



Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns

NewsNotes

A bi-monthly newsletter of information on international justice and peace issues

November-December 2012

Vol. 37, No. 6

<i>Pacem in Terris</i> and the new challenge of peace.....	3
Philippines: Framework agreement on Bangsamoro.....	4
China, sustainability, peace: A missionary's account.....	5
Sudan/South Sudan: Step toward peace.....	7
Israel/Palestine: Review of military aid.....	8
Guatemala: Protestors put down by police, military.....	9
Bolivia: Update on TIPNIS.....	10
Central America: Promoting restorative justice.....	11
Brazil: Archdiocesan group sponsors debate.....	12
Global hunger: Who decides what?.....	13
Climate change: Final prep for Qatar conference.....	14
Trans-Pacific Partnership: Secret negotiations.....	16
Nuclear weapons: Moving toward elimination.....	17
UN Conference on Small Arms, Light Weapons.....	17
Hershey's commits to 100 percent certified cocoa.....	18
Resources.....	19

Published by the Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns: Peace, Social Justice & Integrity of Creation

200 New York Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001

Phone: (202)832-1780 Fax: (202)832-5195

ogc@maryknoll.org www.maryknollogc.org

Save trees, postage! Receive NewsNotes electronically

If you would like to receive your bimonthly copy of *NewsNotes* via email, please send a message with your name, city and state to ogc@maryknoll.org, subject line: NN subscription, or check our website.

Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns

Peace, Social Justice and the Integrity of Creation

<http://www.maryknollogc.org>

Maryknoll Sisters
Maryknoll Lay Missioners
Maryknoll Fathers & Brothers

Kathy McNeely — Director..... kmcneely@maryknoll.org
Sr. Ann Braudis, MM..... abraudis@mksisters.org
Judy Coode..... jcoode@maryknoll.org
Sr. Rose Bernadette (Meg) Gallagher, MM..... rgallagher@mksisters.org
Susan Gunn..... sgunn@maryknoll.org
Sr. Veronica Schweyen, MM..... vschweyen@maryknoll.org

MOGC Washington
200 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20017
(202)832-1780 phone
(202)832-5195 fax
ogc@maryknoll.org

MOGC Maryknoll NY
P.O. Box 311
Maryknoll, N.Y. 10545-0311
(914)941-7575 phone
(914)923-0733 fax
ogc@maryknoll.org

MOGC UN Office
777 First Ave., 10th Fl.
New York, N.Y. 10115
(212)973-9551 phone

Take action - Email, call, fax or write U.S. decision makers

President Barack Obama
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500
www.whitehouse.gov

Vice President Joe Biden
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500
vice_president@whitehouse.gov

White House Comment Desk
(202) 456-1111 phone
(202) 456-2461 fax

Hillary Rodham Clinton
Secretary of State
2201 C Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20520
(202) 647-6575 phone
(202) 647-2283 fax
www.state.gov

Leon Panetta
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301
(703) 695-5261 phone
www.defenselink.mil

Eric Holder
Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202)353-1555 phone
AskDOJ@usdoj.gov
www.justice.gov

Susan Rice
U.S. Representative to UN
799 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017
(212) 415-4000 phone
www.usunnewyork.usmission.gov

Robert B. Zoellick
President
World Bank Group
1818 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20433
www.worldbank.org

Christine Lagarde
Managing Director
International Monetary Fund
700 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20431
www.imf.org

Current status of bills:
(202) 225-1772
<http://thomas.loc.gov>

Capitol switchboard:
(202) 224-3121
www.congress.gov

***Pacem in Terris* and the new challenge of peace**

Two notable characteristics of Pope John XXIII's great encyclical, Pacem in Terris, written almost 50 years ago in 1963, were its scope and its optimism. The sweeping content of the document says relatively little directly about war; concentrating instead on describing the kind of political, social, economic and cultural conditions that generate peace/shalom on earth – right relationships based on justice, respect, love and solidarity – from the interpersonal to the national to the global. The following reflection is written by Marie Dennis.

The “rights and duties” the document holds up as “universal and inviolable and therefore altogether inalienable” are incredibly far-reaching. Many of them, including the most basic, are in need of urgent attention in these times. A few examples:

- the right to live, to the means necessary for the proper development of life (food, clothing, shelter, medical care, rest, necessary social services, the right to be looked after in the event of ill health, disability, old age, unemployment);
- the right to seek truth, to be accurately informed about public events, to receive a good education;
- the right to work, to decent conditions for work, to a wage “determined in accordance to the precepts of justice”;
- the right to emigrate and immigrate;
- the social obligation that qualifies the right to own private property.

Pacem in Terris also emphasizes the right role of government, based upon the principal of subsidiarity, and insists on the inadequacy of the modern state to ensure a globally inclusive and sustainable common good: “Today the universal common good presents us with problems which are world-wide in their dimensions; problems, therefore, which cannot be solved except by a public authority with power, organization and means co-extensive with these problems, and with a world-wide sphere of activity. Consequently the moral order itself demands the establishment of some such general form of public authority... But this general authority equipped with world-wide power and adequate means for achieving the universal common good cannot be imposed by

force. It must be set up with the consent of all nations. If its work is to be effective, it must operate with fairness, absolute impartiality, and with dedication to the common good of all peoples.” (Paragraphs 137,138)

A second notable characteristic of *Pacem in Terris* is its optimism. For example, paragraph 40 talks about the “progressive improvement in the economic and social condition” of workers; paragraph 42 says “soon no nation will rule over another and none will be subject to an alien power; paragraph 43 – “nor is any nation nowadays content to submit to foreign domination” and “[t]he longstanding inferiority complex of certain classes because of their economic and social status, sex, or position in the State, and the corresponding superiority complex of other classes, is rapidly becoming a thing of the past.” That kind of optimism would be very hard to sustain in these times.

Pacem in Terris does, of course, speak directly to the arms race. Fifty years later, the need for disarmament is even more urgent. For too many people and nations, a major component of the fabric of life is war - preparing for war, struggling to survive in the context of war, and dealing with its consequences. We know that 90 percent of the casualties of modern wars are civilians. The human and environmental cost is enormous: millions of refugees roam the earth, a sea of landmines and cluster bombs make many communities uninhabitable; psychological trauma resulting from war destroys families and communities; war exacerbates climate change, deforestation and other environmental problems; and the economic cost of war and perpetual preparation for war is a huge burden on the backs of the poor.

Pacem in Terris brings a tremendous challenge to a highly militarized and nationalistic U.S. foreign policy and to a contemporary global economy that benefits a few very wealthy and powerful people, while leaving millions in dire poverty and the whole earth community threatened.

Clearly, on this 50th anniversary of *Pacem in Terris* (and 30th anniversary of the U.S. bishops' 1983 pastoral letter on peace), there is a new challenge of peace confronting the human community. It keeps these rich and powerful documents as relevant as they were decades ago.



Pope John XXIII signs *Pacem in Terris*, April 1963

Philippines: Framework agreement on Bangsamoro

The following article is contributed by Fred Goddard, who recently moved to the Philippines after stepping down from his role as executive coordinator of the Maryknoll Affiliates.

On October 15, the Philippine government and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) signed an historic agreement that all hope will end decades of armed conflict in the southern Philippines. The Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro (FAB) will ultimately lead to the creation of a new autonomous political entity, the Bangsamoro (Bangsa is a word that means “nation,” thus the term means “Moro Nation.”)

In his speech at the signing, MILF chairman Al Haj Murad gave a brief history of the struggle of the Muslim people of the southern Philippines, which goes back to “five centuries of foreign invasions and domination...” Prior to the colonization by the Spanish, Dutch and other European powers of the Philippines, Indonesia and Malaysia, much of what is now the southern Philippines was part of the Moro sultanates. These sultanates were lost and the Moro people marginalized when much of their territory was expropriated first by the Spanish and then later by the United States and the emergence of the Philippines as a nation state.

Al Haj Murad went on to say, “This unjust condition that sustained this conflict in our generation made it inevitable for the Moro Liberation movements [Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) and subsequently the MILF] to emerge.” Peace negotiations did take place in 1976 in Libya under the auspices of the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) and in 1996 in Indonesia between the MNLF and the Philippine government. These negotiations, as well as the forming of the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (ARMM), were seen as “failed experiments.” Thus, armed conflict and the government’s response of counter-insurgency, often with the assistance of the United States, dominated the scene of southwestern Mindanao and the Sulu Archipelago for decades. Al Haj Murad lamented that this conflict “has invariably taken a heavy toll on the lives, properties, and livelihoods of our people—Moro-indigenous communities and settlers in Mindanao and Sulu.”

So what makes this agreement any different than those that preceded it? As Philippines President Benigno Simeon Aquino III said, the FAB “symbolizes and honors the struggles of our forebears in Mindanao, and celebrates the history and character of that part of our nation.” In his speech during the signing, Al Haj Murad

said the Framework Agreement is the “most important document in the chapter of our history—a landmark document that restores to our people their Bangsamoro identity and their homeland, their right to govern themselves and the power to forge their destiny and future with their very hands.” The foundation of the document was based on years of negotiations and on the recognition of a common struggle for peace and justice for the Muslim people of Mindanao and all Filipinos.

The FAB is not the end agreement but rather an “outline” or a major step on the path to peace. The Framework includes the establishment of the Bangsamoro; formulation of basic law and powers; determination of revenue generation and wealth sharing and territory; and the basic rights of all people within the territory, Muslim, indigenous and all others living there. The FAB also outlines the transition and implementation, as well as the “normalization.” This last term, while seeming to be one of the most understated, is probably the most important. As written in the Framework, “The aim of normalization is to ensure human security in the Bangsamoro” (2012 Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro, p. 11). This includes the decommissioning and disarming of the MILF.

The FAB states, “The government of the Bangsamoro shall have a ministerial form” (p. 1). At the same time, “The Bangsamoro shall have competence over the Shari’ah justice system. The supremacy of Shari’ah and its application shall only be to Muslims” (p. 3). These Shari’ah courts will try personal, non-criminal cases between Muslims. “Consistent with the Bangsamoro Basic Law, the Bangsamoro will have the power to create its own sources of revenues and to levy taxes, fees, and charges, subject to limitations as may be mutually agreed upon by the Parties.”

While these are important structures and powers for the Bangsamoro, the central government shall retain the powers of defense and external security, foreign policy, common market and global trade, coinage and monetary policy, citizenship and naturalization.

To see this all through, the Framework Agreement calls for the creation of a Transition Commission (TransCom) whose functions are “[to] work on the drafting of the Bangsamoro Basic Law; [to] work on proposals to amend the Philippine Constitution for the purpose of accommodating and entrenching in the constitution the agreements of the Parties... and [to] coordinate whenever necessary development programs in Bangsamoro communities” (p.9).

Given that the Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro is just that, a framework or outline, there is much to be done and many obstacles to overcome. Including the signing of the Agreement itself, there are 15 stages to the creation of the Bangsamoro, ending with the formation of the Bangsamoro legislative assembly, all of which is hoped to be achieved before the end of the term of President Aquino in 2016—a very ambitious timeline.

Of these stages, some will be greater challenges than others. The Transition Commission, itself, requires not only an Executive Order, but also a supporting resolution of the Congress. There is no doubt that President Aquino will promulgate the Executive Order, but some in Congress could delay or even attempt to block the resolution. President Aquino's cabinet, members of his staff and allies have already been encouraging Congress to pass the resolution. At a speech during a briefing, the government's chief negotiator, Marvic Leonen, urged the members of Congress to "support this particular framework agreement," stating that that it is considered to be "constitutional already, that does not contain independence, that is democratic and inclusive. I beg you to support this particular framework agreement."

The Transition Commission has to draft the Bangsamoro Basic Law Bill for submission to Congress. This bill must be enacted into law and approved by the president and then must be ratified in a plebiscite. Most analysts are optimistic about each of these stages, but politics being politics, not matter what country, and changes in the reality on the ground mean there are no guarantees.

In addition to working through these specific steps in the process of the Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro, there is the existing situation of southern Mindanao. Many within the MILF may be hesitant to give up their arms when the power of the gun has been the way of life for so many individuals for so long. More seriously,

the MNLF has expressed criticism of the Agreement, at times through very belligerent language. The long-time leader of the MNLF, Nur Misuari, has been particularly vitriolic in speeches and interviews, even making exaggerated claims that thousands of members of the MILF have defected to the MNLF. At the farthest extreme are those who claim to be affiliates with Al Qaeda, such as the Abu Sayaf. While very diminished in strength, they still threaten the peaceful resolution to conflicts in Mindanao.

Mindanao, like much of the Philippines, is also plagued with corruption, especially tied to those with economic power. "War lords," who often hold political offices as mayors and governors, control large areas and the natural resources that are so abundant and in demand in Mindanao. They have not given up their power to the central government and are unlikely to do so to a duly elected Bangsamoro government. It is hard to imagine a new layer of laws in Mindanao when the existing ones have done little to curb this corruption. Even the Ampatuan massacre of 11 members of the Mangudadatu family and their associates -- 34 journalists and five others -- languishes in the courts after almost three years.

Despite these obstacles, the Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro remains a hopeful sign in the Philippines. As His Excellency Dato' Sri Mohammad Najib bin Tun Abdul Razak, Prime Minister of Malaysia, whose country played a key role in the peace negotiations, said, "This is not an endpoint, but a beginning. There is much still to be done. The Framework Agreement is a historic document but it does not solve all the problems. Rather, it sets the parameters in which a lasting peace may be found."

The Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro, speeches made during the signing and other information can be found at <http://www.gov.ph/the-2012-framework-agreement-on-the-bangsamoro/>

China, sustainability, peace: A missionary's account

Maryknoll Sr. Marjorie Ann Bush returned to the U.S. on September 14 after making a short trip back to China where she worked in mission from 1999 until 2010. Sr. Ann Braudis interviewed Sr. Marjorie Ann regarding her sense of China's movement toward sustainable development and whether or not a sense of peace is being strengthened through China's development.

Sr. Marjorie Ann lived for four years in the Yangtze River Delta, much of which is undergoing fast-track

economic development. It was from this area that Marjorie Ann drew an illustration that seems to be emblematic of issues of sustainability in China and globally. But first, the following provides some background for understanding her observations.

The Yangtze River flows from the Tibetan Plateau to China's eastern seaboard. For thousands of years the Yangtze has been a conduit for moving valuable products from China's interior to its heavily populated coastal cities and great harbors. The products wending

their way to the coastline span an impressive array from agricultural goods to precious metals. Aside from transportable goods, the area has other assets, not least of which is its stunning natural beauty, traditionally a great lure for tourists and vacationers. Added to this, the ancient city of Nanjing is a mecca for the arts, particularly of the period of the Ming dynasty.

Unfortunately, notwithstanding its great resources, the area has known hunger within living memory. This point raises the question of how resources are used. When resources are used sustainably, the needs and rights of present and future generations of people are taken into account and planned for in the development process. If resources are not used sustainably, some people will be well provided for in the present and perhaps in the immediate future, but the basic rights of others may not be met now or in the future. Furthermore, when development is defined as sustainable, the development process takes into account equally economic needs, social justice and protection of the environment.

The case that Marjorie Ann recounted refers to a small householder faced with the loss of his property due to economic development that did not include social justice and environmental protection. According to Marjorie Ann, developers moved into an agricultural area and rapidly acquired all the small farms and homes in the area at prices disadvantageous to the owners. The small farms and homes were replaced by apartment buildings and commercial sites. However, one owner refused to accept the terms of the developer and remained defiantly in his house, determined to exercise his right to social justice. As time passed, all the land around the house was excavated, applying great pressure on the owner to sell under unfavorable conditions. (A building/residence in this situation is called a “nail house”; its owner/occupant is called a “stubborn nail.” This scenario has been replicated in other parts of China and has gained much attention in the press and on the internet.)

Aside from illustrating the issue of social justice, this case draws attention to the environment. Land and water are needed to support life; large scale development projects contribute to the collapse of life support systems



Photo by Anita Ritenour

unless carefully planned, implemented and monitored. In addition, China's arable land is scarce raising perennial questions about food security and the wisdom of converting fertile agricultural land into development projects.

Sadly, the development pictured in this case is destructive to the location's natural beauty and deprives people of the expansiveness of soul found in the presence of beauty; in cultivated fields, in views of hills, water and sky. Finally, in Marjorie Ann's view, growth that does not stand on the three pillars of economic development, social justice and environmental protection does not lead to peace. Rather, anxiety, discontent and violence are generated within the population.

As indicated above, the case described here is typical around the globe.

Wherever there is unsustainable development, there are those who resist it with all their strength. The United Nations is responding to the grave concerns raised by rapid unsustainable development by engaging the nations and civil society in the formulation of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) that will come into effect in 2015. The SDGs will apply to all nations equally and will be concerned with the right to food and water as well as the need for energy, among others.

The National Bureau of Statistics in China has designated Nanjing as the city within the Yangtze River Delta with the greatest potential for sustainable development. Nanjing may be highly motivated to work toward this goal as it will host the 2014 Youth Olympic Games. The youth and their future hold humanity's purpose in living sustainably today. (Learn more from this episode in PBS's Journey to Planet Earth series: <http://www.pbs.org/journeypointplanetearth/hope/yangtze.html>.)

Finally, the words of theologian Elizabeth Johnson speak directly to the topic of sustainability and peace: “If we as church are truly following our risen Lord, making his historical concerns our own and committing our lives to the coming victory of the reign of God, then we are compelled to be involved in critical peacemaking and economic issues where the shalom and well-being of all peoples, and indeed of the whole earth are at stake.” (*Consider Jesus: Waves of Renewal in Christology*, Crossroad, 1990).

Sudan/South Sudan: Step toward peace

The following article, contributed by Marie Dennis, explains how church leaders responded to the September 27 Cooperation Agreement between Sudan and South Sudan; the agreement covers a number of areas of vital importance, including oil, security arrangements, economic affairs, the status of nationals of the other states, a framework for cooperation on central banking, borders, trade, and other matters.

In their response to the announced agreement, Catholic Archbishop Paulino Lukudu Loro and Episcopal Archbishop Daniel Deng Bul wrote in part: "...We praise the governments of Sudan and South Sudan for their perseverance in negotiations, and we thank the African Union, the United Nations and other members of the international community who have helped to facilitate the talks. We commend our two presidents for their personal role in reaching an agreement. We appreciate some of the confidence-building measures which have already taken place, such as the resumption of flights between the two capitals. It should always be remembered that negotiations are about the lives of the people, not the politics of two governments, so measures which benefit the citizens of both nations are to be welcomed.

"We begin from the basic premise that it is not acceptable for the two nations to go back to war under any circumstances, whatever the differences and difficulties in the negotiations. For this reason we applaud the establishment of a demilitarized buffer zone along our common border..."

"The old Sudan was a family which has found itself divided. The family assets must be shared in an equitable way, so that neither side finds itself badly disadvantaged. This is the spirit which should guide negotiations about oil and borders. We welcome the agreement to allow the oil to flow once more, to the mutual benefit of all. The current economic hardship in both countries is affecting the ordinary people, and will certainly affect the development of both nations. Borders should take into account the traditional community boundaries which are known to the chiefs and their people on the ground, and

should be porous to recognize traditional grazing and migration rights. If the politicians from Sudan and South Sudan cannot agree, then both sides should accept binding international arbitration.

"We fully support the 'four freedoms' agreement on the rights of citizens of either state who find themselves in the other state. Freedom of residence, freedom of movement, freedom to undertake economic activity and freedom to acquire and dispose property are a basic

minimum. Sudanese residents in South Sudan and South Sudanese residents in Sudan are not simply 'foreign aliens' who have come from nowhere; they are part of the old Sudanese family with long-standing historical, geographical and kinship links which should not be broken by the new political dispensation. We would add that freedom of religion is also a prerequisite for justice, peace and human dignity. The implementation of the agreement on the four freedoms must be closely monitored. Actions taken by

the government of Sudan over the past year have already impinged upon these freedoms, and concrete steps will be needed to reassure South Sudanese in Sudan that their rights will be respected..."

According to South Sudan two areas of significant concern remain. One is the chronic problem of implementation of agreements. The second is the crisis over the status of Abyei and the disputed and claimed areas of the border.

Abyei is not a "disputed area" in the same sense as other border areas. Here too, a series of agreements have been dishonored. The 1972 Addis Ababa Agreement, which ended the first war, granted the Ngok Dinka of Abyei the right to decide whether to remain under the administration of the North or rejoin South Sudan from which it was severed in 1905. That provision was never implemented. This eventually triggered a local rebellion that contributed to the resumption of the war in 1983.

The Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) and its Protocol on Abyei granted the Ngok Dinka nine chiefdoms the same right, but that also has not been implemented. The report of the Abyei Boundary Commission (ABC), whose demarcation of the Ngok Dinka borders



Archbishop Daniel Deng Bul (left) and Archbishop Paulino Lukudu Loro as they vote in Juba, southern Sudan during the January 2011 referendum. Photo: Nils Carstensen/ACT/DCA

was supposed to be final and binding, was rejected by Khartoum. The decision of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, which revised those borders by reducing the territory the ABC had demarcated for the Ngok Dinka, though initially accepted by both parties, has not been acted upon. The terms of the June 20, 2011 agreement following the military occupation of Abyei by elements of the Sudan Armed Forces have yet to be fully implemented.

A significant positive step has been taken, but much remains to be done. For example, even as the significant accomplishment of a Cooperation Agreement was be-

ing welcomed, Sudan Catholic Radio Network reported that the Sudanese Air Force had dropped bombs on a community in the Nuba Mountains; the peace agreement among six communities in Jonglei State, South Sudan was threatened by a rebel faction led by David Yau Yau; and a food security and nutritional assessment carried out by an international non-governmental organization (but for security reasons made public by the Enough Project) released evidence that food security conditions in South Kordofan are dramatically declining and malnutrition among children is on the rise, with 81.5 percent of households surviving on one meal per day.

Israel/Palestine: Review of military aid

In a recent letter to Congress, Kathy McNeely of the Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns (MOGC) and the leaders of 14 other national Christian groups, including the Presbyterian Church (USA), the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, the Conference of Major Superiors of Men, among others, urged the U.S. to investigate possible human rights and weapon violations by the Israeli government.

In the October 5 letter, the signers expressed their commitment to the pursuit of peace for both Israelis and Palestinians. The religious leaders cited possible violations by Israel of the U.S. Foreign Assistance Act and the U.S. Arms Export Control Act, which respectively excludes assistance to any country that engages in a consistent pattern of human rights violations and limits the use of U.S. weapons to “internal security” or “legitimate self-defense.”

The signers were clear in their recognition that Israel faces real security threats and that it has both “a right and a duty to protect both the state and its citizens,” but the “measures that it uses to protect itself and its citizens, as in the case with any other nation, must conform to international humanitarian and human rights law.”

Unfortunately “unconditional U.S. military assistance to Israel has contributed to (the) deterioration, sustaining the conflict and undermining the long-term security interests of both Israelis and Palestinians,” the letter states. “This is made clear in the most recent 2011 State Department Country Report on Human Rights Practices covering Israel and the Occupied Territories, which details widespread Israeli human rights violations committed against Palestinian civilians, many of which involve the misuse of U.S.-supplied weapons.”

Examples of human rights violence related to U.S. military support were included as an annex to the letter

and, in addition to specific rights violations, the leaders expressed their concern that Israel continues to expand its settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, claiming territory “that under international law and U.S. policy should belong to a future Palestinian state.”

The letter requested that Congress hold Israel accountable to these standards by “making the disbursement of U.S. military assistance to Israel contingent on the Israeli government’s compliance with applicable U.S. laws and policies. As Israel is the single largest recipient of U.S. foreign aid since World War II, it is especially critical for Israel to comply with the specific U.S. laws that regulate the use of U.S.-supplied weapons. We also encourage Congress to support inclusive, comprehensive and robust regional diplomacy to secure a just and lasting peace that will benefit Israelis, Palestinians, and all the peoples of the region and the world.”

It stated, “[O]ur moral responsibility [is] to question the continuation of unconditional U.S. financial assistance to the government of Israel. Realizing a just and lasting peace will require this accountability, as continued U.S. military assistance to Israel – offered without conditions or accountability – will only serve to sustain the status quo and Israel’s military occupation of the Palestinian territories.”

Read the letter in its entirety on the MOGC website; if you do not have access to the internet, contact the office and we will send you a copy.

Faith in action:

Contact your U.S. representative and senators, and use information found in this letter to urge “Congress to support inclusive, comprehensive and robust regional diplomacy to secure a just and lasting peace that will benefit Israelis, Palestinians, and all the peoples of the region and the world.”

Guatemala: Protestors put down by police, military

The Pan American highway runs through a barren stretch of Guatemalan territory at kilometer 170. This cold and deserted place, known to the local population as the Alaskan Summit, was the site of Guatemalan President Otto Perez Molina's recent attempt to silence opposition resulting in the October 4 deadly clash between indigenous protestors and members of the Guatemalan military, a clash which resulted in at least eight deaths and several injuries.

María del Carmen Tacam, president of the 48 cantons of Totonicapán, said that the indigenous communities planned to block a major intersection of the highway that connects several large western Guatemalan municipalities in an effort to draw attention to meetings she and other community leaders were supposed to have with government officials, including President Perez Molino, in Guatemala City. The community leaders hoped to discuss several recent decisions and proposals that would have major impact on their communities and to ask for a formal consultation process. Specifically they wanted to talk with government officials about their opposition to recent hikes in the prices of electricity; reforms to the teacher training and certification process; and the constitutional reform process recently put forward by the government.

During the October 4 rally, local police and Guatemalan military were dispatched with orders to evict the demonstrators and restore the flow of traffic. Despite the Interior Minister's order to maintain distance, a military contingent of 89 soldiers under the command of Col. Juan Chiroy Sal advanced and confronted the protestors. According to preliminary investigations, eight soldiers fired their weapons into the crowd. Eight protestors were killed, and at least 33 others injured. Thirteen soldiers also reported injuries.

On October 9, Friends of the Earth International issued a statement of solidarity with the people of Totonicapán condemning Perez Molina's repressive security policy. "The massacre in Totonicapán follows a crackdown in Santa Cruz Barillas – where a community leader was killed and 10 people were detained on political grounds – in early May this year and the subsequent state of emergency in the municipality... This 'security'

policy goes hand-in-hand with unsustainable large scale development projects, involving indigenous territories without the consent of the people affected."

The Guatemalan Human Rights Commission (GHRC) also reports that, starting in August, 171 U.S. Marines and the Guatemalan military participated in a joint mission, "Operación Martillo" (Operation Hammer), to combat drug trafficking in the Pacific coast region. After two months, however, only 14 arrests and 10

drug seizures were made. GHRC claims that in this maneuver the United States has basically lost its moral authority to condemn the use of the military force against civilians. GHRC asks: "How can the U.S. tell Guatemala that the military shouldn't act as police when we're sending down U.S. soldiers to fight crime?"

In response to the hostilities in early October, the United Nations High Commission for Human Rights sent two teams of observers to verify the facts and follow up on the reports of the violence. Also, a thorough investigation was carried out by the Public Prosecutor's Office and National Science Institute (INACIF) which led to the prompt arrest of Col. Chiroy and the eight soldiers for the crime of extrajudicial execution, among other charges.

This is important departure from Guatemala's long history of impunity for crimes committed by the armed forces represents a radical shift for Perez Molina. Since taking power earlier this year, Perez Molina has proposed government reforms which are supported by and benefit Guatemala's economic elite and has used combined security forces (National Civil Police and Army) to repress any opposition. In spite of public and social outcry to these actions the government continued to implement this as a strategy for solving "social conflict."

Faith in action:

Sign GHRC's petition that calls for the government of Guatemala to repudiate any state violence against the indigenous peoples and to support the right of the K'iche' people of Totonicapán and their municipal authorities to express their collective political voice. Find the petition at GHRC's website, www.ghrc-usa.org or find the link at the MOGC website.



The department of Totonicapán in Guatemala

Bolivia: Update on TIPNIS

The following article is written by Maryknoll Fr. Eugene Toland, who lives in Cochabamba, Bolivia. See related articles in the March-April 2012 and November-December 2011 issues of NewsNotes.

The Bolivian government of Evo Morales that identifies itself as indigenous and defender of the Mother Earth, continues in conflict with indigenous peoples who live in the Isiboro Sécure National Park and Indigenous Territory (Territorio Indígena y Parque Nacional Isiboro Sécure, TIPNIS), an area of rich biodiversity between the states of Cochabamba and the Beni. The conflict revolves around the government's decision to build a highway joining the two states that would cut through the middle of the TIPNIS.

Since early this year the conflict has been the focus of national attention when the government announced a contract to build the highway in three stages. The problematic part of the construction would be the second phase of the highway that would pass directly through the middle of the 3,860 square mile indigenous territory and national park. Immediately after the announcement the indigenous leaders of the territory initiated broad protests; the government was acting contrary to the rights of the indigenous people guaranteed in the new constitution and international agreements signed by Bolivia that before any major construction such as a road is initiated in indigenous territories the indigenous of that

territory are to be consulted. In the case of TIPNIS the government signed a contract to build the road without making this consultation.

After many months of resistance the major groups of indigenous peoples in the TIPNIS forced the government to pass a temporary law that blocks the building of the road through the park. The government then launched a consultation of the territory's communities, relying on the support of some communities who have accommodated to the new arrivals of coca growers near the territory's southern area who favor the construction of the road. This consultation has been resisted by the majority groups to the extent of blocking the brigades of the Election Tribunal from reaching a number of the tribal communities.

The government announced that as of early October, 49 of the 69 communities in the park have been consulted and that the majority back the construction of the road. Since the contract with a major Brazilian construction company to build all three phases of the road was cancelled some months ago, the government has now contracted a Bolivian company to continue work on the first phase. On October 8, President Morales stated that since 47 (sic) communities have been consulted and agree with the construction of the road, there is no need to continue consulting the other communities. He repeated the recurring government position that the resistance of some communities is influenced by certain

foreign non-government organizations and self-interested indigenous leaders.

However, the leaders of the major organizations representing the communities of the park deny that the consulting brigades have reached the number of communities reported by the government, and further, that the government is manipulating the consultation by including communities outside the park who favor the government's position.

The president of the Sub Central of TIPNIS, Fernando Vargas, stated that of the 22 communities affiliated to his organization, 15 have not been consulted. Further, in one



"We are all TIPNIS" Photo by Dario Kenner/NACLA

community, Puerto San Lorenzo, the Electoral Tribunal brigade reported that it had interviewed two families, yet the government reported that all the families of the community were in agreement with constructing the road. In another instance the brigades consulted a community, Santa Rosa, but that this community should not be consulted because it does not belong to the Community Land of Original Peoples (TCO) within the TIPNIS, and that the same holds for another community, Limo, which is private property and not community land.

A further complication to this on-going conflict is the government's promulgation on October 15 of a new law on land, the Law of the Mother Earth and Integral Development for Living Well. While the new law aims to eliminate large haciendas and gives preference in distribution to appropriated lands to women, indigenous peoples and AfroBolivians, it also permits the exploitation of natural resources in whatever zone of the country they are found while respecting the environment.

At the ceremony promulgating the new law, Vice President Alvaro Garcia said, "[M]uch of the conflict with the TIPNIS Park is based upon a green capitalism which seeks to use Bolivians as guards of the forest in exchange for a little cash. ... We are not going to be mere guards of the forest and live like we are living now for 1,000 years more." He continued, "[I]f we have to take a mineral from the ground, we have to take it without destroying the environment, but seeking a balance between satisfying basic necessities, production, and preserving the Mother Earth."

Yet major indigenous organizations such as la Confederación de Pueblos Indígenas de Bolivia (Cidob) and the Consejo de Ayllus y Markas del Qollasuyo (Conamaq) reject the new law because in their eyes it replaces a concept of ecological development in favor of Mother Earth with a more established concept of development camouflaged with the word integral.

Central America: Promoting restorative justice

Escalating violence and crime in Central America during the last decade and the devastating toll they take on society demand urgent attention. The following article was written by Rhegan Hyypio.

Despite increased requests for alternative initiatives to curb violence and crime (for instance, see the Caravan for Peace, September-October 2012 *NewsNotes*), the U.S. continues to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in military aid to Latin America, which often promotes a dysfunctional system. Lisa Haugaard, director of the Latin America Working Group, testified to the U.S. Congress in September: "[It] is essential that the United States not encourage militaries to take over roles that are more appropriate for police forces ... In both Central America and Mexico, we are concerned that the U.S. government has either encouraged or tacitly supported inappropriate roles for the military ... Even though we all know that police are often too weak, corrupt, or abusive, it is a short-term and shortsighted solution to place military in police roles, and it can lead to more abuses. And military-style responses to law enforcement problems—whether or not they are carried out by military forces—can lead to serious human rights abuses."

One alternative response that has shown proven results – decreasing violence and crime and transforming communities – involves restorative justice initiatives.

Maryknoll lay missionary Joanne Blaney describes

restorative justice as "a process that brings together victims, offenders and a community of support. The process is based on truth and only happens if the offender admits and accepts responsibility for the crime or conflict. A key concept of restorative justice is that a crime is an offense against a human being and not just against the laws of the state. The victim decides if the process will go forward. The pain and suffering of the victim are communicated directly to the offender, who is held accountable." In her work in Brazil, Joanne witnesses first-hand how the process leads to forgiveness and healing. All too often, however, the strategy used throughout Central America, as well as the world, is one that involves militarization and a failed punishment system.

In September, the Washington Office on Latin America co-hosted a panel entitled "Citizen security in Central America: Challenges for society and responses from the international community." Panelist Transito Ruano, executive director of PASSOS, a non-profit organization in El Salvador that works to keep youth out of gangs and crime, spoke about how the *mano dura* (iron fist) policy to deal with crime and violence does not work. The aim of her organization is to allow for healing and transformation within communities. Like Joanne, Transito works with victims and violators, bringing them together to address the roots of the problems.

Transito noted the problem of fear and demonizing those whom we fear. She shared that when she first be-

gan working with youth who were either gang members or at risk of joining gangs, she found that much of the community, especially the parochial communities, were deeply afraid of them. Many from the religious community thought that the only way to resolve the problem with gangs was to wipe them out, for them to be killed. In order to help gang members choose a different path, she needed to change the minds of the community. This involved using restorative justice methods and tools.

She began to bring gang members, former gang members and others in the community together to listen to and learn from one another. Community members were able to voice their fears of the crime and violence that takes place with gangs and drug trafficking. Those with gang experience had a chance to hear how their involvement had caused others to suffer. They were also able to share that they chose that lifestyle because of the lack of alternatives. By sitting down together, they began to establish mutual understanding, empathy, trust and respect. The communities organized themselves to provide more options for youth than joining gangs and/or involvement with drug trafficking. Through PASSOS, community outreach workers are trained to teach violence prevention curricula in schools, run afterschool sports programs and provide after school accompani-

ment in areas where gangs are prevalent.

True citizen security will never exist when opportunities are not present for education, employment with a dignified salary, enough nourishing food, a decent home to live in and community support. For positive transformation to occur, those involved and affected by the crime and violence (perpetrators, victims and others from the community) need to be a part of the healing process. In a militarized approach, this is not possible. It recognizes the crime as against the state and does not allow for the possibility to bring affected parties together for restoration and healing. More often than not, the end result of a militarized approach is the extermination of those who commit the crime against the state. It does not recognize the unjust systemic factors that lead people to choose crime and violence in the first place. Instead of spending as much on a military approach, more needs to be invested in positive structural change, including ways to bring victims, perpetrators and other community members together to decide what is needed to bring about true restorative justice, which leads to citizen security.

Learn more about PASSOS at www.destinyschildren.org/en/need-help/after-school-programs/el-salvador-passos/.

Brazil: Archdiocesan group sponsors debate

The following update was provided by Maryknoll Fr. Dan McLaughlin.

On October 28, residents of São Paulo, Brazil's largest city and its financial capital, elected Fernando Haddad of the Workers Party as mayor.

Brazilian political campaigns, much like their counterparts in the U.S., can be very negative and weak on specific policy suggestions. However, this year, a small group from the Archdiocese of São Paulo decided that the candidates for mayor should better understand the issues and problems that affect many of the city's poorest, most marginalized residents.

Fr. Dan McLaughlin lives and works in the northern Brasilia area of São Paulo, a peripheral, poor area where 812,000 of the city's 11 million residents live. Here the archdiocese has a number of social committees, including the 12-member Faith and Politics Pastoral group that meets monthly.

In mid-2011, the Pastoral's members began to reflect on the upcoming mayoral election, and decided to invite the candidates for a debate which would take place in August 2012. The group began a process to name the

concerns of the people of this sector of the city. After many months of discussion, meetings and research, the Faith and Politics Pastoral, in union with different movements and stakeholder groups, agreed on the following major issues: health, education, environment, violence, housing, and public transportation.

A written invitation was sent to the 12 candidates for mayor, signed by the auxiliary bishop of the region of Brasilia, along with the signatures of the coordinators of the social pastorals, the Base Christian Communities and the Faith and Politics Pastoral. Six candidates accepted the invitation to the debate; Haddad excused himself and sent a representative in his place; and five did not respond.

A PowerPoint presentation on the reality of Brasilia was sent, along with the proposals on the six topics of concern, to the candidates. On August 11, more than 300 people attended the event. The success of the debate gives hope that the community will continue to actively engage in the political process, and that politicians will remember that they represent all residents of their regions/cities.

Global hunger: Who decides what?

In recent years industrial agricultural corporations and financial actors have taken control over many aspects of the global food industry including land, production processes, and even the pricing. At the same time governments and multilateral organizations increasingly are embracing and promoting private sector solutions in the struggle against hunger and malnutrition without adequate public regulation of existing conflicts of interest. As all of this unfolds, concerns escalate that the people suffering from hunger and malnutrition will have even less access to food and to the resources to grow food for themselves. Moreover, these very people may even lose their voice in the political decision making process around food policy. The following article looks at recent attempts to identify and address these concerns as hunger around the world only increases.

Since the food crisis of 2009 faith-based groups in Washington have been watching the U.S. response to global hunger and food security. Agricultural programs in less industrialized countries around the world have suffered in the past 20 years, first through cutbacks made through structural adjustment programs, and then with the global financial meltdown in 2009. Small holder farmers need new investment, but the type of investment is as important as the investment itself.

In recent years the U.S. response has shifted. What was once publicly funded increasingly is being replaced with private investments, first through public-private partnerships and more recently through private-only sources with initiatives like those proposed in the G8's New Alliance, announced in May. The Maryknoll discussion paper "Public-private partnerships: Working together to reduce global hunger," released in September, highlights a set of principles designed by faith groups and allied organizations that give public-private partnerships the best chance of success, while detailing the historical trends that led to the New Alliance announcement.

First, at the most basic level, public-private partnerships and private investment should complement, not substitute, public investments in agriculture. Public investments and public commitments to invest in

agriculture – like the U.S. commitment made under the L'Aquila accords – are generally more accountable to the public at large. Second, public-private partnerships and private investment should reflect a "right to food approach" and enhance smallholder farmers' capacity to meet their immediate household food and nutrition needs. Third, these investments should provide measurable benefits to smallholder farmers and rural consumers. Fourth, they should encourage socially and environmentally sustainable farming practices. Fifth, they should ensure transparency and provide mechanisms for civil society participation so that the people who are most impacted by hunger and food insecurity actually have a place at the table in decision-making and a means to hold both private and public sector actors accountable for delivering on their commitments. And sixth, such investments should prioritize and strengthen local economies – the global private sector should not be prioritized at the expense of the local private interests.



Public-Private Partnerships: *Working Together to Reduce Global Hunger?*

A Faith Community Discussion Paper
Published by the Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns

Developed in consultation with faith-based &
allied organization advocacy partners

At the same time, in Europe, the Right to Food and Nutrition Network was looking at similar issues, and in October 2012 released a report entitled “Who decides about global food and nutrition? Strategies to regain control.” Members of the network (including staff at the Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns) looked mainly at the human right to food as a framework and tool that can be used to help those most impacted regain some control over the food system. This report is much more comprehensive in looking at the roles of speculation, private and public-private investments in food accessibility; and how strong agribusiness interests are becoming extremely powerful in young democracies and weak nations. This concern is especially alarming as land grabbing continues on a global scale. In many cases it is the industrial agribusinesses themselves who are convincing legislators in less industrialized countries to write the laws that will benefit their business interests – creating “enabling environments” for business to flourish. The conflict of interest issues are tremendous.

One ray of hope for using the human rights approach to balance the trend toward private investment and control in food security projects is the first version of the new Global Strategic Framework for Food Secu-

urity and Nutrition (GSF) issued by the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) in mid-October. The CFS was set up as an intergovernmental body and was reformed in 2009 to be more inclusive of all stakeholders; it is a forum for review and follow-up of food security policies. It reports annually to Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (ECOSOC).

This newest draft of the GSF was crafted with the extensive input of farmers’ organizations and other civil society groups through the CFS’s Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) and was built on the human rights approach, women’s rights and the recognition of the central role in food and nutrition security played by smallholder farmers, agricultural food workers, artisanal fisher folks, pastoralists, indigenous peoples, landless people, women and youth. Once finalized, the new GSF will act as the primary global reference for coordination and coherence in decision making on food and agricultural issues; and with its new rights based approach, may serve as a tool to hold accountable states, intergovernmental institutions and the private sector for their actions and omissions regarding their obligations under international human rights law.

Climate change: Final prep for Qatar conference

As we pray for those affected by the terrible devastation in the wake of Hurricane Sandy at the end of October -- a storm whose size and ferocity can be attributed to climate change -- we are faced with the dire need to respond as one Earth community.

On October 18-19, representatives of like-minded countries met in Beijing to create a platform to exchange views and, significantly, to coordinate negotiating positions in preparation for the upcoming UN Climate Change Conference, to take place in Doha, Qatar, beginning at the end of November. The meeting was attended by representatives of Bolivia, China, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Malaysia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Thailand and Venezuela, countries already experiencing severe climate change impacts. The work of the meeting was rooted in sustainable development; that is, economic development that takes into account social justice and environmental protection as well as equity. In this context, equity refers to using the planet’s resources with prudence lest future generations find themselves without the necessary resources to meet their needs.

A major factor in development is sourcing energy. Industrially developed nations either had their own en-

ergy resources or were able to import what they needed. Some currently less industrialized countries had their own energy sources but did not utilize them to modernize and move their populations out of poverty. In some cases, the populations are now huge, as in China and India, and the energy currently required for development is also huge. Other nations traditionally have not had sufficient energy to meet their needs. Whereas poverty and under development may have been seen as inevitable in the past, the case is different now. Now, it is universally acknowledged that all humanity has the fundamental right to live with freedom and dignity. Access to the resources, such as energy, to achieve these rights is implicitly understood.

One of the main development problems today rests in the fact that the rapid industrial development of the post-World War II years had the unanticipated consequence of nearly using up the planet’s atmospheric space for safely storing burned energy’s toxic carbon emissions from fossil fuels. This severely compounds the development challenge for nations currently struggling to move out of poverty and into the modern period through the use of fossil fuels for energy.

To deal with this issue, in 2007, an international

agreement was reached stating that all countries are obligated to diminish the generation of carbon emissions. However, the obligations apply differently; industrialized countries have a greater obligation to lower carbon emissions and to cede to less industrialized countries the remaining carbon storage space in the planet's atmosphere, even as these same countries plan for a future mainly undergirded by renewable energy sources.

Basically, this means that while all nations accept the responsibility to develop within the framework of planetary limitations for absorbing carbon emissions, wealthier countries that have been creating carbon emissions and occupying the atmosphere's limited carbon storage space over a long period of time should be the first to pull back and give poorer nations the chance to catch up. In other words, more industrialized countries need to be at the forefront in developing and putting into use clean renewable energy sources and allow less industrialized countries to prudently use carbon based energy and occupy the remaining carbon storage space even while they plan for a future based in renewable energy sources. The representatives attending the Beijing meeting of likeminded countries reaffirmed their support for this principle, commonly referred to as the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, which, in addition to the points mentioned above, includes the obligation on the part of industrialized nations to help other nations by sharing information about renewable technologies and helping to finance the movement of adaptation to a new planetary reality, where everyone is required to live within the limits of planetary boundaries, in a per

capita sense.

Related to this, as the date of the climate change conference approaches, more will be heard of the Kyoto Protocol (KP), which will doubtlessly be renewed for at least another five to eight years. The KP is the agreement in which nations publically commit themselves to particular percentage cuts in their national carbon emissions. The United States will definitely not become a party to the KP. Nevertheless, the U.S. has committed itself to be part of the conversations for a new climate change agreement, the Durban Platform, which will be binding on all nations. It is hoped that the terms of this new agreement will be delineated by 2015, and that it will be ratified and come into effect by the year 2020. It is generally agreed that the terms need to be ambitious so that the process of global warming may be halted and the balance of earth's atmosphere may be maintained.

The end of the year will also bring Advent and Christmas with their eternal theme of peace on earth. Clearly, peace will not come if humanity fails to turn away from its unsustainable greed and overly competitive economic patterns. Perhaps, though, the peace that has always eluded humanity may become possible if thinking shifts into a new paradigm where everyone's primary identification is as planetary citizen, with equal rights and shared responsibilities. The vision statement of the June 2012 sustainable development conference, the parent of the climate change conference, states unequivocally that peace on earth is the ultimate goal of all negotiations regarding the economy, social justice and environmental protection.

At God's table: Food justice for a healthy world

April 5-8, 2013 Washington, D.C.

The Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns invites you to join us for the **11th annual Ecumenical Advocacy Days (EAD)** to seek food justice for a healthy world. EAD 2013 will explore the injustices in global food systems that leave one billion people hungry, create food price shocks that destabilize communities everywhere, and undermine God's creation. At God's table, all are invited and fed, and the poorest in our midst are given a special place. Together we will seek the abundance and equality that we find reflected in the biblical image of God's great banquet table. Speakers will offer a faith-based vision for fair and humane food policies and practices, along with grassroots advocacy training, all culminating with Monday's Lobby Day on Capitol Hill.

EAD 2013 follows in the wake of national elections, a new Congress, a lingering Farm Bill debate, and devastating droughts and floods, all with lasting consequences for our society and world. **April 5-8, 2013** will be a critical time to raise faith voices in support of ending hunger, improving nutrition, creating more just and sustainable food systems and protecting God's creation - and advocating for a "Faithful Federal Budget."

Come to EAD 2013 and help build a world in which every person, in present and future generations, has a place "at God's table."

Learn more at www.advocacydays.org or contact the MOGC.

Trans-Pacific Partnership: Secret negotiations

In early September countries involved in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) negotiations resumed their 14th round of negotiations in Leesburg, Virginia. Though lip-service was given to transparency by the inclusion of stakeholder engagement, the meeting proceeded with the kind of secrecy that shrouds most trade negotiations. The Interfaith Working Group on Trade and Investment participated in stakeholder meetings raising a number of concerns including those around the section of the agreement that deals with investor state provisions.

Nestled in Virginia's wine country, the Lansdowne resort, with its manicured 45 holes of golfing pleasure, is the perfect destination for the upper one percent to get away from the distractions of the 99 percent. It turns out it is also an ideal location for trade laws to be hammered out without the scrutiny of Congress, the public and the press. This negotiating round the office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) reversed its longstanding practice of allowing members of Congress to observe trade deal negotiations; however over 600 mostly corporate advisors were consulted on the content of the classified TPP text.

At a Congressional hearing earlier this year, USTR Ron Kirk said that the TPP negotiation process is the most open and transparent ever. Without a doubt he was referring to the inclusion of stakeholder engagement activities on the agenda. But the format of the meeting made these less than constructive.

By USTR design, scores of stakeholder groups including religious, consumer, advocacy and business groups were granted 10 minutes each to speak on a particular aspect of the TPP. Civil society groups outnumbered corporate business groups in speaking slots because plenty of corporate representatives are already on the advisory committees and have direct access to U.S. negotiators.

All the stakeholders were crammed into small meeting rooms designed to seat about 20 people to deliver their critiques on various trade topics including access to medicines, keeping the internet free, investments, capital controls and many other topics. The rooms were so crowded with NGO and corporate representatives that the negotiators themselves left in frustration. Negotiators did not receive the agenda with the stakeholder topics until late in the process, and the presentation rooms

were so full, that it was standing-room-only.

Later in the program, eight of the nine current TPP country negotiators held a question and answer session with some stakeholders. While stakeholders asked specific questions, and for the most part, raised concerns about the TPP, the responses given were evasive and vague.

The Interfaith Working Group on Trade and Investment (IWG) was represented at the stakeholder meeting. A major IWG concern surfaced after learning of a leaked

TPP investment chapter. A chapter of the agreement leaked earlier this year revealed a radical redefinition of foreign investor rights which would allow multinational corporations to sue governments for millions of dollars in compensation for environmental or public health safeguards by claiming that such protections constitute an infringement of their newfound "rights." This would basically give foreign investors the power to tar-

get and undermine policies ranging from bans on toxins to natural resource protections; just as they have done under the similar investment provisions of the North American and Central American Free Trade agreements, NAFTA and CAFTA.

Nearly \$365 million has already been awarded to foreign corporations under NAFTA and CAFTA, to be paid by taxpayers, while over \$13 billion remains pending in such investor-state cases. Eleven member organizations of the IWG stated in a letter to the USTR: "[I]t is our common conviction that if we are to respect the integrity of God's creation, then the natural world, with all its richness and diversity, must not be sacrificed to short-sighted profit motivations. Unfortunately, the investor-state provisions under negotiation in the Trans-Pacific Partnership undermine the very principles of human dignity and respect for the integrity of God's creation..."

In mid-October a group of 11 senators led by Sen. Ron Wyden (D-OR) encouraged Kirk to ensure that negotiators remain firm on legally binding environment chapters in any agreement that arises out of Trans Pacific Partnership talks. The senators stated that "[a] binding and enforceable TPP environment chapter that stands up for American interests is critical to our support of the TPP." They also cautioned that other chapters in the proposed TPP agreement, such as the investment chapter, not undermine the goals of the environment.



Photo from Foreign Policy in Focus

Nuclear weapons: Moving toward elimination

Fifty years ago, the 13 days of the Cuban missile crisis left U.S. residents with a stronger recognition of the danger that nuclear weapons pose to the entire planet. Today, over 20,000 nuclear weapons exist throughout the world. The nuclear posture review by the current U.S. administration can be an opportunity to make progress toward a nuclear weapon free world.

On October 17, 116 local, regional and national organizations (including the Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns) highlighted the anniversary of the 1962 crisis to write a letter to President Obama urging him to use his current review of nuclear policy to move the U.S. program in such a way that it truly makes the world safe from these weapons. The letter also encourages the president to “reduce all forms of nuclear weapons well below the levels required by the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty [START], engage the other nuclear weapons states on transparency and nuclear posture, and push for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.”

In the last 50 years progress has been made in reducing stockpiles, limiting testing, and halting much of the development of new weapons, but much work still needs to be done. The letter to the president, organized by the Campaign for a Nuclear Weapons Free World and signed by local, regional and national organizations including faith leaders, environmental groups, elected of-

ficials and peace groups representing hundreds of thousands of people, carried one united message – to rid the world of nuclear weapons with the goal of saving billions of dollars, and making the world a safer place.

The letter quotes President Obama’s 2009 Prague statement, when he said that it’s time to “put an end to outdated Cold War thinking,” and points out that in “today’s world, nuclear weapons are a liability, not an asset, and the U.S. can maintain its security while taking responsible steps to reduce our stockpile and work with other countries to do the same.”

Though signers of the letter do not expect the administration to take any action until after the election, the letter also makes a fiscal argument for eliminating nuclear weapons. “At a time of intense budget pressures in Washington, D.C., and economic struggles around the country, conservative estimates put our spending on the nuclear weapons arsenal at \$30 billion a year. It is unwise to continue to invest billions of dollars in weapons we don’t need to keep us safe.”

In his September 23 speech to the UN General Assembly, President Obama appeared to provide a hint of his intentions with the review process when he said: “We will complete a Nuclear Posture Review that opens the door to deeper cuts and reduces the role of nuclear weapons.”

UN Conference on Small Arms, Light Weapons

“My mission can only be successful if the feeling is shared that the illicit trade in small arms forms a huge impediment for growth, development, safety and security.” Ambassador Joy Ogwu of Nigeria, President of the Second Review Conference for the Program of Action (UNPoA) on Small Arms and Light Weapons

From August 27-September 7, the UN conducted its Second Review Conference regarding its Program of Action for Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALWs); a framework for activities to counter the illicit trade in such arms. Small arms are weapons of choice for insurgents, armed gang members, pirates, and terrorists, all of whom can multiply their force through the use of unlawfully acquired firepower; small arms are cheap, light, and easy to handle, transport and conceal.

The illicit circulation of small arms, light weapons and their ammunition destabilizes communities, and impacts security and development in all regions of the

world. While it is true that a build-up of small arms alone may not create the conflicts in which they are used, their excessive accumulation and wide availability aggravates the tension. The violence becomes more lethal and lasts longer, and a sense of insecurity grows, which in turn lead to a greater demand for weapons.

At the end of the Conference, member states were able to adopt a consensus document that represents a positive reaffirmation of the importance of the UNPoA framework to international peace and security and, more specifically, combating the scourge of illicit trade in SALWs. Among the conference achievements is the creation of an International Tracing Instrument (ITI).

As conference president Ambassador Joy Ogwu of Nigeria stated, “Undoubtedly, the UNPoA remains the only global framework of practical measures for combating illicit trade in SALWs and its dire humanitarian consequences.”

Hershey's commits to 100 percent certified cocoa

On October 3, the Hershey Company announced that by 2020, all of the cocoa it sources will be independently certified, according to a press statement, "to assure that it is grown in line with the highest internationally recognized standards for labor, environmental and better farming practices."

Seventy percent of the world's cocoa is grown in West Africa, specifically Ghana and the Ivory Coast, where tens of thousands of children are forced, often trafficked, to work on cocoa plantations, and small farmers are unfairly compensated for their crops. Certified cocoa accounts for five percent of the total volume of cocoa in the world today, and practically all of the major cocoa buyers have been cited for labor abuses.

For a number of years, Hershey has been the focus of consumer campaigns by such groups as the Raise the Bar, Hershey! campaign of Green America, Global Exchange and the International Labor Rights Forum. The organizations have been calling on the company to end child and forced labor in its supply chain and start sourcing Fair Trade certified cocoa. Of all the major chocolate companies, based on what it has publicly disclosed, Hershey has done the least in ensuring that cocoa production in West Africa is free of forced and child labor.

In 2008, Hershey received a shareholder proposal from members of the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility (ICCR), and since then ICCR members have pressed the company to source cocoa in a manner that 1) can verify that none of the worst forms of child labor are being used in the supply chain; 2) traces the cocoa from the farm of origin through every step of the supply chain to the finished product; and 3) pays a just price to farmers growing the cocoa.

While Hershey's Dagoba Organic chocolate is currently produced from Rainforest Alliance certified farms and the company had previously announced its commitment to make its Bliss line Rainforest Alliance-certified by year-end 2012, the move to accelerate certification across all its product offerings is welcome and encouraging news.

With a 43 percent share of the U.S. chocolate market, ICCR views Hershey's decision as an important advancement that is certain to influence the industry and

result in more sustainable cocoa farming and production.

Kate Walsh of the Tri-State Coalition for Responsible Investment and co-leader of the ICCR dialogue with Hershey said in an ICCR statement: "As Hershey owns the lion's share of the U.S. chocolate market, we are pleased to see such a substantial commitment from the corporation. While there is no one solution to injustices such as forced labor, Hershey's commitment has helped raise the industry bar and is further acknowledgement of the reputational risks that non-certified brands face. We look forward to receiving more information around the upcoming certifications."

The Raise the Bar, Hershey! campaign said it was "pleased that Hershey is announcing 100 percent certification for its cocoa by 2020. To truly address child labor, Hershey needs to make sure it is certifying all of its cocoa Fair Trade, the only certification that adequately addresses the Worst Forms of Child Labor [as identified by the International Labour Organization]. Hershey should certify and label one of its top-selling, brand name bars Fair Trade within the next year, and should certify and label all of its chocolates Fair Trade by 2020. We urge Hershey to reveal how the company plans to get to 100 percent certification by disclosing the certifiers it will be working with as well as a timeline for converting specific product lines."

Indeed, how Hershey will certify its cocoa supply is a key question. On January 1, 2012, Fair Trade USA (FTUSA) left Fairtrade International (FLO), the dominant certifier of Fair Trade products, and companies faced a choice about how to participate in the Fair Trade certification process. As the Fair Trade Resource Network said, "An era of significant competition greatly accelerated between certifiers and labels in Fair Trade."

The global cocoa supply is under threat due to growing demand, climate change and tree diseases. Cocoa companies are realizing the farmers they source from need to adopt sustainable agriculture practices. In addition, thanks to pressure from civil society, the companies are beginning to see that cocoa growers need to be paid just wages in order to stay on their farms and that human rights violations must stop.



Resources

- 1) **A Maryknoll Liturgical Year: Reflections on the Readings for Year C.** This collection of scripture reflections written by Maryknoll missionaries covers the readings for each Sunday and holy day from the first Sunday in Advent (Dec. 2, 2012) until the Feast of Christ the King (Nov. 24, 2013) for the C cycle of the liturgical year. Missioners share their reflections based on their experiences in Nepal, Guatemala, Tanzania, Oaxaca, to name only a few of the places where Maryknollers have served. Edited by Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns' staffers Judy Coode and Kathy McNeely. Available from Orbis website, www.orbis-books.org; 160 pages, \$20.
 
- 2) **Friends Across Borders immersion experiences:** Friends Across Borders, a project of the Maryknoll Lay Missioners, has several immersion trips planned: 1) **Cambodia, February 15–March 1, 2013** and 2) **São Paulo, Brazil, March 9–21, 2013.** Both trips will include site visits to Maryknoll ministries, daily reflections on the work of the Maryknoll community and contemporary issues, and opportunities to visit cultural and historic sites. Trips to Bolivia, Tanzania and Kenya are also being planned for 2013. For more information, visit www.friendsacrossborders.org or call 914-762-6364, ext. 207.
- 3) **Canaan Fair Trade shop:** This program is dedicated to artisan quality products based in Jenin, Palestine. The company sources its agricultural food products from a network of 49 cooperatives organized in the Palestine Fair Trade Association with the membership of over 1,700 farm families. Canaan products are certified fair trade, USDA organic, and are found at specialty and organic shops across the U.S. and Europe. Canaan's olives and olive oil are highly prized and appreciated for the impact they have on the producers' communities. Shop their online store here: https://www.canaanusa.com/_endtheoccupation.php?v1. Proceeds go to support the U.S. Campaign to End the Occupation.
- 4) **New list of cleared Guantanamo prisoners:** The "Close Guantanamo" campaign has published the names and details of the latest list of Guantanamo prisoners who have been cleared by the Obama administration. This list was released in September by the Justice Department, and includes the names of 55 of the 86 men who have been cleared for freedom President Obama's Guantánamo Review Task Force. Read the update and the details on each man at <http://www.closeguantanamo.org/Articles/69-Who-Are-the-55-Cleared-Guantanamo-Prisoners-on-the-List-Released-by-the-Obama-Administration>.
- 5) **350.org:** This global grassroots movement to solve the climate crisis promotes online campaigns, grassroots organizing, and mass public actions which are led from the bottom up by thousands of volunteer organizers in over 188 countries. The number 350 means climate safety: To preserve our planet, scientists tell us we must reduce the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere from its current level of 392 parts per million to below 350 ppm. 350.org works hard to organize in a new way—everywhere at once, using online tools to facilitate strategic offline action. It wants to be a laboratory for the best ways to strengthen the climate movement and catalyze transformation around the world. Learn more and find organizing and informational resources at its website, www.350.org/resources.
- 6) **Public-private partnerships: Working together to reduce global hunger?** This new discussion paper was prepared by the Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns and allied organizations. It examines the role of the private sector in agricultural development and food security and highlights the principles outlined by faith groups and allied organizations that give public-private partnerships the best chance of success. Learn more on page 13; read the document online at the MOGC website or contact the office for a hard copy.