



DISARMING TIMES

The Journal of Pax Christi Australia

Vol 44 No. 1

March 2019

EXTREME MILITARISM ON THE RISE.

Joseph Camilleri

Dear Friends,
I am deeply concerned by the extreme militarism that is now in full swing. It has been with us for some time, but has now reached frightening proportions - and bar a few voices - the silence is deafening - not just from the government, but the other parties as well, and, of course, our media.

- Some weeks ago, the Trump Administration announced that it was withdrawing from the INF Treaty, the first major nuclear disarmament treaty that helped pave the way for the end of the Cold War. Soon after, the Russian Government announced that it would retaliate by withdrawing as well.
- in recent months, both the US and Russia have announced major plans for the expansions of their respective military arsenals, including expensive nuclear modernisation plans
- In the meantime, arms sales to some of the most explosive parts of the world continue unabated - absolutely no response from our political parties, and hardly a murmur in the media.
- Last year the Australian government unveiled plans to become one of world's top 10 arms exporters. The Defence Export Office is to work hand in hand with Austrade and the Centre for Defence Industry Capability to coordinate the commonwealth's whole-of-government export efforts and provide a focal point for more arms exports. And, a \$3.8 billion Defence Export Facility, to be administered by the Export Finance and Insurance Corporation, is to provide the finance to Australian companies to help them sell their defence equipment overseas. Just now, we've had the extraordinary announcement that Australian weapons system manufacturer EOS has received more than \$36 million ingovernment assistance (taxpayers money). According to documents seen by the ABC, EOS has struck a deal which will see its sophisticated weapons mounts supplied to Saudi Arabia, the leader of a coalition in war-torn Yemen which has been accused of indiscriminate airstrikes on civilians.
- And now the shocking revelation (arising from a US Congressional inquiry) based on whistleblower accounts and documents showing communications between Trump administration officials and nuclear power companies. It states that "within the US, strong private commercial interests have been pressing aggressively for the transfer of highly sensitive nuclear technology to Saudi Arabia". These commercial entities could "reap billions of dollars through contracts associated with constructing and operating nuclear facilities in Saudi Arabia". Mr Trump is reportedly "directly engaged in the effort". The implications of this would be horrific. Once Saudi Arabia is suspected of developing nuclear facilities capable of feeding nuclear weapons ambitions, Iran would immediately do the same. within a few years, the world's most unstable region would have three nuclear armed states: Israel, Saudi Arabia and Iran - a recipe if ever there were one for a regional nuclear conflict with incalculable global repercussions.

What we are faced with is extreme militarism, and with that comes what E. P. Thompson famously described at the height of the Cold war as "exterminism". It seems we are back to square one. It is, I suggest, time, for the peace movement to face up to the new reality, but with a view to bringing this reality into full public view. May I suggest that we think creatively in coming months about ways in which this can done. I can think of no issue that is more relevant to our current efforts to promote a "just and ecologically sustainable peace" because the new militarism threatens not just endless bloodletting, but grave humanitarian catastrophes, and endless destruction of the environment.

Lots to think about - I'm hopeful that collectively humanity we can rise to the new challenge.

DISARMING TIMES

A quarterly journal of Pax Christi Australia. It aims to provide members and interested peacemakers with peace news and views both local and international. We endeavour in each edition to reflect the three-fold emphasis of Pax Christi which engages members in study, Non-violent action and prayer for peace, justice, human rights, development and inter-faith and inter-civilisation dialogue.

PAX CHRISTI AUSTRALIA
is an Australia-wide
Christian Peace Movement, affiliated with Pax
Christi International.
Human rights, justice and integrity of
creation are central to its work.
We take a stand against militarism, nuclear
weapons and the arms race.
As an ecumenical Christian movement
Pax Christi fosters the spiritual and scriptural
dimensions of peace-making.
www.paxchristi.org.au

Disarming Times is compiled by a team of
Pax Christi Australia members:
Joe Camilleri, Rolf Sorenson, Harry Kerr,
Rita Camilleri and Barbara Hadkinson (Vic)
Claude Mostowik and Maggie Galley (N.S.W.)
Pancras Jordan and Claire Cooke (Qld)

Pax Christi Victoria
P.O. Box 31 Carlton Sth Vic. 3053
Tel: 03 9893 4946
Fax: 03 9379 1711
email: pax@paxchristi.org.au

Pax Christi New South Wales
P.O. Box A 681 Sydney Sth 1235,
Tel: 02 9550 3845 or 0411 450 953
Fax: 02 9519 8471
email: mjscjust@smartchat.net.au

Pax Christi Queensland
PO Box 305
Carina QLD 4152
Tel: 0415 461 620
email: pancrasjordan@gmail.com

Unsourced material in *Disarming Times* may be copied with due acknowledgement. A copy of the publication would be appreciated. Not all views expressed in this journal are equally shared by Pax Christi Australia.

Disarming Times is printed by Arena Press
2-14 Kerr St. Fitzroy 3065 Ph 03 9416 0232

PEACE, JUSTICE AND ECOLOGY

Geoff Lacey

Any exercise of power without restraint is at once an assault on people, especially the poor, and an assault on nature. I would like to consider two global examples of this.

First example: the historical connection between the Manhattan Project and the denial of climate change—along with proposals for geoengineering.

Naomi Oreskes and Erik Conway in their book, *Merchants of doubt* (2010), have pointed out a connection between nuclear weapons development and climate change denial. In fact the roots of climate denial go right back to the Manhattan Project to make the atom bomb.

In 1984 a number of scientists (including Edward Teller) who worked on the bomb and related defence projects in America got together to found the General George C. Marshall Institute. A prime aim was to lobby in support of the Strategic Defence Initiative ('Star Wars') and to defend it from the critiques made by the Union of Concerned Scientists.

In the late 1980s the cold war came to an end and there was no longer an enemy that justified a Strategic Defense Initiative. However, the team decided to fight on and they found a new enemy: environmental 'alarmists'. In 1989 the Marshall Institute issued its first report attacking climate science.

Clive Hamilton, in his book *Earthmasters* (2013), tells a similar story about geoengineering. This is the term used for a range of engineering proposals to reduce the temperature of the earth without reducing carbon emissions. These proposals would subject the entire earth to technological control. The most common proposal is to get sulphate aerosol particles into the upper atmosphere in order to reflect back solar radiation into space.

Hamilton points out that many of the scientists working on geoengineering have worked at or with

the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, the nuclear weapons facility. Edward Teller, its co-founder, was again a key figure. After the collapse of the USSR the leaders looked for new opportunities to keep the Laboratory relevant and in the 1990s they expanded its capacity to study greenhouse effect. In 1997 Teller published a paper on the 'prospects for physics-based modulation of global change' and in 2002 another paper arguing that the world should regulate solar radiation *instead of* reducing greenhouse gas emissions, even in the absence of global warming.

Second example: The global conflict over genetically modified (GM) crops vs Agroecology

On December 17, 2018, the United Nations General Assembly took a historic vote, approving the *Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and other People Working in Rural Areas*. The declaration, which was the product of some 17 years of diplomatic work led by the international peasant alliance *La Via Campesina*, formally extends human rights protections to farmers whose seed sovereignty is threatened by corporate practices.

While some countries abstained, the only 'no' votes came from the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, Hungary, Israel, and Sweden.

To understand what is at stake, consider an example (provided by Hugh Lacey) from the State of Piauí in Brazil's north-east.

Until recently this area was renowned for its biodiversity. Family farmers and indigenous and other traditional groups had practiced agriculture and stock raising—in ways that kept the biodiversity largely intact, and enabled a healthy, self-reliant, stable life for the rural communities. Moreover, many of them had begun to organize with movements that highlight the practices of agroecology, which incorporate their traditional farming methods.

Since their traditional methods

required little interaction with the formal economy, their lands were officially regarded as ‘unproductive’. The lands were expropriated, and sold to agribusiness entrepreneurs. The new owners employed security forces to evict the people from the area, destroying their homes, possessions and communities, and brought in heavy equipment to eliminate the native vegetation.

The new proprietors planted monocultures of GM soybeans. For their successful cultivation, these GM crops require intensive applications of chemical fertilizers and agrotoxics, leading to an increased release of greenhouse gases and pollution of local waters and soils.

The displaced farmers, their traditional communities destroyed, faced limited options. They could become day or migrant laborers on the corporate owned farms, required to work long hours under unhealthy conditions (often being exposed to the chemicals). Or they could migrate to the margins of large cities.

Agribusiness thus involves violence against both people and nature. The new Bolsonaro government in Brazil plans to intensify this, and it is shifting the role of demarcating Indigenous territory in the Amazon to the agriculture ministry, controlled by agribusiness. (*Guardian Weekly*, 18 Jan. 2019)

In contrast to agribusiness, the popular movements are engaged in *agroecology*: a set of practices that combine food production, including traditional practices, with respect for the local ecology and the empowerment of people.

Features of their farming systems include: high levels of biodiversity; appropriate technologies of land and water resource management; and strong cultural values and collective forms of social organization.

Agroecology in Brazil has been advocated and adopted by many members of Christian Base Communities, whose practices and way of life are articulated in the Theology of Liberation. For these communities, the values of popular movements (social justice, democratic participation, food sovereignty, sustainability) resonate with the biblical values of the Kingdom of God.

Ecological conflicts and initiatives in rural Australia

Such issues, in which the assault on nature, are by no means confined to the third world. On a different scale, such issues are taking place in Australia. And here also some families and communities are responding with ecological initiatives that also have powerful implications for social justice.

Consider the current tragedy of the deaths of a million fish in the lower Darling River system. This is not just the effect of drought but of inappropriate management of the river system, in favour of big irrigators. For example, on-farm dams have been built upstream in northern NSW and southern Queensland by cotton growers in the home country of the water ministers. Some of the on-farm water storages are the size of Sydney Harbour. (Helen Vivian., *SMH*, 9 March 2018). This represents an assault, not only on the biosphere but also on the lives of so many people in the communities affected.

This striking example is related to a wider phenomenon: the practice of current industrial agriculture, as supported by the multinationals. With such agriculture, farmers are going into debt for giant spray-rigs, tractors, etc. Environmental costs include destruction of complex, self-organising ecosystems and the pollution of the environment.

Regenerative agriculture

However, there has been a response to this predicament. In his remarkable book, *Call of the Reed Warbler: a new agriculture, a new earth* (2017), Charles Massy explores the principles and practice of the alternative system, regenerative farming, with many case studies.

Regenerative agriculture implies ‘an active rebuilding of existing systems towards full health. It implies the rebuilding of the soil itself, and of biodiversity more widely, the reduction of toxins and pollutants, the recharging of aquifers, the production of healthier food, and the enhancement of social capital and ecological knowledge.’ It entails the promotion of vital rural cultures.

Massy discusses many examples where farmers are practicing conservation on land devoted to crop or live-

stock production. Many have found ways not only of retaining part of the remnant woodland ecosystems but also of integrating native groundstorey species into their farming—enhancing both biodiversity and farm productivity.

An interesting example on record is a family who have a sheep and cattle property *Lana* on the northern NSW tablelands. Following a drought they began a ‘holistic management’ approach. In each paddock they graze the stock intensively for a short period and follow up with a long rest period, so that 95% of the property is rested at any one time.

Consider some of the outcomes. The groundcover has improved and with it the soil structure and carbon content. Native perennial grasses are abundant. Water in rivers and dams is clean. Streamside vegetation is recovering. Grazing-sensitive wildflowers are turning up again. Woodland birds, for example the brown treecreeper and speckled warbler, that are declining in some places, are present here.

One third of the property is forested hills. Trees are important for stock shade. And the insect and bird life present there affects everything, including pest control. [Norton and Reid, *Nature and farming* (2013)]

As well as restoring health to the soil and ecosystems, regenerative farming brings people together, sharing experience and partaking in *Land-care* activities. Once again ecological practice and empowerment of people go together.

And in the city

Environmental scientist Herbert Girardet proposes that we extend such a regenerative approach to the cities: The time has come for cities to regenerate soils and watercourses—to regenerate local communities and economies:

‘Creating a circular rather than a linear economic metabolism—giving plant nutrients back to nature, storing carbon in soils and forests, reviving urban agriculture, powering human settlements efficiently by renewable energy, reconnecting cities to the regional hinterland—is the basis for creating viable new local economies.’ [Girardet, in *Resurgence and Ecologist*, No. 306 (2018).]

In a city like Melbourne we are used to many kinds of inappropriate development, involving freeways or higher density building. Such developments impinge on the wellbeing of communities and damage the environment. However, it is remarkable how people experiment in sustainable and equitable living, right here in the suburbs of Australian cities.

David Holmgren, in *RetroSuburbia* (2018) spells out the experience of many households in achieving a high degree of self-reliance and resilience in the urban environment. He argues that as globalised capitalism begins to unravel we are seeing a resurgence of interest in the history and future of the commons. With 'energy descent' residential neighbourhoods will have to become more self-managed and resilient.

As with regenerative farming, urban gardeners experience the benefits of biodiversity. 'Frogs, lizards and small insect-eating bats perform ecological services that we can enhance and encourage by creating diverse habitats... especially through structural diversity of vegetation, the inclusions of ponds and wetlands, appropriate native plant species, and habitat for native pollinators.'

The Hood is an informal neighbourhood community of about 10 families in West Heidelberg. It involved coordinated buying and renting of neighbouring houses. Families share resources and tools—also childcare and some meals.

The gardens are full of dense, luxuriant vegetation. Trees, shrubs, vegetables and flowers grow close together in ways that mimic wild ecosystems. The trees include fruit trees, other exotics and natives, such as wattles and sheoaks that fix nitrogen in the soil. Most of the families have chickens. One has goats. All do composting, with layers of scraps, grassy material and manure. Adults and children work together.

Nick Rose & Andrea Gaynor, in *Reclaiming the urban commons* (2018), observe: 'We have seen a remarkable rise of interest in taking back the food economy so that it contributes directly to the health of people and the planet. A reinstated language of the commons... has been central to this movement. In our densifying cities, people have come together to reclaim land for urban gardening.'

Many spin-off projects happened as people found their confidence to act and learned skills to be engaged. People have connected around social justice issues. They are being empowered in their local communities.

A fundamental reimagining of the built environment

Samuel Alexander and Brendan Gleeson, in their book *Degrowth in the suburbs* (2018), point out that the post-carbon suburbs will require much more than the development of renewable sources of energy. What is at stake is 'a fundamental reimagining of the built environment and the modes of political economy and culture that our cities both shape and are shaped by'. They point out that lifestyle changes in the community are a pre-condition for a broader political change towards sustainability.

I would like to take this further. Besides the groups that are producing food sustainably, there are *Friends* groups and *Landcare* groups that have directed their efforts towards enhancing and developing habitat corridors, for example along rivers and creeklines. This direct engagement with the indigenous ecology is a vital part of the reimagining that Alexander and Gleeson talk about.

I have worked with the Friends groups at Yarra Bend Park, for example on two of the alluvial terraces, one on either side of the river. We have seen substantial restoration of the indigenous vegetation. Besides the resurgence of the plants, the richness and vitality of these sites is

expressed by the abundance of the bird life. On one occasion in November 2001, I noted:

I am sitting among young red gum trees and a lot of saplings. A few more silver wattles are springing up. The tussock-grass, liberated from weeds, is doing well, and the newly-planted seedlings are growing fast.

More than 20 nankeen night herons are flying around, high above the river, some alighting in big gums on both sides. A pair of white-faced herons are flying up and down the river, sometimes perching in trees or lower down, looking for somewhere to nest. From time to time, an oriole and a shrike-tit call from across the river.

A deeper engagement with our landscape

The remnant native ecosystems constitute the font of biodiversity. They provide the environment in which sustainable cultivation can take place, on farm and garden. For our culture and economy to be sustainable and equitable all our productive processes, all our urban planning and activity, must take place within the context of the ecological network.

This deeper engagement with our landscape—a growing intimacy with nature—is vital if we are to gain the insights and experience that will lead to a sustainable culture. In the process we work together in community to rebuild the commons, the basis for equity.

I began by noting that any exercise of power without restraint is at once an assault on people and an assault on nature. I conclude with the observation that the practice of ecology and the building of an equitable society are intimately bound together.

This paper was presented by Geoff Lacey at the Pax Christi Victoria February 2019 Agape. Geoff is an environmental engineer and long time member of Pax Christi

WHAT DOES CHINA'S "ECOLOGICAL CIVILIZATION" MEAN FOR HUMANITY'S FUTURE? Jeremy Lent

China's leader, Xi Jinping, affirms an ecological vision that is in line with progressive environmental thought. Is it mere rhetoric or does it have a deeper resonance within Chinese culture? The answer may ultimately have a profound effect on humanity's future.

Imagine a newly elected President of the United States calling in his inaugural speech for an "ecological civilization" that ensures "harmony between human and nature." Now imagine he goes on to declare that "we, as human beings, must respect nature, follow its ways, and protect it" and that his administration will "encourage simple, moderate, green, and low-carbon ways of life, and oppose extravagance and excessive consumption." Dream on, you might say. Even in the more progressive Western European nations, it's hard to find a political leader who would make such a stand.

And yet, the leader of the world's second largest economy, Xi Jinping of China, made these statements and more in his address to the National Congress of the Communist Party in Beijing last October. He went on to specify in more detail his plans to "step up efforts to establish a legal and policy framework... that facilitates green, low-carbon, and circular development," to "promote afforestation," "strengthen wetland conservation and restoration," and "take tough steps to stop and punish all activities that damage the environment." Closing his theme with a flourish, he proclaimed that "what we are doing today" is "to build an ecological civilization that will benefit generations to come." Transcending parochial boundaries, he declared that his Party's abiding mission was to "make new and greater contributions to mankind... for both the wellbeing of the Chinese people and human progress."

It's easy to dismiss it all as mere political rhetoric, but consider how the current President of the United States came to power on the basis

of a different form of rhetoric, appealing to the destructive nationalism of "America First." In both cases, it's reasonable to assume that the rhetoric doesn't exist in a vacuum. Just as Trump's xenophobic vision spells potential danger for the world, so could it be that Xi's ecological vision could offer a glimpse to a hopeful future?

A transformative vision

In fact, this is just the type of fresh, regenerative thinking about transforming the current global economic system that many in the environmental movement have been calling for. And this hasn't been lost on some leading thinkers. David Korten, a world-renowned author and activist, has proposed expanding the vision of Ecological Civilization to a global context, which would involve—among other things—granting legal rights to nature, shifting ownership of productive assets from transnational corporations to nation-states and self-governing communities, and prioritizing life-affirming, rather than wealth-affirming, values.

Within a larger historical context, it's not too surprising that this vision of "harmony between human and nature" should emerge from China. As I've traced in my book *The Patterning Instinct: A Cultural History Of Humanity's Search For Meaning*, traditional Chinese culture was founded on a worldview that perceived an intrinsic web of connection between humanity and nature, in contrast to the European worldview that saw humans as essentially separate from nature.

Early Chinese philosophers believed the overriding purpose of life was to seek harmony in society and the universe, while Europeans pursued a path based on a different set of values—which have since become global in scope—driven by "conquering nature" and viewing nature as a machine to be engineered.

Furthermore, Xi's rhetoric does seem to be grounded in at least some reality. Two months before Xi's speech, China announced they were more than doubling their previous solar power target for 2020, after installing more than twice as much solar capacity as any other country in 2016. This new target—five times larger than current capacity in the U.S.—would entail covering an area of land equivalent to Greater London with solar panels. They are similarly exceeding their wind power targets, already boasting more capacity than all of Europe.

As a result, China has recently halted previous plans for building more than 150 coal-fired power plants. In electric cars, China is leading the world, selling more each month than Europe and the U.S. combined, with more aggressive quotas on gas-guzzlers than anywhere else in the world, including California. Additionally, China has the world's most extensive network of high-speed trains, and has already passed laws to promote a circular economy where waste products from industrial processes are recycled into inputs for other processes.

China's industrial avalanche

Some observers, however, are far from convinced that China is on its way to an ecological civilization. Economist Richard Smith has written a detailed critique of China's quandary in the *Real-World Economics Review*, where he argues that China's political-economic system is based on the need to maximize economic growth, employment, and consumerism to an even greater extent than in the West. These forces, he claims, run diametrically counter to the vision of an ecological civilisation. There are compelling arguments for why this makes sense. Beginning in the 19th century, China suffered more than a century of humiliation and brutal exploitation from Western

as a result of its relative military and industrial weakness.

After Mao Zedong's death in 1978, Deng Xiaoping transformed China's economy into a hybrid of consumer capitalism and central planning that catapulted China to its current prominence on the world stage. Astonishingly, China's GDP is more than fifty times greater than at the time of Mao's death, the result of a growth rate approaching 10% per year for four decades.

This achievement, perhaps the most dramatic economic and social transformation of all time, is bringing China back to the dominant role in global affairs that it held for most of history. Within a decade, China's GDP is expected to surpass that of the US, making it the world's largest economy. It is just in the early stages of a profusion of record-breaking industrial megaprojects of a scale that boggles the mind. It plans to extend its influence further through its Belt and Road Initiative, a vast infrastructure and trading project encompassing sixty countries in Europe, Asia, and Africa, envisaged as a 21st century version of the famed Silk Road. This industrial avalanche comes, however, at great cost to China's—and the world's—environmental wellbeing. China is by far the world's largest consumer of energy, using over half the world's coal, a third of the world's oil, and 60% of the world's cement. Astonishingly, China poured more cement in three years from 2011 to 2013 than the US used during the entire twentieth century! China is also the world's largest consumer of lumber, as Smith describes, “levelling forests from Siberia to Southeast Asia, New Guinea, Congo, and Madagascar.” These are just some of the forces that draw Smith to the conclusion that Xi Jinping's vision of an ecological civilization is untenable. “The hyper industrialization required,” he writes, “to realize this China Dream of great power status

compels him... to let the polluters pollute, pump China's CO2 emissions off the chart, and thereby bring on the ecological collapse not just of China but the whole planet... Xi Jinping can create an ecological civilization or he can build a rich superpower. He can't do both.”

Intimately placed between heaven and earth

Or can he? That is a crucial question with ramifications for all of humanity. While it is clear that future economic growth at anything close to China's historic rate is untenable, there is a more nuanced question that poses the possibility of a sustainable way forward for both China and the world. Once China has regained its status as a leading world power, can it achieve yet another transformation and redirect its impressive vitality into growing a life of quality for its people, rather than continued consumerism? Is it possible that Xi Jinping is sowing the seeds of this future metamorphosis with his vision of an ecological civilization?

There is urgent awareness among thought leaders around the world that continued growth in global GDP is leading civilisation to the point of collapse. Movements are emerging that call for “degrowth” and other approaches to a steady-state economy that could allow a sustainable future for humanity. But how can we break the death-grip of a global system built on continually feeding the growth frenzy of gigantic transnational corporations voraciously seeking a never-ending increase in profits to satisfy their shareholders? Along with the grassroots citizen movements emerging around the world, is it possible that China could pioneer a new path of sustainability, steering its citizens back to the traditional values that characterized its culture over millennia?

Even if China could achieve this redirection, the continuous human rights abuses of its authoritarian govern-

ment raise further questions. An ecological civilization—as envisaged by Korten and many others in the environmental movement—seems inconsistent with a centralized bureaucracy forcing its rules on citizens through coercion and repression. For China to genuinely move in this direction, Xi would need to be prepared to devolve decision-making authority and freedoms back to the Chinese people. It's a tall order, but not necessarily inconceivable.

For those living in the West, it would take a tremendous dose of cultural humility to accept philosophical leadership from China on the path to a flourishing future for humanity. But, if we are to get to that future, we must recognize the structural underpinnings of Western thought that brought us to this imbalance in the first place. A thousand years ago, Chinese philosopher Zhang Zai expressed a realization of connectedness with the universe in an essay called the Western Inscription, which begins with these words:

Heaven is my father and earth is my mother, and I, a small child, find myself placed intimately between them.

What fills the universe I regard as my body; what directs the universe I regard as my nature.

All people are my brothers and sisters; all things are my companions.

Is it possible that this deep recognition of human interconnectedness, rooted in traditional Chinese culture, could form the philosophical basis for a future ecological civilization? The answer to this question may ultimately affect the future wellbeing, not just of China, but of the entire human family.

Jeremy Lent is author of [The Patterning Instinct: A Cultural History of Humanity's Search for Meaning](#), which investigates how different cultures have made sense of the universe and how their underlying values have changed the course of history. He is founder of the nonprofit [Liology Institute](#), dedicated to fostering a sustainable worldview.

From p 11 International Monetary Fund, which would put Venezuela in debt to western bankers and under their control, and to privatize the Venezuelan oil industry, which would rob Venezuela of the funds being used to lift up the poor and working

class. The appointment by Mike Pompeo of Elliott Abrams as the person in charge of overseeing operations “to restore democracy in Venezuela” is an ominous sign. While Sanders got all the facts wrong about Venezuela, he did reach the right conclusion: “The

United States has a long history of inappropriately intervening in Latin American countries. We must not go down that road again.” *Kevin Zeese and Margaret Flowers are directors of Popular Resistance.*

From Countercurrents

YEMEN'S DESCENT INTO HELL A SAUDI-AMERICAN WAR OF TERROR

Rajan Menon

For years now, a relentless Saudi air campaign has hit endless civilian targets, using American smart bombs and missiles, without a peep of protest from Washington. Only a highly publicized, completely over-the-top slaughter recently forced the Pentagon to do a little mild finger wagging. On August 7th, an airstrike hit a school bus in northern Yemen, killing 51 people, 40 of them schoolchildren. Seventy-nine others were wounded, including 56 children. Soon after, a U.N. Security Council-appointed group of experts issued a report detailing numerous other attacks on Yemeni civilians, including people attending weddings and funerals. Perhaps the worst killed 137 people and wounded 695 others at a funeral in Sana'a, Yemen's capital, last April.

The attack on those schoolchildren and the U.N. report amplified a growing global outcry. In response, on August 28th, Secretary of Defence James Mattis let it be known that the Trump administration's support for the Persian Gulf potentates' military campaign should not be considered unreserved, that the Saudis and their allies must do "everything humanly possible to avoid any innocent loss of life." Considering that they haven't come close to meeting such a standard since the war started nearly five years ago and that the Trump administration clearly has no intention of reducing its support for the Saudis or their war, Mattis's new yardstick amounted to a cruel joke.

The Statistics of Suffering

By April 2018, the Saudi-led coalition had conducted 17,243 airstrikes across Yemen, hitting 386 farms, 212 schools, 183 markets, and 44 mosques. Saudi Arabia and its partners have accused the Houthis, the rebels with whom they have been in such a deadly struggle, of attacking Yemeni civilians, a charge Human Rights Watch has validated. Such a defence hardly excuses the relentless bombing of non-military sites by a coalition that has overwhelming superiority in firepower. Then naval block-

ade of the country by Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates cut the number of ships docking in the Houthi-controlled port of Hodeida from 129 between January and August 2014 to 21 in the same months of 2017. The result: far less food and medicine entered the country, creating a disaster for Yemenis.

That country, the Arab world's poorest, relies on imports of 85 % its food, fuel, and medicine, so prices soared, famine spread, hunger and malnutrition skyrocketed. Nearly 18 million Yemenis, 80% of the population, rely on emergency food aid to survive. According to the World Bank, "8.4 million more are on the brink of famine." In December 2017, following bad publicity, the Saudi-Emirati blockade was eased marginally but it had already set in motion a spiral of death.

The blockade contributed to a cholera epidemic, which the shortage of medicines exacerbated. According to a World Health Organisation report between April 2017 and July 2018, there were more than 1.1 million cholera cases there. At least 2,310 people died from the disease, most of them children. *The prime contributors are: drinking water contaminated by rotting garbage devastated sewage systems, and water filtration plants that stopped running due to lack of fuel -- all the result of the horrendous bombing campaign.*

Wartime economic blockades starve and sicken civilians and soldiers alike and so amount to a war crime. The Saudi-Emirati claim that the blockade's sole purpose is to stanch the flow of Iranian arms to the Houthis is nonsense. Choking off Yemen's imports was a disproportionate response, and clairvoyance wasn't required to foresee the calamitous consequences to follow.

President Trump's U.N. ambassador, Nikki Haley, echoed Saudi charges that the Houthi missiles were Iranian-supplied Quiam-1s and condemned that country's interference in Yemen. Given the scale of destruction by a foreign coalition using arma-

ments and technical assistance provided by the United States (and Britain), her comments, in less grim circumstances, would have been laughable.

Those American-supplied weapons have included cluster munitions, which pose a particular hazard to civilians. Their devastating bomblets often disperse over enormous areas. In May 2016, the Obama White House confirmed that it had stopped sending such weapons to Saudi Arabia, which then continued to use Brazilian made variants. However, other American arms have continued to flow to Saudi Arabia, while its warplanes rely on U.S. Air Force tankers. The Saudi military has received regular intelligence information and targeting advice from the Pentagon since the war began. And with the advent of Donald Trump, military involvement has deepened: U.S. Special Operations forces are now on the Saudi-Yemen border, helping to find and attack Houthi redoubts.

In June 2018, ignoring U.S. opposition, the Saudi coalition heightened the risk to Yemeni civilians by launching an offensive to capture the port of Hodeida. Saudi and Emirati airpower and warships supported Emirati and Sudanese troops on the ground joined by allied Yemeni militias. The advance, however, quickly stalled in the face of Houthi resistance, after at least 50,000 families had fled Hodeida and basic services for the remaining 350,000 were disrupted, creating fears of a new outbreak of cholera.

The Roots of War

Yemen's progression to its present state began as the Arab Spring swept through the Middle East in 2011. Street demonstrations grew against Yemen's strongman, Ali Abdullah Saleh, and gathered strength as he attempted to quell them. In response, he allied more strongly with Saudi Arabia and the United States, alienating the Houthis, whose main bastion, the governorate of Saada, abuts the Saudi border. Adherents of Zaydi Islam, the Houthis played a pivotal

role in creating a political movement, Ansar Allah, in 1992 to assert the interests of their community against the country's Sunni majority. In an effort to undercut them, the Saudis have long promoted radical Sunni religious leaders in Yemen's north, while intermittently raiding Houthi territories.

As a Houthi rebellion began, Saleh tried to make himself an indispensable ally of Washington in its post-9/11 anti-terrorist campaigns. He joined the Saudis in painting the Houthis little more than tools of an Iran that Washington and Riyadh loathed. When those powers came to see the Yemeni autocrat as a political liability, they helped oust him and transfer power to his deputy, Abdu Rabbu Mansour Hadi. Such moves failed to calm the waters, as the country started to disintegrate and Saudi-U.S. efforts to consolidate the transition from Saleh to Hadi unravelled.

Meanwhile, regular American drone strikes against AQAP angered many Yemenis. In their eyes, not only did the attacks violate Yemen's sovereignty, they killed civilians. Hadi's praise for the drone campaign only discredited him further. AQAP's power continued to grow, resentment in southern Yemen rose, and criminal gangs and warlords began to operate with impunity in its cities, highlighting the Hadi government's ineffectuality. Neoliberal economic reforms further enriched a clutch of families that had long controlled much of Yemen's wealth, while the economic plight of most Yemenis worsened. The unemployment rate was nearly 14% on 2017 (25% for young people), while the poverty rate and inflation rose precipitously. When Hadi proposed a plan to create a federal system for Yemen, the Houthis were infuriated. New boundaries would, have cut their homeland off from the Red Sea coast. So they gave up on his government and girded for battle. Soon, their forces were advancing southward. In September 2014, they captured the capital, Sana'a, and proclaimed a new national government. The following March, they occupied Aden in southern Yemen and Hadi, whose government had moved there, fled across the border to Riyadh. The first Saudi air-strikes against Sana'a were launched in

March 2015 and Yemen's descent to hell began.

The American Role

The commonplace rendition of the war in Yemen pits a U.S.-backed Saudi coalition against the Houthis, cast as agents of Iran and evidence of its increasing influence in the Middle East. Combating terrorism and countering Iran became the basis for Washington's support of the Saudi-led war. Predictably, inconvenient facts were shunted aside.

It's worth considering some of those facts. There are significant differences between the Houthis' Zaydi variant of Shia Islam and the Twelver Shiism dominant in Iran which makes the ubiquitous claims about a Iran-Houthi faith-based pact shaky. Iran did not jump into the fray during the violent 2004-2010 clashes between Saleh and the Houthis and did not have longstanding ties to them. Contrary to the prevailing view in Washington, Iran is unlikely to be their main source of weaponry and support. Sheer distance and the Saudi coalition's naval blockade have made it next to impossible for Iran to supply arms to the Houthis. The Houthis do not lack for weaponry having pillaged various military bases during their march toward Aden. Iran's influence in Yemen has undoubtedly increased since 2015, but reducing the intricacies of that country's internal crisis to Iranian meddling and a Tehran-led Shiite bloc amounts to a massive oversimplification.

The obsession of Trump and his key advisers with Iran and The Donald's obsession with plugging American arms makers and hawking their wares helps explain their embrace of the House of Saud and continuing support for its never-ending assault on Yemen. None of that, however, explains the full-scale American backing for the Saudi-led intervention there in the Obama years. Even as his administration denounced Bashar al-Assad's slaughter of Syrian civilians, his officials seemed unmoved by the suffering war was inflicting on Yemenis. The Obama administration offered a \$115 billion worth of weaponry to Riyadh, including a \$1.15 billion package finalised in August 2016, when the scale of

Yemen's catastrophe was already obvious.

In recent years, opposition to the war in Congress has been on the rise, with Senator Bernie Sanders and Representative Ro Khanna playing prominent roles in mobilising it. But such congressional critics had no effect on Obama's war policy and are unlikely to sway Trump's. The mainstream narrative on the war remains powerful, while the Gulf monarchies continue to buy vast quantities of American weaponry.

That is the context for the Pentagon's gentle warning about the limits of U.S. support for the bombing campaign in Yemen and Secretary of State Mike Pompeo's subsequent certification, as required by Congress, that the Saudis and Emiratis were taking perfectly credible action to lower civilian casualties -- without which the U.S. military could not continue refuelling their planes. As the fifth anniversary of this appalling war approaches, American-made arms and logistical aid remain essential to it. Consider President Trump's much-ballyhooed arms sales to the Saudis, even if they don't total \$110 billion. Why then would the Saudi and Emirati monarchs worry that the White House might actually do something like cutting off those lucrative sales or terminating the back-end support for their bombing campaign?

One thing is obvious: U.S. policy in Yemen won't achieve its declared goals of defeating terrorism and rolling back Iran. After all, its drone strikes began there in 2002 under George W. Bush. Under Obama, as in Pakistan and in Afghanistan, drones became Washington's anti-terrorist weapon of choice. There were 154 drone strikes in Yemen during the Obama years according to the most reliable high-end estimates, and civilian casualties ranged between 83 and 101. Under Trump they soared quickly, from 21 in 2016 to 131 in 2017.

The reliance on drone attacks has bolstered al-Qaeda's narrative that the American war on terror amounts to a war on Muslims, whose lives are deemed expendable. And so many years later, in the chaos of Yemen, the group's power and reach is growing. The U.S.-backed, Saudi-led interven-

intervention is also likely to prove not just self-defeating but self-prophetic. It seems to be cementing an alliance between Iran and the Houthis who, still control a big chunk of Yemen. Meanwhile, in a move that could make the war even deadlier, the Emiratis appear to be striking out on their own, supporting secession in southern Yemen. There's not much to show on the anti-terrorism front

either. Indeed, the Saudi coalition's airstrikes and U.S. drone attacks may be moving Yemenis, enraged by the destruction of their homes and livelihoods and the deaths of loved ones, toward AQAP. In short, a war on terror has turned into a war of and for terror.

In Yemen, the United States backs a grim military intervention for which -- unless you are a weapons company --

it is hard to find any justification, practical or moral. Unfortunately, it is even harder to imagine President Trump or the Pentagon reaching such a conclusion and changing course.

Rajan Menon, is the Anne and Bernard Spitzer Professor of International Relations at the Powell School, City College of New York, and Senior Research Fellow at Columbia University's Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies.

VENEZUELA: THE US—LED COUP

Kevin Leese and Margaret Flowers

28 Jan 2019 – Two things stand out about the US coup in Venezuela.

First, it is unusually open. Typically, the US tries to hide its coups.

Second, the coup is built on a series of obvious falsehoods, yet the bi-partisans in Washington, with a few exceptions, keep repeating them.

First, we will correct the falsehoods so readers are all working from the same facts. Second, we will describe how this coup is being defeated. It will be another major embarrassment for the Trump administration and US foreign policy.

It is important to understand: Venezuela has become a global political conflict as Russia and China are closely allied with Venezuela. China and Russia coming into the backyard of the United States challenges the antiquated Monroe Doctrine

Venezuela has the largest oil reserves in the world and the second largest gold reserves, as well as diamonds and other minerals such as coltan (needed for electronic devices). Venezuela is taking over as president of OPEC and will be in a position to push for oil payments in non-dollar currencies or in crypto currencies, a major threat to the US dollar.

Correcting the Record

There are a series of false statements repeated by DC officials and corporate media to justify the coup that are so obvious, it is hard to believe they are not intentional. In his two-paragraph comment on the coup, even Senator Bernie Sanders repeated them

Truth: President Nicolás Maduro is the legitimate president.

President Maduro was re-elected on

May 20, 2018, in response to the opposition demanding an early election. The legitimacy of the election of Maduro is so evident that it must be assumed those who say he is illegitimate are either intentionally false or ignorant. The election was scheduled consistent with the Venezuelan Constitution and in consultation with opposition parties. When it became evident that the opposition could not win the election, they decided, under pressure from the United States, to boycott the election in order to undermine its legitimacy. The facts are: 9,389,056 people voted, 46% of eligible voters. Sixteen parties participated in the election with six candidates competing for the presidency.

The electoral process was observed by more than 150 election observers. This included 14 electoral commissions from eight countries among them the Council of Electoral Experts of Latin America; two technical electoral missions; and 18 journalists from different parts of the world, among others. According to international observers, "the elections were very transparent and complied with international parameters and national legislation."

Venezuela has one of the best electoral systems in the world. Voter fraud is not possible as identification and fingerprints are required for each voter. Voting machines are audited before and immediately after the election. Venezuela does something no other country in the world does — a public citizen's audit of a random sample of 53% of voting machines that is televised. All 18 parties signed the audits.

Maduro won by a wide margin, obtaining 6,248,864 votes, 67.84%; followed by Henri Falcón with 1,927,958, 20.93%; Javier Bertucci with 1,015,895, 10.82%; and Reinaldo Quijada, who obtained 36,246 votes, 0.39% of the total.

This same voting system has been used in elections that Maduro's party has lost in governor's and legislative elections. Venezuela is a real democracy with transparent elections. The United States could learn a good deal about real democracy from Venezuela.

Truth: The economic crisis is caused by outside intervention, internal sabotage and the decline in oil prices.

There is no doubt the economic situation in Venezuela is dire. The cause is the economic war conducted by the United States, the major decline in oil prices and economic sabotage by the opposition. In essence, the United States and opposition created problems in the Venezuelan economy and now say Maduro must be replaced because of problems they created.

Oil was discovered in Venezuela in the early part of the 20th Century and has dominated the economy since then. The Dutch Disease the negative impact of an economy based on one natural resource, causes a sharp inflow of foreign currency, which raises the value of the country's currency, making the country's other products less price competitive. It is cheaper to import products rather than create them. This makes it more difficult for segments of the economy like agriculture and manufacturing to develop. Chavez/Maduro sought to diversify the economy. They put in place

thousands of communes and hundreds of thousands of people working in cooperatives to build agriculture and manufacturing. When the global price of oil was cut by more than half, it collapsed Venezuela's public finances undermining these efforts. The economic war by the US made it difficult for Venezuela to borrow and trade with some countries.

Economic sanctions against Venezuela began under President Obama, and the Trump administration escalated them with financial sanctions. United States sanctions cost Venezuela some \$6 billion since August according to an October analysis. Measures against the nation's oil industry have prohibited the Venezuelan majority-owned company, CITGO, from sending profits back to Venezuela, a \$1 billion loss to the government yearly. Now, the Bank of England is refusing to return 12 million dollars in gold reserves after US officials, including Secretary of State Michael Pompeo and National Security Adviser John Bolton, lobbied them to cut Venezuela off from its overseas assets.

The US economic war and sabotage of the economy by business interests has been exposed as part of the effort to remove Maduro. by creating social unrest and lack of confidence in the government. This has included hoarding of goods, storing essentials in warehouses and selling Venezuelan goods in Colombia.

In September 2018, Venezuela pointed to a false media campaign exaggerating migration from Venezuela. They highlighted statistics from the United Nations High Commission for refugees to affirm that Venezuela has the fewest volunteer migrants in the continent. They pointed out 5.6 million Colombians have fled violence in their country and live in Venezuela. Venezuela has programs that have helped thousands of refugees to return home.

Socialism strengthens economies, as demonstrated in Portugal. Indeed, one criticism of Venezuela is that the Bolivarian Process is moving too slowly to put in place a socialist economy. There is a need for more sectors to be nationalized and put under democratic control of the people.

Truth: The opposition is violent, not the Maduro government.

Opposition protesters have been extremely violent. One tactic of the opposition was to be violent and then film the government's response to make the government look violent. When Abby Martin was confronted by opposition protesters, they told her, "Do not film anything that we do. Just film what the government does to us." She reported on the violence saying, "the vast majority has been caused by either indirect or direct violence by the opposition."

Martin reports the opposition attacked hospitals, burned down the Housing Ministry, assassinated Chavistas and attacked citizen communes such as an art commune that gave free dance and music lessons to local children. Afro-Venezuelans were burned alive. Protesters pulled drivers out of buses and torched the buses. When photos and videos of opposition violence were put on social media, Martin and her colleague, Mike Prysner, became the target of a false media campaign on social media. The opposition did all they could to prevent them from reporting the truth using hundreds of death threats and threats they would be lynched.

In 2017 *Venezuela Analysis* reported that violent opposition protests included an attack on a maternity hospital endangering the lives of more than 50 newborn babies. Another report described the opposition using snipers to shoot government officials and civilians. Opposition newspapers urged that blunt objects be used to "neutralize" pro-government protesters, resulting in serious injuries and death.

Steve Ellner also reported that violence was coming from the opposition. He pointed to attacks at grocery stores, banks, buses, and government buildings. Other commentators described specific incidents of violence by the opposition including killing people. Maduro ordered the arrest of a retired general who tweeted how to use wire to decapitate people on motorcycles, which happened, and how to attack armored vehicles with Molotov cocktails.

Documents show that violence was the opposition's strategy. They sought to "Create situations of crisis in the streets that will facilitate US intervention, as well as NATO forces, with the support of the Colombian gov-

ernment. Whenever possible, the violence should result in deaths or injuries."

The tales of government violence are rooted in lies. The government's response was Maduro calling for a peace conference describing it as "a national peace conference with all the country's political sectors ... so we Venezuelans can try to neutralize violent groups."

Truth: The National Assembly acted in violation of the law and is in contempt of court.

The National Assembly is not the only democratic body in Venezuela. Indeed, its actions since the opposition won a majority have violated the law and protected the violence of the opposition with an embarrassing amnesty bill.

On December 6, 2015, the opposition won a parliamentary majority in the Assembly. There were allegations of vote buying in Amazonas state that were investigated by the National Electoral Council, another branch of the government. The Supreme Court barred four legislators from Amazonas taking office, two from the opposition, one allied with the opposition and one from the ruling party. The National Assembly allowed three candidates to take office. The Assembly has been held in contempt of court since July 2016 and their decisions were nullified.

Before the court ruling, the Assembly passed an amazing amnesty law, which granted amnesty for crimes the opposition has committed since 1999 (Chavez' election). The law is an admission of guilt and provides a well-organized catalog of crimes including felonies, crimes committed at public rallies, terrorist acts involving explosives and firearms and undermining the economy. They essentially admitted exactly what Chavez/Maduro have claimed — crimes to overthrow the government for 17 years. Venezuela's Supreme Court ruled the amnesty law was unconstitutional. Inaccurately, the Trump administration calls the Assembly Venezuela's only remaining democratic institution.

This January, a subsidiary of the state oil company asked the Assembly to intervene claiming the president cannot make reforms to mixed public-private oil businesses without the prior approval of the National As-

sembly the Assembly to intervene claiming the president cannot make reforms to mixed public-private oil businesses without the prior approval of the National Assembly. On January 16, the court ruled that the Assembly was still in contempt of court and could not act. This is also when the Assembly elected Juan Guaidó as their president, who would later appoint himself President of Venezuela, as part of the US-led coup. Guaidó's election to head the legislature was illegal and nullified by the court.

The Assembly still exists but remains in a state of contempt of the judiciary. It can rectify the situation by removing the lawmakers accused of electoral fraud. The Assembly refuses to do so because their goal is to remove Maduro from office and they need a super-majority to do so.

A Timeline of the US Coup in Venezuela

Since August 2017, Donald Trump has been saying that military intervention against Venezuela was a distinct possibility. AP describes this as a "watershed moment" in the coup planning. They report Trump pressuring aides and Latin American countries to invade Venezuela. In September, the New York Times reported that the Trump Administration had meeting with plotters since mid-2017. The Wall Street Journal reports that Trump has long viewed Venezuela as one of his top priorities. Trump requested a briefing on Venezuela on his second day in office, talking of the immense potential of Venezuela to become a rich nation through its oil reserves. After Maduro was re-elected, administration plans began taking shape, driven in part by key members in the National Security Council and anti-Maduro advocates in Congress like extreme interventionist Senator Marco Rubio.

On November 1, John Bolton zeroed in on Latin America, calling Cuba, Nicaragua, and Venezuela a "troika of tyranny. On January 2, Bolton met with his Brazilian and Colombian counterparts to collaborate to "return Venezuela to its democratic heritage."

On January 10, Maduro was sworn in for his second term, Pompeo spoke with opposition leader Guaidó, pledging support. Canada also played a key

role, AP reports that Foreign Minister Chrystia Freeland spoke to Guaidó the night before Maduro's inauguration offering Canada's support. This was 13 days before Guaidó announced he was president of Venezuela.

On January 12, the State Department backed Guaidó's move to invoke his authority as president of the assembly, saying, "It is time to begin the orderly transition to a new government." On January 15, the National Assembly declared Maduro as illegitimate. The Trump administration worked to get allies lined up to support Guaidó. By January 18, the Venezuela Foreign Minister was describing a US coup in progress.

The night before Guaidó's announcement on January 23, Vice President Mike Pence put out a video message, encouraging Venezuelans to overthrow their government, saying, "We are with you. We stand with you, and we will stay with you" Guaidó also received a phone call from Pence the night before he appointed himself president where he pledged that the US would back Guaidó.

Guaidó declared that Maduro's government was illegitimate and he was assuming the presidency. In a well-coordinated charade, almost instantly, Trump recognized Guaidó as the country's rightful leader. To further demonstrate the preconceived, tightly coordinated and efficiently carried out the coup, US allies, among them Canada, Brazil, Argentina, Colombia, Chile, and Peru, quickly recognized the coup president.

The Trump administration is claiming that Guaidó represents the lawful government and is entitled to all Venezuelan revenues. The State Department notified the Federal Reserve that Guaidó is the agent for access to Venezuelan assets in US banks.

Nearly as quickly, Maduro drew statements of support from Russia, China, Turkey, Mexico, Cuba, Bolivia, and others. The the Venezuelan Supreme Court called for an investigation into the National Assembly and Guaidó, regarding the illegal usurpation of Executive power. The Venezuelan military announced it supported Maduro and Russia warned the US not to intervene militarily.

On January 25, the Organisation of American States which is traditionally a US tool, rejected a resolution to recognize Guaidó. Medea Benjamin of CODE PINK interrupted Mike Pompeo holding a sign that said: "a coup is not a democratic transition!" Venezuelan Foreign Minister Jorge Arreaza thanked Benjamin, saying, "With her protest, she revealed the macabre coup plan against Venezuela, we will always prevail, thank you!" Eighteen countries defeated the proposal.

At the UN Security Council Meeting on January 26, Russia's UN Ambassador Vassily Nebenzia accused the United States of attempting "to engineer a coup d'etat." He demanded to know whether the Trump administration "is ready to use military force" against Venezuela. European countries gave Venezuela eight days to hold an election, a suggestion Venezuela rejected. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo called Venezuela an "illegitimate mafia state." He accused Russia and China of trying "to prop up Maduro."

Both China and Russia have told the US not to intervene in Venezuela's internal affairs. In December, Russia sent two nuclear-capable strategic Tu-160 bombers to Venezuela along with an An-124 heavy military transport plane and an Il-76 long-haul plane. As of December, Russia has one brigade in Venezuela and was discussing sending a second military brigade to Venezuela even before the coup due to the continued threat of intervention from the United States.

China has lent over \$50 billion to Venezuela through oil-for-loan agreements over the past decade and has become a partner in the Venezuelan oil industry. In December, seven months since signing a financial business venture with China, Venezuela's oil production has doubled to 130,000 barrels per day. The takeover of Venezuela's oil would also be an attack on China. China and Venezuela signed 28 bilateral strategic cooperation agreements on September 14 in the areas of oil, mining, security, technology, finance, and health.

Demonstrating the nature of the coup president, the first acts that Guaidó took were to seek a loan from the

Continued on page 6

NOTICE BOARD

NEW SOUTH WALES

Pax Christi Meetings

We normally meet on the First Monday of each month at 6.00pm for shared meal that members bring and the meeting follows at 6.30 pm.

**Contact: Claude Mostowik
(02) 9550 3845 or 0411 450 953**

The venue: 209A Edgeware Road, Enmore.

QUEENSLAND

Pax Christi Meetings

Contact:

Pancras Jordan OP

0415 461 620

pancrasjordan@gmail.com

Pax Christi

Fundraising Film

To raise funds for Theresa Achary's pioneering work with young women and girls in India

“Everybody Knows”

by Asghar Farhadi starring Penélope Cruz and Javier Bardem

on Sunday March 17th 2019 at 4:30pm (113 minutes) at Nova Cinéma 380 Lygon Street Carlton 3053. Tickets \$18.50 from Pax Christi, P.O.Box 31, Carlton South 3053

Dalm Sunday 14 April 2019

Walk for Justice for Refugees

MELBOURNE

State Library of Victoria, 2 P.M

SYDNEY 2-4pm

Belmore Park, 191 Hay St, Haymarket

BRISBANE 2-4pm

Speakers Corner, outside Parliament House

CANBERRA 1P.M

Garema Place, Civic,

PERTH 1P.M

St George's Cathedral
38 St Georges Terrace

ANZAC DAY

24 April 11 a.m.

Service of Lament Repentance and New Hope

St. Paul's Cathedral,
Melbourne.

Preacher: Revd Professor
Mark Brett
(Whitley College)

VICTORIA

EARTH@PEACE EVENTS:

Public Forum

Earth@Peace: Impossible Dream or Necessity?

APRIL 23rd 2019 7:30-10:00pm

29 College Crescent Parkville VIC 3052

Professor Heather Eaton, Professor Conflict Studies program at Saint Paul University, Ottawa
Behrouz Boochani Kurdish-Iranian writer, detained on Manus Island

Nyadol Nyuon lawyer, community advocate, refugee from Ethiopia
Sister Patricia Fox has worked for justice in the Philippines for 27 years.

Earth@Peace

Cultural Evening

APRIL 24th 2019 6:30pm 29 College Crescent Parkville

An evening of poetry, singing, music and performance based on themes from the Earth@Peace 2019 conference.

Launch of **William Kelly's Just Art** exhibition,

I/We wish to apply for or renew membership of the International Christian Peace Movement - Pax Christi Australia.

(Membership is from January to December)

(Please tick box if you wish to receive your copy of **Disarming Times** by e-mail)

New South Wales Members please return your membership application/membership renewal to PO Box A 681 Sydney South 1235 NSW

All others: please return your membership application/membership renewal to P.O. Box 31 Carlton Sth Vic. 3053

Name..... Address.....

.....P'code.....Phone.....

Email..... Mobile.....

ENCLOSED \$..... (Single \$35; Low income \$20; Family \$45)