

initiating role in the setting up of the End Conscription Campaign. In addition, a number of past objectors have been centrally involved in ECC.

ECC and the various COSGs play complementary roles. While ECC is conducting a high profile public campaign, COSG is able to give personal support to those individuals who, having been challenged by the message of ECC, choose not to serve in the SADF.

Roger Field

5.5.3. RESISTING THE APARTHEID WAR

COSAWR - Committee On South African War Resistance

COSAWR, the Committee on South African War Resistance, was formed in London in late 1978 and in Amsterdam by young South Africans who had left South Africa rather than fight in the South African armed forces in defence of apartheid. The two committees share the same aims and purposes:

- Raising the issue of militarisation and resistance to the apartheid regime in Southern Africa
- Providing assistance and advice to refugee South African war resisters
- Involving exiled South African resisters in anti-apartheid solidarity activity
- Reaching into South African militarism and resistance to it
- Producing publications, including a bi-monthly journal, "Resister".
- Campaigning in support of all those resisting the apartheid war.

Since its formation COSAWR has assisted a few hundred resisters to apartheid military service with advice regarding asylum, settling in the countries in which they have been exiled and so on. The numbers of young South Africans who have left the country to avoid military run into the thousands, but only a small proportion of these have required assistance with obtaining asylum and refugee status. Many exiled resisters are involved in the broader anti-apartheid struggle.

The basis of our call for support for South African war resistance and for those opposing conscription under apartheid is the fact that the South African regime is engaged in three interconnected wars: The war against the people of Namibia whose land it illegally occupies in defiance of the United Nations Security Council and the International Court of Justice; the war against the front-line states and neighbouring countries; and thirdly its war against the South African people, all of which are waged to defend and entrench apartheid.

The SADF and its extension the South West Africa Territory Force have committed countless atrocities in Namibia, where an occupation army of an estimated 100,000 troops is based. Since 1975 the SADF has launched attacks and invasions against Angola and has occupied parts of Southern Angola since 1981 in order to bolster UNITA, its surrogate force in Angola. It has continually and systematically violated the Nkomati Accords under which South Africa and Mozambique undertook to prevent forces based in their countries from undermining the other state. While Mozambique has held to the accords, the South African regime has stepped up its military aid and political support for the so-called Mozambique National Resistance. Both before and since the Declaration of the State of Emergency in July this year, blood has flowed in South Africa's streets as a result of police and army action. Under the State of Emergency, the deployment of police, military and paramilitary forces in townships has led to the deaths of several hundred people and to the detention without trial of well over five thousand.

Conscription in South Africa maintains war and apartheid. Young white males are the basis of the South African military machine. They are subject to conscription as soon as they leave school, although deferment is often given for further studies. Conscripts undergo an initial period of two years continuous service, followed by another 12 years in the Citizen Force. This involves up to three months active service every year. After this they become members of local white militia, the commandos, with commitments until the age of 55. Older white men are also being mobilised into the commandos. Conscripts spend much of their time fighting in Namibia, patrolling South Africa's northern borders of shooting and killing their fellow South Africans in urban areas.

The Committee on South African War Resistance, in common with those resisting conscription inside South Africa, believes that in South Africa today there can be no peace without justice and an end of apartheid. Consequently, campaigns in support of individual conscientious objectors, for an end to conscription, for the removal of troops from the townships, the exposure of military atrocities and the documentation of apartheid militarism do not represent a third force that stands between oppressor and oppressed, but as an integral part of the struggle for a democratic and non-racial South Africa and independent Namibia.

In response to the growing number of conscientious objectors, and in particular to pressure from the South African churches, the apartheid regime has introduced a system of alternative service administered by a Board for Religious Objection. But this has been strictly limited to religious pacifist objectors, while anti-apartheid objectors, moral objectors and religious objectors who are opposed specifically to the injustice of the SA Defence Force, now face six years imprisonment. Many leading church figures in South Africa have also supported the call for an end to conscription and for the churches to distance themselves from the apartheid forces by refusing to provide a ministry that soldiers in their military obligations. Despite the position of church leadership, and the views of the majority of black congregations, most white congregations see little contradiction between their religious beliefs and the maintenance of apartheid. Recently a group of over 150 South African theologians produced the Kairos Document which argues that church opposition to the SA Defence Force should be greatly increased.

On an international level, the United Nations has declared apartheid to be a crime against humanity and against the conscience and dignity of mankind, and recognised the legitimacy and integrity of the struggles of the Namibian and South African people for liberation and national self-determination, led by the ANC and SWAPO.

The history of the liberation struggles in South Africa and Namibia have been long, rich and bitter. During most of their existence, both the ANC and SWAPO have adopted peaceful, non-violent forms of protest and resistance – only to be confronted by the armed might of the state. It was only after the banning of the ANC in 1960, the arrest and killing of many of its leaders, and the indifference of the international community to SWAPO's peaceful attempts to liberate Namibia from South Africa's control that the two movements began to confront apartheid violence through an armed struggle. But the movements have not ceased to work for change through other avenues, including trade union work, mass popular and community resistance and the formation of democratic organisations. The ANC and SWAPO have also called for the isolation of the South African regime politically,

militarily and economically in order to bring about the end of apartheid as peacefully as possible.

Though confronted internally with an unprecedented level of resistance and increasingly isolated internationally, the apartheid state remains militarily powerful and ruthless. Over the past year, the regime has experienced a massive upsurge of anti-apartheid struggle, to which it has responded by declaring a State of Emergency and giving its police and soldiers extensive powers of detention, arrest, search and seizure. Members of the armed forces have been indemnified from almost all responsibility for their actions.

Under what conditions is peace in South Africa possible? Apartheid must be ended, military conscription in defence of apartheid must cease and there must be freedom and equality for all South Africans.

There are many dimensions to the struggle for peace and freedom in South Africa, and there are many activities and campaigns that national and international organisations can take up in support. As peace activists, we can work to ensure the total isolation of the apartheid regime through the imposition of mandatory sanctions in social, economic, political and military fields.

Despite the imposition of the mandatory UN Arms Embargo against the South African regime in 1977, South Africa continues to spend as estimated 15% of its military budget on arms acquisitions overseas. With many of its weapons systems outdated, its economy in crisis, and its manpower stretched by the State of Emergency, the apartheid regime's dependence on arms imports, and related repressive and surveillance technology, spare parts and components, remains vital to its survival. There is thus an urgent need to campaign to strengthen and enforce the arms embargo and to ensure that it is no longer violated.

The international campaign against apartheid and South African aggression should also include a demand for the recognition of captured combatants of the liberations movement as Prisoners of War. The apartheid regime has executed a number of SWAPO and ANC fighters in violation of Protocol 1 of the Geneva Conventions which extended the provisions of the Conventions to cover "armed conflicts in which people are fighting colonial domination and alien occupation and against racist regimes in exercise of their rights of self determination". The ANC has undertaken, as far as possible, to abide by the Conventions.

There should also be international support for all those resisting conscription and campaigning against the apartheid war in South Africa and Namibia. In particular, churches should support initiatives taken by their sister churches in South Africa in support of conscientious objectors and against the regime's war.

Lastly, the campaign for asylum to be granted to those refusing to fight in the apartheid military and police forces should be supported. In December 1978 the General Assembly of the United Nations passed unanimously to acclaim a call upon member states to "grant asylum or safe transit to persons compelled to leave their country of nationality solely because of a conscientious objections to assisting in the enforcement of apartheid through service in military or police forces" (Resolution 33/165). In October 1979 the UN Centre Against Apartheid published a paper which noted that: "In the escalating struggle for national liberation in southern Africa, more and more young South Africans are taking a stand against their forced involvement in the apartheid regime's armed forces", and

concluded that "support for their plight can only add to the weight of the international campaign to rid the world of the crime of apartheid".

In December 1980, during its debate on military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, the General Assembly called on "the youth of South Africa to refrain from enlisting in the South African armed forces, which are designed to defend the inhuman system of apartheid, to repress the legitimate struggle of the oppressed people, and to threaten, and to commit acts of aggression against neighbouring states" (Resolution 35/206B). It also invited governments and organisations, in consultation with the national liberation movement, to help people forced to leave South Africa "because of their objection, on the grounds of conscience, to serving in the military or police forces of the apartheid regime".

The issue of conscription under apartheid is not only a question of the right of the individual, it is also an international and a national issue.

We believe that all South Africans who believe in justice, peace and nonracism should refuse to identify with the apartheid armed forces. Consequently, we endorse the call made by the United Nations for conscripts to refuse to fight in the apartheid army and police forces. We support both those people who have refused conscription, and those who have deserted from the SA Defence Force. We also support those conscripts who have sought to expose the criminal activities of the apartheid armed forces from within its ranks, for example, Roland Hunter who was jailed for five years for exposing details of South African support for the Mozambique National Resistance in violation of the Nkomati Accords.

COSAWR has spread awareness and mobilised support for the South African freedom struggle, and in particular for the struggle against apartheid conscription, through publications, campaigns, research and anti-racist and anti-apartheid activities. It has established itself as an external support base for South African conscientious objectors who have been imprisoned in South Africa.

COSAWR has also continued to assist conscientious objectors and deserters seeking asylum outside South Africa as a result of their opposition to the apartheid war. We have not worked alone, but greater international support, within the context of the broader struggle for freedom in Southern Africa, would greatly assist the struggle against apartheid militarism.

Contributors

250

Editors:

- Kimmo Kiljunen, Director, Institute of Development Studies, Helsinki University; Former Secretary General, International Peace Bureau
- Jouko Väänänen, Associate Professor, Helsinki University; Former Chairman, Union of Conscientious Objectors in Finland

Contributors:

- Judith Baker, Quaker UN Office, Geneva
Kath Buffington, Upstate Resistance, Mucher Hollow, Allegany, USA
- Jens Drivsholm, Militær- og Nægterforeningen, Copenhagen
Ellen Elster, IKKEVOLD, Oslo
Mike Felker, Veterans Speakers Alliance, San Francisco
Frank Field, International Peace Bureau, Geneva
Roger Field, Committee on South African War Resistance, London
- Tor Egil Forland, National Peace Council, Oslo
Guido Grünewald, DFG-VK, Köln
Peter Hathorn, End Conscription Campaign, Cape Town, South Africa
- Denis Hayes, Lawyer, Central Board of Conscientious Objectors, London
- Jukka Heinonen, Commander, Finnish Defence Forces, General Headquarters
- Ilpo Helén, Union of COs in Finland, Helsinki
Ulrich Herz, President of Swedish People's Parliament for Disarmament, Stockholm
- Aki Hietanen, TAPRI, Tampere, Finland
Pertti Joenniemi, Research Fellow, TAPRI, Tampere, Finland
Rebecca McCornick, European Bureau for Conscientious Objection, Brussels
- Matt Meyer, War Resisters League, New York
Laurie Nathan, End Conscription Campaign, Cape Town, South Africa
- Kari Palonen, Associate Professor, University of Jyväskylä
Riikka Pilli-Sihvola, Amnesty International, Finnish Section, Kuopio, Finland
- Robert Polet, WRI, Floreffe, Belgium
Stelios Psomas, Arnoume-Bulletin, Thessaloniki, Greece
Seppo Randell, Professor, University of Tampere
Bernadette Ridard, WRI, Hamburg
Leila Räsänen, Secretary General, Council for Equality between Men and Women, Helsinki
- Martin Scheinin, Union of COs in Finland, Helsinki
Hannu Sikkilä, Psychologist, University of Oulu Central Hospital, Finland
- Myrtle Solomon, Former President, War Resisters International, London
- Peter Whittle, Quaker Committee, Middlesbrough, England
Dorothea Woods, Quaker UN Office, Geneva

THE RIGHT TO REFUSE TO KILL

A New Guide
to
Conscientious Objection
and
Service Refusal

Published by
The International Peace Bureau
41 rue de Zurich
Geneva

1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<p>THE RIGHT TO REFUSE TO KILL — A New Dimension to the Legal and Moral Right to Refuse Military Service and Orders.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">By Seán MacBride, S.C.</p>	7
RELEVANT DOCUMENTS:	
<p>I. The Nuremberg Principles of International Law. As formulated by the International Law Commission June-July 1950.</p>	19
<p>II. Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe: Resolution 337 (1967) on the Right of Conscientious Objection.</p>	21
<p>III. World Council of Churches: The Uppsala Report (1968) IV Section II A, paragraph 21.</p>	23
<p>IV. Vatican II: Pastoral Constitution <i>Gaudium et Spes</i> (The Church Today) Chapter V, Section 1.</p>	23
<p>V. Committee on Society, Development and Peace (SODEPAX): Report of Baden Consultation 3-9 April 1970. IV. Rights and World Peace, paragraphs 29-32.</p>	23
<p>VI. World Conference on Religion and Peace. Kyoto, Japan, October 16-21, 1970: The Right of Conscientious Objection.</p>	24
FURTHER STEPS TO RECOGNITION UNDER NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LAW OF THE RIGHT OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION.	
<p>International Peace Bureau, Geneva :</p> <p>Recommendation of 8th August 1970 concerning Draft Resolution to be submitted to the General Assembly of the United Nations.</p>	25
<p>Draft Universal Charter of Conscientious Objection to Military Service and Training (1970).</p>	28
<p>Commission on Human Rights 27th Session Agenda Item 6 (1970).</p>	32

The Right to Refuse to Kill

A new Dimension to the Legal and Moral Right to Refuse Military Service and Orders

by SEÁN MACBRIDE, S.C.

Chairman Executive International Peace Bureau, Chairman Executive Amnesty International, Chairman Special N.G.O. Committee on Human Rights (Geneva), Member International Commission of Jurists, former Irish Foreign Minister and signatory to the Geneva Conventions 1949 and to the European Convention on Human Rights 1950.

International Recognition of Conscientious Objectors

Since the last World War the basis for the right to refuse military service and orders has acquired a completely new and widened dimension. Originally, the claim of Conscientious Objectors to refuse military service rested on a religious or ethical opposition to the killing of any human being. Gradually the concept of the classical Conscientious Objector came to be defined and recognised in many countries. The best modern definition of the classical Conscientious Objector as it is internationally *defined* in Europe, but not necessarily *accepted* by Governments, is that contained in Resolution 337 adopted by the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe and enunciated as a "Basic Principle"; it reads:

"Persons liable to conscription for military service who, for reasons of conscience or profound conviction arising from reli-

gious, ethical, moral, humanitarian, philosophical or similar motives, refuse to perform armed service, shall enjoy a personal right to be released from the obligation to perform such service ”.

“ This right shall be regarded as deriving logically from the fundamental rights of the individual in democratic Rule of Law States which are guaranteed in Article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights ”.

Thus, for the first time, an official international institution has recognised the personal right of the individual “ to be released from the obligation to perform armed service ” for “ reasons of conscience or profound conviction arising from (1) *religious* (2) *ethical* (3) *moral* (4) *humanitarian* (5) *philosophical* or (6) *similar motives* ”. This definition is important in that it encompasses not only reasons of “ conscience ” but also “ profound conviction ” related to any of the six factors enumerated.

This Resolution is particularly important in that it equates this right to Article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights. This is the article which guarantees “ the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion ”. The Article, except for the limiting proviso, is a replica of Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The U.N. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted in 1966 but not yet ratified, also guarantees by Article 18 “ the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion ”. The relevant Articles of the Universal Declaration, the European Convention and of the U.N. Covenant each guarantee in exactly similar terms not only “ the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion ” but also:

“ . . . freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance ”.

The U.N. Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, in addition, provides by Article 18 (2):

“ No one shall be subject to coercion which would impair this freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice. ”

Accordingly, on the basis of the interpretation of Article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights, embodied in the Council of Europe Resolution 337, it can be reasonably argued that Article 18 of the Universal Declaration and Article 18 of the U.N. Covenant also recognise the personal right of the individual, for the reasons enunciated in Resolution 337 "to be released from the obligation to perform" military service. The U.N. Covenant, in addition, provides that no coercion shall be used which would impair the right to have or to adopt a chosen belief.

However, two matters must be pointed out, lest the progress just discussed might lead to unjustifiable optimism:

- (a) The Council of Europe Resolution 337 (1967) is not legally binding on any State. It is merely an interpretation by the Consultative Assembly of Article 9 of the European Convention by a responsible international body; to that extent it has considerable persuasive value but it is not legally binding.
- (b) Both the European Convention and the U.N. Covenant make "the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion" subject to a number of limitations which include one based on the much abused concept of what is necessary in the "interest of public safety"; this is a most objectionable "catch all" proviso which is capable of gross abuse by governments.

Despite the purely declaratory nature of the Council of Europe Resolution 337, it is of the utmost importance. The Consultative Assembly in furtherance of Resolution 337 sent a Recommendation No. 478 (1967) to the Council of Ministers urging it to set up a Committee of Experts in Human Rights matters to prepare proposals for a Convention to give effect to Resolution 337 and in addition to invite the Member States to give effect in their domestic legislation to the principles embodied in Resolution 337. This has not yet been done. Pressure might well be applied to European Governments in order they should proceed to give effect to the recommendations of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe.

To conclude on this particular aspect of the right to refuse military service, may I make a few concrete suggestions that might be adopted by this Conference and by all organisations interested in this field:

- (a) That every effort should be made to have adopted by the U.N. General Assembly, as a first step, a Resolution in identical terms to that adopted by the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe.
- (b) That every effort should be made to press the Governments of the Member States of the Council of Europe to give effect to the Recommendations of the General Assembly, No. 478 (1967) referred to above. The most favourable Governments should be canvassed first and a constant lobbying effort should be undertaken.
- (c) That all the N.G.O.'s interested should be invited to assist in getting the above two suggestions implemented.

Wars Outlawed

The events since the last war have given the Right to Refuse Military Service a completely new dimension and these developments deserve careful study.

A world conflict will probably lead to the use of thermonuclear, biological or chemical weapons which must result in the destruction of a large portion of the human race. This in itself would appear to provide a new and valid reason for refusing to participate in a war.

The Charter of the U.N. virtually outlaws war and certainly forbids "the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations".

The Charter of the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg created new offences and imposed new responsibilities on military personnel. Articles 6 and 8 are of special interest to anyone who is compelled to serve in an army.

The combined effects of these two articles is to make every soldier criminally liable for (a) crimes against peace, (b) war crimes, and (c) crimes against humanity. The fact that a soldier or subordinate was acting "pursuant to the order of his Government or of a superior shall not free him from responsibility but may be considered in mitigation of punishment if the Tribunal determines that justice so requires".

Crimes Against Peace include:

"... planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression, or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurance...".

Accordingly a soldier or officer can be made criminally liable for participating in the preparation or waging of any war which amounts to a "Crime Against Peace" as defined in Article 6. Likewise, he may also become guilty under international law of a "War Crime" or of a "Crime Against Humanity" for obeying the orders of his government or of his superior. Logically, therefore, each individual must make a value judgement before participating in any war or obeying certain military orders if he is not to incur the risk of becoming a war criminal.

The Tokyo Tribunal laid down in its judgment; "The principle of international law which under certain circumstances protects the representatives of a State cannot be applied to acts which are condemned as criminal by international law". Lord Wright, who headed the United Nations Commission for the Investigation of War Crimes, laid down in even more precise terms the same legal doctrine. Professor Lauterpacht (in the 7th edition of Oppenheim) points out that the Charter of the International Military Tribunal "affirmed the existence of fundamental human rights superior to the law of the state and protected by international criminal sanctions, even if violated in pursuance of the law of the State".

Thus, the question of refusing military service or orders is no longer a matter of pure conscience; it is also in many cases a legal right or even an obligation under international law.

The Nuremberg and Tokyo Tribunals suffered from certain fundamental defects:

- (a) They were trials of the vanquished by the victors;
- (b) They applied laws which were retroactive;
- (c) They operated under a Statute which was signed only by a small number of states;
- (d) They applied only to trials of offenders who participated in the war on the side of " the axis powers ".

Because these defects were appreciated and because it was desired to make the principles of international law established in these trials of universal application for the future, the General Assembly unanimously adopted Resolution I (95) on 11 December 1946 affirming " the principles of international law recognised by the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal and the Judgment of the Tribunal ". In further pursuance of the General Assembly's desire to establish and to define clearly these principles of International Law, the General Assembly on 21 November 1947 by Resolution 177 (ii) instructed the International Law Commission to formulate what are now known as " the Nuremberg Principles " and to prepare a Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind.

In pursuance of this direction from the General Assembly, the International Law Commission formulated seven Principles of general application which are reproduced on page 19. Principles I to V and VI (b) bear most directly on the individual responsibility of individual participants in armies.

The combined effect of Resolution I (95) of December 1946 and of the Seven Nuremberg Principles formulated by the International Law Commission in 1950, is to lay down for the future the principles of international law which are to prevail. They thus overcome the weaknesses which could be said to have attached to the Nuremberg and Tokyo trials (referred to above). For the future, they lay down the principles of International Law which are to apply. No one in the future can plead ignorance of them; it can no longer be said that they are retrospective or that they have been formulated on an ad hoc

basis by the victors to punish the vanquished in a particular war. They are of general application now and in the future.

It will have been noted that Principle IV which places criminal responsibility on the individual, even when acting under orders, introduces the concept of a moral choice; this must involve the making of a moral and ethical evaluation on the part of the individual; this is clearly a matter of individual conscience.

The matter was taken a step further, in pursuance of Resolution 177 (ii) of November 1947, when the International Law Commission unanimously adopted on 28 July 1954 a Draft Code of Offences "Against the Peace and Security of Mankind". Article 4 of this Draft Code provides:

"The fact that a person charged with an offence defined in this Code acted pursuant to an order of his government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility, provided a moral choice was, in fact, possible to him."

This Draft Code remains only a draft project. In some respects it is much more limited in its provisions than the Charter of the Nuremberg Military Tribunal and even than the Seven Nuremberg Principles. This weakness probably reflects the moral retrogression which is so evident on the part of many governments—particularly those of the major powers. Governments in general, and those of the major military powers in particular, dislike the placing of any limitation on their absolute power to kill and destroy their enemy by any method. They do not like to be precluded from killing civilians, including women and children, either as an indirect incidence of their military operations or as a direct part of their policy to impose their will by acts of brutality and terror directed against civilians, including women, children and babies. Limited as it is, the Draft Code is not likely to secure acceptance in the present world situation. This may be just as well, as any such Code adopted in the present era of brutality would probably be a pale and weak one; this would only weaken the existing rules of international law and existing conventional obligations.

Another relevant international convention is the Genocide Convention of 1948. It not only defines the crime of Genocide in wide terms, which might indeed easily be charged in some of the present day armed conflicts which disgrace our era, but it also places criminal responsibility on individuals as well as on governments. Article 4 provides:

“Persons committing genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in Article 3 shall be punished, whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials or private individuals.”

To summarize, a soldier whether conscripted or a volunteer, who engages in an armed conflict may well be committing an offence under international law as defined by the U.N. Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, by the Humanitarian Conventions, the various Human Rights Conventions, by the Nuremberg Principles, by the Genocide Convention, or under International Customary Laws. It will be no answer for him to plead that he was acting under orders of his State, Government or superior.

Since the above paper was written and presented to the International Peace Bureau, International Conference at Reutlingen in 1968, a number of significant events have occurred. The IPB has itself caused to be prepared a draft Resolution for submission to the General Assembly of the U.N. by some Governments (see page 26) and a Universal Charter for Conscientious Objectors (see page 28).

A very important Conference consisting of representatives from all the Christian Churches was held in Baden (Austria) on April 3-9, 1970. This Conference, which consisted of high level participants from all the Christian Churches and from different regions of the world, considered the rights of Conscientious Objectors and adopted the following four conclusions:

“(a) The consultation considers that the exercise of conscientious judgment is inherent in the dignity of human beings and that accordingly, each person should be assured the right, on grounds of conscience or profound conviction, to refuse military service, or any other direct or indirect participation in wars or armed conflicts.”

- “(b) The right of conscientious objection also extends to those who are unwilling to serve in a particular war because they consider it unjust or because they refuse to participate in a war or conflict in which weapons of mass destruction are likely to be used.”
- “(c) The consultation also considers that members of armed forces have the right, and even the duty, to refuse to obey military orders which may involve the commission of criminal offences, or of war crimes, or of crimes against humanity.”
- “(d) It is urged that the Churches should use their best endeavour to secure the recognition of the right of conscientious objection as herein before defined under national and international law. Governments should extend the right of asylum to those refusing to serve in their country for reasons of conscience.”

These four conclusions are very far reaching. They go further than the basic principles asserted by the Assembly of the Council of Europe; they recognise that the right of conscientious objection extends to selective objection; they recognise that the individual has a right to refuse to participate in a war which he considers unjust or in a war in which weapons of mass destruction are likely to be used. The conclusions not only assert the right of the individual to refuse to obey certain orders, but state that the individual has the *duty* to refuse certain orders.

The matter was also considered by the “World Conference on Religion and Peace” held in Kyoto at the end of 1970. Unlike the Baden Conference, which was a consultation of the Christian Churches, the Kyoto World Conference included not only representatives from all the Christian Churches, but also from the Buddhist, Confucian, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, Shinto, Sikhs and Zoroastrian religions. This World Conference on Religion and Peace adopted the following finding in regard to conscientious objectors:

“We consider that the exercise of conscientious judgment is inherent in the dignity of human beings and that, accordingly, each

person should be assured the right, on grounds of conscience or profound conviction, to refuse military service, or any other direct or indirect participation in wars or armed conflicts. The right of conscientious objection also extends to those who are unwilling to serve in a particular war because they consider it unjust or because they refuse to participate in a war or conflict in which weapons of mass destruction are likely to be used. This Conference also considers that members of armed forces have the right, and even the duty, to refuse to obey military orders which may involve the commission of criminal offenses, or of war crimes, or of crimes against humanity. ”

The My-Lai Massacres and the trial of Lt. Calley have focused public attention on the whole question of the individual responsibilities of officers and soldiers for crimes against humanity. It is quite clear that both under international law and under the domestic law of most countries individual soldiers and officers are criminally liable for the crimes they commit even when these are committed in pursuance of specific orders. All international organisations concerned with the Protection of Human Rights are gravely dissatisfied that there is no international machinery empowered to receive and investigate complaints of violations of the Humanitarian Laws (Hague and Geneva Conventions, Geneva Protocol and the Genocide Convention). These Conventions, while they suffer from being outdated by current methods of warfare, lay down fine principles and detailed rules; they condemn and outlaw methods of warfare that are in current use in most of the armed conflicts that disgrace this era. However, unfortunately, these conventions are not being complied with and are violated practically daily in Vietnam and elsewhere. Strange as it may seem, there is no international body in existence with jurisdiction to receive and investigate complaints of such violations. The International Committee of the Red Cross, which does most invaluable humanitarian work, has to remain on good terms with *all* Governments at *all* times; it can never afford to condemn publicly a major power. It has no judicial investigatory functions. It also suffers from being exclusively Swiss and not international. For these reasons the Geneva Special N.G.O. Committee on Human Rights adopted in February

1971, a concrete proposal for circulation to all International Organisation. This Resolution declares:

“ Gravely concerned by the disregard of the provisions of Humanitarian Conventions and Laws in the course of armed conflicts, the undersigned international organisations urge

- “1. The setting-up within the framework of the United Nations of a permanent Commission of Inquiry charged with the responsibility of investigating all complaints of violations during armed conflicts of:
 - (a) The Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907,
 - (b) The Geneva Protocol of 1925 as defined by Resolution 2603 (XXIV) of the General Assembly,
 - (c) The Geneva Conventions of 1949.
- “2. That such a Commission of Inquiry should have full powers of investigation to inquire into complaints made to it by any government, any party to an armed conflict, or any responsible non-governmental organisation, and should report its findings to the Security Council and to the General Assembly of the United Nations.
- “ 3. Such a Commission of Inquiry should be composed of persons, independent of any government, and chosen because of their high moral character and their capacity to conduct inquiries in accordance with generally recognised judicial principles.
- “ 4. That in so far as possible the investigations undertaken by the proposed Commission of Inquiry should be conducted in public and its findings and reports should be public. ”

It is extremely important that the developments outlined, very briefly, in this paper should be made generally known. It is felt that no conscientious legislator or judge could reject the reasoning outlined nor the persuasive authority of the Nuremberg Principles, the Resolution of the Assembly of the Council of Europe, or the Conclusions of the Baden and Kyoto Conferences. Public opinion at all levels must be informed of these developments. It must use its influence with

Parliaments and Governments to secure legal recognition of the new dimension acquired by the right to refuse to participate in wars.

A very special debt of gratitude is due to the Society of Friends for their persistent and courageous defence of the right to refuse military service. It is always invidious to mention particular persons as deserving special credit because one inevitably overlooks many who deserve equal credit; I feel, however, that I must mention Eric Baker, Arthur Booth and Duncan Wood among the Friends who have made important contributions in recent developments to secure international recognition of the right to refuse military service.

SEÁN MACBRIDE

I P B



**international peace bureau
bureau international de la paix**

Founded in Rome 1892. Nobel Peace Prize 1910. Consultative Status with UN/ECOSOC

- WHAT** The International Peace Bureau (IPB) is an international non-governmental organisation forming a network of independent non-aligned peace organisations, international and national. IPB has a consultative status with the United Nations. It was founded in 1892, being thus the oldest international peace organisation.
- WHY** The aim of the IPB constitution is "to serve the cause of peace by the promotion of international co-operation and the non-violent solution of international conflicts".
- HOW** In practice, these aims have been pursued by promoting communication between member organisations, by organising international peace events, by supplying information and other back-up to the member organisations, by establishing links to governments and by representing its member organisations at United Nations level.
- RESULTS** The IPB has a long history of peace activities. In earlier days, IPB organised annual World Peace Congresses which made comprehensive surveys of world issues. These conferences were a forerunner to the General Assembly of the League of Nations and of the United Nations. In more recent years IPB has concentrated in organising expert gatherings and other events on specific international problems.
- IPB has also attempted to contribute to disarmament negotiations being, for instance, actively engaged in promoting the joint statement of Agreed Principles, declared by the United States and the Soviet Union in 1961. The declaration stated that the goal of all negotiations should be General and Complete Disarmament and not merely arms control or arms limitation. To reaffirm this goal IPB has promoted summit meetings between the Presidents of the United States and the Soviet Union.
- The Bradford Proposals for Disarmament adopted in 1974 in a conference convened by IPB, were one of the initiatives which led to the UN First Special Session on Disarmament in 1978. The IPB bulletin "Geneva Monitor — Disarmament" reports to the peace movement about the work of the UN Conference on Disarmament. IPB is also concerned with alternatives to military defence, United Nations peace-keeping and the right of conscientious objection. It issues publications like "The right to refuse to kill", "Children and war" and "Campaigns against Peace Movements". The illegality of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction has been of special concern.

NOBEL PRIZES No less than thirteen of IPBs officials have received the Nobel Prize since 1892. In 1910, the IPB itself was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for its ability to make the issues of war and peace intelligible to ordinary citizens and for serving as a channel of communication between governments and the Peace Movement.

**ADMINI-
STRATION** The IPB has a regular Annual General Meeting (AGM), to which the member organisations send their representatives. There the overall IPB policy is formed, and initiatives and campaigns decided upon. The AGM also elects the Executive Committee, which meets during the year, and other IPB officials. Since 1924 the IPB office has been in Geneva, Switzerland, where also the United Nations Office is situated. Some of the costs of the IPB are met by a trust fund, but the major expenditures are covered by the member organisations and by donations.

THE FUTURE With its worldwide network of member organisations, the IPB has a full part to play on the world peace scene. It works closely with other international bodies and is in friendly co-operation with all peace movements. With its past history and present status IPB offers a good platform for new peace initiatives and communication between peace movements and governments.

TO JOIN If Your organisation or You would like to know more about the IPB, please write to the office in Geneva. With Your help we can create a strong and well organised international peace movement.

President:	Bruce Kent
Secretary General:	Rainer Santi
Secretariat:	Margie Graf
Adress:	Rue de Zürich 41 CH-1201 Geneva Switzerland
Telephone:	(022) 31 64 29
Cable:	Peacebureau Geneva

IPB Member Organisations:

ACTION FROM IRELAND "THIRD WORLD CENTER", Dublin
A.K.E. (Independent Peace Movement), Athens
ALDRIG MERE KRIG, Vodskov, Denmark
ANTI-BASES COALITION, Philippines
ASSOCIATION POUR LE DROIT A L'INFORMATION, Paris
AUSTRALIAN COALITION FOR DISARMAMENT AND PEACE, Australia
BELGIAN WAR RESISTERS, Bruxelles
CAMPAIGN FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT, London
DEUTSCHE FRIEDENSGESELLSCHAFT (DFG-VK), Velbert, FRG
FINNISH COMMITTEE OF 100, Helsinki
FOLKEREISNING MOT KRIG, Oslo
FUNDACIO PER LA PAU, Barcelona
GENSUIKYO, Tokyo
INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION (IFOR), Alkmaar,
Holland
INTERNATIONAL PROGRESS ORGANISATION, Vienna
IRISH INTERNATIONAL PEACE MOVEMENT, Dublin
IRISH CND CAMPAIGN, Dublin
JOURNEES UNIVERSITAIRES DE LA PAIX, Bruxelles
LAWYERS FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT, London
LINKS EUROPA, Schotten, FRG
MOBILIZATION FOR SURVIVAL, USA
MOUVEMENT POUR LE DESARMEMENT LA PAIX ET LA LIBERTE,
Montpellier, France
NATIONAL PEACE COUNCIL, London
NO TO NUCLEAR WEAPONS, Denmark
NORGES FREDSLAG, Oslo
NORWAYS PEACE COUNCIL, Oslo
NUCLEAR-FREE PHILIPPINES COALITION, Philippines
PEACE AND COOPERATION, Spain
PEACE OFFICE, Tokyo
PEACE UNION OF FINLAND, Helsinki
QUAKER PEACE AND SERVICE COMMITTEE, London
RELIGIOSE GESELLSCHAFT DER FREUNDE IN DER SCHWEIZ, Chamby,
Switzerland
SCHWEIZERISCHER FRIEDENS RAT, Zürich
SOCIETA PER LA PACE E LA GIUSTIZIA, Milano
SOCIETAS POPULORUM PROGRESSIO (SPP), Offenbach/Main, FRG

STOCKHOLMS FREDSFÖRENING, Stockholm
SUTNER GESELLSCHAFT, Vienna
SWEDISH PEACE AND ARBITRATION SOCIETY, Stockholm
SWEDISH PEACE COUNCIL, Stockholm
SWISS WOMEN FOR PEACE, Rivaz, Switzerland
VERSÖHNUNGSBUND e.V. Utersen, FRG
WAR RESISTERS INTERNATIONAL, London
WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE, New York
WOMEN FOR PEACE, Sweden
YUGOSLAV LEAGUE FOR PEACE, INDEPENDENCE AND EQUALITY OF
PEOPLES, Beograd

War is a crime against humanity.



Are you determined
not to support any kind of war,
and to strive for the removal
of all causes of war?

If you are, you should be part of the WRI.

For more than 60 years, the War Resisters' International has linked, supported and served people all over the world who are fighting nonviolently against militarism, racism, economic exploitation, and other causes of war.

Things can be

One of the Dutch sections of the War Resisters' International is called '*t Kan Anders* - "It can be done differently". That name encapsulates the basic philosophy of the WRI, its national sections and associated organisations, and its individual members.

Originally founded in 1921, the WRI links pacifists, war resisters, nonviolent activists and conscientious objectors who support the basis:

War is a crime against humanity.

**I am therefore determined not to support any kind of war
and to strive for the removal of all causes of war.**

WRI members believe that war and military confrontation do not solve social, political and economic problems. **Things can be done differently** – can be done through negotiation, with compassion and without violence. **The WRI is non-aligned**; it condemns militarism and the use of war as a means to an end and works for nonviolent alternatives in the West and East and in Third World countries.

All members of WRI's national sections in 17 countries – see list on the back page – are automatically members of the WRI. So too are individuals who accept the basic statement of intent in countries where there is no WRI section. Should you be part of the War Resisters' International?

Beyond Disarmament . . . to Nonviolence

The WRI's concern with peace goes beyond nuclear disarmament, to total disarmament by unilateral initiatives and to the elimination of the causes of war and conflict. The WRI campaigns for the replacement of military systems with new, nonviolent approaches to "defence". The WRI believes that nonviolence as used for example by Gandhi to liberate India, by Martin Luther King Jr. to speed the liberation of black Americans, by workers in the Polish Solidarnosc, is a potent tool for the defence of human freedom and dignity, which has earned the right of serious consideration when facing oppression. The essence of nonviolence is to build trust and remove the causes of conflict before it deteriorates into war.

Beyond Nonviolence . . . to Liberation and Peace

Many WRI members see their opposition to war as a part of a broader commitment to end the structural violence inherent in many forms of social and political organisation. This violence within the state can be as extensive as the overt violence of war, and the struggle against it is no less vital.

This is not an easy task. But the WRI believes that the way to end wars is for women and men to refuse to cooperate with wars and their preparation, for people to work to eliminate the causes of war, and for real effort to be put into creating alternatives to violence and destructive social, political and economic systems.

done differently

The WRI at Work

Inside this leaflet are many examples of the work of the WRI:

- * support and encouragement for individual war resisters and conscientious objectors.
- * nonviolent demonstrations, direct action and day-to-day work against militarism, racism, economic exploitation, and other causes of war.
- * nonviolent intervention in situations of crisis and conflict, and support for nonviolent struggles against oppression and injustice.
- * working through national governments and transnational bodies such as the United Nations to get laws and political structures changed.
- * linking individuals and organisations – locally, nationally, regionally and internationally.

What the WRI Is

The WRI's sections in 18 countries are autonomous, and vary in size and age. From its headquarters in London the WRI links these sections, thus creating a transnational movement of organisations and their supporters committed to war resistance and nonviolence. The WRI strives to extend its membership in Third World countries and East Europe but in some of these countries the WRI is banned and its potential supporters cannot work openly without fear of reprisal.

An elected International Council meets regularly, and Triennial Conferences held in different parts of the world are open to all WRI members.

Your part in the WRI

If you support the WRI's basis and live in a country where there is a WRI section – join it. You are then a member of the WRI.

If there is no section in your country or if you cannot join this national section, it is possible to become an individual member. Tick the form overleaf as appropriate.

If you want to give special help to the WRI without becoming a member you can become a **Friend of the WRI**. A Friend of the WRI is anyone who expresses support for the work of the WRI with a financial contribution. You will receive an Annual Report and can get other literature or mailings by request.



If you believe that war is a crime against humanity
 If when you think of war, violence and oppression
 you do believe that it can be done differently
 then you need WRI, and WRI needs you
 Look inside for more about our work **tick a till at**
 the form overleaf.

SECTIONS

BELGIUM Internationale van Oorlogstegestanders; Mouvement International de la Reconciliation /Internationale des Résistants à la Guerre **BRITAIN** Fellowship of Reconciliation; Peace Pledge Union **CANADA** Union des Pacifistes du Québec **DENMARK** Aldrig Mere Krig **FRANCE** Union Pacifiste de France **INDIA** Shanti Sena Mandal **ISRAEL** WRI Israel **ITALY** Movimento Nonviolento **JAPAN** WRI Japan **NETHERLANDS** 't Kan Anders; Werkgroep voor de Vrede **NEW ZEALAND** Christian Pacifist Society **NORWAY** Folkereising Mot Krig **SPAIN** Movimento de Objetores de Conciencia (Madrid) **SRI LANKA** Nonviolent Direct Action Group **SWEDEN** Kristna Fredsrörelsen; Svenska Freds-och Skiljedomsforeningen **UNITED STATES** Fellowship of Reconciliation; War Resisters League **WEST GERMANY** Deutsche Friedensgesellschaft/Internationale der Kriegsdienstgegner e.V. (Hamburg); Deutsche Friedensgesellschaft/Vereinigte Kriegsdienstgegner e.V.; Graswüzelrevolution Föderation Gewaltfreier Aktionsgruppen; Internationale der Kriegsdienstgegner e.V. Berlin.

ASSOCIATES

INTERNATIONAL International Seminars on Training for Nonviolent Action
AUSTRIA Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Zivildienst, Gewaltfreiheit und Soziale Verteidigung; Begegnungszentrum für Aktive Gewaltlosigkeit **BELGIUM** Confederation du Service Civil de la Jeunesse; Mouvement Chrétien de la Paix **BRITAIN** Birmingham Peace Centre; Greenpeace (London); Housmans Bookshop **FINLAND** Union of COs **FRANCE** Mouvement International de la Reconciliation; Mouvement des Objecteurs du Conscience **ITALY** Lega degli Obiettori di Conciencia; Partito Radicale **JAPAN** Nipponzan Myohoji **NETHERLANDS** Vereniging Dienstweigering **SCANDINAVIA** Kampanjen mot Verneplikt **UNITED STATES** Movement for a New Society; Resource Center for Non-violence **WEST GERMANY** Societas Popularum Progressio.

ASSOCIATED PUBLICATIONS

BRITAIN *Peace News* **IRELAND** *Dawn*

I BELIEVE THAT WAR IS A CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY

- Please send me information about the WRI section(s) in my country.
- Please send me more information about the WRI, its programme and its publications.
- I support the basis of the WRI, but cannot join a section. Please enroll me as an individual member.
- I wish to support the international work of the WRI and enclose a donation of £ _____
- Please keep me on your list of "Friends of the WRI".
- I wish to keep up-to-date about the international war resistance movement, and enclose £5 for a one-year subscription to the WRI Newsletter (sea mail).
- Please send me a copy of the WRI's latest Annual Report.
- Please send me a report of the work of WRI's national sections over the past three years. I enclose £1.
- I am prepared to send greetings to imprisoned conscientious objectors during the Christmas/New Year period. Please send me the annual Prisoners for Peace list when this is published, and information about war resisters and conscientious objectors facing imprisonment or other repression during the year.

NAME

ADDRESS

Total Money Enclosed £ _____

(Giro account no. 58 520 4004 War Resisters' International)

Send to WRI, 55 Dawes St, London SE17 1EL, Britain

YOUTH and CONSCRIPTION

Conscription forms a mechanism via which youth meets the military system in conditions of both war and peace. Despite its significance, conscription has not been a popular subject of social or historical investigation. This book aims to fill the gap. It focuses on the historical origin and expansion of conscription as well as on the oppositon to it. Furthermore, it examines the social and cultural effects of conscription, particularly from the point of view of youth — both male and female. Special attention is given to campaigns against conscription, especially to the right of conscientious objection and to the actual situation of CO's in different countries.

The book can be obtained from:

- International Peace Bureau
Rue de Zürich 41
1201-Geneva
- War Resisters International
55 Daves St.
London SE17 1EL
- Peace Union of Finland
Rauhanasema
Veturitori
00520 Helsinki

Cover: Markku Böök

ISBN 951-9193-01-4

Collection Number: AG1977

END CONSCRIPTION CAMPAIGN (ECC)

PUBLISHER:

Publisher:- Historical Papers Research Archive

Location:- Johannesburg

©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document is part of a collection held at the Historical Papers Research Archive at The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.