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Thank you to everyone who took part in our QCEA Action Alert in July about the new plan to spend development budgets on military equipment, known with the paradoxically named ‘Capacity Building for Security and Development’.

QCEA supporters from ten countries made up 80% of all responses to the official public consultation. Together we explained why trying to solve problems with military power will not work and gave practical examples of non-violent policies that will build peace.

The structure of the public consultation made it difficult to express concerns. The clear and consistent message given by QCEA supporters meant that a peaceful voice was heard, with the vast majority of respondents recorded as opposing the plan. The official impact assessment for the proposal now includes a number of your contributions paraphrased by officials, such as:

- “the EU should support civilian-led peacebuilding efforts, since stabilisation and conflict prevention is best carried by civilians”, and,
- “The EU should focus on peacebuilding techniques to integrate young people into society. Education will help reduce the number of people whose only option seems to come with being recruited to armed forces. Peace education would be a particularly useful peacebuilding activity that focuses on young people, offering the opportunity to address the needs of a group whose interests are often marginalised during conflict”.

What now?
You prevented the consultation from being used to persuade MEPs that the proposals were popular with the public. We are now working to stop the proposal altogether. The proposals now move to the European Parliament. In the next few weeks the Parliament will choose an MEP who will be responsible for guiding the initiative through parliamentary processes. A committee will also be chosen to consider the proposals in more detail, before an eventual vote in a session of the full Parliament.

Andrew Lane
The European Forum on Armed Drones (EFAD) has held an event to inform MEPs about the harm caused by armed drones. Speakers included the Chair of the Yemeni Mwatana Organisation for Human Rights, who reported the experience of people who suffered directly from the use of drones and the European arms trade. A former official turned whistle-blower who had worked on drone operations also addressed MEPs.

EFAD’s event focused on the need to halt the proliferation of armed drones, and interim measures that would increase the security of civilians. Regular Around Europe readers will have followed the progress of EFAD, only established by QCEA in 2015.

The event was held the day before a joint hearing of the European Parliament’s Security and Defence Committee and Human Rights Committee. This hearing revealed two new pieces of information. Firstly, that EU Member States have discussed agreeing a common position on armed drones. Yet, they were unable to find consensus.

Secondly, many QCEA supporters will remember writing to their MEPs in 2014 in advance of a European Parliament resolution on the human rights applications of armed drones. It was confirmed at the hearing that the 2014 resolution is continuing to guide the policies of the EU's diplomatic service, the European External Action Service (EEAS). As a result, the EEAS should be opposing extrajudicial targeted killings by drones and not itself developing fully autonomous weapons systems.

It is far from all good news. For example, Italy has recently become the latest European country to operate its own armed drones. In the absence of a ban, there is an urgent need for an international framework that can ensure transparency, establish accountability and limit proliferation.

Website appeal
As part of the next step in its development, EFAD members have decided that the coalition needs a website to serve as an easy and professional way for policy makers to access information about the harms caused by armed drones, and the alternatives available. If you would like to make a small one-off donation so that a website can be developed, please contact Andrew [Andrew.Lane@QCEA.org].
Before the UK voted to leave the European Union, a poll for the Observer indicated that when asked for the most important issue affecting the country, more people chose migration than any other issue. Some referendum campaigners promoted fear of migration, such as the official Vote Leave campaign billboard that read, ‘Turkey (population 76 million) is joining the EU. Vote Leave’. Another billboard, published by UKIP, showed refugees walking through a field, and read ‘Breaking Point: The EU has failed us all. We must break free and take back control of our borders’.

These were examples of a ‘Post-Truth politics’ where political argument repeatedly appeals to emotion, but is disconnected from the facts of a situation, and factual rebuttals are ignored. This dishonest politics must be resisted by all who value their relationship with fellow humans and with the divine truth that caused us to be here in the first place.

**Bearing witness to the truth of our common humanity**

In August the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination published a report saying, “Many politicians and prominent political figures not only failed to condemn it but also created and entrenched prejudices, thereby emboldening individuals to carry out acts of intimidation and hate towards ethnic or ethno-religious minority communities and people who are visibly different.” Post-truth politics is no joke, it has consequences.

**Post-referendum hate**

In Newcastle, a group of people held a sign reading “Stop immigration, Start Repatriation,” the day after the referendum result. In Huntingdon, cards saying “No more Polish Vermin,” were posted through doors and left on cars, and racist graffiti was found on the entrance of the Polish Social and Cultural Association in West London. London experienced nearly 600 reported hate-motivated incidents in one single week following the referendum, increasing the daily average from 44 to 67 reported hate crimes. Changes in hate crime statistic are difficult to interpret, as we know that most hate crime crime is not reported to authorities (see QCEA’s Briefing Paper: Hate Crime: Prevention and Restoration, 2015). However, there is no evidence to suggest that victims of hate crime have suddenly become more likely to trust the criminal justice system and therefore more likely to formally report their experience.

In interviews conducted for the New York Times in the Lincolnshire town of Boston (the area with the highest leave vote - 76% in favour of Brexit), some Eastern European residents said they have been scared to speak their mother tongue in public, and fear for their children being racially bullied at school.

This is not to link leave voters and racism in general. One could also assume that many of the perpetrators of hate were part of the 28 percent who did not vote. For example, shortly after the referendum a US-citizen on a Manchester tram was told to “Get back to Africa” by a group who were themselves too young to vote.

“We this mess of myths and misinformation has been packaged in a way that both dehumanises the vulnerable migrants and prevents solidarity from working class Brits screwed over by the same unequal distribution of global wealth that drives much migration”

Rebecca Omonira Oyekanmi
Standing up to hate together
Reassuringly, some organisations and citizens are responding. A Facebook group called “Worrying Signs” was set up after the vote for members to share xenophobic or racist incidents they experience. Their website also provides resources and information for reporting hate crimes and victim support.

The UK Race and Europe Network have also published an article post-Brexit called “8 Things You (As An Ally) Can Do To Combat Racism And Xenophobia.” These include knowing your rights, so that you can help others be aware of theirs in practical situations, and how to help someone experiencing a racist or xenophobic attack and how to report it. It also explains how we can use our privileges in society to pro-actively address racism, including by contacting MPs, local councils and journalists.

Elizabeth Wenninger

Eight things you (as an ally) can do to address racism and xenophobia
www.ukren.org/ukren-blog.html

Brexit vote sparks hateful referendum in Hungary
October will see Hungarian voters asked whether Hungary should accept a share of refugees under the EU redistribution plan. The recent success of the Leave campaign in the UK has reminded populist politicians across Europe of the power of referenda in spreading hate and fighting pluralism.

However, an atmosphere of fear surrounds the referendum. This is incited by a government that has spent 10 million euros on what the European Council on Refugees and Exiles has described as “a xenophobic campaign to divert public opinion offering scaremongering and distorted facts about immigration and refugees”.

A statement by 22 Hungarian civil society organisations, said “Its only outcome will be that the already extremely fragile solidarity in society will be further weakened and this will boost the government to carry on with the hate campaign”.

Brexit is about much more than just the UK leaving the structures of the EU. Every success for the nationalist cause will make their next success more likely.

Andrew Lane

Did you read the recent QCEA blog: Why the European Court of Human Rights should be important to young people? Visit: www.QCEA.org
Restorative Justice is a transformational way of approaching conflict and harm: rather than the adversarial win/lose model, benefits are sought for both parties through a third party supporting communication between them. This ‘balanced model’ has been developed in Northern Ireland alongside the recognition that, just as harm is not confined to crime, the need for justice is not confined to the criminal justice system. This need is as keenly felt in families, schools, workplaces, communities and in organisational and political life.

The European Forum for Restorative Justice (EFRJ) was founded in 2000 with the aim of contributing to the further development of victim-offender mediation and other restorative justice services in Europe. There is a wealth of experience and expertise across the countries of Europe offering the opportunity for shared learning, and the growth of policies and legislation to enable this form of personal accountability, this painful and demanding practical peacemaking.


The EFRJ organises a conference every two years in a different European location and in June 2016 the host country was the Netherlands. In all, 217 participants from 35 different countries worked together in an atmosphere of shared curiosity, learning and commitment. Against this backdrop, it was very difficult for the UK participants to digest the news on the second day of the event, that a majority in the UK had voted to leave the EU. Reports to the UK police of hate crime increased, illustrating the urgent need to build structures for non-violent participation and communication, which are at the heart of restorative work.

The EFRJ conference had begun with a major review of the Forum as a member organisation and a decision to adopt the expansive vision that ‘Every person in Europe should have the right to access Restorative Justice’. This ambition is anchored in the need to agree standards for the delivery of services, and the need to build institutional and political commitment nationally and internationally.

The setting of the conference, in the beautiful historic city of Leiden, reminded me of public co-operation. It was everywhere in the form of canals and waterways. The themes included liberty, detention and access to justice, and broader applications of restorative approaches that help protect human rights, security and the dignity of vulnerable people. Abstract ideas were brought to life through a total of 36 workshops, including by a memorable young man whose meeting with a victim had led him to turn his life around. Some workshops were led by academics providing evidence to policymakers, some were the work of practitioners informing academics.
On the theme of hate, the expression of hostility towards people identified as different; one workshop addressed whether restorative language can effectively prevent ‘terrorism’ and justifications of a power-based struggle. Another was a ‘Master-class in the skills to deal with

Restorative Justice is achieved through safe, supported and voluntary communication between a person harmed by a crime or conflict and the person who caused the harm, for the purpose of repairing the harm.

conflict around the accommodation of refugees’. Another was an invitation to participate in a circle process which has been successfully introduced in some refugee camps to build relationships and resilience in the face of trauma - including the camp guards. The principles underpinning circles of support and accountability have countless applications.

Engaging citizens and civil society organisations with the aim of becoming more restorative, holds great potential. For example, restorative approaches offer a shared language which crosses all borders and emphasises our shared humanity while recognising and respecting differences of experience and perspective.

Deborah Mitchell, Marazion Quaker Meeting

For more information about International Restorative Justice Week (20-27 November) please visit: www.euforumrj.org/events/rj-week-2016/

Deborah's participation at the conference was supported by the hospitality of Dutch Friends Inge Herrebout and Peter van Leeuwen. Thank you.

Deborah Mitchell and other participants at the European Forum for Restorative Justice conference. Credit EFRJ.

Restoration better than retribution, QCEA tells EU religious dialogue

QCEA Representative, Andrew Lane, called for restorative justice options to be developed for hate crime, at the meeting in early September. Andrew gave examples of where restorative justice had been used successfully to address the harm caused to victims of hate crime. His remarks also explained how restorative approaches can improve re-offending rates and benefit the wider community.

The meeting heard an address from, Katharina von Schnurbein, the European Commission official responsible for dialogue with religious groups and for action to reduce anti-Semitism. Some participants raised concerns that European Commission hate crime initiatives were restricting freedom of speech, but Andrew offered the Commission encouragement in their work. He also took the opportunity to raise concerns about the absence of ethnic diversity within the European Commission, and pointed to some of the Commission’s structures and processes that are excluding ethnic minorities.
Welcome to our new Peace Programme Lead

Olivia Caeymaex joins QCEA as our new Peace Programme Lead, and the third member of our staff team. The role will work with European policy-makers to discourage the use of harmful and ineffective military responses, and build the capacity for peacebuilding.

Olivia has eight years experience of peacebuilding and conflict prevention, including six years at the United Nations. Her policy work in conflict prevention also includes field experience working for the International Crisis Group and the Enough Project respectively in Kenya and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Olivia is bilingual in English and French and is fluent in Spanish.

Before joining QCEA, Olivia worked as the Special Assistant to the United Nations Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General for West Africa and the Sahel, based in Dakar. Her prior work at the United Nations headquarters includes experience at the United Nations University looking at issues such as modern slavery and crimes against humanity, as well as at the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Policy Committee Secretariat at the Executive Office of the Secretary-General.

You can contact Olivia at Olivia.Caeymaex@QCEA.org

Quaker House hosts four fundraising dinners for Syrian refugees

The project is led by the refugees and asylum seekers themselves. An average of 45 guests have attended each dinner, experiencing a wide range of Syrian cuisine. QCEA promotes the peacebuilding policies that could reduce violent conflict and forced migration. However, we will also use our space to make a more immediate contribution, alongside the local Quaker community.

One of the four dinners in Quaker House, Brussels this summer.
Are the seeds of war and oppression found in our pensions and savings?

Investment plays a huge role in the global economy. Almost 60 trillion euro is invested in the companies that we buy from, that employ us, and that shape the world we live in. A lot of this money belongs to ordinary people through savings and pensions, and we all have a stake in the way it is spent.

The European Union is an important global actor in setting standards on ethical investment. Europe has an advanced system of regional cooperation in this area, particularly given current plans for a Capital Market Union, and the Green Paper on Retail Financial Services. The UK had one of the loudest voices in these discussions in Brussels, so Brexit will make a difference to the compromises reached between different member states.

QCEA has often been critical of France’s proactive support for the French and European arms trade. However, in the area of sustainability, France has recently been leading efforts to encourage ethical investment in Europe. In part, this may have been because of their role in hosting the COP21 climate change negotiations.

“We turn all the treasures we possess into the channel of universal love becomes the business of our lives.”

John Woolman, 1763.

Considering the impact that companies have on communities and the environment, investment has potential to be a transformational force for good. But only if the people making decisions about how to invest define value more broadly than just short-term profit.

We all feel responsible, but it can be difficult to know how to act if we think we are alone.

Quakers were amongst the earliest communities to seek to invest ethically. For example, in 1758, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting prohibited members from participating in the slave trade. More recently Quaker Peace and Social Witness, part of Quakers in Britain, co-founded the Your Faith Your Finance website (www.yourfaithyourfinance.org).

QCEA recently met with ShareAction - a charity that is advocating for responsible investment across Europe. They have spent ten years working towards a vision of an investment system that truly serves savers and communities, and protects our environment for the long term.

We discussed current developments in Europe, and the possibility of disinvesting from fossil fuels and the arms trade. ShareAction run campaigns on environmental and social issues that the investment industry has the power to help solve. Sixty percent of ShareAction’s work is to promote ethical investment to ensure the sustainability of our environment.

As an individual, you can get involved with their campaigns and influence the people managing your savings to invest more responsibly. Find out more at shareaction.org or email info@shareaction.org.

Andrew Lane, with colleagues from ShareAction
In May 2016 Quakers in Britain, together with the Quaker Council for European Affairs (QCEA) wrote to European Trade Commissioner, Cecilia Malmström and (then) UK Prime Minister David Cameron about the Transatlantic Trade and Investment partnership (TTIP). Our letters explained that many Quakers, in both Europe and the US had deep concerns about the proposed trade deal and enclosed copies of Trade for Wellbeing, not just for profit - a shared Quaker Statement on TTIP and Free trade agreements which had recently been produced by five Quaker agencies working in Europe and the United States.

Both the UK government and the EU’s trade commissioner have now responded to our letters. July 2016 also saw the 14th round of TTIP talks, with new EU negotiation documents being put into the public domain. Quaker Peace & Social Witness (QPSW) and QCEA staff thought it would be helpful to share some highlights of both of these with Friends alongside our responses to them.

One question we know is upmost on the minds of many British Friends is the extent to which the United Kingdom (UK) will either be involved in or affected by TTIP negotiations following its recent decision to leave the EU. Unfortunately, neither of the responses we received to our letters (which we wrote well before the referendum) have done anything to clarify this and this remains very much an open question around which there is likely to be considerable uncertainty for some time.

Whatever the UK’s future relationship with TTIP, it’s clear that TTIP negotiations are continuing and our worries about the type of deal that might emerge from those talks remain as valid as ever.

Our key concern remains a fear that the negotiations are prioritizing the possibility of short term economic gains over fundamental longer term issues such as the need to protect the Earth, promote equality and safeguard democracy. We - alongside many others - are concerned, for example that TTIP would give too much power to large, transnational corporations, would make it more difficult for governments to introduce measures designed to protect the environment or workers rights, and could impede the transition to a truly clean energy system. These outcomes would not just affect TTIP signatory countries, but also be felt well beyond.

Both the European Commission and the UK government were keen to allay our fears in these respects. In some areas such as the level of transparency around TTIP negotiations and our view that there is no place for the so called Investor State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) or Investor Court System (ICS) in trade negotiations[1], their responses yielded very little that was new.

However, one area that may be worth focusing on is the fact that the European Commission wants to include a so called “trade and sustainable development” chapter in TTIP. The Commission published initial proposals for the chapter in November 2015. It added to these in July 2016 and has emphasised that achieving an ambitious set of commitments in this area is high priority. So what is the trade and sustainable development chapter? And will it make a difference?

According to the European Commission website the aim of the chapter is to ensure that “economic growth, development and environmental protection go hand in hand” and “to make sure that more trade doesn’t have to come at the expense of workers or the environment.”

On first glance, the draft chapter looks impressive. It covers a wide range of social and environmental issues from the trade in natural resources to corporate social responsibility issues. The latest version of the proposals even highlights the need to “phase out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies” something that many Friends have been actively campaigning for.
That the European Commission is making an attempt to include such matters in a trade agreement is almost certainly a positive step. But in our view we are still a very long way from the vision expressed in Trade for Wellbeing not just for profit, where the trading system actively “contributes to fairly shared prosperity, and has a positive impact on the environment”. Firstly it’s important to bear in mind that the proposed trade and sustainable development chapter remains just that - at this stage we don’t know how much, if any, of the EU’s proposals will make it into the final TTIP deal.

Secondly, even if the EU’s proposals were adopted wholesale, some of them remain rather vague and aspirational. For example, whilst it is great that the draft chapter recognizes fossil fuel subsidies as a problem, the text would only commit the EU and US to “share the goal” of phasing them out, rather than taking any specific action. In other areas the text doesn’t seem likely to commit either party to much that they have not committed to elsewhere. For example on the issue of workers’ rights the proposed chapter “recognizes the value of global standards and agreements”. (This refers to legally binding international treaties or ‘conventions’ agreed by employers, governments and workers’ representatives under the auspices of the International Labour Organization (ILO)). However, the text only seems to require implementation of those standards which the EU or US have already ratified - significant when one considers that the US has only ratified two of the ILO’s eight core labour conventions.

However, perhaps the most fundamental limitation is that there is, as yet, no information about how the sustainable development chapter would be enforced, or what the consequences might be should either party fail to implement their commitment. Again - compare this to the very detailed proposals that have been published for the proposed Investment Court System.

To its credit, the Commission does recognize the need for enforcement mechanisms, saying it intends to develop proposals for these once it and the US are closer to agreement on the content of a sustainable development chapter. It is vital that this happens as soon as possible, as without effective enforcement, the risk is that any environmental or social commitments could be easily sidelined. Furthermore, for any sustainable development chapter to have credibility, it is also vital that other areas of the TTIP agreement are made consistent with its declared aims. At the moment, for example, it is difficult to see how increased trade will not “come at the expense of workers or the environment” when in other parts of the TTIP talks the EU is pushing hard to be able to import more carbon based fuels from the US and both parties continue to be committed to mechanisms such as the ICS.

As we recognize in Trade for Wellbeing, not just for profit, addressing these anomalies will not be simple, but it will be vital for negotiators to do so before we - and many others - can be confident that social and environmental issues really are at the centre of TTIP and other trade talks.

Suzanne Ismail, Quaker Peace & Social Witness
Andrew Lane, QCEA, August 2016

[1] Both the proposed ISDS and ICS mechanisms would allow corporations to sue governments whose policies or practices are believed to undermine that company’s profitability.

Take part in the discussion on the Quakernomics blog:
www.quakerweb.org.uk/blog/
Brexit has shaken the confidence of EU countries and their neighbours in the institutional mechanisms for dialogue that underpin peace. Nationalist political forces are seeking to take advantage of this vulnerability, by spreading fear and prejudice. If these narratives are not countered, societies will become more divided and the cycles of mistrust and violence will be spiral upward.

Europe is in need of Quaker work and values, perhaps more now than at any time in recent years. QCEA is small, but we are well connected, both in Brussels and to Friends across Europe. Together we are adapting our presence to meet the challenges of witness and reconciliation of the years ahead.

Do you enjoy *Around Europe*? Why not share your copy with your local community group, inter-faith or peace group? Or with a local university or library?

To subscribe to *Around Europe* please visit QCEA.org/stay-in-touch, or email office@qcea.org

---

**Donate to our Quaker work**

*From the UK:*
Cheques can be made to ‘QCEA British Committee’ and sent to: QCEA British Committee, 1 Lynton Green, Maidenhead, SL6 6AN. For electronic payments, please use the ‘Donate’ button on www.QCEA.org/home/involved/donate

*For donations in Euro:*
Please transfer donations to BNP Paribas Fortis Bank - a/c name Quaker Council for European Affairs, IBAN BE58 2100 5598 1479. You can also send a gift using the ‘Donate’ button as above.