

## **War, Police and Prisons: Cross-Examining State-Sanctioned Violence, Streams of Justice, September 28, 2009**

### *Introduction: Hiddenness of Scapegoat Mechanism*

We all know the story of the Emperor's obstinate denial of reality, to the point of a public parade of sheer nakedness he could not acknowledge at all, in Hans Christian Andersen's *The Emperor's New Clothes*. And we all incline to identify with the little boy who blurted out: "BUT HE HAS NOTHING ON AT ALL!"

This easy identification with the little boy is reminiscent of Jesus' challenge to us:

*"Woe to you, teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You build tombs for the prophets and decorate the graves of the righteous. And you say, 'If we had lived in the days of our forefathers, we would not have taken part with them in shedding the blood of the prophets.' So you testify against yourselves that you are the descendants of those who murdered the prophets (Matt 23:29-31).*

We like to think collectively we are that little boy in the fairy-tale; we are that civilized people who would never kill the prophets, the innocent children, the righteous old and infirm. We could never do what Clifford Olson, Robert Picton, Paul Bernardo, Charles Manson – or any other mass murderer did! Jesus and the Gospels say emphatically however to our smug moral superiority, "Think again!"

There is a hidden cultural dynamic throughout all time and place that in fact makes us beneficiary if not participant in precisely that. What does one make of the slaughter of 100,000 residents of Tokyo in March, 1945; 120,000 residents of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August, 1945; almost 1,000,000 residents each of Germany and Japan, immolated by our Allied bombs; tens of thousands of German POW's left exposed during winter to terrible open "cage" conditions for months at war's end with thousands of consequent deaths, etc., etc.<sup>1</sup> *We are the literal and/or cultural descendants of those who murdered the innocents massively.*

Jewish and Christian believers are at home *in theory* with two classic biblical texts:

*The heart is deceitful above all things and beyond cure. Who can understand it?* (Jeremiah 17:9); and

*As it is written: "There is no one righteous, not even one... (Rom 3:10)"*

---

<sup>1</sup> As to this last less known fact, see <http://www.cyberussr.com/hcunn/for/us-germany-pow.html>, and this "Overview":

During the final collapse of Nazi Germany (1945), between 3.4 and 5 million <sup>p-1</sup> German PoWs fell into US hands. Thousands or tens of thousands would die of hunger, exposure, and neglect; many hundreds of thousands would barely survive 3-4 months of such conditions; and millions would still be imprisoned many months after the war was ended.

The German annual death rates in US hands (1%?) <sup>p-2</sup> and French hands (2.6%) <sup>p-3</sup> were a whole order of magnitude less than for US PoWs in Japanese hands (27%) <sup>p-4</sup>, German PoWs in Soviet hands (35-50%) <sup>p-5</sup>, or, worst of all, Soviet PoWs in German hands (60-80%). They were comparable to, but probably higher than, the annual death rate of US PoWs in German hands (1%). <sup>p-6</sup>.

Yet mysteriously, when it comes to attitudes about the state, an arguably longstanding misreading of one biblical text, Romans 13:1 – 6, that is seen mistakenly to endorse (almost) unthinking subordination to governing authorities, Christians in most Western democracies believe that a kind of magical alchemy transposes the *individual* sinner into a *collective* society saint, if one is a politician or bureaucrat in service of the state.<sup>2</sup>

Surely this is indefensible by any kind of Judeo-Christian logic or otherwise. But there it is!

---

<sup>2</sup> Evangelical scholars Glen H. Stassen and David P. Gushee (*Kingdom Ethics: Following Jesus in Contemporary Context* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2003) write, with reference to the oft-cited passage, Rom. 13:4 in defence of legitimized (by Christians) state violence:

A team of New Testament scholars in Germany has studied Romans 13 and its historical context (Friedrich et al., “Zur historischen Situation”, [1976,] 131 ff.) These scholars have concluded that Paul was not teaching about the death penalty but was urging his readers to pay the taxes and not to participate in a rebellion against Nero’s new tax. An insurrection against taxes had recently occurred and had led to Christians, including Priscilla and Aquila, being expelled from Rome. Another insurrection was brewing. The Greek word for “sword” (*machaira*) in Romans 13:4 refers to the symbol of authority carried by the police who accompanied tax collectors. Paul was urging Christians to make peace, pay Nero’s new tax and not rebel. He was not arguing for the death penalty, as he so often has been interpreted as doing. He was arguing *against* the violence of insurrection (Stassen and Gushee, 2003, p. 207).

Whether this is the exact historical background and explanation or not (there are obviously others – see for example Greg Herrick (1997). “Paul and Civil Obedience in Romans 13:1-7”, Biblical Studies Press 31, <http://bible.org/article/paul-and-civil-obedience-romans-131-7> (last accessed September 29, 2009), it is very questionable that Paul, in a brief pericope, in the midst of a parenetic, hortatory section on how Christians in Rome should live, set out to give a full-blown doctrine of the state! One must add: Paul was also *in no way* arguing for the legitimacy of a state military!

Further, in the context of early, pre-Constantinian Christian understandings of the state as *Public Enemy Number One*, Paul called on believers to overcome that evil power, not with a show of revolutionary fervour, equally evil, but with good (Romans 12:21). Thus, taught Paul, the Gospel would totally subvert the evil of the Roman or any Empire/government.

This early Christian “good” response to evil, as Jean Lasserre points out (*War and the Gospel*, Scottsdale: Herald Press 1974), was most likely a reflection of their understanding of the Ten Commandments, or Old Testament Law. Jesus sweepingly summarized this law as LOVE for God, neighbour, and enemy. Paul and other writers took up this theme, often dropping love for God because it was so obviously assumed. Paul’s teaching accurately reflected the words and example of Jesus. Biblical writers stressed love for one’s neighbor as fulfillment of the law. Love was the overarching theme of Paul’s entire understanding of ethics in Romans 12 to 15. Christians who love intend no harm to neighbour, and overcome enmity by doing good, not evil.

As recorded in Romans 8:37, Paul exulted, that “... in all these things ...”, things such as trouble, hardship, persecution, famine, nakedness, danger or sword, Christians are “more than conquerors”. For him the source of evils over which Christians were more than conquerors was largely the Roman state. It was the state that “bore the sword” (Romans 13:4). Paul used the same words as in Romans 8:37, “overcoming evil”, again in chapter 12.

Paul understood such conquering over evil in a manner that was a far cry from the revolutionary spirit of some early Christians. Influenced by the Jewish Zealots, they were ready to incite armed insurrection against the hated Roman state. To these Peter likewise wrote about the need for submission to the enemy-state. “If you suffer, it should not be as a murderer or thief or any other kind of criminal, or as a *revolutionist* (I Peter 4:15).” To my awareness, the term “revolutionist” was never used in English translations of the Bible even though, I suggest, it accurately reflects the meaning Peter intended in the above text (*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957, p. 39). Certainly in the context of first century Christianity the term “revolutionist” was used to describe grievous crimes against the Roman state; something a Zealot, such as Barabbas, would be proud to commit. Paul taught that Christians are more than conquerors over angels and demons. He used the term “*archai*” translated “demons”; the same *archai* of whom Paul wrote in Titus 3:1. “Remind people to be subject to rulers [*archai*] and authorities, to be obedient, to be ready to do whatever is good”. Both Peter and Paul, even as Jesus did, said NO to all revolutionary violence against the state, and any other “fallen” powers under which Christians were obliged to exist.

I take no joy in presenting the following material. All I can plead is: *I did not make it up!* Nor is it gleaned from obscure, questionable sources. It is all reputable and footnoted, there on the public record and readily accessible. All I have done is focus the interpretative lens somewhat.

One pre-critique of this presentation said that the terminology of “state-sanctioned violence” already put a negative cast on the issue. Better he said would be “state-sanctioned force”. I ask simply: Is a prison any less a prison for the euphemism “correctional facility”? A rose is still a rose by any other name... In this talk, I *do* mean “state-sanctioned violence”, which I question, as opposed to “state-sanctioned force” across a wide options spectrum which I might endorse.

### *War and War Crimes*

The Allies committed war crimes on a grand scale. But compared to the grander scale of murder under Hitler, the Allies were “small potatoes”. And compared to the still grander scale of murder under Stalin, Hitler was “small potatoes”. My point *only* is: *mass killing is mass killing!* And we Western Allies did and still do it massively. If Hitler is overshadowed in his mass killing by Stalin, he is no less wrong for his mass killing. If the Allies are overshadowed by Hitler and Stalin in their mass killing, the Allies are no less wrong for their mass killing. Unless one wishes to play an impossible numbers game about how many may be slaughtered before it is no longer okay and becomes the war crime of mass killing... “I’ll match your one thousand and raise it to one hundred thousand...”, and so on.

Interestingly, the Geneva Conventions never do set “legitimate” numbers of kill, or its euphemism, “collateral damage”. Just how many mass civilian murders may a state commit as “collateral damage”? Implicit in the Geneva conventions, the only criterion seems: *as many as are needed for the Allies (that would be US – the “good guys”! – and in a world of hegemonic American Empire, that would also be U.S.!) to win...* One may rightly ask: How can the Geneva Conventions authorize mass civilian slaughter by the Allies, but disallow the same to everyone else – mass killers such as Stalin, Hitler, Ho Chi Minh, Saddam Hussein, etc...?

Robert McNamara, architect of the Vietnam War, admitted in Errol Morris’ documentary *The Fog of War* that had the United States lost World War II, he and his superior, General Curtis LeMay, both mass killers, would have been tried for war crimes<sup>3</sup>. Instead, LeMay became until then the most decorated American military hero of that republic, and McNamara who was eventually promoted to Secretary of State became chief promulgator of the ultimate American Empire crime of the twentieth century, the Vietnam War.

The Americans might as well have decorated Nazi leaders Albert Speer and Hermann Göring or others for humanitarian service to their nation and world. General Curtis LeMay for instance boasted that “we scorched and boiled and baked to death more people in Tokyo on that night of March 9-10 [1945] than went up in vapor at Hiroshima and Nagasaki combined.”, and hated the Japanese viscerally. General Eisenhower likewise authorized (as did the French) the massive brutal caging of post-war German POW’s under killing conditions, for whom he too had a visceral hatred. Winston Churchill amazingly acknowledged that the primary objective of at least

---

<sup>3</sup> More on this is below.

some incendiary bombing was to incite “terror” amongst civilians.<sup>4</sup> He also wrote in 1919: “I do not understand the squeamishness about the use of gas. I am strongly in favour of using poisonous gas against uncivilised tribes.” He further advocated repeatedly “drenching” German cities with poison gas in World War II, a procedure that thankfully he was never allowed to carry out.<sup>5</sup>

American World War II war correspondent Edgar L. Jones tells of horrific Allied atrocities in his 1946 *Atlantic Monthly* article, “One War is Enough”<sup>6</sup>. Paul Fussell does similarly in a 1997 *Atlantic Monthly* article and in several other publications<sup>7</sup>. Contemporary war correspondent Chris Hedges does it again in *War Is A Force That Gives Us Meaning* (New York: Anchor Books, 2003). The picture is not pretty nor limited to a “few bad apples”.

And the Allies, with the Americans lead players, twice released the until then most lethal instrument of mass killing in humanity’s history with hundreds of thousands ultimately of civilian casualties. The Allies in fact created close to two million civilian casualties in Germany and Japan, far more than the civilian bombing casualties of the Nazis. During the Nuremberg trials, one Nazi accused said: “You have defeated us Nazis, but the spirit of Nazism rises like a Phoenix

---

<sup>4</sup> A military historian writes:

At this point, Prime Minister Churchill interposed himself, once again, into the history of the Dresden raid. By March 1945 the crisis atmosphere surrounding the war effort had passed, and the fate of Hitler’s Reich was well and truly sealed. With Yalta behind him as well, Churchill now had troubled second thoughts. These surfaced in a minute he wrote on March 28 to Portal and General Sir Hastings Ismay (for the Chiefs of Staff Committee). “It seems to me,” Churchill began, “that the moment has come when the question of bombing of German cities simply for the sake of increasing the terror, though under other pretexts, should be reviewed.” After stating that “the destruction of Dresden remains a serious query against the conduct of Allied bombing,” he insisted there was a need for “more precise concentration on military objectives, such as oil and communications behind the immediate battle zone, rather than on mere acts of terror and wanton destruction, however impressive (“Sifting Dresden’s Ashes”, Tami Davis Biddle, *Wilson Quarterly* 29:60-80 Spring 2005.)

<sup>5</sup> See more below on the British “imposing the customs of civilization” through incendiary bombing. Of Churchill and the use of poison gas against Germany:

Prime Minister Churchill wanted to “drench the cities of the Ruhr and many other cities in Germany [with gas] in such a way that most of the population would be requiring constant medical attention.” He informed his military advisers: “It is absurd to consider morality on this topic when everybody used it in the last war without a word of complaint from the moralists or the Church. On the other hand, in the last war the bombing of open cities was regarded as forbidden. Now everybody does it as a matter of course. It is simply a question of fashion changing as she does between long and short skirts for women.”...

His directive to military advisers was blunt and chilling: “I want a cold-blooded calculation made as to how it would pay us to use poison gas. ... I want the matter studied in cold blood by sensible people and not by that particular set of psalm-singing uniformed defeatists which one runs across now here now there.” (“Why We Didn’t Use Poison Gas in World War II”, Barton J. Bernstein, *American Heritage Magazine*, August/September 1985, Volume 36, Issue 5; [http://www.americanheritage.com/articles/magazine/ah/1985/5/1985\\_5\\_40.shtml](http://www.americanheritage.com/articles/magazine/ah/1985/5/1985_5_40.shtml) last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>6</sup> See: <http://www.theatlantic.com/unbound/bookauth/battle/jones.htm> (last accessed September 29, 2009); *Copyright © 1946 by Edgar L. Jones. All rights reserved. The Atlantic Monthly; February 1946; One War is Enough; Volume 177, No. 2; pages 48-53.*

<sup>7</sup> See: “The Other Side of War”, <http://www.theatlantic.com/unbound/bookauth/battle/pfint.htm> (last accessed September 29, 2009), *Copyright © 1997 by The Atlantic Monthly Company. All rights reserved.*

amongst you.”<sup>8</sup> To prove his point, though obscenely unthinkable, the West now owns thousands of exponentially more destructive nuclear bombs that we hang onto year after year, “just in case”. Just in case exactly what? In case we want to outdo Hitler, Stalin, all previous mass murderers combined, in sheer numbers of Western Allied victims? In case we wish to obliterate the planet many times over, of which these weapons are capable. And as you know, it became a Bush doctrine that nuclear weapons could be first strike. President Obama so far has not reversed that doctrine.

That one-time twice deployed nuclear mass killing is still unmatched in world history. Yet Stephen Harper still wants Canadians to call mass murderer Uncle Sam “Mr. Nice Guy”<sup>9</sup>. And this is the very “guy” whom the world hates “because of our freedoms”, according to a former United States Emperor who strutted around for eight years daily in the buff, *and never got it at all!* That said, tragically, on the issue of the American Empire War on Terror, his comparatively enlightened successor is strictly following suit in mass killings of innocent civilians. Over against Michael Ignatieff in various writings and in *Empire Lite: Nation-Building in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan* (Toronto : Penguin Canada, 2003<sup>10</sup>), or Christian political theorist Jean Bethke Elshtain’s *Just War Against Terror: The Burden of American Power in a Violent World*, (New York: Basic Books, 2003<sup>11</sup>), Empire is never “lite” for its victims. Mass killing is however invariably and only what happens throughout history if one has an Empire to run. One cannot be individually or collectively a “nice guy” and keep up an Empire. President Obama is

---

<sup>8</sup> For an in-depth summary of presidential Bush family ties to the Nazis as a related issue, see: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2004/sep/25/usa.secondworldwar> (last accessed September 29, 2009). The September 25, 2004 article ends with:

More than 60 years after Prescott Bush came briefly under scrutiny at the time of a faraway war, his grandson [George W.] is facing a different kind of scrutiny but one underpinned by the same perception that, for some people, war can be a profitable business.

<sup>9</sup> See: “Conservative Canadians Speak Out!” (**Wall Street Journal** | 3/28/03 |), Stephen Harper, Stockwell Day) <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/879589/posts> (last accessed September 29, 2009). Harper and Day wrote in part:

Modern Canada was forged in large part by war -- not because it was easy but because it was right. In the great wars of the last century -- against authoritarianism, fascism, and communism -- Canada did not merely stand with the Americans, more often than not we led the way. We did so for freedom, for democracy, for civilization itself. These values continue to be embodied in our allies and their leaders, and scorned by the forces of evil, including Saddam Hussein and the perpetrators of the attacks of Sept. 11, 2001. That is why we will stand -- and I believe most Canadians will stand with us -- for these higher values which shaped our past, and which we will need in an uncertain future.

These words are tragically ironic in light of what is presented in this paper, considering the current ascendancy of the Harper government and pro-American Empire policies.

<sup>10</sup> “**Empire lite** is a form of [imperialism](#) in which major powers shape world affairs using diplomacy and short-term military intervention rather than [conquest](#), [colonialism](#) or direct governance of other countries. It differs from classical [imperialism](#) in two ways: it involves a much smaller commitment of resources, and it does not involve new settlement by the imperial power.

“The term was first popularized by [Canadian](#) philosopher [Michael Ignatieff](#) in his book *Empire Lite: Nation-Building in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan* (2003). Here and in other writings, Ignatieff identifies the author of empire lite as the [United States](#), the world’s last military [superpower](#). The purpose of empire lite, Ignatieff believes, is to build a global “humanitarian empire” of free, self-governing countries through long-term nation building — including the use of military force — in [failed or failing states](#).

“Ignatieff supported the U.S. [invasion of Iraq](#) in 2003 because he saw it as one such intervention, a step he later regretted ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Empire\\_lite](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Empire_lite), last accessed September 29, 2009).”

<sup>11</sup> See my review at: <http://m2w2.com/wp/category/book-reviews/> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

sheer relief over against his staggeringly self-righteous predecessor. President Obama is for all that no less a mass murderer of innocent civilians.

The “hidden phenomenon” of all cultures, including Western and most emphatically American Empire culture is called *scapegoating*, a ubiquitous dynamic across all times and peoples. I shall be describing more the work of anthropologist René Girard in this connection. He states that the passage about the Pharisees’ building tombs for the prophets yet unaware of their own deep violence is a classic scapegoating text.

The Gospels’ critique concerning scapegoating is not in fact of “the Jews” as a specific people (all the main New Testament characters and writers were after all Jews), but of a universal religiously grounded scapegoating phenomenon, ever dynamic within human culture since the species *homo sapiens* emerged, no less in secular culture that is just as religious. And a central characteristic of *scapegoating* in all cultures, *throughout Western culture*, is its *hiddenness*. Like Andersen’s Emperor and Lords of the Bedchamber, like the Pharisees, like today’s CBC’s newscasts honouring the latest fallen soldier’s sacrifice for his country, we fail to acknowledge our core commitment to violence towards and murder of innocents to perpetuate “civilization”. One aspect of the message of the Cross to which I shall return is: *There is no one guilty, no not one. All are innocent.*

My thesis then can be stated in the form of a question: *How can we invest ultimate power of life and death in our military, police, and prisons (“state-sanctioned violence”), and in the politicians directing them, with their pervasive deceit, self-serving and criminal wrong-doing; and deny that widespread psychological and physical destruction of innocent civilians is the consequent norm?*

*Police, Criminal Justice Actors, Ottawa and Fog*

In this section I shall draw mainly on material from Thomas Gabor’s ‘*Everybody Does It!*’: *Crime By the Public* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), and Paul Palango’s *Dispensing the Fog: Inside the Secret World of Ottawa and the RCMP* (Toronto: Key Porter Books, 2008).

Many of you live and work in or near the Downtown East Side, the poorest area in all Canada. Many of you consequently have seen police up really close. None of the following will come therefore as a surprise to you. I have worked with thousands of criminals in the last thirty-five years. I have often said, if I discounted as lies fully half of all the negative I have heard about police and prisons over these year, there is still *far and away too much criminal wrongdoing, violence, and fundamental disrespect directed towards our “criminals” by those sworn to be society’s guardians, who by definition in a democracy supposedly are highly professional and fundamentally non-criminal in their work! I say with deep feeling: If only!!!*

***I must quickly also add: This is not to tar all our guardians, police and guards, with the same brush.***

Gabor lists in a table “Varieties of Police Misconduct”:

- **Mooching** – free coffee, donuts, cigarettes for protection
- **Chiselling** – demanding free admission, price discounts, etc. for protection
- **Favouritism** – license tabs, window stickers, courtesy cards used for immunity from traffic arrest for family and friends
- **Shopping** – picking up small items like candies and cigarettes when a store is unlocked after business hours
- **Extortion** – demanding payment for traffic violations in lieu of a ticket with points docked
- **Bribery** – accepting cash or gifts in return for not being arrested
- **Shakedown** – taking items of significant value such as ipods, laptops, etc. after a burglary, rationalizing that this will just be added to the insurance claim
- **Perjury** – lying to provide an alibi for fellow officers

He argues that the above are threshold crimes, like gateway drugs, that lead too easily to escalation of seriousness.

The 1970 Knapp Commission in the United States was appointed to investigate police corruption in New York. Excerpts from that commission and many other studies and reports are given as samplings below, all of which found that police corruption in Western democracies was widespread:

- Small gratuities were accepted by constables from local businesses
- payoffs in the thousands of dollars were received by senior officers from gamblers and narcotics dealers
- police accepted payoffs by construction companies to ignore numerous city ordinances
- bar owners paid off police to operate after hours and offer immunity to prostitutes, drug pushers, gamblers operating illegally on their premises
- drug dealers allowed police to keep money and narcotics confiscated during raids in return for not being arrested
- police in turn sold the narcotics for personal gain or to informers
- gamblers made regular payoffs to keep their operations going
- in Edmonton in 1987/88 ten police officers were charged with criminal offences including attempted murder, assault, theft, fraud and drug trafficking
- one Edmonton police officer handcuffed and raped a prostitute, then brought cocaine to her to keep her quiet
- an officer charged with sexually assaulting a female police officer shot and killed his wife, then himself
- in 1991 a police officer kidnapped and sexually assaulted two young boys and a young girl
- in the same year two officers were charged with impaired driving, and another was sent to prison for having sexually assaulted a shoplifter
- in January 1988, a major scandal surfaced in Winnipeg that eventually indicted a provincial court judge, two magistrates, a Crown attorney, two other lawyers, and a provincial court judge

- in 1991, a veteran defence lawyer often critical of police activity, was set up for a false charge of sexually assaulting a female client, that included a *Winnipeg Free Press* journalist and photographer tipped off to cover the story, and the client having been encouraged by police to tell a false story
- there were also serious allegations from the inquiry into senior Manitoba justice officials using favouritism in prosecutions, and prosecutors in turn accused police of often withholding key information in a criminal investigations

Gabor comments:

The number of people involved in both the Edmonton and Manitoba scandals suggests that the criminality and unscrupulousness of police, lawyers, and judges often are not simply a matter of character flaws among a few ‘rotten apples’ but rather indicate the existence of conduct norms that are favourable to misbehaviour. Ellwyn Stoddard has written about the informal code that fosters police deviance or ‘blue coat’ crime. He found that criminal activity on the part of the police was widespread in most major departments (p. 144).

Stoddard found that honesty on the police force was a quality often to be squelched in new recruits. Gabor quotes a police officer in Mark Baker’s 1985 book, *Cops: Their Lives in Their Own Words* (New York : Simon and Schuster, 1985):

In any department, anywhere, you can take 5 per cent of the cops and they will be honest under any circumstances and they’ll never do anything wrong. They are the priests of the department. Five per cent on the other end of the spectrum would have become criminals had they not become policemen. They are, in fact, criminals who happen to be cops. The remaining 90 per cent will go whichever way the peer pressure goes (quoted on p. 145).

Gabor’s commentary on this is:

This formula sounds very similar to that provided by authorities on employee theft and other types of crime. If it is correct, it tells us that most people are capable of dishonesty, that behaviour is largely governed by the situation at hand, and that the attitudes prevailing in a given milieu will have a lot to do with the type and extent of misbehaviour we can expect to find there (p. 145).

Gabor quotes further from Baker:

Racism, corruption, brutality can slowly become institutionalized throughout a police department simply because so many officers are willing to be indifferent, to let standards erode from inattention, to go along and follow the crowd. Slowly the pendulum swings toward criminality (quoted on p. 145).

Favouritism and discrimination are rampant on police forces in the enforcement of the law. Law enforcement in fact is highly selective and often capricious. In other words: *police are human!* – not saints, and not better or worse for wearing a badge than the rest of humanity.

The classic current Canadian story is of Robert Dziekanski’s death after having been tasered five times by the four attending RCMP officers. The Wikipedia Encyclopaedia report says:

The officers have been subject to public criticism, both in the media and in formal proceedings before the [Braidwood Commission of Inquiry](#). The officers were served notices of misconduct by the commission forewarning them the commissioner may include a finding of misconduct in its final report.<sup>[32]</sup> The warnings allege specific but overlapping grounds for each of the four. The collective allegations are that they failed to properly assess and respond to the circumstances in which they found Mr. Dziekan-ski. They repeatedly deployed the taser without justification and separately failed to adequately reassess the situation before further deploying it. The notices allege that afterwards they misrepresented facts in notes and statements, furthered the misrepresent-ing before the commission and provided further misleading information about other evidence before the commission. The four officers each sought judicial review to pre-vent the commission from making findings based on the notices.<sup>[33]</sup> The petitions were dismissed but at least two officers are appealing ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert Dzieka%C5%84ski Taser incident](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_Dzieka%C5%84ski_Taser_incident), last ac-cessed September 29, 2009).

One officer, “Corporal Benjamin Monty Robinson, is suspended with pay awaiting trial on charges of [impaired driving causing death](#) which resulted in the death of a 21-year old Vancou-ver man.<sup>[29][30][31]</sup> (*ibid.*)”

Paul Palango includes several other stories of questionable RCMP activities in his *Dispersing the Fog*, and in his two previous publications about Canadian policing: *Above the Law* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1994), and *The Last Guardians (The Crisis in the RCMP – and in Can-ada)*, Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1998). A recent story the CBC reported reads:

Two B.C. members of the RCMP with First Nations backgrounds have filed lawsuits against their superior officers and high-ranking members of the provincial and federal governments alleging discrimination and harassment (<http://www.rcmpwatch.com/rcmp-officers-sue-force-allege-racism/#more-1965>, last accessed September 29, 2009).

Stories about RCMP misconduct across Canada abound. Throughout his books on the Mounties, Palango underscores that the reality of a failed RCMP trumps all carefully guarded and honed images of their success. He utterly demythologizes all such images. He further connects ram-pant RCMP wrongdoing to the highest levels of Canadian political interference. At the begin-ning and end of his third book, he makes the case that from the election of Pierre Elliott Trudeau in 1968 on, billionaire Québecker Paul Desmarais has been the “kingmaker”:

He is the equivalent of former Chase Manhattan chairman and chief executive officer David Rockefeller in the United States – a kingmaker who decides who will lead the country and what its policies should be (p.11).

Palango in fact connects Desmarais to the Rockefellers, and in turn to the Trilateral Commission and the Chase Manhattan Bank, etc. He compares this to the P2 Lodge in Italy where

It is entirely possible that virtually every senior politician in the established parties and most business executives of importance in that country are corrupt. One estimate is that 60,000 people would have to go through the courts if everybody suspected were to be charged. The anti-corruption campaign threatens to uproot the state itself (quote by Martin Woollacott in *Everybody Does It!*, p. 136).

Palango in turn connects these to the right wing *Opus Dei* in the Catholic Church, the Bilderberg Group, Le Cercle, etc., while eschewing any kind of easy conspiracy theories. He comments:

These various entities have one thing in common – to keep alive and vibrant such old-world concepts as the British and Holy Roman Empires, powerful political-economic-military alliances. The driving force behind these groups is leading industrialists, the descendants of European and British royal families, and New World tycoons like Canada’s Paul Desmarais (p. 381).

One representative high-end instance of criminal wrongdoing was the appointment in 2000 of the new RCMP Commissioner, Giuliano Zaccardelli by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien, who like Trudeau and all Québécois prime ministers after 1968, according to Palango, were entirely controlled by the interests of Paul Desmarais. Zaccardelli basically struck a deal with Chrétien: give Zaccardelli free rein to run the RCMP as he saw fit, and he would never investigate any aspect of Chrétien’s financial holdings, including the extensive connection to Paul Desmarais. Palango writes:

Business links to Chrétien in China were a matter of public record. He had worked closely with Hong Kong tycoon Li Ka-Shing in one of Li’s companies. The Desmarais were just about the only Canadian capitalists making a killing in China. It was clear to Chrétien that the end result of the Project Sidewinder investigation<sup>12</sup> – should it continue – would lead inevitably to an investigation of him, his extended family, and their considerable corporate holdings. Power Corp. also had a large stake in China where it was heavily invested in a multitude of projects. *For Chrétien, protecting his corporate interests and contacts was much more important than the public interest* (p. 16, italics added).

Palango comments at the end of his book:

In his oft-quoted 1887 letter to Bishop Mandell Creighton, Lord Acton wrote: “Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely.” What exists in Canada today is the very definition of absolute power. It rests within the narrow confines of the Prime Minister’s office, the Privy Council Office, and the elite of the bureaucracy, where the intertwining of corporate and political interests is largely hidden from view by a thick fog of secrecy (p. 526).

So with the fog of police and government entities, so with the fog of war, so with the fog of prisons. Once again, my thesis can be put in the form of a question:

*How can we invest ultimate power of life and death in our military, police, and prisons (“state-sanctioned violence”), and in the politicians directing them, with their pervasive deceit, self-serving and criminal wrong-doing; and deny that widespread psychological and physical destruction of innocent civilians is the consequent norm?*

---

<sup>12</sup> See chapter 2 of *Dispersing the Fog* for more on this investigation that, after the deal struck by Zaccardelli and Chrétien, resulted in “The Sidewinder file [evaporating] into the mists, and was never again pursued... (p. 17)”.

## *Prisons – And Who Goes There?*

In 1993, noted international criminal justice scholar Nils Christie published *Crime Control As Industry: Towards GULAGS, Western Style?* (Routledge: London & New York, 1993). The subtitle was a question. In two subsequent editions, the interrogation mark was removed. Christie believes that the United States is premier international model for development towards the “gulag” in Western societies. The author begins the first edition thus:

This book is a warning against recent developments in the field of crime control. The theme is simple. Societies of the Western type face two major problems: Wealth is everywhere unequally distributed. So is access to paid work. Both problems contain a potentiality for unrest. The crime control industry is suited for coping with both. This industry provides profit and work while at the same time producing control of those who otherwise might have disturbed the social process (p. 11).

Christie says that being at war with “criminals” contributes to massive crime control development, and “general adaptation to industrialized ways of thought, organization and behaviour is another [contributor] (p. 12).” He also points out that “The major danger of crime in modern societies are not the crimes, but that the fight against them may lead societies towards totalitarian developments (p. 14).” This is precisely the thesis of Chris Hedges in his *American Fascists: The Christian Right and the War On America* (Free Press, 2007).

Some facts: The United States has roughly 5 percent of the world’s population, and 25 percent of the world’s prisoners. In 1975, the combined state and federal prison population of the United States was 300,000 men and women. By 2006, it had exploded to 2.3 million. In other words, as social critic Ivan Illich warned, the Western state, supremely modelled in the United States, had become a gulag. The third edition of Christie’s book was published before September 11, 2001. His forewarnings are so much more profoundly the case since 9/11.

Christie argues that all Western states are following these trends, that the U.S.A. is in fact the greatest impulse, magnet and model towards creation of Western gulags. Christie says the U.S.A. has already surpassed in prisoner numbers Communist Russia gulags. He says that in a democracy, there is no natural limit to the growth of crime control, provided the majority wishes it. *Since 9/11, the majority in Western democratic states have wished it.*

Peter Wagner in his review of the third edition of Christie’s book writes:

The first book of Norwegian criminologist Nils Christie, *Limits to Pain*, argued that the criminal justice system is in fact a pain delivery system, with the size of the system controlled not by the number of committed acts labeled as crimes but by the amount of pain that a society is willing to impose on its citizens. *Crime Control as Industry* expands upon that theme, and tracks how an industry has arisen to manage crime. And like any industry, the crime control industry is not about to say on its own: “Stop, we have enough of the market. We don’t need to grow. (See: <http://www.prisonpolicy.org/articles/christiereview.html>, last accessed September 29, 2009; originally published in [Prison Legal News](#) on May 9, 2002)”.

Vern Redekop along similar lines asks generally of Western criminal law: “Is it possible that what we call a criminal justice system is really a scapegoat mechanism?” He continues later:

In a secular democratic society, nothing is as sacred as the law code and the justice system which enforces it. The buildings in which laws are made are the most elaborate and the courts in which decisions are made about points of law are the most stately. Formality, uniforms, and respect surround the agents of law.

He finally states baldly:

It is possible to think of the criminal justice system as one gigantic scapegoat mechanism for society.... [A] tiny percentage of offenders who are severely punished can be thought of as a collective scapegoat for society (*Scapegoats, the Bible, and Criminal Justice: Interacting with René Girard*. Akron: MCC U.S. Office of Criminal Justice/MCC Canada Victim Offender Ministries, 1993, pp. 1, 16, 33 & 34).

I shall return to scapegoating in the theory of René Girard.

Wagner’s review continues:

Christie traces the extent to which crime control has come to dominate the economic structure by absorbing the unemployed into the roles of keeper and kept and then supplying services to each. ...[L]et me highlight two of Christie’s many sharp observations. First Christie argues that the applicable political economy to describe prisons is not [that of] slavery, but of the old work-houses, where the objective was not profit for the State, but for private parties to relieve the State of its unwanted population at the lowest cost possible.

The second sharp observation is that justice itself has been mechanized to cope with the influx of raw materials and remove a democratic restraint upon growth. Mandatory minimums and the sentencing guidelines have served to remove discretion from judges, turning them into little more than secretaries for the legislature. While judges are in a unique position to learn details about victims and the accused; and could adopt sentences to match the needs of the offender and the community; that takes time. Time costs money, and the industry’s conveyor must be kept moving, hence the removal of judge’s discretion (*ibid*).

The concluding sentence of the review is:

Christie’s excellent book asks: *Do we want a societal culture with this much depersonalized pain delivery?* (*ibid*, italics added)

That question rings like an indictment in many Western and other nations: *Do we want a societal culture with this much depersonalized pain delivery?*. “The history of punishment [or pain delivery] is in some respects like the history of war,” says Deirdre Golash in her book *The Case Against Punishment (Retribution, Crime Prevention, and the Law*, New York: New York University Press, 2005). “It seems to accompany the human condition almost universally, to enjoy periods of glorification, to be commonly regarded as justified in many instances, and yet to run counter to our ultimate vision of what human society should be (no page number).” This “ultimate vision” for the secularist and Christian is the peaceable kingdom.

In *Justice Behind The Walls: Human Rights in Canadian Prisons* (Vancouver/Toronto: Douglas & McIntyre, 2002<sup>13</sup>), Michael Jackson comments:

Engaging the scholarship of imprisonment is thus also of critical importance at a time when the public seems to be demanding more, rather than less, use of imprisonment. In the face of declining crime rates, Canada's incarceration rate continues to rise, ranking among the highest in the world. Even the appearance that we in Canada may be "soft" on crime in comparison to the United States, the most punitive country in the world, disappears when it comes to rates of locking up young people. In this Canada eclipses even the U.S. Yet there is currently a public clamour for more young people to be tried in adult court and for sentences to be made longer, parole more difficult, and prison regimes more rigorous. Politicians seem unable to resist the political benefits perceived to flow from stepping up the war on crime, *deploying imprisonment as the principal artillery* (p. 17, italics added).

Jackson also points out that crime control through imprisonment has been often observed by writers such as Winston Churchill and Feodor Dostoyevsky to be the primary measure of the degree of "civilization" a society possesses. I shall return to the notion of *civilization*. Jackson draws on a study by David Garland, *Punishment and Modern Society: A Study in Social Theory*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), to highlight the way in which the raw violence and brutality of state punishment in prison is increasingly "civilized" through obfuscation and semantics, while the violent repressive reality persists:

The civilizing process in punishment is also apparent in the sanitization of penal practice and penal language. Pain is no longer delivered in brutal, physical form. Corporal punishment has virtually disappeared, to be replaced by more abstract forms of suffering, such as the deprivation of liberty or the removal of financial resources . . . [T]he aggression and hostility implicit in punishment are concealed and denied by the administrative routines of dispassionate professionals, who see themselves as "running institutions" rather than delivering pain and suffering. Similarly, the language of punishment has been stripped of its plain brutality of meaning and reformulated in euphemistic terms, so that prisons become "correctional facilities", guards become "officers", and prisoners become "inmates" or even "residents", all of which tends to sublimate a rather distasteful activity and render it more tolerable to public and professional sensibilities. (quoting Garland, p. 235, in *Justice Behind The Walls*, p. 28).

For all that, as Nils Christie pointed out in *Limits to Pain* (Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1982), the word "penal" derives from the Latin *poena*, and is best understood as "pain delivery" like milk delivery. Christie urges that this is at once banal as in Hannah Arendt's understanding of the banality of evil committed against Jews by concentration camp guards "just doing their duty", and at once brutal for all its state authorized routine – and victims!

Jackson cites several major studies done on the innumerable crises of imprisonment in Canadian history, crises around which in fact Canadian penitentiary history can be written, indicating that imprisonment invariably backfires in its intent to render its prisoners law-abiding. *It tends to "render" alright, but with a meaning closer to that in hog farming, or CIA torture renditions:*

---

<sup>13</sup> The entire book with links is available online: [www.justicebehindthewalls.net](http://www.justicebehindthewalls.net), last accessed September 29, 2009.

What these and many more official reports suggest is that the experience of imprisonment, as a response to crime, *is itself criminogenic*: it actually produces and reproduces the very behaviour it seeks to control. There is another theme that runs the historical course of 150 years between the early days of the penitentiary and the cusp of the twenty-first century. It is that the experience of imprisonment, intended to inculcate respect for the law by punishing those who breach its commands, actually creates disrespect for the very legal order in whose name it is invoked (pp. 18 & 19, italics added).

And this criminogenic dynamic is not limited to prisoners on whom such treatment backfires. It extends to the keepers. In the last major Canadian inquiry into the penitentiaries, called the “Commission of Inquiry into certain events at the Prison for Women in Kingston” (Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada, 1996), Judge Louise Arbour stated of Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) that “the lack of observance of individual rights is not an isolated factor applicable only to the Prison for Women, but is probably very much part of CSC’s corporate culture (pp. 62 & 63)”. She said further:

In its Mission Statement, the Correctional Service of Canada commits itself to “openness”, “integrity”, and “accountability”. An organization which was truly committed to these values would, it seems to me, be concerned about compliance with the law, and vigilant to correct any departures from the law; it would be responsive to outside criticism, and prepared to engage in honest self-criticism; it would be prepared to give a fair and honest account of its actions; and it would acknowledge error. In this case [under inquiry], the Correctional Service did little of this. Too often, the approach was to deny error, defend against criticism, and to react without a proper investigation of the truth.

...

I believe that it is also part of that corporate culture to close ranks, and that the defensive stance of senior managers was often motivated by a sense of loyalty to their subordinates. This otherwise admirable instinct should, however, always defer to the imperatives of scrupulous commitment to the truth which must be displayed by those entrusted with people’s liberty.

...

In my view, if anything emerges from this inquiry, it is the realization that the Rule of Law will not find its place in corrections by “swift and certain disciplinary action” against staff and inmates [in response to the strip-searching of women prisoners by male guards]. The absence of the Rule of Law is most noticeable at the management level, both within the prison and at the Regional and National levels. The Rule of Law has to be imported and integrated, at those levels, from the other partners in the criminal justice enterprise, as there is no evidence that it will emerge spontaneously (pp. 174, 175 & 180).

Judge Arbour was stating baldly that Correctional Service of Canada, despite a plethora of rules, *is rampantly criminal itself in its mistreatment of prisoners*.<sup>14</sup> “The Rule of Law is absent, although rules are everywhere.”, she writes (p. 181).

---

<sup>14</sup> The above quote in fact continues:

The role of legal norms in penal institutions was recently described by Lucie Lemonde as follows:

The title and thesis of the 1966 publication by psychiatrist Karl Menninger is, *The Crime of Punishment* (New York: Penguin Books, 1977). He asked the question in that book: *Was the spread of violence in spite of our laws and courts or because of them and us?* Dr. Menninger dissected the criminal justice system and concluded, “I suspect that all the crimes committed by all the jailed criminals do not equal in total social damage that of the crimes committed against them.” The book has just been republished<sup>15</sup>, and is pointer to transforming the criminal justice system in the direction of nonviolence, non-scapegoating, non-criminogenic, and ultimately non-warmaking, rather peacemaking responses to criminals.

On September 24, 2009, U.B.C. law professor Michael Jackson and former Director of John Howard Society Canada Graham Stewart released a very detailed report in response to the Conservative government’s “roadmap” to transforming federal corrections. They entitled it “A Flawed Compass: A Human Rights Analysis of the Roadmap to Strengthening Public Safety”. They wrote at the beginning of the Preface:

This report is a critical review of the policy paper on the Correctional Service of Canada released publicly in December 2007 by a panel appointed by then Minister of Public Safety, the Honourable Stockwell Day. Headlined *A Roadmap to Strengthening Public Safety*, the report has been embraced by the Government and the Correctional Service of Canada as the script for a “transformation” agenda for Canadian federal corrections. Neither the report nor the transformation agenda has been subject to any serious public policy analysis or debate, yet corrections is now being made over in its image. Makeovers – of faces, bodies and houses - may provide acceptable scripts for popular reality television shows, but this makeover of federal corrections affects not just the external façade of prisons but would undermine the fundamental human rights of the men and women confined behind their walls and fences. Yet the *Roadmap* makes no reference to and indeed seems oblivious to the long struggle in the history of Canadian imprisonment to entrench a culture of respect for human rights. There are many recommendations of the *Roadmap* which reflect ideological and populist views that being “tough on crime” is a sufficient and defensible basis for public policy. Not

---

Imperative rules are omnipresent in the penal legal order. In addition to institutional rules, there are innumerable directives, regional instructions, standing orders, memoranda and manuals applicable to inmates, etc. These rules control in minute detail all aspects of daily life. According to Foucault, they amount to a complete microsystem of penal rules regulating time (lateness, absenteeism), action (carelessness, laziness), behaviour (impoliteness, disobedience), expression (insolence, disrespect), sexuality (indecenty).

“There is no aspect of institutional life that is not covered by a rule”, writes Berkman. “Rules systems within institutions are always expanding. Even when a particular rule is changed or abandoned, other rules grow up to regulate the area of activity.” He illustrates this statement with the following example: when mandatory prison uniforms were abandoned in some American institutions, a plethora of rules were enacted to regulate the type, style and colour of the street clothes allowed.

Notwithstanding the proliferation of rules, analysts of penal systems are almost unanimous in concluding that they are lawless States. Thus, Greenberg and Stender, in their 1972 article “The Prison as a Lawless Agency”, assert that “the prison, supposedly designed to enforce the law, became a complete negation of very principle of legality”. In 1974, Professor Michael Jackson, after scrutinizing the disciplinary process in some penitentiaries, concluded that the Canadian Correctional Service was “a lawless State”.viii (Translation) (p. 180).

<sup>15</sup> by New Leaf – New Life, Inc./Citizens for Effective Justice (see: [www.citizensforeffectivejustice.org](http://www.citizensforeffectivejustice.org), last accessed September 29, 2009).

only will implementation of many of the key recommendations undermine respect for human rights but they will also do nothing to enhance public safety. They are deeply flawed and we believe it is necessary that the Government and CSC be held accountable before the “transformation” makes a mockery of Canada’s commitment to the defence of human rights (<http://www.cbc.ca/news/pdf/a-flawed-compass-final-web-distribution-sep25-09.pdf>)<sup>16</sup>.

This document is one more instance of the self-arrogating right governments maintain to do violence in a democracy in the name of “public safety”, when not only is that right rightly and roundly to be questioned, but so is its theoretical basis for transformation towards draconian federal Corrections as proposed by the current Harper government. On the contrary, all the best scholarship points towards the efficacy of human rights strenuously upheld in Corrections policy. “A Flawed Compass” presents that powerfully.

Further complicating this picture are revelations of rampant white-collar corporate crime in the Western world. The name *Enron*, and the documentary *The Corporation* evoke instant associations with criminal wrong-doing at the highest and very widespread corporate levels. After Enron, “The President’s Corporate Fraud Task Force” was created in the U.S. Its United Kingdom counterpart, “The Serious Fraud Office” have both indicted large numbers of white-collar corporate criminals. Sadly this is not the case in Canada with its “Integrated Market Enforcement Teams” under the RCMP, due to what Nicholas Le Pan, the IMET expert adviser, designates as for all intents “horribly broken culture” of incompetence within the RCMP.<sup>17</sup>

In one study estimating the annual take by welfare fraud in Canada, the figure reached was \$500 million. Corporate fraud in Canada that same year amounted to \$44 billion, consumer damage, collusion and bribery not included. Corporate fraud was 88 times greater than welfare fraud. (*We’re Being Cheated!: Corporate and Welfare Fraud, The Hidden Story*, Ruth Morris, Harry Glasbeek, Dianne Martin, no date, p. 2).

A mid-20<sup>th</sup> century work on corporate fraud found that “90% of the 70 largest corporations in the USA ARE HABITUAL CRIMINALS [emphasis added] (Edwin H. Sutherland, *White Collar Crime*, New York: Dryden, 1949).

Estimates from a 1986 Canadian study showed there were approximately 500 victims of homicide, but about 15,000 killed in job-related preventable deaths. And financial costs not counting environmental damage of corporate harm was estimated that year at ten times the amount in street crime (*We’re Being Cheated!...*, p. 7).

The point is, as the former Law Reform Commission of Canada observed, there is one law for the rich in Canada and in most Western states, another for the poor. An overwhelming disproportionate number of poor and ethnic minorities are sent to prison for their wrongdoing, even though the vast majority of the “law-abiding” in fact are not – which I’ll discuss in a moment.

---

<sup>16</sup> See: <http://www.cbc.ca/canada/story/2009/09/24/conservative-prison-plan024.html> (last accessed September 29, 2009.)

cluded that the Canadian Correctional Service was “a lawless State”. viii (Translation)

<sup>17</sup> See Palango, *op. cit.*, 2008, pp. 373ff.

American scholar Jeffrey Reiman published a study on this with the arresting title: *The Rich Get Richer and the Poor Get Prison (Ideology, Class and Criminal Justice*, New York: Wiley, 1979). The Canadian Church Council on Justice and Corrections once produced a poster: “Laws are like cobwebs. They catch the little bugs, but the big ones get away.”

As earlier mentioned, in the positively peer reviewed *‘Everybody Does It!’: Crime By the Public*, criminologist Thomas Gabor spends almost 400 pages on the criminality of Canada’s and other Western state’s “law-abiding” public, 90% of whom, he presents, are “routine opportunistic criminals”, as opposed to a much smaller minority of hardened career criminals, and an equally tiny minority of those who *never* commit crimes. He writes, anticipating anthropologist René Girard’s work on pervasive legitimated societal scapegoating violence:

The objective of this book is to examine the evidence on a wide array of crimes – from conventional violent and property crimes to technological crimes and those committed by society’s élites and professionals, as well as those committed by justice-system personnel. The primary goal is to explore the *prevalence* of criminality – the proportion of citizens or those within a given milieu who engage in criminal or unscrupulous behaviour.

...

Apart from noting the flaws in the self-righteous position [that wrongly divides “humanity into criminal and non-criminal camps”], I wanted to take issue with the hypocrisy displayed by many citizens who routinely condemn what they consider to be our leniency towards convicted criminals, while they justify their own illegalities. Simplistic and Draconian policies may appeal to our tendency to project all that we find unacceptable in ourselves onto some identifiable social group, but they do nothing to help us understand or deal with criminal victimization (pp. xii to xiv).

The book is one long criminological demonstration of the biblical assertion: “*There is no one righteous, not even one... (Rom 3:10)*”. Change “righteous” to “law-abiding”, and the book’s author could have written that line as subtitle. *A chilling note is, the vast majority of the normal middle-class opportunistic criminals never go to jail, seldom even are arrested or appear in court.* Gabor spends three chapters addressing this.

On the other hand, the capacity for wrongful conviction and incarceration of the poor and ethnic minorities is rampant in Canada and other Western states.

The seven volume Marshall Inquiry report about the wrongful conviction of Micmac Indian Donald Marshall in Nova Scotia

is a scathing indictment of the Nova Scotia criminal justice system. Its findings are blunt, and unequivocal: Donald Marshall Jr. was wrongfully arrested, wrongfully prosecuted, wrongfully defended, wrongfully convicted of murder, wrongfully treated during his appeal, and deceived and cheated by investigating officials (from CBC website. [http://archives.cbc.ca/on\\_this\\_day/01/26/](http://archives.cbc.ca/on_this_day/01/26/), last accessed September 29, 2009).<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> The facts of the case and Marshall Inquiry findings are:

- Marshall, then 17, was convicted of the murder and sentenced to life in prison. The trial took just three days.

The 1991 “Report of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry of Manitoba” (Winnipeg: Queen’s Printer), in Volume I begins:

The justice system has failed Manitoba’s Aboriginal people on a massive scale. It has been insensitive and inaccessible, and has arrested and imprisoned Aboriginal people in grossly disproportionate numbers. Aboriginal people who are arrested are more likely than non-Aboriginal people to be denied bail, spend more time in pre-trial detention and spend less time with their lawyers, and, if convicted, are more likely to be incarcerated (p. 1).

Examples could be multiplied of systemic criminal justice failings in Canada and other Western states almost *ad infinitum*, certainly *ad nauseum*.

In 2009, there is no significant indication that the corporate criminal culture in Canada’s provincial and federal corrections systems has changed, or that criminal justice systems provincially have significantly improved. On the contrary, since September 11, 2001, a corporate culture responsive to general public punitive attitudes and fear is in the ascendancy. This is corroborated by much informal discussion with CSC personnel.

Crime control through imprisonment has been primarily undertaken in terms of the imagery of war. Michael Jackson again comments:

The image of the practice of imprisonment as a form of civil war is not a comforting one. But then, and this is Garland’s point, we should never be comforted or complacent about our prisons. Even though this imagery is far removed from the professional language of corrections, increasingly it is the preferred language of governments and law enforcement agencies in describing and seeking public vindication of their crime control policies. The “war on crime” is not an ambiguous rally to arms (p. 31).

In this war on crime, its prisoners have hardly been pre-eminently, as widespread policy, respectfully treated *ever* in Canadian or most Western state history. In a conversation just this month

- 
- Ten days after the conviction, Jimmy MacNeil came forward to say he was with Ebsary and had seen him commit the murder. In 1974, Ebsary’s daughter Donna told Sydney police that she had seen her father washing blood from a knife on the night of the murder. In both cases the information was not passed along to either the Crown or the defence team.
  - While incarcerated, Marshall battled depression, drugs and alcohol. In 1983, the Nova Scotia Court of Appeal acquitted Marshall because Ebsary had admitted that he, not Marshall, had killed Seale. But even as it acquitted him, the court told Marshall he was dishonest in his testimony and therefore partly to blame for his wrongful conviction. “Any miscarriage of justice is, however, more apparent than real,” the court suggested.
  - A royal commission was established to investigate the case. After three years and \$7 million, the damning report was released. “The criminal justice system failed Donald Marshall Jr. at virtually every turn, from his arrest and wrongful conviction for murder in 1971 up to, and even beyond, his acquittal by the Court of Appeal in 1983,” the royal commission report stated.
  - The royal commission report also stated clearly that Marshall was “convicted and sent to prison, in part at least, because he was a native person (from CBC website, [http://archives.cbc.ca/version\\_print.asp?page=1&IDLan=1&IDClip=12858&IDDossier=3107&IDCat=&IDCatPa=](http://archives.cbc.ca/version_print.asp?page=1&IDLan=1&IDClip=12858&IDDossier=3107&IDCat=&IDCatPa=), last accessed September 29, 2009).”

with a former senior player in CSC, the guard's union by this person's estimation was a "fascist" organization, operating under a "them-us" scapegoating siege mentality like Nazis towards the Jews. Whether overstated, at least this is true: respectful treatment of prisoners is *not* the bottom line gold standard of corrections in Canada, federal or provincial. *Inmate control is*. Peter Hennessy wrote a history of Canada's most notorious federal prison, entitled: *Canada's Big House: The Dark History of the Kingston Penitentiary* (Toronto/Oxford: The Dundurn Group, 1999). Hennessy, an educator, developed early in his career the fixed idea that schools are comparable with prisons, mental institutions, and homes for the aged. They are all designed, he believes, to shape humans into semi-dependent beings for the convenience of society. That is the animating philosophy of his book (from inside brief biography of the author).

The author writes of the results of a representative coroner's jury into the death of a prisoner at the Kingston Penitentiary:

It confirms the view of J. Michael Yates, author of *Line Screw* ([*My Twelve Riotous Years Working Behind Bars in some of Canada's Toughest Jails, an Unrepentant Memoir*, Toronto : McClelland & Stewart,] 1993) that there is not one well-managed institution within the Canadian corrections system (p. 201).

This lack of proper management translates too frequently into scapegoating violence towards prisoners, a culture of lawlessness by prison administrators, and a "circle-the-wagons" dynamic amongst the rank and file: all that is antithetical to high humanist and Christian ideals of what constitutes "civilization".

So my question as thesis once again is: *How can we invest ultimate power of life and death in our military, police, and prisons ("state-sanctioned violence"), and in the politicians directing them, with their pervasive deceit, self-serving and criminal wrong-doing; and deny that widespread psychological and physical destruction of innocent civilians is the consequent norm?*

### *Civilization and Wickedness*

Civilization derives in fact from the Latin word *civitas*<sup>19</sup> meaning "city". As you recall the Biblical story of Cain and Abel, the first murder was committed by Cain, founder of the first city. All *civilization* argues René Girard has been founded on scapegoating murder ever since. *To be "civil" by all including Western civilization's norms is in fact to be murderous and not know/acknowledge it*. A Canadian example is Michael Ignatieff (well, the *Canadian* aspect is jokingly disputed!). He is scion of one of Canada's great Establishment intellectual families, but is no less singularly homicidal in his much published support of the War on Terror. He is philosophically and politically a committed "Liberal", and has seemingly had in the past no idea of

---

<sup>19</sup> See a disturbing article by [Donald Gutstein](http://thetyee.ca/Mediacheck/2005/11/29/HarperBush/), 29 Nov 2005, TheTye.ca (<http://thetyee.ca/Mediacheck/2005/11/29/HarperBush/> (last accessed September 29, 2009), in part about a shadowy Canadian group named "Civitas", in which Stephen Harper figures significantly, a "network of Canadian neoconservative and libertarian academics, politicians, journalists and think tank propagandists".

how murderous his support is of the War on Terror. Though he later repented of his support for the invasion of Iraq<sup>20</sup>.

In the movie adaptation of Jane Austen's *Mansfield Park*, the central character, Fanny Price at age 10 goes to live at her relatives' fairy-tale estate, Mansfield Park. Her new life is idyllic and genteel in every way by early nineteenth century English standards. But eventually into her adulthood the awful truth emerges, adumbrated throughout the movie: Mansfield Park's "civilized" opulence is underwritten by the putrid horror of New World slavery that her uncle, Sir Thomas and a host of similar ilk, oversees business interests in, and (implied) also participates in rape with impunity of chattel black women, and far more and worse. The beautiful estate Mansfield Park and all its opulent "civilized manners" are situated on a gargantuan garbage dump of greed, rapacity and murderous violence.

Even so for us. Our cherished Western avowals of democracy and freedom, our protestations of inviolable international human rights, our vaunted self-designated civilization, stand knee-deep in the blood of millions of civilian domestic and international victims the world over, throughout the entire history of Western culture. This unmitigated horror is the (officially) unacknowledged legacy of World War I, of World War II, of the Vietnam War, of the First Gulf War, of the War on Terror, of the War on Drugs, of the War on Crime, of all war in which Western culture has been awash for millennia. *We are Mansfield Park*.

We fail consequently to see that all "civilizations", no less *Western civilization*, are perpetuated by the same scapegoating violence committed by police, prisons and military, all legitimated by the apparatus of state, in turn ultimately by its citizens. No one outside police, prison guards, and military personnel in a Western state is permitted to confine, attack, and slaughter others. We allow however minions of the state to commit mass murder of others, and authorities in democracies not only look the other way, for instance invoking the Geneva Conventions to justify no limit to "collateral damage", but require it. State killing is done massively, indiscriminately, and with impunity.

Some may know the famous response of Mahatma Ghandi to Sir Winston Churchill's question, "What do you think of Western civilization?": "I think it would be a good idea." If only this were lighthearted kidding, and not our predominant Western nasty little secret built upon a garbage dump of putrid horror like the estate and genteel society of Sir Thomas in *Mansfield Park*. Just as surely Establishment society today, British Royalty for example – with its own long sordid tale of gruesome violence – showers with knighthoods and honours all such leaders as Sir Thomas. And their savagery remains well hidden from a willingly duped public who just adores its Royalty, where grasping fools like "Lord" Conrad Black give up Canadian citizenship to be appointed to the British House of Lords! It is no surprise that the current Queen of England delights in reviewing the troops in whatever Commonwealth country she visits. Civilization is largely built upon its commitment to violence.

---

<sup>20</sup> See: <http://www.vigile.net/Ignatieff-says-supporting-Iraq-war> (last accessed September 29, 2009), and for a critique of his change of heart, <http://www.cdfai.org/bergenarticles/Has%20Michael%20Ignatieff%20changed%20his%20mind%20on%20Canada%20Afghan%20mission.pdf> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

Retired American Lt. Col. David Grossman initiated a whole field of study dubbed *killology*. He says that modern Western soldiers such as those the Queen routinely reviews and blesses are trained in brutalization. He writes: “Brutalization, or ‘values inculcation,’ is what happens at boot camp...”<sup>21</sup>.

He explains in another place:

“This brutalization is designed to break down your existing mores and norms and to accept a new set of values that embrace destruction, violence, and death as a way of life. In the end, you are desensitized to violence and accept it as a normal and essential survival skill in your brutal new world.”<sup>22</sup>

A Canadian elite force member known to me said that the movie *Jarhead*<sup>23</sup> demonstrates accurately current Canadian/Western military training. The movie depicts the systematic brutalization, bastardization, and “bellicosification” of the Marine recruit; the choking out of every vestige of civilized attitude and behaviour – especially the complete objectifying of women as sexual objects; most certainly the abject dehumanization of the enemy who *must* be killed like all despicable vermin. Other movies such as Stanley Kubrick’s *Full Metal Jacket* do this even better, so I read.

The “jarhead”/Marine the revered English Queen loves, once emptied of all human decency through basic military training (utter inversion of “All I really need to know I learned in kindergarten”), becomes ultimately receptacle for one all-pervasive value: *to kill*. The elite force member I know of was trained, like Anthony Zwofford in the *Jarhead* movie, as an assassin, to take out through stealth whatever “target” he was assigned. In the criminal underworld, such a killer is called a “hit man”. Our Canadian military, the American CIA, police and military forces around the world, routinely train hit men to murder in the name of civilization, on the ground or massively from the air, just as state executions were done in Canada, still are done in the U.S.A., *in the name of civilization*.<sup>24</sup> Or, as nineteenth-century Britons imagined it, there would one day

---

<sup>21</sup> “Teaching Kids To Kill”, [http://www.killology.com/print/print\\_teachkid.htm](http://www.killology.com/print/print_teachkid.htm) (last accessed September 29, 2009). See also Grossman’s website: [www.killology.com](http://www.killology.com) (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>22</sup> See: [http://www.killology.com/art\\_trained\\_methods.htm](http://www.killology.com/art_trained_methods.htm) (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>23</sup> Please see my reflection on the movie *Jarhead*, a movie that depicts well this brutalization at: [http://clarionjournal.typepad.com/clarion\\_journal\\_of\\_spirit/wayne\\_northey/](http://clarionjournal.typepad.com/clarion_journal_of_spirit/wayne_northey/) (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>24</sup> Gil Bailie in *Violence Unveiled (Humanity at the Crossroads)*, New York: Crossroad, 1995) discusses the 1989 execution of serial killer Theodore Bundy, when hundreds of men, women and children camped outside the Florida prison in a festive spirit one reporter likened to a *Mardi Gras*. The same reporter described the event as “a brutal act... [done] in the name of civilization (p. 79).” Bailie reflects on that commentary thus:

It would be difficult to think of a more succinct summation of the underlying anthropological dynamic at work: *a brutal act done in the name of civilization*, an expulsion or execution that results in social harmony. Clearly, after the shaky justifications based on deterrence or retribution have fallen away, this is the stubborn fact that remains: a brutal act is done in the name of civilization. If we humans become too morally troubled by the brutality to revel in the glories of the civilization made possible by it, we will simply have to reinvent culture. This is what Nietzsche saw through a glass darkly. This is what Paul sensed when he declared the old order to be a dying one (I Cor. 7:31). This is the central anthropological issue of our age ( p. 79).

The *Bourne Trilogy* movies give the impression that this is not routine with the “good guys” in the CIA. Our hero, Jason Bourne, asks a CIA agent who turned on other CIA agents to help Bourne:

**BOURNE**

Why’d you do it?

**LANDY**

hence be aerial warfare raining down incendiary bombs to “establish the customs of civilization”<sup>25</sup>, and to fulfill “the white man’s burden” of civilizing the savages through what Rudyard Kipling called and blessed in turn: “savage wars of peace”<sup>26</sup>.

When a simple question is posed: *Do our military hit men know in fact that each target is worthy of execution?*, the answer is obvious: No. When a further question is posed, *Has there been a process of meticulous intelligence gathering, full due process, arguments mounted and challenged for the guilt of the targeted person in front of an unbiased tribunal, before the death penalty sentence is carried out?*, the answer is: No. If a further question is put: *Are Canada’s hit men in Afghanistan right now not then murdering others based upon possibly flimsy, erroneous, and often just plain false and malicious intelligence from enemy warlords?*, the answer this time is: Yes. And once again someone’s father, brother, uncle, grandfather is mercilessly slaughtered by our Canadian military, with full blessing of its military leaders, of Canadian politicians, and of a watching informed public that for instance listens avidly and intelligently but no less gullibly to the CBC award-winning broadcast series *Afghanada*<sup>27</sup>.

And if one asks: *Did this kind of innocents killing not happen routinely in Allied bombing attacks on civilian targets in forty-two German and sixty-seven Japanese cities during World War II?*, the answer is again, Yes. But, it is argued, this was war, and our guys are permitted to murder civilians indiscriminately during wartime. In contradiction of this, no less than F.D.R. Roosevelt wrote about civilian aerial bombings to state leaders September 1, 1939 as World War II began, referring to it as “inhuman barbarism”. He stated:

If resort is had to this sort of *inhuman barbarism* during the period of tragic conflagration with which the world is now confronted, hundreds of thousands of innocent human beings, who have no responsibility for, and who are not even remotely participating in, the hostilities which have broken out, now will lose their lives... (“Appeal of President Roosevelt to Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany and Poland, September 1, 1939.” <http://avalon.law.yale.edu/wyii/ylbk325.asp>, last accessed September 29, 2009).

---

This isn’t us, David. What they turned you into [a cold-blooded assassin], what they’re doing with Blackbriar [the CIA assassination squad, its “black ops” hit-men called “assets”]... This has to stop.

Everything about the Trilogy is fantasy, its *dénouement* with Blackbriar bosses and the CIA chief arrested for their abnormality complete farce. *The CIA, on behalf of American Empire, is ultimately about torture, murder, and mayhem the world over.* This is no different from the former Soviet Empire KGB, or the Nazi SS. Landy’s statement was pure hypocritical Hollywood propaganda. This is indeed “us” and “U.S”. to the core in defence of American Empire, as it was the U.S.S.R and Nazi Germany last century, as it was Britain until the 19<sup>th</sup> century, as it was and is with all Empires, and for the most part all their nation-state imitators and collaborators including Canada.

Landy was right about one thing, however. For the U.S. to be considered remotely decent, remotely honourable, remotely “civilized”, “This has to stop.”! Under Barack Obama’s watch? There is a world of difference between an Enlightened Liberal and a Civilized Liberal. Obama is only the former. Though I’d love to be proved wrong!

<sup>25</sup> Military historian Tami Biddle writes of this in *Rhetoric and Reality in Air Warfare: the Evolution of British and American Ideas about Strategic Bombing, 1914-1945*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

<sup>26</sup> See Kipling’s poem “The White Man’s Burden”, [http://www.wsu.edu:8001/~wldciv/world\\_civ\\_reader/world\\_civ\\_reader\\_2/kipling.html](http://www.wsu.edu:8001/~wldciv/world_civ_reader/world_civ_reader_2/kipling.html) (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>27</sup> See: <http://www.cbc.ca/afghanada/> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

Roosevelt proved to be absolutely prescient and of course as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces directly indictable for subsequent United States massive slaughter of innocents. According to one study, in round numbers, the death toll from aerial bombing in World War I was about 10% of all casualties; in World War II about 50%; in the Vietnam War about 70%; and in the War on Terror, about 90%<sup>28</sup>. In one century of aerial warfare the Western imposition of the customs of civilization to fulfill the white man's burden through savage wars of peace, only wistfully imagined by citizens of the nineteenth century British Empire, has increased ninefold. One could have said in response with most Western Christians in World War II: "*Praise God; and pass the bombs!*" But I think one would have been morally wrong. In war years public opinion polls of American citizens after Pearl Harbor was bombed in 1941, over ten percent of the United States citizenry proposed a "final solution" of *completely destroying the entire population of Japan!*<sup>29</sup> Right after the bombing, 67% of the population favoured "unqualified and indiscriminate bombing of Japanese cities"<sup>30</sup>! One could have said at the time in response to that: "*In God we trust; and God bless America.*" But I think one would have been morally wrong. Since its inception, the United States has invariably trusted in guns more than God. In fact, arguably, America and "god" together are oxymoronic, unless is meant the American state or flag as idol rivalling God.

But of course, no majority *today* in Canada or in the United States would ever think let alone act in that way! *We* know the Emperor in truth has no clothes. *We* would never kill the innocents like king Herod – or kings Truman, Churchill and McKenzie King, more recently Bush, Blair and Harper, or Barack Obama... In response and for starters, according to a Pew Charitable Trusts Poll in 2003, 87% of white evangelicals totally supported America's War on Terror, as

---

<sup>28</sup> From transcript by Loretta Alper & Jeremy Earp, *War Made Easy: How Presidents & Pundits Keep Spinning us to Death*, 2007; [http://www.warmadeeasythemovie.org/downloads/full\\_transcript.pdf](http://www.warmadeeasythemovie.org/downloads/full_transcript.pdf) (last accessed September 29, 2009), p. 21; <http://freedocumentaries.org/theatre.php?id=1076&wh=1000x720> (last accessed September 29, 2009). The book is by the same title: Norman Solomon, *War Made Easy: How Presidents and Pundits Keep Spinning Us to Death*, Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2005.

<sup>29</sup> This is from one significant revisionist essay by Stephen R. Shalom, "VJ Day: Remembering the Pacific War" (<http://www.wpunj.edu/hmss/polisci/faculty/shalom/ssvjd.htm>, last accessed September 29, 2009):

Throughout the war, public opinion polls showed 10-13 percent of the American public consistently supporting the annihilation or extermination of the Japanese as a people.<sup>82</sup> [82. John W. Dower, *War Without Mercy*, New York: Pantheon, 1986, p. 53]. Paul V. McNutt, the head of the War Manpower Commission, gave public voice to this sentiment when he declared in April 1945 that he favored "extermination of the Japanese in toto" (though he later added that he was expressing his personal view).<sup>83</sup> [83. Dower, *ibid*, p. 55]. The atom bomb made such a preference possible.

Another writer quotes an eyewitness:

"It was freely admitted that some of our soldiers tortured Jap prisoners and were as cruel and barbaric at times as the Japs [*sic*] themselves. Our men think nothing of shooting a Japanese prisoner or a soldier attempting to surrender. They treat the Japs with less respect than they would give to an animal, and these acts are condoned by almost everyone." – Charles Lindbergh, who lived and flew as a civilian observer with U.S. forces based in New Guinea in mid-1944, cited in John W. Dower, *War Without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War* (Pantheon Books, New York, 1986, p. 70.) See several similar quotations at: <http://www.socialist.nu/citat/japan.html> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>30</sup> Shalom, *ibid*.

did all but one Roman Catholic bishop, and 81% of the white American Roman Catholic flock<sup>31</sup>...

Did you catch Roosevelt's expression? The good President, a Lord Conrad Black favourite, referred to indiscriminate bombing of civilians as "*inhuman barbarism*". However, by 1945, both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, and all other Allied leadership including then Canadian Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King, had rejected this 1939 appeal *utterly*, and had authorized instead a huge number of Allied *inhuman barbarians* by fighters in Air Force uniforms to carry out multiplied thousands of mass murder campaigns in Germany and Japan *knowingly* against civilians. No less than Sir Winston Churchill called this Allied aerial bombing campaign over Germany and Japan "terrorism", as cited earlier.

Yet, when in 2006/07 the Ottawa Canadian War Museum displayed one small panel that was straightforward about the questionable efficacy and implicit immorality of aerial bombing, something about which Roosevelt had been at least brutally honest, though equally barbarically inconsistent, there was such a hue and cry from Canada's veterans and other Allied War Crimes Deniers, that the panel was removed.<sup>32</sup> The panel was entitled "An Enduring Controversy" and accurately presented the issue. It read:

The value and morality of the strategic bomber offensive against Germany remains bitterly contested. Bomber Command's aim was to crush civilian morale and force Germany to surrender by destroying its cities and industrial installations. Although Bomber Command and American attacks left 600,000 Germans dead and more than five million homeless, the raids resulted in only small reductions in German war production until late in the war.

Three historians reflecting on this classic instance of cultural scapegoating cover-up wrote:

All three of us have had conversations with critics of the War Museum who say all they want is for the museum, and Canadian schools, to teach "proper" history. They cannot always define what that is, but it seems to be a history of the past achievements of this country and a pride in its present. What they do not want is a history that presents only the darker side of the Canadian past – its treatment of the aboriginals, for example, or the internment of the Japanese during the Second World War. While they have a point, as Canadian history has become excessively preoccupied recently with showing that Canada can be every bit as wicked as the next country, their solution would flatten out the richness and complexity of the past. If students learn anything from the study of history it should be to keep asking questions and be wary of simple explanations (See footnote 32 for website location.).

The point is indeed, Canada not only *can be, it is* "every bit as wicked as the next country", and this in turn is the human condition of all nation states, Western or otherwise. Jews and Christians actually quote their scripture on this very point, as done earlier: "*The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?*" (Jeremiah 17:9 KJV)?" As literary

---

<sup>31</sup> See: <http://people-press.org/report/179/war-concerns-grow-but-support-remains-steadfast> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>32</sup> See: [http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi\\_0199-9671848/Controversy-commemoration-and-capitulation-the.html](http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi_0199-9671848/Controversy-commemoration-and-capitulation-the.html) (last accessed September 29, 2009). Unfortunately, the whole article may be viewed only by paying for it.

critic Terry Eagleton points out in *Reason, Faith and Revolution (Reflections on the God Debate*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009)<sup>33</sup>, all kinds of secularists, liberal Christians, and contemporaries do not see human culture that way, just as no one saw the Emperor's naked bum until it was rudely pointed out by an unsophisticated little boy who had not yet learned the niceties of pervasive cultural *Scapegoating Denial!* The need to reinvent human culture over against its foundational violence is scarcely recognized in Canada's genteel upper crust civilized society, along the corridors of political power, in the military that protects that power and amongst its self-righteous veterans not knowing the horrors of their own "civilization" they were fighting for so "inhumanly".

It is also widely unacknowledged by enlightened would-be schoolyard bully and domestic violence preventers whose patron is nonetheless titular Chief of the Canadian Armed Forces, Governor General of Canada Michaëlle Jean. This is the case for both the Canadian Red Cross and of PREVNet (Promoting Relationships and Eliminating Violence Network).<sup>34</sup> They are each

---

<sup>33</sup> See my review at: [http://clarionjournal.typepad.com/clarion\\_journal\\_of\\_spirit/wayne\\_northey/](http://clarionjournal.typepad.com/clarion_journal_of_spirit/wayne_northey/) (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>34</sup> An International Red Cross worker dismissed the following as irrelevant, written in 2007 as an Op. Ed. Piece: "War is Peace", Freedom is Slavery", and "Ignorance is Strength." George Orwell's "doublespeak" is not some futuristic "1984", it is present in Canadian and Western culture. It is also *not* to be discussed in polite, civilized society, as the following illustrates.

On May 22, 2007, Her Excellency the Right Honourable Michaëlle Jean was sent this letter:

I am writing about a concerning discrepancy, in the spirit of your Installation Speech where you welcomed dialogue as "the founding principle of this country."

In your patronage of PREVNet (Promoting Relationships and Eliminating Violence Network), you are quoted on the official website thus: "Finding ways of predicting and preventing the development of these relationship problems is a necessity. Bullying is not only about threats and intimidation, it is foremost about contempt and injustice." The same website explains the purpose of the organization: "PREVNet is a national network committed to stop bullying. Bullying is wrong and hurtful. Every child and youth has the right to be safe and free from involvement in bullying. It affects children and youth who are bullied, those who bully others, and those who know it is going on."

You are also Commander-in-Chief of Canada's Armed Forces. I know of one of your *élite* military personnel, who ... told his dad that he should watch the movie *Jarhead* to grasp the kind of military training he had received. The 2005 movie is based upon the training and participation in the U.S. military of Anthony Swofford, recounted in the book *Jarhead: A Marine's Chronicle of the Gulf War and Other Battles* (2003). It is about abject dehumanizing of not only the "enemy"!

Retired U.S. Lt. Colonel David Grossman, founder of the science of *Killology*, indicates that no institution pays more attention to dehumanization of its recruits than the military: "This brutalization is designed to break down your existing mores and norms and to accept a new set of values that embrace destruction, violence, and death as a way of life. In the end, you are desensitized to violence and accept it as a normal and essential survival skill in your brutal new world (Grossman, 1999, p. 1)."

Hence the use of the word, "discrepancy", and why I am asking for dialogue. On the one hand you support the elimination of bullying and violence in Canada; on the other, you command training of our youth in ultimate bullying and violence tactics by Canada's Armed Forces. Attitudes and actions of "threats, intimidation, contempt and injustice" towards others are routinely inculcated. Our Canadian youth are taught in fact supreme bullying tactics. You are one of "those who know it is going on."

*Jarhead* begins and ends with this statement: "A man fires a rifle for many years, and he goes to war. And afterward he turns the rifle in at the armory, and he believes he's finished with the rifle. But no matter what else he might do with his hands, love a woman, build a house, change his son's diaper; his hands remember the rifle."

Renowned anthropologist René Girard claims that bullying, as all violence, is imitated, learned behaviour. How can we expect Canada's youth to *not* continue imitating bullying when you the Gover-

doing national violence prevention work. The Canadian Red Cross program, RespectEd, which is also an international Red Cross program, and PREVNet, do not challenge cultural violence where it is supremely legitimated and modelled: in the Western state's police, prisons, and military. We know the story of the child who is searching for a coin under a street light. When asked exactly where she thought she'd lost it, she points to a dark part of the street, but is looking for it elsewhere, and explains, "because there is more light here". And she may indeed find some lost coin or coins where she is looking, as keys to violence reduction are everywhere because of its ubiquity in human culture. But she will never find *the most significant key* if she dictates where it may never be looked for: *in state-sanctioned violence modelled indiscriminately for all by our military, police, and prisons, including therefore for criminals, domestic violence perpetrators, and schoolyard bullies (of whom, as seen too often, our very civilization guardians are chief).*

I propose that, until Governor General Michaëlle Jean is publicly struck as patron from the Canadian Red Cross and PREVNet, and her role as titular head of the Canadian Armed Forces is

---

nor General endorse it and Canada's military models it? "You can't get to a good place in a bad way – EVER." (Molly Baldwin)

My request for dialogue is a response to this question: *How do you expect Canadians to unlearn bullying through initiatives like PREVNet, when you, PREVNet's patron, support its very indoctrination and utilization in a major Canadian government institution under your titular command?* Sincerely...

In response, Yonatan Lew, who wrote on the Governor General's behalf (June 26, 2007), predictably deftly dodged the request in the spirit of no dialogue:

"While the Governor General appreciates the points you have raised, she feels that your concerns regarding Canadian Forces training would be best addressed by the Department of National Defence.

You may wish to contact the minister of this department at the following address..."

I know nonetheless the answer to the final question posed: in two words, *ethical realism*. It asserts the "tragic but necessary" Jekyll and Hyde symbiosis of Western civilization: peace-loving Dr. Jekyll (respectful behaviour towards others as learned in kindergarten); monstrous Mr. Hyde (brutal suppression of others through police and military as needed in "the real world" outside kindergarten). [*continued on next page*]

According to online *Wikipedia*, the word "fuck" or derivatives appears 335 times in *Jarhead*, placing it amongst the top five films for such use. One presumes Ms Jean and other "civilized" Canadians/Westerners would not approve... One knows there is not a simple remedy of washing soldiers' and their trainers' mouths out with soap... It goes a tad deeper as in: "The former apartheid cabinet member Leon Wessels was closer to the mark when he said that they had not wanted to know, for there were those who tried to alert them." (Desmond Tutu about the brutalities of apartheid's police and military in *No Future Without Forgiveness*.)

Jared Diamond in *The Third Chimpanzee: The Evolution and Future of the Human Animal* writes that *the only consistent signature of our species is genocide*. David Livingstone Smith in *The Most Dangerous Animal: Human Nature and the Origins of War* presents humans as biologically "wired to fight" and *murderous to the core*: Western civilization not exempt, Canada's current strident militarization and the U.S. War on Terror cases in point.

A friend, award-winner for work on violence, said it was useless to urge public discourse on Canada's and the West's commitment to police and military lethal violence, since it's the air we breathe and we're not about to reinvent human culture in our lifetime! An *ethical consistent realist* asserts nonetheless: **Unless Canada's and the West's commitment to institutional violence is addressed, all other public non-violence initiatives are at best symptom-only treatment, at worst hypocrisy, and "Western civilization would be a good idea" as Mahatma Gandhi once said to Winston Churchill.** While this is logically true, discussion of it is ultimate establishment taboo.

I have a doublespeak for Ms Jean and other ethical inconsistent realists who invariably want their "no-ble Western civilization/peace-loving Canadian culture" cake and eat it too: *Pretence is Truth*. Sincerely...

denounced by them for the ultimate bullying and murderous violence she endorses, like the child searching for the lost coin, RespectEd and PREVNet will never find and thus leave unaddressed the ultimate source, cultural legitimation, and pivotal modelling by the state of violence in Canadian culture.

There is a summer camp skit about the man in a wheel barrow who approaches each day a border crossing with loads of boxes. The crossing guard suspects something, so savages the load each time in search of the illegal loot. To no avail. Finally, after having crossed the border one last time, the smuggler turns to the audience saying: “Little does he know that I’ve been smuggling wheel barrows!”

I am trying to argue that there will never be significant reduction of violence in society until its ultimate source of legitimation and modelling is removed: the lawful violence, training in violence, and employment of violence by the Western state in our police, prisons, and military. This is the evil violence like those wheelbarrows routinely smuggled into Western civilizations throughout history right under our noses.

### *Scapegoating Violence: The Ultimate Western Process Addiction*

In this section entitled *Scapegoating Violence: The Ultimate Western Process Addiction*, I shall draw on material from a research project of mine two years ago on Restorative Justice and International State Conflict. The paper presented to the Conflict Studies Department at St. Paul’s University Ottawa may be found at a website called *Clarion Journal*<sup>35</sup>, and was also published by an international chaplaincy journal, *Justice Reflections*<sup>36</sup>.

I learned from alcohol and drug counsellor, and radical feminist Anne Wilson Schaefer, to give this pervasive addiction to state-sanctioned violence a name – *process addiction*. Process addiction to violence is the ultimate recourse of the state to “fall back” on violence when all else fails. This is like an alcoholic who turns to the bottle invariably and inevitably. To even remotely suggest *abstinence* to a state whose society is committed to use of violence (democratic or totalitarian is of little consequence) is *anathema*. A criminologist says with reference to this concept:

[P]rocess addiction... is more lethal than physical addictions. This is the real drug problem – greater than alcohol, tobacco, valium, and crack – from which the war on drugs [and the war on crime generally] aims to divert our attention (Harold E. Pepinsky and Richard Quinney, Editors, *Criminology as Peacemaking*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991, p. 325).”

The modern Western state – Canada, the U.S., all members of NATO – is a *process addict*, consequence of which is indescribable mass murder, deceit, and environmental devastation. Yet we clutch the “process bottle” of this addiction immediately to the chest the moment there is even a hint of taking away the substance responsible for the addiction; the moment there is breathed a hint of pointer to the ultimate cure for violence: *total abstinence by the state*.

---

<sup>35</sup> See: [http://clarionjournal.typepad.com/clarion\\_journal\\_of\\_spirit/files/spu\\_presentation\\_september\\_2007\\_3\\_1.pdf](http://clarionjournal.typepad.com/clarion_journal_of_spirit/files/spu_presentation_september_2007_3_1.pdf) (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>36</sup> See: <http://www.justicereflections.org.uk/> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

“War is hell”, observed Civil War General William Tecumseh Sherman. Just War theory claims: “War is peace”. Sherman’s expanded comment goes:

“If the people raise a howl against my barbarity and cruelty, I will answer war is war... War is cruelty, and you cannot refine it... War is hell.”

Errol Morris produced the award-winning documentary film, *The Fog of War*, featuring a series of interviews with former Secretary of State Robert S. McNamara, architect of the Vietnam War.

Morris poses a question in the film:

**EM:** The choice of incendiary bombs [during World War II], where did that come from?

**McNamara:** I think the issue is not so much incendiary bombs. I think the issue is: in order to win a war should you kill 100,000 people in one night [of attacking Tokyo, March 9 & 10, 1945], by firebombing or any other way? [General Curtis] LeMay’s answer would be clearly “Yes.”

...

Proportionality should be a guideline in war. Killing 50% to 90% of the people of 67 Japanese cities and then bombing them with two nuclear bombs is not proportional, in the minds of some people, to the objectives we were trying to achieve.

I don’t fault Truman for dropping the nuclear bomb. The U.S.-Japanese War was one of the most brutal wars in all of human history. Kamikaze pilots, suicide, unbelievable. *What one can criticize is that the human race prior to that time, and today, has not really grappled with what are, I’ll call it, “the rules of war.” Was there a rule then that said you shouldn’t bomb, shouldn’t kill, shouldn’t burn to death 100,000 civilians in one night?*

LeMay said, *“If we’d lost the war, we’d all have been prosecuted as war criminals.” And I think he’s right. He, and I’d say I, were behaving as war criminals. LeMay recognized that what he was doing would be thought immoral if his side had lost. But what makes it immoral if you lose and not immoral if you win?* (Morris, Errol (2003). *The Fog of War: Eleven Lessons From the Life of Robert S. McNamara* (Transcript), [http://www.errolmorris.com/film/fow\\_transcript.html](http://www.errolmorris.com/film/fow_transcript.html) (last accessed September 29, 2009, italics added)

That’s called, Mr. McNamara, MIGHT MAKES RIGHT! – *and it is the most pervasive ethical creed known to humanity.* It also underscores the Western state’s abject process addiction to violence – the Nazis, the “Japs”, and the *Good Guys, the Allies!*

What was going on in World War II is perfect illustration of a raving process addiction.

Chris Hedges as mentioned in 2003 published *War Is a Force That Gives Us Meaning*. Here is but a tiny taste of what he says in the Introduction:

I learned early on that war forms its own culture. The rush of battle is a potent and often lethal addiction, for war is a drug, one I ingested for many years. It is peddled by mythmakers – historians, war correspondents, filmmakers, novelists, and the state – all of whom endow it with qualities it often does possess: excitement, exoticism, power,

chances to rise above our small stations in life, and a bizarre and fantastic universe that has a grotesque and dark beauty...

The enduring attraction of war is this: Even with its destruction and carnage it can give us what we long for in life. It can give us purpose, meaning, a reason for living.

...

But war is a god, as the ancient Greeks and Romans knew, and its worship demands human sacrifice.

...

Look just at the 1990s: 2 million dead in Afghanistan; 1.5 million dead in the Sudan; some 800,000 butchered in ninety days in Rwanda; a half-million dead in Angola; a quarter of a million dead in Bosnia; 200,000 dead in Guatemala; 150,000 dead in Liberia; a quarter of a million dead in Burundi; 75,000 dead in Algeria; and untold tens of thousands lost in the border conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea, the fighting in Columbia, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Chechnya, Sri Lanka, southeastern Turkey, Sierra Leone, Northern Ireland, Kosovo, and the Persian Gulf War (where perhaps as many as 35,000 Iraqi citizens were killed). In the wars of the twentieth century not less than 60 million civilians have perished, nearly 20 million more than the 43 million military personnel killed.

Civil war, brutality, ideological intolerance, conspiracy, and murderous repression are part of the human condition – indeed almost the daily fare for many but a privileged minority (*passim*, pp. 5 – 16).

Dr. Richard Land of the Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention in the U.S. authored “A Letter from Conservative Christians to President Bush” October 3, 2002, in which *carte-blanche* support of the War on Terror was given. It was signed by other leading white American Evangelicals such as Chuck Colson and Bill Bright, who drew not on the Way of Jesus but on the Way of American Empire for justifying the War on Terror. The letter begins:

In this decisive hour of our nation’s history we are writing to express our deep appreciation for your bold, courageous, and visionary leadership. Americans everywhere have been inspired by your eloquent and clear articulation of our nation’s highest ideals of freedom and of our resolve to defend that freedom both here and across the globe (<http://erlc.com/article/the-so-called-land-letter/>, last accessed September 29, 2009).

As an outside observer to this kind of self-serving Eusebian<sup>37</sup> obsequy, the level of sheer, seemingly wilful, self-deceit in this letter strikes as simply amazing!

---

<sup>37</sup> Eusebius was the “court theologian” whose writings praised Constantine for his “godly” Christian leadership of the Roman Empire, when Constantine’s embrace of the church was likely much more calculated and self-serving. Wrote one church historian:

But there is one conquest made by Constantine, the effect of which still continues to the present day, his most surprising yet least acknowledged... He conquered the Christian church. The conquest was complete, extending over doctrine, liturgy, art and architecture, comity, ethos and ethics... But this achievement, unheralded then, unrecognized now, represents Constantine’s greatest conquest, the one which has persisted largely unchallenged through the centuries in Europe and wherever European Christianity has spread... (*Constantine versus Christ: The Triumph of Ideology*, Alistair Kee, London: SCM Press Ltd. 1982, p. 154.)

In light of subsequent discrediting as abject lies of every justification by the Bush administration for attacking Iraq; of the horrors of routine torture of prisoners authorized by the Bush administration<sup>38</sup>; of the violation of all the Geneva conventions about respectful treatment of POW's; by 2006 of in about 655,000 civilian victims in Iraq<sup>39</sup>, the majority at the hands of the U.S. and British military since the beginning of the War; of routine "renderings" of terrorist suspects to other countries for torture and execution; of scores of secret CIA interrogation and torture compounds around the world; of countless violations of the United Nations International Declaration on Human Rights; of massive repealing of American human rights; of overwhelming retaliatory violence perpetrated against Afghanistan and Iraq; of astronomical trillions spent to perpetrate the War rather than address the health care and hunger needs of humanity; etc., etc.; etc., Dr. Land's language in the open letter, approvingly quoting President Bush that "We must stand up ... for the permanent rights and hopes of mankind.", one must say Dr. Land and his leading Evangelical co-signers are a tad out of touch, perhaps in fact are from another planet. As if Bush and all (especially Evangelical) Americans of course did "stand up... for the permanent rights and hopes of mankind"; a claim that is not only tragically ironic and ludicrous at some years remove and in light of the mass slaughter in Iraq and Afghanistan by Americans, it is exponentially beyond despicably disingenuous.<sup>40</sup>

---

The conquest was not "complete" as any sustained readings of the Church Fathers will demonstrate. But it definitely held sway politically in Christendom.

<sup>38</sup> This appeared in an article in the *Globe and Mail* about films critiquing the U.S. War on Terror:

"Americans are now one of the leading torturers in the world," Maher said. "And the government is run almost exclusively by 'people of faith.' It's amazing to me how many evangelical Christians are okay with torture, considering how their boy got tortured so bad. But their Christianity isn't about morals or ethics, it's about saving their ass. They pray to Christ so that they can do whatever they want in this world, and he'll forgive and protect them in the next. That's ass-backward (Johanna Schneller, "Films That Fight the Power", *Globe and Mail*,

[http://www.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/RTGAM.20070911.wtiff2007\\_schneller11/BNStory/Entertainment/columnists](http://www.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/RTGAM.20070911.wtiff2007_schneller11/BNStory/Entertainment/columnists) (last accessed September 29, 2009)."

<sup>39</sup> See further below. Predictably, "only" a (fairly static) number of 30,000 civilian victims – ten times nonetheless those killed September 11, 2001 – is generally allowed by corporate media and the U.S. government. *Only!* See however: Sabrina Tavernise and Donald G. McNeil (2006). "New estimate puts death toll for Iraqi civilians at 600,000, About 15,000 deaths a month since '03 invasion, researchers say", *New York Times*, Wednesday, October 11, 2006, <http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2006/10/11/MNGFILMTB71.DTL> (last accessed September 29, 2009). See also: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2006/oct/11/iraq.iraq>, '655,000 Iraqis killed since invasion' *The Guardian*, Wednesday 11 October 2006. See further discussion below.

<sup>40</sup> This is not about only a slight disagreement concerning a minor point of Biblical doctrine. It is about ultimate issues of life and death, about fundamental biblical teaching concerning *love of God, love of neighbour, and love of enemy*. When I wrote Dr. Land about the open letter to President Bush, I drew attention to the fact that his Evangelical peers were in the minority over against worldwide Evangelical opinion on a matter of ultimate life and death, and that this should perhaps give him at least some pause. Is it possible, I suggested, that nepotistic American Empire ideology and not *Christ and the Bible* informed his conclusions about the justice of the war on terror? I likewise wrote to Jean Bethke Elshtain about her, in my view, reprehensible book (though well-informed) *Just War Against Terror (The Burden of American Power in a Violent World)*, Jean Bethke Elshtain, New York: Basic Books, 2003). My long review of her book may be found online at: [http://clarionjournal.typepad.com/clarion\\_journal\\_of\\_spirit/wayne\\_northey/index.html](http://clarionjournal.typepad.com/clarion_journal_of_spirit/wayne_northey/index.html) (last accessed September 29, 2009). Neither responded.

Charles Marsh is professor of religion and director of the Project on Lived Theology at the University of Virginia. He published *Wayward Christian Soldiers (Freeing the Gospel from Political Captivity)*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), excerpts of which were printed in *The Boston Globe*, July 2007. He wrote in part:

EARLY ONE SUNDAY morning in the spring of 2003, in the quiet hours before services would begin at the evangelical church where I worship in Charlottesville, Virginia, I opened files compiled by my research assistant and read the statements drafted by Christians around the world in opposition to the American invasion of Iraq.

The experience was profoundly moving and shaming: From Pentecostals in Brazil to the Christian Councils of Ghana, from the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch and All the East to the Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem, from Pope John Paul II to the The Waldensian Reformed Church of Italy and the Christian Conference of Asia, the voices of our brothers and sisters in the global ecumenical church spoke in unison.

Why did American evangelicals not pause for a moment in the rush to war to consider the near-unanimous disapproval of the global Christian community? The worldwide Christian opposition seems to me the most neglected story related to the religious debate about Iraq: Despite approval for the president's decision to go to war by 87 percent of white evangelicals in April 2003, according to a Pew Charitable Trusts poll, almost every Christian leader in the world (and almost every nonevangelical leader in the United States) voiced opposition to the war (Marsh, 2007, p. 2).

A theologian writes, after his conclusion that the univocal New Testament ethic is nonviolence equally for church and state:

One reason that the world finds the New Testament's message of peacemaking and love of enemies incredible is that the church is so massively faithless. On the question of violence, the church is deeply compromised and committed to nationalism, violence, and idolatry (Richard Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics*, HarperSanFrancisco, 1996, p. 343).

In commentary on the capacity for *practising* Christians to have supported Hitler in destroying the Jews (to which Dr. Land and his fellow Evangelicals allude in the open letter of support to their *Führer*), two authors write:

Other Christians did consider such sources, like Scripture and prayer, but mangled them due to captivity to the power of anti-Semitism, nationalism and other "powers and authorities." For example, Scripture was interpreted by some to mean that God was punishing the Jews for "killing Christ" and should be aided in doing so. This act of *interpretive mayhem* was not unique, nor is similar *interpretive mayhem* today... (Stassen and Gushee, *ibid*, p. 83, italics added)

Dr. Land and his fellow Evangelical authors of the letter to the President are, by majority Christian world opinion outside the United States, guilty of "interpretive mayhem"<sup>41</sup> and<sup>42</sup> sanctimo-

---

<sup>41</sup> It is instructive that nowhere in their letter do they cite Scripture, even selectively, rather Just War tradition, by their own admission invented by "Christian theologians in the late fourth and early fifth centuries A.D." For People of the Book, their letter represents not only "interpretive mayhem", but also Christian treason, a blatant sell-out to another god named *Pax Americana* – American Empire.

nious subscription to “*Christian mission without the Gospel!*” This is beyond tragic not only for the hundreds of thousands of victims immolated from *The Warmongering on Terror* promulgated currently by the United States and its massive majority white Evangelical supporters; it is abject sacrilege and heresy against the name of God in Christ that contrary to declaring the Good News of God’s love for the world in Jesus Christ, it demonstrates that a branch of Christianity is utterly hateful and massively unfaithful to the very Name it most vociferously and self-servingly proclaims! *The contradiction is staggering, beyond reprehensible, into a twilight zone of unadulterated religious and nationalistic nepotism!* This has also been true of the Roman Catholic Church.<sup>43</sup>

I say this as one of them: I was raised and remain an Evangelical.

Marsh is likewise harsh in the rest of his article.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> One could wish to say “unprecedented” – but the precedent has been well established for centuries throughout the Western church.

<sup>43</sup> I was raised, and am still in, the Evangelical tradition. I feel “comfortable” critiquing as an “insider” this tradition – rather than any other. A reader of an earlier draft of this paper, Father Emmanuel Charles McCarthy, in a personal e-mail (September 11, 2007) commented on this part of my paper. (Please see more about Father McCarthy’s work at: <http://centerforchristiannonviolence.org/index.php>, last accessed September 29, 2009):

However I don’t think it appropriate to give a pass to the Catholic hierarchy of the U.S. only one of whom, out of over 200 bishops who lead dioceses, condemned this war as unjust and intrinsically evil from its inception and told his flock to stay away from it. As of this date no bishop or group of Catholic bishops or the Catholic bishops as a group has said that this war is unjust and therefore the killing in it is unjust killing, murder, and hence don’t go into it. Catholics, not right wing Evangelicals, represent the largest group of Christians over there. The

Catholic bishop who is head of the Catholic military diocese of the U.S. and an in-your-face justifier of this war as well as of the Vietnam war to this day, was just named to be Archbishop of the Diocese of Baltimore which is a Cardinal’s Chair. The Catholic Churches policy in the face of the evil of murderous war is as worthy of condemnation as anything the Evangelical right has done to put the aura of Christianity over this war. It is the tried and tested and time-honored policy of institutional survival called “preaching planned moral ambiguity.” It is what was done in Hitler’s Germany and it is what is being done in the U.S. today in relationship to this moral abomination in Iraq. It is as morally despicable as anything the Evangelical right is doing. It is no less a barbarized interpretation of the Gospel and of reality as Franklin Graham, Jerry Falwell, Charles Stanley, et al., are about. “Be silent and if required to speak,

be calculatingly morally ambiguous regardless of how blatant the government’s evil-doings become.” This is pretty much the survival modus operandi of all the mainline Churches but none seem to be able to carry it off so well with this war as the Catholic bishops. Part two of this approach is that after time passes after the war, what is not forgotten about how the Church acted during the war is revised in Church and possibly secular history, unless some group like the Jews with an acute sense of the power of history prevent revision. But this is rare. Chris Hedges also gives the Catholic leadership a near total pass. Ecumenical etiquette has its place but if one is going to name names in one group one is outside of, then why not the others.

Two publications that give no such pass are as mentioned above: James Megivern’s *The Death Penalty: An Historical and Theological Survey*, and James Carroll’s *Constantine’s Sword*. The latter should be taken with a grain of salt given its captivity to Jesus Quester misreading of the New Testament with reference to the Jews.

<sup>44</sup> The gospel has been humiliated because too many American Christians have decided that there are more important things to talk about. We would rather talk about our country, our values, our troops, and our way of life; and although we might think we are paying tribute to God when we speak of these other things, we are only flattering ourselves.

...

What can possibly account for this travesty, other than *massive state process addiction to violence*?

### *Two Metaphors: The Cross and Constantine's Sword*

There is a famous quote about the sword from Church Father Tertullian:

For although soldiers had approached John to receive instructions and a centurion believed, this does not change the fact that *afterward, the Lord, by disarming Peter, disarmed every soldier.*

“It is a great irony of history,” writes theologian Paul Anderson, “that the Cross, symbol of the ultimate triumph of peaceful means to peaceful ends, has been used as a standard in battle (Paul N. Anderson (1992). "Jesus and Peace", pp. 104 - 130, *The Church's Peace Witness*, Marlin E. Miller and Barbara Nelson Gingerich, editors, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, p. 104).”

It is a longstanding truism that one cannot get to the right place in the wrong way. Gandhi said that the means are the ends in embryo. A.J. Muste declared there is no way to peace: peace is the way.

So I present to you two metaphors: *the Cross* and *Constantine's Sword*. The classic text for this is 1 Corinthians 1:18-25:

*For the message of the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God. For it is written: "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise; the intelligence of the intelligent I will frustrate." Where is the wise man? Where is the scholar? Where is the philosopher of this age? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world? For since in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom did not know him, God was pleased through the foolishness of what was preached to save those who believe. Jews demand miraculous signs and Greeks look for wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified: a stumbling block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles, but to those whom God has called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. For the foolishness of God is wiser than man's wisdom, and the weakness of God is stronger than man's strength.*

---

To a nation filled with intense religious fervor, the Hebrew prophet Amos said: You are not the holy people you imagine yourselves to be. Though the land is filled with festivals and assemblies, with songs and melodies, and with so much pious talk, these are not sounds and sights that are pleasing to the Lord. “Take away from me the noise of your congregations,” Amos says, “you who have turned justice into poison.”

He concludes his piece thus:

Franklin Graham, the evangelist (and son of Billy Graham), boasted that the American invasion of Iraq opens up exciting new opportunities for missions to non-Christian Arabs. This is not what the Hebrew or Christian prophets meant by righteousness and discipleship. In fact, the grotesque notion that preemptive war and the destruction of innocent life pave the way for the preaching of the Christian message strikes me as a mockery and a betrayal.

But if Franklin Graham speaks truthfully of the Christian faith and its mission in the world -- as many evangelicals seem to believe -- then we should have none of it. Rather, we should join the ranks of righteous unbelievers and big-hearted humanists who rage against cruelty and oppression with the intensity of people who live fully in this world. I am certain that it would be better for Christians to stand in solidarity with compassionate atheists and agnostics, firmly resolved against injustice and cruelty, than to sing “Amazing Grace” with the heroic masses who cannot tell the difference between the cross and the flag (Marsh, *ibid*, p. 2).

The power of God is conversely evidenced in the abject weakness of the Cross on which Jesus is crucified. The same author, Paul, writes elsewhere:

*My grace is sufficient for you, for my power is made perfect in weakness.” Therefore I will boast all the more gladly about my weaknesses, so that Christ’s power may rest on me. (2 Corinthians 12:9)*

The Cross in early Christian symbolism is at once *ultimate peacemaking* in response to *ephemeral violence*, and *overcoming weakness* in response to *misguided strength*. It is indeed the inverted sword, its sharp edge forever sheathed since on it was crucified the Lord of Glory by the most advanced legal and religious systems of the day.

While the Church was never entirely peace oriented, it was so largely until the era of Constantine. It resisted service in the military because of idolatrous practices, to be sure, but also because military service of the state and carrying out capital punishment *were idolatrous practices for the state*. Under Emperor Constantine, the Cross was unsheathed in what historian Alistair Kee calls in *Constantine versus Christ* the “Judas Kiss” and a great “triumph of ideology” completely alien to the Way of Jesus. Under Constantine, pagans flocked to the Church for baptism as a way of political advancement in an Empire now favouring Christians. By the time of Emperor Theodosius, Constantine’s grandson, *only* Christians could serve in the military. And the Cross, humanity’s ultimate peace symbol, was fully unsheathed and in the Western Church has dripped with blood ever since. The Two studies that especially underscore this are as mentioned in footnote 43, *The Death Penalty: An Historical and Theological Survey*; and *Constantine’s Sword: The Church and the Jews: A History*.

The Church that began with the Cross in embracing the Sword totally lost its way in support of the very scapegoating violence that had killed its Founder.

*War as Addiction to Violence and Twelve Steps of Recovery From Addiction*<sup>45</sup>

If violence is the most profound addiction of humanity, and Western state process violence exponentially worse given its capacity for and legitimation of mass killing, ever in the name of some vaunted self-deceitful goal of “civilization” for “freedom and democracy”, “glory and honour”, “God and Flag” – *whatever!* – then *to be citizen of a Western state is to be addicted to violence, and to be a Western state citizen and addicted to violence, is to stand in need of nonviolent liberation from violence*. This obtains at the personal human level to be sure, but overwhelmingly at the state human!

Chris Hedges wrote:

When we ingest the anodyne of war we feel what those we strive to destroy feel, including the Islamic fundamentalists who are painted as alien, barbaric, and uncivilized. It is the same narcotic (Hedges, *ibid*, p. 5).

This murder in the heart feeling is succinctly captured by James in the Bible:

*What causes fights and quarrels among you? Don’t they come from your desires that*

---

<sup>45</sup> I first developed some of the following material in “Is There A Place for Dreaming?”: see [http://clarionjournal.typepad.com/clarion\\_journal\\_of\\_spirit/wayne\\_northey/](http://clarionjournal.typepad.com/clarion_journal_of_spirit/wayne_northey/) (last accessed September 29, 2009).

*battle within you? You want something but don't get it. You kill and covet, but you cannot have what you want. You quarrel and fight. You do not have, because you do not ask God. (James 4:1-2)*

A Twelve Step Recovery Program from addiction to violence in fact is laid out in Chapter Eight of Glen Stassen's *Just Peacemaking (Transforming Initiatives for Justice and Peace*, Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992).

*A Guiding Principle Of Restorative Justice in Application to International State Conflict: Peacemaking Versus Warmaking*

I will present one overarching guiding principle that arises in the Restorative Justice field of research and practice. *Restorative Justice is supremely a peacemaking rather than a warmaking response to conflict.*

This first most came home to me through the book mentioned above, *Criminology As Peacemaking*, published early in the emerging literature on Restorative Justice.

One of the two editors, Harold Pepinsky, wrote the concluding chapter, "Peacemaking in Criminology and Criminal Justice". He discerns three longstanding traditions of thought that have led to *criminology as peacemaking*: "religious traditions, feminist or women's traditions, and critical traditions ( p. 299)."<sup>46</sup>

He asks, then responds:

What is the obvious connection between crime and war? Crime is violence. So is punishment, and so is war. People who go to war believe that violence works. So do criminals and people who want criminals punished...

But to recognize that the kind of criminologist one is is fundamentally a matter of religious preference is to see that reason cannot dictate whether a criminologist chooses to learn within a paradigm of war or a paradigm of peacemaking (p. 301).

Restorative Justice early on adopted the language of peacemaking, reintegration, *shalom*, reconciliation, forgiveness, relational justice, satisfying justice, informal justice, transformative justice, peacemaking circles, family conferencing, etc. (Many of these are lifted from book titles in my office.) These terms stand in consistent contradiction of all language of war, warfare and warmaking. *For the only enduring peace of all such is the eternal peace of the graveyard.*

---

<sup>46</sup> He goes on to say:

I discovered that by far the strongest contingent [of criminology peacemakers] are workers and activists with religious affiliations, notably the peace churches and ecumenical peace groups. Religiously self-identified people cross all eight intellectual traditions [of criminology as peacemaking] which have emerged: academicians and theorists, activists and reformers, feminists, lawmakers, mediators, native traditionalists, peoples of color, and prisoners ( p. 300).

Anatol Rapoport in *Peace: An Idea Whose Time Has Come* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992)<sup>47</sup> suggests that war and its entire military paraphernalia devoted to the preparation for war, massively vast beyond imagination, is an institution like slavery and capital punishment, whose time has come for its utter and complete abolition by all *truly* civilized nations. This is *the good idea of civilization's total abstention from the state process addiction to violence* Gandhi suggested to warmongering and terrorism promulgator Winston Churchill.

There is a response to Robert McNamara's statement, cited above, when he said:

*What one can criticize is that the human race prior to that time, and today, has not really grappled with what are, I'll call it, "the rules of war." Was there a rule then that said you shouldn't bomb, shouldn't kill, shouldn't burn to death 100,000 civilians in one night?*

Well yes, Mr. McNamara, there is indeed such a rule, and it's been around for some time: *The Golden Rule*, found pretty much universally in all human cultures. Problem is, that Rule says the state, the Western state, "*shouldn't bomb, shouldn't kill, shouldn't burn to death*" even *one civilian! Even one person!!! Not "just this once" – like any addict going back to the substance for "just one more time"!*, as in *World War I being the war to end wars*. Problem is, that Rule brings in fact humanity's oldest addiction to a complete and crashing halt – and demands total abstinence!

All Western Allies returned to the bottle of what may be called violent process addiction: they committed to massive and increasingly deliberate indiscriminate deployment against innocent civilians of the most advanced and devastating weapons of mass destruction in their arsenals. Mahatma Gandhi was indeed on to something in response to Winston Churchill's question about Western civilization: *I think it would indeed be a good idea!*

#### *Western State Process Addiction Promulgated by the Church*

I shall insert at this point that Saint Augustine in the fourth century first invented the Just War Theory that has been the dominant Christian justification for warfare in the West ever since. He drew not from Judeo-Christian Scripture which he never quoted, *not* from Jesus' teaching or major early theological interpreters to that point, but from the Roman Republican Cicero. He also seemed to have lived on another planet in his imagining an ideal of only Christian soldiers defending the state in warfare. Philosopher A. J. Coates writes:

St. Augustine, a major contributor to the just war tradition, argued that, despite the horror of war and the pain and suffering that soldiers inflict on one another, war can be fought without violating the law of charity: to fight without hatred and with compassion is a basic moral imperative<sup>48</sup>. According to realism, however, the imperatives of combat are altogether different. In the first place, military training, or the preparation for combat, is designed to generate in the soldier feelings, dispositions, states of mind that undermine any moral capacity or inclination to fight "justly" or "compassionately", let alone "lovingly". The military trainee is to be divested of his civilian and

---

<sup>47</sup> See John Bacher (Review of *Peace: An Idea Whose Time Has Come*, *Peace Magazine*, Sept.-Oct., 1993, p. 27, <http://archive.peacemagazine.org/v09n4p27a.htm> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>48</sup> And without *lying*, claimed the good Saint! One wonders indeed in just what world Augustine actually lived!

pacifist responses and turned into an efficient “killing machine”. Not only is he to be taught how to kill, but the ardent desire to kill is to be implanted in him. In this way behaviour and attitudes that in peacetime would be regarded as beyond the pale become in war the moral or professional norm. As Field Marshall Montgomery advised: “The troops must be brought to a state of wild enthusiasm before the operation begins... They must enter the fight with the light of battle in their eyes and definitely wanting to kill the enemy” (Montgomery, [B. L. (1958), *Memoirs*, Collins, London], pp. 88 – 9) (*The Ethics of War*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997, p. 29).

Such training is not just to do a “9 to 5” job like Nazi death camp guards however, then punch the clock, return home, hug the wife and kids, and take in a Beethoven concert that evening. It never quite works that way. The “Vietnam Syndrome” was only named such in the 1970’s, but has been reality from time immemorial<sup>49</sup>. The movie *Jarhead* begins and ends with this statement:

A man fires a rifle for many years, and he goes to war. And afterward he turns the rifle in at the armory, and he believes he’s finished with the rifle. But no matter what else he might do with his hands, love a woman, build a house, change his son’s diaper; his hands remember the rifle.

As with child soldiers, once this training to kill has “taken”, full “untraining” becomes virtually impossible. Canada’s “finest” paraded before us by the obsequious press from the Canadian Broadcasting Commission to Global Television, are in fact praising a whole sector of Canadian society that are trained killers and hit-men, some also torturers as several emerging studies underscore<sup>50</sup>, who in civilian times are sadly much more likely to kill given that training and combat experience.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Answers.com supplies this definition: “On an individual level Vietnam syndrome refers to a form of [Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder \(PTSD\)](#) found in 20 to 60 percent of Vietnam veterans. The symptoms include not only all the classic PTSD symptoms such as [anxiety](#), rage, depression, and addiction but also [intrusive](#) combat-related thoughts, nightmares, and flashbacks. Guilt is also a significant part of Vietnam syndrome. Soldiers not only experienced guilt for surviving when their friends did not but also guilt over the Vietnamese killed, especially women and children. The strategies veterans developed to cope with life in a combat zone did not translate back into civilian life and manifested as [dysfunctional](#) behaviors. Treatment for veterans with Vietnam syndrome symptoms includes drug therapy, individual as well as group therapy, and behavior management techniques (<http://www.answers.com/topic/vietnam-syndrome>, last accessed September 29, 2009).”

<sup>50</sup> See a website devoted to resources on this: <http://www.ra-info.org/library/specialbib/tort.shtml> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>51</sup> See: “Article On Veterans Stirs Debate”:

<http://blog.newsweek.com/blogs/soldiershome/archive/2008/01/14/article-on-veterans-committing-murder-stirs-debate.aspx> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

Former war correspondent Chris Hedges in a recent article writes:

Violence is a dark undercurrent of American history. It is exacerbated by war and economic decline. Violence is spreading outward from the killing fields in Iraq and Afghanistan to slowly tear apart individuals, families and communities. There is no immunity. The longer the wars continue, the longer the members of our working class are transformed by corporate overlords into serfs, the more violence will dominate the landscape. The slide into chaos and a police state will become inevitable.

The soldiers and Marines who return from Iraq and Afghanistan are often traumatized and then shipped back a few months later to be traumatized again. This was less frequent in Vietnam. Veterans, when they get out, search for the usual escape routes of alienation, addictions and medication. But there is also the escape route of violence. We risk creating a homegrown *Freikorps*, the demobilized German

In October, 2003, *The Toledo Blade* ran a Pulitzer-Prize winning four-part series, “Buried Secrets, Brutal Truths”, on atrocities committed by an elite army unit, *Tiger Force*, in Vietnam, designated “a rogue unit”. During its reign of terror in the Central Highlands of Vietnam in 1967, hundreds of civilians were mercilessly tortured and murdered. The government investiga-

---

soldiers from World War I who violently tore down the edifice of the Weimar Republic and helped open the way to Nazism.

The Afghanistan and Iraq wars have unloaded hundreds of thousands of combat troops, suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder or major depression, back into society. According to a joint Veterans Affairs Department-University of San Francisco study published in July, 418,000 of the roughly 1.9 million service members who have fought in or supported the wars suffer from PTSD. As of August 2008, the latest data available, about a quarter-million military veterans were imprisoned on any given day—about 9.4 percent of the total daily imprisoned population, according to the [National GAINS Center Forum](#) on Combat Veterans, Trauma and the Justice System. There are 223,000 veterans in jail or prison cells on an average day, and an unknown number among the 4 million Americans on probation. They don’t have much to look forward to upon release. And if any of these incarcerated vets do not have PTSD when they are arrested, our corrections system will probably rectify the deficiency. Throw in the cocktail of unemployment, powerlessness, depression, alienation, anger, alcohol and drugs and you create thousands, if not tens of thousands, who will seek out violence the way an addict seeks out a bag of heroin.

...

There are minefields of stimulants for those who return from war. Smells, sounds, bridges, the whoosh of a helicopter, thrust you back to Iraq or another zone of slaughter, back to a time of terror and blood, back to the darkest regions of your heart, regions you wish did not exist. Life, on some days, is a simple battle to stay upright, to cope with memories and trauma that are unexplainable, probably unimaginable, to those seated across from you at the breakfast table. Families will watch these veterans fall silent, see the thousand-yard stare, and know they have again lost these men and women. They hope somehow they will come back. Some won’t. Those who cannot cope, even by using Zoloft or Paxil, blow their brains out with drugs, alcohol or a gun. More Vietnam veterans died from suicide in the years after the war than during the conflict itself. But it would be a mistake to blame this on Vietnam. War does this to you. It destroys part of you. You live maimed. If you are not able to live maimed, you check out.

But what happens in a society where everything conspires to check you out even when you make the herculean effort to integrate into the world of malls, celebrity gossip and too many brands of cereal on a supermarket shelf? What happens when the corporate state says that you can die in its wars but at home you are human refuse, that there is no job, no way to pay your medical bills or your mortgage, no hope? Then you retreat into your private hell of rage, terror and alienation. You do not return from the world of war. You yearn for its sleek and powerful weapons, its speed and noise, its ability to abolish the lines between sanity and madness. You long for the alluring, hallucinogenic landscapes of combat. You miss the psychedelic visions of carnage and suffering, the smells, sounds, shrieks, explosions and destruction that jolt you back to the present, which make you aware in ways you never were before. The thrill of violence, the God-like power that comes when you can take a human life with impunity, is matched against the pathetic existence of waiting for an unemployment check. You look to rejoin the fraternity of killers. Here. There. It no longer matters.

...

It is we who are guilty, guilty for sending these young men and women to wars that did not have to be fought. It is we who are guilty for turning away from the truth of war to wallow in a self-aggrandizing myth, guilty because we create and decorate killers and when they come home maimed and broken we discard them (<http://dandelionsalad.wordpress.com/2009/09/14/stop-begging-obama-to-be-obama-and-get-mad-by-chris-hedges/>, last accessed September 29, 2009).

tion into these atrocities was intended to remain buried forever. There were no criminal charges laid.<sup>52</sup>

In a December 28, 2003 article, *The New York Times* quoted David Hackworth, creator of the Tiger Force unit:

Vietnam was an atrocity from the get-go. It was that kind of war, a frontless war of great frustration. There were hundreds of My Lais<sup>53</sup>. You got your card punched by the numbers of bodies you counted.

The article adds:

But they [those from Tiger Force interviewed] wanted to make another point: that Tiger Force had not been a ‘rogue’ unit. Its members had done only what they were told, and their superiors knew what they were doing (Kifner, John (2003). “Report on Brutal Vietnam Campaign Stirs Memories”, *The New York Times*, December 28, 2003,

<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/12/28/national/28TIGER.html?ex=1073639319&ei=1&en=94ecfbb2e66368dd> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

This “defence” was regularly heard at the Nuremberg Trials.

In fact, in some ways, the trial for the My Lai massacres reversed the Nuremberg Trials precedent of indefensibility of “just following orders”, and acquitted all but one officer, William Calley, himself obviously the U.S. government scapegoat, as lowly prison guards became such at Iraq’s infamous Abu Grahیب prison, despite in both instances orders that came from the highest levels of military and political authority in the United States.

Calley’s life sentence was immediately commuted by President Nixon. Calley in fact served a grand total of four and a half months at Fort Benning! What was it itself renowned for, and possibly Calley helped in the instruction? Fort Benning trained right-wing dictatorship police, prison guards, and military in all the fine arts of political suppression through large-scale torture, kidnappings, and murders. It was officially called, “School of the Americas” (SOA), but to those who knew, including thousands of its graduates, it was in truth a “School of Assassins”.

Incidentally, as a metaphor of how and why lies are told by police, guards, and military personnel in Western democracies<sup>54</sup>, then Major Colin Powell, in true Lord of the Bedchamber Scape-

---

<sup>52</sup> See: <http://www.toledoblade.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20031022/SRTIGERFORCE/110190169> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>53</sup> See the *Wikipedia Encyclopedia* article about My Lai, and weep ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/My\\_Lai\\_Massacre](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/My_Lai_Massacre), last accessed September 29, 2009)! Then try to claim that this is not routine Western military practice and ordered at the highest levels of military command all the way up to the highest political leadership in whatever Western nation. Then, if you still will not believe it, read Chris Hedges’ *War Is a Force That Gives Us Meaning*. Then remember that *scapegoating* is invariably hidden throughout all cultures and times.

<sup>54</sup> After World War I, British MP Arthur Ponsonby published *Falsehood in War-Time: Propaganda Lies in the First World War* (1928) and summed up his conclusion thus:

Is further proof needed that international war is a monster born of hypocrisy, fed on falsehood, fattened on humbug, kept alive by superstition, directed to the death and torture of millions, succeeding in no high purpose, degrading to humanity, endangering civilization and bringing forth in its travail a hideous brood of strife, conflict and war, more war? Yet statesmen still hesitate to draw the sword of their wits to destroy it.

(Arthur Augustus William Harry Ponsonby, 1st Baron Ponsonby of Shulbrede (16 February 1871 - 23 March 1946) was a British politician, writer, and social activist. He was the third son of Sir Henry Ponsonby, Private Secretary

goating Denial fashion, who had been appointed lead army investigator into claims about American atrocities such as My Lai, did his obsequious self-serving career usual: he bum-wiped Emperor Nixon, white-washing the American Emperor's My-Lai massacre and hundreds like it. He concluded his "thorough" investigation with these classic words about how Americans have treated no doubt all its enemy civilians around the world:

In direct refutation of this [murderous] portrayal [of the American army] is the fact that relations between American soldiers and the Vietnamese people are excellent.

Later, in 2003, now Secretary of State but still Lord of the Bedchamber Colin Powell continued his bum-wiping under then Emperor Bush, and far more famously and overtly lied to the world at the United Nations on the eve of the Second Gulf War in declaring that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Shortly afterwards and since in fact weapons of mass destruction were found throughout Iraq: *all launched by the U.S.-led "Coalition of the Willing"*.

No one knows the exact civilian body count resulting from the lies and consequent U.S. and Allied slaughter in Iraq to which Powell directly contributed. But it has been indiscriminate and massive in comparison to the 3,000 American civilians killed September 11, 2001. As mentioned above, a study in 2006 by the prestigious British medical journal, *Lancet* reported:

A team of American and Iraqi epidemiologists estimates that 655,000 more people have died in Iraq since coalition forces arrived in March 2003 than would have died if the invasion had not occurred...

Of the total 655,000 estimated "excess deaths," 601,000 resulted from violence and the rest from disease and other causes, according to the study. This is about 500 unexpected violent deaths per day throughout the country...

The surveyors said they found a steady increase in mortality since the invasion, with a steeper rise in the last year that appears to reflect a worsening of violence as reported by the U.S. military, the news media and civilian groups. In the year ending in June, the team calculated Iraq's mortality rate to be roughly four times what it was the year before the war. ("Study Claims Iraq's 'Excess' Death Toll Has Reached 655,000", By David Brown, Washington Post Staff Writer, Wednesday, October 11, 2006; <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/10/10/AR2006101001442.html>, last accessed September 11, 2009).

Typical of American Empire and all Empire culture throughout history, for a career of such consistent obsequious lies about and consequent massive killings of innocent civilians and untold

---

to Queen Victoria. Lord Ponsonby is probably most remembered for the statement: "When war is declared, truth is the first casualty." See: [http://books.google.ca/books?id=4WMkABeRQDkC&dq=ponsonby+-+falsehood+in+wartime&printsec=frontcover&source=bl&ots=-bBuy3sIoK&sig=feqG\\_auuoeZ\\_BijrMpHdet7u-rQ&hl=en&ei=tMyfSpmIII7QM4yDjdcP&sa=X&oi=book\\_result&ct=result&resnum=4#v=onepage&q=&f=false](http://books.google.ca/books?id=4WMkABeRQDkC&dq=ponsonby+-+falsehood+in+wartime&printsec=frontcover&source=bl&ots=-bBuy3sIoK&sig=feqG_auuoeZ_BijrMpHdet7u-rQ&hl=en&ei=tMyfSpmIII7QM4yDjdcP&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=4#v=onepage&q=&f=false), last accessed September 29, 2009)

See as well the story of the suppression of reportage about the effects of bombing Hiroshima and Nagasaki at: <http://www.motherjones.com/commentary/columns/2005/08/hiroshima.html> (last accessed September 29, 2009). State lies about war are normative.

carnage endorsed and wreaked, in 2005 Colin and Alma Powell were awarded the Woodrow Wilson Award for Public Service<sup>55</sup> by the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars of the Smithsonian Institution. Powell's contributions to mass slaughter are of course far beyond the wildest imaginings of mere run-of-the-mill American or Canadian mass murderers like Charles Manson and Robert Picton, or even World War II General Curtis LeMay with Tokyo, Hiroshima, and Nagasaki combined. Who could claim, if one is a Western state patriot, that the crime of civilian mass murder does not pay?

It is claimed on the contrary that Colin Powell and so many of his ilk according to the Woodrow Wilson award wording, have "shown a special commitment to seeking out informed opinions and thoughtful views". Except of course for those of the tens of thousands into the millions of Vietnamese civilians dead at the hands of American soldiers whose views were not sought out. Perhaps in truth there was a love-in between Vietnamese civilians and American soldiers during the Vietnam War, but no one was asking the Vietnamese civilian dead about it. Except again of course for the 655,000 and counting Iraqi civilian dead by 2006 since the American launch of the Second Gulf War in 2003. But again, presumably good citizen Powell did not bother to "seek out informed opinions and thoughtful views" from those dead, ideally even before their immolation, perhaps because Afro-American Powell might hold a "white-man's-burden" racist view that those soon-to-be-dead Iraqis in fact had none to offer?...

The Jim Carrey movie, *Liar, Liar, Liar* is too fitting for all our Western state politicians in relation to war. It is known that the Gulf of Tonkin incident that justified the beginning of the Vietnam War was fabricated by the Eisenhower regime. It may be that the bombing of Pearl Harbor was "permitted" by the Roosevelt administration that needed a widely accepted incentive for entering World War II, over against a longstanding public attitude of "splendid isolation". It is also widely conjectured that the 9/11 incident was at least allowed to proceed by the Bush administration in order to launch a worldwide enduring crusade (the original language used) against Islamic terrorists. It is also widely known that the international terrorist organization Al Qaida is a product not of Islam, but of the CIA in its failed bid to defeat Russia in Afghanistan. International Islamic terrorism is a gift to the world by the American Empire.<sup>56</sup>

Former Democratic Presidential candidate John Kerry gave evidence before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1971. He reported that American soldiers in Vietnam had "raped, cut off heads, taped wires from portable telephones to human genitals and turned up the power, cut off limbs, blown up bodies, randomly shot at civilians, razed villages in fashion reminiscent of Genghis Khan, shot cattle and dogs for fun, poisoned food stocks and generally ravaged the countryside of South Vietnam in addition to the normal ravage of war, and the normal and very

---

<sup>55</sup> The Woodrow Wilson Award for Public Service is given to individuals who have served with distinction in public life and have shown a special commitment to seeking out informed opinions and thoughtful views. Recipients of this award share Woodrow Wilson's steadfast belief in public discourse, scholarship, and the extension of the benefits of knowledge in the United States and around the world. These leaders devote themselves to examining the historical background and long-term implications of important public policy issues while encouraging the free and open exchange of ideas that is the bedrock of our nation's foundation ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Woodrow\\_Wilson\\_Awards](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Woodrow_Wilson_Awards), last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>56</sup> See Mahmood Mamdani, *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: America, the Cold War, and the Roots of Terror*, New York: Three Leaves Press/Doubleday, 2004.

particular ravaging which is done by the applied bombing power of this country.”<sup>57</sup> A similar reality is being revealed repeatedly in the War on Terror in Afghanistan and Iraq.

But we Westerners do not see and do not want to acknowledge any of this because, like the Lords of the Bedchamber, our entire way of life, our vaunted superior Western culture, our saccharine secularism that a Rick Cluff or a Stephen Quinn or a Peter Mansbridge (did I almost say “Mansfield”?) on the CBC and a host of other tranquillizing normalizers of the status quo let on day after day that everything is fine, that all is indeed “quiet on the Western (Cultural) Front”. Nothing to worry about when our boys and girls go off to defend Canada and the Western World from terrorism. Such lulled-to-sleep normalcy like that of civilian life in Nazi Germany would in fact collapse around us if we actually acknowledged, when it comes to indiscriminate mass murder and mayhem violence, the *true naked asshole* nature of an Emperor Obama to the south who as we speak has almost doubled American troop presence in Afghanistan; not to mention in this respect *naked asshole* Bush and all wartime and post-War American Empire Presidents before.

This self-serving premeditated ignorance and Western Scapegoating Denial is reminiscent of a scene from *Watership Down*, where a rabbit warren is discovered that seems the ultimate ideal rabbit lifestyle: lots of food, space, and safety. But then an awful truth is discovered: the implicit pact with violence committed by the local farmer who liked his daily rabbit stew. Western culture, all human culture, tragically has a similar pact with the devil, with violence, with death. The origin of the Olympic Games in ancient Greece was not the naïve niceties of international cooperation where all are smiles and goodwill as sold to us in the West, and soon again to be showcased in British Columbia (with an obscene billion plus security bill). The ancient Olympics originated in the brutality of War Games where fights to the death were routine, since for ancient Greeks there was no glory to be had in an afterlife.<sup>58</sup>

A writer friend, Lloyd Billingsley, once described the United States to me as a society so nearly ideal that only a bit of tweaking here and there was needed to make it for all intents perfect. I asked him at the time (still do) what planet he had grown up on! As with formation in criminal law, there is obviously a certain kind of American Empire mentality and wider that is trained to focus on non-essentials and only see highly selectively, such that all significant human relationality is lost to view. A CIA operative wrote a book about the War on Terror entitled *Imperial*

---

<sup>57</sup> The full article may be found at:

<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/12/28/national/28TIGE.html?ex=1073639319&ei=1&en=94ecfbb2e66368dd>.

<sup>58</sup> See “What Olympic Ideal?”,

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/08/08/magazine/WLN130551.html?ex=1092967840&ei=1&en=939c3a57b7d76b00>  
(last accessed September 29, 2009). The author writes:

The problem, of course, is that such notions [such as an Olympic spirit of friendship, gentlemanly cooperation, chivalry, honor and disinterest] are wholly foreign to the Greek way of thinking, which actually has more in common with the relentless egotism, nationalism, promotion and self-promotion of athletes we associate with professional sports than with any fantasy of the noble Greek spirit. A lot of the sentimentality of the modern Olympics -- the relentless emphasis on human-interest drama, the uncomfortable efforts to maintain the thin pretense that politics are absent, the ceaseless rhetoric of pure athleticism, even after the all-amateur rules were abandoned -- looks, if anything, like the uncomfortable byproduct of our compensatory desire to graft Judeo-Christian values onto the irreducible, very ancient and very ugly business of competitiveness.

*Hubris: Why the West is Losing the War on Terror* (Dulles, Va.: Brassey's, 2004)<sup>59</sup>. In an interview with NBC Chief foreign affairs correspondent Andrew Mitchell<sup>60</sup>, Scheuer blatantly stated: That's the way war is. I've never really understood the idea that any American government, any American elected official is responsible for protecting civilians who are not Americans.

Chillingly, if America is to be protected, *all other citizens of the world are expendable!* But is that not the case with the Allies in general, Canadians no less? My friend Lloyd is right at home with this sentiment. Chillingly also for me, I once realized after a phone conversation with him, that *I, his friend, was similarly ultimately expendable if I opposed "Truth, Justice, and the American Way"*<sup>61</sup>, as Superman used to say – though interestingly, not yet in the updated series. So would, perhaps, most urbane status quo culture purveyors in Canada today sacrifice anyone who was not similarly “loyal”, from in this sense high priests Governor General Michaëlle Jean to our current political leaders to most public news purveyors.

Again, would not most say, “Surely not! We’d never slaughter the innocents!”?

As Isaiah (6:9) puts it, reprised in Matthew’s and John’s Gospels:

*He said, “Go and tell this people: “‘Be ever hearing, but never understanding; be ever seeing, but never perceiving.’ Make the heart of this people calloused; make their ears dull and close their eyes. Otherwise they might see with their eyes, hear with their ears, understand with their hearts, and turn and be healed.”*

There *is* no civilization without state-sanctioned violence: from the beginning, throughout, to the very end! If we can acknowledge this, agree it is wrong to live off the avails of such pervasive violence, and commit to work towards the abolition of violence from society where it is fully legitimate and promulgated, by the state, we will advance towards at last being a “civilization” in the best Christian humanist sense of the term. If one asks where violence is officially legitimated in the West and hence serves as society’s ultimate model in schoolyard bullying, domestic violence, and commission of murder, the answer is: *at the state government level.*

### *Ethical Epistemology*

“Epistemology” is how we know, and how we know that we know. One of my friends grew up in the Church, participated in it actively when I first knew her, then rejected it along with all

---

<sup>59</sup> It was initially published anonymously. The author in fact was Michael Scheuer.

<sup>60</sup> See: <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/5279743/> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>61</sup> The “American Way” has been predominantly “American Exceptionalism”:

**American exceptionalism** (def. "[exceptionalism](#)") refers to the theory that the [United States](#) occupies a special niche among the nations of the world<sup>[1]</sup> in terms of its national [credo](#), historical evolution, political and religious institutions and unique origins. The roots of the term are attributed to [Alexis de Tocqueville](#),<sup>[2]</sup> who claimed that the then-50-year-old United States held a special place among nations, because it was a country of [immigrants](#) and the first [modern democracy](#).<sup>[citation needed]</sup> The term itself did not emerge until after [World War II](#)<sup>[3]</sup> when it was embraced by [neoconservative](#)<sup>[4]</sup> [pundits](#) in what was described in the *International Herald Tribune* as "an ugly twist of fate".<sup>[5]</sup> (See: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American\\_exceptionalism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_exceptionalism), last accessed September 29, 2009).

Church dogma ever since. Bob Dylan rightly sings “You Gotta Serve Somebody”<sup>62</sup>, just as you gotta believe something. When my friend left Christian belief this did not make her into an independent moral agent free of “religious” commitment. On the contrary, she rejected her *Christian beliefs* for a *secular faith*. Her ethics have now a more inchoate epistemology, product of her personal choices except the hidden ones she herself does not know of. One such is the inevitability and hence rightfulness of state violence. She will not look at state violence as modelled behaviour that first and foremost calls for prevention, since it is not under the “light” of pragmatic acceptability to challenge. She therefore relegates that option to the dark area of “unthinkable”, even if it is key to the whole problem.

Yet her career with a secular international service agency has been entirely directed towards violence prevention in the family, schoolyard, and generally domestically. I ask: *How does she know that what she knows about violence prevention will actually go far enough down to address its source?* She of course does not. Furthermore, it is my contention that she is *not looking far enough down – down in the dark part of human culture, namely state-sanctioned violence.*

I suggest Western culture is composed of a society of self-deceiving would-be alchemists. We somehow believe that police, guards, and military trained in tactical violence including lethal somehow can live free of using it privately in “civilized” society; and somehow keep others from emulating their professional violent behaviour – though it screams at us for imitation from all Western cultural outlets. A poster I once saw with a handgun pointed at the viewer reads: “Portrait of a fellow American exercising his ‘constitutional rights’”. We also believe in a magical alchemy that the mayhem wanton violence in particular of mass military killing will somehow a nonviolent civilization make. It appears that not just the good saint Augustine with his Christian Just War theory and my friend Lloyd grew up on another planet.

What is your *ethical epistemology*? How do we know, and know that we know, what is right? Put differently, do we know our ethical starting-point or points? It is widely acknowledged by philosophers of science that science proceeds not on the basis of its own scientifically discovered presuppositions, but on values and assumptions arrived at from elsewhere.<sup>63</sup> *So it is with ethics.*

I once formally dialogued with a political scientist about the rightness of the NATO invasion of Bosnia. He did not declare in advance his ethical epistemology. At one point, he stated that a NATO-caused civilian death toll of whatever thousands was “not all that bad”, by whatever standard he was using – but not telling. A then recent NATO bombing had taken out the telecommunications tower in Sarajevo. I asked him, not knowing he actually had an adult daughter, to imagine a daughter visiting a hairdresser friend in that same tower the day of the bombing. When I asked him to imagine his response to the same collateral damage statistic but now with

---

<sup>62</sup> See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sqxW6E24Jh8> (last accessed September 29, 2009); for the lyrics see: <http://www.bobdylan.com/#/songs/gotta-serve-somebody> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>63</sup> David Cayley of *CBC Ideas* draws on his twenty-four hour series “How To Think About Science” (<http://www.cbc.ca/ideas/features/science/index.html>, last accessed September 29, 2009) in opining about the book *Reason, Faith, and Revolution: Reflections on the God Debate*:

[Terry Eagleton’s] conclusions resonate in various ways with a theme that runs through “How To Think About Science” in several different keys: *science’s complete dependence on purposes and presuppositions which are necessarily established outside of science* (italics added).

his daughter numbered among the dead, he turned instantly furious, and told me I could not ask that kind of question!

But of course!: every civilian dead from collateral damage is someone's daughter, sister, mother, grandmother, aunt, great-aunt, etc. What I had achieved by that personal scenario was eliciting his ethical epistemology, which obviously included in part: *no dead personal family members from NATO bombs!* I'll go for that! I'd even push for a mass stationing of NATO political and military leaders' loved-ones at every NATO ground zero site as one potential way to stop Western Allied mass slaughter. Some actually urged then Pope John Paul II to take up residence at an unknown location in Baghdad in hopes it might have stopped U.S. "shock and awe" bombing on the eve of the Second Gulf War, March 2003. If only! On a smaller scale, Christian Peacemaker Teams recruit, train and deploy personnel to precisely that end.<sup>64</sup>

What if an Al Qaida cell took several hostage at the seniors residence in Abbotsford where our agency has an office? What if the response of the Canadian government after days of tense stand-off and international news hype authorized going in with machine guns blazing, or taking out the building itself in order to deal with the Al Qaida threat? Can you imagine the hue and cry against such police or military action? Yet the hostages' death would be after all "just collateral damage" in the ultimate best solution of the incident: the safety of the rest of Canada and warning to all would-be terrorists on Canadian soil about any future al Qaida threat. But that is unthinkable to allow happen inside Canada. Though M.O.V.E. headquarters were bombed by police in Philadelphia<sup>65</sup>, and the F.B.I. also slaughtered many innocents in Waco, Texas<sup>66</sup>.

It happens "over there" with regularity and impunity. Why? Is the most straightforward reason not the scapegoating racism of the "white man's burden"?

### *René Girard and Scapegoating Violence*

Anthropologist René Girard made what he calls for him a *second* great moment of discovery, namely that all human culture participates in an all-pervasive "scapegoat mechanism". If true, the enormous irony in Christianity is: the faith that was initially built upon the revelation of God in Christ of a totally nonviolent mimetic desire imitating Christ turns the symbol of that very rejection of violence, the Cross, into the model for how Christians have interpreted the work of Christ, the atonement, ever since. Because God ordered the execution of Christ, the dominant theology goes – all the way back to Saint Anselm in the 11th century – he not only therefore models an ultimate violent response to enemies, but as well decrees violence upon all who literally or vicariously participated in crucifying the Lord of Glory – the very execution God ordained yet by that theory then punishes the God-ordained perpetrators! Says Gil Bailie:

The most familiar form of the atonement doctrine... supposes that a wrathful God demanded that a victim pay in blood for human sin... and that God chose to take a human form and pay for the sin 'Himself.' It is an understandable doctrine, given the religious and cultic backdrop against which early Christian thought was first forming. But the doctrine is not only logically incoherent; it is morally and theologically inade-

---

<sup>64</sup> See: <http://www.cpt.org/> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>65</sup> See: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MOVE> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>66</sup> See: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Waco\\_Siege](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Waco_Siege) (last accessed September 29, 2009).

quate as well (Gil Bailie, *Violence Unveiled: Humanity at the Crossroads*, New York: Crossroad, p. 37).

The above is what usually is called the “satisfaction theory” of the atonement, reflective of an 11<sup>th</sup> century feudal culture where the lord of the manor demanded violent “satisfaction” of his serfs for offences committed. Girard throughout his writing anathematizes it, and another interpreter dubs it a “mysticism of pain which promises redemption to those who pay in blood (Timothy Gorringer, *God’s Just Vengeance: Crime, Violence and the Rhetoric of Salvation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 102).” It is this theory that gives rise to the dominant form of Western criminal justice, “retributive justice” that has bequeathed a nightmare of horrific pain upon convicted criminals to this day.

Two years ago, Brad Jersak and Michael Hardin published a book entitled *Stricken By God?: Nonviolent Identification and the Victory of Christ* (Abbotsford: Fresh Wind Press/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007). All of us, from across the spectrum of Christian faith traditions, argued in that publication for non-violence in God, and therefore in humanity.

Girard’s second great moment of discovery of the “scapegoat mechanism” in all human culture completed the “mimetic theory” for which he has become word-famous, and in honour of whom an annual Colloquium on Violence and Religion (COV&R) is convened<sup>67</sup>. Scapegoating is “The age-old way of gaining release from the violence or potential violence that mimesis [imitation] produces ... through nonconscious [societal] convergence upon a victim (*The Girard Reader*, New York: Crossroad Herder, James G. Williams, 1996, p. 293).” The Holocaust directed toward the Jews by the people of Germany in World War II is a classic instance of a centuries old practice by Christians both productive of, and resulting from in part in Western history, a “satisfaction theory” of the atonement.

Girard understands the birth of all cultures, including Christendom and Christian culture, to arise from the unanimity achieved by scapegoating a victim or victims. Ritual, prohibition, and myth dominant in all cultures religious and secular arise in the repeated exercise of a sacrificial mechanism designed to re-establish the peace. Cultic rites the world over in archaic religions and scapegoating interpretations of Christianity demonstrate the phenomenon; the criminal justice system in a secular society as mentioned above serves a similar “scapegoating mechanism” function (*Scapegoats, the Bible, and Criminal Justice: Interacting with René Girard*, Vern Redekop, Akron: Mennonite Central Committee., 1993, pp. 32ff) – though this was not initially recognized by Girard in *Violence and the Sacred* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University 1977, pp. 22 & 23).

The “scapegoat mechanism” is “simply a generative scapegoat principle which works unconsciously in culture and society (Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 294).” Its hiddenness is key to its unthinking functioning. A mundane example is: I return from work troubled by conflict with a colleague. I begin yelling at the kids. My wife, ever patient, gently asks if it was another difficult day with Sam. I suddenly realize my violence towards my kids is an unconscious scapegoat mechanism. If I am sensitive, I hopefully stop immediately yelling at them and make amends<sup>68</sup>.

---

<sup>67</sup> See: <http://www.uibk.ac.at/theol/cover/> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>68</sup> I could, however, also turn more violent! This can explain why Christ said:

Gil Bailie as quoted earlier supplies a more sinister example, the 1989 execution of serial killer Theodore Bundy, when hundreds of men, women and children camped outside the Florida prison in a festive spirit one reporter likened to a *Mardi Gras*. The same reporter described the event as “a brutal act... [done] in the name of civilization (Bailie, *op. cit.*, p. 79).” All cultures, Western societies no less, are unwittingly committed through our military, police, and prisons, to *perpetuating brutal acts done in the name of civilization*.

The grand enterprise of the Gospel impetus is to reinvent culture consonant with the Peaceable Kingdom:

*The wolf will live with the lamb, the leopard will lie down with the goat, the calf and the lion and the yearling together; and a little child will lead them. The cow will feed with the bear, their young will lie down together, and the lion will eat straw like the ox. The infant will play near the hole of the cobra, and the young child put his hand into the viper's nest. They will neither harm nor destroy on all my holy mountain, for the earth will be full of the knowledge of the LORD as the waters cover the sea (Isa 11:6-9).*

What Girard considers the most difficult aspect for others to grasp of his understanding of Christianity is “that scapegoating does not play an essential role in the Gospels, whereas it has an enormous role in myths since it generates them.” In fact, says Girard, “...Christianity ... [witnesses] to the God who reveals himself to be the *arch*-scapegoat in order to liberate humankind (Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 263).” Now that turns the traditional doctrine of the atonement on its head, and reveals the scapegoat mechanism to be part of the murderous lie upon which all cultures (including Christendom) are founded and from which the Jesus story is the Ultimate Declaration of Emancipation!

In this regard, Girard argues that the biblical message *after* the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ (this terminology is in the Book of Hebrews<sup>69</sup>), as mentioned earlier, is: *all are innocent. There is no one guilty, no not one!* Put otherwise: *Jesus' death spells universal end to scapegoating in the private/personal and in the socio-political realms.*

*“Vision Unrequited”: Hope For the Western State Process Addict and Costa Rica, a Case Study*

For centuries in the West it was unthinkable theologically and pragmatically that the state not keep capital punishment in its arsenal against its domestic enemies, criminals. There are very few Western states today that still execute criminals. The American Empire state is one of them. And in that country state-sanctioned violence is disproportionately meted out against the poor and non-white, with false convictions a significant percentage reality.<sup>70</sup>

---

*“Do not suppose that I have come to bring peace to the earth. I did not come to bring peace, but a sword. For I have come to turn ‘a man against his father, a daughter against her mother, a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law - a man's enemies will be the members of his own household.’ (Matt 10:34-36 )”*

<sup>69</sup> Hebrews 10:10.

<sup>70</sup> See <http://www.deathpenaltyinfo.org/home> (last accessed September 29, 2009) for multiple resources on this issue in the U.S.A.

Anatol Rapoport as mentioned earlier proposed the Western state abolition of war as viable and timely. I do too.<sup>71</sup>

He explains that institutions fall into disuse and disappear when no longer serving a cultural purpose. He thinks in Western culture we already have arrived there. He explains:

Up until World War I, war was romanticized and glorified, at least in Europe, as the highest expression of the human spirit, which was identified, as a matter of course, with the national spirit. Today it is at most rationalized as a necessary evil, practically never glorified or romanticized.

So, why does it continue to have such coinage and a bright future, especially, one can add now, with a perpetual War on Terror on the books?

Rapoport looks at the United States, not traditionally a militaristic nation, for answers. He writes:

I believe that the war system in the United States derives its vitality and potential for unimpeded growth from three components of what one might call the main stream American ideology. One is technolatriy (an analogue of idolatry), that is, worship of technology. Another is business mentality. Recall Calvin Coolidge's profound summary of American civilization, "The business of America is business." Finally, the mainstream American aspiration is to "succeed," whereby its material rewards are valued not so much as a key to unlimited consumption and luxuries as for their certification of victory in competition.

Rapoport believes that these broad cultural values can be changed, thereby eliminating the institution of war itself.

In the month and year I was born, Costa Rica abolished its military. According to *Wikipedia*, there are twenty-one nations without a military<sup>72</sup>. On the day, month and year I was born, ten days in fact after Costa Rica abolished its military, the United Nations also issued its International Declaration of Human Rights. I like that my birth is associated with both these dates.

Costa Rica was bordered to the north and south in 1948 by bellicose nations, and in its sixty years without an army, this continues to be so. It has enjoyed nonetheless a peaceful existence; a comparatively (to other Central American nations) strong economy, and overall strong social programs. Former President Oscar Arias won the Nobel Peace Prize for his role in ending the conflicts in El Salvador and Nicaragua, and was an ambassador for peace out of the Costa Rican vision of no more military and no more war.

An essay on this phenomenon using what it calls a "levels-of-analysis" approach<sup>73</sup> begins:

---

<sup>71</sup> I was unable to secure a copy of his book, *Peace: An Idea Whose Time Has Come*, mentioned above. I am drawing on an article published here: <http://archive.peacemagazine.org/v13n5p16.htm> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>72</sup> See: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_countries\\_without\\_armed\\_forces](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_without_armed_forces) (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>73</sup> [It will] attempt to show how the systemic, domestic, and idiosyncratic levels were all crucial to the decision to abolish the military.

Since time immemorial, our world has been plagued by strife, war, and conflict. It is difficult to imagine today a world wholly absent of war. For this reason, attaining military strength has been one of the primary policy goals of nearly every state, kingdom, and empire in the history of the world. There are very few nation-states that would willingly give up the military strength they have, and most of those who have may not have done so without having been forced by stronger powers. It would be difficult to say that any country at all would be willing to give up their military strength for some greater purpose if it were not the case that Costa Rica has done so (Bailey, "How Costa Rica Lost Its Military" (<http://bailey83221.livejournal.com/45020.html>), last accessed September 29, 2009)

I offer Rapoport's book and life mission, and Costa Rica's case study to suggest that what Ken Wilber calls a "vision unrequited"<sup>74</sup>, namely, the abolition of a nation's military and with it the disappearance of the institution of war, is not unthinkable.

### *Abolition of State-Sanctioned Violence: Why Not?*

If my thesis-question is right, I want to ask where does one go from here? I asked in each of my discussions of war, police, and prisons: *How can we invest ultimate power of life and death in our military, police, and prisons ("state-sanctioned violence"), and in the politicians directing them, with their pervasive deceit, self-serving and criminal wrong-doing; and deny that widespread psychological and physical destruction of innocent civilians is the consequent norm?*

I wish to end the paper by pointing to one possible alternative: to the institution of war.<sup>75</sup>

In the Judeo-Christian concept of Time, an event referenced by all Western calendars as Year Zero, the Birth, Cross, and Resurrection of Christ, are seen ever after in *chronological time* to pre-determine the *Now* of human existence in terms of the *Then* of what we're living towards: *Kingdom Come, already begun, not yet consummated*. In other words, *the future is now* is not just empty sloganeering: it is profound reality – the only ultimate *Realpolitik* if you like – to be lived out right now, however "unrequited", incompletely, imperfectly. A former local music group Salmon and Mulder caught it in a song years ago: "*Stumbling Heavenwards*".

This is a key Judeo-Christian concept with enormous ethical implications. For instance: short-term sexual gratification in "cheating" on one's partner may seem, in the "heat" of the moment alright<sup>76</sup>, but it has long-term devastating consequences, for it is violation of this very Judeo-Christian principle – quite apart from being a violation of the marriage vow<sup>77</sup>.

---

<sup>74</sup> See: <http://wilber.shambhala.com/html/misc/iraq.cfm> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>75</sup> I'm drawing again on research at St. Paul's University and my resultant paper entitled "Is There A Place for Dreaming?": see [http://clarionjournal.typepad.com/clarion\\_journal\\_of\\_spirit/wayne\\_northey/](http://clarionjournal.typepad.com/clarion_journal_of_spirit/wayne_northey/) (last accessed September 29, 2009). Lee Griffith has also written a vigorous challenge to prison as weapon in the war on crime in *The Fall of the Prison: Biblical Perspectives on Prison Abolition*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1993.

<sup>76</sup> Remember that Oscar-winning movie, *Shakespeare in [Heat]* with Gwyneth Paltrow?

<sup>77</sup> If Presidents Kennedy and Clinton demonstrated repeatedly that their marriage vows were lies, where does the lying leave off and statesmanship begin? Obviously, it did not! It probably never does, as discussed above.

Arguably, all the best social changes known to humanity began with an imagination of an “unexperienced” future *that is now!* That’s how the Montgomery Bus Boycott started with Rosa Parks. She sat down and refused to move in a bid to live out the *future* right *now!* That’s how Gandhi helped achieved Indian independence from the British Raj. That’s how Martin Luther King, Jr. changed the face of civil rights in the Deep South. The examples could be multiplied<sup>78</sup>.

For several centuries in the West, the institutions of slavery and the slave-trade were part of the state apparatus and unquestioned in their legitimacy by most. Capital punishment was also once an unquestioned institution in most Western nations. Today, most Western countries have abolished these institutions for the *inhuman barbarisms* (President Roosevelt) they are.

*It is time to abolish likewise the institution of war.*

Canada has enjoyed an international peacemaking reputation that is slowly eroding under the current government’s systematic militarization. This is tragic and a move to imitate the massive process addiction of the continuing out-of-control drunken bully to our south. Canada could opt instead for total abstinence, and become a world leader in a movement to abolish the state process addiction and institution of war.

I had initially thought of doing two imagination exercises in conclusion. But I decided against the first.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> Walter Wink in fact does this in terms of nonviolent direct action in a great book: *Engaging the Powers: Discernment and Resistance in a World of Domination* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992, Chapter 13.) He draws in turn on amongst others Gene Sharp’s *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*, (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1973) and *Making Europe Unconquerable: The Potential of Civilian-Based Deterrence and Defence* (Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1985).

<sup>79</sup> The first might read, I had suggested:

Whereas it is universally acknowledged that the preparation, practice, and promulgation of war is a blight upon the human family that has marred humankind since the beginning, we, the member parties of the United Nations, do commit to forthwith begin steps to abolish all vestiges of war within our member nation-states. This shall include:

- Commitment to cease immediately in the engagement of all wars anywhere on Planet Earth;
- Commitment to begin dismantling and destroying all weapons of mass destruction with specific target dates of by when to be agreed upon in a soon convened meeting of representatives from all member states;
- Commitment to dismantle and/or convert to peaceful usage (what some Holy Scriptures of the human family call “*beating swords into ploughshares*”), all aspects of the current arms industry;
- Commitment to deployment of human, financial, scientific, technological and the best in “human ingenuity” resources within our member nation-states to develop non-lethal defence systems to protect from outside enemies; that aim not only *not* to destroy our enemies, but to destroy the enmity instead by making our enemies our friends, through deployment and application of all collective peacemaking wisdom and techniques to date, and through the encouragement of research into the inexhaustible and creative imagination of our collective humanity for finding ever better peacemaking ways and solutions in the future.

The immediate establishment of an international monitoring body, along the lines of international arms inspections – for all member countries!

However, Rev. McCarthy, in the same e-mail noted above (September 11, 2007), commented thus on these two “imagination exercises”:

The two imagination exercises regarding the UN, in my feel for the matter, trivialize your efforts. Not all that is impossible is a good practical or theological dream. This ending seems to me to be shoehorn-

Years ago my wife and I were playing, with her parents, a paper version of a board game called “Battleship”. (I know: so many of the games we play, as the children’s stories and cartoons we allow, are violent!) The game involved making guesses about the whereabouts of others’ battleships: destroyers, carriers, a submarine, etc. As you got a hit, it was noted on the grid, and you kept guessing so as to eliminate your opponent’s fleet of ships and win the game. This particular game went on and on! Finally, every single square but one on everyone’s grid had been filled in with an “x”. The reason no one had guessed the only square not filled in was: *everyone had a battleship, or portion of one, in that square! To have selected that would have been to self-destruct, and lose the game.*

This experience has served as metaphor for me in many ways. Let me try one tonight. French sociologist Jacques Ellul wrote: “I have shown in detail that every state is founded on violence and cannot maintain itself save by and through violence (*Violence: Reflections From a Christian Perspective*, New York: Seabury Press, 1969, p. 84).” My dilemma is: how can I appeal to any government, the current Canadian government, to eliminate the process addiction of interstate violence, if, by definition, to stay in the game called “Statesmanship” (and it always comes down to the game called real life “Battleship” and all other forms of war), that is, to continue to exist as a state, *the one thing the state can never eliminate is resort to violence?* For to do so would be, by Ellul’s assessment, to self-destruct as a state.

My dilemma only gets worse. An addict, by definition, is ultimately a liar and hides the addiction through habitual lies. Former Eaton Professor of the Science of Government at Harvard University, Carl J. Friedrich wrote in *The Pathology of Politics (Violence, Betrayal, Corruption, Secrecy, and Propaganda*, New York, Harper & Row, 1972):

Our analysis has, I hope, shown that politics needs all these dubious practices; it cannot be managed without violence, betrayal, corruption, secrecy, and propaganda (no page number).

A. J. Coates in *The Ethics of War* wrote similarly:

The moral prohibition of lying, for example, makes good sense in the context of personal relations, but no sense at all in affairs of state. Telling the truth is a moral luxury that politicians and diplomats can rarely afford. More than that, the fulfillment of their public duty will require them not only to conceal the truth but to suppress it and twist it constantly ( Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997, p. 36).

Now Professor Coates is highly erudite throughout his book in his discussion of the ethics of war. But the analogy leaps out: *If I were an alcoholic, deeply committed to that substance abuse,*

---

ing a most serious set of reflections regarding issues and principles of resolution for conflict into a ready-made box. Said another way by someone with whom I am on speaking terms, it seem to be an attempt to put new wine into old UN wine skins. “...(A)nd the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together,” is absolutely the correct hope and goal and, therefore, ending. But via the power elites that are the UN? An imagination exercise to set up structures to resolve conflicts among Herod, Caiaphas and Pilate may be a step toward revealing the glory of God for all to see together, but it feels to me to generate only more of the atmosphere of the ephemerality, a passing hope that is, like the tasty attracting foam running down Sartre’s glass of beer, transcendently hopeless. So, I’d probably leave out or replace those final imagination exercises with their subdivisions. But that is my only reservation that I think might be pertinent to the deliverance of this paper Thursday.

*I would do all in my power to legitimize my lies so that the addiction could continue! Just like the Emperor and the Lords of the Bedchamber who went on with the procession (or process addiction) at all costs.*

So this bright ethicist, without evident commitment to an overarching counter-cultural narrative to challenge him, adds in step with the best of scholastic casuistry:

This is not so much the violation of a single morality as the application of another and different morality, according to which the moral permissibility of any act is determined in the light of its foreseeable consequences rather than of its intrinsic quality. In this way what is morally impermissible in one sphere may become morally obligatory in the other (*ibid.*, p. 36).

This is an “above-morality” argument identical to “above-the-law” attitudes widely embraced across the spectrum of all guardians of the Western state.

*This truly is the logic of all addiction, no less of all state process addiction.* Translated, it means at least two things:

- *The end justifies the means;*
- *Might makes right.*<sup>80</sup>

I have known personally two alcoholics, highly intelligent and functioning, who knowingly and resolutely continued their addiction. The first, a former neighbour, drank himself to death, and left a wife and family to deal with the devastating loss. The other, a brilliant inventor and businessman, is now estranged from his wife and family, with likely only a matter of time before his liver gives out too.

---

<sup>80</sup> A. J. Coates goes into greater detail about one form of realism Christians since St. Augustine have often adopted:

Another form of realism, while still resisting the moral determination of politics (at least from time to time or in extreme circumstances), is far indifferent to moral considerations. What it propounds is a moral paradox, whereby the achievement of political objectives necessitates the use of *immoral* means. What distinguishes this form of realism is its overt moral concern and the sense of moral unease or of moral tragedy with which it accepts the need for actions that other realists regard with equanimity. This form of realism recognizes the claims both of morality and politics, while affirming their potential irreconcilability and, at times, unavoidable conflict. Even normal politics are seen to be clothed in moral ambiguity, and in extreme emergencies no act, however wicked or immoral, can be excluded ‘realistically’. Tragically (and, as it seems to critics, incoherently), the ruler may have a duty to act immorally, with all the moral anguish that entails.

Niebuhr’s Christian and Protestant realism takes this form. The political order is seen as naturally resistant to morality, and the structure of power in which it consists as intrinsically flawed. Unlike the more purely moral domain of private life, ‘the realm of politics is a twilight zone where ethical and technical issues meet’. It is impossible to act within that realm without incurring sin. Nevertheless, rulers have a duty so to act, while repenting of their actions and falling back ultimately on the mercy and redemptive power of God. This understanding of politics appears in a more secular guise in the thought of Hans Morgenthau, who argues that ‘there is no escape from the evil of power’ and that ‘to know with despair that the political act is inevitably evil, and to act nonetheless, is moral courage’ (Morgenthau 1946, [*Scientific Man vs Power Politics*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago], p. 203). On this view the politician – and the soldier – are faced with hard choices or cruel necessities that, in the terms of one analysis, require that they ‘stoically immolate their personal morality on the altar of the public good’ (Evans and Ward 1956 [*The Social and Political Philosophy of Jacques Maritain*, Geoffrey Bles, London], p. 320). (*ibid.*, pp. 33 & 34).

Father Emmanuel Charles McCarthy is a priest of the Eastern Rite of the Catholic Church, who has devoted a lifetime to the nonviolent Way of Jesus.<sup>81</sup> In an e-mail exchange he wrote:

Gandhi entitled his autobiography *An Experiment in Truth*. Truth passes from concept to concrete enfleshed reality available to all only via the path of experimentation. If Einstein's  $E=mc^2$  remained only in his mind as a thought we would not be able to watch reruns of the Beverly Hillbillies or send a man to the moon, etc. But, trillions of dollars and billions of hours of mental and physical human labor have been put into figuring out experimentally how to move this truth from conceptualization to practical individual and societal incarnation. Now, imagine, if proportionately, the same amount of time, mind and money had gone into figuring out experimentally how to effectively incarnate Jesus' Sermon on the Mount, where would we be as a human race and as Church be today? But, such an allocation of resources has not taken place. So it is folly to expect answers on how a truth would work in an empirical situation, when almost nothing has been done in 1700 years to even consider the question, let alone with experimenting with possible ways of individually or socially empiricalizing it (September 13, 2007).

There I leave it: a wonderful, impossible challenge! Or, in Ken Wilber's delightful terminology: "an unrequited vision"...

But I will now offer something a little more concrete. In 1975, a small program emerged in Kitchener-Waterloo, Canada, that proved to be the "proverbial shot that echoed around the world"<sup>82</sup>: the Victim Offender Reconciliation Project (VORP) was created as a joint partnership between Ontario Provincial Corrections and the Mennonite Central Committee Ontario.<sup>83</sup> One of the two key players in establishing VORP was Dave Worth, who had lived on Koinonia Farms, Americus Georgia, and had known first-hand some of the stories and sermons of Clarence Jordan, one of the founders. Clarence Jordan had two earned doctorates: one in New Testament, and the other in agriculture. He helped form a creative Christian farm community in 1942 that was integrated – and consequently persecuted – from the outset<sup>84</sup>.

---

<sup>81</sup> He was formerly a lawyer, university educator and founder and original director of The Program for the Study and Practice of Nonviolent Conflict Resolution at the University of Notre Dame. He is also a co-founder of Pax Christi-USA. For over forty years he has directed educational programs and conducted spiritual retreats throughout the world on the issue of the relationship of faith and violence. He was the keynote speaker for the 25th anniversary memorial of the assassination of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., at the Lorraine Motel in Memphis, Tennessee. He was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize for his life's work on behalf of peace within people and among people.

<sup>82</sup> Two other Canadian "firsts", also echoing around the world, in this field were "Sentencing or Peacemaking Circles" (see Kay Pranis, Barry Stuart and Mark Wedge, *Peacemaking Circles: From Crime to Community*, St. Paul, MN: Living Justice Press, 2003); and Circles of Support and Accountability (CoSA) (see Michael Petrunik, "Circles of Support and Accountability: Tensions Between Faith-Based and Rational-Utilitarian Responses to Moral Panic over High-Risk Sex Offenders", *International Journal of Restorative Justice*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 41 pages, 2007).

<sup>83</sup> The full story is told in Gary Nyp, *Pioneers of Peace: the History of Community Justice Initiatives Waterloo Region, 1974-2004*, Kitchener, ON: Community Justice Initiatives, 2004.

<sup>84</sup> See their website at: <http://www.koinoniapartners.org/> (last accessed September 29, 2009), one part that reads: Home of the Cotton Patch Gospel, birthplace of Habitat for Humanity, Jubilee Partners, Prison Jail Project, Fuller Center for Housing and other ministries. Still growing pecans and peanuts, welcoming visitors, and living the "demonstration plot for the Kingdom of God."

If a farmer wanted to encourage others to try out new seed, Jordan constantly said, he'd not go out and rent a lecture hall to get them in, he'd plant a "demonstration plot" right in the main crossroads and let everyone see for themselves how well the seed produced! VORP in 1975 was like that "demonstration plot" that soon was being replicated and creatively developed into all kinds of other "demonstration plots" of Restorative Justice the world over.

Now imagine with me this formal resolution adopted by the United Nations:

Whereas it is universally acknowledged that we shall never wage enough war to win through to peace, an empirical fact of unquestioned finality from the entire sweep of recorded human history; whereas whenever we wage peace, in the very process we already have achieved our goal; whereas it is acknowledged that there is no way to peace, but peace is the way; whereas when a farmer wants to attract the attention of her fellows about a superior new line of seed developed, she goes out and plants a "demonstration plot" right at the major crossroads of the entire community for all to see and believe; we the member parties of the United Nations, do commit to

- forthwith establish a new International Cooperative Conflict Resolution agency (ICCR) as "demonstration plot" that shall be granted similar status and authority as the International Court of Justice<sup>85</sup>, and the International Criminal Court<sup>86</sup>, to begin mediation of all international disputes brought to it by signatory member nations.
- Further, it is resolved that former US President Jimmy Carter be appointed the new ICCR United Nations Commissioner, and that he in turn be authorized to set up office immediately in Geneva, Switzerland through
- the further hiring of previous Nobel Peace Prize winners as consultants, and proceed with full infrastructure implementation to be ready for business by January 1, 2010 just before the Winter Olympics – and so urgently needed!

Impossible dream? It's time for such an international demonstration plot to replace war against international enemies, as the VORP demonstration plot replaced the war against domestic enemies.

Desmond Tutu published *God Has a Dream: a Vision of Hope For Our Time* (New York: Doubleday, 2004). He drew on the language of arguably one of the most famous speeches of all in recent times by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.: "I Have a Dream", delivered August 28, 1963 at the Lincoln Memorial, Washington DC. Part of the speech went like this:

I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal."

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

I have a dream that one day even the state of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice.

---

<sup>85</sup> See: <http://www.icj-cij.org/homepage/index.php?lang=en> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

<sup>86</sup> See: <http://www.icc-cpi.int/Menus/ICC?lan=en-GB> (last accessed September 29, 2009).

I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.

I have a *dream* today!

I have a dream that one day, down in Alabama, with its vicious racists, with its governor having his lips dripping with the words of “interposition” and “nullification” -- one day right there in Alabama little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.

I have a *dream* today!

I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, and every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain, and the crooked places will be made straight; “and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together.”

This is our hope, and this is the faith that I go back to the South with (King, Jr., 1963).

Amen!