

Revised Schedule for CPP conference
(enables all people to attend all sessions)

Friday morning and afternoon
Murphy 103

9:00 – 9:45	Greg Moses
9:45 – 10:30	Jane Fitz-Gibbon
10:30 – 10:45	break
10:45 – 11:30	William C. Gay
11:30 – 12:15	Blake Hereth
12:15 – 1:00	David Speetzen
Lunch 1:00 – 1:45	Barry Gan in the University Club upstairs from the Hickey Dining Hall
2:00 – 2:45	John Lango
2:45 – 3:30	Jennifer Kling
3:30 – 3:45	break
3:45 – 4:30	Sanjay Lal
4:30 – 5:15	Andrew Fitz-Gibbon
7:00	Keynote address in Doyle Hall Trustees Room Medea Benjamin Reception and book sale to follow keynote address

Saturday morning
Swan 209

9:00 – 9:50	Randall Amster
9:45 – 10:30	John Gaski
10:30 – 10:45	break
10:45 – 11:30	Carlo Filice
11:30 – 12:15	Jean-Marie Makang
Lunch 12:15 – 2:00	Business meeting in University Club upstairs from the Hickey Dining Hall
2:00	Keynote address in Doyle Hall Trustees Room Robert L. Holmes

Saturday afternoon sessions
Swan 209

3:45 – 4:30	Harry van der Linden
4:30 – 5:15	Mark Woods
6:30	Banquet in Doyle Hall Dining Room President David Boersema Music to follow. Bring your instruments!

Alphabetical Index of Abstracts by Author

Randall Amster
Georgetown University

Saturday Morning 9:00
Swan 203

Gender, Peace, and Ecology: From Environmental Justice to ‘Sustainability Saviors’

In the annals of environmentalism, the role of gender is central yet often underexplored. Due to their close connection to the material bases of life in many locales—including procuring food, fuel, water, and other essentials—women have a unique perspective and capacity to address environmental challenges in important ways. While this can be empowering, it also potentially reifies historical associations of gender and nature that are problematic, as well as running up against a core tenet of *environmental justice* stating that people who contribute the least to crises are often impacted the most by them—and further that it should not then fall upon them to be solely responsible for remediating those crises. How can we engage these questions without resorting to either victimization or valorization? The emerging paradigm of *environmental peacebuilding* represents one mechanism for incorporating gender issues into a more complex analysis that credits both the burdens and benefits while suggesting pathways toward collaborative ecological engagement, emphasizing policy frameworks and lived experiences equally in seeking tenable and durable solutions.

Carlo Filice
SUNY Geneseo

Saturday Morning 10:15
Swan 209

Religions And Violence – How Do Major Religions Rank With Respect To Violence, Based On Their Key Texts?

The connections between religious texts and the support for, or ban of, violence are complex. Perhaps some simplified things can be said about which basic “Sacred” texts (hence which religions) have been most opposed to violence, and which ones have not. How to define violence? How about “*the deliberate infliction of harm*” (without initially worrying about separating justified from non-justified harm-infliction)? “Harm” in turn can be understood in common sense terms to include: pain, injury, capacity-losses, freedom-restrictions, death. Religions will be ranked with respect to violence based on their sacred texts and this account of violence.

Andrew Fitz-Gibbon
SUNY, Cortland

Friday Afternoon 3:10
Murphy 105

Pacifism and Nonviolence: Psychological, Spiritual and Sociobiological Perspectives

The paper is the initial results of my research for the invited book chapter in the *Routledge Companion to Pacifism and Nonviolence* edited by Andy Fiala. In some respects, it is a further exploration of Gan’s conceptualization of “Comprehensive Nonviolence,” especially as it relates to personalist aspects of the nonviolent actor. I explore some of the data on meditation and mental/emotional states of peace, etc.

Jane Hall Fitz-Gibbon
TST BOCES

Friday Morning 9:00
Murphy 103

Of Course God is a Man! Masculinist Justifications of Violence and Feminist Perspectives

In this paper I explore the concept of a male God and its implications for legitimizing violence. When God is perceived as male then the supposed masculine traits (domination, violence, strength) are accredited to God and heralded as something to be imitated and extolled. I will be looking at the work of feminist theologians Elisabeth Fiorenza and Phyllis Trible among others and suggest a re-imagining of God for a non-violent future.

Barry L. Gan
St. Bonaventure University

Friday Morning 10:15
Murphy 105

Clinton, Trump, and Pacifism

The most vociferous arguments I've heard in recent months from those whom I consider my friends are arguments insisting that I must vote for Hillary Clinton to prevent Trump from being elected. A vote for a third-party candidate, Jill Stein in particular, is a wasted vote, they say. I've heard these arguments before, I respond, and I'm told, "Yes, but this time its *different!*" Perhaps this time *is* different. But it's not a difference that matters. The same line of reasoning that led me to become a pacifist leads me to conclude that I must vote for Jill Stein this November. And so below I will review the arguments for and against voting for a third party candidate, and I will show why, in spite of all that appears different this time around, one should be voting neither for the Democratic nor the Republican Presidential candidate.

John Gaski
Notre Dame University

Saturday Morning 9:00
Swan 209

Reconsidering the "Religion of Peace"

Contrary to a popular impression in some leading circles, an argument is offered questioning whether Islam is in fact a "religion of peace," as it also promotes itself to outsiders. Evidence mustered features Islam's own occasional revelatory declarations in various ways about its true nature, including some culled from prominent secondary data, and behavioral indications of actual motivations. If the analysis is correct, failure to discern the reality could prove mortally dysfunctional for Western societies—just as Islam has proven mortal for many who have intersected with it.

William C. Gay
UNC, Charlotte

Friday Morning 10:15
Murphy103

Pacifism, Feminism, and Nonkilling Philosophy: A New Approach to Connecting Peace Studies and Gender Studies

For several decades, theorists have made connections between pacifism and feminism. Less well known is the new approach of nonkilling philosophy and its benefits for strengthening such an alliance through its efforts to unite peace studies and gender studies. Nonkilling philosophy contends that our primary normative focus and practical action should be directed, at the least, against all types of intentional killing of human beings and, ideally, also against many other types of killing of non-human life and the environment. In this essay, I will discuss how, beginning in 2009, Spanish philosophers Irene Comins Mingol and Sonia Paris Albert initiated nonkilling philosophy to unite peace studies and gender studies. In addition, after citing work by Robert Holmes, Betty Reardon, Duane Cady, and Karen Warren, I will argue that in several ways nonkilling philosophy is more radical in scope than either pacifism or feminism. At the same time, nonkilling philosophy is not hampered by stereotypes that often thwart acceptance of pacifism and feminism. With its reliance on discourse ethics and care ethics, nonkilling philosophy can move peace studies beyond conflict resolution and conflict management to conflict transformation and can move gender studies beyond exposing patriarchalism and achieving gender equality to fostering restorative justice. I conclude that nonkilling philosophy provides a constructive approach for criticizing militarism and sexism and for unifying efforts to respect, protect, and advance the value and diversity of life and the environment

Blake Hereth
University of Washington

Friday Morning 11:30
Murphy 103

Pacifism and Feminism

Some feminists have argued that being a feminist commits one to an ethics of care, and an ethics of care is incompatible with pacifism: If we truly care for those in our care, we will defend them from unjust harm—with violence, if necessary. Call this kind of feminism Anti-Pacifist Feminism. Against Davion and Anti-Pacifist Feminism, I offer reasons to believe that feminism supports pacifism (i.e., Pacifist Feminism). First, I argue that another fundamental commitment of feminism is a commitment against causing unconsensual harm to others. Thus, other things being equal, feminists should prefer Pacifist Feminism to Anti-Pacifist Feminism. Second, I argue that it is a fundamental commitment of feminism that the employment of unconsensual sexual violence is always wrong. However, there can be cases in which the only way to defend others from unjust harm is to use sexual violence against the unjust aggressor. Assuming Anti-Pacifist Feminism, it follows that it is permissible to use sexual violence against the unjust aggressor. By implication, it follows that Anti-Pacifist Feminism is not feminism at all. Thus, Anti-Pacifist Feminists must either (i) abandon their claim that a commitment to feminism requires one to do whatever is necessary to defend those in one's care, or (ii) show that it's necessarily wrong to employ unconsensual sexual violence but not necessarily wrong to employ unconsensual non-sexual violence, or (iii) claim that both kinds of violence are necessarily wrong. On any option, the Anti-Pacifist Feminist loses significant ground against Pacifist Feminism. I then consider several objections to my arguments and Pacifist Feminism more generally. I conclude that Pacifist Feminism coheres.

Jennifer Kling
Siena Heights University

Friday Afternoon 3:10
Murphy 103

Engaging in a Cover-Up: The 'Deep Morality' of War

In his book, *Killing in War*, Jeff McMahan argues for a revolutionary understanding of the justice of war. Combatants, he claims, only act justly when they fight on the right side of a war. Because they either do know better or should have known better, they act wrongly when they choose to fight. So, if it is true that one nation's involvement in a war is wrong, then Private Johnson's actions in fighting for that nation are wrong, and he ought to be blamed for them, not celebrated. McMahan argues that, although it is true that combatants who fight unjust wars act wrongly, we should not seek to publicize this fact. He claims to have uncovered the "deep morality" of war, but concludes that we should not integrate this deep morality into our military and international public policies, because of possible negative consequences. In effect, McMahan argues that just war theory should be divorced from military and international public policy. I first question whether McMahan is right to think that publicizing the deep morality of war will have the negative consequences that he claims, and then I argue that he is wrong to think that we ought to de-couple the theory of just war from the practice of military and international public policy. To do so would be to give up on the just war tradition's stated project of preventing morally unnecessary wars.

Sanjay Lal
Clayton State University

Friday Afternoon 2:00
Murphy 105

Affirming A Vital Connection: Nonviolence And The Disavowal Of Death As A Harm

Though it can be said that having freedom from the fear of death is a quality needed not just by peace activists, it is in particular need of affirmation by those espousing a philosophy of nonviolence. This follows from the commonly offered assertion that violence (be it personal, institutional, or cultural) is required for protecting our lives. While there is a rich philosophical literature exploring the supposed harmfulness of death, the topic is scarcely discussed by peace theorists. In this paper, I will show the significance the topic has for more broadly showing the attractiveness of nonviolent philosophy given certain non-religious understandings of death that are well suited for advancing non-violence.

John Lango
Emeritus Professor, Hunter College, CUNY

Friday Afternoon 2:00
Murphy 103

The Ethics of Nuclear Weapons: Why a No-First-Use Policy is Morally Imperative William J. Broad and David E. Sanger ask: “Is there any check on a president’s power to launch nuclear arms that could destroy entire cities or nations?” They say: “The short answer is no...” But there ought to be. While affirming nuclear abolition, I also want to affirm that so long as various states have nuclear weapons in their arsenals, it is morally imperative that they never be used. Therefore, every state possessing nuclear weapons should adopt a policy of no first use. If no state ever used a nuclear weapon first, no state would ever use a nuclear weapon. But what about a second use of nuclear weapons? Launching nuclear weapons in retaliation for a nuclear attack is a second use of nuclear weapons. Even if it is conceded that it is reasonable for Congress to delegate the power of authorizing such a second use of nuclear weapons to the president, why is it reasonable for Congress to delegate the power of authorizing a first use of nuclear weapons to the president? The Constitution grants Congress the power “To declare War” and “To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.” Therefore, to check a president’s power to launch nuclear arms, Congress should make a rule that Congress does not delegate to a president the power to authorize a first use of nuclear weapons, but instead that Congress reserves that power to itself.

Jean-Marie Makong
Frostburg State University

Saturday Morning 11:30
Swan 209

Peace and Democracy Beyond the Fear of the Other

This paper analyzes the current debate over the so-called clash of civilizations. This clash is between the East and the West and between the Judeo-Christian tradition and the non-Christian traditions. In addition, the claim is made that the spread of terrorism—mainly carried out in the name of religious creeds—is symptomatic of that clash. The first part of the paper analyzes this debate by exploring the motivations behind the debate; then it discusses the soundness of the concept “clash of civilizations.” The second part of the paper examines the connection between the fear of the other and the concept of “the clash of civilizations.” Thirdly, the paper explores the way in which the current culture of violence partakes in an age-long history and global context of violent encounters among human communities in the name of civilization, pointing out that the culture of violence should not be viewed as unique to any geographical or religious group or to any civilization; the paper also rejects the view that the violence which we witness today is an aberration to human civilization. The paper rather seeks to look at the human consciousness or mentality contributing to violent practices and to the inhumane treatment of fellow humans, a consciousness or mentality that presided over the emergence of the culture of Western modernity. That mentality is one of exclusiveness. In line with the latter claim, the paper discusses the way in which Christopher Columbus can be viewed as a representative of a civilization built on an exclusivist approach to otherness. Fourthly, in place of the belief in the clash of civilizations, the paper invites for a radical reinvigorating of the spirit of democracy and for a consistent application of that spirit in all our individual, communal, and global practices and institutions, as an avenue for lasting peace.

Greg Moses
Texas State University

Friday Morning 9:00
Murphy 103

Nazaretyan’s Strange Attractor and the Evolutionary Imperative of Nonviolence

This experiment is born of the desire to think nonviolence in terms of the advancing logics of dynamic systems. One compelling theorist is Akop P. Nazaretyan who conceptualizes the “Evolution of Nonviolence” in system-theoretic terms. In this presentation we will review the main terms of analysis that Nazaretyan deploys in his English language publications, pointing to his conclusion that we are approaching an evolutionary singularity that will test the ability of human culture to transcend its powers of self-destruction. Then we will survey some resources in Pragmatism, Nonviolence, and Social Theory in order to sympathetically affirm Nazaretyan’s conjecture that pluralism is the logic of a real future.

David Speetzen
Winona State University

Friday Morning 11:30
Murphy 105

Peace Officers and Police Officers: Last Resort, Discretion, and Self-Defense in Law Enforcement

The 'last resort' condition on the use of force says that it is wrong to use force when doing something less harmful or destructive would have been sufficient to bring about the same end. Because many people view this limitation on the use of force as a self-evident truism, they are surprised to learn that police officers have no legal duty to use force only as a last resort. Three reasons are commonly offered for legally abandoning the last resort condition in favor of officer discretion: (1) the officer's right to self-defense; (2) decreasing police casualties; and (3) epistemic limitations on investigation. I present objections to each of these reasons. I argue that an on-duty officer's right to self-defense might extend further than a private citizen's, but not in such a way that it allows him or her to use unnecessary force. Moreover, while I agree that decreasing police casualties is a laudable goal, I argue that legally abandoning the last resort condition results in a tradeoff that systematically (and objectionably) places the value of police lives over the lives of private citizens. Finally, I argue that the epistemic difficulties involved with determining whether officers did or did not use force as a last resort are either surmountable, or are common enough in other aspects of the law that they present no special reason to give up on the last resort condition in evaluating police force.

Harry van der Linden
Butler University

Saturday Morning 11:30
Swan 203

Global Warming, Military Force, and Feminism

The COP 21 agreement in Paris concerning global warming will likely fail to live up to its proclaimed aim of "holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2° C above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5° C above pre-industrial levels." The current promised GHG (greenhouse gas) mitigation goals of the supporting states, the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs), fall far short of ensuring this aim, and it is uncertain that necessary future revisions of the INDCs will be adequate. This makes it important to consider the full securitization of climate change, placing the enforcement of mitigation goals in the hands of the UN Security Council. This paper will argue against this kind of militarization of the prevention of catastrophic climate change on basis of political and moral grounds, finding support in just war theory and feminist responses to the use of military force.

Mark Woods
University of San Diego

Saturday Morning 10:15
Swan 203

The Nature of Necessity and the Necessity of Nature

However much we might like to protect and spare nonhuman nature from the ravages of wars and violent conflicts, we must contend with the notion of military necessity that functions as a foil for environmental ethics and a trap for environmentalists. In this paper, I argue that we must rethink our traditional understanding of military necessity to free ourselves from this foil and trap. Three environment-specific international treaties regulate the conduct of war: (1) the 1976 ENMOD Convention, (2) the 1977 Geneva Conventions Protocol I, and (3) the 1998 Rome Statute for the International Criminal Court. Conceptual problems with these treaties offer very little environmental protection in practice. Many problems with building environmental protection into international humanitarian law stem from the legal notion of military necessity; these problems requires us to rethink the moral notion of military necessity within the just war tradition. Nonhuman nature must be incorporated into the just war tradition as a whole to escape the foil and trap of military necessity.