War Starts Here!
The militarisation of Sweden

The global war machine kills each year directly and indirectly, millions of people, destroying entire communities, and destroys nature. Contrary to the popular image of Sweden, both at home and abroad, Sweden plays a major role in the war industry. Sweden is the world’s largest arms exporter per person. Sweden participates in NATO’s war in Afghanistan and Sweden has the largest practice area for war within its borders.

Sweden is at war and it is waged in our name, even though we have never been asked. It’s a war waged as a means to uphold an unjust world order in which a small global elite maintains its economic and political power. Although Sweden isn’t an official member of NATO, most of the Swedish soldiers work under the NATO flag. Sweden also has an embassy at NATO headquarters in Brussels.

Last winter Wikileaks-leaked documents from the U.S. Embassy in Sweden, showed that our so-called policy of neutrality is just a lie and that employees at the U.S. Embassy in Sweden are well aware that Sweden plays an active role in NATO.

In February and March 2011 Ofoj went on a lecture tour in Sweden to talk about war, militarism and the way that Sweden is involved in ongoing wars in the world. The focus was on the military training area NEAT in Norrbotten, which is used by, among others, NATO and the United States to drop bombs on practise targets. During the tour, we asked those we met, in which way they saw militarism around them, and it became clear that militarism and Sweden’s war policy is something that is rarely discussed. This is while an extensive militarization of Sweden is going on, in many places around the country, and on several levels. It’s about an increase in military training areas, advertising campaigns from the Armed Forces and a military that gets increasingly more and more influence on our society.

NEAT is the largest but not the only military training area in Sweden. In both Gothenburg and over the lake Vättern, the Armed Forces have applied for extended military exercises. At the lake, they want to expand the current state of the 20-day exercises a year to 90 days, to conduct air and shooting activities, including JAS 39 Gripen. In Gothenburg, the Armed Forces are now allowed to shoot 1.3 million shots during 115 days per year, against the previous 100 000 shots during 25 days a year.

Another part of the militarization that is going on is the transformation of the Swedish armed forces, from being just a defense force to becoming a professional army and attack power. Last summer the general conscription was taken away. In connection with this the Armed Forces marketed themselves with an advertising campaign (worth 2.5 million euros) in order to recruit more soldiers. The
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Editorial
As we get ready for another WRI get-together - with WRI’s Council meeting taking place in Luleå, as part of War Starts Here – here we have an issue of The Broken Rifle focusing on what we do best at WRI: mutual support and international solidarity. WRI is a network of groups committed to antimilitarism and nonviolence, the network depends on the work and support of its members - as many of you know WRI has a very small office run by two staff.

Since its foundation WRI has been a natural source of solidarity on issues of antimilitarism and nonviolence. In many ways people have a sense of WRI being something like your political community, people from all parts of the world sharing common values, with whom you have contact from time to time and even in special occasions like a Council meeting you get to see them.

In this newsletter we share a few examples of the importance of this mutual support. We kick off with two articles with background on the events planned in Luleå, where Ofog has been organising a peace camp for several years. For 2011 Ofog decided to make this an international event, so here goes our solidarity with the Swedish peace movement.

The Freedom Flotilla is one of the best examples of the power of international solidarity and of mutual support, with groups in many countries working together to end the blockade of Gaza. Historically WRI has been known for its support to conscientious objector to military service, the latest example being our support for Maikel Nabil Sanad, the Egyptian CO serving a three-year sentence for “insulting the Egyptian military”. Workshops in nonviolence have often been opportunities for international sharing as we learn from what others are doing. The article on Venezuela is part of a WRI visit to the country where WRI was requested to give a training in nonviolent campaigns. Let’s hope this year’s events in Luleå is an occasion for enlarging and strengthening our WRI community to make our work more effective and our solidarity more powerful.

Javier Gárarte
Sweden lends “uninhabited” land – to make friends with NATO

A military exercise area for war in northern Sweden, a commercially independent but politically very hot area where the U.S. and NATO countries are testing their weapon systems on previously neutral, but now only “alliance-free” land. The exercises also disturb the residents in neighbouring areas, and occurs without regard to the UN Indigenous Declaration.

What used to be several small training areas for the Swedish military, have now become the largest military test range in Europe, open to other countries’ armed forces to test their weapon systems. The area covers a large part of northern Sweden, offering unique conditions such as darkness and “uninhabited” areas. Areas that are populated by several reindeer-herding Sami communities.

On 15 December 2004, i.e. 10 years after Sweden’s entry into the EU, a decision was made in the parliament on our future defense. The decision was an embedded proposal to the military testing ground already existing in the north, that NEAT, North European Aerospace Test Range could also be rented to foreign countries’ armed forces and their arms industry.

NEAT does now - after the cooperation agreement between SSC and FMV - consist of both Esrange Space center, outside of Kiruna and Vidsel Test range outside of Álvsbyn. NEAT is thus made out of two test sites, NEAT 1 and 2, that are connected by an intermediate air-field, which can be used for test-flights. Together they constitute an area almost the size of Macedonia. This makes NEAT Europe’s biggest military test range in a contiguous area of land. It is the Swedish government that approves which weapons may be tested, and which countries/companies that can use the test range and participate in the exercises that are offered.

**Battlefield: Space**

Space has become an increasingly important part of modern warfare. Esrange, the world’s largest download station for satellites, is an important component of the training of airborne weapons systems. e.g. unmanned aerial vehicles, UAV’s. Large investments are made in infrastructure and facilities at Esrange and Vidsel for advanced testing of UAV’s. Opportunities for similar activities are almost non-existent in the densely populated Europe. NEAT provides a unique opportunity, according to SSC. Also the Swedish war industry is investing in unmanned aircrafts. Along with other European countries, Swedish Saab is developing the unmanned plane Neuron.

---

**Continued from page 1**

campaign was based on that the problems of the world (both imaginary and real, floods, natural disasters, “violation of the Swedish boarders”, etc.), should be resolved with military means. Those who disagreed that it was a good solution was not worth listening to, they did not have “what it takes to have an opinion.” When the military no longer receives an automatic filling of soldiers by the military service, they need to promote militarism. Many of the young people we met during the tour had received a letter in which they were encouraged to go into the military’s website to test whether they were good enough to be soldiers. The profession of a soldier is marketed as an attractive job where you have to be smart enough, fast and strong. Military intervention is marketed as the only way to really do something, the alternative is to do nothing. The military restructuring also means that other parts of society are affected and drawn into the militarization. The Employment Service is now part of the war machinery as a distributor of military jobs.

But we do not accept to be part of war and militarism. We do not accept the fact that Sweden is at war, the weapons that shoot people in the resistance movement, protesters and freedom fighters are manufactured from north to south in Sweden. We do not accept that the unmanned fighter planes that drop bombs on civilians in Afghanistan and Pakistan are trained and tested in Norrbotten and that the soldiers who are part of NATO’s occupying army are sent from here. The fact that war starts here means that we have the opportunity and duty to stop it. We can mark out the places where war starts, we can interfere with the preparations and trainings, it is here and now that we can build a sustainable and just world instead of supporting that which destroys it. This summer we invite you to an international action camp in Luleå against Europe’s largest military training area NEAT in Norrbotten. Together, we show that we do not accept that war is started either here or elsewhere.

Cattis Laska
Neuron is a prototype worth 400 million Euros, and will pave the way for future unmanned bombers. Saab will begin its testing in 2012.

Land for sale

Gun Britt Måkitalo, who lives in Kiruna and is a part of Women for Peace, is very critical to the development of the military test range.

- We realized, of course, we that followed the development, that it would be very negative to put our land up to the highest bidder, both countries and companies. We did desperate attempts to contact various peace organizations, before the decision was taken in 2004. But very few reigned on our cry for help. Then it did not take long, she says, until the air was filled with noise and planes from all sorts of countries.

- 2007 was the worst so far, she says:

  - The sky was swarming with military aircraft’s, in an exercise that was called Nordic Air Meet and I think it was the start for military operations on a large scale. In the newspapers they said it was a milestone because it was such a large practice area without restrictions. We from Women for Peace were protesting with our placards, as usual, she said.

  - The head of the U.S. Air Force in Europe was so amazingly happy that it was such an great large area, because they had been driven away from Germany’s training area, north of Berlin, a few years earlier.

In 2009 it was time for a big NATO exercise led from Bodø, Norway. It was called Loyal Arrow, but Ofoq renamed it Royal Error. That was exactly what it was, a royal error – because we’re not a part of NATO. During 2010 the Americans came and trained at dropping bombs in Vidsel and now the turn has come to the Royal Air Force of Britain. They will train nearly throughout the year up here.

We are really tired of this and we are looking forward to the major international action camp in July this summer, that Ofoq is organizing. Because we want to show that we do not accept this. I hope there will be lots of people that will join us.

It’s not just Women for Peace who are dissatisfied. Lilian Mikaelson, vice president of the Sami National Organization, Same Atnam, is also very critical. Sweden has signed the UN Declaration of Indigenous Peoples. In paragraph 30 it says that military operations should not be conducted on indigenous lands/territories unless justified by a significant threat to the public interests. In the same section it says that states shall consult with affected indigenous peoples, through their representative institutions, before they use their land for military activities, she says.

Lilian Mikaelson calls for information on what is happening and how these military operations will affect the reindeer-herding of Sami life. “Is it indifference or ignorance that such a thing has not yet happened? “ she wonders.

Neutrality - an echo from the past

All this is going on while a majority of the Swedish population is unaware that the Swedish security policy has changes quite dramatically during the recent years. Most Swedes think that their country is “alliance-free” and many believe that they are still neutral. But according to the former colonel Per Blomquist, Sweden is now an attacking state. The Swedish armed forces are not equipped for military defense but for attack.

The fact that Sweden no longer is a neutral country, and that its foreign policy draws closer to that of NATO-countries, does not only affect its own population and neighbours but it may have consequences for the stability throughout the surrounding region.

Agneta Norberg

---

**International Seminar: War Profiteering and Peace Movement Responses**

**Barcelona 30 Sept - 2 Oct 2011**

Justicia i Pau (Centre Delà), Fundació per la Pau, War Resisters’ International and the European Network Against Arms Trade invite you to the seminar “War Profiteering and Peace Movement Responses” to be held in Barcelona between 29 September and 2 October, 2011.

War profiteering is one of the main pillars that support war. The military-industrial complex has a long record of pushing for the development of a war industry and of battlefields to test its products. War profiteering has many forms and a wide range of impacts. The most notorious forms of war profiteering are the arms industry and the arms trade, but there are also many other forms, such as companies involved in war “reconstruction”, companies to which military functions are outsourced, financial institutions backing warfare, companies profiting from the extraction of resources in conflict areas and many more.

The seminar will bring together activists from groups from all regions of the world, with and among which we see the potential to build long-lasting cooperation. That is, from groups that represent the spectrum of the movement against war profiteering. The seminar will analyse the different trends in war profiteering and its impact on local communities. We then plan to work, using participatory tools, on how to develop successful strategies in our campaigning against war profiteers and on how to strengthen the links between our groups.

For more information:
http://wri-irg.org/node/13102
Freedom Flotilla – Solidarity from words to action

The illegal blockade of Gaza has been condemned by most major international actors. The horrible consequences of this brutal violation of humanitarian law are unacceptable from every point of view. One and a half million people interned on the small strip (45 square km) between the Israeli occupied West Bank, Mediterranean, and Egypt. The blockade has reduced the transport of goods to and from Gaza by 80%.

During the European Social Forum in September 2008 a small group of activists in a cafe shared some bottles of beer and discussed how to lift the blockade of Gaza. They wanted an initiative to move from words to deeds. Tired of nice speeches and words of solidarity, they began planning how to end the embargo. Inspired by the Swedish initiative “Ship to Bosnia”, in which a ship carrying 108 containers and a fire truck to the war-stricken Bosnia and Hercegovina in 1995, and the ongoing “Free Gaza Movement”, they wanted to do something large scale to lift the sanctions and help the victims in Gaza. The main idea was to fill ships with goods and famous people and then sail to Gaza. Everyone understood that the idea was crazy. One of the initiators, Stellan Vrinthagen, later said: “We all knew it would be impossible; that was why we had to do it.”

In the following December and January Israel launched a full scale war against Gaza and 1400 were killed. The majority of victims were civilians and the Israeli Prime Minister told media that the military operations “hit their intended targets”. The war made the plans for ships to Gaza more urgent than ever. The situation in Gaza deteriorated day by day and neither the EU, USA, nor UN presented anything but mild criticisms of the belligerent Israeli policy.

From that beer-chat during the European Social Forum the idea started to grow and soon more people and organisations took part in the discussions. Through contacts in Sweden, Greece and Turkey a coalition of civil society actors from several countries were formed later in 2009. Traditional mobilising, organising, and formulation of strategies took speed in the winter 2009-2010. They collected money, bought ships, and planned to sail to Gaza with medical supplies, building materials and other goods needed. Through contacts with Palestinian Non-Governmental Organisations (PNGO) in Gaza, the coalition of The Turkish Human Rights and Emergency Fund IHH, European Campaign to End the Siege of Gaza (ECESG), Free Gaza Movement, Ship to Gaza Greece, and Ship to Gaza Sweden grew into an international movement. The flotilla was ready to sail in May 2010.

Traditional Israeli lobby groups initiated a discussion in the mass media claiming that this was claimed that it was badly disguised support of the “terrorist organisation” Hamas. Remember Hamas won the free and fair elections in Palestine in 2006, but Israel and the US gave weapons and other forms of support to Fatah (who lost the elections) to launch a war and defeat Hamas. Fatah managed to take control on the West Bank, but not in Gaza. Hamas were labelled “terrorists” and all so called “democratic voices” in the world either kept silent or actively supported the fight against the winners of the democratic elections. These are probably the most stupid acts of commission and omission by Western states and civil society actors in the Middle East since the crusades!

The organisers of the Freedom Flotilla had a declared policy of nonviolence and they promised to do their best to reach the shores of Gaza. Representatives of the Israeli government said they would use any means necessary to prevent the ships from reaching Gaza and ordered IOF to stop any ship trying to reach Gaza.

The Freedom Flotilla created a classical dilemma for the Israeli government. They had two choices: Let the ships reach Gaza and hence end the blockade, or use force to stop peaceful activists. The first alternative would be a direct victory for the Flotilla - in practice lifting the blockade. The second alternative would show the true and grim and brutal policy of the government and the Israeli Occupation Forces (IOF). Preventing humanitarian assistance to people who suffer is difficult to justify. They did their best to blame the activists as “terrorists” or “supporters of terrorists”, but the conclusion is that the Israeli state lost a lot of support and was blamed by former allies worldwide. The attack on the flotilla escalated quickly when commando soldiers entered the ships and killed nine unarmed activists. IOF confiscated almost all photos, videos and equipment for recording what happened. Even journalists onboard lost their computers, cameras etc. The ships were still in international waters when they were attacked and most experts on international law agree that the attack was illegal.

Most mainstream international media covered the flotilla as they left harbours in Athens and Malta. But when the IOF started the raid, they jammed all communication and very soon the activists were out of touch with the rest of the world. The ships were taken to the harbour of the Israeli city Ashdod and all activists imprisoned. For the next two-three days Israeli authorities had a monopoly on all information about the confrontation. They used that opportunity to present their own version of the story. When they started to release their prisoners, the other stories came out. That soldiers had opened fire as they entered the ships from helicopters, that some of those killed were shot at close range, etc. Partly due to the time factor, these stories never got the same attention as the Israeli version of what happened. Control of information to media for the first 48 hours proved to be important for what sort of memories many have of the confrontation.

All investigations, except those set up by Israelis themselves, concluded with criticism - usually condemnation - of the IOF and/or the Israeli government.

The Flotilla and the attack on it increased the international pressure on Israel to lift the blockade. And they did to some degree. They have raised the amount of supplies from 20% to 35% of the pre-blockade level. Hamas and West Bank parliamentarian Aziz Dweik concluded: “The Gaza flotilla has done more for Gaza than 10,000 rockets.”

2011 - New strategies from both sides

For 2011 the organisers once again planned a Freedom Flotilla. Since last year the political context in the region had changed a lot. “The Arab Spring” had removed regimes and empowered people in many parts of Northern Africa and the Middle East. The Freedom Flotilla 2.0 attached the slogan “Stay Human” to their logos and banners. The border between Gaza and Egypt had been open for some more goods and people, but still with serious limitations.

More organisations joined the Flotilla and to do their utmost to avoid violence and deadly clashes they put more emphasis on nonviolent training. All participants had to sign a declaration where they promised not to use violence in any situation. Prior to departure practical training took place in several countries and in the ports of departure.

Much of the planning focused on how to act if, or rather when, the IOF would stop the ships. Part of that was how to document what was happening and get pictures and videos out from the ships under siege. A number of creative techniques were tested and planned for. Another part of the preparation focused on how still to have ships move towards Gaza even when the soldiers came onboard. Many different technical options
were discussed and planned for.

Not too surprisingly the Israeli authorities had changed their strategy as well. Their main goal this time were to prevent the ships from leaving their last ports. They managed to put sufficient pressure on the Greek government to create a bureaucratic mess of security checks and inspections. Greek harbour authorities created a minor hell with paperwork, inspections, and when they had no more means to delay departure they forbade all ships going to Gaza from leaving the harbour. All captains got the following statement:

Prohibition of the departure of ships with Greek and foreign flags from Greek ports to the maritime area of Gaza today

Pursuant to a decision by the Minister of Citizen Protection Mr. C. Papoutsis, the departure of ships with Greek and foreign flags from Greek ports to the maritime area of Gaza has been prohibited today.

By orders of the Hellenic Coast Guard Head Quarters to all local Hellenic Coast Guard Authorities, all appropriate measures are taken for the implementation of the said decision.

As it is known, the Hellenic Coast Guard local Authorities have already been instructed to submit to ships Masters of ships of any flag the relevant notice to mariners that designates the area of maritime blockade by Israel.

More specifically, for ships flying the Greek flag, relevant entries shall be made in the ships logbook together with the reception of the above mentioned notice to mariners as well as with the communication by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, dated 22 June 2011.

Furthermore, the broader maritime area of eastern Mediterranean will be continuously monitored by electronic means for tracking, where applicable, the movements of the ships allegedly participating in such campaign.

Finally, police controls of passengers and crews are conducted while there is cooperation with local police and customs Authorities for rigorous controls on issues of their competence.

Such an “order” has no base in International Maritime Law and probably not in domestic Greek legislation either.

In addition the Greek government prohibited deliveries to the flotilla. In an email dated 5 July, the Swiss cement supplier Interbulk notified the organisers of the Freedom Flotilla that it would not go through with its sale of 25,200 Euro worth of cement, for which it had already signed a contract and received payment. The company was citing the Greek government's prohibition of any maritime traffic, regardless of flag, from Greek ports to Gaza. A company representative wrote: “Due to Force Majeure we cannot deliver the cement, and we will therefore repay the 25,200 Euro which we had collected as advance payment back into your account.”

The Greek government’s decision to forbid European companies from conducting business with humanitarian grassroots movements like Freedom Flotilla is obviously a result of the pressure from the Israeli and/or US government(s). This is of course completely reprehensible in any democratic state governed by law.

At a summit in Jerusalem on July 11th Israeli President Peres thanked Greece for thwarting Gaza-bound Flotilla.

As this text is written most of the ships are still in Greek harbours waiting for a possibility to go to Gaza.

Conclusion

The Freedom Flotilla has challenged the Israeli blockade of Gaza more than any other effort since the blockade. After the 2010 flotilla Israel was heavily criticised worldwide and forced to accept some more goods to be transported to Gaza. The nonviolent dilemma action improved the situation in Gaza even if they did not managed to lift the blockade. In 2011 the Israeli government successfully used "behind the scenes" diplomacy and political pressure to prevent the ships from leaving Greece. Most probably they got help from US who played a crucial role in the negotiations with the IMF regarding the need for loans and other forms of financial assistance to the bankrupt Greek economy. By having the Greek authorities playing on their side the Israeli government in reality managed to outsource the blockade of Gaza to the European Union. This strategy managed to reduce the focus on Israel and, in the short run, made the Freedom Flotilla 2011 look like a failure.

Future Flotillas to Gaza would need to develop a strategy to counter preventive action by the states of departure. This should be possible - both against prohibitions for the boats to sail and the prohibition on supplies of material.

Jørgen Johansen
"We got rid of the dictator, but not of the dictatorship"

Impressions from (post)-revolutionary Egypt

From 11 to 15 May we – Andreas Speck, WR's Right to Refuse to Kill programme worker, and Igor Seke, conscientious objector from Serbia – visited Egypt, originally to act as facilitators and resource persons in two workshops on conscientious objection, pacifism, and military service, which were planned with Maikel Nabil Sanad before his arrest on 28 March 2011. Andreas Speck also visited Cairo in early April 2011, during the trial of Maikel Nabil Sanad. In this article, we try to report on our impressions of Egypt after the revolution.

On 7 March, a few weeks after the resignation of Egyptian dictator Hosni Mubarak, Maikel Nabil Sanad wrote a article on his blog, analysing in detail the role of the Egyptian military during and after the revolution. He came to the conclusion that the people and the military never “were one hand” - as people said so often during the revolution.

Before that Maikel had already written how on 28 January 2011, when the police shot at the hundreds of thousands of protesters on Tahrir Square, the military always supplied the police with ammunition when the police ran out of it. Maikel was arrested by the military on 4 February: he was tortured, and finally released after 27 hours. Amnesty International too reported that during the revolution the military arrested and tortured activists. Maikel's position could be summed up with the title of this article: “We got rid of the dictator, but not of the dictatorship”.

The questionableness of the role of the military can also be linked to personalities. For example, Mubarak's former Minister of Defence Muhammad Tantawi is now the chair of the “Supreme Council of the Armed Forces” (SCAF), Egypt's de-facto rulers. He always opposed reforms because he feared the government's political and economical power would erode. It is also telling that Tantawi's nickname was "Mubarak's poodle".

In Egypt, the military is also an important player in the economy. Many companies, especially in the water and olive oil business, the cement and construction industry, or in tourism, are owned by retired officers. The Egyptian Army was a stable partner of the US during Mubarak's era. US military and financial aid to the Egyptian Army is what helped it play the central role in maintaining Mubarak in power, as a guarantee that there would be no radical Islamist influence in Egyptian politics. It's difficult to believe that all the bonds between Mubarak and the pillars that were holding him in power for over 35 years are now broken.

Repression after the revolution

Maikel Nabil Sanad describes in his article that already, shortly after Mubarak's resignation, it was the objective of the military to clear Tahrir Square of protesters. First the military banned photography on Tahrir Square on 12 February 2011, to have a free hand against people who might document the abuses of the military. In the weeks that followed the military and police repeatedly attacked protesters who remained on Tahrir Square. And on 9 March, after a demonstration against the proposals for amendments to the Egyptian constitution, Tahrir Square was again cleared of protesters violently. More than 190 people were arrested by the military and tortured in the nearby Egyptian museum or in military prisons. The German paper “Die Zeit” reported that thugs brutally beat the protesters in front of the military.

“They tortured me with electric shocks on legs and breast, and addressed me with obscene names”, reported female activist Salma al-Hussaini Guda. In the military prison they were taken to, the female prisoners had to strip. The unmarried women were subjected to a forced “virginity exam”, conducted on a bed in a prison hallway by a man. When the women pleaded to be examined by a woman instead, they were threatened with cattle prods, Ms Guda said. Those who were found not to be virgins were threatened with being charged with prostitution. During their ordeal the victims were also filmed. We were later told by friends of one of those arrested that her parents tried to kill her, as her honour had been violated, although she was examined by force.

At the end of March, the interim government passed a new law that bans any form of protest that has an impact on the smooth functioning of institutions or the economy. Only four hours after the law came into force, the military made use of it and cleared the occupation of Cairo University. Through strikes and the occupation the students demanded the replacement of the old deans and lecturers, who had been put in place by the Mubarak regime.

Human Rights Watch reported that General Emam, head of the Moral Affairs Directorate of the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces, on 22 March sent a letter to editors of Egyptian newspapers telling them, not to publish any articles/news/press releases/complaints/advertising/pictures concerning the armed forces or the leadership of the armed forces, except after consulting the Moral Affairs Directorate and Military Intelligence since these are the competent parties to examine such issues to protect the safety of the nation”.

A further escalation followed on 8 April. It was the biggest demonstration since the resignation of Mubarak, and protesters were not only demanding that Mubarak should be put on trial, and that the provincial governors he had put in place
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be replaced, but many protesters were also denouncing human rights violations by the SCAF and were demanding the resignation of Tantawi and creation of a civilian transition government.

The same night, the military again stormed Tahrir Square. At least two people were shot dead, and many more injured. The following day, the highly symbolic Tahrir Square was again occupied, but protesters were evicted again on 12 April. And again there were thugs supporting the military and handing over people to the military. In the hours that followed, people were often arrested randomly in the streets around Tahrir Square.

Egyptian people demonstrated non-violently to overthrow Mubarak, and maintained the spirit of non-violent revolution even when the security forces were using live fire against them, causing more than 800 deaths in only a few weeks. Although there is numerous evidence that the Army was acting against the protesters during the revolution, the SCAF and a large part of the mainstream media in Egypt try to maintain the myth that they are the only guarantee of a democratic transition in the country. However, it is obvious that the SCAF is ruling the country the same way Mubarak did, and it is using the most brutal forms of repression against its opponents.

The case of Maikel Nabil Sanad

“The sentencing of Maikel Nabil is a clear message from the military that any civilian who criticises the military will be arrested”, said Adel Ramadan, lawyer of the Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights, who was part of Nabi’s team of lawyers.

Maikel was arrested by military police in his flat on 28 March, and initially a detention order was made for 15 days, where he was put on trial. The author of this article went to Cairo on 2 April as an observer on behalf of War Resisters’ International, but whether he, not Maikel’s friends and supporters, were allowed to observe the trial at the military court in Nasr City in Cairo. Even though the trial lasted almost two weeks – normally trials at military courts last only five minutes – it still can not be considered a fair trial.

Firstly, the trial was conducted mostly without any public present. Secondly, Maikel and his defence team did not have sufficient time to prepare an effective defence. And thirdly as a civilian Maikel should not have been tried in a military court.

Especially scandalous were the circumstances of the sentencing. His family and lawyers were told on 10 April that sentencing would be on 12 April. After they had left the court room, Maikel was then – in the absence of his family and lawyers – sentenced to three years’ imprisonment. Only through the phone call from another person, who was visiting his brother in prison, did Maikel’s family learn of the sentence.

And even then the lies continued. The next day, they told that Maikel had been taken to Tora prison. A soldier guarding Maikel allowed Maikel to secretly use his mobile phone to inform his brother and to tell him that he was imprisoned in El-Marg prison.

In a message he was able to smuggle out of prison he told his friends that he had been arrested in order to silence him. And in an article smuggled out, he wrote: “I can feel the intention of harming me after the court ruling. Don’t believe the army’s worthless claims about suicide attempts. Hence, the Military Council is responsible for my safety and well-being until the time of my release”.

Although high representatives of the European Union, and individual EU countries, expressed their concerns about Maikel Nabil Sanad’s imprisonment, there has so far not been a solution. German Federal Foreign Minister Guido Westerwelle, at the meeting with his Egyptian counterpart Nabil El-Araby, said that the sentence imposed on Maikel is a step back in the democratisation of Egypt, and that Germany wants “to encourage those people who are bringing the democratic process forward”. During his visit to Egypt on 2 and 3 May, Şefan Füle, EU Commissioner for Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy, raised his concerns about a number of reported human rights violations in Egypt, and specifically mentioned Maikel’s case as one of the most obvious cases.

Military service and the right to conscientious objection

Conscription is a cornerstone of male socialisation in Egypt, guaranteeing military indoctrination of a large part of Egyptian society. Military service is obligatory for all men aged between 18 and 30 and it lasts for 3 years. There is no legal right to conscientious objection.

During one of our workshops we had a long and open discussion with – mostly young – men on compulsory military service and conscientious objection. Some of the participants considered the army the most corrupt institution of the state. But the real problem is not just corruption, it is militarism itself. There are different strategies and actions young men take in order to avoid military service by being declared “not fit” for it. However, most of them believe that peace cannot be achieved until Israel is demilitarised, and if Israel keeps nuclear weapons and continues to buy arms as it is doing now, Arab countries will never accept any kind of demilitarisation or reduction of their armed forces – such is widespread opinion.

Rise of religious tensions

Shortly before we arrived in Egypt, a Coptic church was burned and 11 people were killed in clashes that followed, while more than 200 were injured (65 had bullet wounds) on 7 May 2011. While some accuse the “SALAFISTS”, radical Muslims, of being behind the attacks, others accuse members of Mubarak’s old National Security who want to spark chaos in the country. Although most of the people we spoke to believe that Mubarak’s old State Security is behind the attack on Christians, the fact is that even before the revolution, while Mubarak was still in power, 23 Copts were killed in a bomb attack at the Coptic Church in Alexandria on 13 January 2011.

On 13 May we witnessed a massive but peaceful Coptic protest in Cairo, in front of the national TV station. The main chant of the demonstrations was “They are taking our rights away! What do we do? What do we do?” The following day, 14 May, there was an attack against Coptic protesters with Molotov cocktails on the same spot.

Conclusions

The media, especially television as the most powerful one, is trying to convince people that the revolution was successful and that now, when freedom has been gained, the job is done and the revolution is over. Around Tahrir Square a variety of post-revolutionary merchandise of any kind is for sale, but none of it is about keeping the flame of the revolution alive, it is only about the memory of the revolution, especially 25 January, when the biggest demonstration took place.

However, in spite of these attempts by the media and by the old elites, people are still wary, and from time to time rise up again. Strikes are still widespread, even though they have been effectively outlawed. In a Facebook page entitled “The 2nd revolution of anger”, activists say the fundamental demands of the uprising – to protect rights and freedoms – have not been met. At present, the timetable and plans for the transitions get more attention, and many secular opposition groups are demanding the postponement of the elections, and are calling for a large demonstration on 8 July.

Clearly, the revolution is not over. The coming months and even years will still be turbulent and interesting times in Egypt, and the outcome is still very much open.

Andreas Speck and Igor Seke
Opinions are polarised on Venezuela. The Western establishment argues that there is a socialist dictatorship while many on the left believe that a true socialist revolution is taking place. Chavez's denunciation of Western military intervention, his rhetorical opposition to capitalist globalisation, and the fact that he has survived an attempted coup make most of the world's anti-war movements likely to sympathise. But there is also disquiet – about his personality cult, about Chavez's own authoritarianism and affinity with other authoritarian rulers, about an economic policy which in reality is based on partnerships with western oil corporations, and for us in WRI the sheer militarism – the creation of uniformed militia, the presence of military officers at the head of "civilian" organisations, the continuing incultication of a war mentality. At the invitation of PROVEA (an internationally respected human rights education organisation) and the anarchist magazine El Libertario, in May a three-person WRI delegation went to Caracas and also visited the state of Lara.

Hecho en socialismismo

Arriving at the airport in Venezuela already something feels different, instead of your Coca-Cola billboard there are huge banners drooping from the ceiling saying Hecho en Socialismo (made in socialism), stating all the achievements of the current Venezuelan government ... millions of this, less of that, more of this ... something that is being repeated on billboards and posters all over the city, once in a while including a picture of Chavez lifting up a baby or some other scene that is clearly targeted to touch emotions. So from the moment you set a foot in the country the word socialism starts being bombarded to you. In one way it is nice not to have your usual Coca-Cola add, but at the same as you start seeing these billboards more and more, you can not stop thinking that actually they are doing the same as Coca-Cola – selling a product.

On the road from the airport, however, the most striking image is of precarious ramshackle houses, vulnerable to flooding, and in the metro we saw queues sitting and waiting to register for the new Mission Vivienda – the latest attempt (surely timed with the 2012 election in mind) to address Venezuela's housing problem, worsened under the revolution (Chavez's government is near the bottom of the Latin American league in building new homes).

2010 – the Bicentenario, 200 years since Venezuela declared independence from Spain - was used to the extreme to reinforce nationalist sentiments. We even visited the special monument erected to mark this date, which is called the "Misil Ideologico" (the ideological missile) which is a huge missile painted in red and black, representing the need to arm themselves to protect their ideology. The use of words are always carefully chosen, for example all ministries include the concept people power in their title, for example it is the ministry of people power of education, with this trying to present that it is the people who are leading the ministries, which the reality can not be further away from.

Real politik

Chavez's rule has been based on promises and on a posture of defying the global superpower. Yet everywhere there is a growing chasm between the image the government seeks to cultivate and the actual practice. It is a strange kind of "anti-imperialism" that sees the US still being the biggest buyer of Venezuelan oil, and doing so hand-in-hand with one a global corporation with as bad an environmental, human rights and labour record as Chevron.

Food sovereignty, you might believe, is a key objective for the Venezuelan revolution. Yet the reality is that Venezuela's national agriculture now produces less than before and the dependence on imports, including food, is increasing year by year.

The promotion of cooperatives has been one of the most heralded features of the Venezuelan revolution. We visited the country's biggest cooperative – Cecesolasa in the state of Lara – which began back in 1978 by organising funerals, spread into running a bus service, then into agricultural distribution, and now has a weekly fruit and vegetable market supplying 55,000 households and has ploughed back its profits to build a 90-bed hospital. They emphasis the importance of cooperative relationships, organising horizontally and taking decisions by consensus. Under Chavez thousands of cooperatives have applied for government funding, and those that exist – in stark contrast, to Cecesolasa – are hierarchical, often with a Party member as boss and imposing work conditions that union would not accept and sometimes being little more than maquilas – production lines – for larger corporations, often based outside Venezuela.

Meanwhile, in the name of defending the revolution, Venezuela is one of the biggest spenders in military equipment in South America: in 2000-10 Venezuela spent €2,032 billion on arms imports, 72% of this sum went to Russia - Chavez maybe is not be aware that the cold war is over.

Grass-root led revolution

Many things are forgiven about the Chavez government, arguing that one of the most important aspects of this government is that it has finally given a voice to the poor and to grass-root social movements. So despite the awareness of corruption among the ruling circle and of the impunity enjoyed by police and military officials, these are things you have to put up if you want a people's government. During our visit to Venezuela we visited the Coordinadora Simón Bolívar, based in the “Barrio 23 de Enero” in Caracas - a working class barrio - which is said to be one of the strongholds of Chavez. The coordinadora does incredible work for the community, with their own radio, an info-centre run entirely on linux, a library, gym, etc. and being a place for all sorts of activities in support of the community. All this from premises that used to be a police station. However we could not avoid feeling very uncomfortable when they stated the need of all youth in the barrio to take military training to protect their revolution as well as being a place for youth to learn how to better behave. Also we saw an exaggerated war mentality as even a fish-farming project was presented as being food security in case of invasion.

In 1989, the people of Venezuela rebelled against the IMF’s imposition of a packet of neoliberal measures. In Caracas itself, hundreds – if not thousands – were slaughtered during protests that began opposing a rise in transport prices. For Chavez himself this was a turning point, and yet today we find the committee founded by the relatives of those disappeared (COFAVID) still campaigning for a proper investigation of who was responsible, for the exhumation and identification of names victims, and for the implementation of the recommendations of the Inter-American Human Rights Court, which includes reform of police structures and training.

Visiting the Comité de Víctimas contra la Impunidad del estado Lara (Committee of Victims against the Lara State Impunity), we heard of the continuous and alarming high rate of violence, murders and disappearances of Venezuelan
denounce the links between crime gangs, police officers and government representatives in the city of Barquisimeto. Victor is convinced that Mijail was killed as a way of intimidating him and to try to stop him from continue his denunciations. If a revolution is led by its people, it wouldn't be suspected of the disappearances and killing of them.

Conclusion

It is always good to see things for yourself, and this is even more so in the case of Venezuela, given the many diverse images you get of the country depending from whom it comes. After two weeks of work visiting groups from all sectors, we can see an increase of expressions of independent social movements in Venezuela, many of them coming from a left tradition and who supported the Chavez government in its early years, but have been severely disappointed since. As part of our presence in Venezuela we gave a workshop on nonviolent campaigning, looking at how to be more strategic and creative in the actions and campaigns carried out by groups. This was on request by groups in Venezuela who see that it is hard to come out of the routine of doing always the same actions and also the need to make links between different Venezuelan movements. Venezuelan social movements have a rich tradition of creative actions to draw on. Now there is a need to build connections across sectors and to reach out to those confused, passive, and once more feeling powerless. The world media may focus on next year's elections as the key, but whatever happens then autonomous social movement have an important role to play in Venezuela, to counterbalance the monopoly of power by the state, and show that it is not about state revolution or dictatorship, it's about a real grass-root revolution.

Javier Gárate
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John Hyatt - “yours for a better world”

John Hyatt, secretary of War Resisters' International from 1980-84, has died of cancer at the age of 62 in Turkey. Michael Randle who served with John on the WRI Executive in the 1970s and during John's period as secretary pays tribute to him here:

I share the sense of shock and sadness which others have expressed over the death of John Hyatt. I first met him as a young man representing the Youth Section of the Peace Pledge Union at the WRI Council meeting in Vienna in August 1968.

Nearby Czechoslovakia was experiencing what turned out to be the last days of the Prague Spring during which Dubcek and the Czechoslovak people were struggling off authoritarian Soviet control and attempting to build 'Socialism with a Human Face'. On the last day of the Council meeting a WRI delegation, which I think included John, travelled to Bratislava at the invitation of the Slovak Peace Committee and had a remarkably open discussion with them. Departing from the usual Moscow line of such peace committees, they warned us that, with Warsaw Pact military manoeuvres still taking place on Czechoslovakia's borders, the danger of Soviet intervention had not passed.

Four days later, Soviet and other Warsaw Pact armies invaded. Most of us had left Vienna by then, but John had stayed on, travelled to Bratislava, and was there when the tanks rolled into the city. In a courageous act of solidarity, he joined the thousands of citizens who thronged the streets in protest and defiance.

The following month WRI sent international teams to Moscow, Warsaw, Budapest and Sofia who displayed banners and distributed leaflets protesting against the invasion and expressing solidarity with the nonviolent resistance of Czech and Slovak citizens. The leaflets also drew parallels with the US invasion of Vietnam and called for the dismantling of both NATO and the Warsaw Pact. John at the Peace Pledge Union was involved in publicizing the event and personally delivered a PPU statement about the action to newspapers and other media outlets.

John was involved in peace activities for the rest of his working life. As youth secretary of the PPU, he was able to pass on his considerable knowledge of pacifist writing to other youth activists, producing a bibliography on Pacifism published by Housmans in 1972, and founding the series of PPU publications Studies in Nonviolence.

In 1973, he returned from the Philadelphia Life Center / Movement for a New Society, to join Peace News. In 1974 he was one of the 14 members of the British Withdrawal from Northern Ireland campaign charged with “conspiracy to incite disaffection” for possessing the BWNIC leaflet explaining how British soldiers could refuse to serve in Northern Ireland - this charge carried a possible life sentence. Fortunately, after an 11-week trial, the jury did not follow the judge's advice but accepted the defendants' argument that their actions were justified and returned a verdict of Not Guilty. In addition, John – along with three others – was charged with “aiding and abetting” two AWOL British soldiers go to Sweden to which he pleaded “guilty” and was fined.

John left Peace News after the BWNIC trial and worked at Housman's bookshop. During this period he served on the Executive Committee of WRI and, in 1980, when the office returned to London from Brussels, WRI chair Myrtle Solomon convinced him to become WRI secretary. He served in that role until nearly the end of 1984. Later, after Myrtle's death in 1987, he took over the administration of the Lumsdale House Trust fund, set up to support the educational side of WRI's work.

While John's convictions were very much in the tradition of anarcho-pacifism, he was never narrowly sectarian. I remember at a WRI study conference in the late 1970s in Prades in the south of France that he became impatient with what he saw the rigid ideological stance of some anarchist participants and said he preferred to define himself instead as a 'guerrilla anarchist'. I took him to mean by this that, while holding on to basic anarchist principles, he wanted to be open and flexible on how they were interpreted in practice.

But politics aside, I remember John as a personal friend and the number of occasions when he and his partner, Liz Chapple made me welcome in their home in London when I was on my way to WRI meetings and we enjoyed together the real ales which he took pride in stocking. His death will be a particularly heavy blow to Liz and their son Matthew, and our sympathy must be with them at this time.
European Court of Human Rights affirms the right to conscientious objection to military service


The Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights, in a ground-breaking judgment (issued on Thursday) in the case of Bayatyan v. Armenia (Application no. 23459/03, 1/6/2011), has ruled that states have a duty to respect individuals' right to conscientious objection to military service as part of their obligation to respect the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion set out in Article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights. In the light of this judgment, the above-named organisations call on Turkey and Azerbaijan, the only two parties to the Convention who do not yet provide for conscientious objection to military service, to take immediate steps to do so. Moreover, Armenia should amend its Alternative Service Act to ensure that it provides a genuine alternative service of a clearly civilian nature, which should be neither deterrent nor punitive in character, in line with European and international standards.

This is the first time that the right of conscientious objection to military service has been explicitly recognised under the European Convention on Human Rights.

The above-named organisations welcome this judgment in which the European Court of Human Rights has interpreted this right in line with the long-standing interpretation of the equivalent provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights by the UN Human Rights Committee, the body set up under that treaty to monitor states parties' compliance with its provisions.

The Bayatyan v Armenia case concerned a Jehovah's Witness who was sentenced to two and a half years in prison following his refusal of military service on the grounds of conscientious objection. Amnesty International, Conscience & Peace Tax International, International Commission of Jurists, Quaker UN Office and War Resisters’ International submitted a joint third party intervention (http://wri-irg.org/node/10689) to the Grand Chamber which highlighted the UN Human Rights Committee’s long-standing position that conscientious objection to military service is protected under the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. The organisations also highlighted recommendations of the Parliamentary Assembly and Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe and provided the Court with information about the recognition of the right to conscientious objection to military service in the 47 member states of the Council of Europe.

Background

The case concerned Armenian conscientious objector Vahan Bahatyan, born in 1983, who lives in Yerevan, Armenia. He is a Jehovah’s Witness who for reasons of conscience refused to perform military service. In 2001 he was sentenced to a prison term of one and a half years. His sentence was increased by one year after the Prosecutor appealed for a harsher sentence, claiming that his conscientious objection was “unfounded and dangerous”. When this decision was confirmed by the Armenian Supreme Court, Bayatyan took his case to the European Court.

On accession to the Council of Europe in 2000, Armenia committed itself “to adopt, within three years of accession, a law on alternative service in compliance with European standards and, in the meantime, to pardon all conscientious objectors sentenced to prison terms or service in disciplinary battalions, allowing them instead to choose, when the law on alternative service has come into force, to perform non-armed military service or alternative civilian service”. The Alternative Service Act of 17 December 2003 made provision for conscientious objectors to military service including the creation of an “Alternative Civilian Service”. At no time was Bayatyan given the option of performing this service; moreover those Jehovah’s Witnesses who did embark on the service found that it was not clearly civilian in nature and included requirements such as the swearing of a military oath and the wearing of military uniforms that were unacceptable to them. More than 80 Jehovah’s Witnesses have been imprisoned in the last four years for refusing this “alternative civilian service”, which in its nature, in its duration (42 months, the longest stipulated anywhere in the world, and one-and-three-quarter times that of military service) and in its close supervision by the military authorities, is clearly not in accordance with European and international standards.

This judgment by the 17-person Grand Chamber of the European Court is the result of its review of an October 2009 judgment in the case by a seven-person Chamber which ruled that Article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights did not protect conscientious objection to military service.

Article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights and Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) contain almost identical provisions on the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. All states which are party to the European Convention are also party to the ICCPR. Since 1993, the UN Human Rights Committee, the body of independent experts established under the ICCPR to monitor states’ compliance with its provisions, has interpreted this as including the right to conscientious objection to military service. This is the first case where the European Court has ruled on this issue. Earlier European Court cases, such as Ulke v Turkey, where the repeated imprisonment and other penalties imposed on a conscientious objector for the refusal of military service were found to constitute inhuman or degrading treatment, had not addressed conscientious objection to military service as such.
Devi Prasad (1921-2011)

Devi Prasad, WRI’s General Secretary from 1962-1972 and chairperson 1973-1975, died on 1 June in Delhi. An artist and potter, Devi graduated from Rabindranath Tagore’s Shantiniketan before moving to Sevagram where he worked with Gandhi from 1942 to 1947. Post-India’s independence, he remained active in the Gandhian movement, especially in the field of education.

For his first two years in the WRI office, Devi was Joint Secretary with Tony Smythe and their Conscription: A World Survey, was the first really systematic study of compulsory military service and resistance to it around the world. Devi was fascinated by the Western tradition of conscientious objection, but also challenged WRI to grow beyond this and embrace non-Western approaches to nonviolent action, as illustrated by the title of the 1969 Triennial “Liberation and Revolution: Gandhi’s challenge” - held in Gandhi Centenary Year - and by subsequent debates around nonviolent revolution (the 1972 Lakey and 1975 Randle manifestos) and also critiques of Western perspectives on “development”.

Devi’s period as General Secretary was, of course, dominated by the Vietnam war, where radical war resistance was raising the issue of the deeper need for nonviolent social revolution - it also coincided with the 1968 Soviet military intervention in Czechoslovakia, where WRI organised a direct action project with activists traveling to several Warsaw Pact capital cities to protest. In 1971, WRI and Peace News launched an even more ambitious nonviolent direct action project, Operation Omega to Bangladesh, to challenge the Pakistani blockade of the future Bangladesh.

The sudden death of his first wife, Janneke, left him bringing up his sons Sunand and Udayan and his daughter Amman while facing the demands of working in the WRI office.

Devi’s subsequent involvement in WRI included a brief period as chairperson and a longer involvement as a council member. He married again, and in 1983 returned to India from where he promoted the 1985-86 Triennial conference, Resistance and Reconversion: The Power of Nonviolence, in the Swaraj Ashram, Vedchhi, Gujarat, India, and his detailed history of WRI from 1921-1974, War is a Crime against Humanity: The Story of the War Resisters’ International.

These bald details cannot convey what we most valued about Devi: his encouragement of youth, and his steady presence offering reflectiveness, a continual reference to basics of nonviolence, and his habitual good-humoured charm.
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War Profiteering and Peace Movement Responses

International Seminar
Theme Groups
- New developments in war profiteering: How do we respond to new developments such as Privatisation of war, (the growing use of commercial companies instead of national armed forces, the use of Drones (you don’t go to war, you just take your joystick) and homeland security as a new profitable branch, used for crowd control, catching refugees and spying on opposition. How do we develop arguments, can we make new strategic connections with other campaigns?
- Exposing the bad guys: By challenging the links between governments and the arms industry, we can use the fact that people – even if they are not against arms trade per se – do not like the subsidies and support the latter receive. By exposing the role of the banks, pension providers, etc. in supporting the war profiteers we use the fact that these financiers also have a individual consumer connection. By targeting specific companies we can expose the actual transfers and use of specific systems. Can these strategies be improved? What can we learn from each other?
- War and the exploitation of natural resources: Exploiting natural resources is a central economic motive for war and a central feature of war “reconstruction”, such as we see in Iraq. It is an explicit part of strategies of alliances such as NATO or EU. It is also a major factor in the violent displacement of poor and indigenous communities in many parts of the world. How can we connect anti arms trade strategies and strategies against environmental destruction?

The Broken Rifle No 89, July 2011
New in the WRI webshop

War Resisters’ International offers a range of merchandise via its webshop. These and many other books can be ordered online — and some are even available for reading online or downloading as PDF.

VENEZUELA: Revolution as Spectacle analyses the Chávez regime from an anti-authoritarian Venezuelan perspective. It debunks claims made by Venezuelan and U.S. right wing that the Chávez government is dictatorial, as well as claims made by Venezuelan and U.S. leftists that the Chávez government is revolutionary. Instead the book argues that the Chávez regime is one of a long line of Latin American populist regimes that - “revolutionary” rhetoric aside - ultimately have been subservient to the United States as well as to multinational corporations. The book concludes by explaining how Venezuela’s autonomous social, labour, and environmental movements have been systematically disempowered by the Chávez regime, but that despite this they remain the basis of a truly democratic, revolutionary alternative.

Rafael Uzcátegui
See Sharp Press, 2011
Publication date: January 2011
Orders: £11.00 + postage

Conscientious objects 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 antimilitarism from a feminist perspective, opposing not only militarism, but also a form of antimilitarism that creates the male conscientious objector as the ‘hero’ of antimilitarist 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.

Published by: War Resisters’ International
Edited by Ellen Elster and Majken Jul Sørensen
Preface by Cynthia Enloe
Publication date: April 2010
Orders: £6.00 plus postage
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