Greetings Peace History Society Members!

PHS is currently gearing up for our conference this coming October at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. The conference theme: **Envisioning Peace, Performing Justice: Art, Activism, and the Cultural Politics of Peacemaking**, has generated a very exciting program including sessions on power and performance during the Vietnam War, ways of understanding and looking at peace-themed artwork, and women’s peace rhetoric in a nuclear age. Our keynote speaker, Dr. Tony Perucci, an Association Professor of Performance and Cultural Studies at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, has published on topics that examine the interactions between performance, politics, and race. Although our organization has a long history of hosting peace and solidarity sing-a-longs during our conferences, this year we are breaking new ground with music and poetry during the opening reception and a special performance of the musical *Ragtime* by the SIU Department of Theater and School of Music. I am particularly looking forward to announcing the winners of the Scott Bills Memorial Prize and the DeBenedetti Prize at our conference banquet, as well as presenting over half-a-dozen travel awards to graduate student presenters. Our special thanks to Heather Fryer and Andrew Barbero, co-chairs, for their hard work on what should be a great conference.

Our journal, *Peace & Change*, continues to publish interesting and relevant articles under the leadership of its editor, Erika Kuhlman. The financial situation of PHS remains strong, thanks in large part to the online inclusion of past journal articles in the Wiley Online Library. Our membership numbers are stable, but we are exploring more efficient and member-friendly ways to maintain our email and mailing label database. I personally look forward to beginning my second year as president of PHS and working with a wonderfully dedicated group of officers and board members.

Best wishes to all,

Christy Snider,
Berry College
Barack Obama in his speeches has often employed historical analyses and allusions to great effect. In his September 10, 2013 speech on Syria – not so much.

Obama powerfully invoked in his second inaugural address earlier this year both the Declaration of Independence and the struggles of reformers past and present when he alliteratively intoned: “We, the people, declare today that the most evident of truths – that all of us are created equal – is the star that guides us still; just as it guided our forebears through Seneca Falls, and Selma, and Stonewall.”

In his Cairo speech in 2009, when he appeared to be holding out an olive branch to the Muslim world, Obama repeated what many of us teach in our World History classes when he spoke of “civilization’s debt to Islam.” The intellectually vibrant Muslim communities of the Middle Ages “developed the order of algebra; our magnetic compass and tools of navigation; our master of pens and printing,” and other innovations, “paving the way for Europe’s Renaissance and Enlightenment.” Obama here also implicitly acknowledged United States complicity in thwarting the rights and the will of peoples in the Middle East, as he referred to “a Cold War in which Muslim-majority countries were too often treated as proxies without regard to their own aspirations.” It was a powerful background for the larger argument for “a new beginning between the United States and Muslims around the world.”

Obama’s speech urging support for military strikes against Syria to punish the Assad regime for its use of poison gas also marshaled arguments drawn from the historical record to make its case. However, the President was so selective and disingenuous in his “use” of history that his attempt to fashion a doctrine for “humanitarian” intervention should fall flat to those with even a modest familiarity with the American record in world affairs since World War II.

To be sure, Obama framed his speech around a very limited intervention, acknowledging that “a decade of war in Iraq and Afghanistan” had made Americans weary and wary of further war. His promise not to place American “boots on the ground” was a response to these quagmires and to the American casualty rates that were unexpectedly high. Obama did not commit the U.S. to regime change in Syria because, he said, “we learned from Iraq that doing so makes us responsible for all that comes next.” The President even distinguished his proposed air strikes from the “prolonged air campaign” in Libya in 2011, as that intervention has become politically contentious in the U.S. and has led in Libya to what in other contexts many Americans would call a “failed state.” So Obama tried to show that he was learning some lessons from our recent history of intervention, even as critics pointed out that these examples of failure do not lead to confidence that achieving the objective of deterring future use of chemical weapons by Assad or others can be achieved by the means proposed.

But the larger rhetorical framework of the speech was even more problematic to the historian of American foreign policy. As Obama laid out the moral and legal case against the use of chemical weapons, he went back to the “deadly gas in the trenches of Europe” in World War I and the Nazi use of gas in the Holocaust. But then he fast-forwarded quickly – far too quickly – to the U.S. Senate’s approval in 1997 of an international treaty banning these weapons’ use. He therefore ignored the U.S.’s shameful record in the use of chemical weapons, beginning with the indiscriminate use of napalm in the Korean and Vietnam Wars which caused thousands of civilian casualties, and continuing with the millions...
of gallons of Agent Orange and other herbicides in Vietnam which caused brain damage, birth defects, and premature deaths. Later, the U.S. provided some of the materials for the chemical weapons which Saddam Hussein’s forces used against both Iranian troops and Iraqi civilians. Even after the U.S. signed that 1997 agreement, the U.S. used white phosphorus — classified as a chemical weapon when used offensively — against insurgents in the Iraq War. Acknowledging this history would have nudged Obama off the moral high ground, but omitting it is, to say the least, intellectually dishonest.

Worse still was Obama’s glorification of the U.S. as “the anchor of global security” since World War II, enforcing “international agreements.” “The burdens of leadership are often heavy,” he intoned, “but the world’s a better place because we have borne them.” As they say on Saturday Night Live!: “Really, President Obama? Really?” What agreement was the U.S. enforcing when it overthrew the elected governments of Iran and Guatemala, and when it helped to overthrow (on “the other 9/11”) the elected government of Chile? In all three cases dictatorship, repression, widespread torture, and hundreds or thousands of deaths ensued. What international agreement underlay covert aid to the Contras in Nicaragua and the mining of the harbors of that nation? Was the world “a better place” because the U.S. defined Fascist Spain and Portugal, and even apartheid South Africa, as part of the “free world,” helped prop up their despotic regimes, and opposed the struggles for independence by Portugal’s colonies and helped send Nelson Mandela to prison? (Has the President forgotten that his first major political activity, as described in his memoir, Dreams of My Father, was to help change U.S. policy in South Africa?) And how about the Vietnam War, where the U.S. made up its own rules about intervention and caused literally millions of deaths, or the Iraq War, where the Bush Administration failed to get its way at the United Nations and all-but-destroyed a nation nevertheless?

Two weeks before his speech on Syria, President Obama spoke at the Lincoln Memorial on the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, where Martin Luther King delivered his iconic “I Have a Dream” speech. Fair enough. But Obama should take a few minutes to study another of King’s speeches, from April 4, 1967. In “A Time to Break Silence,” marking his public break with the Johnson Administration’s Vietnam War, King declared sadly that “the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today” was the U.S. government.

One might also note that Obama’s demand that the U.S. enforce that 1997 treaty signed by the Senate reflects a selective approach to U.S. law by this former professor of constitutional law. When the generals in Egypt overthrew an elected government in July 2013, the Obama Administration refused to call it by its rightful name — a coup — in order to avoid a law requiring an end to U.S. aid in such circumstances. When Egypt’s military proceeded to kill hundreds of unarmed protestors in separate incidents, the U.S. canceled some joint military exercises and weapons deliveries, but the bulk of the $1.5 billion annual military aid continued to flow.

At this writing (mid-October 2013) Obama’s drive to a military strike in Syria is on hold, derailed by public and congressional protest by both the right and the left and, more hopefully, by diplomatic cooperation with Russia to dismantle Syria’s chemical weapons stockpile. But analyses of the President’s case for war are still appropriate, especially as he still asserts the right of the executive branch to use U.S. military might when he deems it necessary. Moreover, peace historians should also turn our attention to the case against war made by conservative Republicans as well as by the left. At the very least, the dissent by Republicans reminds us that often in U.S. history anti-interventionist sentiment has come from the right as much as from the left. And if Obama’s narrative leaves gaping holes in the historical record, so, too, do these Republicans’ arguments, given that most of them spent the last decade voting and arguing for the American fiasco in Iraq.

(The opinions expressed here are those of the author, and not of the PHS.)
The Peace Movement and U.S. Policy on Syria

The following letter was initiated by the Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL). The letter is also posted on the FCNL website, at http://fcnl.org/issues/middle_east/18_ngos_military_strikes_are_not_the_answer_in_syria/

August 28, 2013

Dear President Obama,

We, the undersigned organizations, are writing to express our grave concerns with your reported plans to intervene militarily in Syria. While we unequivocally condemn any use of chemical weapons along with continued indiscriminate killing of civilians and other violations of international humanitarian law, military strikes are not the answer. Rather than bringing an end to the violence that has already cost more than 100,000 lives, they threaten to widen the vicious civil war in Syria and undermine prospects to de-escalate the conflict and eventually reach a negotiated settlement.

In the course of more than 2 years of war, much of Syria has been destroyed and nearly 2 million people - half of them children - have been forced to flee to neighboring countries. We thank you for the generous humanitarian assistance the US has provided to support the nearly 1 in 3 Syrians - 8 million people - in need of aid. But such assistance is not enough.

As the U.S. government itself has recognized, there is no solution to the crisis other than a political one. Instead of pursuing military strikes and arming parties to the conflict, we urge your administration to intensify diplomatic efforts to stop the bloodshed, before Syria is destroyed and the region further destabilized.

American Friends Service Committee; Church of the Brethren; Code Pink; CREDO Action; Democrats.com; Fellowship of Reconciliation; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Historians Against the War; Institute for Policy Studies; Just Foreign Policy; Oxfam America; Peace Action; Peace Education Fund; Physicians for Social Responsibility; Presbyterian Church, USA; Progressive Democrats of America; RootsAction.org; Shomer Shalom Network for Jewish Nonviolence; United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society; USAction; Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS); Veterans for Peace; Women’s Action for New Directions
The President’s decision to back away from the use of military force and to seek a diplomatic solution to the Syrian government’s alleged use of chemical weapons is obviously a positive development. Especially significant, given the now 12 year-old “war on terror,” was the highly visible public opposition to military intervention. Less visible perhaps, but extremely effective, was the mobilization of national and local grassroots peace organizations across the country. Members of Congress were besieged with calls, emails and petitions. In Washington, D.C. and around the country, concerned constituents sent delegations and organized vigils at Congressional offices. Over the course of a week, scores of Senators and Representatives were changing their minds.

It would be comforting to think this was a watershed moment, when the American people and their government turned away from war and threats of war as the centerpiece of American foreign policy, but the impediments to that change are substantial. On the immediate question of how the US government will respond if it cannot obtain a favorable deal on Syria’s chemical weapons, there are clearly grounds for concern. It is by no means certain that the Obama Administration has abandoned any intention of launching a military attack.

We want to thank the many of you who signed on to our Historians Emergency list-serve and who participated in some form of action. For the present, we want to keep this list-serve alive given the uncertainties of the moment. If you would like to be included and have not already done so, you can do this by sending an email to: Syria-request@lists.historiansagainstwar.org?subject=subscribe or to Carolyn.Eisenberg@hofstra.edu

Other news from Historians Against the War

The HAW Steering Committee has also endorsed a November 5 solidarity "read-in" event being organized by faculty members at Purdue University, in which participants will read passages from Howard Zinn's writings. This is in response to the revelation that Purdue's current president, Mitch Daniels, when governor of Indiana, had welcomed the death of the person he called "this terrible anti-American academic" and sought assurance that Zinn's writings were not being taught in the state. Prof. Tithi Bhattacharya of the Purdue history department is a contact person on the read-in, at tbhattac@gmail.com. HAW sponsored a conference in April 2013, in conjunction with Towson University and several Baltimore-area anti-war organizations, entitled “The New Faces of War: A conference for historians and activists.” Keynote speakers were University of Wisconsin historian Alfred McCoy and former military officer and diplomat Col. Ann Wright. Other plenary speakers were Rashid Khalidi, Nick Turse, John Prados, and Carolyn “Rusti” Eisenberg. Some of the presentations have been posted on the internet, either as videos or text. Go to http:// www.historiansagainstwar.org/ conf2013/schedule.html for more information.

For general information about Historians Against the War, go to http:// www.historiansagainstwar.org/. To sign up for their listserve, which includes bi-weekly (more or less) announcements of events and articles of interest to historians of peace and anti-war movements, go to haw-info@historiansagainstwar.org.
Peace History Society Lifetime Achievement Award, October 2011:
Lawrence S. Wittner

What follows is the statement accompanying the award presented at the PHS 2011 conference at Barry University in Miami. The committee which determined the award recipient consisted of Harriet Alonso, Scott Bennett, Marian Mollin, and Robert Shaffer.

We are delighted to give this award to Lawrence S. Wittner – Larry – for over 40 years of scholarship in the area of peace history, for decades of service to the Peace History Society, and for a lifetime of activism in the peace movement.

Larry, born in New York City just before the U.S. entered World War II, received his BA and PhD from Columbia, picking up an MA from Wisconsin along the way. He taught at Hampton Institute and Vassar before moving to the State University of New York at Albany, where he has been since 1974, and is now emeritus.


For the next two decades Larry Wittner remained an extremely prolific author whose work touched many subjects: MacArthur (1971), an edited collection on the World War II general and the leader of the occupation of Japan; American Intervention in Greece, 1943-1949 (1982), an early revisionist study of the U.S. and the Cold War; Cold War America (1974), a survey textbook; and article-length biographies of prominent peace movement leaders. His articles appeared in scholarly journals such as Diplomatic History and the Pacific Historical Review as well as in publications of the peace movement, such as Peaceworker and the A.J. Muste Memorial Institute’s Where Do We Go From Here? Larry has written over 70 book reviews. He has published five articles and four book reviews in our own Peace & Change – none of them, of course, while he served as co-editor of the journal from 1984 to 1987.

But that tremendous scholarly output – more than enough for most professors – was almost like a warm-up for Larry’s magnum opus, The Struggle Against the Bomb, published in three volumes in 1993, 1997, and 2003, and in a single condensed volume for classroom use, in 2009, under the title, Confronting the Bomb: A Short History of the Nuclear Disarmament Movement. Larry achieved in these books a truly international history based on research in dozens of archives in several continents. This work by a scholar fully engaged in some of the most important social movements of our time elicited not only praise but calls to action in our most prestigious historical journals. To take just two reviews of the third volume, we read in the American Historical Review (Oct. 2004): “Wittner’s impressively researched, clearly written, and balanced assessment of the antinuclear-weapon movement belongs on the shelf not only of every serious student of the nuclear arms race but also of everyone who is concerned about the future of humanity.” And in the Journal of American History (Sept. 2004): “In order to abolish nuclear weapons, the author maintains, the pathology of the nation-state must be changed. Although others have been reaching the same conclusions for over half a century, the wisdom of Wittner’s passionate plea still speaks truth to power.”

From the 1960s until today, Larry has been a scholar of peace movements firmly committed to building a movement...
of peace scholars. He was active in the Council on Peace Research in History (now the Peace History Society) in its early years — and he spoke about this activity at the PHS conference at Georgian Court University four years ago — and Larry served as president from 1977 to 1979. He has been a member of the CPRH or PHS executive board for thirty years since 1970, and he probably would have served longer if the by-law that board members have to rotate off after their terms expire had not been adopted. He has helped PHS become more visible in the international community of peace scholars, serving as chair of the Peace History Commission of the International Peace Research Association from 1998 to 2001, and presenting papers at IPRA and other international peace conferences in Oslo, Hiroshima, Durban, Malta, the Hague, and elsewhere. Larry was one of the two winners of our Society’s Charles DeBenedetti Prize the first time it was awarded, for his 1987 article in Diplomatic History, “Peace Movements and Foreign Policy: The Challenge to Diplomatic Historians.”

Larry’s service to the PHS extends beyond his service virtually as a roving international ambassador and the formal offices he has held. Several former presidents of the Society have noted to our committee Larry’s invaluable aid during their tenure, and he was instrumental in getting articles about the Peace History Society in recent issues of the American Historical Association’s Perspectives on History and in Passport, the newsletter of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. And, of course, most long-time members of PHS remember fondly Larry’s singing and banjo-playing of peace and labor movement favorites at our conferences, as well as at events jointly sponsored with Historians Against the War.

Unlike some historians, Larry never lost his connections to the social movements which led him to undertake the kind of scholarship he has pursued. He has been a member of the Board of Directors of Peace Action since 2005, and he co-edited a book in 2007 as part of the 50th anniversary celebration of one of Peace Action’s predecessor groups, SANE (National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy). Larry was an officer of the Albany area chapter of the World Federalist Association in the 1990s, and is now a fellow of the World Federalist Institute. From 1980 until his retirement, he was an officer or executive committee member of the faculty union, the United University Professions (AFT), at SUNY at Albany; we should all honor this service even more highly now, when public employee unions, public universities, and even the value of a liberal arts education are under attack across the country. A fixture in the Albany activist scene, Larry was also a leader of the Capital District Labor-Religion Coalition and a member of the Labor Advisory Committee of Cornell’s labor relations extension program in New York’s capital city.

Over the past ten years, Larry has combined his scholarship and his activism in regular short columns he writes for a popular audience on items relating to war, peace, and history. Beginning with a few op-eds in his local newspaper, the Albany Times-Union, in the late 1990s — such as “Heed the Lessons of Hiroshima, Nagasaki,” on August 6, 2003 — Larry soon moved to the internet, with a prolific outpouring of articles on ZNet,
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the History News Network, the Bulletin Online (associated with the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists) and the Huffington Post. Many of these articles – the Huffington Post lists 20 in just the last eighteen months – get reposted online and in print, in venues far and wide. Sample titles include “Did Reagan’s Military Buildup Really Lead to Victory in the Cold War?,” from 2004 – the correct answer, Larry tells us, is “no” – to “Foiled Again: The Defeat of the Latest Bush Administration Plan for New Nuclear Weapons,” in 2007, to “The Peace Movement Today,” from March 2011. Among Larry’s latest was the August 8 posting of “How to Save a Quarter of a Trillion Dollars” – stop the $180 billion plan to “modernize” U.S. nuclear weapons and end the unworkable Star Wars boondoggle, with its $80 billion projected future price tag – and, just last week, “Is Mitt Romney Ready for the World?”

But Larry continues to write longer works as well: his memoirs are forthcoming from the University of Tennessee Press.

As one of the most significant scholars of the peace movement in recent decades, as a stalwart leader throughout our organization’s history, as peace activist, and as public intellectual, Larry Wittner certainly deserves the Lifetime Achievement Award of the Peace History Society, and we are very proud to award it to him this year.

An Open letter to the American People about a Project to Accurately Commemorate the American War in Viet Nam
By the North Carolina Veterans for Peace

[The North Carolina Veterans for Peace launched this open letter in response to reports that the U.S. government is funding the Department of Defense to organize commemorations of the Vietnam War. The members of the Peace History Society, in an on-line poll in September 2013, voted overwhelmingly (over 90% in favor) to sign this statement calling for an alternative commemoration of this war and to participate in the N.C. Veterans for Peace petition campaign. For more information, go to http://www.ncveteransforpeace.org/memorial/. For reflections on such a campaign, see the essay immediately by Ian Christopher Fletcher, a member of the Peace History Society Board.]

We are coming up on the 50th anniversary of key moments in the American war in Viet Nam. As peace and justice activists, we believe it is crucial that the realities of the war be faced squarely. President Obama has announced his plan for a 13-year-long commemoration funded by Congress at $65 million, featuring a full panoply of Orwellian forgetfulness and faux-patriotism. On May 25, 2012, President Obama proclaimed: “As we observe the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam War, we reflect with solemn reverence upon the valor of a generation that served with honor. We pay tribute to the more than 3 million servicemen and women who left their families to serve bravely, a world away from everything they knew and everyone they loved ... fighting heroically to protect the ideals we hold dear as Americans. Through more than a decade of combat, over air, land, and sea, these proud Americans upheld the highest traditions of our Armed Forces.” (at http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2012/05/25/presidential-proclamation-commemoration-50th-anniversary-vietnam-war). The purpose of the official proclamation -- rather than honestly looking backward so as to glean and educate about important lessons -- will be to promote an ex post facto justification of the war, lay lingering doubts to rest, and provide a stamp of approval without attending to or contending with the horrors of the war that many of us opposed.

The whole idea is a bit staggering, that this project was put into the hands of the Department of Defense (DoD) so that they can attempt -- a half century later -- to rewrite a tragic history which already has been distorted and manipulated by those in power in the US. The DoD is recruiting "partner" organizations from across the country to help them distort and silence much of the real history. Numerous events are scheduled over the next 12 years to “honor” our soldiers and extol the selfless sacrifices of Americans during an ugly period of our history. There will likely be little mention of the Vietnamese, and what the nation and the society of Viet Nam suffered as a result of U.S. intervention, nor of the resistance to the war by courageous and committed Americans. Almost certainly, the DoD project will not pay tribute to the voices and postwar reconciliation activities of many antiwar veterans.

Those years many of us remember, with painful acuity, as other than glorious. We feel compelled to make sure that the history of US involvement in Viet Nam is told truthfully.

Rather than let this Madison Avenue PR campaign just roll over us, we are viewing this as an opportunity to truly examine what happened during those tragic and tumultuous Viet Nam years, and use those lessons to turn American policy and shape a better future for ourselves and other nations. The US seems as committed as ever to military interventions heedless of the consequences for the invaded and occupied people or even for those called upon to invade and occupy.

We believe that an honest remembrance of what actually went on in Viet Nam is essential -- to face the realities for the millions of Vietnamese civilians killed, maimed, poisoned, and traumatized; our soldiers propagandized, thrown into a "war of choice"; and subsequently largely abandoned to cope with post-war stress, our citizenry lied to and manipulated who came to recognize the war’s futility, if not its immorality.

It is incumbent on us not to cede
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the war’s memory to those who have little interest in an honest accounting and who want to justify further acts of military adventurism. The experience of the war ought to be cautionary against the fantasy of world dominance that besots many of our political and military leaders. What are the consequences of trying to control the fate of a people from afar with little understanding or interest -- except for the purposes of counterinsurgency -- in their history and culture, or their human desires? What are the consequences of dehumanized ideologies used to justify wars of aggression? To honor the Viet Nam generation and to inform current and future generations, we should make every effort to pass on a critical and honest history of the war.

As part of our counter-commemoration, we also will also pay tribute to the broad-based resistance to the war. Taking inspiration from the civil rights movement, an unprecedented opposition movement arose not just on campuses, but in the streets, in the military, and around family dinner tables. Millions of Americans resisted the war spontaneously, as well as in organizations ranging from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee to the Chicano Moratorium, Women’s Strike for Peace, the War Resisters League, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, American Friend Service Committee, Students for a Democratic Society, Labor for Peace, Business Executives Move for Viet Nam Peace, and Vietnam Veterans Against the War, not to mention countless community groups. The movement made the morality of the war an issue for Americans, moving beyond the cost-benefit analysis favored by the punditocracy. The war was wrong, not just too costly; as Martin Luther King warned in his “Beyond Vietnami” speech: “the US was on the wrong side of the world revolution.”

The work around the quincen-tennial of Columbus’s voyages is a useful precedent. Originally designed as a celebration of Eurocentrism and empire, wide-spread grassroots action instead turned the quincentennial into a critique of the conquest and destruction of native peoples.

We therefore are inviting you to join us in developing a strategy for an antiwar commemoration with direct relevance for today. Here are some beginning, suggestive ideas to expose the truths of war and pose alternatives to its normalization by developing:

1.) A central storehouse of information, a web site, and digitized archives;
2.) Curriculum for schools and colleges;
3.) A speaker’s bureau;
4.) A program on the model of the Viet Nam era’s teach-ins and Winter Soldier investigations;
5.) Our own commemorations of significant war and antiwar events.

In tandem with the civil rights, Black liberation, and women’s movements, the anti-war movement fostered a cultural and intellectual revolution which undermined Euro-centrism and traditional hierarchies while honoring the previously marginalized. Our grasp of history, culture, and human capacity was qualitatively expanded. We learned and demonstrated that history could be made by ordinary people; by people of color, by women, by the ignored and excluded.
I’ve been reflecting the last several days on the call for an alternative to government plans for an official commemoration of the war in Southeast Asia. I agree this is an “opportunity” to envision a better future as well as understand a bitter past. I like the emphasis on popular education and welcome the openness to different ways of remembrance. Certainly historians can contribute to commemorative efforts.

The call frames the proposed “counter-commemoration” in terms of speaking truth to power, counterposing what really happened to misrepresentations in official stories, bringing out the opposing history of antiwar activism, and drawing the relevant lessons. This resonates with me as someone who grew up in those years and took part in the movement, but I wonder if we also need a critical form of commemoration that asks a wide range of questions to stimulate dialogue among generations, movements, and communities. In interpreting meanings as well as facts, we need to consider how the significance of a moment and its aftermath can be complex, varied, and changing even among people who share many things.

Undoubtedly refracted through my own experience and outlook, here are some of the questions I am asking myself. How have we already been commemorating the war and the turbulent period in which it unfolded? What new perspectives have been opened up in recent years by historians in their research, teaching, and public scholarship, as well as by archivists, curators, documentarians, artists, and writers? How do people who did not live through those years make sense of them, and how do people who did make sense of them now? How can we think about the war as a worldwide event and especially about peace and solidarity activism in all its transnational and global scope and variety? Along similar lines, how can we appreciate the creative, diverse, and everyday ways that ordinary people in many social sectors and social movements in the U.S. challenged the war, changing themselves and each other as they tried to change the world? And how can we evaluate the complicated ways that leaders and institutions, not to mention other parts of the population, responded to these challenges? Forty and fifty years later, how can we negotiate the crosscurrents of experience and history, between a time that some people will recollect and even continue to live and a time that other people will encounter as something new and come to know and imagine in different ways?

Resources of Interest

1) Rethinking Schools has published a collection of articles and hands-on lessons on the wars in Afghanistan and the Middle East since 2001, entitled Teaching About the Wars. Edited by Jody Sokolwer, this 132-page book is geared to teaching at the secondary school level, and includes material by Bill Bigelow, Camilo Mejia, Howard Zinn, Arlene Inouye, and many others. It is available as a pdf for $7.95 and paperback for $12.95. Information is at http://www.rethinkingschools.org/publication/index.shtml.
2) PHS International Advisory Board member Peter van den Dungen reports that a “Peace Trail” map and brochure for Birmingham (Great Britain) was completed in the summer of 2013. The two-hour walking tour covers statues, buildings, and parks where important residents and organizations in that city worked for peace and where commemorations of war and peace can be seen. “Stops” on the tour include, for example, sites important in the life of noted 19th century Quaker and peace activist Joseph Sturge, and the War Poetry Collection at the Central Library. It also includes the area around St. Thomas’s Church, which was largely destroyed by German bombardment in December 1940, and which was rededicated as a “Peace Garden” in 1995, the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. (A similar “peace trail” walking tour has been created for Cambridge [Great Britain] as well.) The brochure for this “Birmingham City Centre Peace Trail” is at:

http://civilisation3000.files.wordpress.com/2013/07/peace-walk-pamphlet.pdf

3) Passport, the newsletter of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations, has several articles of interest to peace historians in its latest issues. In the September 2013 issue, Lawrence Wittner wrote on the history of nuclear disarmament and Rhodri Jeffreys-Jones discussed the U.S. left’s impact on American foreign policy. In April 2013, Molly Wood described her teaching about the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. In January 2013, John Prados compared the Phoenix program during the Vietnam War to recent drone warfare, and there was a roundtable discussion of Richard Nixon and the Vietnam War. The January and April issues are already available online, at www.shafr.org.

4) To mark the 100th anniversary of “the first modern war,” the Peace & Justice Studies Association will publish an edited, peer-reviewed volume that will critically examine the efforts over the last 100 years to “end all war,” with the goal of inspiring further strategic work on this project in the coming decade by providing leading peace educators, researchers and activists with a forum in which to critically reflect upon how peace activists and scholars should orient their work to advance the goal of ending war as a legal and accepted human institution. More specifically, the purpose of this book is two-fold: to provide readers with a concise overview of the efforts to end war in the 20th century, and from this vantage point, to suggest where those interested in world peace should concentrate their efforts in the next decade. Cris Toffolo, PJSA Board Co-Chair and professor in the Justice Studies Department at Northeastern Illinois University, will serve as editor of the project.

(The deadline for the call for contributors [August 18, 2013] has passed.)
Tisa M. Anders, independent scholar, recently published two chapters on the betabeleros, Mexican-origin sugar beet field workers, for edited collections:


Tisa also reviewed Antony Adolf's Peace: A World History, in The International Journal on World Peace, March 2013. (Adolf had been a keynote speaker at the PHS conference in Rock Hill, South Carolina in 2009.)

Scott H. Bennett, Georgian Court University, received a Fulbright Award for the Netherlands. In Spring 2014, he will teach at Leiden University and conduct research in Amsterdam (at the International Institute of Social History) on David McReynolds and the War Resisters international. Scott is writing a biography of socialist pacifist David McReynolds.


Chuck Howlett, Molloy College, has published several recent essays:

"When Nations Tried to Outlaw War: A Forgotten Event in American Diplomatic History," Time and Place (Spring 2013), the journal of the New York State Council for the Social Studies;

"Duck and Cover: The Evolution of Peace Education at the Beginning of the Nuclear Age," (co-authored), Journal of Peace Education (Summer 2013);

entries on "The American Peace Movement" and "Conscientious Objection" in editor Kurt Piehler's Encyclopedia of Military Science (Sage Publishers, 2013);

and a lesson plan for the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations based on his 2009 PHS presentation, "Bubble Gum Cards and the Horrors of War."

Chuck has also edited a new centennial edition of Nicholas Murray Butler's The International Mind: An Argument for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes (Information Age Publishing, 2013), and, with Scott Bennett, Patriotic Protest: Peace Activism and Antiwar Dissent in World War I America: A Reader (University of Nebraska Press), to appear on the upcoming World War I Centenary.

The Peace History Society is co-sponsoring a session at the 2014 annual meeting of the American Historical Association in Washington, D.C., on Saturday, 4 January 2014, from 2:30 to 4:30 PM, in the Omni Sheraton Diplomat Ballroom. Entitled "Advocating Peace, Debating War: Disagreement and Division leading up to World War I," the session marks the centenary of the outbreak of the First World War and explores the dilemmas encountered by activists and intellectuals as the war spread around the world between 1914 and 1917. Participants include Sandi E. Cooper, Ernest Ialongo, Sungshin Kim, Elaine P. Rocha, Kurt Gulden-tops, and Ian C. Fletcher. The session is designed to be discussion-based and interactive between panelists and audience members. All PHS members and friends are encouraged to attend and participate!

Colloque International: Les Defenseurs de la Paix (1899-1917) (International Colloquium on Defenders of Peace, 1899-1917)
15-17 January 2014

The Research Center in Comparative European History of the Université Paris-Est and the German Historical Institute are sponsoring a major conference in January 2014 in Paris, with participating scholars from nine European nations plus the U.S. and Canada, on the efforts of the peace movements in the years in Europe, China, and Brazil, c. 1900-17," the session marks the centenary of the outbreak of the First World War and explores the dilemmas encountered by activists and intellectuals as the war spread around the world between 1914 and 1917. Participants include Sandi E. Cooper, Ernest Ialongo, Sungshin Kim, from Canada, PHS Board member Sandi Cooper from the U.S., and Werner Wintersteiner from Austria. A full program is available at:

Position Announcement: Director, May 4th Visitor’s Center, Kent State University

Kent State University College of Arts & Sciences, in conjunction with the Department of History, invites applications for a non tenure track position in Public History. The successful candidate will serve as Director of the May 4th Visitors Center, have a PhD in hand by the time of appointment (July 2014), and contribute to the academic mission of the Department of History. The Kent State University May 4 Visitors Center provides students and the public opportunity to reflect on the facts of what happened May 4, 1970, and the meaning of the event for today's citizens. Dedicated in May 2013, the $1.1 million dollar Center is located on campus and was designated as part of a National Historical Places site in 2010. KSU seeks candidates with strong inter-personal skills and a demonstrated ability to work across disciplines that share academic interests in May 4th related activities. The director will be expected to secure external funding to enhance and grow the Center’s public presence, promote outreach to the larger public community including leading May 4 events, supervise public history interns at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and contribute to the academic mission of the Department of History.

Applicants should send their letter of application, curriculum vitae, links to public events, writing samples or hyperlinks, three letters of recommendation other materials that outline qualifications by email or mail to:

Dr. Kenneth J. Bindas, Chair
Department of History
Kent State University
305 Bowman Hall
Kent, OH, 44242-0001
kbindas@kent.edu

Review of applications will begin on November 14, 2013 and will continue until the position is filled. For more information on the May 4th Center, please visit http://www.kent.edu/about/history/May4/thenvisitorscenter/

Kent State University is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer and encourages applications from candidates who would enhance the diversity of the University’s faculty.
The program committee invites paper proposals on Dissent, Activism, & Transformation in the World War I Era. The First World War was a watershed event in modern world history and among the most significant events in the 20th century. The war triggered dissent and activism; and it had an impact on political activism, social reform, and cultural expression. In turn, these developments transformed society, politics, and culture. This conference will explore the themes of dissent, activism, and transformation during the war and the immediate postwar era.

Keynote Speakers:
• ADAM HOCHSCHILD, author of To End All Wars: A Story of Loyalty and Rebellion, 1914-1918.
• HARRIET HYMAN ALONSO, author of Peace As a Women’s Issue: A History of the U.S. Movement for World Peace and Women’s Rights.

We welcome paper and panel proposals from all scholarly disciplines. We also welcome panels dealing with teaching and pedagogy related to the conference theme. Proposals should be limited to one page and should explain the scholarly significance of the topic. With your proposal, submit a short C.V. (3 pp.). Please forward proposals for individual papers or panels by March 1, 2014 to Scott H. Bennett at: <bennetts@georgian.edu>

Paper topics might include:
• Peace activism, antiwar dissent, & modern peace movements
• Local, national, transnational, & global topics • Individuals, groups, governments, & institutions
• Conscientious objection & conscription • Civil liberties in wartime
• Repression, loyalty & conformity • Impact of WWI on immediate postwar developments
• Labor, race, & African American activism • Anti-colonial movements
• Women’s movement & activism • How WWI transformed politics, society, & culture
• Cultural & intellectual movements (literature, poetry, art, music, philosophy, theology)
• Social & political movements (social justice, reform, resistance, & revolution)
• Dissent (social, political, cultural, intellectual, economic)
• Opposition to dissent, peace activism, & social reform
• International law & treaties, postwar peace treaties, & economic consequences
• New social, political, cultural, & intellectual trends & developments

For more information, go to: <http://www.georgian.edu/WWIconference.htm>
2) A Special Issue of Peace and Change: Bodily Pain and Peace Studies Thirty Years after Elaine Scarry’s The Body in Pain

2015 will mark the 30th anniversary of the publication of Elaine Scarry’s seminal work, The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World. Since its publication, Scarry’s work has remained the most influential work on how bodily pain shapes power in Western culture. While critics are divided as to the merits of Scarry’s main conclusions about how bodily pain deconstructs the sufferer’s world, they recognize that grappling with Scarry’s arguments is necessary for anyone who wishes to understand the political and ethical consequences of inflicting and writing about pain.

The purpose of this special issue is to examine the importance of attention to bodily pain in peace and social justice studies. Scarry’s work suggests the impossibility of representing the pain of another without appropriating that pain for the political agenda or power of the historian, social justice advocate or torturer. In part for this reason, Scarry argues that language cannot describe bodily pain; that is, pain itself exists outside of representation. While this assertion has been challenged by Scarry’s critics, most agree that representations of extreme pain are especially tricky and often appropriated for particular political agendas thus silencing those in pain. The purpose of this special issue will be to both add to our empirical understanding of how war, torture and other forms of violence inflict bodily pain and the consequences of that pain on individuals and culture and to grapple with the ethical responsibilities of writing about the pain of another. Topics may include, among others: Truth and Reconciliation Committees and testimonies about pain; Trauma and pain; Bodily destruction and its representation; Hate Crimes and representations of pain; Peace movements and representations of pain; Relationship between constructions of gender and race and pain; Torture; Killing without seeing; use of drones, long range missiles; Ethics of representing the pain of another; etc.

Authors should submit a detailed abstract by November 15, 2013 of approximately 750 words that discusses the specific topic and its importance to peace and social justice studies, provides a clear statement of the sources used and or bibliography, and discusses how the proposed paper situates itself in relation to Scarry’s work. Authors should also include a vita and contact information. Direct abstracts or inquiries to Prof. Kathleen Kennedy, Missouri State University, at KathleenKennedy@MissouriState.edu.

3) War and Childhood in the Age of the World Wars: Local and Global Perspectives

June 5-7, 2014, German Historical Institute, Washington D.C.

We are looking for presenters who can enrich our understanding of the place and role of children and youth in war during the first half of the twentieth century. The goal of our conference is to come to grips with a fundamental paradox: How was it possible for modern societies to reimagine childhood as a space of sheltered existence and mobilize children for war at the same time? And how did modern warfare disrupt or accelerate rites of passage in the realms of gender, sexuality, national loyalty, ethnic and racial identity, and military involvement? We ask these questions on the assumption that young people experienced war in ways that
were age-specific and different from how adults endured it. Usually, these differences found some means to express themselves, and despite the devastation suffered by real children in wars, the power of youth as a symbol of renewal outlived them...

We invite contributions that address the nexus of childhood, youth, and war across political and geographical boundaries. But we also encourage proposals from scholars whose research revolves around a group of people, a region, a nation, or a certain cultural space. We do this in the spirit of practicing a "connected history," a history that is aware of global influences on local events without losing sight of local particularities in an interconnected world. We want to attract historians specializing in various fields (military, political, social, economic, and cultural history) who can help us develop a comprehensive and exciting synthesis of the historiographies on war, youth, and childhood from roughly 1910 to 1950. We will give...preference to proposals that focus on the following areas:

- Depictions of young people in war and antiwar propaganda;
- Children as casualties of war (death, disease, malnutrition) and the politics of emotion;
- Children as soldiers, partisans, prisoners, refugees, and resistance fighters;
- Youth organizations and war;
- Young people on the home front;
- Military toys and war in children's games; Militarism and anti-militarism in schools;
- War in youth literature and popular culture; Childhood and war trauma;

Narrations of war and youth in postwar politics and culture.

Send a proposal of no more than 500 words and a short CV to Susanne Fabricius, at fabricius@ghi-dc.org. The deadline for submission is November 30, 2013. Participants will be notified by early January 2014. The conference, held in English, will focus on discussing 6,000-8,000 word, pre-circulated papers (due April 30, 2014). We intend to publish the contributions. Expenses for travel and accommodation will be covered.

4) The Cold War on Film: Then and Now
19-20 September, 2014, Moscow, Russia
Sponsored by the Wilson Center (Washington, D.C.), the University of Hertfordshire (UK), and the German Historical Institute in Moscow

Up to now, most work on the relationship between the Cold War and cinema has focused on Hollywood. This is understandable given the headlines that the witch-hunt of leftists in Hollywood attracted during the McCarthy era and the global reach of the American film industry. Nonetheless, this American-centric approach has tended to skew the picture overall, leaving some with the impression that Hollywood was subjected to unique political pressures during the Cold War and that the American film industry won the cinematic Cold War almost by default.

Our approach is interdisciplinary, and we welcome proposals for papers from scholars of all fields, including history, film studies, literature, cultural studies, and the social sciences. The languages of the conference will be English and Russian. Proposals of 500 words, together with a brief CV, should be sent to Professor Tony Shaw at a.t.shaw@herts.ac.uk by 31 December 2013. Invitations to the conference will be issued by 31 January 2014. Papers (up to 25 pages in length) should be distributed to all participants one month before the event. All lodging and meals for the duration of the conference will be covered. A limited number of grants will be given to contributors to cover their travel costs.
In the summer of 2014, people throughout the world will commemorate the centenary of the start of the First World War. For historians of international business and management, this period will be an opportunity to reflect on the impact of the war on the industries and companies they study.

The First World War had a dramatic and immediate impact on international business, particularly the financial services sector, but the impact quickly spread to other sectors as international trade and investment were disrupted. As the war progressed, the integrated world economy that had emerged during the first great era of globalization disintegrated and liberal assumptions and practices were discarded. The realities of the total war shattered the assumption that it would be “business as usual.” The disruption of international supply chains by the war created threats and opportunities for firms in many countries. The seizure of patents, factories, and other assets in belligerent countries created complex legal issues that lasted for decades. The war challenged the ascendancy of British international business and capital, opening the way for rivals from newly industrialising countries to compete in markets around the world.

The impact of the war on international business lasted long after the fighting stopped, due in part to the nature of the peace settlement dictated by the victorious allies, the growth of institutions of global governance, and changes to the international political economy. In particular, the transfer of financial power from the City of London to Wall Street was not matched by a corresponding increase in the willingness of the United States to guarantee the political underpinnings of an integrated global economy. In turn, this change spurred organizational innovation and change among international firms as they adapted their strategies and structures to a changed business environment.

We are seeking contributors who are interested in presenting their research at the workshop and publishing their papers as part of an edited collection. Contributors can be of any nationality and can be from any discipline, although our expectation is that all papers will focus on the impact of the war on international business, should be based on original research, and should expressly engage with and seek to develop historiography and/or reflect on relevant business and management theory.

Themes that might be addressed include: Crisis management; Short and/or long run impacts; Organizational and managerial change; Innovation and entrepreneurship; International political economy; Business strategy.

For inquiries or submit a 300-word abstract of your paper plus a short CV, contact Andrew Smith (Coventry University), ab0352@coventry.ac.uk by 1 December 2013.
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