 2005).

This partial list of Boulding’s books provides a clearer picture of her wide-ranging concerns and accomplishments as scholar and activist:

- The Underside of History: A View of Women Through Time (1976, two volumes)
- Women in the Twentieth Century World (1977)
- Children’s Rights and the Wheel of Life (1979)
- Building a Global Civic Culture: Education for an Interdependent World (1988)
- New Agendas for Peace Research: Conflict and Security Reexamined (1992, editor)
- Building Peace in the Middle East: Challenges for States and Civil Society (1994)

Over the years, Boulding wrote frequently for Peace & Change, with her essays and reviews usually demonstrating the overlap between scholarship and activism. Her first essay in this journal (co-authored with Chadwick Alger), “From Vietnam to El Salvador: Eleven Years of COPRED,” published in Spring 1981, reviewed the formation and development of the Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development, including her own role as a member of the organization’s initial organizing committee. (COPRED merged in 2001 with the Peace Studies Association to form the Peace and Justice Studies Association, which contributes to the publication of Peace & Change.)

Boulding’s long-standing concern with the education of children for peace was evident in “World Security and the Future from the Junior High Perspective,” published in Fall 1981, in which she presented the words of young people invited to address a COPRED conference panel about how they viewed the future.

Boulding’s most ambitious essay for Peace & Change, “Feminist Inventions in the Art of Peacemaking: A Century Overview” (October 1995), prefigured her 2000 book on Cultures of Peace, and it reiterated her longstanding view of the overlap between women’s history and peace history. Boulding’s three reviews for the journal also demonstrate the range of her concerns, as she analyzed books on Women’s Strike for Peace (January 1995), on peace-making efforts in the former Yugoslavia.
(April 1999), and on the impact on civilians of economic sanctions (October 2000). The prolific author’s last contribution to Peace & Change, in July 2003 – which was appropriately labeled an “Activist Note” – consisted of a presentation Boulding had given at the 2001 College of the Holy Cross conference, “Toward a Deeper Understanding of Forgiveness.” Boulding entitled her paper, “The Other America: The Forgivers and the Peacemakers,” and it recapitulated her persistent belief, rooted in her adopted Quaker faith, that a peace tradition and culture has always existed that challenged the culture and practice of war and militarism. Here are portions of the first and last paragraphs of that essay:

In spite of all the public rhetoric about the United States being the world’s policeman, a corollary of the Manifest Destiny doctrine, in spite of the new drive to achieve mastery in space through an anti-ballistic missile defense system, and in spite of our commitment to keep order in our own society by being tougher on crime, there is another America with a long history of nonviolence and peacemaking, forgiveness, and reconciliation. This history goes back to William Penn’s Holy Experiment in the colony of Pennsylvania in the last decade of the 1600s, which involved both Quaker settlers and Native Americans. This experiment has left traces in some of the wording of the United States Constitution. It might be said that from the beginning, the two traditions of the gentle Quakers and the judgmental Puritans were present but that the Puritan tradition has remained more visible. Although the willingness to use violence to right wrongs has been the more celebrated image, traditions of nonviolent problem solving and peaceful change strategies played a significant role in the American Revolution itself and have been alive and present in a continuing series of movements over the past three centuries. These movements have actively resisted injustices and have created new ways of accomplishing social goals without harming persons…

Because cultures of war and violence are so visible to us in our history books and in our media, it is easy to forget that the longing for peaceable lifeways and the social movements to create those lifeways are as old as human history. Every people, every society, has its own traditions of peacemaking that need to be made visible…All the creation of social space for forgiveness and reconciliation that is going on today in this country, and the new social bonding that arises from it, tells us that peaceableness exists in the United States, and, therefore, a peaceful, nonviolent, forgiving American society is possible.

The Peace History Society is, indeed, proud to name its new book prize for Elise Boulding, peace scholar and activist.

On the namesake of one of the other PHS prizes, see PHS News July 2016, on Scott L. Bills.
Elise Boulding, 89, a sociologist who was instrumental in establishing peace studies and conflict resolution as an academic discipline, died June 24 of complications from Alzheimer's disease at a nursing home in Needham, Mass. Dr. Boulding, a Norwegian-born Quaker, taught at the University of Colorado at Boulder before retiring from Dartmouth College in the mid-1980s. As a matriarch of the peace studies movement, she emphasized the role of women and families in creating a less violent world.

"Elise Boulding was to peace studies what Rachel Carson was to conservation and Margaret Mead to anthropology," Colman McCarthy, a peace activist and former Washington Post columnist, wrote in an e-mail. "She gave academic legitimacy to the study of pacifism as both a moral force and a practical alternative to violence -- all the way from military violence to domestic violence."

Dr. Boulding raised five children long before she entered academia, and her experience as a mother convinced her that people can be taught to wage peace just as they are taught to wage war. Lessons learned around the dinner table and on school playgrounds inevitably mold a person's method of dealing with conflict, Dr. Boulding thought. She wrote about the importance of educating children to become diplomats instead of aggressors and also about finding ways to raise children "to be sufficiently alienated from society, so they won't accept things 'as they are.'"

"We still don't know much about producing children who will irrepressibly dream about a better society than the one we have, and obstinately work for its realization," she wrote in notes unearthed by her biographer, Mary Lee Morrison. "Most of our writing about educating children for peace is concerned with helping children to become peaceful, rather than how to spur them to the rugged, often lonely task of peacemaking."

**History's underside**

Much of Dr. Boulding's scholarly work was grounded in what she called the underside of history -- the people and ideas that have been largely overlooked in narratives of the past. She wrote about important, little-heralded contributions by women from the Paleolithic period through modern times. As a counterpoint to studies of past wars and conflicts, she examined peaceful eras and cultures. In her book *Cultures of Peace: The Hidden Side of History* (2000), Dr. Boulding said that peace is a daily and dynamic activity rather than a dull, static state. "Pacifism, which literally refers to the making of peace," she wrote, "is often mistakenly understood as passivism."

Elise Marie Bjorn-Hansen was born July 6, 1920, in Oslo. She moved with her family to New Jersey when she was 3. Growing up, she came to know her native country through her mother's homesick tales, and she thought of it as a refuge untouched by the rest of the world's tragedies. Then Hitler's army invaded Norway in 1940. "And that was when I realized that there was no safe place on earth," she said. "And I knew that I had found my life's mission."

She graduated from what is now Rutgers University and joined the pacifist Friends Church, where she met her future husband, Kenneth Boulding, a Quaker poet and internationally renowned economist. As the couple moved frequently for his academic career, Dr. Boulding established an early
reputation as a skilled networker. While living in Tennessee in the 1940s, she created a newsletter to connect Quakers living in the South; later, she created another newsletter to unite women against nuclear testing. In 1949, she received a master's degree in sociology from what is now Iowa State University.

When the family settled in Ann Arbor, Mich., she worked toward a doctorate and volunteered at the University of Michigan's Center for Conflict Resolution. She recalled going through the garbage at the center to rescue letters sent by researchers detailing their work in the nascent field of peace studies. In Dr. Boulding's hands, that correspondence became the foundation of the International Peace Research Newsletter. That publication led to the formation of the International Peace Research Association, and she served as its secretary-general.

In the late 1960s, the Boulding family moved to Boulder, where Dr. Boulding headed the Women's International League of Peace and Freedom. In 1969, when her youngest child was a teenager, she received a doctorate in sociology from the University of Michigan. She spent much of 1973 on sabbatical in an isolated mountain cabin, writing the foundation of her 1976 book *The Underside of History: A View of Women Through Time*. She taught at the University of Colorado until 1978, when she joined the faculty at Dartmouth. There, she headed the sociology department and helped establish a peace studies department...

Dr. Boulding said one of her most important tasks was challenging people in workshops held across the country to envision a world in which quarrels are settled without threats or weapons. "We cannot achieve what we cannot imagine," she wrote.  

(slightly excerpted)

From *Muste Notes*, the newsletter of the A.J. Muste Institute, Summer 2017:

**Nat Hentoff, 1925-2017**


*For a special deal to get both books, along with several Muste Institute pamphlets, for $20, go to [http://www.ajmuste.org/mustenotes.htm#hentoff](http://www.ajmuste.org/mustenotes.htm#hentoff)*
From the Archives: “Students Fight ROTC at Willamette”

[We are very familiar with anti-militarist activity on college campuses in the 1930s, and then again in the 1960s, but less so in the early 1950s. This account from Fellowship, October 1951, page 19, shows that student anti-militarist activism made a difference even at the height of the Cold War. — Robert Shaffer]

Two FOR [Fellowship of Reconciliation] students, Marian Sayre and David Poindexter, at Willamette University in Salem, Oregon, have sparked a remarkable campaign against the decision of the college trustees to install an Air ROTC unit there. Willamette is a Methodist college, and in February the Board of Trustees instructed the President to apply for an AROTC unit for the college. He did so and it was approved by the Air Corps. Student opposition began to arise soon after, and received strong impetus when Bayard Rustin of the National FOR staff visited and spoke there. The spring conference of the Oregon Methodist Student Movement likewise gave encouragement to the opposition to ROTC, and a petition circulated at the college was signed by forty or fifty students, despite strong social and administration pressure.

Marian Sayre and David Poindexter brought the issue before the board of education of the Oregon Methodist Conference, and the board acted in opposition to ROTC. In June the Conference itself met, and the question was debated. President G. Herbert Smith of Willamette spoke in favor of the ROTC unit for Willamette, and the two students upheld the negative. When it came to a vote, the Conference voted 89 to 74 to request Willamette to bring about an “early termination” of the Air Reserve Offices Program scheduled to begin operating with the fall term. Observers reported that the ratio of those opposed was notably higher among ministers, and said that if laymen alone had voted ROTC would probably have been approved.
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From the Archives: Peace Activists Helping an Earlier Group of Refugees:
A Letter from the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom to President Franklin Roosevelt, November 1938

[The WILPF sent this letter after Kristallnacht, the November 9-10, 1938 anti-Jewish pogrom in Nazi Germany. The letter was published in Fellowship, December 1938, page 5. Some of the arguments and assumptions that Hull and Detzer make are worthy of fuller analysis and deconstruction, including comparison and contrast with present circumstances. Nevertheless, the letter is reprinted here in full, as it appeared in the magazine, without further comment. — Robert Shaffer]

Mr. Roosevelt:
Your statement quoted in the press of November 16th, expressing your amazement over the latest persecution of the helpless Jewish people in Germany, will be welcomed by all the members of this organization. We believe that you have uttered the deep sense of grief and

Dorothy Detzer
WILPF National Secretary, 1924-46
despair which all free Americans are feeling today.

We are concerned, however, that this natural sense of outrage expressed by every type of group in the United States shall not be wasted in futile protests and developed into a psychology of hate which makes clear and constructive action impossible.

May we hope that, as you rightly protest to the Nazi Government, you will also take the opportunity to point out to our people the responsibility which we must help to bear for the present neurosis in Germany.

You can do it.

You have those qualities of leadership which would make it possible for you to find the way to use this opportunity for what should be our own national soul-searching.

It is unbearable to us that the German press is able to point to the lynchings in the United States and thus to question the sincerity of the present wave of American indignation. We would point out that since our own Government has failed to act positively in regard to this great national shame, our pleas now to the German Reich cannot be as effective.

We would therefore beg you to direct the emotion which has been engendered during this past week toward constructive and helpful ends.

Therefore, we beg you as the head of this great nation to channel this energy back to the fine and noble tradition on which our country was founded – namely, to serve as a refuge for persecuted peoples. As a practical first step, we would urge you to call a special session of the Congress at once for the purpose of widening our quotas as they apply to the victims of European pogroms. We are confident that all political parties would cooperate in this humanitarian effort. We recognize fully the difficulties which would be raised because of the labor situation in this country. Yet we are confident that all wings of the labor movement would raise no serious objections if assurances were given that the refugees would be handled as a special problem.

We believe that the Congress would respond generously, since fifty-one Senators and one hundred and ninety-four Congressmen signed a petition asking the Secretary of State to intervene with Great Britain to keep open immigration to Palestine. Those same Congressmen would not ask of the poverty-stricken Arabs what they themselves would fail to do in this, the richest country in the world.

We know that kindness is the cornerstone of American character and that this quality, coupled with American ingenuity, will find a way to rescue the helpless Jews now tormented by the Hitler pogroms, without endangering the livelihood of American workers.

With gratitude for your own personal efforts in behalf of these persecuted people, we are,

Respectfully yours,

Hannah Clothier Hull, National President
Dorothy Detzer, National Executive Secretary

---

Hannah Clothier Hull, Quaker and WILPF national president, 1924-39
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Deep Cuts:  
Older Peace & Change articles worth another look

With the digitization of Peace & Change by the Wiley Online Library, more prospective readers than ever have access to an almost complete run of the PHS journal. Many college and university libraries that did not subscribe to it, or had only partial holdings, now provide access to Peace & Change to students and faculty through such databases as Academic Search Complete. Some such subscriptions do not include the most current issues (to provide an incentive for interested readers to still subscribe – by joining PHS!), but the opportunity to browse past issues is most welcome. Here are capsule summaries of two articles – one almost 40 years old – from the on-line library. Readers may send similar analyses (250-750 words) of past articles – at least ten years old – that have been meaningful to your research, your teaching, and/or your thinking about peace history and peace studies.  
Robert Shaffer, roshaf@ship.edu

Barton J. Bernstein,  

This past semester I once again assigned my first-year students, in a required World History course, to write a brief paper on the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, based on selected primary sources presented in Alfred Andrea and James Overfield, The Human Record, vol. II, 7th ed. Those students who concluded that the bombings were justified were most likely – by far – to cite Henry Stimson’s 1947 article in Harper’s that a prospective ground invasion, in the absence of the bomb, might have resulted in “over a million casualties to American forces alone.” Next time I assign this paper, I will be sure to include some of the material from Barton Bernstein’s 1999 Peace & Change essay which subjects to rigorous analysis loose talk about such casualty projections.

It is certainly unusual to publish a 28-page article, with 36 footnotes, to rebut a 6-page essay, but that is what Bernstein, who has for decades studied the circumstances surrounding the use of the bomb, did here. He mounted a point-by-point critique of a 1995 article in the

Bernstein’s 1999 essay in Peace & Change took up some of the issues raised in the aborted 1995 Smithsonian exhibit on the Enola Gay
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U.S. Naval Institute’s Proceedings which had posited that American policy-makers believed in June and July 1945 that an invasion may have resulted in almost half a million U.S. battle casualties, including roughly 150,000 deaths. (Almost all scholars agree that Stimson’s one million figure was a post-facto rationalization.) Bernstein took issue with authors Norman Polmar and Thomas Allen for mis-reading evidence time and again to inflate prospective casualties as a whole and prospective deaths in particular. Equally as important, Bernstein contextualized the original article as part and parcel of the debate raging in 1995 over the planned exhibit of the “Enola Gay” at the National Air and Space Museum on the 50th anniversary of the dropping of the bombs. So the disagreement over prospective casualty rates was not simply an arcane controversy among specialists, but formed part of public discourse at the time, with the perspective of Polmar and Allen buttressing the attack on the museum’s plans.

Two more points may be made. First, Bernstein turned to Peace & Change as a venue for publication only after the Naval Institute’s Proceedings made it clear they would not publish a detailed rebuttal. Thus, the PHS journal demonstrated one of its important functions, to present scholarship critical of the valorization of war. Second, Bernstein’s argument did not hinge on the morality or immorality of the use of the bomb – let alone whether the U.S. was right to engage in World War II itself – but on the types of “evidence” used in the justification of a particular military tactic. Certainly there will be PHS members who reject such an approach, based on pragmatism rather than principle, but it certainly creates more of an opening for me to discuss this important issue with my students.


With Donald Trump ordering a dramatically increased crack-down on undocumented immigrants living in the U.S., both near and far from the borders, it is worthwhile to look back at the history of enforcement. Joanne Belenchia, a Northwestern University Sociology Ph.D., addressed the issue over thirty-five years ago in a brief article on the impact that the Immigration and Naturalization Service (now re-labeled Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or ICE) had on Latinos in Chicago. Belenchia interviewed police officers and leaders of Latino organizations, and she reviewed relevant laws, policies, and statistics. She found that INS officials, trained for military-style enforcement roles at the nation’s borders, too often stopped and detained in Chicago anyone they suspected of looking Latino, despite the fact that most Latinos were U.S. citizens or legal residents and that many undocumented immigrants were from Europe or elsewhere. “Nearly every Latino community leader or organizational representative I spoke with,” Belenchia wrote, “told of being stopped by the INS.” Even a reform that appeared to be a nod toward civility and community policing – mandatory Spanish lessons for INS officials – “worked to isolate the Latino as the one hyphenated American who is not an American.”

While articles in Peace & Change overwhelmingly address issues of war and peace, militarism and pacifism, Joanne Belenchia’s essay raised important questions that are just as important in 2017 as they were in 1980 about issues of race, ethnicity, justice, and injustice within American society.
Opposition to War: An Encyclopedia – Update

Mitch Hall, general editor of Opposition to War: An Encyclopedia of United States Peace and Antiwar Movements (ABC-CLIO) provides this update on the project, as of mid-July 2017:

The completed manuscript went to the publisher in mid-February on deadline. After receiving the copyedited version and reading everything again, I returned that to the copyeditor on the June 7 deadline. I believe the copyeditor sent that to the publisher during the first week of July. At some yet undetermined date, I will receive the galley proofs for a final review. I have been very pleased with the results so far, and the publisher has scheduled a December 2017 release date. You may refer to the ABC-CLIO website for additional information. The link is below:

This project has been over two years in the making, and the result is a two-volume work that includes 375 entries written by 135 contributors from four continents, many of whom are members of the Peace History Society. The topics include concepts, documents, individuals and organizations representing government and NGOs, events, popular culture, race and gender reform, religious ethics, socialism, and wartime movements. It also includes a lengthy introduction, bibliography, chronology, and is supplemented by 50 images. I have learned a great deal from my colleagues who have so generously contributed to this important project.

Mitch, professor of history at Central Michigan University, is a past president of PHS and a former editor of Peace & Change.

According to ABC-CLIO’s website, the 765-page hardcover set will cost $198.00, and e-book options will be available. Here are excerpts of the description of the project from that website:

How have Americans sought peaceful, rather than destructive, solutions to domestic and world conflict? This two-volume set documents peace and antiwar movements in the U.S. from the colonial era to the present.

Although national leaders often claim to be fighting to achieve peace, the real peace seekers struggle against enormous resistance to their message and have often faced persecution for their efforts. Despite a well-established pattern of being involved in wars, the United States also has a long tradition of citizens who made extensive efforts to build and maintain peaceful societies and prevent the destructive human and material costs of war. Unarmed activists have most consistently upheld American values at home.

Opposition to War: An Encyclopedia of U.S. Peace and Antiwar Movements investigates this historical tradition of resistance to involvement in armed conflict—an especially important and relevant topic today as the nation has been mired in numerous military conflicts throughout most of the current century. The book examines a largely misunderstood and underappreciated minority of Americans who have committed themselves to finding peaceful resolutions to domestic and international conflicts—individuals who have proposed and conducted an array of practical and creative methods for peaceful change, from the transformation of individual behavior to the development of international governing and legal systems, for more than 250 years…
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“Historians Against the War” is now “Historians for Peace and Democracy”

(Historians Against the War sent out an update on its work in July 2017. PHS News is reprinting that update – in slightly edited form – along with the statement of purpose of the new Historians for Peace and Democracy, for the benefit of members who might be interested in joining and participating.)

July 4, 2017
Dear Friends of HAW/Historians for Peace and Democracy,

We want to let you know about some changes we have undergone recently and our current campaign. It is necessary for us to work together to resist the current reactionary politics of the Trump administration. As you may or may not be aware, Historians Against the War has undergone some changes recently. In April, we ratified a new policy statement (see below) to better address and oppose the perilous times we live in following Donald Trump et al’s ascension to power. We also elected a new steering committee (Marc Becker, Matt Bokovoy, Sandra Deutsch, Carolyn Eisenberg, Barbara Epstein, John J. Fitzgerald, Jeri Fogel, Martin Halpern, Tom Harbison, Jeremy Kuzmarov, Staughton Lynd, Jim O’Brien, Roger Peace, Ellen Schrecker, Andor Skotnes, James Swarts, Barbara Weinstein, Max Weiss, Kevin Young) and named Van Gosse and Margaret Power as co-chairs. And, we changed our name to Historians for Peace and Democracy, H-PAD. We hope you are as excited with these changes as we are!

We are now launching a fall campaign of dialogue, “Threats to Democracy, Dangers of War.” Via roundtables, workshops, teach-ins, podcasts and more, we will engage students, faculty, and members of the broader community in discussions about the different forms of authoritarianism, anti-democratic governance, and racial injustice that we currently face, how they were countered in the past, and how we can resist them today. To facilitate and maximize the campaign, we have developed an impressive list of endorsers and a Speakers’ Bureau of historians and public intellectuals, who are available for speaking engagements as part of this campaign.

We hope you will take part in it this work.

Here’s how you can get involved. First, we hope you join H-PAD. To do so, please sign the new membership form we have designed. And – good news -- it should take under one minute to fill out. Please go to https://www.historiansforpeace.org/join-us/ to sign up. We have also designed a new web page, which you can access at https://www.historiansforpeace.org/. Most of all, we hope you become an active member of the “Threats to Democracy, Dangers of War” campaign.

Here are some different ways you can become involved:
· host a Teach-In with faculty/student/community participants addressing the range of issues
· host a Roundtable addressing basic civil liberties and rights, with ACLU, law professors, etc.
· host a live Streaming of a citywide Teach-In with leading scholars and activists
· host a lecture by a historian or activist intellectual from our Speaker’s Bureau on one of the major issues connected to rights, repression, or militarism in U.S. history

We look forward to hearing from you. If you have any questions, please contact Margaret Power (marmacpower1@gmail.com) or Van Gosse (vgosse@fandm.edu).

New Statement of Purpose, adopted April 2017:

Historians Against the War was formed in January 2003 to oppose the Bush Administration’s drive for a pre-emptive, illegal invasion of Iraq. We participated actively in the antiwar movement of the Bush years, and we continued to challenge U.S. foreign policy and extended support for Palestinian human rights in the Obama era. Now, with the ascent of an
extreme rightwing administration contemptuous of constitutional norms, we have a new mission: to stand up for peace and diplomacy internationally, and democracy and human rights at home.

Our work, as historians against war and for peace and democracy, will have two focuses. First, we see our campuses as key sites for both repression and resistance. We will fight for the right to education, free speech and academic freedom for all members of campus communities, and for the human and civil rights of our students, especially the undocumented, Muslims, people of color, women and LGBTQ people. Second, we will join the organized resistance to Donald Trump’s regime by mobilizing historians, teachers, and historically-minded activists to challenge the permanent campaign of “fake news” and phony history that has driven the right’s ascent. We will defend the discipline of history against attempts to reduce it to simple affirmations of “American greatness,” and document how prior eras of reaction and repression were successfully combated. We recognize that the Trump/Pence Administration is a threat not only to the people of the United States, but to the people of the world, and we will stand against a new nuclear arms race, more imperial interventions, and collaboration with authoritarian regimes in the Middle East, Europe, and Asia.

Anticipating the Forthcoming PBS Documentary, “The Vietnam War”
By Camillo Mac Bica,
Posted on Antiwar.com, July 20, 2017

Much has been written and many documentaries made about the American War in Vietnam including the highly acclaimed 1983 effort by PBS, “Vietnam: A Television History.” Though not without its shortcomings, this 13-part documentary series was well crafted, meticulously researched, carefully balanced and thought-provoking.

In September 2017, PBS will air the highly anticipated series – seemingly touted as the definitive documentary – about the Vietnam War, directed by respected documentarians Ken Burns and Lynn Novick. The goal of this 10-episode, 18-hour project is, according to the directors, to “create a film everyone could embrace” and to provide the viewer with information and insights that are “new and revelatory.” Just as importantly, they intend the film to provide the impetus and parameters for a much needed national conversation about this controversial and divisive period in American history.

The film will be accompanied by an unprecedented outreach and public engagement program, providing opportunities for communities to participate in a national conversation about what happened during the Vietnam War, what went wrong and what lessons are to be learned. In addition, there will be a robust interactive website and an educational initiative designed to engage teachers and students in multiple platforms.

In an interview and discussion of the documentary on Detroit Public TV, Burns describes what he hopes to accomplish as a filmmaker, "Our job is to tell a good story." In response and in praise of Burns’ work, the interviewer offers his view of documentary. "The story that filmmakers like yourself, the story that storytellers create, are the framework that allows us to understand the truth because the truth is too unfathomable to take in all at
once.” To which Burns quickly adds, "And there are many truths."

My hope is that Burns and Novick, in "creating their story" of the Vietnam War, will demonstrate the same commitment to truth and objectivity as did their PBS predecessor. That they will resist the urge and the more than subtle pressure from what many historians and veterans see as a Government-sponsored effort to sanitize and mythologize the US involvement in this tragic war, as illustrated in President Barack Obama’s proclamation establishing March 29 as Vietnam Veterans Day.

"The Vietnam War is a story of service members of different backgrounds, colors, and creeds who came together to complete a daunting mission. It is a story of Americans from every corner of our Nation who left the warmth of family to serve the country they loved. It is a story of patriots who braved the line of fire, who cast themselves into harm’s way to save a friend, who fought hour after hour, day after day to preserve the liberties we hold dear."

Though the documentary has yet to be released in its entirety, based upon Burns’ and Novick’s recent New York Times op-ed (“Vietnam’s Unhealed Wounds,” May 29, 2017), several interviews with the filmmakers, and the "Special Preview" and numerous video clips from the series posted at the documentary’s PBS website, there are, in my view, serious grounds for concern.

Lowering Expectations

In their op-ed, Burns and Novick expressed their skepticism regarding whether, despite a decade of careful research and analysis and 18 hours of documentary, viewers will come away with a greater, more accurate understanding of the war:

There is no simple or single truth to be extracted from the Vietnam War. Many questions remain unanswered. But if, with open minds and open hearts, we can consider this complex event from many perspectives and recognize more than one truth, perhaps we can stop fighting over how the war should be remembered and focus instead on what it can teach us about courage, patriotism, resilience, forgiveness and, ultimately, reconciliation.

After nearly 50 years of hindsight, building on the work of previous researchers, as well as having access to new, comprehensive and formerly unavailable information, archives and recordings, to acknowledge that after 18 hours of documentary, "many questions remain unanswered," is disappointing and does not inspire confidence in the skill, thoroughness and research capabilities of the documentarians. More troublesome, perhaps, is the claim that "we must recognize more than one truth," as it smacks of perspectivism, the view that truth is relative and the opinions of individuals with different, even opposing, viewpoints are equally valid. This would explain, I think, why Burns and Novick can claim to have created "a film everyone could embrace." If the premise of the documentary is that truth is perspectival, relative not objective, then one may argue for the validity of accepting the “truth” that most benefits us, that makes us look just, courageous, patriotic, resilient and exceptional…

Documentary as Therapy

Perhaps I am being overly critical and expecting too much. Documentary is a human endeavor after all, and despite the best of intentions, inevitably expresses the viewpoint and biases, however implicit, of the filmmakers.
Expectations of objectivity, therefore, may be unrealistic. Like with much historical reporting, memoirs and documentaries, there is a tendency on the part of the historian, writer and documentarian, intentionally or not, to tread lightly when recording and analyzing the motives of their political leaders and the actions of their countrymen so as not to offend prospective readers or viewers by appearing unpatriotic and disrespectful of the sacrifices of members of the military who "fought hour after hour, day after day to preserve the liberties we hold dear." Burns and Novick, not insensitive to how their nation and countrymen are portrayed, indicated their hope that their documentary will provide the impetus for a much-needed national reconciliation between supporters and critics of the war and, perhaps more importantly, contributes to the healing of veterans who suffered and sacrificed so much on behalf of their country.

“If we are to begin the process of healing, we must first honor the courage, heroism, and sacrifice of those who served and those who died, not just as we do today, on Memorial Day, but every day.”

Burns’ and Novick’s expectation that their documentary be therapeutic and their belief that veteran healing is contingent upon honoring their courage, heroism, and sacrifice is misguided on so many levels. My fear is, of course, that this misunderstanding of the wounds of war, specifically PTSD and Moral Injury, will inform, influence and bias their presentation of fact. Documentary and history is not an established therapeutic modality, necessarily suited to effect healing and reconciliation. Rather, the goal and function of the historian and documentarian, as generally understood, is to accurately record the relevant issues and events as they occurred – in this case, the causes and justification for the war, why and how the belligerents became involved, the manner in which the war was conducted, etc. It may be the case that accurate, historical reporting and clarification of what actually transpired may, as a collateral effect, be therapeutic by putting the war and the experience into perspective and enabling veterans and non-veterans alike to understand what transpired and thereby determine and come to grips with their personal responsibility and culpability, if any, for the horrors of the war. But this therapeutic consequence of documentary and history, should it occur, is a secondary, not the primary, intended effect of such an undertaking.

**Part of the Solution or Part of the Problem**

In the *New York Times* op-ed, Burns and Novick set the stage for their discussion of the Vietnam War by referencing an address delivered by President Gerald Ford at Tulane University in New Orleans. They write, "As the president spoke, more than 100,000 North Vietnamese troops were approaching Saigon, having overrun almost all of South Vietnam in just three months. Thirty years after the United States first became involved in Southeast Asia and 10 years after the Marines landed at Danang, the ill-fated country for which more than 58,000 Americans had died was on the verge of defeat."

Referencing the sacrifice of some 58,000 of its own citizens, ignoring completely the deaths of over 3 million Vietnamese, and the description of the US’s involvement in the war as an ill-fated effort to save South Vietnam from invading hordes of North Vietnamese Communists, illustrates a not so tacit American bias and begs the historical question regarding why the war was fought, its legitimacy, and inevitable outcome. Objectivity (or at least
neutrality) in documentary requires that we not accept without question, assumptions that are fundamental to what the documentary is alleging to ascertain – the legitimacy of South Vietnam as a nation and US’s claim of justification for its involvement in the war.

In truth, South Vietnam was an illegal construct made possible by the intervention of the United States in violation of the provisions of the Geneva Accords that forbade foreign intervention during the interim period of national reconciliation following the defeat of the American funded French colonialists at Dien Bien Phu and required a democratic election to unite all of Vietnam within two years – an election that was prevented from occurring by Saigon’s puppet regime and its U.S. overlords for fear that Ho Chi Minh would emerge victorious. Consequently, rather than to describe the North Vietnamese as "overrunning" an "ill-fated independent country," it would be more historically accurate, not merely a different perspective, to describe the end of hostilities as the liberation of the occupied south…

After much research as a philosopher studying the institution of war and even more soul-searching and introspection as a veteran striving to come to grips with the Vietnam War experience, I have realized that to restore the moral character of this nation and to achieve a measure of normalcy in my life – I hesitate to speak of healing as I am not at all certain that healing is possible – what is required is not more of the mythology of honor, nobility, courage, and heroism, as Burns and Novick suggests. Rather, we must have the courage to admit the truth, however frightening and awful it may be, regarding the immorality and illegality of the war and then to accept national (and perhaps personal) responsibility and culpability for the injury and death of millions of Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian people. We can, as Burns suggests, finally stop fighting over how the war should be remembered and reconcile our differences, but only if we realize that there are not "many truths" and "alternative facts," with which to make our involvement and our defeat more palatable. This is what history requires and what the documentary should work to clarify.

Despite the reservations I have expressed in this article, my hope is, of course, that, when viewed in its entirety, this documentary will prove more than propaganda and mythology intended to restore patriotism, this nation’s resilience, exceptionalism, and unity of purpose for further militarism and war. Regardless of whether my hope is realized, I will use this documentary in my course on war this fall semester, whether it is to provide insight and a historical basis for understanding the nature of war in general and of the Vietnam War in particular, or to demonstrate the manner in which historians and artists may contribute to the appropriation of memory and the distortion of truth in behalf of furthering the interests of the corrupt, the greedy, and the powerful. My hope is it will be the former.

Camillo Mac Bica is an author and Professor of Philosophy at the School of Visual Arts in New York City. Mac is a former Marine Corps Officer, Vietnam Veteran, longtime activist for peace and social justice, and coordinator of Veterans for Peace/Long Island.

(This commentary was submitted to PHS News by Roger Peace, and it has been excerpted and slightly edited by the PHS News editor. For the complete essay, including hyperlinks, go to http://original.antiarw.com/Camillo_Mac_Bica/2017/07/19/anticipating-forthcoming-pbs-documentary-vietnam-war/
The viewpoints expressed here are those of the author, and do not necessarily represent the views of PHS News or of PHS. Other analyses of this Burns-Novick documentary are welcome for future issues of this newsletter.)
In Memoriam

Three significant American antiwar activists and scholars have died recently: Tom Hayden, Marilyn Young, and Marvin Gettleman. Moreover, a pioneering German peace historian, Karl Holl, has also died. Here are a range of tributes to them.

Tom Hayden, 1939-2016

Hayden (right) after his indictment in 1968 for allegedly trying to disrupt the Democratic National Convention

Peter Dreier profiled Tom Hayden as one of The 100 Greatest Americans in the 20th Century: A Social Justice Hall of Fame (New York: Nation Books, 2012). Here are excerpts from that entry, on pages 394-398.

Inspired by Jack Kerouac’s On the Road, Tom Hayden, the twenty-year-old editor of the Michigan Daily (the University of Michigan’s student newspaper), took a cross-country hitchhiking trip during the summer of 1960.

During his trip, Hayden visited the San Francisco area, where he met activists who were organizing pickets in front of Woolworth’s and Kresge five-and-dime stores to support the southern sit-ins. Some activists took Hayden to Delano, California, a rural agricultural area, where he encountered the near-slavery under which Mexican farmworkers toiled. He also interviewed Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., who was walking a picket line outside the 1960 Democratic convention in Los Angeles to demand that the party endorse a strong civil rights platform.

“There I was,” Hayden recalled years later, “with pencil in hand, trying to conduct an objective interview with Martin Luther King, whose whole implicit message was: ‘Stop writing, start acting.’ That was a compelling moment.” King gently told Hayden, “Ultimately, you have to take a stand with your life.” When Hayden returned to Ann Arbor that fall, he committed himself to the life of an activist...

[After serving as the first field secretary of Students for a Democratic Society, which emphasized, among other issues, mobilizing poor Americans to demand change], Hayden moved to New Jersey in 1964 to build the Newark Community Union. For over three years, Hayden and his colleagues knocked on doors in Newark’s black ghetto, recruiting jobless and low-wage residents into the community group, which aimed to help them gain a voice over such problems as slum housing, police brutality, inadequate schools, and other issues. But progress was slow, and Hayden, like the poor residents trapped in Newark’s ghetto, began to lose patience as corrupt local white politicians resisted change and as funding for Lyndon B. Johnson’s War on Poverty gave way to funding for the Vietnam War. In August 1967 Newark’s ghetto exploded in riots, one of dozens of urban uprisings (including one in Detroit) during that “long hot summer.” Hayden wrote a long analysis of the roots of the riot in his book Rebellion in Newark.

While living in Newark, Hayden devoted careful study to the history and culture of Vietnam and to US foreign policy in Southeast Asia. In 1965 he joined pacifist
historian Staughton Lynd and Communist Party official Herbert Aptheker on a fact-finding trip to North Vietnam, a journey that violated US State Department rules and was attacked in the media. He and Lynd wrote a book, The Other Side, about their journey. In 1967 he returned to North Vietnam with other antiwar activists, to investigate the human impact of US bombing. While they were there, the North Vietnamese government asked them to bring home several American prisoners of war. Because the United States did not recognize the Hanoi government, the Vietnamese wanted to release them to Americans involved in the peace movement. The release was viewed as both an act of humanitarianism and a propaganda gesture...

[After four more decades of progressive activism, including almost twenty years as an elected state representative and state senator in California, in 2008] Hayden helped launch Progressives for Obama, investing in the young Illinois senator some of the same hopes he had had for Robert Kennedy. After Barack Obama took office, Hayden supported his progressive initiatives but criticized what he considered the new president’s weak policies to bolster the economy and his reluctance to quickly withdraw troops from Iraq and Afghanistan. Soon after the 2008 election, Hayden committed most of his energy to organizing opposition to the war in Afghanistan. Once again, Hayden understood the necessity of linking outsiders and insiders to bring about needed change. “No sooner had a social movement elected [Obama] than it was time for a new social movement to bring about a new New Deal,” Hayden wrote. “Lest his domestic initiatives sink in the quagmires of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan, a new peace movement must rise as well.”

PHS News, July 2017
magazine on January 30, 2017, Hayden begins by describing the first meeting in January 2015 of antiwar movement veterans with representatives of the Pentagon’s Vietnam Commemoration office, led by Col. Mark Franklin:

We started by telling our personal stories and expectations for the meeting. I shared a story more personal than political. Since everyone knew of my activities during the Vietnam War – my unauthorized trips to Hanoi to seek the release of American POWs, my marriage to Jane Fonda, my trials in Chicago for helping to organize protests at the 1968 Democratic National Convention – I simply said that all the stories of my efforts to end the war were true. I said my father, a World War II Marine, had disowned me for 16 years, cutting me off from my younger sister, all because of what he read in the papers about my adventures. My mother had virtually lived in hiding every time my name was in the news.

I described my experience when I was hauled into a New York induction center: All I recall seeing was a room full of confused, fearful, and naked 18-year-olds like me. I explained that torment and breakups had occurred in the families of soldiers, veterans, and political radicals alike. We were a generation divided by big lies and propaganda, although many had finally achieved reconciliation on personal levels. We wanted now to honor Vietnam veterans for their sacrifice and suffering, including the many thousands who had created an unprecedented GI peace movement and led the effort to end the war. We believed we must put a stop to false and sanitized history; real truth and sharing of stories were crucial to any authentic reconciliation…

It is not too late to recover and begin again. This is already happening in the reconciliation process between the Vietnamese and our country. But we must not forget that for the Vietnamese, the war is not fully over. The soil of Vietnam is contaminated with Agent Orange. Unexploded ordnance still covers the landscape. Those deformed by our defoliants will transmit their disabilities to their children for generations. Each generation of Americans has a responsibility to help mitigate this permanent damage…

The disaster that began in Vietnam still spirals on as a conflict between empire and democracy. The cycle of war continues its familiar path. Truth, it is said, is war’s first casualty. Memory is its second.
Marilyn Young, 1937-2017

Christy Thornton and Stuart Schrader posted a tribute to Marilyn Blatt Young on the “Jacobin” website. The first part of the tribute, on her early years, follows:

Historian and activist Marilyn B. Young died at her home in New York on February 19. A longtime professor at New York University, she was a towering figure in the history of US foreign relations, a celebrated critical historian of the Vietnam War and US intervention overseas. But her prominence as a scholar was matched by the strength of her political convictions, and by her unwavering use of her public platform to fight misogyny, US empire, and unending war.

Young’s political consciousness was sparked as a teenager in Brooklyn. She was sixteen when the funeral for Julius and Ethel Rosenberg was held in her neighborhood, at the IJ Morris funeral home on Church Avenue in Brownsville. Though the chapel — the biggest in the city — held only 500 people, some 10,000 gathered there, filling the streets around the neighborhood landmark, and around Young’s apartment building.

Many of the activists who had defended the Rosenbergs were there; a ticket to the service is among WEB Du Bois’s personal papers. As the crowd swelled throughout the day, Young ventured out on to her fire escape to watch and listen, she recounted to her friend Barbara Weinstein — until her father yelled, “Get back inside! The FBI is taking pictures!” Young recalled this moment as a political awakening.

She left Brooklyn for Vassar College, among the last generation who would attend Vassar as an exclusively women’s college. She worked as a managing editor for the college newspaper, where editorials under her direction denounced the red-baiting rhetoric of the Eisenhower administration and heralded the formation of new campus groups dedicated to civil rights. Already in 1954, still her freshman year, she had an eye to the world beyond the United States, as she reported on “an increase in the number of women participating in the job of running this far-flung empire of ours.”

Young’s commitment to fighting against war was evident even in these early days, as she emphasized the message of a speaker invited to campus, printing in bold, “We must work for peace. The best brains in the country do nothing but prepare for war.” When she was invited with a group of college newspaper editors to a press conference with then Vice-President Nixon in 1956, she found herself overwhelmed at his ability to evade any real questioning. “Barring the use of objectionable language,” she wrote, “I find myself unable to articulate my disgust, my horror and my fear after seeing Nixon in action. He is shifty and he is dangerous.”

For the rest of this tribute, go to https://www.jacobinmag.com/2017/02/marilyn-young-obituary-vietnam-wars-feminism-imperialism/
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Marilyn B. Young
PHS Editor Robert Shaffer was a student of Marilyn Young’s in the M.A. program in History at NYU, and Young served as the “outside reader” for his dissertation at Rutgers. Here he provides snapshots of her work, including excerpts (in italics) from some of her writings:

Marilyn Young – a co-editor with Marvin Gettleman, among others, of Vietnam and America: A Documented History – will be long remembered for The Vietnam Wars, 1945-1990 (HarperCollins, 1991), which presented an unsparing critique of decades of U.S. policy, and which quickly joined Frances Fitzgerald’s Fire in the Lake, George Herring’s America’s Longest War, and Stanley Karnow’s Vietnam: A History on the short list of indispensable one-volume overviews of the war. Here are several passages from Young’s epilogue, on American soldiers returning home:

Each young man who went to war had an individual tour of duty, 365 days, and then home, on his own, with no effort on anyone’s part to prepare for the shock of return, to help make the transition from war to peace, from the privileging of violence to its prohibition, from the sharp edge death brings to the life of a soldier to the ordinary daily life of a civilian, which denies death altogether. They had spoken always of coming back “to the world,” counting each day “in country” which brought them closer to the end of their tour. But the homecoming was harder than any of them had expected. Later, many veterans would tell stories of having been spat upon by anti-war protesters, or having heard of veterans who were spat on. It doesn’t matter how often this happened, or whether it happened at all. Veterans felt spat upon, stigmatized, contaminated. In television dramas, veterans were not heroes welcomed back into the bosom of loving families, admiring neighborhoods, and the arms of girls who loved uniforms; they were psychotic killers, crazies with automatic weapons. It was as if the country assumed that anyone coming back from Vietnam would, even should, feel a murderous rage against the society that had sent him there. The actual veteran – tired, confused, jet-propelled from combat to domestic airport – disappeared. Or rather, he became a kind of living hologram, an image projected by conflicting interpretations of the war: a victim or an executioner, a soldier who had lost a war, a killer who should never have fought it at all...

Veterans of other American wars, Robert Jay Lifton argued in his book Home from the War, had come to terms with the absurdity and evil of war by believing that their war “had purpose and significance beyond the immediate

horrors [they] witnessed.” But “the central fact” of the Vietnam War, Lifton wrote in 1973 while it was still going on, “is that no one really believes in it.” Although it is possible to challenge Lifton and demonstrate that soldiers in World War II also had difficulty discerning significance beyond the immediate horror of their situation, it is nevertheless true that when they got home, the purpose and significance of
what they had done was universally affirmed and most were able to accept it. This was not the situation of Vietnam veterans, for even those who came home to families or communities who approved of the war were aware of those who protested against it. Moreover, the announced goals of the war – to repel an outside invader, to give the people of South Vietnam the chance to choose their own government – were daily contradicted by the soldier’s sense that in fact he was himself the invader, and that “the government he had come to defend [was] hated by the people and that he [was] hated most of all.”

Young remained a staunch opponent of U.S. military intervention abroad and combined her scholarship with her activism. She was especially interested in demonstrating the failure of U.S. policymakers to learn from history, as in the books she co-edited with Lloyd Gardner, The New American Empire: A 21st Century Teach-In on U.S. Foreign Policy (New Press, 2005), and Iraq and the Lessons of Vietnam, Or, How Not to Learn from the Past (New Press, 2007). Here are several passages from Young’s own essay in the latter collection, “Counterinsurgency, Now and Forever,” which give a taste of her biting prose:

The United States has had a long history of fighting small, dirty wars, though most Americans prefer to focus on the good war it fought in the middle of the last century, World War II. The suppression of the insurgency in the Philippines at the turn of the twentieth century was soon forgotten; pacification and counterinsurgency in the Korean War were rarely reported on at the time, and not much discussed by American historians thereafter; covert and overt subversion of governments in Latin America, the Middle East, and Africa were accomplished largely through the use of local military forces.

Thus, the ambiguities of the Vietnam War came as a surprise...Convincing peasants that the United States was on their side was one aspect of counterinsurgency, and counterinsurgency greatly interested President Kennedy and his advisers. Proud of their knowledge of how the enemy operated – not necessarily the Vietnamese, but any enemy – they quoted Mao: the guerrilla is a fish swimming in the ocean of the people. Dry up the ocean and the problem is solved. No one paused for very long over the metaphor: what, after all, would it mean to dry up the ocean?...

[Turning to Iraq at the height of the civil war and insurgency in 2006, Young dissects an analysis by three high-ranking U.S. officers and a political scientist on the challenges of counterinsurgency.] The essay ends with the authors’ own lessons from Vietnam. After that war, the military “responded to the threat of irregular warfare chiefly by saying ‘never again.’” The result has been an army unprepared to fight insurgencies. “Our enemies are fighting us as insurgents because they think insurgency is their best chance for victory. We must prove them wrong.” The authors ignore the possibility that insurgents fight the United States as insurgents because they have no other choice, rather than because they decide to leave behind their aircraft carriers, precision bombers, drones, B-52s, and attack helicopters.

Young’s no-holds-barred approach to U.S. policymakers was epitomized in her reaction to former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara’s widely heralded 1995 book, In Retrospect. McNamara, the conventional wisdom goes, engaged in a serious self-analysis of mistakes which led to the Vietnam War. Young was unconvinced, as this excerpt of her review in Diplomatic History (Summer 1996) makes clear:

Watching Robert McNamara being interviewed by Diane Sawyer, in the first flurry of his book promotion, I surprised myself by what may have been just a gendered response: As tears welled in his eyes, my own eyes watered in sympathy. He seemed, in that moment, so vulnerable, so lost, I had an irresistible, if
possibly socially constructed, impulse to protect and comfort him. Then I read his book.

There is something terribly, terribly wrong with this book. In Retrospect, McNamara’s apologia pro vita sua criminale, offers no apology, but a lot of excuses. To the question, “why did you do X?” McNamara answers essentially, “Well, everyone was doing it then; we didn’t know any better.”...

Repeatedly, McNamara hides behind “hindsight”: All the experts had been fired in the McCarthy period and no one in the administration knew much about Southeast Asia; the Sino-Soviet split was still not clear; everyone believed in the domino theory.

But there were people knowledgeable about Southeast Asia in the academy and elsewhere, even in the State Department; the Sino-Soviet split was not at all invisible to students of China, nor to lower echelon advisers like James C. Thomson; and not everyone believed in the domino theory.

There was no need for the hindsight McNamara so insistently invokes; there was plenty of foresight available. His failure to enlighten himself, in 1961, does not arise even as a question in 1995. McNamara, of course, did not read I.F. Stone or Noam Chomsky, did not consult George Kahin, was unfamiliar with the writings of William Appleman Williams, C. Wright Mills, and a host of others. Yet even now he does not notice these gaps in his education. Critics of American Cold War policy did not appear on his intellectual map in the 1960s, and he has not discovered them since...

Young also co-edited, with Yuki Tanaka of the Hiroshima Peace Institute, Bombing Civilians: A Twentieth Century History (New Press, 2009). She was president of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations in 2011; her presidential address to that society, entitled “‘I was thinking, as I often do these days, of war’: The United States in the Twenty-First Century,” appeared in Diplomatic History, January 2012. SHAFR remembered its former president – only the third woman to hold that post in SHAFR – with a panel at its June 2017 conference in Arlington, VA entitled “War: What Is It Good For? A Conversation in Honor of Marilyn B. Young.” (The panel opened to the still-powerful staccato beat of Norman Whitfield and Barrett Strong’s 1970 Motown anthem.) Speakers were Lloyd Gardner (Rutgers), Mary Dudziak (Emory), Michael Sherry (Northwestern), Scott Laderman (Minnesota-Duluth), and Michael Allen (Northwestern); the session was chaired by Mark Bradley (Chicago) and Robert Brigham (Vassar).

Young’s obituary notice suggested that contributions in her memory be sent to the War Resisters League, 168 Canal St., Suite 600, New York, N.Y. 10013. New York University is also establishing a Marilyn B. Young Memorial Fund; for more information, go to https://shafr.org/content/nyu-marilyn-b-young-memorial-fund

Join PHS –
www.peacehistorysociety.org
Marvin E. Gettleman, 1933-2017

In the introduction to the influential *Vietnam and America: A Documented History* (Grove Press, 1985), the editors – Marvin Gettleman, Jane Franklin, Marilyn Young, and H. Bruce Franklin – describe how a volume twenty years earlier, edited by Gettleman, itself became a historical agent:

In 1965, as US Marines first went ashore to join the 21,000 US military “advisers” already in Vietnam, it seemed to many Americans that the US government was in the process of making a terrible “mistake.” A step-by-step escalation appeared to be taking us ever deeper into the quagmire of a nasty war in some remote corner of southeast Asia.

The tiny handful of Americans familiar with the major features of the history of the region, particularly Vietnam and the rest of Indochina, sensed that the mistake was probably coming from ignorance. Perhaps the policy makers in Washington, and certainly the great mass of Americans, were unaware of the history that had led our nation into a hopeless and potentially devastating confrontation in Vietnam. What seemed to be needed was education. Then, either the politicians would understand the errors of their ways or the American people would bring them to their senses.

This was the impulse that led to the teach-in movement of early 1965, along with a flood of publications intended to educate America about Vietnam. The four editors of this book all participated in this educational enterprise. One of them, Marvin Gettleman, produced what was to become a basic text for those involved in the growing national debate, *Vietnam: History, Documents, and Opinions on a Major World Crisis* (New York: Fawcett, 1965), a collection of primary and secondary documents weaving a history of Vietnam and America’s deepening war. Together with an enlarged edition (New York: Mentor, 1970), this book became not only the all-time best seller on Vietnam (over 600,000 copies) but also part of the very reality it set out to study. For the movement against the war, organized first as a spontaneous education project, soon developed into an integral part of the history of the war.

That early impulse to educate an ignorant government came to seem more and more naïve as it became ever clearer that the successive administrations in Washington knew the truth all along and were consciously deceiving the American people. To some, this seemed an extreme position, for in those relatively innocent days, many Americans could not believe that the government would systematically lie. But then, in 1971, came the unauthorized release of *The Pentagon Papers*, a top-secret multivolume history prepared by the government itself. All the claims of the antiwar movement turned out to be true, including the willful deception of the people by the government, all proven beyond doubt by the government’s own collection of primary and secondary documents weaving a history of Vietnam and America. 

Marvin Gettleman

PHS News, July 2017
secondary documents. Ironically, the Gettleman volume and much of the splendid scholarship performed by amateurs and professionals during that 1965-1971 period now seemed a bit superfluous. The truth was out. The lies were exposed.

Marvin Gettleman, who taught for many years at Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, wrote an early monograph on Rhode Island’s mid-19th century working class upsurge, *The Dorr Rebellion: A Study in American Radicalism, 1833-1849* (Random House, 1973). But – as indicated in the above passage from and about his Vietnam War books – he will probably be best remembered by historians for his anthologies on U.S. war and intervention, each of which presented a full spectrum of opinions but were motivated by opposition to empire. As Gettleman and his co-editors (Patrick Lacefield, Louis Menashe, and David Mermelstein) wrote in the introduction to the 1987 revised edition of *El Salvador: Central American in the New Cold War* (Grove Press), “By presenting developments, reports, viewpoints, and perspectives little known by the general public, we hope to promote wider knowledge and thus help prevent the tacit or active support for further bloodshed in that country named for a peaceful savior.” Gettleman co-edited, with Stuart Schaar, *The Middle East and Islamic World Reader* (Grove Press, 2003), and he compiled (also with Schaar) the first pamphlet issued by Historians Against the War, with the unwieldy title of “Annotated Bibliography of English-Language Sources and Studies on the Middle East and Muslim South West Asia.”

Long-time PHS member Sandi Cooper (College of Staten Island, emeritus), in what she calls “a short memoire,” recounts her first meetings with Marvin at City College in the 1950s, and then reconnecting with him in the late 1960s:

It was in History 100 or 101 in 1953 at City College where I met Marvin. He was unlike the rest of us – we were kids, he was a married man; we were freshmen, he had been at another college for several years; we worked at all kinds of part-time jobs, he often raised money by donating blood. We were respectful of the teacher’s authority – he was, well, you know Marvin…not easily hoodwinked. The diet of Western Civ which we were fed, that presented the bourgeoisie as rising since ancient Elon, gave him indigestion. Never in my previous schooling had I met anyone who acted as if he knew more than the authority figure with the chalk in his hand at the front of the room.

When I came back from a year abroad to finish my senior year, Marvin was editing the college magazine. He invited me to contribute a piece about my European experience which had been made possible by the only scholarship CCNY had to send a student abroad. And so I gave Marvin a lighthearted description of the foibles of nosy Scottish landladies, the characters I met hitch-hiking around, the cargo
boat from Edinburgh to Copenhagen in March that got stuck in the ice, waking up in a Welsh farmhouse to find newborn lambs snuggling up...hardly anything that most CCNY students might have encountered. Marvin, as you might have already guessed, was ready with his scorching blue pencil. His well-known talent as an editor of *Science and Society*, later, of letting authors know what he really thought of them, was already evident in 1956.

We lost touch after graduation, off to different grad schools, but reconnected in the late 1960s at the Socialist Scholars Conference. Eventually my husband, John Cammett, worked with Marvin on the *Science and Society* editorial board, and while Marvin could be ferocious as a critic, he was generous and kind, especially when John fell ill.

How does one remember someone who was such an independent spirit, with such a powerful intellect and devoted to the principle that scholarship must serve a progressive political purpose? The Marvin that I remember was all those things, and if I remember the early years correctly, it must have been in his DNA.

We all will remember the active, lively, insightful, muscular Marvin of all those past decades.

---

**Karl Holl, peace historian**

International Advisory Council member Peter van den Dungen (*University of Bradford*, emeritus) notified PHS of the April 2017 death of leading German peace historian Karl Holl:

On Sunday, 23rd April 2017, Prof. Dr. Karl Holl passed away in Bremen, aged 85. He was the father of German historical peace research and the main driving force behind the creation of PHS’s German counterpart, the Arbeitskreis Historische Friedensforschung (Working Group Historical Peace Research). It was formally established in 1984 but had been preceded by meetings since 1977.

A specialist on the peace movement of Wilhelmine and Weimar Germany, Holl was the author of numerous publications, mostly in German. He contributed many entries to the *Biographical Dictionary of Modern Peace Leaders*, edited by Harold Josephson (1985). With Helmut Donat, Holl was editor of a similar (and beautifully illustrated) reference work on the historical peace movement in Germany, Austria and Switzerland: *Die Friedensbewegung: Organisierter Pazifismus in Deutschland, Österreich und in der Schweiz* (1983).

Holl was also a leading authority on the history of German pacifists in exile during the Nazi period and published many scholarly articles on the subject, one of which appeared in *Peace Movements and Political Cultures*, edited by Charles Chatfield and myself (1988). His magnum opus was a large, well-received biography of Ludwig Quidde (1858-1941), the most significant representative of the 20th century German peace movement, and the 1927 Nobel peace laureate. This work, published in 2007, was reviewed by Prof. Roger Chickering, who knew Holl well, on H-Soz-u-Kult (October 2007, in German).

The *PHS News* editor adds, after consulting the digitized *Peace & Change* back issues:

Holl also contributed an article to *Peace & Change*: “German Pacifist Women in Exile, 1933-1945” (October 1995). The abstract of the article describes it as follows: “The German peace movement in general, and women’s pacifism in particular, lost ground as part of the general decline of the Weimar Republic. Adolf Hitler’s seizure of power in 1933 meant the end of organized pacifism in Germany, and it exposed all activists of the peace movement — men and women alike — to physical threats. Many women pacifists went into exile, including Anita Augspurg, Lida Gustava Heymann, Helene Stöcker, Elsbeth Bruck, Constanze Hallgarten, and Gertrud Baer. This article briefly examines the experience of such exiles.”

Moreover, Benjamin Ziemann (*University of Sheffield*) — another PHS International Advisory Council member — reviewed Holl’s German-language biography of Ludwig Quidde in *Peace & Change*, October 2008, declaring that it “set a new benchmark for the way (peace) historians can and should write
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biographical accounts.” Here are other excerpts from Ziemann’s review:

Among the four Germans who have been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in the

twentieth century, Ludwig Quidde is today certainly the least known…It is only one of the many achievements of this biography to set the record straight and to fully illuminate the pacifist ideas and politics of Quidde, who was the most prominent German liberal pacifist from the moment he took over as chairman of the…German Peace Society…in 1914 until his death in 1941. Karl Holl, the author of this meticulously researched, well-written, and gripping book, is not only the doyen of peace history in Germany and the foremost expert on the history of German pacifism. He has also spent almost two decades tracking down and sifting through the archival records which shed light on the huge network of both domestic and international relations and activities Quidde built up over the years…

Apart from the meticulous research, it is one of the strengths of this book that the author avoids the pitfalls of much peace history, to present his “hero” in an uncritical fashion as a positive reference point for identity projections. Holl’s account rather points to the many ambivalences and outright failures of his “hero,” not only with regard to the apparent failure of liberalism in the Weimar era, but also in terms of the often illusionary assessments of the political situation Quidde arrived at.

The New York Times has taken note of a number of books on peace and antiwar history in recent months, in addition to its review of Michael Kazin’s War Against War (excerpted on page 6, above).

Sam Roberts, in the “Metropolitan Bookshelf” section (January 29, 2017), called Kate Hennessy’s biography of her grandmother, Dorothy Day: The World Will be Saved By Beauty, “an intimate, revealing and sometimes wrenching family memoir of the journalist and social advocate who helped found The Catholic Worker in 1933, edited the radical newspaper until her death in 1980 and is now being considered for canonization.”

Chilean writer Ariel Dorfman praised Eileen Markey’s A Radical Faith: The Assassination of Sister Maura (Nation Books, 2016). Maura Clarke was one of the four American Maryknoll nuns found murdered in El Salvador in December 1980. Dorfman—long an eloquent voice against dictatorship in his country—writes: “At a time when many in Maura’s country are once more questioning its imperial role in the world and her church is yet again searching its soul for ways to save not only the forgotten of the earth but the earth itself, this nun’s life and sacrifice seems more relevant than ever.”

Michael Lind—in a mixed review, to be sure—considered (Jan 29, 2017) Stephen Kinzer’s The True Flag: Theodore Roosevelt, Mark Twain, and the Birth of American Empire. “Not content to retell the story of the controversy over annexation of the Philippines,” Lind writes, Kinzer “tries to promote an overarching theory of United States foreign policy, and he cites the former Marine Gen. Smedley Butler, who in the 1930s bitterly described his military service in the Philippines, Cuba, China, Haiti, Mexican and Central America as that of a ‘gangster for capitalism’ and ‘a high-class muscleman for big business.’”
The American Friends Service Committee Celebrates Its Centennial, 1917-2017

The AFSC held an academic symposium in Philadelphia on April 21, 2017 to celebrate its century of work on behalf of peace and justice. Listed below are a few of the papers presented, which provides a sense of the wide range of AFSC activities and achievements. Videos of many of the sessions, along with the texts of some conference papers, are available at www.afsc.org/resource/academic-symposium-program

Susan Armstrong-Reid, “‘Three China Gadabouts’: Working with the Friends Service Unit, 1947-1952”
Guy Aiken, “Peace Without Justice? The AFSC’s Early Relief Projects in Appalachia”
Immaculada Colomina Limonero, “The AFSC & the Victims of the Spanish Civil War”
Terence Johnson, “African American Civil Rights and Educational Equality Organizing in South Carolina”
Francis Bonenfant-Juwong, “Catalytic Agents: Community Development and the ‘Organizing’ of Arab Villages for Peace and Prosperity in the 1950s”
Nan Macy, “An American Farmer in WWI France: Quaker Roots and Influences in AFSC’s Early Years”
Carolyne Lamar Jordan, “The Third World Coalition’s Influence on AFSC’s Mission and Impact for Nearly Five Decades”
Gordon Mantler, “Partners in Justice and Peace: AFSC and the Poor People’s Campaign of 1968”
David Hostetter, “Speak Truth to Power: Anatomy of Anti-Communism and AFSC Strategy to Thaw the Cold War”

As part of its centennial commemoration, Lucy Duncan, working with Willie Colon, Tony Heriza, and Tonya Histand, produced “Love in Action: A Brief History of AFSC’s Work in the Past 100 Years,” available (with many historical photographs) at https://www.afsc.org/blogs/acting-in-faith/love-action-brief-history-afsc%E2%80%99s-work-past-100-years. Here are excerpts from that post, with a focus on AFSC’s early years, and one incident from the 1980s:

When the United States entered World War I in 1917, a military draft was immediately introduced. Prison would be the new home for those who refused to fight. Young pacifists -- Quakers and others -- needed a way to serve their country nonviolently. Out of this need, the American Friends Service Committee was born. During WWI, Service Committee volunteers drove ambulances in combat zones and rebuilt homes and roads. After the war, as hunger and malnutrition swept through Europe, AFSC began feeding millions of children -- in Austria, Germany and Poland -- with U.S. government funds arranged by Herbert Hoover. By the 1920s, a temporary Quaker “response” had become an enduring and highly regarded relief organization.

Back home, one of the earliest domestic issues AFSC addressed was racism. The “Interracial Section” was created in 1925 to challenge racial prejudice and violence in the United States. African American staffer Crystal Bird travelled across the country and spoke with thousands of white Americans about race and racism. Her efforts were followed by decades of...
work to combat lynching, expand employment and housing opportunities, and integrate public schools.

AFSC looked at its own practices, too, integrating work camps and Peace Caravans in the 1930s to help young people overcome the rigid segregation of the wider society.

The Great Depression brought a new focus on economic justice. A slump in the demand for coal left thousands of Appalachian miners unemployed, hungry and desperate. AFSC provided relief and supported economic alternatives, such as training in local crafts like furniture making – and the development of a model community where residents participated in a shared economy.

During the Spanish Civil War in the late 1930s, AFSC joined British Quakers in feeding displaced women and children on both sides of the conflict. After Franco’s victory, the relief moved to the south of France, where Spanish refugees were soon joined by many others fleeing the Nazis. AFSC staff worked to assist people in these refugee camps and to secretly transport children to safety. Numerous “hostels” were created -- across Europe, in the U.S., and in Cuba -- to provide safe haven for tens of thousands of Jews.

In 1947, AFSC and the British Friends Service Council accepted the Nobel Peace Prize on behalf of Quakers everywhere for their work worldwide to heal rifts and oppose war. According to the Nobel committee, “The end of World War II brought a burst of AFSC effort, with Quakers engaged in relief and reconstruction in many of the countries of Europe, as well as in India, China, and Japan.”

…While most of our work is unheralded and behind-the-scenes, we have had moments in the limelight. In 1986, we walked the red carpet in Los Angeles. The Academy Award for Best Documentary Short Subject that year was awarded to “Witness to War,” a film produced by AFSC. The film told the story of Dr. Charlie Clements, who, after being discharged from the U.S. Air Force for reasons of conscience, went on to work as a physician amid El Salvador’s civil war.

AFSC Communications Analyst Carly Goodman has also examined “Three reasons why you should explore AFSC’s archives to learn from history for resistance,” at https://www.afsc.org/blogs/media-uncovered/three-reasons-to-explore-archives-to-learn-history. Goodman focuses on three examples of AFSC actions and policies with “clear resonance” in the Trump era: 1) helping to resist Japanese-American internment; 2) providing aid and training to out of work coal miners – in the 1930s; and 3) supporting sanctuary for refugees. Goodman writes, in part: “In trying to make sense of how events unfolded in the past, we can recognize our own agency today to make things better. The archives of the AFSC are filled with stories of ordinary people in challenging circumstances acting with extraordinary love to build stronger communities.”
Member News

Harriet Alonso (CCNY, emeritus) writes: “I am thrilled to announce the upcoming publication of my first children’s book. Martha and the Slave Catchers (Seven Stories Press) is a Middle Grade novel involving two children (ages 13 and 7) caught up in the effects of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 and the workings of the Underground Railroad. I am particularly excited about sharing our PHS values of human rights and non-violence to young readers.” The publication date is November 7, but the book is already listed for preorder on several on-line booksellers’ sites.

Blanche Wiesen Cook (John Jay College) has published what the New York Times called her “long-awaited third volume” of her biography of the “first lady to the world”: Eleanor Roosevelt: The War Years and After (Viking, 2016). Elaine Showalter, in the New York Times Book Review, stated: “Three-volume biographies of women are extremely rare, so the completion of Blanche Wiesen Cook’s monumental and inspirational life of Eleanor Roosevelt is a notable event.” Robert Cohen, in “Out of the Closet and Into History? The Eleanor Roosevelt-Lorena Hickok Affair” (Reviews in American History, June 2017), closely examines the reception of this last volume in light of Cook’s path-breaking interpretation of ER’s sexual conduct.

Chuck Howlett (Molloy College, emeritus) has published "Bickering over Brass Buttons," New York Archives 16 (Summer 2016). It details the fight over attempts to establish a Junior ROTC Program at Jamaica High School in the late 1920s and early 1930s, and how leading educators like John Dewey and William Heard Kilpatrick pushed back against efforts to make it mandatory. Chuck has also published, with Audrey Cohan, "John Dewey and his Evolving Perceptions of Race Issues in American Democracy," Teaching Social Studies 17 (Winter-Spring 2017).

Joseph Jones (University of British Columbia, emeritus) has published Simulacrum of Refuge: a History of Canada as Destination for U.S. Iraq War Deserters (Vancouver, BC : Quarter Sheaf, 2017). From the publisher’s description:

In 2004 U.S Iraq War deserters began to seek asylum in Canada, inspired by a legend of "refuge from militarism." About 50 surfaced as named individuals. Under both governing parties, courts and lawmakers delivered a series of rejections. This first book-length history tells the story of the campaign to establish sanctuary. The main legal challenge ended in November 2007 with Supreme Court of Canada denial of leave to appeal. The political campaign foundered in July 2010 with a new immigration directive from the Conservative government. In September 2010 a handful of Liberals sabotaged their own party’s legislative provision. Chapters cover U.S. based organizing, Nelson B.C. as locus of activity, deportation and police harassment, life underground, the psychosocial experience, and the intersection of Vietnam and Iraq generations.


Alice and Staughton Lynd have written Moral Injury and Nonviolent Resistance: Breaking the Cycle of Violence in the Military and Behind Bars (PM Press, 2017, paper, $17.95). From the publisher’s description:

“When ordinary people have done, seen, or failed to prevent something that betrays their
deeply held sense of right and wrong, it may shake their moral foundation. They may feel that what they did was unforgivable. In this thoughtful book culled from a wide range of experiences, Alice and Staughton Lynd introduce readers to what modern clinicians, philosophers, and theologians have attempted to describe as ‘moral injury.’ Moral injury, if not overcome, can lead to an individual giving up, turning to drugs, alcohol, or suicide. But moral injury can also demand that one turn one’s life around. It offers hope because it indicates resistance to the use of violence that offends a sense of decency. Within the military and in prisons—institutions created to use force and violence against perceived enemies—there have arisen new forms of saying ‘No’ to violence. From combat veterans of America’s foreign wars to Israeli refuseniks, and from ‘hardened’ criminals in supermax confinement in Ohio to hunger strikers in California’s Pelican Bay prison, the Lynds give us the voices of those breaking the cycle of violence with courageous acts of nonviolent resistance.” Joseph Jones reviewed in *PHS News*, January 2016, an earlier pamphlet by the Lynds which introduced some of these ideas.

**Klaus Schlichtmann**, who writes from Japan, has published *A Peace History of India. From Ashoka Maurya to Mahatma Gandhi* (New Delhi: Vij, 2016). Prof. Hermann Kulke of Kiel University writes about the author and his new book: “After having devoted nearly twenty years to a thorough analysis of the pre-war peace history of India, Klaus Schlichtmann returns with his new book on the peace history of India, a country he first encountered as a twenty year-old Buddhist novice at Benares’s Sanskrit University. The outcome is a fascinating attempt to link Max Weber’s religious studies with the worldwide impact of Ashoka’s and Gandhi’s personal peace messages.”

Schlictmann, who is also the author of *Japan in the World: Shidehara Kijuro, Pacifism and the Abolition of War* (Lexington Books, 2009, 2 vols.), also sent to *PHS News* a copy of an interview with him, in Japanese (see below), and provides this explanation, ending with tongue-in-cheek:sarcastic note:

This is an article based on an interview by the *Tokyo Shimbun* with me in September
2016. The article was published on the front-page on Sunday, 11 November 2016. It shows the scene from a History Manga with Prime Minister Kijuro Shidehara suggesting the war-abolishing Article 9 to General Douglas MacArthur (which as we know happened on 24 January 1946). The upper Manga shows the true fact of the matter until around 1990. The lower part shows how the Manga was changed in a new edition after the Iraq War, during which Japan had been criticized for its 'check book diplomacy'. This marks the beginning of the final phase of the revisionist attempt by the Japanese Government to change Article 9 in order for it to be able to participate in military action for so-called peace-keeping. Since the German Constitutional Court ruled in 1994 that "Collective Security and Collective Self-Defense are the same" – which until then had been understood to be two very different things – and then since the Gulf War, Japan is seriously thinking of changing the war-abolishing article in its Constitution. The Germans seem to be happy about this, as the spirit of the old brotherhood in arms is revived, and this time we are on the right side. Isn't that great to be finally able to fight on the right side? How did we manage to achieve this? (Note: Please take what I am saying with a grain of salt!)

Peter van den Dungen (University of Bradford, emeritus) reports on his involvement in an all-day event in the Peace Palace in The Hague on 16th November 2016 when the (now bi-annual) Carnegie Wateler Peace Prize ceremony took place. Peter writes: “On that same day 100 years ago, in the middle of the Great War, Dutch banker J.G.D. Wateler wrote his peace testament, leaving his considerable fortune for the creation of an annual prize. The oldest one after the Nobel Peace Prize, it was first awarded in 1931, four years after the benefactor’s death. The Carnegie Foundation commissioned fellow peace historian Marten van Harten to write a biography of this unknown and forgotten philanthropist. The handsome volume, with many illustrations, was presented during the ceremony; an English translation is forthcoming.” Peter spoke during a ‘Peace philanthropy learning event’ earlier in the day when the exhibition that he curated, ‘Peace philanthropists – then and now’ (2013) was also shown. Peter has also contributed a comment to a new Dutch edition of one of the great classical writings on peace, Erasmus’s Dulce Bellum Inexpertis (Sweet is war to those who do not know it), published in Rotterdam on the occasion of its 500th anniversary. And, for a special symposium in Peace Review (July-September 2016) on ‘The path to a world free of nuclear weapons,’ Peter wrote “Abolishing nuclear weapons through anti-atomic bomb museums.”

Send news of your publications and other professional accomplishments to PHS News, Robert Shaffer, editor, at roshaf@ship.edu.
Next deadline: January 1, 2018.

Announcements

“Voices of Conscience: Peace Witness in the Great War” (Exhibit)

To mark the centennial of the entrance of the United States into World War I, the Kauffman Museum of Bethel College has developed an exhibit “which remembers the narratives of peoples of faith who opposed the war. Stories of the death of the Hutterite Martyrs of Alcatraz and the tarring and feathering of the Mennonite farmers of Kansas provide examples of stalwart faith in the face of terror perpetrated by war advocates.” The exhibit also raises such questions as: “Could the Great War have been avoided? Are war resisters patriots? Who are the voices of conscience today?” It will be available as a traveling exhibit beginning January 2018. For information about sponsoring and hosting the exhibit, or to financially support it, visit www.VoicesOfConscienceExhibit.org or contact Chuck Regier, at crregier@bethelks.edu.

“This Evil Thing,” solo play written and performed by Michael Mears

Michael Mears, an award-winning writer and performer of solo plays, has been touring the British Isles with “This Evil Thing,” about “the men who said no to war” 100 years ago in the United Kingdom. Among the host of characters whom Mears portrays are mathematician Bertrand Russell and schoolteacher and preacher Bert Brocklesby, partly using verbatim testimonies while showcasing the actor’s “breath-taking physical and vocal dexterity.” “From a chapel in Yorkshire to the House of Commons, from a cell in Richmond Castle to a firing squad in France, the questions raised here are as relevant and urgent as they were 100 years ago.” For more information, go to https://michaelmears.org/this-evil-thing/ or www.facebook.com/thisevilthing.

The Vietnam Peace Commemoration Committee has posted material relating to the 50th anniversaries of Martin Luther King’s iconic antiwar speech at Riverside Church (April 4, 1967) and of other 1967 antiwar actions, at http://vnpeacecomm.blogspot.com/?view=flipcard. Also under consideration is a one-day conference in October marking the 50th anniversary of the “March on the Pentagon.”

Join the Peace History Society:

www.peacehistorysociety.org

PHS News, July 2017