Nonviolent Livelihood Struggle and Global Militarism: Links and Strategies

International Conference, Ahmedabad, India, 22 25 January 2010

Whenever the time comes to organise a WRI Triennial (now Quadrennial) conference, we search for a conference theme that will combine different elements of our vision. Just as Gandhi gave an activist twist to the ancient notion of ahimsa (non-harm), transforming it into “action based on the refusal to do harm”, so WRI’s “no” to involvement in war and war preparations leads us into involvement in and support for nonviolent action in a range of contexts. Ultimately it leads to our intention to build movements for nonviolent social transformation.

The theme for the Ahmedabad triennial in 2010 juxtaposes nonviolent livelihood struggles – that is, nonviolent resistance by communities to localised threats – with the global forces that pose this danger, and in particular the global face of militarism. There are many differences. A community’s campaign for its own survival and dignity has a very different character than a campaign by people who choose to involve themselves in dismantling the machinery of war. Yet somehow the solidarity generated by their coming together – the local and the global, the community whose livelihood is in danger with those concerned to challenge the power structures of their own society – can construct a counter-power to defy, perhaps withstand and one day stop the forces of destruction.

The history of nonviolent action – and indeed of war resistance – is typified by this dual dynamic: on the one hand local communities standing against the imposition of their rulers, on the other a sense of the global, of a common humanity that transcends frontiers and cuts through the structures of hierarchical power.

The conference programme

The opening session in Ahmedabad will be addressed by one of the other outstanding India critics of the politics of capitalist globalisation, probably Arundhati Roy. Three other plenary sessions will take up the issues of “Mining – a threat to community, a
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Editorial

This issue of The Broken Rifle introduces the forthcoming War Resisters’ International International Conference, historically known as the WRI Triennial: “Nonviolent Livelihood Struggle and Global Militarism: Links & Strategies” that will take place in Ahmedabad, India between the 22 and 25 of January 2010. As Howard Clark says in the opening article “a WRI Triennial is more than a conference. It is a central part of our building a transnational community of resisters.” Yes, in India we expect much more than just to have another conference, but to be the place where the WRI world gets together to continuing shaping the history of the network.

In this issue we introduce some of the topics that will be covered at the conference. The article on aluminium mining in India and on the resistance from local communities in Orissa tells us the story of the impact of the aluminium industry, the connection of this industry with weapon production and the resistance of local villagers to the mining of their sacred land. “Exodus of a country at war” presents the courageous work of Colombians supporting displaced people particularly from rural areas to the cities. Displacement enforced by military and paramilitary forces is part of the lasting Colombian conflict and also aids the schemes of multinationals to take possession of large tracts of land to extract natural resources. The last two articles are related to war profiteering, the first introducing us to the rapid development of the arms industry in India and the second one reflecting on WRI’s work against war profiteers. All these topics and many more will be part of the conference - we present the draft programme for the conference. If you want to learn more about the conference and also register to it, you should check the following link:http://wri-rig.org/india2010.

Javier Gárate
Nonviolent Livelihood Struggle and Global Militarism: Links & Strategies
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contribution to war” with a speaker from the struggle against the Vedanta bauxite mine in Orissa, India; “Land Struggle” with a Paraguayan speaker from Via Campesina, a worldwide network with which WRI has not yet had much direct interaction; and “Transnational Alliances – their role in nonviolent struggle”, with Medha Patkar who came to prominence in the campaign against the Narmada dams. However, most of the conference time will be spent in workshops where participants will have the chance to contribute from their own experience and to ask. If you’d like to set up a workshop, it’s never too late to offer.

This Triennial will be the third to be held in India. We will meet in the city of Ahmedabad at the Gujarati Vidhyapith, a university founded by Gandhi himself and whose most glorious achievement was probably to be closed three times during civil disobedience campaigns in India’s freedom struggle. Our two other hosts are products of different eras of nonviolent struggle – the Gujarati Sarvodaya Mandal, founded in the 1950s to coordinate the Bhooayan (land-gift) campaign led by Gandhi’s “spiritual heir”, Vinoba Bhave, and the Sampoorana Kranti Vidyalaya (Institute for Total Revolution), founded by Narayana Desai in the 1970s to develop the nonviolent movement against the Emergency imposed by Indira Gandhi into a movement for total revolution. All three remain closely involved with different types of nonviolent movement. These will be our formal hosts. Informally, we would not be going to India at all were it not for three grassroots nonviolent troublemakers living in Gujarati villages – Swati Desai, Michael Mazgaonkar and Anand Mazgaonkar. In addition to the conference, there will be an excursion visiting nonviolent projects in the vicinity of Ahmedabad, scene in the past of lethal communal riots, and the chance to organise study trips further afield.

More than a conference

A WRI Triennial is more than a conference. It is, of course, part of WRI’s continuing work. The ideas we discuss should feed into cooperation and action, the people we meet might become co-workers, and so our networks grows in effectiveness and numbers. The Triennials remain a central means in our effort to build a transnational community of resisters who will support each other, and amplify the message of any part of our network in the rest of the world. This is why activists from Australia in the south to Finland in the north are raising funds to support the participation of people they work with in other countries, and why Patrick Sheehan-Gaumer in New England, USA, will be a running a sponsored marathon to raise the money for himself and someone else to participate.

Whatever is on the agenda, we try to make the most of a time when so many of us from so many countries will be together. Often people comment that the best part of a conference is what takes place out of session, in the lunch queue, in the evenings, etc. This also may be true of WRI conferences, but in Ahmedabad we will also do our best to make the sessions themselves interactive - for instance, we propose to start each day with a few people preparing a “newspaper theatre” sketch (one of the techniques associated with Agosto Boa’s Theatre of the Oppressed) on the news of the day.

I was 22 years old when I first attended a Triennial, in 1972, and it made a huge impression of me. Not for the quality of debate - to be frank, that was rather patchy. Nor even for giving me the opportunity to hang out with some legendary activists I’d read about and some recently released prisoners. First, I was struck by the sense of “encounter”, of finding the person behind a useful contact address. Second, I was impressed by the strength of feeling - how much we all cared about this work for our common cause and beyond that for each other, for the people who despite all our difficulties keep on keeping on – there are so many persisters among the war resisters! I hope that anybody attending their first Triennial in Ahmedabad will have the same kind of experience.

Looking through the list of participants already registered, I see several names of people I’m really keen to meet. The reasons vary. For some it is to find out “how did you do that?” or even “how did it feel to do that?” and always “what happened next?” or “what should we expect now?” For some, it is that they come from places where news sources - including movement sources - leave us unsatisfied: Rafael Uzcategui from Venezuela is a good example, someone WRI has been trusting as an anti-militarist reference point amid all the propaganda for and against Chavez’s “Bolivarian revolution”.

For WRI as an organisation, the Triennial is a vital point of renewal – it’s the time when new members come onto Council, perhaps new projects are set in motion, and where together we look afresh at the challenges ahead of us. If you are reading this, you are very welcome to attend.

Howard Clark
Chair of WRI
Keep the Bauxite in the Mountains

Mining in the Age of Terror
The aluminium industry occupies a vital position in the military-industrial complex. Supply links between mining companies and arms companies are at the heart of this complex, along with the financial institutions that invest in both. In a context where state violence, as well as the terrorism it targets, is escalating in many countries, the “war against terror” has created a climate where too few are questioning the arms industry, and its role in promoting war.

Among many other issues, the greenhouse gas emissions of arms factories are massive, yet barely studied, and conspicuous by their absence from most climate change debates. This is also true of metal production in general, when compared to attention given to the oil industry and individuals’ carbon footprint. What about our metal consumption? And who calculates the carbon footprints of our wars?

The mining industry needs to be understood as intrinsically destructive to human life (if not life on earth) at both ends of the production line: the invasion of greenfield mines and factories onto indigenous communities and some of the world’s last pristine environments, that these communities have preserved; and the end result of metal consumed in weapons systems and wars, at exorbitant economic as well as human costs (our theme in “Double Death: Aluminium’s Links with Genocide” 2006). Producing one ton of steel consumes an estimated 44 tons of water. Producing one ton of aluminium consumes a staggering 1,378 tons of water, so the expansion of aluminium plants threatens to disrupt water access for future inhabitants of Orissa and bodes ill for Orissa’s cultivators (Rithoff et al 2002). Producing one ton also emits an average of 15 tons of CO2.

Among India’s most significant people’s movements are those resisting new mining/metals projects in Orissa and neighbouring states, and the dams that feed them. In places, violent repression of these movements threatens a state of civil war. To put this another way, a number of “resource wars” are escalating in several parts of India. Examples are south Chhattisgarh, where the Salwa Judum militia’s battle against Maoist insurgents has involved burning and displacing hundreds of tribal villages, in a context of vast new iron/steel projects; and the Lalgir area of West Bengal, where police suppression of Santals protesting against Jindal’s steel plant plans has sparked another war zone between Maoist-supported tribal villagers and state security forces. This follows the success – at high human cost – of the Singur and Nandigram movements in defeating plans for vast factories on cultivated land. In these areas of West Bengal, as in Orissa, protest is often erroneously branded as Maoist-led, justifying increasingly harsh repression. The Orissa Government is even copying the Salwa Judum model, training several hundred tribal youths as Special Police Officers (SPOs) in Maoist-affected districts.

Continued on page 4

Dongria villager on the Niyamiri mountain. Photo: Jason Taylor
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Local Organisers

Gujarat Sarvodaya Mandal
Established in the 1950s, Gujarat Sarvodaya Mandal was the central organisation in the Bhoodan (land gift) movement, led by Vinoba Bhave. Today it is involved in raising awareness on development issues, organising people against unjust and destructive development projects, and the search for alternatives in fields such as agriculture, energy etc.

Sampoorna Kranti Vidyalaya ("Institute for Total Revolution")
This training centre for nonviolent activists was founded by Narayan Desai in the 1970s during the movement for "total revolution" led by Jayaprakash Narayan (at the time of the Emergency imposed by Indira Gandhi). It has also played a significant role in challenging India's commitment to nuclear energy.

Venue
The venue is one of the historic institutions of nonviolent struggle in India - the Gujarat Vidyapith, founded by Mohandas Gandhi in 1920 as Rashtriya Vidyapith (National Institute of University Education) at the beginning of the Non-cooperative Movement. Students and faculty members participated actively in the freedom struggle, and on three occasions the Vidyapith was forced to stop functioning – the civil disobedience movements of 1930 and 1932 and the Quit India Movement of 1942. It resumed functioning afresh in 1945 and in June 1947, the Mahadev Desai College of Social Work was established. Gandhi remained chancellor until his death, and his successors have included Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Morarji Desai and currently Narayan Desai.

Continued from pages 3

This brings closer a danger of civil war, in a context where neoliberal orthodoxy views most of India’s cultivators as “inefficient” and in need of removal from the land, to make way for biotech models of large-scale farms. India is repeating the pattern of European history in which subsistence farmers are removed by enclosing and clearing the land.

Already, an unequal war is being waged in India, with the Prime Minister speaking of Maoists as India’s biggest security threat (Al Jazeera news 17th August 2010; www.youtube.com/watch?v=gpQP8JMY68). In a typical incident, police on 12th August killed 6 villagers in Dantewada district – the epicentre of the war on terror since 2005 (http://groups.yahoo.com/group/chhattisgarhnet/message/12649).

"Aluminum for defence & prosperity" – the scene in Orissa

This text by Dewey Anderson by the Public Affairs Institute in Washington in 1951 (sold for 50 cents but now hard to access) is perhaps the only time a top aluminium expert has written frankly about the industry:

Aluminum has become the most important single bulk material of modern warfare. No fighting is possible, and no war can be carried to a successful conclusion today, without using and destroying vast quantities of aluminum.

Aluminum making is dependent on vast continuing grants of low cost electricity... Aluminum reduction is no great maker of employment, uses little skilled labor, and adds little to the independent development of an area [...] the US cannot any longer afford to make aluminum if it can be obtained in large enough quantities and on favourable price terms from other sources. (pp.3, 10, 21)

New aluminum projects in East India, based on plans for mining some of the biggest mountains in south Orissa and north Andhra, are on a huge scale. Already Sterlite/Vedanta has built a new refinery and smelter, and Hindalco/Utkal is constructing the same, while other companies have advanced plans for more refineries. In the words of a leader of the Kashipur movement against Utkal, Bhagaban Majhi:

To destroy the millions of year old mountains is not development. If the government has decided that we need alumina, and we need to mine bauxite, they should oblige us with replacement land. As Adilavasi, we are cultivators. We cannot live without land... If they need it so badly, they need to tell us why they need it. How many missiles will our bauxite be used for? What bombs will you make? How many military aeroplanes? You must give us a complete account.

(quoted from A & S. Das: Matro Poko Company Loko, 2005)

Vedanta’s Lanjigarh refinery was constructed right next to Niyamgong, in the Niyamgiri range, one of the best forested mountains in India, due to the protection of primary forest on the summit by the Dongria Kond tribe. Following the Supreme Court case (2004-8), which basically granted clearance for mining on Niyamgong, Vedanta is trying to construct a mining road and conveyor belt up this mountain, despite opposition from Dongria and other villagers. The Supreme Court case excluded Dongria opinion – one of the judges said that “tribal people have no place in this case”. But the judgement did extract a promise from the company to halt surveys, and to halt tribal development, reforestation and wildlife management. Considering that tribal development is notorious for its corruption (P. Sainath 1996), and that tribal leaders have often said “Don’t flood us out with money”, these plans are not in line with the wishes of most tribal people. The timber mafia is known to have been extremely active on new roads built into the Dongria hills to co-ordinate with Vedanta – and operates along new roads built for mining projects as a matter of course. Moreover, the plantations planned, or used to “rehabilitate” bauxite mines by Nalco, Balco and other companies, are mostly of foreign species such as eucalyptus – no substitute for the biodiversity destroyed. As for wildlife management – a leopard photographed on top of Niyam Dongar (shown in Down to Earth) has already been shot.

Most Dongria strongly oppose the mine, but some have been bought up by the company, or believe its promises. A classic tactic of mining companies, as of colonial powers throughout history, is to divide the people like this, and the situation replicates the scene in Kashipur, where massive construction of Hindalco’s refinery is under way. Each mountain is a sacred entity for local Adivasis, who remain active against the mining companies, which include Jindal, Larsen & Toubro, and companies from the United Arab Emirates, while BHP Billiton, Rio Tinto and Alcoa are waiting in the wings.

Though Vedanta and Hindalco have built (or part-built) their refineries in south Orissa, as well as smelters in north Orissa, neither have yet been able to start mining bauxite, while mines of Vedanta’s subsidiaries Nalco and Balco have been closed or forbidden to expand by government orders, due to negative impacts on the environment and local communities. The smelters, which are designed to draw huge amounts of water from the Hirakud reservoir, face repeated protests from farmers who were promised water from this reservoir’s refurbishment, only to find that their canals are running dry, since most of the water is going to factories (POKSSS 2008). These movements against these bauxite-aluminiun projects, and by Orissa’s farmers, are among the strongest in India.

Stronger than Steel

As with aluminium, so with steel. When Sir Ratan Tata signed a deal for a joint venture with Lockheed-Martin, India’s main newspapers had a photograph of him smiling rather maniacally as he sat in the back seat of a F-16 for a test flight (8th Feb 2007).

A movement of tribal people in Jajpur
In Chhattisgarh, iron mining & steel plants by Tata and other companies are at the heart of the Salwa Judum war against Maoists. The state-sponsored militia has burnt about 600 tribal villages, and turned over 100,000 villagers into refugees (PUDR 2006, Padel 2007).

Resource Wars

These “resource wars” are driven by foreign investors keen to gain control of Eastern India’s “mineral assets”, with promises of a new age of prosperity once these assets are being “utilised”, even though the whole history of the “resource curse” shows that – and even more, regions of countries – that are rich in minerals or oil, far from benefiting from extraction, are launched into a cycle of poverty and violence worse than anything that came before. India’s mining regions are generally its most impoverished and conflict-stricken (Kalshian 2007, CSE 2008). Vedanta is driven by a range of the world’s biggest financial investors. For Tata, its recent acquisition of Corus, Landrover and Jaguar, and the oversize loans it took to finance this, are factors driving its India projects.

The aluminium industry’s influence in Iceland, Guinea, Jamaica, Australia, Brazil and other countries is one of economic mayhem and environmental devastation, whose history has not been taken into account (Padel & Das, forthcoming). In Vietnam, newly prospected bauxite deposits in the central highlands are about to be heavily exploited by Chinese and other foreign mining companies, despite strong protest from a range of respected citizens, including a 97 year old general who led resistance to the French and American invasions (International Herald Tribune 15.1.09).

The base rock of Orissa’s mountains was named “Khondalite” after the Konds. The layer of Bauxite near the top of these mountains holds monsoon water throughout the year, releasing it slowly in perennial streams, which dry up when the bauxite is mined (as at Panchpat Mali, mined by Nalco since 1980). The industry claims, absurdly, that the groundwater is benefited because “during bauxite mining, micro-cracks develop in the mountain sides which facilitate run-off, recharging the groundwater below.” In other words, during the hot season, these streams run dry.

Aluminium forms 8% of the earth’s crust, and in the soil, it plays a vital, though little known role in holding moisture, by combining with H2O. Some of parts of the world richest in biodiversity are those rich in Bauxite, such as Brazil, West Africa, northern Australia and Orissa. Mining and metal factories reverse these life-giving properties.

As a metal, the element’s combinability gives rise to a huge range of alloys, and a vast range of applications, not least in aerospace, where the lithium range in particular is exceptionally polluting.

Extracting and processing aluminium from bauxite, and turning it into the igniting agency, fuel and casing of missiles involves a transformation from life-giving properties to “double death” – an agent of war, and a cause of environmental conflict.

We cannot afford the war in Afghanistan, environmentally or economically let alone the human cost & counterproductive strategy, that creates “terrorists” out of citizens outraged at the killing of brothers and sisters, and the double standards that count the lives of foreign soldiers killed in Afghanistan, but not the – far more numerous lives - of civilians killed, let alone of Taliban or even Afghan government soldiers. The war against Maoists likewise fuels an already smouldering injustice.

So the movements against new industrialisation engulfing Eastern India is intimately connected to the war on terror, both because the metals’ apex use is in manufacturing arms, and because the attempt to set up new mining-metals projects is escalating conflicts over resources – the war on terror in India.

Felix Pade & Samarendra Das
Exodus of a country at war

...this bitter daily reality

 Forced displacement in Colombia has been caused by both official and illegal military groups, by paramilitary and guerrilla groups. However, little is being done to tackle these consequences of the war and there is a lack of preventive measures to deal with the effects of displacement on different kinds of victims.

 In a rural country such as Colombia, rural workers have become military targets and their lands are of strategic interest to multinationals; their children have become fodder for recruitment into the different military groups, both legal and illegal. Since the 1950s, the pressures of everyday life in rural areas have forced thousands of farmers (campesinos) to migrate to the expanding cities, usually into the outskirts and most deprived neighborhoods.

 Violence is not a natural fact; it reflects the existing unequal power relations. However, attitudes justifying violence are found in everyday life, including in the academic sphere - where women's inferiority, male domination - both sexually and in terms of imposition of rules - and gender discrimination in both public and private spheres of life are seen as normal.

 Nobody is prepared for displacement, militarisation and the ongoing internal exodus in Colombia since the 1930s, when the initial outbreak of violence took place, reflects our history of impunity and assassinations. This is a continued internal armed conflict which is increasing the gap in social inequalities caused by such conflict: misery, poverty, tears, pain, deaths, the countryside, interests, deals, fear, terror, attacks, harassment, humiliation, anxiety, hunger, weapons, shootings, wars, conflicts, hate, anger and vengeance are the main catalysts which lead to displacement, which has become a bitter daily reality.

 The number of displaced people in Colombia as a result of violence since 1985 has reached 4.3 million.

 In 2007, according to CODHES (Consultancy for Human Rights and Displacement), 305, 683 people were displaced and in 2008 a further 380,863 - in fact not all displacement is recorded, probably more than 400,000 people were displaced in 2008. The government only defines people as “vulnerable” if they have official documentation stating that they have been displaced. This forced displacement continues because it is not in some people’s interests to end it.

 However, it is simply merely a matter of displacement from rural to urban areas. There is further displacement in the cities, and further consequences such as the emergence of paramilitary groups and militarised official police in a city such as Medellin in the past 20 years invading and imposing themselves in vulnerable neighbourhoods. To cite Medellin as a case in point - in the past 20 years paramilitary groups and the police have invaded deprived neighbourhoods, high risk zones and poor communities.

 Other effects of displacement arise from uprooting, including loss of collective memory and culture, the burden imposed and violence carried out on women, the elderly, youth and children. Life in the “receiving” city is not free from armed conflict, and the displaced face hostility and stigmatisation.

 As part of the Red de Organizaciones Comunitarias (ROC - network of community organisations) and Movilización Popular (People’s Mobilisation), Red Juvenil in Medellin works with communities in the peripheral areas of the city, with the aim that they should organise and struggle for dignity. The areas of the cities that “receive” displaced people often lack drinking water, drains or access routes. There is hunger, unemployment, high levels of demographic growth, a large number of families lacking access to public services, violence spread by gangs, allegedly “demobilised” fighters, paramilitary groups, the police and army.

 The Red Juvenil also works with rural initiatives elsewhere in the department of Antioquia, which through the strengthening of a network called Roots, involving the production of organic, fair-trade agricultural products and the elimination of intermediaries, has enabled several communities to become less vulnerable to collective uprooting of people in the interests of multinationals, as well as preventing the loss of their lands and rural identity.

 Rural workers have become a military target, their children have become fodder for extrajudicial executions carried out by soldiers, daughters have become the soldiers’ women and the workers now work on mega-projects, their lands have become booty in order to bring together and privatise Colombia; the dispossession of lands is due to the need to group together the land and hand over our paradise to the multinationals who exploit our natural resources, in the name of development and economic growth, which does not require inhabitants.

 In the 90s the rural workers of the northeast, Magdalena medio and Santander were displaced. Over 40,000 families were forced to abandon their lands due to the conflict which broke out between the different illegal armed factions fighting over control for the land for growing and producing coca. This rural eviction of peasant farmers from their smallholdings took place to make way for illegal cultivation, achieved through the felling of forests, the expansion of the agricultural lands, and exploitation of water, mineral and wood resources.

 We consider the national and international...
treatment relating to illicit farming as a joint political, military and economic strategy for the peasant farmers’ lands, which mainly favours multinational companies linked to the war and other sectors of the global economy.

The way in which these displacements come about and the role the government plays in favour of the multinationals and against the people can be summarised in the following example of the municipality of Antioquia Ituango, in which the Pesca-dero-Ituango hydroelectric plant is planned to be built - on behalf of the Antioquia governing authorities and the EPM group since 1987. In these years these territories were smallholdings where the clear absence of the State led to the proliferation of armed insurgent groups and there was an inability to provide services satisfying people’s basic needs; in the ‘90s, while studies were being carried out about energy production, the conflict intensified with the presence of paramilitary groups, who harassed families to flee and committed crimes against humanity such as the el Aro massacre in 1998 which occurred on October 22, 1997 in the municipality of Ituango, Department of Antioquia. 15 individuals accused of being leftist supporters of the FARC were massacred by paramilitary groups with support from members of the Colombian army. Perpetrators also violated women, burned down 43 houses, stole cattle and forcibly displaced 900 people.

**Gender and Displacement**

Having been presented with several cases of women who are victims of forced displacement, the constitutional Court issued auto 002, authorising an impact study analysing how women’s bodies and lives are affected by forced displacement in a patriarchal society, where there is a long standing tradition of violence against women. Some of the effects of such violence, as well as the risks and other forms of violations are as follows:

- Violence and sexual abuse, including forced prostitution, sexual slavery or human trafficking for sexual purposes.
- Domestic violence and violence within the community due to gender related issues.
- Ignorance and violation of the right to health, in particular in relation to their sexual and reproductive rights at all levels, with especially serious violations being carried out on girls children and adolescents, as well as pregnant or breast feeding mothers.
- The fact that these women then assume the role of main breadwinner of the family, without having the minimum means required to lead a life based on the principle of human dignity. There are particularly complicated situations regarding women with young children, women with health problems, women with disabilities or elderly women.
- Increased difficulty in gaining access to basic education.
- Further obstacles in integrating within the economic system and gaining access to job opportunities.
- Domestic and labour exploitation, including human trafficking for sexual purposes.
- Greater difficulty in gaining access to owning land and ensuring the protection of the lands for the future, especially relating to plans for returning to the land and relocation.

remove or assassinate leaders and organisations that opposes privatisation.

The phenomenon of displacement shows two visions of the world: one, that of the rural workers, native Indigenous population and those of African descent, who see the land as life, home, the mother earth and the life source for their communities throughout history; and then there is the other, where land is seen as a source of wealth, progress for individual exploitation. Therefore, land is the means to ensure the “well-being” of a precious few.

We call for the protection of women from the different gender-related effects of displacement, given that women are victims in three ways: firstly, suffering the trauma caused by the violent acts; secondly, they losing their possessions and their familiar surroundings in the rural areas and thirdly, being socially uprooted. They are coming from the ‘countryside, a domestic, smaller world’ to an urban, hostile and unknown environment. This situation shows us how violence against women has a long standing history and how displacement further worsens the already present violence taking place, especially in the domestic sphere.

Forced displacement in Colombia is a recurring crime caused by a war. It is a crime against humanity and it is the State and governments who are responsible for the daily disappearance of the fundamental and collective rights.

**Conclusion**

Militarisation is a mechanism used by the government in power, as well as by counter-insurgency factions, in order to intimidate, harass, terror and banish those individuals living on lands facts. This instrument of fear is used to implement the “counter-agrarian reform” and open the way for “development” and progress as prescribed by the multinationals.

The areas where most displacement takes place have usually already been chosen for mineral and oil exploration or are areas with an abundance of natural resources. Therefore displacement is a useful tool for structural violence and in the name of economic growth and productivity offers the country for exploitation by the multinationals. These multinationals in turn demand a strong police presence while also hiring security companies and paying bribes to paramilitaries in order to
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Push for military-industrial complex in India?

Indian acquisitions of military hardware are the hot topic in the global armaments bazaar. India is expected to spend around $30 billion on arms imports over the next few years and is perhaps the world’s largest importer currently spending around $6 billion a year out of a defence budget of $28 billion for 2009-10. Security analysts are fond of pointing out that this is only around 2.5% of GDP compared to India’s neighbours Pakistan and China whose annual defence budgets are around 4.5% ($4.4 billion) and 4% ($100 billion) of their GDPs respectively. While the merits or otherwise of India’s defence spending are beyond the scope of this article, it rather addresses an aspect that has largely escaped scrutiny. The nature and scale of India’s defence imports, the recent and growing involvement of large Indian corporates and global arms manufacturers in India’s defence industry, and governmental policies governing defence production are all coming together to lay the foundation of what could evolve into an export-oriented military-industrial complex in India in place of a staɪd, inward looking, mainly state-owned industry.

Three distinct but inter-related trends are visible in India’s defence sector. First, steadily rising defence budgets linked to substantive modernization of India’s military and a new strategic outlook. Second, large-scale procurement of high-value military hardware due to delayed procurement of equipment in earlier decades, obsolescence of current hardware and failure of indigenous efforts to meet the military’s requirements. Third, a major procurement of equipment being from foreign suppliers but with offset provisions under which domestic firms, now also in the private sector, would also be substantially involved. These trends together reflect a significant shift in Indian military, industrial and science and technology policy with noteworthy implications for the Indian defence industry but also for the global arms industry in the short to medium term.

Rising imports
Indian capital expenditures in defence have been on a steady upswing since 2004-05 when acquisitions went up from around $3.5 billion to $7.5 bn in each of the following three years and then to $11 bn in 2008-09. Aircraft, naval vessels and accompanying communications and weapons systems are of course very expensive and their acquisition has meant big-ticket orders. The so-called “Revolution in Military Affairs” — a term applied to the qualitative jump in hardware capabilities and development of “force multipliers” due to rapid advances in electronics, computerisation and satellite-based systems along with the sharp increase in use of missiles — has also pushed up costs.

In India, force modernization in the Army has meant acquisition of new infantry gear, artillery guns, contemporary tanks and anti-aircraft and anti-missile systems, but the the real big money has been spent on the navy and the air force. This trend is likely to continue well into the next decade. The Indian Air Force has in recent times acquired troop carrier aircraft from the US, mid-air refueling tankers from Russia and airborne early-warning systems from Israel. The Navy has acquired long-range maritime reconnaissance and anti-submarine aircraft again from the US, is engaged with France for co-production of diesel-powered submarines, and has agreements in place with Russia for purchase of a refitted aircraft carrier and lease of two nuclear-powered submarines, combining to give it a blue-water capability in the wider Indian Ocean region or even beyond. All three services have also acquired numerous types of tactical missiles and related systems, mostly from Israeli Aerospace Industries (IAI) including a recent $2bn deal for missile-defence systems. Suppliers the world over are now holding their breath waiting for India to complete user trials and then place orders for 190 advanced helicopters for around $1 billion and the so-called “mother of all orders” for purchase and co-production of 126 multi-role combat aircraft (MRCA) for around $10 billion.

India has also entered into joint design and development collaboration agreements related to several systems it wants for the third to fifth decades of this century such as with Russia for co-development of 5th Generation fighter aircraft and with IAI for medium range anti-missile systems. The above pattern of acquisitions reveals that the Indian military is transforming from an essentially defensive force oriented to protect the country’s borders and coastline to one capable of extended outreach and force projection well beyond India’s frontiers. This has enormous significance for regional and global geopolitics, and has raised the concerns of progressive forces in India, but also poses new questions of relevance to this article: will India’s external policies drive the nature of its military forces or will hardware acquisition strategies of their own and drive India’s external posture?

Failure of indigenization
In the 1960s and ’70s, India’s defence policy was marked by a more modest defensive posture and a programme of building indigenous capability in manufacture and later in design and development, driven by the desire for reducing dependence on foreign suppliers and the consequent pressure exerted on India’s sovereign foreign policy. India first built up an industrial base of state-sector defence undertakings making aircraft, tanks, armoured and heavy transport vehicles, radar and communications equipment. Then, through the ’70s and ’80s, this base was given depth with the addition of several research laboratories. Arms exports were never given serious thought, mainly on political grounds of wanting to retain a posture of neutrality between nations but also with a hint of moral pangs over war merchandising.

However, despite a few notable successes in missiles and electronics, India never came close to meeting its declared goal of self-reliance in defence production, leaving along research and development. Most objective assessments put the current ‘self reliance index’ as somewhere in the 30-35% range. Today, after four decades of efforts to build indigenous capability through foreign collaboration and technology transfer, the evidence of this failure are visible in repetitive and costly cycles of imports and license production, and the implications are unfolding.

Over-dependence on foreign suppliers has reached dangerous proportions. It is already reducing India’s bargaining power, pushing up prices and pressuring India into compromises in foreign policy. Recently, despite clear proof of corruption and kickbacks by Israel’s IAI in military deals with India, new orders worth several billion dollars have been placed with IAI ignoring the requirement to blacklist firms engaging in such practices.

Many explanations are advanced for how
and why India came to such a pass: Poor management, non-professional culture in state-sector defense production and research establishments, lack of accountability in an overly secretive system, and notorious delays in decision-making by the political and civil bureaucracy. Even conspiracy theories about the techno-bureaucracy who dominate decision-making, or elements of the military recommending imported equipment against equivalent Indian-made ones, may have some element of truth.

New offsets policy
Against this background, the government has adopted a new policy of offsets, as done by many other developing countries. Under the new Defence Procurement Procedures of 2007, at least 30% in value of all import orders over $60 million must be spent on sourcing products and services from Indian firms. In exceptional cases, this could even be increased to 50%. Indian firms, and global armaments majors, are now greedily eyeing the prospects of sharing about $10 billion likely to be up for grabs through offsets in just the next few years.

In theory, apart from keeping substantial part of India’s defence expenditure within the country, the policy is designed to strengthen the defence industry in India and bring in new technologies, thus building self-reliant capacities for the future. In practice, however, things are likely to turn out quite differently, and there are other dangerous portents too. The offsets policy has already been severely diluted under pressure from the global armaments industry. Foreign suppliers have now been permitted to “bank” their offset obligations, that is, to accumulate offset provisions over two or more projects and then enter into a single sub-contract. Offset obligations can now also be transferred from one contract to another, including in the civilian sector. So Boeing could, for instance, if it won the tender to supply F/A18 fighters, avoid sub-contracting any part of the F/A18 manufacture but instead sub-contract manufacture of doors for Boeing passenger jets. By de-linking offsets from contract-specific obligations, the desired technology absorption in will not transpire. Offsets will boil down just to money and the structural problems of repetitive imports and scant self-reliance will be perpetuated.

This should not come as a surprise given neoliberal policies and globalization being embraced by the Indian ruling elite. Self-reliance itself is seen by these sections as an old-fashioned idea and one that is increasingly contested by important sections of the domestic private sector as well.

Starting from the 1990s when India embarked on the path of liberalization, involvement of the private sector in the defence industry, hitherto dominated by state-sector enterprises, has gained momentum. In 2001, government formally brought the private sector into defence production and also allowed upto 26% foreign direct investment (FDI) in such firms. Over the years, even though the Indian private sector as a whole received only 9% of total military orders or around $700 million annually, a few engineering majors have emerged as important players even in strategic areas. Given the anticipated offsets boom, there is now a scramble to set up joint ventures with international armaments majors who are expected to bring in capital as also technology.

For instance, Tata Advanced Systems has been set up as a joint venture (JV) with an investment of $150 million and 76% holdings by the mammoth Tata Industries and $50 million by Israel’s IAI to manufacture Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs), electronic warfare systems, missiles, radar systems and security systems. Similarly, there have been tie-ups involving large Indian companies such as Mahindra & Mahindra, Godrej, Larsen & Toubro and global companies like British Aerospace, Italian Finmecanica, Airbus manufacturer EADS Defence & Security and US aerospace major Boeing.

An orchestrated campaign is now underway by global consultancy firms such as Ernst & Young along with Indian industry associations calling upon the government to increase the FDI limit from 26% to 49% with some even calling for allowing 100% foreign-owned firms into the Indian defence sector! The argument runs along lines familiar to those following the Indian liberalization story: the state sector has proved incapable of timely delivery of quality military hardware, therefore the private sector should be encouraged to step in and maximum FDI should be encouraged to bring in capital and more importantly technology. The icing on the cake, it is further argued, will be the opening up of an export market by integrating Indian industry with the global armaments supply chain, a path that India had hitherto wisely eschewed.

The present push is clearly part of a larger plan to undermine the state-sector defence industry which, for all its weaknesses, would be subject to public accountability, and replace it with large private sector corporates with substantial or even controlling interests of global arms manufacturers. In such a dispensation, acquisition and upgrading of defence hardware and export of armaments would become important drivers of India’s defence and external policy. This is precisely what former US President Eisenhower warned about what he termed the military-industrial complex.

D. Raghunandan
Delhi Science Forum
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Transnational solidarity can be crucial for movements of non-violent struggle – in helping them emerge, in accessing contacts and resources, and in applying leverage on a regime or corporation. Some “transnational advocacy networks” have been criticised for “taking over” from local organisers and for in effect having a disempowering impact on the struggles which they intend to support. The central argument of this book is that the prime role for transnational solidarity is to strengthen the counter-power of those resisting domination and oppression.

• Analyses from Serbia, Burma, Zimbabwe, Colombia, India and Palestine.
• Accounts of solidarity networks such as Women in Black, with Turkish war resisters, diaspora groups, Lesbian Gay Bisexual and Transsexual groups in Africa, and the World Social Forum.
• Debate on the criticisms of external funding and training in the “colour revolutions”.
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Profiteering Globally Acting Locally
Campaigning Against War Profiteers

Act local think global, it’s one of the main motheos of the globalisation from below movement. In this globalised world where there are no borders for goods and information. Where corporations cover all the world and the dominant culture is imposed in every corner of the planet. The reaction from the movement is to act locally while thinking globally, the globalisation from below movement protests against big summits of the economic power while constructing economic alternatives locally – as cooperatives, squatters, barter markets, etc. During the last four years, War Resisters’ International (WRI) has worked fostering campaigns against war profiteering, with the aim to work at a global scale. The challenges has been how to have a global impact while acting locally. Through this process there has been a lot of discussions on the focus, strategies and scope of the work against war profiteering by WRI.

Focus

Discussions about a WRI global campaign against war profiteers started in 2004, in the heights of the invasion of Iraq – war that showed the intrinsic connection between war and economics. At the time the discussion was for WRI to focus on one or two corporations, following Arundhati Roy’s speech at the 2004 Mumbai World Social Forum that the movement should pick two major corporation profiteering from the destruction of Iraq. A natural focus seemed to be Halliburton - one of the biggest corporation making profits in Iraq and with direct links to the decision makers as Assistant Vice President Dick Cheney had previously been CEO of the corporation. However, especially as Halliburton does not have any consumer products to boycott, it was hard to envisage how an international campaign could be effective. Therefore, in line with WRI’s general role of trying to link groups, it made more sense for WRI to try to play more of a role in connecting groups already campaigning in their own countries and with their own targets.

A central question in shaping the work against war profiteering has been, how to define who are war profiteers. War profiteering clearly goes beyond the arms industry but how far can we go? Our latest discussion concluded by including the following activities:

- arms and other products sold to the military. So it is not just the product but the client that defines what companies we target.
- the private military sector, a booming business especially in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars and with the US progra-

mme of re-organising its overseas military bases into super-bases.
- military entrepreneurship i.e. where the military uses its position to dominate economic sectors, as in Indonesia, Turkey and Pakistan.
- companies directly exploiting war (e.g. those “reconstructing” Iraq, those making profits from the occupation of Palestine, etc.)

Strategies

What makes a good strategy against war profiteers? Successful campaigns have developed effective campaigns by combining different types of tactics.

- Neither direct action nor lobbying a military factory will be effective by themselves. You need a combination where you can put direct pressure against the corporations, like with direct action, as well as activities more involving the general public, such as boycotts. Companies that produce consumer goods like CATERpillar or have direct links to the public as banks, are easier to target as they depend on consumers to stay in business.

- Corporations as Private Military Constructors (mercenaries) are harder to campaign as they have no direct links with the public, they make their deals in close doors with governments and people get recruited without public notice. Here is where we need to use a combination of tactics in our campaigns, lobbying governments telling them that the presence of mercenaries in conflict zones is illegal, exposing these corporations to the general public for what they are – mercenaries, supporting the work on counter recruitment in all fronts, etc.

As an international organisation we are especially conscious of the contribution that transnational alliances can make to successful campaigns. For example forming alliances between organisations against the arms trade in the Netherlands campaigning against the export of Dutch weapons to Indonesia, and Indonesian organisations working with local communities and the impact of violent conflicts in the region and the sharing of information on military budgets and export deals can strengthen our level of impact.

Some successful stories...

Honeywell was a company based in Minneapolis, USA, that produced cluster bombs. In 1968 a group of people in Minneapolis formed a group to campaign against Honeywell. The group started with six months of research to know as much as possible about the corporation. Then they started leafletting outside the company. A year after the group was formed they held a big demonstration during Honeywell’s Annual Shareholders Meeting. More than 14 local groups were form to work in the campaign and speaking tours took place. After years of campaigning they started carrying nonviolence training and doing direct actions with the aim of shutting the headquarters for a day, these actions took place twice a year. The campaign included media work by getting presence at TV shows and having famous people at their action. In 1989 Honeywell tried to sell off their weapons division, when it could not be sold, they created a new company named Alliant Tech. Honeywell said the closure had nothing to do with the strong protest against them, but the facts manifest the contrary. Alliant Tech continues to exist and to produce cluster bombs.
My Money Clear Conscience is a Belgian campaign that initially began asking the banks to disinvest from arms producers, later, the goal became disinvesting from controversial arms producers. From the beginning it was a campaign combining peace organisations and ethical bank watchers, where the ethical bank watchers did the research on the financial links, the peace organisations did the research on the arms producers. The campaign started by researching Belgian banks with investments in the arms trade, after the research they published a report, which was made public, which banks could not ignore. After the report was published, the campaign combined creative street actions at offices of the banks with lobbying work and public awareness work to make the clients of the banks to write to the banks demanding them to dis-invest from the arms trade. The campaign has had several successes, including getting banks to withdraw from companies producing cluster bombs and a law in Belgium that bans investments in cluster munitions.

DSEi is one of the biggest arms fairs in the world that takes place every two years in London. For many years there has been campaigns to shut down DSEi. The arms fair till 2007 was owned by Reed Elsevier, a well known publisher specialising in the scientific world. The campaign against DSEI has included, direct action at the fair, big demonstrations during the event, shareholders action, etc. After years of pressure against Reed Elsevier, and especially after key members of the scientific world said that it was incompatible for a publisher like Reed to also be involved in the arms trade, the company decided to sell the fair cause it could not continue to be associated to the arms trade. The fair has now been bought by Clarion Event, a company that specialises in the organisation of events, and that doesn’t feel that the organisation of an event promoting the arms trade will have a damaging impact for them.

In all these cases, the campaigns included a combination of tactics, starting with good research on the corporations and a diversity of actions, including direct actions, lobbying, big demonstration, shareholders actions, etc. Having a range of actions, facilitates that different people can get involved in different ways. Some feel that the way to change things is by incurring in actions of civil disobedience, other are prepared to take part in big demonstrations and others see that their contribution to the campaign can be in the form of writing letters. We need a space for all.

In peace campaigning there are few absolute victories, and so it is with these three cases. In the first case the company changed name and continued to be involved in the same business. In the second one, banks have not dis-invested in all the arms trade and the producers of cluster bombs continue to receive investment from financial institutions outside Belgium. In the case of DSEI, the fair is again taking place in September 2009, where deadly agreements will be made. Nevertheless, each campaign should be seen as an achievement, a step along the long road of making war profiteering visible and holding war profiteers to account.

Javier Gárate

---

**Donate to War Resisters' International**

How to make a donation to WRI?

- by standing order which enables us to plan but let us know (see bank details overleaf)
- in USA by arranging for regular donations to be sent through your bank’s bill payment service
- by giro transfer to War Resisters’ International,
  - in Euros to Bank of Ireland, IBAN IE91 BOFI 8000 9240 413547 BIC/SWIFT BOFIIE2D
  - in £ sterling to Unity Trust Bank, IBAN GB11 CPBK 0800 5150 07 32 10
- by credit card – complete details in the next column or use our web facility at [http://wri-irg.org](http://wri-irg.org)
- by cheque, in £, €, or US$, payable to "WRI"
- (UK only) by Charity Aid voucher (CAF), made out to Lansbury House Trust Fund (to request such vouchers, write to: Charities Aid Foundation, Kings Hill, West Malling, Kent ME19 4TA, or visit www.CAFonline.org)
- (USA only) by sending a tax deductible donation – make checks payable to the A.J. Muste Institute
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**Payment by credit card**

Please **debit my credit card** for the amount of £/€/US$ _______ (delete currency as appropriate)

**Credit Card**

(please issue as appropriate)
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<tr>
<th>Card number</th>
<th>__________</th>
<th>__________</th>
<th>__________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expiry date</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security code</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Name on card:**

.................................................................

**Billing address** (if different from overleaf)

.................................................................
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A new WRI webshop

You can order merchandise from War Resisters’ International on WRI’s new webshop at http://wri-irg.org/webshop. The new webshop offers more books, and also will calculate postage for your order when you go to the checkout. On the new webshop, you can also donate for specific WRI programmes, or the upcoming conference Nonviolent Livelihood Struggle & Global Militarism – Links & Strategies.

Handbook for Nonviolent Campaigns

WRI’s Handbook for Nonviolent Campaigns is also available on the webshop, now for £5.00 plus postage. This means if you also order other items, you will save on postage.
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Please send your donation today to support the work of WRI – Thank You!

I want to support WRI:

(Please tick at least one)

- I enclose a donation of €/US$ ………. to WRI
- Please send me a receipt
- I have completed credit card details overleaf
- I will set up a monthly/quarterly/yearly (please delete) standing order to War Resisters’ International

In **Britain** to Unity Trust Bank, account no: 5072 7388, Sort Code: 08-60-01 for £ ……….

**Eurozone:** IBAN IE91 BOFI 9000 9240 4135 47, Bank of Ireland, for € ……….

- Please send me a **standing order** form
- I enclose a CAF voucher for £ ……….
- I enclose a cheque to A.J. Muste Institute for US$ ……….

Please visit our **webshop** at http://wri-irg.org for War Resisters’ International publications, Broken Rifle badges, and other WRI merchandise. Thank You!
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Address: …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….

Country: ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Where to send your donation to:

**USA only:**
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WRI keeps supporters names and addresses on computer, for our sole use. If you do not consent to this, please let us know.