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Gender Ideology and the Disarmament Movement

KAREN KAHN

Amidst all the hue and cry that the disarmament movement is dying, there has been little critical assessment of why the movement seems to be faltering when the issues remain so critical. One crucial element of this analysis, and the one to be addressed here, involves the role of women in the movement. In the late 1970's and early '80's, women seemed to be taking a leading role within the movement, particularly with actions such as the Women's Pentagon Actions, Greenham Common, and the Seneca Peace Encampment, and even in more traditionally oriented peace groups such as Women's Action for Nuclear Disarmament.

Nonetheless, in more recent years, it has become clear that women have remained marginal to the mainstream movement. Their role has most often been described as symbolic, rather than substantive, suggesting that the mainstream movement has not seen women as serious political thinkers and organizers. Moreover, because the ideology failed to address the real issues underlying women's resistance to nuclear weapons and militarism, women activists were unable to sustain powerful grassroots support.

War and Peace as Gendered Concepts

In our culture the concepts of war and peace are gendered; war is perceived as masculine, peace as feminine. Men are supposed to be strong, aggressive and violent, capable of waging wars, while women are thought to be weak, passive, afraid of violence, and therefore, inclined toward peace. Since men, more often than women, actually engage in combat, it is a persuasive ideology. We graciously forget that women have supported "men's wars" for centuries, working in war industries, caring for the sick and wounded, and even fighting on the frontlines, just as men, at times, have refused to join the state in waging war.

This ideology evolved in support of the state, and a particular set of political, economic and social relations. It mystifies both the reality of gender differences, and the real meaning of war and peace in our lives. Most often it is used by the state to garner support for wars. Cynthia Enloe, in her recent book, Does Khaki Become You?, argues that the armed services depend on the integration of a traditional gender ideology with an ideology of war and peace to inspire men to become, and remain, soldiers. Soldiers fight for the protection of the weak, passive women, the victims of enemy brutality. In this version of the ideology women are seen as "moral mothers" — the self-sacrificing wives, and mothers who support the war effort by sending their sons, brothers and husbands off to the front, while praying for peace. What is forgotten here is that women are also portrayed by the military as degraded whores, or as weak, emotional beings unable to participate in the heroics of the male war effort. Everything thought to be feminine, including a longing for peace, is devalued in order to heroize the aggressive, violent behavior needed for waging war.

As we begin to draw out and examine the way in which gender ideology is used by the military, we recognize the contradictions inherent in the social construction of gender wherever it is played out. Women have only two options — to take on the role of the "morally superior mother" or the "degraded whore." Both roles play into the power of men, since either women must be protected in their innocence, or destroyed by their own sin. Nonetheless women have chosen to exploit the "moral mother" image and its implicit connection to peace in order to build movements to resist war and militarism.

One reason for this is that women have rarely been recognized as legitimate political actors by our society. Entering the political arena as out-
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siders, they have traditionally been faced with the need to prove their right to voice political concerns, prior to making any particular claims on the polity. Historically, white middle class women often used their culturally defined role as morally superior mothers to enter the political arena. They played on the “moral mother” image, arguing that as mothers and caretakers they had something special to offer society — a sense of morality capable of countering male greed and individual interest, which they believed was destroying society’s collective wellbeing.

This ideology of female moral righteousness melds easily with that which suggests that women have a special relationship to peace, making war resistance particularly fertile territory for white, middle class women activists. Peace activists can always take the moral high ground, and women have found it easy to justify their resistance in these terms. The ideology, however, cannot replace a thorough analysis of women’s real interests in maintaining peace. If it does, women remain trapped within oppressive cultural categories and limit the impact of their own resistance.

The Marginalization of Women by the Disarmament Movement

The marginalization of women in the disarmament movement must, in part, be attributed to the failure of this ideology to challenge a set of social relations, and a social process which is, in the first instance, male-dominated.

In this respect, the disarmament movement is not different from any other social arena. Within the movement, by drawing on an ideology which evolved historically to support male hegemony, women make themselves vulnerable to cultural stereotypes. It is difficult enough for women, often lacking the organizing and leadership skills males acquire through daily experience, to challenge male authority. A political strategy, which recreates the cultural categories underlying this hierarchy, is certainly mistaken.

Gender ideology is much too complex to simply assert the superiority of “feminine values” or the “female principle” in an attempt to transform social relations. As discussed above, the very fact that the culture is able to simultaneously idealize and degrade women is fundamental to women’s oppression. When viewed as the “protectors of the moral order,” women have always been attributed a certain sense of innocence. This argument has inevitably been used to keep them out of the public arena where they might be corrupted by the mundane affairs of politics.

If women don’t challenge these cultural categories, they become trapped in the public/private cultural dichotomy which supports the assumption that women have only one acceptable social role, motherhood. In the face of this ideology, all other female roles and social activities, particularly those outside the domestic arena, become invisible. Asserting the natural peacefulness of women’s nature does not escape this cultural trap, since women’s “nature” is still interpreted culturally as a natural inclination toward motherhood. As such, there is little difference between those activists who proclaim that women’s special relationship to peace is based upon motherhood, and those who argue that it is based upon women’s relationship to nature. In either case, motherhood becomes the primary metaphor through which the general public, whether inside or outside the disarmament movement, understands women’s resistance.

Although a traditional gender ideology, asserting that women do not belong in the political arena, has not been explicitly articulated within the disarmament movement, it surfaces in other ways. When women are viewed as “moral mothers” within the movement, they are not respected as competent political actors. Their role is primarily seen as symbolic; women carry the moral banner of the movement, while men do the real work, arguing over scientific facts, missile technology, and arms control. Moreover, having entered the political arena as mothers, women are seen as having only one interest — their children’s survival; having achieved this they are expected to retreat back into the domestic arena. It is understood that women (read “mothers”) may have something special to offer with respect to this particular cause — peace — but they are not expected to express a broad range of political interests. As mothers they can be kept at the margins, dragged out to express the emotional arguments for peace and disarmament, and then sent back home to raise the children. In addition, if women’s interest in peace is attributed to a “natural desire” the material conditions of women’s lives can be ignored. By making absolutely no connections to the impact of militarism on women’s daily lives, “natural desire” provides a perfect screen for the mystification of women’s real interests, thus, making it appear that “women’s issues” are irrelevant to the disarmament movement.

Material Conditions and Women’s Resistance to Militarism

It is true that women in the disarmament movement have generally taken little interest in the issues that have come to define the mainstream movement — arms control, the technology of first strike weapons and SDI, scientific studies of nuclear winter, and the medical effects of nuclear holocaust. However, the assumption that women do not share these political interests with men because they are not serious political actors is founded on false premises. Women’s political concerns are the product of the social, political and economic relations which define their place in society; that women often lack the knowledge and expertise, as
The Church and Revolution in Latin America, Part II

JEANNE GALLO

Editor’s Note: The following is Part II of a two-part article. In the first part Jeanne Gallo looked at the church in Latin America since World War II, specifically at events in Brazil where the earliest CEBs (Christian Base Communities) emerged with programs that empowered the poor, such as rural unionization and educational projects. In this article the author continues to discuss the development and activities of the CEBs and how they relate to those of us organizing for peace and justice in the United States. For copies of Part I, write to Resist, 38 Union Square, Somerville, MA 02130.

Early Beginnings of Base Communities

Within the Church itself, a number of events were to give impetus to the emergence of the CEBs. Aware of the ferment in Latin America, Pope Pius XII in 1957 appealed to the European and North American Churches and to religious orders to send priests and religious to the continent. John XXIII, after the Cuban Revolution, repeated the request. He called for a plan of action in response to the new and urgent challenges to Catholic hegemony: Protestant inroads, the threat of communism, secularization, and the shortage of priests.

The response was enthusiastic. However, the missionaries who arrived brought with them new ideas and new lifestyles. Many chose to live and work among the poor, often in the most isolated communities. This was to be an important factor in the later development of the CEBs.

Then in 1962, Vatican Council II began with its questioning of the very nature and role of the Church in the modern world. The Council would lead Brazil’s bishops to say in 1967: “Society is changing each day more quickly and the ecclesiastical structures don’t always accompany this change. The parish and diocesan structures require . . . profound modifications.”

Previous to this statement, pastoral experiments had been taking place in many parts of Latin America. The immense parishes of the Latin American Church, combined with the scarcity of priests, had led to a “service station” approach to religion. The need for more manageable organizational units was recognized by church workers.

One of the first experiments was by a team of Chicago priests in the slum neighborhood of San Miguelito, Panama. In 1963, they formed a network of neighborhood-based communities in their parish. The group was led by Father Leo Mahon. Mahon developed a course known as “The Family of God” which brought married couples from the same neighborhood together to reflect on their lives by using biblical themes.

The merit of the approach was the method which helped people express their feelings and thoughts about basic life realities such as justice/injustice, sex/love/marriage, work, family sickness, death, the meaning of life and of the world — and to correlate these with stories from the Bible.

The major criticism of “The Family of God” was that it ignored the larger social and structural aspects of people’s lives. Thus it did not lead to action for social change. As pastoral workers used the method in other places, more explicitly social and political dimensions were brought in.

The importance of “The Family of God” movement lies in the fact that hundreds of missionaries stopped in Panama en route to their destination and took aspects of the program with them. Also, what was happening in San Miguelito was being documented at Ivan Illich’s center at Cuernavaca, Mexico. Missionaries to Latin America studied language at this center (and the one in Brazil) and so were exposed to the program and its basic methodology.

During the same period, the Centro de Formacion Campesina in Choluteca, Honduras, began training hundreds of “Delegates of the Word” who worked with small, rural communities where priests seldom visited. In Chile, biblical reflection groups were forming that took on their own style and spirit, while in Peru, Maryknoll missionaries were preparing Indian catechists and
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lay preachers to minister to their own indigenous communities.

The key experience, however, was that of Brazil. The bishops, in response to John XXIII's request, designed an "Emergency Plan" for the period 1962-1964. The plan structured pastoral action in Brazil: renewal plans for clergy, restructuring of parishes and encouragement of "natural communities," socio-economic programs, lay participation and leadership training. The plan urged bishops to "identify natural communities and work on the basis of their life situation" and to give lay Christians in these communities "a more decisive role." The term "base communities" was yet to be used.

In Rio de Janeiro, lay people had already been designated as "popular catechists"—to baptize, assist the sick and dying, and act as coordinators of small communities. And MEB, in 1958, in Natal (Northeast Brazil) had begun "creating over a thousand church-sponsored radio schools that encouraged people to gather in face-to-face groups and critically examine the situation of poverty, malnutrition and illiteracy that plagued the region" (Latinamerica Press, 6/27/85).

In 1963, when sisters of my religious congregation arrived in Maranhao in Northeast Brazil, they were visited by Dom Fragoso, the auxiliary bishop of the diocese. He explained the Archdiocesan five-year plan to them which included the initiation of base communities and he spoke about organizing three-day meetings in the outlying villages for this purpose.

It appears that the term "natural communities" had been replaced by the term "base communities" by early 1963. This is one reason why it is very difficult to pinpoint where CEBs actually first emerged—in Panama, Brazil, or some other country. What is clear is that there was a lot of cross-fertilization and sharing of ideas taking place from one region to another, from one country to another.

The Emergency Plan was replaced by the Joint Pastoral Plan, 1966-1970. It was explicit about the CEBs: "It becomes urgent to incentivize and dynamize, within the parish territory, basic communities where Christians will not be anonymous persons...." Thus, the term "base communities" had become an official one, and the movement spread rapidly.

The Impetus of Vatican II and the Medellin Conference

The reforms of Vatican II served as an important impetus to the CEB movement as the Council declared human rights to a decent standard of living, adequate education, and political participation and asserted the Church's fundamental responsibility to oppressed social groups. The Council also emphasized the need for greater participation by the laity in the life of the Church, thereby deemphasizing the role of the clergy. This would be a prime factor in the emergence of new lay ministries in the CEBs.

Vatican II gave direction to the Latin American Bishops' Conference in 1968 at Medellin, Colombia. At this conference, the bishops backed the new pastoral trends, called on the Church to make a "preferential option for the poor," and pledged itself and its resources in the struggle for the liberation of the poor from all forces of oppression and injustice.

Also at Medellin, the term liberation was substituted for the term development and "liberation of the whole person and of all people" became the in phrase in church circles. Many countries were living in captivity to repressive National Security regimes and so the expression caught on. It expressed a hope and more often than not a commitment. In concert with Vatican II which affirmed the human rights of all peoples, the particular importance of Medellin was that the Church heard the cries of the poor caused by the inhuman situations on the continent and that it gave the poor the official support of the Church in their struggle against oppression.

The grassroots strength of the CEBs was to grow considerably after Medellin as networks of CEBs developed all over the continent. Today the number of existing CEBs has been estimated to be between 100,000 and 150,000 (some two to three million people).

The Puebla Conference — The Attempt to Undo Medellin

Simultaneously, with the proliferation of CEBs during the period between Medellin and the third conference of bishops at Puebla, Mexico in 1979, liberation theologians added flesh and blood to the bones created at Medellin. In 1971 Gustavo Gutierrez published A Theology of Liberation which has become the touchstone of liberation theology. As a result of his work and the works of other theologians, many Christians have been converted to what is considered the single most important imperative of their faith — "a preferential option for the poor" (Mesoamerica, August 1985).

At the same time, opponents of liberation theology and of the CEBs were preparing to undo at Puebla what had been accomplished at Medellin. In the end they failed, largely because the Latin American situation was grimmer than it had been in 1968. The bishops, due to their pastoral experience of the ten years since Medellin, could see that the poor were getting poorer and that violations of human rights had multiplied. Tens of thousands had been tortured, mutilated, killed or disappeared for the option taken at Medellin.

At Puebla, the bishops clearly named the roots of the injustices: inhuman and unjust political and economic systems, dependency of third world nations, multinationals, unequal terms of trade, the arms race with its devouring of scarce resources, lack of agrarian reform, capital flight, and human greed. In the face of this, they reiterated their commitment to social change because of the needs of their people. This was a decided shift from the 1950s when they acted in response to the communist threat. Now they named the major threat as poverty and exploitation of the many by the few. This thinking definitively moved the bishops away from their alliance with the status quo and set them against the National Security regimes which had emerged in many countries over the decade.

Most important, the bishops further endorsed the presence of the CEBs in the Latin American Church and declared that in them lies the "hope of the Church."

What Do Basic Ecclesial Communities Do?

Because the CEBs are grassroots innovations, they tend to vary from place to place. But there are some common elements. As mentioned previously, an aim of the CEBs is conscientizacio through use of the Catholic Action
Lay leaders are the key to the continuity and dynamism of the CEBs. They assemble the community at least once a week in a set place, usually a family home, in a chapel, or simply in the shade of a tree. The community prays, listens to the Scripture, and discusses problems affecting their lives. They are groups whose purpose includes action. That action will vary depending upon the level of commitment of the members to their local community and to the community at large. Action may be in the religious domain: catechesis, bible study, planning a prayer week. It may also be in the social arena: improvements in the neighborhood, collective works, teaching the illiterate to read, doing political and legal education, creating and strengthening trade unions, participation in political activities.

Whatever action the CEB undertakes, religious or social, it arises from the reality of the people and their needs as discerned through the dynamic of analysis, reflection, and dialogue. What is unique about the CEBs is that what is decided is decided from the bottom, so to speak, and includes all who join with the poor in the historical project of liberation.

In the 1950s, the Latin American Church had been concerned with its waning influence both on the larger society and on its own members. A new kind of Church, a new kind of structure was needed. The CEBs are the Church influencing society in a radically new way: from the masses, the poor, the marginalized. They have given space to those who have had no space; voice to those who have had no voice — neither in the Church nor in the larger society. And they are emerging at a time when the poor are erupting into history all over the globe, when they are making themselves visible and heard in places like El Salvador, Nicaragua, South Africa, and the Philippines.

Further, the CEBs are developing a whole new generation of leaders in Latin America. They are learning skills that can be transferred to other spheres. The ability to think on one’s feet, to organize and lead discussions, to express their ideas, to solve community problems, to act as advocates or mediators, to administer larger social units than the family — all these are skills that can be applied in the political arena.

All this is not without struggle. It is being born at great sacrifice and loss of life. The emergence of the poor as an organized group has threatened those in power and their reaction has been brutal as poor people have mobilized to assert their dignity and claim their rights. Latin America has become a land of heroes and martyrs and many of these have come from the CEBs.

The bishops at Puebla named the communities as “the hope of the Church.” Within the CEBs lies not only the vision of a new Church, but also the vision of a new society, one of friendship, justice and peace. More than “a true ‘ecclesiogenesis’ is in progress throughout the world, a Church being born from the faith of the poor.” A true “sociogenesis” is in progress throughout the world, a new society being born from the struggle of the poor.

Challenge of the CEBs to U.S. People
For the U.S. people to participate in the building of this new society is the challenge held out by the CEBs. They call us to solidarity with the poor in their struggle to realize their rights in history. They call us to come together in communities to reflect on our own society and its values, to assess our own reality, our own injustices, the needs of our own communities, to resist and to change our government’s policies with regard to the Third World, especially in Central America.

In other words, the CEBs challenge us to reflect on what “is” and to articulate what “ought” to be. They call us to the struggle to create the kind of society in which what “ought” to become what “is” — to create a society in which the rights of the poor will be realized.

Because of the way U.S. society is structured, the question of how to move from the “ought” to the “is” is a public policy question. David Hollenbach, in Claims in Conflict, suggests three priority principles which can be used to guide public policy decisions.

1. The needs of the poor take priority over the wants of the rich.
2. The freedom of the dominated takes priority over the liberty of the powerful.
3. The participation of marginalized groups takes priority over the preservation of an order which excludes them.

To do what needs to be done, choices must be made between the privileged and the marginalized. To use these principles as a guide means that we change our very perspective on the world, that we see the major threat to the world as poverty and exploitation of the many by the few.

The CEBs challenge us to stand with the poor in their struggle to gain their rights, their dignity. The CEBs challenge us to do as the Church in Latin America has done — to do as the people in Central America have done.

Continued on page Eight
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well as the desire, to participate in the abstract scientific and political debates which have come to define the disarmament movement has to do with their systematic exclusion from social arenas where this knowledge is acquired and becomes meaningful. Women, as mothers, as well as in other social roles, have political interests beyond "survival"; these, however, have not been addressed by the disarmament movement.

By allowing "motherhood" to define their interests in peace, women have failed to make explicit the broad range of concerns which underly their resistance to militarism. As a cultural category, motherhood is heavily laden with symbolic baggage which does not allow for a thorough analysis of the historical conditions presently shaping women's lives. A disarmament movement which intends to seriously address women's political interests needs to develop an analysis of women's relationship to the state, the military, a militarized economy and culture, and technology. Only in analyzing these social, political and economic relationships, and the forms of domination which shape them, particularly the use of violence, can we begin to develop an understanding of the impact of militarism on women's lives.

Historically we recognize that women have always been less well integrated into the state than men. Social, political and economic structures have often limited women's lives to the domestic area, preventing them not only from taking part in the formation of foreign policy, but also from taking a real interest in this level of national politics. The state has more often appeared as a foreign object to women, than something of their own construction.

There is some evidence to suggest that women, less well-integrated into the state than men, are more willing to resist national policies they see as contrary to their interests.4 This has been particularly true over the last two decades as women, especially middle class women, have gained more direct control over their private lives, and have begun to express political opinions which differ from those of their fathers and husbands.7 Nuclear weapons are a target of women's resistance because they represent the state's willingness and ability to enter into women's private lives and threaten even this small amount of control. Nuclear holocaust may not be, in reality, any more threatening to women than to men, but when already struggling for a sense of power over one's own life, the state's omnipotence and overwhelming power to destroy life takes on a very different pallor. This difference between male and female perception is certainly heightened by the fact that women so often lack a sense of ownership over state policy.

Nuclear weapons and increased militarism threaten the control women have gained over their lives, not only in the case of war, but in an ongoing way. Nuclear weapons represent two significant trends in post-industrial society: an increased dependence on technology, and increasing societal violence. Both of these trends directly affect the quality of women's lives.

Power and knowledge in the post-industrial world are centered in control over technology. Again, this is one of the many social arenas from which women have been excluded. Unfortunately, rather than attempting to gain some control over science and technology, women have tended to reject it. In a society increasingly dependent on high tech industry, this can only lead to a loss of both economic and political power for women. Women in the disarmament movement reinforce rather than challenge this trend by proclaiming that it is women's relationship to nature which underlies their resistance. The problem is not in technology per se, but in who controls it and how it is used. The disarmament movement should be challenging the economic and social relations which exclude women from the technological arena, not valorizing women's "culturally derived" relationship to nature.

Just as women are marginalized by an increasingly technologically dependent society, they are marginalized by the militarization of the social order.
The military provides fewer jobs for women than for men, and those that it does provide are of lower status. Moreover, as the military penetrates more deeply into society, hierarchical structures and male aggressive and violent behavior are legitimized. That which the culture associates with being feminine, whether found in males or females, is furthered devalued, and "Rambo" becomes a cultural hero.

Over the last two decades women have become more willing to confront the violence in their daily lives. As women have begun to name and analyze that violence — wife-battering, rape, incest — they have become more aware of how it functions within the social order to maintain male hegemony. Recognition of the connections between state violence, as represented by the military, and domestic violence and rape, is another step in revealing the structures of domination and oppression within the social order.

Women are not attracted to the disarmament movement as frightened mothers. Although the ideology of motherhood certainly appeals to some women, the majority of women have entered the movement because they are experiencing a loss of social, political and economic power as the result of an increasingly militarized society and culture. Any analysis of militarism which was to address these issues would inevitably lead to a critique of the dynamics of gender within the social order. Since such a critique is threatening to male hegemony within the disarmament movement, women activists must take on the challenge and construct a feminist analysis of militarism which transforms, rather than reconstructs, existing cultural categories.

Conclusions
All of these issues — women's relation to the state, technology, the economy, and violence — have been touched upon by women in the disarmament movement, but they have remained hidden behind ideological statements equating women's nature and motherhood with a desire for peace. Rather than a feminist analysis we have seen the rejection of that which is thought to be male — technology, violence, the state — and the valorization of that which is thought to be female — motherhood, nature, children. What little feminist analysis has emerged, in making connections between a high tech, militarized economy and the loss of jobs for women, defense funding and the loss of social welfare programs which primarily impact women, and state violence and other forms of anti-female violence, has been unable to gain hegemony in the face of Mother's Day Marches for Peace, campaigns such as "Millions of Moms for Peace," or even a feminist spirituality which insists on an implicit connection between women and nature. The latter has proven to be an ineffective political strategy again and again, precisely because it maintains the social and cultural categories which define women as outside the political arena.

As such women become marginalized even within a movement in which they are often primary actors.

A feminist analysis of the impact of militarism on women's lives inevitably leads to a critique of gender relations much more threatening to the social order than the valorization of female nature. An increasingly militarized society, because it reinforces male domination, disempowers and marginalizes women. We can see these effects in direct attacks on abortion, social welfare programs, and childcare, in increased levels of female poverty, and in increased levels of anti-female violence. These issues are not irrelevant to the disarmament movement if they are understood as the product of the militarization of the economy, the society, and the culture.

In failing to address these issues the disarmament movement has never been able to gain the wholehearted support of working class women or women of color, who have never responded to the "motherhood" ideology exploited by white, middle class women activists. However, as white, middle class women begin to feel the full impact of their loss of social, political and economic power, they too are leaving the disarmament movement. A movement which refused to address issues in terms of their impact on people's daily lives cannot survive. Without an analysis of gender, in the context of the full range of social, political and economic relations which define the social order, the disarmament movement will remain an abstract, and narrow-minded political movement, failing to address the real political interests of women, as well as the vast majority of other politically marginal people in this society.

Karen Kahn is an activist and writer who lives in the Boston area.

Footnotes
1. Radical America's recent issue, Vol. 19, No. 1 (1985), dealing specifically with the European and North American disarmament movements, is a notable exception.
4. Historically, the "moral mother" argument has been used over and over again by women peace activists. A few examples are the Women's Peace Party Declaration of 1915, in which women peace activists proclaimed themselves to be the "mother-half of humanity"; Women's Strike for Peace, initially a campaign by mothers to protect their children from Strontium-90; and more recently, Women's Action for Nuclear Disarmament's "Millions of Moms for Peace Campaign."
7. We can relate the recently discovered "gender gap" to Virginia Woolf's argument in Three Guineas suggesting that until women had achieved economic independence their political interests would be completely tied to those of the men supporting them.

Job Opening: New Collective member needed at Whetstone Press, a small union letterpress print shop. Varied duties include estimating, job-intake, phone-answering, production back-up and sales work. Print shop experience necessary; knowledge of letterpress preferred. Call or send resume to Whetstone Press, 94 Green St., Jamaica Plain, MA 02130 or call 617/524-7909.
The Madrona Community Center (MCC) was founded in 1964 as racial and class tensions were dividing the neighborhood and bringing about community disintegration in Seattle. The MCC believes that true community must be rooted in social justice and they are therefore dedicated to addressing the problems of racism, sexism, poverty and empowering the powerless. Programmatically, MCC has impacted an increasing broader constituency, with a primary emphasis on youth and cultural enhancement. Their programs include a Summer Day Camp, a Youth Employment Program, and a Mayfair Spring Celebration. Unique to the Seattle area is their Youth Theatre Project which provides youth with the opportunity to express their creativity and talent, enhancing self-esteem and exploring important social issues. Currently, the MCC is establishing the Urban Youth Counter-Military Recruitment Project in order to provide youth with a clear view of the military and the alternatives to enlist, along with concrete training and resources. Their goal is to develop strong minority youth leadership who will speak out and act in behalf of counter-recruitment efforts. They are expanding their programs to include workshops on job search and refusal skills, and they are sponsoring cultural expression events with music, art, essay contests, and rap contests. Their Youth Theatre Project will develop a production which will explore the issues related to military recruitment. The project will also work closely with other organizations, schools, churches, and youth groups in the Seattle area. Resist's grant went towards the costs of the theatre production.

The Last Chance Peacemakers Coalition, P.O. Box 11, Helena, Montana 59624.

The Last Chance Peacemakers Coalition (LCPC) is a grassroots membership organization working on peace and justice issues in Helena, MT and surrounding rural communities. The LCPC began in October, 1981 when it was announced that Montana was a possible location for deployment of the new land-based ICBM, the MX. Within days, a group of Helenans met to form the Last Chance MX Coalition. From that time on, the MX Coalition, later renamed the Last Chance Peace Coalition, has been pursuing peaceful solutions to the arms race and interventionist foreign policies. Because Montana has the highest number of students per capita who have volunteered for military service, they recently formed a committee of veterans, teachers and interested members in the spring of '85 in response to requests for information about registration and the draft from high school students. Committee members are in the beginning stages of reaching out to local schools with a counter recruitment campaign. Members have met with school administrations and are designing brochures to distribute to local high schools. Also, LCPC is going ahead with plans to hold a Draft Counselor Training Workshop in Helena. It will be conducted by the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors. Topics include: counseling non-registrants, the registration process, draft procedures, deferments and exemptions, conscientious objection, counter-recruitment and military first-aid. Resist's grant of $450 went towards the start up costs of the Youth and Military Project.

The Church in Latin America

Jeanne Gallo is a Sister of Notre Dame who has written extensively on the role of the Catholic Church in Latin America.

Be all you can be and do away with ROTC

Is there an ROTC unit on your high school or college campus? Or is one on its way? If so, contact the War Resisters League's ROTC Clearinghouse for organizing information.

☐ I am interested in getting rid of the Army/ Navy/ Marine Corps/ Air Force ROTC at ________ college/high school.

☐ Enclosed is $5 for your "ROTC Dismantling Kit."

Name __________________________ Organization __________________________

Address __________________________

City __________________________ State ________ Zip ________

Phone(s) __________________________

Mail to: WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE

339 Lafayette St., NYC, NY 10012
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