The Draft and CO Rights in the New Congress

By Bill Galvin

In early January, 2003, Rep. Charles Rangel announced, on CNN and in the New York Times, his intention to introduce legislation to bring back the draft. While explicitly stating that the rights of conscientious objectors should be protected, he stated that his main concern was to get the country and Congress dealing with the reality of going to war. His words were, “I believe that if those calling for war knew that their children were likely to be required to serve -and to be placed in harms way- there would be more caution and a greater willingness to work with the international community in dealing with Iraq.”

The legislation introduced by Rep. Rangel (H.R. 163) calls for a military draft of men and women to meet the needs of the Pentagon, and everyone who is not drafted into the military would be conscripted for national service (such as Americorps). The only exemptions would be for hardship or medically disqualifying conditions. Conscientious objectors who get drafted would be drafted into the military as non-combatants. COs would be able to “at the discretion of the president” be transferred to a civilian national service program for performing their obligation under this law.

A delegation representing CCW, the Washington Peace Center, FCNL, MCC, and others met with Charles Rangel’s staff to discuss our concerns about his proposal for a military draft and universal national service. We were joined by Rep. Rangel (via speaker phone) for part of the meeting. Although we did not convince him to withdraw the proposal (we had not expected to), we did have a productive conversation with his office.

The delegation shared in the concerns raised by the Congressman, but explained how this proposal was not the way to accomplish the goal, and talked about ways that his objectives could be achieved. John Judge, of the Washington Peace Center, pointed out that during the Vietnam draft, not one child of a Congressional member was drafted and sent to Vietnam. Rangel’s office expressed a willingness to work with us on fixing some of the more objectionable parts of the bill, but was not willing to withdraw it.

Honorable Objective, Skewed Strategy

At one point, when questioned, “what’s the bottom line intention of Rep. Rangel?”, his legislative director said it was to get people engaged in the discussion and thinking seriously about the course the government was taking. He felt that the country was drifting towards war without seriously considering the implications. His premise was that the churches and regular people were not engaged or concerned about the impending war, and he was pleased that

Berrigan’s Spirit Lives On

By Steve Woolford

In 1992 I visited my parents for a few weeks while in transition. Lenore and I had just completed a year of volunteer service and were about to visit three different Catholic Worker communities and move into the one where we most belonged. When it came time to leave, following goodbyes, I was almost inside the car when my mother called from the porch, “Don’t be like the Berrigans.”

I suspect my mother was telling me I could do what I want for the oppressed as long as it did not lead to arrest. For her, as for many, the Berrigans’ nonviolent actions were intimately associated with the serious consequences their actions earned. My mother did not want to have to visit me in prison.

For those unfamiliar with the life of Phil Berrigan, he is most known for pouring blood on draft files in Baltimore, for burning Selective Service files with the Catonsville 9 in 1968, for being falsely accused of planning to kidnap Henry Kissinger and bomb tunnels in Washington D.C. (while in jail), for co-founding the Jonah House resistance community, and for six Plowshare actions of personally disarming nuclear weapons. Having spent more than eleven years of his life in prison, Phil died on December 6, 2002.
News Briefs

A meeting of Patriarchs from Middle Eastern Catholic churches was held in Lebanon recently, where the diverse leadership warned the U.S. against war with Iraq. With the obvious choice to negotiate and arrive at peaceful solutions, the patriarchs find it impossible to support an attack using the “just war theory”, which justifies war as a last resort and is the standard belief within the Catholic church’s doctrine.

“Nothing justifies a war with Iraq, whatever the pretexts and reasons invoked,” the heads of the Armenian, Chaldean, Coptic, Latin, Maronite, Melkite, and Syrian Catholic churches said in a statement.

They bring up an interesting point, that “equity demands that countries in the region are treated according to the same criteria — if we wish to finish with weapons of mass destruction, all the region’s countries should be disarmed together, including Israel.”

More than 500 people attended the Office of the Americas 19th anniversary celebration on November 2nd. Acknowledging honors went to Kelly Campbell and Barry Amundsen, the brother and sister-in-law of a victim of the September 11 Pentagon attack, Craig Amundsen. Kelly and Barry are founding members of “September Eleventh Families for Peaceful Tomorrows”, a group of victims’ family members who are interested in peaceful solutions and forgiveness in response to the attacks. The two have each visited Afghanistan to commiserate with families there who lost loved ones in the U.S. retaliation.

Bishops across America express “fear” that military intervention in Iraq might run counter to the church’s teachings on war.

“With the Holy See and bishops from the Middle East and around the world, we fear that resort to war, under present circumstances and in light of current public information, would not meet the strict conditions in Catholic teachings for overriding the strong presumption against the use of military force,” says a segment of a three-page statement approved by U.S. Catholic bishops on November 13. It continues to read, “based on the facts that are known to us, we continue to find it difficult to justify the resort to war against Iraq, lacking clear and adequate evidence of an imminent attack of a grave nature.”

The bishops admitted that “there are no easy answers” to the problems that the Iraqi government is posing. Understanding that our elected leaders are responsible for the country’s decisions, they “hope that our moral concerns and questions will be considered seriously.”

This fall, in the West Chester, PA area, a high school consisting of predominately white students decided to keep the legacy of one civil rights leader alive. The West Chester Area School Board decided to name the building after Bayard Rustin, who was a member of their community and credited with organizing the 1963 march on Washington where Martin Luther King Jr. delivered the famous, “I Have a Dream” speech. Some opposed honoring Rustin because he was jailed after refusing to serve in the armed forces in WWII, was a homosexual, and belonged to a Communist youth league at an early age. The divided school board’s 6-3 vote ensured that the new school would retain Rustin’s name.

Thinking of a doll house for your kid? Think twice about the newest line from Ever Sparkle Industrial Toys entitled Army Forward Command Post. The most questionable item is a $44.95 bombed-out doll house. The “fully outfitted battle zone” comes to America’s children complete with “holes in the roof, demolished and bullet-scarred walls, and broken porch railings.” A recommendation on Amazon.com dryly says the toy is “sure to excite bloodthirsty passions in even the most passive of preschoolers.” The toy is not a big hit so far, maybe causing more “furor” than fun. One who was upset about the marketing of such a product e-mailed J.C. Penney, a distributor (along with Toys R Us and KB Toys), saying if the “company wants to involve children in the sad business of war and its effects, perhaps [it] could sponsor a pen-pal program between American and Iraqi children so they can truly understand (as you apparently do not) that war involves death, destruction, and long-term consequences.” To stop the marketing of violence to children, contact the Lion and Lamb Project (www.lionlamb.org).
New Staff Member to Lighten the Load

The Center welcomes Jennifer Flamant to our team this January. She will focus on supporting those seeking conscientious objector status and dealing with the increased workload in these times. Jenny is originally from the Cleveland area and will graduate in May from American University. Beginning in grade school, she has been deeply involved with nonviolence, service and social justice issues and continued this tradition throughout college. With the belief that a nonviolent solution is possible, Jenny wanted to support those who choose not to fight and hoped to actively work for peace and solidarity. Her search for an opportunity to contribute led her to the Center as a volunteer last fall and we are glad to announce that she has become a regular member of our office staff. She is very grateful for this chance to support conscientious objectors and hopes to make a meaningful contribution to the peace movement.

A Fresh Volunteer

James Reichard has been assisting us here at the Center every Wednesday since just before Christmas. James is from Thorton Friends High School and he is volunteering some community service hours in our office. He will be coming in for a few hours every Wednesday until the beginning of March. James has been managing the copy machine, sending out material orders, and simply helping out where we need him most.

Travis Poling Leaves the Center

Travis’s one year with the Brethren Volunteer Service ended on February 14, 2003. It’s been great to have him here during this hectic time. His plans for the future include his wedding in May 2003, then completing his undergraduate degree in religion and peace studies at one of the Brethren colleges. After that he will remain active in the Church of the Brethren and the antiwar movement, hopefully finding a career in the pursuit of removing the causes of war. Thank you all for helping make his service at CCW a meaningful experience.
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this proposal had generated a lot of discussion. He said we would not have been in his office having this discussion had it not been for his proposal.

We pointed out that many people had been engaged around the issue and that the overwhelming majority of Congressional offices reported getting an incredible volume of mail expressing opposition to the war. From our perspective, the people were engaged, but Congress was not listening. Ned Stowe of FCNL reported that his constituency, which has been working very hard to prevent the war in Iraq, is getting diverted from that objective because they are now also working to prevent a return to the draft. He explained that if he were not in Rangel’s office at that moment talking about the draft, he would be in a different office talking about Iraq!

Both sides concluded that we had similar objectives, even though there was a disagreement on strategy.

According to Rangel’s office, this bill was being introduced in the Senate by Fritz Hollings (S 89).

Subsequently, Rangel’s office contacted CCW to discuss the problems with the CO provisions in his legislation. We explained how this proposal would take us back to the World War I era in terms of CO rights because it would require COs to serve in the military. This would be unacceptable to many and they would refuse to cooperate, and many would end up in jail.

After considerable conversation, Rangel’s staff asked, “What could we do to move CO rights forward?” which ultimately led to a discussion of the Military CO Act which had been introduced by Ron Dellums in 1992, to rectify the problems COs had encountered during (Papa) Bush’s Gulf War. Rangel’s office promised to study the legislation, and current military policies concerning CO discharge; they are considering reintroducing this legislation.

Required Service for Everyone?

Remember HR 3598? That’s the bill introduced last year that would require EVERY young person to spend 6 months to a year in the military, even COs. One of the bad consequences of Rangel’s action is that Rep. Nick Smith (MI) was quoted in the Washington Post on January 3, saying that he and Curt Weldon (PA) were going to reintroduce that bill in response to Rangel’s bill with the feeling that Rangel didn’t really seem serious about bringing back the draft. A visit to Weldon’s office revealed that Weldon was not going to become a cosponsor of that bill. (He had originally cosponsored the bill, but after hearing about problems with the bill from many constituents, withdrew as a cosponsor.)

During a visit to Smith’s office last year his aid had assured us that they had originally not thought through the CO provision, and had not intended to create the problems for COs that were in the original bill. After revisiting his office in January 2003, Smith’s staff promised to send us a copy of the revised legisla-

A Glimmer of Hope

On Jan. 29, 2003, Representative Ron Paul (R-TX) reintroduced the bill (HR 487) to repeal the Military Selective Service Act of 1980. He has been introducing the same bill for the last few years waiting for an opportunity for it to go somewhere. Our hope is that the pending war with Iraq, along with Rangel’s request for a draft, is making Congress think about the Selective Service Act. The chances for this bill to pass now are higher than ever. Through some lobbying of our own, and with your help, we can hopefully push the repeal to pass this time.

Please join us in this effort and make sure your representatives in the House and Senate hear from you. Make sure they know that you are opposed to conscription and support Paul’s bill. This is will be one more step in our struggle to strengthen the rights of COs.

Berrigan’s Spirit (cont. from page 1)

While Phil’s words and actions were stern, his demeanor was kind and humorous. When I first met Phil (in front of the Pentagon, incidentally) I felt nervous. I wanted to introduce myself but I worried that I was going before St. Peter and would have to account for how little I had done with my life. To my relief Phil was warm and welcoming. I now realize that his life was one big welcoming invitation to be a part of the solution to our broken world. It was an honest invitation as well in that it included the consequences that come with such a witness.

One of Phil’s greatest gifts to us was his persistence in the face of serious consequences. Phil never quit, moved on, or outgrew the struggle of nonviolence. Obviously it was in that struggle that he found true life. Phil’s day-in-day-out, year-in-year-out work inside and outside of prison has most inspired my own notions of taking responsibility for peace. His life inspires my work as a GI counselor, helping soldiers who seek discharge from the same war machine Phil opposed, and my work as a catholic worker, helping the poor and homeless victims of a culture that prefers to spend its wealth on militarism.

Last week I attended a Faith and Resistance retreat led by Jonah House and the Dorothy Day Catholic Worker in Washington D.C. We shared much about Phil’s life and its gift to those in the movement. The retreat concluded with a 7 a.m. Monday demonstration at the Pentagon. Protesters splashed blood on a new entrance, prayed and sang, hoping to call attention to the madness and horror of war. Phil’s spirit was there among us.

Steve Woolford is a friend of the Center and a counselor with the GI Rights Hotline who lives and works in the Silk Hope Catholic Worker House, in Siler City, North Carolina.
As I share what I believe in regards to Christian witness and peacemaking, I often wonder what issue to focus on. I have so many ideas that are all interrelated, yet I can’t quite articulate them. Recently I realized that I already have something to share without even thinking about it. It’s the story of my family. I’m so used to it that I often take it for granted. However, it’s the reason I’m involved in witnessing for peace. It’s the reason I’m in Washington, DC right now. It’s what I’ve heard growing up, and what I’ve later discovered on my own as I try to figure out my history, my story before I was around, the story that has passed through generations that I am just a small part of, yet makes me who I am.

Our stories are what we carry with us, what influence us, and sustain us. As we share our stories, we influence and sustain one another. They can heal our wounds or inspire us into action as they weave us together as a community.

My story begins when the United States were not yet the United States. Countless years of warfare in the colonists’ lands of origin had scarred their souls. Many traveled across the ocean to the New World which offered the hope of a better tomorrow. However, the stories they carried with them were those of violence, which kills something inside all of us. It should come as no surprise that the colonists couldn’t avoid the wars that came with settling in a new land. From among these settlers came the Brethren, a group with a story that also told of centuries of war, but had a new story to weave into the old.

Michael Wine, a Brethren Elder during the 18th century was one of the great ancestral patriarchs of my family. Michael’s highest allegiance was to God. He refused to associate with either side of the American Revolution, the colonists or the British crown. To do so was to justify killing those on the other side whom Christ commands Christians to love as much as we love those on our side. Michael chose to live out the truth that all people are created in the image of God and that Christ died for all. No mere human has the right to take away their chance of finding the love and peace of God. Christ suffered and died so that no one else would have to and refused to kill to get his own way. As a disciple of Jesus, Michael Wine chose to suffer for the benefit of all rather than bring that same suffering on another.

When the authorities confiscated his Maryland farm for his refusal to swear his allegiance to the either fighting side. John’s refusal to claim allegiance to the either fighting force eventually cost him his life. He once wrote in his journal: 

My highest conception of patriotism is found in the man who loves the Lord his God with all his heart and his neighbor as himself. Out of these affections spring the subordinate love for one’s country; love truly virtuous for one’s companion and children, relatives and friends; and in its most comprehensive sense in the whole human family. Were this love universal, the word patriotism, in its specific sense, meaning such a love for one’s country as makes its possessors ready and willing to take up arms in its defense, might be appropriately expunged from every language.

This idea of allegiance and patriotism is one that we can still learn from today. When most of us hear the word “patriotism” we think of love for one’s nation. While nothing is wrong with loving your home, patriotism often places the authority of the civil government above, or at least close to the same level as the authority of God. This form of idolatry excludes all others the authorities deem unworthy of our love: those on the other side.

With this view, it is easy to forget that both citizens and their governments are under the highest authority of God who deems no one unworthy of love and salvation. It was this limited view of patriotism that lead several Confederate soldiers to take John Kline’s life. Allegiance to God’s universal love may not have been in the hearts of the men who killed John, but the church did not forget their own allegiance, because they took no revenge once they discovered the identities of those involved.

Jacob Wine, an officiator at John Kline’s funeral was under a similar threat as John Kline had been. Still, Jacob’s faith in God was so strong that he risked his life to travel more than eight miles to the church that day. He was willing to die for what he believed was righteous in God’s sight, yet for that same principle-God’s justice and peace for all nations- he was unwilling to (cont. on page 7 as A New Patriotism)
Preparing for a Draft

By JE McNeil

The most frequent question we have been asked since September 11, 2001 is: "Is there going to be a draft?" Last year at this time the Center would answer "There is no draft. There is no draft in the foreseeable future."

But something happened last May which has changed the Center’s response. In May 2002, President Bush asked Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense if the military was prepared to invade Iraq. Rumsfeld responded that the military was not capable at that time to invade Iraq because it needed some particular weapons that would take six months to obtain—and then ordered the weapons. So in May the Center began to warn people about the possibility of war against Iraq.

Donald Rumsfeld said two other things in May that changed what the Center answers about a potential draft. Rumsfeld had been answering the weekly question about whether there would be a draft since September 11, 2001, as well. Until May his answer had always been, “There is no draft. There is no need for a draft.” But in May he told reporters that he believes al-Qaeda cells are in at least 60 countries. He said that we should attack all sixty countries if they did not wipe out the al-Qaeda cells. Then he said, “There is no draft, but if we invade any more countries, the troops will be thinned.”

Thinned troops are the first step for a serious call for a draft. For this reason the Center has begun offering draft counselor training around the country. By the time this newsletter is out we will have been in Pennsylvania, New York, Maryland, Texas, Illinois, and Connecticut. (Draft counselor training is provided for the costs of travel and a place to hang our hats at night. Individual attendees must buy the draft counselor manual. We do not charge for the actual training itself.)

Some suggest that this is over reacting. The last time we worried about a potential draft—the Gulf War twelve years ago—nothing came of it. But the reality, as has been repeatedly outlined in the Reporter, is that it is possible for the first feet to hit boot camp in 14 days after the President directs Selective Service to begin a draft. Even assuming that there is much a debate in Congress, the first draftees may have much less than a month to begin to understand what their choices are, make them, and document them.

There will be less time to train the counselors to help them. Training from the Vietnam era is helpful, but the system is completely different and an untrained counselor could unknowingly advise a draftee in a manner that would irrevocably harm his chances of obtaining his correct classification. Training from the Gulf War era more closely tracks the system as it exists now, but it is still different from today and very few received that training.

If a draft is re instituted, there will not be the time or staff to train enough counselors properly as to how to help draftees. The Center views this work to be similar to married couples having powers of attorney for each other in case one of them becomes incapable of making decisions and the other spouse has to make the decisions for them. You always hope that you go to your grave without ever having to use the power of attorney, but when you need it, it is too late to get it. When we need trained draft counselors, it will be too late for some people to wait while we train them.

Is this reading too much into small signs? I hope and pray I am overreacting. But we cannot afford to take that chance. When draft counselors are needed, they are going to be needed RIGHT NOW.

July 31, 2002 the headline of U.S.A. Today was: “No October Surprise.” The build up for an invasion is now, of course, impossible to ignore. Bush, Rumsfeld, and Condoleezza Rice continued to send out obvious signals that Saddam Hussein cannot successfully avoid the wrath of the U.S. for something—Deny he has weapons, admit he has weapons, shoot at the U.S. planes that have been bombing Iraq weekly for more than ten years. There will be something.

A few weeks ago Rumsfeld stated in response to the weekly question about the draft, “There is not draft. There is no need for a draft—yet.” “Yet” is a new word. Just as we should not have ignored the 1991 papers written by Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld and Paul Wolfowitz laying out their vision for an invasion of a country such as Iraq to revitalize the military and thereby revitalize the United States, we cannot ignore their words today.

There is no draft. There is no need for a draft—YET

!!ACTION ALERT!!

CONGRESS COULD WITHDRAW AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF FORCE AGAINST IRAQ — BUT ONLY IF YOU ACT NOW!

The antiwar mood in Congress, while not overwhelming, seems to be picking up. It is now our job to keep it rolling. On February 5, 2003, Representatives Peter DeFazio (D-OR) and Ron Paul (R-TX) introduced a bill intended to withdraw Congress’s approval of the use of military force against Iraq.

Unlike previous resolutions (Senate Resolution 32 and House Concurrent Resolution 2), which admonish the President to act, HJRes20 would actually repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002, withdrawing Congress’s permission for the President to take any actions he thinks necessary. The President would then be forced to follow the War Powers Act, placing constraints on his military might without further Congressional authorization.

Currently the resolution has approximately 30 bi-partisan co-sponsors in the House. It needs more support, so ask your members of Congress in both the House and Senate to approve HJRes 20, in addition to each chamber’s respective bills listed above.

Time is running, so be sure to contact your members of Congress immediately. Our goal is to flood Congress with calls and letters so that it is abundantly clear to them, and to the President, that we still do not support this war, and never will.
cause another to suffer or die.

Because of this conviction, when the question of fighting in the Civil War came up, most Brethren refused. John Kline and others lobbied leaders from both sides of the Mason-Dixon Line, including Abraham Lincoln and General “Stonewall” Jackson, for exemption or alternatives to military service for those who objected on religious grounds. These efforts only sometimes bore fruit. Michael Wine’s grandson John was dragged off and forced to join the Confederate Army. When he was about to go from cooking to the front lines, he fled to the mountains. He was separated from his family for a long time and had to rely on God’s guidance for his protection and survival in the wilderness. Most objectors paid a highly priced fee so that the government could hire a replacement. Many refused to do even that, believing they should not be responsible for sending anyone into battle. The Confederacy and the Union both imprisoned or even executed many for following their interpretations of God’s call, but still the Brethren church held onto its conviction that all war is sin.

This belief that it is against God’s will to have any part in war has continued to exist throughout our nation’s history; and the Brethren, including my family, continue to be a part of the story. Some of my earliest memories of childhood are of listening to my dad tell about how he dealt with the question of the draft when he was younger. He registered for the draft assuming he would go into Alternative Service, but as the war escalated, Dad’s call to faithfully obey God’s will grew stronger. He saw reports of the war, and learned more of its effects on those he knew, as well as those he knew only from images labeled as “the enemy.” His global perception broadened much like John Kline’s patriotism. Dad’s was a love that took in the whole human family so much that there was no way he could take up arms against another. He concluded that he could not support the war effort in any way, shape or form, and that to perform Alternative Service would be cooperating with the system he believed to be full of sin. He sent his draft card back to the Selective Service, explaining that he would never fight in the war, and that he would refuse induction.

My older brother and I grew up with that story and were both influenced by it. While my brother never registered for the draft, I did not want to risk any punishment for resisting. I now realize that if I had as much understanding of my story as I do now, I would never have registered either, just as I never stood for the Pledge of Allegiance in High School. I did write “I am a Conscientious Objector” on my registration card to document that I had these beliefs at age 18. But, if I were to be drafted now, I would probably refuse induction, because my primary allegiance is to God. I could never act on my government’s judgement of someone who has not yet been judged by the final authority just because they have not yet found God’s peace. It seems more likely to me that loving our enemies as Christ did will help both us and our enemies to know God’s forgiveness. How do I know that this is possible? Because I take its story with me everywhere I go. A story that I pray will bless us all.

Injustice Towards COs Continues in Israel

By Bill Galvin

On Thursday, January 16, 2003, two imprisoned Israeli conscientious objectors, Noam Bahat and Hillel Goral, began a hunger strike. Both are among the signatories of a letter signed last year by over 300 high school students, declaring:

When the elected government tramples over democratic values and the chances for a just peace in the region, we have no choice but to obey our conscience and refuse to take part in the attack on the Palestinian people. As youth about to be called to serve in the military we pledge to do all that we see fit so as not to serve the occupation. Some of us will refuse to serve beyond the green line, others will avoid military service in other ways - we view all these means as legitimate and necessary, and we call on other youth, conscripts, soldiers in the standing army, and reserve service soldiers to do the same.

According to Noam Bahat, the hunger strike comes to protest his imprisonment for opposing the occupation of the Palestinian people, as well as to protest the occupation itself.

Draft resisters are routinely sentenced to several consecutive terms of imprisonment for the same ‘offense.’ Until this past year, COs were generally found unfit for service and left alone after two or three consecutive sentences.

On Thursday, January 16, another conscientious objector, Jonathan Ben-Artzi was sentenced by Gen. Gil Regev, head of the military manpower division, to 35 days in military prison. This is the seventh consecutive prison term for Ben-Artzi, raising the total length of his imprisonment, so far, to 196 days. Jonathan Ben-Artzi is a pacifist who opposes war as a matter of principle. He is also against the Israeli army’s occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip, a position at the opposite end of the political spectrum from his uncle, Benjamin Netanyahu.

In separate cases, both Jonathan Ben-Artzi and eight army reservists brought suit in the Israeli courts to secure their right to refuse military service on the grounds of conscience. Although the Israeli Supreme Court rejected this right, it did recognize that these objectors were acting out of conscience, rather than simply political disagreement.

Ben Artzi and Uri Ya’acobi, who have both already served more than five consecutive prison terms for refusing to serve in the army, were officially adopted as prisoners of conscience by Amnesty International (http://www.amnesty.org). In Israel, the law exempts from army service every “Yeshiva (religious) Student” - who do not, in the least, object to the use of violence, only to themselves having to do the dirty work. It is unacceptable to many that at the same time “non-religious” students are again and again imprisoned for having a conscience which forbids them to take part in an army which, for all their life and much longer, has been an occupation army.
From the Desk of the Executive Director

“I am only one, but still I am one. I cannot do everything, but still I can do something; I will not refuse to do something I can do.” -Helen Keller

Sometimes we feel overwhelmed. So much to do. So little time.

Need time to save the world. Need time for our faith practices. Need time for our families. Need time for ourselves. The young men and women who work in this office often forget the last two items. They will often get wrapped up in the calls for our time and services and work hard for long hours.

That is why for the week between Christmas and New Years I established the policy that each day is covered by one staffer. To face a New Year we must have time for our families and ourselves.

The world will be there for us to “save” when the New Year arrives, just as the organization has done for more than 60 years. Each New Year has its special challenges. We have faced New Years with continued support for CPSers, New Years with calls for amnesty for COs, New Years with the chill of the Cold War killing our young men and women in Korea, New Years with rising anger in the United States over the “police action” in Vietnam, New Years with new calls for amnesty for COs, New Years with calls to register our youth in a unified “response” to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

Last year, most found the New Year difficult. This year it looks even more bleak as the drums of war continue to beat.

Helen Keller’s clarion call rings true today as it did so many decades ago.

I am only one. But the staff and volunteers are a few. The people we have trained and worked with are many. The people they reach are hundreds.

I am only one, the staff few, but our efforts to do “something” are multiplied by your acts and your financial support. And so we do not refuse to do the something we can do.

Yours for Peace and Justice,

J. E. McNeil