



WORLD**BEYOND**WAR.org
a global movement to end all wars

Myth: War Is Inevitable

War is not in our genes:

War has only been around for the most recent fraction of the existence of our species. We did not evolve with it. During this most recent 10,000 years, war has been sporadic. Some societies have not known war. Some have known it and then abandoned it.

War is not “natural”:

A great deal of conditioning is needed to prepare most people to take part in war, and a great deal of mental suffering is common among those who have taken part. In contrast, not a single person is known to have suffered deep moral regret or post-traumatic stress disorder from war deprivation.

War is not a permanent part of our culture:

Any feature of a society that necessitates war can be changed and is not itself inevitable. The military-industrial complex is not an eternal and invincible force. Environmental destructiveness and economic structures based on greed are not immutable.

War is not created by crises beyond our control:

War in human history up to this point has not correlated with population density or resource scarcity. The idea that climate change and resulting catastrophes will inevitably generate wars could be a self-fulfilling prophecy. It is not a prediction based on facts.

Ending war is possible:

Human societies have been known to abolish institutions that were widely considered permanent. These have included human sacrifice, blood feuds, duelling, slavery, the death penalty, and many others.

Ending all war is an idea that has found great acceptance in various times and places. It was more popular in the United States, for example, in the 1920s and 1930s. In recent decades, the notion has been propagated that war is permanent. That notion is new, radical, and without basis in fact.

Myth: War Is Necessary

War Is Not “Defense”

The U.S. War Department was renamed the Defense Department in 1947, and it is common in many countries to speak of the war departments of one's own and all other nations as “defense.” But if the term has any meaning, it cannot be stretched to cover offensive war making or aggressive militarism. If “defense” is to mean something other than “offense,” then attacking another nation “so that they can't attack us first” or “to send a message” or to “punish” a crime is not defensive and not necessary.

Read also: [Myth: China Is a Military Threat](#)

There Are No “Good Wars”

Among those who believe that only select wars are necessary, the most recent widely popular example in a number of nations, including the United States, is World War II. This fact is stunning. People go back three-quarters of a century to find a defensible example of one of our largest endeavors as a species.

Taking the claim that World War II was “a good war” on its own terms, here are some often overlooked facts, none of which — needless to say — excuse in the slightest the hideous crimes of any party to that war:

- It is widely accepted that World War I was unnecessary, yet without World War I its sequel is unimaginable.
- Ending World War I with punishment of an entire nation rather than of the war makers was understood by wise observers at the time to make World War II very likely.
- The arms race between the two world wars was widely and correctly understood to be making the second war more likely.
- U.S. and other Western corporations profited by enriching and arming dangerous governments in Germany and Japan, which also had the support of Western governments between the wars.
- The United States had tutored Japan in imperialism and then provoked it through territorial expansion, economic sanctions, and assistance to the Chinese military.
- Winston Churchill called World War II “The Unnecessary War” claiming that “there was never a war more easy to stop.”
- Churchill obtained a secret commitment from U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt to bring the United States into the war.
- The U.S. government expected the Japanese attack, took numerous actions it knew were likely to provoke it, and prior to the attack: ordered its Navy to war with Japan, instituted a draft, collected the names of Japanese Americans, and ignored peace activists marching in the streets for years against the long build-up to a war with Japan.
- Japanese Prime Minister Fumimaro Konoye proposed talks with the United States in July 1941, which Roosevelt rejected.
- President Roosevelt lied to the U.S. public about Nazi attacks and plans in an effort to win support for entering the war.
- President Roosevelt and the U.S. government blocked efforts to allow Jewish refugees into the United States or elsewhere.
- Facts about Nazi crimes in concentration camps were available but played no part in war propaganda until after the war was over.
- Wise voices predicted accurately that continuing the war would mean the escalation of those crimes.
- Nonviolent resistance to Nazism in Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands, and even in Berlin — poorly planned and developed though it was in that day and age — showed remarkable potential.

War Preparation Is Also Not “Defense”

The same logic that would claim that attacking another nation is “defensive” can be used to try to justify the permanent stationing of troops in another nation. The result, in both cases, is counterproductive, producing threats rather than eliminating them. A defensive military would consist of a coast guard, a border patrol, anti-aircraft weapons, and other forces able to defend against an attack. The vast majority of military spending, especially by wealthy nations, is offensive.

Defense Need Not Involve Violence

Evidence shows that the most effective means of defense is, far more often than not, nonviolent resistance. The mythology of warrior cultures suggests that nonviolent action is weak, passive, and ineffective at solving large-scale social problems. The facts [show just the opposite](#).

People under attack can refuse to recognize an attacker’s authority. Peace teams from abroad can join the nonviolent resistance. Targeted sanctions and prosecutions can be combined with international diplomatic pressure. [There are alternatives to mass violence](#).

War Makes Everyone Less Safe

War mythology would have us believe that war kills evil people who need to be killed to protect us and our freedoms. In reality, recent wars involving wealthy nations have been one-sided slaughters of children, the elderly, and ordinary residents of the poorer nations attacked. And while “freedom” has served as a justification for the wars, the wars have served as a justification for curtailing actual freedoms.

Myth: War Is Beneficial

Wars do not benefit the people where they are waged, and do not benefit nations that send their militaries abroad to wage wars. Nor do wars help to uphold the rule of law — quite the reverse. Good outcomes caused by wars are dramatically outweighed by the bad and could have been accomplished without war.

War Does Not Benefit Its Victims

There is a fundamental error in supposing that a new war is likely to bring benefits to a nation where it is waged, given the dismal record of every war that has occurred heretofore. Scholars at both the anti-war Carnegie Endowment for Peace and the pro-war RAND Corporation have found that wars aimed at nation-building have an extremely low to nonexistent success rate in creating stable democracies. And yet the temptation rises zombie-like to believe that Iraq or Libya or Syria or Iran will finally be the place where war creates its opposite.

Wars fought by wealthy nations against poor ones tend to be one-sided slaughters; quite the opposite of beneficial, humanitarian, or philanthropic exercises. In a common mythical view, wars are fought on “a battlefield” — a notion that suggests a sportsmanlike contest between two armies apart from civilian life. On the contrary, wars are fought in people’s towns and homes. These wars are one of the most immoral actions imaginable, which helps explain why governments that wage them lie about them to their own people.

The wars leave lasting damage in the form of brewing hatred and violence, and in the form of a poisoned natural environment.

Wars and militarism and other disastrous policies can generate crises that could benefit from outside assistance, be it in the form of nonviolent peacemakers and human shields or in the form of police. But twisting the argument that Rwanda needed police into the argument that Rwanda should have been bombed, or that some other nation should be bombed, is a gross distortion.

War Does Not Bring Stability

War can be imagined as a tool for enforcing the rule of law, including laws against war, only by ignoring the hypocrisy and the historical record of failure. War actually violates the most basic principles of law and encourages their further violation.

War Does Not Benefit the War Makers

War and war preparations drain and weaken an economy. The myth that war enriches a nation that wages it, as opposed to enriching a small number of influential profiteers, is not supported by evidence. In addition:

- Greater consumption and destruction does not always equal a superior standard of living.
- The benefits of peace and international cooperation would be felt even by those learning to consume less.
- The benefits of local production and sustainable living are immeasurable.
- Reduced consumption is required by the earth’s environment regardless of who does the consuming.
- One of the largest ways in which wealthy nations consume the most destructive resources, such as oil, is through the very waging of the wars.
- Green energy and infrastructure would surpass their advocates’ wildest fantasies if the funds now invested in war were transferred there.

Research and development would be more efficient and accountable and more directed into useful areas if separated from the military. Similarly, humanitarian aid missions could be run better without the military.

War Creators' Motives Are Not Noble

Wars are marketed as humanitarian, because many people, including many government and military employees, have good intentions. But those at the top deciding to wage war almost certainly do not. In case after case, less than generous motives have been documented.

War Is Immoral

Murder is the one crime that we're taught to excuse if it's done on a large enough scale. Morality demands that we not so excuse it. War is nothing other than murder on a large scale.

Over the centuries and decades, death counts in wars have grown dramatically, shifted heavily onto civilians rather than combatants, and been overtaken by injury counts as even greater numbers have been injured but medicine has allowed them to survive.

Deaths are now due primarily to violence rather than to disease, formerly the biggest killer in wars.

Death and injury counts have also shifted very heavily toward one side in each war, rather than being evenly divided between two parties. Those traumatized, rendered homeless, and otherwise damaged far outnumber the injured and the dead.

The idea of a "good war" or a "just war" sounds obscene when one looks honestly at independent reporting on wars.

When we say that war goes back 10,000 years it's not clear that we're talking about a single thing, as opposed to two or more different things going by the same name. Picture a family in Yemen or Pakistan living under a constant buzz produced by a drone overhead. One day their home and everyone in it is shattered by a missile. Were they at war? Where was the battlefield? Where were their weapons? Who declared the war? What was contested in the war? How would it end?

Is it not perhaps the case that we have already ended war and now must end something else as well (a name for it might be: *the hunting of humans*)?

If we can change our manner of killing foreigners to render it almost unrecognizable, who's to say we can't eliminate the practice altogether?

War Endangers Us

There are more effective tools than war for protection.

War planning leads to wars.

In arming, many factors must be considered: weapon-related accidents, malicious testing on human beings, theft, sales to allies who become enemies, and the distraction from efforts to reduce the causes of terrorism and war must all be taken into account. So, of course, must the tendency to use weapons once you have them. And a nation's stockpiling of weapons for war puts pressure on other nations to do the same. Even a nation that intends to fight only in defense, may understand "defense" to be the ability to retaliate against other nations. This makes it necessary to create the weaponry and strategies for aggressive war. When you put a lot of people to work planning something, when that project is in fact your largest public investment and proudest cause, it can be difficult to keep those people from finding opportunities to execute their plans. Read more.

War making provokes danger.

While the best defense in many sports may be a good offense, an offense in war is not defensive, not when it generates hatred, resentment, and blowback, not when the alternative is no war at all. Through the course of the so-called global war on terrorism,

terrorism has been on the rise. This was predictable and predicted. The wars on Iraq and Afghanistan, and the abuses of prisoners during them, became major recruiting tools for anti-U.S. terrorism. In 2006, U.S. intelligence agencies produced a National Intelligence Estimate that reached just that conclusion. [Read More](#).

War's weapons risk intentional or accidental apocalypse.

We can either eliminate all nuclear weapons or we can watch them proliferate. There's no middle way. We can either have no nuclear weapons states, or we can have many. As long as some states have nuclear weapons others will desire them, and the more that have them the more easily they will spread to others still. If nuclear weapons continue to exist, there will very likely be a nuclear catastrophe, and the more the weapons have proliferated, the sooner it will come. Hundreds of incidents have nearly destroyed our world through accident, confusion, misunderstanding, and extremely irrational machismo. And possessing nuclear weapons does absolutely nothing to keep us safe, so that there is really no trade-off involved in eliminating them. They do not deter terrorist attacks by non-state actors in any way. Nor do they add an iota to a military's ability to deter nations from attacking, given the United States' ability to destroy anything anywhere at any time with non-nuclear weapons. The United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France, and China have all lost wars against non-nuclear powers while possessing nukes.

War Threatens Our Environment

A major motivation behind some wars is the desire to control resources that poison the earth, especially oil and gas.

Oil can be leaked or burned off, as in the Gulf War, but primarily it is put to use in all kinds of machines polluting the earth's atmosphere, placing us all at risk. Some associate the consumption of oil with the supposed glory and heroism of war, so that renewable energies that do not risk global catastrophe are viewed as cowardly and unpatriotic ways to fuel our machines.

The interplay of war with oil goes beyond that, however. The wars themselves, whether or not fought for oil, consume huge quantities of it. One of the world's top consumer of oil, in fact, is [the U.S. military](#).

The U.S. military burns through about 340,000 barrels of oil each day. If the Pentagon were a country, it would rank 38th out of 196 in oil consumption.

The environment as we know it will not survive nuclear war. It also may not survive "conventional" war, understood to mean the sorts of wars now waged. Intense damage has already been done by wars and by the research, testing, and production done in preparation for wars.

Wars in recent years have rendered large areas uninhabitable and generated tens of millions of refugees. War "rivals infectious disease as a global cause of morbidity and mortality," according to Jennifer Leaning of Harvard Medical School.

Perhaps the most deadly weapons left behind by wars are land mines and cluster bombs. Tens of millions of them are estimated to be lying around on the earth, oblivious to any announcements that peace has been declared. Most of their victims are civilians, a large percentage of them children.

The Soviet and U.S. occupations of Afghanistan have destroyed or damaged thousands of villages and sources of water. The Taliban has illegally traded timber to Pakistan, resulting in significant deforestation. U.S. bombs and refugees in need of firewood have added to the damage. Afghanistan's forests are almost gone. Most of the migratory birds that used to pass through Afghanistan no longer do so. Its air and water have been poisoned with explosives and rocket propellants.

If militaries were made green in terms of their operations, they would lose one of their main reasons for war. (Nobody can own the sun or the wind.) And we would still have a long list of ... More reasons to end war.

War Erodes Our Liberties

We're often told that wars are fought for "freedom." But when a wealthy nation fights a war against a poor (if often resource-rich) nation halfway around the globe, among the goals is not actually to prevent that poor nation from taking over the wealthy one, after which it might restrict people's rights and liberties. The fears used to build support for the wars don't involve such an incredible scenario at all; rather the threat is depicted as one to safety, not liberty.

In close proportion to levels of military spending, liberties are restricted in the name of war — even while wars may simultaneously be waged in the name of liberty. We try to resist the erosion of liberties, the warrantless surveillance, the drones in the skies, the lawless imprisonment, the torture, the assassinations, the denial of a lawyer, the denial of access to information on the government, etc. But these are symptoms. The disease is war and the preparation for war.

It is the idea of the enemy that allows government secrecy.

The nature of war, as fought between valued and devalued people, facilitates the erosion of liberties in another way, in addition to the fear for safety. That is, it allows liberties to first be taken away from devalued people. But the programs developed to accomplish that are later predictably expanded to include valued people as well.

Militarism erodes not just particular rights but the very basis of self-governance. It privatizes public goods, it corrupts public servants, it creates momentum for war by making people's careers dependent on it.

One way in which war erodes public trust and morals is by its predictable generation of public lies.

Also eroded, of course, is the very idea of the rule of law — replaced with the practice of might-makes-right.

War Impoverishes Us

War cost the world \$9.46 trillion in 2012.

Direct Expenses:

War has a huge direct financial cost, the vast majority of which is in funds spent on the preparation for war — or what's thought of as ordinary, non-war military spending. Very roughly, the world spends \$2 trillion every year on militarism, of which the United States spends about half, or \$1 trillion. This U.S. spending also accounts for roughly half of the U.S. government's discretionary budget each year and is distributed through several departments and agencies. Much of the rest of world spending is by members of NATO and other allies of the United States, although China ranks second in the world.

Indirect Expenses:

Wars can cost even an aggressor nation that fights wars far from its shores twice as much in indirect expenses as in direct expenditures.

The costs to the aggressor, enormous as they are, can be small in comparison to those of the nation attacked.

War Spending Drains an Economy:

It is common to think that, because many people have jobs in the war industry, spending on war and preparations for war benefits an economy. In reality, spending those same dollars on peaceful industries, on education, on infrastructure, or even on tax cuts for working people would produce more jobs and in most cases better paying jobs — with enough savings to help everyone make the transition from war work to peace work.

War Spending Increases Inequality:

Military spending diverts public funds into increasingly privatized industries through the least accountable public enterprise and one that is hugely profitable for the owners and directors of the corporations involved.

War Spending Is Unsustainable, As Is Exploitation it Facilitates:

While war impoverishes the war making nation, can it nonetheless enrich that nation more substantially by facilitating the exploitation of other nations? Not in a manner that can be sustained.

Green energy and infrastructure would surpass their advocates' wildest fantasies if the funds now invested in war were transferred there.

We Need \$2 Trillion/Year For Other Things

It would cost about \$30 billion per year to end starvation and hunger around the world. That sounds like a lot of money to you or me. But if we had \$2 trillion it wouldn't. And we do.

It would cost about \$11 billion per year to provide the world with clean water. Again, that sounds like a lot. Let's round up to \$50 billion per year to provide the world with both food and water. Who has that kind of money? We do.

Of course, we in the wealthier parts of the world don't share the money, even among ourselves. Those in need of aid are right here as well as far away.

But imagine if one of the wealthy nations, the United States for example, were to put \$500 billion into its own education (meaning "college debt" can begin the process of coming to sound as backward as "human sacrifice"), housing (meaning no more people without homes), infrastructure, and sustainable green energy and agricultural practices. What if, instead of leading the destruction of the natural environment, this country were catching up and helping to lead in the other direction?

The potential of green energy would suddenly skyrocket with that sort of unimaginable investment, and the same investment again, year after year. But where would the money come from? \$500 billion? Well, if \$1 trillion fell from the sky on an annual basis, half of it would still be left. After \$50 billion to provide the world with food and water, what if another \$450 billion went into providing the world with green energy and infrastructure, topsoil preservation, environmental protection, schools, medicine, programs of cultural exchange, and the study of peace and of nonviolent action?

U.S. foreign aid right now is about \$23 billion a year. Taking it up to \$100 billion — never mind \$523 billion! — would have a number of interesting impacts, including the saving of a great many lives and the prevention of a tremendous amount of suffering. It would also, if one other factor were added, make the nation that did it the most beloved nation on earth. A recent poll of 65 nations found that the United States is far and away the most feared country, the country considered the largest threat to peace in the world. Were the United States responsible for providing schools and medicine and solar panels, the idea of anti-American terrorist groups would be as laughable as anti-Switzerland or anti-Canada terrorist groups, but only if one other factor were added — only if the \$1 trillion came from where it really ought to come from.

Some U.S. states are setting up commissions to work on the transition from war to peace industries.

Security Without War

Militarism has made us less safe, and continues to do so. It is not a useful tool for protection. Other tools are.

Studies over the past century have found that nonviolent tools are more effective in resisting tyranny and oppression and resolving conflicts and achieving security than violence is.

Wealthy militarist nations like the United States think of their militaries as global police, protecting the world. The world disagrees. By a large margin people all over the world consider the United States the greatest threat to peace.

The United States could easily make itself the most beloved nation on earth with much less expense and effort, by ceasing its “military aid” and providing a bit of non-military aid instead.

The momentum of the military-industrial complex works through the hammer-nail effect (if all you have is a hammer, every problem looks like a nail). What’s needed is a combination of disarmament and investment in alternatives (diplomacy, arbitration, international law enforcement, cultural exchange, cooperation with other countries and people).

The most heavily armed nations can help disarmament in three ways. First, disarm — partially or fully. Second, stop selling weapons to so many other countries that don’t manufacture them themselves. During the Iran-Iraq war in the 1980s, at least 50 corporations supplied weapons, at least 20 of them to both sides. Third, negotiate disarmament agreements with other countries and arrange for inspections that will verify disarmament by all parties.

The first step in handling crises is to stop creating them in the first place. Threats and sanctions and false accusations over a period of years can build momentum for war that is triggered by a relatively small act, even an accident. By taking steps to avoid provoking crises, much effort can be saved.

When conflicts inevitably do arise, they can be better addressed if investments have been made in diplomacy and arbitration.

A fair and democratic international system of law is needed. The United Nations needs to be reformed or replaced with an international body that forbids war and allows equal representation to every nation. The same goes for the International Criminal Court. The idea behind it is exactly right. But if it only prosecutes tactics, not the launching, of wars, and if it only prosecutes Africans, and only Africans not cooperating with the United States, then it weakens the rule of law rather than expanding it. Reform or replacement, not abandonment, is needed.

Abolish War Campaign

We are developing a strategy to end all war and all preparedness for war and all armaments. Contact us with your ideas, projects, and campaigns.

Please do this: Find someone who believes that war cannot or should not be entirely ended. Ask them to read our responses to common arguments for war and our arguments for ending war, including our case for greater security without war. Let us know of any point on which the case we’ve made fails to persuade, and we’ll work to improve it.

Send this email to all your friends.

There is much more that you can do, and the tools to do it with, in the Resource Center.

An outline of the strategy we are pursuing can be found in this Introduction to World Beyond War.

We believe this movement can best succeed, and other popular movements for positive change, can best succeed if all work together. We will be better able to protect the natural environment if we end war, and vice versa. We will be better able to create truly

representative governments if we end war, and vice versa. And so on. Ending war is not the only important cause worth working on, but it is one of them and part of the array of changes needed to make life good and lasting.

At the bottom of this website you'll find some current campaigns we are focused on supporting that move us in the direction of the abolition of war and the establishment of a sustainable and just peace.

We believe that the following types of steps are likely to help. You can let us know of others:

- Education about war, peace, and nonviolent action — including all that is to be gained by ending war.
- Improving access to accurate information about wars. [Exposing falsehoods](#).
- Improving access to information about successful steps away from war in other parts of the world.
- Creating a coalition that supports good work in the direction of ending all war, all over the world.
- Creating an easily recognizable and joinable mainstream international movement to end all war.
- Increased understanding of partial steps as movement in the direction of eliminating, not reforming, war.
- Partial disarmament. Elimination of offensive but not defensive weapons. Full disarmament.
- Conversion or transition to peaceful industries. ([PDF](#))
- Restraining and dismantling the [Military Industrial Complex](#).
- Base closures. Close, convert or donate foreign military bases.
- Democractizing militaries and making them truly volunteer.
- Ending current wars and occupations, and preventing particular new ones.
- Bans on particular weapons or tactics. Phase out nuclear and high tech weapons. A nuclear- or WMD-free Western Asia (Middle East) and/or other region.
- Ban foreign weapons sales and gifts.
- Advancing alternatives to war.
- Promotion of diplomacy and [international law](#), and consistent enforcement of laws against war, including prosecution of violators. Reforming or replacing the U.N. and ICC.
- Expansion of peace teams and human shields.
- Promotion of nonmilitary foreign aid and crisis prevention. A Global Rescue/Aid/Friendship/Marshall Plan.
- Placing restrictions on military recruitment and providing potential soldiers with alternatives.
- Thanking resisters for their service. (*"War will exist until that distant day when the conscientious objector enjoys the same reputation and prestige that the warrior does today."* —John Kennedy)
- Thanking many people not engaged in war for their service.
- [Honoring deserters](#). (Here's a project to honor peace makers.)
- Replacing war culture with peace culture.
- Drafting legislation to redirect war taxes into peace work. [Resist paying war taxes](#).
- Creating compliance with existing laws and treaties, including the Kellogg-Briand Pact.
- Creating new non-aggression treaties between nations.
- Abolish the CIA and other secret agencies.
- Outlawing profiteering from war. Ban the use of mercenaries and private contractors by militaries.
- Encouraging cultural exchange.
- Discouraging racism and other forms of bigotry.
- Discouraging and diminishing nationalism.
- Developing less destructive and exploitative lifestyles.
- The creation of a peace conversion taskforce to help communities make the transition from war making to meeting human and environmental needs.
- Expanding the global nonviolent peaceforce of civilian, trained, international, nonviolent peacekeepers and peacemakers who will be available to protect civilians and local peace and human rights workers endangered by conflicts in all parts of the world and to help build peace where there is or has been violent conflict.
- Expanding the use of public demonstrations and nonviolent civil resistance to enact all of the changes above.
- We're training people for nonviolent action. If you are a nonviolent action trainer please [click here](#).
- Creating Departments of Peacekeeping.

The Resource Center

Resources Are Being Developed Here As Campaign Is Planned

Everything we're developing is a work in progress waiting for your input. [Contact us here.](#)

Check out upcoming [events](#) and [resources for events](#).

[Send this email to all your friends.](#)

[Graphics.](#)

[Flyers, sign-up cards, sign-up sheets.](#)

[Quotes.](#)

[Send these messages to government officials.](#)

[Wear the message on shirts, stickers, cups, etc.](#)

[Wear sky blue scarves and bracelets.](#)

[Listen to this music.](#)

[Use this source of op-eds for newspapers.](#)

We're training people for nonviolent action. If you are a nonviolent action trainer please [click here](#).

Get More Involved:

Do you have time to get more involved?

If you'd like to help us with research into facts about wars and peace, email research@worldbeyondwar.org

If you'd like to do public speaking in support of ending all war, email speakers@worldbeyondwar.org

If you'd like to train or be trained in Nonviolent Action, email nv@worldbeyondwar.org

If you'd like to help with media and communications, email media@worldbeyondwar.org

If you'd like to help with this website, email website@worldbeyondwar.org

If you'd like to help with social media, email social@worldbeyondwar.org

If you'd like to help with fundraising, email funding@worldbeyondwar.org

If you'd like to help with lobbying governments and other large institutions, email lobby@worldbeyondwar.org

If you'd like to help plan events, email events@worldbeyondwar.org

If you'd like to join one of our working committees, such as Outreach, Events, Website, Strategy, Communications, Research, Fundraising, Social Media, Speakers, Nonviolent Action Training, Counter-Recruitment, or Alternatives to War for

Security — or if you'd like to help organize a local chapter in your area — please [contact us, introduce yourself, and explain how you'd like to help.](#)

[Contests.](#)

[Videos, Articles, Books, Etc.](#)

Declaration of Peace – Individual

I understand that wars and militarism make us less safe rather than protect us, that they kill, injure and traumatize adults, children and infants, severely damage the natural environment, erode civil liberties, and drain our economies, siphoning resources from life-affirming activities. I commit to engage in and support nonviolent efforts to end all war and preparations for war and to create a sustainable and just peace.

Declaration of Peace – Organization

We understand that wars and militarism make us less safe rather than protect us, that they kill, injure and traumatize adults, children and infants, severely damage the natural environment, erode civil liberties, and drain our economies, siphoning resources from life-affirming activities. We commit to engage in and support nonviolent efforts to end all war and preparations for war and to create a sustainable and just peace.