Ecuador and Military Power

Many of us have seen or heard about the events on 30 September in Ecuador, a day where, quite simply, the world was turned on its head. Police officers burning tyres and throwing stones, taking over the hospital where the President had been allegedly “sequestered”.

What happened that day?

On the morning of September 30th, police officers and a few members of the military declared themselves on strike. They claim this was a response to a law approved by the National Assembly which cut a number of their social benefits and service awards usually received after a number of years in the force.

At this stage of the morning, the President decided to head over to the central police headquarters, in an attempt to bring calm and find a way out of the police and military protests. Once there, however, his words were received by protesters as a dressing down and further provocation, rather than a negotiation. At its height, the address took on melodramatic overtones, with the President pulling off his tie, ripping open his shirt and saying “If you intend to kill the president: do it. I am right here.”

The speech and its melodrama did little to appease the heated mood, adding rather, to the frustration among the police pickets. Soon, tear-gas bombs were shot into the building, which forced the president to take cover in the nearby police hospital.

From that moment on, the government’s rhetoric changed completely. Attempts to reach a consensus with the police force were dropped and the tone became openly confrontational. Immediately, uninterrupted governmental coverage of the situation was established in all media. Through this channel, the message that the President had been sequestered at the police hospital was repeated time and again. Furthermore, the broadcast openly called people to defend the “Citizens’ Revolution” by making their way to the hospital. Evidently, this brought about clashes between unarmed citizens and armed police forces who proceeded to attack the population.

That night, the government went on to organize a spectacular “rescue mission” to free the president from the police hospital. It did not matter, apparently, that inside there were newborn children and vulnerable elderly people: both sides – police and military forces – simply proceeded to open fire, until the President had been removed from the hospital, and approximately five people were killed.

Now, what lies behind these events? In my view, what happened was another example of the continuous growth of militarization and the control exerted by the Armed Forces over our countries. After all, those who ultimately decided to support the President and bring the conflict to an end were the military forces. As a result, only a few days later, a significant
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Editorial

It is in Europe where War Resisters’ International (WRI) was founded. It is also there and in the USA where it has its bigger number of members and supporters. Clearly this is reflected in the way it functions as also in the issues that takes on. For the same reasons the groups that identify most strongly with the international are those in Europe plus War Resisters League in the USA. Through the years WRI has worked to become - as its name says - truly international, by adding groups and having activities with groups in other regions of the world. The best example of this effort is Latin America, where there have been several initiatives to make WRI more present and for the region to have a stronger presence in the International.

In recent years, WRI has added a significant number of groups to the network, has employed staff in London coming from the region, has had Latin Americans on Council and the Executive, and many of WRI’s materials have been translated into Spanish. So why there is still the perception of distance and of not ownership with WRI? This has to do with the continued domination of the organisation by Europe and the USA, which is reflected in its structures and in the way of working on antimilitarism and nonviolence. But in fact the doors of WRI are more than open for a bigger influence of Latin America in the network. The challenge is to build a WRI identity for Latin America, with the issues that interest us, way of working and of relating that we feel comfortable with. First of all we need to strengthen the work between antimilitarist groups in the region, where there is not a real articulation and clarity on how to work with our own diversity.

This seems to be a slow process and with quite a few holes, this Broken Rifle tries to fill some of these holes. This has been a common effort of groups and people, to try to build this identity, by working together.

Javier Gárate
Antimilitarist Trends in Latin America

Within the global antimilitarist movement, Latin America has had a tradition based on its own particular history. During a large part of the 20th century, the region was governed by military dictatorships. Some of those non-democratic regimes were encouraged or supported by the United States (the majority of cases) or by the Soviet Union during the period known as the Cold War. Other democratic governments were headed up by authoritarian leaders, known in the region as caudillos, who count on widespread popular support and promote values extracted from the armed forces for the organisations that support them. Other governments develop a democracy that is restricted to the oligarchic elites. Many of the governments dedicate large portions of their budgets to military expenditure, in contrast with the meagre investment in social areas such as health and education. Many Latin American countries were also involved in civil wars and temporary bi-national confrontations during these years. The development and growth of the so-called ‘wars of national liberation’ was also important, with guerrilla organisations fighting against both dictatorships and democratic governments. From Patagonia to the south of the Rio Grande, violence was the catalysing instrument of political and social changes, amid one of the most unjust distributions of wealth on the planet. The model of development was almost exclusively based on the export of prime resources and food to the world market, while all of this occurred in the middle of a very late modernisation process compared to the so-called ‘developed countries’.

For all of the aforementioned reasons, the formation of movements of an antimilitarist profile was later and generally more hybrid than in order parts of the planet. While there are some local initiatives, antimilitarists in Latin America are unsure about writing our own history. The creation of a timeline would permit us to visualize our evolution as a social movement, recognising errors, limitations and contradictions but also successes in order to reflect on and face the future. The purpose of this text is much more modest; it attempts to categorise the principal tendencies within the Latin Americans antimilitarist movement. However, let’s start with a warning. Like any rationalisation, this interpretation is partial and is a poor reflection of reality. The proposed categories only attempt to supply an initial picture of the phenomenon, packaging the available information for quick consumption. Some initiatives that exist or have existed don’t easily fit within one single category. They communicate or interact with each other in more or less effective ways according to country. Not all have been present in all countries and some don’t consider antimilitarism to be part of their identity, but rather to be a strategic response that emerges from particular circumstances. All have had in common a rejection of forced recruitment and the recognition, in practice or in law, of conscientious objection to military service. However, opinion on the legitimacy of the armed forces is split, as is also the case with regard to strategies for promoting social change and visions of what democracy – or revolution – should be. Despite all these prerogatives, it seems pertinent to try to identify the principal sources from whence our predecessors came.

1. - Religiously inspired antimilitarism

Christians, generally those aligned with liberation theology, evangelical groups, adventists and other creeds have promoted different specific initiatives that reject forced recruitment in various countries of the region. The main argument against participation in the armed forces has been the biblical commandment against killing others. To counter the laws which oblige military service the religious people invoke the only legitimate rule, the ‘law of God’. Their
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increase in salaries throughout military personnel was instated, placing them among the State employees with highest income and benefits in Ecuador. After September 30th, the lowest individual income for members of the military forces in Ecuador is US$780, in stark contrast with the average teacher, who earns roughly US$450.

The extent of the governments militarized apparatus was also evidenced, at least for the case of Ecuador. The array of repressive resources available to the police were also widely displayed during the day’s events. For example, it seems that more tear-gas bombs were fired in a single day than in the entirety of the year across the country. Furthermore, “security” forces‘ weapons were used to attack the population at large; a warning, no doubt, as to the dangers of having armed groups financed by our own taxes.

Following these events, the country is left with mixed feelings; people have lost trust in the police forces, but have paradoxically gained confidence in the military, who now top the charts of credibility among national institution, according to polls.

Seizing this fair wind, the government has begun a “which hunt” of sorts, targeting not only police officers, but also a series of members of civil society. A number of people have been accused of masterminding September 30th, and the president has even announced an investigation into NGOs and activist groups considered suspects in the day’s events.

In other words, this violent episode became an opportunity for consolidating a State with a larger repressive apparatus, and greater control over the population. Even now, laws are being passed which allow telephone tapping and inquiries into the finances of uninformed individuals. In the light of this new state of affairs, a reflection is called for: the fateful events of a single day such as this, can be fed the rise of a more militarized and controlled society, as we have seen for the USA after September 11th.

It seems that contemporary governments are attempting to exact gains from calamitous days such as these, to be able to consolidate more vertical power structures, effecting greater control over society at large. It becomes necessary, therefore, for those of us involved in peace movements and anti-militarism, to take this into account, so as to generate strategies in our causes, and effectively block the advances of militarism in our countries and regions.

Today, more than ever, we must come up with new strategies to counteract the new forms of militarism that are, bit by bit, being imposed upon our countries.

Xavier León
Translation by Benjamin Molineaux

ISAIF troops in Afghanistan. Source: NATO
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strategies range from practical non-violence, as in the case of Mormons or evangelicals, to coexistence with, or tolerance of armed action against the ‘bad government’, as in some cases linked to the theology of liberation. Their vision for future society is the return to primitive Christian communalism, without defining the role that the armed forces would play in such a society. Their book of reference is the bible or holy scriptures.

2.- Antimilitarism of non-governmental origin

This tendency is represented by the non-governmental organisations. Its emphasis has been the respect of human rights and the so-called ‘rule of law’, which lays out the right to conscientious objection. One of its strategies has been to campaign in favour of outlawing forced recruitment and obligatory military service, as well as the promotion and normalisation of social service as an alternative. In addition, they have worked to publicise cases of human rights violation carried out by the armed forces against civilians or their own personnel. They have also monitored the budget destined to national defence and have compared its size with the budget allocated to social programmes and poverty reduction policies. Within these campaigns the concepts of non-violence and civil disobedience have been introduced. They envisage the role of the armed forces as the guardian of national sovereignty, a function that should be carried out in a professional manner, subordinate to the democratically elected civilian powers. Its foundational text is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

3.- Antimilitarism of anti-imperialist origin

This aspect has been developed by nationalist and leftist organisations. Its central themes have been the condemnation of imperialism, the subordination of Third World countries to North American policies, and the construction of a socially just society. Their strategies have included campaigns against the School of the Americas, denunciation of the presence of US military bases in Latin American territory, as well as highlighting cases of massacres and human rights violations carried out by the military. They consider the traditional army to be ‘bourgeois’ and opposed to everyday people’s interests, preferring the revolutionary army or people’s militia. According to this vision, antimilitarism is a momentary strategy in the process of transitioning to socialism or the utopia of the strong, autocratic state. Its reference text is Das Kapital or the works of leftist nationalist authors such as José Martí and Maritagui.

4.- Antimilitarism of anarchist origin

This tendency is represented by organisations of anarchist inspiration. Quantitatively they have been the least numerous and their main themes have been the denunciation of the army as the armed wing of the State, the militarisation of society, the acceptance of military values as part of the process of voluntary servitude, and the participation of the military in massacres against the people. Anarchists reject the existence of all armies and aspire to a society without blind obedience of authority. Internally there is no consensus on the role of violence in social change, though they promote complete disobedience of the State. Their foundational texts are the classic works of anarchist authors such as Bakunin o Kropotkin.

Rafael Uzcategui

Translation by Ian Macdonald

Prisoners for Peace 2010

Action

• On 1 December, put aside at least one hour and write at least four cards to prisoners;
• Get your peace group or class or meeting place to organise a card-writing session;
• Set up a stall in your town centre, perform a bit of street theatre, or do whatever else it takes to attract attention and interest.

Sending cards and letters

• Always send your card in an envelope;
• Include a return name and address on the envelope;
• Be chatty and creative; send photos from your life, drawings;
• Tell prisoners what you are doing to stop war and war preparations;
• Don’t write anything that might get the prisoner into trouble;
• Think about the sort of thing you’d like to receive if you were in prison;
• Don’t begin, “You are so brave, I could never do what you have done”;
• Don’t expect the prisoner to reply;
• Remember-next year it could be you …

For the up to date Prisoners for Peace Honour Roll go to:

http://wri-irg.org/node/4718

Support our future work

For 50 years, War Resisters’ International has publicised the names and stories of prisoners of conscience. Help us keep up the tradition. Send in a special PFP donation to WRI to help fund next year’s research.

Send contributions to: War Resisters’ International, 5 Caledonian Rd, London N1 9DX, Britain (email pfp@wri-irg.org).
Mapuche Resistance: An indomitable people continue in their struggle for life

“There can be Water without Fish and Peoples without Tyrants, but there can’t be Fish without Water, nor Tyrants without Peoples”

Periódico Anarquista Regeneración, November 5th, 1910 California, Mexican Revolution

The hunger strike of the Mapuche Political Prisoners (MPP) in the Southern territories governed by the Chilean State, has recently come to an end. The strike, which began on July 12th lasted 90 days, with the participation of a total of 34 Mapuche rebels, imprisoned in 6 different prisons in the South, including a minor who was also tried under the Anti-Terrorist Law (ATL).

Their demands consisted mainly in ending the application of the ATL, putting an end to the militarization of the Mapuche territory, an end to the dual trials of civil and military justice where there are risks of incurring up to 104 year prison sentences, as well as freedom for the the MPPs, amongst other demands. This action was carried out in a context in which the Mapuche fighters are targeting a fundamental question, the debt of the Chilean State, incurred during all those years of subjugation and due to the capitalism which kills.

We continue our social struggle for autonomy, and not just regarding services but also in terms of our organization. It is the first time that over 30 MPPs support a strike at the same time in different prisons (in addition to the supporting strikes carried out by "civil" society) with these judicial/legal, territorial and cultural claims against the Chilean state. These strikes highlight what is happening and how the prison system deals with those who are excluded from this model. The most recent actions attempted to undermine the bicentenary celebrations of the republic which took place in September, this time in the hands of Pineda and the staunch neo-liberalist... business minded, right wing conservative government, who are influenced by opus dei. Remembering that the previous government of La Concertación, which was in power for 20 years after Pinochet, continued to implement terror policies of the Pinochet era, imprisoning, killing and repressing the dissidents who opposed the extreme opening to capitalism in Chile and all the consequences that this entailed.

In the past few years, and as has been recently shown, many sectors adhered to these demands. Hundreds of organizations, thousands of people took to the streets, and we saw the significant support amongst the Mapuches between the different sides of the Wallmapu, including the Argentine region where the same demands for the right to life are also being recognized.

Each time more walls of silence are being broken down in the Southern cone of South America. Unfortunately, social apathy sometimes undermines situations such as these, where in order to be heard, you have to put your lives at risk, the very lives of those who are willing to defend their culture and nature. The state policy is that of dispossession and repression, and despite this, the mobilization still continues. In June of this year there were 96 MPPs put on trial, 57 of which under the ATL.

Children are not exempt from this repression. For example in October 2009 a minor, F.P.M, 14 years of age from the Rofue Community, near to Temuco, was collecting herbs with the Machi4 when a Chilean Special Operations Unit, militarized police, shot him in the leg, elbow and back. As the child tried to run away he was followed via a low-flying helicopter for almost 3 kilometers. They grabbed hold of him and forced him into the helicopter and beat him whilst he was handcuffed. Once they were in flight with the doors opened they threatened to throw him off if he did not provide names of those who participated in the occupation of a neighboring piece of land in his community. This case was taken to a court but it was declared incompetent in dealing with this matter and so was passed on to the military court/...out of the question. Stories like this are commonplace.

In the majority of cases, the accusation which they make, invoking the antiterrorist law, is due to actions against forest trucks, setting fire of latifundista’s farms, amongst other acts, such as taking of country estates or stealing pine. It has been denounced that public prosecutors offer impunity, decreased sentences and money to some Mapuche so that they accuse others, who are then converted into “witnesses without a face”. Chile has been sanctioned and questioned countless times by Human Rights organizations for such procedures.

The strategy: Neutralize those who are part of the struggle and who question the plunderers in power. Therefore anyone who criticizes the established powers of the state is criminalized, as well as those who demand autonomy through direct action, both in the countryside and in cities. For example, in the city of Temuco, there is increased repression and where there are autonomous social movements which fortunately emerge, they are constantly being monitored by repressive bodies. Prosecutions, raids on okupas, on specific houses, thus creating judicial stages, all happen, as it does in the rest of Chile, which is coupled with the criminalization of anarchists. This is another headache for the state which has taken every opportunity to get their claws out and impri...son those in the struggle, without any need of proof.

The mass media control the same businesses, such as the Edwards family vii, owner of the newspaper El Mercurio amongst other media which has followed the same fascist line since its inception: “...men were not born in order to live in an idle manner as jungle animals, without benefiting mankind; and a group of savages, as savage as the pampas or the araucanos is no more than a horde of beasts, which must be urgently stopped or destroyed in the interest of civilization” El Mercurio de Valparaíso May 24th 1859.

Nowadays this very media, along with the rest of them (those which are controlled by the rich and powerful), disseminate this sense of anesthe...sia so that there is no questioning of the existing order rooted in consumption, apathy and hate for those who they label “criminals” which rise up against this imposition of norms. They try to hide all the damage caused by this way of life, especially now that Chile is trying to keep the Mapuche territory for megaprojects, hydroelectric, mining and thermoelectric plants, paper mills, extractive industries such as salmon farming, trawling, or forestation of Pine and Eucalyptus, which is a central sector which is controlled by the the rich families of Chile such as the Mattievich or Angelinix family.

The stance of governments after the dictatorship has been to ignore the Mapuche voices, to repress this boiling pot of protest, boasting about their economic model based on industrial or energy projects. On the other hand, there are groups which have joined the struggle in order to defend these territorial rights and, despite some defeats such as Ralco, these organizations continue to strengthen themselves, learn from the past and demonstrate a significant support network. For example during the recent
strike the media of counter-information managed to provide coverage of the events despite the media blockade which was imposed by the official media. This shows the importance of creating our media, radio stations, written press, or even TV and. This is possible based on the level of interest in creating such media and in such times where the fraud of the rest of the media is so evident.

The Mapuche have led many battles and now the solidarity with their demands continues to grow, just as the respective governments are diversifying their strategies in order to stop these demands from being met. The state is now preparing to carry out “Plan Araucanía”, a strategy which we can only hope will not be the same as the horrifying “Plan Colombia”.

Hunger strikes and experiences such as those in la Chepaxii, by Elena Varela, or the 14 anarchists who are now imprisoned in Santiago, are proof that those in power intimidate across all sectors with anyone who bothers them, but solidarity is growing amongst the different oppressed sectors of society. In this regard, solidarity is the cornerstone for the reconstruction of a territory taken over by capitalism and the state. By regaining back this territory, which belongs to the oppressed mestizos and Mapuches, we will gain back our freedom which the authorities are denying us.

Quoting from an open letter sent by the MPP during the strike in Temuco: “Our lives are worth less than a house, all our lives combined are less important than a truck which emits fumes, the future of poor people is rationed by the World Bank and the IMF”...

“As we have already stated, the main objective of our prison based mobilization is to contribute to the unity within the Mapuche community and their movement, but also to encourage the unity of all the Chilean poor and displaced people in their fight against the economic system and the State, guarantors of the rich, our common enemy.”...

“We have spent too much time looking at ourselves from a distance, as though we were strangers or enemies whilst those in power have strengthened their domination. Unity in the fight. Unity to win. Unity to rediscover our strength”... “to foster social commitment in order to unmask these tyrants who pretend to act with humility and who, at all costs, try to convince us that their tyranny is necessary. We need to undermine the system from within so as to build, with our own hands, the future we deserve.”

We hope we can maintain this open communication between the different forms of resistance both in South America as well as the rest of the world, because the Mapuche people who are fighting are not alone. Their different visions of the world and their way of life will not be ruined by the greed of a few. We have to continue to be aware of what is happening in Wallmapu despite many questions remaining and many paths we yet need to take. What will happen with this pressure cooker situation if the authorities continue to give the go ahead to the militarization, social and environmental injustice? Is it possible that in the 21st century, the Chilean state will at one point recognize the project of Mapuche’s cultural and territorial autonomy? Once the hunger strike was over, the government gave in on the dual civil and military trials of the ATL. However, the political judges continue to apply this law, for example, against the 14 anarchists, kidnapped in Santiago.

We need to look South, to foster solidarity, to inform ourselves about how, at this very moment, a path of resistance is being forged, which is trying to force the hand of history, written by the forefathers of the same tyrants who govern Chile today. Get informed.

Eleda Makilef
Translation by Francesca Denley

---

**Foreign Military Support and the invasion process of the United States in Colombia**

*Most brigades of the Colombian Army receive military aid from the USA.*

In addition units of Military Intelligence in Medellín, Bogota and Villavicencio received US funding. Various military radars are operated by US personnel, in addition to those operated by the Colombian Armed Forces. Seven military bases are operated in cooperation. This military cooperation should be seen in the context of US Direct Foreign Investment for “economic development” - in short, maintaining the status quo for the elites.

The history of the civil and military relation between Colombia and the USA for the last 20 years can be summarised as: Military cooperation, military training for high-ranking officers in the School the Americas, loans for war, administration of military intelligence and the development of infrastructure, support to small military units and advice in war plans like with the case of El Patriota, tax exemption and legal guarantees to US corporations, for them to invest and exploit natural resources, commercial agreements between both countries, fight against terrorism and offering of Colombian military bases to the US military, companies and personnel for foreign intelligence.

US security and defence corporations in Colombia include Lockheed-Martin and Dyncorp, which work to make profit from armed conflicts, as a way of imposing the neoliberal project, against social resistance and the rights of people to the environment.

Grupo de OxC Accionando Resistiendo Transformando

---
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The Sexual Uniform

The military uniform hides under its camouflage – olive green, pale kaki, dark blue or snowy white – yet another uniform deployed over the very body which sustains the warrior clothing. Over there, taking the form of skin and hairs, you will find the sexual uniform: that act of faith that turns men into men and women into women, regardless of our identity, wishes or actual actions. For the military (and the various kinds of militarisms), sex is the ultimate certainty and the ultimate order. Provided this remains in place, the space for this hierarchical, conservative, aggressive, militarized society will be secured.

Because in spite of it all, in spite of existing desire, identity and sexual intercourse and all of the analyses around gender, or the space between things, there exists the order that sustains it all: you are a man, or else... a woman. There is no other option. One or the other. That is Order, that is Reality, that is Truth.

Fundamentally, such sexual uniform, for the military and the various kinds of militarism, is natural, biological, scientific, incontestable. It is a conviction (an absolute certainty), as firm as a bunker, more solid than a mortar -- some indisputable conviction where all abnormalities are resolved. All is negotiable, except that stronghold: sex.

You can fuck whatever, you can screwed whoever you like and you can sodomize as many people and whichever way you like. You can wear any costume, pick your looks, identity with anything, be whatever you want to be, as long as you keep treading the path from macho to female, from female to macho. Over this fundamental line is where the Prevail Game by military and militarist conservadurism is won. Because that’s what it is — from the military viewpoint of protracted war, almost everything is diversionary tactics. To keep the stronghold of definite natural sex. Within this scope we move on and move backwards along the lines of the universal battle, gaining ground in some spaces and losing none nowhere, because almost all is fun combat, a simple pastime.

Nothing important is at stake. In any case, we must prevent the fire from moving closer to the vital points.

Consequently, it is irrelevant whether you are a trans or not, a cis, an intersex. While the discussion remains in the realm of the solid consensus around binary sex, there is no need to worry. Patriarchy is not questionable; therefore military forms are not questionable either. It is all about keeping the lines as far as possible from what is vital — that is why we can discuss liberties, abortion, the family, infant sex... in this sense, essentialist stances on sex will be as operational for militarism as the stalemest and most machista patriarchal concepts regarding Order and the System-World. Each in its rank contributes to sustaining the ontological order that the faith in our binary essence establishes.

But yes, each battle won is important, each territory gained is precious, each loss, each casualty, irreplaceable. Guerrilla warfare opens up new spaces, de-structuring the Patriarchal at least a little -- Is that possible? The gains are great. Depathologizing transexuality, confronting machista violence, empowering cis women, deconstructing the supremacy of cis men, the intersex discussion, the queer explosion (not yet domesticated)... are scenarios for clashes and openings in the rock-solid defensive block of a patriarchal system soundly founded on two—so far, unbeatable —pillars: there exists man, there exists woman. And all the rest will exist within that framework.

What is military, thus, promotes this faith and generates the alliances that sustain it. The forces are abandoning blatant machismo to enthusiastically engage women in the first place, then gay people, then the whole of Diversity, for by maintaining the same hierarchy of authoritarian subjection posed by the Rule-and-Obey Model and the Binary Sexual Uniform, everything keeps in place, both concepts nurturing and sustaining one another.

The disaster of this militarist Order occurs when it is questioned, unbelieving in, uncertain, when we refuse to accept as given the biopolitical and medical-governmental description of Being a Man and of Being a Woman, as well as the paths leading to those places. What needs to be done is break the mold — not only the identity mold (stop being something, start to be there), or the mold for desire, but also that of the certificates those grant you (stop believing you are this or that, stop labeling yourself) — because what is a man? What is a woman? But to willingly accept a sexual uniform given out by the militarized machine of a society biopolitically controlled from a kind of Power that considers itself natural, biological, explaining, consequently, along those lines (biologically) its legitimacy: it is natural, it is scientific, it is real. You are a man, you are a woman.

And we—all accept this uniform without turning the jacket inside out, without stepping deep into the mud, without chucking away the medals. In the gender discussion, sanctity for militarism lies in the fact that we are not allowed to question sex. This faith sustains positions, hierarchies, knowledge, skills, power, economy, history and salaries. It sustains it all both in the military and the civilian, establishing alliances -- even bizarre -- to the point that the ontological conviction is the same for a feminist pro-abortion or for a military commander: he believes he is a man, she believes she is a woman. All in place, excellent.

And what’s left for antimilitarists... more of the same: we have to know where we stand, we have to discuss about our faith, believes our deeply rooted convictions and all that is upheld by these. With our work, aren’t we making men more men-like and women more women-like? Are we accepting the binary mold willingly because it shows us where we belong? And this place where we belong (supposing we’re allowed to have a say)... is it the contented place of the Ordinary Person or the uncomfortable place of the rebel?

Right, from the realm of resistance, before accepting we are men we will say we are women, before being cis we will be trans, before being certain we will be inter. However, from a truly constructive position, before acknowledging we are something, we will acknowledge we are nothing; instead of accepting bio-conformist certainties, we will become walking questions: before comfortably saying yes to identity, we will be rebels of norm parting from, because we will have made contact with the actual boiling pot of our desire.

Because violence is also unquestionable dogma and compulsory consensus, and nonviolence is also saying no to impositions and refusing to be their partners in crime. A direct antimilitarist action working ethically and politically should allow us to abandon the track of Compulsory Consensually Certain.

Pelu Carvallo

Translated from Spanish into English by michelle (December 2010), proofread by Pelu Carvallo
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Latin American and Caribbean Antimilitarist Network

It seems that we are always announcing a new attempt at co-operation between antimilitarist organisations in Latin America and the Caribbean. From time to time it is good to establish when a period ends and a new one begins, but at the same time, always trying to pretend to reinvent the wheel, or to focus our energies on trying to build something new, can burn you out and be unreal.

When we talk about the Latin American and Caribbean Antimilitarist Network, we talk of a recent initiative of co-operation, but at the same time it’s the result of and in some way the continuation of previous experiences. Most of the groups in the network were at one time members of ROLC (Latin American and Caribbean Network of Conscientious Objection) and its later transformation into CLAOC (Latin American Antimilitarist and Conscientious Objection Coordination). The main emphasis, as the names say, was conscientious objection (CO). CO has the characteristic of uniting groups from different traditions, depending on the focus you give it. It can be organisations which are clearly antimilitarist, as they see in military service one of the clearest examples of the power of militarism in our societies; or it can be from a Human Rights perspective, with a focus more in the individual right of a person to not carry a weapon. So in ROLC, and later in CLAOC, there were groups representing the spectrum of the CO movement. This diversity, in itself, can be seen as a strength of the movement, but at the same time it shows big differences, which if they are not clarified over time, can lead to misunderstandings and lack of trust, and can finally make co-operation impossible.

As the Antimilitarist Network comes from this history, it has been necessary to work from a fresh start. It is hard to say when exactly it was that this new initiative started - one option is to go to the events of 15th of May, International COs’ Day, in 2004, in Santiago, Chile. During the event there was a CLAOC meeting, where it was agreed that it was effectively inactive. The event, even though it was part of CO activities, had a clear antimilitarist focus, and with the goal of reactivating regional cooperation. Another moment can be identified in the proposal presented to WRI by Yeidy Rosa and Xavier Léon Vega to set up a WRI office in Latin America. This proposal included a consultation process with the different groups in each country, to identify the cooperation needs and how we could function in a better way. From the beginning it was clear that we didn’t need new institutions – an office – but that we needed a space for dialogue, to share experience and co-ordinate efforts.

Through the years, WRI has worked with most of the members of this regional network, where a number of groups are actually members of WRI. In this period WRI had the presence of representatives of these groups at WRI events, and there were even joint events, like in Medellin in 2003. But there has always been the perception of WRI being something far away, without clarity of how it functions, and very European. Most of these perceptions remain the same.

As an International, from the beginning WRI supported this new initiative, as WRI understands that, in international work, the first step is to build regional alliances. WRI has always respected the autonomy of this process, but at the same time offered to facilitate it. The first step was to set up a list serve (irg-al@lists.wri.org) to allow us to have space for exchanging information. It is clear that the list has improved communication in the network but, at the same, it is a small group of people who post to the list, even though there are many people who have subscribed to it. It is the challenge of passive participation and how to transform it into an active one. The list has enabled us as a network to come up with statements in response to emergencies, such as the increase of tensions between Venezuela, Colombia, and Ecuador in March 2008, or the coup d’etat in Honduras. These statements were a first step towards working in a coordinated manner. Taking the next steps, with more concrete actions, has not been easy. Mainly this is because there is a lack of clarity of what are our common aims as a network, and a lack of a clear decision-making structure, and many times we depended in “someone” taking the initiative.

From 2006 to 2010, members of a number of groups in the network have met at WRI meetings, allowing us to move forward the co-ordination process, at the same time making Latin America more visible within WRI itself. However there is a problem which is that in most cases the network has not had a say about who from Latin America could attend these meetings, and without regional meetings, these have been the only opportunities for discussing the co-ordination, which has been within a WRI framework and where clearly we need to meet and to make our own decisions as a network.

In May of this year (2010), using the opportunity of 15th of May activities in Asunción, Paraguay, we had a meeting with representatives of most of the groups in the network, which was an important step. From the different meetings, many ideas have come up: the problem is that almost none of them have been followed up.

As a network we still need to define what our common ground is when we talk about militarism. We call ourselves antimilitarist, but we don’t know what exactly we mean by this, as we see in the network a diversity of forms of groups and struggles. For this we need to analyse the different forms that militarism in the region, and how this militarism is evolving. A clear example of this is the increase of policies of “citizen security”, with its clearest manifestation in the criminalisation of social protest and the militarisation of our communities in favour of the exploitation of natural resources, the permanent increase in military expenditure, the militarisation of our bodies, and the militarisation of the discourse from both conservative and ‘progressive’ regimes.

All of us in the network say that we want regional co-ordination, but at the same time we are overwhelmed by our local realities. The question is how we move from an electronic and passive co-ordination to an active one: this is the challenge we have as antimilitarists and in which we invite you to join us.

Javier Gárarte
War profiteering in South America: What is the current state of affairs?

Despite an effort to appear otherwise, the countries of South America do not re-interpret the military-industrial complex (the relationship between governments and the arms industry that favours the latter and underlies an endless arms race). Although the military- industrial complex does not manifest as brutally in South America as in the United States, the pressure of the war industry on politics is unquestionable. So what is the justification for all the money and resources wasted on the purchase of arms? The subcontinent has for years been without war between countries, although there has been an increase in tensions, mainly between Colombia and Venezuela. Militaristic rhetoric posits that this relative peace is thanks to the policy of military deterrence, with its recurring military statement: “arm ourselves for peace.” The truth is that the reduction of conflict is not a result of military deterrent, but the product of many factors, including the economic interdependence driven by the free market. That despite the dominant progressive discourse, represents the common denominator in the region.

Military powers

Justifications for the buying and stockpiling of arms are not lacking. In recent years, most South American countries have argued that increased military spending is needed in order to replace obsolete equipment. Does this justify the increase in military spending by 150% in the past six years? During this period, military spending increased from 24 billion to 60 billion dollars, according to the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS). The increase has been sustained throughout the region, countries with highest military expenditures are: Brazil (U.S. $ 27.12 billion), Colombia (U.S. $ 10 billion), Chile (U.S. $ 5.68 billion), Venezuela (U.S. $ 3.25 billion) and Argentina (U.S. $ 2.61 billion). In relation to previous years, the country with the highest proportional increase in spending was Ecuador, followed by Venezuela, Colombia and Chile. As a percent of GDP, military spending was highest in Colombia (3.7%), followed by Chile (3.5%), Ecuador (2.8%), Brazil (1.5%) and Venezuela (1.4%) according to data for 2009. (Source: SIPRI)

Let’s look at some specific cases:

Brazil

Brazil recently signed an agreement to build four Scorpene submarines and a nuclear submarine with French company DCNA. Brazil has also bought fighter planes and other armaments. Brazil seeks technology to reinvigorate its own military-industrial base. According to the official discourse, this is of great importance. The Brazilian Defence Minister Nelson Jobim said: “Our priority now is the technological empowerment in the defence area, particularly in the area of cyber space and nuclear weapons ... The first consequence of this policy is the end of bargain acquisitions. From now on every major purchase must include technology transfer and partnerships with Brazilian companies.”

Some of the countries supplying arms to Brazil in recent years include Germany, Italy, Jordan, Russia, Spain and the U.S. The largest settlement was made in 2009 with France for 12 billion dollars. Aside from the purchase of 50 military transport helicopters and 5 nuclear-powered submarines, the rest of this money went to technology transfer.

Brazil justifies these purchases as a necessary renewal of its arsenal, but as the minister of defence says, Brazil sees the development of its military industry as a strategic element in international positioning.

Colombia

Colombia has the largest defence budget in relation to GDP. As is well known, this country receives a large financial contribution from the U.S., under the justification of the “War on Drugs”, which amounts to over 6 billion dollars since 2000. The main countries supplying arms to Colombia are, Israel, Spain and the U.S. In recent years, Colombia has purchased a significant number of helicopters, including Brazilian-made helicopters.

Colombia justifies its high military spending, due to the prolonged war against the FARC and the war on drugs. However, in recent times, the increase in tensions with Venezuela has been used as an argument for the need to increase spending. Under former President Alvaro Uribe, military spending greatly increased, justified by a strategy of military defeat of the FARC, and the policies of “democratic security.” The new president, Juan Manuel Santos, is expected to continue these practices and even promote a significant increase in the prevalence of military power in Colombia.

Chile

Chile also claims its high military spending is based on the need for renewal of its armaments. However, such “renewal” has shown no limits, creating a troubling degree of uncertainty, especially in Peru. This has led Peru to increase its military spending, in contrast to President Alan Garcia’s original proposal to avoid an arms race in the region.

Chile, taking advantage of high copper prices during the last decade and a law inherited from the Pinochet regime (which stipulates that 10% of the copper revenues are for the Armed Forces), is spending billions of dollars on weapons. This has included the purchase of 2 Scorpene submarines from the Franco-Spanish consortium DCN / IZAR for a price that exceed US$ 800 million. The submarine program has since suffered numerous technical problems. Other major military investments in Chile are 44 F-16 combat aircraft which were bought from the Netherlands and the U.S. The latest acquisition amounted to 18 used aircraft from the Netherlands for the sum of $ 270 million.

Chile is also interested in developing “new technologies” such as unmanned aerial vehicles, better known as drones. In October 2010, Chile received a Skylark drone as a “gift” from Israel. The gift comes as Chile’s military authorities draw closer to a decision on UAV acquisitions that could result in three or four contracts with the Israelis by the end of the year. In addition, Chile hopes to develop its own unmanned aircraft technology with the University of Concepción and the private sector to develop this technology. The unmanned aircraft are used in surveillance and intelligence gathering. As a result, we recommend to Chilean social movements, especially the Mapuche movement, to be mindful of the appearance of these robots in the air. (Source: http://chiledefence.blogspot.com/)

Venezuela

Venezuela in recent years has shown a significant increase in military spending based on the profits from oil revenues. The justification for increased spending is the threat of an imminent U.S. invasion in cooperation with Colombia, especially after the agreement allowing the presence of U.S. troops on Colombian military bases.
Under the “anti-imperialism” banner, Venezuela has made major acquisitions of weapons from Russia. During a visit to Caracas, Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin, revealed that purchases made by the Venezuelan government have exceeded 5 billion dollars. During his testimony, Putin mentioned a report on the defence sector, noting that the contracts were made with 13 Russian companies, including Izhmash — a manufacturer of rifles. According to SIPRI, in the last ten years, 77.6% of arms imports to Venezuela come from Russia. The acquisitions include Sukhoi fighter jets, Mi-17 and Mi-35 helicopters, Kalashnikov assault rifles (plus the agreement to build a local Kalashnikov rifle and ammunition plant), tanks and S-300 antiaircraft missiles.

Mercenaries

The presence of private Chilean soldiers who are active in Iraq is well known. At first, many of these former soldiers in search of better wages received high contracts as a hook for undertaking security work. Chilean private soldier in Iraq in 2005 could earn up to US $ 1,300 a month while private soldiers earn from the U.S. could earn about 700 U.S. dollars a day. Currently in 2010, these South American private military who are performing security work in the Australian embassy in Baghdad, receive minimum wage: US $ 310 per month. Many are employed by Blackwater USA, known for torturing and killing in Iraq. In recent months, it has come to light that in 2005 Blackwater (now re-named Xe Services LLC - in an effort to clean up its image) illegally trained people in Colombia (under an agreement with the State Department in Colombia) who were then sent to Iraq as citizens of third countries, supported by a contract with the U.S. State Department. In Colombia itself, mercenaries are hired by private military companies to do work abroad. Earlier this year (2010), the news broke that 60 Colombian were performing military duties in Afghanistan. This case is repeated in many South American countries because the soldiers are tempted by lucrative salaries that are not available locally. The biggest problem for a campaign against these mercenaries, is that the contractors in each country operate under strict confidentiality. Nevertheless, it is of utmost importance to investigate companies that provide search services for private military companies who are looking to hire former soldiers.

Regional overview

Although the borders in the region still show some instability, one cannot speak of a situation of active belligerency among most South American countries. The exception to the rule, would be the volatile relations between Venezuela and Colombia, which are cleverly used by both governments as a justification for arms purchasing and military protection. In the case of Venezuela, the main issue is the U.S. imperialist threat in conjunction with Colombia. In turn, the Colombian government claims that the FARC is a “terrorist” organisation that is being supported by Venezuela. Another similar but less-politicised case, is a border argument between Chile and Peru and that includes the problem of providing access to the sea for Bolivia. These issues have not been resolved but do not pose a risk of military conflict.

The best example of this fallacy of the “need” defend themselves from neighbours is the formation of UNASUR and the corresponding South American Defence Council, which seeks military integration in the region. This goal of promoting a high degree of military integration underlies a proposal to create a joint military force for South America. This was raised by Colonel Oswaldo Oliveta Neto of Brazil during the formation of the Council of Defence. However, we know from other cases of regional cooperation, such as the European Union with the European Defence Agency (which promotes the development of the region’s military industry), that the ability to act militarily as a block in the NATO alliance with a South American military joint task force would imply an increase in military spending to afford a military force that meets the regional standard.

Another objective of the South American Defense Council is to promote the arms industry of its members. Brazil is already a leader in terms of national industries and it would not be surprising that as part of the policies of the Defence Council Brazil develops a plan to support its national military industries.

Information sharing is one of the objectives of the South American Defence Council, however it is not clear which information is being referred to. There are known risks of military cooperation when it comes to combating social movements – an unfortunate example was the military dictatorships of the 1970s and the bloody Operation Condor in the Southern Cone.

The question is: What is the need for weapons if there is no risk of conflict in the region? Personally I think there are two major reasons which can be linked to two types of military arsenal. Combat aircraft like the F–16 or submarines and other weapons of great power, are linked to the need for countries to position themselves as regional military powers and get an international status. They are widely known plans to create a “NATO of the South”, which requires members to obtain standards dictated by this military alliance. Several South American countries have been part of the “peacekeepers”, especially in the case of Haiti, where Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru participated with troops or police officers. If NATO South becomes a reality, the South American armed forces would participate in more military interventions outside the region. Moreover, the purchase of this arsenal is linked to relations with the North. The EU and U.S. call for supporting the development of South America. Based principally on free market agreements and the sale of weapons, these policies favour large corporations and military expansion.

Another sphere of militarism is an attempt to control the “enemy within”, to fight against “terrorism” and “drug trafficking” and to promote “citizen security”. All of these activities involve police who engage in social control through force, accompanied by the criminalization of social movements in government discourse.

As an anti-militarist movement, we have a great responsibility to investigate the business of war and take action. There are many possible actions that can be performed against companies that profit from war. A very clear example that protests arms profiteers and governments but also educates the general public, is to show up at arms fairs - which are often disguised as air and space shows - and denounce the bloody actions for which military equipment is designed. Also in South America, the obligatory military parades are a good opportunity to express our opposition to the military industry and militarism.

Javier Gárate

Translation by Matt Yarrow
Latin America: the possibilities of radical, feminist and antimilitarist politics against patriarchy and capitalism

The journey of women in the depths of left-wing political movements and mixed social organisations has had to endure a long struggle. The story of the presence of women with ideas for the transformation of the patriarchal culture, has for a long time been subjected to the achievement of “more wide and important ideals”, and arguments that these “particular” claims should wait, otherwise it would imply the division of the struggle that was forging towards “social and political revolution” which required the unity of the popular movement. Those proposals and revolutions have been and are “Revolutions of men that believe that everything can be revolutionised except the life of women. They are the revolutions in their liberties and their rights, their ability to create constitutions, but they continue subduing half of humanity, women, just as feminist, anarchist, Chilean women workers said at the beginning of the 20th century”.

During the first decade of the 21st century, this argument hasn’t disappeared from social organisations’ political practice nor from the antimilitarist organisations and associations, with libertarian proposals of a mixed nature. It seems that being feminist and antimilitarist involves an automatic division. What sustains this argument? In general is equality quite a debatable liberal principle. Are men and women the same? Are antimilitarist women and men exempt from the patriarchal culture? Does the fact of belonging to an association or organisation that claims to be antimilitarist make men and women equal? Latin America has in the past had proposals for antimilitarist coordination. Taking these questions as a starting point, it is necessary that any proposal for a network, a meeting, or a collective project set up in Latin America recognises that no emancipation project is possible if it doesn’t include the total liberation of half of humanity: women. This single step would allow a starting point at an important place, within a struggle which doesn’t just include this matter, but treats it as one of the basic consensuses for political action.

In that antimilitarist struggle, not only must we question the cost of the military, and the whole of the war industry and war itself, but also the values that support it. However, opposition to patriarchal values hasn’t been strong. Men see themselves obliged or seduced by war as a way of life and/or an affirmation of masculinity, and it is this affirmation of masculinity which creates the extension and justification of the discrimination, subordination and violence suffered by women, both during peacetime and during war.

Broadening our struggle as feminists and antimilitarists involves disclosing the social and cultural phenomena which may seem normal aspects of our societies, “hidden” but fully validated and which affect women in particular (girls, young women and adults): discrimination, exclusion, sexual violence, forced motherhood, sexual exploitation, pornography, human trafficking, domestication, emotional relationships and feminine sexuality, at the service of and under the control of men who hold power based on the use of force, violence and intimidation.

At the same time it is necessary to point out that the capitalist system and the categorisation of social classes is relevant for our history of Latin America and this awareness is necessary for the struggle for emancipation. Yet the radical struggle against capitalism is repeatedly branded as anachronistic whilst social movements and institutions prioritise public policies as a field in which to carry out claims and not transformations and to include historically marginalised groups. The anti-capitalist struggle must show that capitalism deeply embodies the values of patriarchy, that it works and feeds upon women’s unpaid housework, that it wreaks havoc in women’s lives when it exploits their bodies in the advertising and pornography industries, and in human trade. It must recognise that the history of Latin America is marked by the colonisation which isn’t yet over and where the values of domination and exclusion that mark the bodies and lives of women still exist.

We must therefore ask ourselves how we can counteract the dominant discourse, which leads us to ignore our history of struggle, and to feel that the pragmatic world is the way forward, that ideologies don’t exist, that our struggle only exists in the economic field and that opposition is the same whether against a left-wing or a right-wing government and that both types of government are the same thing, because real socialism was a failure. Building our dreams and radicalising an anti-capitalist struggle implies challenging the dominant, colonising, racist culture and not postponing transformations, especially those in which the State isn’t required to mediate. Racism, sexism, male chauvinism, lesbophobia, homophobia and the dominant “common sense” are part of our everyday communities and this is what must be revolutionised.

People take on the struggle for their territory, they defend their history and their way of living in harmony with natural resources, opposing the expropriation and deprecation of those resources. However, in order to build the world which we dream of, free of wars and violence, we must observe the various forms of oppression and exploitation and how these affect not only the bodies of warriors, but also the bodies of millions of exploited women in textile factories, in the pornography industry and in human trade, in obsequious domestication and in the experience of subordination and suffering as part of emotional-sexual relations.

One of the main challenges is to put aside the analysis where we put to one side the struggle of women, Native Americans and children. Dividing up the struggle and dividing up the oppressed in order to try to find them a place in their official human rights categories, all this does is recycle the system. Destroying the domination system implies recognising the historic domination of our people marked by the rootlessness and dispossession of colonisation, which imposed on our America a racist dominance, the legalisation of the plundering of natural resources and the annihilation of natives, imposing on us a single vision of the world. At the same time it implies recognising that this imperial company led to forced mixing of races in many areas based on sexual violence carried out on black and Native American women.

Colonialism didn’t end with independence, it continues and is recycled in capitalist globalisation which favours militarism as the method to expropriate territories and create their energy reservoirs, to guarantee control over natural resources and food, to maintain private property and to establish with more strength their hegemony discourse in all cultures: the defence of the family, the control over sexuality, domestication, servility and fear.

This disastrous system is incompatible with our aspirations as antimilitarists and feminists. As Maria Mies said: Starting by recognising that patriarchy and accumulation at a global scale constitute the structural and ideological framework within which women’s reality must be understood, the feminist movement worldwide must challenge this referential framework, together with a sexual framework and the international division of work, to which they are linked. (Mies, 1986:3)

Radicalising our struggle is inevitable as long as this exploitation and domination system’s wish to take over all common goods is a radical one, annihilating diversity on its way. In our emancipation struggle we must make our analyses more...
complex and maintain our criticism of the lack of a development model or the lack of implementation of public policies. "Endless wars, massacres, whole populations escaping their land and becoming refugees: these are not only the consequences of a dramatic impoverishment which intensifies the contrast caused by ethnic, political or religious differences, but they are also the required complement for the privatisation process and the more and more deadly attempt to create a world where nothing escapes the logic of profit, to expropriate populations which, until recently, could still use some land or natural resources (forests, rivers), which nowadays have been appropriated by multinational companies”.

The memory of our struggle, of our journey started many years ago, leads us to radicalise our political project: revolutionary politics should give way to emancipative and deeply revolutionary politics, where self-censorship is overcome, we integrate our will for transformation, de-homogenise political action, decolonise our bodies and minds, live freedom, free our sexuality, recognise the multiple oppressions against us and mock the power that oppresses us.

The struggle for our emancipation is the struggle for the abolition of capitalism and patriarchy from our everyday activities, from our values and from our individual and collective ethical constructs. Our major challenge is to become more like the world we dream of. The cultural battle that we must undertake is not only against the state, nor just against the powerful, it is also against ourselves.

Adriana Castaño
Translation by Nayua Abdelkefi

War tax resistance: Inland Revenue threatens WRI

The Inland Revenue is threatening War Resisters’ International with the seizure of assets because the pacifist organisation is withholding a proportion of income tax due to its conscientious objection to paying for war. War Resisters’ International has been withholding tax – usually about 7% of income tax, roughly the proportion of the military budget – since the tax year 2002/03. In its regular letters to the Inland Revenue, the organisation states:

“We dispute that the debt constitutes a legal debt, as it is a result of a law which violates basic human rights, as implemented by the Human Rights Act.” In addition, the organisation refers to the tradition of civil disobedience, as practised by Henry David Thoreau, Mohandas K Gandhi, or Martin Luther King.

The present dispute is about outstanding taxes for the tax years 2007/08, 2008/09, and 2009/10. In its threatening letter to War Resisters’ International, the Inland Revenue does not at all mention human rights aspects, and does not engage with the issues raised by War Resisters’ International. The letter simply reads: “Our records show that you have failed to pay this tax on time. You must therefore pay the full amount due immediately… If you fail to do so we will assume you are unwilling to comply and will take distraint action which involves seizing your assets for sale at public auction.”

In its reply from 10 September, WRI writes: “Again we want to stress that we would very much appreciate discussing this matter with one of your representatives, preferably outside court – and maybe in a public discussion? However, if this matter cannot be resolved outside a court, then we will be prepared to present our arguments in court.”

WRI stresses the human rights of its employees to conscientious objection to paying for war. We demand from the Inland Revenue to engage with our legal and moral arguments.
Women Conscientious Objectors — An Anthology

Conscientious objectors are generally seen as male — as are soldiers. This book breaks with this assumption. Women conscientiously object to military service and militarism. Not only in countries which conscript women — such as Eritrea and Israel — but also in countries without conscription of women. In doing so, they redefine antimitlarmist from a feminist perspective, opposing not only militarism, but also a form of antimitlarmist that creates the male conscientious objector as the ‘hero’ of antimitlarmist struggle.

This anthology includes contributions by women conscientious objectors and activists from Britain, Colombia, Eritrea, Israel, Paraguay, South Korea, Turkey, and the USA, plus documents and statements.

“For what we see here is women, at different moments, in one country after another, creating for themselves the concept, analysis and practice of a distinctive feminist antimitlarmism.”

Cynthia Cockburn, Women in Black London

“Our radical retheorising of militarism with a feminist perspective reminds us of the centrality of women in processes of militarisation, as well as their power to turn militarisation processes on their head and to contribute to radical reimaginings of a world where violence, war, patriarchy, sexism, heterosexism, and other forms of domination are not taken for granted.”

Ayse Gul Altinay, Sabanci Univeristiy, Turkey
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