Greetings Peace History Society Members!

On behalf of the entire PHS board and executive officers, I hope everyone is having an enjoyable (and productive if you are working on peace research) summer. Although PHS does not hold a conference this year, our members and the board remain very active, as seen in the highlights and news found in our newsletter prepared by Robert Shaffer.

Let me give a brief overview of ongoing and new PHS business.

PHS has created a new prize to be awarded to an outstanding book in peace history with the qualification that first books and dissertations are not eligible. The idea behind this prize is to recognize the excellence of established scholars who have already published a book and thus whose work is no longer eligible for the Bills Memorial Prize. I express thanks to Chuck Howlett, who launched this idea to the Board and to an ad hoc committee - Harriet Alonso, Scott Bennett, Kevin Clement, Wendy Chmielewski, and Robert Shaffer – who worked out some of the specifics of this prize. We are still in the process of working out some final details, most importantly, in whose honor the prize will be named. Please send any nominations of a deceased female peace scholar or activist to Wendy Chmielewski by August 15, 2016, at wchmiel1@swarthmore.edu.

We have also solicited proposals/invitations from PHS members and his/her host institution to host the 2019 Peace History Society conference. We have received some excellent proposals and look forward to sharing more news about this process later this year.

It is not too early to start thinking about the next PHS conference, in 2017, for which we are partnering with other institutions and organizations. The theme is on “Remembering Muted Voices: Conscience, Dissent, Resistance and Civil Liberties in World War I through Today” and the conference will take place October 19-22, 2017 at the National World War I Memorial Museum, Kansas City, MO. PHS has strong representation for this conference with David Hostetter, Scott Bennett and Christy Snider serving in key positions. With PHS support, David traveled to Kansas City in June
2016 to represent us as part of the program committee.

Also make note of the CFP deadline fast approaching (Oct. 1) for the American Friends Service Committee April 2017 conference: 100 years of peace with justice: Looking back, Moving Forward, which celebrates the 100th anniversary of the AFSC.

Long-time PHS member Roger Peace is developing a website – United States Foreign Policy History and Resource Guide - on the history of U.S. foreign policy from a peace and justice perspective, and he encourages PHS members to contribute to this project. PHS is also a sponsor. Please check out the website http://peacehistory-usfp.org/ and contact Roger at repeace3@embarqmail.com on how you might participate,

Membership renewals for 2016 have been extremely successful. Thanks to everyone who renewed and to Ginger Williams, PHS Treasurer, and Andy Barbero, PHS Secretary, for encouraging others who might have forgotten. Due to the influx of new members from the October 2016 conference and to continuing interest in peace history, our membership for 2016 has grown by about 25% in comparison to our membership at this time in 2015. Our finances remain strong, thanks to member renewals and our relationship with Wiley through our journal, Peace & Change, which generates royalties. Such resources allow us to support graduate student travel to our conferences and to offer prize money to award winners (including in the future the new book award prize).

Peace & Change remains a significant voice in the field of peace studies and conflict resolution. We have been most fortunate to have amazing editors, currently Heather Fryer of Creighton University, who has already brought great energy and ideas to the journal, including launching a blog. Please check it out regularly, at https://peaceandchangeblog.wordpress.com/, and contact Heather on how you might contribute.

You might also be interested to know that Peace & Change truly has a global readership, with close to 70,000 article downloads in 2015 from different regions of the world (USA 36%, UK 18%, Europe 16%, China 1%, Japan 1%, etc). The most downloaded article published in 2015 was Ryan Kirkby’s “Dramatic Protests, Creative Communities: VVAW and the Expressive Politics of the Sixties Counterculture.” Ryan also shared his research at the 2013 PHS conference on Envisioning Art, Performing Justice: Art, Activism, and the Cultural Politics of Peacemaking at Southern Illinois University. The most popular article download in 2015 was Majken Jul Sorensen’s “Humor As A Serious Strategy of Nonviolence Resistance to Oppression,” published in 2008.

PHS always welcomes its members to take on even greater roles in our society, so we continue to generate the leaders of the society for the future. We will be holding elections for officers and board members this fall – terms beginning in January 2017 - so please start to think about how you might serve PHS. We welcome nominations and self-nominations, so please consider running. We have created a nomination committee to preside over our next election. The members include: Ginger Williams, Andy Barbero, myself and David Hostetter. David is chairing this committee so please direct any questions or a nomination/self-nomination about the forthcoming election to him, at dlhostetter@yahoo.com.

Pax, Kevin J. Callahan
University of Saint Joseph, CT
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Conference Announcement/Call for Papers:

**Remembering Muted Voices: Conscience, Dissent, Resistance, and Civil Liberties in World War I through Today**

October 19-22, 2017  
National World War I Museum at Liberty Memorial  
Kansas City, MO, USA  

World War I had a profound impact on the United States, including in ways that are largely forgotten today. Although the United States actively took part in the conflict for only 18 months, the war effort introduced mass conscription, transformed the American economy, and mobilized popular support through war bonds, patriotic rallies, and anti-German propaganda. Many people nevertheless questioned the claims of the Allied and Central powers, desired a negotiated peace, opposed American intervention, refused to support the war effort, and/or even imagined future world orders that could eliminate war. Among them were members of the peace churches and other religious groups, women, pacifists, radicals, labor activists, and other dissenters.

Intolerance and repression often muted the voices of these war critics. Almost overnight, the individuals and groups who opposed the war faced constraints on their freedom to advocate, organize, and protest. The Selective Service Act of 1917 made few concessions for conscientious objectors. The Espionage Act of 1917 – reinforced by the Sedition Act of 1918 – prohibited many forms of speech and made it a crime to interfere with the draft. Peace advocates and antiwar activists and conscientious objectors confronted not
only external hostility from the government, the press, and war supporters, but also internal disagreements over how to respond to the war and advance the cause of peace. The experience of American dissenters was not unique; their counterparts in other belligerent countries and colonial dependencies found themselves in comparable situations. Yet, those who opposed World War I helped initiate modern peace movements and left a legacy that continues to influence antiwar activism.

This interdisciplinary conference, hosted by the National World War I Museum at Liberty Memorial, Kansas City, will explore the experiences of those groups and individuals who raised their voices against the war, sometimes at great cost. We welcome paper, panel, poster, roundtable, and workshop proposals that engage in diverse ways with issues of conscience, dissent, resistance, and civil liberties during World War I, in the United States and around the world. We encourage proposals that examine historical and contemporary parallels to the war. Strong conference papers will be given consideration for publication in special issues of the journals Mennonite Quarterly Review and Peace & Change.

Topics might include:

- War Resistance as an Expression of Religious Conscience (Amish, Brethren, Catholics, Hutterites, Latter Day Saints, Mennonites, Methodists, Nazarenes, Pentecostals, Quakers, etc.)
- Secular Dissent and Resistance to War (feminists, socialists, and other movements and communities)
- The Costs of War (economic, political, social, physical, psychological, etc.)
- Civil Liberties in World War I and War Today
- Race, Empire, and World War I
- The Legacy and Relevance of World War I Peace Activism to the Present
- The Causes and Prevention of War: World War I and Since
- Teaching World War I and Peace History in High School and College
- Memory, Memorialization, and the Public History of World War I

The program committee invites interested participants to send a 1-page proposal focused on the theme of the conference by January 31, 2017 to John D. Roth, at johndr@goshen.edu. Paper presenters/panelists will be expected to register for the conference and pay the registration fee.

Conference Working Committee: Scott H. Bennett (Georgian Court University), Andrew Bolton (Community of Christ/Graceland University), Jesse Hofer (Silverwinds Hutterite Community), David Hostetter (Peace History Society), Ian Kleinsasser (Crystal Springs Hutterite Community), Dora Maendel (Fairholme Hutterite Community), Peter Mommsen (Plough Publishing), John D. Roth (Goshen College), Christy J. Snider (Berry College), Duane Stoltzfus (Goshen College), Lora Vogt (National WWI Museum).

Conference Co-sponsors: Brethren Historical Library and Archives; Bruderhof Communities; Community of Christ Seminary; Hutterian Communities (3); Peace History Society; John Whitmer Historical Association; Historians against the War; Center for Mennonite Brethren Studies, Tabor College, KS; Mennonite Central Committee, US; Mennonite Historical Society; Mennonite Quarterly Review; National World War I Museum; Plough Quarterly; The Sider Institute for Anabaptist, Pietist and Wesleyan Studies at Messiah College; American Civil Liberties Union; American Friends Service Committee.
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United States Foreign Policy: History & Resource Guide (A Website):
A Call for Collaboration
By Roger Peace

To members and friends of Peace History Society:

I am currently developing a website on the history of U.S. foreign policies and wars. Written for the general public and undergraduate students, the intention is to include in each entry a principled analysis of the causes and conduct of the war and related domestic debates and antiwar movements.

There are many critical studies of U.S. foreign policy at higher levels of academia, but little of this information seeps into high school and community college textbooks, let alone popular websites that non-history-major students typically use.

It is an ambitious project, but very much needed, based on my experience teaching 35 “U.S. in the World” history courses at the community college level. Having recently retired from teaching, I am dedicating my time to creating this website.

The website is unique in blending three approaches: progressive diplomatic history, peace studies values, and global/international history. There is more about the philosophical foundation on the homepage: peacehistory-usfp.org.

Two entries have been completed: The War of 1812 and the U.S.-Mexican War. An entry on the Korean War, written by Jeremy Kuzmarov, should be on the site by August. I am working with another scholar on the War of 1898 and U.S.-Filipino War.

I welcome assistance and input from PHS members and friends. Larry Wittner has prepared an outline for the nuclear arms race section of the entry, “The Cold War, Nuclear Arms Race, and Global Interventionism, 1946-1990.” Perhaps someone would like to write this section, or parts of it. Michael Kazin has agreed to write on World War I. Perhaps some papers being prepared for the next PHS conference could be adapted and added. Think of reaching a wider audience.

Other than writing entries, I would welcome assistance from those with expertise in a particular area in the form of an outline of key developments and themes, a list of best resources (books, articles, websites, and films), or help in reviewing and editing articles. Also, if you use the web site in one of your courses, I would welcome feedback and suggestions for improvement. The different entries, or subject areas, are listed below.

Please contact me if you are interested in contributing to this project.

Roger Peace
rcpeace3@embarqmail.com

Website subject areas:

- Historical overview and future directions
- 1775-1783 – War for Independence
- 1775-1890 – U.S. territorial expansion and Native American resistance
- 1812-1815 – The War of 1812 [completed]
- 1846-1848 – United States-Mexican War [completed]
- 1898-1902 – The War of 1898 and U.S.-Filipino War [in progress]
- 1903-1934 – “Yankee imperialism” in Latin America
- 1917-1918 – U.S. participation in World War I

(continued on page 7)
- 1941-1945 – U.S. participation in World War II
- 1946-1990 – The Cold War, nuclear arms race, and global interventionism
- 1950-1953 – Korean War [in progress]
- 1964-1973 – Vietnam War
- 1980s – Central America wars
- From the Cold War to the “War on Terror” in the Greater Middle East
- 1991 – Persian Gulf War
- 2001-present – War in Afghanistan
- 2003-present – War in Iraq
- Genocide prevention, collective security, and human rights

Laura Secord, Canadian heroine of the War of 1812
Opposition to War: An Encyclopedia of U.S. Peace & Antiwar Movements: Call for Contributors

Dear Peace History Society Members:

I am making an additional request to solicit your participation in completing my current project, which is editing Opposition to War: An Encyclopedia of United States Peace and Antiwar Movements for ABC-CLIO.

About one-quarter of the entries remain unassigned, and I would like to include as many of these as possible in my final submission to the publisher. Information regarding this publication (such as available entries, essay length, guidelines, and compensation) is at http://www.uspeaceencyclopedia.com

If you are interested in participating, please contact me and identify which entries you would like to write. Also, please include a brief CV. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have either through email at hall1mk@cmich.edu, or by phone (989-774-3374). Please respond at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Mitch Hall, History Department
Central Michigan University
Editor: Opposition to War: An Encyclopedia of United States Peace and Antiwar Movements

Here are a few of the people, organizations, and topics still open for contributors for the encyclopedia, as of July 1, 2016:
Devere Allen; Norma Becker; Merle Curti; Dorothy Detzer; George F. Hoar; Meyer London; National Arbitration League (1882); National Council for Prevention of War (1922); Protest Against the Iraq War (Feb. 15, 2003); Student Strikes for Peace (1934, 1935, 1937, 1970); Fanny Garrison Villard; Win Without War (2002); World War I: Antiwar Movement.

The Person Behind the Name on the Prize: Scott L. Bills

By Robert Shaffer

The PHS is taking steps to establish a third academic prize, this one on peace history by an already established scholar. Discussions are underway as to the person for whom this new prize will be named. It is, therefore, appropriate to keep in mind the PHS leaders and scholars for whom the existing prizes are named. PHS News briefly profiled in the January 2016 issue Charles DeBenedetti, who died far too young at the age of 44 and in whose memory the biennial article prize is named. Here we provide some background on Scott L. Bills, the namesake for the prize given to recognize an outstanding first book of a peace history scholar.

Scott Bills was a prolific scholar of U.S. foreign relations, whose dissertation was published in 1990 as Empire and Cold War: The Roots of U.S.-Third World Antagonism, 1943-47. Lawrence Wittner in the American
Historical Review called it “a richly researched, well-argued book,” while Yale diplomatic historian Gaddis Smith summarized in Foreign Affairs Bills’s thesis: “Throughout much of the Third World the United States was the great disappointment, a barrier to self-determination. Therein lay the roots of lasting anti-Americanism.”

Bills expanded one chapter of this study into his next monograph, published just five years later, on an understudied area where colonialism and nationalism intersected with the Cold War: The Libyan Arena: The United States, Britain, and the Council of Foreign Ministers, 1945-1948. In this case, the Soviet Union favored the restoration of Italian rule over its former Libyan colony more than the U.S. did, as the Soviets hoped that such a stance would improve the Communist electoral prospects in Italy while American leaders feared that a Communist Italian government might open North Africa to the Soviet military. While reviewers chided Bills for his dry prose and for inadequately exploring Libyan nationalism, but they appreciated his careful delineation of the issues and his explanation of seemingly paradoxical stances by the major powers.

But Bills had published a major book even before these diplomatic histories, a well-received book that was and is of direct relevance to peace and antiwar history in general and to Bills’s personal experiences in particular: Kent State/May 4: Echoes Through a Decade (Kent State University Press, 1982). Bills compiled dozens of accounts of the 1970 killings at Kent State, with the focus not so much on the events themselves but on how participants and observers from a multiplicity of viewpoints made sense of them. So it was a book on the important issue of historical memory. Bills also contributed a 60-page introduction, in which he asserted, “The events of May 4, 1970, more than any other single moment—fairly or unfairly—have come to epitomize the heights of societal strife engineered by U.S. involvement in the Vietnam conflict. The response to the shootings well portrayed the generational polarization characteristic of the period.”
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Bills accompanied this impressive publication record with an equally impressive record of teaching, rising quickly at Stephen F. Austin State University, where he taught from 1983 until 2001, to become a full professor and then earning a named chair. It was in Texas that Bills became a major figure in the Peace History Society, co-editing *Peace & Change* from 1994 to 1997, then serving as vice president, and finally, from 1999 until 2001 as president.

Scott Bills then decided to devote his teaching more fully to issues of war and peace, moving from Texas to western North Carolina in 2001 to begin a Peace Studies program at Warren Wilson College. However, Bills died suddenly in October 2001 at age 52, just months after arriving at his new post – a loss felt by his family, by Warren Wilson College, by his colleagues in the Peace History Society, and by the historical profession in general.

The Scott L. Bills Memorial Prize, whose most recent recipient was Gearóid Barry for *The Disarmament of Hatred: Marc Sangnier, French Catholicism and the Legacy of the First World War, 1914-45*, is certainly a fitting way to honor the memory of this peace activist and scholar, whose ability to contribute more in both realms was cut tragically short by his premature death.

(More information on Scott Bills appeared in *PHS News*, Spring 2002, at www.peacehistorysociety.org. E. Timothy Smith, a graduate school colleague and also a longtime PHS member, wrote that tribute to his friend, who died while serving as PHS president. Lawrence S. Kaplan’s tribute to Bills appeared in *AHA Perspectives*, February 2002.)

---

**Peace Activism and Civil Rights: Reinforcing the Connections**

*By Robert Shaffer*

At the April 2015 OAH panel on peace activism in the early Cold War years, described elsewhere in this issue, Robbie Lieberman of Kennesaw State University lamented that too often the peace activism of progressives is overlooked by historians, who categorize such people too narrowly as simply “civil rights activists” or “feminists,” to give two examples. Lieberman discussed several writers who crossed issue boundaries in the period under consideration.

Since hearing her presentation, I have become more attuned to these connections and to the fact that Lieberman was correct in pointing out how they are sometimes ignored. Three examples that I came across this spring and summer bear out her analysis, though none was written by an academic historian.

The *New York Times* on May 9, 2016 carried an obituary of James Haughton, a longtime advocate in Harlem for the integration of the building trades and their unions, who died at...

---

**Jim Haughton (1928-2016)**
the age of 86. The respectful account, by Sam Roberts – a fine reporter – quoted several experts on New York City government and labor who described Haughton’s achievements in this area, which of course deserved the lion’s share of the obituary. But I remembered working with Haughton in the 1980s on other progressive campaigns, and Vincent Intondi, in African Americans Against the Bomb (2015), shows that Haughton was among the important organizers in the Black community of the historic June 12, 1982 Nuclear Freeze rally in Central Park. As I wrote in a letter to the Times (which was not published), “Haughton’s career – like that of Martin Luther King, another civil rights leader who was also a peace movement leader – shows that progressive activists often bridged seemingly diverse causes. Pigeon-holing such leaders into one box alone does not do justice to the breadth of their vision.”

Perhaps more striking were the opening lines to an article in the May-June 2016 Social Education, the journal of the National Council for the Social Studies, on using with secondary students Rep. John Lewis’s graphic memoir, The March, of his experiences in SNCC. The authors noted that Lewis remembered the impact that a comic book, Martin Luther King and the Montgomery Story, issued in 1957 by the Fellowship of Reconciliation, had on African American students in the South. So far, so good. But the authors labeled FOR simply “a civil rights organization,” erasing the origins of the group in opposition to World War I and thereby overlooking completely the impact of the peace movement in helping to jumpstart the 1950s civil rights movement. FOR, of course, helped popularize Gandhian nonviolence as a template for strategy in the U.S., and FOR leader Bayard Rustin advised King.

Once again I responded by writing a letter to the editor, and this one will probably be printed. I wrote, in part: “Textbooks and teachers tend to mention American pacifism only in very specific contexts: during World War I and the Vietnam War, and perhaps during the ‘isolationist’ 1930s and in the ‘nuclear freeze’ movement of the 1980s. But scratching the surface finds such activism and ideals in other times and places, and we should take the opportunity when such an instance arises to broaden our students’ understanding rather than to keep a tight lid on familiar, but too narrow, categories.”

And then there appeared this offhanded comment in Time’s July 11, 2016 “Celebrate America” issue, on p. 95, under the heading, “A Genius Still Inspires Greatness,” about Albert Einstein. In his one-paragraph description of “the smartest man who ever lived,” staff writer Jeffrey Kluger notes Einstein’s involvement in “social and political causes, especially civil rights.” One does not wish to counterpose peace and civil rights, but any historically accurate depiction of Einstein would recognize that he devoted far more attention to peace and disarmament issues and organizations.

PHS members should be alert to other examples of this phenomenon, and respond appropriately – including in the pages of this newsletter! – to ensure that peace activism and peace sentiment receive their due in the historical record.
Losing Two Giants of the Peace Movement: Daniel Berrigan and Muhammad Ali

Two towering – but very different – figures from the movement against the Vietnam War died this spring: Catholic pacifist priest Daniel Berrigan and Black Muslim boxer Muhammad Ali. *PHS News* cannot replicate the many obituaries, eulogies, and tributes to both men, but we did want to mark their passing with some indication of their significance. David Schalk sent in some recollections of his friendship and correspondence with Berrigan, along with a poem that Dan sent him about the U.S. Catholic Bishops’ response to the war in Afghanistan. Seth Kershner submitted excerpts from an interview by Lee Lockwood with Berrigan. Robert Shaffer added a section from Dan’s introduction to his brother Phil’s *Prison Journals of a Priest Revolutionary*.

Memorial tribute to Daniel Berrigan, S.J., 1921-2016

By David Schalk
Professor Emeritus of History
Vassar College

I loved Daniel Berrigan. I once had the honor of "being" him – the year was 1971 – in a reading at Vassar of *The Trial of the Catonsville 9*. I, and I believe the audience, as well, were profoundly moved when I read his testimony. I could probably still cite some of his exchanges with Judge Roszel Thomsen (1900-1992). (The actual trial took place October 5-9, 1968. The burning of the draft files with homemade napalm, outside Draft Board 33 in Catonsville, Maryland, was on May 17, 1968.)

But we didn’t meet until Daniel read a review of my *War and the Ivory Tower* (Oxford University Press, 1991), in the *Catholic Worker*, and wrote me a wonderful, blistering, letter, dated February 7, 1992. He deservedly took me to task for not mentioning the Plowshares Movement. I quote him: "For the record, in the Plowshares movement alone, since our first foray in 1980, there have been some thirty actions, in the US, England, Holland, Germany, Australia. All have been nonviolent. All the American actions (save one, charges dropped inexplicably), have resulted in the most savage sentences of my lifetime – everything short of death row."

A former student of mine, who lives in Baltimore, sent me Judge Thomsen’s obituary – he clearly was much respected, and even loved. The memory of the Catonsville case was always with the judge, however, and he viewed it as the most important trial of his career. I wrote Daniel on April 14, 1992 and informed him of the judge’s memories. Daniel replied just a few days later, and included an excerpt from a letter that Philip Berrigan wrote him:
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days later, on April 24, 1992, writing, "It was touching to have news of Judge Thomasen's death. He was a good man (one can say this rarely) in a bad job. But to him I owe two years of intense exposure to the 'other America,' rarely at the disposal of clerics, the federal penal system."

Daniel and I corresponded a lot between 1992 and 2010 – the last letter I have from him is dated March 10 of that year. I have a big file. It includes poems he sent me, such as one entitled "a poem on learning that my beloved brother Philip, is ill with cancer." And much more. Philip died in 2002.

There are so many stories I could tell. Daniel came to St. Luke's Roosevelt Hospital in 1996, when my late wife was being treated for breast cancer. If my memory is correct, he forgot to eat lunch, and we were able to get him a sandwich.

Given the link with Peace History let me tell this one.

Both Daniel and Phil, until Phil became ill, along with somewhere between one and two hundred peace activists, would march periodically from the Isaiah Wall opposite the United Nations, to the military recruiting station in Times Square, where they picketed, lay down, blocked the entrances, and got arrested. It was a "familiar route." Twenty-nine people, including Daniel, were arrested for disorderly conduct on December 6, 2004, as described in a New York Times story by David Gonzalez, "Giving Up Lives of Comfort for a Chance to Serve" (Dec. 14, 20014).

A year earlier, October 5, 2003, Daniel wrote to me: "On what would have been Philip’s 80th birthday, 29 were arrested at the USS Intrepid, a war museum polluting the noble Hudson River. We carried images and words of Philip." (I think the fact that the same number of people were arrested on both occasions was simply coincidental.)

Fairly often Daniel and I would have a simple luncheon in a little restaurant he enjoyed, near his apartment on West 98th Street. One time I saw red marks on his wrists, which worried me, and he commented on them.

"Don't worry - they are from handcuffs. They will disappear in a few days." About a year later we had another lunch and he proudly told me that he had been arrested again. This time a very large policeman, a big bruiser, asked him how old he was. I think, if my memory is good, he said 83, which would mean we are in 2004, but it was perhaps a later arrest.

The policeman said in a very loud voice: "No cuffs on this guy!"

But he may have been arrested again, for all I know.

Peace.
Daniel Berrigan wrote this poem in November 2001, in response to the U.S. Catholic bishops’ response to the war being launched in Afghanistan. He sent this page to David Schalk, with marginal notes about France and about Elie Wiesel. The poem appears in Berrigan’s Testimony: The Word Made Flesh (Orbis, 2004).

"It seems to me that a society such as this, bent on consuming and on producing for more consumption, ultimately ends up by consuming lives. It is for this reason that I see war as the inevitable other end of the consumer process. In order to justify and protect the game and allow it to expand into new areas of technology, war is inevitable. Because other people stand in the way, other people challenge us with other visions of reality, other ways of arranging human life, and this cannot be borne by the masters. So the death count, the body count, becomes the other end of the money count." (p. 74)

Submitted by Seth Kershner
(Kershner is co-author, with Scott Harding, of *Counter-Recruitment and the Campaign to Demilitarize Public Schools* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2015)

---

**Daniel Berrigan, “The Breaking of Men and the Breaking of Bread”**

Daniel Berrigan in the autumn of 1969 wrote the introduction to *Prison Journals of a Priest Revolutionary, by his brother Philip, published in 1970 by Holt, Rinehart, & Winston. These excerpts from that introduction focus on the challenge that the Berrigan brothers and their associates posed to the Catholic Church.*

On April 1, 1968, the trial of the “Baltimore Four” opened in the federal court of that city. David Eberhardt, Tom Lewis, Jim Mengel, and Phil Berrigan went on trial for pouring of blood on draft files in the Customs House in October of the previous year…

The night before the trial opened, President Johnson ordered his bombers home; no more forays over North Viet Nam. I remember how we received the news – as men who were accustomed only to bad news, suddenly and unexpectedly granted a breakthrough. It was as though we had surfaced with bursting lungs after a long and dangerous submersion…The President had stopped the bombing. Could Americans make it after all, racist and bellicose as we were?

Alas, alas. Johnson stalked off, a sullen marauder, recouping his losses as best he might. Kennedy died, McCarthy faded, Nixon came on; last year’s Halloween was this year’s political charade. The war goes on…

And what of the impact of the war upon the Church? Officially speaking, in the Catholic instance, the sacred power has quite simply followed the secular, its sedulous ape. Bishops have blessed the war, in word and in silence. They have supplied chaplains to the military as usual and have kept their eyes studiously averted from related questions – ROTC on Catholic campuses, military installations, diocesan investments.

And yet, in a quite astounding way, the war has shaken the church. Indeed, for the first time in the history of the American church,
warfare has emerged as a question worthy of attention. A number of priests are in trouble on this deadly serious and secular issue. Consciences are shaken, the law of the land is being broken.

The good old definition of church renewal (everything in its place, children seen and not heard, virtue its own reward, a stitch in time, a bird in the hand, render unto Caesar) is shattered. The hope for strong, open, affectionate relationships between bishops and communities is dissipated. The war has deepened and widened the chasm; the bishops spoke too late and acted not at all. So the war, along with questions like birth control…, has made less and less credible official claims to superior wisdom and access to the divine will…

And yet, something else has happened. Since Catonsville, more hands than ours have stretched out, to block the brute gravity of that boulder. The Boston Two, the Milwaukee Fourteen, the D.C. Nine, the Pasadena Three, the Silver Springs Three, the Chicago Fifteen, the Women Against Daddy Warbucks, the New York Eight, the Boston Eight, the East Coast Conspiracy to Save Lives…

If there is one feature common to all the draft-file attacks, it is that they were invariably planned, and in major part executed, by Catholics. The fact is all the more remarkable, in face of the official stance of the church; in face also of the dissolution of the Left, broken by the repeated blows of national policy and factional despair. The Catholic community, that sturdy and well-fashioned hawk’s nest, has suffered an invasion of doves, against all expectation, against nature and (they say) grace, a cross-breeding has followed…

Maybe there was something to this Catholic tradition after all! We used to joke about it, in jail or out, reading our New Testament, breaking the Eucharist, battling to keep our perspective and good humor, trying with all our might to do something quite simple – to keep from going insane…

Muhammad Ali, 1942-2016: Why he refused induction

Boxing champion Muhammad Ali made his mark as a peace activist by refusing induction in the U.S. Army in 1967, during the Vietnam War. While many may find it difficult to reconcile the idea of a boxer as a champion of peace, Ali placed his opposition to the war in Vietnam in the context of the long history of American racism. His 1967 statement in his hometown of Louisville, Kentucky at a rally against housing discrimination summarized his argument:

Why should they ask me to put on a uniform and go 10,000 miles from home and drop bombs and bullets on Brown people in Vietnam while so-called Negro people in Louisville are treated like dogs and denied simple human rights? No, I’m not going 10,000 miles from home to help murder and burn another poor nation…

Muhammad Ali after refusing induction in the U.S. Army, April 1967
simply to continue the domination of white slave masters of the darker people the world over. This is the day when such evils must come to an end.

I have been warned that to take such a stand would cost me millions of dollars. But I have said it once and I will say it again. The real enemy of my people is here. I will not disgrace my religion, my people or myself by becoming a tool to enslave those who are fighting for their own justice, freedom and equality.

If I thought the war was going to bring freedom and equality to 22 million of my people they wouldn’t have to draft me, I’d join tomorrow. I have nothing to lose by standing up for my beliefs. So I’ll go to jail – so what? We’ve been in jail for 400 years.

(Ali did not, in fact, go to jail. He remained free while his case was on appeal, and the U.S. Supreme Court, in Cassius Clay v. United States [1971], overturned his earlier conviction for draft evasion, on the narrow grounds that the lower court did not specify its basis for denial of conscientious objector status for Ali.


Of course, Ali did suffer financial losses and he was stripped for several years of his heavyweight championship title.)

“I Just Wanted to Be Free’: The Radical Reverberations of Muhammad Ali’
By Dave Zirin
(Of the many tributes to Ali, the editor thought excerpts from this one would be of particular interest to PHS News readers. For the full essay, see the URL below.)

The reverberations. Not the rumbles,...it’s the reverberations that we have to understand in order to see Muhammad Ali as what he remains: the most important athlete to ever live. It’s the reverberations that are our best defense against real-time efforts to pull out his political teeth and turn him into a harmless icon suitable for mass consumption.

When Dr. Martin Luther King came out against the war in Vietnam in 1967, he was criticized by the mainstream press and his own advisors... But Dr. King forged ahead and to justify his new stand, said publicly, “Like Muhammad Ali puts it, we are all – black and brown and poor – victims of the same system of oppression.”

When Nelson Mandela was imprisoned on Robben Island, he said that Muhammad Ali gave him hope that the walls would some day come tumbling down. When John Carlos and Tommie Smith raised their fists on the medal stand in Mexico City, one of their demands was to “Restore Muhammad Ali’s title”...

When Billie Jean King was aiming to win equal rights for women in sports, Muhammad Ali would say to her, “Billie Jean King! YOU ARE THE QUEEN!” She said that this made her feel brave in her own skin.

The question is why...was he able to create this kind of radical ripple? The short answer is that he stood up to the United States government – and emerged victorious. But it’s also more complicated than that. What Muhammad Ali did...was redefine what it meant to be tough and collectivize the very idea of courage...


From [http://tomhayden.com](http://tomhayden.com) April 21, 2016

Rep. Barbara Lee (Dem.-Calif.) has introduced a House Resolution (H.Res.695) recognizing the Vietnam anti-war movement as, “one of the largest and most prolonged efforts to achieve peace and justice in recent generations and was critical to bringing an end to the war.” Rep. John Conyers became a co-sponsor as an effort begins to seek endorsements from other congressional representatives.

The Lee resolution is a direct result of the May 1-2, 2015 commemoration of the movement at a conference in Washington DC. The peace resolution will draw the ire of Republicans and reluctance of some Democrats. The Vietnam peace movement is the only Sixties movement that has been marginalized instead of memorialized. Yet it was a life-changing experience for many during the war, including thousands of soldiers and veterans, and the US government has tried to stamp out what they call “the Vietnam Syndrome.”

The Lee Resolution is an organizing tool for anyone wanting to respond to the Pentagon’s recent false narrative of history on its website. If grass-roots organizers visit, engage and petition their congressional offices, there is a strong chance for reinvigorating the continuing debate over Vietnam.

**Text of Rep. Lee’s Resolution:**

```
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Ms. LEE submitted the following resolution:
Recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam War,

Whereas the Vietnam War began on 1964 and ended in 1975;
Whereas more than 58,000 United States citizens were killed, approximately 10,786 were wounded, and 75,000 veterans left seriously disabled;
Whereas it is estimated that more than 1,500,000 people from Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia died as a result of the War, and many more were wounded or displaced;
Whereas thousands of people continue to suffer from the lethal effects of exposure to Agent Orange and unexploded ordnance;
Whereas the movement to end the Vietnam War was one of the largest and most prolonged efforts to achieve peace and justice in recent generations and was critical to bringing an end to the War;
Whereas the movement to end the Vietnam War was broad and included students, professors, workers, draft resisters, United States service members and veterans, musicians and artists, candidates for Congress and the presidency, and mobilized a majority in opposition to the Vietnam war;
Whereas the movement generated the largest protests, moratorium actions, and mobilizations in United States history, including a strike of 4,000,000 students from across the Nation following the United States invasion of Cambodia in 1970, multiple acts of protest and resistance on military bases and ships around the world, and the rise of Vietnam Veterans Against the War;
Whereas United States expenditures on the Vietnam War impacted domestic resources, including for President Lyndon B. Johnson’s War on Poverty;
```

---

Whereas the 1970 blue-ribbon Scranton Report on campus unrest in the United States recognized the growing opposition to the Vietnam War by stating that, “The crisis on American campuses has no parallel in the history of this nation. This crisis has roots in divisions of American society as deep as any since the Civil War. If this trend continues, if this crisis of understanding endures, the very survival of the nation will be threatened”;

Whereas Vietnam peace memorials have been erected at Kent State University in Ohio, the steps of Sproul Hall at the University of California, and the peace memorial adjacent to the RAND Corporation in Santa Monica, California;

And Whereas peace and reconciliation research programs were widely incorporated in high school and university classrooms after the Vietnam War era: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—
(1) Commemorates the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam War;
(2) Recognizes that the movement to end the Vietnam War was one of the largest and most prolonged efforts to achieve peace and justice in recent generations and was critical to bringing an end to the War;
(3) Acknowledges the role of those who participated in public protests, teach-ins, and opposition to the War, and the many people who supported political candidates of both parties who sought to end the War;
(4) Applauds the establishment of educational programs at colleges and universities across the United States that are focused on conflict transformation and peace building; and
(5) Urges continued efforts during this 50th anniversary period to reflect on the lessons learned from the Vietnam War and to recommit to sustained diplomacy that prevents conflict.

http://tomhayden.com also reported that the LBJ Presidential Library in Austin held a “Vietnam War summit” on April 26-28, 2016, with keynote addresses by Henry Kissinger and John Kerry, and a panel on “The War at Home” with Marilyn Young, David Maraniss, and Hayden himself.

Harriet Alonso, “Jane Addams, Hull House, and the Devil Baby”

Harriet Alonso (Professor Emerita, City College of New York) has posted a new article on http://harrietalonso.com titled, “Jane Addams, Hull House, and the Devil Baby.” Although it is not directly about the peace movement, it illustrates one more step Addams took in order to foster understanding, conflict resolution, and world peace – which should be of interest to PHS members. Harriet wrote this piece with undergraduate and possibly high school student learners in mind.

In the autumn of 1913, thousands of people visited Hull House demanding to see the Devil Baby they were convinced Addams was hiding there. The settlement house workers had no luck convincing people that the baby was a myth built out of superstition. Addams wrote several articles about the incident, which Harriet examines, in each explaining how the Devil Baby connected with the lives of the community, especially older women. In her analysis Harriet then delves into the world of Chicagoans during the 1913 episode (by reading every issue of the Chicago Tribune for ten weeks) to identify specific happenings in the city that could have produced such great tension that a Devil Baby hysteria seemed a logical outcome. Harriet also provides suggestions for class discussion and projects for a broader understanding of the incident.

Jane Addams’s ultimate goal was to understand people, get them to understand each other (not necessarily in a personal sense, but certainly in a cultural one), and then create ways which would help them to handle conflict through knowledge.

Harriet would very much like to hear from anyone who adopts this piece for classroom use and urges readers to respond in the space provided on her website.

There are two other articles on http://harrietalonso.com: one introduces the U.S. feminist peace movement up to the 1920s, and the other combines thoughts on the process of writing biography while telling the story of William Lloyd Garrison’s mother, an abandoned wife and mother of the early nineteenth century.
Conference Reports

Resistance to War, 1914-1924
18-20 March 2016, Leeds, U.K.

By Marie-Michèle Doucet
(Université de Montréal)

This past March, Ingrid Sharp (University of Leeds) organized an international conference titled “Resistance to War, 1914-1924” at her university and at the Leeds City Museum. Organized as part of The Legacy of War Centenary Project, this conference brought together scholars from across the United Kingdom and from more than eleven nations.

Over the course of three days, participants discussed different aspects of resistance during and following the First World War, from cultural representation of pacifism to the different motivations (ideological, feminist, political, religious) for opposing war. The three keynote lectures were given by Sarah Hudspith (University of Leeds) who presented on Leo Tolstoy’s vision of peace, June Hannam (University of West England) who spoke about Leeds’s very own peace activist Isabella Ford, and Benjamin Ziemann (University of Sheffield) who presented on resistance to war in Germany.

Renowned historian Sandi Cooper (College of Staten Island and CUNY Graduate Center) presented “Feminism Fractured: World War I as Watershed,” while Barbara Winslow (Brooklyn College), talked about Sylvia Pankhurst’s activism again the British government’s World War One campaign. In conjunction with the conference, Tammy Proctor (Utah State University) offered a public seminar on “An English Governess in Occupied Brussels (1916-1919): Resistance and Nationalism.” Proctor also presented a paper at the conference on American neutrality and resistance in occupied Belgium.

My own paper, titled “Disarmament of Hatred through Children’s Literature: Madeleine Vernet’s Tales of Peace and Reconciliation,” focused on this member of the most radical branch of the women’s peace movement in France, and on Vernet’s use of children’s literature as a way to disarm children’s minds. Using two children’s books Vernet wrote in the early 1930s and her children’s tales published in La Mère Éducatrice in the 1920s, I argued that while using a colourful language accessible to children, her stories were far from being politically neutral. Not only did Vernet present a moral lesson – often on the theme of reconciliation – but she also took strong and sometimes controversial positions on many important debates of the time.

In addition to the Conference, participants were invited to a very interesting one-day event titled Conscientious Objection and Resistance to the First World War. This event gathered over a hundred people, many of whom were from local history and community groups. Speakers included Cyril Pearce, Julian Putkowski, Lois Bibbing and Martin Crick, then and concluded with a performance called “Out of Silence” by Simon Heywood. Overall, these three days fostered stimulating discussions and rich intellectual exchanges.

Abstracts of papers presented are at www.leeds.ac.uk/arts/info/125259/conference_resistance_to_war_1914_1924/2688/abstracts
War, Peace & International Order?
The Legacies of the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907
University of Auckland, New Zealand, April 19, 2016
By Mike Clinton
Gwynedd Mercy University

Scholars from around the world gathered at the University of Auckland on April 19 to share their research on the peace conferences held at The Hague in 1899 and 1907 that continue to influence international law and organization today. The Faculty of Arts at the University of Auckland and the New Zealand Centre for Human Rights Law, Policy and Practice hosted the event. Maartje Abbenhuis, Associate Professor in Modern European History at the University of Auckland, along with graduate students Chris Barber, Annalise Higgins, and Thomas Munro, organized the one-day conference, which featured five panels, totaling fifteen presenters, plus keynote presentations and a final recap session. Routledge will publish several of the papers from the conference in a volume due to appear in early 2017.

Rosslyn Noonan, Visiting Fellow at The New Zealand Centre for Human Rights Law, Policy and Practice and former Chief Commissioner for the New Zealand Human Rights Commission, welcomed the participants in the morning by reciting a Maori blessing that nicely set the tone and suited the geographic context of the proceedings:

\textit{Kia hora te marino  
Kia whakapapa pou namu te moana  
Kia tere te kārohirohi I mua I tōu huarahi}

(May the calm be widespread  
May the sea glisten as greenstone  
May the shimmer of light ever dance across your pathway.)

William Mulligan, of University College Dublin and author of \textit{The Great War for Peace (Yale University Press, 2014)}, followed this introduction with the first keynote presentation. Titled “Justifying International Action: International Law and Diplomacy before 1914,” it touched upon several themes reprised in various presentations throughout the day. Mulligan asserted that a complex normative environment that combined power politics and international law emerged during the 1870s, with diplomats regularly framing foreign policy actions in terms of international law by the time the first Hague Conference met. He observed that the function of international law in diplomacy became increasingly unstable during the first decade of the twentieth century, and shared understandings of international law among diplomats fragmented.

The first panel scheduled for the day focused on “The Culture of The Hague Law.” Robert A. Nye, emeritus Professor of History and Humanities at Oregon State University, examined the intersection of the culture of dueling known among the elite gentlemen-diplomats assembled at The Hague and its application to the emergent international law on war. Marco Duranti, Lecturer in Modern European and International History at the University of Sydney, deconstructed the architectural design and décor of The Hague Peace Palace, in his presentation titled “The Hague Peace Palace and the Romance of Fin-de-Siècle International Law.” A master’s student at the University of Auckland, Annalise Higgins, gave the final presentation of the session, as she...
reconsidered W.T. Stead’s role in the 1899 British public peace petitioning movement. She contends that Stead’s highly publicized “International Crusade for Peace” has received proportionally more attention by historians than it deserves, with the result that many hundreds of other petitions signed by Britons, along with pursued by the League of Nations following the First World War. He challenged the prevailing historiographical view and argued for regarding it as another era in which policymakers sought to embed elements of flexibility and restraint into the international system. In another paper that questioned the historiographical tendency to dismiss the Hague Conferences’ achievements—or perceived lack of achievements—towards disarmament, Marion Girard Dorsey, of the University of New Hampshire and author of A Strange and Formidable Weapon: British Responses to World War I Poison Gas (University of Nebraska Press, 2008), asserted that the Hague Conventions pertaining to chemical weaponry had enduring influence as “proactive efforts to incorporate cutting edge science into diplomacy, an approach later followed with other weapons.”

The third concurrent session held during the morning considered “Neutrality and Neutralism” through the lens of The Hague Conferences. Yolanda Gamarra, of the University of Zaragoza in Spain, discussed the influence of the Third Convention of the 1907 conference on Article 6 of the Spanish Constitution of 1931 that renounced war “as an instrument of general policy.” Marta Stachurska-Kounta, a doctoral student at the University of Oslo, Norway, explained how the experience of The Hague conferences influenced Norway’s legalistic approach towards the new international system as it emerged after the First

Bertha von Suttner, who later received the Nobel Peace Prize, was among the activists who worked to convene the 1899 Hague conference, and the only woman invited to attend the actions promoting and organizing support for the Conference led by the Peace Society and other existing peace groups, have been overlooked.

The first Hague Conference was convened following an appeal by Tsar Nicholas II, who pointed specifically to the dangers posed by the escalating arms race. Appropriately enough, then, another session considered “Arms and Warfare” as a central concern of the conferences. Neville Wylie, professor of international political history and associate pro vice chancellor at the University of Nottingham, analyzed steps taken at the two conferences to update and apply the Geneva conventions to maritime conflicts and the legacy that this difficult process had for subsequent attempts to apply “Geneva principles” to such disputes. Andrew Webster, Senior Lecturer in Modern European History at Murdoch University in Perth, Australia, linked the Hague Conferences’ efforts in the area of disarmament to those
World War. Alison Fletcher, Associate Professor of History at Juniata College in Pennsylvania, traced the engagement of the International Council of Women with the conferences in 1899 and 1907. She critiqued the disparaging characterization by the press of the ICW’s deputation to the 1907 conference as a “peace comedy” and related women’s activism in connection to the two conferences to the Women’s Peace Congress that met at The Hague in 1915.

The afternoon began with a second keynote session, with Randall Lesaffer of Tilburg University in the Netherlands and the University of Leuven in Belgium speaking on the topic “Peace through Law: The Hague Peace Conferences and the Rise of the jure contra bellum.” In a tour de force presentation that displayed his legal and historical expertise, Lesaffer questioned the narrative depicting the movement in support of arbitration and other judicial paths to peace that occurred between the first Hague Peace Conference and the First World War as a movement away from international use of force law and collective security. He contended, instead, that steps taken to restrict the use of force occurred not in a judicial vacuum and could only be understood correctly when read against the backdrop of existing use of force law. Lesaffer additionally remarked favorably on the recent trend towards collaboration among legal scholars and historians.

The final two concurrent sessions of the day were held during the afternoon, with the fourth session organized broadly around “The Hague’s Legacies.” Sarah Gendron, Associate Professor of Francophone and Genocide Studies at Marquette University, considered the legacy of the Hague Conventions as the first codification of rape as an international criminal offense. In her paper titled “‘Femininigenocide’: Or the Effacement of Women in War,” Gendron examined the legal and political narratives surrounding the treatment of women in international conflict since then to demonstrate the fundamental bond between the evolution of legal language and that of social change. Matthias Packeiser, a Ph.D. student at the University of Hamburg and Tilburg University, followed with a presentation titled “Adjudication in International Law—A Legacy of The Hague?” that focused on the influence of the Second Hague Peace Conference on the development of international justice in such forums as the 1907 Washington Conference, the 1908 London Conference, and the 1910 Four-Power Conference and Permanent Court of International Justice created in 1922. Another doctoral candidate, Thomas Munro of the University of Auckland, referred to newspaper coverage in Great Britain and the United States during August and September 1914 to show how The Hague conferences had become an important framework for citizens in those countries as they sought to understand and assess belligerent states’ treatment of civilians in occupied territories, their access to neutral
communication networks, and their deployment of submarines and aircraft.

My contribution to the conference came during the session devoted to examining “Political Affairs at The Hague.” I traced the expansion of the peace movement in France during the decade following the 1899 conference, the elements of a distinctively French perspective within the transnational peace movement, and the peace movement’s growing legitimacy in French politics and society during the fifteen years preceding the First World War. Alan M. Anderson made his own presentation only weeks after the successful oral defense of his Ph.D. thesis in the Department of War Studies at King’s College London. He advanced a revisionist assessment of the views of Vice Admiral Sir John Fisher, Great Britain’s technical naval delegate at the 1899 Conference, suggesting that Fisher took the implications of the laws of naval warfare more seriously than previous accounts had acknowledged. Andrei Mamolea, a Ph.D. candidate at the Graduate Institute for International and Development Studies in Geneva, sorted out “myth and reality” as it related to conventional depictions of the exceptional commitment of the United States to “the Hague tradition.” He argued stridently that the primary objectives of the U.S. at each conference was, in 1899, to make a favorable impression for the upcoming 1900 election while preserving U.S. freedom of action and, in 1907, to disrupt Latin American proposals for a prohibition on the use of force and equitable representation on the international prize court.

The perpetuation of the myth of U.S. legalism, Mamolea asserts, continues to be used to give cover for U.S. unilateralism today.

The day ended with a recap of the sessions by Maartje Abbenhuis, Neville Wylie, and Glenda Sluga, Professor of International History and Australian Research Council Laureate Fellow at the University of Sydney. Abbenhuis explained that the conference itself grew out of a Royal Society of New Zealand Marsden Grant for a project titled “A Global History of The Hague Peace Conferences, 1898-1915.” She had originally expected to hold a workshop with perhaps a half dozen participants, but those plans changed when over 50 submissions arrived in response to the call for proposals, quite a testament to the interest that has emerged around the topic. Abbenhuis herself is writing a monograph with the working title For the Peace of the World? A Global History of The Hague Conferences, 1898-1915, and the Marsden fund is supporting the work of two of the graduate students who helped organize the conference, Annalise Higgins and Thomas Munro.

With Abbenhuis and her students producing important work on the legacy of The Hague Conferences and prompting scholars from around the world to share their own, we may soon be welcoming even more members to PHS and more contributors to Peace & Change from New Zealand and elsewhere.
From the Archives

PHS News readers are encouraged to submit brief primary source accounts they have come across in their research that will advance our understanding of peace history. These may be sources that could not be fully quoted in your publications, or that ended up on the cutting room floor (as they used to say) when editing a publication to meet space requirements. Send items, transcribed to MS-Word and with full source citations, to editor Robert Shaffer at roshaf@ship.edu.

A Kansas Baptist minister on the Korean War, March 1953
(Submitted by Robert Shaffer)

R.J. Wynne, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Hays, Kansas, was the author of one of the twenty-three letters to the editor in the Mar. 11, 1953 issue of The Christian Century (vol. 70, pp. 288-92) in the readers’ symposium, “What Shall We Do About Korea?” The editors gave Wynne’s letter the title, “Limit the War,” here reprinted, unchanged, in its entirety:

As a father of a drafted son now on the Pacific ocean on his way to combat duty in Korea, I should like to raise some questions about this Korean business. I have supported the United Nations and recognize that the North Koreans by military aggression violated the Charter of that organization, and the action of our government and others was in fulfillment of international obligations. For that reason the United States Constitution was bypassed by Pres. Truman and Congress has never been asked to declare a Korean war.

The questions arises, Is this any longer really a United Nations project? In matters pertaining to Korea our American leaders have usually either dominated or ignored the United Nations. Such allies as we have had have not given adequate cooperation, and some have simply gone along out of loyalty to us or the United Nations, or because of the influence of the U.S. treasury. And now Pres. Eisenhower’s action in encouraging the Nationalists on Formosa under the defeated and discredited Chiang Kai-shek to renew the Chinese civil war makes this still more an American war against the North Koreans and their Chinese and Russian allies. Mr. Eisenhower did not consult either Congress or the United Nations about this important international action. In view of the profound opposition of our European friends to the action regarding Formosa, we shall probably find ourselves going it very much alone in the two Asiatic wars we shall now be promoting. Somebody might have asked Mr. Eisenhower about giving Congress a chance to vote on these wars.

Whatever hopes the American people in general had concerning Eisenhower and Korea, they did not expect him to enlarge the war in Asia, and he had no mandate of that sort in the November election.

Emma Goldman Makes Her Antiwar Plea, 1918
(Submitted by Chuck Howlett, Molloy College)

When writing and editing Antiwar Dissent and Peace Activism in World War 1 America: A Documentary Reader (University of Nebraska Press, 2014) with Scott Bennett, we came across a number of documents which for varied reasons could not be included in the publication. This one is from Mother Earth Bulletin (vol. 1, Feb. 1918, p. 1), which we located at NYU’s Tamiment Library.

Emma Goldman was one of America’s leading anarchists, who blamed World War I on capitalists and the State. She made her opinions known through her editorship of the radical periodical Mother Earth, in which she sought to link her anarchist thought with American traditions of dissent. In 1917 the Federal government shut down her monthly magazine. She had strongly defended the Bolsheviks during the Communist Revolution. Because of her actions she was imprisoned under the Espionage Act. In a "Bulletin" for Mother Earth she made her impassioned plea that others pick up the cause and keep the magazine going. In December 1919, at the height of the Red Scare, she was deported to Russia, along with fellow
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anarchist Alexander Berkman and other alleged “communists,” on a ship dubbed The Soviet Ark. She soon became disillusioned with Bolshevik rule, and she later lived in Germany, Britain, Canada, France, and Spain. She was allowed to visit the U.S. on one occasion in the 1930s.

“On the Way to Golgatha”

Dear Faithful Friends:

How many have gone the way to Golgotha, and how many will yet have to go? Only Time, the Great Redeemer of all who are made to suffer for their ideals, can tell. Time hangs heavily on those who cherish great hope, but it moves with surprising swiftness and far beyond our fondest dreams.

Russia stands a glowing proof of that. In 1905 the Tsar’s troops drenched the streets of Petrograd and other cities with the blood of the Revolutionists. In 1917 the revolutionary troops, more humane than those who did the butchery, drove the Tsar out of Russia.

This thought came to my mind when I was being dashed up Fifth Avenue in a police patrol automobile to the Pennsylvania Station on Monday, February 5th.

The Avenue and streets were lined with a curious mob, awaiting the parade of the soldiers from Camp Upton. Like the soldiers of the Tsar before 1905 who saw in every revolutionist an enemy to their country, the American soldiers would have greeted me with scorn and jeers and at the command of their Tsar would have taken my life in the ignorant belief that they were saving their country from a dangerous enemy.

Will Time do for America what it has done for Russia? Will her soldiers some day make common cause with her people? Who can say what the future will bring?

The idealist may not be a prophet, but he nevertheless knows that the future will bring changes, and knowing he lives for the future he is given indefinite strength to support the present.

So I, too, Dear Friend, will be strengthened while in prison by the passionate belief in the future, by the hope that the two years taken out of my life may help to quicken the great events Time has in store for the human race. With that as my guiding star, confinement, convict’s clothes and the other indignities the guilty conscience of society heaps upon those it dares not face, mean no hardship.

You will want to help me while I am in prison, I know. You can do so in various ways. First, take care of my love child, Mother Earth Bulletin. I leave her to your sympathetic care. I know that you will look after her tenderly, so that I may find her bigger, stronger and more worth while when I return from Jefferson.

Secondly, spread my Boylsheviki [sic] pamphlet in tribute to their great courage and marvelous vision and for the enlightenment of the American people. Thirdly, join the League for the Amnesty of Political Prisoners which is working for the release of all Political Prisoners. And finally, write to Berkman and myself. Always address us as Political Prisoners. Always sign your full name.

Good-bye, dear friends, but not for long – if the spirit of the Boylsheviki prevails.

Long live the Boylsheviki! May their flames spread over the world and redeem humanity from its bondage!

Affectionately,

EMMA GOLDMAN
U.S. Political Prisoner
Jefferson Prison, Jefferson City, Mo.

Emma Goldman’s deportation photograph, 1919
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Deep Cuts: Decades-old Peace & Change articles worth another look

With the digitization of Peace & Change back issues by the Wiley Online Library, more prospective readers than ever have access to an almost complete run. Many college and university libraries that did not subscribe to the journal, 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 I have provided capsule summaries of two articles from the on-line library, one from four decades ago and one from almost a quarter-century ago. I encourage readers to 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


By Robert Shaffer

Blanche Wiesen Cook, a Peace History Society founder and long-time leader, provides a sweeping narrative of U.S. expansion based on the massacre of non-white peoples, from the Pequots and the Vietnamese in the title to Mexicans, Plains and California Indians, and Filipinos, among others. While many “peace historians” today focus on those who proffer alternatives to militarism, Cook, who is perhaps best known today for her two-volume path-breaking biography of Eleanor Roosevelt, reminds us of the importance of passionate and well-documented indictments of the military mindset. Of course, the date of the essay’s publication – 1975 – will indicate to today’s readers the impact of the Vietnam War on the development of critical voices in the U.S., including within the historical profession.

Much of the material in Cook’s essay will be familiar to readers of Howard Zinn’s A People’s History of the United States (published five years later), and some has been incorporated into college-level U.S. history survey textbooks. Yet there are two main reasons Cook’s treatment of the issues is still worth perusing by those investigating American warfare or preparing for classroom lectures and discussions. (And her voluminous footnotes, from both primary and secondary sources, will still prove valuable for teachers and researchers, although much has been added by historians since 1975.)

First, her rapid-fire (forgive the military metaphor) narrative and analysis of the events and rationalizations of racially-based massacres on behalf of U.S. territorial and economic expansion demonstrate real continuity in American actions that leave a powerful
impression on readers because of the quick juxtaposition of these atrocities repeated across the decades.

Second, Cook frames the essay around the principles and outcome of the Nuremberg and Tokyo trials, which American and other prosecutors claimed applied universally, not just to the German and Japanese defendants. The hypocrisy of American prosecutors is immediately apparent as Cook describes massacres of civilians, mistreatment and killing of prisoners, and other misdeeds throughout the course of U.S. expansion for which some Axis officers paid with their lives after World War II. Perhaps more importantly, Cook compares the Nazi rationalization that their Jewish and Slavic victims were sub-human with the consistent arguments by American military officers (and many political leaders) that their Indian, Mexican, Filipino, and Vietnamese victims were similarly outside the boundaries of civilization. As Cook states, “if the victim could be made to seem less than human – savage, nigger, or gook – then we justified the suspension of law and civility and extended our power and property by enslavement or conquest.”

Specialists still debate, of course, whether “genocide” is an appropriate category to apply to the military actions which accompanied U.S. expansion and aggression; Cook’s case for this term is not airtight. But her argument that what have often been characterized as “limited wars” by the U.S. military, policymakers, and historians have really been “total wars” is unassailable, in my view, and an important reminder. After describing the defoliation of Vietnamese cropland, Cook quotes Tacitus on the methods of the Roman empire: “To plunder, to slaughter, to steal, these things they misname empire; and where they make a desert, they call it peace.”

A few critics of these massacres appear in Cook’s essay, including Sen. George Hoar in relation to the Philippines and Sen. Gaylord Nelson regarding Vietnam. But her focus here is on American brutality and its ideological background.

For the past several years, since I discovered Blanche Wiesen Cook’s scorchingly critical survey of American massacres, I have re-read it each semester before I teach the U.S. history survey course, U.S. diplomatic history, or U.S. military history, and incorporated its comparative perspective and some of its quotations in my classes. I encourage PHS members and other historians to do the same.

Metta Spencer


By Robert Shaffer

I admit that I usually do not read very carefully the articles in Peace & Change by political scientists and sociologists. But in 1992 I was just starting to read the journal. After finding purely by chance in this issue an essay by an old friend of mine, I also noticed this piece, with an intriguingly paradoxical heading, about the then-just-concluded Persian Gulf War, an issue which had been one of the reasons I moved from teaching high school social studies to pursue a Ph.D, in history.
Metta Spencer is a Canadian sociologist who founded the Peace and Conflict Studies program at the University of Toronto, and she is an expert on what is now the former Soviet Union. In this essay she analyzed the puzzling phenomenon for some in the U.S. who were often considered doves to favor military action in that first war against Saddam Hussein, on the basis of “collective security” – global action, via the United Nations, to punish aggression. Conversely, Spencer identified some hawks – especially within the military itself – who were hesitant to go to war, for fear of the consequences to the military in the wake of the Vietnam War. She then explored a similar pattern in the Soviet Union, which was still in existence under President Mikhail Gorbachev. His followers, who generally favored disarmament and wished to reduce the power of the military, East and West, endorsed the war at the UN. Meanwhile Soviet hawks, especially Russian nationalists and military leaders, opposed the war because they believed it subordinated the Soviet Union to the U.S., and because of the long history of cooperation between the SU and Saddam’s Iraq. Spencer’s account is more complex than that, of course, and she attributes Gorbachev’s fall in part to the fact that he lost support of “hard-liners” over the Persian Gulf War while at the same time losing support from many reformers over internal issues relating to the use of force. But it is these complexities that make the essay so thought-provoking.

Spencer’s essay – published only a year after the events it described – is suggestive rather than definitive, and I would say the evidence she presents is more compelling in the Soviet case than in the American one. For example, the hesitancy of Colin Power, then-chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to go to war was probably more to get a commitment of what he saw as adequate resources rather than any commitment to being an “antiwar hawk.” And, like many social scientists, Spencer engages in what I see as an overly long disquisition over terminology – the “common security” (good) vs. “collective security” (bad) of the title.

But the commitment of both Gorbachev on the Soviet side and some liberal internationalists in the U.S. to global collective action against Iraqi aggression are phenomena that even committed peace activists and peace scholars must take seriously, as similar choices arose during World War II and the Korean War, as well. And it is here that Metta Spencer’s tentative exploration of this issue deserves continued consideration even a quarter of a century later. And perhaps it should lead me to read more carefully the current articles by her colleagues in the social sciences.

A 2010 book by Metta Spencer

For membership information for the Peace History Society, go to: www.peacehistorysociety.org

Membership includes a subscription to Peace & Change
News of Members (and Others)

Chuck Howlett's new book, *The American Peace and Justice Movement from the Early Twentieth Century to the Present*, was the feature story on the *Peace & Change* blog for April 2016, under the heading, "Writing a Twentieth Century American Peace History Textbook for Students." The book is an abridgement and revision of Chuck’s major survey, co-authored with Robbie Lieberman, *A History of the American Peace Movement from Colonial Times to the Present* (2008). Chuck officially retired from Molloy College in April 2016, although he will be teaching half time for one more year.

Louis Kriesberg (Maxwell Professor Emeritus of Social Conflict Studies at Syracuse University) has published *Realizing Peace: A Constructive Conflict Approach* (Oxford University Press, 2015). The book examines “major foreign conflict episodes in which the United States has been involved since the onset of the Cold War to analyze when American involvement in foreign conflicts has been relatively effective and beneficial, and when it has not.” Louis is also publishing in July 2016 (with Springer) an analysis of his life’s work, under the title *Louis Kriesberg: Pioneer in Peace and Constructive Conflict Resolution Studies*.

Jerry Lembcke (College of the Holy Cross) published an extensive bibliographic essay in the June 2016 issue of *Choice* of new works (published between 2010 and 2014) on the memory and commemoration of the Vietnam War. *Choice* is the monthly catalogue of book recommendations published by the American Library Association. The essay is on-line at: [http://www.cro3.org/content/53/10/1427.full.pdf](http://www.cro3.org/content/53/10/1427.full.pdf)


Harvey Strum (Sage College of Albany) has had two articles published: "'To Aid Their Unfortunate Coreligionists': Impact of World War I on the Jewish Community of Albany," *Hudson River Valley Review* 32.2 (Spring 2016), and "Divided by War," *New York State Archives* 15.2 (Fall 2015). He also presented two papers recently relating to war and peace: "New York and the End of Mr. Madison's War," Northeastern Political Science Association Conference, Philadelphia, November 2015, and "Zionism, Patriotism and Pogroms," New York State Political Science Association Conference, SUNY New Paltz, April 2016.

Peter van den Dungen (University of Bradford, U.K.) contributed a chapter entitled ‘Civil resistance to chemical warfare in the First World War’ to Jean Pascal Zanders (ed.), *Innocence slaughtered: Gas and the transformation of warfare and society* (London: Uniform Press, 2016). He also spoke about ‘Frans Masereel’s visual condemnation of war & militarism (1915-1920)’ at an international conference on resistance to World War I that was held in the UK at Leeds Beckett University and Leeds City Museum, 18-20 March. (See the conference report elsewhere in this issue.) Abstracts of papers presented at Leeds can be seen at [www.leeds.ac.uk/arts/info/125259/conference_resistance_to_war_1914_1924/2688/abstracts](http://www.leeds.ac.uk/arts/info/125259/conference_resistance_to_war_1914_1924/2688/abstracts).

Peter’s chapter on Alfred H. Fried’s radical pacifism appeared in a volume containing the papers originally given at an international conference that was held in 2011 in Potsdam (Germany) to celebrate the centenary of his Nobel Peace Prize: Guido Gruenewald

With Kazuyo Yamane, Peter was guest editor of a special issue on ‘Peace education through peace museums’ of the *Journal of Peace Education* (12.3, December 2015). Peter is also helping to organize the 9th triennial conference of the International Network of Museums for Peace (INMP) that will be held in Belfast, 10-13 April 2017. Hosted by Visit Belfast and Ulster University, the conference theme is ‘Cities as living museums for peace’. For further information, including a call for papers, see [www.museumsforpeace.org/projects/inmp-conferences/2017-belfast-northern-ireland.html](http://www.museumsforpeace.org/projects/inmp-conferences/2017-belfast-northern-ireland.html)

In addition, Peter reports that he is retiring from the University of Bradford after forty years. We wish him the best in retirement!

The edited transcript of the round-table discussion at the 2015 Organization of American Historians conference on “Activists, Writers, and Expansive Ideas about Peace in the Early Cold War Years” will be published in an upcoming issue of *American Communist History*. PHS members Robbie Lieberman, Lailah Danielson, Marian Mollin, Rich Updegrove, and Robert Shaffer participated on that panel (which was not limited to the issue of Communist peace activism). See *PHS News*, August 2015, for an account of that panel.

The *Peace & Change* blog, which Chuck Howlett mentions above, is at [https://peaceandchangeblog.wordpress.com/2015/10/22/welcome/](https://peaceandchangeblog.wordpress.com/2015/10/22/welcome/). Other recent posts include a review of the “people power” revolution in the Philippines and an account of Canada’s missing and murdered indigenous women.

The *Swarthmore College Peace Collection* has launched a Facebook page featuring “this day in peace history” posts. On June 29, 2016, for example, it marked the 50th anniversary of the protest by the “Fort Hood Three” – Privates Dennis Mora, David Samas, and James Johnson – against their prospective deployment to Vietnam. The three soldiers held a press conference the next day questioning the war’s legality. The post also included the cover of a contemporary pamphlet about the case. On April 29, this Facebook page noted the picket line outside the White House on that date in 1962 by chemist Linus Pauling and members of Women Strike for Peace, in opposition to President Kennedy’s decision to resume nuclear testing. You can find, and “like,” the page at [https://www.facebook.com/Swarthmore-College-Peace-Collection-176932032353741/?fref=ts](https://www.facebook.com/Swarthmore-College-Peace-Collection-176932032353741/?fref=ts)

Peter van den Dungen also brings to the attention of PHS members the *Bertha von Suttner Project*, and especially its website, at [www.berthavonsuttner.com](http://www.berthavonsuttner.com), devoted to this Czech/Austrian peace activist, author, and 1905 Nobel Peace Prize recipient. The Project has also organized activities about von Suttner and her ideals through the Peace Through Education Fund at Central Michigan University, including a “Peace Day” celebration on May 18, 2016. The website and project were developed by Candice Alihusain of the Peace Palace Library at The Hague, Hope Elizabeth May (Central Michigan University, Philosophy Department), and van den Dungen.
Announcements/Calls for Papers and Publications

The American Friends Service Committee will mark its 100th anniversary of its founding – when the U.S. entered the first world war – with a conference in Philadelphia on April 21, 2017 on “100 Years of Peace with Justice: Looking Back, Moving Forward.” The AFSC invites scholars to submit proposals for this conference on original work on peace and justice issues, broadly defined. Key themes may include: peace building at home and abroad, racial justice, economic justice, and contemporary social movements. (Examination of AFSC and Quaker activities is encouraged, but not required, according to the call for papers.) Scholars from a wide range of disciplines and at all career stages are invited to submit proposals. The deadline for submission of abstracts is October 1, 2016. For more information, go to: http://www.afsc.org/content/100-years-peace-justice-looking-back-moving-forward

PHS members and friends will be interested in Koozma Tarasoff’s Ottawa-based “Spirit-Wrestlers” blog, at www.spirit-wrestlers.com. Tarasoff, who grew up in a Doukhobor community in Saskatchewan, is now a leading authority on this Christian pacifist group, initially based in Russia but with a majority of its members immigrating to Canada over one hundred years ago. On his blog Tarasoff mixes historical and commemorative material about the Doukhobors with commentary on present-day issues of war and peace. Some recent blog posts have included: “Appeal – No to War. No to NATO” (July 2), on the recent NATO summit; “Doukhobor Society of Saskatoon – 60th Anniversary” (July 2); and “American ‘Citizen Diplomats’ in Russia: Peace and Friendship Tour – June 15-30, 2016” (June 21).

William Knoblauch of Finlandia University and Christian Philip Peterson of Ferris State University have issued a “call for publications” for an Anthology on World Peace since 1750, which they hope to have ready for publication in 2017. They are soliciting case studies on specific peace movements, political dissenters, transnational aspects of peace, non-Western societies and peace, religion and peace, human rights and its role in peace promotion, and many other possible topics. While the deadline for the
call for 500-word abstracts was April 1, 2016, it is possible that proposals may still be considered. For more information, contact Prof. Knoblauch at William.knoblauch@finlandia.edu.

Prof. Frank Jacob of Queens Community College and Prof. Stefan Kamer of the University of Graz in Austria have issued a “call for publications” for a volume on *War and Its Aftermath: Veteran Treatment and Reintegration in Post-War Societies*. Possible topics for chapters include, but are not limited to, the veteran as a radical force in post-war societies; veteran education in post-war societies; political movements and veterans; paramilitarism in post-war societies; medical issues and veterans; and economic perspectives on veteran reintegration. 300-word proposals and a short c.v. are due July 15, 2016, with full chapters due October 15. Contact Prof. Jacob at fjacob@qcc.cuny.edu.

The *International Studies Association* announces that its 58th annual convention, on Feb. 22-25, 2017 in Baltimore, will be on the theme “Understanding Change in World Politics.” The call for papers encouraged consideration of issues relating to war and peace, and especially to the feasibility of peaceful change. While the deadline for proposals was June 1, 2016, it is possible that late submissions may be accepted. For more information, go to http://www.isanet.org/Conferences/Baltimore-2017/Call

*Historians Without Borders*, based at the University of Helsinki, Finland, hosted a conference in May 2016 on “The Use and Abuse of History in Conflicts.” Topics of panels and workshops included, among others, “Turkey and Armenia 1915,” “The Presence of History in East Asia: Why Can’t Bygones be Bygones?” “Colonial History or History of Colonialism,” “1917 in Finnish and Russian Historiography,” “U.S.-Latin American Relations in Historiography.” Major speakers included Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Martti Ahtisaari, Médecins Sans Frontières co-founder Bernard Kouchner, Oxford professor Margaret MacMillan, and former South African president Thabo Mbeki, and Jawaharlal Nehru University professor emerita Romila Thapar.

According to the group’s website, Historians Without Borders was founded in 2015 “at the initiative of Erkki Tuomioja, former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Finland, to further public discussion about history and to promote the use of historical knowledge for peace-building and conflict resolution.” The conference was organized in conjunction with Finland’s Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the Finnish Institute of International Affairs, as well as the University of Helsinki. The group has also published, in Finnish, but with an English version forthcoming, an anthology on “The Use and Abuse of History,” based on an earlier symposium. For more information: www.historianswithoutborders.fi/en/.

*Environmental activists at the Paris Climate Summit, December 2015, literally put their bodies on the line to spell out their commitment to renewable energy and to demonstrate its connection to world peace*
From the Editor:
The *New York Times* on war, peace, and history

By Robert Shaffer

Like many academics, I read the *New York Times* assiduously—one can almost say “religiously,” as many an hour on a weekend morning is spent poring over (still in the print version, for me) its various sections. My former university president—Boston born and bred, as it happens—once told the faculty that regardless of our subject, the *Times* could well serve as a textbook, and I have long followed his advice by assigning articles on many historical topics and on the present-day ramifications of historical events.

But my devotion to the *Times* is often tested—as it is for many progressive readers, academics and non-academics alike, I’m sure. Here are a few examples from the past several months, along with others in which writers and editors for the “paper of record” came through more favorably. (All examples provide the date and headline from the print edition, which in some cases vary slightly from those on-line, at www.nytimes.com.)

The obituary headline on April 11 read: “Duane R. Clarridge, Spy, Dies as 83; Fought Terror for Decades With C.I.A.” The obituary itself, by Mark Mazzetti, did not shy away from noting Clarridge’s self-identification as a “rogue,” and it described in depth his indictment for his role in the Iran-contra scandal. Mazzetti mentioned parenthetically that Clarridge boasted that it was his idea to mine Nicaragua’s harbors in 1983 as part of the effort to overthrow the Sandinistas. So this founder of the CIA’s “Counterterrorism Center” was a terrorist himself, designing ways to destroy civilian ships in the waters of a nation with which the U.S. was not formally at war. Surely the savvy headline writers at the *Times* should have picked up on this aspect of Clarridge’s—and the CIA’s—work, rather than present “terrorism” as only something that the U.S. government rejects.

Barack Obama’s visit to Asia in May and June occasioned much discussion of history. The President sought to put the Vietnam War behind as he visited that nation to discuss trade and even a new military relationship, and he bravely became the first U.S. President to visit Hiroshima and speak at that site about the atomic bombing and its legacy.

The *Times* did remind readers of the history of war in Vietnam, but its efforts in this regard were unsatisfactory, even infuriating. White House correspondent Gardiner Harris, under the headline “Obama in Vietnam Will Focus on Future, Rather Than the Past” (May 16) discussed “the flood of painful memories” that the visit would evoke for some. But his analysis was limited to the memories of Americans who fought in the war, with the most space devoted to high-profile veterans Chuck Hagel and John McCain, both of whom became U.S. senators. (McCain reiterated the “spat upon” veteran trope in his recollections.) The only mention of the war’s impact on Vietnam that Harris presented was regarding Agent Orange, and that only because its after-effects harmed U.S. veterans as well. To his credit, Harris interviewed Bobby Muller, a disabled veteran who became a leader of Vietnam Veterans Against the War and later Vietnam Veterans of America. But Muller, who

![VVAW leader Bobby Muller later helped provide wheelchairs for Cambodians](image)

expressed the only antiwar views in the article, received only two paragraphs in this twenty-four paragraph feature story. And surely it would
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have been appropriate for Harris to quote some antiwar activists who were not soldiers, or Vietnamese-Americans, or scholars of the war – and then to follow-up while traveling with the President to get some Vietnamese views on the issue. (Two letters to the editor, printed on May 20 under the heading, “Vietnam’s Legacy,” did provide some much-needed balance.)

Meanwhile, an otherwise thoughtful editorial, “Too Soon to Lift the Arms Ban on Vietnam” (May 15), included a profoundly ahistorical introduction: “The United States and Vietnam moved more quickly than most adversaries to rebuild a relationship after a devastating war. It took only two decades for the two countries to re-establish diplomatic ties after the Americans withdrew from Vietnam in 1973.” Peace scholars and activists can debate the wisdom of Obama’s decision to end the embargo on arms shipments to Vietnam as part of his “pivot to Asia.” But the editors’ first two sentences are simply wrong.

Aside from the error of chronology – some U.S. troops remained in South Vietnam until 1975, of course – the historical record shows that the U.S. reestablished diplomatic ties with almost all its military adversaries quite soon after wars ended. Alexander Hamilton – currently the darling of Broadway – moved to formalize economic ties with Britain, and let bygones be bygones, from the outset of George Washington’s administration. The U.S. and Mexico pledged to cooperate on many issues – from boundary claims to property rights – in the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Most famously, the U.S. helped rebuild (west) Germany, Italy, and Japan after World War II, and to use them as military bases and launching pads.

Probably the only clear example in U.S. history which supports the editors’ contention is continued U.S.-North Korea hostility. To be sure, the U.S. did withhold diplomatic recognition from governments which emerged from Communist revolutions (the Soviet Union, Cuba, and China). In the first two of these cases the U.S. engaged in undeclared military activity against these governments, and in the third the U.S. financially supported the revolution’s opponents. But in none of these cases did the U.S. conduct or endure “devastating wars” which prevented reconciliation.

Why the editors of the New York Times would seek to minimize the long punishment by the U.S. of unified Vietnam for two decades after the war ended is both puzzling and exasperating.

Next came “Lessons and Hopes in Vietnam” (May 24), an op-ed by John Kerry, John McCain, and Bob Kerrey. One hesitates to criticize the Times for publishing a specific op-ed, as so many viewpoints are and should be represented on this page. Moreover, an op-ed co-written by three current or former senators of different parties, two of whom served as their party’s nominee for President, one of whom is currently Secretary of State, and all of whom fought in Vietnam, deserves to be printed. But this piece was as vacuous as could be, with four vague “lessons” – treat U.S. soldiers with respect and gratitude whenever they serve; leaders need to be honest with Americans about plans for war; “exercise humility in assuming knowledge about foreign cultures”; reconciliation is possible after wars – followed by a recitation of current economic ties and environmental cooperation between the two nations.

The fourth lesson is self-evident, while the first elides the issue of the antiwar movement’s attitude toward U.S. rank-and-file soldiers in the 1960s and 1970s and offers no clear statement that it is permissible to oppose U.S. policies during wartime. The second lesson is true – but almost laughable coming from

As senator and Secretary of State, John Kerry has downplayed his VVAW insights
Kerry and McCain, who both voted for the U.S. war in Iraq, presented under the falsest possible pretenses, long after they should have learned from their experience in Vietnam. (What was it George W. Bush said? “Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice – we won’t get fooled again.”) The third lesson is important, and key to our work as historians. But Kerry, McCain, and Kerrey offer no specific examples of what American hubris led to in the case of the Vietnam War or what humility would tell us about the war, so it remains virtually meaningless here. My criticism here is of the three veterans/politicians, but the editors could easily have solicited a more substantive companion piece.

However, the Times redeemed itself within two weeks by providing extensive coverage of the controversy that emerged when it was announced that former senator Kerrey—who acknowledged years ago that he had killed civilians during a nighttime raid and won a Bronze Star for falsely claiming to have killed a score of Vietnamese guerrillas—would become the head of Fulbright University Vietnam, sponsored in part by the U.S. government (and celebrated in the op-ed and by Obama during his visit to Vietnam). Richard Paddock, who helped break the story of Kerrey’s atrocities fifteen years ago, cited a wide range of Vietnamese opinions on the Fulbright University appointment in an excellent article (“War Record Fuels Debate Over University Appointment in Vietnam,” June 3). One Vietnamese lawyer wrote on Facebook, according to Paddock, “Please tell me the name of any prestigious university in the world, where a killer in cold blood of women and children— he admitted it and he is not charged for it—could be the president.”

Next came an extraordinary op-ed, “The ‘American Tragedy’ of Vietnam” (June 20), by Viet Thanh Nguyen, the novelist whose The Sympathizer just won the 2016 Pulitzer Prize. Nguyen, who teaches English and American Studies/Ethnicity at the University of Southern California, was born in Vietnam but came to the U.S. in 1975 at age four. While noting that many Vietnamese support Kerrey’s appointment as chair of Fulbright University “as an act of reconciliation,” Nguyen disagrees: Kerrey “is the wrong man for the job and regarding him as a symbol of peace is a failure of moral imagination.” Though critical of the Vietnamese government both for its Communist authoritarianism and its current facilitation of capitalist development and exploitation, Nguyen makes two major points above all. First, the focus on Kerrey’s confession and redemption reinforces the tendency in the U.S. to ignore Vietnamese victims of U.S. intervention and to focus on the war as “an American tragedy.” Second, a U.S.-supported university in Vietnam might be a blessing, as universities at their best “cultivate humane thinking,” but “at their worst they both practice and promote an economic inequality that supports the interests of the one

Bob Kerrey acknowledged committing atrocities in his 2002 memoir
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percent.” Nguyen thus not only engages the debate over reconciliation and commemoration of the war but adds a critical edge to the discussion over the future direction of Vietnam and the nature of ties with “the West.”

So even as Obama, Kerry, McCain, Kerrey, and others – including some on the New York Times staff – tried to gloss over the nature of the war in the interests of “focusing on the future,” uncomfortable issues bubbled back up to the surface – which the Times, to its credit, did cover.

Obama’s visit to Japan – historic as it was in light of his visit to Hiroshima – raised fewer red flags in terms of reporting in the Times. Indeed, I was pleased to read, days before Obama spoke at the site of the atomic bombing, Motoko Rich’s insightful dispatch from Nagasaki (“In Shadow of Hiroshima, A City Stands as an Afterthought,” May 25). Presenting survivors’ accounts and descriptions of two museums devoted to the bombing of Nagasaki, Rich also gave voice to those who link their city’s tragedy with present-day efforts to end the arms race – several of whom added a decidedly skeptical voice. A former official at one of the museums, according to Ms. Rich, “contends that Mr. Obama’s visit is aimed at bolstering [Prime Minister] Abe’s efforts to change the [nation’s pacifist] Constitution and draw Japan into war.” The Times also printed the text of Obama’s speech at Hiroshima itself (“The Memory of the Morning of Aug. 6, 1945, Must Never Fade, May 28). The sincerity of the ideals clash with the reality of NATO brandishing its nuclear weapons in war games in Poland (see “NATO’s Unity Facing Russia Shows Some Cracks as Putin Pressures Old Alliance,” July 9) – but the problem there is with the Obama administration, not the Times.

My renewed commitment to the Times became stronger in late June with the exhaustively-researched two-part investigative report, “Hydrogen Bombs’ Aftermath,” on the legacy after fifty years of the crash of a nuclear-armed American B-52 bomber over Palomares, Spain (“In Sick Airmen, Echo of ’66 Nuclear Crash,” June 20; “An Air Force Bomber Crash Leaves Scars in Spain,” June 21.”) The first part focuses on the hurried clean-up by the U.S. Air Force, with many participants exposed to excessive radiation and, years later, suffering abnormally high cancer rates. Nevertheless, the Air Force still refuses to recognize these men as radiation victims, and so Veterans Affairs hospitals do not cover their treatment. Part two describes the impact on Palomares itself, especially in spreading radioactive material on farmland, still lingering a half century later. Reporter Raphael Minder recounts Spanish diplomatic demands, initially revealed on WikiLeaks, that the U.S. fully clean up the region, resulting in just such a promise by Secretary of State Kerry last October. The thousands of words that the Times devoted to this story viscerally remind us of the continuing health, environmental, and financial costs of the
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Sections of Palomares are still off-limits due to radiation contamination

nuclear arms race, and of the harm that atomic bombs cause even without being used in combat.

I will be assigning part one of the Palomares articles to my U.S. Military History students this fall, and I will use Viet Thanh Nguyen’s with my Immigration and Ethnicity students next spring. (My retired university president would be proud.) So – what began as a rant has become more of a rave, though I will continue to be on the lookout for lapses at the Times.

And speaking of the Times – This just in…

Longtime PHS member Sandi Cooper (College of Staten Island and CUNY Graduate Center, emerita) had a letter published in the New York Times on July 12, 2016 commenting on the killings of five Dallas police officers the previous week and responding to the deputy police chief’s plaintive question, “How can we not let this happen again?”

Cooper responded: “One clear path might be for national organizations of police chiefs or police departments to launch a loud, raucous, insistent campaign against assault rifles. It would not hurt if they also visited those frightened Republican members of Congress who are in the cross hairs of the National Rifle Association.”

Cooper received the PHS Lifetime Achievement Award in 2009.

The next issue of PHS News will be January 2017. Deadline for submission of material: January 1, 2017.

We welcome “member news” (appointments, promotions, retirements, publications, presentations, prizes, etc.); conference reports and announcements; your selections for “Deep Cuts” and “From the Archives”; ideas for and experiences in teaching peace history; tributes to peace activists and peace scholars who have died; commentary on current issues from a peace history perspective, and other material.

Send as e-mail attachments to editor Robert Shaffer at roshaf@ship.edu. (Please send photos and other graphics as separate file attachments.)

www.peacehistorysociety.org
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