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OBJECTIVES OF GREENPEACE Nonviolence TRAINING

FOR THE ORGANIZATION

- To ensure that non-violence remains a core principle in everything we do.
- To improve safety for everyone involved in our activities including authorities, bystanders, others, and ourselves.
- To reduce the likelihood that violence will prevent us from achieving the goals of our actions.
- This training enhances Greenpeace’s image by communicating to the public how seriously we take the practice of non-violence.

FOR INDIVIDUALS

- To introduce and explore Greenpeace’s historic use of non-violence.
- To build an understanding in the theory and practice of non-violence.
- To provide useful tools for non-violent attitude and behaviour during our activities.
- Build confidence among the participants in the use of non-violent direct action.
- Increase the level of understanding, co-operation and confidence amongst team members.

Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of contents</th>
<th>Brief look at the subsections in contents.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module 1</td>
<td>At the end of this module the participant will have been exposed to the values, history, and campaigns of Greenpeace and will have discussed the various points of view in non-violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 2</td>
<td>The aim of this module is to encourage the group to consider and discuss why new and experienced activists are involved with Greenpeace, and to share their own feelings about participating in actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 3</td>
<td>At the end of this module, participants will be able to identify differing views on violence and nonviolence and the group will have agreed on acceptable behaviour for their planned activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Module 4          | At the end of this module, participants will be able to understand why and how violence is generated, to know how
to contain it and how to deal with it nonviolently. This module will also teach participants how to identify and control their triggers, and to create empathy toward their opponents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module 5</th>
<th>At the end of this module the participant will be able to identify and demonstrate non-technical strategies and techniques that make an action safer and more effective, and will have discussed various aspects of action safety and effectiveness.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module 6</td>
<td>At the end of this module participants will be able to identify the elements of teamwork and apply them in real life situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>This section includes training techniques, sample agendas, NVDA trainers and evaluation forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVDA &amp; Legal</td>
<td>This section provides a link to the Greenpeace Legal website and information on jail solidarity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Introduction

### Objectives

### Nonviolent Direct Action Modules

#### Module 1

Objective: At the end of this module the participant will be exposed to the values and history of Greenpeace, and will have discussed nonviolence history and various points of view in nonviolence.

**CONTENTS:**

**Lecture/Discussion:**
- Greenpeace core values
- What is nonviolence and why does Greenpeace use it?
- Greenpeace history and campaigns
- History of nonviolence
- “Why use nonviolence?” brainstorm

**Exercises:**
- Tug-0-War

**Literature:**
- Greenpeace Mission Statement
- Waves of Compassion, The Genesis of Greenpeace by Rex Weyler
- Quaker Peace Testimony
- Challenges and Choices by Arun Gandhi
- Six Principles of Nonviolence & Six Steps for Nonviolent Social Change by Martin Luther King, Jr.
- Prague Spring, Czechoslovakia
- People Power, Philippines
- 198 Methods of Nonviolent Action by Gene Sharp
- Highlights of nonviolence in history by Sanderson Beck
Module 2

Objective: The aim of this module is to encourage the group to consider and discuss why new and experienced activists are involved with Greenpeace, and to share their own feelings about participating in actions.

CONTENTS:

Lecture/Discussion:
- Discussion of experiences
- Discussion topics

Literature:
- Protesting May Be Good for Your Health

Module 3

Objective: At the end of this module the participant will be able to identify differing views on violence and nonviolence, and the group will have agreed on acceptable behaviour for their planned activities.

CONTENTS:

Lecture/Discussion:
- Violence/Nonviolence brainstorm
- Action Videos – violent and nonviolent examples
- Nonviolence Guidelines

Exercises:
- Spectrum

Literature:
- Controversies in Nonviolent Action Theory

Module 4

Objective: At the end of this module the participant will be able to recognise violent situations and identify possible ways of dealing with them.

CONTENTS:

Lecture/Discussion:
- Definitions, what is violence?
- Understanding anger
  - Ways people deal with anger
  - Arousal cycle
Answers to verbal and physical aggression
   Identifying triggers
   Defusing strategies
   Confrontation using assertive communication
Non-Physical blocking, discussion and exercise

Exercises:
   Empathy/Respect exercises
      Us/Them
      Listening dyad
   Voice Control
   Body Control
   Hassle Line

Handouts: (Tips for dealing with anger and violence)
   Anger management skills
   Notes on Nonviolent action
   Nonviolent Response to Personal Violence

Module 5

Objective: At the end of this module the participant will be able to identify and demonstrate non-technical strategies and techniques that make an action safer and more effective, and will have discussed various aspects of action safety and effectiveness.

CONTENTS:

Lecture/Discussion:
   Action Dress
   Safety
   Image
   Greenpeace logo
   Discussion scenarios

Exercises:
   Non-technical blockade techniques
      Standing line
      Turtle
      Spiral
      Centipede
      Star
   Passive Resistance, discussion and exercises
      Tree method
      Sack of potatoes method
      Rock method
   Mass demonstration communication
      Group Clap
      Whisper Chant
Group techniques for responding to violence
   Huddle
   The V
   Puppy pile
   Fetal position

Literature:
   Police chemical weapons

Module 6

Objective: At the end of this module participants will be able to identify the elements of teamwork and apply them in real life situations.

CONTENTS:

Lecture/Discussion:
   Teamwork discussion
   Internal Conflict Resolution

Exercises:
   Trust, confidence and decision making exercises:
      Free Fall
      The Falling Bottle
      The Drunken Person/Bottle
      Blind & Guide
      Caterpillar
      Ship Game
      Twister
      Moon Explorer
      Eiffel Tower
      The Crab

   Roleplay exercises:
      Quick Decision Making Roleplay
      Action Roleplay

Training

Training Techniques
   Video Training Exercises
   Sample agendas
   Evaluation forms
   NVDA trainers

Legal

Legal Issues
   Jail Solidarity
Serving time in Jail

Introduction

For more than 30 years Greenpeace has been known and respected worldwide for its use of creative and confrontational action to bring about change. At the heart of these actions is a core principle by which we operate: that of nonviolence.

In the earlier years of Greenpeace history many of those who joined Greenpeace actions already had some experience in nonviolent protest. Due to various reasons, today this is no longer the reality and a need for training in nonviolence both for our land based teams ship’s crew is increasing.

During the IMAD skill share meeting in March 2002 it was decided that there was a need for nonviolence training in Greenpeace. In an effort to help answer this need, Greenpeace nonviolence trainers from 7 different countries met in Amsterdam in November 2002 for a one-week workshop. Over the next few months, a training program began to take shape.

This is the result of that effort.

There are 6 modules that are designed with the nonviolence trainer in mind. In each you will find the objectives, the content of lectures and discussions, and most important exercises that small groups may use to experience and apply the principles and ideas presented in the module. Also provided when appropriate are possible multimedia tools in aid of the discussion. At the end of each module you will also find relevant literature and references.

The information was borrowed from many different sources from within and outside Greenpeace individual and group experiences, handouts and books. Nonviolence has been used throughout history, and with the vast resources available on nonviolence it is a herculean task to compile all the important information in one set of modules. We have thus taken what we believe are those topics which are most relevant and useful to us as Greenpeace.

The modules are also not complete nor should their contents be considered as inflexible. The trainer can pick and choose what works. Additions, criticisms and positive changes to the modules are highly encouraged.

In this program you will also find an evaluation form. If you have used information from this website for your nonviolence training we are very interested in your experience. Therefore we would appreciated it if you would fill out an evaluation form and send it to Guido Verbist, gverbist@ams.greenpeace.org in IMAD. In November 2003 there will be another meeting of nonviolence trainers in Amsterdam to review the modules. For that reason any input is welcome.
Only by taking part in trainings and by gaining action experience will you find out what will work for you. However the most important thing to share is that actions should be safe and non-violent.

It is the campaign message we want the public to know, not the story about violence, damage or an accident. We hope that this initial effort will help us reach our goals of a green and peaceful future.

**Internal Conflict Resolution**

Objective: Within the activities of Greenpeace, differences of opinion and personality clashes that affect group harmony and our planned goals may arise. It’s important to have a structure that helps resolve these conflicts as they appear.

In case of a conflict, it is important to:

1. Recognise and face the problem.
2. Define the positions and interests of the parties.
3. Come up with solutions where everyone is a winner.
4. Persevere co-operatively until achieving the proposed solution.

When a conflict is perceived, it is important to try to define the conflict. The steps for this activity are well known:

- Sit in a circle.
- Speak one by one, without interruption or accusation.
- Be concise and stick to the facts.
- Respect the authority of the moderator and the opinions of the rest.

If the problem can’t be solved immediately, it must be defined clearly and a timeline should be established that leads to a solution as soon as possible. The issue must be reconsidered once in a while to verify progress and reinforce the results.

1. **Recognise and face the problem**

The first step in problem solving is to recognise that a problem exists and to accept its importance. The first condition is easy to achieve. Anyone may be able to see that something is wrong with a group’s relationships, especially when signs of obvious antagonism or verbal or physical aggression are produced. Accepting that the problem is important and that it deserves to be resolved is more difficult since some of the parties may not agree about the relevance of the conflict.

In this first stage of conflict resolution, then, every party’s personal perceptions about a specific problem must be explored, defining the problem with absolute clarity until an acceptable agreement about the problem’s importance is reached.
Clearly, this must be done through conversation that includes:

- Respect for everyone’s points of view, even if there is no agreement.
- Tolerance and support for group members that have difficulties expressing themselves.
- Patience and good will when listening to others.

Certain personal attitudes are also necessary:
- Self-control: Don’t let anger take control when opinions are adverse.
- Confidence: Express your feelings and opinions clearly, directly, and completely.
- Honesty: Always tell the truth and be sincere when expressing opinions.
- Humility: Admit from the beginning that you can make mistakes.

The spirit of the Activist and the group must prevail during the conflict resolution process. The conviction that a solution must be found that will benefit all has to be maintained. The common will is beyond the individual will.

2. Define the positions and interests of the parties

A position is the stated goal of each party, and may itself be the cause of the conflict. The interest is the underlying motivation that the position is attempting to fulfil. For example, President Bush’s position is to defeat terrorism and all those things threatening the “civilised world”, while his interest is to keep the USA economy strong through the oil security and political hegemony.

In every conflict interests are more important than positions, and only when we consider the interests as primordial or basic does a solution become possible. If we only try to satisfy positions, the result will be an endless series of explanations, excuses and accusations (“you told me…,” “I thought that…,” “you promised me that…,” etc.). Focusing on the interest, the parties will be able to reformulate their interpersonal relationship and develop an understanding for each other’s feelings. Then, they may propose acts for mutual benefit, which constitutes the next stage in the conflict resolution process.

3. Come up with solutions where everyone is a winner

The main goal, after defining the problem and focusing on the discovery of the real interests that lay beneath the problem, is to come up with a meaningful solution that considers the needs and desires of all the people involved. It is not easy to completely satisfy these aspirations. That’s why, in some cases, giving up may appear to be the only solution. So all parties must be warned that they won’t get everything they ask for, but also that they won’t leave with empty hands. Team analysis of a problem guarantees that it will always be neutral “third parties” that assist in the reaching of an agreement.
Throughout the process it must be emphasised that nobody is right all the time, and the group’s spirit and commitment must emerge and be maintained in order to promote and guarantee fair solutions. Also, especially emphasise that nobody “loses” with the possible solution, because even when some pretensions resign, the solution eliminates the conflict, and that’s a big benefit to all. A fight that end’s with one of the parties satisfied and the other not, is not yet resolved.

4. Persevere co-operatively until reaching the proposed solution

Merely coming up with an idea for a solution and forcing both parties to accept it doesn’t always mean that the problem is solved. If this happens, it is necessary to extend the timeframe of the agreement to allow the creation of new relationships and new behaviours. Act co-operatively to ensure that this occurs.

Training

Training Techniques

Video Training Exercises

Sample agendas

Sample Evaluation form

NVDA trainers

Training Techniques

Different nations and cultures will require different styles and methods of training. The following techniques, if appropriate for your training and group, may be useful or may be discarded at the trainer’s discretion.

Introduction

Begin your training with a brief, modest introduction of yourself, your experience with direct action and nonviolence training, and any other relevant information.

Have the participants wear name tags, if you need them as a reminder.

Set some ground rules for the training, including:

- We will treat each other with respect.
- We will not interrupt each other.
- We will create space for less assertive or articulate participants to express themselves.
- We may disagree with opinions, but not attack individuals.
- Since participants should feel free to express their feelings and opinions, statements made during this training should be treated as confidential.
Alternatively, the trainers and trainees may collectively agree on a certain set of ground rules. While more time consuming, this method has the advantage of creating a shared responsibility since the rules were created by the group, rather than being imposed by the trainer.

If the training is to be recorded, or the media or other non-participants are to be present, participants should either have been informed prior to training day, or be given an opportunity to close the training.

Smoking rules acceptable to all must be agreed upon.

If some participants are not native speakers of the language you are training in, encourage them to speak up if they don’t understand something. One suggestion is to give them some pieces of coloured paper or other signal that they may use without feeling like they’re interrupting.

Explain to the group that nonviolence can consume a lifetime of study, is the subject of entire school semesters and many books, or can be the purpose of a multi-day or weeklong training. They should understand that your training, even if 3 days long, is merely a sampling of the subject. Not every topic can be explored in the depth it deserves, and some important items will be skipped altogether.

Review the agenda, including mention of anticipated breaks and the expected ending time. Try hard to stick to this agenda, and ask for group consent when major alterations are necessary. Don’t allow assertive individuals or factions to force an agenda change without ensuring that it is the will of the entire group.

Have the training participants introduce themselves and briefly mention their experience with direct action and nonviolence trainings. Also, ask them to state what they hope to get out of a training. Depending on the size of the group and the time available, these introductions may have to be kept very short. The most important thing is for the trainer to get a sense of what the participants wish to learn or discuss and to tailor the training agenda accordingly. If possible, learn this information before the training even starts, through written or oral input. Alternatively, participants may be given a couple of minutes to write down their expectations. These may then be read aloud, posted on individually on a wall or merged on one large piece of paper or chalkboard.

During the training

Depending on the size of your group, the time available and the issues being discussed, it may be useful to split the group up into smaller groups for short periods of time. This gives everyone an opportunity to share their views, though not every opinion will get heard by all. Small groups may or not discuss the same issues and may or may not be asked to report back to the larger group, at the trainer’s discretion.

Try to mix discussion/lecture sessions with physical exercises to keep your participants from falling asleep.
Bring along some props to make your role plays less confusing and more realistic, including:

- Police badges, toy guns and hats
- Spray bottle of water to simulate pepper spray
- Hand cuffs, or cable (zip) ties as plastic handcuffs for the police to use
- Cardboard tubes to use as police batons
- Hard hats for workers
- Suit jackets and ties for officials or executives
- Cameras and microphones for the media
- Name tags to identify roles
- Generic banner (e.g. "Stop _____")

Technical devices such as lockboxes and chains can turn your nonviolence roleplay into a technical exercise, and so may not be useful.

Debrief your role plays and exercises, as appropriate.

End of Training

Debrief your training. In order to focus discussion, avoid platitudes such as, "It was nice," and avoid dwelling solely on criticisms, the following debrief structure may be used.

Ask participants first what went well, then what didn't go well or wasn't useful, then what should be done different next time. Do this in brainstorm fashion, without getting trapped in debate on any particular point. After all opinions (some will be contradictory) have been expressed, particular items may be discussed if time allows. This debrief format works well for other activities as well such as actions, campaigns, and retreats.

Hand out written evaluation forms. Listing the trainings exercises, lectures and discussions on the form will aid in getting more detailed responses. More evaluations will be received if they are filled out immediately. More thoughtful evaluations may be received if participants are allowed to send them in later.

**Video Training Exercises**

These NVDA exercises were filmed during the meeting of the NVDA working group in November 2002. The main purpose of this workshop was to share experiences. However we decided to film the exercises as well as support to the written explanations of the exercises. Since the exercises were filmed before the writing up of the NVDA modules, the list is not complete. (Video can be ordered from IMAD).

Total duration: 1 hr 11 min.

Exercises:
1. **Tug-O-War** (2 min 13 sec)
2. **Spectrum** (4 min 11 sec)
3. **Listening Dyad** (7 min 11 sec)
4. Hassle Line (16 min 52 sec)
5. Standing Line I (2 min 22 sec)
6. The Turtle (2 min 20 sec)
7. The Centipede (3 min 7 sec)
8. The Star (1 min 38 sec)
9. Standing Line II (1 min 46 sec)
10. Tree method (3 min 29 sec)
11. Rock method (4 min 2 sec)
12. Rock method & Verbal Communication (3 min 35 sec)
13. Rock method & Safety (1 min 14 sec)
14. Group Clap & Whisper Chant (4 min 38 sec)
15. Puppy Pile (1 min 52 sec)
16. Fetal Position (2 min 11 sec)
17. The Falling Bottle (1 min 18 sec)
18. The Drunken Person/Bottle (1 min 51 sec)
20. Twister (1 min 36)

Sample agendas

Developing a nonviolent training, the trainer should create an agenda depending on different factors:
- interests and needs of the group
- level of experience of the group
- group size
- time available
- culture
- preference of the trainer
- etc.

In support of the NVDA program 2 sample agendas have been added. Hopefully more agendas will be added by the end of 2003. Therefor, if you have used the information
of the modules we would appreciate it if you would fill out an evaluation form at the end of your training and send this to Guido Verbist in IMAD.

**Nonviolence Training Agenda 1**

This particular training was held onboard the MV Arctic Sunrise, 3 January 2003, and was attended by 11 crew members of different nationalities. It was relatively heavy on physical exercises and techniques, somewhat light on lecture and discussion items, relied on handouts for certain aspects of nonviolence, and did not include any roleplays.

Time: 6 ½ hours (including lunch and breaks)

Trainers: Butch Turk, Jolanda Cupido

**Introduction - 25 minutes:**

- Agenda review (handout)
- Our experience
- Nonviolence working group and Greenpeace’s plan
- Confidentiality
- Language difficulties
- Nonviolent action - just a sampling offered here
- Participant expectations

Spectrum exercise, Violence/Nonviolence brainstorm – 45 minutes (controversies handout)

Break - 15 minutes

**Tug-0-war - 5 minutes**

**History of Nonviolence -10 minutes (handouts: History, King)**

- Denmark 1940’s, Phillipines 1980’s

**Passive Resistance Discussion and Exercises - 40 minutes (action dress handout)**

**Mass Demonstration Communication - 10 minutes**

- Whisper Chant
- Group Clap

**Nontechnical Blockade techniques - 30 minutes**

- Standing line
- Centipede
- The Star
- The Turtle
- The Spiral

Lunch - 50 minutes
The Crab - 5 minutes

Plastic Handcuff Escape - 10 minutes

Why Use Nonviolence? – 5 minutes (handout)

Group techniques for responding to violence - 20 minutes (individual responses handout)
  The Huddle
  The V
  The Puppy Pile
  Fetal Position

Hassel line - 30 minutes

Break -15 minutes

Twister - 5 minutes

Nonviolence Guidelines discussion - 40 minutes (handout)

Evaluation and debrief - 20 minutes

**Handouts:**

Agenda
Controversies in Nonviolent Action Theory
Historical Examples of Nonviolent Struggle
Happy Birthday to You, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.:
Six Principles of Nonviolence
Six Steps for Nonviolent Social Change
Action Dress
Nonviolence Guidelines
Why Use Nonviolence?
Notes on Nonviolent Action (pages 9-11):
  Preparing for Nonviolent Struggle/Conflict
  Being Nonviolent and Responding to Threats of Violence Directed at You
  Nonviolent Responses to People Being Violent Toward Others
  The Role of Anger and Niceness in Nonviolent Struggle
  Nonviolent Struggle Compared with War

Nonviolence Training Agenda 2

This particular workshop was held onboard the MV Arctic Sunrise during the Onboard Campaign Training, March 2003. It was attended by campaigners from different Greenpeace offices. The objective of the workshop was to start a discussion on nonviolence.
Time: 1½ hours

Facilitator: Thijs Notenboom

1. Introduction - 10 minutes

2. Greenpeace History and the use of nonviolence - 15 minutes
   Video: Taking Back The Earth.
   Greenpeace exposes, witnesses (from Quaker philosophy) and confronts.
   To change opinions, attitudes and legislation.

   Nonviolence is not mentioned in the video. How important is it?

3. Violence/Nonviolence Brainstorm – 20 minutes
   This exercise focuses on the views of the individual.

4. Nonviolence Guidelines – 45 minutes
   Hand out Nonviolence Guidelines

   Discuss the contents, the differences of opinions and the relevance for campaigns/actions.

Sample Evaluation Forms

This part consists of two evaluation forms:
1. for the nonviolence training onboard the Arctic Sunrise
2. if you have used information from the IMAD NVDA program

1. Nonviolence Training Evaluation

(The sample evaluation form is designed to remind participants of each exercise and discussion presented during the training, and elicit comment on all portions of the training. There are many alternative formats for evaluation, including relying solely on a debrief at the end of the training).

Name (optional):

Trainers: Butch Turk
          Jolanda Cupido

Date of training: 3 January, 2003

Location: MVAS, Scheveningen, The Netherlands

Please give your honest opinion of the training as a whole and the individual handouts, exercises and discussions in the spaces provided. Extra space for comment can be found on the back. We would like to know what went well, what wasn’t useful, and what you would like to see done differently.

Was the training too short, too long or just right?

15
Would you be interested in further training including role plays, more exercises and more opportunity for discussion?

Was the presentation understandable?

Were your questions answered satisfactorily?

Was the training relevant to your plans to do actions?

How did this training compare to others you’ve taken and why?

**Nonviolence Training Agenda – 6 1/2 hours**

Introduction - 25 minutes:

Spectrum exercise:

Violence/Nonviolence brainstorm - 45 minutes (including Spectrum):

Tug-0-war - 5 minutes

History of Nonviolence, Denmark 1940’s, Philippines 1980’s - 10 minutes:

Passive Resistance Discussion and exercises - 40 minutes:

Mass Demonstration Communication -10 minutes:
Whisper Chant
Group Clap

Nontechnical Blockade techniques - 30 minutes:
Standing Line
Centipede
The Star
The Turtle
The Spiral

The Crab - 5 minutes:

Plastic Handcuff Escape - 10 minutes:

Group techniques for responding to violence - 20 minutes:
The Huddle
The V
The Puppy Pile
Fetal Position

Hassle line - 30 minutes:

Twister - 5 minutes:
Nonviolence Guidelines discussion - 40 minutes:

Evaluation and debrief - 20 minutes:

Handouts:
Controversies in Nonviolent Action Theory:

Historical Examples of Nonviolent Struggle:

Happy Birthday to You, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.:

Action Dress:

Nonviolence Guidelines:

Why Use Nonviolence?:

Notes on Nonviolent Action (pages 9-11):
Preparing for Nonviolent Struggle/Conflict
Being Nonviolent and Responding to Threats of Violence Directed at You
Nonviolent Responses to People Being Violent Toward Others
The Role of Anger and Niceness in Nonviolent Struggle
Nonviolent Struggle Compared with War:
Please use the remaining space to add comments to the questions above, rate the presentation as a whole, or offer any suggestions for future trainings.

NVDA Trainers

All trainers are part of the IMAD NVDA working group and are responsible for the contents of the NVDA program.

The trainers can be contacted for information either directly, through IMAD or by contacting their action unit.

Butch Turk
Nationality: American
E-mail: butch@wildrockies.org

Experience:
45 years old.
Live in Missoula, Montana USA.
Greenpeace ship's medic/deckhand since 1999.
Registered Nurse.
Wilderness Emergency Medical Technician.
Trainer in first aid and action first aid.
1st NVDA arrest in 1976.
Nonviolence trainer since early 1980's. Have trained peace, environmental, labor and human rights activists.
Also train in low and no-tech blockades and NVDA support roles.
Trainer for the Ruckus Society since 1976.

**Sergio Corrales**  
Nationality: Chilean  
E-mail: vrede@123.cl

I am an International Business Engineer of profession, Greenpeace activist since 2001.

A few months after I joined Greenpeace I was asked to train the new volunteers in working group skills. Then when the action team co-ordinator, Ricardo Scheleff, started a training for activists, I began to work on the NVDA training. Since then I have developed trainings for new and old activist and an introduction to nonviolence for people who want to join to Greenpeace.

*Without Peace, There is no Green possible.*

**Houssam Nassif**  
Nationality: Lebanese  
E-mail: hous21@yahoo.com

Lebanon witnessed a civil war from 1975 till 1991, and Israeli occupation of substantial parts of its territory from 1978 till 2000. Thus violence, in its physical, moral or societal meanings, is common in the society and the country. I am/was an active member in many NGOs dealing with societal peace building, reintegration of war displaced and promoting civil concepts:

I worked and trained on Conflict Resolutions, Group Building, Peace Building, Peace Education, Displaced Reintegration, Mediation, Citizenship…

I joined Greenpeace in 1999, as an action team volunteer.  
Co-ordinated many action team NVDA training camps.  
Worked on and devised the NVDA training program for Greenpeace Lebanon & Greenpeace Med.  
Worked on the Greenpeace Med Peace and Disarmament policy.

**Jose Luis Perlasca (Pepe)**  
Nationality: Mexican  
E-mail: Jose.Luis.Perlasca@mx.greenpeace.org

Photographer and videographer  
Current position at Greenpeace Mexico: Local Groups Co-ordinator and Nonviolence Trainer

I have been involved with Greenpeace Mexico since 1996. In 1997 I became part of the action team where I was trained for climbing, boat driving and scouting. I have assisted to SERPAJ trainings (Peace and Justice Service), which is an organisation that works for Peace and Justice using non-violence through all Latin America. I have
organised and imparted NVDA trainings at the GPMex office since 1998, as well as basic training for activists like climbing and boat trainings.

At the GPMex I started working at the comms office, then I became part of the action department and today I work as the co-ordinator of the local groups in Mexico, Actions and Logistics Assistant, and Nonviolence trainer. I have participated in National and International Actions, and I was a deckhand on the MV Arctic Sunrise in summer 2001. I have also participated in the MV Moby Dick and SV Rainbow Warrior tours when they were in Mexico.

I am available for trainings in Spanish.

**Jolanda Cupido**  
Nationality: Dutch  
E-mail: jcupido@ams.greenpeace.org

I have been involved in the environmental movement since 1980.  
In 1989 I joined Greenpeace. I worked on the ships as deckhand, bosun and activist.  
In 1992 I became action co-ordinator and trainer of the Dutch action team. In 1993 I organised the first NVDA training for the Dutch action team and since then I have organised many NVDA trainings in the Netherlands and other countries.

I will be on sabbatical until September 2003.

**MODULE 1**

Objectives: At the end of this module the participant will have been exposed to the values, history, and campaigns of Greenpeace and will have discussed the various points of view in nonviolence.

**CONTENTS:**

**Lecture/Discussion:**
- Greenpeace core values
- What is nonviolence and why does Greenpeace use it?
- Greenpeace history and campaigns
- History of nonviolence
- “Why use nonviolence?” brainstorm

**Exercises:**
- Tug-0-War

**Literature:**
- Greenpeace Mission Statement
- Waves of Compassion, The Genesis of Greenpeace by Rex Weyler
- Quaker Peace Testimony
- Challenges and Choices by Arun Gandhi
- Six Principles of Nonviolence & Six Steps for Nonviolent Social Change by Martin Luther King, Jr.
The contents of this module can be applied in different ways: for people who are new to Greenpeace and/or unfamiliar with the concept of nonviolence, there is some introductory material. For experienced people there is material to refresh their memories and views.

There is a lot of material available in this module. In view of the available time, this module could be modified, but people’s views on nonviolence and Greenpeace values should be discussed in every training or discussion.

This module has the following structure, but the eventual shape the training will take depends on the expectations and experience of the participants and on available time.

**Greenpeace Core Values**
It is important give to the people the opportunity to discuss the values of Greenpeace. It will increase their understanding of why they want to be involved in the organisation and actions.

**Greenpeace History and Campaigns**
This module is mainly for new members. It contains a (short) historical review of the organisation and it will give them inspiration and an insight into Greenpeace’s working methods.

**History of Nonviolence**
Before starting a discussion on “What is violence/nonviolence?” and “Why use nonviolence?”, it is important to give an overview or have a discussion on the history of nonviolence in the world.

Finally, it is good to remember that the most important issue in this module are the core values of Greenpeace. Make sure to give to this topic enough time to get a good conclusion from your group.

There will be time later to learn more about the history or the campaigns. It may not be easy to get the people together to discuss the core values. Although campaigns and history are important, almost all of our offices have people who can give information on this.

**Lecture/Discussion:**

**Greenpeace Core Values**
Objective: To become aware of the core values of Greenpeace.
Core values are the most important subject for any organisation, because they give meaning to everything an organisation does. That is why we need to stop here and discuss them.

First, briefly explain the core values.

Separate the people into groups according to the number of core values you have mentioned (for example, you can use political and economic independence as one value, or you can separate them for two discussion groups).

You might need people with experience on the subject to assist you. Any of these people should direct the discussion. Principally, the trainees should arrive at their own conclusions about what the core values should be and why core values should be applied.

The trainees will probably arrive at the same conclusions, but they will understand them better since they explained the values in their own words. They will then apply them because they believe in them. This is very important.

At the end the group will get together again and one person from each group will report to the others about the discussion. The others can then give their opinions about the core value being discussed. Do not forget to ask the rest of the group to help their small group representative.

**What is nonviolence and why does Greenpeace use it?**
(written by a group of Greenpeace Mexico activists)

“You can’t be truly nonviolent and remain passive to injustice and the degradation of the environment.” — Mahatma Gandhi

Nonviolence is the result of the moral conviction that all living things have real value and therefore have the right to exist with justice and dignity. This dignity springs from the recognition of, and respect for, the value of each being.

Based on this certainty, acts of injustice imposed on living things can’t be ignored. All this brings Greenpeace to “bear witness” and engage in nonviolent civil resistance, thus making evident those acts that violate this principle and exposing the responsible parties.

Civil resistance is when citizens, aware of their rights and civic obligations, act to stop these acts of injustice. Greenpeace believes that this civil resistance should adhere to the principle of nonviolence. For Greenpeace the most visible expressions of nonviolent civil resistance are direct actions. However nonviolence should be reflected in each of us and each one of the organization’s activities: press releases, documents, speeches, and public events, among others.
Greenpeace promotes nonviolence as a tactic that helps to accomplish the goals that we have established as an environmental organization, and uses nonviolence because it is the most noble and morally unquestionable method.

**Greenpeace History and Campaigns**

Time: 15 mins or more

Objective: to give (new) activists an overview of Greenpeace’ history and campaigns.

Various sources of information are available for this module:
- Videos
- Information on the Greenpeace web site: [www.greenpeace.org/history](http://www.greenpeace.org/history) for powerpoint presentations
- Literature: Waves of Compassion, The Genesis of Greenpeace by Rex Weyler

**Videos**

Two videos are available:
- Taking back the Earth (4 min. and 7 sec.)
- 30 Years of Environmental Protest (22 min. 40 sec.)

These tapes can be ordered from: IMAD

Both videos were produced to commemorate Greenpeace’s 30th anniversary in September 2001.

Taking Back the Earth is a short promotion video but it gives a good overview of Greenpeace’ campaigns. This video could also be used as an introduction to other modules. However, interestingly enough the word nonviolent is not mentioned in the video.

30 Years of Environmental protest was put together to be used as background material. It has no voice-over or sound and thus needs explanation by the trainer.

**Contents of the videos:**

**TAKING BACK THE EARTH**
1. Exposing, witnessing, confronting
2. Taking action: making history, making waves
3. Changing opinions, attitudes, legislation
4. A future for the planet, sustainable, peaceful, safe & healthy
5. The end? No, just the beginning. 30 Years of taking back the earth.

**30 YEARS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTEST**

The first ten years: 1971-1982
Sept. 1971 - The Phyllis Cormack sets sail for Greenpeace’s first protest against US nuclear testing off the NW coast of Canada (Amchitkca).

First whaling actions sequence:
- Greenpeace inflatable boats manoeuvring between two Russian whaling ships
- whale being harpooned
- killed baby whale floating in water with Greenpeace activist on top of it

Anti sealing action sequence:
- Dead baby seal about to be butchered
- Paul Watson takes (a live) baby seal in his arms to protect it from the sealers (Belle Island Canada March 1967)
- Greenpeace activists (Watson and Hunter) stand in front of the Arctic Endeavour

Whaling:
- Inflatable boats in front of huge whaling ship Hvalur 9
- Greenpeace activists (David McTaggert amongst them) celebrate with champagne

More seal action:
- Pups being sprayed with dye to make their pelts worthless (Madeleine Islands, Canada)

Actions against dumping nuclear waste in sea:
- The MV Rhynborg is dumping nuclear waste at sea, Atlantic 1982. One inflatable boat is hit by barrels causing it to capsize

**A Dramatic Leap Forward 1984 – 1990**

Toxins:
- Greenpeace activist parachutes off Gavin Power station smokestack to protest against high level of toxic emissions (1984)
- Greenpeace activists block pipeline (Portman Bay, Spain 1986)

The SV Rainbow Warrior sails to Rongelap in the Marshall Islands to assist residents in leaving their island
- Islanders arrive on the Rainbow Warrior
- Rainbow Warrior sinks during the burial service after she was bombed by the French Secret Service
- Underwater shots of the Rainbow Warrior now forming a reef.

Ban the Burn action against waste incineration at sea

Trident protest, Greenpeace follows a submarine

**Antarctica and beyond: 1990 –1995**

Greenpeace Antarctica Expeditions 1989/1990:
- MV Gondwana goes to the World Park
- Clean up actions of the base stations
Driftnet actions:
- Underwater footage of shark, bird and dolphin in net
- Driftnets with Greenpeace protest banner being hauled into a fishing vessel

Nuclear actions:
- Crosses in front of Bohunice Nuclear Power Plant, Czechoslovakia
- Gas mask put on
- Action on water, testing radioactivity of vessel

Burning oil leaked from the pipeline in Russia. Paul Horsman (Greenpeace campaigner) bears witness (1994).

Action against plutonium Sellafield, UK (April 1995)

Protest against nuclear testing in Moruroa (1995):
- French commandos board the Rainbow Warrior during protest using teargas
- New Zealand Haka
- French commandos board the Rainbow Warrior again, spraying windows and disconnecting the main communication terminal
- Aerial over the ship

Brent Spar action (1995)

**New hazards: 1996-1999**

GMO soybean action in US
Taj Mahal anti nuclear balloon action in India

Amazon:
- Big tree
- Greenpeace Amazone campaigner Paulo Adario walks through burned forest
- Logs in the Amazon river

Ecuador shrimp farm demolishing dykes and replanting mangroves

Whaling:
- Greenpeace activists are thrown overboard by Norwegian whaler
- Greenpeace activists chained to whaling ship

**The new millennium: 2000-2001**

Bunny McDiarmid sails to the Antipodes to witness the first sunrays of the millennium and to “Go Solar”
Underwater footage of penguins

Whaling:
- Japanese whaling actions against Yushin Maru catching Mink whales in the Southern Ocean
- Aerial of butcheted whale and whalers holding up signs
- Activist jumps on dead whale which is being pulled on board whaling ship
GE chicken protest against McDonalds use of GE, Zurich

Eurythmics on Rainbow Warrior in London dedicates a song to Amnesty and Greenpeace

Greepeace forest actions against the destruction of ancient rainforest
- log shipments intercepted in Sea of Japan (2000)

Anti Star Wars protest in Menwith Hill, UK (2000)
- Arrival of activists dressed as rockets and G.W. Bush
- Activists enter and occupy a spy base

**History of nonviolence**

Time: 30 minutes

Objective: To give an overview of the long history of nonviolence. It describes how nonviolence has been used as a tactic and lifestyle throughout history.

Depending on time available and preference, the trainer could either focus on a few examples or invite the participants to write down examples on sheets of paper with dates, for example: 1000 BC – 0, 0 – 500 AD, 1000-1500 etc. This will make the participants understand that nonviolence has a long history.

**Introduction**

Nonviolence has been used throughout history. There have been numerous instances of people courageously and nonviolently refusing cooperation with injustice. The refusal to counter the violence of the repressive social system with more violence is a tactic that has been used by many people and movements, but it all started with one person speaking out loud.

**Historical examples of nonviolent protest**

This list contains just some historical examples of nonviolent protest. Many more could be added.

1660-now Since the beginning of the movement in the mid 1660s, the Quakers have been witnesses for peace. Although the Quakers were a "peaceable people", they were not "Quiet" in a worldly sense. They spoke loud and long and wrote in the same manner.

They were a very determined people and their determination was inevitably seen by their opponents as obstinacy. However they were full of confidence that they possessed the "Truth". They were charged with blasphemy and disturbing the peace, but they refused to give in to violent treatment. It was this steadfastness that eventually enabled the Quakers to survive as a group.

1880s The militant campaign for women's suffrage in Britain included a variety of nonviolent tactics such as boycotts, non-cooperation, limited property destruction,
civil disobedience, mass marches and demonstrations, filling the jails, and disruption of public ceremonies.

1920s-1947 The Indian independence movement from the British Empire led by Mohandas Gandhi included a number of spectacular nonviolent campaigns. Perhaps the most notable was the year-long Salt campaign in which 100,000 Indians were jailed for deliberately violating the Salt Laws.

1940-1945 There are many examples of nonviolent resistance to Nazi occupation during WW II.

In Denmark, the opposition to the Nazis was led by the King, who said that if the Jews had to put on the “Yellow Star of David” then he, the King, would be the first man in Denmark to put one on. When the Nazis moved to arrest the Danish Jews, members of the Gestapo leaked this news to the Danish authorities and in 48 hours virtually all the Jews in Denmark were brought to safety in Sweden.

In Bulgaria, spontaneous civil resistance (including crowds sitting on train tracks) prevented the Nazis from shipping any Jews out of the country.

1954-1965 Using a variety of nonviolent methods, including bus boycotts, economic boycotts, massive demonstrations, marches, sit-ins and freedom rides, the U.S. civil rights movement won passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Martin Luther King, Jr. (1929-1968) was one of the principal leaders of the civil rights movement in the United States and a prominent advocate of nonviolent protest. King’s challenges to segregation and racial discrimination helped convince many white Americans to support the cause of civil rights in the United States.

For a Timeline of the American Civil Rights Movement visit the website:
http://www.wmich.edu/politics/mlk/

1960s-1970s Opponents of the Vietnam War employed the use of draft card burning, draft file destruction, mass demonstrations (such as the 500,000 who turned out in 1969 in Washington, D.C.), sit-ins, blocking induction centres, draft and tax resistance, and the historic 1971 May Day traffic blocking in Washington, D.C. in which 13,000 people were arrested.

1968-1969 Nonviolent resistance to the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia enabled the Dubcek regime to stay in power for eight months, far longer than would have been possible with military resistance.

1960s-1980s The Salvadoran people have used nonviolence as one powerful and necessary element of their struggle. Particularly during the 1960s and 70s, Christian based communities, labour unions, campesino organisations, and student groups held occupations and sit-ins at universities, government offices, and places of work such as factories and haciendas.

1960s-1991 South Africa. Racial segregation and the supremacy of whites had been traditionally accepted in South Africa prior to 1948, but in the general election of that year apartheid was officially included in the Afrikaner Nationalist party platform.
The purpose of apartheid was separation of the races: not only of whites from nonwhites, but also of nonwhites from each other, and, among the Africans (called Bantu in South Africa), of one group from another. In addition to the Africans, who constitute about 75% of the total population, those regarded as nonwhite include those people known in the country as Coloured (people of mixed black, Malayan, and white descent) and Asian (mainly of Indian ancestry) populations.

Despite public demonstrations, UN resolutions, and opposition from International religious societies, apartheid was applied with increased rigor in the 1960s. In 1961, South Africa withdrew from the Commonwealth of Nations rather than yield to pressure over its racial policies.

Probably the most forceful pressures, both internal and external, that finally eroded the barriers of apartheid were economic. International sanctions severely affected the South African economy, raising the cost of necessities, cutting investment, even forcing many American corporations to disinvest for example, or, under the Sullivan Rules, to employ without discrimination. In addition, the severe shortage of skilled labour led to lifting limits on African wages, and granting Africans the right to strike and organise unions. Unions, churches, and students organised protests throughout the 1970s and 80s. Moreover, political, economic, and military pressures were exerted by the independent countries of sub-Saharan Africa.

As a result of these pressures, many lesser apartheid laws, such as those banning interracial marriage and segregating facilities, were repealed or fell into disuse by 1990. In 1991 President de Klerk obtained the repeal of the remaining apartheid laws and called for the drafting of a new constitution. In 1993 a multiracial, multiparty transitional government was approved, and fully free elections were held in 1994, which gave majority representation to the African National Congress.

Nelson Mandela is a South African political leader. He earned (1942) a law degree from the Univ. of South Africa and was prominent in Johannesburg's youth wing of the African National Congress (ANC). In 1952 he became ANC deputy national president, advocating nonviolent resistance to apartheid. However, after a group of peaceful demonstrators were massacred (1960) in Sharpeville, Mandela organised a paramilitary branch of the ANC to carry out guerrilla warfare against the white government. After being acquitted (1962) on charges of treason, he was arrested (1964) and convicted of sabotage and sentenced to life in prison, where he became the leading symbol of South Africa's oppressed black majority. Released in 1990 as an expression of President de Klerk's commitment to change, Mandela was elected (July, 1991) ANC president after a triumphal global tour. He represented the ANC in the turbulent negotiations that led to establishment of majority rule. Mandela and de Klerk were jointly awarded the Nobel peace prize in 1993. In South Africa's first multiracial elections (1994), Mandela was elected president, and served until 1999, when Thabo Mbeki succeeded him.

1970s Since the mid-70s, there has been increasing nonviolent activity against the nuclear arms race and nuclear power industry. Nonviolent civil disobedience actions have taken place at dozens of nuclear weapons research installations, storage areas, missile silos, test sites, military bases, corporate and government offices and nuclear
power plants all over the world. In 1982, 1750 people were arrested at the UN missions of the five major nuclear powers. Beginning in the late 80s and continuing to the present a series of actions have taken place at the Nevada Nuclear Weapons Test Site (USA). International disarmament actions changed world opinion about nuclear weapons.

1980s-1990s In 1981, after Reagan's election and some years before Gorbachev came to power, there was a widespread popular uprising in Europe against the Reagan doctrine and the Reagan Defense Guidance Plan. The former called for a rollback of Communism, while the latter called for huge military budgets and war against the Soviets, beginning with the installation of intermediate-range missiles that could reach Moscow from Western Europe in six to eight minutes. In October 1981, 500,000 people demonstrated in the streets of Rome against deployment of these missiles; 300,000 in Bonn; 100,000 in Hamburg; 200,000 in Belgium; 500,000 in Madrid; 140,000 in Barcelona; 800,000 in The Hague; and similar numbers in Denmark, England, and elsewhere. In 1982 a million people demonstrated in New York. At the same time antiwar rallies took place in the Soviet Union. These were seldom mentioned in the International press.

The change in Eastern Europe began with the antiwar protests in Western Europe and the United States and with visits of US, European, and Third World delegations to the Soviet Union. A change of leadership occurred, and Gorbachev made it official.

The peaceful revolution launched by people of the Soviet Union took many by surprise. But since then changes of government have taken place in Poland, in Hungary, in East Germany (The end of the Berlin Wall!). Inside the Soviet Union there has been a move away from totalitarianism to greater freedom. Not since the days of India's Emperor Ashoka in the third century before the Christian era has there been such a renunciation of imperialism and aggression by a major world empire. The map of Europe has been changed many times, but never before was it the result of a unilateral nonviolent revolution by a people in a heavily armed major nation.


In the mid-1980’s a popular movement sprang up to oust the corrupt Philippine dictator Ferdinand Marcos. As the resistance gained momentum, two key military officers defected from the government and sequestered themselves inside a Manila military base. What followed was an amazing example of nonviolent struggle as hundreds of thousands of ordinary Filipinos took to the streets to protect the rebel officers from troops still loyal to Marcos.

“What the story of the Philippine revolution demonstrates is the power people can have when they withdraw consent.”

A list of highlights of nonviolence in history can also be found on http://www.san.beck.org/GPJ-Chronology

Why use Nonviolence? - Brainstorm
Time: 10 minutes or longer

Objective: To provide an opportunity for participants to explore and discuss the many reasons for practising nonviolence in the work we do.

As we work with others in our nonviolent campaigns, we will find that people have chosen nonviolent action for a variety of reasons. Some of these reasons may be contradictory and some may be controversial. It is important to understand each other’s perspectives and to find a common ground for our work. Also, it motivates us knowing that there are so many reasons to act nonviolently.

Ask the participants to offer reasons for using nonviolence when working for societal change. It may help to summarise these reasons in short phrases on a board or large piece of paper in order to avoid repetition.

Reasons offered may include:
Because it is morally or ethically correct;
Because violence leads to more violence;
Because it incorporates a belief in the worth of all people, regardless of their views;
Because we do not risk causing physical or mental harm when we employ it;
Because it is a model for the world we would like to live in;
Because anyone, even those without power, can use it;
Because “they” will always be able to employ more violence than “we” can;
Because we might be wrong and it would be better if we had not been violent in the process;
Because we can involve more people in a nonviolent campaign than we ever will in a violent one;
Because, at the end of violent conflicts, violent people tend to be the leaders - no matter who won;
Because it is more fun;
Because showing respect to our ‘opponents’ encourages them to listen to our point of view and do the right thing;
Because what we are trying to reach will be more easily approved by the public;
Because it highlights that we are the ‘good guys’ while our violent opposition is not;
Because it decreases the chances we will be hurt, jailed, killed, or convicted of a felony;
Because it keeps our message, rather than our tactics, in the foreground;
Because it tends to bring out the best in our ‘opposition’;
Because it works; and so on...

Notes:

This last reason, ‘Because it works’, can be used as an introduction to a discussion of historic examples of successful nonviolent campaigns.
If time is limited, the trainer could offer these and other reasons in lecture fashion. Allowing discussion on the correctness of any of these reasons may be very time consuming. The trainer should decide up front whether to allow discussion or to keep this section to brainstorm format only.
Exercises:

Tug-O'-War

Time: 5 minutes or more

Objectives:
1. To demonstrate how critical creativity is to nonviolent problem solving.
2. To break up discussion with some fun physical activity.

Without discussing the name or objectives of the exercise, ask all the participants to pair up. Have the pairs face each other with both their left or right feet forward and touching toe to toe, and the opposite hands clasped as in a hand shake. Tell the group that there is a line between each pair of touching feet and that when the trainer says, "Go," everyone's goal is to get their partner across that line into your own space.

Say, "Go." Almost all pairs will forcefully attempt to pull their partner across the line. Watch for any pairs that do something different. The trainer can stop the pulling at any time by saying, "Stop," usually just a few seconds will do. Do not let it get so out of hand that someone might get hurt. Ask the group what happened. Generally the bigger or faster person won. This does not take much discussion.

If any pairs came up with a solution other than trying to pull each other across, have them describe and demonstrate for the group what they did. If not, take a random participant and get in the starting stance. Now, say to this participant, "Let's trade places," and with hands still clasped slowly rotate until the trainer and participant have switched locations.

At this point the trainer has several options:

1. Move on to the next exercise and let the lesson sink in on its own.

2. Make some brief points in lecture fashion:
   - Nonviolence is about creative solutions without losers;
   - With nonviolent solutions even the bigger 'winner' wins without wasting as much energy, resources, money, etc.;
   - Do not limit yourself by following rules that do not exist;
   - If you are less powerful, your only option is to be smarter; and so on...

3. Open up a discussion on violent versus nonviolent problem solving.

MODULE 1

Literature:
Greenpeace Mission Statement
Waves of Compassion, The Genesis of Greenpeace by Rex Weyler
Quaker Peace Testimony
Challenges and Choices by Arun Gandhi
Six Principles of Nonviolence & Six Steps for Nonviolent Social Change by Martin Luther King, Jr.
Prague Spring, Czechoslovakia
People Power, Philippines
198 Methods of Nonviolent Action

Greenpeace Mission Statement

Greenpeace is an independent, campaigning organisation that uses nonviolent, creative confrontation to expose global environmental problems, and force solutions for a green and peaceful future. Greenpeace's goal is to ensure the ability of the Earth to nurture life in all its diversity.

Greenpeace organises public campaigns for:
- The protection of oceans and ancient forests.
- The phase out of fossil fuels and the promotion of renewable energy to stop climate change.
- The elimination of toxic chemicals.
- The prevention of genetically modified organisms being released into nature.
- An end to the nuclear threat and nuclear contamination.
- Safe and sustainable trade.

Greenpeace does not solicit or accept funding from governments, corporations or political parties. Greenpeace neither seeks nor accepts donations that could compromise its independence, aims, objectives or integrity.

Greenpeace relies on the voluntary donations of individual supporters, and on grant support from foundations.

Greenpeace is committed to the principles of nonviolence, political independence and internationalism. In exposing threats to the environment and in working to find solutions, Greenpeace has no permanent allies or enemies.

Greenpeace has been campaigning against environmental degradation since 1971 when a small boat of volunteers and journalists sailed into Amchitka, an area north of Alaska where the US Government was conducting underground nuclear tests. This tradition of 'bearing witness' in a nonviolent manner continues today.

Greenpeace has played a pivotal role in, among other things, the adoption of:
- A ban on toxic waste exports to less developed countries.
- A moratorium on commercial whaling.
- A United Nations convention providing for better management of world fisheries.
- A Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary;
- A 50-year moratorium on mineral exploitation in Antarctica.
- Bans on the dumping at sea of radioactive and industrial waste and disused oil installations.
- An end to high-sea, large-scale driftnet fishing.
- A ban on all nuclear weapons testing - our first ever campaign.
I arrived in Vancouver in the spring of 1972 as a fugitive of American justice, a draft-dodger with the FBI on my trail and intimidating my family to give me up. I faced 25 years in prison had they caught me. My wife of 6 months, Glenn, and I slept by the furnace in the cellar of a Vancouver shelter for war objectors. We had our sleeping bags, a change of clothes, forty-seven dollars, and a wrinkled piece of paper with the names of Canadian peace activists who might help us. Unitarian minister Mac Elrod and his wife Norma took us in and introduced us to the local pacifist crowd. I found a job as a reporter at the North Shore News. While covering a local story, I met Bree Drummond, who was sitting in a cottonwood tree to save it from being felled for a parking lot. Her boyfriend Rod Marining had sailed for Amchitka Island to protest the U.S. atomic bomb test as a member of the Don't Make A Wave Committee that had changed its name to the "Greenpeace Foundation" that spring.

Rod introduced me to Bob Hunter, the hippest young journalist in the city, writing a daily column in the Vancouver Sun in which he discussed Gestalt Therapy, peyote ceremonies, ecology, and edgy psychologists like R. D. Laing. Hunter had also sailed on the protest boat to Amchitka. He had a beard, long hair, and a large leather bag over his shoulder, filled with books and his own journal in which he wrote incessantly. We began sharing beer and philosophy at a local pub, a hangout for Vancouver radicals and intelligentsia. Greenpeace had no public office. We sat near the pay-phone to conduct our journalist and activist business.

It was here in the pub that Dr. Paul Spong, a scientist at the Vancouver Aquarium, appeared in 1974 promoting his radical idea that we should put our lives on the line to save the whales. The anti-war crowd was skeptical at first, but Spong's idea would change the face of this little band of radicals.

On an Ocean Named for Peace

In 1969 in Vancouver, hippies and revolutionaries mixed gleefully redbrick coffee houses and in the rainbow-painted organic juice bars. When the U.S. announced that summer that they were going to test a 1.2 megaton nuclear bomb in the Aleutian Islands the Vancouver counter-culture began to agitate. Hunter warned in his column of "a distinct danger that the tests might set in motion earthquakes and tidal waves." This image of the tidal wave captured the imagination of Canadians opposed to the U.S. bomb test.

Three decades later Hunter recalls "In Vancouver at that time there was a convergence of hippies, draft dodgers, Tibetan monks, radical ecologists, rebel journalists, Quakers, and expatriate Yanks in the one major city that happened to be closest to Amchitka Island. Greenpeace was born in this mix."
Vancouver lawyer Hamish Bruce called Hunter with an idea to organize the "Green Panthers" as the ecological equivalent of the Black Panthers. "Our idea," says Bruce today, "was that ecology was the sleeping giant, the issue that was ultimately going to rock the world."

On October 2, when the U.S. detonated the bomb at Amchitka, a mob from Vancouver closed the U.S. border for two hours. A banner placed at the border crossing read: "Don't Make a Wave" in reference to the potential tidal wave. In the crowd was CBC radio journalist, Ben Metcalfe, who had placed 12 billboard signs in Vancouver that read: "Ecology: Look it up. You're involved."

"It's hard to imagine now," says Metcalfe, "but in those days most people had no idea what the word ecology meant."

Jim and Marie Bohlen were at the demonstration that day. They had fled to Canada from the U.S. to keep their sons out of Vietnam and Jim had helped start a Canadian chapter of the Sierra Club. Irving and Dorothy Stowe had also moved their family to Canada to keep their son out of Vietnam. They had adopted Quakerism and had participated in protests against the U.S. Polaris nuclear submarines by placing boats in front of the launching subs. When the U.S. announced a new, 5-megaton nuclear bomb test on Amchitka Island, the Bohlens and Stowes formed The Don't Make a Wave Committee to come up with a protest plan.

Hunter, Metcalfe, Bruce, and Marining attended the Don't Make a Wave meetings, chaired by Irving Stowe. "These meetings were marathons," recalls Hunter. "We went around in circles for months." Marie Bohlen, inspired by the Quaker boat the Golden Rule, suggested to Jim one morning that someone should "just sail a boat up there and confront the bomb." At the next Don't Make a Wave meeting, the plan was adopted. Typical of those days, the anti-war crowd parted with the V-sign, saying "peace." A quiet 23-year-old Canadian union organizer and ecologist, Bill Darnell, added sheepishly "Make it a green peace."

"The term had a nice ring to it," Hunter recalls. "We decided to find a boat and call it Greenpeace."

Marie's son Paul Nonnast designed a button with the ecology symbol above, the peace symbol below, and the word GREENPEACE in the middle. The Stowes organized a benefit concert with Joni Mitchell, James Taylor, Phil Ochs, and B.C. rock band Chilliwack that netted $17,000.

In April, 1971, UBC graduate student Patrick Moore, writing his dissertation on ecology, joined the group. Moore, Bohlen, and Hunter met halibut fisherman Captain John Cormack and chartered Cormack's 80-foot seiner, the Phyllis Cormack for the voyage. On September 15, 1971 the Phyllis Cormack, renamed Greenpeace, set out from Vancouver. "It was an all-male crew," Hunter recalls, "which would never happen in Greenpeace today, but Captain Cormack did not allow 'fraternizing' on board. Marie Bohlen could have gone since she and Jim were married, but she declined."

Dr. Lyle Thurston, who was providing free medical services for Vancouver youth, who had overdosed on drugs, was the crew medic. Captain Cormack and engineer Dave Birmingham ran the ship. Hunter, Metcalfe, underground writer Bob Cummings, and photographer Robert Keziere were the on-board media. Bohlen, Terry Simmons, and Bill Darnell represented the Sierra Club. Patrick Moore was the ecologist. Richard Fineberg was a last minute addition, suspected by some of being from the CIA.

These twelve souls headed across the Gulf of Alaska for Amchitka Island. The boat was seized by the U.S. Coast Guard and escorted back to Sand Point, Alaska, where
they paid a fine and were released. "We found out in Sand Point," recalls Metcalfe, "that the voyage was getting media attention in the U.S. and Canada." Twenty members of the Coast Guard vessel Confidence, which seized the Greenpeace boat, signed a letter saying "... what you are doing is for the good of all mankind." Metcalfe and Bohlen felt they had done their job and should head home. Hunter wanted to push on to the test site but Bohlen instructed Cormack to head for Vancouver.

During the voyage Hunter read Warriors of the Rainbow by William Willoya and Vinson Brown, which recounts the native Cree prophecy that one day, when the earth was poisoned by humans, a group of people from all nations would band together to defend nature. "This is us, I thought," Hunter remembers. "We're the Warriors of the Rainbow."

The group officially became the "Greenpeace Foundation" on May 4, 1972. Metcalfe, the first chairman recalls, "When France announced a nuclear test for Mururoa Atoll in the South Pacific, I woke up at 3am and told my wife Dorothy, 'We're going.' I released the story in Australia and New Zealand where the French tests were big news. But we still had to find a boat." Metcalfe placed newspaper ads in New Zealand, seeking a sailor who would sail to Mururoa. He received a call from 40-year-old Canadian David McTaggart, in Auckland. In April, Metcalfe, McTaggart, and a crew of three set out for Mururoa on McTaggart's 38-foot ketch, Vega, "Greenpeace III."

McTaggart the sailor and Metcalfe the master of media, clashed over leadership of the campaign. Metcalfe left the boat in Rarotonga and went to Paris to run the media campaign. He was met in Paris by Rod Marining, who was grabbed off the street and beaten by French agents who accused him of being "a Red." "No," Marining insisted, "I'm a Green!" This was one of the earliest proclamations of "Green" as a political/social constituency. McTaggart sailed the Vega into the test zone and maintained a position 3 miles downwind from Mururoa. The frustrated French navy rammed the Vega, towed her into Mururoa, made minimal repairs, towed her back out to sea, and the set off their bombs. McTaggart accused the French of high seas piracy and went to France to pursue his case in the courts. He returned to Mururoa the following year and was severely beaten by French sailors.

McTaggart was killed in a car accident in Italy in March 2001. A few weeks before his death, he recalled, "When the French rammed the Vega, beat me up, then blew up the Rainbow Warrior killing Fernando [Pereira, July 1985], I made a personal vow each time that they would not get away with it. They didn't."

"Greenpeace matured with McTaggart," says Hunter, "because he gave Greenpeace a hard edge that balanced the soft, cuddly stuff."

We Are Whales
As McTaggart fought the French in court, Dr. Paul Spong began appearing among the Greenpeace crowd in Vancouver, urging us to use our confrontation tactics to save whales. Some of the anti-war activists thought this was a distraction. Spong, a brain scientist from New Zealand, had been hired in 1967 to perform behavioral research on the Vancouver Aquarium's first captive Orcinus Orca, Skana. Spong was testing Skana's visual acuity when the whale suddenly her test scores dropped from nearly 100% to zero. Paul concluded that she was failing on purpose, as a sort of protest. He began to see her as an intelligent and self-aware creature. While playing the flute to her one night at the pool, Skana tested Paul's trust by raking her 3-
inch teeth across his feet as he dangled them in the water. He almost felt that she was the trainer and he was the student.

When he advocated that Skana should be set free, he was fired. He moved to remote Hanson Island to study whales in the wild. "When Greenpeace started to have an impact on nuclear weapons," recalls Spong, "I called Hunter."

In November, 1974 Hunter brought Spong to my home in Vancouver. Spong lifted two damp, grey brains from a box and set them triumphantly on my kitchen table. He wanted me to photograph the human brain and whale brain for his Whale Show. Paul explained that the cerebral cortex of the whale brain was bigger and more complex than the human brain. "This brain evolved for a reason," he said. "The cerebral cortex is for thinking, data processing, and communicating. These creatures have more analytical brain power than we have!"

Spong still had to prevail on the rest of Greenpeace. "What a brilliant idea it was," recalls Dr. Myron Macdonald, medic on the whale campaign. "I remember when it first came up at a meeting at Hamish's home. Hunter laid out the plan of using Zodiacs to place ourselves between the whalers and the whales. Hunter insisted that this would make Greenpeace a truly ecological organization."

In his 1971 book *Storming of the Mind*, Hunter had introduced the concept of a "Mind Bomb," an electronic image sent around the world to "explode in the collective consciousness." Our Mind Bomb in this case was to reverse the Moby Dick image of leviathan and replace it with the reality of modern whaling: huge factory ships and exploding harpoons hunting down the last remnants of the peaceful, intelligent whales. Paul Watson, the leftists radical of the group, was seditious and fearless. He joined the whale campaign and agreed to pilot a Zodiac in front of the whaling ships. John Cormack committed the *Phyllis Cormack* for the campaign.

The logistics were daunting. We had to figure out how to find the whaling fleets, not an island, but a moving target on a huge ocean. Spong came up with a plan. The defining characteristic of Greenpeace in the 1970s was that underneath the radicalism each member contributed an essential skill. Bohlen and Stowe were accomplished political organizers. Cormack and McTaggart were consummate sea captains. Patrick Moore understood ecology from a scientist's perspective. Hunter and Metcalfe were inspired journalists. "Simply speaking," says Metcalfe, "We knew how to give a story pizzazz and keep it alive in the media. We were the media!"

Hunter's wife, Bobbi, who ran the office after 1974, was a Project Manager for Rogers Cable. "Every day I was directing hundreds of people in their job flow," says Bobbie Hunter now, "so organizing a bunch of hippies was no big deal." Bill Gannon, accountant for Vancouver commercial developer Daon, fashioned a credible financial reporting system for the fledgling organization. There were activists like Watson willing to risk their lives. "It was right-brain/left-brain balanced," says Marining. "In those days we referred to the Mystics and the Mechanics."

Spong was a serious scientist and with all his quixotic ideas and mystic communications with whales, he was rigorous and observant. He inspired us to put our ecology on the line. He insisted consciousness is bigger than the human race. Consciousness is a quality of nature.

Spong's plan for finding the whalers was to visit the International Whaling Commission records office in Sandefjord, Norway, to pose as a research scientist looking for data on whale populations. That data, he correctly surmised would be collected by whaling boats. In January 1975, he departed for Norway, where he convinced the director of the Bureau of International Whaling Statistics to let him examine the files. When he found a file cabinet with the dates, longitudes, latitudes,
and kill numbers for the entire Soviet and Japanese whaling fleets, he copied it all down in his notebook, went back to his hotel, and called Hunter.

In Vancouver, had Greenpeace rented its first public office on Fourth Avenue, Vancouver's Hippie Row. Volunteers appeared and the numbers swelled in what we called "The Great Whale Conspiracy." A local street poet, Henry Payne, donated five acres of land. Bobbi organized a lottery for the land, we raised $40,000 and the voyage was on.

"We believed then, and I still believe," says Hunter, "that we were blessed by higher powers. The Pope, the Buddhist Karmapa, and the Kwakuitl Indians had all consecrated our flag. We believed we were fulfilling the Warriors of the Rainbow prophecy. We were on a spiritual mission and we expected miracles."

Lawyer Hamish Bruce left his law practice to work full time as he witnessed the manifestation of his Green Panthers vision. In a soft-spoken manner he became a spiritual leader, chief of the "Mystics." The head "Mechanic" was electrician Al Hewitt, engineer and radio operator for the voyage, who fashioned a homemade radio-directional finder for tracking Soviet ships. Taeko Miwa and George Korotva were our Japanese and Russian interpreters. Carlie Trueman was the Zodiac expert. Musicians Mel Gregory, Will Jackson, and Paul Winter, joined us to attempt communications with whales.

On April 27, 1975 The Great Whale Conspiracy headed out of Vancouver's English Bay, flying the UN flag, a Kwakuitl image of a whale on our sail, and a flag of the earth snapping in the breeze at the top of the mast. In mid-May we drifted with migrating grey whales in Wickininish Bay near Uclelet as the musicians played music to the whales through underwater speakers and we listened via underwater microphones. Spong's information suggested that the whalers would be at the Mendocino Ridge sea mounts, where the ocean bottom rises and sperm whales feed, in June, some 40 miles off the coast of California. We headed south, listening for Russian voices on the marine radio.

On the morning of midsummer's day we twice heard Russian voices on the radio only to discover that they were Soviet draggers. The ocean seemed unspeakably vast. We drifted to save fuel and watched for whales from high in the rigging.

Halfway around the world, Spong was in London for the International Whaling Commission meetings, lobbying the Commission for a ban on pelagic whaling. Our plan was to confront the whalers during the meetings but out in the Pacific we were desperate. Our radio had mysteriously died, we could not reach Spong in London, and unless we confronted the whalers, we had little hope of attracting media attention or influencing the IWC vote.

Then, on the evening of June 26, we heard Russian voices and the word "Vostok," one of the Soviet ships on Spong's list. Hewitt fixed their position with his crude RDF, and we headed southeast after them. Cormack's routine was to go to bed at midnight and rise at 4:00am. On this night, he turned the wheel over to Mel Gregory with instructions to keep our heading at SSE. When Gregory took the wheel the moon was dead ahead. Disregarding the compass, Gregory simply headed along the moonbeam, which meant he was slowly drifting westward. When Cormack rose, we were heading 90-degrees off course. An enraged Cormack threw Gregory out of the wheelhouse, calling him a "hippie farmer."

However, Russian transmissions continued throughout the morning and the RDF reading put them dead ahead of us. An unrepentant Gregory awoke around noon as a brilliant rainbow appeared off the starboard bow. Figuring this was a sign, Mel made his way to the wheelhouse, calmly relieved cameraman Fred Easton of the wheel, and
made for the rainbow. Whether it was magic, good karma, or just good luck, thirty minutes later Soviet whaling boats dotted the horizon. To add to the miracle, our radio suddenly began to work and we were able to reach Spong in London on the final day of the IWC meeting.

As we approached the colossal factory ship Vostok, we gagged at the stench. Harpoon boats trailed behind off-loading sperm whale carcasses. High on the main deck, huge cranes ripped massive strips of blubber from the whales. Just above the water line, a red torrent of blood poured from a six-inch pipe. Sharks cut through the red water behind the factory ship.

The Soviet whalers seemed bewildered by this colorful boatload of hippies flying a flag with the earth on it, playing rock music, and zipping around them in little Zodias. The workers waved and smiled from decks and the officers glared from the bridge. The first time we got close enough to the whalers to talk to them, a deckhand leaned over the railing and shouted in English, "Do you have LSD?"

We followed the harpoon boat, Vlastny, as it pursued a pod of sperm whales. Hunter and Watson maneuvered a Zodiac in front of the Vlastny, were swamped by the bow wave, and lost power. Korotva picked up Hunter and moved directly in front of the harpoon, shielding the whales. When they dropped into a trough, the Soviet harpooner fired over their heads hitting a whale. "The harpoon cable slashed down beside us," recalls Hunter, "nearly ripping us in two." Easton captured the entire episode on film and I took still photographs.

The story was carried in every London newspaper on the final day of the IWC. Reporters swarmed the Soviet and Japanese delegates. "They could no longer ignore us," remembers Spong. "It was the ultimate Mind Bomb."

"Old Greenpeacers still argue," says Marining, "about whether the Mystics or the Mechanics found the whalers. Was it Mel following the rainbow, Hewitt's RDF, or Spong's spy work? It was everything, the Mystics and the Mechanics, divine intervention, good planning, good seamanship, and good karma all rolled into one."

The Eco Navy

With McTaggart in France, Spong in London, and the media frenzy in San Francisco, Greenpeace emerged onto the world stage. However, back in Vancouver, we were $40,000 in debt. Bill Gannon guided us in creating a cash-flow projection based on the campaign and fundraising ideas we had. "Do the right thing," he encouraged us, "and the money will come. It's the first law of money."

"We drafted a budget of $300,000 for the year," recalls Gannon, "we had 20,000 names on a mailing list. The Royal Bank of Canada loaned us $150,000." We designed fundraising brochures, launched a Greenpeace Chronicles newspaper, and organized a campaign to protest the Canadian Harp seal hunt in Labrador. We were sending money to McTaggart in Paris and making plans for a second whale voyage in the summer of 1976 to confront the Japanese whalers. To keep pace with the fast whaling boats, we chartered a converted mine sweeper ("Mind Sweeper" we called it) the James Bay.

By 1977 there were some 20 Greenpeace groups around the world. We prepared the James Bay for a third voyage against the whalers but we needed money for diesel fuel and for a direct mail funding drive.

Gannon asked the bank for a $15,000 extension but they refused. "I went into the office to get some graphs I had prepared," he recalls, "and Julie [McMaster, office manager] handed me a brown paper bag that had arrived in the mail. It was filled with U.S. dollars." Inside the bag was a note from a hermit in a mountain cabin in
Washington. "I'm dying of cancer," the note said. "This is all the money I have. I know you can use it. Thanks for what you are doing." Gannon took the bag into the bank, where they counted the money. It came to $15,500, the first law of money in action.

The French stopped their atmospheric nuclear tests in the South Pacific as the Americans had done at Amchitka. The IWC passed a moratorium on pelagic whaling and the Canadian seal hunt was halted. We launched campaigns against supertankers, uranium mining, and trophy hunting in BC. We were protesting nuclear power plants in Canada and the U.S., and against Trident nuclear submarines in Puget Sound. The Greenpeace office in London went after the Icelandic whalers with a boat named Rainbow Warrior.

By 1979 the consolidated Greenpeace groups were raising over $12 million worldwide. However, rivalries and frauds were fracturing the organization. "In 1978 and 1979 there were two meetings in Vancouver to draft a constitution for Greenpeace internationally," recalls Patrick Moore, who was Greenpeace Foundation president at the time. "Whatever the structure turned out to be, we had to have one, unified Greenpeace."

McTaggart came to Vancouver in the summer of 1979 with a proposal for a Greenpeace International body with headquarters in Europe. "The European groups are well organized," he argued, "and there's a million dollars sitting in a bank account in Amsterdam." Hunter backed the McTaggart plan and swung the vote. On October 14, 1979 we signed an agreement in our lawyer's office establishing Greenpeace International. In November we met in Amsterdam with Greenpeace representatives from Canada, the U.S., France, Germany, Denmark, U.K., Australia, New Zealand, and the Netherlands. McTaggart was elected as the Executive Director. Throughout the meetings, the Rainbow Warrior, flagship of a new eco-navy, sat majestically in Amsterdam Harbour, rainbow flags flying.

Where are they now?

Captain John Cormack died peacefully on November 17, 1988, at the age of 76 in Vancouver. "Captain John," recalls Hunter "was the only fisherman on the west coast willing to take a motley group of protestors to the Aleutian Islands in 1971 to protest the American nuclear blast. He skippered the first two whale voyages. Without Cormack, there's no Greenpeace."


Jim and Marie Bohlen founded an energy-efficient, organic farm in 1974 and Jim Bohlen rejoined the board of Greenpeace Canada in 1983 to head anti-nuclear campaigns.

Moore is a private environmental consultant for resource companies. He has been critical of latter-day Greenpeace and was seen by some environmentalists as a turncoat. Hunter once called him "The eco-Judas" in his newspaper column, but has since softened and apologized. Gaia Hypothesis author James Lovelock has praised Moore's "scientific environmentalism."

"By the mid-1980's," says Moore, "we had won over a majority of the public and I made the transition from confrontation to building consensus. I wanted to talk about solutions. The key points to a global environmental policy," he says, "are renewable energy and material resources, control of our human population and urban sprawl, and the protection of forests, primarily from agricultural production."
Ben Metcalfe lives on Vancouver Island. "Be creative," he encourages Greenpeace today. "Name the perpetrators, who are profiting from the destruction of the earth. Make them visible. Set up outside their house. Don't imitate what went before. An image only works once."

Dr. Paul Spong continues the work with live orcas that he started thirty years ago on Hanson Island. "The best thing I can do for whales now," says Spong, "is to learn things about them that will take humans to a new level of relationship. I was upset with Greenpeace for years because they abandoned whales while still making money off them. Lately they've become whale defenders again, which is a great relief to me. The world needs Greenpeace."

Hamish Bruce, the original Green Panther, operates a nursery business in Vancouver. "The vision came to pass," he says. "It doesn't matter who gets credit for it. A lot of people contributed from day-one who never worried about getting credit."

Linda Spong and Bill Gannon married and live in Vancouver, where Gannon still has an accounting practice. Paul Watson left Greenpeace in 1977 and founded the more militant Sea Shepherd Society, which rammed pirate whalers on the high seas.

Rod Marining is still active environmental protests in British Columbia. In April 2001 he returned to the U.S./Canada border with anti-globalization activists protesting the FTTA Quebec City Summit. "The protesters asked me what they should do. 'Close the border,' I told them. 'We closed this border for two hours in 1969 to stop the atomic bomb tests. Let's see what you can do.' They closed the border for six hours. Broke our record."

Bob and Bobbie Hunter moved to Toronto in 1988. "When we opened the first Greenpeace office in Vancouver," Bobbie recalls, "no one was paid. Every penny we raised went toward confronting the whalers. Greenpeace Germany just built a US$35 million office building. More power to them, but times have changed."

Bob Hunter is an Ecology Specialist at Toronto's Citytv. "If anything," says Hunter now, "the ecology crisis is more urgent and I would advocate even tougher environmental law. There should be heavy sentences and staggering fines for eco-crimes."

Frank Zelko, a historian writing his doctoral dissertation on Greenpeace at the University of Kansas, says "Greenpeace developed in an evolutionary manner. There was no single founder, but Hunter had the vision and the guts to take the organization in a new direction once the anti-nuclear aspects wore thin. He was the archetypal hippie intellectual/activist but with a knowledge of media and a commitment to ecology."

"Greenpeace captured the public imagination because it resonated with their own instinctive fears of extinction and hopes for survival," says Hunter. "It was reality mythology."

In the summer of 2000, Greenpeace International invited Hunter to Europe to speak to the young activists. "They're just like we once were," he observes proudly, "but the bureaucracy of Greenpeace is a whole other matter. They showed me their 'Media Protocol Manual.' My god! It was thicker than the Toronto phone book." Hunter took the media representatives out for a beer and stories of early Greenpeace media secrets. "Chuck the manuals," he told them. "Think for yourselves. The media is not interested in yesterday's hashed-over tactics." And he reminded them: "In the beginning, there was no protocol."
Rex Weyler was a director of the Greenpeace Foundation from 1974 to 1979, a cofounders of Greenpeace International, and a director of Greenpeace Canada until 1982. He writes on environmental, social, and scientific topics. He lives in Vancouver with his wife Lisa Gibbons and three sons.

QUAKER PEACE TESTIMONY
Ask anyone, Quaker or otherwise, about the essential beliefs of the Society of Friends and chances are you will hear something about 'Friends' historic peace testimony'. 'Quakers don't fight in wars' is something specific that people can say about this awkward set which steadfastly refuses to be defined by creed or dogma. Moreover, in a world where it is considered acceptable, indeed praiseworthy, to go to war and kill one another for the sake of peace or justice, in a world where we have learned to define our successes amass our fortunes or win our arguments at the expense of others like us (our enemies) who lose out, the perception that 'Quakers are peacemakers' sets Friends apart and makes them visible.

But Friends' peace testimony is not a creed, in the sense of a statement of belief true for all time. Nor is it a code of behaviour, a set of rules to which all Quakers individually and corporately must adhere. On the simplest level, 'testimony' means 'bearing witness'; and Friends' long history of witness to peace can be found in public statements and personal reflections, in their refusal to bear arms in times of civil and international conflict, in acts of prophetic confrontation and quiet, reconciling diplomacy. But these are merely outward and visible signs of inward conviction. This conviction springs from a living Spirit, mediated through the human experience of those trying to understand and follow its leadings. It grows afresh in every life, in every worshipping group, in every generation.

At the heart of this conviction is Friends' experience that there is something of God - the seed of God - in all people. Quakers believe that more can be accomplished by appealing to this capacity for love and goodness, in ourselves and in others, that can be hope for by threatening punishment or retaliation if people act badly. This is not to ignore the existence of evil. It is to recognise that there is no effective way to combat evil with weapons which harm or kill those through whom evil is working. We must turn instead, in the words of early Friends, to the 'weapons of the spirit', allowing God to reach out through us to that of God in those with whom we are in conflict. 'Spiritual weapons' - love, truthslaying, nonviolence, imagination, laughter - are weapons that heal and don't destroy.

All this sounds grand indeed; its consequences are for the most part very ordinary. The peace testimony is not something Quakers take down from a shelf and dust off only in wartime or in times of personal or political crisis. Living out a witness to peace has to do with everyday choices about the work we do, the relationships we build, what part we take in politics, what we buy, how we raise our children. It is a matter of fostering relationships and structures - from personal to international - which are strong and healthy enough to contain conflict when it arises and allow its creative resolution. It is a matter of withdrawing our co-operation from structures and relationships which are unjust and explorative. It is a matter of finding creative ways of dealing with conflict when it does arise, with the aim of freeing all concerned to find a just and loving solution.
Like everyone else, Quakers live in the real world. Insights which are gloriously clear in the spirit translate into words or actions which seem muddled and imperfect. From time to time we fail; we fudge; we are hurt and hurt others. To accept as a certainty the spiritual conviction which underlies the peace testimony is not to be certain of the outcome. We cannot guarantee that we will never kill, far less that we will never do violence to those with whom we share the earth. Nor can we, by refusing to do harm and seeking always for a creative response in conflict, ensure either our own personal safety or the triumph of the causes we support. We can only choose to live day by day as if it were possible always to defend what we value and to resolve conflict without deliberate harm - in such a way that if damage occurs, healing is possible.

If we choose to attempt this, we are not alone. Those who have lived and witnessed before us (by no means all of them Quakers) have left examples to find and follow. Those of us alive now who are struggling with the same dilemmas can offer each other comfort, courage and support. And we are many. Like seventeenth-century Quakers, we live in an 'end time' - a time of crisis, of rapidly shifting perceptions, a time of great danger and great opportunity. People are becoming aware of their interdependence, and of the interconnectedness of creation. We are beginning to realise that security is common, indivisible, and cannot be assured by military means. To seek to live, at such a time, in 'that life and power that takes away the occasion of all wars' is no longer (if it ever was) a saintly, other-worldly alternative; it is now an urgent and practical imperative.
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Nonviolence in the 21st Century:
Challenges and Choices
By Arun Gandhi

*The greatest challenge in promoting nonviolence is the English language and its limitations. The next is our perception, rooted for centuries, that violence is the only way we can resolve our problems.*

Going back to the first challenge when Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi developed his philosophy of nonviolence in South Africa and wanted an appropriate word to describe it he could not find one. "Passive Resistance" and "Civil Disobedience" did not appeal because he said there was nothing passive or disobedient about the movement. He even offered a reward to anyone who could come up with a positive English word to describe what he had in mind but, alas, no one could.

At this point Gandhi decided a Sanskrit word may be more appropriate since he was planning to move back to India and lead the Indian struggle for freedom. He found "Satyagraha" described his philosophy the best. It is a combination of two Sanskrit words "Satya" meaning Truth and "Agraha" meaning pursuit of. Thus, "Satyagraha" means the "Pursuit of Truth", which is important because it is the opposite of the Western concept of "Possessing the Truth."

Nonviolence, therefore, can be described as an honest and diligent pursuit of truth. It could also mean the search for the meaning of life or the purpose of life, questions that have tormented mankind for centuries. The fact that we have not been able to find satisfactory answers to these questions does not mean there is no answer. It only
means we have not searched with any degree of honesty. The search has to be both external and internal. We seek to ignore this crucial search because the sacrifices it demands are evolutionary. It means moving away from greed, selfishness, possessiveness and dominance to love, compassion, understanding and respect. It means to be true to our Faith and religion - it is not enough that we pray 10 times a day but that we make the scriptures the basis of our existence.

Because of our materialistic and greedy lifestyle we have become very possessive. We seek to possess not only material goods but even our spiritual beliefs and even peace, if we find it. How many times have we heard people say: "I am at peace with myself." Or, when Gurus say to their devotees "find your peace and hold on to it." Can anyone find peace or spiritual awakening and greedily hold on to it for themselves?

A favorite story that Grandfather liked to tell us was the story of an ancient Indian King who was obsessed with the desire to find the meaning of peace. What is peace and how can we get it and when we find it what should we do with it were some of the issues that bothered him. Intellectuals in his kingdom were invited to answer the King's questions for a handsome reward. Many tried but none could explain how to find peace and what to do with it. At last someone said the King ought to consult the sage who lived just outside the borders of his Kingdom: "He is an old man and very wise," the King was told. "If anyone can answer your questions he can."

The King went to the sage and posed the eternal question. Without a word the sage went into the kitchen and brought a grain of wheat to the King. "In this you will find the answer to your question," the Sage said as he placed the grain of wheat in the King's outstretched palm. Puzzled but unwilling to admit his ignorance the King clutched the grain of wheat and returned to his palace. He locked the precious grain in a tiny gold box and placed the box in his safe. Each morning, upon waking, the King would open the box and look at the grain to seek an answer but could find nothing.

Weeks later another sage, passing through, stopped to meet the King who eagerly invited him to resolve his dilemma. The King explained how he had asked the eternal question and this sage gave him a grain of wheat instead. "I have been looking for an answer every morning but I find nothing."

The Sage said: "It is quite simple, your honor. Just as this grain represents nourishment for the body, peace represents nourishment for the soul. Now, if you keep this grain locked up in a gold box it will eventually perish without providing nourishment or multiplying. However, if it is allowed to interact with the elements - light, water, air, soil - it will flourish, multiply and soon you would have a whole field of wheat which will nourish not only you but so many others. This is the meaning of peace. It must nourish your soul and the souls of others, it must multiply by interacting with the elements."

This is the essence of Gandhi's philosophy of "nonviolence" or the pursuit of truth. In the life-long pursuit of truth we must always be guided by love, compassion, understanding and respect, allow everything we have to interact positively with the
elements and help create a society of peace and harmony. The more possessions we have the more we have to secure them from those who covet it generating feelings of jealousy and the desire to take by force what the needy cannot get through compassion.

The four essential principles of Gandhi's philosophy are quite simple to understand and implement.

At the public level the four principles are: Truth, Ahimsa, Trusteeship and Constructive Action.

While at the personal level the four principles are: Respect, Understanding, Acceptance and Appreciation.

The success in attaining enlightenment or finding the Truth depends on how honest we are and whether we can liberate ourselves from the attachments that tie us down. Gandhi said being liberated politically or socially is not enough. He did not mean that we become careless or adopt a "don't care" attitude towards life and relationships. Freeing yourself of attachments means one must be willing to stand up for truth and justice and not be afraid of the consequences like losing your possessions, your job or even your life. It is only when we reach that level of spiritual power that nonviolence will become relevant.

When white racists humiliated Grandfather in South Africa because they did not want a "black" man traveling in a first class compartment of a train he tried to enlist the support of the non-whites in South Africa to stand up for their rights. Instead, he found that fear dominated their response. "What will happen to my family? My job? My home and possessions?" The middle-class was content to submit to the white man's injustices rather than stand up to them and risk losing everything. That was when grandfather discovered the corrupting influence of materialism.

This attitude persists everywhere. We still accept injustice because we are afraid of suffering and losing our possessions or our security? True liberation comes when we can liberate ourselves of the FEAR that controls our lives. In the final analysis that is the key. In reality, this is not something impossible that nonviolence demands. When we are forced by law to sacrifice our lives to protect our country in war we don't ask who is going to take care of the family or what will happen to my possessions. We just go with the knowledge that we may not come back again. This is a sacrifice that is forced upon an individual by a government. Then, why is it so difficult for the same individual to make the same sacrifice to stand up for justice, ethics and values?

"I am prepared to die but there is no cause for which I am prepared to kill," Gandhi said.

However, to come back to the core principles of nonviolence. The meaning of TRUTH is, of course, obvious. We must remember truth has many sides and it is ever changing. What appears true today may not be true tomorrow. Or what appears to be the Truth to us does not necessarily appear to be the Truth to others. We cannot therefore say that we possess the Truth and so our understanding of Truth is the right
one. We must develop the ability to look at everything from different perspectives and have the humility to understand that we could be wrong.

AHIMSA, is the Sanskrit word for total nonviolence, that is, nonviolence in thought, word and deed. Grandfather recognized the limitations of ahimsa. Living the way we do being totally nonviolent may not be possible for everyone. It may even not be possible for anyone. Yet, it must be the objective of every individual in the same way as getting an "A+" grade is the objective of every student who goes to school. If any student goes to school with the mindset that he/she will never get an "A+" grade then that student is in big trouble. That person has already discounted himself and will, therefore, only slide down into oblivion.

TRUSTEESHIP is a unique concept that needs to be properly understood. Each individual has the talent or the ability to achieve our goals. We exploit that talent or the ability for personal gains in the belief that we “own ” the talent or ability. Gandhi said we don't own the talent but we are appointed "Trustees" by God and so we must use the talent to help others, less fortunate or talented than us. But this "giving" or "sharing" or "helping" must not cripple the receiver.

There is a very thin line that divides "pity" and "compassion" and we often mistake one for the other. Pity is degrading and oppressive while compassion is uplifting for both the giver and the receiver. Pity is when we give a hungry person money to buy food or when we feed the hungry through soup kitchens. When feeding becomes an end in itself then we are causing a problem. Feeding should be a means to constructive action. By feeding the hungry we make them dependent on handouts.

On the other hand, compassion requires that we get involved in finding ways in which the unfortunate can be helped to become self-sufficient citizens. The help they receive should be such as to help rebuild their self-confidence and self-respect which are crushed by poverty and oppression.

CONSTRUCTIVE ACTION is the natural corollary to trusteeship. It means getting involved in finding constructive solutions to problems. We are usually so pre-occupied with the Self that we don't have time for anyone or anything. We usually want to hang the responsibility on someone's shoulders. Usually the Government's shoulders yet they have severe limitations. Bureaucrats or paid social workers don't always have the compassion needed for this kind of work. In 1970 six young people in Mumba City in India, each working for a livelihood and committed to raising their children, decided to find a solution to the overwhelming homelessness in the city that is growing rampanty.

Using Gandhi's philosophy of trusteeship and constructive action this group, led by Mahipat Rao Mohite, assembled more than 500 homeless people and challenged them to become a part of the solution by saving a coin everyday to build the necessary capital so that an economic project could be launched. Mohite could have sought donations or applied for grants but that would give the homeless the feeling they could ask for what they need and receive it on a platter.

Mohite said the homeless would have to collectively save a coin every day. Most people would have considered this impossible or even heartless to ask someone to
save a coin every day when they did not know where the next meal was going to come from. However, the homeless accepted the challenge and with Mohite's encouragement saved the equivalent of $11,000 in about 19 months.

The money was used to start in 1971 a small textile factory with second hand power looms in a tin shed in Vita village near Sangli, 200 miles south of Mumbai. Some 70 of the homeless were sent to the village to work in the jointly owned factory under the guidance of Mohite and his friends until the homeless were trained to run the business for themselves. Today all those who contributed to the capital are back in their village living on the earnings of their four textile factories, enjoying a much better life-style and able to send their children to schools and higher education.

The homeless continued saving money and in 1978 opened the Sangli Jilla Kranti Cooperative Bank in Mumbai City. Today the Bank has 7 branch offices and total assets worth $2 million. This is an example of what Gandhi meant by trusteeship and constructive action. Mohite and his friends did not make major sacrifices other than their leisure and vacation time.

The four principles of nonviolence to be practiced by individuals begin with RESPECT. We must respect ourselves, respect others and respect our relationship to all of creation. A myth persists, especially in the West, that we are independent individuals with no responsibilities towards others. A cohesive society cannot be built with each individual pulling in different direction. To achieve harmony and cohesiveness we must accept the fact that we are inter-dependent, inter-related and inter-woven working together to build a human society.

It is not enough to respect individual human beings. We must also respect different cultures, different ways of life and different belief systems. Danger lies in our becoming competitive, in believing that ours is the only way and the best way and attempting to impose our way on others. To assume that our way is the best is to say that we "possess" the Truth. When we accept that others could also be right then we join others in an honest search for Truth.

Religion, Grandfather explained, is the beginning of a spiritual journey. When we come to understand Religion properly we reach an understanding of spirituality, that is the acceptance and respect for different ways of worship. Salvation is when we reach the mountaintop. When we become one with creation and creation becomes one with us.

UNDERSTANDING is reached when we learn who we are and what is our role in all of creation. In our arrogance we believe that humans are not a part of nature. We are here to conquer nature. In our attempt to conquer nature we are destroying our habitat and cannot expect to survive for very long.

ACCEPTANCE is reached when we accept the differences - physical and philosophical -- between human beings. When these differences begin to melt away then we accept each other as human beings and can dispense with the labels that keep people apart.

APPRECIATION of our humanity is achieved at this stage.
The best way, however, to understand Gandhi's philosophy of nonviolence is to first understand the extent of violence that we practice, consciously or unconsciously, every day of our lives. Grandfather made me aware of the violence in society, including the violence within myself, by asking me to work on a family tree of violence on the same principles as a genealogical tree.

He said: "Violence has two children - Physical and Passive. Now, everyday before you go to bed I would like you to write under each heading everything that you experienced during the day and the relationship of the violence with each other."

I had to be honest and write about my own acts of violence during the day. This meant that every night I had to analyze my actions and if I found them to be violent then the act had to be put down in its appropriate place. It was an excellent way of introspection and acknowledgement of one's own violence.

We generally deny our own violence because we are ignorant about it or because we are conditioned to look at violence only in its physical manifestation - the wars, fighting, killing, beating, rapes etc. where we use physical force. However, we don't consider oppression in all its forms, name calling, teasing, insulting, disrespectful behavior etc. as passive forms of violence.

The relationship between passive violence and physical violence is the same as the relationship between gasoline and fire. Acts of passive violence generate anger in the victim and since the victim has not learned how to use anger positively the victim abuses anger and generates physical violence. Thus, it is passive violence that fuels the fire of physical violence, which means if we wish to put out the fire of physical violence we have to cut off the fuel supply.

The choice before humanity, to quote Gandhi's words, is quite simple: "We have to be the change we wish to see." Unless we change individually no one is going to change collectively. For generations we have been waiting for the other person to change first. A change of heart cannot be legislated, it must come out of conviction.

Is nonviolence relevant for the 21st Century?
Nonviolence is always relevant because it is the natural response of any civilized human being. Violence is unnatural, a learned behavior. If violence is human nature then we would not need martial arts institutes and military academies to teach us how to kill. We should be born with the instinct and the ability to kill.

The question that we need to ask is, therefore, not whether nonviolent is relevant but whether we are willing to move away from greed, selfishness and all the negative attributes that govern our lives to the more positive attributes of love, compassion, understanding and respect.
The choice is ours to make.

Martin Luther King, Jr. found in the life and writings of Mohandas K. Gandhi a nonviolent method of social change that was both practical and morally sound. In the course of King's own preaching and organizing he developed a set of nonviolent principles and a way to apply them. These are now being carried forward by the
work of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Nonviolent Social Change in Atlanta, Georgia.

SIX PRINCIPLES OF NONVIOLENCE

1. **Nonviolence is a way of life for courageous people.** It is active nonviolent resistance to evil. It is aggressive spiritually, mentally and emotionally. It is always persuading the opponent of the righteousness of your cause.

2. **Nonviolence seeks to win friendship and understanding.** The end result of nonviolence is redemption and reconciliation. The purpose of nonviolence is the creation of the Beloved Community.

3. **Nonviolence seeks to defeat injustice, not people.** Nonviolence recognizes that evil doers are also victims and are not evil peoples. The nonviolent resister seeks to defeat evil, not people.

4. **Nonviolence holds that suffering can educate and transform.** Nonviolence accepts suffering without retaliation. Nonviolence accepts violence if necessary, but will never inflict it. Nonviolence willingly accepts the consequences of its acts... Suffering has the power to convert the enemy when reasons fails.

5. **Nonviolence chooses love instead of hate.** Nonviolence resists violence of the spirit as well as the body. Nonviolent love is spontaneous, unmotivated, unselfish and creative. Nonviolent love gives willingly, knowing that the return might be hostility. Nonviolent love is active, not passive. Nonviolent love in unending in its ability to forgive in order to restore community. Nonviolent love does not sink to the level of the hater. Love for the enemy is how we demonstrate love for ourselves. Love restores community and resists injustice. Nonviolence recognizes the fact that all life is interrelated.

6. **Nonviolence believes that the universe is on the side of justice.** The nonviolent resister has deep faith that justice will eventually win...

MARTIN LUTHER KING, Jr.

SIX STEPS FOR NONVIOLENT SOCIAL CHANGE

1. **Information Gathering:** To understand and articulate an issue, problem or injustice facing a person, community or institution you must do research. You must investigate and gather all vital information from all sides of the argument or issue in order to increase your understanding of the problem. You must become an expert on your opponent’s position.

2. **Education:** It is essential to inform others, including your opposition, about your issue. This minimizes misunderstandings and gains you support and sympathy.

3. **Personal Commitment:** Daily check and affirm your faith in the philosophy and methods of nonviolence. Eliminate hidden motives and prepare yourself to accept suffering, if necessary, in your work for justice.
4. **Negotiation:** Using grace, humor and intelligence confront the other party with a list of injustices and a plan for addressing and resolving these injustices. Look for what is positive in the actions and statements the opposition makes. Do not seek to humiliate the opponent but call forth the good in the opponent. Look for ways in which the opponent can also win.

5. **Direct Action:** These actions are taken to morally force the opponent to work with you in resolving the injustices. Direct action imposes a "creative tension" into the conflict. Direct action is most effective when it illustrates the injustice it seeks to correct.

6. **Reconciliation:** Nonviolence seeks friendship and understanding with the opponent. Nonviolence is directed against evil systems, forces, oppressive policies, and unjust acts, not against persons. Reconciliation includes the opponent being able to "save face." Each act of reconciliation is one step closer to the "Beloved Community." Both the individuals and the entire community are empowered. With this come new struggles for justice and a new beginning.


---

In 1968 the Soviet Union and four other Communist countries invaded Czechoslovakia. Rather than defending themselves militarily, the Czechoslovakian people responded with nonviolent resistance. This piece describes some of the nonviolent tactics they used in an attempt to thwart Soviet objectives. There are also some comments on how the Czechoslovakians could have used nonviolence more effectively, the vulnerabilities of bureaucratic systems, and the practicality of using strategic nonviolence for national defense (civilian-based defense).

"The story of Czechoslovakia in 1968 is a testament to the power of civilian resistance and the limitations of military force. Even when the country was bristling with Warsaw Pact troops and military equipment, in no way could it be said the Soviets were in control of Czechoslovakia."

**PRAGUE SPRING**

In the late 1960's Czechoslovakia was still part of the Eastern Bloc—essentially a satellite of the Soviet Union—but was beginning to show a certain degree of independence. At the Thirteenth Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party in 1966 a radical new economic policy was introduced. Steps were taken that could lead to the separation of the Communist Party from the State government. Writers and intellectuals were demanding an end to censorship and more freedom to travel abroad. The reformers gained ground, and in early 1968 Ludvik Svoboda was installed as President and Alexander Dubcek made head of the Czechoslovakian Communist Party. Press censorship and travel restrictions were abolished. Plans were made for open elections, free trade, and economic reforms. Czechoslovakia became the most liberal Communist state in the world. Czechoslovakians reveled in their newfound freedom. The resulting euphoria and blooming of creativity was known as the "Prague Spring."
This train of events deeply disturbed the Soviets and the other Warsaw Pact countries. After some tense negotiations a compromise was worked out. Reforms could continue, but at a slower pace. Everyone in Czechoslovakia breathed a little easier.

INVASION
However, the Soviets were still not satisfied. Late at night on August 20, 1968, they struck like lightning, initiating a massive invasion of their wayward ally. By the morning of the 21st Czechoslovakia was inundated with tanks and troops from East Germany, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria and the U.S.S.R. Within a week there were over half a million Warsaw Pact troops in the country. In Prague alone 500 tanks controlled strategic locations.

The Soviets had planned to crush any military resistance, install a puppet government, and begin withdrawing within four days. The invading troops were well prepared to counter any resistance the small Czechoslovakian army might offer. But the Czechoslovakian army was surprised and completely unprepared for an invasion by allies, and was ordered by the Czech government not to fight. This was an unfortunate turn of events for the invaders, because they were completely unprepared for the kind of resistance they were to encounter.

The troops had been told they would be welcomed with open arms by the Czechoslovakian workers. Instead, they were booed, taunted, spit at, and jeered. Initially there was some violence, as angry kids set tanks on fire and threw paving stones and Molotov cocktails at the troops. But radio and TV stations denounced the violence and called for "passive" resistance instead. Over the next couple of weeks these clandestine broadcasters coordinated the civilian resistance that prevented the Soviets from taking control of the country.

CIVILIAN RESISTANCE STORIES
NOISE
At 9:00 am on August 26, people all over Czechoslovakia rang church bells, blew horns and sounded sirens to protest the invasion. The din frightened some of the nervous occupation troops, who shot a woman in Klarov and roughed up an engineer in Prague who was sounding his train whistle. Sirens and horns also announced the beginning of one-hour general strikes in Prague. Soviet tank crews watched helplessly as motorists blew their horns and all traffic stopped.

HUMAN BLOCKADE
Citizens in a small village in Eastern Bohemia formed a human chain across a bridge and blockaded a Russian convoy of tanks and other vehicles. After eight and a half hours the Russians turned back.

THE LOST TRAIN
The Czechoslovakians discovered that a Russian freight train was transporting equipment to jam pirate radio broadcasts. A radio station put out an appeal for rail workers to stop the train. It never made it to Prague. First the train was delayed when the electricity failed, then it ended up on a side track stuck between two other immobilized locomotives. The Soviets eventually had to transport the gear by helicopter.

NUDE PICTURES
In Bratislava a group of young people gathered up boxes of "girlie" magazines that had recently become available from the West. They went to a park and handed them out to the lonely Soviet tank crews that were keeping watch over the area. After a while the commander realized what was happening and ordered his men back into their tanks. The kids joked that the soldiers, who had been abused by the local Slovaks for the last few days, were now abusing themselves. With the soldiers sealed inside their tanks, the kids then stuck paper over their periscopes, making it impossible for the Soviets to continue their surveillance.

THE CASTLE AT BRATISLAVA
Some Russian troops took up residence in an old castle in Bratislava. The castle housed a museum. The museum curator asked the Russian colonel if he could check the exhibits to make sure they were unharmed. The colonel readily granted him permission for an inspection. When the curator was left alone he sneaked down into the basement and turned off the main water valve. When the soldiers found they had no water, they had to look for it elsewhere. But mysteriously, much of the water in the rest of Bratislava had somehow been cut off as well. Finding potable water became a serious problem for the troops, and for several days it had to be brought in from Hungary by helicopter.

NO WATER
The Soviet tank crews had brought powdered rations that needed to be mixed with water. In Bratislava, when they tried to fill their canteens with public tap water, the Slovaks gathered around and warned them that "counter-revolutionaries" had poisoned the water supplies. Some soldiers resorted to scooping up water from puddles, or getting it from the heavily polluted Danube River.

The troops were expecting a warm reception from the Slovaks and brought few supplies and facilities with them. The lack of food, sleep and proper sanitation took its toll. Drinking polluted water added to their distress and many soldiers became ill.

ROZNAVA
The people who lived in Roznava, a small town in eastern Slovakia, were mostly of Hungarian decent. Hence the Soviets decided to send in Hungarian troops, confident that they would receive a warm welcome. Instead, the soldiers were spit at and booed. The citizens of Roznava refused to provide the troops with food, water, supplies or lodging.

Desperate, the Hungarian colonel had a meeting with the mayor. They finally came to an agreement. The troops would receive the supplies they needed and could stay at a temporarily unoccupied school. However, they would be forced to obey the town's curfew. So each day at nightfall the Hungarian occupiers returned to the school so the mayor could lock them inside. Then at dawn the mayor would come back to let them out again.

CLANDESTINE BROADCASTING
The electronic media—radio and television—played a key role in the resistance. It was able to create a sense of solidarity and hope by keeping citizens informed about what was happening in other parts of the country. This underground news media broadcast Czech government appeals and made suggestions on how to resist the
invaders, while urging people to remain nonviolent. The amazing thing is that none of this was planned beforehand. All broadcasting arrangements were continually improvised and varied to prevent detection.

The Russians had a hard time closing down all the television stations because broadcasting facilities were dispersed throughout Prague. Clandestine TV broadcasts were also done from factories and other buildings using mobile and remote transmitters. For instance, on the day of the invasion television workers escaped with a remote broadcast truck. They then set up a studio in an empty apartment building in the Prague suburbs. From there broadcasts were beamed all over the country using microwave links. The on-air personalities—well-known newscasters, athletes, intellectuals and other Czech celebrities—all urged nonviolent resistance and noncooperation. Clandestine radio stations were even more important than television because there were more of them and they were easier to hide. Mobile transmitters, supplied by the Czech army, were moved every few hours to avoid detection by Soviet tracking equipment. The army also helped transport audiotapes, which were recorded in secret locations, to the radio transmitters.

GRAFFITI
The Czechs made good use of graffiti to make the invaders feel unwelcome. They hung posters and used chalk or paint to apply anti-Soviet slogans to the walls of buildings. A common activity was to climb on a tank while it was stopped at a traffic light and paint a swastika on it. Some slogans seen in Prague:
"Why bother to occupy our State Bank? You know there is nothing in it."
"United States in Vietnam, Soviet Union in Czechoslovakia."
"Leonid, send 10 more tanks—20 more counter-revolutionaries arrived here today."
"An elephant can not swallow a hedgehog."

THE UNDERGROUND PRESS
The Czechoslovaksians, using printing presses and mimeograph machines (photocopiers were unheard of in 1968), published leaflets, pamphlets and newspapers right under the noses of the occupiers. Soviet troops shot some kids who were distributing clandestine newspapers. Hundreds of people attended their funerals.

LOST IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA
Travelling in Czechoslovakia was a nightmare for the Warsaw Pact troops. The Czechs had removed street signs and painted over building address numbers. Many small villages renamed themselves "Dubcek" or "Svoboda." In rural areas it was not uncommon to see a troop convoy stalled at a crossroad, the commander scratching his head over an open map.

THE MOSCOW AGREEMENT
On the leadership level the Soviets met more resistance for their plans to set up a puppet government. Top Czechoslovakian officials refused to corroborate the Soviet's story that the troops had been invited in to put down an uprising of "counter-revolutionaries." Because of the near unanimous civilian resistance throughout the country, even conservative leaders were reluctant to collaborate with the Soviets, and no one could be found to form a puppet government that had a facade of legitimacy.
Government bodies continued to meet right under the noses of the Warsaw Pact occupiers. Many of these secret gatherings were coordinated by pirate radio broadcasts. The Czechoslovak Communist Party Congress, the National Assembly, and many of the remaining government officials all denied the legitimacy of the Soviet’s actions, demanded the withdraw of troops, and encouraged nonviolent resistance by the population.

Dubcek and several other high officials were taken to the Soviet Union to be executed as soon as a new government could be put in place. Svoboda was at first placed under house arrest in Prague and pressured to cooperate, but he refused. A couple of days after the invasion the Soviets flew him to Moscow to work out a compromise. Svoboda refused to negotiate unless Dubcek was present. When the Soviets finally brought Dubcek into the meeting he was still tied up.

The Soviet leaders seemed to temporarily abandon their plan to install a new regime, and instead worked on pressuring the legitimate government to change its ways. At the Moscow meeting the Soviets used threats and demanded cooperation in no uncertain terms. The Czechoslovakian leaders stood their ground. In the end a vague agreement was worked out which scrapped many of the reforms, but left the legitimate government leaders, including Svoboda and Dubcek, still in office.

DEFEAT
When Czechoslovakians heard about the Moscow Agreement many were outraged. They felt their leaders had sold them out. Demoralization began to set in. Gradually the clandestine printing presses and radio stations were found by the Soviets and closed down. Throughout the next few months scattered dissent continued in the form of factory resolutions, demonstrations and the occupation of university buildings. But generally the intense resistance of the first few weeks after the invasion slowly turned into a disgruntled complacency.

Their military tactics having failed, the Soviets began to use political manipulation, economic pressure and subtle threats against the Czechoslovakian leadership to chip away at the reform movement. The Czech government made more and more concessions to the Soviet demands. Finally in April 1969 anti-Russian riots (which may have been instigated by agents provocateurs) created a shift in power in the Czechoslovakian government. Dubcek and his reformers were ousted. Eight months after the invasion the Soviets finally got the conservative government they wanted in Czechoslovakia.

COMMENTARY
The story of Czechoslovakia in 1968 is a testament to the power of civilian resistance and the limitations of military force. Even when the country was bristling with Warsaw Pact troops and military equipment, in no way could it be said that the Soviets were in control of Czechoslovakia. If it had fought, the highly trained Czechoslovakian army would only have lasted a couple days, and then the country would surely have come firmly under Soviet control. Instead, an improvised campaign of noncooperation kept the Soviets from installing their puppet government for eight months!

The Czechoslovakians could have been even more effective in their resistance if they had seen it as an integrated strategy rather than as a series of spontaneous actions. Pre-planning would have enabled them to start the resistance earlier, avoid violence (that
occurred mainly on the first day), and coordinate their actions for maximum effect. The leaders should have gone underground when the invasion first began so they would have been available to coordinate the resistance and inspire their fellow citizens. If that were not possible, they should have resigned rather than accepting the unfavorable terms of the Moscow Agreement. That would have left the country without legitimate leadership. The ball would have then been in the Soviet's court to find authorities that had credibility with the population.

If the Czechoslovakian people and their leaders had continued their defiance in a determined and coordinated fashion, there is every likelihood that they could have created serious internal problems for the Soviet Union. At the time some experts speculated that there were major differences of opinion within the Kremlin hierarchy, not only about Czechoslovakia, but also about the reform issue itself. It was known that there were officials who favored instituting exactly the kinds of reforms for the Soviet Union that the Dubcek government had been implementing. (In fact, twenty years later Gorbachev did create similar changes, which ultimately resulted in the disintegration of the Soviet system and the subsequent fall of Communism in Eastern Europe.) In any event, it's possible that a crisis resulting from continued resistance in Czechoslovakia may have served to exacerbate policy differences in the Soviet government, weakening it politically and strengthening the Czechoslovakian bargaining position.

**HIERARCHY**

All bureaucratic and hierarchical organizations have fault lines that make them vulnerable to nonviolent strategies. The (mostly) men who comprise these bureaucracies are typically very competitive and aggressive (or they wouldn't be there). In such groups there are always officials who don't like each other personally, who feel they have been snubbed or stabbed in the back by some fellow politician and are looking for revenge. There are always jealousies, insecurities, divergent goals and philosophies.

That natural divisions are a major vulnerability of all bureaucratic and hierarchical structures is a fact that should not be lost on those of us interested in developing strategies to overthrow such organizations. A major strategic concern when planning a campaign of resistance should be finding ways to drive wedges in the cracks that naturally occur in these organizations. It's the old divide and conquer strategy, and it has often been a decisive factor in successful nonviolent campaigns. The tendency to create dissension in the opponent's ranks is a unique strength of nonviolent tactics. On the other hand, when faced with violence groups tend to band together and increase solidarity.

**CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE**

Many believe that it may be possible to use nonviolent strategies to defend a country against internal coups and foreign invasions. In fact, a number of small countries are researching the possibility of using carefully planned programs of civilian noncooperation either to supplement their military defense capabilities, or as a stand-alone system. In the U.S. it is called *Civilian-Based Defense* (CBD); Europeans call it *Social Defense*.

A prerequisite for instituting CBD in a large capitalist country like the U.S. would be the radical transformation of society itself—to the point where it would no longer be a large capitalist country. It would require major revisions in the way we think about security, defense, consumerism and social equality.
First of all, CBD can only defend societies, not territory. It cannot project power around the globe like a large military machine can. If we wish to maintain our extravagant and exploitative lifestyles (and most Americans do, make no mistake about it), we must have the capability to keep our "colonies" and client states in line, because they provide us with resources and cheap labor.

Another problem is that the U.S., like most large countries, is really made up of smaller nations that have been fused together through that violent process called "nation building." As a result, there are many surviving ethnic and cultural differences. Most capitalist countries also have major disparities in economic classes. Since rock-solid solidarity is one of the most important elements in successful nonviolent struggle, it’s possible that the U.S. would not be able to withstand the violent repression and divisive pressures of a long struggle.

It should be noted that Czechoslovakia was not ethnically unified either. Consequently, it separated into two countries (the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic) in 1993, soon after the pressures of Soviet hegemony were released. If the Czechoslovakians had chosen to wage a long campaign of noncooperation in 1968, it is likely that the Soviets would have exploited these divisions to their own advantage.

A more practicable application of nonviolence might be to defend small communities of people who share common values and deep bonds. Such entities would become even more difficult to subdue by traditional military means if they were to form mutual defense pacts and coalitions with other small communities in their area, depriving any potential enemy of a regional base of support.

From: www.mindspring.com/~fragments/TXT2/czechotx.html

In the mid-1980’s a popular movement sprang up to oust the corrupt Philippine dictator Ferdinand Marcos. As the resistance gained momentum, two key military officers defected from the government and sequestered themselves inside a Manila military base. What followed was an amazing example of nonviolent struggle as hundreds of thousands of ordinary Filipinos took to the streets to protect the rebel officers from troops still loyal to Marcos.

“What the story of the Philippine revolution demonstrates is the power people can have when they withdraw consent.”

FERDINAND MARCOS
When Ferdinand Marcos was twenty years old he was arrested for conspiracy in the murder of one of his father's political rivals. He was convicted of murder and sentenced to prison. The case was appealed before the Philippine Supreme Court. Marcos, a young lawyer with no trial experience, represented himself and won the appeal. He was set free.

At one time Marcos was one of the world's most powerful dictators. First elected president of the Philippines in 1965, he pulled the strings of power like a master puppeteer. He consolidated power by manipulating public opinion, stealing elections,
perfecting the arts of political patronage and bribery. Arrests and assassinations kept the public living in fear.

Although the Philippine constitution limited the presidency to two four-year terms, Marcos ruled for twenty years. He achieved this by suspending the constitution (after declaring martial law), and then writing another constitution more conducive to his ambitions. He ran the Philippines like it was his private country club, controlling the military, the parliament, the courts, the bureaucracy, the press and several business monopolies. He and his "cronies" got richer while the country got poorer.

ASSASSINATION
Then in 1983 Benigno Aquino decided to return to the Philippines after three years of self-imposed exile. As a popular politician, Aquino represented the primary threat to the Marcos presidency. For his "protection," a military escort greeted Aquino when he arrived at Manila International Airport. As he exited the plane, there were shots. When it was over Aquino's body lay sprawled on the tarmac. The assassination of Benigno Aquino was the match that lit the fire that would eventually consume the Marcos regime.

THE FUNERAL
The Marcos government banned TV coverage of the Aquino funeral. As a result, thousands of people showed up, wanting to see for themselves what was going on. The funeral march turned into an eleven-hour impromptu demonstration against Marcos.

By not allowing TV coverage, Marcos was using the old-fashioned tactics of heavy-handed repression. He didn't understand what the elites of most modern industrial nations have learned—that there are much more subtle (and efficient) means of controlling a population. Had he allowed, even encouraged, extensive TV coverage and turned the whole affair into a spectacle, people may have stayed home and watched the tube instead of going out and getting involved.

REACTION
The public reacted angrily to the Aquino murder. Rallies and other forms of resistance sprang up in cities and towns all over the Philippines. During the next two and a half years all segments of the population, including the upper and middle classes, joined the struggle to get rid of Marcos. Finally, yielding to pressure from his people (and the U.S.), Marcos called for presidential elections to prove he still had widespread support.

Benigno Aquino's widow Cory, a self-described housewife, ran against Marcos. The election was marked by widespread fraud, with Marcos' thugs beating up election workers and scrambling voter roles. The government declared Marcos the winner. After the election Cory Aquino spoke to a crowd of one million people at a rally in Manila. She proposed a seven-part program of nonviolent resistance, including a one-day work stoppage and a boycott of Marcos-controlled banks, stores and newspapers. She urged people to "experiment with nonviolent forms of protest" and declared: "...if Goliath refuses to yield, we shall keep dipping into our arsenal of nonviolence and escalate our nonviolent struggle." The revolution had begun.

DEFECTION
On February 22, 1986, Defense Minister Juan Ponce Enrile and Deputy Chief of Staff Fidel Ramos defect from the Marcos government. Enrile and Ramos barricade themselves in the Defense Ministry headquarters in Manila, along with a small group of sympathetic troops. They say they are prepared to die rather than continue supporting the corrupt Marcos regime. Marcos is not worried about the rebel officers. "They are cornered," he says. They "can be easily wiped out with simple artillery and tank fire." He declares: "I intend to stay as President and if necessary I will defend this position with all the force at my disposal." Unfortunately for Marcos, force is not the same as power, and although he still has plenty of force at his disposal, the sources of his power are drying up.

RESISTANCE
Radio Veritas, an independent radio station run by the Catholic Church, calls for people to surround the Defense Ministry and block the movement of any troops that Marcos might send. Hundreds of thousands of people respond. They chop down trees and park buses in intersections to blockade streets leading to Camp Crame where the small contingent of rebels has consolidated their forces. For the next four days, entire families camp out on the streets of Manila, using their bodies to protect the rebel troops from attack.

A carnival-like atmosphere prevails. Hawkers sell peanuts and souvenirs. People sing and dance and cheer. They talk and sleep and listen to Radio Veritas. Priests hold street masses and prayer vigils. There are spontaneous rallies and processions. Marcos has a plan: "We'll bide our time, but we'll disperse the civilians, protects them, take care of them, and then we'll hit Enrile and Ramos." He sends Marines, tanks and armored personnel carriers to attack Camp Crame.

Marcos’ soldiers and weapons are met in the streets by tens of thousands of ordinary Filipinos who are surrounding Camp Crame to protect the rebel officers. As the tanks start forward into the crowd, people sit down in front of them. The tanks stop.

People offer the soldiers candy and cigarettes, asking them to defect and join the rebellion. Young girls walk among the soldiers, passing out flowers. The blocked tanks start forward again. The people sit tight, holding their ground. The tanks stop again. A Marine commander threatens to start shooting. Priests and nuns kneel before the tanks, praying the Rosary. No shots are fired. Finally the tanks turn around and withdraw as the crowd cheers.

Marcos, the power professional, knows the foundation of his authority is perception. Despite his frail health, he lashes out against the rebels with macho bluster: "If they think I am sick, I may even want to lead the troops to wipe out this Enrile and Ramos. I am just like an old war horse, smelling powder and getting stronger." Enrile responds: "He can't even lead himself to the bathroom."

On February 24 Marcos imposes a dusk to dawn curfew. No one pays any attention. By now the Reagan White House, whose support is one of the keys to Marcos' power, is openly calling for him to resign. Troops begin to defect in increasing numbers. Seven helicopter gunships land at Camp Crame to join the rebels.
A small group of rebel soldiers in Manila take over channel four, a government-run TV station, cutting off a Marcos speech in mid-sentence. Tens of thousands gather outside to defend the station while the opposition begins broadcasting news updates and appeals for assistance from Enrile, Ramos and Aquino.

DEFENDING CHANNEL FOUR
When several platoons of loyalist soldiers try to take back channel four, they are surrounded by civilians. A priest walks up and leads the crowd in the Lord's Prayer. People begin shaking the soldiers' hands and giving them McDonalds hamburgers, doughnuts and orange soda. The tension eases. After a while the commander agrees to withdraw his troops.

As the soldiers prepare to depart, a middle-aged woman in an Aquino T-shirt helps a machine gunner wind belts of ammunition around his chest. 'There, now you look like Rambo," she tells him. But as the soldier bends down to pick up his gun, it accidentally discharges. Another soldier is hit in the face and killed. It is the only violent death on February 24, the next to last day of the revolution.

VICTORY
On the 25th both Aquino and Marcos hold separate inaugurations. The Marcos inauguration is a pathetic affair, attended by family members and a few paid guests. Behind the scenes Marcos is manoeuvring to save face, placing phone calls to influential Filipinos and begging to be allowed to stay on as an "Honorary President," or at least to remain in the Philippines as a private citizen. He must be astonished to see his power, which seemed so absolute only a few weeks ago, evaporate so quickly and completely.

At about nine o'clock that night, Marcos and his family sneak out the back door of Malacañang Palace and take a boat across the Pasig River where helicopters are waiting. At Clark Air base they board a U.S. Air Force plane headed for Guam. Marcos, who ruled for twenty years as one of the world's most powerful dictators, is now just a sick old man fleeing his country like a frightened dog.

When Marcos' departure is announced jubilant Filipinos celebrate in the streets and flood into Malacañang Palace. There is some fighting and retribution against citizens and troops that had been loyal to Marcos, but it is minimal.

After violent revolutions there are always scores to settle, grudges to satisfy, revenge to extract, and the cycle of violence continues. But because the Filipino people created major political change largely without violence, national reconciliation was that much easier.

COMMENTARY
While the Philippine revolution deposed a powerful dictator, it left much of the old centralised power structure unchanged. The U.S. still retained major influence through military aid and bases. The Philippine military remained intact under Defence Minister Enrolee, the same man who had rotten rich from political connections while serving as Defence Minister under Marcos. The new President, Cory Aquinas, was from a wealthy family. The poor were still poor, and the rich were still in charge. Capitalism emerged stronger than ever.
What the story of the Philippine revolution demonstrates is the power people can have when they withdraw consent. The same dynamics apply, no matter what the issue. Had Filipinos decided to go on and struggle for a more equitable distribution of wealth, the abolition of the military, or a decentralised government that was more responsive to their needs, who knows what more amazing things they might have achieved.

For more info: [www.mindspring.com/~fragments/TXT2/philipgp.html](http://www.mindspring.com/~fragments/TXT2/philipgp.html)

198 Methods of Nonviolent Action

Practitioners of nonviolent struggle have an entire arsenal of “nonviolent weapons” at their disposal. Listed below are 198 of them, classified into three broad categories: nonviolent protest and persuasion, noncooperation (social, economic, and political) and nonviolent intervention. A description and historical examples of each can be found in volume two of "The Politics of Nonviolent Action", by Gene Sharp.

THE METHODS OF NONVIOLENT PROTEST AND PERSUASION

Formal Statements
1. Public Speeches
2. Letters of opposition or support
3. Declarations by organizations and institutions
4. Signed public statements
5. Declarations of indictment and intention
6. Group or mass petitions

Communications With a Wider Audience
7. Slogans, caricatures, and symbols
8. Banners, posters, and displayed communications
9. Leaflets, pamphlets, and books
10. Newspapers and journals
11. Records, radio, and television
12. Skywriting and earthwriting

Group Representations
13. Deputations
14. Mock awards
15. Group lobbying
16. Picketing
17. Mock elections

Symbolic Public Acts
18. Displays of flags and symbolic colors
19. Wearing of symbols
20. Prayer and worship
21. Delivering symbolic objects
22. Protest disrobing
23. Destruction of own property
24. Symbolic lights
25. Displays of portraits
26. Paint as protest
27. New signs and names
28. Symbolic sounds
29. Symbolic reclamation
30. Rude gestures

Pressures on Individuals
31. “Haunting” officials
32. Taunting officials
33. Fraternization
34. Vigils

Drama and Music
35. Humorous skits and pranks
36. Performances of plays and music
37. Singing

Processions
38. Marches
39. Parades
40. Religious processions
41. Pilgrimages
42. Motorcades

Honoring the Dead
43. Political mourning
44. Mock funerals
45. Demonstrative funerals
46. Homage at burial places

Public Assemblies
47. Assemblies of protest or support
48. Protest meetings
49. Camouflaged meetings of protest
50. Teach-ins

Withdrawal and Renunciation
51. Walk-outs
52. Silence
53. Renouncing honors
54. Turning one’s back

THE METHODS OF SOCIAL NONCOOPERATION

Ostracism of persons
55. Social boycott
56. Selective social boycott
57. Lysistratic nonaction
58. Excommunication
59. Interdict

**Noncooperation with Social Events, Customs, and Institutions**
60. Suspension of social and sports activities
61. Boycott of social affairs
62. Student strike
63. Social disobedience
64. Withdrawal from social institutions

**Withdrawal from the Social System**
65. Stay-at-home
66. Total personal noncooperation
67. “Flight” of workers
68. Sanctuary
69. Collective disappearance
70. Protest emigration (hijrat)

**THE METHODS OF ECONOMIC NONCOOPERATION: ECONOMIC BOYCOTTS**

**Actions by consumers**
71. Consumers’ boycott
72. Nonconsumption of boycotted goods
73. Policy of austerity
74. Rent withholding
75. Refusal to rent
76. National consumers’ boycott
77. International consumers’ boycott

**Action by Workers and Producers**
78. Workmen’s boycott
79. Producer’s boycott

**Action by Middlemen**
80. Suppliers’ and handlers’ boycott

**Action by Owners and Management**
81. Traders’ boycott
82. Refusal to let or sell property
83. Lockout
84. Refusal of industrial assistance
85. Merchants’ “general strike”

**Action by Holders of Financial Resources**
86. Withdrawal of bank deposits
87. Refusal to pay fees, dues, and assessments
88. Refusal to pay debts or interest
89. Severance of funds and credit
90. Revenue refusal
91. Refusal of a government’s money
Action by Governments
92. Domestic embargo
93. Blacklisting of traders
94. International sellers’ embargo
95. International buyers’ embargo
96. International trade embargo

THE METHODS OF ECONOMIC NONCOOPERATION: THE STRIKE

Symbolic Strikes
97. Protest strike
98. Quickie walkout (lightning strike)

Agricultural Strikes
99. Peasant strike
100. Farm Workers’ strike

Strikes by Special Groups
101. Refusal of impressed labor
102. Prisoners’ strike
103. Craft strike
104. Professional strike

Ordinary Industrial Strikes
105. Establishment strike
106. Industry strike
107. Sympathetic strike

Restricted Strikes
108. Detailed strike
109. Bumper strike
110. Slowdown strike
111. Working-to-rule strike
112. Reporting “sick” (sick-in)
113. Strike by resignation
114. Limited strike
115. Selective strike

Multi-Industry Strikes
116. Generalized strike
117. General strike

Combination of Strikes and Economic Closures
118. Hartal
119. Economic shutdown

THE METHODS OF POLITICAL NONCOOPERATION

Rejection of Authority
120. Withholding or withdrawal of allegiance
121. Refusal of public support
122. Literature and speeches advocating resistance

**Citizens’ Noncooperation with Government**
123. Boycott of legislative bodies
124. Boycott of elections
125. Boycott of government employment and positions
126. Boycott of government departments, agencies, and other bodies
127. Withdrawal from government educational institutions
128. Boycott of government-supported organizations
129. Refusal of assistance to enforcement agents
130. Removal of own signs and placemarks
131. Refusal to accept appointed officials
132. Refusal to dissolve existing institutions

**Citizens’ Alternatives to Obedience**
133. Reluctant and slow compliance
134. Nonobedience in absence of direct supervision
135. Popular nonobedience
136. Disguised disobedience
137. Refusal of an assemblage or meeting to disperse
138. Sitdown
139. Noncooperation with conscription and deportation
140. Hiding, escape, and false identities
141. Civil disobedience of “illegitimate” laws

**Action by Government Personnel**
142. Selective refusal of assistance by government aides
143. Blocking of lines of command and information
144. Stalling and obstruction
145. General administrative noncooperation
146. Judicial noncooperation
147. Deliberate inefficiency and selective noncooperation by enforcement agents
148. Mutiny

**Domestic Governmental Action**
149. Quasi-legal evasions and delays
150. Noncooperation by constituent governmental units

**International Governmental Action**
151. Changes in diplomatic and other representations
152. Delay and cancellation of diplomatic events
153. Withholding of diplomatic recognition
154. Severance of diplomatic relations
155. Withdrawal from international organizations
156. Refusal of membership in international bodies

Expulsion from international organizations

**THE METHODS OF NONVIOLENT INTERVENTION**
Psychological Intervention
   158. Self-exposure to the elements
   159. The fast
   a) Fast of moral pressure
   b) Hunger strike
   c) Satyagrahic fast
   160. Reverse trial
   161. Nonviolent harassment

Physical Intervention
   162. Sit-in
   163. Stand-in
   164. Ride-in
   165. Wade-in
   166. Mill-in
   167. Pray-in
   168. Nonviolent raids
   169. Nonviolent air raids
   170. Nonviolent invasion
   171. Nonviolent interjection
   172. Nonviolent obstruction
   173. Nonviolent occupation

Social Intervention
   174. Establishing new social patterns
   175. Overloading of facilities
   176. Stall-in
   177. Speak-in
   178. Guerrilla theater
   179. Alternative social institutions
   180. Alternative communication system

Economic Intervention
   181. Reverse strike
   182. Stay-in strike
   183. Nonviolent land seizure
   184. Defiance of blockades
   185. Politically motivated counterfeiting
   186. Preclusive purchasing
   187. Seizure of assets
   188. Dumping
   189. Selective patronage
   190. Alternative markets
   191. Alternative transportation
   192. Alternative economic institutions

Political Intervention
   193. Overloading of administrative systems
   194. Disclosing identities of secret agents
195. Seeking imprisonment
196. Civil disobedience of “neutral” laws
197. Work-on without collaboration
Dual sovereignty and parallel government


Highlights of nonviolence in history
(Note: This section is taken mostly from Guides to Peace and Justice by Sanderson Beck and indicates some of the highlights in that book.)

c. 2050 BC King Bilalama formulated the Eshnunna law code.
1848-1806 BC Hammurabi ruled Babylon with a law code.
c. 1275 BC Moses led Hebrew slaves out of Egypt.
742-697 BC Isaiah and Micah prophesied in Israel and Judah.
c. 700 BC Parshva taught nonviolence in India.
682 BC Athenian kingship was reduced to annual election.
628-551 BC Zarathushtra taught a new religion in Persia.
627-580 BC Jeremiah prophesied in Judah.
594 BC Solon was elected archon and revised laws for Athens.
551-479 BC Confucius taught humanistic ethics.
545 BC Heang Seu organised a peace conference at Song.
531-510 BC Pythagoras taught at Crotona.
528-483 BC Buddha taught in India.
c. 520 BC Lao-zi wrote Dao De Jing in China.
519-490 BC Mahavira taught nonviolence in India.
509 BC Rome became a republic.
494 BC Roman plebeians asserted rights and elected tribunes.
462 BC Pericles led democratic reforms in Athens.
432-393 BC Mo-zi and his disciples intervened to stop wars in China.
425-405 BC Euripides' tragedies protested the Peloponnesian War.
424-405 BC Aristophanes' comedies protested the same war.
403 BC Socrates refused to cooperate with 30 tyrants ruling Athens.
399 BC Socrates was the first philosopher to be publicly executed.
355 BC Isocrates wrote On the Peace criticising Athenian imperialism.
320-310 BC Confucian Mencius advised Qi king Xuan.
261-236 BC Ashoka applied Buddhist principles in ruling India.
70 BC Cicero prosecuted Verres for corruption in Sicily.
44-43 BC Cicero's "Philippics" criticised Anthony.
c. 27-30 CE Jesus taught and healed in Israel.
c. 30 CE Jesus was crucified by Romans at Jerusalem.
202 Christians were martyred for religious belief in Carthage.
249-251 Christians did not fight back when persecuted by Decius.
303 Christians did not fight back when persecuted by Diocletian.
989 Church council at Charroux declared the Peace of God.
1047 Truce of God was proclaimed at Caen for Normandy.
1073-1085 Hildebrand as Pope Gregory VII opposed Heinrich IV.
1167-1279 Cathars were persecuted by the Albigensian Crusade.
1215  King John was persuaded to sign the Magna Carta.
1219  Francis of Assisi on a crusade preaching against war.
1231-1273  Sufi Rumi taught mystical love and whirling dance.
1259  Louis IX abolished judicial duels in France.
1392-1398  Chinese planted one billion trees.
c. 1400  The Hopi lived peacefully north of present day Mexico.
c. 1420-1460  Peter Chelcicky taught nonviolence.
1466-1536  Erasmus wrote extensively against war.
1501-1539  Nanak founded the Sikh religion.
1525  Anabaptists formed a nonviolent church.
1526  Nonviolent Hutterite communities began.
1544  Peaceful Mennonites began following Menno Simons.
1565-1576  The Dutch nonviolently resisted Spanish rule.
1651  "Quaker" George Fox was jailed during the civil war.
1682-1756  Pennsylvania (USA) had a pacifist government.
1765  American colonists resisted the Stamp Act.
1773  Merchants dressed as Indians dumped tea in Boston (USA) harbour.
1760-1775  Nonviolent phase of the American revolution.
1815  Peace societies were founded in England and America.
1838  Garrison founded the New England (USA) Non-Resistance Society.
1838  Emerson lectured on war to the American Peace Society.
1845  Elihu Burritt began advocating passive resistance.
1846  Thoreau was arrested for not paying a war tax (USA).
1846  Adin Ballou published Christian Non-Resistance.
1848  Peace Congresses began being held in Europe.
1848  Woman's Rights Conference was held at Seneca Falls (USA).
1849  Thoreau published "Resistance to Civil Government" (USA).
1869  Imprisoned Bahá'u'lláh sent prophetic tablets.
1850-1867  Deak led Hungarian struggle against Austrian domination.
1858  Lucy Stone refused to pay taxes.
1872  Susan B. Anthony was arrested for voting in Rochester (USA).
1890  Sioux ghost dancers were massacred at Wounded Knee (USA).
1893-1910  Tolstoy wrote about love and nonviolence (Russia).
1894-1914  Gandhi helped Indians win rights in South Africa.
1901-1905  Finns nonviolently resisted Russian oppression.
1905, 1917  Nonviolent phases of the Russian revolution.
1906  Gandhi used first massive civil disobedience (South Africa).
1906-1918  Emily Pankhurst led suffragette campaign in England.
1909  Jailed suffragettes went on hunger strikes (USA).
1911-1913  'Abdu'l-Bahá spoke in Europe and America.
1914  Fellowship of Reconciliation was founded.
1915-1935  Jane Addams led WILPF (Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom).
1917  American Friends Service Committee was founded.
1917-1919  Alice Paul led the Woman's Party direct action.
1918  Bertrand Russell was imprisoned for pacifist writing.
1919  Gandhi called a general strike in India.
1920  Berlin (Germany) nonviolently defeated a rightist coup.
1921  Gandhi led non-cooperation to end untouchability (India).
1923  War Resisters League was founded.
1928  Einstein advised refusing military service.
1930  Gandhi led salt march and civil disobedience (India).
1933  Dorothy Day founded the Catholic Worker.
1936-1937  CIO strikes used sit-down tactic at General Motors (USA).
1940-1945  Denmark and Norway resisted Nazi occupation.
1940-1953  A. J. Muste led the Fellowship of Reconciliation.
1947  India and Pakistan gained independence nonviolently.
1947  Pax Christi International was founded.
1948-now  Costa Rica has no military forces.
1953  300,000 East German workers went on strike.
1955-1956  Montgomery (USA) bus boycott desegregated buses.
1955-1965  Nonviolent protests won civil rights legislation (USA).
1955-1961  Catholic Workers refused to obey civil defence drills.
1956  Hungarians changed their leader but were crushed.
1957  SANE was founded to protest nuclear weapons.
1958  Schweitzer made radio broadcasts on atomic weapons.
1959  King organised Southern Christian Leadership Conference (USA).
1960  Russell led 5,000 in sit-down protest of Polaris submarine.
1961  Women Strike for Peace began protesting.
1963  King wrote a letter from the Birmingham (USA) jail.
1964  Mario Savio led Free Speech Movement at Berkeley (USA).
1964-1965  Civil Rights Act and Voting Rights Act passed (USA).
1965  Cesar Chavez began United Farm Workers grape boycott (USA).
1968  Czechoslovakia experimented with nonviolent reforms.
1968  Catonsville 9 led by Berrigan burned draft records (USA).
1968  Protesters disrupted Democratic Convention in Chicago (USA).
1971  Greenpeace began using nonviolent direct action (Canada, USA).
1969  Large demonstrations deterred Vietnam War escalation.
1976  Thousands protested nuclear power in Wyhl, West Germany.
1977  1,414 were arrested at Seabrook, New Hampshire (USA).
1977  Argentina mothers of disappeared people protest.
1979  200 blocked the first Trident submarine at Groton (USA).
1979  250 blockaded at Rocky Flats, Colorado (USA).
1980  Poland's Solidarity Union began and grew to ten million.
1980  Plowshares 8 were arrested in Pennsylvania (USA).
1981  1,900 were arrested at Diablo Canyon, California (USA).
1982  1,691 were arrested at the United Nations.
1982  Nearly a million marched in New York (USA) to end arms race.
1983  777 were arrested at Vandenberg Air Force Base (USA).
1983  1,066 were arrested at Livermore, California (USA).
1983-1990  Pledge or Resistance protested Central America wars (USA).
1983-1993  Witness for Peace groups travelled to Nicaragua.
1984  Winooski 44 sat in and were acquitted by a jury.
1986  Filipinos nonviolently overthrew the Marcos regime.
1986  The Great Peace March crossed the U.S.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>3,000 protested at Nevada Test Site (USA) on Mother's Day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-1992</td>
<td>Nuremberg Actions blocked weapons trains at Concord (USA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-now</td>
<td>ACTUP protested for better AIDS treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Chinese demonstrated for democratic reforms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Hungary and Poland gained independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria gained independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>East and West Germany were reunited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1994</td>
<td>Nelson Mandela was released and later elected (South Africa).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Disabled demonstrated in Washington (USA) for rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Many protested U.S. Gulf War and depleted uranium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Gorbachev and Strong initiated Earth Charter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>World Court declared nuclear weapons illegal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-now</td>
<td>Roy Bourgeois led protests at Ft. Benning (USA) School of the Americas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-now</td>
<td>Kathy Kelly led Voices in the Wilderness delegations to Iraq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Protestors disrupted World Trade organisation meeting at Seattle (USA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Yugoslavia replaced Milosevic after election fraud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Zapatistas marched to Mexico City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>East Timor became independent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Millions marched to protest imminent U.S.-Iraq war.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Module 2**

Time: 1 hour or more

Objective: The aim of this module is to encourage the group to consider and discuss why new and experienced activists are involved with Greenpeace, and to share their own feelings about participating in actions.

**Contents:**

**Lecture/Discussion:**
Discussion of experiences  
Discussion topics

**Literature:**
Protesting May Be Good for Your Health

**Lecture/Discussion:**

**Discussion of experiences:**

Begin by having people with Greenpeace experience share their perspective. If no participants are experienced, the trainer may share his or her own perspective or invite some people with experience to come speak. You might want a meeting with these
people beforehand to talk about how much time they have. This could be important since some activists are very good, but also very long talkers.

Participant perspectives may be discussed either by the whole group or in small groups. Make sure that the others actively listen while one person talks. It’s also important that the participants give feelings not facts!

Team leaders should encourage discussion around the following questions. These questions are on large sheets of paper so that people can refer back to them. Try to ensure that everyone has an opportunity to be involved in the discussion. Comments may be written on flip chart paper. The trainer may also wish to propose his or her own alternative topics.

**Discussion Topics:**

People share their personal feelings about nonviolent action by responding to questions such as:

- What are the qualities of nonviolence you personally hope to embody?
- What is leading you to nonviolently protest?
- What have been your best and worst direct action experiences?
- Greenpeace often conducts actions at short notice, some of which involve breaking the law. Why would people want to be a part of this? Discuss both good and bad reasons (e.g. because they believe in the cause, because they get an ego boost from confrontation, etc.).
- Greenpeace actions often bring people into contact with the police. Does this mean Greenpeace and the police are in conflict? Does it matter that the police uphold the law, not make it? How do you feel about having this kind of contact with police?

**LITERATURE:**

Protesting May Be Good for Your Health

Reuters Health

Monday, December 23, 2002


LONDON (Reuters Health) - Taking part in protests and demonstrations can be good for your physical and mental health, a new British study suggests.

Psychologists at the University of Sussex found that people who get involved in campaigns, strikes and political demonstrations experience an improvement in psychological well-being that can help them overcome stress, pain, anxiety and depression.

The finding fits in with other studies suggesting that positive experiences and feeling part of a group can have beneficial effects on health.

"Collective actions, such as protests, strikes, occupations and demonstrations, are less common in the UK than they were perhaps 20 years ago," researcher Dr. John Drury said in a statement.
"The take-home message from this research therefore might be that people should get more involved in campaigns, struggles and social movements, not only in the wider interest of social change but also for their own personal good."

The results emerged from in-depth interviews with nearly 40 activists from a variety of backgrounds. Between them, they had more than 160 experiences of collective action involving groups of demonstrators protesting against a range of issues. These included fox hunting, environmental damage and industrial matters.

Volunteers were asked to describe what it was about taking part in such collective action that made them feel so good.

"Many published activist accounts refer to feelings of encouragement and confidence emerging from experiences of collective action," said Drury. "But it is not always clear how and why such empowerment occurs, so we aimed to explain what factors within a collective action event contribute to such feelings."

He said the interviews revealed that the key factors were that participants felt they had a collective identity with fellow protestors. They also derived a sense of unity and mutual support from taking part.

Such was the strength of the feelings they experienced that the effects appear to be sustained over a period of time.

"Empowering events were almost without exception described as joyous occasions," said Drury. "Participants experienced a deep sense of happiness and even euphoria in being involved in protest events. Simply recounting the events in the interview brought a smile to the face of the interviewees."

**MODULE 3**

"Many definitions treat the word “non-violence” as the negative of violence - defining violence then allowing "non-violence" to mean everything else. Other definitions treat nonviolence as a positive force in its own right. People using it this way often omit the hyphen..."


There are as many different perspectives on what is “violent” and what is “nonviolent” as there are people on the planet. Most people would agree that firing a gun at someone or knocking down a fence are violent acts. But, what if the alternative to becoming an armed rebel were to let your child die of hunger, or what if leaving the fence intact meant allowing the crimes against humanity and the environment to continue unabated on the inside? Can inaction be, in the end, the more violent act?

No nonviolence training can present a set of definitions of violence and nonviolence that will apply to every situation, all the time. However, nonviolence training can present the historic debates in nonviolence theory, allow participants to express their
beliefs on the issue, and give participants an opportunity to hear and understand alternative views. Most importantly, nonviolence training provides a forum for groups to reach agreement on what actions are acceptable for this action, this campaign, and this organisation, now and in the future.

Objective: At the end of this module, participants will be able to identify differing views on violence and nonviolence and the group will have agreed on acceptable behaviour for their planned activities.

Contents:

**Lecture/Discussion:**
Violence/nonviolence brainstorm
Action videos – violent and nonviolent examples
Nonviolence Guidelines

**Exercises:**
Spectrum exercise

**Literature:**
Controversies in Nonviolent Action Theory

**Lecture/Discussion:**

Violence/nonviolence Brainstorm

Time: 30 minutes or more

Objective: This is an exercise to start a discussion and explore various opinions as to what defines violence and nonviolence. The purpose of this exercise is not to define any one set of “right” or “wrong” answers, but to facilitate a thoughtful and honest evaluation of the subject and to identify areas where the distinction between violence and nonviolence may not be so clear.

Without discussing the objective of the exercise, create two adjacent columns on a piece of paper or board large enough for the entire group to see. Label one column “Violence” and the other “Nonviolence”. Now ask the group to call out one or two word phrases that help define “violence”, then repeat this step for “nonviolence”. All phrases should be written in the selected column. If someone offers a surprising phrase, the trainer may give them a moment to explain why he or she feels it fits, but do not allow group discussion on the phrase at this time, just write it down. If all phrases offered focus on physical violence (war, assault, pollution, etc.), the trainer may prompt the group by suggesting things like hunger, sexism, dictatorship, etc. Similarly, if all phrases offered focus on active nonviolence (witnessing, protest, sit-ins, etc.), the trainer may prompt the group by suggesting things like compassion, honesty, health care, etc.
Next, ask the participants to point out and discuss any potential contradictions they see on the lists. For example: disorder and hierarchy may both be on the “violence” list; property destruction may be on both lists; militancy and passivity may be on the “nonviolence” list, etc. The trainer can then point out some contradictions that may not be so clear. For example, if compassion is on the “nonviolence” list and assault is on the “violence” list, which is it when one swats away the hand of a child who is about to reach into a flame? Or, if lying and pollution are both on the “violence” list, what do participants think of pretending to be janitors when we sneak in to a factory to hang a banner?

Finally, the trainer can raise these questions:
How do we act, given the different definitions of violence and nonviolence?
Is violence acceptable when it is used to prevent greater violence?
At this point the trainer or participants may offer personal anecdotes that illustrate the problem.

This exercise can then lead into an unstructured discussion of violence and nonviolence, or a discussion of the specific nonviolence guidelines for an action, campaign, or organisation.

Action videos – violent and nonviolent examples

Objective: These video examples are meant to support the violence/nonviolence discussion. Issues that could be discussed are:
Verbal/non verbal communication
Passive/active resistance
Body language
Cultural diversity

All examples come from Greenpeace actions and should only be used for training purposes by Greenpeace NVDA trainers.

Total duration: 24 min 52 sec

Active resistance (2 min 52 sec)
- Fighting with French police, La Hague.
- Activist tries to pull chain from security guard, Turkey. How much force should you use?
- Activist runs away from security, Menwith Hill, UK. Is running away “active resistance”?
- Activist trying to resist being thrown out, Menwith Hill, UK. Is this active or passive?
- Activist blocking a German policeman by putting his arms around him, Castor, Germany. Is this acceptable?
- Activist is actively blocking a Dutch policeman, The Hague, The Netherlands. What is acceptable while blocking? Notice the arm lock.

Passive resistance (4 min 10 sec)
- Activist is dragged along by his ear but stays calm, Czechoslovakia.
- Activist stays calm in neck lock.
- Activist stays calm being force-marched off.
- Activist stays calm being dragged off.
- Activist goes “limp/floppy”, Menwith Hill, UK. Classic passive resistance.
- Activist being carried off and thrown in van, Finland.
- How to hang on to your banner at all costs, Finland.
- Making yourself “heavy”, Castor, Germany.
- Staying calm while in pain, Belgium
- Activist stays calm despite being punched in the face, Castor.
- Activist stays calm and goes limp while his nose is being broken, Dordrecht, The Netherlands. Notice the tooth peg in the other activist’s mouth. This footage was important evidence for Greenpeace during the court case later on.

**Body language** (1min 10 sec)
- Is the body language of the activist nonviolent? Notice the folded arms.
- Facial expression of 3 female activists
- Facial expression of male activist
- Why you should not wear dark glasses while being interviewed! It makes you look secretive, suspicious, and shy, with something to hide.
- Supporters, passers-by greeting/kissing activists while cameras are around. What’s the message? It’s very nonviolent!

**Negative verbal communication** (2 min 20 sec)
- Unnecessary screaming, Czechoslovakia.
- Activist throws away police cap and argues, France.
- Provocative hand gestures and tone of voice, Turkey.
- Activist shouts “Fucking idiot” at policeman, Malta
- Activist shouts “You’re going to jail, buddy!” at ship worker with raised knife. Le Havre, France. Is it all right to voice threats?

**Verbal communication** (6 min 30 min)
- Speaking with policeman, Malta. Good: Activist asks him politely if he would like to see the banner and read the message. Not so good: more people against one and the tone of the lady’s voice.
- Reasoned argument with official, UK. Campaigner explains the reasons for the action and puts the company representative on the spot. Not so good: campaigner becomes personal.
- How to win an argument - India. Activist persists in asking questions of the company representative and finally gets an admission out of him.
- Activist tries to distract and calm down an angry worker by talking to him. Notice the tone of her voice.
- Activist communicates verbally and non-verbally in a nonviolent way. But she is lying when she tells the policeman she does not have the key. When the action coordinator tells her to open the lock she follows his orders. This can be hard for committed activists. In the end she decides to resist passively, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

**Property destruction** (3 min 25 sec)
- Cutting fence, Sellafield. How far can property destruction be justified?
- Crop trashing, UK. Protestors were charged with criminal damage (and acquitted).
- Chain cutting, Sydney Olympic site. Activists use bolt cutters to gain access to a building site. Note how they try to hide what they are doing from the cameras.
- Crop pulling, UK. Mass destruction of someone else’s property.
- Siberian oil action, Elf HQ, The Hague. What sort of message does this send out?
- Painting of tree trunks, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- Painting of slogan on GE ship, Mexico

Nonviolent action (4 min 10 sec)

After watching the video, ask the group:
- What happened when you watched the video?
- Did you become emotional?
- Did your adrenaline start to flow?

During an action we might become emotional for various reasons:
- we feel passionate about the issue
- we are afraid because it is hard to communicate, and due to lack of information
- the police gets agitated because of lack of cooperation by the activists.
- etc.

Emotions can make us do things which can compromise the safety and nonviolent aspect of an action.

**Nonviolence Guidelines**

Within Greenpeace, as with the rest of the world, it is difficult if not impossible to reach a consensus on what is violent and what is nonviolent. Spanning 5 continents, more than 30 nations, dozens of cultures, millions of members, thousands of volunteers, hundreds of employees, and a lifespan of over three decades, it would be hopelessly idealistic to imagine that we could. There are too many reasons individuals choose to use nonviolence – religious, ethical, practical, political expediency, image consciousness, self-interest, even fear – for it to be otherwise. Moreover, Greenpeace is a very pragmatic organization, adopting strategies and tactics designed to win particular campaigns more often than choosing to adhere to rigid principles over the long term.

It would be impractical to write a set of nonviolence rules that would work equally well in Thailand and Lebanon, or in the Southern Ocean and the United Nations headquarters. Things we did in 1971 may not be appropriate in 2003 or 2013, and vice versa. However, we need not throw up our hands in defeat and tolerate a policy of “anything goes.” Rather, for particular campaigns, within different countries or regions, during individual actions, and among unique groupings of activists, Greenpeace can and must come to agreement on what behaviour is acceptable and what is not.

Below is a set, or checklist, of possible nonviolence guidelines. It is recommended that offices, campaigns, media departments, captains, action coordinators, and groupings of activists study this list carefully, debate its contents, and come to agreement in advance of any activities as to which guidelines will apply to a given
situation. Also, this list may be used to spark discussion during nonviolence trainings or other appropriate forums.

**Possible nonviolence guidelines:**

No matter the circumstance of provocation, we will not threaten others with physical harm nor respond with physical violence to acts directed against us.

We will not call names, make hostile remarks, or otherwise inflict verbal violence upon others.

We will carry no weapons. If a necessary tool could be used as a weapon, we will never use it against a person or threaten a person with it.

We will minimize or eliminate any pollution or other harm to the environment that our activities could cause.

Our attitude – as conveyed through words, symbols, and actions – will be one of openness, politeness, creativity, commitment, and respect.

We will strive to speak to the best in all people, rather than seeking to exploit their weaknesses to what we may believe is our advantage.

We will always attempt to interpret as clearly as possible to anyone with whom we are in contact – and especially to those who may oppose us – the purpose and meaning of our actions.

We will adhere as closely as we are able to the letter and spirit of truth in our spoken and written statements.

We will take responsibility for and accept the legal and other consequences of our actions, and will not seek to evade these consequences beyond legitimate recourse.

We agree to follow the directions of the decision making body. In the event of serious disagreement where compromise cannot be reached, participants agree to remove themselves from the activity.

We will not damage property; or
We will not damage property, except as necessary to remove barriers to our rights to free speech and assembly.

We will not bring or use any intoxicating drugs or alcohol, other than for medicinal purposes.

We will not run.

**Exercises:**

**Spectrum exercise**
Time: 10 minutes or more

Objective: This is an exercise to start a discussion and explore various tactics of nonviolent action. There are personal, political and philosophical values involved in the choice of tactics. The purpose of this exercise is not to define any one set of “right” or “wrong” answers, but to facilitate a thoughtful and honest evaluation of our campaigns and to help draw out the underlying principles that guide our decisions about what to do.

Without discussing the objective of the exercise, identify two points in your training space. One point is “violence”, the other “nonviolence”. The group is then asked to individually place themselves along the line between the two points in accordance with the statement, “Violence is acceptable/never acceptable in order to achieve our political goals.” Emphasise that this training is designed to explore what people believe at this moment, not what they would like to believe or feel they should believe.

Next, ask participants from different points in the line (spectrum) to explain why they placed themselves where they did. Encourage people to say, “I think that…” or “I feel that…” Everyone should speak for themselves. This is a discussion, not a definition. The trainer can point out that the group is working together, or plans to work together, and that finding a “right” answer is less important than agreeing on what is acceptable for a particular action or campaign, despite differences in opinion or philosophy.

This exercise can then lead to the violence/nonviolence brainstorm exercise, an open discussion of violence and nonviolence, or a discussion of the specific nonviolence guidelines for an action, campaign or organisation.

Note: The spectrum exercise may be used to explore a variety of issues including: hierarchy and egalitarianism, property destruction, lying, planning and spontaneity, etc.

**Literature:**

**CONTROVERSIES IN NONVIOLENT ACTION THEORY**
by Lynne Shivers (1988)

These are some of the big controversies in nonviolence theory. This brief training tool is designed to challenge and clarify your thinking about the nature of nonviolent action. Nonviolent activists have been thinking about the controversies for some time. Some controversies are in the nature of either-or arguments, some are both-and, and some search for a resolution of polarized points. What this tool does is to identify some of the most important issues in the field. You may not resolve all the issues in one session, but even if you don’t, you’ll have better questions as a result of this training exercise!

1. **THE POWER OF LOVE VS. FORCE AND AGGRESSION**

**PRO “POWER OF LOVE” ARGUMENT:** Social change will come about if we understand the power of love. Love should not be seen as sentimental, or effective only among individuals. Love is disarming and prevents the development of fear and
anger. Love keeps the focus away from seeing people as the opponent and on the focus of greed, war, injustice, etc., as the “opponent”. Power is not the issue.

PRO FORCE AND AGGRESSION: You cannot change anything just by love. It takes forever and we can’t wait. We need power and aggression as an active force to change anything. After all, it’s nonviolent ACTION. Aggression towards our oppressors is healthy; we do not need love them to make them change.

2. PRINCIPLE VS. TECHNIQUE

PRO PRINCIPLE: We need to see nonviolence as a principle. Using nonviolent action as a technique alone too easily weakens when the opponent escalates the oppression and the struggle. Supporters of principled nonviolence have been responsible for staying in the struggle and initiating innovations in nonviolent action, when “technical” supporters do not see the need to continue the struggle. Witness the falling off of the US anti-war movement when the Indochina War stopped.

PRO TECHNIQUE: Nonviolent action is an effective method of change. Our main goal is change, not to convert people to believe in the rightness of nonviolence. Trying to convert everyone is not the best use of time and energy. Nonviolent action works because of its own dynamics. Nonviolent action is a technique of taking power and destroying the opponent’s power by removing support for the opponent. The vast majority of historical cases where nonviolent action was used effectively has been carried out by people who saw only the value of the technique.

3. PERSUASION VS. COERCION

PRO PERSUASION: Persuasion creates more lasting change because it brings a change of heart and values. If you force people to change their behavior without a simultaneous change of heart, the change will last only a short time. Besides, you should not use force to change because you may not be right. Our motto is “better no change than change by force”. Admittedly, it is slower than coercion, but it is surer.

PRO COERCION: Persuasion is not enough. Power never gives up willingly. Some institutions have to be coerced. There is a form of nonviolent coercion by which we can act against the opponent while not wishing them harm or destruction. Vested interests and systematic oppression require nonviolent coercion from time to time. It is true that we cannot legislate morality, but we can force changes in laws against some people’s will so that a more just society will have a chance to develop.

4. NONVIOLENCE AND PACIFISM: SAME OR DIFFERENT?

THEY ARE THE SAME: Pacifism and nonviolence are essentially the same concept. Both are based on the view that life is sacred, and killing is never justified for any reason. If you are a pacifist, you are also nonviolent. If you are nonviolent, you are also a pacifist.

THEY ARE NOT THE SAME: Pacifism and nonviolence are not the same concept. Pacifism is a principle based on the sacredness of life. Nonviolence is essentially a
means of carrying out social change without weapons. (There is also the concept of a nonviolent life style.) Not all pacifists are nonviolent because they do not always act on their principles. Not all nonviolent activists are pacifists -- e.g. labor union strikes are nonviolent, yet an overwhelming majority of labor union members are not pacifist.

5. OPENNESS VS. SECRECY

PRO SECRECY: It is nice when you can be open, but it is not always possible. Sometimes you need to be secret under dictatorships and heavily repressive regimes when open organization and protests are illegal and are heavily punished. For example, during World War II, Dutch and French underground people needed to keep their identities secret. Otherwise, they would not have been so effective in working against the nazi occupations. If you are open, the government will have the upper hand, so they can stop you in advance of the actions. They are the enemy; why be open with them?

PRO OPENNESS: Secrecy undermines trust among allies. Secrecy is defensive, prevents confrontation, and increases fear among allies and opponents. Most important, a policy of secrecy develops two classes of people: those who know the confidential plans and those who do not know. There are examples of open resistance in dictatorships; Guatemala, Holland, and Norway are examples. And, protecting Jews, for examples, during World War II may have been a moral and necessary imperative, but essentially it was not nonviolent because it relied heavily on secrecy.

6. UNIVERSAL APPLICATION OF NONVIOLENT ACTION: YES OR NO

PRO UNIVERSAL APPLICATION: Nonviolent action is applicable in all conflict situations whether or not we are talking about an intensely repressive regime. This analysis is based on the principle that governments derive their power from the consent of the people. If people noncooperate with that power, then the regime ultimately falls. The deciding force is people’s awareness of their own power and capacity to organize themselves. It may be next to impossible to create a successful nonviolent revolution. But an armed strategy may have no greater chance of success. The use of nonviolence is not a guarantee of success.

CON UNIVERSAL APPLICATION: Third world people have tried nonviolent action and found it does not work in their situation. Third world people see nonviolent action as a weak idea which middle class Westerners just talk about. We cannot really know what third world people really face. So we should not judge them if they choose a military campaign as a means for liberation. Besides, Gandhi himself said that if you have to choose between a violent struggle or no struggle at all, it is imperative to carry on a violent struggle.

7. ANGER AS BASIS OF A CAMPAIGN: YES OR NO

PRO ANGER: Anger is a sound basis for a campaign. When people are outraged at injustices, corruption, etc., they are ready and willing to act. Organizers of all forms of action campaigns, military or nonviolent, recognize that apathy and fear are the
biggest obstacles to action. Anger is more conducive to action than fear is. We need to encourage anger and use it as a basis for a social change campaign.

CON ANGER: Anger is not a sound basis for organizing a campaign. When people are angry they do not think carefully about goals, strategy and tactics (steps) of a campaign. Anger spends so much emotional energy that it leads to burn-out. People cannot hold a pitch of “righteous indignation” for very long. In addition, people are too easily swayed by emotional ups and downs of apparent short-term victories or defeats. What successful campaigns really need are careful planning, thinking, and analysis.

8. PROPERTY DESTRUCTION AND SABOTAGE: YES OR NO

PRO YES: Sabotage destroys property, not people. Property is not important in a revolution intending to create humane social values. Therefore, it is OK to use sabotage. It is appropriate as a means of coercion. We can make sure that no one is hurt, so it is nonviolent. Some property should not exist, such as some corporation files or some forms of military equipment. Therefore, we are justified in destroying them.

PRO NO: Property destruction escalates the struggle in such a way that allows activists to have less control over the struggle than if property had not been destroyed. Property destruction gives clear justification for greater oppression by the opposition. It frightens potential allies and creates a bad image of the campaign for the uncommitted. Because planning is done in secrecy, property destruction creates two classes of people---those who know and those who do not know. Property destruction is easy to spill over to a destruction of people. There is always the problem of accidents. Finally, property destruction creates a climate of violence, counter-productive in a struggle.

9. PERSONAL CHANGE VS. POLITICAL CHANGE

PRO PERSONAL CHANGE: We must start with ourselves; we must begin at home. Changing the world is hypocritical if our actions are not reflected in our lives. We cannot have a new society without also having new people.

PRO POLITICAL CHANGE: Changing life styles does nothing to confront governments or corporations which hold the real power. The revolution is a change of institutions---it means cultural changes. We can mess around with our lives after the revolution. Anyway, we are not able to lead pure lives because of the nature of the system. Life styles are irrelevant to political struggle. We need to put all our energy into organizing, not to cooking soybeans, meditating, and so on, which are just self-indulgent.

MODULE 4

How to deal with violent situations
Anger is a tool of change, if we know how to direct it…

Objective: At the end of this module, participants will be able to understand why and how violence is generated, to know how to contain it and how to deal with it nonviolently. This module will also teach participants how to identify and control their triggers, and to create empathy toward their opponents.

Introduction
We deal with anger and violence in everyday situations. Sometimes we are angry and violent; sometimes we are subject to it. Moreover, we experience violence in both its forms especially in times of stress. And what could cause more stress than a Greenpeace action?

In an action, we are usually the Trigger for the workers/guardians. Our presence in their building/land is an unusual and suspicious event. With our blockers efficiently blocking access to the hot spot, the Escalation Phase turns into a Crisis very quickly. We will thus be dealing (often) with the highest potential anger and violence.

This Crisis atmosphere can easily affect us, our temper will rise, and we will enter in a vicious circle of Escalating anger. It is our duty, as members of Greenpeace, to settle the atmosphere into the recovery phase, and to remain calm and nonviolent.

Much of the material in this module has been adapted from a Mennonite training and the handout: “Dealing with Anger Training Manual” (Mediation Services, Winnipeg, Canada, 1995)

Contents:

Lecture/Discussion:
Definitions, what is violence?
Understanding anger
Ways people deal with anger
  Arousal cycle
Answers to verbal and physical aggression
Identifying triggers
Defusing strategies
Confrontation using assertive communication
Non-Physical blocking, discussion and exercise

Exercises:
Empathy/Respect exercises
Us/Them
Listening dyad
Body Control
Voice Control
Hassle Line

Handouts: (Tips for dealing with anger and violence)
Anger management skills
Notes on Nonviolent Action
Lecture/Discussion:

Definitions, what is violence? - Discussion

Time: 20 minutes

Objective: This is an exercise to start a discussion and explore various opinions as to what defines anger and violence. The trainer has to pinpoint the link between anger and violence, where anger almost always leads to violence, and a vicious circle between the two is formed.

In a plain discussion, ask participants to define "anger". Write their definitions on a flip chart that can be seen by everyone. If someone offers a surprising definition, the trainer may give him/her a moment to explain why he or she feels it fits, but do not allow group discussion on the definition at this time, just write it down.

The definition of anger should enclose the following three points:
- Emotional response to something not going the way we hoped.
- Physiological response to threat, fear, intimidation…
- Being displeased about somebody's undesirable action

If all definitions offered focus on one of the above points, the trainer may prompt the group by suggesting things from the missing categories.

Then ask them to define "violence". Operate similarly to the definition of anger.

The definition of violence should enclose the following points:
- Physical violence
- Moral & Psychological violence (e.g.: fired from work)
- Verbal violence (e.g.: swearing)

Finally, the trainer raises these questions and opens a discussion:
What is the link between anger and violence?
How do we behave when confronted with direct violence?
Try to discuss both aspects of anger and violence: when we produce anger/violence, and when we are subject to anger/violence.

This discussion can be an introduction to the exercise in dealing with anger.

Understanding anger - Discussion

These discussions are meant to explain how people react to anger and violence. It is recommended to do them before proceeding to "Answers to verbal and physical aggression".

Ways in which people deal with anger
Time: 30 minutes

Objective: This discussion explores ways the participants deal with anger; and overviews and discusses the different ways people deal with anger. The participants will know what is their way, what are the alternatives, and what is the cost and efficiency of each one. Also, the group will think about the cost of inappropriate reaction, and how situations escalate. It will highlight the long-run efficiency of nonviolent methods.

In a plain discussion, ask participants "What do you do when you are angry?"
Gather the different answers and display them on a flip chart.
After all answers are written, display the following document:

WAYS PEOPLE DEAL WITH ANGER:
1. STUFF IT:
   Some people swallow their anger and hold it inside. They may not even know they are angry. What happens when they do this?
2. HIDE IT:
   Some people hide their anger and then try to get revenge later. How do they do this?
3. VENT IT:
   Some people throw their anger at others like a volcano exploding. What usually happens?
4. DUMP IT:
   Some people hide their anger and then dump it on the wrong people or things. What does this look like?
5. SUBLIME IT:
   Some people sublimate their anger into other forms of activity (sports, arts, social work…)
6. EXPRESS IT:
   Some people tell others how they feel and what they do not like.

Which style(s) do you use?
(See the answers to the first question and analyse them)
The trainer should classify the different participant responses into these six ways, give examples, and discuss each one of them.

When dealing with anger, situations may escalate, and the cost may get higher. Does your style change as the cost gets higher? (example: Hit the opponent. If the opponent turns out to be stronger, run away) Get individual responses from the group.

Can violent or passive ways lead to resolving the problem? Which method is more efficient?

Arousal cycle

Time: 10 minutes

Objective: This chart explains the arousal cycle, and how our quality of judgement is affected by tense situations and the level of violence. It is meant to visualise the
importance of being calm and acting nonviolently. It is an appropriate visual introduction to "anger management skills" and "triggers".

We experience anger in our bodies as well as in our minds. As we begin to experience angry thoughts and feelings, our bodies prepare for action. The sequence is event --> decision --> response. A certain event happens. A person has to make a decision and respond. The tenser the situation is, or the angrier a person is, the shorter the decision (thinking) time and the worse the judgement and response, and the harder it is to solve the problem.

The following graphic illustrates our bodies' response over time.

THE AROUSAL CYCLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Escalation</th>
<th>Crisis</th>
<th>Recovery</th>
<th>Depression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physiological Arousal

Quality of judgement

Normal situation

This cycle starts with a trigger, an event that evokes a violent reaction. To stop this cycle, we have to stop it at the trigger phase. Even better, we have to know our triggers so that we can control them and prevent the arousal cycle from arising.

**Answers to verbal and physical aggression - Discussion**

This part is crucial for the module 4 objectives. It trains on how to deal with violence which may occur during Greenpeace actions. The recommended order of topics is "identifying triggers", "defusing strategies" and "confrontation using assertive communication".
Identifying triggers

Time: 40 minutes

Objective: One of the most important aspects of managing your own anger and behaviour is to know your "triggers". Triggers are words or events that make you feel angry. They are often referred to as events that 'get to you' or 'get under your skin'. What is important to note is that people have different triggers. The best way to deal with triggers is to know what they are and then develop a strategy on how you to control yourself when you are triggered. This exercise will incite participants to reflect on some situations that have resulted in them experiencing significant anger or behaving violently.

It is also an instance of personal experience/history.

In an action, many events or situations may generate a violent response.

In a group discussion, let the participants name the triggering event, as well as the underlying reason for their anger/violent behaviour in a stressful situation.

If the trainees have previously participated in actions, ask them to talk about these actions. Let them talk extensively about their experiences. It is a case of personal experience/history. Much can be learned from such discussions.

The trainer puts the results on a flip chart in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Triggering Event</th>
<th>Why I experienced anger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then he/she and the group analyse the triggers extensively, trying to think of ways to avoid them or to reverse their effect.

The triggers can be of many types:
- emotions (anger and fear)
- physical (cold, hot, hunger, fatigue…)
- verbal (tone of voice, swearing) and non-verbal communication (body language)…
- a sense of injustice
- an attack on self esteem
- condescending behaviour…

These triggers can be a driving force, a tool of change, if we know how to deal with them.
Defusing strategies

Time: 20 minutes

Objectives: These are the methods that should be used in the trigger phase of the arousal cycle (refer to "anger management skills") in order to defuse violence and tension in our action/environment. They should be explained by the trainer, discussed and practised (in "hassle line" scenarios and mock actions).

These behaviours can help defuse hostile confrontations by modelling understanding and win-win problem solving. Display, explain and discuss.

1. **Remain calm yourself**
   - reduce physiological stress through some form of relaxation
   - use coping self-talk (Think twice before you act and talk with your self. It will let you see different alternatives, and minimises the risk of stupid/violent acts.)
   - ensure physical safety
   - assess the meaning and nature of angry behaviour

2. **Non-verbally reassure the other person**
   - allow adequate personal space
   - use a supportive stance (Have a supportive attitude. Adopt a non-aggressive body position, keeping your hands open and visible. Alternate looking to the other's eyes and to the ground so as to minimise tension.)

3. **Encourage talking**
   - use attentive body language
   - do not interrupt
   - minimise the use of encouragement (Activists may not be supposed to chitchat or engage in lengthy conversations with workers/police.)

4. **Show understanding**
   - respond sympathetically
   - reframe statements
   - invite problem solving
   - match and lower intensity
   - use the individual's name
   - be prepared to repeat yourself

5. **Commit to resolving the issue**
   - emphasise willingness to resolve the issue
   - acknowledge the importance of resolving the issue

6. **Help the other person save face**
   - reassure him/her
   - offer the option to pursue the issue later
   - refrain from openly judging his/her behaviour.
Always remember that, by our sole presence as Greenpeace activists, we are a trigger for workers/police.

**Confrontation using assertive communication**

Time: 15 minutes

Objectives: These are the methods that should be used in the escalation phase of the arousal cycle (refer to "anger management skills") in order to defuse violence and tension in our action/environment. They should be explained by the trainer, discussed and practised (in "hassle line” scenarios and mock actions).

**Confronting:** Effective confrontation focuses on problem behaviours, not on individuals: hard on the problem, soft on the person. Confronting can clarify your intention, help identify your response, provide feedback to the other about his/her actions, and set constraints on behaviour.

**Formula:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledge feelings</th>
<th>I can see…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>I want to solve…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe behaviour*</td>
<td>When you…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express your feeling</td>
<td>I get…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify</td>
<td>I want…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>So that we can &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Describe behaviours objectively, in a non-judgmental language. Attempt to make consequences positive and mutual, or at least neutral. If a confrontation yields no response, try a firmer, more authoritative approach.

**Assertion - Requesting a behavioural change**

Acknowledge… the other's issues, feelings.

Commit Involvement… show interest in solving the problem.

Describe.... the other's behaviour using specific and objective words.

Express.... your reaction to the behaviour(s).

Specify.... name desirable behaviour changes.

Consequence.... explain how the outcome will be of mutual benefit.

**Non-Physical Blocking Discussion and Exercise**

Time: 60 minutes

Objective: These are exercises that emphasise nonviolent behaviour during actions.
In Greenpeace, blocking is a key factor in actions, and nonviolence is a corner stone of our image and belief. This part trains in non-physical, nonviolent blocking techniques and behaviour.

Discuss Blocker role:
- people on the front line protect and create a diversion for fellow activists, giving them time to work.
- direct contact with workers, police, and others. Presenting the "on the ground” image of Greenpeace is a big responsibility.

Responsibilities:
- always stay in position.
- take instructions from the team leader only (if you do not agree, argue about it later).

Exercise scenario:
in front: confrontation with angry, puzzled or careless workers, security guards or police
in back: climbers, factory entrance, pipe blocking…

Confrontation:
The first minute is the most important. Workers or security will come and try to take control of the situation, so surprise them to gain time.
example: on one Greenpeace action 2 blockers prepared coffee + donuts for 400 workers

Keep talking to them, any blocker can speak to workers or security, but do not negotiate with or give information to officials.
Before an action, blockers need to be briefed about what they can say to officials.

Talking
The most important criteria for blockers! They must be able to talk:
- to distract and gain time
- to get establish dialogue with others
- to represent Greenpeace, the campaign and the purpose of the action

Know what to say:
- be brief and come straight to the point
- stress common ground and the target of the action
- discuss the negative effects this pollution is having on workers

Know how to talk:
- tone of voice: always low and confident
- NEVER SHOUT
- maintain eye contact

Attitude:
- be confident
- be aware of body language (hands, posture and facial expression)
- establish communication. Find something, anything, to talk about and get your “opposition” talking about. It’s crucial that both sides see each other as human beings rather than opponents.
- always be physically and verbally nonviolent
- try not to scream when you are hurt. This will frighten other activists. Do not fake injuries (“cry wolf”)

Tools:
Show video to illustrate these concepts (violent/nonviolent attitude, good/bad communication, etc.)

Discuss:
Is the scene one of violence or nonviolence?
How would a bystander view this scene, would they understand what was going on?
What message might they pick up from this scene?
Where would they think the violence was coming from?
What about the physical and verbal interaction between both sides, is it violent?

This exercise and discussion may be followed by the physical, nonviolent blockade techniques found in Module 5.

Exercises:

Empathy/Respect Exercises

Total time: 35 minutes or more

Objective: These exercises are designed to improve listening skills, tolerance, and understanding for another’s point of view.

Us/Them exercise

Time: 20 minutes or more

"...Black and blue
And who knows which is which and who is who
Up and down
And in the end it's only round and round and round
Haven't you heard it's a battle of words..."

--Us, and them by Pink Floyd

Objective: To promote understanding of our ‘opponents’, and to increase our awareness of how we may be perceived.

Without discussing the exercise’s objective, create two adjacent columns on a piece of paper or board large enough for the entire group to see. At the top, label one column “Us” and the other “Them”. Now ask the group to call out phrases of one or two words that describe us as activists (e.g. nonviolent, committed, right, etc.). Write these down in the “Us” column.
Now ask the group to call out phrases of one or two words that describe the authorities, government officials, workers, or corporate heads, whoever our ‘opponents’ are (e.g. polluting, greedy, cynical, etc.). Write these down in the “Them” column.

Now ask the group to imagine themselves to be our ‘opponents’ and repeat the process as before on a separate piece of paper or adjacent part of the board. So, the “Us” column may now include entries such as “employed”, “family oriented”, “rational”, etc. and the “Them” column may now include entries such as “smelly”, “unrealistic”, “violent”, etc.

At this point, the trainer can lead the discussion in a variety of directions, including:
- point out contradictions. For example, both groups may see each other as violent.
- point out what we have in common. For example, both groups may see themselves as family oriented.

Ask how we might appeal to the values “They” hold.

Ask how we might change how we are perceived.

Ask how we promote greater mutual tolerance. And so on…

This is an exercise that can spark as lengthy a discussion as the trainer is willing to allow.

**Listening Dyad**

Time: 15 minutes or more

Objective: To stress the importance of ‘active listening’ while providing an opportunity for participants to discuss one or more of many possible personal considerations when contemplating direct action.

Without discussing the exercise’s objective, split the group into seated pairs facing each other. Participants should preferably seek a partner that they do not know (very well). Now announce that the member of each pair closest to some designated point in the training space should speak for 2 or 3 minutes in answer to a statement or question, while their partner remains silent. There are many possible statements or questions, such as:

In doing direct action, I need help with ______.
I’m made most angry by ______.
In considering direct action, my biggest fear is ______. And so on…

I (Butch) usually use the last one, but I could see another trainer choosing some alternative. As long as it allows the broaching of some personal subject that may not otherwise come up in the training, the exercise will work.
After the speakers have had their 2 or 3 minutes, call “stop”. Now, give the listeners 1 or 2 minutes to repeat or reflect back on what they heard. The original speakers should now remain silent. At the end of the 1 or 2 minutes, call “stop”.

Now ask the group a few questions about the experience:

Was it difficult to share something personal?
Was it difficult to listen without comment?
How was it to repeat back the original speaker’s thoughts?
Did the person doing the repeating get it right?
And so on…

Try to limit discussion to one or two comments on the questions you ask.

Now have the participants switch roles and ask them either the same or a different question. Repeat the ‘repeat or reflect’ portion of the exercise as before.

Again, ask the group a few questions about the experience, but focus more on the difference, knowing that the listener would have to repeat back what he or she had heard:

Did it change your attentiveness?
Did you feel like the listener was really listening?
Did listening harder help you understand more?
Was it strange not planning on expressing your own thoughts and opinions?
And so on…

Finally open up a short discussion on how ‘active listening’ might affect our work, the way we communicate with others, and our understanding of our ‘opponents’.

**Body control exercise**

**Time:** 20 minutes

**Objective:** Body language is extremely important in actions. People not only notice your words, but also the way you speak, and the stance you take whilst doing so. Thus, by learning to stand in a comfortable way, you are less likely to panic yourself.

**Breathing**

Explain that if people cannot breathe properly they are more likely to panic.
Get the group to stand up.
Ask them to stand with their legs slightly apart and arms loosely along their sides.
Now ask them to shift all their weight on to one hip, and try to breathe in.
Next, put their arms behind their back.
Next, put their arms out in front of them.
(try as many positions as you like)
Explain that if the lungs are constricted by bad posture it is harder for people to breathe properly. This also applies when people are sitting down.

**Body language**
Explain about open and closed body language.
Open: Hands free and apparent, nice facial expression, body relaxed.
Closed: Being very agitated and nervous, arms crossed or hands behind back, staring into worker/police eyes

A film is recommended here.

Hand out sheets of paper with some of the following directions on them: angry, scared, arrogant, nice, shy, determined, happy, frightened, aggressive, authoritative - you may need more or have other ideas (refer to "voice control"), and ask people to stand in the style on their piece of paper. The other members of the group should be asked to guess what stance is taken. Encourage discussion on what this felt like, and what it looked like.

**Voice control exercise**

**Time:** 15 minutes

**Objective:** to show that the way you use your voice can convey all sorts of emotions you may not have intended because of cold, fear, anger etc. These factors can make you lose control of your voice, which can have an important effect in tense moments. This exercise will make people aware of this.

Exercise: Hand out sheets of paper with some of the following voice directions on them: angry, scared, arrogant, nice, shy, determined, happy, frightened, aggressive, authoritative - you may need more or have other ideas.

Tell the group not to show anyone else what is written on the paper. Ask a person at the time to say the phrase GIVE IT TO HIM (maybe another phrase works better for you) in the style that is written on the paper. After each person, ask the rest of the group what they think was on the paper. Did they convey what was on the paper, if not, why not? You may find that people who are supposed to be “angry” sound frightened and that shy people can sound arrogant.

Explain that a controlled voice is low and slow. Fast or high-pitched speech often denotes panic or anger to the listener. Vocal directions should also be explicit. People should try to think before speaking when giving important commands or when trying to get their point across.

Divide the group into pairs and ask them to practice saying "Stop it, you are hurting me", in a non-violent manner to each other. The pairs should also consider any other ways of saying this.

Explain again, using the figures below, the importance of being in control of one’s voice.

**Communication:**

*55% Body language*
*38% Tone of your voice*
7% Your actual message!

These numbers come from American and European Studies. Since communication depends very much on culture, these numbers can differ!

**Hassle line exercises**

Time: 30 minutes

Objective: Hassle lines are a confrontation exercise designed to raise questions and to stimulate discussion among participants concerning specific techniques and attitudes that can be used to calm down a potentially violent or dangerous situation. The participants can explore how confrontation affects them and how they can de-escalate and/or deal with their fear and/or anger.

Exercise:

SET UP: Ask the participants to form two lines facing each other, each person opposite another. Ask them to shake hands with this person to find out if there is an even number of participants. If you have an odd number, ask that person to help with your observations, then switch for the following exercise.

Each pair should only interact with themselves and ignore the others around them. They should also ignore the trainer.

Do the introduction, then explain the specific scenario and make sure to tell them how you will end the exercise (clapping or whistling). Ask for questions and give the players a moment to get into their parts. Then say: GO. Observe for 2-4 minutes. Break or ask them to “FREEZE”, then debrief.

Switch roles between the lines to allow everyone to experience both sides of the situation.

Look for verbal and non-verbal communication:
- Verbal: level of sound, noise, and content.
- Non verbal/physical: body language - hands, eyes, type of movement.
- Emotional: building a relationship, listening.

Discussion:

Ask the demonstrators/peace keepers:
- What were you trying to achieve in this situation?
- What did you say or do that seemed to lower/raise the level of confrontation?
- How did you feel when placed in this situation?

Make people aware of personal space (only applicable in some parts of the world!):
- Public zone: 4m – 1.20 m
- Social zone: 1.20 – 50 cm
- Personal zone: 50 cm – close
• Intimate zone: very close!

Ask the aggressors:
• What did your partner do/say that calmed you down/excited you further?
• What made it harder/easier for you to continue to be aggressive?
• What do you think your partner should have done when faced with a person like you?
• What were you feeling/thinking during the scene?

Hassle Line Scenarios

These are some scenarios that can be used for the hassle line exercise. Feel free to create your own scenarios particular to your own situation.

1. Place: café, cafeteria, some eating place
   One side has a beautiful new yellow shirt, maybe a gift from someone special. The other side somehow splatters the yellow shirt with tomato sauce. The person in yellow is ANGRY.

2. Place: a (National) park
   One side is going for a walk through a (National) park. The other side is dumping waste illegally. The environmentalists (!) feel they have the obligation to prevent this. The other side of course is not interested….

3. Place: a protest at a nuclear weapons manufacturer.
   One side is demonstrating, blocking the entrance to the building. They believe nukes are BAD, etc…
   The other persons are workers. They need the job to support themselves (maybe they have children…). They are of course angry, need to get to work and for every 15 minutes of work they miss they lose pay. They think the activists are smelly and should get a real job.

4. Place: In the (Greenpeace?) office.
   One side smokes in a place where it is not allowed, defying the rules. The other side, non-smokers, are sick and tired of this.

5. Place: at a store that sells furs.
   One side is picketing in front of the store. They are pro-animal rights. The other side is a fur purchaser and has just bought a coat.

6. Place: at a quiet demo.
   One side: one protester starts chanting loudly. This person wants a loud active rally. The other side is peacekeeper.

7. Place: a highway blockade of waste shipments
   One side has completely blocked a highway in order to halt the shipment of extremely toxic waste. The other side are nurses on their way to work in a hospital.

Note: It could be good to go through scenarios in a specific order, such as:
1. **The café**  
   This is a situation that could happen to anyone.

2. **The park**  
   An environmentalist on his/her own.

3. **The nuclear weapons manufacturer or the store that sells fur.**  
   Environmentalists working as a team, but there is one-to-one communication.

Many Greenpeace actions have a negative effect on people other than the focus of our actions. These maybe include delivery people, commuters, dock workers, fire brigades, even the police, and others. This hassle line scenario may be used to open a discussion of:

What is our responsibility to non-targets that we effect?  
Is it nonviolent to impact bystanders?  
Can we take measures to minimize or at least explain our impacts?  
Do we have the right to make our cause more important than these impacts?  
Does impacting non-targets harm our image or campaigns?

**Handouts (Tips for dealing with anger and violence)**

These lists are a summary of skills and techniques, which are explained in other parts of this module. They can be given to participants as handouts or summaries. They are not in any way a substitute for the actual training. It is advisable not to distribute them if the trainer does not intend to cover the actual training parts.

**Handout 1**

**Anger management skills**

In an action, we are usually the trigger for the workers/guardians. Our presence in their building/land is an unusual and suspicious event. With our blockers efficiently blocking access to the hot spot, the Escalation Phase evolves into a Crisis very quickly. We will thus be dealing (often) with the highest potential anger and violence. This Crisis atmosphere can easily affect us, our temper will rise, and we will enter in a vicious circle of escalating anger.

It is our duty, as Greenpeace, to move the atmosphere into the recovery phase, and to remain calm and non-violent.

Display and discuss the following list:

Self-awareness (refer to "identifying triggers", "ways people deal with anger" and "Us/Them")

Constructive self-talk

Before, during, and after the confrontation
Building rapport (refer to "nonviolent non-physical blocking")

Non-verbal messages

Defusing anger (refer to "Defusing anger")
Used in the trigger phase (refer to "arousal cycle"):

Open-ended questions
Validating
Summarising
Reframing
Silence

Assertive confrontation (refer to "Assertive confrontation")
Used in the escalation phase (refer to "arousal cycle")

"I" messages
Specificity

Assertive disengagement (done only by campaigner or action coordinator)
Used in the crisis phase (refer to "arousal cycle")

Identify interests and issues that exist

Handout 2

The following handout is a comprehensive list of tasks, recommendations, tips, do’s & don'ts. It can be distributed by the trainer at the beginning or end of the training. It is not in any way a substitute of the actual training module. Some points may not be appropriate in some countries or situations.

Notes on Nonviolent Action (pp. 9-11, Randy Schutt, 1993)

Preparing for Nonviolent Struggle/Conflict

• Prepare yourself
• Think carefully about your motivations for nonviolent action and how you want to do it – bold and effective, yet loving
• Meditate, engage in acts of self suffering, etc. to build empathy for your opponents
• Carefully plan your action
• Prepare contingencies – consider what might happen and how you want to respond
• Role play various situations - practice
• Build a strong organization that can provide good support for you and your compatriots
• Respect yourself and your opinions (and others will respect you)
• Relax, stretch your muscles
• Get ready to enjoy yourself – it is exciting and fun to make the world better!
• **Prepare your opponents**, the police, authorities, etc. so they won’t arrive afraid or angry
  • Talk personally with police, etc. in advance in an informal setting so they understand what we are doing and why we will be confronting them
  • This keeps them from believing myths about us (“Dirty, Communists, hippies”, etc.)
  • It also gives them a chance to question their role – why they will be ordered to oppose our good actions and defend the destructive status quo – why are they not helping us?

**Being Nonviolent and Responding to Threats of Violence Directed at You**
Just because you are nonviolent doesn’t guarantee that others will be nonviolent towards you – but it should calm things down and minimize the violence

• **Stay centred**
  • Stay calm, cool
  • Be confident and self-assured – fear and uncertainty can incite attack
  • Keep breathing – slowly, deeply
  • Remember why you are there, what you are trying to accomplish – what a great day for making the world a better place!
  • Respect yourself – be proud of your actions
  • Enjoy yourself, this is your action
  • Do not give up or run away in fear

• **Be open and loving**
  • Be honest
  • Maintain a non-aggressive, open stance
  • Be friendly and smile (but don’t smirk)
  • Be humorous, keep things light
  • Maintain direct eye contact (but don’t stare them down)
  • Be assertive (but not aggressive)
  • Stand up for yourself, don’t cower
  • Make an unexpected, loving gesture – give them a gift, give them flowers, offer support

• **Be non-provocative**
  • Don’t brandish signs
  • Watch your body language – don’t make threatening motions, avoid challenging stances, don’t tower over them
  • Sit down and speak from below – don’t tower over them
  • Don’t run – you may appear cowardly or guilty of something or may encourage them to chase you
  • Don’t be wild and freak out the opponents or police

• **Be a person, not a target** – make yourself as human as possible
  • Make human to human contact – hard for them to be violent to another human being, but easy to hurt an “object”
  • Introduce yourself, ask who they are (but don’t demand to know)
  • Express yourself clearly
  • Try to engage them on a rational, loving level
• Wear nice, respectable clothes – show you are a responsible member of society
• Wear durable clothes you feel comfortable in and you are not afraid of ruining
• Don’t wear helmets, masks, sunglasses or anything that hides your humanness
• Dance, sing, play children’s games like the hokey pokey – show you are just another silly human
• Show your love for your friends and other nearby beings

**Talk with your opponents**
• Ask them questions about themselves, why they are there, how they feel, why they are angry or afraid – listen well
• Let them blow off steam and express their fears
• Establish your mutual concern about the issue
• Acknowledge their position and express empathy – realize they are humans with their own problems and are probably victims too
• Try to work with them – incorporate their concerns into the solution you propose
• Tell them why you are there, how you feel, who you are – explain yourself like you would to a friend
• Point out your agreement on other issues
• Express your concerns for your community and indicate you are acting responsibly to make things better for everyone
• Be as human as possible with them – talk about your family, your love for others, etc.
• Don’t make snide comments, call them names, guilt-trip them, or act like a snotty punk
• Tell people when they are hurting you – ask them to stop

**Get support and comfort from your friends**
• Hold hands, stay together with your group, hug others
• Sing
• Keep TV cameras, journalists, or other witnesses nearby – point out that others are watching

**If all else fails**
• Wear “action” clothes that don’t hinder your movement
• Walk away, retreat
• Run like hell
• Act insane or disgusting to try to drive them away
• Curl up into a fetal position on the ground – protect the back of your neck and your face with your arms
• Accept it

**Nonviolent Responses to People Being Violent toward Others**

• **Remind fighters what is happening**
  • “You’re hurting that person”
  • “Other people see you hurting that person”

• **Try to turn the fight into a discussion**
  • Ask them to tell you why they are angry
  • Ask them to think about good solutions
• Offer your ideas for mutually satisfying solutions

• **Get fighters to focus on you instead of on their opponents**
  • Ask them questions
  • Tell them how you feel, what you are doing, etc.
  • Do something outrageous that forces everyone to focus on you instead of their anger for each other

• **Physically intervene**
  • Separate fighters – use your body as a shield
  • Link arms with others so that fighters can’t get to each other – if necessary, encircle them so they must talk to you
  • Give a group hug to fighters so they are squished together and can’t fight anymore – hold until things have calmed down and you are having a discussion

**The Role of Anger and Niceness in Nonviolent Struggle**
• Don’t be cutey or sweet – it’s usually either revolting or insulting
• Let your anger embolden you to demand that things change in a positive way
  • “Revolution can’t be polite” – be bold!
• Express anger at people’s actions, but not at them as people – support them personally while you insist that they change their behaviour
  • Don’t rage at people – it may make you feel better, but it generally is not useful to effect positive social change
• Notice what makes you “see red” and review the reasons for it later
• Go somewhere safe and feel and express all your emotions – including grief, fear, rage, anguish, etc. – ask close friends to support you or be alone if that is safer
  • Intense fury often comes from past experiences – don’t let your past interfere with or distort your present work

**Handout 3**

**Nonviolent Response to Personal Violence**
-- Adapted from an article by Markley Morris

Nonviolence focuses on communication:

1. Your objectives must be reasonable. You must believe you are fair and you must be able to communicate this to your opponent.

2. Maintain as much eye contact as possible.

3. Make no abrupt gestures. Move slowly. If possible, tell your opponent what you are going to do before you do it. Don’t say anything threatening, critical, or hostile.

4. Don’t be afraid of stating the obvious; say simply, "You're shouting at me," or "You're hurting my arm."

5. Someone in the process of committing an act of violence has strong expectations as to how his/ her victim will behave. If you manage to behave differently in a
nonthreatening manner you can interrupt the flow of events that would have culminated in an act of violence. You must create a scenario new to your opponent.

6. Seek to befriend your opponent's better nature; even the most brutal and brutalized among us have some spark of decency which the nonviolent defender can reach.

7. Don't shut down in response to physical violence; you have to play it by ear. The best rule is to resist as firmly as you can without escalating the anger or the violence. Try varying approaches and keep trying to alter your opponent's picture of the situation.

8. Get your opponent talking and listen to what s/he says. Encourage him/her to talk about what s/he believes, wishes, fears. Don't argue but at the same time don't give the impression you agree with assertions that are cruel or immoral. The listening is more important than what you say- keep the talk going and keep it calm.

MODULE 5

Objective: At the end of this module the participant will be able to identify and demonstrate non-technical strategies and techniques that make an action safer and more effective, and will have discussed various aspects of action safety and effectiveness.

Contents:

Lecture/Discussion:
Action Dress
  Safety
  Image
  Greenpeace logo
Discussion scenarios

Exercises:
Non-technical blockade techniques
  Standing line
  Turtle
  Spiral
  Centipede
  Star
Passive Resistance, discussion and exercises
Mass demonstration communication
  Group Clap
  Whisper Chant
Group techniques for responding to violence
  Huddle
  The V
  Puppy pile
  Fetal position
**Action Dress Discussion**

Objective: To inform participants about clothing choices that can make actions safer and more effective.

Often, clothing will be provided by Greenpeace. But as a nonviolent activist it is important to be aware of why particular clothing is worn and how.

Begin by explaining that clothing is important for the following reasons:

- protection from rough treatment  
- protection from weather and the environment  
- protection against toxins (Hazmat)  
- recognition as Greenpeace activist  
- conveying a positive image to the public

Hats or hoods may be necessary to protect the head from sun, rain and cold. However, hats with brims shade the face and make for poor images. Consider the relative merits of wearing a hat or not, and always remove a brimmed hat when being interviewed.

Dark sunglasses may be necessary to protect the eyes from sun, snow, or water glare. However, they preclude eye contact and thus create a separation between us and those we are communicating with, and make us appear more hostile in images. Avoid their use, if possible. If you can, remove them for interviews.

Depending on the purpose of the action overalls of different kinds of materials (paper, cotton, synthetic) might be provided. In cold weather, dress in layers of wool, polypropylene, or fleece. Do not wear cotton or down if there’s a possibility of getting wet. Multiple layers provide better protection than one heavy layer due to insulating air trapped between the layers, and allow the activist to shed some clothing to avoid perspiration. Always try to stay dry. Also, police have been known to remove clothing from ‘locked-down’ activists in an attempt to get them to unlock. This is more difficult to accomplish if many layers are used.

Always wear long pants. As with shoes, long pants protect the skin better than shorts should the activist be dragged. In most countries, long pants also convey a more mature image to the public we hope to reach.

Be aware of how your attire may be perceived by the viewing public and even the police. If it will help our cause, perhaps it is worth dressing in business wear for a
short while. Also, it will be interesting to see whether it changes the way we are treated by police and other authorities.

If the action calls for sitting for a long time, consider placing some foam padding inside the pants. This will increase comfort and offer protection from the cold ground. Also, the police can’t remove padding from inside the clothes as easily as external padding.

Consider wearing an adult diaper if an extended ‘lock-down’ is anticipated. This helps avoid embarrassment and prevents evaporative heat loss in cold weather.

Always wear real shoes or boots, not sandals or thongs. In any action, whether ‘hard’ or ‘soft’, the possibility for arrest or rough treatment exists. It is not comfortable to have ones heels or toes dragged across pavement.

**Reasons to wear the Greenpeace logo:**

- It clearly identifies us as belonging to a group that always acts nonviolently.
- It empowers us knowing that we’re part of a larger group.
- It may deter violence among those authorities who are aware that Greenpeace is a large, powerful, well-funded, international organization that defends its activists.
- It gives credibility to our message with viewers that know of and like Greenpeace.
- It conveys a sense of organization and discipline.
- “Greenpeace” images increase our name recognition and fundraising potential.
- It helps with coordination and visibility when we participate in large demonstrations with broader coalitions.

**Reasons to not wear the Greenpeace logo:**

- It may anger authorities that have a negative view of Greenpeace.
- It reduces the credibility of our message with viewers that know of and dislike Greenpeace.
- We appear to be paid, professional activists, rather than just ‘normal’ concerned citizens.
- It gives us a sense of anonymity, thus reducing our personal responsibility for our actions.
- The Greenpeace ‘uniform’ may appear semi-militaristic.

**Discussion Scenarios**

Objective: The aim of this section is to encourage participants to consider their own personal responsibility during actions. Team leaders should encourage discussion around the following questions (these questions are on large sheets of paper so that people can refer back to them). Try to ensure that everyone has an opportunity to be involved in the discussion. Comments may be written on flip chart paper. The trainer may also wish to propose his or her own alternative scenarios.
1. You are sitting in a protest line. The police are clearly visible in the distance. You notice the person sitting next to you, with whom you have just linked arms has a sheath knife in their boot. What do you do? Talk about other inappropriate items.

2. On the coach on the way to a mass action you become aware that the person next to you is intoxicated on alcohol or drugs. What do you do? Discuss what people would regard as other forms of inappropriate behaviour, as well as personal responsibility.

3. You are part of a protest where some activists are leafleting cars as they approach the entrance gates of a factory. Two of the leafleters become over-enthusiastic and start to dash in front of cars to make them stop? What action do you take? Talk about other examples of over-enthusiastic behaviour, and how these might be perceived of otherwise effect the action.

Exercises:

Nontechnical Blockade Techniques

Total time: 35 minutes

Objectives:
1. Greenpeace often uses various technical devices (lockboxes, U-locks, chains, etc.) to establish and maintain blockades. This can be necessary to create a dramatic image or to maintain control of a space for the longest possible period of time. At other times, these devices may not be available to us, our images may be enhanced without their use, or we may have sufficient numbers that they are unnecessary. The following techniques stress using only our bodies to blockade effectively, while presenting the best possible image.

2. To provide some physical activity during the nonviolence training.

Standing Line

Time: 15 minutes

Objective: To create a less hostile appearance and create a difficult to break standing blockade.

Begin by having the group form into pairs facing each other. One of each pair is a “blocker”. Have the other partner try to push past the “blocker”. Have everyone switch roles and repeat. Point out how easy it is to be knocked off balance when standing normally. Now demonstrate a more stable way to stand. Place one foot back and one foot forward with almost all your weight on the rear foot. Lift the front foot and gently place it back on the floor to show that your weight is on the rear foot. Have the group demonstrate this position, then repeat the exercise above with everyone getting a chance to be both a “blocker” and a person trying to get past.
Ask the group to stand as they normally would in a blockade. Typically, they will link arms and most will clench their fists. Point out that the clenched fist is a particularly aggressive form of body language. Next, approach a point in the line and demonstrate how easy it is to pry arms apart and thus break up the blockade.

Now, have the group stand shoulder-to-shoulder, arms behind each other’s backs, grasping the forearms of the people one person away from each other. Alternatively, the participants may link elbows and then grasp their own hand behind their own back. See which feels more comfortable and stable. Briefly discuss how this appears less aggressive, then demonstrate how it’s more difficult to grasp arms and break the blockade. The group may also practice spinning 3 or 4 person segments of the line should authorities approach from behind.

Next, take half the group and place them behind the “standing line” blockade as “supporters”. These “supporters” should assume a stable stance (one foot forward, one back) and lean forward and place their hands on the hips or lower back of the person in front of them in the “standing line”. You now have a two-deep, stable line with everyone facing the same direction.

Finally, split the group into three equal parts. One group form the “standing line”, one group “support” the “standing line”, and one group tries to push through the blockade. Repeat this part of the exercise three times so everyone can experience all three roles. Point out that this blockade can be broken by determined authorities or others. However, if your blockade looks stable they may not even try. Also, there are times when you only need the blockade to last a few seconds or a minute so that climbers or other activists can deploy behind you. These techniques will help gain you that time.

**Centipede**

**Time:** 5 minutes

**Objective:** To create a difficult to break sitting blockade.

Ask the group to sit as they normally would in a blockade. Typically, they will sit shoulder-to-shoulder with linked arms. Next, approach a point in the line and demonstrate how easy it is to pry arms apart and thus break up the blockade. Note that it would be difficult to put arms behind each other’s backs, as in the standing line, and still sit comfortably.

Now, have the group all spin 90 degrees in the same direction so that each participant, other than the first in line, is facing someone’s back. Then, beginning with the rear of the line, have each participant wrap their legs around the waist of the person in front of them, crossing their ankles if possible, wrap their arms around the chest of the person in front of them, then lean forward, covering as much of the legs and arms in their lap as possible. Demonstrate how difficult it is to break apart this blockade. Note that this blockade requires more people to span a given distance than the traditional, elbows-linked sitting blockade.

**The Star**
Time: 5 minutes

Objective: To stop a car or block an intersection with relatively few people.

Five people lay face down, heads towards a central point, link elbows, grasp their own forearms, and bring their heads and chests forward over their arms thus preventing easy access to the arms and making the blockade more difficult to break. Note that this leaves the back of the head, legs and back unprotected and that consideration should be given to ending the ‘star’ should authorities become violent.

Point out that, while the ‘star’ can be broken, many ‘stars’ in an intersection may prove too daunting for the authorities to attempt to dismantle, and that a single ‘star’ can be quickly replaced by other activists, thus prolonging a blockade until we run out of people or the authorities run out of energy.

**The Turtle**

Time: 5 minutes

Objective: To create a moveable, standing blockade of 12-30 people that is difficult to break apart.

Approximately 4 people form a core and face outward with arms behind each other’s backs. Then another group of people join the core facing inwards with arms intertwined with each other and the center. Finally, an outer layer of people, also facing inwards, joins the ‘turtle’ with arms linking inwards and one leg in and the other braced out. Now, pick a destination and move there.

Note that injured or frail participants can be absorbed into the center of the ‘turtle’. Also, if a participant is grabbed by authorities the ‘turtle’ can spin around while other participants grab onto the person targeted, thus preventing him or her from being separated from the group.

This also a great ice-breaker at parties.

**The Spiral**

Time: 5 minutes

Objective: To create a standing blockade with a large group of people.

One person places their arms around the chest of a person in front of them. Adding people in a tight spiral formation creates a situation where arms and, eventually, whole bodies become inaccessible.

**Passive Resistance Discussion and Exercises**

Objective: During some actions activists decide to “passively resist” or “go limp” rather than voluntarily walk away with the police during arrest. The purpose of this
discussion is to explore the reasons for choosing to go limp or not, and how to do it in the safest way possible.

The trainer may choose to present this information in lecture fashion or open up the subject for discussion.

Reasons to “go limp”:
- It will allow the action to last longer.
- It will stretch police resources and possibly cause the police to reconsider arresting the activists.
- As a matter of conscience, some people refuse to cooperate in any way with their arrest.
- It will create a better media image.

Reasons to not “go limp”:
- It will contribute nothing to the action.
- In certain images or cultures we may be perceived as not “peaceful”.
- It may escalate tensions and lead to violence.
- “Road rash”, shoulder and arm injuries are common, head and facial injuries are possible.
- An individual’s physical condition (e.g. advanced age or frailty) or problems (e.g. easily dislocated shoulder) may make being carried or dragged unsafe.
- Police officers may hurt their backs or get other injuries while carrying us.

How to go limp safely:

When lifted by the police/opposition try to be in a position or quickly twist into a position so that you are facing the sky rather than the ground, with your heels dragging on the ground. This will prevent facial injuries should you be dropped. Tuck the chin slightly towards the chest and if you are dropped, attempt to have your shoulders rather than the back of your head absorb most of the impact.

At any time you can inform the officers that you are willing to walk. They will usually be happy to allow you to do so.

Note: In some actions you may wish to tell the officers that you will not fake injury or "Cry Wolf". They may then believe you if you later tell them that you are being hurt. It is a bad idea to fake an injury or illness as a diversion or for any other reason during an action. First, it can frighten and distract members of your own team, other demonstrators or bystanders. More importantly, if a real medical problem occurs at this or subsequent actions, we don't want authorities suspecting a ruse and delaying care.

Exercises:

In order to become aware of some of the techniques of passive resistance or going limp you can practice the following exercises. State again that these are techniques to reduce the possibility of violence while at the same time one is not resisting arrest. Also emphasize that these techniques won’t prevent the activist being dragged away,
but it makes it much more difficult for the police. It also lessens any chance of injury and conveys a less aggressive or violent physical message

Divide the group into pairs. Each member of the pair should try each role in turn, whilst the other person tries to move them. Do all exercises twice so that everyone gets a turn.

Warning:
Mind backs!
Wear old clothes!
Take off watches/jewelry!

1. Tree method
Sometimes you can't sit down and have to be as firm as you can without standing.
a) #1 imagines to be a deeply rooted tree (i.e. standing). Give time to focus. #2 tries to push #1 away.
Swap and repeat.
b) Focus and repeat exercise.

2. Sack of potatoes method
a) #1 sits/lies down and holds themselves as stiff as possible. #2 tries to drag #1 at least 1 meter.
b) #1 goes completely limp, like a sack of potatoes, relaxes and goes heavy. #2 tries to drag #1 away.
Can they feel the difference?

3. Rock method
a) #1 imagines being a rock by sitting solid, heavy and firm but not stiff. Take time to focus on being immovable, with a low heavy center of gravity. #2 tries to move them. This shows the difficulty of moving a body that is calm, controlled, heavy yet limp.
b) Repeat with #2 using police “persuasion” or abuse. #1 stays silent and focussed.
c) Repeat, allowing #1 to respond verbally to #2. Is there a difference?

Let both sides explore the escalation of provocative speech. The mover tries to provoke a violent reaction, which, represents the rock's loss of control. The physical contact should be restricted to pushing or pulling only. The rock tries to maintain self-control, centeredness, focus. The "mover" should try to scale their speech up from gentle persuasion, through sarcasm, to attempts to weaken, belittle, provoke and annoy the rock.
Have the rock answer or speak to the mover. Notice the effect on concentration.

Other implements:
Activists should be aware of the potential message implements they may be holding might convey. If confronted by authorities they should drop any sticks, shovels, placards, etc. In the midst of a tense situation these can be perceived as a potential dangerous weapon and the way encourage the police to react as such.
Discussion:
Talk to people after every exercise. Ask how it felt. Expect that these exercises don’t work for everyone, for some people there may have been no difference, but the point about this exercise is that activists can control their body language and that they can be resistant without actually resisting arrest or giving the media images of fighting/struggling.

These techniques can also help stop “the opposition” becoming violent, at least you don’t give them any excuse to do so.

The focusing technique can help pass boring hours on some actions. In some actions people can be stuck for hours and knowing how to withdraw mentally from the discomfort, boredom or chaos can give a lot of inner calm and strength. Many people find focusing on treelike or rocklike qualities is very helpful, but it might not work for all. Encourage people to experiment and find out what does.

Talk about the bit of the exercise when people were invited to use abusive language. Many people will say it was hard to maintain that abuse. This is partly because most of them don’t normally behave like this and they may know and like their “opponent”. However the point of this exercise is, that it is hard to sustain being abusive if you get no response.

Some people respond to being abused by smiling or looking provocative. The reason for this can be nerves or fear. A cocky expression implies superiority and may incite further abuse. However it is very difficult to carry on being very rude to someone who has made eye contact with a calm expression on their face. How did it feel when the “activist” responded verbally?

The activist: how hard was it to focus on staying while you were having eye contact with the opponent? A useful method is not to look “the opposition” in the eyes, but to look at the third eye, an imaginary spot on his/her forehead.

Mass Demonstration Communication

Total time: 10 minutes

Objective: Although most Greenpeace actions involve small teams, we occasionally sponsor or participate in events with much larger numbers of people. Two examples are the Fall 2002 oil action in Luxembourg involving 600 Greenpeace activists, and the participation by a small GPUSA team in the November 1999 World Trade Organization protests in Seattle. Chants, singing, megaphones (ours and theirs), drums, whistles, and conversation may make for a very noisy scenario. At times, the scale of these actions may make our traditional action coordinator/cell phone/radio communications difficult or impossible. The following techniques offer alternative methods for communicating effectively in a crowd.

Group Clap
Objective: This technique enables one person to deliver an instruction or piece of information quickly to as large a group as possible.

The person wishing to speak shouts, "If you can hear my voice, clap once," then, using broad arm movements so those around can get the timing, claps his or her hands once. Next the speaker shouts, "If you can hear my voice, clap twice," claps twice, then shouts, "If you can hear my voice, clap three times." At this point, hundreds of people will have clapped three times and the announcement can be made. Often, not only the demonstrators but also the police, workers, media, and bystanders will have quieted so that they can hear what's going on. This technique can also be used to refocus a chaotic situation, even if no particular information needs to be conveyed.

Practice this once or twice with the group.

Whisper Chant

Objective: This technique enables a group of any size to effectively communicate a message or issue a demand without escalating tensions amongst ourselves or our opponents.

At times, situations may arise where someone is being injured, a group may be refusing authorities instructions, or attention needs to be focused on something particular. Typically, everyone starts shouting something different ("Fascist", "Stop beating her", "Hell no, we won't go", etc.). This babble is then added to the normal noise of a demonstration, the excitement level of all involved is heightened, and no successful communication is achieved.

Instead, the group may try whispering their message. Often, this will work to deliver a message, reduce tensions, and even defuse potential violence, while focusing and unifying the group. One person begins the chant in an audible whisper while pointing at the trouble spot (if appropriate), then others join in. Practice this a few times.

Possible chants include:
"Hey cameras, someone's being beaten."
"We won't move until ______(name) is brought back to us."
"We're nonviolent, please take off your gas masks."
"Cutting that rope is dangerous."
"Gerd Leipold sent us." (just kidding)

Group Techniques for Responding to Violence

Objective: To provide small groups with some techniques to prevent or halt violent situations.
The Huddle

Time: 5 minutes

Objective: To physically restrict a violent or potentially violent individual without actually grabbing him or her.

At some agreed signal such as, “Huddle”, a group of eight or more surrounds the individual and moves inward until the individual is unable to use his arms and legs in a violent manner. Meanwhile, one person calmly talks to the individual in an effort to keep him calm.

Note: In general, this technique should not be used on police as it may constitute ‘assaulting an officer’. The ‘huddle’ is designed for those times when one of our own goes over the edge.

The V

Time: 5 minutes

Objective: To physically remove a violent or potentially violent individual without actually grabbing him or her.

At some agreed signal such as, “Vee”, a group of eight or more forms a ‘v’ with the aggressive individual inside the legs of the ‘v’ and the point of the ‘v’ towards the target of the individual’s aggression. This creates separation between ‘aggressor’ and ‘target’, while allowing the aggressor an exit away from the dispute. The ‘v’ can slowly move away from the ‘target’, thus creating greater separation in the dispute. When there’s a confrontation between two aggressive individuals, two ‘vees’ may be employed.

Note: Sometimes a group may choose to switch from ‘huddle’ to ‘v’, or from ‘v’ to ‘huddle’.

The Puppy Pile

Time: 5 minutes

Objective: To prevent the authorities from removing an individual from the group, or to protect an individual from physical abuse.

The ‘target’ of aggression gets down on hands and knees while the rest of the group surrounds him or her forming a dense, interlocked, inward facing pile. Care should be taken that the ‘target’ is not crushed and quiet should be maintained so that the ‘target’ or others can communicate effectively.

Fetal Position

Time: 3 minutes
Objective: To provide maximum individual protection when violence is unavoidable.

When it is certain that violence will be used against you it is, of course, best to remove yourself from the source of the violence. Sometimes, though, escape is not possible. At these times, it may be best to get into a modified ‘fetal position’. Lie on your side, tuck your knees up towards your chest and cross your arms over the back of the head and neck. This position provides the best possible protection to the face, head, cervical (neck) spine, and internal organs. You’ll still be sore the next day, but hopefully no permanent damage will have been done.

Literature:

Police Chemical Weapons

Although most Greenpeace actions involve small teams and a relatively controlled police response, this is not always the case. First, we occasionally sponsor or participate in events with much larger numbers of people. Two examples are the Fall 2002 oil action in Luxembourg involving 600 Greenpeace activists, and the participation by a small Greenpeace USA team in the November 1999 World Trade Organization protests in Seattle. Secondly, police departments in some parts of the world are increasingly using a variety of so-called “non-lethal” chemical weapons against nonviolent activists. These may be used against large numbers of people as a method of crowd control, or to persuade individual “locked down” activists to end their protest. In one particularly disturbing incident caught on video tape, California forest activists that were locked to an official’s desk had pepper spray applied directly to their eyes with cotton applicators.

Police have a variety of chemical weapons at their disposal. These include several types of tear gas, Mace, different brands of capsicum (red chilli) pepper spray, and others. These chemicals are designed to cause a severe burning sensation on the skin, watering of the eyes and consequent difficulty with vision, and respiratory discomfort. Individuals with pre-existing respiratory conditions such as asthma or an allergic sensitivity to the chemicals have suffered respiratory emergencies and even death. Reports of health problems lasting for long periods, even months or years after exposure are not uncommon. These weapons contain not only the chemical irritants but also a variety of other chemical propellants and stabilizers. Information on the cumulative cancer, birth defect, and mutation causing potential of these chemical weapons is difficult to come by, but it is certain that they aren’t harmless.

Preparation for action:

Most police chemical weapons are in an oil-based solution, so any oil on the skin can enhance the irritating effects. Avoid the use of oil-based soaps, shampoos, or other skin products for at least 24 hours prior to an action. Some activists wash with castile soap or other non-oil based soaps before an action to decrease the presence of natural skin oils. Water-based sunscreen put on approximately one hour before an action provides some degree of protection from the sun but there is no applied substance to
protect you from chemicals. Avoid all the egg wash, baking soda paste preventive measure mentioned in some activist “zines”, publications and websites.

The best protection for your skin is to wear as much clothing as the local climate will allow. This also provides some padding if rough treatment is a possibility. Wool and pile clothing soak up the chemicals and thus should be avoided. Rain gear is great since it creates an impermeable barrier and can be rinsed off easily. Stylish activists wear silk since it doesn’t seem to absorb the chemicals, and keeps you warm in the cold and cool in the heat.

For eye protection, shatterproof wrap-around sunglasses may be worn. Swim goggles also work, and have the advantage of being available in prescription form for people that need eyeglasses. Avoid wearing contact lenses to an action where chemical weapons might be used. The chemicals may become trapped under the lenses and cause permanent damage. The lungs and airway can be protected with a painter’s mask or bandana (or both) soaked in vinegar. Organic apple cider vinegar is best. These items can be carried easily and can be hidden quickly when necessary.

The best protection for the eyes, face and airway is a gas mask. However, be aware that wearing, or even possession of a gas mask may be seen as provocative by the police, public, and other demonstrators. Suitable gas masks have a speaking diaphragm (voice box) and double plastic lenses. Never wear glass lenses as an ugly injury may occur if they’re shattered. The “German-clone” gas masks have been reported to work well, while the “Israeli-clone” ones have not.

Asthmatics and others with existing medical problems may consider writing their condition on their arm so that street medics and other care providers can quickly identify an emergency situation.

While police chemical weapons are being used:

The best option is to swiftly leave the area to prevent or minimize exposure. If this is not possible, close any open clothing and put on any protective gear you’ve brought. A piece of cloth soaked with water held over the mouth and nose is better than nothing. Avoid running when blinded, since many people have been injured worse by collisions and falls than they would have been by the chemicals. If necessary, crawl away from the danger area. Shouting and screaming are rarely helpful and often panic others in the vicinity. As a last resort, curl up in the fetal position – side-lying, knees drawn towards the chest, hands and arms protecting the back of the head and neck – and wait until the chaos has subsided.

After exposure to police chemical weapons:

Note: All care providers and assistants should wear protective gear as described above, since secondary contamination is common.

The first priority is to assess for the presence of a respiratory emergency such as an asthma attack or bronchospasm. If available, a trained medic might choose to administer a bronchodilator like albuterol (Salbutamol, Ventolin) via inhaler. Some street medics have had success using the accupressure points near the seventh cervical
(neck) vertebrae. Place thumbs 2.5 cm (1 inch) to the sides of the spine near where the neck joins the shoulder and press inwards hard using a clockwise motion. Another useful acupressure point is the web of skin between the thumb and index fingers of both hands. Any respiratory emergency must be evacuated to a medical facility as quickly as possible.

Someone who has gotten a lot of chemical in their mouth should be given LAW (1/2 liquid antacid without simethicone, 1/2 water) and told to swish and spit several times. This will help relieve the burning and spasm and may prevent a respiratory emergency from developing.

The second priority is to decontaminate the eyes. They have received first degree burns. Remove contact lenses immediately since swelling may make this difficult or impossible later on. The best method of decontamination is to flush continuously with very large amounts of sterile or clean water. After flushing, one drop of LAW in each eye will help relieve the pain and stop the spasm. Vision will be cloudy for about a minute but will then clear. Natural healers like to use Rescue Remedy and water on a cotton ball or gauze and placed on the closed eyelids as a compress. Caution the victim to avoid touching the eyes with the hands until after they have been thoroughly decontaminated, too.

The third priority is to address the panic and anger that usually accompany exposure to police chemical weapons, since both physiologic and emotional damage have occurred. It will be much easier to decontaminate a victim once they are calm. Natural healers like to use Rescue Remedy, taken by mouth.

The final priority is to decontaminate the skin. While having these chemicals on the skin is very uncomfortable, it is not the emergency that respiratory and eye exposure are. Begin by removing all contaminated clothing. Otherwise, re-exposure will be continuous and repeat respiratory or eye contamination may occur. Then, rinse the skin with a water hose or in a shower. These steps should be done outside of any structure or treatment space, or else it will quickly become uninhabitable. Contaminated clothing should be immediately double bagged in plastic for later washing or disposal. Remember to wear protective gear when opening these bags to avoid secondary contamination.

Lots of water is the best way to get chemicals off skin. If not available or in short supply, wipe chemical off skin with dry cloths, toilet paper or gauze. Apply LAW, milk, soy milk or Rescue Remedy Cream to help soothe the pain and burning. Now, the activist is ready to go out and do it again.

*This essay on police chemical weapons was written by Butch Turk, R.N., Greenpeace ship’s medic, and is based on personal experience and the advice of numerous street medics (Thanks!). The sole responsibility for its contents is his.*

**MODULE 6**
Objective: At the end of this module participants will be able to identify the elements of teamwork and apply them in real life situations.

Contents:

**Lecture/Discussion**

- Teamwork discussion
- Internal Conflict Resolution

**Exercises:**

Trust, confidence and decision making exercises:
- Free Fall
- The Falling Bottle
- Drunken Person/Bottle
- Blind & Guide
- Caterpillar
- Ship Game
- Twister
- Moon Explorer
- Eiffel Tower
- The Crab

Roleplay exercises:
- Quick Decision Making Roleplay
- Action Roleplay

**Lecture/Discussion:**

**Teamwork discussion**

The team is more than just a group of people. It works towards a clear goal, is coordinated, and should be interdependent, so that the effort of each effects the effort of all. Each person in the team should develop the capacity to trust and communicate within the team. Nobody is irrelevant in a work team, therefore it is important that each one thinks, feels and acts in relation to their partners. An efficient team takes advantage of the abilities and qualities of each one its members. Recognition of existing abilities and those which may potentially be developed, and deploying them effectively within the team, will lead to greater success and satisfaction.

During the training it is important to take time to discuss the importance of teamwork and then strengthen it with some exercises.

**Importance of teamwork:**

- Increased confidence and strength;
- Individual and group security;
- Increased efficiency and harmony;
- Improved communication;
- Improved quick decision making;
- To take advantage of or compensate for the strengths and weaknesses of team members;
- To reduce the margin of error;
- To counteract intimidation and violence from others during a confrontation (police, guards, workers, etc.);
- To achieve goals quickly.

Trainers may consider opening up a discussion of the following items:
- Previous experiences in NVDA;
- Individual fears and doubts;
- “Control, don’t ignore, your fear”;
- Every effort should be made to ensure that each activist is never alone during an action or while in custody. For example, don’t allow just one woman or one man to be arrested, since men and women will usually be separated;
- All participants should have access to the same information;
- To consolidate the action team and promote a confident atmosphere, involve them as much as possible in action preparation activities such as: painting banners, scouting, action planning, legal topics, etc.

**Internal Conflict Resolution**

Objective: Within the activities of Greenpeace, differences of opinion and personality clashes that affect group harmony and our planned goals may arise. It is important to have a structure that helps resolve these conflicts as they appear.

In case of a conflict, it is important to:
1. Recognise and face the problem.
2. Define the positions and interests of the parties.
3. Come up with solutions where everyone is a winner.
4. Persevere co-operatively until achieving the proposed solution.

When a conflict is perceived, it is important to try to define the conflict. The steps for this activity are well known:
- Sit in a circle.
- Speak one by one, without interruption or accusation.
- Be concise and stick to the facts.
- Respect the authority of the moderator and the opinions of the rest.

If the problem can’t be solved immediately, it must be defined clearly and a timeline should be established that leads to a solution as soon as possible. The issue must be reconsidered once in a while to verify progress and reinforce the results.
1. Recognise and face the problem

The first step in problem solving is to recognise that a problem exists and to accept its importance. The first condition is easy to achieve. Anyone may be able to see that something is wrong with a group’s relationships, especially when signs of obvious antagonism or verbal or physical aggression are produced. Accepting that the problem is important and that it deserves to be resolved is more difficult since some of the parties may not agree about the relevance of the conflict.

In this first stage of conflict resolution, then, every party’s personal perceptions about a specific problem must be explored, defining the problem with absolute clarity until an acceptable agreement about the problem’s importance is reached.

Clearly, this must be done through conversation that includes:

- Respect for everyone’s points of view, even if there is no agreement.

- Tolerance and support for group members that have difficulties expressing themselves.

- Patience and good will when listening to others.

Certain personal attitudes are also necessary:

- Self-control: Don’t let anger take control when opinions are adverse.

- Confidence: Express your feelings and opinions clearly, directly, and completely.

- Honesty: Always tell the truth and be sincere when expressing opinions.

- Humility: Admit from the beginning that you can make mistakes.

The spirit of the Activist and the group must prevail during the conflict resolution process. The conviction that a solution must be found that will benefit all has to be maintained. The common will is beyond the individual will.

2. Define the positions and interests of the parties

A position is the stated goal of each party, and may itself be the cause of the conflict. The interest is the underlying motivation that the position is attempting to fulfil. For example, President Bush’s position is to defeat terrorism and all those things threatening the “civilised world”, while his interest is to keep the USA economy strong through the oil security and politic hegemony.

In every conflict interests are more important than positions, and only when we consider the interests as primordial or basic does a solution become possible. If we only try to satisfy positions, the result will be an endless series of explanations, excuses and accusations (“you told me…,” “I thought that…,” “you promised me that…,” etc.). Focusing on the interest, the parties will be able to reformulate their interpersonal relationship and develop an understanding for each other’s feelings. Then, they may propose acts for mutual benefit, which constitutes the next stage in the conflict resolution process.
3. Come up with solutions where everyone is a winner

The main goal, after defining the problem and focusing on the discovery of the real interests that lay beneath the problem, is to come up with a meaningful solution that considers the needs and desires of all the people involved. It is not easy to completely satisfy these aspirations. That’s why, in some cases, giving up may appear to be the only solution. So all parties must be warned that they won’t get everything they ask for, but also that they won’t leave with empty hands. Team analysis of a problem guarantees that it will always be neutral “third parties” that assist in the reaching of an agreement.

Throughout the process it must be emphasised that nobody is right all the time, and the group’s spirit and commitment must emerge and be maintained in order to promote and guarantee fair solutions. Also, especially emphasise that nobody “loses” with the possible solution, because even when some pretensions resign, the solution eliminates the conflict, and that’s a big benefit to all. A fight that ends with one of the parties satisfied and the other not, is not yet resolved.

4. Persevere co-operatively until reaching the proposed solution

Merely coming up with an idea for a solution and forcing both parties to accept it doesn’t always mean that the problem is solved. If this happens, it is necessary to extend the timeframe of the agreement to allow the creation of new relationships and new behaviours. Act co-operatively to ensure that this occurs.

Exercises:

Trust, confidence and decision making exercises

There are countless similar exercises and variations on these exercises. Consult sources on “new games” or non-competitive games to find alternatives.

Free Fall

Time: depends on size of group

Objective: This exercise helps establish trust and confidence among group members. Use it as a team building exercise.

A (blindfolded or not) participant stands on a platform approximately 1.5 to 2 meters high with his or her back to the rest of the group. A minimum of 6 other participants form two facing, parallel lines behind the (blindfolded) participant and grasp forearms with the person opposite, right hand to right hand and left hand to left hand so that all arms are crossed. The person standing the platform now falls backwards like a plank, without any flexion of the back or legs. The other participants catch the falling person. Do not tolerate dropping the falling person, since serious injury could occur. The exercise is complete when all persons participate in falling and catching.
At the end of the exercise, participants should share their experiences and conclusions.

**The Falling person**

Time: 5 min

Objective: This exercise helps establish trust and confidence between group members. Use it as a team building exercise.

Divide the group into pairs. Person A has to stand behind person B, looking at the back of person B. Person B has to close his or her eyes, stay rooted in the ground, with their body rigid like an “I”, and fall backwards. Person A has to catch person B and prevent him or her from hitting the ground. Then reverse roles.

It is very difficult for person B to remain rooted and rigid, and keep their eyes closed. Many persons cannot do it the first time. Do not tolerate that A allows B fall to the ground, since serious injury can occur.

After playing the game, open a discussion:
Was it hard for B to fall?
How did A and B feel?

This discussion can then lead into discussion of confidence in the group and responsibility.

**Drunken Bottle**

Time: 10 min

Objective: This exercise helps establish trust and confidence among group members. Use it as a team building exercise.

The participants form a circle with one person standing in the middle. He or she is the “drunken bottle” and has to place his or her feet together and stand rooted in the ground. The “bottle’s” feet must not move from their original place in the middle of the circle and their body has to be kept rigid like an “I”. Then, with eyes closed the “bottle” falls. The participants forming the circle must keep the “bottle” from falling to the ground and must pass the “bottle” between themselves in the circle. Thus, the bottle will be rooted in the centre of the circle, and zigzagging inside it.

It is very difficult for the “bottle” to remain rooted and rigid, and to keep their eyes closed. Many persons cannot do it the first time. Do not tolerate someone allowing the “bottle” to fall to the ground, since serious injury could occur.

After playing the game, open a discussion:
Was it difficult for the bottle? Why?
What did the bottle feel?
What did the circle persons feel?
What if someone couldn’t handle the bottle? Did adjacent persons help?

This discussion can lead into a discussion about confidence in the group, responsibility, and working within a group.

**Blind & Guide**

Time: 15 minutes

Objective: This exercise is a confidence and team building exercise. It helps in establishing trust and confidence among group members. This exercise can also help identify who has leadership qualities. Thus, the trainer has to keep an eye on the behaviour of the participants!

Divide the group into pairs. One of each pair is the blind person, the other is his guide. The blind person is required to keep his or her eyes closed during the game. The guide has to take the blind person’s hand and talk to him to help him manoeuvre around other participant pairs or objects. Some guides might lead the blind person into walls, furniture, or other persons. Do not interfere. Let the inept guide and his or her blind person sort it out. Then reverse roles.

Initiate a discussion:
How did you feel being blind? And when being the guide?
What difference is there?
Did any of the blind persons open their eyes? Why?
Did the blind trust the guide?
Did the guides act with or feel responsibility towards the blind?

This discussion can lead into a debate about responsibility and confidence in the group. It also can reveal potential leaders who felt comfortable while being the guide, gained the blind person’s trust, and acted responsibly.

The exercise can be extended to the following stages:
The guide has to guide the blind without talking to him or her (e.g. by grasping hands, by tapping on the back to indicate directions, the blind putting his or her hand on the guide’s shoulder, etc.).
The guide has to guide the blind only by talking to him or her. No physical contact is allowed.

**Caterpillar**

Time: 15 minutes

Objectives:
To generate confidence, team strength, communication, and individual security within the group;
To promote harmony and efficiency within the team, allowing it to do more things in less time;
To improve quick decision making skills.
Instruct the group to form an inward facing circle and hold hands. Everyone then steps forward until all are shoulder-to-shoulder. All should release each other’s hands, then turn 90° in the same direction and place their hands on the shoulders of the person in front of them. All persons are then told to sit on the legs of the person behind them at the same time. So, each person in sitting on someone else’s lap while they are being sat upon.

Now, inform the group that their goal is to be able to demonstrate that they can take at least 5 steps forwards and 5 steps backwards. Let them work out how.

At the end of the exercise, participants should share their experiences and conclusions.

**Ship Game**

Time: 10 to 15 minutes

Objective: This exercise is mostly for fun and may not be entirely nonviolent. However, it encourages participants to find creative ways to communicate and work as a team towards a common goal.

You need at least 8 persons for this game to work, more would be better. Divide the group into two subgroups of 4 or more people each and blindfold all but one person in each group. The person who is not blindfolded is the driver. All 4 people make a queue, the last person is the person without the blindfold. This person, the driver, has to drive the rest of the group by touching the shoulder of the person in front. They are not allowed to talk. This person then has to give the signal to the person in front and so on until everybody knows what to do. If the driver wants to turn left he or she has to touch the left shoulder, if the driver wants to turn right, the right shoulder. The mission is to break the other ship by steering one group into the side of the other group.

During the game you might have to stop to allow the people to invent other instructions that work better, like touching the head as signal to stop, touching the back in order to go faster, or any other instructions they think will help.

**Twister**

Time: 15 minutes

Objective: This exercise encourages participants to find creative ways to communicate and work as a team towards a common goal.

Have the group all stand up, form a circle, close their eyes, and extend their hands to the front. Then have them step towards the centre of the circle until they are able to grasp the hand of someone else without opening their eyes. Once every hand is holding one and only one hand, have them open their eyes and attempt to untangle without speaking until a perfect circle (sometimes more than one) is formed.

Discuss:
Was the team led? By who?
Did anyone hinder the team’s efforts?
What worked or didn’t work?
How were ideas communicated?, and so on…

Moon Explorer (NASA)

Time: 40 minutes or longer

Note: You will need 1 Moon Explorer (NASA) form for each participant, and one answer sheet for the trainer. These forms can be found elsewhere in this nonviolence training program.

Objectives:
To emphasise the superiority (in general) of group decision making over individual decision making.
To explore alternative methods of small group decision making.

Without discussing the objective of the exercise with the group, pass out a Moon Explorer form to each participant. Read the instructions out loud and explain that each person should place their choices in Column A only, with #1 being the most important item to take and #15 being the least important. Give the group 15 minutes to complete this task. Warn the group when they have 5 minutes and 1 minute remaining so they are sure to have a number entered for each item when time is called.

When the 15 minutes are up, have the group form into small groups of 4 or 5 individuals. Instruct the group to now fill in Column B. The entire group must agree on the rankings they devise. Give the small groups 10 minutes to complete this task. Warn them when they have 5 minutes and 1 minute remaining so they are sure to have a number entered for each item when time is called.

When the 10 minutes are up, ask the group some questions to explore how they did their decision making, such as:
Did any group select a facilitator?
Did any group make their selections by voting?
Did certain individuals dominate the discussion?
Did anyone feel that their opinion wasn’t listened to or valued?
Was the result really a consensus decision? And so on…

There is no “right” way for groups to make decisions, however some are more or less efficient, effective, empowering, participatory, democratic, or appropriate in any given situation. This exercise helps us be aware of and understand the choices we make when faced with a problem. The trainer can allow this discussion to continue as long as he or she wishes.

Now give the group the correct answers and instruct them to fill them in the spaces in Column C. These are the answers according to the experts at NASA (the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Agency), so no debate should be allowed at this time.

1. Oxygen. A person will die in minutes without it.
2. Water. A person will die in a 2 or 3 days without it.
3. Maps. Reaching the mother ship will be impossible without them.
4. Food concentrate. This will be necessary to maintain energy for the long journey.
5. FM receiver/transmitter. While the Mother ship can’t come to the rescue, it may be able to send out a team to meet you with supplies.
6. Rope. This can be used for tying on or dragging supplies, or getting up or down a cliff.
7. First aid kit. Illness or injury could prevent you from reaching the mother ship at all.
8. Parachute silk. This could be used for creating shade (the sunny side of the moon is very hot) or bundling supplies.
9. Life raft. Supplies could be placed in this and then dragged, or carried by two or more people.
10. Signal flares. While these won’t burn in the absence of oxygen, a person could jump up and get some propulsion in the moon’s low gravity by firing them.
11. Pistols. As with #10, some propulsion can be obtained by firing these. This force will be less than can be obtained from the flares.
12. Dehydrated milk. This will provide some minimal nutrition, but less than the food concentrate.
13. Heating unit. This is unnecessary on the sunny side of the moon, though its parts might be adapted for some use.
14. Compass. The moon has no magnetic field. Its parts might be adapted for something.
15. Matches. Matches won’t burn in the absence of oxygen.

Have each participant fill in the “Score individual” column by writing the difference, whether higher or lower, between the number in Column A and Column C. For example, if an individual’s ranking for flares in Column A is “5”, the number “5” should be written in the “Score individual” column since the NASA ranking for flares is “10” and the difference is 5. If an individual’s ranking for flares is “15”, the number “5” also should be written in the “Score individual” column since the difference is still 5. Total all the numbers in the “Score individual” column.

Next, have at least one member of each group repeat this process for the differences between Column B and Column C and place the results in the “Score group” column. Inform the group that “40” is the maximum total above which survival is unlikely. The lower the number, the better the chances of survival. Ask for a show of hands on:
- Who’s group score was better (lower) than their individual score?
- Who’s individual score was better (lower) than their group score?
- Who’s individual score and group scores were the same?
- Which individual and which group scored best and worst?

In most, or nearly all cases, group scores will be better than any individual scores. The trainer may take as much time as he or she wishes to discuss:
- The value of collective decision making over individual dictates;
- The implications of this for the work we do;
- Instances when group decision making is not appropriate;
- What decision making processes did the best and worst scoring groups use;
What happened to the opinions of the few individuals that scored better than the group?, and so on…

If the trainer chooses, no discussion is needed at the end of this exercise. The results generally speak for themselves. Small ‘space-type’ prizes or candy can be awarded to the most successful individuals and groups.

**Eiffel Tower**

Time: 5 minutes.

Objective: To emphasise the importance of communication within a group.

Materials: A box with 100 straws and two rolls of adhesive tape.

Separate the participants into two or more groups. The mission of each one is to build the tallest possible tower using only the straws and adhesive tape. The team that builds the tallest tower will be the winner. In one or more groups oral communication will be forbidden and these groups should be watched to make sure that nobody talks. The other groups may talk. Each group will have 5 minutes and at the end the towers will be compared.

In this exercise we can observe that the groups which were forbidden to talk had more difficulty building the tower.

**The Crab Exercise**

Time: 5 minutes

Objective: This exercise is purely for fun and to loosen people up after a talking session or lunch.

Have the group form into back-to-back pairs with elbows linked, then squat down so that their butts are almost touching the floor. Now they should crab-walk around the room trying to knock other pairs off balance. If a butt or hand touches the floor, that pair is out of the game. The last pair with their butts above the floor wins.

**Roleplay exercises**

**Quick Decision Making Roleplay**

Time: 20-25 minutes per situation (very flexible, depending on group size and trainer)

Objectives:
To give participants some experience in potential action situations;
To develop a sense of teamwork among participants;
To explore small group decision making.
Split the participants into groups of 5-10. Give a basic set up (e.g. they are planning an action, sitting in a blockade, marching in coalition with other NGO’s, etc.) Explain that they will have 5 minutes (or more) to make a plan or come up with a solution to a problem. No action co-ordinator, team leader or campaigner is available to tell them what to do.

- Give them a situation. Possible topics include:
- The police announce that your permit is not valid.
- A counter-demonstrator is verbally or physically harassing people.
- Another activist is smoking marijuana.
- Some other demonstrators look and act suspicious.
- Someone starts swearing at authorities.
- A fight breaks out between 2 or more demonstrators.
- The action co-ordinator wants you to do something stupid, dangerous, or harmful to the campaign.
- Someone starts chanting, “Bush Sucks!”
- An activist has been hurt, but is being treated. What about the action? And so on…

At the end of the time period given, discuss what happened:
Did you come up with a good solution? What was it?
What was your decision making process? Did it work? Was everyone included?
Would you do anything different next time?

There are limitless variations to this exercise:
Have different small groups discussing different situations.
Have the groups select an action co-ordinator before giving them the situation.
Have the groups working on one thing and then present the problem. Example: A group engaged in planning a factory gate blockade in one hour is told that it turns out there’s a second gate.
The problem arises from a person within the small group that’s been prepped by the trainer. Example: One of the small group members announces that he or she is underage, which will mean being separated from the group at the jail.

**Action Role-play**

Time: 45 minutes or longer

Objectives: The aim of this section is to give participants an opportunity to practice the skills they have learned during the day in a safe environment. It is also designed to give participants plenty of opportunity to discuss the events.

Note: It’s important that you tailor the role-play to your needs and the groups needs.

Mechanics:
- There should be one team of activists, one team of police, and one team of supporters/demonstrators for each site.
- All activists except those previously briefed should be expected to behave non-violently.
- The police teams should behave as real police should, i.e.: upholding the law impartially.
- The activists should be told that their objective is to remain in place for 20 minutes after the police have arrived. The police should not be aware of this. The activists should not know when the police will arrive.
- The police must negotiate before attempting to remove anyone.
- At any time, activists can choose to leave the action and join the supporters/demonstrators.
- The trainer can stop the action by saying, “Freeze,” if grossly inappropriate behaviour takes place and explain why, or just to allow participants to catch their breath and re-assume their roles’ proper demeanour.
- Individual team members from both activists and security are to act inappropriately. They should be briefed by the trainer privately. Their behaviour might include loud, aggressive behaviour, flailing body movement, panic, etc. The rest of the teams should not be forewarned of this. The idea is that members of the group should recognise that this behaviour is inappropriate and try to alter it. To encourage the other members of the team to note the inappropriate behaviour and attempt to modify it themselves, it is best if these “problem people” are not situated next to a team leader.

Trainer/s should be observing the overall structure of the action, what worked and what didn’t, as well as the participants’ behaviour.

Logistical concerns:
- Whenever possible, teams should be made up of people from different groups, so that the risk of clique building is reduced.
- If necessary, notify the local (real) police beforehand of the planned activity.
- Check that the locations you choose for the afternoons simulations are suitable and permission has been obtained if necessary.
- Prior to the action, team leaders may be briefed privately to discuss such points as the start and end of the action, and who calls the end of the action.
- People should be divided into teams of between 6 and 8 people. You will need one action site for each group of teams. Below are some suggested sites and scenarios.

Suggested types of sites:

Place: Gateway to a field, a rural environment.
Scenario: the activists are trying to block the entrance to a field of genetically modified soya so that the farmer cannot get in to harvest it.

Place: Entrance to a building, an urban environment.
Scenario: the activists are trying to stop the entrance of employees at a supermarket selling genetically engineered foods.

Place: Factory gates, an industrial environment.
Scenario: the activists are trying to block the gates to stop the entrance of lorries carrying genetically engineered soya.

Divide your group into activists, police/security, and supporters/demonstrators. You may also include roles such as: media, workers, managers, anxious parents, etc. Give
them the scenario. For example: protestors have already gained access to the construction area, but they want to get to certain piece of equipment. The police have to stop the activists without necessarily knowing where they are headed. Make the following points clear: cameras are on you at all times; the more people that get to the piece of equipment the better, but even one would be a success. So if you can’t get to the equipment, try to occupy as many of the police as you can to enable others to get there.

Ask the participants to consciously try out all the techniques of nonviolent action that they have been practising. End the roleplay when some have reached the objective or when the whole thing degenerates into a melee. The trainer/s should not interfere but if they see any activist behaving in ways they do not consider to be nonviolent, they should take note and comment afterwards.

Discussion and round-up:
It is very important to leave enough time for discussion and questions, particularly if the trainer/s noted anyone behaving “non nonviolently”. The trainer/s should explain their reasons and the person or group should discuss whether they think the trainer/s are right. Remember that this is not about judging the activist or trainer/s right or wrong - there are many grey areas in non-violence practice, and we each have to work out our perceptions and limits. Also ask if the group noticed anything activists did or didn’t do during the role play. Often people focus on the action goal and don’t look out for their team. Team awareness can be crucial to the success of any action and the safety of the participants and is important to emphasise.

Notes
Livermore Conversion Project
nonviolence guidelines
from brochure of livermore conversion project
as participants, we agree to abide by the following nonviolent discipline in all our actions.

* we will harbor no anger but suffer the anger of the opponent (1).
* we will refuse to return the assault of the opponent.
* we will refrain from insults and inappropriate language.
* we will protect opponents from insult or attack.
* if arrested, we will not resist. we will not go limp.
* if arrested, we will behave in an exemplary manner.
* we will not evade the legal consequences of our actions.
* our attitude as conveyed through words, symbols and actions will be one of openness, friendliness and respect toward all other people we encounter including livermore nuclear weapons laboratory security officers and workers.
* we will not damage any property.
* we will not bring or use any drugs or alcohol.
* we will not run or use any threatening motions.
* we will carry no weapons.
Legal Supplement to the Nonviolence Training Program

It is important that activists contemplating direct action have an understanding of all the possible consequences of their decision, and how to cope with them. Prior to engaging in actions in general and before each particular action, activists should receive thorough training in dealing with the legal system. Such training is beyond the scope of this nonviolence training program. Also, the particulars of a legal training must be adapted to the local conditions, laws, practices, and justice system. Nevertheless, some basic information is provided here.

An adequate legal training should include information on:

- The “voluntary” nature of Greenpeace actions;
- Greenpeace’s commitment to supporting activists;
- Arrest, booking, arraignment, detention time limits, and bail;
- Police interrogations and interviews;
- Local jail conditions and practices;
- Jail solidarity tactics;
- Local and international criminal rights;
- Common defences for the crimes activists are often charged with;
- Coping with incarceration.

Also, before each action legal briefings for activists should include:

- Anticipated and possible charges, and the consequences of each;
- Previous relevant experiences;
- Jail solidarity agreements, if any;
- Discussion of what to say or not to the police;
- Special rights or consequences for foreign nationals;
- Attorney and other support available.

Attached to this legal supplement are 2 documents that may be of use to the prospective activist:

Jail Solidarity
Serving Time in Jail

Further information is available on the Greenpeace internal Legal website.
Jail Solidarity
From “Handbook for Nonviolent Action (War Resisters League)"

Jail solidarity may be defined as complete unity of purpose of those incarcerated or imprisoned. The ultimate objective of that unity is for everyone committing the same act to be treated equally and fairly in jail and sentencing. Refusing citations, bail, fines, community service or probation keeps us together as a community with the potential for collective bargaining to meet that objective.

For jail solidarity to be most effective, the issues surrounding it must be addressed and resolved to the greatest extent possible before reaching jail. Jail authorities are not going to patiently wait for us to reach consensus on solidarity agreements before they start employing “divide and conquer” tactics to weaken our bargaining power.

One divisive tactic used by the prison/legal system is different treatment for certain individuals or groups. These people risking harsher treatment usually include noncooperators, repeat offenders, known organizers, people of color, lesbians and gay men. Discussions of solidarity should always include the issue of how to give these people the extra protection they need.

Coming to agreements about solidarity goals and tactics is a powerful but difficult process. To reach true solidarity with the greatest number of participants, people must have enough information and time to make wise decisions. Solidarity tactics that are employed successfully are empowering. Ill-considered, unfocused uses of solidarity tactics are less successful and drain our energies.

Some of the issues that cause the most controversy around solidarity include interpretation of the nonviolence guidelines, and under what circumstances, if any, we will keep solidarity with those who have previous records, are on probation or have not followed the nonviolence guidelines for that action.

People’s motivations for participating in civil disobedience will affect their attitudes toward the police and jail guards. Some people are motivated to civil disobedience as a protest against the multiple structures in society which work together to create a weapons industry. The prison/judicial system is seen as one of these structures.

The effect of this political viewpoint on behaviour in jail can be very dramatic. Often people refuse to cooperate with the authorities at all. Some ways they do this are by going limp during arrest, not abiding by prison regulations, and refusing to participate in arraignment. Some of these acts serve personal moral goals; others are initiated as levers to make the legal system mete out equal and fair sentences to all.

Another group may reflect a different set of motivations and approaches. For some people for example, their fundamental reason for civil disobedience stems from an awareness of the destructive power of nuclear weaponry. Their fear and outrage over these weapons may be their only motivation to do civil disobedience. Often these people will stress more of the need to communicate with the human beings behind the helmets, uniforms and roles. They will talk to the police, perhaps befriend the prison guards,
and try to use persuasion and dialogue to raise questions about the roles. The differences between these two approaches will frequently lead to conflict. The stress of the jail experience tends to intensify conflict but by discussing differences beforehand their effect on jail solidarity can be minimized. Conflicts that arise in jail must be acknowledged and dealt with at the time or they may become divisive. Conflict is an expression of opposing viewpoints and should not be confused with violence.

Often it is not possible for everyone to agree to stay in jail for solidarity purposes. Sometimes there are people who question the need to struggle inside the jails when the action’s primary goal is something else. Some people, because of outside responsibilities, cannot afford the time jail solidarity may demand. Others find jail conditions physically or emotionally intolerable. And still others take the political stand that we’re more effective back on the streets encouraging other people to take a stand. Whatever the reasons for not participating in jail solidarity, individuals should make this information known beforehand since it may affect decisions of the group.

Those who must leave jail are not betraying the group, there are many ways they can continue supporting those inside: by speaking to the media, to the movement and to the public about conditions inside, by fulfilling responsibilities for those inside, carrying messages to family, friends, and employers.

Jail solidarity must never become coercive. In jail, solidarity is our strength and the strength of our solidarity comes from the free agreement of all who take part in it.

**Serving Time in Jail** 

Any act of civil disobedience implies the willingness to risk jail for one's convictions. For those who land there as a consequence of conscious decisions, jail can present an opportunity for testing and strengthening spiritual and political convictions. Though it should not be courted imprudently, it is something that must be faced and can certainly be endured. Those arrested as a result of civil disobedience have the advantage over most prisoners of knowing that they are there having made a conscious choice. That knowledge can make the difference between what is otherwise a thoroughly miserable situation and a larger possibility for reflection and education. What is more, it can provide you, when the time comes, with a reserve of strength of which you were previously unaware.

Being in jail can give a rounded picture of the militaristic, oppressive society against which we struggle in our nonviolent resistance. It is an education in the underside of justice. In state prisons throughout the country (United States) most of the people who are locked up are people of colour. The vast majority is poor, in jail for poverty-related crimes, or awaiting (and waiting and waiting) trial because they cannot afford bail. Jail is a lonely place. It aims to weaken solidarity, to try to isolate people from one another and reduce one's concentration to dealing with the demands of authority and of one's survival. However, no one in jail for affirming her or his conscience is ever alone. Remember that and you should have no trouble getting by.
What exactly can you expect? Jails differ as to particular conditions, regulations and privileges allowed. Yet, jails are enough alike that it is possible to make some rough generalisations. Entering prison is like going into another culture — new behaviour norms, language, symbols, new reality. Go slow, and use common sense. To quote someone who served a year in Rhode Island's Adult Correctional Institute, "It took me six months to figure out what was really going on in prison. And I am not such a slow learner. So, be humble and be quiet, and listen and learn".

"You can expect overcrowding, which means frustrating and irritating levels of noise and distraction, little personal space or privacy, and scant regard for cleanliness. You must exercise patience, consideration and discipline to preserve peace and sanity. It will be difficult to sleep, there will be blaring radios and TVs, slamming bars, and loud arguments, which may make you irritable and short-tempered. Learn to watch for this in others and try to respect their need for space. Time will be distorted: days will slip by but each hour will seem like an eternity. Food will be starchy and dull (don't expect vegetarian menus). You will learn to wait, for a phone call, a shower, a meal, the answer to a question, the time of day.

You may be issued a uniform. In that case, your clothes will be confiscated along with all your other belongings. You can expect a complete strip search, possibly including rectal and vaginal examination for contraband, which will be the first of many other casual assaults on your dignity.

The guards have a great deal of power and they are aware of this. And because they are human beings, this knowledge tends to have a bad effect on them. Long exposure to jail, whether as a prisoner or a guard, tends to have a corrosive effect on one's confidence in human nature and goodness, and the guards are victims of this as well. They expect the worst out of people, and, not surprisingly, they are not often disappointed. Their principal concern is to preserve order, which demands an atmosphere of unquestioning respect (fear) for authority. This is their contribution to the process of "rehabilitation," supplanting personal responsibility with thoughtless obedience and submission. You should try not to indulge them in their exalted self-image. Keep expecting that they should act with respect and compassion and you may be surprised by the results. Perhaps you will surprise them into remembering that they and the prisoners in their charge share a common humanity. At least you may establish a basis for dialogue. But at the same time that you recall the humanity of your guards don't forget that, in the end, you and they have different jobs to perform. Let them be responsible for keeping order. You are responsible for keeping your conscience.

Just because your body is detained doesn't mean you've got to turn in your conscience and convictions along with your other belongings. Whether in jail or on the "outside", the freedom we enjoy is always the freedom we claim for ourselves. Being under lock and key does not deprive you of your essential freedom as long as you continue to insist on your power to say "yes" or "no" within the limits of whatever situation you find yourself. It was your commitment to make decisions for yourself about what you should and shouldn't do that landed you in jail in the first place, and it remains a good principle to live by, even in jail.
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The following is a list of observations and suggestions from people who have served time:

• Pay attention to how the other women/men are doing. Don't feed into others' bad vibes.
• You'll make good friends but do set limits. Know what your needs are.
• Keep your mouth shut and listen. Things are not often what they appear.
• Keep a realistic viewpoint. Pay attention to your needs, but remember that you are there for a short time and most of the others are there much longer.
• Don't proselytise. Be clear and be proud but don't hit people over the head with your story and beliefs.
• Don't talk more than you have to with the guards; the other inmates will not trust you. If you are in prison for a long time you'll be able to figure out which guards you can trust.
• Bring in some cigarettes to share with others even if you don't smoke. Bring a few books, pens, paper, envelopes and stamps. The worst that can happen is you won't get them or they'll get lost.
• Be patient; hurry up and wait is often the prison time frame for no apparent reason.
• It is alright to be afraid, lonely, and unhappy. It is also alright to feel wonderful, happy and proud.

Serving Time in Jail

Any act of civil disobedience implies the willingness to risk jail for one's convictions. For those who land there as a consequence of conscious decisions, jail can present an opportunity for testing and strengthening spiritual and political convictions. Though it should not be courted imprudently, it is something that must be faced and can certainly be endured. Those arrested as a result of civil disobedience have the advantage over most prisoners of knowing that they are there having made a conscious choice. That knowledge can make the difference between what is otherwise a thoroughly miserable situation and a larger possibility for reflection and education. What is more, it can provide you, when the time comes, with a reserve of strength of which you were previously unaware.

Being in jail can give a rounded picture of the militaristic, oppressive society against which we struggle in our nonviolent resistance. It is an education in the underside of justice. In state prisons throughout the country (United States) most of the people who are locked up are people of colour. The vast majority is poor, in jail for poverty-related crimes, or awaiting (and waiting and waiting) trial because they cannot afford bail. Jail is a lonely place. It aims to weaken solidarity, to try to isolate people from one another and reduce one's concentration to dealing with the demands of authority and of one's survival. However, no one in jail for affirming her or his conscience is ever alone. Remember that and you should have no trouble getting by.

What exactly can you expect? Jails differ as to particular conditions, regulations and privileges allowed. Yet, jails are enough alike that it is possible to make some rough generalisations. Entering prison is like going into another culture — new behaviour norms, language, symbols, new reality. Go slow, and use common sense. To quote someone who served a year in Rhode Island's Adult Correctional Institute, "It took me
six months to figure out what was really going on in prison. And I am not such a slow learner. So, be humble and be quiet, and listen and learn”.

"You can expect overcrowding, which means frustrating and irritating levels of noise and distraction, little personal space or privacy, and scant regard for cleanliness. You must exercise patience, consideration and discipline to preserve peace and sanity. It will be difficult to sleep, there will be blaring radios and TVs, slamming bars, and loud arguments, which may make you irritable and short-tempered. Learn to watch for this in others and try to respect their need for space. Time will be distorted: days will slip by but each hour will seem like an eternity. Food will be starchy and dull (don't expect vegetarian menus). You will learn to wait, for a phone call, a shower, a meal, the answer to a question, the time of day.

You may be issued a uniform. In that case, your clothes will be confiscated along with all your other belongings. You can expect a complete strip search, possibly including rectal and vaginal examination for contraband, which will be the first of many other casual assaults on your dignity.

The guards have a great deal of power and they are aware of this. And because they are human beings, this knowledge tends to have a bad effect on them. Long exposure to jail, whether as a prisoner or a guard, tends to have a corrosive effect on one's confidence in human nature and goodness, and the guards are victims of this as well. They expect the worst out of people, and, not surprisingly, they are not often disappointed. Their principal concern is to preserve order, which demands an atmosphere of unquestioning respect (fear) for authority. This is their contribution to the process of "rehabilitation," supplanting personal responsibility with thoughtless obedience and submission. You should try not to indulge them in their exalted self-image. Keep expecting that they should act with respect and compassion and you may be surprised by the results. Perhaps you will surprise them into remembering that they and the prisoners in their charge share a common humanity. At least you may establish a basis for dialogue. But at the same time that you recall the humanity of your guards don't forget that, in the end, you and they have different jobs to perform. Let them be responsible for keeping order. You are responsible for keeping your conscience.

Just because your body is detained doesn't mean you've got to turn in your conscience and convictions along with your other belongings. Whether in jail or on the "outside", the freedom we enjoy is always the freedom we claim for ourselves. Being under lock and key does not deprive you of your essential freedom as long as you continue to insist on your power to say "yes" or "no" within the limits of whatever situation you find yourself. It was your commitment to make decisions for yourself about what you should and shouldn't do that landed you in jail in the first place, and it remains a good principle to live by, even in jail.

The following is a list of observations and suggestions from people who have served time:
• Pay attention to how the other women/men are doing. Don't feed into others' bad vibes.
• You'll make good friends but do set limits. Know what your needs are.
• Keep your mouth shut and listen. Things are not often what they appear.
• Keep a realistic viewpoint. Pay attention to your needs, but remember that you are there for a short time and most of the others are there much longer.
• Don't proselytise. Be clear and be proud but don't hit people over the head with your story and beliefs.
• Don't talk more than you have to with the guards; the other inmates will not trust you. If you are in prison for a long time you'll be able to figure out which guards you can trust.
• Bring in some cigarettes to share with others even if you don't smoke. Bring a few books, pens, paper, envelopes and stamps. The worst that can happen is you won't get them or they'll get lost.
• Be patient; hurry up and wait is often the prison time frame for no apparent reason.
• It is alright to be afraid, lonely, and unhappy. It is also alright to feel wonderful, happy and proud.
MOON EXPLORER EXERCISE (NASA)

Your group is the crew of an earth/moon shuttle originally scheduled to meet with a mother ship on the lighted surface of the Moon. Because of mechanical difficulties, your shuttle crash landed some 200 miles from the mother ship. The mother ship does not have the fuel to come pick your crew up.

During landing much of the equipment on board your craft was damaged—only the 15 items listed below are available. Your survival depends on reaching the mother ship, and you must choose the most crucial items to help you on the 200 mile trip by foot.

In Column A (your Individual choice) place the number 1 by the most important item—the one you absolutely must take; place the number 2 by the second most necessary, and so on through 15, the least important. You must number every item. Good luck and keep going!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Box of matches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food concentrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 feet of nylon rope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parachute silk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable heating unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two .45 caliber pistols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One case dehydrated milk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two 100-lb. tanks of oxygen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star maps, as seen from moon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life raft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetic compass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five gallons of water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal flares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aid kit with injection needles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar-powered FM receiver/transmitter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:**
MOON EXPLORER EXERCISE (NASA)

Your group is the crew of an earth/moon shuttle originally scheduled to meet with a mother ship on the lighted surface of the Moon. Because of mechanical difficulties, your shuttle crash landed some 200 miles from the mother ship. The mother ship does not have the fuel to come pick your crew up.

During landing much of the equipment on board your craft was damaged—only the 15 items listed below are available. Your survival depends on reaching the mother ship, and you must choose the most crucial items to help you on the 200 mile trip by foot.

In Column A (your Individual choice) place the number 1 by the most important item—the one you absolutely must take; place the number 2 by the second most necessary, and so on through 15, the least important. You must number every item. Good luck and keep going!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Box of matches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food concentrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 feet of nylon rope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parachute silk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable heating unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two .45 caliber pistols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One case dehydrated milk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two 100-lb. tanks of oxygen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star maps, as seen from moon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life raft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetic compass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five gallons of water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal flares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First aid kit with injection needles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar-powered FM receiver/transmitter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:**
Moon Explorer Answer Key

**Box of matches** 15
Virtually worthless -- there's no oxygen on the moon to sustain combustion.

**Food concentrate** 4
Efficient means of supplying energy requirements. Man can live well over a week without food.

**50 feet of nylon rope** 6
Will prove useful for carrying and climbing over rocky, rough terrain, and for tying gear or injured.

**Parachute silk** 8
Will prove useful for wrapping and carrying items, and for protection from the sun's rays.

**Portable heating unit** 13
Not needed since the light side of the moon is extremely hot.

**Two .45 caliber pistols** 11
Possible means of self-propulsion, but may not be needed or very effective.

**One case dehydrated milk** 12
Bulkier duplication of food concentrate. Water is needed to reconstitute and there's not enough to spare.

**Two 100 lb. tanks of oxygen** 1
Most pressing survival need (weight is not a factor since gravity is 1/6 of the Earth's -- each tank would weigh about 17 lbs. on the moon).

**Star maps, as seen from moon** 3
Primary means of navigation - star patterns appear essentially identical on the moon as on Earth.

**Life raft** 9
Could be used for carrying and/or for shelter from the sun. CO2 bottle in raft may be used for propulsion.
**Magnetic compass** 14
The magnetic field on the moon is not polarized, so it's worthless for navigation.

**5 gallons of water** 2
Needed for replacement of tremendous liquid loss on the moon's light side.

**Signal flares** 10
Won't work properly because there is no oxygen. May use as a poor distress signal when the mother ship is sighted.

**First aid kit containing injection needles** 7
The first aid kit could be needed. Needles connected to vials of vitamins, medicines, etc. will fit special aperture in NASA space suit.

**Solar-powered FM receiver-transmitter** 5
Can be used to communicate with the mother ship, but FM requires line-of-sight transmission and can only be used over short ranges.