

IMMIGRATION | MILITARIZATION
ENVIRONMENT | GENDER



MILITARIZED ZONES: GENDER, RACE, IMMIGRATION, ENVIRONMENT

A Special Issue of *Political Environments* (PE No.10)

AMERICAN FRIENDS
SERVICE COMMITTEE



COMMITTEE ON WOMEN, POPULATION,
AND THE ENVIRONMENT



POPULATION AND
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM,
HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE

American Friends Service Committee

The American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) is a Quaker organization that includes people of various faiths who are committed to social justice, peace, and humanitarian service. Its work is based on the Religious Society of Friends' (Quaker) belief in the infinite worth of every person and faith in the power of love to overcome violence and injustice. AFSC's programs are carried out through more than 40 local and regional offices around the United States as well as in more than two dozen international locations. Immigrants' rights, peace and anti-militarism, and sustainable development are major focuses for AFSC's U.S.-based as well as international work. In all of these efforts we work in partnership with activist networks and grassroots communities. More information about AFSC programs and initiatives is available on our website, www.afsc.org.



Committee on Women, Population, and the Environment

The Committee on Women, Population and the Environment is a multiracial alliance of feminist activists, health practitioners, and scholars. We are committed to promoting the social and economic empowerment of women in a context of global peace and justice and to eliminating poverty, inequality, racism, and environmental degradation. By focusing on emerging political issues and alliances, we work to expose the human rights violations that follow from population-based analyses—such as welfare "reform," criminalization, and immigration control in the North, and increasing population control in the South—and to get political attention and grassroots action on these subjects. For more information contact CWPE, P.O. Box 16178, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA; tel. 410.889.3375; e-mail cwpe@cwpe.org, or visit our website at www.cwpe.org.



The Population and Development Program

Founded in 1986, the Population and Development Program at Hampshire College in Amherst, MA, is widely recognized as a source of progressive feminist analysis, education, and activism on population, environment, reproductive rights, women's health, and global security issues. The program publishes the *DifferenTakes* issue paper series, which brings cutting-edge feminist analysis of controversial subjects to the media, policy makers, advocacy organizations, and activists. The program challenges population control policies in the U.S. and abroad that violate women's rights, especially impacting poor women and women of color. It works for an expansive vision of reproductive rights grounded in social, economic and environmental justice. For more information contact the Population and Development Program, Hampshire College, Amherst, MA 01002; tel. 413.559.5506, e-mail popdev@hampshire.edu, or visit our website at clpp.hampshire.edu/population_and_development.htm.



MILITARIZED ZONES: GENDER, RACE, IMMIGRATION, ENVIRONMENT

A Special Issue of *Political Environments* (PE No.10)

Edited by Ryn Gluckman, Rachael Kamel, *and* Betsy Hartmann

For the Immigration, Militarism, Environment, and Gender (IMEGE) Task Force
Committee on Women, Population, and the Environment

AMERICAN FRIENDS
SERVICE COMMITTEE



COMMITTEE ON WOMEN, POPULATION,
AND THE ENVIRONMENT



POPULATION AND
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM,
HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE

Militarized Zones is a project of the Immigration, Militarism, Environment and Gender Task Force of the Committee on Women, Population, and the Environment (CWPE), with the cosponsorship and institutional support of the Population and Development Program at Hampshire College and the Nationwide Women's Program of the American Friends Service Committee.

CWPE is a project of the Tides Center.

Published in November 2003 as a special issue of *Political Environments* (PE No. 10).

Additional copies of this compilation may be downloaded free of charge from the CWPE website, www.cwpe.org, for non-commercial educational use. Reprint requests should be directed to the original copyright holders for each piece.

Designed by Jane Spencer

Cover design by Binta Jeffers

Printed in the United States of America by union labor at the American Friends Service Committee.

IMEGE Task Force (2003–2004)

Rajani Bhatia (CWPE coordinator)

Anannya Bhattacharjee (corresponding member)

Eunice Cho

Ryn Gluckman

Betsy Hartmann

Anne Hendrixson

Binta Jeffers

Rachael Kamel

Joni Seager (IMEGE task force coordinator)

Contents

- 5** Introduction
Joni Seager for the IMEGE Task Force
- 9** Ten Reasons Why Militarism Is Bad for Reproductive Freedom
Population and Development Program, Hampshire College
- 13** Ten Reasons to Oppose U.S. Militarization of Aid and Reconstruction in Iraq
Yifat Susskind, MADRE
- 17** The New War Against Immigrants: Sham Security Policy Promotes Anti-Immigrant Agenda
Eunice Hyunhye Cho, NNIRR
- 23** Human Rights and Human Security at Risk (executive summary)
National Network on Immigrant and Refugee Rights
- 27** The "Youth Bulge": Defining the Next Generation of Young Men as a Threat to the Future
Anne Hendrixson
- 31** Is Opposing the War an LGBT Issue?
American Friends Service Committee and National Youth Advocacy Coalition
- 37** "An Enhanced Supply of Babies": The Politics of Race, Gender, and Population in Israel
A Dialogue Between Rela Mazali and Rachael Kamel
- 47** Why Environmentalists Oppose War and Militarism
Environmentalists Against the War
- 49** Depleted Uranium: Questions and Answers on its Use in War
H. Patricia Hynes and Sardor Ibragimov
- 53** Gender and Militarism: An Activist's Guide

Introduction

JONI SEAGER

Joni Seager is a member of the steering committee of the Committee on Women, Population, and the Environment and a professor at the University of Vermont.

GENDER. RACE. IMMIGRATION. ENVIRONMENT. MILITARISM. These words can be shuffled and reshuffled in almost any order, in order to explore the intersections among the issues they name.

In our current global context of endless (and endlessly expanding) warfare, at home and abroad, gender, race, immigration, and the environment are all militarized zones. At the same time, militaries and militarism, like race, immigration, and the environment, are all gendered zones. And, especially in the United States and other “western” countries, gender, immigration, militarization, and immigration are all racialized zones.

For more than a decade, the Committee on Women, Population and the Environment (CWPE) has focused on the “dangerous intersections” among reproductive rights, the resurgence of population politics, and the environment. Since the mid-1990s, we have sought to weave additional issues, such as mass incarceration and the backlash against immigrants’ rights, into our efforts. In the wake of 9/11 and the U.S.-led invasion of Afghanistan and then Iraq, we have redoubled our efforts to explore the links between the rise of militarism and coercive social, economic, and law-enforcement policies around the world.

As a multiracial alliance of feminist activists, researchers, and health practitioners, CWPE is committed to promoting the social and economic empowerment of women in a context of global peace and justice. We are likewise committed to

exposing the social and economic forces that create and perpetuate poverty, inequality, racism, and environmental degradation.

By contributing to feminist analysis and activism at the intersections of militarism with the many current attacks on immigrants’ rights, queer communities, reproductive rights, and the environment, we seek to expose the workings of large structures of oppression that might otherwise remain cloaked. Time and again, we have seen how dealing with these issues in isolation results in incomplete and contradictory approaches, in which the needs and concerns of women—especially women of color and women in the developing world—are ignored, trivialized, and cast aside, while new “improved” forms of violence and coercion are upheld as beneficial to women.

Only an integrated approach, we believe, can bring us to a wholistic understanding in which racial justice, gender justice, environmental justice, economic justice, and universal human rights are understood as an indispensable foundation for a peaceful and sustainable future for our world.

Ours is a small and much-abused planet. We have so degraded and polluted the global environment that the lives and futures of millions of people around the world are at risk, along with the integrity and diversity of the natural world itself. “We,” however—as the undifferentiated mass of “humanity”—have not done so. Global environmental problems are the handiwork of very particu-

lar clusters of powerful institutions acting in particular ways—almost invariably, in gendered and racialized ways. The state of our environment is largely shaped by a handful of large institutions that include, most prominently, militaries, multinational corporations, and governments (which are often in collusion with, or indistinguishable from, militaries and multinationals).

Militaries are arguably the planet's single-largest environmental threat, wreaking havoc on a scale beyond the capacity of most other institutions. At the same time, militaries are also the most protected of environmental vandals, typically beyond the reach of law or even scrutiny. Militaries are also the most thoroughly masculinized of modern institutions, everywhere in the world. (Although these statements apply to militaries in many different national contexts, we must also note that the U.S. military is the largest in the world by far, in terms of its size, investment, and destructive capacity, amassing more firepower than any conceivable combination of opponents).

The environmental impact of militaries and their manipulation of gender (which includes their reliance on the construction of both a dominant masculinity and a dependent femininity) are not unrelated. We can see the “gendering” of militarized environmental destruction in the unceasing and willful acts of environmental aggression, disregard for environmental consequences, fascination with ever-larger and more lethal weaponry, and the certainty that militaries will be protected from scrutiny by fraternal bonds and interlocking directorates of male elites in government and industry.

At the same time that rapacious environmental destruction by militaries goes largely unchallenged, mainstream environmental policy increasingly focuses on “overpopulation” as a global threat. Mainstream journalists and public policy experts explain global crises ranging from civil war in Rwanda to deforestation in the Amazon as the result of “overpopulation.”

For many of us, the resurgence of population politics is a familiar (and ominous) reflection of the global resurgence of racialized thinking. By the 1970s and 1980s, after decades of challenges from

around the world, population control ideology had greatly diminished throughout the world scene. Its re-emergence beginning in the 1990s is, we think, one more signal of the growing “respectability” of racism in the current global climate.

Blaming population growth for global environmental problems deflects attention away from the political and economic causes of poverty and environmental degradation such as militarism, first-world consumerism, inequitable and unsustainable trade policies, profit-driven economic exploitation, corporate greed, biopiracy in the global South by industrial interests from wealthy countries, and the persistent legacies of colonialism.

The emphasis on “overpopulation” also blames women's fertility—invariably, the fertility of women of color—for global problems and conflicts. In a patriarchal system, blaming women is the easy way out. Demographically driven population policies and programs are deeply disrespectful of women, particularly women of color and their children. Such policies disempower women, treat women as objects of control, and violate the basic feminist tenets of reproductive choice and bodily integrity. An ongoing part of CWPE's efforts is to expose the people, philosophies, funding and politics behind the promotion of the rhetoric of “overpopulation.”

In the United States as well as other “western” countries, anti-immigrant movements are deeply militarized and explicitly racialized. The assault on immigrants' rights is typically thick with the rhetoric of “defending borders” or “securing the homeland.” White supremacy is never far below the surface of even the most “mainstream” anti-immigrant groups. The anti-immigrant backlash also taps into the language of population control, invoking white anxiety about the fertility of women of color.

One of the dangerous intersections CWPE has been tracking for several years is the “greening of hate”: anti-immigration activists repeatedly play the environmental card, arguing that immigration is a threat to the American environment. For nearly a decade CWPE has kept a watchful eye out for anti-immigrant racism, nativism, and eugenics emerging at the population-environment nexus. In 1998

CWPE played an integral role in the grassroots activism that led to the defeat of a measure within the Sierra Club calling for a “reduction of net immigration” as part of a “comprehensive population policy for the United States.” Sixty percent of the Club’s members voted against the anti-immigrant measure, but anti-immigrant advocates are still actively courting allies in the population control and environmental movements.

As sketched out in this brief introduction, CWPE is committed to the “intersectionality” of feminist analysis and activism—exploring the relationships among population politics, environmental racism, the anti-immigrant backlash, the prison-industrial complex, and attacks on reproductive rights, among others.

This publication is intended as a resource for activists and educators who are seeking to challenge the logic of militarism and coercion in all of these intersecting “militarized zones.” This collection of readings includes work by CWPE members and allies. We have also prepared a directory of some of the other organizations that are working on feminist, anti-racist challenges to war and militarism.

Both the articles in this collection and the directory at the end are undoubtedly incomplete. We know that our words will be neither the first nor the last on these critical subjects. Our intention is rather to contribute to this vitally important discussion as it unfolds—across movements, communities, and countries.

Additional information about CWPE and the other institutional sponsors of this collection is provided on the inside front cover.

Ten Reasons Why Militarism Is Bad for Reproductive Freedom

Released in spring 2003 as a DifferentTakes issue paper by the Population and Development Program at Hampshire College. Reprinted by permission.

LATELY, IT SEEMS WHENEVER WE NEED a reminder about why it is the U.S. should budget more national funds for the military, or take aggressive action in another small poverty-stricken country, the battle cry of equal rights for women is sounded by the most unlikely people. When U.S. soldiers invaded Afghanistan in the fall of 2001 and unseated the Taliban, they were hailed as the liberators of Afghani women. Bush has repeatedly referred to women's rights in Afghanistan and Palestine as a positive outcome of U.S. intervention in those areas as well as in Iraq. If we are to believe what we hear, militarism is the true herald of feminism. But don't let the talking heads fool you. Upon closer examination it is clear that tanks and guns are doing more damage to women than liberating them. Here are ten reasons why:

1. Military toxins damage the environment and reproductive health.

Militaries are among the worst polluters on the planet. Not only does war degrade or destroy local environments, but military bases and weapons facilities contaminate the air, soil, and water with deadly toxins. According to geographer Joni Seager, "Anywhere in the world, a military presence is virtually the single most reliable predictor of environmental damage." Military pollution has many harmful and long-lasting effects on reproductive health. In Vietnam, the herbicide Agent Orange sprayed by

the U.S. military is responsible for ongoing high rates of birth defects, miscarriages and reproductive cancers. In both the U.S. and Russia, releases of radioactive materials from nuclear weapons production and testing are associated with sterility, cancer and genetic abnormalities. Military pollution is usually shrouded in secrecy. In Memphis, TN, a military depot dumped chemical weapons in the midst of a black residential community without informing people of the health dangers. Today, women there report a high incidence of miscarriage, birth defects, kidney diseases and cancer.

2. Army bases increase prostitution.

Military bases are notorious for their contribution to prostitution, child prostitution, and the spread of HIV/AIDS. In countries where prostitution is illegal, women are counted as "special job workers" and are categorically denied protection against abuse both by their customer and their boss. At the U.S. Udon Air Force Base in Thailand, the number of "special job workers" increased from 1246 in 1966 to 6234 in 1972 during the Vietnam War. In 1991, a U.S. Navy convoy returning from the Gulf War with seven thousand soldiers made a stop at the Thai beach resort town of Pattaya. The men aboard were prepped on how to use a condom and the convoy was greeted with banners that proclaimed, "Welcome U.S. navy to the Red Parrot Sexy Life Show." Military base prostitution has led to the dev-

astating spread of HIV among prostitutes. Today, sex workers are still blamed for the spread of HIV/AIDS and sexually transmitted infections while little or no attention is given to the military's role.

3. Militarism increases violence against women.

In times of war, military-sponsored rape becomes commonplace. Rape is frequently used as a tool to further "ethnic cleansing." In Bosnia-Herzegovina, an estimated 20,000 women and girls were raped by the Serbian military in the early 1990's. The rapes were committed to terrorize the population and eliminate Muslims from the region by impregnating women and forcing them to bear Serbian children. The climate of militarism also easily gives way to domestic violence. In the summer of 2002, four wives of U.S. military officers, all stationed at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, were killed by their husbands. Three of the four officers had recently returned to the country after being deployed to Afghanistan as special operations soldiers. It is suspected that these women were victims of domestic violence long before their murder, but could not or did not choose to obtain help. This is not surprising given Cynthia Enloe's observation that, during times of war, "Soldiers' girlfriends and wives... [have] been persuaded that they are 'good citizens' if they keep silent about problems in their relationships."

4. Militarism cuts funding from social services.

War is expensive and must be funded at the cost of health care, education, and social security. In February 2002, President Bush proposed a national budget for FY 2003 that would raise defense spending by nearly 13%, the greatest increase since the Reagan Administration's Cold War era budget. Bush's proposed defense budget would reach \$451 billion by 2007, while funding to social services would be sacrificed in order to support this increase in military spending. The Bush budget relies heavily on savings from Medicaid and CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program), as well as cuts in Social Security. Budget cuts such as these put safe and accessible healthcare for low income women and older women in severe danger.

5. Militarism and military occupation restrict freedom of movement.

Restrictions on freedom of movement during wartime include curfews, roadblocks, checkpoints, and closure of geographical areas. These restrictions are enforced by the military, often with the use of force. They have a devastating effect on women, barring their access to food, work, and medical attention. The right to move freely is particularly critical for sick, injured, and pregnant women. The Israeli human rights organization, B'Tselem, has documented 35 cases of death since 2000 due to restriction of movement imposed by the Israeli military. Eighteen of those have been women and girls. Eight have been infants that died because their mothers were detained at checkpoints while in labor.

6. Militarism increases racism and anti-immigrant activity.

It is no secret that militarism fosters racial prejudice in the name of national security. From Japanese-American internment camps during World War II to the current INS detention of Middle Eastern men, war reinforces racial stereotypes and discrimination. Today, racial profiling of Arab-American, Muslim, and South Asian people is defended as necessary for homeland security. In the wake of September 11, national anti-immigrant groups strengthened their activism to severely restrict immigration into the United States. Organizations such as the Federation for American Immigration Reform, Negative Population Growth, and the Carrying Capacity Network blamed immigration for the attacks on the World Trade Center, using fear-based tactics to play upon the national panic. The sentiments of these organizations have helped lead to programs, public policy, or legislation that target women of color and immigrant women for population control. Population control has often taken the form of involuntary sterilizations, welfare family caps, and/or risky long-term contraceptives. Anti-immigration attitudes associated with militarism pose huge threats and challenges to immigrant women, particularly those seeking asylum or those fleeing domestic violence. According to Amnesty International, women seeking asylum in the U.S. (some of whom are pregnant) have report-

ed being detained without adequate food or medical care and undergoing strip searches, as well as physical, verbal, and sexual assault.

7. Militarism silences women.

During war, the first voices to be eliminated from the public sphere are those belonging to women. According to a study conducted by Fairness and Accuracy in Media, in the month following September 11, women were outnumbered by 10 to 1 on op-ed pages of the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and *USA Today*. Similarly, while Bush's 90% approval rate was consistently hailed, a poll finding that 48% of women supported limited or no military action was severely under-reported.

8. The military restricts soldiers' right to abortion.

Women in the U.S. military are unconstitutionally denied their right to choose abortion if they are faced with an unplanned pregnancy. Women serving in the armed forces are barred from obtaining an abortion on a military base, even if they are able to pay for the procedure with their own money. In June 2002, the Senate voted 52–40 to lift this ban. However, the House of Representatives opposes this measure, and prevented it from being included in the FY 2003 National Defense Authorization Act. As a result, women who are stationed in countries where abortion is illegal or inaccessible are still forced to carry their pregnancy to term whether or not they want to do so.

9. Militarism encourages a climate hostile to choice.

Militarism shifts the nation's priorities toward increased support for military and defense programs. This undercuts issues like gender equity and reproductive choice, thus discouraging citizens from considering such social concerns when voting. Candidates with the staunchest support for war are usually the most adamantly opposed to reproductive freedom; hence, anti-choice politicians win wartime elections and continually draft and introduce anti-choice legislation. Under the Bush Administration and the Republican-controlled House, several anti-choice, anti-child initiatives have passed in the House including the Child

Custody Protection Act, the Abortion Non-Discrimination Act, and the Unborn Victims of Violence Act (for more information on this legislation visit www.crlp.org). President Bush has also consistently supported judges who are opposed to reproductive freedom.

10. War kills people.

It is impossible to deny that war kills innocent people. Civilian casualties occur, no matter how "smart" the bombs or how much peanut butter is dropped from the sky. In Afghanistan, among other things, the U.S. bombed a Red Cross building, a U.N. building, and a wedding. The first Gulf War, though hailed as a war with so few casualties that the first Bush Administration described it as "surgical," resulted in the destruction of all Iraqi irrigation systems, 52 health centers, 28 hospitals, 56 mosques, and over 600 schools. Due to the extensive damage to water and sewer systems, more than 250,000 people (most of them children under the age of five) died within a few months. Even after the Gulf War, the U.S. led the United Nations in imposing sanctions on Iraq. The International Action Center estimates that, as a result, 1.5 million Iraqi people have died, over half of them children under the age of five. Why, one might ask, is this amount of death and destruction considered "very clean" and continually justified? Furthermore, why are these atrocities committed by U.S. leaders who claim to be "pro-life"?

Prepared by the Population and Development Program at Hampshire College. This article and a poster based on this publication are available from the Population and Development Program. Please contact the program at 413.559.5506, rgluckman@hampshire.edu, <http://hamp.hampshire.edu/~clpp/popdev.html>.

References

- #1. Joni Seager, "Patriarchal Vandalism: Militaries and the Environment," in Jael Silliman and Ynestra King, eds., *Dangerous Intersections*, Boston: South End Press, 1999.
Nancy Lee Peluso and Michael Watts, eds., *Violent Environments*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001.
Military Toxics Project and Environmental Health Coalition, *Defend Our Health: A People's Report to Congress*, 2001, accessed at <http://www.milttoxproj.org/magnacarta/DefendOurHealthReport.html>.
- #2. Cynthia Enloe. *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000.
- #3. Angela Robson, "Rape: Weapon of War." *New Internationalist*. Issue 244 (1993).

Associated Press, "Military Murders: Series of Slayings Shakes Fort Bragg Community." *Crime and Justice*, <http://pub86.ezboard.com/fcrimeandjustice13552frm51.showMessage?topicID=75.topic>

Cynthia Enloe, "Sneak Attack: The militarization of U.S. culture." *Ms.*, December 2001/January 2002: 15.

- #4. "Bush Unveils 'War' Budget." *BBC News*. 4 February 2002. Accessed at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/1798732.stm>.
- #5. B'Tselem. www.btselem.org
- #6. Azi Shariatmadar, "Anti-Immigrant Alert!" *Political Environments*. Issue 9 (2002): 8-9.
Amnesty International. www.amnesty.org
- #7. Jennifer Pozner. "Casualty of War: The U.S. Press Corps wimps out." *Ms.* December 2001/January 2002: 33-34.
- #8. National Organization for Women, www.now.org/news/goodnews.html#_abortion
Center for Reproductive Law and Policy, www.crlp.org/hill_military.html
- #9. Center for Reproductive Law and Policy. www.crlp.org
- #10. Barbara Kingsolver "Jabberwocky." *High Tide in Tucson*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1995.
International Action Center. www.iac.org/iraq.htm

Ten Reasons to Oppose U.S. Militarization of Aid and Reconstruction in Iraq

YIFAT SUSSKIND, MADRE

Yifat Susskind is the associate director of MADRE. Released in spring 2003 on www.madre.org; reprinted by permission.

“We will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free.”

—George Bush, televised address, 3/17/03.

NOW THAT BUSH'S ILLEGAL INVASION has given way to illegal occupation, how should we understand his promise to the Iraqi people? The United States insists on exercising direct military control over the administration of humanitarian aid and reconstruction in Iraq. We believe these processes should be handled by independent agencies of the United Nations. Here are ten reasons why:

1. **When aid is linked to military force, food and water are turned into weapons.**
 - Every person has an unconditional right to food, water and medicine. Meeting basic human needs should not be exploited as a means to a political end.
 - Leveraging control over the resources that people require to survive gives the military coercive power to demand people's allegiance and cooperation.

2. **The militarization of aid contradicts the basic principles of humanitarian assistance: impartiality and neutrality.¹**
 - For this reason, aid organizations such as Oxfam have refused to work under the control of the U.S. military. Aid agencies fear that their staff—in Iraq and elsewhere—would be endangered by an association with the U.S. attack.
 - Invading troops are hardly neutral or impartial. They are psychologically primed to kill people and destroy infrastructure, making them poor candidates for humanitarian roles.
3. **The military lacks the training and experience to distribute aid properly.**
 - The result has been utter chaos: soldiers firing handguns into the air to keep order at distribution points, randomly throwing aid boxes off trucks into crowds and standing by while Iraqis fight each other with fists and knives to get at food packages.
 - These conditions violate the dignity of aid recipients. When people are pitted against each other in competition for scarce resources, their capacity to pull together to survive the crisis at hand is undermined and their dependence on the invading army is reinforced.

- Aid distribution requires expertise. For example, in late March, Oxfam reported that soldiers had handed out powdered milk without proper instructions. For children, ingesting milk powder that has not been properly mixed with water can result in diarrhea or even death.
4. Militarization of aid threatens women and their children.
- As we saw from the television images of men shoving aside women to grab food packages, bungled aid distribution gets aid to those who are most powerful, not those who are most in need.
 - Women are disproportionately harmed when aid is distributed inequitably, first because they make up a larger sector of the poor, and secondly, because women are responsible for meeting the needs of the vast majority of the population, including those made most vulnerable by war (children and those who are sick, elderly, disabled and injured).
 - Unlike the U.S. military, international relief agencies have learned that because women are usually the ones who grow, sell, procure and prepare food and who distribute food within families and communities, the best way to ensure that aid gets to those most in need is to involve community women in distribution.
 - When men control food aid, they are more likely to exchange food for cash or liquor or use it to demand sex from women and children.²
 - During the bombing, the U.S. army distributed desperately needed drinking water to a few enterprising Iraqi men with trucks, who were then permitted to sell the water to thirsty families in one of Iraq's poorest areas. Some U.S. press touted this decision as way to "jump start" a market economy in Iraq.
5. Humanitarian aid should be directed to meet the basic needs of Iraqis, not the propaganda needs of the U.S. military.
- Army spokespeople have stated bluntly that aid delivery is intended to make Iraqis view U.S.

- soldiers as liberators rather than occupiers.
- That aid distribution is primarily a public relations exercise became clear early on. There are 24 million people in Iraq. Yet, U.S. soldiers came provisioned with enough food aid to sustain only two million people for a day and a half.
 - The UN World Food Program, meanwhile, was prepared to provide food for the entire Iraqi population for four months. But its operations were suspended for more than a month because the U.S. military arbitrarily barred aid workers from entering Iraq.
6. Emergency relief is the first stage of reconstruction.
- Administering humanitarian aid and reconstruction is never a neutral process. These undertakings generate resources, jobs, training opportunities, the creation of new hierarchies and access to government, media and financial resources. Such opportunities empower those who are involved in reconstruction. Therefore, who controls and participates in aid and reconstruction efforts has far-reaching implications for Iraq.
 - The United States is maintaining tight military control of aid and reconstruction through the Pentagon's Office of Reconstruction and Humanitarian Assistance (ORHA). Under this plan, the UN and private relief agencies are being subordinated to the U.S. military.
 - Unlike the ORHA, UN agencies such as UNICEF and the World Food Program are independent agencies whose mandate is not tied to the political agenda of the Bush Administration, but to principles of humanitarianism. These agencies are more likely to work in partnership with Iraqi civil society groups that can be encouraged to promote women's leadership, prioritize the needs of people within the community and leave skills and resources in the hands of local organizations when the reconstruction process is ended.

7. The United States is “reconstructing” Iraq in ways that will benefit U.S.-based corporations and endanger the majority of Iraqis.

- As a product of an illegal invasion waged without authorization from the UN Security Council, the U.S. occupation of Iraq is also illegal. Therefore, the United States should not be allowed to claim any power to determine economic, political or social arrangements in Iraq.
 - Yet, without consulting any representative Iraqi body, the United States is auctioning off Iraq’s nationally-owned assets to U.S. corporations. Iraq’s oil, utility companies, air and sea ports and other enterprises will generate tremendous profits for U.S. companies who are not likely to reinvest profits to meet the basic needs of Iraqi women and families.
 - The overhaul of Iraq’s educational, health care and banking system will be paid for by U.S. taxpayers, but the profits will go to private companies.
 - While Iraqis suffered extreme political repression under Saddam Hussein, his government used oil revenues to ensure relatively high levels of public health, education, housing, employment and other social services. As in the United States, these social and economic rights will not be protected in “free Iraq.”
- 8. U.S. control of reconstruction encourages war profiteering and unscrupulous conflicts of interest.**
- The destruction of Iraq means big bucks for U.S. corporations who are being hired—to the tune of \$100 billion in government contracts—to rebuild the roads, government buildings, water systems, bridges and other infrastructure destroyed by the United States. The contracts are blatant examples of kick-backs and conflicts of interest.
 - Even before the war began, the Administration secretly invited six U.S. companies to bid on reconstruction contracts. These companies have a history of making large campaign contributions to the Republican Party.⁴

Liberation or Starvation?

- A January 2003 UN planning report (<http://www.casi.org.uk/info/undocs/internal.html>) warned that a U.S. invasion could lead to the death by starvation of 30% of Iraq’s children as a result of the disruption of government food aid delivery and the destruction of water and electricity systems. Bush launched this war knowing that 1.25 million children might starve as a result of the attack.
- U.S. concern about the welfare of Iraqis is extremely suspect. If not for 12 years of U.S.-led sanctions and bombings, Iraqis would not be in need of humanitarian assistance in the first place.³
- As of July 2002, the United States was using its seat on the UN Security Council to block \$5.4 billion worth of humanitarian supplies from reaching Iraqis. The items, which Iraq had paid for and the Security Council had approved, included ingredients for child vaccines, plasma bags and replacement parts for water treatment facilities.

-
- Many of the same individuals who lobbied aggressively for the war have ties to the companies who are now profiting from rebuilding Iraq. For example, Dick Cheney is paid \$1 million a year in “deferred retirement” by Halliburton, which was hired to fight oil-well fires in Iraq. Former Secretary of State George Shultz, who heads the advisory board of the virulently pro-war Committee for the Liberation of Iraq, is also on the board of directors of the Bechtel Group, which won the first major contract to repair transportation, power, water and sewage systems in Iraq.⁵

9. The United States is trying to shirk its responsibility to pay for aid and reconstruction in Iraq.

- The Bush Administration has trumpeted its provision of some limited aid, but refuses to acknowledge that under the Geneva Convention, it has an obligation to provide for the full humanitarian needs of the entire Iraqi population and for post-war reconstruction.⁶
- The United States has pressured the UN to release funds from its Oil-for-Food Program to

pay for reconstruction. But the oil-for-food money belongs to the Iraqi people and should only be released to a new Iraqi government.⁷

10. Only the United Nations has the legitimate authority to provide governance and administer the rebuilding of Iraq.

- Yet, the United States is determined to rule Iraq through military force. As Secretary of State Powell has said, “we didn’t take on this huge burden with our coalition partners not to be able to have significant, dominating control over how it unfolds in the future.”⁸
- The United States has arbitrarily claimed the right to dictate the role of the United Nations in Iraq. According to Powell, “what we have to work out is how the UN role will be used to provide some level of endorsement for our actions.”⁹
- If the Bush Administration succeeds in relegating the UN to the role of a subcontractor for the U.S. military, the system of international cooperation will be further eroded, leaving the world even more prone to eruptions of violence and lawlessness.

MADRE Calls For:

- An immediate end to the U.S. occupation of Iraq;
- U.S. recognition of its obligation to fund Iraq’s humanitarian operations and honor UN leadership in administering aid and reconstruction efforts and interim governance in Iraq;
- Representation of women’s voices and priorities in a UN-led reconstruction process in accordance with UN Resolution 1325;¹⁰
- Costs of Iraq’s reconstruction to be covered neither by the Iraqi people nor U.S. taxpayers, but by a 50% Excess Profit/Windfall for War tax on contracts offered to U.S. corporations.¹¹

Notes

- ¹ In Afghanistan in 2001, the United States gave food to loyal warlords to distribute and left other people to starve. This kind of partisanship could lead abusive governments to block humanitarian aid, for fear that it would be used against them.
- ² In 2002, the United Nations discovered that male aid workers were using control of food aid to sexually exploit women and children in three refugee camps in West Africa. A UN investigation found that such abuse is common during humanitarian crises around the world.
- ³ U.S. policies have caused widespread poverty, malnutrition and disease, leaving 60% of Iraqis dependent on a government aid program that has now been destroyed by the U.S. bombing.
- ⁴ For more information on these companies and their ties to members of the Administration, see “Reconstructing Iraq—the Contractors” at http://www.opensecrets.org/news/rebuilding_iraq/index.asp.
- ⁵ In fact, a recent study by the Center for Public Integrity reveals that at least nine members of the Pentagon’s Defense Policy Board, a non-elected group that plays a key role in determining foreign policy, have ties to corporations that won more than \$76 billion in defense contracts in the past two years (www.publicintegrity.org).
- ⁶ Article 55 of the 4th Geneva Convention and Article 69 of the First Protocol.
- ⁷ Security Council Resolution 986 (known as “oil-for-food”) allows for the monitored sale of Iraqi oil to purchase food and other essential humanitarian supplies. The resolution was implemented in an effort to assuage the humanitarian disaster caused by the imposition of sanctions.
- ⁸ Congressional Testimony. March 26, 2003.
- ⁹ “Powell Briefs Press on Iraq, Turkey en route to Ankara.” U.S. Department of State Official Text. April 1, 2003.
- ¹⁰ Security Council Resolution 1325 recognizes that women are disproportionately impacted by war and calls for women’s involvement in conflict-resolution and peace-building.
- ¹¹ As called for in “Who Rules The Peace?” by Phyllis Bennis. April 4, 2003.

The New War Against Immigrants: *Sham Security Policy Promotes Anti-Immigrant Agenda*

EUNICE HYUNHYE CHO

Eunice Hyunhye Cho coordinates the BRIDGE Project, a popular education initiative focusing on immigration, race, and globalization, at the National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights. She is a member of the steering committee of the Committee on Women, Population, and the Environment and also works with the Korea Solidarity Committee (San Francisco.)

ONLY MINUTES AFTER PLANES crashed into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, a wave of hate violence swept the country, with immigrants the main victims of “retaliation.” Since the first moments after the tragic events of September 11, 2001, immigrant and refugee communities have become the frontline victims of a new war. In the Bush Administration’s war against terrorism, immigrants and refugees have once again become “enemy aliens.” “In this new war,” declared Attorney General John Ashcroft, “our enemy’s platoons infiltrate our borders...their tactics rely on evading recognition at the border and escaping detection within the United States.”¹

In the post-September 11 era, immigrants and refugees have become the most politically expedient (and vulnerable) scapegoats for the new “war against terrorism.” Noncitizens, the majority of whom are people of color, are denied the most basic of rights in immigration proceedings, including the right to probable cause for arrest, the right to a speedy trial, and the right to a court-appointed attorney. As a result, the government has conveniently used immigration policies and practices to implement arbitrary programs of detention, registration, and surveillance.

Instead of creating a coherent policy that effectively addresses the root causes of violent conflict and human insecurity, the U.S. government has chosen to portray immigrants as a threat to “national security.” Government action has quickly and quietly implemented administrative edicts, mammoth legislation, and policies of secrecy that have stripped immigrants and refugees of their civil and human rights, endangering the safety of entire communities. Mainstream discussions of national security are framed around the fundamentally nativist distinction between “Americans” and “outsiders.” This in turn has paved the way for immigration policies and practices that deny immigrants, even those who are longtime residents or naturalized citizens, the due-process protections enjoyed by citizens. The result has been increased surveillance, detention, and harassment of immigrant communities.

As the Bush Administration has pushed its war agenda within the United States and abroad, it has simultaneously touted new immigration policies to buoy public confidence in the effectiveness of the “war against terrorism.” After Sept. 11, policy makers began to view immigration as a crucial component of national security policy, reflected in the push to transfer responsibility for immigration

from the Department of Justice to the Department of Homeland Security.

Policy makers also quickly realized the value of immigration as a component of the government's public relations strategy in its national security efforts. In order to project a tough and effective image on national security, the government embarked on a program of interrogation, round-ups, and secret detention of immigrants, portrayed as "intelligence sweeps." Law enforcement particularly targeted South Asian, Arab, and Muslim communities in the United States, fostering rampant paranoia that has reinforced racial discrimination and made racial profiling a cornerstone of immigration enforcement.

These well-publicized policies, however, have done little or nothing to increase public safety and gather intelligence about potential acts of violence. Instead, they have spread massive confusion, dislocation, and fear among immigrant and refugee communities.

Round-ups and Interrogations: The Criminalization of Immigrants

In the months following Sept. 11, the Department of Justice encouraged the public to report any "suspicious activity" that could be associated with "acts of terror," fanning the flames of fear and prejudice—and racial profiling. The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS),* in cooperation with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), subsequently rounded up, secretly detained, and denied legal counsel to more than 1,200 South Asian, Arab, and Muslim men, with many arrests coming from minor violations such as traffic stops, old warrants for petty crimes, and tips from neighbors.² In November 2001, the Department of Justice announced its policy of "voluntary interviews" with a list of 5,000 additional South Asian, Arab, and Muslim men, requiring local police offices to interrogate local immigrants about their ties to "terrorist organizations."³

By June 2002, INS announced the start of its "special registration" program, known formally as

the National Security Entry-Exit Registration System, requiring male visa-holders 16 years and older from a targeted list of countries to report to INS facilities to be fingerprinted, photographed, and interrogated about topics including their political affiliation, religious practices, and personal credit and financial accounts. A close reflection of the Bush Administration's foreign and military policy, the list consisted of Arab, South Asian, and Muslim nations, including Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan in the first round, followed by North Korea in a subsequent round. Refusal to register is a punishable by arrest and possible deportation.

The initial rounds of special registration, however, resulted in the arrest and detention of hundreds of immigrants, some of whom registered late due to lengthy lines, and many of whom had applications pending with the INS for adjustment of status to gain documents.⁴ In short, many immigrants are faced with the threat of arrest and deportation whether or not they register, often due to INS bureaucratic incompetence. The vast majority of all detainees since September 11 have been held on violation of minor immigration requirements and have been cleared of any connection to acts of violence. The handful that have been charged with connections to acts of violence have been subject to such enforcement as the use of military tribunals, secret evidence, closed hearings, and denial and monitoring of legal counsel, making the validity of the charges questionable.

Government attempts to "look tough" on national security by targeting immigrants extends well beyond round-ups of Arab, South Asian, and Muslim men, affecting immigrant and refugee communities in all walks of life across the United States. After Sept. 11, the INS began to conduct highly visible raids at high-profile public events such as the Super Bowl ("Operation Game Day") and the Salt Lake City Winter Olympics. Policies supposedly designed to increase security for air traffic specifically targeted immigrants. "Operation Tarmac," a nationwide initiative, conducted raids against immigrant workers at airport facilities. In Nov. 2002, the Aviation and Transportation Security Act mandated the replacement of over 28,000 immigrant airport screeners—about 25 percent of all screeners nationwide—with U.S. citizens, who were

* In March 2003 the former Immigration and Naturalization Service was transferred into the Dept. of Homeland Security and broken into separate "service" and "enforcement" arms.

slated to receive much higher wages. The Social Security Administration began to issue “no-match” letters to thousands of employers who reported inconsistent information regarding individual employees, resulting in the firing of tens of thousands of immigrant workers, without investigating whether inconsistencies may have been due to bureaucratic error.

Not a single charge related to acts of violence, however, has resulted from any of these law-enforcement initiatives. Instead, these policies have resulted in unemployment, detention, deportation, and despair for countless immigrant workers and their families.⁵ Such initiatives have kept national security enforcement in the headlines, assuaging public doubts when recommendations to buy plastic sheeting and duct tape do not suffice. These illusory initiatives for secure borders and immigration enforcement have served as a sham policy, ignoring the tragic costs sustained by immigrant families and communities while doing nothing at all to increase public safety for the larger community.

Recent developments have shed light on the role of immigration enforcement as image control for the government’s national security program and the extent to which racial profiling has played a role in post-9/11 immigration practice. A memo leaked to the press revealed that the FBI leadership recently issued explicit directives establishing numerical quotas for “counter-terrorism” investigations and secret wiretaps in Arab and Muslim communities, based on geographic regions with a high concentration of mosques. If numerical goals are not met by regional offices, they will be subject to inspection reviews from FBI headquarters.⁶

Critiques of these policies from inside the FBI rank them as ineffective and even counter-productive. In an open letter addressed to FBI headquarters, veteran FBI agent Colleen Rowley, who gained recognition when she testified to the agency’s inaction on intelligence gathered prior to the events of September 11, highlighted the use of immigration enforcement as a stand-in for “national security” policies. “From what I have observed, particular vigilance may be required to head off undue pressure (including subtle encouragement) to detain or

‘round up’ suspects—particularly those of Arabic origin,” she stated. “After 9/11, Headquarters encouraged more and more detentions for what seem to be essentially PR purposes. Field offices were required to report daily the number of detentions in order to supply grist for statements on our progress in fighting terrorism.”⁷

Current immigration policies and practices, however, are not unique to this new period of “national security,” but build upon xenophobic policies and practices widely present before September 11. Detention, deportation, border militarization, and immigration enforcement abuse have long been standard operating procedure for the Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS), just as anti-terrorist rhetoric has long been a staple of anti-immigrant arguments.

In 1996, Congress passed the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA) and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA). The former was spurred by fears of violence in the wake of the 1995 Oklahoma City bombing; the latter by anti-immigrant scapegoating that became widespread during the economic recession of the early 1990s, rising to national prominence through California’s anti-immigrant Proposition 187. These two pieces of legislation set much of the legal infrastructure in place for today’s policies of detention and deportation. In addition, IIRIRA expanded the government’s ability to use secret evidence in cases involving terrorism charges, which have become a key tool in targeting Arabs and Muslims. It is important to note, however, that the U.S. government has had contingency plans in place for rounding up immigrants for more than fifteen years. In 1986, the Investigations Division of the INS released an operational guide entitled “Alien Terrorists and Undesirables: A Contingency Plan,” which outlined plans for focusing counter-terrorism efforts against particular nationalities. Statistics in this document focused exclusively on immigrants from eight countries—seven Arab nations and Iran. The report also proposed a location in the southern United States as a potential internment camp.⁸

September 11, 2001: A Dream Come True for the Anti-Immigrant Right

The government's attacks on immigrant and refugee communities are a direct result of its need to present a public scapegoat to justify its national security initiatives. The source of these policies, however, reflects the increased influence held by right-wing, anti-immigrant forces in shaping policies within the Bush Administration and Congress. In the weeks following Sept. 11, organized factions of the racist, right-wing, anti-immigrant movement seized upon this unprecedented opportunity to set their agendas in motion.

A day after the attacks, on Sept. 12, 2001, the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), a right-wing, anti-immigrant group based in Washington, D.C., released a press statement before any information was available about the causes of the plane crashes the day before. "The nation's defense against terrorism has been seriously eroded by the efforts of open-border advocates, and the innocent victims of today's terrorist attacks have paid the price," the statement read. "Past experience has shown that foreign terrorists take advantage of our lax border enforcement, gaping holes in our legal immigration laws, and our political asylum process."⁹

Before the dust had begun to settle, anti-immigrant forces saw a way to draw on the shock, fear, and hysteria caused by the attacks to pass their agenda into law. By equating the Sept. 11 attacks with immigration, anti-immigrant forces found a way to cloak their long-standing agenda in the language of "national security." As a result, standard policy objectives of anti-immigrant groups such as the Federation for American Immigration Reform, Center for Immigration Studies, Americans for Immigration Control, Negative Population Growth, and Numbers USA have passed through Congress with little controversy and with astonishing speed. In addition, these groups recognize the strategic value in the national security argument, and have since formed a coalition called "United to Secure America" (USA) to lobby Congress and place advertisements in broadcast and print media, under the slogan of working for "improvements in immigration security and reductions in overall numbers."¹⁰

Anti-immigrant groups such as the membership of the "United to Secure America" coalition often try to portray themselves as respectable and mainstream organizations with a wide base of support. Many of these organizations, however, are actually spin-off organizations that often share funding, staff, and strategy. Three of these groups—the Center for Immigration Studies, FAIR, and Numbers USA—also share the same founder. As a recent report by the Southern Poverty Law Center revealed, what appears to be a broad assortment of anti-immigrant groups with large grassroots support is in fact an illusion. "The vast majority of American anti-immigration groups—more than a dozen in all—were either formed, led, or in other ways made possible" by a single individual, John Tanton. Over the past twenty-five years, Tanton and his wealthy allies have been able to bankroll many successful anti-immigrant organizations and campaigns through a subsidiary called "U.S., Inc.," including "English Only" legislation and Proposition 187, and have moved to shape anti-immigrant discourse in environmental groups such as the Sierra Club. Many of their arguments have also attempted to drive wedges between African American and immigrant communities.¹¹

While these groups purport to represent mainstream views on immigration, the leadership and membership of the anti-immigration movement suggest otherwise. Observers have noted that these anti-immigrant activists have cultivated close relationships with white-nationalist hate groups such as the Council of Conservative Citizens (CCC)—a white-nationalist group seeking to restore "Confederate values" to the United States, with ties to Jesse Helms, John Ashcroft, and Trent Lott. Groups such as FAIR and the American Immigration Reform Foundation have shared editorial positions and have published articles in white supremacist publications such as the CCC's *Citizens Informer* and the New Century Foundation's *American Renaissance Magazine*, whose editor recently warned that a "second Mexican-American war would erupt in 2003." These anti-immigrant forces also conducted Congressional visits after September 11, 2001—with a roster of extremist lobbyists including Mark Weber of the Institute for

Historical Review (which denies the Holocaust took place); former Klansman Don Black, and several members of the neo-Nazi National Alliance.¹²

Immigrant Rights and the Movement for Peace

Since September 11, the government has put into place a set of policies that anti-immigrant groups have been urging for years: increased policing, restriction, and militarization. As the Bush Administration continues its occupation of Iraq and aggressive military and economic posture toward the rest of the world, internally it promotes a nationalism based on “wartime loyalty.” This jingoistic climate heightens public fears of more “terrorist attacks,” while further emboldening those with racist, hateful agendas in the corridors of power. War and militarism shape the public perception of the “enemy,” and immigrants and refugees—the “enemy aliens” living within U.S. borders—are vulnerable to acts of hate violence that have been stimulated by the anti-immigrant climate, as well as detention and deportation for those who become caught in the government’s anti-immigrant dragnet. Meanwhile, thousands have died at the hands of U.S. military forces, and tens of thousands more have become internally displaced or international refugees as a result of U.S.-led military activity in Afghanistan and Iraq.

While the Bush administration has formally declared the “end” of war in Iraq, it has continued its military occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan and has also expanded U.S. military presence around the globe. In the U.S., the transfer of the INS into the Department of Homeland Security demonstrates the current administration’s view of immigration affairs. Proposed policies such as the CLEAR Act (Clear Law Enforcement for Criminal Alien Removal Act), which would allow all local police departments to enforce immigration law without training, and penalize local governments for not enforcing immigration laws, further threaten the human rights of immigrants and refugees. As organizers and activists for peace and justice, our fight is against war—at home here in the U.S., and at home in the entire world.

Notes

- ¹ John Ashcroft, “Attorney General Prepared Remarks on the National Security Entry-Exit Registration System,” June 6, 2002. Department of Justice transcript.
- ² Somini Sengupta and Christopher Drew, “A Nation Challenged: The Immigration Agency,” *New York Times*, November 12, 2001. For more detailed documentation of Post-September 11 detention, see Human Rights Watch, *Presumption of Guilt: Human Rights Abuses of Post-September 11 Detainees*, August 2002.
- ³ Thomas Farragher and Kevin Cullen, “Plan to Question 5,000 Raises Issue of Racial Profiling,” *Boston Globe*, November 11, 2001.
- ⁴ Hugh Son, “Pakistanis Fear INS: Registration Rule Called a Catch-22,” *New York Daily News*, February 7, 2003.
- ⁵ Michael Tackett, “Airport Net Caught Small Fry: Washington-Area Sweep Yielded No Terror-Related Charges,” *Chicago Tribune*, October 6, 2002; Sarah Tippit, “INS Detains 69 Foreigners in Super Bowl Sweep,” *Reuters*, January 25, 2003; National Immigration Law Center, *SSA “No Match Letters Packet”*, March 2002; and Fred Tsao, *Losing Ground: The Loss of Freedom, Equality, and Opportunity for America’s Immigrants Since September 11*, ICIRR, September 2002.
- ⁶ Michael Isikoff, “The FBI Says, Count the Mosques,” *Newsweek*, February 3, 2002.
- ⁷ Colleen Rowley, “Rowley Letter to FBI Director, February 26, 2003,” *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, March 6, 2003.
- ⁸ Dan Kesselbrenner and Sandy Lin, “An Immigrant’s Worst Nightmare: Facing the U.S. Legal System,” *From the Borderline to the Colorline: A Report on Anti-Immigrant Racism in the U.S.*, National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights, 2001.
- ⁹ FAIR, “Defending America Against International Terrorism Requires Better Screening of Aliens,” Press Statement, September 12, 2001.
- ¹⁰ United to Secure America, “Questions and Answers Regarding Ads Sponsored by United to Secure America,” January 15, 2002.
- ¹¹ Southern Poverty Law Center, “The Puppeteer: The Organized Anti-Immigration Movement, Increasingly in Bed with Racist Hate Groups, Is Dominated by One Man,” *Intelligence Report*, Summer 2002.
- ¹² Ibid.; Political Research Associates, *Defending Immigrant Rights*, February, 2002.

Human Rights & Human Security at Risk: *The Consequences of Placing Immigration Enforcement and Services in the Department of Homeland Security*

HEBA NIMR, CATHERINE TACTAQUIN, AND ARNOLDO GARCIA
NATIONAL NETWORK FOR IMMIGRANT AND REFUGEE RIGHTS

At the end of March 2003, the responsibility for immigration law enforcement and immigration services were transferred from the U.S. Department of Justice to the new Department of Homeland Security. In September 2003, the National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights (NNIRR) issued a report documenting the impact of this shift on immigrant communities as well as public safety.

Heba Nimr is the Soros Justice Fellow at La Raza Centro Legal in San Francisco. Catherine Tactaquin is executive director of NNIRR, and Arnolando Garcia coordinates NNIRR's Enforcement and Justice Project. Executive summary reprinted by permission; copies of the complete report are available from agarcia@nnirr.org.

Executive Summary

“Human Rights & Human Security At Risk” demonstrates that since immigration enforcement and services were placed within the new Department of Homeland Security (DHS) just six months ago, abusive and discriminatory immigration enforcement has become even more entrenched, seriously jeopardizing community safety and compromising access to services. Immigration policies and practices that have been prone to abuse and human rights violations may now be even more difficult to reform or to establish government accountability within a structure that cements immigration policies to a war against terrorism. Immigrant communities, families, and neighborhoods will likely find little or no relief from the mounting discrimination and abuse as a result of these profound changes, as DHS consolidates the management and jurisdiction of immigration matters.

The inclusion of immigration functions within DHS has expanded and deepened U.S. government

policing and incarceration powers, accelerating a dangerous trend begun more than thirty years ago. Moreover, budget priorities are being skewed away from meeting human needs and towards policing and incarceration. In effect, there will be little “human security,” including human rights, economic security, civil liberties, labor protections, health, safety, and freedom from fear, for diverse immigrant communities—for those that had been the targets of restrictive immigration policies prior to September 11 and for those that have been the particular focus of national security and anti-terrorist policies.

As the Department of Homeland Security consolidates its jurisdiction in most immigration matters, “Human Rights & Human Security At Risk” finds that:

1. Families and communities continue to be separated and devastated by stepped-up immigration policing, detentions, and deportations.

2. Access to immigration and public services, and options for legalizing immigration status, are dramatically decreasing.
3. Escalating militarization of U.S. borders and the criminalization of border communities cause more migrant deaths and human rights violations.
4. Military-style policing and criminalization of immigrant communities are expanding in the U.S. interior.
5. Government targeting of border and immigrant communities fuels hate and vigilante attacks against those same communities.
6. Federal pressure on local law enforcement to become enforcers of immigration law is exponentially widening the net of DHS' enforcement power, undermining public safety.
7. The United States' over-reliance on incarceration continues to grow.
8. The scope of the United States' police powers in controlling migrants is extending beyond its physical borders, engaging other governments in U.S.-style policing, enforcement, and detention that violate the human rights of migrants.

Key Recommendations

The report's findings suggest that policymakers need to fundamentally shift policies away from criminalizing immigrants, de-link immigration policy from national security measures, and commit to upholding human rights and providing for human needs. In particular, the National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights recommends that:

- Policymakers at all levels should recognize that racial, religious, and national origin profiling takes many forms and should adopt policies that eliminate all such targeting of immigrant communities and communities of color.
- Secret arrests, detentions, or hearings must end, and the conditions of arrests, detention, and access to legal processes and constitutionally guaranteed rights must meet standards articulated in international human rights treaties and documents.

- The DHS should immediately cease detaining and deporting refugees, asylees, and stateless persons.
- Congress should legislate routine programs of legalization that expand access to visas and permanent residency for current and future migrants.
- Local and state officials should reaffirm their refusal to ask about immigration status when providing public services and widely publicize this policy to immigrant communities and the federal government. Policy makers must include the need for "human security" and human rights as a guiding principle in developing immigration policies and laws and setting budget priorities and allocations.
- Policy makers should cease promoting more border enforcement as an "alternative" to other immigration enforcement initiatives, and end all enforcement policies, practices, measures, strategies, and laws that criminalize migrants and force them into dangerous crossing areas.
- DHS should enhance the safety of border communities and protect migrants by demilitarizing the borders, including tearing down the walls along the U.S.-Mexico border, and establishing accountability mechanisms for independent civilian and community-based monitoring and oversight. Government officials should clearly and publicly declare their opposition to private vigilante groups and the hateful acts they perpetrate, and prosecute any criminal activity against immigrants and others.
- Congress should create an independent monitoring and accountability mechanism that directly engages impacted communities in holding DHS accountable for its immigration enforcement and detention policies and initiatives.
- DHS and all law enforcement agencies should cease conducting sweeping surveillance, investigation, and apprehension initiatives. Congress should forbid the entry of names into the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) of

people currently wanted solely for civil immigration law violations.

- Congress should abolish all incarceration of immigration law violators, except where there is a particularized finding of a high risk to public safety.
- Congress should pass legislation affirming dozens of years of legal interpretation that state and local police are forbidden from enforcing civil immigration laws.
- Local governments should pass resolutions or ordinances specifying their non-cooperation in immigration law enforcement.
- Policy makers at all levels should end all policies that unfairly punish and criminalize migrants for civil violations.
- Rather than collaborate with other countries to target migrants for arrest and detention, the federal government should cooperate with neighboring nations to implement economic policies that effectively resolve problems of unsustainable economic development, forced displacement, and migration.
- Congress should make the United States a true partner in international cooperation by ratifying the International Convention on the Protection of the Human Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.

The “Youth Bulge”: *Defining the Next Generation of Young Men as a Threat to the Future*

ANNE HENDRIXSON

Anne Hendrixson is a freelance writer and activist. She is a member of the steering committee of the Committee on Women, Population, and the Environment. Released in spring 2003 as a DifferentTakes issue paper by the Population and Development Program at Hampshire College. Reprinted by permission.

IN AN ARTICLE ANALYZING THE 9/11 TERRORIST ACTIONS, *Newsweek* asks, “Why do they hate us?” Under the heading “The Politics of Rage,” the article comments on possible reasons for terrorism in the Arab world. It reads, “Arab societies are going through a massive youth bulge, with more than half of most countries’ populations under the age of 25... A huge influx of restless young men in any country is bad news. When accompanied by even small economic and social change, it usually produces a new politics of protest. In the past, societies in these circumstances have fallen prey to a search for revolutionary solutions.”¹

This sentiment, linking young Arab men in the global South with political upheaval and potential violence, echoes through many articles in the popular press. The “Culture Briefs” section of *The Washington Times* picked up this quote from Hassan Fattah, author of *The Middle East Baby Boom*: “The sheer number of these Arab Boomers will give them more influence over the course of their nations than any other generation before them. To be sure, there’s plenty of reason to be concerned with any youth bulge. Indeed, the one generalization demographers are willing to make is that youth bulges disrupt the social equilibrium, invariably inviting turmoil and drastic change.”²

The Youth Bulge Concept

The correlation that the media makes between young men and violent uprisings popularizes the “youth bulge” concept. This concept identifies young men as a historically volatile population. It explores the idea that the presence of more than twenty percent of young people in the population signals the possibility of political rebellion and unrest. The concept specifically equates large percentages of young men with an increased possibility of violence, particularly in the global South where analysts argue that governments may not have the capacity to support them.

Historically, the United States has viewed youth in the South as a threat to national security. After World War II, when overall perceptions about population growth were beginning to shift, U.S. military analysts and academics began to define the growing number of youth in the South as a problem. This fear of youth in the South coincided with growing U.S. interest in access to raw materials to supply industry. For the U.S., this access depended on good relationships with Southern governments. However, at the time anti-colonial nationalism was on the rise, and U.S. interests were threatened by this trend. Betsy Hartmann, author of *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs*, notes:

The success of the Chinese Revolution, Indian and Indonesian nonalignment, independence movements in Africa, economic nationalism in Latin America—all these contributed to growing U.S. fears of the Third World. Population growth, rather than centuries of colonial domination, was believed to fuel nationalist fires, especially given the increasing proportion of youth.³

Though political trends have shifted since that time, U.S. military analysts have continued to characterize youth as a threat and have created “appropriate” defense policy in response. Personified as a discontented, rebellious teenage boy, almost always a person of color, the youth bulge is portrayed as an unpredictable, out-of-control force in the South with the potential to catalyze uncontrollable conflicts that may spill over into neighboring countries and even other areas of the world, including the U.S.

The Youth Bulge as a Threat to U.S. National Security

On March 15, 2000, in his testimony before the House Armed Service Committee, General Anthony C. Zinni, then commander in chief of the United States Central Command, commented about the Arabian Gulf region:

Population growth is also increasing dramatically putting pressure on natural resources, specifically water, and economic systems. This has resulted in instability, especially in countries experiencing this “youth bulge.” Certain areas of this dynamic and volatile Central Region offer a fertile environment for extremists to recruit, train, and conduct terrorist operations. These extremists pose a significant and growing threat to U.S. personnel around the world and to their own people and governments as well.⁴

The belief that the youth bulge represents a security threat is partially based on the idea that population pressures inevitably cause resource scarcities, which in turn force young people to compete for limited educational and employment opportunities. When governments fail to meet their needs, young people will supposedly react with violence.

In reality, a complex web of national and international political and economic forces determines

the extent and availability of resources. In Egypt, for example, development problems are often framed in terms of population pressures, ignoring growing disparities in income and power between rich and poor and the role of U.S. aid in undermining basic food production, eroding public welfare institutions, and strengthening the hand of the military.⁵ In fact, no discussion of resource scarcity can be complete without addressing how swollen military budgets in many countries take much-needed funds away from health, education and job creation.

Resource scarcity arguments are often coupled with the assumption that governments in the global South are not sophisticated enough to accommodate growing populations of young people. John L. Helgeson, chairman of the U.S. National Intelligence Council, commented that “the inability of states to adequately integrate youth populations is likely to perpetuate the cycle of political instability, ethnic wars, revolutions, and anti-government activities that already affects many countries. And a large proportion of youth will be living in cities, where opportunities will be limited.”⁶ Thus, youth are characterized as having the potential to send a nation into a state of chaos.

Given that the U.S. military defines the youth bulge as an explosive force that holds great power over nation states, the military feels it must be equipped to handle sudden unrest. The youth bulge’s supposed volatile nature serves as a rationale for U.S. defense build-up in areas where the youth bulge is defined as a problem, notably in the Middle East.

Anthony Cordesman, a senior fellow in strategic assessment at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, remarks that neither 9/11 or the “war on terror” changed the basic reasons for the U.S. military presence in the Middle East. He charges, “...we need to remember what our key strategic priorities are. The United States is ever more dependent on a globalized economy, and the global economy is becoming steadily more dependent on Middle Eastern energy exports.”⁷

Cordesman contends that the U.S., as the primary global power, needs to fulfill its responsibility to “protect” Middle Eastern energy exports and

shield the global economy from any threats, including the threat of the youth bulge. He believes that as the population of young men and women increases, “hyperurbanization and population mobility are destroying traditional social safety nets, while modern media publicize the region’s weakness and at the same time present images of material wealth that most citizens can never obtain. The result is to drive many into mosques, and some toward an Islamic extremism that is at least as opposed to modernization and secular government as it is anti-Western.”⁸

Military and academic analysts have long linked the youth bulge with Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism. In *Clash of the Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Samuel Huntington argues, “The Islamic challenge is manifest in the pervasive cultural, social, and political resurgence of Islam in the Muslim world and the accompanying rejection of Western values and institutions.” He warns that the expansion of the youth cohort in Muslim countries provides “recruits for fundamentalism, terrorism, insurgency and migration.”⁹ Underlying Huntington’s and Cordesman’s anxiety about the youth bulge in the Middle East are concerns about maintaining U.S. control over oil. Given the current political climate, the youth bulge will continue to feature highly as a national security threat, because of its potential to disrupt U.S. access to oil.

The Role of Gender

The angst surrounding the youth bulge thus contains underlying assumptions about race and religion. In addition to anti-Muslim prejudices, the youth bulge concept builds from gender stereotypes. It contends that men, particularly young men, are prone to violence. It preys on fears that when young men face challenges like gaining employment, political power and wealth, they will form alliances and find outlets for their essentially violent natures. Christian Mesquida and Neil Weiner, researchers at York University, go so far as to suggest this violence is biologically determined. Weiner contends that, “human (especially young male) tendencies to engage in coalitional aggression must be an advantageous trait; if not, natural selection would have ensured the trait’s extinction by now.”¹⁰

The gendered notion of the “youth bulge” has a parallel in the U.S. policy response to the concept of the “teenage superpredators:” young, black men from urban centers who will supposedly rise up in an unstoppable tide of crime. Superpredator theories have led to an increase in domestic militarism, resulting in increased zero-tolerance policies at schools and ever more punitive legislation for juvenile offenders, particularly young men of color.¹¹

Alternative Viewpoints

Not all analysts position the youth bulge as a threat. Some argue for looking at the youth bulge and youth uprisings without assuming a violent outcome. Jennifer S. Holmes, author of *Terrorism and Democratic Stability*, remarks, “I would describe demography as a challenge that the state needs to meet, whether it’s developing countries with a youth bulge or developed countries with a graying population. It is not going to predetermine the outcome.”¹² Henrik Urdal of Oslo’s International Peace Research Institute argues that whether or not youth bulges cause political instability depends on other variables, such as intermediary regimes and economic recession.¹³ Further, in *Student Resistance*, Mark Edelman Boren writes, “Empowered through collective action, unruly students can challenge their institutions, societies, and governments; they can be tremendous catalysts for change.”¹⁴ Although Boren does not address the youth bulge concept directly, his work catalogues how collective action by young people has resulted in meaningful social change movements, some of which were non-violent.

Unfortunately, most commentary about the youth bulge condemns young men as potential terrorists who are swayed by dogma and rhetoric to form collective reigns of terror. Without recognition that this generation will contribute positively to the advances of society and development, discussions of this generation strip it of self-respect, underestimate its potential, and leave it devalued. The alarmist youth bulge concept is clearly in the interests of those who advance it and not in the interest of supporting the next generation of youth. The question is not “why do they hate us?” but instead, “why do we hate them?”

Notes

- 1 Fareed Zakaria, "Why Do They Hate Us: The Politics of Rage," *Newsweek*, (October 15, 2001), 32.
- 2 Excerpts from Hassan Fattah "The Middle East Baby Boom," *The Washington Times* (September 11, 2002), www.washtimes.com/culture/20020911-25730380.htm
- 3 Betsy Hartmann, *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs* (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1995), 102.
- 4 General Anthony C. Zinni, commander in chief of the U.S. Central Command, Prepared Testimony, Federal News Services, Inc. (2000).
- 5 Timothy Mitchell, "The Object of Development: America's Egypt," in Jonathan Crush, ed., *Power of Development* (London: Routledge, 1995).
- 6 John L. Helgerson, "The National Security Implications of Global Demographic Change," address to the Denver World Affairs Council and the Better World Campaign, Denver, Colorado (April 30, 2002), www.cia.gov/nc/speeches/speeches/Denverspeech.htm
- 7 Anthony H. Cordesman, "The U.S. Military and the Evolving Challenges in the Middle East," *Naval War College Review* (Summer 2002), vol. LV, no. 3.
- 8 Ibid.
- 9 Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996), 103.
- 10 Christian Mesquida and Weiner, Neil, "Young Men and War: Could We Have Predicted the Distribution of Violent Conflicts at the End of the Millennium?" *Woodrow Wilson ESCP Report*, 2001, issue 7, 230.
- 11 Ryn Gluckman. "The Scapegoating of America's Youth: Past and Present (Mis)Conceptions." *DifferenTakes*, Issue 13, Fall 2001
- 12 Jennifer S. Holmes, quoted in "Radicalism: Is the Devil in the Demographics?" *New York Times* (December 9, 2001).
- 13 Henrik Urdal, "Is the Devil in the Demographics?: How Population Pressure and Youth Bulges Influence the Risk of Onset of Domestic Armed Conflict," Department of Political Science, University of Oslo, (Spring 2002).
- 14 Mark Edelman Boren, *Student Resistance: A History of the Unruly Subject* (New York: Routledge, 2001), 249.

Is Opposing the War an LGBT Issue?

An LGBT Issue Brief

Working in partnership with grassroots queer organizations, the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) has helped support the emergence of a strong antiwar voice among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) communities. Race, gender, and class stand at the center of our analysis, reflecting the views of many grassroots queer organizations serving youth and people-of-color constituencies, both immigrants and U.S.-born.

The "issue brief" reprinted was originally released in March 2003 by AFSC's LGBT Program in partnership with the National Youth Advocacy Coalition (NYAC). It is the first in a series of publications addressing the violent and destructive impacts of the U.S.-initiated "war on terrorism" on LGBT communities, in the United States and around the world.

This piece was originally developed as a tool for educational outreach to queer organizations that had not already taken a stand against war on Iraq. It built on an antiwar strategy meeting for lesbian, gay, bisexual, two-spirit, and transgender (LGBTST) activists in November 2002, which was convened by the New York-based Audre Lorde Project and cosponsored by AFSC. This meeting—an historic first—led to the release of an "Open Letter to LGBTST Communities Opposing War" in January 2003. Within three weeks, the number of endorsers had grown from an initial twenty organizations to more than 130. (The text of this letter is posted on the web at www.afsc.org/lgbt/peace/openletter.htm and also at www.alp.org).

Both the Open Letter and the AFSC/NYAC issue brief have helped to revitalize progressive discussion in queer communities, in large part by promoting the leadership of people of color in the antiwar movement and increasing the visibility of an emergent, progressive, queer antiwar movement. AFSC will release a second publication in this series, with a focus on queer youth and militarism, in late 2003. Also produced in partnership with NYAC, the forthcoming publication will feature the voices of young queer women and men, most of whom are people of color.

For more information about AFSC's LGBT programs, please see www.afsc.org/lgbt/default.htm. The National Youth Advocacy Coalition (NYAC) is the only national organization focused solely on improving the lives of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) youth through advocacy, education, and information. For more information about NYAC's programs and resources, please call 202.319.7596, ext. 12, or e-mail nyac@nyacyouth.org.

A DEBATE IS RAGING THROUGHOUT the broad movement for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) rights: Is the U.S. government's "War on Terror," including the impending war on Iraq, an issue that the LGBT movement should address? The National LGBT Program of the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) has prepared this issue brief in partnership with the National Youth Advocacy Coalition (NYAC), informed by the expe-

riences of many LGBT groups. Together with a rapidly growing number of LGBT organizations, we answer that opening question with an unequivocal "Yes". We know that some LGBT people and organizations support the war. Some say we shouldn't even discuss the war because "It isn't a gay issue." Many more are not yet certain where they stand and are searching for clarity. Although AFSC and NYAC have a clear point of view about the war, we do not seek

to further polarize the discussion or demonize those who disagree with us.

The corrosive politic of polarization, so ascendant in almost every aspect of U.S. political life today, threatens to overwhelm necessary exploration of the impacts of this war through dialogue, critical inquiry, and civic debate. The stakes for all of us, as individuals and as part of a larger LGBT movement for civil and human rights, are high. Silence and suppression of differences of opinion and uncertainties at such a critical time serve no one well. Our movement needs more, not less, thoughtful discussion of the impacts and consequences of the war.

We Speak from our Own Experience

We speak from our own experience as LGBT people of color, queer women, poor and working class LGBT people, queer youth, and LGBT people of faith.

As Audre Lorde, the noted poet, activist, and writer who was both Black and lesbian, said, “There is no such thing as a single-issue struggle because we do not live single-issue lives.”

Race, gender, culture, class, age, and the complex interrelationships of these factors are central to our LGBT experience and analysis of the impacts of the “War on Terror” here and abroad.

While all of us in the LGBT movement are affected by the “War on Terror,” people of color, immigrants and refugees, women, children and youth, and poor people—including LGBT people—disproportionately bear the burden of war-related repression, violence, and harm. These are the same groups in the United States who already suffer the multiple harms of domestic and sexual violence, hate violence, poverty, and dispossession.

Why We Oppose the War

Today, in the name of the “War on Terror,” the U.S. government is directing many forms of violence against vulnerable communities as well as less powerful nations.

The U.S. government’s “national security strategy” now advances a radical new doctrine of pre-emptive military strikes, which may be launched whenever the government feels they are necessary to

protect vital interests, both geopolitical and economic. This doctrine of pre-emption overturns the very foundations of international law, arms reduction treaties, and diplomacy in the post-World War II era, which have sought to restrict military action to self-defense.

Our own commitment to human rights, not only to LGBT civil rights, compels us to speak out against the violence of the “War on Terror” and the repressive policies that accompany it. We speak not only for ourselves but in unity with people throughout the United States and the world who experience the daily terror of interpersonal, structural, and military violence, including poverty, hunger, homelessness, lack of adequate and appropriate health care, dispossession, and disenfranchisement.

LGBT people fight daily for our dignity, well-being, rights, and sometimes even our lives, within families, schools, faith communities, and society as a whole. LGBT people know all too well what it feels like to be singled out for hatred and violent treatment, made scapegoats, and declared expendable by others. These experiences should help shape our responses whenever violence directed against some demonized “other” is justified by public authorities and accepted without challenge by the majority.

Regardless of one’s position on the war, a cloud hangs over us all—a cloud of growing repression, surveillance of domestic civic and religious organizations against whom there is no evidence of wrongdoing, and invasive information-gathering programs used by the Pentagon and other government agencies to strengthen the war machine. The USA Patriot Act, the Homeland Security Act, the Total Information Awareness program, and other repressive measures trample rights and erode constitutional principles. The Patriot Act, for example, is vague and diffuse enough to paint LGBT people speaking out against the war, or even marching in a gay rights parade, as “terrorists” working to overthrow the government.

The LGBT movement in the United States thrives in no small measure because the legal framework of civil rights and constitutional rights, and reasonable government checks and balances, however imperfectly realized, support us in our struggle

for justice. Today, however, those checks and balances are weakened, and the legal framework of rights is corroded.

LGBT people have never fared well in politically charged climates when governments say that it is necessary to sacrifice rights in order to achieve safety. The question LGBT communities must confront is this: Whose safety will be increased by erosion of rights? Whose safety will be further jeopardized?

Finally, war on Iraq and “the War on Terror” will not protect the human rights of LGBT people in war-torn countries. The International Human Rights Commission (IGLHRC) says, “The U.S. policies of military aggression have served to render those who deviate from sexual and gender norms and people living with HIV/AIDS especially vulnerable to state-sanctioned violence and discrimination.”

As citizens and residents of the United States, we feel a special responsibility to join with many others worldwide to speak out when we feel that this country’s actions are immoral, unjust, and dangerous. We believe we are morally obligated to resist when particular policies lead neither to justice nor peace,

Youth & the War

Young men and women serving in the armed forces of all nations face all the risks that wartime service entails, including the risk of injury, long-term illness, and death. Children and youth living in war-ravaged countries are at risk of death, injury, long-term illness, malnutrition, poverty, and the tearing apart of families. Many will become refugees. Among other impacts: Severe reduction of services to queer youth, especially poor youth and youth of color because of human services and education budget cuts. Homeless youth, a disproportionate number of whom are queer, will pay a particularly steep price—Censorship of anti-war views in school publications and other public platforms—Penalties for youth who do not register for the Selective Service. In different states, these may include denial of driver’s license, denial of state employment, denial of state financial aid, and denial of admittance to public colleges and universities—Easy military and other governmental access to private information about high school and college students—Stepped-up military efforts to recruit Latinos, and the use of fraudulent, deceptive, and coercive military recruiting techniques—Repressive, discriminatory, and punitive anti-LGBT military policies.

Opposition to the War Is Both Spiritual and Political.

The ethics of love, compassion, and justice resonate through every major faith and spiritual tradition, calling many of us from a broad spectrum of Muslim, Christian, Jewish, Buddhist, indigenous, and other spiritual traditions to oppose this war. The violence of the “War on Terror” will not produce safety or security, but only an endless cycle of retaliatory violence and hatred. Lasting peace can only arise from a firm foundation of human rights, social justice, and economic security for all.

but only to a widening spiral of human suffering and ecological catastrophe.

We oppose the “War on Terror” today so that tomorrow the United States could use its status as a leading world power to strengthen, rather than undermine, the values of international law, international cooperation, multilateralism, human rights, and economic security for all peoples.

Impacts on LGBT Communities

Racial Profiling & The War on Immigrant Communities

As a direct result of the racial profiling of all immigrants, LGBT immigrants are in jeopardy.

Al-Fatiha Foundation (LGBTQI Muslims and friends), South Asian Lesbian and Gay Alliance (SALGA), and many other LGBT organizations serving Arab, Muslim, South and Central Asian, and Latino communities are being deluged by immigration and deportation issues and concerns. Many are reporting increased problems with the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). Community-based LGBT organizations serving immigrant constituencies generally operate with small budgets, and with the escalation of the “War on Terror,” resources are being stretched beyond capacity. Few immigrant and refugee rights organizations have developed a systemic capacity to help LGBT immigrants. LGBT activists of Arab and South or Central Asian descent face special obstacles and risks in traveling. Some choose not to travel outside the United States, even for religious pilgrimage, for fear of not being permitted back into the country. Some are taking refuge in Canada.

The “special registration” program of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) is spreading fear and confusion in immigrant communities and heightening war fever throughout the U.S. by stigmatizing immigrants as a threat to national security. By institutionalizing the racist presumption that immigrants are terrorists, it reinforces the drive for war. Mass roundups of immigrants, secret detentions, detention without charges, and denial of legal counsel to detainees, are now “acceptable” practices. Many people have been detained or face deportation orders because of confusion, backlog, and hopelessly complex and poorly understood procedures within the INS itself. Those who fall in the net of immigration authorities may be deported and barred from the United States for life.

The policing of the already heavily militarized U.S.-Mexico border has intensified, placing severe strains and hardship on border crossers and border communities. Human rights abuses are commonplace.

Increased Violence

In the aftermath of September 11, 2001, a number of community-based LGBT programs serving youth, people of color, and victims of violence reported surges in instances of domestic violence and in hate violence directed against people of color, immigrants, and Muslims. The 2002 annual report of the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Projects noted that attacks against Muslim/South Asian/Arab LGBTQ people had increased 155% over the previous year. This mirrors sudden post-9/11 surges of hate violence against Muslims and immigrants reported by AFSC and many other civil rights and anti-violence organizations.

Communities of color, including immigrant communities, report increases in police violence as racial profiling is re-institutionalized in the post-9/11 era. At the same time, LGBT communities of color perceive less public willingness to challenge law enforcement violence.

LGBT people of Arab and South and Central Asian descent also report that verbal violence and bigotry sometimes has been directed against them within the LGBT movement. Some LGBT media

have published stereotyped, false, and inflammatory information about Islam.

Finally, the war is distorting the LGBT movement’s ability to evaluate violence. As U.S. bombs rained down on Afghanistan after 9/11, the LGBT community took note of a photograph showing “Die Fags” graffiti written on one of those bombs. A widely publicized response by a national LGBT organization expressed outrage at the homophobic graffiti, but did not comment upon the lethal intent of the bomb itself—or the effect it would surely have on the human beings in its path.

Fear, Intimidation & Self-Censorship Within LGBT Communities

Many LGBT groups describe divisiveness, dissension, and anxiety within their own organizations and communities. That there are differences of opinion is not surprising. What is striking, however, is the level of fear that accompanies discussion about the war and the possibility of taking a stand against it.

Many people in immigrant and people-of-color communities, for example, fear racial profiling and its consequences, including possible police brutality, detention, and deportation. Some LGBT organizations fear loss of funding from donors, foundations, or local, state, or federal funding sources—or being “blacklisted” by other LGBT organizations. Many are afraid of wrongly being branded (sometimes by other LGBT activists) as “unpatriotic” at a time of heightened war fever. At the same time, some LGBT organizations that have not taken a stand against the war or are exploring the possibility report feeling harshly accused of inaction and denounced by other LGBT activists.

This climate of polarization, intimidation, and fear sometimes creates the mistaken impression that LGBT antiwar activism is not widespread. In fact, a groundswell of LGBT anti-war organizing unites us with majorities in this country and throughout the

A projected war cost of \$100 billion would fund about four years of health expenditures to address the health needs of the world’s poorest peoples.

—Medact (British affiliate of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War)

The grief we continue to feel for those who were killed and whose lives were shattered on September 11, 2001, also extends to those who have been harmed by U.S. military violence and economic sanctions.

world who have serious doubts about the wisdom of war on Iraq or believe it is wrong.

Decreased Funding for Human Needs & LGBT Programs

In 2002, AFSC's Seattle-based GLBTQ Youth Program received notice of severe cutbacks in municipal funding for the following fiscal year as city officials shifted more resources from an increasingly strained budget into policing and transportation. Simultaneously, other Seattle organizations providing advocacy and services for women, homeless people, immigrants, and refugees were also targeted for funding cuts.

Chicago-area LGBT activists note, "Just this year we've seen huge cutbacks at Horizons Community Services and the Howard Brown Health Center, while three AIDS service agencies collapsed into one in order to save money, and the entire \$2.5 million State of Illinois budget for AIDS minority outreach was wiped out. Even without war, looming budget deficits at the city, state and federal levels will mean further attacks on our social services."

Many more LGBT programs and organizations providing basic education and services are experiencing or expecting similar debilitating cutbacks and reductions in donor and foundation income.

The "War on Terror," coupled with increasing privatization of government services and resources, and tax reductions favoring the wealthy, accelerates a fiscal shift that was already well underway prior to 9/11: redirection of public investment from human needs—schools, health care and other human services, childcare, job training, housing—to prisons, policing, and militarization.

Human Rights & War on Iraq

In our fight for the human rights of LGBT people, we call on others for support. We have a reciprocal obligation to defend the human rights of others,

including those of peoples severely impacted by U.S. foreign policy.

Twelve years of war on Iraq already have produced a human and ecological catastrophe. A preemptive strike launched in violation of international law is likely to produce hundreds of thousands of new short-term and long-term casualties and refugees and more long-term environmental damage. Should nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons be introduced into the conflict, the human and ecological toll will be beyond estimation.

An estimated 205,000 Iraqis died as a direct result of the Gulf War. About 110,000 were civilians who died in 1991 from the health effects of that war. 750,000 people were internally displaced. Thousands of children have been disabled by land mines. Tens of thousands of women were made war widows. Most of the military and civilian infrastructure of Iraq was destroyed.

This, combined with harsh post-war economic sanctions and bombing raids by the United States and Great Britain, has produced a human rights crisis of staggering proportions. According to Medact, the people most affected by sanctions include pregnant and lactating women, children under five years of age, older people, and people with chronic diseases. In the twelve years since the Gulf War, between 344,000 and 525,000 children under five years of age died because of those sanctions, and the UN confirms that about 1,000 such deaths per week continue to occur.

Regimes such as that of Saddam Hussein and the Taliban are brutal and despotic. The U.S. government, however, helped to arm and support these regimes for many years when it was expedient to do so, as it has supported numerous other violent, corrupt, and authoritarian regimes. In a final and grimly ironic note, the current U.S. administration actually has blocked efforts to strengthen international treaties intended to prevent the spread of biological and chemical weapons.

We will stand with the United States when we believe the government is right, but today, the government is betraying the principles of democracy,

constitutional rights, and human rights, and so we must speak out.

Educational & Organizing Resources

Listed below are selected LGBT organizations, websites and listservs offering more in-depth information, commentary, resources, and assistance on the topics covered in this issue brief. A more extensive listing of resources is available in the web-based version of this publication on the AFSC website.

Al-Fatiha Foundation

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/al-fatiha-news>

<http://www.al-fatiha.org>

<http://www.al-fatiha.net>

AFSC-LGBT

<http://www.afsc.org/lgbt>

<http://www.afsc.org/lgbt/peace>

<http://www.afsc-fan.org>

Audre Lorde Project

<http://www.alp.org>

National Youth Advocacy Coalition

<http://www.nyacyouth.org>

Out Against the War

http://www.temenos.net/action_war.shtml

Out Against the War—UK

<http://www.outagainstthewar.org.uk/>

Queers for Peace & Justice

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/QueersForPeaceAndJustice>

International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission

<http://www.iglhrc.org>

“An Enhanced Supply of Babies”:

The Politics of Race, Gender, and Population in Israel

A DIALOGUE BETWEEN RELA MAZALI AND RACHAEL KAMEL

Rela Mazali, an Israeli writer and feminist peace activist, is one of the founders of New Profile, an activist group that supports young Israeli draft resisters (and other military refusers). An outspoken critic of Israeli militarism, she has worked for many years to challenge torture and other human rights violations by Israeli authorities and was instrumental in exposing the use of depleted uranium shells by the Israeli military. She is the author of *Maps of Women's Goings and Stayings* (Stanford University Press, 2001) and many other books and articles.

Rachael Kamel is a member of the steering committee of the Committee on Women, Population, and the Environment (CWPE) and a founding member of the Philadelphia Jewish Peace Network. Since the outbreak three years ago of the Al-Aqsa intifada, she has been involved in building grassroots networks of Jewish Americans as well as cross-constituency coalitions opposed to U.S. support for the Israeli military occupation of Palestinian lands. She has written and edited numerous publications for the American Friends Service Committee on economic globalization, immigrants' rights, women's issues, and related themes.

Rachael: I invited Rela to join me in creating this interchange (which we have done mostly over e-mail) to explore the militarization of Jewish consciousness and culture, in both Israel and the United States. For both of us, turning a critical eye on our own culture and our own community is not an academic pursuit, but a vital dimension of our activism—against militarism and U.S. intervention and in support of a peaceful future for the Middle East.

The activist movements we are both part of have focused, quite naturally, on resisting Israeli (and U.S.) militarism by challenging its devastating impact on Palestinian communities, on the status of women, and on human rights. Another aspect is the role of the United States as the chief source of the military, financial, and diplomatic support

that sustains the Israeli occupation of Palestinian territories.¹

For many reasons, the ideas and approaches of the past have failed to bring a peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, or even a minimal level of stability to the region. Instead, as the Israeli-Palestinian conflict settles into an even more deadly phase, there are increasingly open discussions of ethnic cleansing—known as “transfer” in Israel—and political parties advocating transfer are now part of the Israeli government.

As supporters of peace with justice—in Israel/Palestine and around the world—we need to take an unflinching look at how this happened and where it is leading us. To that end, we wanted to explore how ideas about race, gender and population have shaped the discussion of the conflict, in

Israel, in the American Jewish community, and in the United States overall.

Rela: My belief in de-militarization, and my related views about demography in Israel, formed gradually over 20-some years of activism against the occupation. My parents' commitment to Zionism, or the formation of a Jewish state, and their choice to come here to live in 1947, formed the point of departure for my consciousness. While their choice was an undoubtedly political act, it functioned during my childhood as an underlying foundation, taken for granted and unquestioned. So I grew up in the tension between their coming here, which was affirmed as an explicitly political choice, and the very conformist world I lived in, in which dissidence didn't even occur to us as an option. While many of my peers were children of refugees from Europe, who didn't choose freely to come here, we did share the experience of Zionism as a way of thinking that was not really open to question and that was central to our idea of what was "normal."

I became politicized relatively late, in my early thirties, and I've been learning ever since. For me activism is a continuous learning process—finding out new information, opening myself to new perspectives and new interpretations, and also unlearning what I had always believed.

When Rachael proposed interviewing me, one of the issues she mentioned was reproductive rights and how I viewed political developments here in that area. I wasn't sure I understood her and, frankly, I was intrigued. Her explanation of that concern, as well as of the background for other questions she had in mind, turned out to be a learning experience for me. In my view, knowledge building is a shared process. I think this is often hidden from view in standard writing formats, so I suggested we keep this piece a dialogue, incorporating both of our standpoints and some of the process of how we drew on each others' views and cues. Here it is, then.

Rachael: I wanted to explore the tensions between the way we think about demographic realities and the vision of Israel as a Jewish state. Among

American Jews, the importance of maintaining Jewish numerical superiority in Israel is usually taken to be self-evident. At the same time, it functions largely as part of an abstract, idealized discussion—about Jewish safety, or Jewish nationhood, or Jewish destiny (or all three). What is the impact of this ideological frame-work in the lives of real women, both Jewish and Palestinian?

Rela: I'll start my answer from Jewish safety. There are obviously considerable historical grounds for wanting to ensure that people are not put at risk by the fact of having been born Jewish. More than fifty years after its foundation, however, Israel is the place where the greatest number of Jewish people are continually put at risk, where the highest number of Jewish people are killed and injured. That seems to be a reality that Jews outside Israel, and even many inside Israel, tend to brush aside, to discount as temporary, perhaps as a phase to be endured on the way to the creation of this safe haven.

Some of this disregard for reality is rooted in an extension of the idea of "home" as a protective, safe space. I think it's a mistake to assume that safety for an entire society comes from creating something like a "home," but on a larger scale. I don't think that citizenship in a state can or should be seen as a larger version of family. And I don't think modern-day borders (which Israel doesn't even have) can or should function like the walls of what is hopefully a protective home.

I don't believe that a solution to the risk of persecution on grounds of identity can be a geographical one—for Jews, for people of color, or for other types of minorities. Jews and all people need to be safe everywhere and to be able to exercise their human rights everywhere.

Rachael: In the United States, women of color have been in the forefront of questioning whether the idea of the home as a safe haven is even true on the micro level, given that law enforcement and immigration authorities routinely disregard the supposed privacy or safety of the homes of people of color, both immigrant and U.S.-born. Failing to come to terms with this reality has led many domes-

tic violence advocates, for example, to cooperate with law-enforcement agencies in ways that have been very harmful to women of color. So perhaps we should be asking ourselves whether the idea of a safe haven is ever a useful one.²

Rela: Regardless of what you and I may believe, however, the assumption of such analogies is present and potent in every aspect of Israeli culture. Yet this very preoccupation with demography, with numbers and birthrates and immigration rates of Jews as opposed to others in Israel, shows that the attempt to establish this supposedly safe space simply creates another kind of risk. Will the space continue to be “held” by sufficient numbers of “our people?” Will its government continue to be in “our” hands, thereby supposedly making it safe for “us?”

All this, of course, affects individual women’s lives in Israel in endless ways. One of the most cogent is the sense, shared by the vast majority of Jewish people in Israel, that “we” and the state live in constant, immediately present existential peril. (So much for our protective home!) This sense is usually a presupposition, not questioned or examined, but rather accepted as self-evident. It is transmitted to all of us through myriad cultural channels.

One of its chief premises is the history of anti-semitism and particularly the Nazi genocide of European Jews. Its other main premise is the history of chronic warfare, which began here even before the declaration of the state of Israel in 1948. As a result, it is widely accepted that Jewish people in Israel need to maintain and take part in a culture of military service, for what are perceived as defensive reasons. This in turn has a huge effect on childrearing in Jewish society in Israel, where children are raised in an awareness of their impending conscription. Parents and children consent to, and actively implement, a contract according to which the children will be put at risk (at least potentially) at age 18. This fact has many very practical implications in the daily routine of families.³ Among other things, this contract may be one more reason for the relatively high birthrates in Israel as compared to other advanced industrial countries.

Rachael: In U.S. society, the politics of fertility is an integral part of the discussion of race as well as military dominance. The fertility of U.S. women of color, and of women in the developing world more generally, is portrayed as a “threat” to “our way of life,” through violent imagery about the “population bomb” dating back to the 1960s and proceeding from there.⁴ The need to respond to this supposed threat then offers a rationale for social policies that criminalize women, particularly poor women of color, and exert very repressive and coercive types of control over their reproductive and sexual lives—through the health care and social welfare system and also through the criminal justice system.

I’ve heard many echoes of this in how Jewish people in both Israel and the United States talk about the “threat” posed by Palestinian fertility, as well as Arab fertility more generally. All, of course, without any acknowledgement (or perhaps even awareness) of the close parallels to the larger global context of this discussion. I’m curious about your perspective as an Israeli woman as to how this discussion plays out in Israel. What kinds of pressure do Jewish Israeli women face to reproduce for the nation, or in order to help perpetuate a Jewish majority? How does that affect their ability to make their own reproductive choices?

Rela: I have believed for many years that Jewish women in Israel are under a great deal of pressure to have children. Just to mention two random symptoms of this pressure, Israel’s per-capita investment in modern reproductive technology, such as “test-tube” fertilization, is the highest in the world by far. Or there’s the familiar custom of quite casually asking both married and unmarried women when they plan to have a child. To paraphrase an apt formulation by feminist author Tamar Hager,⁵ everybody assumes they can stick their noses right into my womb. I myself, as a young woman, thought about when to have children but never actually asked myself whether I wanted to have children at all. In other words, Israeli society quite successfully ruled out my capacity to make the most fundamental of reproductive choices. Today, over a quarter of a century after I had my first child, as far as I can tell it’s no

different for the vast majority of young Jewish women in Israel.

In recent years, a young feminist researcher of Mizrahi origin,⁶ Yali Hashash-Daniel, has demonstrated the differing social pressures exerted on Jewish women of the Ashkenazi middle classes and the lower-income Mizrahi communities in Israel. Hashash-Daniel has documented and revealed how Israeli medical and social services (run by the predominantly Ashkenazi middle class) have pressured lower-income Mizrahi women to lower their birthrates, on the assumption that their children would be poorly educated, “underprivileged,” and not the kind of “quality” people needed for building the young Jewish state. To the best of my knowledge, this kind of analysis is still unrecognized by the majority of feminists in Israel (not to speak of Israeli society at large) and cannot be said to be part of mainstream Israeli feminist discourse.

Rachael: What about Palestinians within Israel—are there state policies that restrict women’s freedom to have children?

Rela: The short answer would be, yes, of course. However, the details are complex and not always obvious. This is an issue that has been exhaustively researched in recent years by a young Palestinian feminist from Israel, Rhoda Ann Kanaaneh.⁷ She has documented numerous policies intended to increase births to Jewish Israeli women and decrease births to Palestinian women who are citizens of Israel. As she has demonstrated in detail, “While Zionist ideology was neither monolithic nor static...this movement was concerned largely with maximizing the number of Jews in Palestine in relation to non-Jews through immigration, displacement of Palestinians, and selective pronatalism” (p. 28). She cautions, however, against overestimating “the coherence and totalizing power of such [population control] projects” (p. 27). As Kanaaneh notes, “Pro- and anti-natalism are more complicated to implement than immigration and land distribution policies” (p. 56). Like the work of Yali Hashash-Daniel, Kanaaneh’s work is not (yet?) a standard or widely recognized part of feminist discourse in Israel.

Beyond the issue of reproductive rights, for well over a decade now there has been an ongoing public discussion in Israel of embedded, institutionalized discrimination against Palestinian citizens of Israel. The voices participating in this discussion and driving it are by no means exclusively or predominantly feminist. A very recent example from the public sphere is the large segment of the Or Commission Report⁸ dedicated to analysis of the severe and ongoing discrimination against Palestinians in Israel in the allocation of public resources.

To cite just a few statistics—19 percent of Israel’s population is Palestinian, while 19 of the 23 communities with the highest unemployment in Israel were Palestinian in 2001. Of the fourteen Israeli communities rated lowest on socioeconomic measures, eleven were Palestinian. More than 41 percent of the Palestinian families inside Israel were living under the poverty line that year, as opposed to fewer than 18 percent of Jewish families. Despite the growing visibility of activist groups working to counteract this discrimination, it is still very much in place and affects every aspect of the lives of the Palestinian citizens of Israel.

In addition, the discussion in the Jewish public sphere by and large implicitly assumes that Palestinian citizens of Israel are, first and foremost, potential enemies. This is a direct result of the militarized thinking into which Israeli Jews are socialized, and a reflection of the historical fact that Israel was founded through the dispossession of the Palestinian people. As a result, even when discrimination by both the state and the dominant Jewish society is clearly acknowledged, proposals for amending it are most often linked with the requirement that Palestinians must somehow demonstrate their loyalty to the state. It is only rarely that the point of departure is an unconditional, straightforward recognition of Palestinians’ inalienable rights as human beings and their rights as a minority in a state that claims to be a democracy.

Rachael: As I try to understand the Israeli scene from the outside, it looks like the politics of demographic balance are spiraling out of control. In July 2003,

the world was stunned by the passage of a law that bars Palestinians from the occupied territories who marry Israeli citizens from seeking either citizenship or residency in Israel—a restriction imposed on no other group. In August, the World Zionist Organization announced a new initiative to build 30 new Jewish-only settlements in the Negev and Galilee (areas inside Israel's pre-1967 borders that have traditionally been predominantly Palestinian). In commenting on this initiative, the treasurer of the Jewish Agency (a nongovernmental organization that is in charge of regulating land ownership in Israel) explained that “the settlement drive is the only way to ensure that Israel remains a Jewish state.”⁹ In 2002, the government-funded Israeli Council of Demography was reactivated after being dormant for five years. Among other things, this group has tried to discourage Jewish Israeli women from having abortions.

As we were editing this piece, Rela sent me an article from the Israeli daily *Ha'aretz* about the rollback of public benefits for fertility treatments, one of many types of benefits currently being slashed in Israel. In describing the controversy sparked by this proposal, the article commented that “the background is demographic: there is an expectation that the state of Israel will do everything, without limiting resources, in order to ensure an enhanced supply of babies” (*Ha'aretz*, 9/21/03). There are many other examples we could mention.

Beyond Israel proper, meanwhile, the drive to expand Jewish-only settlements in the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, is continuing and even accelerating. Even mainstream Jewish voices, including some very prominent figures in both Israel and the United States, are beginning to say that the government of Gen. Ariel Sharon is doing everything within its power to render the establishment of a Palestinian state a practical impossibility. What was introduced as the “separation wall,” which was billed as a border fence along the “green line” (Israel's pre-1967 border), has morphed into a \$1.5 billion project to build walled ghettos around Palestinian population centers in the West Bank. In the process, tens of thousands of Palestinians have already been cut off from some

of their most fertile agricultural land, either because they cannot reach their land to work or harvest their crops or because olive trees, wells, and other vital natural resources are being destroyed outright during the wall's construction. Ultimately, hundreds of thousands of Palestinians will be displaced by the wall (if it is completed as planned).

Where do you think this is all going? Are we heading, as some people argue, in the direction of a massive tragedy of ethnic cleansing, to rival or even surpass the original expulsion of Palestinians in 1948 from what is now Israel? What can we do to stop this scenario? How can we imagine a different future, for Jews as well as Palestinians?

Rela: In my view, and that of thousands of others in the anti-occupation community, it's not that we're heading there, but that we're already at least part-way there. The situation is misleading because it is the inhuman restrictions on daily life that are pushing more and more Palestinians to leave if they have the means to do so, rather than dramatic large-scale operations such as loading thousands of people onto trucks. Such restrictions impose a daily, mundane routine of making it impossible to earn a living, to feed and cook for a family, to provide children with schooling, to reach doctors or hospitals or pharmacies, or to attend prayer services, to say nothing of watching a play, or just sitting at a cafe, or going to the beach.

Under such conditions, which have existed for over a decade but have worsened very sharply in recent years, individuals and families are forced to make very painful choices, and many are indeed leaving in a gradual, largely invisible stream. The advantage of this “silent transfer” is that Israel is not condemned for it. The massive tragedy is and has been occurring for years. And it is and will be both peoples' tragedy. While the balance of power is very much in Israel's favor, life here inside the green line is also becoming steadily uglier. People live in constant fear of bombings, the economy is in deep recession and has been for years, unemployment is very high and still climbing. Social services are being slashed across the board. Here, too, many young people are leaving in search of saner, less brutalized lives.

Mainly, though, I believe that sooner or later Israelis will have to bear a consciousness of their responsibility as perpetrators of this tragedy, along with the shame and guilt that go with that, for many years—even generations. Beyond the crimes that Israel is committing against the Palestinian people, I think that Israel is sentencing its children and grandchildren to bearing this terrible burden.

What can we do? If the United States really wanted Israel to pull out of the territories and reach an agreement with the Palestinians, it would simply clarify that the huge amounts of foreign aid it channels into Israel and the enormous loan guarantees it hands the Israeli government every year would be cut in the absence of a peace treaty. As a citizen, rather than a government, however, I have

no simple answer to this question. Keeping up pressure on both of our governments in as many creative ways as we can find is a general sort of answer, without going into specifics. Finding people to talk things over with and work with. Working as a group to find yet more people. Spreading information and views.

I've been doing all these things for more than 20 years now. The bottom line for individuals, I think, is that it's important—imperative—to find some form of action that you believe in and can commit to and to keep at it. I draw hope from the model of South Africa, for instance. If people could bring about the end of apartheid there, they can, in the long run (though I hope not too long), bring about the end of the occupation and of oppression here.

Activist Resources on Israel/Palestine

The groups listed below represent a sampling of Israeli, Palestinian, and U.S.-based efforts in support of human rights and a just peace based on an end to the Israeli military occupation of Palestinian lands. All are nonprofit, nongovernmental, nonpartisan organizations. Further details of group activities and views are available on organizational websites.

GROUPS BASED IN ISRAEL

Adalah: Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel (www.adalah.org)—

Independent human rights center involved in litigation, advocacy, and public education to achieve individual and collective rights for the Arab minority in Israel, including land rights; civil and political rights; cultural, social, and economic rights; religious rights; women's rights; and prisoners' rights.

Adva Center (www.adva.org)—Conducts policy analysis, advocacy work, and public outreach to inform policy makers and the general public in Israel and abroad about equity and social justice issues in Israeli society. Adva analyzes equality and inequality in Israel in a way that integrates gender, ethnicity and nationality.

Alternative Information Center (www.alternativenews.org)—Palestinian-Israeli organi-

zation that disseminates information, research and political analysis on Palestinian and Israeli societies as well as the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, while promoting cooperation between Palestinians and Israelis based on the values of social justice, solidarity and community involvement.

B'Tselem: Israeli Center for Human Rights in the Occupied Territories (www.btselem.org)—Established in 1989 by a group of prominent academics, attorneys, journalists, and legislators to document and educate the Israeli public and policy makers about human rights violations in the occupied territories, in order to combat the phenomenon of denial prevalent among the Israeli public and help create a human rights culture in Israel.

Gush Shalom (www.gush-shalom.org)—Activist organization that aims to influence Israeli public opinion and lead it towards peace and reconciliation with the Palestinian people, based on an end to the occupation and respect for human rights.

HaMoked: Center for the Defence of the Individual (<http://hamoked.org.il>)—Israeli human rights organization whose main objective is to assist Palestinians of the occupied territories whose rights are violated due to Israel's policies.

Kav La'Oved (www.kavlaoved.org.il)—

Nonprofit organization dedicated to protecting the rights of the most disadvantaged workers in Israel, primarily migrant workers, Palestinians from the occupied territories, contract workers, and new immigrants.

New Profile: Movement for the Civil-ization of Israeli Society (www.newprofile.org)—

Feminist, anti-militarist group founded in 1998 to work toward the demilitarization of Israeli society. Ongoing efforts focus on rethinking conscription, advocacy for demilitarization, education for demilitarization, study groups and adult curriculum development, and partnership in the Women's Coalition for a Just Peace (see).

Physicians for Human Rights—Israel

(www.phr.org.il) was established in 1988 as a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization, dedicated to promoting and protecting the right to health care in Israel and in territories under Israel's effective control. Our operating premise is that the maintenance of human rights as they pertain to health is a necessary condition for social justice, as well as a legal obligation in accordance with international human rights law. Activities include direct intervention and the provision of medical aid, advocacy, legal action, pub-

Rachael: I've thought a lot about how the Jewish-American experience has shaped our perceptions of this conflict. Like most progressive Jewish Americans, I grew up thinking of the Jewish community as a mainstay of the liberal/progressive coalition within this country. The great social and political movements of the 20th century—the union movement, the socialist movement, the Civil Rights Movement—were part of my family's history and my community's history, continuing on into my own individual experience of the Vietnam antiwar movement, the feminist movement, and so on.

Earlier generations of my family fought to participate freely in U.S. society and to gain the right to be “just like everyone else”: to attend the same schools, have access to the same occupations, live

in the same neighborhoods, and so on. When I was growing up, these democratic values were central to the Jewish-American experience. To my parents' generation, it seemed only natural to support other sectors of the population, such as African Americans, in what they understood to be another version of the same struggle against discrimination and exclusion. Which, of course, in many ways it was, except that at the end of the road we got to be white people, and they did not. I'm not sure we have ever really understood the implications of this.

That same generation of Jewish Americans overwhelmingly believed that the creation of Israel was the crowning achievement of our process of democratic empowerment. Finally, we would even have “our own country,” along with access to vir-

lic outreach, community education and campaigning.

Public Committee Against Torture in Israel (www.stoptorture.org.il)—Aims at strengthening democracy and the rule of law by protecting human and civil rights. PCATI believes that the use of torture as a method of interrogation undermines the foundation of democracy in an enlightened society and is contrary to Israeli law as well as international human rights norms which have been signed by the state of Israel.

Women Against Violence (www.wavo.org)—Palestinian group in Israel working since 1992 to provide social and legal services, shelters, community support, research and public education, and political advocacy in support of Palestinian women from Israel faced with domestic violence and other forms of abuse.

Women's Coalition for a Just Peace (www.coalitionofwomen4peace.org/)—Coalition of Israeli Jewish and Palestinian women's groups involved in activist initiatives in support of a just peace, including equal rights and an end to the Israeli occupation of Palestinian lands.

PALESTINIAN CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS

Grassroots Palestinian Anti-Apartheid Wall Campaign (www.stopthewall.org)—Coordinates Palestinian as well as international solidarity efforts against the Wall. The goals of the campaign are to stop the wall, dismantle sections already built, return all lands confiscated for construction of the Wall, and compensate for all losses.

Palestine Monitor (www.palestinemonitor.org)—Website of Palestinian NGO Network (PNGO), established in 2000 to create a forum for perspectives from Palestinian civil society. Web portal to Palestinian health, education, human rights, women's rights, charitable, and research organizations, with extensive listings of other Palestinian civil society organizations.

Palestine Environmental NGO Network (www.pengon.org)—Nonprofit, nongovernmental organization which coordinates efforts by Palestinian environmental organizations in the occupied Palestinian territories. PENGON also coordinates Palestinian and international solidarity efforts against the wall (see listing above).

U.S.-BASED GROUPS

Electronic Intifada (<http://electronicintifada.net>)—News, commentary, analysis, and reference materials about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict from a Palestinian per-

spective. EI is a leading web portal for information about the conflict and its depiction in the media.

Jewish Peace News (<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/JewishPeaceNews/>)—Daily news service sponsored by A Jewish Voice for Peace in San Francisco. Selections from the Israeli, Palestinian, U.S., and world press offering a critical perspective on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Accessible through e-mail subscriptions or open, searchable archives.

Palestine Chronicle (www.palestinechronicle.com)—Independent internet magazine offering news, features, and opinion on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the situation of Palestinian refugees, and Middle East issues more generally.

Refuser Solidarity Network (www.refuser-solidarity.net)—U.S.-based network established in 2002 to support all of the growing refuser movements in Israel, including draft resisters and the various movements of military refusers.

US Campaign Against the Israeli Occupation (www.endtheoccupation.org)—Multi-constituency coalition focusing on public education, grassroots activism, and legislative advocacy to challenge U.S. financial, diplomatic, and military support for the occupation.

tually every other social realm. It's been very hard for us to say out loud that every day the dream is looking more and more like a nightmare, and that Israel is in fact a society founded on dispossession, ethnic cleansing, racial segregation, institutionalized violence, and unending warfare. (Which, of course, makes it very similar to the United States.)

We also face the problem of racialized interpretations of Israeli militarism—of people buying into the mythology that Israelis act as they do because they are Jews, or (in a more nuanced version) that the U.S. is not more “even-handed” in the Middle East because of Jewish influence. This in turn only helps strengthen Jewish fears of antisemitism and plays into the hands of those who argue that we have to defend “our own” —even though the “defensive” measures they advocate invariably make life more dangerous for Jews and everyone else.

As the terrible human costs of Israeli militarism become harder and harder to deny, there are different ways that people try to come to terms with this understanding. I believe it is one of the major factors causing many people to distance themselves from Jewish communal life and a sense of Jewish identity. Other segments of our community have responded by moving very far to the right and espousing a very hawkish and openly racist way of understanding the world.

Still others (and this group includes many non-Jewish white Americans) have simply flipped over and entered into a vicarious identification with the suffering and dispossession of Palestinians, or with Palestinian history and culture. In the end, this can become a more sophisticated form of cultural appropriation—it is Palestinians who need to be free to develop their culture and identity, not their supporters.

As someone who has been involved in antiwar and solidarity movements my entire life, I think this is the deepest challenge for those of us who are part of the oppressor group in any type of conflict: to understand our own humanity in a positive and transformative way, without closing our eyes to the realities of oppression and the ways we are asked to be complicit with it. Guilt and self-hatred

are of no use to anyone—whether we enter into it as Jews, as white people, or as citizens of the U.S. global empire. Likewise, political activism that we undertake “for” somebody else is never fully authentic. It can never win strategic victories or develop into real social transformation. Ultimately, it is not solidarity, but charity.

After many years as an activist, I've come to believe that authentic solidarity work must always have three dimensions. It must expose and challenge the concrete structures of oppression: the war profiteers, the corporate exploiters, the military planners. Second, it must be willing to see the world through the eyes of those who are oppressed and exploited, and to respect their political leadership. And third, those of us who are not the primary targets of oppression must bring ourselves fully into the picture, joining in the struggle from our own deepest and most authentic selves.

This is why I remain committed to struggling over Jewish identity as well as fighting the occupation, the Wall, and the rest of it. We must believe that not only another world but also another Judaism is possible.

Rela: I can't say we share the last point. I'm not very aware of my Jewish identity and not working to create or re-create it. I feel quite skeptical about group identities in general and see them, more often than not, as forcibly imposed or exploitative.

For me, part of upholding people's rights means complicating our understanding of “belonging,” of the ways in which violence that is based on a presumed group identity—such as violence to Jews, women, Palestinians, or the elderly, to name just a few examples—flattens out the gray zones, intersections, and multiple facets of our experience.

Such violence is based on the *perpetrator's* understanding of who we are, not the understanding of those who suffer the violence. In this sense violence not only trespasses on our most fundamental human rights, it also enforces a very simplistic notion of group identity and “belonging,” erasing the specific emotional, psychic, and biographical reality of the person who is targeted by the violence.

I am less inclined to assume identity as a necessity and a given. And I personally am not struggling for Jewish identity. I suppose if anything I feel more Israeli than Jewish. Maybe this is part of being born and raised (mainly) in Israel, in a non-religious, loosely socialist family of Jewish descent. Jewishness was the baseline. Paradoxically, I experienced it as unmarked, unremarkable—something like “whiteness” in the States. And I think this is true of many non-religious Jewish Israelis.

The belonging I feel is more to a language, to specific landscapes and kinds of sunlight and smells, to the Mediterranean beaches that Israeli real estate developers are steadily trashing, to a particular kind of social atmosphere, to a community of friends and family. This is what I’m fighting for—this place where I live and this community that I happened to be born into. I’m struggling for its humanity, for its sanity, fighting to make it a more decent community, with a real respect for human beings of all kinds and for the environment they live in. This struggle, for me, has branched into almost every part of my life. It has fed and formed both my creative work as a writer and my work as an activist, which are in turn interconnected. My writing is an aspect of my activism while my activism finds expression in, and draws on, my writing.

For the past seven years, I’ve had the extraordinary privilege of conducting part of this struggle with and through a feminist group. We started out with an intensive learning process focused on women’s position within the context of Israeli militarization, after which we went on to found New Profile, a feminist anti-militarist group, working to de-militarize society in Israel. While a number of very serious, committed organizations do important work “across the lines,” against the enmity between Jews and Palestinians, our orientation is “inwards,” towards changing the society into which many of us were born and raised, the culture that all of us live in.

Our basic tenet is that this culture is actively making wars, not simply defending itself against outside aggression. We see this, at least partly, as a result of deeply rooted mindsets that in turn blind the majority of Israelis to this simple fact, and so

we work to raise consciousness regarding this vicious cycle. The main channels through which we work to counteract it include challenging the militarization of Israeli education, creating public opportunities for discussing and learning about militarization in Israel, and supporting young people, men and women, who refuse to enlist.

There is a growing movement of draft resistance in Israel today, and New Profile is providing the young people who are part of it with information as well as moral and emotional support. Most draft resisters start out very isolated, and we put them in touch with each other so they can develop a consciousness of being part of a group. At the same time we learn from them, both from their thinking and from the experience that each of them goes through in his or her process of refusal.

This is a truly important development in Israeli society and we are intensively engaged with it. Most of the movement is unorganized, a de facto accumulation of thousands of young people who do not comply with the legal obligation of mandatory military service. About a third of each annual group of candidates for service doesn’t enlist at all. Another 12–15 percent, at a minimum, drop out of service early. So about half of the candidates for service don’t serve or don’t complete their service every year.

A small but highly significant minority of these are brave young men and women who openly declare their conscientious objection to military service. Given the mindset of the Jewish majority in Israel, this is a difficult step to take. While women are legally entitled to exemption from service on grounds of conscience, based on the sexist assumption of a militarized culture that women aren’t “real” soldiers anyway, there is no law explicitly allowing conscientious objection for men, and the declared COs are routinely imprisoned. This past year has witnessed the highest numbers ever of young Israeli men in prison at the same time for refusing conscription. It has also seen the unprecedented (and still ongoing) court martials of six of these brave young 18- and 19-year-olds.

While the general situation in Israel and the occupied territories continues to deteriorate quickly, and the Israeli government deploys the army to take criminal actions on a scale many wouldn't have thought possible just a few years ago, these young people are a reservoir of hope and energy. I feel lucky to know some of them and to be able to support their stand in a concrete way.

Notes

- ¹ Organizations and websites that focus on these issues are listed on page 42.
- ² See CWPE's anthology, *Policing the National Body*, Jael Silliman and Anannya Bhattacharjee, Eds., South End Press, 2002.
- ³ See Rela Mazali, "Parenting Troops: The Summons to Acquiescence," in *The Women and War Reader*, New York University Press, 1998.
- ⁴ See Binta Jeffers et al., "Stop the Blame: Population Control Imagery (1933–2003)," multimedia presentation forthcoming from CWPE (www.cwpe.org).
- ⁵ See *A Perfectly Ordinary Life* (Hakibbutz Hameuchad/Siman Kri'a, 2000) [Hebrew].
- ⁶ "Mizrachi" Jews, increasing numbers of whom refer to themselves as Arab Jews, are rooted in Middle Eastern Jewish communities, while "Ashkenazi" Jews are of European descent. Although many Middle Eastern countries, particularly Iraq, were major centers of Jewish life for thousands of years, most Mizrahi communities were forced to emigrate following the founding of the state of Israel. The history and causes of this forced relocation are little known and remain controversial.
- ⁷ See Rhoda Ann Kanaaneh, *Birth of the Nation: Strategies of Palestinian Women in Israel* (University of California Press, 2002).
- ⁸ The Or Commission was appointed to examine the police killings of 13 Palestinian citizens of Israel in October 2000. A summary of the report in English is available at <http://www.adalah.org/eng/commission.php>.
- ⁹ "A Jewish State, Or State of Jews?" *The Forward*, 8/8/03.

Why Environmentalists Oppose War and Militarism

Originally published in spring 2003 on www.envirosagainstawar.org. Reprinted by permission.
Please direct comments and suggestions to editor@envirosagainstawar.org.

1. War Kills People

War is humankind's deadliest activity. From 500 BC to AD 2000 there have been 1,022 major documented wars, 25 in the last decade alone. Some 17 million soldiers and 34 million civilians died in WW II. Seventy-five percent of those killed in modern war are civilians. War disproportionately kills and injures women, children, the elderly, minorities and the poor.

2. War Destroys Nature

War destroys wildlife, disrupts native habitats and contaminates the land, air and water. The damage can last for generations. The US dropped 25 million bombs and 19 million gallons of Agent Orange and other chemical weapons on the forests, fields and farms of Vietnam. Millions of acres around Russia's Baltic Sea have been contaminated by military chemicals and radioactive wastes. Angola's environment is burdened with more than 10 million landmines. Cluster bombs, thermobaric explosions, chemical and biological weapons and depleted uranium shells are weapons of mass destruction which attack not just human beings but all natural life.

3. War Devastates Society

War destroys villages, farmland, and urban infrastructure. Wars destroy irreplaceable cultural artifacts, ancient landmarks and archeological sites. The US dropped tons of bombs on Iraq in 1991, destroying 9,000 homes. The bombing created a health emergency that contributed to the deaths of 500,000 Iraqi children. In 2003, the US dropped 28,000 rockets, bombs and missiles on Iraq. In the past 25 years, war has devastated cities and villages around the

world leaving lasting damage in such diverse countries as Sudan, El Salvador, Mozambique, Angola, Lebanon, Yugoslavia, Rwanda, Afghanistan, Liberia, Uganda, Colombia, Somalia, Congo, Iraq, Burundi, Iran and Ethiopia.

4. War Consumes Resources

Waging war requires burning vast stores of oil and other fossil fuels which contributes to global climate change. The world's armies consume nearly 2 billion barrels of oil annually. The Pentagon is the US's largest consumer of oil, chemicals, precious metals, paper and wood.

5. War Pollutes

Bombs, missiles, shells, bullets, and fuel poison our land, air and water with lead, nitrates, nitrites, hydrocarbons, phosphorous, radioactive debris, corrosive and toxic heavy metals. Unexploded ordnance covers more than 15 million acres in the US. The world's armies are responsible for as much as 10 percent of global air pollution. The 1991 Gulf War generated 80,000 tons of global-warming gases. On any given day, more than 60,000 US troops are engaged in operations or military exercises in about 100 foreign countries. The Pentagon admits that its bases have polluted communities in Canada, Germany, Great Britain, Greenland, Iceland, Italy, Panama, the Philippines, South Korea, Spain and Turkey.

6. War Is Costly

Military spending drains funds from critical social, educational, medical and environmental needs. In the US, 51 percent of the 2003 discretionary federal

budget goes to military. The Pentagon accounts for half of the world's total military spending, spending which now stands at over \$842 billion a year. It costs \$2.2 billion to build, support and operate one naval battle group for one year. \$13 million could provide access to clean water for 80,000 Third World villages. The cost of one \$1.5 billion Trident submarine could immunize the world's children against six deadly diseases and prevent 1 million deaths a year.

7. Militarism Undermines Peace

War diverts vast amounts of capital resources and human energy from serving critical social, educational, medical and environmental needs into efforts that are destructive and deadly. Unsustainable economies rely on the use of military force to secure control of essential foreign resources—oil, uranium and metals. In 2001, 247,000 US soldiers were stationed at 752 bases in more than 130 countries. The US is the world's largest supplier of weapons to developing countries (\$31.8 billion in 2000). Many countries that buy US weapons are repressive regimes. Around the world, militarism impoverishes the many and enriches the few.

8. Militarism Weakens Democracy

Military organizations are inherently authoritarian systems that promote obedience over independence. Since 1859, US troops have intervened around the world more than 160 times—an average of once a year. To justify these interventions, US officials have lied to the American people about the pretexts underlying the wars. Around the world, declarations of war and martial law have been used to institute press censorship, curtail dissent and imprison political opponents. Militarization and the war on terrorism have been used as an excuse to erode political and civil liberties. Under the USA Patriot Act, environmental protests can be defined as terrorist acts. Around the world, the military insists on being exempt from environmental and civil laws.

9. Militarism Distorts Science

Militarism encourages the development of ever-deadlier weapons. Universities and corporations that could be devoting time, talent and resources to addressing problems of poverty, sickness, and injus-

tice are instead, designing exotic new military technologies. These exotic weapons include: chemical weapons, ethnically targeted weapons, electromagnetic guns, mind-altering drugs, miniaturized surveillance technology and “less-than-lethal” weapons to be used to control and repress a country's own citizens. The US spends more than \$58 billion a year on military research and development. Worldwide, more than 50 million scientists, researchers and workers are employed in the arms industry.

10. Militarism Promotes Racism and Sexism

Militarism requires citizens of one country to believe that the citizens of competing nations are less intelligent, intrinsically evil, or even sub-human. The last several years have seen drastic increases in racial profiling and the scapegoating of immigrants. Military bases and military exercises expose low income neighboring communities (disproportionately communities of color) to debilitating levels of noise, chronic air pollution, the risks of chemical contamination and accidental death and injury. The military's ranks are filled with low income youth, especially youth of color, desperate for jobs and economic opportunity. Nuclear ore is extracted from native lands, nuclear weapons are tested on native lands and nuclear wastes are deposited on native lands. Militarism fosters male supremacy from the military use of rape against civilians during war to the sex trade that military bases foster to the culture of violence that militarism promotes.

11. Militarism Threatens Human Survival

The US has threatened other countries with the preemptive use of nuclear weapons—the ultimate weapons of mass destruction. US nuclear blasts targeted against the civilian populations of Hiroshima and Nagasaki killed 210,000. Fallout from open-air nuclear testing is expected to eventually kill about 2.4 million people worldwide. Nuclear weapons stockpiled by the US, Israel, India, Pakistan, Russia, China, and Britain have the potential to end human civilization. An exchange of nuclear weapons between India and Pakistan could kill 30 million. These costly and dangerous stockpiles must be dismantled and destroyed.

Depleted Uranium: *Questions and Answers on its Use in War*

H. PATRICIA HYNES AND SARDOR IBRAGIMOV

Released in Sept. 2003 by the authors, who are affiliated with the School of Public Health at Boston University. Reprinted by permission.

1. What is depleted uranium?

Uranium (U) is a naturally occurring radioactive and chemically toxic metal that is widespread in the earth's crust. The average amount of uranium in soil is about 3 grams per ton or 3 mg/kg. Natural uranium consists of three atomic components called isotopes: U238 (99.27%) and minute amounts of U235 and U234. Uranium is enriched for use in nuclear power reactors and nuclear weapons by increasing its percentage of U235.

Depleted uranium (DU) is the waste product of the uranium enrichment process. It consists of the same components as natural uranium but has differing proportions, with slightly more U238 and a reduced amount of U235. Uranium's radioactivity is largely determined by the quantity of U235 it contains. DU has about 60% of the radioactivity of natural uranium (1). The United States has stockpiled an estimated 450,000 tons of DU (2).

2. What are the current uses of DU?

Civilian: DU is currently used in hospital irradiation shields, containers that transport radioactive substances, wide-bodied aircraft components, and petroleum drilling equipment (3, 4, 5).

Military: DU is used by the U.S. and other militaries in both defensive armor and armor piercing ammunition that is known as DU penetrators.

These weapons have a solid rod of DU that increases their ability to penetrate heavily armored vehicles because DU sharpens upon impact and self-ignites. DU weapons, thus, increase the potential of detonating combustible vehicles such as tanks and destroying buildings (2).

3. How much DU has been used in recent wars?

An estimated 320 tons of DU were used in weapons during the 1991 Gulf War; about 12 tons were used in the Balkans in the late 1990s (6). While there is no clear information about the amounts of DU used in Afghanistan, it is likely that U.S. forces used DU munitions in the war in Afghanistan because U.S. weapons systems that shoot DU were used in that war (7). Available information suggests that the U.S. and UK forces released approximately 90-180 tons of DU during the 2003 Gulf War in Iraq (8), although more recent estimates are between 110-165 tons (7). Much of DU munitions were likely fired near urban areas in the second Gulf War, which would create higher risk of exposure for the civilian population (8).

4. What happens when DU weapons strike a target?

U.S. test data show that approximately 20% of a DU weapon penetrator becomes aerosolized particles upon impact with an armored vehicle (9). A 120 mm

DU penetrator, when fired from an Abrams tank, created 2 to 7 pounds of uranium oxide dust upon impact, according to U.S. Army tests. From 50-96% of the dust are respirable particles, the majority of which, if inhaled, can remain in the lungs for years (10). Some fraction of the aerosolized DU particles may be dispersed and spread by wind. A significant amount, however, contaminates soil within a few hundred yards of the target (11).

5. What are the pathways of exposure to DU?

Both soldier and civilians in war and post-war situations are at risk of internal and external exposure to DU through inhalation, ingestion of DU particles, and skin exposure. Those riding in a vehicle struck by a DU shell experience an acute exposure to DU. Civilians can be exposed when they are victims of a DU weapon that strikes a nearby target and generates aerosolized fine particles. Soldiers and civilians in conflict areas can suffer DU exposure from embedded shrapnel, with DU entering the blood stream through the wound. Prolonged exposure, such as that of soldiers driving for long periods in DU vehicles equipped with DU ammunition, may result in soldiers exceeding regulatory limits for external exposure (10).

The recent assessment in the Balkans by the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) revealed soil contamination close to the site of embedded DU penetrators, from within a few yards to within a few hundred yards. Soil within a yard of the DU penetrator exceeded internationally recommended standards (12, 13, 14). Children playing near these sites are at risk of ingesting contaminated soil and breathing resuspended fine particles (1). A recent UNEP study in the Balkans also recorded DU contamination of groundwater in Bosnia-Herzegovina from DU rods that had corroded and released soluble forms of DU that reached groundwater (15). A journalistic report on Iraqi children working to support their families revealed that the children are sorting through blasted Iraqi tanks and armored vehicles, stockpiled in scrap yards by U.S. military contractors, in order to salvage metal parts to sell to metal dealers (16). If the vehicles were hit by DU weapons, the interior of the vehicles would be highly contaminated with DU particles and expose

the children to ingestion and inhalation of DU.

Groundwater in Concord, Massachusetts, USA has been severely contaminated by DU waste, which was stored and dumped at a manufacturing facility there. Investigations of the water in wells on site revealed uranium isotopes of DU levels up to 3,000 times the permitted state level for drinking water (8).

6. What are the human health impacts of exposure to DU? Is it harmful?

The two primary organs to suffer from exposure to DU are the lung and the kidney. The lung is exposed after inhalation of DU particles and the kidney filters and excretes DU dissolved from particles that were ingested and inhaled. The health effects of DU exposure depend on the solubility of DU particles. Relatively insoluble particles in the lung will remain there longer, exposing surrounding cells to radiation through the process of radioactive decay. The rate at which DU dissolves depends on its chemical form and the solvents it contacts. Human body fluids can carry DU to many organs and tissues. Soluble forms of DU will dissolve in the blood and circulate to other organs and systems, with potential toxic effects on those organs, before being excreted (17).

The heavy-metal chemical toxicity of DU is the same as that of natural and enriched uranium. Both possess a high chemical affinity for biological molecules (18). They may cause cellular necrosis (or death of cells) and cellular atrophy in the kidney with the risk of impairing the kidney's function of filtering impurities and toxins from the blood (17).

Thus far, no conclusive studies have been conducted that demonstrate the long-term human health effects and harm of exposure from DU. Currently 29 veterans from the 1991 Gulf War who have DU metal shrapnel fragments embedded in their body and 38 non exposed veterans are being followed clinically. Those with DU fragments were excreting higher levels of DU in urine 7 years after exposure, which indicates that DU continues to enter the bloodstream and circulate to other parts of their body. The study found subtle central nervous system and reproductive effects in the exposed veterans (19). Research on mice by the U.S. military has

shown that DU particles from implanted DU fragments are deposited from the bloodstream into the bone and to a lesser degree in the brain, testes, and lymph nodes and that DU crosses the placenta from the mother into the fetus (20). Research on rats shows that DU accumulates in the testes, bone, kidney and brain; and in vitro tests found that DU may be genotoxic and mutagenic (21). Other research found that implanted DU fragments caused soft tissue sarcomas in the muscles of rats (22).

Animal studies are not a reliable source of evidence for human health effects because of differences in exposure scenarios, relative concentration doses, and physiology. However, the animal studies signal serious concern for the fate of DU in the human body. The number of exposed 1991 Gulf War veterans who are being followed clinically is small; and there has not been sufficient time since their exposure to draw definitive conclusions. The lack of scientific evidence of direct human harm from DU exposure is an indictment of the paucity of research not a proof of no harm. Thus, the decision to use DU in weapons has been made in an environment of uncertainty about the health impacts on those exposed in conflict and post-conflict situations.

7. What can we conclude about the risks of using DU weapons?

Many forecast the proliferation of DU weapons because of DU's penetration and ignition characteristics and as a means of disposing the stockpiles of DU in countries that are enriching uranium. Most armed forces will not be protected from exposure to DU since few militaries acknowledge that DU exposure is or may be harmful. Although there is solid evidence that DU weapons contaminate soil and air upon impact, it is unlikely that contaminated soil will be removed or cleaned by those who used the weapons or by the country under siege because other post-war crises, such as rebuilding infrastructure, will claim the scarce resources. Civilian populations in DU contaminated sites are likely to be exposed to hot spots of DU soil contamination and of groundwater contamination, since systematic surveillance of soil and groundwater in areas of conflict where DU weapons have been employed has not been the norm.

We conclude that DU exposure in and after war adds long-term radiation and chemical exposure to the already existing risks of death, injury, and environmental damage from war. We advocate that depleted uranium not be used to augment weapons of war because its health effects on those acutely and chronically exposed are not known, because it persists in the environment in zones of conflict, and because contaminated sites are not adequately documented and remediated.

Editorial Assistance, Genevieve Howe

References

1. World Health Organization. (2001). "Depleted uranium: sources, exposure and health effects." Retrieved July 3, 2003 from www.who.int/ionizing_radiation/pub_meet/DU_Eng.pdf
2. Schmidt E, Wirz C. (2002). "Background information on a current topic." AC-Laboratorium Spiez, May 2000. Retrieved July 6, 2003 from http://www.vbs.admin.ch/ls/e/bg_info/du/
3. World Information Service on Energy (WISE) Uranium Project. (n.d.). "Civil application." Retrieved July 3, 2003 from the WISE web site <http://www.antenna.nl/wise/uranium/dviss.html>
4. Birchall A, Clark M. (2001). "Depleted uranium." March 2001. Retrieved June 20, 2003 from the National Radiological Protection Board web site, http://www.nrpb.org/publications/bulletin/archive/bulletin_229.pdf
5. National Radiological Protection Board. (2003). "Where is depleted uranium used?" Retrieved August 14, 2003 from the NRPB web site on Frequently Asked Questions: Depleted Uranium <http://www.nrpb.org/faq/du/du4.htm>
6. Royal Society, (2002). "The health hazards of depleted uranium: a combined summary of parts I and II." March 2002. Retrieved July 9, 2003 from the Royal Society web site <http://www.royalsoc.ac.uk/templates/statements/statementDetails.cfm?StatementID=168>
7. Fahey, D., Personal correspondence, August 24, 2003.
8. Fahey D. (2003). "The use of depleted uranium in the 2003 Iraq war." June 24, 2003. Retrieved June 30, 2003 from the WISE Uranium Project web site <http://www.antenna.nl/~wise/uranium/dissgw.html#DFIQ03>
9. Fahey D, "Science of science fiction." (2003). March 12, 2003. Retrieved July 7, 2003 from <http://www.antenna.nl/wise/uranium/pdf/dumyths.pdf>
10. Fahey D. (1999). "Depleted uranium weapons: Lessons from the 1991 Gulf War" in *Depleted Uranium A Post-War Disaster For Environment And Health, Part 2*. Laka Foundation, May 1999. Retrieved July 13, 2003 from the WISE Uranium Project web site, <http://www.antenna.nl/wise/uranium/dhap992.html>
11. International Atomic Energy Agency. (n.d.). "The facts: Depleted uranium." Retrieved July 17, 2003 from the IAEA web site http://www.iaea.org/worldatom/Press/Focus/DU/faq_depleted_uranium.html
12. United Nations Environment Program. (2002). "UNEP confirms low-level DU contamination in Serbia and Montenegro, calls for precaution." Retrieved July 19, 2003 from <http://postconflict.unep.ch/press-frydusermar2002.htm>

13. United Nations Environment Program, Post Conflict Assessment Unit. (2003). "Low-level DU contamination found in Bosnia and Herzegovina, UNEP calls for precaution." Press Release, March 25, 2003. Retrieved July 19, 2003 from the UNEP web site <http://postconflict.unep.ch/pressbihdu25mar2003.htm>
14. UNEP, "Depleted uranium in Serbia and Montenegro," Retrieved July 19, 2003 from <http://postconflict.unep.ch/publications/duserbiamont.pdf>
15. United Nations Environment Program, Post Conflict Assessment Unit. (2003). "Low-level DU contamination found in Bosnia and Herzegovina, UNEP calls for precaution." Press Release, March 25, 2003. Retrieved July 19, 2003 from <http://postconflict.unep.ch/pressbihdu25mar2003.htm>
16. Walt V. (2003). "Iraqi children working to survive." *The Boston Globe*. August 12. A1,A10.
17. U.S. Department of Defense, Office of the Special Assistant for Gulf War Illnesses, GulfLink. (1988) July 31. "Depleted Uranium—a Short Course." Chapter 2 in *Environmental Exposure Report*. Retrieved July 14, 2003 from http://www.gulfink.osd.mil/du/du_sec02.htm
18. Harley NH, Foulkes EC, Hilborne LH, Hudson A, Ross Anthony C. (1999). "Concluding remarks and future research." Chapter 3 in *A Review of the Scientific Literature as it Pertains to Gulf War Illnesses*. RAND. Retrieved July 16, 2003 from <http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR1018.7/mr1018.7.chap3.html>
19. McDiarmid MA et al. (2002). "Health effects and biological monitoring." *Military Medicine*. 167(2 Suppl):123-4, Feb.
20. Fahey D. (1999). "Policy paper on the use of depleted uranium in ammunition." December 15, 1999. Retrieved August 11, 2003 from the Military Toxic Project's web site, <http://www.milttoxproj.org/DU/Policy.htm>
21. Arfsten DP, Still KR, Ritchie GD. "A review of the effects of uranium and depleted uranium exposure on reproduction and fetal development." Accessed 08.08.03 http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&list_uids=12539863&dopt=Abstract
22. Hahn FF, Guilmette RA, Hoover MD. "Implanted depleted uranium fragments cause soft tissue sarcomas in the muscles of rats." Accessed 08.08.03. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&list_uids=11781165&dopt=Abstract

Gender and Militarism: *An Activist's Guide*

Descriptions of the three sponsors of this publication (American Friends Service Committee; Committee on Women, Population, and the Environment; and the Population and Development Program at Hampshire College) appear on the inside front cover.

Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era

(www.dawn.org)—Network of women scholars and activists from the global South who engage in feminist research and analysis of the global environment and are committed to working for economic justice, gender justice, and democracy. DAWN works globally and regionally in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, Latin America, and the Pacific on the themes of the political economy of globalization; political restructuring and social transformation; sustainable livelihoods; and sexual and reproductive health and rights, in partnership with other global NGOs and networks.

The East Asia–U.S.–Puerto Rico Women's Network Against Militarism

Network of women from Okinawa, mainland Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, Puerto Rico/Vieques, and the United States. The Network works to challenge the massive presence of U.S. military in East Asia through public education, lobbying, and community and transnational organizing. It focuses on developing the leadership of women and communities directly affected by the actions of military personnel by supporting the work of local NGOs and survivors and to build a movement that challenges all forms of militarism and creates models of women's leadership, community service and development, policy development, and planning that replace false notion of national security with genuine forms of human security. Contact: 353 30th Street, San Francisco, CA 94131 USA. tel/fax: 415.550.7947; e-mail gwyn@igc.org.

Environmentalists Against War

(www.envirosagainstar.org)—Network of environmental organizations and individuals that opposed the U.S. attack on Iraq and is continuing to work in opposition to the social and environ-

mental impacts of war and militarism, in the United States and internationally.

Focus on the Global South

(www.focusweb.org)—New electronic network for activists and researchers focusing on U.S. military bases around the world. Currently includes representatives from 26 countries, and is open to representatives from communities affected by US bases/military presence; representatives from local, national or international organizations working or intending to work on US/bases/military presence; researchers studying U.S. bases/military presence; and any other individual or organization that could contribute to this campaign. Contact: herbert@focusphilippines.org.

GABRIELA Network

(www.gabnet.org)—Philippine-U.S. women's solidarity organization. GABNet provides the means by which Filipinas in the United States can empower themselves, functions as training ground for women's leadership, and articulates the women's point of view. GABNet effects change through organizing, educating, fundraising, networking, and advocacy.

PRODUCED BY NNIRR & PEEK MEDIA, 2003

Journey to Durban: Migrant Rights at the UN World Conference Against Racism

In a world where borders increasingly divide people, immigrants and refugees are building an international movement against racism and for human rights. In Sept. 2001, more than 15,000 people from around the world met in Durban, South Africa, and the UN World Conference Against Racism. *Journey to Durban* documents the efforts and accomplishments of international immigrant and refugee rights organizers at the conference, projecting the hopes and challenges that lie ahead.



\$20 per copy plus \$3.50 shipping and handling for the first copy plus \$1 for each additional copy. Order from NNIRR, 310 8th St., Ste. 303, Oakland, CA 94607. For more information call 510.465.1984 or e-mail nnirr@nnirr.org.

INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (www.incite-national.org)— National activist organization of radical feminists of color advancing a movement to end violence against women of color and their communities through direct action, critical dialogue, and grassroots organizing.

ISIS International Manila (www.isis-women.org/organization/index.html)— Feminist NGO dedicated to creating opportunities for women's voices to be heard, strengthening feminist analyses through information exchange, and promoting solidarity and support for feminist movements for economic justice, reproductive rights, and demilitarization across the globe, especially focused on Asia and the Pacific, with sister organizations in Chile and Uganda (Isis Internacional-Chile: www.isis.cl; Isis-WICCE: www.isis.or.ug).

MADRE (www.madre.org)— International women's human rights organization that works in partnership with community-based women's groups to address issues of sustainable development, community improvement, and women's health; violence and war; discrimination, and racism; self-determination and collective rights; women's leadership development; and human rights education.

Military Toxics Project (www.miltox-proj.org)— Provides information, education resources, community and political organizing resources to the public with the goal of cleaning up military pollution, safeguarding the transportation of hazardous materials, and advancing the development and implementation of preventive solutions to the toxic and radioactive pollution caused by military activities

National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights (www.nnirr.org)— National organization composed of local coalitions and immigrant, refugee, community, religious, civil rights, and labor organizations and activists. It serves as a forum to share information and analysis, to educate communities and the general public, and to develop and coordinate plans of action on important immigrant and refugee issues.

National Priorities Project (www.nationalpriorities.org)— Provides information, data, and analysis for citizens concerned about the local impact of federal spending and priorities. Excellent source of statistics on the cost of war with Iraq.

WAND / Women's Action for New Directions (www.wand.org)— WAND's mission is to empower women to act politically to reduce violence and

militarism and redirect excessive military resources toward unmet human and environmental needs. WAND works to rewrite national budget priorities from the perspective of women; end the culture of violence in our society and prevent violence against women; empower women to act politically, encourage women's leadership, and bring more women into the public policy arena to further WAND's goals; eliminate the testing, production, sale, and use of weapons of mass destruction; and clean up the environmental effects of nuclear weapons production.

Women in Black (www.womeninblack.net)—International peace network of women who stand in vigil against war, occupation, and violence

against women. Women in Black is a means of mobilization and a formula for action. Women in Black vigils were started in Israel in 1988 by women protesting against Israel's occupation of the West Bank and Gaza. Women in Black has developed in countries such as Italy, the United States, Spain, Germany, England, Azerbaijan, Colombia, and in the former Yugoslavia.

Women's International Coalition for Economic Justice (www.wicej.org)—International coalition representing organizations in all regions of the globe. WICEJ works to link gender with macro-economic policy in international inter-governmental policy-making arenas, from a human-rights perspective.

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (www.wilpf.org)—WILPF is the oldest women's peace organization in the world. It aims to bring together women of different political beliefs and philosophies who are united in their determination to study, make known, and help abolish the causes and the legitimization of war; to work toward world peace and total and universal disarmament; to support civil society to democratize the United Nations system; to support the continuous development and implementation of international and humanitarian law; and to enhance environmentally sustainable development.

JUSTICE VISIONS

What is the meaning of justice in a world based on violence, exclusion and inequality?

NEW!

The Prison Inside the Prison: Control Units, Supermax Prisons, and Devices of Torture

In recent decades, the growth of "control units" and other forms of isolation in U.S. prisons have emerged as a key manifestation of the increasingly dehumanizing nature of imprisonment in the United States. Over this same period, the number of prisoners in this country has also exploded, making the United States the incarceration capital of the world. This issue brief chronicles efforts by AFSC programs and partners to work with prisoners, family members, and community-based coalitions to challenge these human rights abuses, with the ultimate goal of eliminating control units and supermax prisons. *A Justice Visions issue brief by Rachael Kamel and Bonnie Kerness.*

STILL AVAILABLE

Whose Safety? Women of Color and the Violence of Law Enforcement

(2001, copublished with CWPE)

A Justice Visions working paper by Annanya Bhattacharjee.

In a Time of Broken Bones: A Call to Dialogue on Hate Violence and the Limitations of Hate Crimes Legislation

A Justice Visions working paper by Katharine Whitlock.



Justice Visions working papers may be downloaded from www.afsc.org/justicevisions.htm. For more information, please contact cruweb@afsc.org or call 215.241.7126.

PRODUCED BY THE NATIONAL NETWORK FOR IMMIGRANT AND REFUGEE RIGHTS



UPROOTED: Refugees of the Global Economy

A compelling tale of how the global economy has forced people to leave their homes. *Uprooted* weaves the stories of three immigrants — from Haiti, Bolivia, and the Philippines — to raise critical questions about U.S. immigration policy in an era when corporations cross borders at will. *English with Spanish subtitles.*

\$20 per copy plus \$3 shipping and handling for the first copy plus \$1 for each additional copy. Order from NNIRR, 310 8th St., Ste. 303, Oakland, CA 94607. For more information call 510.465.1984 or e-mail nnirr@nnirr.org.

Women's Global Network for Reproductive Rights (www.wgnrr.org) — Autonomous network of groups and individuals in every continent who aim to achieve and support reproductive rights for women. WGNRR strives for women's right to self-determination in keeping with their freedom, dignity, and personally held values. Transforming social, political, and economic conditions are part of the reproductive rights agenda, so that all women are able to fully enforce reproductive rights.

Women of Color Resource Center (www.coloredgirls.org) — Promotes the political, economic, social, and cultural well being of women and girls of color in the United States. WCRC is committed to organizing and educating women of color across lines of race,

ethnicity, religion, nationality, class, sexual orientation, physical ability, and age.

Women Peacemakers' Program of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation (www.ifor.org/WPP) — Works to support and strengthen women's peacemaking initiatives. WPP supports networking and capacity building for women's organizations; works to engender peace movements; documents and analyzes women's peacemaking efforts and strategies; and conducts workshops on how women peacemakers can improve their use of the media for peace.

Women's Environment and Development Organization (www.wedo.org) — International advocacy network that seeks to increase the

power of women worldwide as policymakers in governance and in policymaking institutions, forums, and processes at all levels, to achieve economic and social justice, a peaceful and healthy planet, and human rights for all. WEDO advocates women's equality in economic and political decision making; seeks development solutions that are sustainable for women, communities, and the planet; and promotes economic equity for women and increased public awareness about the negative impacts of globalization on women, their families and their communities, and the environment.

Echando Raices Taking Root

IMMIGRANT AND REFUGEE COMMUNITIES IN CALIFORNIA, TEXAS, AND IOWA

A new video documentary from AFSC



A resource for community education and action

- Available in Spanish and English.
- Includes discussion guide.
- Designed for immigrant organizations, labor unions, faith communities, educators, and more

For more information or to order, visit www.takingroot.org or call 215.241.71



American Friends Service Committee

www.afsc.org

The Population and Development Program has a variety of projects that focus on developing feminist critique and analysis of global issues and translating that analysis into grassroots activism.

The **DifferenTakes** series of issue papers providing alternative information and perspectives on cutting-edge reproductive rights, social and environmental justice concerns. Past issue papers include:

- DT # 2: *Cracking Open CRACK: Unethical Sterilization Movement Gains Momentum*
- DT #4: *The New Eugenics: The Case Against Genetically Modified Humans*
- DT #8: *Is Inequality Bad for the Environment and Bad for Your Health?*
- DT #20: *Ten Reasons Why Militarism is Bad for Reproductive Freedom*

New Perspectives on Population is an alternative population studies curriculum for classroom use by high school teachers. Informed by women's rights, anti-racist, and economic justice viewpoints.

A Critical Look Campaign is a public education campaign critiquing the history and health impacts of the provider controlled, hormonal contraceptive, Depo-Provera in the larger context of promoting women's health and contraceptive safety.

Panels, Courses, and much more... Population and Development offers courses on reproductive rights and population issues to students at the Five College community in Western Massachusetts and sponsors panels, lectures, and discussions by leading feminist activists on subjects from HIV/AIDS to human cloning. There are many activist opportunities available through the program including fighting the scapegoating of immigrants and US environmental problems, and challenging population control policies at home and abroad.



The Population and Development Program

Hampshire College, Amherst, MA, 01002. 413.559.5506. popdev@hampshire.edu

New and forthcoming from

COMMITTEE ON WOMEN, POPULATION, AND THE ENVIRONMENT



www.cwpe.org

Sex, Lies, and Contraception

A Reproductive Rights Resource Packet

This packet of information and organizing tools for activists addresses how women's rights to safe and voluntary sex, birth control and motherhood are increasingly restricted, controlled, and criminalized. Includes fact sheets, issue papers, brochures, and calls to action. You can view and print individual pieces of the packet on our web-

site or request a full hard copy packet from info@cwpe.org. We are committed to making the packet available at no cost, but would appreciate a \$3.00 donation, when possible, to help defray material and mailing expenses. Checks may be made out to Tides Center/CWPE and sent to CWPE, P.O. Box 16178 Baltimore, MD 21218.

The Population Curriculum Project

The Population Curriculum Project is a joint effort of the Population and Development Program at Hampshire College and CWPE. Its purpose is to encourage a more complex and culturally sensitive presentation of international population issues in high school social studies, environmental studies, and biology curricula. In January 2004 the project will publish a major new high school

curriculum, *New Perspectives on Population*, by human rights and development educators Mary Lugton and Phoebe McKinney, with chapters on population and food, population and the environment, and population and poverty. For an advance copy, please contact the Population and Development Program at popdev@hampshire.edu or 413.559.5506.

Stop the Blame: Population Control Imagery (1933-2003)

New CD-ROM on Reproduction, Race, and Representation

Stop the Blame is a multimedia presentation produced by Binta Jeffers which offers historic context for the coercive imagery of population organizations. Apparently simple depictions of women of color with children are linked with images of hunger, scarcity, overcrowding, and environmental burden. How have these negative linkages been established over the past decades? This interactive CD-ROM presents the visual media of past campaigns and their representation of population, poverty, and the fertility in a clear

and accessible format. It demonstrates how images of overpopulation have evolved over time and have (mis)shaped popular understandings of population, development, and environment issues, in the United States and overseas. This interactive CD-ROM is intended as a tool for activists, educators, and related groups interested in new discussions about population and privilege. The easy-to-use program will also be available online at www.cwpe.org.