Countering the Militarisation of Youth
A new area of work for War Resisters' International

In Europe, and to some degree on a global level, there are presently two trends which both contribute to an increase in the militarisation of youth. The first trend is the end (or, more exactly, the suspension) of conscription in most European countries since the 1990s. In 2011, Germany, one of the last major military and economic powers in Europe which still maintained conscription, suspended conscription. The second trend is one of an increasing “normalisation of war”. Since the war in the Balkans, but even more so since 9/11 and the announcement of the “war on terror”, the political use of military force has increased – war is no longer seen as a failure of politics, but as one of the tools of politics. This led to a radical restructuring of military forces, oriented towards mobility and military intervention. But it also brought with it new justifications for the use of military force: first “humanitarian intervention” (Yugoslavia, Somalia), then the “war on terror” (Afghanistan, Iraq) and the “responsibility to protect” (Libya). Both trends reinforce each other, and one outcome is the increased militarisation of youth from an early age on.

War Resisters’ International’s “Right to Refuse to Kill” programme focuses on military recruitment, conscientious objection to military service, and resistance by military personnel (be it conscientious objection, desertion, or going AWOL). It is therefore important that we respond to shifts in military recruitment – away from conscription and towards “voluntary” recruitment – and address the challenges this poses for an antimilitarist movement. Paradoxically, the end of forced recruitment through conscription leads, in some respects, to increased militarisation, as the military has to recruit personnel and has to justify its present and future wars. The militarisation of society – and especially of youth – is one prerequisite for military recruitment and war.

Consequently, War Resisters’ International is now broadening the scope of its work on the Right to Refuse to Kill to include work against the militarisation of youth, and our international study conference in Darmstadt, Germany, from 8-10 June 2012 will be an important milestone in developing this work.

The end of conscription?
The end of conscription has long been one of the objectives of War Resisters’ International and other antimilitarist
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Editorial
Countering the Militarisation of Youth is the theme of this issue of The Broken Rifle, just in time for our international study conference with the same title. As I wrote in a guest editorial in Peace News back in 2002, to work effectively, we need to know our enemy, or what our enemy is doing. With enemy I mean the military, and I consciously call the military our enemy, knowing that within most nonviolent circles we are not supposed to have enemies. But the military institution is not just an opponent - someone you can discuss things with, maybe convince and change - it is a structure based on violence, something that we do not want to just change, but to get rid of entirely.

This means when we work on countering militarisation with a focus on youth, and is at first important that we analyse how militarisation works in different societies, what mechanisms are used, how it is related to other structures of power such as the state, patriarchy and heterosexism, and so on.

In this issue of The Broken Rifle we cannot do more than provide some inspiration - 12 pages are not sufficient for an comprehensive analysis - and also to provide some examples of resistance. However, some more information is available in the reader we produced for our conference, and we invite you to have a look at http://wri-irg.org/militarisationofyouth/Darmstadt Reader.

Resisting militarisation lies at the core of our antimilitarist work. In doing so it is important that we exchange our experiences and learn from each other - but also challenge each other about our different approaches and political perspectives. As an antimilitarist network, we do come from different political perspectives and cultures - making it inevitable that we come up with different approaches. This can be a strength, if we value difference, but also engage with each other in a critical debate based on respect. Militarisation means making everyone uniform - our resistance needs diversity and creativity.

Andreas Speck
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organisations, and rightly so. Shortly after WRI was founded, it launched a campaign and a manifesto against conscription in 1926. Now, almost 90 years later, few countries in Europe maintain conscription. Austria and Sweden (on 1 January 2011) and Germany (on 1 July 2011) suspended conscription, it is mainly some Scandinavian and Eastern European (former Soviet Union) countries, plus Austria, Switzerland, and Greece that still hang on to compulsory military service. But even in these countries there is a move towards professional military units based on “volunteers” for the more “serious” tasks: military interventions abroad.

So, have we won then? Yes and no. Yes, because it has become increasingly difficult for governments and the military to justify conscription. In many countries that abolished conscription, public opinion had turned against it long before it was abolished. However, this was rarely based on antimilitarism, but rather on the infringement on personal freedom caused by conscription, and an unwillingness to personally be part of the military, rather than opposition to military action in itself. In fact, in most countries, it was the military that pushed for an end to conscription as part of a drive to professionalise the military. Conscription was seen as a burden than as an advantage, for a lean, mobile, and professional military, ready to engage in military operations all over the globe.

With the end of conscription, the Armed Forces face the challenge of recruitment. The presence of the Armed Forces in the public sphere – through advertising on TV, public billboards, magazines and newspapers, but also through open space for military parades and ceremonies – and especially the presence of Armed Forces in educational institutions – schools, colleges and universities – is crucial for the military to create a culture and environment favourable to recruitment.

The normalisation of war

Before the end of the Cold War, war was commonly seen as a failure of politics. However, this has changed in the last two decades. The wars that accompanied the breakup of Yugoslavia have been used to justify military intervention as “humanitarian interventions”. Following the genocide in Rwanda, the concept of the “responsibility to protect” [1] was developed, which amounts to little more than a thinly disguised justification for war.

In parallel, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), originally set up with the alleged purpose to defend the “democratic West” against the Soviet Bloc, refocused its attention to military operations “out-of-area”, which meant outside of the territory of the NATO member states. NATO’s intervention in the wars in Yugoslavia – from Bosnia to the war against Serbia and “peacekeeping” in Kosovo – was the first step of the transformation of NATO. With the European Union following suit – and later taking over NATO’s role in Bosnia – EU member states that were officially “non-aligned” (such as Ireland, Sweden, Finland, among others) were also dragged (or joined happily) into this militarisation.

The “war on terror” provided the backdrop for the next step in the normalisation of war. For the first time in history, NATO invoked article 5 of its treaty – a situation of collective defence – following the terrorist attacks of 9/11. Today, NATO maintains military activity in a variety of places: among others in Afghanistan since 2003 with presently about 125,000 soldiers under NATO’s command, in Kosovo since 1999 with today about 5,500 soldiers, in the Mediterranean sea since October 2001 as part of Operation Active Endeavour [2]. The NATO-led bombing of Libya last year “to protect civilians” was a new “highlight” in this normalisation of war.

While this development might not seem very dramatic from a US, British, or French perspective – countries that are somewhat used to conduct military interventions globally (in the case of France and Britain, with a focus on former or present colonies) – it has meant a very dramatic change for most European countries, which have not been involved in combat operations since the end of World War II. Today, all EU member states with the exception of Cyprus are involved in the war in Afghanistan, and many are involved in other “robust peacekeeping” operations, such as in Lebanon, Congo, Bosnia, etc.

Militarisation

The normalisation of war would not have been possible without massive militarisation of civilian society and space, especially in those countries not normally used to seeing “their boys” (and it’s still mostly boys) killing and being killed abroad. The objectives of this process are two-fold: creating acceptance for war within society (supporting “our boys”), and creating a climate favourable to recruitment, with the aim to recruit sufficient numbers of soldiers to maintain the capability for military operations.

Militarisation of schools

For example, the UK Ministry of Defence youth policy states: “The MOD is engaged in curricular activities as a further way to reach out to Youth in support of the overall MOD Youth Policy. In particular it offers unique and subtle ways of enhancing understanding of the Armed Forces within wider society, particularly of the value of military traditions and ethos which are essential to maintaining military effectiveness. More directly, it offers opportunities to raise public awareness and empathy with the Armed Forces and finally, it is a further, powerful tool for facilitating recruitment, especially if the skills developed through curricular activities have a direct bearing on military requirements.” (emphasis added) [3] This is also very clearly stated in the “Armed Forces Overarching Personnel Strategy”: “We will need, in particular, to increase efforts to explain the role and requirement for the Services to society as a whole and to sow the seeds for our future growth by establishing our links with parents, teachers, community leaders and other ‘gatekeepers’. We will want to consider our approach to schools, AFCOs (Armed Forces Career Offices) and public military events to enhance our recruiting outcomes.” [4]

It is therefore no surprise that in February 2007, the head of army recruitment strategy, Colonel David Allfrey, told The New Statesman: “Our new model is about raising awareness, and that takes a ten-year span. It starts with a seven-year-old boy seeing a parachutist at an air show and thinking, ‘That looks great.’ From then on the army is trying to build interest by drip, drip, drip.”

This is echoed in the approach of the German Bundeswehr. As Michael Schulze von Glaisher writes in The Broken Rifle No 88: “If young people can’t be convinced to take up arms themselves, then at least they should be convinced of the need for military interventions: the military leadership and the government want to turn the Bundeswehr into an army operating globally, and aim long-term for the creation of stable political support within the population. Therefore, they focus their agitation on (still easily persuadable) young people – tomorrow’s voters. And (former) Defence Minister Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg (CSU) knows where to find the young people: ‘the school is the right place to reach young people.’”

Instrumentalisation of veterans and Armed Forces Day

The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have not been popular, and counter-measures had to be taken to shore up support for “our boys”. In Britain, these came partly in the form of a newly introduced “Armed Forces Day”, which began as “Veterans Day” in 2006, and is celebrated as “Armed Forces Day” since 2009, “to raise awareness and appreciation for those on active duty”, or, as the Ministry of Defence writes in a press release, “it allows the nation to show their support for the men
and women who make up the Armed Forces community, from serving troops to Service families, veterans and cadets.” [5]

Remembrance (or Armistice) Day – originally introduced to remember the victims of World War I – is also increasingly turned into a propaganda event for war. In November 2010, several UK veterans wrote in an open letter: “A day that should be about peace and remembrance is turned into a month-long drum roll of support for current wars. This year’s campaign has been launched with showbiz hype. The true horror and futility of war is forgotten and ignored. The public are being urged to wear a poppy in support of ‘our Heroes’. There is nothing heroic about being blown up in a vehicle. There is nothing heroic about being shot in an ambush and there is nothing heroic about fighting in an unnecessary conflict.” [6]

These are only two examples where and how militarisation works. However, militarisation is a process that encompasses all aspects of our lives, and is difficult to avoid.

**Countering the Militarisation of Youth**

Luckily, this militarisation is not unchallenged. When War Resisters’ International initially discussed how to respond to the challenge of changes in military recruitment, we were encouraged by the long and inspiring history of counter-recruitment work in the USA. However, it quickly became clear that recruitment itself is only the tip of the iceberg – it is only the potential end result of the ongoing ‘drip, drip, drip’ that Colonel David Allfrey referred to. Militarisation does not only lead to an environment favourable to recruitment, it is also needed to prepare and maintain the public support of the “home front” for war and the military. Countering this militarisation is therefore not only part of counter-recruitment work, but is the core of antimilitarism.

There are many inspiring examples of work to counter the militarisation of youth. Several schools in Germany have now declared themselves “military free”, denying the Bundeswehr access to the schools and not participating in events organised by the military. In the US, limiting recruiter access to high schools and universities has been one of the main “battlefields” between the military and the counter-recruitment movement.

But schools and universities are only one example. Queers are countering the military’s outreach and recruitment attempts within the queer community, for example through participation in gay pride events, and NGOs are fighting the recruitment of under eighteen through lobbying at different levels.

The role of War Resisters’ International as an international pacifist and antimilitarist network is mainly to foster debate, to facilitate the exchange of experiences, and to strengthen the networking of antimilitarists globally working against the militarisation of youth. The international study conference in Darmstadt in June is hopefully an inspiring first step.

**Andreas Speck**

**Notes**


**Countering the Militarisation of Youth**

International Study Conference, Darmstadt, Germany 8-10 June, 2012

War Resisters’ International is organising an international study conference on countering the militarisation of youth, in cooperation with German partner organisations and supported by the German teachers union (GEW). The conference will not just look at military recruitment and counter-recruitment actions, but will take a much broader view on the militarisation of youth, the creation of a culture and value system favourable to recruitment.

The programme of the conference will begin with a focus on analysing the different ways youth are militarised, looking at issues such as military and public spaces, Militainment, military and education, Queer/ gender and militarism, and the recruitment of immigrants and low income youth. The second part of the conference will focus on the exchange of experiences of resistance, including, but not limited to Queer resistance, resistance in educational settings, the role of veterans, direct action against the militarisation of youth, and children’s rights. A draft programme is available at http://wri-ig.org/programmes/militarisationofyouth/conference-programme.

The aim of the study conference is to foster an on going regional and multi-regional network of cooperating anti-militarist organisations. The overarching objective is strengthening the work against the militarisation of youth in Europe (and beyond) by providing opportunities for people to exchange skills and experience of working in this field and to create/strengthen networks and relationships across the region.

More information at: http://wri-ig.org/militarisationofyouth

You can register for the conference online at http://wri-ig.org/shop/militarisationofyouth
Countering the Militarisation of Youth

Challenging the military's involvement in education in the United Kingdom

The UK armed forces visit thousands of schools each year. They offer school presentation teams, ‘careers advisors’, lessons plans, away days and more. While they claim that this is not recruiting, the Ministry of Defence itself states that the activities enable them to ‘provide positive information to influence future opinion formers, and to enable recruiters to access the school environments.’ Their youth policy, including school-based cadet forces, aims to create “the conditions whereby recruiting can flourish.” This is a long-term approach to recruiting young people both as supporters of the armed forces and, for some, softening them up for actual enlistment.

An injection of ideology

The Government has recently indicated that there will be an expansion of cadet forces within state schools to encourage the ‘spirit of service’ and they have established a number of schemes such as ex-services mentoring and ‘troops to teachers’.

Another recent development is the Phoenix Free School, to be run entirely by ex-military. With a ‘zero-tolerance’ approach to discipline, the proposed head teacher of the school states that it “will discard moral relativism and child-centred educational theory. ‘Self-esteem’ training is out... Competition...is in.” (1) Proposed by the right-wing policy think tank, the Centre for Policy Studies, there is clearly an ideological political agenda at work which pays no attention to professional concerns that military values may not be appropriate within the educational system.

Another right-wing think tank, ResPublica is advocating the development of military-sponsored academies, “officially backed by the Armed Services and delivered by the Cadet Associations”. (2) The proposal was presented as a response to the 2011 riots and has been condemned by the NASUWT, the largest teaching union in the UK, as ‘national service for the poor’.

The rhetoric around increasing military influence within schools is one of instilling discipline and values but it is based on quite a number of unevincing assumptions, including: that those who have served in the military are better able than teachers to create productive learning environments; that the military is better than community-based or other activities in developing the ‘spirit of service’, and that parents look to the military as embodying values they wish their children to absorb.

The legal framework

One of the characteristics of armed forces’ involvement in UK educational establishments is that relationships between them and the school are informally established, unlike the US for example, where the military have a legal right to visit schools. Indeed, the armed forces claim that the school must make the first contact. While this is a simplification, it does suggest that it is within the schools authorities that awareness and attitudes need to be addressed.

With the perception by many of the military as uncontroversial or even to be promoted – much boosted in recent years by various government measures – it is unsurprising that schools accept the armed forces’ offer with readiness, as free resources and as benign.

There is a legal framework to ensure balance and guard against political indoctrination of younger children. In particular, section 407 of the Education Act 1996 states that when-political issues are “brought to the attention of pupils” they must be “offered a balanced presentation of opposing views”. Developing an understanding that military activities and materials constitute a view, that information is presented from a particular, very biased, perspective and
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Universities, the Bundeswehr and “networked security”

The debate about the “militarisation of research and teaching” is relatively new in Germany, and happens against the background of the restructuring of the German Bundeswehr from an alleged “defence army” to an “army in deployment”. This restructuring and the extent to which it affects the entire German population, are usually underestimated. While the defence army was, by design, relatively evenly distributed over Germany’s territory, at present, several military bases are being closed or merged, and military capabilities are concentrated at some locations. The rationale for this is no longer presence all over the country, but rather the ability for quick deployment abroad. All in all, the total number of Bundeswehr soldiers and civilian employees of the is to be reduced, but more soldiers than before are to be made available for deployment abroad. This is only possible through the outsourcing of tasks which are not “core military tasks” (this is the term used in Ministry of Defence strategy papers and press releases) to private companies and civilian institutions. In the past two decades, this process could already be observed in the form of civilian-military cooperation with the private sector: about 75% of maintenance for the German air force is already carried out by private companies, and for maintaining weapon systems of the army the Ministry of Defence and the arms industry jointly formed a special company, the HIL Heeresinstandsetzunglogistik GmbH.

Since 2002, the non-armed vehicle fleet of the army is administered by the BwFuhrparkService GmbH, and clothing, since 2003, by LH Bundeswehr Bekleidungsgesellschaft mbH. Additional aspects of basic logistics and telecommunication are currently being privatised. Even the battlefield training centre of the army (Gefechtsübungszentrum Heer – GÜZ), which is central for the final training of German soldiers before deployment abroad, is being managed by a consortium of private companies.

Outsourcing to private companies is also being advanced in Afghanistan: private companies are increasingly involved in anything from camp security through catering and cleaning, and up to training and repair for operating new weapon systems.

The focus of this “army in deployment”, however, is now less on “combat” as such, and more the permanent “crisis management”. Even if there is at some stage no “real” war, in which Germany is engaged, German forces uncontested access to young people. We want to raise the level of debate and thereby open a space for challenging the policy and presenting alternative perspectives.

We are producing materials that will empower and assist teachers, parents and students to question and confront their school or college on the presence of the military. While the prevalence of militarism more generally within society also operates as a tool to engage young people, the education system offers a direct opportunity for the military to bypass the “gatekeepers” that protect a child’s interests. We aim to support parents, carers and students themselves in resisting this agenda, building on work done by teaching unions in England and Scotland as well as campaigns waged by students themselves.

Continued from page 4

that alternative perspectives need to be made available to young people is a vital step to effectively challenging schools on their acceptance of the military.

Schools are legally required under the Children’s Act 1989 to act ‘in loco parentis’, assuming a duty of care for children and acting as a ‘reasonable parent’. Surely a reasonable parent would present a balanced picture to a child in their care and ensure they are provided with an understanding that allows them to make an informed choice about decisions that will affect the rest of their lives.

Creating debate and empowering action

ForcesWatch aim to develop that understanding of military involvement as essentially biased and therefore controversial and that schools have a legal, and moral, duty to deny the armed forces access to young people. We want to raise the level of debate and thereby open a space for challenging the policy and presenting alternative perspectives.

We are producing materials that will empower and assist teachers, parents and students to question and confront their school or college on the presence of the military. While the prevalence of militarism more generally within society also operates as a tool to engage young people, the education system offers a direct opportunity for the military to bypass the ‘gatekeepers’ that protect a child’s interests. We aim to support parents, carers and students themselves in resisting this agenda, building on work done by teaching unions in England and Scotland as well as campaigns waged by students themselves.

ForcesWatch are gathering as much information as possible on military activities in individual schools and colleges to inform this work and have developed surveys (for teachers and staff and for parents and students) that can be completed online. If you have experience of the military within education, we need to hear from you. See http://forceswatch.net for surveys, resources and more.

Emma Sangster

Notes
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soldiers will be deployed in a range of countries, to fight pirates, take on policing, train soldiers, or serve as “advisors” to “protect” and “support” the development of new state institutions, repressive institutions included. All these deployments are multi-lateral, that is in cooperation with changing allies under the leadership of the UN, NATO, or the EU, and with the Bundeswehr sometimes only contributing a small number of soldiers with specialist skills. There is often no organised military opponent, but the deployment is targeted at the entire civilian population. The military components of the deployment mission from different states therefore need to be flexibly complemented by civilian components – advisers, observers, jurists, police officers, personnel involved in humanitarian aid, development cooperation, construction, etc. These “asymmetric conflicts” also mean that the Bundeswehr increasingly uses “weapons”, which are also used by the police within Germany and do not have a genuinely military character, and are being developed within the framework of “civil security research”. Examples are “less lethal agents” such as water canons or batons, but also drones for surveillance. Intelligence becomes increasingly important — subdivided into “signal intelligence” (Sigint) and “human intelligence” (Humlnt) — to identify “opponents”, “pirates”, “terrorists”, and “spoilers” among the population. These too are tasks for which civilian organisations, companies, or scientists are increasingly used.

Last but not least, the “army in deployment” also means a shift in its legitimisation strategy. While so far, Bundeswehr deployment abroad of the has usually been justified on humanitarian grounds, among the elites and in strategy papers, “national interests” are now increasingly cited as reasons for military deployment. And as contradictions between the alleged humanitarian purpose and “national interests” become more visible (think, for example, of the fight against pirates at the coast of East Africa), and to maintain public support for increased operations abroad, it is especially important to “include” or sensibilise (future) “multiplicators” or “decision makers” in the discourse on security policy (which orient itself at national interests). Such concepts can be found, among other places, in the “New Concept for the Reserve Forces” (a concept paper published by the Ministry of Defence) and in annual reports by the Bunderswehr Youth Officers unit. The Youth Officers (whose job is to spread information about the military to young audiences) complain in their annual report for 2007 that “the situation regarding the opinion in relation to the Bundeswehr and its role and tasks” in German universities is not satisfactory, and that German universities are “for Youth Officers an area which is difficult to access and a challenge for the future”. The annual report for 2010 already describes a much better situation from the army’s point of view: “A steadily increasing number of universities and technical colleges recognise the advantages of the specialist offers made by Youth Officers”, who are recognised “as lecturers on par with others”. “The opinion of the audience can be judged as satisfactory following Youth Officer events...”. The number of participants from universities at Youth Officer events could be increased by 30%.” In addition to students for teaching degrees, this strategy is aimed, among others, at students of cultural anthropology, regional science, Arabic and African studies, future staff of administrations and humanitarian organisations, to create among them an “understanding for the Bundeswehr’s perspective.” The future elites should not just get accustomed to the fact that the Bundeswehr enforces German interests with arms all over the world, but also agree to this and actively support it. Just recently the Süddeutsche Zeitung quoted the Minister of Defence, Thomas de Maizière, who complained that he could not recognise “a great intellectual contribution of German universities to the question of war and peace”: “De Maizière wishes to see answers to present day questions. For example: Is the military allowed to use drones during battle? Is it allowed to deploy private security companies? How should states react to a cyber attack?” In addition, Michael Brzoska from the Hamburg Institute for Peace and Security Research is quoted as saying: “If there would be a war between Iran and Iraq, Germany would not have a sufficient number of experts who have knowledge of the Iranian leadership”, and it is stunning that this kind of knowledge does not seem to be necessary during times of peace, or while searching for a diplomatic solution to the nuclear conflict.

Alongside these demands, directed more towards the social sciences, German universities are also involved in security research, often in cooperation with armament projects and/or companies. This often involves research on dual-use products (i.e., products that could be used for both military and civilian purposes), such as surveillance drones, sensors, artificial intelligence, and encrypted communication. Such activities are purposefully funded through a European and national programme for security research, and these programmes are designed to especially induce the development of European and interdisciplinary cooperation and to develop technology parks linked to universities, and clusters of universities, public research, private companies and administrations, including also the Bundeswehr and the police. Cutting-edge and fundamental research, structured in such a way, is not explicitly concerned with military use or questions, but happens almost always within a framework, in which arms companies are involved and can benefit. This is especially true also for biology, in particular in relation to artificial intelligence and machine/human interfaces. This is often the starting point of military medical research, so the Ministry of Defence is directly involved in shaping cutting edge research.

Christoph Marischka
How the U.S. collects data on potential recruits

The US military maintains an Orwellian database containing intimate details on 30 million youth between the ages of 16 and 25, providing local recruiters with personal information to use in a psychological campaign to lure youth within their designated regions. Before meeting, recruiters know what’s in Johnny’s head, if Johnny has a girlfriend, and what she thinks of his decision regarding enlistment. We’ll examine how they do it.

A federal law passed in 2002 under the Bush Administration provides military recruiters the names, addresses, and phone numbers of all American high school students, provided that parents and students are given the opportunity to "opt out" of the lists being forwarded to recruiters. To this day, the opt-out portion of the law remains relatively unknown and unenforced.

That law provides the military with current data on about 7 million high school juniors and seniors every year. This data forms the cornerstone of the Pentagon’s massive “Joint Advertising Market Research Studies” (JAMRS) database. It encompasses: full name, date of birth, gender, address, city, state, zip code, e-mail address, ethnicity, telephone number, high school name, graduation date, grade point average, education level, college intent, military interest, field of study, current college attending, ASVAB Test date, and Armed Forces Qualifying Test Category Score.

The JAMRS database is also populated by data from the Selective Service System, which requires 18-year-old men to register for a potential military draft. Selective Service has the names and addresses of 15 million men 18 to 25 years old. Add to that total the data from the departments of motor vehicles from most states. Some states require young males to register with Selective Service to have their driver’s licenses renewed in the year they turn 18. Both state and federal job training and college funding opportunities and federal employment are linked by law to proof of draft registration.

JAMRS also includes records from several formidable commercial sources. The database has information on 5 million college students purchased from corporate entities like Student Marketing Group and American Student List.

Pertinent data is delivered to the laptops of local recruiters which are loaded with the PrizmNE Segmentation System, a software program purchased from the Nelson Company, whose clients include BMW, ACL, and Starbucks. PrizmNE is a cutting-edge commercial marketing system that combines “demographic, consumer behavior, and geographic data pertaining to individual prospects.” This information is merged by recruiters with personal information from social media sites like Twitter and Facebook and the result is staggering. Before first contact, recruiters know Johnny reads wrestling magazines, weighs 150, can bench press 230, drives a ten year-old Chevy truck, loves Pink Floyd’s “Dark Side of the Moon,” and enjoys fly fishing.

It matters. Recruiting is a psychological game. Imagine the first phone call. “Dude, hold on; the Staff Sergeant always cranks up Pink Floyd; sorry for the noise...He’s tryin’ to tell me it’s time to go out fly fishin’...”

The Army sure must be cool. Advantage: Recruiter.

The data described above paints a virtual portrait of a potential recruit, but leaves out the future soldier’s cognitive abilities. The Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) Career Exploration Program provides this crucial element, something the Pentagon can’t purchase or find on line. The ASVAB is the military’s entrance exam that is given...
Recruitment of and resistance by queers - example Sweden

In this article we will explain how we understand in what ways politics about gender, sexuality and war are related to each other. We will also tell you about some actions Olog (anti-militarist network) did against the Swedish Armed Forces participation in the last Pride festival (August 2011).

We are both activists active in various movements; peace, feminist, no border and queer. We do not see these struggles as separate but as parts of the same struggle. For example you cannot maintain an anti-militarist struggle without also working against borders: against national ones as well as those between “us” and “them”, since these borders legitimize and are a prerequisite for war and militarization. Another example is that war and militarism depend on and reinforce an oppressive, controlling and racist social order, which clearly tells whose life is worth defending and who’s not. To justify the Swedish Armed Forces involvement in war, the image of an external enemy must be created and maintained. Also, a united “we” must be established, as in “we whose lives are worth defending”.

Militarism is an ideology rooted in the heterosexist system, which forms social norms for gender/sex and sexuality. Militarism, just as society in general, is based on the construction and assumption of two opposite genders; one that is in need of protection (feminine) and one that protects (masculine), and their
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to fresh recruits to determine their aptitude for various military occupations. The test is also used as a recruiting tool in 18,000 high schools across the country. The 3 hour test is used by recruiters to gain sensitive, personal information on more than 660,000 high school students across the country each year. Students typically are given the test at school without parental knowledge or consent. The ASVAB is used to pre-qualify leads in the high schools and the scores are good for enlistment purposes for two years. Now recruiters know if a teenager can factor polynomials or decipher different types of fuel injection systems.

Websites

The Department of Defense has several recruiting websites that collect information. Typically, the military hides its true recruiting intentions. For instance, you’d have to dig pretty deep on the www.asvabprogram.com site to find out what the acronym stands for. The website never explains that the primary purpose of the ASVAB is to produce leads for recruiters.

www.myfuture.com , a sophisticated DoD site that provides rather biased career, education and military options for youth, never reveals its tie-in to recruiting. Its affiliation with the military is buried. Users are required to register to use the site and their information is used for recruiting purposes.

Each of the branches, reserves, and Guard units has its own websites that collect data. Most have a presence on Facebook, You Tube, and Twitter. Recruiters spend countless hours trolling these sources.

www.todaysmilitary.com is an obvious military site that collects information on users. The Army sponsors www.BoostUp.org , a high school dropout prevention campaign with a presence on social media sites. For the post-dropout set, Job Corps serves approximately 60,000 youth annually at Job Corps Centers throughout the country. These youth are seriously courted by the military and most are required to take the ASVAB test. Over 100,000 teens have graduated from the National Guard’s Youth Challenge Program, another military recruiting program that pursues dropouts.

For high achieving students, the Army sponsors www.ecybermission.com , a web-based engineering and mathematics competition for the 10-14 year-old set where teams compete for awards. The website recruits ambassadors and cyber guides for various competitions who must complete a lengthy application. Also for the high achievers, March 2 Success, www.March2Success.com is an Army site that provides standardized test-taking tips for high school students. High school counselors routinely encourage college-bound students to use the free service that catalogues student use for recruiting purposes. Personal information finds its way to recruiters.

www.armystrongstories.com is an Army recruiting website program ostensibly dedicated to telling the Army story. Although soldiers are invited to share their “unfiltered perspective” on life in the military, submissions that do not comply with content guidelines are not posted. Army life is great.

There are more than a half a million results for “US Army” just on MySpace, another favorite hangout for recruiters.

Google and Yahoo forums also provide fertile recruiting grounds. Recruiters “lurk” in these virtual settings, often posing as potential recruits with questions designed to lure responses, “What kind of job could I get with a really low ASVAB score?” is a favorite.

Finally, the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) is the military’s most valuable recruiting program in the schools. Children as young as thirteen are groomed to be officers. Their personal information is meticulously gathered and preserved. There are JROTC units at more than 3,200 high schools across the country, where students perform military drills and participate in marksmanship programs.

The notion of a voluntary American military force is laughable. To find soldiers, the U.S. has developed a massive military recruitment surveillance complex and few realize it.

Pat Elder
mutual interdependence and attraction. Militarism defines masculinity as powerful and aggressive, and femininity as humble and passive, and thus reproduces the construction of gender/sex. Heterosexism also includes the presumption that everyone (or at least most people) is heterosexual and that heterosexual relationships are ‘normal’ and therefore superior. These assumptions and prejudices about gender/sex and sexuality have been used, and are still used, to marginalize, discriminate and criminalize LGBT-people who challenge the legitimacy of these norms. When governments make war a priority and increase the dependence on the military they reinforce a heterosexist, patriarchal culture and intensify the stigmatization of those who challenge this culture.

For us it was therefore evident to interfere when the Swedish Armed Forces took part in the Pride festival last summer. They participated in the Pride Festival with the slogan “Openness - part of our reality”. This was part of their recruiting campaign “Welcome to our reality”, where they promoted themselves as a challenging, exciting and open workplace. At the Armed Forces recruitment tent in the “Pride Park” we did a die-in with a banner saying “your reality kills”. With this action we wanted to show what their reality really is about: war and death, that the reality of military operations is based on violence and the threat of violence. Our action was quite efficient and we blocked their tent for a few hours.

In the Pride parade, which concludes the Pride festival, the organization for LGBT-soldiers marched, in military uniforms, with a big truck with the slogan “Openness - part of our reality”. We walked beside them the whole parade with speech bubbles saying: “My job kills”, “I’m just as good at killing as heterosexual soldiers” and “Here I walk defending my human rights, while my job is is about violation of other people’s human rights”.

When asking the military about their purpose of participating in the Pride festival, they didn’t answer us. But for us, the purpose of the military’s presence at Pride is quite clear: to legitimize, and conceal their activities of war and death by marketing themselves as human rights promoters and open to everyone (including LGBT people).

As the society gets more and more militarized, the acceptance increases for repression of dissidents and persons who don’t follow the social norms. This applies both for the regions where war is being waged, as well as the ones where they are being waged from. LGBT-people and other marginalized groups in society are among the first in danger of suffering violence and abuse in a climate of militarism, violence and fear. Therefore it is fundamental that we continue the struggle against war and militarization, and as part of this don’t let the military hijack any struggle that should be about human rights for everyone. The struggles against oppressive structures based on gender/sex and sexuality are essential in the struggle against militarization. Consequently, we need to continue the work against heterosexism, transphobia and patriarchy, in our own movements as well as in the rest of the society.

*Cattis Laska and Harms Molander Ofog - direct action for peace*
Child Soldiers:
Learning from Kony2012?

The issue of child soldiers is back on the global agenda, thanks to two major recent developments. In March, Thomas Lubanga became the first person to be convicted by the International Criminal Court. He was found guilty of forcibly recruiting child soldiers to his Union of Congolese Patriots, known as 'the army of children'. The second, most visible development, was the massive popularity growth of web-based film KONY2012. It aims to raise awareness of the activities of Joseph Kony, the Ugandan warlord who leads the Lord's Resistance Army, calling for the US military to intervene to bring him to justice. Kony and the LRA are known for their brutality and use of child soldiers. Invisible Children's initiative went viral to become an Internet phenomenon. It amassed over 30 million views in 48 hours, at a rate of up to 1 million per hour, mostly in North America, Europe, Asia and Latin America.

It has been hard to miss. In March #STOPKONY became the number one hashtag worldwide. Perhaps you, like me, were one of more than 112 million viewers who went onto YouTube or Vimeo to watch the 29-minute film. Did you see it on Facebook? Do you follow Rihanna on Twitter (14.9 million fans), or Justin Bieber (18.4 million), receiving their tweets #STOPKONY or #KONY2012? Or Jay-Z, Bill Gates, Bono, J.K. Rowling, Oprah or Angelina Jolie? Perhaps you bought an ‘Action Kit’, wore a bracelet, put up a poster or signed up to give $3 a week. The message is simple and the cash transaction is easy. Donate: you’ve ‘made a difference’: you can stop thinking. Indeed, we are actively encouraged to abandon our capacity for critical thought. The voice over tells us ‘we are not studying history, we are shaping it’.

The outpouring of care and energy shown by so many young people springs from a sincere motivation to take action to confront injustice in the world. It demonstrates that we are not as selfish and apathetic as we are constantly being told. But the KONY2012 campaign is really dangerous. The idea that mass social media movements can leverage public opinion to call for foreign military intervention is terrifying.

Scheduled screenings in Northern Uganda had to be abandoned when angry viewers began to shout and throw rocks at the screen. The factual inaccuracies, the overt warmongering and the disregard for the real trauma and suffering of the LRA’s victims. The staggering narcissism and the commercialisation. The slick graphics, simplistic and often infantile soundbites and the one-sided story. And the portrayal of ‘Africans’ as helpless children in need of rescuing by young and
idealistic Westerners.

According to YouTube statistics, KONY2012 was most popular with girls aged 13-17, boys aged 13-17 and young men aged 18-24. Children and young people were also the driving force behind the film’s viral exposure. Young adults aged 18-30 were twice as likely to view the film as older adults.

While many have questioned KONY2012’s simplistic paradigm, its success in raising awareness among ‘normally apathetic’ Western youth has been almost universally praised. However, the film presents US military intervention as the only solution. KONY2012 is attempting to recruit children and young people to their belligerent campaign, trying to persuade 13-17 yr olds that military force is the answer and that US violence will heal the world. This is morally repugnant. Ugandan civilians will have to pay the ultimate price so that some naive Westerners can feel good about themselves.

Then comes the question: ‘What can we do?’ Moved by the suffering in the world, many young people feel called to act. First, we can educate ourselves. We can study child rights. The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child is the most widely ratified human rights treaty in the world. Everyone is onboard, except for the USA and Somalia (and Somalia plan to ratify). It obliges all states to ensure that people under 15 yrs don’t become soldiers (Art. 38). An Optional Protocol extends this, specifying that no one under 18 can be recruited compulsorily and that no under 18s can take a direct part in hostilities. The African Charter on the Rights and the Welfare of the Child is stronger: no one under 18 can be recruited by a State, under any circumstances. Under the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the use of child soldiers under 15 is a ‘war crime’. This is how Lubanga was convicted.

So international law is one tool we can work with. We also need to understand the social, political, historical and cultural contexts of the issues in question. Some child soldiers in the world are coerced, but many volunteer to fight. Why is this? And what about child soldiers in our own countries?

As for direct action, instead of asking how Western governments can intervene to solve Africa’s conflicts, we might ask how our own governments are causing and prolonging those conflicts. Do we challenge the militarisation of Africa in the name of the ‘Global War on Terror’ and efforts to control oil resources? As consumers, do we make choices that contribute to water and other natural resource shortages, potentially (but never inevitably) fueling conflict?

The reaction to KONY2012 shows the world how much children and young people care. When our energy and commitment is combined with our ability to think for ourselves and critically examine what we are told, we can be a powerful movement for peace.

Helen Kearney

---

**Donate to War Resisters’ International**

**How to make a donation to WRI?**

- by standing order which enables us to plan but let us know (see bank details overleaf)
- in USA by arranging for regular donations to be sent through your bank’s bil payment service
- by giro transfer to War Resisters’ International,
  - in Euros to Bank of Ireland, IBAN IE91 BOFI 8000 9240 413547 BIC/SWIFT BOFIIE2D
  - in £ sterling to Unity Trust Bank, IBAN GB11 CPBK 0800 5150 07 32 10
- by credit card – complete details in the next column or use our web facility at http://wri-irg.org
- by cheque, in £, or US$, payable to “WRI”
- (UK only) by Charity Aid voucher (CAF), made out to Lansbury House Trust Fund (to request such vouchers, write to: Charities Aid Foundation, Kings Hill, West Malling, Kent ME19 4TA, or visit www.CAFonline.org)
- (USA only) by sending a tax deductible donation – make checks payable to the A.J. Muste Institute

**Payment by credit card**

- Please debit my credit card for the amount of £/US$ ____ (delete currency as appropriate)
- Credit Card (delete Visa/Access/Mastercard/ as appropriate)
- Card number ______________________
- Expiry date: ____ / ____
- Security code: ______
- Name on card: __________________________
- Signature: __________________________
- Billing address (if different from overleaf)
  - ______________________________________
  - ______________________________________
  - ______________________________________
  - ______________________________________

92/05/12/en
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**African Nonviolence Trainers Exchange**

**26-29 July 2012**

War Resisters’ International and Ceasefire Campaign in South Africa in collaboration with the African Women’s Active Nonviolence Initiative for Social Change (AWANICH), Women Peacemaker Program of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation (IFOR) and the Organization for Nonviolence and Development of South Sudan (ONAD), are proposing to organise a nonviolence trainers exchange to take place between 26-29 of July, 2012 in Johan-

**Background**

This project is a first step in a several-year programme to strengthen the network of nonviolent action trainers throughout the continent. The development of nonviolence training in Africa has been patchy. This project will therefore empower African partners to broaden their understanding in nonviolence and create an opportunity for interaction, learning and networking. Building a strong alliance between the WRI, the Interna-

**African Nonviolence Trainers Exchange**

The exchange will bring together trainers from different networks and countries to meet and share their experiences and skills, while also looking at the challenges faced when promoting nonviolence training in African countries. We will also look at the potential of forming a network of African trainers that can serve as a base point for sharing experiences, resources, and mutual assistance. The four days will be divided in such a way that there is time for active participation of all participants, by using participatory methods used by the trainers themselves in their training.


---

**The Broken Rifle No 92, May 2012**
New in the WRI webshop

War Resisters’ International offers a range of merchandise via its webshop. These and many other books can be ordered online — and some are even available for reading online or downloading as PDF.

VENEZUELA

Revolution as Spectacle analyses the Chávez regime from an antiauthoritarian Venezuelan perspective. It debunks claims made by Venezuelan and U.S. rightists that the Chávez government is dictatorial, as well as claims made by Venezuelan and U.S. leftists that the Chávez government is revolutionary. Instead the book argues that the Chávez regime is one of a long line of Latin American populist regimes that, "revolutionary" rhetoric aside, have historically been subservient to the United States as well as to multinational corporations. The book concludes by explaining how Venezuela's autonomous social, labour, and environmental movements have been systematically disempowered by the Chávez regime, but that despite this they remain the basis of a truly democratic, revolutionary alternative.

Rafael Uzcátegui
Publication date: January 2011
Orders: £11.00 + postage

Conscientious objectors are generally seen as male — as are soldiers. This book breaks with this assumption. Women conscientiously object to military service and militarism. Not only in countries which conscript women — such as Eritrea and Israel — but also in countries without conscription of women. In doing so, they redefine antimilitarism from a feminist perspective, opposing not only militarism, but also a form of antimilitarism that creates the male conscientious objector as the ‘hero’ of antimilitarist struggle.

This anthology includes contributions by women conscientious objectors and activists from Britain, Colombia, Eritrea, Israel, Paraguay, South Korea, Turkey, and the USA, plus documents and statements.

Published by: War Resisters’ International
Edited by Ellen Elster and Majken Jul Sørensen
Preface by Cynthia Enloe
Publication date: April 2010
Orders: £8.00 + postage

Social change doesn’t just happen. It’s the result of the work of committed people striving for a world of justice and peace. This work gestates in groups or cells of activists, in discussions, in training sessions, in reflecting on previous experiences, in planning, in experimenting and in learning from others.

Preparing ourselves for our work for social justice is key to its success. There is no definitive recipe for successful nonviolent actions and campaigns. This handbook, however, is a series of resources that can inspire and support your own work, especially if you adapt the resources to your own needs and context.

This handbook has been a collaborative effort of people working in nonviolence within the WRI network from Australia, Belgium, Britain, Colombia, Chile, Germany, Italy, Israel, South Korea, Scandinavia, Spain, Turkey, and the USA.

Published by: War Resisters’ International
ISBN: 978-0-903517-21-8
Orders: £5.00 + postage

Check out the WRI webshop at [http://wri-irg.org/webshop](http://wri-irg.org/webshop)