

12-1-2008

Concerned Philosophers for Peace, Vol. 28

Concerned Philosophers for Peace

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/concerned_philosophers



Part of the [Philosophy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Concerned Philosophers for Peace, "Concerned Philosophers for Peace, Vol. 28" (2008). *Concerned Philosophers for Peace*. 47.

https://ecommons.udayton.edu/concerned_philosophers/47

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Philosophy at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concerned Philosophers for Peace by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact mschlangen1@udayton.edu, ecommons@udayton.edu.

Concerned Philosophers for Peace

Newsletter Vol. 28 (Winter 2008 - 2009) ISSN: 1062-9114

peacephilosophy.org

NOT TO LEAVE
ROESCH LIBRARY
MAR 19 2009
UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON

Peacemaking

by Barry Gan

On more than one occasion I have sat in a roomful of peacemakers discussing and often arguing about some strategy or other to bring about a more just or peaceful world. Often on these occasions I have found among these peacemakers, as some of them call themselves, some people with very large egos, some with a great deal of self-righteousness, some with a great deal of anger, and some with a great desire for victory over the so-called evil forces of the world. Often times I have been one of those people myself, and as a result I've often wondered first, whether or not I am really contributing to a more just and peaceful world, and second, if I am not, how I might do so.

In other words, often I have found the personalities within peace and justice groups to bear striking resemblances to what I imagine the personalities in the White House Situation Room to be. In fact, probably the only differences—perhaps symptomatic of morally significant differences, but perhaps not—are (1) the richness of the decor and furniture surrounding the people in these two otherwise similar circumstances and (2) the types of tools, to use a euphemism, available to these two groups of people. We'll return to those differences later.

So what is peacemaking? And how does it differ from other kinds of work? A colleague of mine, Jean-François Godet-Calogeras, has identified some of the characteris-

see GAN p. 5

Ahimsa

*or How I Learned to Start
Loving and Loathe The Bomb*

by Gary Romriell

His hands were covered in blood. His hands covered his face. His face was painted in shame. The small Iraqi girl that lay across his knees was curled into a tight ball and painted in blood like a still-born fetus that had recently been torn from a vengeful womb. Bullets had entered her chest and torn themselves free from her sides and back. Life fled from her and hid in a pool of blood. A sob rattled from the soldier's chest and a solitary tear landed on the dust cover of his M-16.

It had been an order, he thought. There was no way that he could have known what was actually in the truck. He had just been following orders, stupid fucking orders! That's how the army trained them, like Pavlovian dogs with frothy jowls. It was a subconscious switch. An order was given and testosterone mixed with adrenaline, leaked from the finger tips, leapt to the trigger, into the bolt, the firing pin, through the primer, out the bore, down the barrel, and into the chests of unsuspecting children. Thoughts of consequence were lost somewhere in the process. It had been such an order and the training had worked like a slave. Of course none of that mat-

see ROMRIELL p. 11

The Story of Father Roy Bourgeois, p.4

Chiba and Schoenbaum on Pacifism after Sept. 11, p. 13

Executive Director's Report

by David Boersema

The twenty-first annual meeting of the Concerned Philosophers for Peace was held at SUNY-Cortland from October 30 to November 2, 2008. Hosted by Andy Fitz-Gibbon and his colleagues, the meeting was stimulating and enjoyable. The conference theme was "Resisting War, Educating for Peace." More than thirty papers were presented, covering a wide range of topics and concerns, with conference highlights being the keynote talk by Arun Gandhi and the CPP President's address, given by Gail Presbey. Thanks, once again, to Andy and SUNY-Cortland.

The venue for next year's meeting was set. It will take place on November 6-8, 2009 at the University of Dayton. The conference theme will be "Just Communities" and the local coordinator will be Danielle Poe. Danielle is arranging to have Angela Davis as the keynote speaker. This promises to be another excellent meeting. See more details on the back cover, and please join us in November.

While it is not yet set in stone, plans are afoot to hold the 2010 meeting in Asilomar, on Monterey Bay, near Santa Cruz, California. Stay tuned!

CPP treasurer, Dennis Rothermel, noted that as of the end of October 2008, CPP's financial balance stood at \$6167.56. If you have not yet paid your 2008-2009 dues, please contact Dennis and do so right away.

With respect to CPP's published proceedings of past conferences, the volume from the 2005 conference is almost to the printer. The proceedings from the 2006 and 2007 conferences are moving along well, and Andy Fitz-Gibbon has taken on the duties of getting the 2008 papers ready for publication. For those new to CPP, we publish conference proceedings as part of the Philosophy of Peace series, under the leadership of our own Bill Gay. The PoP series is itself part of the VIBS (Value Inquiry Book Series), published by Rodopi press.

Finally, if you would like to contact any of the officers of the CPP, you can find their contact information on the CPP web site, maintained by Greg Moses (thank you, Greg!). Go to: peacephilosophy.org, where you will find a "contact us" link.

David Boersema is Professor of Philosophy at Pacific University (in Oregon), where he has been teaching for the past 24 years. He also teaches in the Peace and Conflict Studies program at Pacific. He co-authored a book with Katy Gray Brown in Rodopi's Philosophy of Peace series, Spiritual and Political Dimensions of Nonviolence and Peace, and this past year had a book, Pragmatism and Reference, published by The MIT Press. Professor Boersema is currently completing work on a textbook in the philosophy of rights. After serving as CPP's treasurer for four years, he became the executive director this past year.

Concerned Philosophers for Peace Newsletter

Vol. 28 (Winter 2008-2009)

Published by the

Concerned Philosophers for Peace

CPPN welcomes submissions of short articles and book reviews. Please indicate "cppn submission" in subject line and include a bio and contact information. Email to any of the following by Aug. 30 or Jan. 30:

Editor: Greg Moses

gmosesx@gmail.com

Associate Editor: Wendy Hamblet

whamblet@ncat.edu

Books Editor: Deb Peterson

debpeterson@brainerd.net

peacephilosophy.org

Making Peace and Meaning Business

Review of *Cesar Chavez and the Common Sense of Non-violence*, by Jose-Antonio Orosco. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2008

by Greg Moses

In the opening pages of this study, the author considers the difficulties of philosophizing upon an icon. As with Martin Luther King, Jr. before him, Cesar Chavez is being memorialized in street signs, civic celebrations, and commercial branding campaigns that too often suggest hopes for completed unity without reminders of uncompleted struggles. And yet in recollection of actual struggle lies another temptation in believing that real concepts can't live where so much pushing and pulling is to be done.

The Chavez who is to be centered in this work is the one who acts in particular ways, but who increasingly articulates those actions within a general discourse of philosophical import. He is a "community intellectual"—a term that the author takes from Mario T. Garcia's study of the late Bert Corona—and he works out a "logic of nonviolence" that is distinct and interesting.

From the speeches and writings of Chavez, Jose-Antonio Orosco discerns a general project carried forward upon general themes. The general project lies in displacing a cultural status quo with a cultural alternative. Even during Chavez's lifetime, he could see that demographic trends were pointing in the direction of a new majority for California and the American Southwest. Winning this cultural transition on terms of majority rule was not the problem. A deeper kind of transformation could be waged and won.

On Orosco's view, the model of "La Causa" advanced by Chavez was structured upon central themes embedded within a certain kind of Latino experience. Religious pilgrimage structured the deeper discipline of the protest march. Marchers carried images of the Virgin of Guadalupe and ended each day in Mass. Alongside this movement of penance and petition, Chavez facilitated a process of re-education as the Teatro Campesino of Louis Valdez "put on short one-act skits" that dramatized labor activism

(26). Pilgrimage was lived as a transformation of consciousness calling forth a transformed reality.

On this view, penitential suffering could be lived as a welcoming call to values that exceed short-term demands for satisfaction. The self-sacrifice that Chavez learned from Mexican Catholicism has deeper cultural roots which Orosco traces to Mayan and Aztec heritage. The hunger strikes of Chavez were continuous with ancient practices of blood letting that "allowed individuals to have visions and moral clarity about the actions needed to preserve or restore harmony in the world" (28).

Finally, there was a heritage of revolution. In the "Sacramento March Letter" Chavez makes explicit reference to "Pilgrimage, penitence, and revolution." So alongside the spiritual work came the activities of a people who were living out the daring history of 1910.

"The pilgrimage from Delano to Sacramento has strong religio-cultural overtones," wrote Chavez. "But it is also the pilgrimage of a cultural minority who has suffered from a hostile environment, and a minority who means business" (Jensen and Hammerback 15-16).

But how can a minority "mean business" without violence? Orosco takes up the question in Chapter Two, with a patient philosophical exposition of the logic set forth by Chavez. And in Chapter Three we are treated to the moral argument for nevertheless condoning property sabotage. Masculinity is the focus of Chapter Four, while Chapter Five takes up an interesting contrast between Chavez and King on the question of time.

In keeping with a kind of simplicity that does justice to the spirit of Chavez, Orosco seems to lay out the case in as few pages as possible. But the work that Orosco sets out to do is well done in this elegant exposition.

The book should work well in undergraduate and graduate classrooms, especially when paired with *The Words of Cesar Chavez*.

Additional Work Cited

The Words of Cesar Chavez. Ed. by Richard J. Jensen and John C. Hammerback. College Station: Texas A&M Univ. Press, 2002.

Greg Moses is author of Revolution of Conscience: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Philosophy of Nonviolence.

From Marine to Anti-SOA Organizer

Review of Disturbing the Peace: The Story of Father Roy Bourgeois and the Movement to Close the School of the Americas, by James Hodge and Linda Cooper, with a foreword by Martin Sheen. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 2004

by Emily Barone

Disturbing the Peace is a biographical account of Maryknoll Father Roy Bourgeois' transition from United States Marine, active in the Vietnam War, to peace activist and leader of the movement to close the School of the Americas, an extension of the militaries of the United States and numerous Latin American countries.

The work chronicles Bourgeois' experiences in the mission fields, foreign prisons, familiar Catholic Worker houses, and college speaking tours, with a frankness which resonates, through its simplicity, the haunting truth of the atrocities opposed by those active in the SOA Watch movement.

Authors Hodge and Cooper focus on Bourgeois' interpersonal conflicts with groups as large and forboding as

the Catholic Church and the United States Government, and as small and persuasive as his fellow Maryknollers and missionaries, friends, and family.

His resulting intrapersonal reflections, which the authors adapted from transcriptions of collected and first-hand interviews, motivated him to action, first, for specific impoverished persons and communities of Latin America, and later against the militant forces oppressing them.

At once the apologetics of a peace movement that mobilizes thousands annually, and an expression of that movement's demand for "No Mas; No More," *Disturbing the Peace* offers an account of the past and present risks of political dissent in the United States, and the perspective of a man who can find no moral alternative to taking those risks.

Emily Barone is a graduate of the Philosophy and Political Science Departments of the University of Detroit Mercy, and is currently studying towards her Master's in the Art of Social Justice at Marygrove College. While at the University of Detroit Mercy, she participated in multiple protests to close the School of the Americas. She continued this practice of action and reflection for social justice during her year with the Jesuit Volunteer Corps Northwest.

*CPP at APA Central
Palmer House Hilton, Chicago
Saturday, February 21, 12:15-2:15, Session GV-5*

Chair: Danielle Poe, University of Dayton

"Turning Swords Into Ploughshares: The Transformative Possibilities of Winter Soldier Movements," Tracey Nicholls, Lewis University

"Ethics as First Philosophy: King, Levinas, and the Praxis of Peace," Scott Davidson, Oklahoma City University and Maria D. Davidson, University of Oklahoma

"Agonism and Violence: Critique of an 'Ethos of Democracy,'" Fuat Gursozlu, State University of New York, Binghamton

"Does extreme pacifism need an after-life metaphysics?," Carlo Filice, State University of New York, Geneseo

. . . . from GAN p. 1

tics of peacemaking in an analysis of the story of St. Francis and the Wolf. In his encounters with the wolf of Gubbio and the townspeople affected by the wolf, Francis showed (1) a readiness to meet with the so-called enemy, (2) a willingness to recognize the so-called enemy as a brother or sister, (3) community with others, (4) the unwillingness to use weapons, (5) a sense of justice, and (6) a willingness to meet the needs of the "other."

Peacemaking, then, is not simply working for peace or working for justice. It is a function of how one works, even if or when one is not working directly for peace and justice. I did not see this for a long time. And it was a somewhat casual remark by my mentor, Bob Holmes, that finally enabled me to see it clearly.

Eight or nine years ago, when I was re-designing the peace studies program at St. Bonaventure University, I was trying to decide whether or not to orient the program around peace studies or nonviolence. The United States has many peace studies programs, over 250 of them. These programs are largely offshoots of political science departments, programs in international relations, and sociology departments. Occasionally they are offshoots of philosophy departments. Peace studies itself is an established major in New York State. But there was only one other program in nonviolence in the U.S., a very small one, at Colorado College.

I discussed the matter with several people, especially with Robert Holmes and with LouAnn Ha'aheo Guanson from the peace studies program at the University of Hawaii. At the time we were all serving on the national board of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, an international interfaith group dedicated to nonviolence with which a number of you are already familiar. Both of them were urging me to confront the issue head-on, to call the program what it was, a program that teaches nonviolence strategies, tactics, and lifestyles. And Bob, in his usual manner, made a somewhat casual but profound remark. He said, "It's not a question of whether or not one is working for peace. Even the Air Force says it's working for peace."

I don't know whether Bob remembers that remark. I suspect he does. But the remark clarified for me in a very profound way that the difference between genuine peacemaking and what almost everyone else calls peacemaking is a difference between means and ends.

Nobody disagrees on what end we desire. Almost all of us, except for sadists, who genuinely enjoy causing others to suffer, seek a peaceful home, a peaceful community, a peaceful nation, a peaceful world. No, what we differ on, what distinguishes peacemaking from other work, whether one is an electrician, a retail clerk, or a philosopher, is the means by which one does one's work.

The insight was driven home to me even more when two years ago I made one of my infrequent visits to a synagogue—in this case the synagogue in which I had grown up as a teenager, Temple Beth-El in Rochester, NY. I noticed that since I had last been there, the prayer books had been replaced. And I also noticed that in the new prayer books the translation of a very famous line from Isaiah had also been changed. Each week, one of the Sabbath prayers that I had uttered and heard as a teen had been

Lo yiseh goy el goy herev, v'lo yl-medu od ml-hamah

Nation shall not lift up sword against nation. Neither shall men learn war anymore.

But though the Hebrew remained unchanged in the prayer book, the English translation had changed. It now read:

Nation shall not lift up sword against nation.

Neither shall men experience war any more.

That's curious, I thought. In the original Hebrew the idea was that paradise would be a place where people would not learn war anymore. But now the idea had shifted from a world in which nations would not practice war to a world in which nations would not suffer war.

After the service I approached the rabbi and asked him about this change. I asked him whether the Hebrew word *yl-medu* meant "learn" or "experience." I knew what it meant, and so did he. It means "learn." It does not mean "experience." But he made excuses for the translation.

And it was clear to me, at least, why such a translation in an American prayer book had been altered. Israel and the U.S. both spend a great deal of money, time, and effort in learning war. Both nations have turned away from the paradise.

The wishes of both nations are that neither of them experience war in their own territories. Neither wishes to

see GAN p. 6

.... from GAN p. 5

suffer war, but both are willing to learn it. Both are willing to learn war in the mistaken view that by doing so they will not suffer it. But the Bible strongly suggests that paradise is the circumstance that obtains, not when nations suffer war no more, but when they learn it no more.

Thus one cannot reach the end one desires by pursuing means inimical to those ends. In *Hind Swaraj*, Chapter 16, Gandhi said, "The means may be likened to a seed, the end to a tree; and there is just the same inviolable connection between the means and the end as there is between the seed and the tree."

And so we return to the question of peacemaking. And we may now ask: what is genuine peacemaking, as opposed to what passes for peacemaking in everyday usage? This much, I think, is clear. Peacemaking does not entail making war. It does not entail harming others intentionally or out of negligence. To put it in Platonic terms, it requires that we not make others worse off. If one is making any others worse off, one is not engaged in peacemaking.

But some think otherwise. Some think, along with the Pentagon, that it is often necessary to use violence to prevent harm to innocent people. In 2006 I heard Archbishop Celestino Migliore speak at the annual conference of the Peace and Justice Studies Association. Migliore is the Pope's representative to the U.N. and though I shouldn't have been surprised, I was surprised to hear some of his remarks. When asked whether the Church would condone the use of violence in some circumstances, he said that it would be wrong sometimes to turn the other cheek. I was curious to see how he would explain this since it contradicts what Jesus says in the Beatitudes, and he obliged me by trotting out the following worn example:

Imagine a person carrying a baby, assaulted by a third person. Should the person charged with the care of the baby turn the other cheek? No, said the Archbishop, not if it means that the baby would be assaulted—because one has an obligation to protect innocent third parties.

If there were a Frequently-Asked-Questions book for pacifists and nonviolentists, it would begin with this example. The responses are also standard, but they point the way toward a deeper understanding of genuine peacemaking.

One response is put forward by Leo Tolstoy, who speaks not of a baby allegedly about to be assaulted but of a child allegedly about to be killed. He says first, that the person wishing to protect the child could not know whether or not the child would be harmed before it is. Nor, he continues, could one know that the world would be a better place if the child instead of the third person were saved. Both assumptions presume that we can know another's intentions. To know that the child would be harmed is to know not only the capabilities of the other person but also his or her intentions. To know that the world would be a better place if the child were spared at the expense of the alleged attacker is to know what each being will make of himself or herself in the future. And both assumptions presume that we can know that the outcomes of our actions will be as we desire them. Both assumptions are unknowable.

Another response is to acknowledge that many actions short of doing violence might stop an attack. One of my friends was once accosted in Kansas City at gunpoint in a street-corner robbery. He looked the potential robber in the eye, spoke quietly to him, and talked him out of the robbery. There is, of course, no guarantee that such efforts will always yield such outcomes, but what must be realized is that there is no guarantee that violent efforts will always yield desirable outcomes, either.

There are other responses, too. The most important question one can ask oneself is: What sort of person do I want to be? Do I want to be the sort of person who injures others, who occasionally kills others? Or do I want to be a person who shows faith in the goodness of others, and who is willing to absorb a blow or two rather than deliver one?

Most people, like the Archbishop, would hedge on that question. They would say that, well, yes, it would be nice to be the sort of person who never injures or kills others, but sometimes duty requires me to injure another. After all, I don't want to be the sort of person who allows innocent third parties—such as babies—to be injured.

Built into such a response, in certain circumstances, is a major moral misunderstanding. I am not obliged to do whatever I must to prevent innocents from suffering wrongdoing. I am certainly obliged not to contribute to their suffering. But I am not obliged to do all that is necessary to prevent wrongdoing to innocents.

We may have an obligation to inform others that what they are about to do is morally questionable, or wrong, especially if those others are people under our care. I would call this bearing witness, in much the same way that Socrates and Thoreau bore witness to what they believed to be wrongdoing. But bearing witness to alleged wrongdoing should not involve harming others or, as Socrates argued in the *Crito*, harming the concept of law by which people govern themselves.

Gandhi notes that we are finite beings who cannot know with any certainty that wrongdoing is about to occur. Thus we should not knowingly or negligently harm others in an attempt to prevent what may not happen. This is one major insight at the basis of Gandhi's philosophy of *ahimsa*.

Bob Holmes captures this insight rather neatly in his book *Basic Moral Philosophy*. There he distinguishes between what he calls mediated and unmediated consequences of actions. An unmediated consequence of an action, he says, is a consequence that results directly from my action, without the intervention of another human being's actions. The example he offers is that of breaking a window. The broken glass is an unmediated consequence of my throwing a stone through it.

A mediated consequence, on the other hand, is a consequence that results indirectly from one of my actions by the response my action generates in another. If I admonish a student in front of other students and he runs to the Dean and complains that I've humiliated him, his complaint to the Dean is a mediated consequence of my action.

Gandhi, I think, would have said that, as finite beings, we cannot know the mediated consequences of our actions, only the unmediated consequences. Thus we cannot justify unmediated consequences of our actions on the basis of expected mediated consequences.

It seems to me that the readiness to do violence in the defense of innocent people is one of the major sources of all violence in the world.

But there is yet another response to the Archbishop's example, and trite though this response may at first appear, nothing about it is trite at all. One can ask, what are you doing with a child in a dark alley, anyway? How did you get there? And what did you expect to find? Somehow, for some reason, while walking with this child, or carrying this baby, you decided it would be perfectly all right to walk down this dark alley, to place yourself in a circum-

stance where a crisis was, if not likely, at least reasonably possible. Why?

If I have someone in my care, then I have obligations with respect to that person, obligations that include planning intelligently what I will be doing while that person is in my care. For example, last year I had offered to drive some friends to the nearest major airport, a good seventy miles away. I knew I had a couple of tires on my car that would soon be in need of replacement. I decided to replace them a bit early rather than run into a problem while these friends were in my care. In this way I avoided a potential crisis.

Here's another example: we know now that the dikes in New Orleans needed repair long before Hurricane Katrina hit, but we did little or nothing to address that problem until it became a crisis.

Yet another example is the continuing spread of nuclear weapons. Thirty-six years ago the nuclear nations of the world had an opportunity to begin disarmament of their weapons and thereby reduce incentives for other nations to acquire nuclear stockpiles. Today the U.S. and Russia each still have well over 6,000 nuclear weapons each in their arsenals, and the U.S. is complaining about North Korea's detonation of a nuclear device so small that at first people weren't even certain the explosion was an atomic explosion.

The U.S. and Russia both had the opportunity, beginning in 1970 or even earlier, to reduce desire among the nations of the world to acquire nuclear weapons. But unwillingness to make significant reductions, even to levels of hundreds rather than thousands of nuclear weapons, assured that other nations would seek to acquire the same power. Unwillingness to address an acknowledged problem before it became a crisis guaranteed that the problem would become a crisis.

Some may still object that what I am doing is blaming the victim. Doesn't one have the right to walk with a child down any dark alley one chooses without having to worry about being assaulted? Isn't the person who assaults me the person who should be blamed?

Actually, there is a legal principle, well established, that addresses a similar question. It is the principle of "last clear chance." The principle asserts that a person who had a last clear chance to avoid injury or damage but chose not

... from GAN p. 7

to do so may not recover damages. This principle is not a principle of criminal law; it's a principle of civil law, and in recent years it has been replaced in most states with the notion of comparative negligence. But it captures, nonetheless, the intuition at the heart of this particular argument, namely, that people have some responsibility to avoid placing themselves in circumstances where injury is likely, especially if they seek to recover damages from the party that injured them.

So we can now return to the question of peacemaking. What is it, and how does genuine peacework differ from what the Pentagon does, from what every President in my lifetime has engaged in, and from the work of some of the grassroots peace groups to which I have belonged?

As I began by saying, genuine peacemaking distinguishes means from ends. The types of tools available to those in the White House Situation Room should never be the tools that peacemakers use. One cannot justify means that harm others or might harm others by appealing to the ends that we seek. In short, genuine peacemaking, of necessity, is nonviolent in all its means, all the time.

Second, genuine peacemaking is long-term work. If one is in crisis mode, odds are good that one is not doing genuine peacemaking, especially if crisis mode means that one is acting in ways that may harm others. Labeling something as a crisis is often, though not always, another way of justifying the doing of violence to those we perceive as "enemies." Newton Garver, a philosopher, Quaker, and pacifist, once remarked: "I think that crisis management is itself a disease." Genuine peacemaking, in other words, is an activity requiring patience.

I am reminded of this each time I recite the prayer that is called St. Francis' Prayer (even though it is not). The prayer begins, "Lord, make me an instrument of thy peace. Where there is hatred, let me sow love. Where there is injury, pardon." The prayer does not talk about supplanting hatred with love, supplanting injury with pardon. It talks about planting love, planting pardon. It implies that these orientations are like seeds, or seedlings, to be nurtured, watered, protected, and, above all, not to be hurried along, because they can't be hurried along.

Third, genuine peacemaking recognizes, as Plato said, that it is better to be harmed than to harm (*Crito*, 49b). Genuine peacemaking, in other words, recognizes Gan-

dhi's insight that people, as finite beings, cannot know the mediated consequences of their actions and thus cannot justify unmediated consequences of actions on the basis of expected mediated consequences.

We know the effects of many of our actions on the environment. We know the effects of over-consumption. We know when we have more than we need. And so, we know, too, that the furnishings in the White House Situation Room are symptomatic, if not of waste, then at least of the great and unnecessary divide between rich and poor. We harm others, negligently if not deliberately, in allowing such a great divide, in allowing over-consumption. As Nietzsche said, "The superfluous is the enemy of the necessary" (Nietzsche, 59).

Finally, peacemaking involves a creative tension. It is the tension between working on oneself to become a better person, while working to make the world a better place. The world is never made a better place if we become so certain of ourselves that we think we are entitled to harm others to achieve our vision of a better world. Should we work to make peace by working on ourselves or by working on others? I think that the answer is that we must do both.

Like Socrates, I think a wise person knows that he doesn't know. And such wisdom precludes one from ever undertaking to do violence to others. To do so is to be smug, to be certain, to regard oneself as more than finite. This is why I am a philosopher and an educator, a person who practices meditation, and a person who engages in political action. I must develop my own character as I work to develop the character of the world of which I am a part. And I want to inculcate in my students a kind of humility born of their own growing recognition that they do not know any more than I do.

The earth and all its creatures should be regarded as our family. In peacemaking, we must show them patience, forbearance, love, and care; and we must have faith that, whether we live to see the fruits of our actions, whatever those mediated fruits may be, at least, in not deliberately or negligently harming others, we have done the right thing.

Works Cited

Gandhi, *Hind Swaraj*.

Garver, Newton. e-mail.

Holmes, Robert. *Basic Moral Philosophy*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2006.

Tolstoy, Leo. "Letter to Ernest Howard Crosby," in *Nonviolence in Theory and Practice*. Edited by Robert L. Holmes and Barry L. Gan. Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press, 2005.

Migliore, Archbishop Celestino. Talk at October, 2006 Annual Conference of the Peace and Justice Studies Association. Manhattan College, Bronx, NY.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Untimely Meditations*. Trans. R. J. Hollingdale. Ed. Daniel Breazeale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Plato. *Crito*.

Barry L. Gan, Professor of Philosophy and Director of the Center for Nonviolence at St. Bonaventure University, delivered the above remarks as the presidential address for the 19th annual CPP conference.

Gan is co-editor with Robert L. Holmes of a leading anthology on nonviolence, *Nonviolence in Theory and Practice*, 2nd edition; editor of *The Acorn: Journal of the Gandhi-King Society*; co-editor of *Peace and Change: A Journal of Peace Research*, *Journal of the Peace History Society* and the *Peace and Justice Studies Association*; and for two years he served as program committee chair of the oldest and largest interfaith peace group in the United States, the *Fellowship of Reconciliation*.

He has taught at St. Bonaventure University for the past twenty-three years since receiving his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in philosophy from the University of Rochester in 1981 and 1984, respectively. Prior to that he taught high school and junior high school English for six years.

His wife teaches English and remedial reading at a local high school. He has a daughter just graduated from college and a son who has just begun his studies in college. He, himself, enjoys walking, tennis, and playing guitar in a retro garage band.

*CPP at APA Pacific
The Westin Bayshore, Vancouver
Thursday, April 9, 8:00-10:00 p.m., Session GVI-B*

Topic: A New Day in Washington? The Prospects for Reason

Speakers: Ron Hirschbein (California State University–Chico) "The Folly of Political Realism"

Ovadia Ezra (Tel Aviv University) "Three Neglected Reasons for Just Behavior in War"

Andrew Fiala (California State University–Fresno) "Toward a Cosmopolitan Peace"

Also, please note:

The Gandhi-King Society will host an author-meets-critics session with Joseph-Antonio Orosco on his new book: *Cesar Chavez and the Common Sense of Nonviolence*, Saturday Evening, April 11 Group Session GIX-A, 6:00-8:00 p.m.

A Light in the Dark Tunnels of Middle Eastern Intrigue?

by Wendy C. Hamblet, Ph.D., SAC (Dip.)

In an article in the major Canadian newspaper, *Globe and Mail* (dated January 23, 2009), Gerald Caplan highlights a notable exception to the hope-filled signs that accompany President Obama's arrival at front center of the stage of world politics.

Turkey and Israel, previously thick allies in the generally chaotic Middle East, have recently fallen out of friendship, a counterintuitive friendship that had itself received little press among the greater concerns of the area. Turkey and Israel had developed close ties that proved valuable to both states: a huge arms deal to upgrade the Turkish air force enriched Israel's industrial-military complex while Israel's steadfast refusal to recognize the 1915 Turkish genocide against its Armenian minority served Turkey's interests.

Caplan points out that the Faustian agreement has been shattered these past weeks by Israel's latest bloody incursions into Gaza. Turkish Prime Minister Recep Erdogan, along with human rights groups the world over, accused Israel of savagery and crimes against humanity. Israeli leaders and the Israeli media reacted swiftly with the usual accusations against critics—they must be anti-Semitic! But Israel's deputy foreign minister, less circumspect, admitted what was actually at stake in Turkey's defense of its Palestinian brothers: "Erdogan says that genocide is taking place in Gaza. We [Israel] will then recognize the Armenian-related events as genocide."

What this series of events makes crystalline is that genocide is not a fact of history, documented by corpse counts and military records, but a geopolitical pawn in contemporary international relations. Caplan concludes his article: "In the real world, you call it genocide if it bolsters your interests. If it doesn't, it's not."

However, while Caplan captures succinctly the new challenge that the Turkish-Israeli fallout portends for President Obama, he may be missing a double flicker of ironic light at the end of this dark pragmatic tunnel of Middle Eastern

Realpolitiking. The Israeli foreign minister's response to Turkey has finally unequivocally exposed the vacuousness of its tiresome strategy of naming all critics of its hyper-violence against Palestinians "anti-Semitic."

And since few serious genocide scholars question the reality of the Turkish genocide of its Armenian civilians in 1915, the Israeli deputy foreign minister's pointed equation of Turkey's historical brutality with his own country's recent attacks on civilians in Gaza may have the ironic effect of putting right both historical records, granting greater attention and credibility to the genocidal crimes of both parties.

Wendy C. Hamblet is a Canadian philosopher, Assistant Professor at North Carolina A&T State University, where she teaches genocide studies and contemporary moral problems. She is author of three books: The Sacred Monstrous: A Reflection on Violence in Human Communities (2004); Savage Constructions: The Myth of African Savagery (2008); and The Lesser Good: The Problem of Justice in Plato and Levinas (2008). She is a member of the International Association of Genocide Scholars (IAGS) and Johan Galtung's Transcend Network of scholar-activists. Hamblet serves in private practice as a counselor and mediator, and as an ethics consultant (Organizational Ethics/Anti-corruption) in the international capacity of the Paul Maillet Center for Ethics, Ottawa.

Peace Education

Exploring Ethical and Philosophical Foundations

James Page

Southern Cross University, Australia

Explores some possible ethico-philosophical foundations for peace education, through an examination of five specific ethical traditions.

Information Age Publishing

www.infoagepub.com

. . . . from ROMRIELL p. 1

tered to the weeping man. He had pulled the trigger and he had destroyed this beautiful little girl.

The flaming truck was the only light in the post-midnight gloom. The flames popped and cackled as though bragging of their own destructive power. A cool breeze sighed through an ally mockingly and blew sweat into the man's eyes. More tears fell. The other soldiers moved about the truck like carrion to the scent of death. Two men stood over a teenage boy whose fat, purple intestines fell from his abdomen like wet, angry snakes. His eyes darted frantically, maniacally. Lips quivered. He fought for breath. . . . (Passages taken from my unfinished novel.)

The *American Heritage Dictionary* defines war as:

1. A state of open, armed, often prolonged conflict carried on between nations, states, or parties. 2. The period of such conflict. 3. The techniques and procedures of war; military science. 4. A condition of active antagonism or contention: a war of words; a price war.

This definition may only aid in our understanding of war as a sociopolitical tool of powerful nations. War, unfortunately, is a complex machine and one must understand the human aspect of combat in order to fully understand war.

The War on War

While in Iraq I began to search for an understanding of my experiences, for the solace of knowledge. In aid of my search a second lieutenant friend gave me a book on Eastern philosophy. Things began to come together for me in the belief in Eastern Ahimsa (non-violence) and I would soon become a conscientious objector to the very war that I was fighting. So, for this evaluation of war I will look to the Ahimsa of Mahatma Gandhi, without whom the civil rights movement and the Indian independence movement would have been impossible.

About war, Gandhi wrote that, "War with all its glorification of brute force is essentially a degrading thing. It demoralizes those who are trained for it. It brutalizes men of naturally gentle character. It outrages every beautiful canon of morality. Its path to glory is foul with passions of lust, and red with the blood of murder" (Gandhi 326). He understood that war was wholly evil because it lessened the humanity of all those involved, directly and otherwise,

and he saw it as nothing more than an evil person's means of garnering power. "The science of war leads one to dictatorship pure and simple. The science of non-violence alone can lead on to pure democracy" (Gandhi 334).

Gandhi did realize that violence was necessary under certain instances, writing that, "I believe all war to be wholly wrong. But if we scrutinize the motives of two warring parties, we may find one to be in the right and the other in the wrong" (Gandhi 334). He felt that it was occasionally necessary for the defense of others and the duty of a moral people. "I do believe that where there is a choice only between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence. Thus when my eldest son asked me what he should have done had he been present when I was almost fatally assaulted in 1908, whether he should have run away and seen me killed or whether he should have used his physical force which he could and wanted to use, and defend me, I told him it was his duty to defend me even by using violence" (Gandhi 156-157).

He also stated that we should be careful in making accusations (Osama did it!) because they simply breed more accusations and evils. "[Be] most careful about accusing the opponent of wickedness . . . Those whom we regard as wicked as a rule return the compliment . . . Mind is its own place, it can make hell of heaven . . . Trust begets trust. Suspicion is foetid and only stinks. A suspicious man is lost to himself and the world . . . Suspicion is of the brood of violence. Non-violence cannot but trust" (Gandhi 210).

Additionally, he felt that it is odious for people to war over ideological and spiritual differences (Iraq, Iran, Democracy?) Every person is entitled to his or her own systems and each should be allowed the comfort of his or her beliefs given that they don't encroach on those of others. He wrote, "The most heinous and the most cruel crimes of which history has record have been committed under cover of religion or equally noble motives. But . . . we are no better off for the destruction that has gone on even under the highest sanction . . . We have no right to destroy life that we cannot create" (Gandhi 211). "I disbelieve the conversion of one person by another. My effort should never be to undermine another's faith but to make him a better follower of his own faith. This implies the belief in the truth of all religions and respect for them" (Gandhi 212).

... from ROMRIELL p. 11

He believed that Ahimsa could effectively combat warfare and despots and was essential for the maintenance of our humanity. He "believe[d] non-violence is infinitely superior to violence, forgiveness is more manly than punishment. . . . But . . . Forgiveness only when there is power to punish . . . A mouse hardly forgives a cat when it allows itself to be torn to pieces by her" (Gandhi 157).

When it is within our capacity to both forgive and punish, punishment comes more easily and forgiveness is thus the more respectable, powerful action. "Human nature will find itself only when it fully realizes that to be human it has to cease to be beastly and brutal" (Gandhi 331). He emphasized though, that Ahimsa could only be effective if exercised not only at a personal level by the people, but by the people *en mass*, writing that, "We have to make truth and non-violence not matters for mere individual practices but for practice by groups and communities and nations" (Gandhi 336).

It is essential that we all practice Ahimsa at all times and see all cruelty for what it really is. "A pacifism which can see the cruelties only of occasional military warfare and is blind to the continuous cruelties of our social system is worthless" (Gandhi 326).

If we all practice non-violence Gandhi felt that it would be possible even to reach the bombers above us, out of sight, because, "behind the death-dealing bomb there is a human hand that releases it, and behind that still is a human heart that sets the hand in motion" (Gandhi 331). Gandhi felt that it is a personal duty to do this immediately and fearlessly, rather than watching and waiting as cruelties are built around you. "We must refuse to wait for the wrong to be righted till the wrong-doer has been roused to a sense of his iniquity. We must not, for fear of ourselves or others having to suffer, remain participators in it . . . If a father does injustice, it is the duty of his children to leave the parental roof" (Gandhi 154).

He felt that honesty and truth were essential for the health of the global political structure, stating that, "I believe that it is possible to introduce uncompromising truth and honesty in the political life of the country . . . I would strain every nerve to make truth and non-violence accepted in all our national activities. Then we should cease to fear or distrust our governments and their measures"

(Gandhi 153). But these actions must start with one for peace to be possible.

"[Before] general disarmament . . . commences . . . some nation will have to dare to disarm herself and take large risks. The level of non-violence in that nation, if that event . . . comes to pass, will naturally have risen so high as to command universal respect. Her judgments will be unerring, her decisions firm, her capacity for heroic self-sacrifice will be great, and she will want to live as much for other nations as for her self" (Gandhi 336). May America be that one!

I feel that the application and understanding of Ahimsa in our lives can help us better understand the human element of war. Gandhi showed us how we are the root of aggression and how war degrades the humanity of all of those involved, directly or otherwise. I believe that we must embrace Gandhi's doctrine of non-violence in order to become a wholesome and peaceful people. Then we may be able to minimize the inhumanity of our global community and be able to accept other ideologies and become a human race, one rather than many.

In order to further develop the term war I feel that we must understand the root of war. Ourselves. Thich Nhat Hanh, a Buddhist monk, civil rights leader from Vietnam, and an admirer of Mahatma Gandhi wrote that, "The death penalty is a sign of weakness, an expression of our fear and inability to know what to do to help the situation. Killing a person does not help him or us . . . Our enemy is not the other person, no matter what he or she has done. If we look deeply into ourselves, we can see that their act was a manifestation of our collective consciousness" (Hanh 75).

It is the violence of our own egos that builds that machine that we have titled war. Hanh goes on to say, "Even if we transport all the bombs to the moon, the roots of war . . . are still here, in our hearts and minds, and sooner or later we will make new bombs. To work for peace is to uproot war from ourselves and from the hearts of men and women" (Hanh 77).

This can be seen particularly in the history of the 60's: the Vietnam police action, the civil rights movement, and assassinations of our peace leaders. Martin Luther King Jr., who was a friend of Thich Nhat Hanh, came to this understanding when he traveled to India. He put it to use when he came home and helped to save his race from the

slavery of segregation (for the most part). He wrote that, "The end of violence or the aftermath of violence is bitterness. The aftermath of non-violence is reconciliation and the creation of a beloved community" (King 12).

Bill Hicks, a Texas comedian, had an insightful plan to make peace possible. He said, "You know all that money we spend on the military every year—trillions of dollars? Instead, if we use this money to feed and clothe the poor of this world, which it would do many times over, then we can explore space, inner and outer, together, as one race" (Hicks 36).

Works Cited

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 4th Ed. Houghton Mifflin Company, 2006.

Gandhi, Mahatma. *The Essential Gandhi*. 1962. New York: Vintage Books, 1983.

Hanh, Thich Nhat. *Living Buddha, Living Christ*. New York: Riverhead Books, 1995.

Hicks, Bill. *Love all the People: Letters, Lyrics, Routines*. New York: Soft Skull Press, 2004.

King, Martin Luther, Jr. *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: Harper Collins, 1986.

Gary Romriell lives in Austin, Texas, where he wrote the above essay as a required paper for Introduction to Philosophy. He can be found online at myspace: Rooster and the Kid.

Call to the 11th Session of the Provisional World Parliament

In conjunction with the 12th International Conference of International Philosophers for Peace (IPPNO) July 2-8, 2009, Nainital, India, in the beautiful Himalaya Mountains.

Look for Details at:

www.worldproblems.net

www.wcpa.biz

www.radford.edu/~gmartin

Experience and the Peace Constitution of Japan

Review of Peace Movements and Pacifism after September 11, edited by Shin Chiba and Thomas J. Schoenbaum. Cheltenham UK: Edward Elgar, 2008

by Greg Moses

In its *D.C. v. Heller* opinion of June, 2008, the Supreme Court of the United States re-affirmed that the right to bear arms is an individual right that pre-exists the Constitution. "By the time of the founding, the right to have arms had become fundamental for English subjects" (*Heller* 20). Behind the right to bear arms was a memory of struggles during which Protestants had been disarmed by a Catholic king. When William and Mary subsequently guaranteed in the 1689 Declaration of Right that "Protestants may have arms for their defense," a principle of right was carried forward that codified the experiential memory of concrete struggles against the tyrannies of an armed state power.

The people of Japan, in their post-war Constitution of 1946-47, introduced another kind of guarantee against the violence and oppression of an armed state. "Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat of use of force as a means of settling international disputes" (Japanese Constitution, Article 9).

As with the English Protestant demands upon William and Mary, the Japanese people's demand upon their post-war state was born of fresh memory. As Professor Shin Chiba argues, the pacifist Constitution of Japan was an expression of "the disappointment, contrition, and remorse for 'the horrors of war through the action of government' (Preamble) shared equally by the people" (138). As a result, the Japanese people pledged that, "land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained" (Japanese Constitution, Article 9).

The relatively recent experiment of the Japanese people to renounce an armed state has taken a tumble, however, in the wake of American influence. First, writes Professor

... from MOSES p. 13

Shiba, there was the order of Gen. Douglas MacArthur that the Japanese government form an armed national police force, now known as the Self-Defense Forces (SDF/Jietai). The budget for Japan's defense force has grown to be the "the largest among non-nuclear powers." But especially after Sept. 11, 2001, Japanese defense forces have been increasingly pulled into global theaters in support of US military operations, especially in Iraq (129).

This spectre of a Japanese militarism reconstructed at the behest of US bidding is but one of the belligerent developments considered in a collection of essays recently published by Professors Chiba and Thomas J. Schoenbaum under the title of *Peace Movements and Pacifism after September 11*. The contributions for this collection are taken from talks delivered under the auspices of the peace research program at the International Christian University of Tokyo.

If Professor Chiba intends to raise concerns about the Constitutional principles of Japan in a post-Sept. 11 world, he also argues that the basis of those peace principles is resilient, precisely because the foundation resides ultimately in the experienced memory of the Japanese people.

With militarist concerns duly noted, Professor Chiba argues that the trajectory of Japanese culture in the post-war period has been very much in the direction of the pacifist principles articulated by Article 9. From a cultural base that Professor Chiba calls "humiliated democracy" the Japanese people have by-and-large endeavored to nurture a "culture of peace."

As a people, then, Professor Chiba argues that the Japanese have developed a kind of popular pacifism that might be classified as "the pacifism of war abolition" which is to be carefully distinguished from seven other kinds of pacifism, including "anti-war pacifism" (137-138).

Furthermore, for Japanese experience, the pacifism of the people rests neither within an "idealism" nor upon certain versions of "hard" realism. Instead, the pacifism of the Japanese people is to be understood as grounded in a "soft-power realism" which takes seriously "power components such as political and diplomatic power, economic power, power of culture, support and cooperation of the populace, or power of ideals and morals" (141).

With reference to the work of Makoto Oda, Professor Chiba argues that the realism of Japanese pacifism has grown out of "*taiken teki heiwashugi*, that is a pacifism of the immediate experiences of the people. These immediate experiences include the utmost experiences of atomic warfare (Hiroshima and Nagasaki)" (142).

Social science research confirms that to some deep degree Japanese experience is at work upon a pacifism of ordinary life. Comparing the rates of murder, violence, or domestic abuse between the US and Japan reveals striking contrasts. Professor Chiba offers a comparison of the 1995 murder rate (per 100,000) in the US to that of Japan to yield a ratio of 8.95 to 0.60, or fourteen to one (146).

Other social science sources tend to corroborate what Chiba indicates. For example, in a 2005 World Health Organization survey of intimate partner violence, Japan's rate ranked lowest of all countries studied (WHO Ch. 2). When a recent change in Japanese law mandated an increased attention to recidivism prevention among "mentally disordered offenders," a group of social scientists set out to establish a baseline rate from which to begin measuring future changes. They concluded that, "Violent recidivism was so unusual that, on this outcome, it could take many years to show any effect of the new service" (Yoshikawa et al 137).

Finally, Professor Chiba argues that Japan's culture of peace has produced a meaningful level of "post-war civil and resident movements for democracy, peace, social justice, pollution, and environmental betterment" (147). Recent corroboration for the claim may be found in a 2006 study of "Grassroots efforts of Japanese women to promote services for abused women." In summary, the authors of that study confirmed previous claims by K. Ii that, "community members are not simply consumers but rather the makers and builders of a better and more comfortable community. It is clear these women had the ability to recognize an issue, increase their awareness, and take action" (Hatashita, et al 173).

On the usual model of the militarist cycle, the Japanese people could have emerged from the war determined to become a competitive nuclear power. Instead, as a people, they thoroughly renounced the trajectory of nuclear militarism and instead constitutionalized an abolition of war. Professor Chiba argues that the post-war insight of the Japanese people should sustain further progress toward a culture of peace. Perhaps it takes the contrast between

that insight and the US-led militarism since Sept. 11 to convince other peoples of the world that a realism based upon experience can serve as the basis for new principles of human rights to peace without war.

Additional Works Cited

Hatashita, Hiroyo, Kyoko Hirao, Karen A. Brykczynski, and Elizabeth T. Anderson. "Grass-roots efforts of Japanese women to promote services for abused women." *Nursing and Health Sciences* (2006), 8, 169-174.

WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women. Geneva: WHO Press, 2005 (accessed at who.int/gender/violence/who_multicountry_study on Jan. 31, 2009)

Yoshikawa, Kazuo; Pamela J. Taylor, Akira Yamagami, Takayuki Okada, Kumiko Ando, Toshihiro Taruya, Toshihiko Matsumoto, Akiko Kikuchi. "Violent recidivism among mentally disordered offenders in Japan." *Criminal Behaviour & Mental Health* (Sep2007) 17.3, p137-151.

Greg Moses is Editor of this newsletter. His article on the Purdue Sermons of Martin Luther King, Jr. appeared in the Fall 2008 Newsletter on Philosophy and the Black Experience, published by the American Philosophical Association.

CPP Membership

ANNUAL DUES for CPP membership are \$20.00, including a subscription to the newsletter. There is also a \$5.00 membership for students or low income. If you have not already paid dues for 2008-09, please send a check to:

Dennis Rothermel, PhD, CPP Treasurer, Department of Philosophy, California State University - Chico, Chico, CA 95929-0730

Name: _____

2008-2009 CPP dues: _____

Additional contribution: _____

Total amount enclosed: _____

Please provide the following information if there are any changes from last year:

Address/University affiliation: _____

Telephone / Fax: _____

Email: _____

Please remove my name from your mailing list: _____

2009 CPP Annual Conference with Angela Davis

The 2009 Concerned Philosophers for Peace Conference will be held at the University of Dayton, November 6-8, 2009. The topic of the colloquium is "Communities of Justice." The focus of the colloquium is on the opportunities and challenges of creating just conditions in local communities. Our keynote speaker on November 7, 2009 will be Dr. Angela Davis. Possible paper topics include:

- What constitutes a just community?
- What obstacles do we face in creating Communities of Justice?
- How can obstacles be overcome in order to make a community more just?
- What is the relationship between local action and national or international action?
- Who is oppressed and who are the oppressors?
- How should, and how do oppressed groups respond to each other?
- How should, and how do oppressed groups respond to their oppressor?
- How can we learn from the past, making use of what is valuable, without being tainted by what is harmful?
- What aspects of race theory and feminist theory are supportive of, or prevent creating Communities of Justice?

Anyone interested in presenting a paper should submit an abstract of no more than 250 words by **August 1, 2009** to danielle.poe@notes.udayton.edu

CPPN 28 Articles and Reviews:

- 1 Peacemaking by Barry Gan*
- 1 Ahimsa by Gary Romriell*
- 2 Executive Director's Report by David Boersema*
- 3 Chavez: Meaning Business and Making Peace by Greg Moses*
- 4 From Marine to Anti-SOA Organizer by Emily Barone*
- 10 A Light in the Dark Tunnels of Middle Eastern Intrigue? by Wendy C. Hamblet*
- 13 Experience and the Peace Constitution of Japan by Greg Moses*