Greetings Peace History Society Members!

On behalf of the entire PHS board and executive officers, let me express to everyone a Happy New Year. Let me also express my thanks to all those folks who made the 2015 PHS conference a success: program chairs Ben Peters and Prue Moylan; committee members of the Lifetime Achievement Award, Bills and DeBenedetti prizes; keynote speaker Leilah Danielson; Marc Becker for photographs of the conference; Robert Shaffer for the PHS newsletter, which features many highlights of that conference, including minutes of the PHS Board and General Meeting, and many folks in the University of Saint Joseph community.

In broad strokes, the feedback I have received about the conference has been nothing but extremely positive, from veteran PHS attendees to first-time graduate student presenters. Many folks spoke of the high-quality scholarly presentations, the richness of the conference program and sessions and the convivial atmosphere (that is a hallmark for PHS conferences). For the first time, we had a twitter presence. We welcomed scholars locally, nationally and internationally and we can look forward to a special issue of Peace & Change in the future.

I hope that many PHS members had the opportunity to attend the AHA this year in Atlanta, and specifically the PHS-sponsored panel organized by Ian Fletcher and Robbie Lieberman: “The Whole World is Mobilizing: Global Dimensions of Peace and Antiwar Activism around the Vietnam War.” (See p. 26.) I also hope that many PHS members will share their scholarly expertise with contributions to Mitch Hall’s forthcoming Opposition to War: An Encyclopedia of United States Peace and Antiwar Movements. (See p. 28.)

Membership renewals for 2016 have gone out, so if you have not done so, make sure you take care of this promptly to ensure no disruption in receipt of our journal, Peace & Change. Editor Heather Fryer is already making a mark with Peace & Change by recently launching a blog and working to further elevate the stature and visibility of the journal. Our membership remains stable and likely will increase once everyone has renewed for 2016. Our finances

Table of Contents – see page 3
remain strong, which in recent years has allowed us to support graduate student travel to our conference and to offer prize money to award winners.

PHS always welcomes its members to take on even greater roles in our society, so we continue to generate the leaders of the society for the future. To that effect, we will be holding elections for officers and board members in Fall 2016 – terms beginning in January 2017 - so please start to think about how you might serve PHS.

It is not too early to start thinking about the next PHS conference, for which we will be partnering with other institutions and organizations. The theme is “Remembering Muted Voices: Conscience, Dissent, Resistance and Civil Liberties in World War I through Today” and the conference will take place October 19-22, 2017 at the National World War I Memorial Museum, Kansas City, MO. (See pp. 4-5.) PHS has strong representation for this conference with David Hostetter, Scott Bennett and Christy Snider serving in key positions.

On a personal note, in early January, I had the chance to travel to India and visit the National Gandhi Museum in New Delhi, which was inspiring. The museum, which in large measure also functions as a memorial site, does an excellent (and understated) job of presenting Gandhi’s life and peace work in his struggle for Indian independence and social justice.

A few things stood out to me. The museum was as much a place of reflection as it was of learning. The museum included a list of all the non-Indian texts Gandhi had read in his lifetime, a testament to his wide-ranging erudition, which certainly informed his peace activism and speaks to the importance of peace scholarship. The museum also included a World Peace Gong with the flags of the nations of the world on it as well as the symbols of the world’s great religions (including, refreshingly, the swastika, which, due to the Third Reich, has been unfortunately hijacked for evil purposes). And I was touched by one of many quotes from Gandhi that one could read at the museum:

“I am praying for the light that will dispel the darkness. Let those who have living faith in non-violence, join me in the prayer.”

Pax,
Kevin J. Callahan
University of Saint Joseph, Connecticut

Peace History Society: For membership information and activities, go to:
www.peacehistorysociety.org

Send material for the next issue of PHS News (July 2016) to editor Robert Shaffer at roshaf@ship.edu, by June 20, 2016. Announcements of recent publications, conference reports, teaching articles, resources of interest, commentaries on current issues through a historical lens, etc. are welcome.
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www.peacehistorysociety.org
For its biennial conference in 2017, the Peace History Society is joining with others to co-sponsor a conference on resistance to World War I and the echoes and legacy of that resistance in succeeding decades. The conference commemorates the 100th anniversary of U.S. entry into World War I.

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

OCT. 19-22, 2017
NATIONAL WORLD WAR I MUSEUM AT LIBERTY MEMORIAL, KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

The World War's profound effect on the United States is often overlooked. Although the United States actively took part in the conflict for only 18 months, the war effort introduced mass conscription, transformed the American economy, and mobilized popular support through war bonds, patriotic rallies, and anti-German propaganda. Nevertheless, many people desired a negotiated peace, opposed American intervention, refused to support the war effort, and/or even imagined future world orders that could eliminate war. Among them were members of the peace churches and other religious groups, women, pacifists, radicals, labor activists, and other dissenters.

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

We invite proposals for papers, panels, posters, roundtables, and workshops that engage in diverse ways with issues of conscience, dissent, resistance, and civil liberties during World War I, in the United States and around the world. We
encourage proposals that examine historical and contemporary parallels to the war. Strong conference papers will be given consideration for publication in special issues of *Mennonite Quarterly Review* and *Peace & Change*.

Topics might cover:

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

The program committee invites interested participants to send a 1-page proposal focused on the theme of the conference by January 31, 2017 to John D. Roth at johndr@goshen.edu

Conference Co-sponsors: American Friends Service Committee, Brethren Historical Library and Archives; Bruderhof Communities; Historians against the War; Community of Christ Seminary; Hutterian Communities (3); John Whitmer Historical Association; *Peace History Society*; Center for Mennonite Brethren Studies, Tabor College, KS; Mennonite Central Committee, US; Mennonite Historical Society; *Mennonite Quarterly Review*; National World War I Museum and Memorial; Plough Quarterly; The Sider Institute for Anabaptist, Pietist and Wesleyan Studies at Messiah College.
In 2005, the Peace History Society set up the Lifetime Achievement Award to be presented every other year to a PHS member who has contributed outstanding scholarship and exemplary service to peace history. The recipients of the award have been: Charles Chatfield (1934-2015) in 2007; Sandi Cooper in 2009; Lawrence Witten in 2011 and Berenice Carroll in 2013. The Lifetime Achievement Award Committee in 2015 included Christy Snider (past PHS president; Berry College); Ginger Williams (PHS Treasurer; Winthrop University) and Robert Shaffer (PHS Newsletter Editor; Shippensburg University.

This year, the Lifetime Achievement Award committee confers the highest distinction of the Peace History Society on Geoffrey S. Smith, Professor Emeritus of History and Physical and Health Education at Queens University in Kingston, Ontario. Dr. Smith was born in San Francisco and raised in California. His interest in security and its misuse by elites began in sixth grade when he was sent to the principal’s office for kissing his classmate, Ginger, during a duck-and-cover air raid drill. The inappropriate and reprehensible nature of his behavior became clear when his principal informed him that his actions had “endangered national security.” Dr. Smith’s ability to critically question the logic of this statement undoubtedly led him to attend Berkley University in the 1960s. While there he engaged in his first protest experience by holding a sign for a week chastising the administration during the Free Speech Movement. He obtained his Ph.D. from the University of California at Santa Barbara in 1969 and taught at Macalester College in St. Paul, Minnesota for two years before joining the faculty at Queens University.

At Queen’s Dr. Smith taught courses on “Conspiracy and Dissent in American History,” U.S. Foreign Relations, Latin American History, the Vietnam War, and American Social and Cultural History. His exuberant and caring teaching style not only won him Queen’s University’s Frank Knox Award for Excellence in Teaching in 2004, but also led his students to refer to him in their course evaluations as “the ‘Krusty the Klown’ of academia,” “an idiotsocratic karismetic genius,” and as a “Professor for the TV generation of low attention spans.” Outside the classroom, Dr. Smith participated in Civil Rights protests and antiwar protests during the United States’ involvement in Vietnam and later military actions. Dr. Smith also has the distinction – unique I’m sure among Peace History Society members – of serving as the coach of the Queen’s University men’s basketball team in the 1980s.

Dr. Smith has written widely on issues related to peace history, gender and U.S. national security in the Cold War, the relocation of Japanese
minorities in the U.S. and Canada during WWII, and American nativism. His 1973 monograph, *To Save a Nation: American Extremism, the New Deal and the Coming of World War II*, was nominated for a Pulitzer Prize. In this work, Smith argued that the activities of right-wing extremists like Father Charles Coughlin and Fritz Kuhn of the German American Bund tainted moderate and responsible non-interventionists prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, thereby making it easier for Franklin D. Roosevelt and his foreign policy advisers to garner support for intervention in World War II.

A true servant to the discipline, Dr. Smith is a Lifetime Member of the Peace History Society and has been an active book and article reviewer for the organization’s journal - *Peace & Chang*. He served as president of the Peace History Society from 1995-1997, PHS executive Secretary-Treasurer from 1997-2000, and most recently a board member from 2008-2012.

Scott Bills Memorial Book Prize: Gearóid Barry

The Peace History Society awards the Scott Bills Memorial Prize bi-annually (in odd years) for an outstanding English-language work in the field of Peace History. This year, the Prize is awarded for an outstanding first book or an outstanding dissertation by a faculty member or independent scholar completed in 2012 or 2013. The Prize carries a cash award of $500. The Bills Committee included Scott H. Bennett (chair; Georgian Court University), Deborah Buffton (University of Wisconsin—Lacrosse), and Michael Clinton (Gwynedd Mercy University).

For the best first book published or dissertation completed in English during 2012-13, the Bills Committee awards the Bills' Memorial Prize to Dr. Gearóid Barry for his book, *The Disarmament of Hatred: Marc Sangnier, French Catholicism and the Legacy of the First World War, 1914-45* (Palgrave Macmillan; 2012). Dr. Barry is a Lecturer in Modern European History.
Gearóid Barry’s response to the award:

23 October 2015

Dear Professors Callahan and Bennett,

Though we have communicated on this by email several times since July 2015, I just wished to place on record, properly, by means of this letter, my thanks and delight in accepting the Scott Bills Memorial Prize awarded by the PHS for my book *The Disarmament of Hatred* (2012). I am delighted to say that here at my university in National University of Ireland Galway, our visiting speaker Professor Michael Clinton acted on your behalf on Wednesday afternoon, 21 October last, and presented me with the Certificate and monetary prize in front of my colleagues, our grad students and some personal friends – about 30 people – at the Hardiman Research Building in our university. It was a simple but lovely occasion with Mike reading the citation from the PHS, adding some personal remarks, followed by my short but heartfelt response.

In summary, I said, and I repeat here for you, that I am honoured and humbled to accept a prize named after Scott Bills, who was both a...
fine scholar and a fine man. I have learnt more about Scott Bills in recent times, not least from the memorial article published by the AHA. It is evident that Scott combined a commitment to rigorous scholarship, in diplomatic and peace history, with community-mindedness and a strong ethical commitment. I know that the Peace History Society continues to uphold this commitment to serving the scholarly and general community.

As I said here in Galway, for all the lonely furrow research can be at times, it remains a privilege to engage in a conversation with the sources and fellow scholars across the miles and across the years. I accept the award gratefully as a valediction of The Disarmament of Hatred’s place in the scholarship of peace and war but also as refreshment in my continuing research activities. I also hope that, at some future date, I may be able to attend your biennial conference as a contributor. Being the first non-U.S. citizen to receive the Prize, I trust that in some small way this also contributes to the PHS’s already fine international profile.

Yours sincerely,
Gearóid Barry,
Department of History,
NUI Galway, Ireland

Charles DeBenedetti Memorial Article Prize: Rachel Waltner Goossen

Since 1987-88, the Peace History Society has awarded the Charles DeBenedetti Prize biannually for the best article published on peace history. Articles may focus on the history of peace movements, the response of individuals to peace and war issues, the relationship between peace and other reform movements, gender issues in warfare and peacemaking, comparative analyses, and quantitative studies. This year, the Prize is awarded to the author of an outstanding English-language journal article, book chapter, or introduction on peace history published in 2013 or 2014.

Of forty-two publications reviewed, the DeBenedetti Committee awarded Rachel Waltner Goossen the prize for "Disarming the Toy Store and Reloading the Shopping Cart: Resistance to Violent Consumer Culture," Peace & Change 38, 3 (July 2013): 330-354. Rachel Waltner Goossen's scholarship on how North American antiwar organizations resisted war

Rachel Waltner Goossen
through the dis-arming of toys and toy stores bridges many important historiographical fields including peace history, women’s history, the history of consumption, the history of childhood, and cultural studies. It is a well-written, engaging look at history “from the bottom up,”

which will undoubtedly appeal to a wide audience, including students raised on some of the violent toys and gaming software under discussion in the article.

Goossen highlights the evolving strategies of peace activists concerned with violent and war toys, from the moral arguments that dominated early twentieth-century crusades to the health and safety campaigns of recent years. Without underplaying the clout and malleability of toy manufacturers, Goossen nonetheless highlights the tenacity and creativity of a broad coalition of peace activists who effectively countered, and sometimes even curbed, the power of the market with their consumer-activism.

Goossen teaches at Washburn University in Topeka, Kansas. She is also the author of Women Against the Good War: Conscientious Objection and Gender on the American Homefront, 1941-1947 (University of North Carolina Press, 1997), among other works.

This year’s DeBenedetti Prize Committee included Mona Siegel (chair and the 2011-12 recent recipient of the prize; California State University, Sacramento), Erika Kuhlman (recent Peace & Change editor; Idaho State University), and Andrew Barbero (University of Southern Indiana). The prize carries an award of $500.

Charles DeBenedetti was a PHS leader during the 1970s and 1980s, serving as both secretary-treasurer and president. He taught at the University of Toledo from 1968 until his untimely death in 1987, at age 44. In addition to The Peace Reform in American History (1980), he wrote Origins of the Modern Peace Movement, 1915-1929 (1978) and An American Ordeal: The Antiwar Movement of the Vietnam Era (1990). DeBenedetti also edited several volumes in the Garland Library of War and Peace, as well as Peace Heroes in Twentieth-Century America (1986). Bestowing the biennial article prize in his name is one way to honor Charles DeBenedetti’s pioneering contributions to the study of peace history.
Peace History Society biennial conference, October 22-24, 2015, University of St. Joseph West Hartford, Connecticut

Historical Perspectives on War, Peace, and Religion

Under the guidance of program co-chairs Ben Peters of the University of St. Joseph and Prudence Moylan of Loyola University-Chicago, along with PHS president Kevin Callahan who served as on-site coordinator, the Peace History Society’s 2015 conference featured fourteen panels, one keynote address, and one plenary session. Paper topics ranged from Judeo-Christian imagery in World War I memorials to the U.S. Catholic bishops’ response to 9/11, from Russian radical pacifists and religious sectarians at the turn of the 20th century to Mormon approaches to peace and violence, from Muslim generals facing Japanese aggression in 1930s China to religion and gender in the Egyptian revolution of 2011, and from divisions among American Christian pacifists over Gandhian nonviolence to Canadian Mennonite aid American Vietnam War refugees.

Several of those who served as moderators provided synopses of their panels, and Doug Rossinow summarized the keynote address by Leilah Danielson of Northern Arizona University on “Supernaturalism and Peace Activism: Expanding the Boundaries of Peace History.” Several graduate students whose travel to the conference was partly subsidized by grants from the PHS budget have also submitted brief accounts of their research and their impressions of the conference. The full conference program is available at http://www.peacehistorysociety.org/phs2015/program.pdf.
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The plenary panel, designed in part to mark the University of St. Joseph’s status as a Catholic institution, focused on “American Catholic Peace Movements: Past and Present.” Papers discussed the views and experiences of Ben Salmon, a conscientious objector and labor organizer during World War I, the causes and consequences of Dorothy Day’s pacifism, and the anti-nuclear activism of Carl Kabat, one of the Plowshares Eight defendants.

PHS especially thanks the University of St. Joseph, and President Rhona Free, Provost Michelle Kalis, Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences Wayne Steely, and USJ staff members Ann Egan and Betty Anne Janelle for institutional support for and hospitality during the conference.
Panel 2:
Ending Militarism, Seeking Justice
By Prudence Moylan
(Loyola University, Chicago)

Presenters:
Christy Jo Snider, Berry College
Philip Wight, Brandeis University
Trevor Burrows, Purdue University

All three contributors explored the complex importance of relationships in resolving conflict.

Christy Snider led off the event with an analysis of the International Federation of University Women's debate over respect for the autonomy of members and a universal principle of non-exclusion based on religion and ethnicity. The IFUW was a decentralized organization which recognized racial, religious and ethnic diversity among its members who were all university graduates. In 1933 the challenge of German exclusion of non-Aryans led to the formulation of the Budapest Resolution (1935) which reasserted the organization's commitment of non-exclusion on the basis of race, religion or politics. The debate over local autonomy or organizational rejection of systemic discrimination continued through meetings in Paris (1937) and Stockholm (1939). A reassertion of the principle of nondiscrimination was passed in Stockholm but it did not require the expulsion offending chapters. The IFUW debates illustrate the challenge faced by transnational organizations in confronting nationalist and religious exclusions among members. The challenge of negotiating conflict based on issues of difference or on universal principles remains.

Philip Wight discussed the life of E.F. Schumacher, the noted economist who died in 1977, as a challenger to the idea of economic growth as God. Schumacher critiqued market liberalism as the idolatry of wealth. Since the theory of growth rejected limits and it became an idol that required and justified violence and exploitation of the earth and the people rather than respect. Economics was a moral pursuit for Schumacher. He was also a spiritual seeker who explored many religious traditions before choosing Roman Catholicism in his later years. It is perhaps not surprising that his criticism of unlimited economic growth has most recently been affirmed by Pope Francis in Laudato Si.

Trevor Burrows discussed the place of 'Religion' in the work of the Student Peace Union, 1959-1964. He challenged the historical interpretation that celebrates the SPU as a specifically secular movement. Asserting a sharp distinction between religious and secular approaches to peace does not explain the extensive cooperation between the SPU and religious peace activists, particularly Christians, in the early 1960s. The SPU relied on churches for meeting locations and financial support and also sought Christians as members because of their persistence and reliability in the organization. Burrows concludes that if we look at the working relationships of the SPU rather than its organizational formation we discover a focus on coalition building not a divide among secular and religious peace activists.
Panel 5: Anti-Military Movements in Latin America
By Geoffrey Smith
(Queens University, Canada)

Presenters:
Ginger Williams, Winthrop University
Marc Becker, Truman State University
Marian Mollin, Virginia Tech University

Militarism in Latin America has a long, sordid history as a bulwark against popular politics. Along with the conservative Catholic Church and the latifundia, the historical place of the army as defender of the status quo stands as the most powerful institution in many countries. There is a disquieting continuity between the strength of the militaries during the Spanish Empire and subsequent independence. Often, as these three papers indicate, Latin American independence existed in name only, as the United States assumed the mantle of imperial guardian. In this role Washington buttressed Latin militaries as a bulwark against perceived European threats—be they fascist, communist, terrorist or druggst. In this role Washington became a partisan of reactionary, anti-democratic programs throughout the hemisphere.

Virginia Williams’ assessment of the School of the Americas (SOA) since the beginning of the cold war clarifies the manner in which the United States trained Latin American armies at Fort Gulick in the Panama Canal Zone both to protect, but, more important, to act against their own people when Washington perceived that need. The template developed during the early cold war against communism came to encompass opposition to development and reform politics—with bloody results in, among other countries, Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador. The SOA, Williams concludes, has outlived its usefulness—a point increasingly recognized by critics—but the institution remains part of the U.S. hemispheric arrangement. What Latin America needs is not the continuation of business as usual, but, rather, “a new foreign policy based on democracy, development, and the preservation of human rights.”

These goals figure prominently in Marc Becker’s well-researched analysis of attempts by Ecuador to remove American military presence from the most famous islands in the history of Western science. The current Ecuadorian drive is not new, having strong antecedents in the 1940s, and it has waxed and waned according to the impact of domestic and external developments. Becker goes behind the scenes as he shows how an initial agreement to station U.S. troops persisted as part of the cold war anti-communist program, despite repeated Ecuadorian attempts to liquidate the arrangement. On several occasions, domestic politics and protest groups seemed close to success, only to fail in the face of American concern at imputed strategic dangers. How else would the U.S. conduct a war against drugs, or terror, without regional bases?

Not until 2007 did Ecuador assume global leadership of the drive to close American military bases, convening a conference that brought forty countries to Quito. The participants concluded that these bases were a key part of a U.S. “culture of aggression” that violates human rights, destroys communities, and oppresses all people, particularly indigenous people and African descendants. The delegates...
called for, among other things, the cleaning up of local base environments and an end to legal immunity for military personnel.

These objectives remain crucial, as part of a stillborn hemispheric program of reform. Marian Mollin’s paper, “Solidarity and Faith: Ita Ford and the Politics of the Catholic Foreign Mission,” connects well with the macroscopic assessments offered by Becker and Williams. Mollin probes the intersecting importance of faith and politics in the life and work of Ita Ford and—by implication—other Maryknoll Catholic missionaries in the dangerous terrain of El Salvador during that country’s civil war agony in the early 1980s. Religious faith preceded political commitment in Ford’s case, but—most important—each force became inextricably linked. (Plenary speaker Leilah Danielson made a similar point in her assessment of the supernatural upon thinking about peace).

Mollin shows how a progressive politics were in fact a logical outcome of Ford’s work among the people, and that her martyrdom (along with that of three other compatriots, and the Archbishop of El Salvador, Oscar Romero) were part of a larger shift that clarified how far liberation theology had moved parts of the Catholic Church away from its reactionary antecedents. Ford and her associates spoke for the people and for positive change. In bearing such brave witness to injustice, they inspire us and still do.

An appreciative audience of thirty people continued the discussion, offering both hope and dismay at more recent developments. Clearly, anti-military movements have enjoyed limited success in many Latin American countries, more so in recent years. Just as clearly, there remains a difficult road to traverse. The United States has much to answer for in supporting anti-left reaction, rather than working with indigenous and regional forces seeking positive improvements. Whether the Republic can step backward from its role as the major midwife of militarism in Latin America remains moot. A country in thrall to guns and violence and wars against just about anything seems a poor model for any peace-keeping assignment.

Panel 7: Religion and the Pursuit of Peace in Global Context
By Kevin Callahan
(University of St. Joseph)

Presenters:
David McFadden, Fairfield University
Ke Ren, Bates College
Ahmad Wais Wardak,
University of Connecticut

Three scholars – David McFadden, Professor of History at Fairfield University; Ke Ren, visiting Assistant Professor of Chinese history at Bates College; and Ahmad Wais Wardak, Ph.D. candidate in Political Science at University of Connecticut – delivered strong presentations in this panel, all of which illustrate the transnational reach of religious-inspired peace activism and concepts in global context.

McFadden spoke on the topic of the Protestant Social Gospel, the Search for a Historical Jesus and Openings to Soviet Russia in the 1920s. The focus of McFadden’s presentation was the social Christianity of Walter Rauschenbusch and

Maryknoll Sister Ita Ford, murdered in El Salvador in 1980

El Salvador, Oscar Romero) were part of a larger shift that clarified how far liberation theology had moved parts of the Catholic Church away from its reactionary antecedents. Ford and her associates spoke for the people and
how it inspired American Protestant pastors in the 1920s and 1930s – in particular Sherwood Eddy and Kirby Page – to lead study trips to Soviet Russia to forge peaceful relations and spread the social Gospel. McFadden argues

G. Sherwood Eddy featured prominently in the presentation by David McFadden as well as in the keynote address by Leilah Danielson.

more broadly that such peace work between religious organizations and individuals in the 1920s helped lay the foundation for the re-emergence in the 1950s and 1960s and later 1980s of “citizen diplomacy” between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Ke Ren explored the alliance between the Rassemblement Universel pour la Paix (International Peace Campaign, IPC) and its China branch and Chinese and Buddhist leaders in the early years of the Sino-Japanese War (1937-1945). Offering a corrective to the Eurocentric perspective that the IPC was largely a failure in its peace campaigns, Ren suggests one must look at national and local branches outside of Europe to appreciate IPC’s vibrancy. Case in point is the China Branch, which by 1938 had recruited over 126 organizations and a million members from social elites, religious leaders, and officials of both the Nationalist and Communist Parties. Ren critically examines the nexus between Chinese Muslim and Buddhist peace groups in their common cause to resist Japanese imperialism.

In “Jihad against Terrorism: Rethinking the Clash of Conceptualizations,” Wardak offered an impressive overview of the historical evolution of the meaning of the term jihad. Wardak contends that the ethical and peaceful elements of jihad have been misused by Islamist extremists in recent times, who have instead emphasized its political and militant meaning. The emphasis on the military aspects of jihad by Islamist groups and the tendency of the Western world today to only equate jihad with terrorism, not its peaceful and ethical meanings, has also marginalized the role of moderate Islam in establishing peace and security.

A common thread between the papers is the role of religiously-inspired non-state organizations and individuals in attempting to promote transnational international understanding and reconciliation.

From left: Jeffrey Meyers, Leilah Danielson, and St. Joseph President Rhona Free, at the conference opening reception
Panel 9: Religious Leaders and the Practice of Peace
By Shyamala Raman
(University of Saint Joseph)

Presenters:
Elizabeth N. Agnew, Ball State University
Deborah Kisatsky, Assumption College
Jeffrey D. Meyers, Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago
Irina A. Gordeeva, Russian State University for the Humanities

This panel featured a decidedly multidisciplinary set of reflective papers on historical, theological and psychological influences among and between founders and leaders of the peace movement, in the American as well as in the global milieu. Unfortunately, there was no time left for discussion except for one question at the very end.

The underlying content in three of the four papers (Meyers, Agnew and Kisatsky) focused on the impact, influence and the deliberative questionings of the message of Mohandas Gandhi. In turn, the influence on Gandhi himself by Tolstoy and/or the Christian Pacifist Movement of the 19th Century movement was also highlighted in the papers.

Meyers emphasized that, while Mohandas Gandhi’s philosophy of nonviolent resistance was cautiously admired, there was skepticism expressed primarily on theological grounds. Meyers also implied that the skepticism was catalyzed by the fact that Gandhi was not from the West. Meyers’ call for the development of a more nuanced theory of non-violence suited to the American milieu, without selected and convenient borrowings from Gandhi, was noteworthy.

Agnew’s paper on Jane Addams and Gandhi, while underlining the several reasons for Jane Addams admiration of Gandhi, also cautioned that the devotion that Addams had for Gandhi was deliberative in that Addams had questions about the consequences of Gandhi’s nonviolent protests. Agnew also implied the need for carefully contextualized borrowings from Gandhian ideas of non-violence.

Kisatsky’s paper analyzed the inner conflicts of three admired pacifists from around the world—Adin Ballou, the 19th century reformer from the United States, Leo Tolstoy from Russia, and Mohandas Gandhi from India. The inner struggles emanated from spiritual questions that arose amongst all three of them—each one sought sustenance in their own respective religious foundations, with Gandhi having the most eclectic religious base to draw from. Kisatsky weaved a nuanced delineation of the psychological-spiritual reflections combined with vulnerability created by sometimes questioning the self-sacrifices that these leaders had to encounter in their mission.

Gordeeva’s paper analyzed the role of Russian radical pacifists, its origin at the end of the nineteenth century via the Tolstoyans and the struggle to promote nonviolent resistance in the early decades of the 20th century. This paper provided a foundation for studying the Russian brand of pacifism, influenced by Tolstoy and other Russian pacifists as well as by Gandhi and the War Resisters International, to name a few.

All of the papers provided considerable ground for further study on the complex network of links amongst and between the areas of theology, psychology, history and politics in the work of peaceful resistance.

From left: Elizabeth Agnew, Deborah Kisatsky, Jeffrey Meyers, and Irina Gordeeva
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Panel 11:
Non-Violence for the Irreverent:
Secular Pacifists & their Religious Histories
By Sandi E. Cooper
(City University of N. Y., emerita)

Presenters:
Scott Bennett, Georgian Court University
Amy Schneidhorst, Independent Scholar
Richard L. Updegrove, Duluth East H.S.

Drawn from research in the War Resisters’ International archives in Amsterdam, Scott Bennett explored an incident in 1966 during the Triennial meeting in Rome of the WRI where language for a resolution on the Vietnam war was under consideration. David McReynolds from the U.S. chapter of the War Resisters’ League, provided language for a resolution which urged the organization to protest the war with governments who were U.S. backers; leaflet U.S. tourists in Europe and provide GI’s in Europe with information about protesting the war. Such behaviors might include writing letters to officers and politicians, discussions with barracks mates, reviewing rules of Conscientious Objection application and walking off bases. McReynolds left the meeting to meet prior obligations as a speaker in Europe, and the WRI changed the resolution to focus on urging US soldiers to defect.

Aware of U S law about treason, sedition and rules for obtaining CO status, McReynolds asked that the last part of the resolution be reworded. Following a back and forth between him and the WRI leadership, which Bennett details, there were several versions of a pamphlet issued, including the request to defect. Exactly how effective these were is an open question but as the war proceeded, it is true that thousands of soldiers did object, leave for Canada, defect, and otherwise protest the war. McReynolds thought that leaflets to tourists would probably be more effective than approaches to soldiers.

Amy Schneidhorst, who gave her presentation via Skype, described “creative community building” in Asia as part of the strategy to protest the current American “pivot to Asia.” On the South Korean island of Jeju, where a U.S. Naval base was proposed as part of the strategy of containing China, the native population organized protests against its creation. Schneidhorst explained that the protests were drawn from their traditions of peace, the native culture of anti-militarism, and the use of the Catholic mass. An important feature of the modes of protest were dances, many of which featured women. While the base was built, the population continued to protest the construction of housing for base residents, to block entries and to sustain regular protests. A video of their modes of nonviolent protest went viral in April, 2015, featuring the mode Gengjeong Style, a particular dance. The protesters derived their practices from formally organized religion along with traditional customs, animism and a deeply held hostility to militarism.

Schneidhorst plans to tie this form of protest to a transnational movement which includes both Afghani youth and women in anti-militarist movements in the American midwest.

Using the examples of the murdered civil rights workers Mickey Schwerner, James Earl Cheney,
and Andrew Goodman, as well as the statistics reflecting the membership of CORE (Congress of Racial Equality), Richard Updegrove demonstrated the varieties of forms where non-institutionalized religious backgrounds impelled actors to non-violence.

Schwerner and Goodman grew up in non-practicing Jewish families which essentially defined themselves as atheists. Their commitment to social justice and its achievement by positive, non-violent actions emerged from profound ethical beliefs. Updegrove also cited the existence of the Ethical Culture group in New York City as a case of a non-religious organization committed to social justice and peace.

James Farmer, founder of CORE in 1942, was influenced by a very secular Gandhian who visited the US. Farmer learned that many of Gandhi’s followers were not religious practitioners and CORE required no statement of faith for membership.

Panel 12: Education for Peace or Peacekeeping
By Chuck Howlett
(Molloy College)

Presenters:
Magali Deleuze,
Collège Militaire Royal du Canada
Chantel Lavoie,
Collège Militaire Royal du Canada
James Olusegun Adeyeri,
University of Ibadan, Nigeria

The presenters offered historical, literary, and policymaking views related to peace awareness.

Magali Deleuze, Associate Professor of History at the Royal Military College of Canada, examines the idea of peacekeeping from ancient to modern times and how its meaning and application has changed over time. She notes that peace is an old idea but efforts to maintain it are far more recent. As an idea to action, modern peacekeeping has its origins in the birth of European and negotiate peace. Peacekeeping became linked to diplomatic efforts in terms of internationalism, balance of power, the Westphalian model, collective security, and the new international order. Professor’s Deleuze’s main point is that the transformation from an individual to a collective idea of peace did exist within the Greek and Roman treaties, but in modern times peace treaties entailed a longer life shelf since peacekeeping now became the essential legal and political instrument for guaranteeing international stability.

Chantel Lavoie, a colleague of Professor Deleuze at the Royal Military College, teaches English. Her topic, “Reading Together, Fighting the Good Fight: A Little Book for Mothers and Sons” (1919),” focuses primarily on that work, written by Nora Brodie Thornhill. Lavoie examines the dual role of mothers and sons as expressed in Thornhill’s book. The presenter was able to find only one extant copy in the British National Library. Looking at how the author related nineteenth century muscular
Christianity to twentieth century realities, Lavoie found that Thornhill’s book is permeated with the idea of courage reflective of a warring world. The role of religious faith (Jesus as Captain and God as Commander) and courage, noted in Thornhill’s book, stand in stark contrast to advertisements for the book alongside published accounts of the war’s dead. Lavoie questions the perception and role of mothers in war and peace as portrayed in Thornhill’s book.

The final paper, from James Adeyeri of the University of Ibadan, Nigeria, looks at the Boko Haram threat in Nigeria and the current problem of peace and security for his fellow people. Adeyeri’s presentation is based on his current dissertation work. He argues that the role of Boko Haram goes back to the mid-1990s and that while it was originally an Islamist movement its growth and expansion has taken on greater political dimensions. He argues for the Nigerians to take destiny in their own hands and to be cautious about Western intervention, which could lead to a “West African Afghanistan.” In terms of peacekeeping and an end to the conflict, Adeyeri argues for African states to strengthen cross-border security to deny militant anti-state organizations like Boko Haram resources and space, a greater regional approach in contrast to age-old national interests and identities, financing multinational military operations through agencies such as the UN and the African Union, and, most importantly, African governments must address the growing problems of youth unemployment, poverty and violations of ordinary citizens’ rights by state security forces, which encourages further extremism and radicalization.

All three papers elevated the conversation about how to look at the historical idea of peace and peacemaking, the literary genre of religious influence and motherhood when raising boys, and the current political realities of Boko Haram’s challenge to Nigerians seeking peace and stability.

Panel 13: Peace, Religion and the State
By Shelley E. Rose
(Cleveland State University)

Presenters:
Joseph Jones, Univ. of British Columbia
Guy Aiken, University of Virginia

“Peace, Religion and the State” was one of the well-attended final sessions of the Peace History Society Conference hosted by St. Joseph University. Presenters included Librarian Emeritus Joseph Jones from the University of British Columbia and Guy Aiken, a PhD candidate (ABD) in American Religions at the University of Virginia. The papers blended nicely to promote discussion of the tenuous relationship between the state, refugees, and religious aid organizations.

Jones has been researching the history of U.S. Vietnam War resister emigration to Canada since 2000. His paper “Canadian Mennonite Assistance to American Vietnam War Refugees” reflected this research and his 1970s work with the Toronto-based collective and publication,
Amex-Canada. Jones contends Canada did not open its doors to refugees but officials “eased up on active discrimination against deserters.” Jones shared the story of Mennonite activists such as Frank Epp, who gauged the difficult situation of American deserters and advocated for them in Canada. In addition, as Jones demonstrated, the Mennonites served as mediators between the refugees and the state, adapting their strategies with the changing needs of the refugees.

This emphasis on mediation was also apparent in Aiken’s case study of the Quakers who served as arbitrators between Nazi perpetrators and Jewish victims before World War II. Aiken is currently working on his dissertation tentatively titled, “Sowing Peace, Reaping War: American Quaker Hunger-Relief and the Politics of Neutrality, 1919-1941.” His research focus is on the American Friends Service Committee’s (AFSC) mass child-feedings in Germany and Appalachia between the world wars. Aiken’s paper, “So, Three Quakers Walk into the Gestapo...The Pragmatic Pacifism of the AFSC,” centered on a December 19, 1938 meeting between Quaker representatives led by Rufus Jones with Gestapo officers in Berlin. This encounter shed light on the challenges of neutrality in the face of extreme violence, as in the case of the Nazi Regime. Aiken problematized narratives of Quaker neutrality, characterizing this meeting with the Gestapo as a “compromise with evil” and placing their actions in a transatlantic context.

The lively discussion of these two papers attested to difficult position of those who attempt to preserve human life and dignity in the face of extreme circumstances. Both the

Mennonites and Quakers negotiated the difficult liminal space between cooperation with state authorities and adherence to their pacifist beliefs. Key points from the discussion included the potential measure of success – for example, Aiken clarified that the AFSC were able to rescue approximately 2,000 refugees from Nazism – and the various effects of transnational events in Vietnam, Germany, and the United States on the mobility and number of refugees in both cases.
Panel 14: Understanding the Causes of Violence
By Agnes Curry
(University of St. Joseph)

Presenters:
Breann Fallon, University of Sydney
Jusuf Salih, University of Dayton
Gail Presbey, University of Detroit-Mercy

The presentations in this panel discussed some contributive factors to violence. Although there was not a single analytic or contextual strand tying all three scholars’ work together, the works shared a focus on the mobilization of rhetorical strategies in both inciting and responding to violence. Three contexts were considered: Rwanda and the Balkans in the early 1990s, and British-ruled India in the first part of the 20th century.

Breann Fallon of the University of Sydney presented on “The Enchanted Aesthetic Effect: Object, Figure, and Rhetoric Fetishisation in the Psyche of the Genocide Perpetrator and the Genocidal Community.” Ms. Fallon discussed the role of what she termed “aesthetic fetishisation” of objects, ideas and people in enabling genocidal violence at both individual-psychological and community levels. Her argument was that through rhetorical and psychological processes, specific cultural elements or objects can become “enchanted,” or invested with seemingly overweening manipulative power. Her case study was the 1994 Rwandan genocide and the particular object she examined in that context was the machete. Ms. Fallon is a doctoral candidate and this paper was part of her more extensive articulation of this model.

Jusuf Salih, an Assistant Professor of Religious Studies at the University of Dayton presented “The Rhetoric of Anger: Violence and War in Bosnia and Herzegovina.” Focusing on the build-up to war in the early 1990s, Dr. Salih discussed how reactive responses ostensibly centered around religion (for example, notions of divine authority, or freedom to practice) coalesced with nationalism to create situations ripe for manipulation by opportunistic politicians.

Gail Presbey rounded off the session by reading her paper, “Gandhi’s views on Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism during the British rule of India.” Dr. Presbey, a Professor of Philosophy at the University of Detroit Mercy, looked extensively to Gandhi’s writings to chronicle key moments in the development of his argumentative and rhetorical strategies in response to both British and Indian usage of the term “terrorism.” In particular, Dr. Presbey pointed out the ways that Gandhi walked a fine line in his responses so as to avoid having his own non-violent stance distortedly co-opted by the British.

All three papers were well received by those in attendance, with the subsequent discussion ranging from further applications of Ms. Fallon’s model, to the barriers for interfaith dialogue still remaining in Bosnia and Herzegovina, to the continued richness of Gandhi’s work in considering today’s challenges.
Prof. Leilah Danielson Delivers PHS Keynote Address:
“Supernaturalism and Peace Activism: Expanding the Boundaries of Peace History”
By Doug Rossinow,
(Metropolitan State University)

On Friday, October 23, 2015, Professor Leilah Danielson, of the history department at Northern
Arizona University, delivered the keynote address at the Peace History Society’s biennial meeting at the University of Saint Joseph in West Hartford, Connecticut.

Professor Danielson has received wide notice and acclaim among peace historians and historians of American radicalism as the author of a series of articles in scholarly journals, and most of all for her book, American Gandhi: A. J. Muste and the History of Radicalism in the Twentieth Century (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014). This is by far the most ambitious, sweeping, and analytically probing study of the career of A. J. Muste, a central figure in the history of American nonviolence. Since the theme of the meeting was “Historical Perspectives on War, Peace and Religion,” Danielson was a highly appropriate keynoter. American Gandhi charts in great detail the interaction and overlap between peace activism and the world of (primarily) Protestant church-based activism in the twentieth-century United States.

In her keynote, Danielson expanded on her ideas about how peace historians can and should conceive of the relations between peace and faith in American history. She did this by focusing on one area of thought and activity among Protestant peace activists in the twentieth century United States that has received little attention from historians: these activists’ interest in, and often firm belief in, paranormal activity, including contact with spirits of persons deceased.

Danielson’s talk, titled “Supernaturalism and Peace Activism: Expanding the Boundaries of Peace History,” began with a discussion of Sherwood Eddy, famous long ago as a globe-trotting evangelist of peace and the Christian gospel. Apparently Eddy devoted considerable time to investigating – and, in his view, to proving – the reality of telepathy, communications from the dead through mediums, and other phenomena now treated with some disdain by, perhaps, most practicing historians and adherents of modernist theology. Professor Danielson explained her view that peace historians should not sweep such supernaturalist commitments on the part of people like Eddy – and she was clear that Eddy, in these commitments, had much company among American Christian believers in peace – under the rug, nor view them as exceptions...
within a generally rational and this-worldly historical mind.

Danielson urged peace historians to take their subjects whole, and therefore to take seriously the belief in the supernatural as a core element in the genuine religious faith that

Emerging Scholars and the PHS

The Peace History Society was pleased to be able to defray part of the travel expenses of seven graduate students to the conference in West Hartford, including two who came from overseas:

- James Olusegun Adeyeri
  University of Ibadan, Nigeria
- Guy Aiken
  University of Virginia
- Andrew Barbero
  Southern Illinois University
- Trevor Burrows
  Purdue University
- Breann Fallon
  University of Sydney, Australia
- John Laaman
  Auburn University
- Jeffrey Meyers
  Lutheran School of Theology, Chicago

Three of these graduate students provided PHS News with brief accounts of their research and of their impressions of the conference.

Guy Aiken:

As an ABD student in American Religions at the University of Virginia, I'm on a shoe-string budget. But thanks to the PHS's generosity, I was able to take the train up to Hartford from Charlottesville in late October and give a paper entitled "So, Three Quakers Walk into the Gestapo...: The Pragmatic Pacifism of the AFSC." Based on four months of research in Philadelphia and three weeks in Berlin, my paper argued that the American Friends Service Committee's uncomplaining cooperation with the Gestapo after Kristallnacht in 1938 to try to evacuate all of Germany's Jews employable
abroad was scandalous, but in both senses of that word. In the biblical sense, in its willingness to get its hands dirty with the Nazis the AFSC cleared a stumbling block that tripped up those

Guy Aiken of the University of Virginia

who cared more about maintaining their purity and innocence than about saving lives. Yet the AFSC's deal with the Gestapo was also scandalous in the more familiar sense of being something ethically compromising, if not outrageous. For the AFSC had to forego any criticism or hint of judgment of the Nazis' brutal treatment of Jews in order to be allowed to continue to operate in Berlin (and Vienna).

I knew that "tragic" might be a better and fairer word than "scandalous" to describe this damned-if-you-do, damned-if-you-don't situation the AFSC was in, but I decided to go ahead and use the latter anyway, in large part because I hoped that it would elicit questions, suggestions, and even strenuous criticism from the audience. And it did. As I wrote on the "Peace & Change" blog (and on the blog "Religion in American History"), the audience's incisive responses--especially from Doug Rossinow, David Hostetter, Robert Shaffer, Andrew Bolton, Shelley Rose (the excellent moderator), Kevin Callahan, and Olusegen Adeyeri--were delivered so gently and with such professional congeniality that I could only be deeply grateful for their help. They will make the paper an immensely stronger chapter in my dissertation – on the AFSC's humanitarian and refugee work between the world wars – and a much more viable journal article.

I loved the conference, and felt privileged to be a part of it (my blog post has takes on several of the excellent papers I heard). As I also wrote in the blog post, I only wish the conference were annual instead of biennial. I could use a dose of its passionate, ethical intellectualism every year.

Breann Fallon

As part of a research trip to New York and Washington, I had the pleasure of flying across the Pacific to attend the 2015 Peace History Conference in Hartford, Connecticut. My paper, “The Enchanted Aesthetic Effect: Object, Figure, and Rhetoric Fetishisation in the Psyche of the Genocide Perpetrator and the Genocidal Community” – which constitutes one chapter of my PhD thesis -- considered the role of aesthetic fetishisation (Ellen, 1988) in the creation of genocidal communities and in the manipulation of the perpetrator psyche, presenting a new paradigm “The Enchanted Aesthetic Effect”. At the conference, I presented this paradigm through the case study of the Rwandan Genocide, the machete being enchanted with a manipulating divine essence. This section of my work is due to appear in article form in The

Breann Fallon of the University of Sydney with PHS president Kevin Callahan
The paper I presented at the PHS conference detailed the experience of the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) in the First World War. The church issued a pacifist statement when the nation entered the war in 1917, but later removed the statement from their list of teachings. My research was aimed at understanding the motivations behind the statement, and explaining why the church departed from the pacifist stance. Most of my research was conducted at the denomination’s research library on the campus of Lee University in Cleveland, but I also did some work at the state archives in Nashville. The paper comes from one chapter of my larger dissertation project, which maps changing attitudes toward war and peace among southern denominations during the First World War.

I was very excited to attend the PHS conference. I had followed the happenings in the PHS through Peace & Change and H-Peace, and was thankful to be able to make it to one of the conferences, which was fortunate because this one combined my two major research interests: peace and religion. I was particularly eager to finally talk with other peace historians, and I enjoyed the many conversations I had in Hartford. I found the experience very enriching, and greatly enjoyed the congenial nature of the conference. I particularly want to thank all the members who talked with us graduate students. I am sure the others would agree that you made us feel very welcome. The only negative during the whole week was that I have never had so much difficulty choosing which panels to attend at a conference. In each session I was extremely torn between at least two panels, if not all three. However, that is only more reason to continue to attend future PHS conferences. I am on track to complete my dissertation this spring, so I will hopefully have some new and exciting research to present at the next conference.

PHS treasurer Ginger Williams presenting John Laaman of Auburn University with a check to defray part of his travel expenses to the PHS conference. Kevin Callahan looks on.
Commemorate, Educate, Conscientize: Antiwar Activism in the World War I and Vietnam War Eras
By Ian Christopher Fletcher, Georgia State University

The concurrent, multi-year commemorations of peace advocacy and antiwar activism during the World War I and Vietnam War eras are now unfolding. To see evidence of this bottom-up alternative to the official commemorations of the wars, one has only to look at the Syracuse Cultural Workers’ new 2016 Peace Calendar. For the month of March, it features the centenary of Jeannette Rankin’s election to Congress in 1916 and her opposition to war from WWI to Vietnam. These commemorations offer opportunities to educate and to conscientize, to study peace as well as war and ask questions of both the past and the present.

Karín Aguilar-San Juan, Yaël Simpson Fletcher, and I co-facilitated a workshop on “Engaging with the WWI and Vietnam Commemorations” at the PHS conference at the University of Saint Joseph in October. We shared information and materials on popular education initiatives, but the best part of the workshop was the semi-structured discussion with colleagues. We touched on several issues, including the relationship between scholarly and public engagements with the commemorations, comparative and connective approaches to the history of the WWI and Vietnam antiwar movements, and of course the continuing impact of the U.S. war in Vietnam and the mass opposition it engendered still felt by many of us.

A growing number of antiwar activists from the Vietnam War era and younger peace and justice activists are interested in dialogue about the experiences of the older generation. An American studies scholar at Macalester College who has written about Vietnamese American communities, Karín has used the publication of her new book, *The People Make the Peace: Lessons from the Vietnam Antiwar Movement* (Just World Books, 2015), co-edited with Frank Joyce, as a starting point for her workshop presentation at the PHS conference.
Joyce, to promote such conversations. The book foregrounds the stories of antiwar activists who went to Vietnam during the war and who have returned for visits more recently. A diverse audience of some twenty people came to hear Karín speak at Charis Books and More, Atlanta’s feminist bookstore in the Little Five Points neighborhood, on a Friday evening during the recent American Historical Association annual meeting. The audience included several former staffers of the Great Speckled Bird, Atlanta’s underground newspaper between 1968 and 1976. (A great source for antiwar history, the Bird has been digitized and is available for teaching and research at http://digitalcollections.library.gsu.edu/cdm/landingpage/collection/GSB.) At the end of a stimulating discussion, which raised issues like the presence and contribution of people of color in the antiwar movement and changing perspectives in the refugee communities that settled in the U.S. after the war, Charis sold all the copies of the book it had ordered for the event!

Two days later the PHS co-sponsored session “The Whole World Is Mobilizing: Global Dimensions of Peace and Antiwar Activism around the Vietnam War,” took place at the AHA meeting. Our small but interested audience was good for a Sunday morning. Karín spoke about the writer and critic Susan Sontag, who visited the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in 1968 and subsequently wrote “Trip to Hanoi,” a complex and challenging reflection on her experience. Abou Bamba, a historian of Africa and the world from Gettysburg College, discussed the importance of Vietnam in Kwame Nkrumah’s and Amilcar Cabral’s outlooks and the wider radicalization of politics and ideas in post-independence Africa. Naoko Koda, who recently earned her doctorate at New York University and soon will take up a teaching position at Kindai University in Osaka, Japan, explored the Japanese antiwar movement’s participation in the worldwide movement, including working with American activists and dissident GIs, and its growing confrontation with Japanese as well as U.S. imperialism in Asia. Pablo Valenzuela, a Ph.D. student at Georgia State University, illuminated the many ways Chileans in the revolutionary years of 1968-73 engaged with Vietnam, from Salvador Allende’s meeting with Ho Chi Minh just before the latter died in 1969 to the solidarity with the Vietnamese repeatedly expressed in the music of

Chile’s Salvador Allende in front of a portrait of Ho Chi Minh

the New Song movement. I spoke about a set of Cuban, French, and U.S. political films and how they condensed and even helped constitute a global Vietnam antiwar moment.

Following these short presentations, Robbie Lieberman, our PHS colleague and chair of the Interdisciplinary Studies Department at Kennesaw State University, guided a rich discussion with the audience. We ranged widely over such questions as the organization, extent, and variety of worldwide antiwar protest; communication, media, and antiwar cultural production and iconography; race, feminism, and political exchanges and alliances; history and memory in as well as of the antiwar
movement; and much more. It was a surprise when Robbie announced that we had run over our two hours, but all of us left with a sense of excitement about the possibilities that global, transnational, and cross-cultural approaches could open up for the history of Vietnam peace and antiwar activism.

I hope this brief account of some of the work underway to promote peace history during the WWI and Vietnam War commemorations will encourage PHS colleagues to share what they may be doing in the realms of scholarship, teaching, or public and community engagement, as well as to consider collaborative projects.

Call for Encyclopedia Entries: 

**Opposition to War: An Encyclopedia of United States Peace and Antiwar Movements**

Dear Peace History Society Members:

I am writing to request your participation in what I believe will be a significant publication for those of us interested in the history of the peace movement. I recently agreed to edit Opposition to War: An Encyclopedia of United States Peace and Antiwar Movements for ABC-CLIO. The best way to ensure the highest quality publication is through enlisting expert scholars as contributors. This work will include substantial entries ranging from 300-4,000 words, an introductory essay, chronology, general bibliography, cross-referenced entries, and photographs.

Information regarding this publication (such as available entries, essay length, guidelines, and compensation) is available on the website [http://www.uspeaceencyclopedia.com](http://www.uspeaceencyclopedia.com). If you are interested in participating, please contact me and identify which entries you would like to write. Also, please include a brief CV. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have either through email, at hall1mk@cmich.edu, or by phone (989-774-3374). Please respond at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Mitch Hall
Chair, Department of History
Central Michigan University
Editor, Opposition to War: An Encyclopedia of United States Peace and Antiwar Movements
AHA defeats Historians Against the War resolution on education rights in the Occupied Territories
By Marc Becker
Truman State University
marc@yachana.org
January 10, 2016

A resolution to protect the right to education in the occupied Palestinian territories was defeated by a 111 to 51 margin at the 2016 meeting of the American Historical Association (AHA).

Historians Against the War (HAW) brought the resolution to the meeting, with the signatures of 126 AHA members. A group calling itself the Alliance for Academic Freedom (AAF) launched a concerted campaign against the resolution.

The resolution (available at http://historiansagainstwar.org/aha16/ ) would have put the AHA on record as upholding the rights of Palestinian faculty and students to freely pursue their education and research in the occupied West Bank and Gaza.

Barbara Weinstein of New York University and 2007 AHA president was one of the historians who supported the resolution. Weinstein stated, “It is entirely appropriate for our professional association to consider this issue. We are addressing serious and ongoing violations of academic freedom by a close U.S. ally.”

The debate and voting on the resolution took place at the AHA business meeting on January 9, 2016, at its annual meeting in Atlanta, Georgia. Margaret Power, professor of history at the Illinois Institute of Technology, made an opening statement for HAW in favor of the resolution. She outlined the limitations of movement that faculty and students in Palestine face, and argued that it was within the purview of the AHA to oppose such violations of human rights.

Sharon Musher of Stockton University provided a rebuttal in the name of the AAF. She argued that it was a divisive act, and pointed to what she claimed were errors in the resolution. The AAF also contended that the resolution wrongly singled out Israel while ignoring violations in other countries, and would burden the AHA with monitoring a situation for which it lacks the necessary resources.

Andrew Zimmerman from George Washington University responded to Musher that disagreement is at the heart of the historian’s work. He asked for logical arguments against the resolution; divisiveness is not such an argument.

Carolyn “Rusti” Eisenberg from Hofstra University noted that no one disputed the charges in the resolution. She highlighted the special relationship between the United States and Israel that allows abuses of Palestinians to continue. She noted that opposing such violations was a moral issue.

The AAF failed to engage the proposed resolution on its merits, but instead used diversionary tactics to challenge its passage. The AAF labeled itself progressive, but at the same time appealed to such conservative outfits as Freedom House as authoritative voices. It also attempted to make an argument supporting right-wing student protests in Venezuela. A particularly low point in the debate was when an AAF supporter resorted to charges of anti-semitism. Nevertheless, as AHA Executive Director James Grossman noted at the end of the annual meeting, the debate was carried out with a good deal of civility.

The resolution did not lose on the merits, but with superior resources and funding the AAF was able to out-maneuver HAW in mobilizing AHA members at the meeting. Even so, the 111 votes against the resolution was a small fraction of the 3338 people in attendance at the conference, and fewer than the 126 who signed the resolution.

Bringing the resolution to a vote in itself was a success for HAW. At the previous year’s AHA in New York, AAF used procedural issues to
prevent a similar issue from even coming to a vote. Van Gosse from Franklin and Marshall College, and lead organizer of the initiative, left the meeting with a sense of victory. “We really dominated in the debate,” he noted. “They had no real arguments—just red herrings.”

At the AHA, HAW also sponsored a roundtable together with MARHO: The Radical Historians’ Organization on “Violations of Academic Freedom in the Occupied Palestinian Territories.” Salim Tamari of the Institute for Palestine Studies, Professor Leena Dallasheh of Humboldt State University, and Tom Ricks, an independent scholar who researches Palestinian higher education, all spoke on the panel.

Ricks drew on his personal experience in Palestine since 1983 to highlight systematic violations of the right to education. He pointed out that universities routinely faced weeks and months of closures, which was a particular issue around examination times, and this prevented students from graduating. Ricks noted that access to education is not only an issue in Palestine, but throughout the Middle East. He argued that we should help people gain access.

Salim Tamari argued for the need to disentangle issues of security and access to education. Every time the issue of freedom of education rises, Tamari noted, Israel uses the issue of security to deny access. Israeli security forces regularly conduct raids on campuses under the pretext of hot pursuit, and arrest faculty and students under suspicion of membership in certain organizations. Educators’ right of movement is restricted at checkpoints. Access of external academics and students are also denied through visit restrictions.

Leena Dallasheh raised the issue of who has access to craft historical narratives, including the creation of historical knowledge. Palestinians face layers of obstacles, including through the active process of excluding their stories and privileging Israeli narratives. Because of a lack of statehood, Palestine does not have a formal archive. Records have been destroyed, stolen, or disappeared. Palestinian scholars also suffer from restricted access to Israeli archives. Dallasheh notes that history matters, because it gives us the tools to create active, engaged citizens. If that is the purpose of education, she asked, then why do we shy away from trying to change this situation? She contended that the AHA has a responsibility to make statements such as that contained in the resolution.

Historians Against the War was founded at the January 2003 AHA meeting to oppose the pending invasion of Iraq. Since then it has campaigned against a militaristic foreign policy via publications, public speaking, teach-ins, and several conferences. HAW has gathered substantial evidence to support the charges of Israeli government violations of the right to education in the territories it controls. For more information, go to http://historiansagainstwar.org.
In Memoriam:

George M. Houser  
(1916 - 2015)

PHS News pays tribute in this issue to two outstanding figures in the American peace and antiwar movements who died in 2015: George Houser and Julian Bond.

In the first essay, Ph.D. candidate Zachary Peterson of Georgia State University recounts some of the highlights of Houser’s life and activism. As he does so, Peterson demonstrates what made Houser an attractive dissertation subject.

The second piece is an excerpt from an essay by Houser, an ordained Methodist minister, in *The Christian Century*, April 4 1951. Houser surveys the bleak prospects for pacifism at this time of hot war (in Korea) and cold war (with much talk about the use of atom bombs), and takes issue with the “realist” approach to world affairs. (Without naming names, Houser’s critique of theologian Reinhold Niebuhr’s “Christian realism” is readily apparent.)

The third selection is from an interview by Bond about the origins of his opposition to the Vietnam War, which catapulted the young civil rights activist to national attention in 1965. Bond’s account appears in Christian Appy’s excellent oral history collection, *Patriots: The Vietnam War Remembered from All Sides* (Viking Penguin, 2003), pp. 143-145. Bond’s criticisms of the NAACP in his account take on particular significance from the fact that from 1998 until 2010 he chaired the board of directors of this civil rights organization.

It is worthy of note that for both Houser and Bond peace activism and civil rights work became intertwined.

Julian Bond  
(1940 – 2015)
The Struggle Never Ends: Glimpses of the Life and Legacy of George Houser

By Zachary Peterson, Georgia State University

This essay chronicles the unheralded, yet historically significant, life of George M. Houser. He died peacefully at the age of ninety-nine, on August 19, 2015, after a difficult battle with cancer. He was a good man who left a loving wife, Jean; a daughter, Martha; three sons, David, Steven, and Thomas; and numerous grandchildren and great grandchildren.

Throughout his long life, Houser played a role in four important social movements: the peace, civil rights, anti-apartheid, and African liberation movements.

Before I begin the story of this remarkable figure, I would like to relate how I came to study the career of this man. It began with the inevitable search for the subject of a dissertation topic. I had my mind set on studying the transnational connections of the American Civil Rights Movement. I first looked into “transnationalizing” Martin Luther King, Jr.’s career; however, it only took a cursory search through the historiography to realize that several people had already done that. But in this search I found an essay entitled “Freedom’s Struggles Crosses Oceans and Mountains: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Liberation Struggles in Africa and America,” written by George Houser. (See Albert and Hoffman, eds., We Shall Overcome: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Black Freedom Struggle, 1993). In this essay Houser discussed not only King’s activism in both Civil Rights and African liberation but how King had worked with the American Committee on Africa (ACOA) on African issues. Taking another look at the historiography on the ACOA and Houser, I found that so little had been written about him that it made sense to focus my dissertation on his life.

I was fortunate to interview Houser in his home for a rather lengthy stay of over a week in May of 2012. What interested me most about George Houser is that he devoted so much of his life to these four movements, yet, for whatever reason, he has been given little credit for the significant contributions that he has made.

As for his peace activism, Houser was always critical of the times when the United States used its great powers toward the cause of warfare. Growing up during the interwar period, Houser spent his youth in the Young Socialist movement and in Christian youth movements. He was a devotee of the Social Gospel movement, which meant that he wanted to turn the teachings of Christianity not only toward the spiritual salvation of individuals but to the betterment of society as a whole. He grew up in an environment tired of warfare: Europe had lost an entire generation to World War I, and the isolationist movement here at home wanted to keep the United States out of future European wars. This environment led Congress to pass several Neutrality Acts in the latter half of the 1930s. In September 1940, however, Congress passed the Selective Service Act, which instituted the draft. Houser, along with seven other students at Union Theological Seminary in New York City, refused to register for the draft. While as seminary students they had built-in immunity from the act, they saw the act of registration itself as tantamount to acquiescing in the brutal act of warfare. Houser and his colleagues became known as the Union Eight, and were each given a year-and-a-day in prison for this act of civil disobedience. (The statement of the Union Eight, “Why We Refused to Register,” can be found in Polner and Woods, eds., We Who Dared to Say No to War: American Antiwar Writing from 1812 to Now, 2008). Until his health interfered after 2010, Houser was still active in the peace movement decades later as he protested American involvement in the Iraq War.

As an example of his activism in the cause of civil rights, Houser and Bayard Rustin invented the freedom ride. Houser, who had joined the Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR) in 1938, became a field representative for FOR in Chicago four years later, as he was finishing his seminary degree. Along with several others, such as James Farmer, Bernice Fisher, and Homer Jack, in 1942 Houser formed the Committee of Racial Equality. This group later
developed into the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), and Houser served for a decade as its Executive Secretary, from 1944 to 1954.

After several years of sit-ins and protests against discrimination and segregation at establishments in Northern and Upper South states, CORE decided to develop a national project, based on the 1946 Supreme Court decision in *Morgan v. Commonwealth of Virginia*. (This case was based on the refusal of Irene Morgan in 1944 to give up her seat to a white person when she was traveling from Maryland to Virginia, which led to her arrest. Her case went all the way to the Supreme Court, which ruled that state Jim Crow laws could not apply to interstate passengers.) Houser and Rustin decided to test this new ruling, so in a joint action by FOR and CORE they formed the Journey of Reconciliation. It involved sixteen riders, eight black and eight white, utilizing buses and trains throughout the Upper South states of Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia.

As those familiar with the more famous freedom rides from the 1960s will attest, Houser’s group of interracial riders were very fortunate to face only a single incident of violence directed against their party. On a leg of the journey in North Carolina from Chapel Hill to Greensboro, four of their number were arrested for sitting interracially in the front of the bus. Meanwhile, a mob of taxi drivers gathered outside of the bus. One hit James Peck on the head. A local minister, Rev. Charles Jones, picked up the arrested men and drove them to his home. They were followed by the mob and when they arrived the mob threatened violence against them. They received a phone call, “Get those damn niggers out of town or we’ll burn your house down.” However, throughout the rest of their journey, while there were a few arrests, many of the bus drivers and members of the public acquiesced in the ruling once it was explained to them by CORE members. (See Houser and Rustin, “We Challenged Jim Crow! A Report on the Journey of Reconciliation, April 9-23, 1947,” in CORE Papers, microfilm edition. Peck also wrote a memoir, *Freedom Ride* [1962], about his experiences in both 1947 and 1961.)

To provide a small sample of his activism in the anti-apartheid movement, one only has to consider the Americans for South African Resistance (AFSAR). AFSAR began in 1952 during the Defiance Campaign Against Unjust Laws in South Africa. (For AFSAR bulletins, see The African Activist Archive, at http://africanactivist.msu.edu or in the ACOA Papers at the Amistad Research Center at Tulane University.) Bill Sutherland, who had been a conscientious objector during the Second World War, became active in African liberation through the American Friends Service Committee. He was in London and heard from the editor of the *Bantu World* that the African National Congress (ANC) and the South African Indian Congress (SAIC) were going to execute a non-violent direct action campaign against the anti-apartheid laws. When Sutherland told Houser about this campaign, an exchange of letters between CORE and Walter Sisulu, Chief Albert Luthuli, and Manilal Gandhi resulted in the formation of AFSAR to raise funds and spread the word of the Defiance Campaign in the U.S. After the Defiance Campaign was over, in 1953, Houser and others in AFSAR, such as Rustin, formed the ACOA. (The title of this essay about Houser’s life invokes the title of an essay that he wrote in 2003 on the 50th anniversary of ACOA’s founding: “The Struggle Never Ends.”) This organization was devoted not only to the anti-apartheid movement which it supported until the first free elections in South Africa in 1994, but was also dedicated to African liberation through the destruction of colonialism throughout Africa.
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I cannot adequately elucidate all the contributions of the ACOA to the cause of the African liberation and anti-apartheid movements throughout the years in this brief article. But I can give a few additional examples of Houser’s many exploits. During his tenure as Executive Director of the ACOA, Houser traveled to Africa dozens of times. He was there during all three All-African People’s Conferences, in Ghana (1958), Tunisia (1960), and Egypt (1961). He was also present at the formation of the Organization of African Unity in May 1963.

In 1962, Houser made a journey into “Rebel Angola,” traveling with Dr. John Marcum, a noted scholar on Lusophone Africa. They went without authorization into territory controlled by anti-imperialist forces, in order to document the colonial practice of forced labor and to witness and assess the progress of the resistance to the Portuguese regime. Houser came away impressed with the efforts of the rebels, and ACOA used his trip to raise funds for medical supplies for their cause. (See Houser, “A Report on a Journey Through Rebel Angola,” at http://africanactivist.msu.edu.)

In 1966, the United Nations declared illegal the mandate of South Africa over Southwest Africa (Namibia), and the following year Houser and several others attempted to enter that territory under the authority of the U.N. They flew a plane over Namibian territory but were refused permission to land by South African authorities. (See Ad Hoc Committee for the Development of an Independent West Africa, “Summary of a Report to the United Nations Council for Southwest Africa,” at http://africanactivist.msu.edu.)

In 1979, Houser toured the Western Sahara with the liberation group, Polisario. While the Spanish had controlled that territory during colonial times, the Moroccans now claim it. However, Houser, until his death, sported facial hair – a sort of soul patch – to protest the unjust treatment meted out to the Polisario by the Moroccans (See Houser, “Blood on the Sahara: America is Fighting King Hassan’s War,” The Africa Fund, at http://africanactivist.msu.edu).

On his retirement from ACOA in 1981 many African heads of state praised Houser’s activism for making significant contributions to their causes. For example, Julius Nyerere, former President of Tanzania, wrote: “The most important people in the world are often those who work quietly in the background of events, devoting their skill, their commitment, and their lives to the causes they believe in. They receive no acclaim; but without them there would be no triumph. George Houser is such a man and his service has been given whole-heartedly and without reserve to the cause of human freedom and human equality, with special reference to the struggle against colonialism and racialism in Africa. Many who are now, or have been, political leaders in Africa have been helped to become effective on the international scene by the assistance and friendship of George Houser.” Robert Mugabe, the first president of Zimbabwe, said, “We want to thank the American Committee on Africa…We view the Committee as one of the most important instruments that have assisted us in the political battle to achieve justice, fair play, and democracy in this country” (See Tribute to George Houser, June 1981, ACOA Papers.) In 2010, South Africa awarded Houser the Oliver Tambo prize which recognizes foreigners for their contributions to the anti-Apartheid struggle.

In conclusion, George Houser was a significant figure, if still largely unknown to the world at large. His contributions to the peace, civil rights, anti-apartheid, and African liberation movements deserve to be remembered. Hopefully my small contribution to the scholarship can correct the record and finally give him the credit he so justly deserves.

PHS News January 2016
“Can Politics Be Moral Now?”
By George M. Houser,
The Christian Century, vol. 68
April 4, 1951, pp 425-27
(excerpts)

In these days of feverish preparation for
total war, when each fateful decision is fraught
with moral relativities, we pacifists are once
more dismissed with the charge that our idealism
is politically irrelevant. The charge is true.
Politics is based upon power, and power in the
present world struggle rests upon the atom
bomb, upon superior armed forces, upon total
armed mobilization. The pacifist concept of
power, on the other hand, is based on
nonviolence—the power of non-retaliation, of
good will, of non-cooperation with injustice.
There can be no question about the fact that the
vast majority of the people in the United States
and elsewhere in the world are not very well
acquainted with the power of nonviolence and
have no faith in it. Thus, the relevant political
choices of the moment are not based on a
pacifist conception of power. It cannot be
argued that pacifism is a politically relevant
factor in the world today…

There are several reasons why I believe
we are facing a real crisis of the relevance of
morality in the world of politics. First, we have
got rid of most of our illusions about war and
about the possibility of creative results
emanating from war. During World War I the
slogans “War to end war” and “War to save
democracy” were really believed. But belief in
any such slogans has long since gone by the
boards. No one assumes that he will survive or
have security of any kind if war comes. No one
seriously doubts that, as [Nobel Prize-winning
chemist] Harold Urey has told us, forty million
people in the United States could be killed in
one night of atomic bombing. According to
reports of “civilian defense” experts, it is
expected that 40,000 would be killed and 60,000
hurt by one A-bomb bursting over an industrial
center. No one takes issue with military men
who prophesy the worst in war. Colonel Edward
Rickenbacker, now president of Eastern Air
Lines [and a highly decorated U.S. fighter-pilot
in World War I], said recently: “No one would
win World War III morally or financially. A
war effort would bring on dictatorship in the
United States…Such a conflict would mean the
economic ruin of the United States and the
world.”…

A cursory glance at world politics today
indicates how decisions are made by the realists
almost entirely on the basis of necessity…It is
necessary to deal with Franco Spain, for Spain
will be an important ally, particularly in view of
the military bases it will offer if armed conflict
breaks out. It is necessary to rearm Germany, in
spite of the fact that German militarism has been
blamed for two world wars and that the German
people seem to be vigorously opposing
rearmament. It is necessary to rearm Japan and
risk the rise to power there of a new military
clique, in spite of the fact that only a couple of
years ago we forced on the Japanese people a
constitution outlawing militarism. It is
necessary to protect Chiang Kai-shek’s regime
in Formosa and still permit Nationalist China a
seat in the United Nations, in spite of the fact
that this makes no political sense. It is necessary
to send loans and arms to the reactionary Bao
Dai regime in Indo-China to placate the French
government and its colonial interests. Many
similar items could be listed. Almost any
compromise with principle is made if
“necessity” demands it.

The third reason why we face the crisis
of the relevance of morality follows closely as a
corollary to this doctrine of necessity: No longer
is there any real tension between the “what
ought to be” and the “what is.” Is there today a
line of non-cooperation that the political realist
will draw? Where does it become obvious that
there is a moral difference between the
convictions and standards of the so-called
Communist and democratic forces in the present
struggle?

Is it in the use of weapons? President
Truman’s statement of some time ago indicated
what was already taken for granted – that the United States would use the atom bomb, or any other weapon of mass destruction, when strategy required it…

Among political realists there are those with liberal sentiments who are resisting two very dangerous trends in our country – the trend toward prevent war and the trend toward the denial of civil liberties. However, in the end these liberal realists will have to choose between their principles and the demands of necessity, and there is no doubt in my mind that their principles will give way. For them to do anything else would be to accept a role of political irrelevance…

The point might well be argued that the realist is longer even politically relevant. Politics by its nature assumes that real alternative choices are possible, that the “lesser of two evils” doctrine still applies. But have not the necessities of political choices now almost obliterated real choices? Choices are now purely tactical rather than either moral or political. The choice is rapidly narrowing down to whether or not we shall embrace a militaristic totalitarianism in order the better to fight a militaristic totalitarianism…

The final way to achieve meaning in life is not necessarily to be politically relevant. Perhaps there are times when being politically relevant denies the purpose of life. What we should seek is historical relevance. It is there that minorities take on real significance. Although not an important factor, the early Christians who refused to cast a pinch of incense before the statue of Caesar were of historic importance. The millions of individuals and small groups who down through the ages have refused to bow the knee to “necessity” and have resolutely lived the truth as they saw it, have achieved historical relevance. Our choice today is between being politically relevant and morally relevant. The issues are such that we cannot be both.

Julian Bond’s Opposition to the Vietnam War


The Vietnam War seemed pretty remote initially. It wasn’t something that pressed on me a great deal…When I ran for the Georgia state legislature in 1965 I talked about local bread-and-butter issues and I don’t think I made any connection between those issues and the war. But in late 1965, just after I won the election, this guy Sammy Younge was killed in Tuskegee, Alabama, shot in the back for trying to use a white bathroom at a gas station. He was a navy veteran who had lost the use of a kidney during his service. The irony of this guy having lost his kidney in the military and then not being able to...
use the bathroom in his own hometown was so stark.

I think initially it wasn’t the pacifist notion that turned most of us against the war – though it was for some people – but the assault on black men and the idea that we were spending all these resources on a war that was not our business. That was initially my feeling

![Bond at an antiwar rally](image)

rather than any question about the rightness or wrongness of war generally. I thought the big fight was here at home.

Sammy getting killed heightened our awareness of the essential wrongness of asking these young men to go defend the country overseas. It prompted SNCC [Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee] to release an antiwar statement pointing out that black soldiers were being sent to Vietnam in the name of “democracy” and “freedom” while being denied it at home. It also said that the United States government bears the responsibility for both Samuel Younge’s death and the deaths of Vietnamese peasants, in Sammy’s case because it wasn’t enforcing the law, and in the case of Vietnam because the U.S. was acting aggressively in violation of international law.

I endorsed the statement about a week or so before I was to take my seat in the Georgia legislature. White southerners are tremendously patriotic and jingoistic and a firestorm of protest erupted in opposition to my antiwar position.

They said I was guilty of treason and sedition …So a dozen of us who had been elected in the fall presented ourselves to be sworn in and I was asked to step aside. They swore in the others and then convened a committee of the whole House. They voted a hundred and eighty to twelve to throw me out. They declared my seat vacant and called a special election to fill the vacancy. So I ran again, and won. By this time the legislature had adjourned, so they named a special committee to hear my case and they expelled me again. When I filed a lawsuit in federal court the two Democratic judges voted against me and the Republican voted for me. We appealed to the Supreme Court. In the meantime, I ran a third time and won that election as well. The Supreme Court heard the case and in December of 1966 ruled nine to nothing that I had to be seated.

When SNCC began to speak out against the war our contributions fell off and we began to suffer financially. Many people who supported civil rights generally didn’t want to see the movement linked with antiwar sentiment. The NAACP and the Urban League were opposed to the civil rights movement taking a stand on Vietnam. That was really disingenuous of the NAACP because of course they had long been involved in questions about African policy.
and if you can take a position on that, why not Vietnam? They thought President Johnson would become alienated from the civil rights movement and the better course was to either be quiet about the war or support him on it, which, of course, didn’t make any sense to us. But the NAACP was certainly right in predicting that Johnson would feel bitterly and personally betrayed by civil rights activists who publicly denounced the war…

I think the civil rights movement was responsible for raising the percentage of Americans opposed to the war and for making black Americans particularly more skeptical about the war. And, of course, Muhammad Ali had an enormous impact because he was so well known and he gave up so much. By refusing to fight in Vietnam he gave up his title as Heavyweight Champion of the World. And he stated his opposition to the war so simply: “No Viet Cong never called me nigger.” I mean, that was it. You didn’t have to say more than that. You didn’t have to talk about the Geneva Accords.

From the Archives:
U.S. Atomic Testing, 1954:
One American’s Response

Radiation poisoning from the U.S. hydrogen bomb explosion on Bikini Atoll in March 1954 tragically contaminated crew members of the Japanese fishing vessel, the Lucky Dragon, which was one hundred miles away from the blast. The radiation also contaminated the fish that crew members brought back to Japan, and the incident seriously strained U.S.-Japanese relations. M.A. Fowler of St. Paul’s Episcopal Church in Wilkesboro, N.C., suggested this solution, which The Christian Century published as a letter in its Aug. 18, 1954 issue:

“There is a simple way in which U.S.-Japanese relations may be improved. Each time there is an atomic test in the Pacific, let the U.S. government buy a quantity of Japanese fish directly from the incoming fish boats and hold a big fish-fry on the White House lawn for the members of Congress, the AEC [Atomic Energy Commission], and the military leaders.”

(Submitted by Robert Shaffer)

Japanese officials in 1954 measuring radiation levels of tuna caught by the Lucky Dragon crew

Have you come across a brief document that you want to share with readers of PHS News? Send it to editor Robert Shaffer at roshaf@ship.edu!
Long-time peace activist Alice Lynd has written *Moral Injury and Conscientious Objection: Saying No to Military Service*, available on-line at [http://historiansagainstwar.org/resources/militaryservice.pdf](http://historiansagainstwar.org/resources/militaryservice.pdf). The first chapter is also available in print form from Quaker House, 223 Hillside Avenue, Fayetteville, N.C., 28301, [www.quakerhouse.org](http://www.quakerhouse.org). “Moral injury,” according to Alice Lynd, “is an emerging concept, increasingly recognized by the Armed Forces and the Department of Veterans Affairs. When men and women in the military believe they did or saw something that betrays their deeply held sense of right and wrong, it can create inner conflict and self-blame, and shake up their moral foundation…They experience ‘moral injury.’”

A brief section of the pamphlet (pages 10-14) is reprinted here (without the footnotes that accompany the original), followed by a review of the pamphlet by Joseph Jones, librarian emeritus of the University of British Columbia.

### What Causes Moral Injury?

There are various theories as to what causes moral injury. One VA doctor published an article called “Guilt and Moral Injury in Veterans: What We Know and What We Don’t.” Much research still needs to be done on causes and treatment.

Moral injury overlaps with but is not the same as post-traumatic stress disorder. A person may experience PTSD if he or she has been the target of others’ attempts to kill or injure, or has survived when others did not. But having been a killer, or having failed to prevent death and injury, may result in moral injury.

The same person may suffer from both PTSD and moral injury. Camilo Mejía describes them both as he experienced them. He attributes his fear and apprehension to unspoken assumptions about the outside world: that bombs don’t explode on the road; that a dead cat is not an improvised explosive device; that kids don’t throw grenades at people even if those people are outsiders occupying their country; that mortar rounds don’t fall from the sky as he walks to the toilet or to the shower or to the mess hall; and that those appointed to positions...
of power are supposed to protect life, not destroy it.

PTSD appeared in my life when the world no longer was a safe place; when I realized I did not trust the roads anymore; when children became a mortal threat; when every beat of my heart pumped fear into my body, reminding me that my life was expendable and could be over at any moment; when death became real, and present, and graphic, and refused to leave my side, and force me into isolation.

His life changed after he came back from Iraq. He became withdrawn from society so as to avoid the fear and anxiety he experienced from interacting with the outside world.

When I go to a public place, such as a bookstore, I always prefer to sit with my back to the wall, and in a place that allows me to see what’s going on around me. I like to be in clear sight of all the exits. And I always identify places that could provide cover and concealment from possible attacks.

Moral injury is different, Mejía says. PTSD resulted from a violation of trust between himself and the world outside himself. But moral injury violated his internal world. As he observed a young man through the sight of his rifle, a voice inside himself told him not to squeeze the trigger.

[C]onscience is the most secret place where we can see the unwritten law of morality. . . . When I opened fire that day, I violated that law and desecrated the most sacred sanctuary of my being.

As I observed that young man through the sight of my rifle, I was staring at a point of no return, the very Rubicon of my life, and I crossed it.

My moral injury is the pain I inflicted upon the very core of my being when I took something I could never give back.

There is strong support among professionals for the following analysis. PTSD is based more on fear and a sense of constant threat or helplessness, while moral injury is based more on guilt, shame, anger or outrage. A person with PTSD has lost his sense of safety; a person with moral injury has lost his ability to trust. This is a “loss of trust in previously deeply held beliefs about one’s own or others’ ability to keep our shared moral covenant,” or about the acts of peers and leaders who betray their expectations in grievous ways.

Two years after returning from combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, a Marine Staff Sergeant, Felipe Tremillo, was still haunted by images of the women and children he saw suffer from the violence and destruction of war in Afghanistan. “Terrible things happened to the people we are supposed to be helping,” he said. “We’d do raids, going in people’s homes and people would get hurt.” . . .

American soldiers had to act that way, Tremillo recognizes, “in order to stay safe.” But the moral compromise, the willful casting aside of
his own values, broke something inside him, changing him into someone he hardly recognizes, or admires.

Steve Dundas was a U. S. Navy chaplain who went to Iraq in 2007:

Seeing the devastation of Iraqi cities and towns, some of it caused by us, some by the insurgents and the civil war that we brought about, hit me to the core. . . . I felt lied to by our senior leadership. And I felt those lies cost too many thousands of American lives and far too much destruction.

When Dundas returned home broken, his faith in God and in his country were shattered.”

According to a retired Navy psychiatrist, patients who experience moral injury are likely to be highly moral. It is people who have strong moral beliefs who are more likely to experience moral injury: “anguish, guilt, and shame are signs of an intact conscience and self . . . .” As Jacob George, a veteran of three tours in Afghanistan insisted, the post-traumatic horror he experienced was not a disorder, but a natural human response to the inhumanity of war.

While serving in Afghanistan as a U.S. Army Sergeant, Jacob George said,

There were lots of incidents that bothered me. The interrogation of people at Bagram . . . people are stored all around Afghanistan, micro-prisons, no one knows where they are at or why they are being held; the interrogation of children, arms tied behind their backs on a flight line with helicopters blowing sand and pushing them into the wire behind them . . . but one incident stands out. We were in Khost. Two Apache gunships winchested a building without knowing who was in it. My job was to carry two bags of body parts out of the building to figure out who it was. We had no idea if they were civilians or insurgents. . . . [We] never determined who the arms and legs belonged to.

Total negligence. We had no idea who was in there, more than likely women and children.

Alice Lynd, Moral Injury & Conscientious Objection:
A Brief Review
By Joseph Jones, Librarian Emeritus, University of British Columbia

This 2015 publication takes two forms: (1) a 48-page printed pamphlet titled Moral Injury (Fayetteville, N.C.: Quaker House) and (2) a 98-page online pdf titled Moral Injury and Conscientious Objection: Saying No to Military Service, issued as a HAW (Historians Against the War) pamphlet, at http://www.historiansagainstwar.org/resources/militaryservice.pdf.

The main difference between the shorter version and the longer is the addition of three chapters: one on international law on war and conscientious objection, and two on the circumstances that prevail in the United States and Israel.

Half a century ago, Alice Lynd compiled We Won’t Go: Personal Accounts of War Objectors (1968), a book focused on “descriptions of the decision-making process” of young men during the Vietnam War era. That more accessible inductive approach does not carry over into the current U.S. situation of a professionalized all-volunteer military force. The stories of recent conscientious objectors such as Jeremy Hinzman and Camilo Mejia tend to fade into the legalities of how they must try to plead their cases to state and military authorities.

The prefatory material in the pdf version identifies the primary audience as soldiers who experience inner conflict, veterans who suffer from military experiences, and anyone troubled
by what society sends its military forces out to do. The selection, arrangement, and documentation of the information result in a useful reference resource for these individuals and for others.

A soldier or veteran with nowhere else to turn could find crucial mental footholds here, given sufficient desperation. However, an inherent communication difficulty seems almost insuperable.

First of all, in the United States today, a claim based on “conscience” must always begin at the huge hurdle of already being an indoctrinated subject in the clutches of the military – and one who lacks the groundswell of fellow and popular support enjoyed by Vietnam-era military dissidents.

Add to this the likelihood that the addressed soldier/veteran will lack facility in grasping the sketched-out concepts and articulations. Despite such barriers, the technicalities of sustaining a case must envelop the practicalities of using a more inviting form of exposition. Alice Lynd has taken on a formidable task.

This work is a handbook designed to help persons “in military service struggling to find a way forward from what may seem an unbearable situation” (Conclusion, pdf 97). Unbearable – because hostile opponents design an unclear, uncertain, arbitrary, and punitive path to constrain conscience. This written manual is one manifestation of a network of support.

Apart from persons in military service having to satisfy difficult criteria to effect their own release, efforts to develop a notion of “moral injury” appear surreal if not insane. Refusal to participate in the abuse, torture, and killing of other human beings should need no explanations. Only arrogant authorities with illegitimate powers could presume to adjudicate the conscience of any individual in these respects.

Advocates of slavery defended their practice as a “peculiar institution.” Compelled military service similarly amounts to a peculiar contract.

Peace History Society:
For membership information and activities, go to:
www.peacehistorysociety.org

Alice Lynd has long documented resistance to war by American soldiers and conscientious objectors, as in this book published in 1968.
This past October, Jean-Michel Guieu (Université Paris I – Panthéon-Sorbonne) and Stéphane Tison (Université du Maine) organized an international conference in La Flèche, France, on the theme of experiencing and imagining peace in wartime, 1914-1918. Organized as part of commemorations for the centenary of the Great War, this conference brought together scholars from both sides of the Atlantic Ocean.

Over the course of three days, participants discussed what constitutes “moments of peace” in wartime, as well as the ways contemporaries imagined and prepared for peace during World War I. Many of the speakers are also familiar names to the PHS. Gearóid Barry (National University of Ireland, Galway), a recent recipient of the Scott Bills Memorial Prize for his monograph *The Disarmament of Hatred: Marc Sangnier, French Catholicism and the Legacy of the First World War, 1914-45* was present, as well as Michael Clinton (Gwynedd Mercy University). Renowned peace historian Norman Ingram (Concordia University) presented on the *Ligue des droit de l’homme* (League of the rights of man) and the origins of “new-style” pacifism. Carl Bouchard (Université de Montréal) introduced his new book *Cher Monsieur le Président. Quand les Français écrivaient à Woodrow Wilson, 1918-1919* (*Dear Mr. President: When the French Wrote to Woodrow Wilson*), recently published by Champ Vallon, examining letters written to President Woodrow Wilson from French people after the war. Several prominent French historians, such as Rémy Cazals, Rémi Fabres and Emmanuelle Cronier, only to name a few, were also present.

My own paper, “Celles qui n’entrent pas dans la guerre: quand les pacifistes françaises préparent la paix, 1915-1920” (“Those who did not enter the war: when French pacifist women prepared peace”), considered French pacifist women’s work during the Great War. I argued that French pacifist women's discourses on peace and reconciliation in the immediate post-war years were, in fact, born during the war. Never renouncing their pre-war internationalism, these women began working on Franco-German reconciliation as soon as 1915 first through letters to their German counterparts, and then in French pacifist journals. In this sense, these women could not “exit the war” (“sortir de la guerre”) in 1919 because they never really “entered it”. This research stems from my recently completed doctoral thesis on French women’s pacifism in the context of international relations during the interwar period.

In addition to the conference, the city of La Flèche and the Prytannée national militaire organized many social and cultural outings for the participants. The mayor and Colonel Duffour (chief of staff at the Prytannée) both gave us warm welcomes. We were treated to a private organ concert in the Prytannée’s chapel. The Prytannée national militaire de La Flèche and the Lycée D’Estournelles de Constant's enthusiastic participation is also worth mentioning. A collection of conference papers will be published in 2017.
Member News

The American Historical Association’s Perspectives on History included a fine tribute in its September 2015 issue to Hilary Conroy, who died in 2015 at age 95. Conroy was among the founders of the Conference for Peace Research in History, which later became PHS. Wayne Patterson of St. Norbert College wrote the tribute, which is on-line at:

Patrick Coy, Kent State University, editor of Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change, announces the publication of volume 38 in the series, from Emerald Group Publishing of the U.K. Articles in the current issue cover, among other topics, the Fenian Brotherhood’s transnational efforts to secure Ireland’s independence, the influence of LGBT organizations in passing hate crimes legislation, and the perseverance of the women’s movement in Spain despite repression.

Esther Franklin of the Sacramento branch of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom published an article in United World on the 100-year anniversary celebration, which she attended, at the Hague, Netherlands, of WILPF’s founding in that city in protest against the outbreak of World War I. Franklin also gave presentations about the anniversary conference at several WILPF branches in California.


Charles Howlett, Molloy College, along with co-author and Molloy colleague Audrey Cohan, will receive an award from the Peace Education Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association at its April 2016 conference in Washington, D.C. Howlett and Cohan are being honored for their presentation on “John Dewey: His Role in Public Scholarship to Educate for Peace,” which is drawn from their forthcoming book, John Dewey: America’s Peace-Minded Educator (Southern Illinois University Press, July 2016).

Robbie Lieberman, Kennesaw State University, will comment on the panel, “Visual Media and Peace Education: Strategic Pedagogy across Disciplines,” at the International Studies Association conference in Atlanta in March 2016. Lieberman hopes to meet up with any PHS members attending the conference.
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Calls for Papers, Study Abroad, & Conference Announcements

Kennesaw State University’s Center for Conflict Management will hold its 6th International Conflict Management Conference on March 29-30, 2016, on the theme, “Religion, Conflict, and Reconciliation.” The keynote speaker will be Father Cedric Prakash, director of PRASHANT, the Jesuit Centre for Human Rights, Justice, and Peace in Ahmedabad, India. For further information, go to: http://ccm.hss.kennesaw.edu/events-programs/2016/2016-03-29/

Summer study on conflict resolution: Bar-Ilan University, Israel
Dr. Rafi Nets-Zehngut, director of the International Summer Program on Identity-Based Conflict Resolution at Bar-Ilan University, Israel, invites applicants for the 2016 sessions. Students have the opportunity to earn 10 academic credits through five courses, including an internship in peace NGOs and leading think tanks over four weeks (June 30-July 28, 2016). Individual courses (12 days each), all taught in English, are also possible. The BIU summer program involves experiential learning, on-site, in a country involved in an intractable conflict. Applications are open to holders of undergraduate/graduate degrees, current advanced undergraduate students, and current graduate students worldwide, from all disciplines in the social sciences, the liberal arts, and the humanities. The summer program is operated by the Graduate Program in Conflict Resolution, Management and Negotiation at Bar-Ilan University, Israel. For an overview of the program, see: http://pconfl.biu.ac.il/en/node/1950. For admissions information, see: http://pconfl.biu.ac.il/en/node/1951.

Graduate Student Conference, Cornell University Judith Reppy Institute for Peace & Conflict Studies, April 16, 2016
Please submit proposals by January 25th, 2016 to reppyfellows@gmail.com.

The 2015-16 Graduate Fellows of Cornell University’s Judith Reppy Institute for Peace and Conflict Studies are pleased to announce their graduate student workshop on Interdisciplinary Approaches to Peace and Conflict to be held on Cornell’s campus on Saturday, April 16th, 2016. In selecting this theme, the Fellows hope to elicit submissions from graduate students whose work seeks to answer questions pertaining to global peace and conflict using innovative methods, novel theoretical applications, and creative interdisciplinary approaches.

This workshop invites submission of abstracts from graduate students from fields including, but not limited to, political science, sociology, history, science and technology studies, and anthropology. Topics should be related to the Reppy Institute’s commitment to historical and contemporary topics in international conflict and security, arms control and disarmament, international law and organization, and technological change and instances of collective violence.

Submissions should include a 300-500 word abstract outlining the topic, theoretical framework, methodology, and a brief statement highlighting the interdisciplinary nature of the work. Please include both your institutional and departmental affiliation in your proposal. Workshop organizers will arrange panels based on themes and topics that emerge from the abstracts. Each presenter will be offered a moderate stipend for reimbursement of travel and accommodation expenses.

Scholars whose submissions are accepted will be notified by mid-February. Please direct any questions regarding the workshop to Michael Allen at reppyfellows@gmail.com.

The Judith Reppy Institute for Peace and Conflict Studies is an interdisciplinary program at Cornell University devoted to research and teaching on the problems of war and peace, arms
control and disarmament, and more generally, instances of collective violence. To learn more, please visit http://pacs.einaudi.cornell.edu/.

_Crossing the Line: Women of Anabaptist Traditions Encounter Borders and Boundaries, June 22-25, 2017_  
Eastern Mennonite Univ., Harrisonburg, VA  
Proposals due Sept. 1, 2016

It has been twenty years since the watershed conference _The Quiet in the Land? Women of Anabaptist Traditions in Historical Perspective_ took place in 1995. New topics, approaches, and viewpoints invite further examination of the constructions of gendered experience within groups in the Anabaptist tradition. Crossing boundaries and borders can and should encompass a wide range of disciplines, approaches and topics, and we seek submissions from scholars, students, activists, and literary, performing and visual artists.

Conference participants are encouraged to think creatively about how Anabaptists, Mennonites, Amish and related groups have crossed and continue to cross lines, borders and boundaries.

Please submit a one-page CV and a 250-word abstract for a paper, a creative performance or presentation, or a complete panel/workshop session (with presenters indicated).

Proposals should be submitted to crossingtheline@gmail.com. The program committee will send out its decisions of acceptance by January 1, 2017.

_The Register of the Kentucky Historical Society_ notes that November 2, 2015 marked the 50th anniversary of the ultimate sacrifice by Norman Morrison—a courageous act which shocked the American public and awakened many to this unjust war.
2015 Peace History Society Executive Board Meeting Minutes

Officers and Board Members in attendance: Andy Barbero, Marc Becker, Scott Bennett, Deborah Buffton, Kevin Callahan, Sandi E. Cooper, Leilah Danielson, Ian Christopher Fletcher, Heather Fryer, Ben Peters, Doug Rossinow, Robert Shaffer, Christy Snider, Rich Updegrove, Ginger Williams

Guests: David Hostetter and Andrew Bolton

Date and Location: October 22, 2015 at University of Saint Joseph, Connecticut

1. Introductions of Officers and Board Members
2. Kevin Callahan’s President’s Report:
   Spoke with Chris Toffolo, Peace & Justice Studies Association President, over the summer
   - Updates on state of both organizations
   - Shared history of P&C
     - PHS has no affiliation with PJSA other than Associate Editorship of P&C
     - PJSA wants more of a role in P&C if possible
     - PJSA might set up their own journal
     - 2015 was the first year that both organization’s conferences did not overlap and would be good to repeat going forward
     - PJSA may be trying to create new relationship with PHS, it was agreed that we should listen, but make no concessions at this time

Peace & Change
- Discussion of P&C editor workload
- Perhaps let PJSA do a conference edition as well
- Agreed that above all, PHS must support our editor, Heather Fryer
- Discussion of possible thematic issues
- PJSA might make up the majority of P&C subscribers, but most revenue comes from institutional subscriptions
- Discussion about the P&C advisory board: Does it need to be reconstituted? What exactly is the role of a board member?
- Matt Cooper of Wiley has strongly indicated that P & C might go paperless (only electronic version available) start of 2017; if so, PHS should make sure some type of hard copy can be made available to members who do not have internet access
3. Ginger Williams’ Treasurer’s Update
   - PHS Finances are solid to start 2016
   - Not all conference fees are in yet, but over $1,000 taken in so far
   - End of year report to PHS board
   - No current investments (CD’s) given low interest rates available, but she will explore it

4. Renewals
   Ginger and Andy will work to get out renewals in December for January 1, 2016 renewal date
   PHS needs to ensure those getting journal are current members or can no longer be subsidized

5. 2017 PHS Conference Report by David Hostetter
   Co-Sponsor with National World War I Museum, in Kansas City
   Onsite planning meeting happened in July
   Program beginning to be fleshed out: Erika Kuhlman will be a keynote speaker, and Louisa Thomas is a possible speaker
   Discussed ways to broaden the conference coalition

6. Andrew Bolton, conference co-chair representing the WWI Museum, gave a presentation
   a. Has already done 11 conferences in Kansas City
   b. Says Museum CEO is very supportive of the conference
   c. First major conference on war resistance at the museum
   d. 200-240 people expected
   e. Expected costs about $36,000—wants to raise $12,000 before conference
   f. PHS will try to continue to offer some travel assistances to grad student presenters and possibly young scholars

Respectfully submitted, Andy Barbero, PHS Secretary

2015 PHS Conference General Meeting Minutes

Attendance: about 40 or 45 people, including PHS board members and officers
Date and Location: October 23, 2015, University of Saint Joseph, Connecticut

Scheduled Business:

Welcome from PHS President and Officer Introductions
Reminders: If you are new to PHS, and paid the conference registration fee, you are now a member for the 2016 year, and will receive the listserv, and P&C
2016 PHS elections, officers serve for 2 years, board members for 4
Per PHS By-laws, Andy Barbero, PHS Secretary, will participate in nominations committee and schedule election – if interested or questions, contact Andy

   Robert Shaffer, PHS News Editor encouraged members to submit short essays, special honors, etc. for publication
   Heather Fryer, Peace & Change Executive Editor spoke about journal, announced that the new P&C blog is up https://peaceandchangeblog.wordpress.com/, and that P&C is now experimenting with live tweeting PHS events
   David Hostetter, 2017 PHS Conference Panel Co-Chair, announced that the call for papers is out, and that the conference will be at the National World War I Museum in Kansas City
   Mitch Hall, editor of Opposition to War: An Encyclopedia of United States Peace and Antiwar Movements, to be published by ABC-CLIO, is looking for contributors; consult www.uspeaceencyclopedia.com
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New Business (Questions raised by members)

What is PHS financial situation?
PHS is on a strong financial footing, due to annual revenues from its journal Peace & Change as well as annual PHS membership dues, currently about 130 active members

What is the relationship between PHS and PJSA like?
Amicable now, hopeful for the future

When do membership renewal notices go out?
They will be sent out in December, and on-line renewals are preferred

What are the P&C Editor by-laws?
Not available on site (at the conference), but the Board will work to clarify them

Is PHS interested in co-sponsoring conferences with other organizations? Outside US?
YES, please contact PHS President with proposal/interest and PHS Board will discuss

Is PHS affiliated with the American Historical Association?
Yes, but the application process for potential panels/contributors to the annual meeting is the same; Ian Fletcher attended an AHA planning event in Atlanta last January

Are there currently any publication opportunities with P&C?
Yes, please contact Heather Fryer for articles & Michael Clinton for book reviews

Respectfully submitted, Andy Barbero, PHS Secretary
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