The rich scholarship on nonviolence has had no distinct and consistent repository. This has hampered the evolution of nonviolence as an academic field of inquiry, making it easier for opponents of nonviolent action to marginalize and attack its various conceptual manifestations. And equally, it has made it easier for supporters of nonviolence to view it somewhat credulously. Perhaps this is understandable in that nonviolent action is a powerful tool; whether it is used to bring about social change, as a tool for liberation, to protect existing social institutions from outside aggression, or as a way of life. Scholars will surely find this enormous field ripe for investigation, and this will in turn make nonviolent action a more socially recognized and viable alternative in conflict situations.

The International Journal of Nonviolence should substantially contribute to the recognition of nonviolence as an intellectually distinct and academically valuable division of human inquiry.

My colleagues and I in the Peace and Conflict Resolution Studies Program here at American University join in supporting this important endeavor.
Introduction

The International Journal of Nonviolence was created to provide a forum in which theorists, activists and academics can explore and focus on nonviolence. Significantly unique and rapidly expanding, the field of nonviolence currently stands somewhat undefined as many of the important writings in the field have been subsumed within the scholarly books and journals of other academic disciplines (anthropology, linguistics, philosophy, political science, psychology, etc.). By bringing together those interested in the many different aspects of nonviolence, the field will become stronger and more defined as a ready tool of reference for those who use nonviolent action techniques in international conflicts, as well as those who believe that nonviolence is a viable alternative to armed conflict.

Our aim, then, is to coalesce future treatments of nonviolence in a single on-going series of volumes which activists and theorists alike can consult as a reference. The International Journal of Nonviolence, then, is an attempt to systematically provide a convenient and accessible outlet for academic articles concerning the various aspects of the field as it evolves.

Each issue of the journal will focus on one theme central to a conception of nonviolence. This issue is devoted to the theme of the power and resistance of nonviolence. The power of nonviolence is explored as an alternative to the power of violence from the unique perspectives of academics from diverse cultures and political situations. Through their inquiry, nonviolence emerges as a powerful, yet developing, tool for resistance and social change.

Theorists, activists and academics have all played key roles in the evolution of nonviolence, and have developed its current characteristics. A brief examination of some of their
many thoughts about nonviolence, born of their own unique experiences, exposes the many facets of the field, and should provide us with a good point of departure for the examinations which follow.

**NONVIOLENCE: Working Definitions**

Paul Hubers

Nonviolence is one of many approaches to creating peace both locally and globally. It is tough yet rewarding work. On the one hand, an overview of the literature indicates that much of the primary experience of nonviolence came to us as refined through the Gandhian struggle against the English Empire. During the Salt Marches to expel the English from India, Indian nonviolence leaders (e.g., Mohandas and Kasturbai Gandhi, and Sarojini Naidu), painfully conquered violence, that of hunger and poverty enforced by military might, with a word they coined from the Jains in Gujarati Hindi.¹

Instead of related English words for general or specific "love," which they found unsuitable, they chose the Gujarati Hindi word *ahimsa* to mean nonviolence. For them, nonviolence fundamentally represented the nonviolent power used to effect mutual change for mutual benefit and responsibility. From then on, after such struggles to overcome Colonialism and Neo-Colonialism, dictionaries for many of the world's languages began to present the word nonviolence as a recognized word.²

On the other hand, we will need to define nonviolence in ways meaningful for the current military "superpower" nation state, i.e., the U.S. with its "Gibraltar" in Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, and its global military taproots stemming from the Caribbean and stretching around the globe. Still, there are nonviolent trends of change in the air.

Toh Swee-Hin and Virginia Floresca-Cawagas

People Power, or the power of Philippine nonviolence is a...

... spontaneous solidarity of hundreds of thousands of human beings, ... when women, youths, men, nuns, priests, lay citizens and even children exhorted, with prayers, songs, tears and words of reconciliation, their brother Filipinos in the armed forces to choose nonviolent resolution....³

Theodore Herman⁴

Some follow a more concise, internationally-oriented definition, in order to explore the range and varieties of nonviolence and then conceptualize practical nonviolence. To begin with, words like love, peace, war, and so forth, can contrast a nonviolent approach with other approaches to peace and war. Nonviolence flows from theory or attitude through a course of action to resist and overcome tyranny and injustice by means other than violence - i.e., to build and rebuild a caring community through the reconciliation of adversaries - simultaneously reweaving personal and environmental contexts in peaceful ways.

Whether constructive or confrontational, the inventions of nonviolence are better ideas, means, and ends for a more peaceful world - for power to effect mutual change and benefit - not a passive compromise (or passive resistance) regarding a tyrannical regime or an unforgiving authority. Organizing strikes and boycotts against injustice may even overthrow tyrannical governments, if these efforts convince those with violent - versus nonviolent - power, of an irresistible necessity for mutual change for mutual benefit and responsibility. In other words, mutual respect and commitment both work as options needed for change when they resolve violence with nonviolent power.⁵
George Lakey

Some turn nonviolence directly toward action, community and societal coalition-building, where an astonishing variety of groups and individual activists around the world resort to nonviolence training - so as to increase the chances of accomplishing their goals. By training we mean enabling struggle for mobilizing social change movements, the social defense of communities and institutions, and third party intervention in conflicts - all of which use knowledge of where the other players "are coming from" - in context.7

Gene Sharp

Some turn nonviolence toward basic, theoretical conceptualization, where:

... nonviolent action ... [means to ] ... conduct the conflict by doing - or refusing to do - certain things without using physical violence....9

Such academic structure-building may also offer cultural variants of analysis into discourse and folkways.

Mubarak Awad

Some turn nonviolence toward nation building, as in the Intifada, where the image of shaking off the dirt from one's sandals represents the hope for Israeli and Palestinian statehood.

Creuza Rosa Maciel

Some turn nonviolence to challenge structural violence as experienced in Africa and Latin America. From the world's second largest "Black" state demographically (second only to Nigeria), Creuza Rosa Maciel underscores the ethical tension in opposing the values of violence, where nonviolence means the values, the "... solidarity, the formation and [the] motivation of grass-roots groups across ..." the Americas. In other words:

... We believe that when a people embark upon the path of liberation against economic and social inequalities they are defeating the causes that make violence possible .... The central element is to assume the conflict and from there learn ways towards its resolution ....10

Te Whiti

Some turn nonviolence to struggle against ocean nuclear bomb testing in the Pacific, as rooted in Maori nonviolence - where conscious nonviolence motivates a struggle to change the laws and customs of others. As Te Whiti put it in a 19th Century land and power struggle:

... Lay down your weapons. Be Wise... Go, put your hands to the plough. Look not back. If any come with guns and swords, be not afraid. If they smite you, smite not in return. If they rend you, be not discouraged. Another will take up the good work.... Have no fear....11
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How to Do (Revolutionary) Things with Words

by Deborah L. Wheeler

This essay is part of a larger work which argues that revolutions do not have to be the result of violent, sudden breaks with the past whereby state power is captured by the opposition and used to transform political and social life. Through subversions of discourse and symbols, images and identities, processes of transformation emerge in several notable situations of revolutionary struggle. This essay examines three: the Women's movement, the Chinese pro-Democracy movement, and the Palestinian Intifada. In all three of these cases, discursive and symbolic nonviolent resistance strives to redefine communities of struggle and oppressor-oppressed relations. These three cases are not treated exhaustively, but rather, generally, to provide some provisional ideas about concrete paths toward nonviolent revolution.

Generally, we as social scientists lack the theoretical frameworks to give more subtle examples of political struggle coherent meaning and relevance for the enterprise of building an understanding of revolution.1 Certain social scientists have analyzed and explained the power of discourse and semiotics in the realm of politics.2 Much more central to these analyses, however (especially in the work of Bourdieu and Foucault), is a desire to understand the "social ordering" capacity of these media of communication as tools of the state, rather than discourse's transformative powers as tools of nonviolent revolution. Although some, like Foucault, recognize that where there is power there is resistance, the emphasis nevertheless, is tilted towards the power side of the equation. Even in those cases where discourse is analyzed as a mode of resistance, as in the work of James Scott and Barbara Harlow, it is analyzed as a "hidden transcript" (Scott), or as a tool for mobilizing the community of resistance itself (Harlow).3 In the former case, words jotted down in protest behind
closed doors give proof of an oppositional mentality which lurks behind oppressive relations, in the minds of the supposedly "controlled". In the latter, discourse is not a tool directed at the minds of the opponent, but rather at those of the oppressed, which means that only one edge of a two-edged sword is being utilized. In both of these cases, the revolutionary potential of discourse as a mode of struggle against an oppressor is ignored. This oversight can be remedied by applying the revolutionary teachings of the events of 1968 to uncommon struggles for change like the Women's movement, the pro-Democracy movement in China, and the Palestinian Intifada; in other words, by integrating alternative revolutionary theory with alternative revolutionary practice. The result is an image of change which is less reliant upon violence and radical state subversions, and more dependent upon subtle but significant alterations in perceptions, attitudes and actions.

Revolution in the Shadow of 1968

Compelled by the failure of "Marxist" revolution in 1968, scholars and activists alike have been searching for alternative ways of understanding political struggle and transformation. "In 1968" Terry Eagleton observes, "the student movement had swept across Europe, striking against the authoritarianism of the educational institutions and in France briefly threatened the capitalist state itself. For a dramatic moment, the state teetered on the brink of ruin." Unfortunately for the euphoric student/worker coalition, the state proved too "powerful" for their opposition. The failure of the "revolution" of '68 to overthrow the French state nevertheless stimulated a kind of revolutionary thinking in scholarship and in the politics of everyday life. For example, Eagleton observes that scholars and activists "unable to break the structures of state power, [nevertheless] found it possible instead to subvert the structures of language." All subsequent efforts to transform the structures of society as a whole were met with suspicion and contempt, for totalizing theories like Marxism proved inadequate for engendering the revolution they promised. Thus efforts to paralyze and transform a state and the whole of society are replaced by struggle of a local, diffused and strategic kind. With this withering away of traditional (Marxist) images of revolution comes an open field for replanting theories of power and transformation.

Many scholars, from literary critics to sociologists recognize and theorize about a new kind of politics inspired by '68. Built into these analyses is the notion that "there are no hegemonies so absolute or systems of control so strict that they are not vulnerable to disturbance." In more conventional revolutionary theory, the tools used to "disturb" the system are assumed to be mass-based, violent class struggle directed at a centralized state. But scholars inspired by the events of 1968 argue that nonviolent linguistic and semiotic resistance can shake-up existing conditions by changing the ways people think. These more post-modern/language dependent approaches to revolution, however, argue that given most systems' power to recuperate from disturbances, even of a violent kind, revolutionary changes are not likely to be radical, universal, or immediate. Rather, they are likely to result from changes local and scattered within the body of society and the minds and practices of its citizens.11

Postmodern approaches to revolution rely upon the notion that "representations can create the substance they supposedly reflect." By emphasizing the power of language and symbol, these approaches suggest that constructions of meaning have political implications not only for scholarship, but for the very practice of revolutionary transformation. The media, and other fields of cultural production like scholarship, are assumed to be so powerful in influencing thought and action, that distinctions between "the real" and "the constructed" break down. As stated by one analyst, "the power of the media means that the real no longer exists. Images or simulacra determine what 'is' as a constantly circulating play of representations." It is in this constantly circulating current of "reality" and "reality construction" that Palestinians and other marginalized revolutionaries such as women, youths, blacks, gays, ecofeminists, peace activists, environmentalists, etc...find room for political and cultural maneuver. By playing with the distinction between reality and fiction, these revolutionaries make their mark on history.
Doing Revolutionary Things with Words: Lessons from History

My current research, of which this is a brief representation, strives to redirect academic attentions to the transformative capacities of word games and symbolic exchanges as tools of nonviolent revolution. The strategic purpose of any revolutionary movement is to violate and "shake up" the status quo as a step towards transforming relations that are oppressive. Although "violence" is a component in many definitions of revolution, it is quite possible that revolutionaries will be unable or unwilling to use violence to encourage this destabilizing process. As this analysis suggests, there are other, more subtle ways of challenging the status quo.

Women

An excellent example of a largely nonviolent revolution is the decision of women to "liberate" themselves from andro-centric state and society by using various discursive and symbolic methods for challenging existing norms. Some women lit bonfires of brassieres to signify an end to what confined them. Others redefined "women's work," by pursuing careers outside of the home. Some female intellectuals created feminist theory/women's studies to bring women's issues into academic communities, thus transforming epistemology, methodology, and the subjects of research. Many women transformed norms of "femininity" by cutting their hair, wearing different clothes and engaging in alternative sexual/familial practices. Feminist resistance also subverted linguistic practices, making unacceptable the use of certain phrases which dehumanize women: "chick", "fox", "girl", "he", "man", "honey", "(dumb) broad", "lazy Susan". Through these discursive and symbolic acts, women struggle(d) to transform gender based oppression by re-presenting themselves as empowered and altered, thus reaffirming control over their own lives. The implications of this struggle have touched each of our lives in fundamental ways, through the kinds of relationships we have with our spouses or significant others, the ways we raise (or don't raise) our children, the kinds or programs we watch on television, the people who are running our country, the language we use, etc....

Do these local and scattered transformations achieved through discursive and semiotic struggle constitute revolution? The answer depends upon your understanding of the term. If you restrict the meaning of "revolution" to taking over a state and/or transforming the class structure of society, then the Women's movement is not a revolution. But if you consider revolution the transformation in customs, norms, culture, society and politics in an eclectic and acephalous manner, then women have made revolution in ways more pervasive and complete than the French, Russian or the Chinese "revolutions".

Chinese Youths

In the same spirit of women attempting to gain control over their own lives, Chinese students in the Spring of 1989 demanded democratic freedoms from an impressive state. By symbolically subverting the authoritarianism of their government through big and little character posters, poems, underground press, hunger strikes, etc.... Chinese society questioned the legitimacy of a system that claims to be representative of the people, but remains unwilling to change in light of popular protest. Through their "cries for democracy" these students, in coalition with "the people", asserted that "all of a state's power belongs to the people, and the power of the ruling party and the government is not intrinsic, but flows from the people."16 Discursive and semiotic challenges revealed the contingency of state power and set a revolutionary agenda for the future. One protest leader, Chai Ling, led 3,000 hunger strikers at the center of Tiananmen Square with her powerful rhetoric and fed the fires of nonviolent revolution.17

In June of 1989 when tanks of the Chinese armed forces crushed alive students armed only with their militant words, and mowed down peaceful protesters with machine-gun fire and beatings, the world watched with horror. Two covers of Time magazine were devoted to the pro-Democracy movement and the subsequent brutalities of a seemingly illegitimate regime. Such unconscionable acts of counter-revolution threatened China's Most Favored Nation (MFN) status with the U.S., adding insult to injury.
When the students spoke up, the world took notice, and the seeds of a power challenge were planted within the Chinese ruling establishment. Although the perpetrators of the disturbances associated with the pro-Democracy movement were hunted down and severely punished by the regime, or forced to leave the country, their discursive and semiotic activity record the revolutionary desires of succeeding generations. It is only a matter of time until their silenced voices are heard once again stating, "Those who lose the hearts of the people lose the kingdom".18 Until then, we are left with the images they created; of popular cries for democratization, and brutal repression; of a state which resembles a "donkey". In the words of one student activist:

The government is in fact a type of donkey...The only alternative we have is to train it with a carrot and a big stick! The "carrot" is the support of the people; the "stick" is the resistance and protest of the people.19

While scholars are uncertain about what concrete results the pro-Democracy movement attained, beyond a symbolic demonstration of what the next China might look like, few people doubt that the actions at Tiananmen Square and throughout China destabilized the political system. The Goddess of Democracy hastily erected "on the great axis, heavy with symbolism...that extended from the main entrance of the Forbidden City...through the Monument to the People's Heroes," professed the emergence of a new era in Chinese politics.20 Like most symbols of struggle associated with the Democracy movement, the statue itself proved ephemeral. It only stood a week until it was declared an illegal permanent structure by the state and dismantled. But the meaning of the statue as a symbol of dying state autocracy and the dawning of democracy lives on. Will the changes, local and scattered, which resulted mostly in the minds of the Chinese people add up to revolution? From one perspective, the revolutionary process was already set in motion by the discursive and symbolic events of 1989. From another, only time will tell, with actual changes in leadership and democratic practice being the only true indicators of revolutionary transformation.

**Occupied Palestine**

Most of my current research focuses upon the uses of discursive and symbolic resistance during the Palestinian Intifada which began in December of 1987. Through discursive and semiotic fabrications of alternative realities, Palestinians attempt(ed) to transform relations between themselves and Israelis, not only on paper, but in the practice of everyday life. The effort bore fruit. In terms of Palestinian self-images, as revealed by much of the resistance literature inspired by the Intifada, the lone guerrilla fighter has been replaced by *atfal-hajarah* - children of the stone. Whereas poetry of the 1960s and 70s glorified the freedom fighter, the new Palestinian heroes of the Intifada were children armed only with David's stone:

...Against the exhausted and hating soldiers
A child barricades himself...
A child rebelled and celebrated
With Stones, the consecrated homeland.21

With this symbolic transformation of self-images, we have also witnessed changes in resistance strategy with a shift from more random violence designed to shake up the world,22 to place more emphasis upon relatively nonviolent struggle designed to reveal the moral injustices of the Israeli status quo.23 This shift in strategy is linked with a shift in theaters of operation, with the heart of resistance no longer located outside of Palestine, but in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Through cultural resistance that is relatively nonviolent, such as graffiti campaigns, stone throwing, sit-ins, publishing communiqués and resistance literature, strikes, and manipulations of standard time, Palestinians demonstrated their autonomy in the face of the occupying army. What resulted is a process of Palestinian empowerment that renewed national self-confidence and encouraged activists to formulate the organizational and cultural bases for future statehood in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

Words of revolutionary encouragement transformed daily life in the Occupied Territories. Palestinians, through mass mobilization directed by routinized calls to action from a Unified
National Leadership in conjunction with the PLO, and often with HAMAS the front of the Islamic resistance movement, learned new ways to confront their oppressors. The elaborate nature of the calls reveal discourse's potential impact upon day-to-day living. Not only do the bayanat prescribe specific, ritualized acts of collective opposition, but they also attempt to regulate and transform social and economic relations between employers and employees, between landlords and tenants, between shop owners and customers, between parents and children, and between women and men. For example, Call Number 15 states that "...the uprising has ended within the mind and spirit of our people any signs of hesitation or reluctance to fight the oppression and terrorism being perpetrated by the occupiers." Moreover, "through the use of their creative energies, they [Palestinians] are creating new means of confrontation." In terms of social transformations, the Intifada has "brought about a new pattern for...daily economic and social life [through] the extensive cultivation of land, the formulation of cooperatives, and the unprecedented social integration."24 In this sense, the calls to action are both vehicles for nonviolent resistance as well as representations of revolutionary change.

Transformations within the Palestinian community occurred while the structures of oppression supporting the Israeli military regime remained intact, and the efforts to suppress resistance redoubled. In spite of this resistance to change, the Israeli state has not been immune to the Intifada. Public opinion polls reveal that although there was great hostility towards the Uprising and what it represented, the undercurrent of such opposition was an increased moderation in Israeli attitudes towards the status of the Occupied Territories.25 The Intifada could not force the Israeli military from the Occupied Territories, but it could get Palestinians to act in ways which would symbolically negate the army's existence by neutralizing its political effectiveness in the region while also creating moral cracks in the legitimacy of continued Israeli occupation which destabilized Israeli self-images. This encouraged discussion about the future of the Territories and ultimately created an end to Likud hegemony in the 1992 elections based partly upon the party's disposition towards the Palestinians. The moral implications of ruling a population against its will, highlighted by Palestinian discursive warfare and symbolic action also revolutionized - to a degree - Israeli consciousness. In some cases, Israeli discourse acknowledges Palestinians as the new "victim" and the Israelis as the new "victimizer". In the words of Hava Alberstein, a popular Israeli singer/songwriter:

...I have changed this year.
Once I was the sheep and the peaceful lamb...
Today, I don't know who I am26

For some Israelis, observing Palestinian resistance raised interesting parallels between the people they were occupying, the Jewish quest for statehood. In the words of Dan Almogar's In My Shoes:

How strange to think that someone, somewhere
In Walid's village near Nablus,
Is wearing my shoes now.
Once, not so very long ago,
I was in his shoes.27

These changes in perception produced noticeable alterations in conventional social behavior as well. For example, participation in Lefist movements increased, and Palestinian issues came to dominate politics as well as informal coffee hours, dinner table discussions, and even Yom Kippur ceremonies, as more secular Israelis sought to atone for their actions against a politically weaker community.28 Although Palestinians have not yet achieved statehood, they certainly shook the Israeli status quo with their discursive and symbolic struggle, and renewed international commitments to finding a solution the Arab-Israeli conflict. What such processes will produce in terms of formal revolutionary changes beyond the local and scattered transformations of consciousness and community action is yet to be determined.

Conclusion

Nadine Gordimer states that "...art is at the heart of liberation."29 Similarly, an Estonian dissident claims that "...the strength of small people isn't in guns, it is in intellect, it is in
culture and traditions and in self-belief." What these two passages suggest is that elements of culture: art, language, traditions, symbols, rituals, etc., can be employed to transform and liberate both ways of thinking and acting. It doesn't take guns and it doesn't take nuclear weapons to transform social and political practices. Words and the trappings of culture can be revolutionary. The conventional logic of revolutionary theory maintains that if noticeable alterations in state power are not present, then revolutions have not occurred. If we are to maintain this formal, state-centric premise, then we would miss the significant changes which occur in the social realm, as represented in discourse and daily action. These subtle shifts in manners, mores, attitudes, and perceptions do not make revolution suddenly, rather, like termites and white ants, they slowly eat away at state and social structures. By taking these more informal processes of political change seriously, this essay argues that just because communities of resistance lack sufficient coercive resources to capture the state for themselves does not mean that they are bound to the ghettos of oppression for the rest of their lives. Through creative uses of politics, the marginalized have the power to concoct nonviolent revolutionary schemes for their own emancipation.
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Violence, War and Peace:
In the Context of Lebanese Women

by Evelyne Accad

Throughout the ages, men have been fascinated with war. At some very deep level, it has been for them a way to prove their existence, an expression, according to Adam Farrar, of "male desire". Desire closely linked to sexuality and the death instinct has been much written about. Sexuality connected with war, power, oppression, and aggressiveness has been analyzed by many authors ranging from Reich, Foucault, Girard, and Laborit to more recent works by men making the connection between masculinity and war (Poole, Connell, Farrar, and others).

In addition there is a growing body of feminist writing (Woolf, Berry, Dworkin, Enloe, Houston, Reardon, Badinter, Brownmiller, Chodorow, and Higonnet, among others). How these issues can be articulated in today’s societies and what avenues can be found for nonviolence and peace as a positive force has been the work of a number of other writers, such as Corm, Morgan, Muller, Vilaine, Charara, Duvignaud, Lapierre, and Ben Ghadifa and others whose ideas are used to illustrate this study.

The difference between the male theorists (e.g., Freud, Lacan, and Bataille) and the feminist ones (e.g., Dworkin, Reardon, and Brownmiller) is that the connection between sexuality and violence of the men does not lead them to want to change men, women, objectification or the dominant/submissive sexuality; it is a way to prove their greatness. They live out a schizophrenia, torn between East and West, tradition and modernity. War seems to come from this tension, a cure to the sickness they are in.

Are there any solutions/actions one can foresee, going along with these theoretical ideas? And have any been tried? In Lebanon, disarming all the various fighting factions as a remedy -
immediate and efficient - to war, seemed obvious but not sufficient to get at the roots of the problems. Disarmament on an international level, and the stop of the sale of weapons worldwide, could equally bring immediate unforeseen results.

Petitions, sit-ins, peace marches, hunger strikes and appeals to international and national peace organizations in Lebanon, as well as talks or conferences between the various communities were tried. They brought about some relief and hope. Lebanese women and some men were very active in this domain. Lebanese women often stood between the guns and tried to stop the kidnappings. Wafa' Stephan has documented how "they tried to appease the fighters by paying visits to refugee camps and military headquarters and putting flowers in the nozzles of guns."³

One day women tried to eliminate the militia checkpoints where people were being kidnapped. Going from East Beirut to West Beirut, from Phalangist checkpoint to Progressive checkpoint, they remonstrated in the name of spouses, mothers, and sisters. They wanted the butchery to stop. They had built homes, but contrary to what an Arab proverb says about boy's positive contribution to home and country, the sons had started destroying the homeland.⁴ The women blocked the passageways dividing the two sides of the capital, organized all night sit-ins, and stormed into local TV stations to interrupt the news in order to have their demands broadcast.⁵

Numerous delegations were sent to various conferences throughout the world and to the United Nations. Numerous vigils, sit-ins, conferences, and peace marches were organized inside and outside the country. The author personally witnessed and participated in one of the actions for peace on 6 May 1984, when she taught at the Institute for Women's Studies in the Arab World of the Beirut University College, located in West Beirut. The action was initiated by Iman Khalifeh, a young woman from the institute who also worked in the kindergarten of the school.

She woke up one day, telling herself: "Enough! Enough of this useless butchery!" She worked with the population of both sides of the city. The march was to carry as its sole slogan: "No to war, No to the 10th year of war! Yes to life!" It was to unite both sides of the city at a critical point, known as the museum passage or demarcation line. Thousands of people were to participate.

Unfortunately, the march was stopped by a "blind" shelling which resulted in many victims - dead and wounded - on both sides. [The word "blind" in Lebanon designates any shelling with no apparent targets, but which might, according to many studies, terrorize people in a pre-planned fashion]. Iman declared:

... I was not introducing an original thought - it was not a new idea. But it was the cry of the "silent majority" voiced aloud by a people that suffered and endured nine years of ugly war and by a people who carried no arms to defend themselves, but struggled to avoid death, violence and ruin, in order to live, to build, and to continue to be ....⁶

Another significant march was that of the handicapped - organized and carried out by Laure Moghaïzel, during the summer of 1987, as a woman lawyer and activist in the nonviolence and human rights movement in Lebanon. When asked what she meant by nonviolence in an interview, Moghaïzel replied:

I am not a pacifist, I am revolted, revolted against injustices and violence. This is why I use the term nonviolent. There is a nuance. Pacifism is a form of passivity which is making itself known through an opposition of unconditioned disarmament... Nonviolence is a struggle and who says struggle also says activity, dynamism... It is a political action sustained and energetic which refuses to exercise violence. But it should not be confused with love for the other. We are not in the era of Love. When there is conflict, there is struggle. Nonviolence is a theory very little known in Lebanon.⁷

She went about explaining the origins of the movement with [Mohandas and Kasturbai] Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr., to cite only the well-known names, and the differences and similarities in Lebanon. They were ready to suffer although martyrdom is not the aim of nonviolence. Their objective consisted in eliminating violence through nonviolence. With dialogue and persuasion, they hoped to modify the actions of human beings.

These are some of the positive actions at work in Lebanon.
They may appear weak, simple and utopian in light of the destructive and violent forces of politics and of history. But history has also shown that the actions of the Gandhi's and Martin Luther King, Jr. did have an impact on their respective societies, and on the world. The theoretical framework for the change we are proposing, lies in a blend of nationalism, feminism and nonviolent active struggles.

If nationalism - in a way we will define - could unite all the various factions fighting each other under a common aim and belief in the existence and the survival of their country, it could move towards a real solution. But if nationalism remains at a sexist stage, and does not move beyond ownership and possession as final goals, the cycle of hell will repeat itself and the violence will start all over again. In Lebanon, both nationalism and feminism are necessary: nationalism in order to unite Lebanon, and feminism in order to change the values upon which social relationships, and thus utility, are created and formed. The work must begin at the most personal levels: with changes in behavior and attitudes toward one's mate, one's family, one's sexuality, and ultimately one's community and society. From such a personal beginning, at least some of the internal conflicts might work towards resolution. With a stronger nationhood based in mutual love, rather than possession and domination, Lebanon might be able to reach for its independence.

What we will need to formulate is a radical change, a whole system to be rethought and conceptualized. To use Betty Reardon's words:

If ... [our world is to be] ... a truly nonviolent one ... , we must come to terms with and accept the other in ourselves, be it our masculine or our feminine attributes, ... [our] ... enemies and criminals, or ... [our] ... heroes and saints.8

People's attitudes must undergo profound transformations - radical changes in the way they perceive power and love.

The ... violence against others ... [in war accounts for] perhaps the most significant common characteristic of sexism and the war system: rape.9

The above analysis clearly concerns Lebanon, as well as wherever there is a potential for war - meaning most countries of the world. Our ideas about sexuality, its centrality to social relations among and between women and men, and its relationship to war and national interests, probably make sense in differing degrees everywhere. What makes the situation in Lebanon relevant is that these questions take on more intense proportions and obvious proportions. Lebanon is a Mediterranean country, highly dominated by Islamo-Arab influences. As such, it carries the codes of honor and women's oppression, as well as masculine-macho values to their farthest limits. The tragedy of this situation holds its own answer.
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Nonviolent Participation in Chinese Reform and Dissidence

By Sanyuan Li

Synopsis

Alienation over slow post-Mao reform has tempted dissidence and civil disobedience, symbolized by the 1989 Tiananmen Square protest. Nonviolence characterizes this dissidence politically.

Dissidence and the Regime

As a nation with an ancient past, and currently one of every five people on the planet [rivalled mostly by India in size and history], Chinese nonviolence has long and influential roots. Such nonviolent power has affected world history, for example, regarding Mo Ti, as the pivotal critic of Lao Tzu and Confucius, or the 1903-1911 strikes, boycotts, and demonstrations against Japan and the U.S.1 From Shantung province, this early Twentieth-Century nonviolence spread throughout China, but could not extricate China from colonialist arms, opium, and heroin businesses also threatening much of the rest of Asia east of India and south of Japan. By the 1960s, Chinese people again mobilized nonviolently, this time from Hunan province to contain "Red Guard" violence. Unarmed, 6,000 Chinese factory and industrial workers led a struggle through barbed wire barricades to evict the Red Guard from Tsinghua University and then three other national universities in China.2

Had Deng Xiaoping even guessed about such massive Chinese civil disobedience again in 1989, he might have not started any reform, or at least not boasted about its speed. Before a whiff of reform in 1979 the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) enforced laws tightly. Deng did not intend real change - only cosmetic reform to consolidate CCP influence. If, however, a
regime like that of Deng allowed some reform, then the number of dissidents may seem to increase or even get out of control (as the Russians well knew). Conflicting, vested interests within an old, corrupt regime like that of current CCP may also stir up internal dissidence.

Put simply, dissidence may differ from revolution against a regime in ways that usually fall short of violence. A few dissidents may tangle with the police, but revolutionaries may also kill the authorities who get in their way. A basic reason for much of the reluctance of dissidents or revolutionaries to resort to violence against the state relates to their slim chance of mobilizing more violence than the state can.

In China, differences between reform, dissidence, and revolution may be unclear, if not confusing. A factional buffer between party reformers and hardliners may determine who gets what. When reformers get an upper hand, then experiments may go ahead under the guise of reform. Influential hardliners however can also oust reformers and condemn reform-minded dissidents. Other reformers may tend toward pragmatic dissidence, pushing reform to the limit, yet renounce their principles when threatened.

Due to differences in collective action in grievance resolution between socialist and capitalist governance policies, dissidents and revolutionaries approach organizational conflict resolution differently as well. Pointing at widening gaps between expectations and how human needs are met, revolutionaries argue for change through violence to put things right. Assymetric tension and setbacks, aggravated by bias and discrimination, may lead revolutionaries to armed revolt. Risking fear and pain, over against a strong desire for change, dissidents and revolutionaries may challenge a cruel and bloody regime despite overwhelming odds.

**Dissident Chinese Nonviolence**

At the end of 1988 Fang Lizhi [often compared with Andrei Sakarov in China] wrote a public letter to the CCP, requesting the release of political prisoners like Wei Jingsheng. Beidao, a nationally known poet, and Fang Lizhi set the stage for further mobilization at this point by inviting other distinguished intellectual and cultural leaders to Beidao's home for a public letter-signing event. Huang, head of the People's Literature Novels Bureau, went too, and later noted that he personally felt the need, once there, "to buy face" - i.e., he was so deeply moved that he could not leave without signing along with everyone else. By early 1989 the public letter appeared in newspapers all over China, signed by thirty-three distinguished cultural leaders. [That letter of solidarity and the death of Hu Yaobang (CCP general secretary, ousted after the 1989 Tiananmen protest) may well have been the definitive events of 1989.3]

As the tone of dissidence increased in 1989, many people flocked to Beijing to defy the regime. In those days, the movement almost looked like a Beijing festival, with sweet excitement about the taste of freedom. A few scattered worries about regime reprisals were over-run by street protests that millions celebrated openly. As wild events accelerated beyond any timelines or objectives, leaders like Li Lu, a co-leader of the hunger strikers, began sounding out scenarios over what regime response would follow the celebrating throngs. To "catch their breath" and regroup for the next stage of action, Tiananmen hunger strikers broke their fast briefly.4

Wu'er Kaixi, another leader, then repeated the prevailing Tiananmen sentiment for "no retreat" in an open public statement, meant for the Chinese premier, Li Peng. That statement said that if one person still distrusted the government and wanted to further engage in hunger strikes, then everybody would protest in solidarity. With that, the CCP killed about 1,000 protestors in Beijing and purged party reform/dissidence leaders like Zhao.

**Illusive Ground**

A Chinese story (I call it the drinker's paradox) may help to explore the resulting complex of guilt, violence, and state repression. It is a story about an old Chinese family in a village in ancient times. The man loves alcohol. He gives the woman silver coins in order to buy alcohol. But the woman never fills her jar at the liquor store completely. She saves a copper coin every time. Then there is a drought and they have little to eat. The woman takes out a vase now full of copper coins from her trunk. It is the
money she has saved from the man's alcohol money over the last few years. She says to the man, "Look, this is enough to tide us over this time. If only you give up alcohol, we can be rich." The man is overjoyed and ashamed by the surprise money, so he quits drinking. A few years later, there is another drought and bad harvest. But this time the woman says, "You never gave me any money after you quit drinking, so I have not saved any."5

Sometimes there is little or no money. Realizing the constraints to resistance against tyranny, it may be argued that a massive, radical protest movement can be too costly and risky. One can hope as well that a dissident movement and counter culture, or a revolution of words alone, will tame political discourse: i.e., that a dissident movement should break hegemonic rules of discourse and recreate new ones. Gramsci, for example, argued that the best way to defeat tyranny is to ruin ruling ideological discourse.6

In the Great Leap Forward, the CCP had deceived Chinese people with Communism as their paradise and the People's Commune as a bridge to that paradise. The CCP even boasted that China would surpass England and the USA in 15 years economically. After the Great Cultural Leap, the CCP's promises lost much of their lure. Though in 1979 when Deng Xiaoping broached faint sounds of reform, many believed that old story all over again.

After 1979, the CCP also liberalized some communication of culture and ideology. Yet people saw little of the promised freedoms from those same aging leaders, all over 80 years old. Victimized by a replay of the same general corruption, many people turned to anger, despair, and disappointment. At the same time, the dream prize of Communism turned into a poisonous dump or snake pit, while Deng's lesser prize, a merging with Hong Kong, may merely help China to manage more money and more corruption after 1997.

People expect almost no escape from the ironic shadows of such old, elitist, corrupt, and muddled-headed violent power. The elite offspring, on the one hand, rapidly stuff themselves more and more in order to legitimate Maoism - with still more sacrifice on the part of the masses, and more corruption on the part of the ruling elites. On the other hand, conservatives symbolized by the Kadoorie (the last "Taipan" or "Robber Baron") family,7 also rule Hong Kong as well: China's front door for air, water, and electronic traffic or communication, and its guarantee for sustainable loans, business, and foreign exchange - and China's source for nuclear theory, power, and weapons technology (resisted at last count by 1,000,000 people in Hong Kong signing a petition against a forthcoming nuclear power plant).8
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Towards the Formulation of a Strategy of Nonviolent Civilian Resistance: The Occupied Palestinian Territories as a Case Study

by Souad Dajani

Over a quarter of a century has passed since Israel occupied the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Recent developments, such as the defeat of Iraq during the Gulf War of early 1991, and the beginning of the peace process at Madrid in October 1991 between Israel, the Palestinians and the Arab States, have only served to underscore the basic asymmetry between the main protagonists. In the struggle between Israel and the Palestinians, Israel wields the greater military and political power, neither of which the Palestinians have been able to match nor topple. Palestinians have learned that their struggle must be directed elsewhere - not as a race to acquire military power comparable to that of Israel - but as a struggle that uses the very asymmetry of the conflict to their own advantage. As the Intifada has taught them, sustained collective civilian action could be used by the Palestinians to cause Israel's excessive power to rebound against itself. Negotiations notwithstanding, the need for such a strategy is no less vital now than it was at the beginning of the Intifada. To achieve their goals for an end to the occupation and the establishment of an independent state alongside Israel, Palestinians must conduct their struggle in a way that systematically challenges Israel's continued rule. This can be accomplished by an active, organized and unrelenting strategy of nonviolent civilian resistance. Such a strategy would wield nonviolent civilian action to expose the degree of repression and violence that Israel must exercise in return to maintain its hold over these areas.

A strategy of civilian resistance requires Palestinians to identify the sources of power that can be used to strengthen their own communities, as well as those that can be marshaled to resist
I. The Palestinian Resistance

Throughout the occupation, Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza Strip have continued to demonstrate their resistance to Israeli rule. Early efforts, principally in the West Bank, concentrated on a negotiated political settlement that would return the area to Jordanian rule. Later, as the PLO gained prominence, and as the Arab states were defeated in several wars, new political forces began emerging within the Occupied Territories. The essence of these developments was to afford the Palestinians under occupation a more immediate and direct role in determining what resistance they would launch against the occupation regime. The general strategy of this period was to rely on the PLO to exert outside pressure on Arab states to intervene militarily against Israel, and to influence the U.S. and the international community to intervene politically to end the occupation. Meanwhile, the people within these areas were gearing up for more active responses. Palestinian leaders and organizations, emerging in the mid-1970s, began organizing mass-based community initiatives around issues of popular concern, like those for youth, agriculture, health care, women's rights, and other community needs. In this way, Palestinians were moving from passive "steadfastness" and reactive resistance to mass mobilization and direct civilian resistance against the occupation. It was these grassroots movements that later provided the structural template for the local and popular committees that proliferated during the Intifada, and the power base on which the collective will and unity of the Palestinian struggle was tested and forged.

By the late 1970s, methods of acceptable resistance were being redefined in light of an emerging Palestinian consensus both within the PLO and in the Occupied Territories to accept a two-state solution. After the 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon, and the subsequent dispersal of the PLO, more Palestinians came to realize that guerrilla struggle was not a feasible option for Palestinians under occupation. There was also increased awareness that the civilian population under Israeli rule had to play a greater role in their own liberation, since it was not likely that the Arab states would go to war with Israel. It would have to be up to the Palestinians themselves under occupation to take matters into their
own hands and say "No" to continued Israeli rule. It would be their voices of suffering, determination, and rejection of this occupation that would produce international concern over their plight. Also, it would have to be their own efforts to unlink themselves from Israel that would at once demonstrate their unity and their determination to build the foundations for their future independent state.

In the months and years since the launching of the Intifada, Palestinians have learned about the effectiveness of a civilian-based (rather than a military-based) resistance. The Intifada stems from the mobilization, commitment and participation of the people themselves. The driving element here is unity - in the face of challenges both from within and without. Israel has used repressive measures to try to break the will of the Palestinians, weaken their resolve and destroy their morale. It has imposed economic sieges of towns and villages, cut off electricity and food to entire communities, broken into homes and employed deliberate violence against the residents. Israel has imposed high taxes and fines on Palestinians, declared prolonged curfews, and engaged in arbitrary arrest and detention. It has also closed off educational institutions, placed obstacles in the way of the provision of health care, outlawed popular committees and imprisoned many of their members. Israel has also recruited collaborators to infiltrate and split the Palestinian community, a classic example of a divide and rule strategy.

Palestinians both inside and outside the Occupied Territories realize that their strength depends on their unity and their sense of collective endeavor. There are two strategic concerns. On the one hand, and quite independent of any action to be taken against Israel, Palestinians must attend to creating unity inside the Palestinian community. They must establish the structures and support systems that would sustain them despite occupation. In the early days of the Intifada, direct action against Israel took form of protests, stone-throwing, tax boycotts, and strikes, and ignited an almost dizzying sense of empowerment and pride. The effects, however, were short-lived because these acts were not backed by a strategy that connects means to ends and tactics to strategy. For example, how would general strikes, tax boycotts, withdrawal of labor, and popular demonstrations end the occupation? Which of the methods would have a direct effect in shaking Israel's hold over the Occupied Territories, and which would be central to strengthening Palestinian unity and their will to resist? Do these overlap? Coincide? Once the initial euphoria and sense of empowerment dissipated, Israeli countermeasures began to be felt as well. A basic question emerged about whether indigenous structures and independent resources were enough to build viable alternatives to the occupation regime that the Palestinians would need to withstand a prolonged struggle.

The years since 1987, the first year of the Intifada, have deepened these concerns and the need to address them strategically. Facing Palestinians - especially in the wake of the Gulf War - is the threat of total economic disintegration. Coupled with the lack of political progress, even the Palestinian ability to cope with basic everyday life under occupation has been eroded. In distinguishing between actions that demonstrate or reflect unity and those that affect Israel, Palestinians need to differentiate between "defensive" and "offensive" techniques. The former emphasizes the structural underpinnings of the Palestinian community that would sustain them economically and organize them politically. The latter are actions designed directly to undermine Israeli rule. By returning to the original meaning of the word intifada - to shed or to shake off - Palestinians were engaging in "defensive" action by recreating an authentic identity. This effort was aimed not so much at shaking the occupation, but at an internal reassessment and reorganization of priorities. Palestinians were wresting away their identity from outsiders who sought to define it, and were intent on instilling a sense of pride in their own heritage and tradition. On this they would build an authentic, indigenous and distinct sense of Palestinian individuality and community. This long-term strategic vision would be coupled with determined civilian resistance to end the occupation.

Stepped up resistance has emerged from some quarters, most notably Hamas and other activists, who have carried out violent attacks largely against Israeli soldiers and settlers. However, for the most part, direct acts against the occupation have taken second place to the economic and political imperatives facing Palestinians after the Gulf War. Palestinians have hoped to use this time to heal and rebuild, empowered by a sense of their identity, and their ties to the land from which they refuse to be dislodged.
Specific issues defining the resistance and its strategic imperatives can be summarized as follows:

A. The need to find and secure the weakest links of the Palestinian community. Economic and political programs must link Palestinians to the land and enhance their ability to resist. Measures are needed that would alleviate unemployment, hunger, and dispossession. Other measures must attend to the destruction of the economy, and address the issue of accelerated settlement building. Threats posed to the Palestinian community by collaborators must be addressed. Attention should also be paid to the shebab, the growing unruly core of young nationalist activist Palestinians, who need to be drawn into a national consensus above the divisiveness and competition of factional party politics.

B. The need to develop and strengthen indigenous centers of power. Local community efforts and cooperative activities are essential in building a strong nationwide economy which is capable of sustaining a national liberation movement consonant with integrated political and economic goals. Economic development paves the way for viable and sustainable indigenous sources of power that underlie the ability of the Palestinian community to resist.

C. The need to consolidate and cement the unity of the resistance. Palestinians have to absorb, deflect and redirect Israeli countermeasures. To do this they also face the task of dealing with factionalism on the inside and the outside and the problem of collaborators.

II. The Opposition (Israel)

The shaking-off process of the Intifada rested on the employment of direct action to loosen Israel's control over these areas and to force it to withdraw. Whether as a "campaign of civil disobedience" to establish the non-governability of the Occupied Territories, or as acts designed to raise the "costs" of continued occupation, the Palestinian strategy of resistance during the early phases of the Intifada contained objectives and methods deliberately selected to undermine their opponent.

To build on earlier resistance at this level, a Palestinian strategy must identify the vulnerable points of the opponent and use direct nonviolent action to split this opponent and thereby undermine its power. A two-pronged strategy would emerge, targeting: (a) the Israeli military; and (b) the Israeli government and public.

Strategic formulation at this level would involve a detailed evaluation of the ideological underpinnings of the occupation rooted in Zionism, and how these are perceived by both the left and right in Israel - topics that are beyond the scope of this paper. If one wanted to make a generalization, one could say that most ordinary Israelis could live with the occupation. Those on the left in Israel could rely upon the relative invisibility of the Palestinians and their political insignificance inside Israel.

The Intifada, however, has appeared to jolt Israel. No longer were Palestinians the silent, acquiescent and dehumanized subjects. Instead, their revolt, universal and largely nonviolent, commanded attention and shattered Israeli myths of the benign occupation. While stated strategic objectives of the Intifada included wielding nonviolent techniques to raise the economic and political costs for Israel of continued occupation, paradoxically, the impact of the uprising on Israel was primarily psychological. Israelis were forced to face the fact that they were occupying an unwilling population. They were forced to acknowledge that this occupation and the degree of repression and violence that accompanied it dehumanized both the occupier and the occupied. For a long time, many Jewish Israelis had engaged in denial or in blaming the victims of that violence (that is, Palestinians) for Jewish victimization of another people. In short, the nonviolent resistance during the Intifada targeted Israeli vulnerability and sensitized many Israelis to unnerving parallels between Israeli and Palestinian claims to victimization.

Strategically speaking, Palestinians could direct their use of nonviolent methods to expose Israeli violence and victimization,
and so increase polarization within Israel over the forced colonization of another people. Palestinians must work to widen the gap between an ideology and the repressive reality of occupation. Having made the first psychological inroads in affecting Israeli perceptions, a severe backlash by Israeli authorities emerged to crush this uprising as swiftly as possible. As a result, Palestinians were deflected and prevented from actively pursuing this strategic focus. Some reasons for their failure rested with the Palestinians themselves, most notably in their inability to fully appreciate the dynamic impact of nonviolent civilian resistance.

In 1990, Israeli voters elected their most right-wing government in history - an event that Palestinians took as an indication of their failure. Demoralization set in, and Palestinians began to lag in their efforts. Lacking an overarching strategic conception, Palestinians could not see that Israeli repression and right-wing radicalism were expected - indeed inevitable - in the short-term. If anything, these developments underscored the impact the Palestinian civilian struggle had in increasing Israeli vulnerability and polarization. Israel would react defensively to try to shield itself and put off the impending debate over the increasingly costly occupation.

The crumbling ideological facade that sustained the occupation since 1967 has isolated and identified two targets for strategically organized nonviolent civilian resistance - as cited above, (a) the Israeli military; and (b) the Israeli government and public. The Israeli military is the single largest sector of Israeli society in daily contact with Palestinians. A Palestinian civilian resistance strategy must operate at two levels, first to affect the morale of the soldiers, and consequently their discipline and willingness to obey orders; second, to influence Israeli society by way of the military. The Intifada incorporated many innovative tactics, though these were not visibly organized into a total strategic program. For example, excessive use of force against civilian demonstrators forced officials at different ranks of the Israeli military to question army orders concerning the use of force. Rather than seeing their task as one of restoring "law and order" in the face of so-called "riots" and "disturbances," Israeli soldiers began to see the occupation itself as the problem that required immediate political attention.10

Despite its professed nonviolent ideals, the Intifada did not split army ranks to the point of mutiny or collapse of its role in the Occupied Territories. For disparate reasons, even excessively brutal acts against Palestinians were not considered serious enough to warrant criminal military sanctions. Instead, Israeli soldiers seemed to be given the signal that the use of force against unarmed Palestinians was both acceptable and legitimate. The Israeli army's dehumanization of Palestinians was supported by measures that kept the two populations apart. These measures included imposing collective punishment, frequently rotating personnel, selecting long-range fire zones, and engaging in sniper-fire (including shooting at civilians from overhead helicopters).

As a result, the Palestinian condition remained routinized and tolerable for many Israelis. To change such a mindset, Palestinian strategy must move the struggle right into the heart of Israeli society. Strategic use of nonviolent methods may contribute to this end. Palestinians must continue to demonstrate their refusal to cooperate with the Israeli forces, and establish their unwillingness to be governed against their will. For Israel to continue its domination of these areas, it must resort to outright and brutal force, with all the attending consequences on the Israeli body politic.

Palestinians are aware that there will be little movement towards a political resolution unless Israelis are convinced that they simply can no longer occupy these areas. Palestinians differ on whether Israel should be targeted directly as the central locus of power, or whether action should be aimed at the U.S. for it in turn to pressure Israel. However, Palestinians do realize that the Intifada has influenced Israel. Concerted nonviolent civilian resistance can polarize both Israel and the U.S., by focusing attention on what degrees of violence and dissent can be condoned in countries priding themselves on their democracy. Violence against Palestinians has corrupted and traumatized the Israelis themselves, and has thus corroded essential Jewish values.12

Evaluating Palestinian progress at this point, we can see that an effective Palestinian strategy rests on determined nonviolent noncooperation with the Israeli regime. At times, Palestinians have had to directly confront the Israeli state and military. At other
times, their struggle has been indirect, as they sought to strengthen their own communities and their roots in the land of Palestine. Palestinians know they cannot intervene directly to force Israel out of the Occupied Territories. They can, however, force recognition that any permanent settlement has to take into account their legitimate national rights. Palestinian collective rejection of occupation daily confronts Israel, and gradually wears away at it from within. This may eventually accelerate the time when Israelis will be forced to reach a meaningful accommodation and settlement.

III. The International Public

The third focus of Palestinian strategy aims at general public opinion and, therefore, at Israel's international allies. Palestinian strategy at this level - conducted together with levels (I) and (II) above - seeks to defeat Israel's occupation by causing outside actors to pressure Israel to withdraw. The extent to which Palestinians can arouse sympathy and international intervention may in the long-term induce conditions favorable to a just resolution to the conflict. Specific targets are actors positioned to wield power. These include most notably the U.S., which is until now closely aligned with the opponent. Palestinian strategy should seek to undermine the opponent by separating it from such power sources. Raising questions in the U.S. about its almost total and blind commitment to Israel may influence a reevaluation of U.S. policy to recognize the legitimate national rights of the Palestinians.

Strategically organized Palestinian action would seek to influence world opinion while also engendering awareness of conditions under occupation. Palestinians have generally been more successful at the latter. Successive United Nations General Assembly Resolutions confirm the support the Palestinian cause has received internationally. While it tried to convene the Madrid Conference for the express purpose of settling the conflict in the region, the U.S. itself remains largely in defiance of the international consensus that recognizes the national rights of the Palestinian people. Strategies to influence varied international actors may include lobbying the United Nations, the Arab League, and the European Community, to make Israel comply with international law. Palestinian influence from within the Occupied Territories on outside third parties (particularly the U.S.) remains indirect, however, when measured against the willingness of such parties to apply direct pressure against Israel.

Though the Intifada was launched specifically against Israel, some of its features were designed to have an impact internationally. The Intifada demonstrated that Palestinians can take their cause to the world directly. It showed that the Arab-Israeli conflict would not be solved without the Palestinians, and that their legitimate national rights commanded immediate attention. Gone were the days when Palestinians steadfastly waited for Arab and PLO diplomatic or military activities to free them. Palestinians have taken matters into their own hands and have asserted that their existence could no longer be neglected. To this extent, they have succeeded. During the Intifada, both the U.S. and Israel scrambled to contain the political damage, seeking any effort to accommodate to emerging realities, short of actual Palestinian independence. If organized within a total strategy of resistance, the Palestinian Intifada can become the springboard for influencing Israel and its international allies. While the range of possible actions at this level is too extensive to be covered fully here, four central areas can be suggested. These are: democracy, human rights and international law, the media, and Jewish public opinion in the U.S.

A. Democracy

Democratic principles are central to the U.S. system, yet the U.S. refuses to listen to the voice of two million Palestinians struggling for independence from occupation. In some small measure, the Gulf War did expose the U.S.'s double standard concerning "occupation." While the U.S.-led war ended the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait, nothing was done to reverse Israel's occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. This occupation has persisted for over 25 years with no discernible opposition, in spite of consistent UN resolutions urging attention to the issue. Awareness in the U.S. increased during the war over domestic restrictions to free expression and over incidents of harassment and
discrimination against Arab-Americans. These were perpetrated at the hands of both an angry populace and by official agencies themselves (including police and immigration authorities). The violence unleashed against this minority group highlighted a process of ethnic stereotyping that violated the spirit of democratic freedoms and justice.

Throughout the Intifada, the relatively nonviolent Palestinian resistance brought the U.S. face to face with the unjust and untenable U.S. support of prolonged Israeli rule. From being previously branded as violent or terrorists, Palestinians began to be perceived as waging a just struggle. Once such cracks appeared in the customarily held view of Israel as victim, a whole host of doubts and questions began to invade the U.S. mass consciousness. In other words, the Intifada ushered in an alternative and more internationally accepted view of the Israeli-Palestinian struggle.

Following the Gulf War, Palestinians under occupation found themselves hampered in their efforts to influence U.S. public opinion. This was due to Israeli restrictions on reporting from these areas, and by the general disinterest of the media. Negative media views of the Palestinians-as somehow being "allies" of Saddam Hussein and Iraq - distorted and then overshadowed attention to the Intifada. Moreover, anti-occupation activities were upstaged by the breakup of the former Soviet Union and the focus on diplomatic efforts in the Middle East.

B. Human Rights and International Law

The scope of this article will not include a full analysis of international legal decisions over the Arab-Israeli conflict. Nor will it consider customary Israeli noncompliance with related international judicial decisions pertaining to the occupation, and indifferent U.S. attitudes towards Israel's violations of human rights and international law in the Occupied Territories. Nevertheless, the Intifada demonstrates quite clearly Israel's ongoing violations of provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 - Relative to the "Protection of Civilians in Time of War." These violations include using restricted measures like collective punishment, expropriation of land and property, settling Jews in Occupied Areas, mass arrests and detention in Israeli jails, and expulsion of Palestinians from their homeland. Of special impact in the U.S. have been the two areas of violence against Palestinian children and restrictions against educational institutions. Through their continued resistance and suffering, however, Palestinians have managed to raise public awareness both in the U.S. and elsewhere on the grave implications of their struggle.

Similarly, on international levels and especially during the U.S.-led Gulf War, Palestinians made concerted efforts to criticize the U.S. for its selective interpretation of international law. They drew attention to the U.S. insistence on the implementation of U.N. Security Council Resolutions against Iraq but not against the Israeli occupation.

Unmasking Israeli intransigence and its persistent flouting of international law over continued Palestinian suffering, can be expected to further delegitimize Israel's violent rule in the Occupied Territories. In return, this will legitimize Palestinian claims for independence and sovereignty. A strategic issue for Palestinians to consider, therefore, is how to sensitize international opinion to lead to action on their behalf. In this vein, Palestinians have revived their idea of placing the Occupied Territories under U.N. protectorship, to shield the civilian population from further Israeli violence until the occupation ends.

C. The Media

During the Intifada, Palestinians in the Occupied Territories learned the impact that their largely nonviolent struggle could have on the media. They learned too of the resulting attention that could be drawn to their cause. Israel, to its dismay, learned the same lesson, causing the Israeli authorities to move swiftly to contain the damage before its image in the world was irreparably harmed. While some Palestinian demonstrations and protests were designed for purposes other than exposing Israeli violence, other Intifada activities seemed strategically organized with precisely such an objective. There were, for example, several communiqués issued by the United Nationalist Leadership of the Uprising in English, designed to alert the media (and hence, public opinion) about the moderation and realism of Palestinian demands. Palestinians
underscored their willingness to coexist in peace, side-by-side with Israel, and emphasized how their intifada only aimed to end the occupation and not to destroy Israel. It was in this spirit that successive communiqués articulated various short and long-term goals and demands. These ranged from family reunifications and the immediate release of detainees, free elections in the occupied areas, the withdrawal of the military from Palestinian communities, and adherence to relevant provisions of international law.19

Using the media to generate concern and attention remains a Palestinian option in the Occupied Territories. The PLO on the outside has also played a role in this regard. Its major diplomatic and media coup of 1988 - declaring Palestinian statehood and recognizing Israeli - is especially significant. Unfortunately, a sympathetic media can also turn antagonistic, as the events of the Gulf War clearly demonstrated. Palestinians and the PLO in particular, were again villainized as the "bad guys" in the media. Still, Palestinians may choose media strategies to enhance their cause, as they did quite effectively during the Madrid Conference. They could, for example, contrast the joyous welcome of Soviet Jews to Israel with the heartrending stories of exiled Palestinians scattered from their homes into the Diaspora - with all the accompanying hunger and desperation they faced. The underlying message here would be that both peoples share a basic need and right for a place to call home.

D. Jewish Public Opinion in the U.S.

Directly or indirectly, U.S. Jews are a focus of Palestinian concern, due to the heavy influence of the pro-Israel lobby on U.S. Middle East policy. Strategically, for Palestinians to undermine Israel's rule over the Occupied Territories would require breaking through any outward facade of cohesion of the American Jewish community. This would be followed by generating sincere and open debates within this community about its own role in encouraging U.S. government bias favoring Israel.

It is not an exaggeration to say that the Intifada has significantly impacted U.S. Jewry. It has truly shocked and disturbed many with the degree of violence perpetrated against innocent civilians, and has caused others to insist publicly on a political settlement that recognizes the national rights of Palestinians. In advocating such a stand, U.S. Jewish groups and individuals were supported by their counterparts in Israel itself, and so heightened the polarization stemming from the Intifada.20

IV. Conclusion

Through the Intifada, the Palestine National Movement articulated strategic elements that operated at each of the three levels above: strengthening Palestinian resistance, undermining and polarizing Israel from within, and creating rifts between Israel and its international allies. However, Palestinians have had varying degrees of success on each front. In comparison, the PLO itself has generated significant concern and attention for the Palestinian cause. Its part - though not discussed here - should not be underestimated. Palestinians under occupation continue to face violent factionalism, serious problems stemming from collaborators, disastrous economic conditions, as well as brutal Israeli repression. Yet their struggle has still been pushed back towards the recesses and shadows of world events.

This study has outlined strategic targets for a Palestinian civilian resistance struggle. To round out our discussion, one conclusive strategic item remains; that is, the choice of the technique of action. Clearly, Palestinians cannot match Israel militarily, and therefore, must turn the asymmetry of the power relationship to their own advantage. As shown, Palestinians must do this by making Israel's occupation of Palestinian lands more untenable. The fallout and the costs, whether political or economic, will at some point be too high for Israel and will force it to accommodate in some form to emerging realities.

For those who study nonviolent political action, the kind of change envisioned here results from one of three mechanisms; conversion, accommodation, or giving in to the coercive power of the nonviolent resistance. The first mechanism denotes a process by which a dominant opponent begins to identify with the resister's suffering, or sympathizes with the latter's demands or viewpoint.21 For various reasons, this is not expected in Israel. The accommodation mechanism describes how opponents may concede some or all the resistance demands, largely to cut and
prevent losses. Accommodation may be an option for Israel and Palestine. For this to occur, Palestinians must pursue noncooperation and non-governability, and force Israel to choose between more severe repression and ending the occupation. Israel has tried to forestall this choice by offering different proposals without making real concessions for a just peace. Such proposals include holding elections and giving autonomy to Palestinians in the Occupied Territories, which fall far short of Palestinian demands. Declared Israeli flexibility instead preempts further demands for concessions and so threatens the Intifada, while accelerating settlement and occupation as "facts of life" in these areas. Palestinians will persist in their nonviolent struggle and rejection of occupation will expose the bankruptcy of all such "solutions," and put more pressure on Israel to reach an equitable and just solution.

Facing increased pressure, Israel could opt to crush the Intifada with overwhelming violence, and so risk further internal and external political damage. Israel could also be forced to give in, ending the occupation. These three options represent scenarios that offer a range of possibilities to be tried, rejected or combined. Which is selected, and what successes can be expected rest on a host of factors. Among them are the salience of Palestinian nonviolent civilian resistance, public perceptions of Israel, and international interventions in the area. Since these may be complicated at any given moment by unpredictable countermeasures, Palestinians should plan and organize disciplined and strategic civilian resistance to withstand any unforeseen measures - such as the imposition of unilateral autonomy at one end, or mass expulsions on the other.

There is no safe guarantee that any Palestinian strategy, violent or nonviolent, will succeed. Given the present power balance in the area, Palestinians may be more successful if they seek to erode Israel's political will through nonviolent civilian action. If the Intifada proves anything, it has proved that Israel is vulnerable to precisely such Palestinian nonviolent action. Israel may one day be forced to face the contradiction of its colonial occupation over an unwilling population. It may then seek two independent states - Israel and Palestine - as the basis for a just, true and lasting peace in the region.
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Nonviolence International (NI) was founded in 1989 to provide assistance to individuals, organizations and governments seeking nonviolent means to bring about social and political change.

In order to act on this philosophy, NI provides general educational materials on nonviolent action from all traditions, as well as hands on strategy sessions and training for activists and organizers. Aside from the International Journal of Nonviolence, NI offers several publications and resources. These include:

Frontline: A quarterly newsletter which summarizes projects and activities of NI, and discusses issues highlighted by current nonviolence campaigns. Subscriptions are available for a minimum annual donation of $16.00.

Nonviolent Action Booklet Series: NI's pamphlet series for organizing nonviolent action. Each pamphlet is 25-30 pages long, and offers a "how to" approach to particular nonviolent action techniques. Topics include: Tax Resistance, Hunger Strikes, Marches, Walks and Nonviolent Responses to Domestic Violence. Booklets sell for $3.00 each, with a reduced rate for orders of 10 or more.

Training and Strategic Planning: NI has developed an experienced team of non-violence practitioners who can be connected with persons interested in developing their skills and strategies for waging nonviolent campaigns.

Trainers Database: In response to increasing interest in training, NI is creating an international databank, and publishing a directory of nonviolence trainers. The information will be used to help organizations respond to urgent requests from people who are interested in waging nonviolent struggle.

Intern/Volunteer Program: Students from accredited colleges and universities who are interested in nonviolence and conflict resolution are encouraged to apply to NI's internship program. Internships can be used to earn university credit. Volunteers are also welcome. Intern and volunteer positions are unpaid.

Individuals interested in any of the above projects or publications should contact:

Nonviolence International
P.O. Box 39127
Friendship Station, NW
Washington, DC 20016
Tel: (202)244-0951
Fax: (202)244-6396
Email: nonviolence@igc.org
1. Diagnosis

The maturity of a conflict diagnosis can be measured by its complexity, roughly a question of the number of actors/parties and number of issues. In the heat of a conflict, a rather safe hypothesis is that one way to reduce complexity would be to identify issues and their interrelations rather than specific, concrete conflict issues, and then let the issue-areas define the actors and parties simply by looking around, and asking who picks up what kind of issue? In so doing, maybe we can get some better grip on what kind of complex conflict, or conflict formation, is exercising its iron grip on ex-Yugoslavia.

The following issue-areas will be considered:

(1) Nationalism, defining national ("ethnic") groups, as usual in terms of shared religion and language, traumas and myths;

(2) Statism, defining states, uni- or multi-national, as usual in terms of governmental control (over means of violence, ultima ratio regis) and intergovernmental recognition;

(3) Super-Statism, defining some states or communities of states as above other states, whose recognition matters more than others, entitled to intervene, sometimes even militarily;

(4) Violence, pitting perpetrators against victims, those who commit acts of violence versus the victims of that violence;

(5) Class, what kind of layers of society are mobilized in various ways in the conflict;
(6) Gender, the role of gender in the conflict;

(7) Generation, the role of generation in the conflict.

1.1 Nationalism

That what happens in ex-Yugoslavia has to do with nationalism, or ethnicity down to the exterminism involved in ethnic cleansing with violent means (as opposed to bureaucratic, administrative measures) is obvious to the unguided eye. But it may be a little bit too obvious; the eye might need some guidance to see more. The basic point, however, is that the national dimension absorbs almost all attention paid to the conflict by politicians, the media and the public at large, inside and outside ex-Yugoslavia. With two or more (Serbs, Croats, Muslins) parties fighting each other, the general occidental tendency would be to map them on a Manichean grid, dichotomizing, seeing one as good and the other as bad (or evil).

What decides who is seen as "the bad guy"? If the evil acts, meaning destructive/violent acts, can be unambiguously attributed to one party the classification is easy; the actor is then defined through the acts. Failing this, there is the possibility of drawing lines in time and space, asking who started when and where, identifying the evil actor at the risk of doing violence to history and/or geography. Beyond this, there is the possibility of using external, non-action criteria as indicators of evil, such as the "wrong Christianity", the "wrong alphabet", the "wrong role in history", the "wrong geographical location", the "wrong role played in the Second World War", etc. All of these indicators would clearly designate the Serbs as the evil actors, and most politicians, the media and the public at large in many Western countries seem to follow this lead. The medication then becomes self-fulfilling. Badly needed are the six other ways of looking at the conflict formation, for a more complete and complex view.

1.2 Statism

That nations are vulnerable, in need of protection in a world where the number of nations is in the order of magnitude $10^3$ and the number of states is in the order of magnitude $10^2$, goes without saying (if we were trained in enjoying differences rather than in being apprehensive of them this might be different). The world system is primarily an inter-state system and only secondarily an inter-national system, the common and incorrect use of the terms by those who should know better notwithstanding (e.g., in naming a discipline "International Relations", when the proper name should be "Inter-State Relations").

Imagine we accept the doctrine, held by many, that the best protection for a vulnerable entity (called a nation) is found in a uni-national territorial entity (called a country) where they are in command of their own state, with a monopoly over the ultimate use of violence in internal and external affairs. The combined entity is known as a nation-state. Each nation is, by the doctrine of self-determination, entitled to its own territory, as an autonomy inside a country or as an independent state.

With the exception of Slovenia, and possibly Macedonia, the republics of ex-Yugoslavia were clearly multi-national. What was recognized in the case of Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina was not a nation's right to have a (reasonably) uni-national state, but a sub-republic's right to become an independent state. The national names of these republics do not make them uni-national; one factor at the root of fatal recognitions. In doing so, vulnerable minorities inside the new states were potentially even more at the mercy of that named nation.

1.3 Super-Statism

Super-states are big states like the United States, or communities of states like the European Community (soon to become the European Union) capable of acting like hegemons in a region. They are lords of the state system. As such they define, through the instrument of recognition, the other actors in their region ("sphere of interest") and have a monopoly over the ultimate use of violence in internal and external affairs of the region. Recent history seems to indicate that the EC regards all of Europe as its sphere of interest, and that the U.S. regards not only the Western Hemisphere but also the Middle East that way (in addition to being the hegemons' hegemon). The relation to
organizations of states, like the United Nations (recently serving EC interests) and NATO (divided between the two) are complex. The U.S. clearly has more coherence that the EC, but is located outside the region and consequently would have to enter with UN legitimacy. The EC may have less coherence, but is located within the region as (self-appointed?) hegemon; claiming expertise in all European affairs.

By recognizing a territorial entity as a state, in the name of national self-determination or not, relations change character. Civil wars within ex-Yugoslavia are transformed to the three types characteristic of the state system: internal revolutionary wars for governmental control over that state organization (or the territorial entity); internal secessionist wars to establish distinctly new states; and external inter-state wars. This facilitates governmental and inter-governmental intervention while at the same time stimulating pre-emptive action.

In a reasonably uni-national territorial entity (like Slovenia, and possibly Macedonia) recognition as a state is unproblematic if the new state has no claims on others, or others have no claim on that new state. In a multi-national territorial entity (like Croatia, Bosnia-Hercegovina, and also Serbia-Montenegro) the effects of recognition are easily predicted:

1. the new government will take pre-emptive, repressive, steps to control any pre-emptive steps taken by minorities (in Bosnia-Hercegovina this means everybody since no nation is in majority);

2. the minorities will take pre-emptive, revolutionary and/or secessionist, steps, also to counteract any pre-emptive steps taken by the government;

3. the government will call on assistance in one form or the other from other states, including super-states, and from organizations of states; an assistance that by necessity will have to be partial since it depends on governmental acceptance;

4. unsolicited assistance given to minorities will be defined as acts of inter-state belligerence, leading to inter-state wars.

All of this has happened, partly before the recognition wave rolling southeastward (15 January 1992, Slovenia and Croatia; 6 April 1992, Bosnia-Hercegovina; is Kosovo next?); mainly afterwards. Transforming an inter-nation conflict into intra- and inter-state conflicts has had catastrophic consequences. In doing so the EC has committed two types of errors: Type I, recognize what should not (yet) have been recognized (Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina); and Type II, not recognize what (perhaps) should have been recognized (Macedonia), against their own theory. So far the consequences, but not the actors, have been contained within ex-Yugoslavia.

Hypotheses about why the EC has done this would include:

1. the EC has to prove to itself and the rest of the world (including applicants for membership) its capability of talking with one voice, consensus being more important than what the consensus is about;

2. the act of recognition was essentially German geo-politics pushing (south)eastward, partly for political reasons (favoring an old Second World War ally, Croatia; disfavoring an enemy, Serbia) and German geo-economics, hoping for contracts in recognized states. The EC element takes the shape of a covenant: EC gives legitimacy to Germany by making the decision collective and consensual, Germany shares economic gains with EC partners;

3. the EC has to pass the hegemon test, to show the ability to re-establish law and order in its own region, and more particularly to do so before the UN manages to do the same, and most importantly before any US intervention. The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) might also have been a dangerous competitor, but has been too weak to make its claims as conflict manager;

4. the EC made use of the urgency to do something, if for no other reason than because of the violence committed, and engaged in ritualistic, precipitate and ill considered textbook activity known from the "International Law" taught at diplomatic academies; having no alternative perspectives.
The four hypotheses do not exclude each other; the present author, for instance, would see some truth in all of them. There was also the element of sincere desire to help the peoples of Yugoslavia in a dire predicament; highly incompatible with responsibility for more than 50% of the violence in Yugoslavia.11

1.4 Violence pits perpetrators against victims

Stands in favor of this or that nation, this or that state - new or old, this or that super-state may be a matter of ideology or prejudice, as those with the opposite ideology may tend to add. A stand in favor of victims transcends ideology and prejudice. The victims are far more numerous than the victims of the four European wars during the 40 years of the Cold War, the wars in Cyprus and Ulster, and the Soviet invasions of Hungary and Czechoslovakia. In a sense it is ironic, but also logical that Yugoslavia should be the stage for all these dirty wars and carnage. An instrument that made Yugoslavia relatively safe in the Cold War context, the territorial defense strategy of having arms that did not provoke key members of the two alliances, NATO and WTO, short range weapons for strong in-depth defense of own territory, proved lethal to the inhabitants of that territory.12 The same goes for the paramilitary militia; very many Yugoslavs of all kinds got training in the use of violence; defensive in the East-West context, highly offensive in the ex-Yugoslav context.

To the credit of the world in general, most parts of Europe in particular, humanitarian assistance has been forthcoming, generally taking stands in favor of the victims of any kind. But there is a dark shadow: the hypocrisy of countries that on the one hand exacerbate conflict through the biased use of recognition instruments and weapons export, and then, on the other hand extend humanitarian assistance (some of them, for some time, did not even do that but closed their borders, requiring visas, to refugees from violence partly of their own making).

1.5 Aspects of Class

There is one obvious factor: ethnic violence is usually rooted in the fear, realistic or paranoid, that another group is seeking dominance or is reacting to being dominated; the other group may reciprocate with the same fears, and both engage in pre-emptive action. In ex-Yugoslavia all of them seem to have been convinced that they were exploited or repressed, dominated being the general term, by the other(s).

But then there is a less obvious factor that may apply to a number of societies around the world if they do not watch out. Here are four theses about Yugoslav politics:

(1) the political class associated with the name Tito, in power for about 45 years after the defeat of the Axis powers and the revolution, had a very concrete agenda and did a remarkable job of reconstruction and construction, bringing Yugoslavia to Central European material levels and beyond;

(2) by the 1970s, and even more during the 1980s, the political class, cosmopolitan, technocratic and competent, not "communist" in any ideological sense, had run out of agenda items. Tasks that could be done within the framework of "socialism" had by and large been done; the economic structure was changing rapidly;

(3) no alternative agenda was being articulated, Yugoslavia not having a democratic structure with parties (or at least one other party, the opposition) lining up openly without fear, competing for the popular mandate to practice alternative agendas;

(4) there was an alternative agenda from the past, the national agendas, even in pan-Serbian and Croatian versions. The agenda had been suppressed. Bratstvo i jedinstvo, brotherhood and unity.

However, for matters to unfold, running out of the agenda was not sufficient (many ruling classes manage to stay in power with no agenda at all); the class also had to be illegitimized. Some of this illegitimacy came from the 1989 cry for democracy; the cry for a free market economy to some extent already having been heeded. But there is a third factor that should not be underestimated: the decline and fall of nonalignment.

Nonalignment had been an important part of the Yugoslav identity, serving as a least common denominator and bridge among.
Yugoslav nations with highly dispersed alignments, at the same time giving Yugoslavia prominence in the world as a bridge-builder. Yugoslav elites enjoyed political functions they would hardly have been accorded as aligned country. There were also clear economic advantages to trading with both sides. With the ending of the Cold War Yugoslavia was left suspended in the air, being nonaligned between something (NATO) and nothing (WTO). The NATO powers, justifiably or not, celebrated having won the Cold War and WTO powers dissolved the WTO claiming it had been imposed upon them by sinister (post)-Stalinist forces and that they themselves had always favored the winning West. Yugoslavia did not have the courage to claim credit for the important part it had played in defusing polarization (already in 1948), had no alliance to dissolve (except itself as should soon become evident), and could not claim to have been suppressed by others.

A political class with neither agenda, nor legitimacy will, in a democracy, yield to the opposition. But there is also the possibility of yielding to history, giving in to the suppressed agendas of the nations, thereby bringing the classes together.

This is part of what happened in Yugoslavia. In retrospect it is more easily seen how it could have been avoided, using the last three theses about Yugoslav politics above:

(2*) higher ability to create new agendas within the existing political system, through open debate and factionalism;

(3*) democracy, with free opinion and organization formation, competing parties with competing agendas for the country, letting people decide in free elections (unoriginal, but a good idea nonetheless!);

(4*) putting the issue of the nationalities on the agenda for a nonviolent revolution rather than suppressing it.

Whether these three together might have worked we shall never know; probably not perfectly, but way beyond what happened.

If agendas are sedimented in layers in the collective subconscious, the top layer erodes and there is no new layer forming on top of it, the layer underneath will surface; that is the core theory. But who will be the carriers of that agenda excavated from the past? If the cosmopolitan upper political class stratum is demoralized because of agenda and legitimacy deficits, and no new political class is forming quickly enough through conventional democratic circulation of elite processes, then layers underneath will be in command of the political process. And the national agendas may fit them perfectly, with suppressed strata picking up repressed discourses. They may not be so good with words, but be very good with guns. No complex theory is needed to know who is their friends and who is their enemies: national belongingness tells what there is to say. And there will always be some marginalized groups for the job, with the old elites on the sidetrack.

1.6 Gender as One of the Clearest Organizing Dimensions

With very few exceptions killing and nationalist decisions are made by men, whereas the victims (magnified by the horrendous use of rape), and the Yugoslav peace movement across national borders, consist disproportionately of many women. One may sometimes get the impression of a land of children, the elderly, and women, occupied by crazy middle-aged males on an uncontrollable rampage. Of course this pattern is the pattern of war everywhere, only highly pronounced in ex-Yugoslavia; so much that a new conflict fault-line is probably emerging, difficult to bridge and heal in the conflict aftermath. The heroic work by women as actors, not as victims, is underreported in media essentially being run for, of and by men. If the war movement is essentially male, and the peace movement essentially female, then the media are part of the war movement.

1.7 The Significance of Generation

The countless children wounded in this dirty complex of wars, post-modern in the sense of being directed against the civilians rather than the military on the other side(s), will carry their traumas in their bodies, minds and spirits throughout their lives; meaning that these scars will outlast one political generation and well into the next. The political shocks suffered by the present political leadership will die with them, biologically or socially; the
psychosomatic traumas suffered by young children will be a part of ex-Yugoslav reality for a much longer time. Families will serve as conduits for stories of the traumas suffered, and nobody thus far has devised a viable method to heal such wounds. The consequences over time are frightening.

1.8 Conclusion: Possible Synergies?

Do the seven issue-areas of nations, states, super-states, violence, class, gender, and generation add up or perhaps multiply in some meaningful way? They are all ways of dividing the peoples of ex-Yugoslavia, pitting them against each other. The combination of nationality and statehood in the struggle for the elusive nation-state, spurred on by the European super-state that works according to that model, mobilizing middle-aged, middle and lower class males to do beastly acts of violence against the other, the other being defined as other nation and/or state, and to some extent other gender/generation. Some of the conflict energy comes from the outside, some from the inside. How to apportion it would be a matter of dispute.

This is an unfortunate constellation. Just to pick up some usually neglected issues: what will be the relation, in ex-Yugoslavia, between the classes, the genders and the generations? Would this not exacerbate class conflict? Would women not have good reasons, better than ever, for hating men as such? How would children feel about the adults after having been treated with extreme callousness and violence? Or of being the products of rape?

But there is also something positive in this more complex perspective. By emphasizing nation as the only category the outside pours gasoline on the fire. By emphasizing other conflict dimensions, nationalism as issue area may recede more into the background. All of the last four conflict dimensions transcend nations, potentially connecting and linking victims, classes, women, children, and the elderly. Together they are by far the majority. Mobilize them against the war, and peace may come!

2. Prognosis

All wars end, otherwise they would have been lasting forever. What is happening in ex-Yugoslavia is warfare; hence it will come to an end. A not very helpful syllogism! When, how, what next, and in the longer run; what will happen as a consequence of this situation?

A prognosis based on no qualitatively new inputs in the current conflict process will necessarily be negative.

For the individual the amount of trauma must be at World War levels by now. Thoughts of revenge are probably more widespread when the author of the trauma is a neighbor, recently a citizen of the same country, than in a truly international war where remoteness may have a dampening impact on the sentiments.

For ex-Yugoslavia the death sentence seems to be irrevocable, but in a sense that is less important. Eternal life of a state, federal or not, is not important; what matters is to find a new formula, such as a Balkan Confederation, within which people can have a reasonable probability of peaceful lives.

For the European region the prognosis is also bleak. Ex-Yugoslavia brought together Catholics, Orthodox and Muslims in an uneasy federation that broke up and ended in mutual butchery. Add the Protestants and these are the religions of Europe. How can Orthodox Russians and Muslim Turks, watching the behavior of the (coming) European Union against Orthodox and Muslims fail to organize themselves the same way; in a Russian Union and a Turkish Union? Is ex-Yugoslavia only a microcosm foretaste of things to come?

3. Therapy

First some words on the type of action from the world community in general, and the UN in particular, that probably is doomed not to work: economic sanctions and collective enforcement action. Military embargo, when impartial, is not objectionable, but ineffective given how easily smaller weapons like guns can be smuggled.

Economic sanctions apply between collective senders (in
principle any citizen of the countries that have voted in favor of the sanctions) and collective receivers (in principle any resident of the countries against which the sanctions are directed). The decision to use sanctions as an instrument is taken by very few people in the foreign policy establishments and discussed within a very narrow circle of people likely to have the corresponding people in the receiving countries in mind. The theory is usually that the distress caused when an export-dependent economy starts crumbling will force the ruling elites out of power by irate masses blaming them for their predicament.

This scenario may perhaps work under some conditions. But a much more likely scenario is the redirection of the distress on groups unable to bring much pressure to bear upon their rulers, such as children, the elderly, and women. In other words, the classical victims of warfare. That being the case, sanctions will probably be regarded by the receivers as the continuation of war with other means, mobilizing their resentment against the senders rather than against their own rulers. This would hold particularly for traumatized peoples who in the sanctions will find more confirmation of "the world is against us" thesis. Sanctions will be destructive, but also counter-productive.

Collective enforcement action will mobilize even more will to resist, and particularly if directed against one group only, the Serbs being the obvious candidate. Military action is supposed to work in two different ways, corresponding to two different stages: as expectation, also called threat, working on the minds of the future receivers of the collective enforcement; and as very concrete violence unleashed by military specialists, on their bodies. Ideally the threat will lead to capitulation through one or both of the mechanisms: the stigma of being branded as a violent criminal to be dealt with in this very harsh manner; and by anticipating the physical defeat. If this does not work there is no alternative to physical defeat.

Physical defeat brought about from the outside brings up the problem of meso warfare against micro warfare. The tools of micro warfare are small militia/guerrilla type groups operating with hand-weapons and small bombs, out to kill and then withdrawing to the safety of the countless caves of the hospitable limestone mountains of ex-Yugoslavia. Hiding is easy, as the Germans learned during the Second World War. The tools of meso war (such as high altitude bombardment, strafing with guns mounted on ships off the coast, and some very heavy tanks) are unlikely to be very successful at destroying micro targets, and could add enormously to the tragedy of the civilians. The alternative is ground war with the combat rules chosen by the other side; an unattractive prospect to say the least. Consequently, military leaders tend to shy away from advocating intervention. So the threat does not work. Nor does the stigma, as any action singling out only one target group, the Serbs, is considered so unjust by them as to increase their will to resist, having nothing to lose.

Let us then consider five therapies that might work, in the view of this author. They can be complemented and specified, but the general guidelines would be as indicated below. But first some general points.

Modern Society can be seen in terms of a tripartite construction, (State, Capital, and the Civil Society) represented by governments, corporations and people's organizations. Modern international society internationalizes them to intergovernmental organizations, transnational corporations and international people's organizations (also called nongovernmental organizations - NGO's - but this term defines people negatively).

Governments of states and super-states - as well as intergovernmental organizations - have tried and failed. One reason is their paradigm: state-recognition (and multi-national states to boot!) with the accompanying transformation of international warfare to intra- and inter-state wars. Added to this comes the standard Western approach of defining the bad guy by drawing lines in time and space, with a beginning and a location in ex-Yugoslavia. But this conflict-formation has no clear beginning. And by imposing a beginning, naming the culprit, it will have no end either.

Corporations have not tried to act, they have tried to make business by breaking sanctions and gain some credit for the future abiding them. And yet they could play a major role by projecting a future, a "when the war is over" scenario, some kind of positive economic sanctions from the world business community to all parts of ex-Yugoslavia. Corporations as peace actors would be something new, and yet there is definitely a longing within these
powerful organizations to play such roles.\textsuperscript{18}

Much more promising, however, is and remains the \textit{world civil society}, the enormous network of people of good will from all over, but particularly in ex-Yugoslavia. The basic point would be to not be partial, not treating the nations of ex-Yugoslavia differently in some kind of pedagogical effort to condition the bad guys to be good, and the good guys to remain so. People look through this, and may not like to be manipulated. Quite another point would be a stand in favor of victims and the peace movement, and against the perpetrators and the war movement. The latter is indeed a minority movement in the ex-Yugoslavia context. But even so the general stance should not be condemnatory but rather working for the victims and with the peace movement, then extending the network to embrace, literally speaking, the other.

At this point the old dialectic principle of transition from quantity to quality enters. The five courses of action mentioned below can all be operated on a modest scale, and they will always make sense in some local context. But ex-Yugoslavia is big, and even bigger is Balkan and European space in general. To work the scale of the operations matters, as indicated in the proposals. What cannot be obtained at the order of magnitude of $2$ or $3$ ($10^2$ and $10^3$) may work at the order of magnitude of $4$ or $5$ participation.

The objection will be that the world cannot afford it, and that a feeling of fatigue is setting in anyhow. Moreover, governments may not admit their efforts have failed and even been counterproductive. But they may fear failure and be less inclined to support any initiative, letting the peoples of Yugoslavia kill themselves till it is all over. After all, that is also a way of bringing about war termination when all efforts seem to fail.

**Proposal #1**

\textit{Let 1000 conferences blossom all over!} The basic point is to make use of people's resourcefulness, which is enormous, their local knowledge on which they have a monopoly, and not to fall into the perennial trap of relying only on governments. They tend to organize conferences of, for and by "leaders", elected, selected, or self-selected, with the hope of negotiating an agreement that can be ratified back home by all the parties. No doubt there are conditions under which this works, particularly when the level of consensus is already high. But in deep conflict an agreement arrived at may be worth nothing lower down; moreover, a conflict arrived at may also not exist lower down. The top level may be deceptive. Error I is to believe that conflict resolution and peace can be obtained by elites alone; Error II is thinking that it can be obtained by people alone. Remedy: use both levels, all levels; and that has not been tried thus far.

The problem, so far unsolved, is how to link this all together so that the findings from 1000 conferences at the levels of regions, states, districts, cities, towns villages, blocs, hamlets, municipalities of all kinds, can be brought to bear upon the enormity of the conflict formation. Modern telecommunication should make networking of conferences even under hardship conditions possible. And do not worry so much about participants being "representative" or "leaders"; worry much more about how to conscientize, to mobilize, to get good ideas and reports of positive actions out into the open, about connecting people of good will with each other. And somewhere in this there will also be an intergovernmental conference, even those of short duration, for "decision-makers" in London and Geneva.

**Proposal #2**

\textit{Start a Helsinki process in Southeast Europe!} Three or at least two years ago the world should have called a Conference on Security and Cooperation in Southeast Europe (CSCSEE), as a special conference mechanism under CSCE, or, better, independently. The general rules would be:

- all relevant parties around the table;
- all relevant issues on the table; and
- sufficient time; years, not only months.

The outcomes of the 1000 conferences in Proposal #1 would then be fed into this conference, which, in line with the best UN
traditions from the big conferences of recent years, would also have a forum for People's Organizations, national and international.

Other states, including super-states, must then get out of their habit of punishing states or parties in general that they do not like by excluding them from organizations and conferences. A clear schizophrenia is operating here; on the one hand demanding that they should abide by international rules and obey the resolutions of the conference, on the other hand they are not permitted to participate. Needless to say, exactly those states that others feel inclined to exclude are the ones most in need of being included in whatever normative political culture emerges from the conference, leaving alone the basic point that they may have important information and ideas to contribute.

Non-European states relevant for the outcome, like the U.S. and Saudi Arabia, will of course be invited to participate. No time should be lost in getting started, with a view to producing a plan for a more lasting settlement in Southeast Europe. One possible formula would be a Balkan confederation of many states.

Proposal #3

*Will the media please start behaving!* One general impression would be that the media are improving. Thus, the anti-Serbian bias has become somewhat less pronounced. And the media have learnt that when Serbs and Croats fight somewhere they are not necessarily directed by Beograd or Zagreb; the situation is much more complex. Moreover, the suffering of common people has been very extensively reported; the focus is not only the elites. One might even argue that there has been insufficient attention paid to them recently. But there is no doubt that as this protracted conflict drags on with its cruel manifestations, journalists at least become more competent. The longer the conflict lasts and the worse it gets, the better the war reporting is bound to be.

But what is still very much missing is giving voice to the peace movements operating in ex-Yugoslavia. Their addresses are well publicized, but the media might perhaps complain that they are missing the single headquarters, and perhaps one or two names on which they can focus. On the other hand, that kind of centralism and elitism would be very contrary to the spirit of the peace movement and the decentralized and non- elitist way in which it works at its best, so the journalists should adjust themselves to the interview-objects and not demand adjustments the other way around. If male journalists cannot report such things, then find women who can do so.

Also missing are positive images of the future, interviews with people who have ideas of what an attractive future might look like. Such ideas may function as a self-fulfilling prophecy. So does single-minded focus on the horrors of the war; to be reported, but not as the only facts to be reported.

Proposal #4

*City/town/municipality adoption!* There is a long and fine tradition of municipality twinning, and of nuclear free municipalities, even of cities and towns dedicated to peace. Municipalities all over ex-Yugoslavia are suffering, the people are under inhuman duress. In addition the whole public structure is breaking down, from schools and hospitals to roads and water/electricity supplies. Municipalities in other parts of Europe can now show their solidarity by adopting, singly or together with other municipalities, maybe even from other countries, municipalities in ex-Yugoslavia with some common characteristics, for instance in terms of size and physical sophistication. Professionals would contact each other; physicians would help physicians, teachers would help teachers, etc. Women would meet. Refugees might find hosts within this system. As far as the present author knows, no such inter-municipal system has been set up; actually a shame for European society. It should be there on a permanent basis as a minimum capability, to be enacted in times of catastrophe.19

This therapy could be operated curatively and pre-emptively. A wounded municipality, hit by mortar fire and snipers, with much of the population escaping, needs help to be cured. And a non-wounded one needs help to remain so, signs that the rest of the world cares and is present, ready to support and report.

In short, the whole system of municipalities is an almost untapped reservoir for peace. They may feel subordinate to governments and believe in the thesis of states having a monopoly
on foreign affairs. But the mismanagement by the state system should make them rethink and create their own system for peace.

Proposal #5

International Peace Brigades. There are many courageous individuals who would like to volunteer as hostages for peace where fighting can be expected, and in order to help mediate, set up conferences, animate discussions, networking with people, literally to be speaking go-betweens. Many have done so, more would be willing. International peace brigades would organize their presence, at minimum costs to the hosts, and with a view to doing peace-making and peace building. Municipalities mentioned above would be important recruiting grounds. Problems:

First, how would they relate to UN peacekeeping forces? By and large they seem to have been among the more positive achievements of the world state system, adding to humanitarian aid a much needed element of protection. But to use states with an interventionist history in ex-Yugoslavia, like the UK, Germany, France, Italy, Austria, Hungary, Turkey and Russia’s definitely a mistake. Some soldiers/observers have probably paid for this insistence on presence with their lives, but then not so much because of their nationality as because they have been armed, even if only with hand or light weapons. Peace brigade people would be unarmed, and be invulnerable precisely because of their vulnerability, building up a reputation that would make them even more invulnerable.

Second, how would they relate to the coming UN civilian peacekeeping? Such initiatives should also be welcomed. But there is the danger that a lasting and massive UN presence, military or civilian, in practice would come close to UN colonialism. The peace brigades would not have any strong backing, and hence would be unable to dominate the host country.

In short, there is so much to be done, that should be done, and that should have been done. What happens, however, is an unfortunate encounter between two incongruent systems.

Down there, in ex-Yugoslavia, are very concrete people suffering the rage of nationalism let loose; some more on the sending, some more on the receiving side of the violence unleashed by that terrible agenda. Given some time, some good will, some outside sympathy they might have been able to sort it out with some people moving, some border adjustments, etc.; administrative measures rather than letting the guns take over.

Up there, in the thin air of well protected conference rooms, is the state system - headed by the super-states. They try to come to grips, literally speaking, with the Yugoslav situation, by imposing their own wills, trying to transform ex-Yugoslavia to fit their concepts, paradigms, discourses. Any Security Council debate about more embargo and sanctions has an air of the absurd, like listening to (partly the same) people arguing peace through the threat of mutual nuclear extermination.

The two systems do not come to grips with each other. The relevance is by and large apparent, more in the power of the discourse and the holders of those discourses than in the sad reality. A healing system would have to enter much more deeply into ex-Yugoslavia, like cell therapy rather than surgery, chemotherapy and radioactivity for the case of cancer. But, to stick to the metaphor, with no guarantee that the more subtle and less violent therapies will work. The cooperation of all the Yugoslav peoples is also desperately needed.
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Kosovo has been the epicenter of an acute power struggle since the end of Fourteenth Century Ottoman rule in the Balkans. The main protagonists to emerge are Kosovo's ethnic Albanian majority population, or "Kosovars" (as they prefer to be called), its Serbian minority, Serbia (or former Yugoslavia), and Albania, with spillover conflict potential along the northern Mediterranean. The current power struggle is exceptional insofar as the Kosovars are waging a nonviolent struggle - a struggle characterized by the absence of armed force for achieving social and political objectives. Meanwhile, opposition to Kosovar nonviolence has involved severe political repression and military force. At a time when the world is transfixed by the armed conflagration and atrocities throughout much of former Yugoslavia - Croatia, Serbia and Bosnia-Hercegovina - it is helpful to recognize the uniqueness of this Kosovar nonviolence and the conclusions that can be drawn from it with regard to broader regional questions.

The broader regional questions rest on ethnic roots in Kosovo - roots of an historical nature that some Balkan strategists believe could well ignite the northern Mediterranean into open war, much as happened before in the Balkan Wars of 1912-13. This essay seeks to ensure that the central issues at stake in this political struggle are resolved without recourse to armed violence, since a nonviolent solution is the clear desire of the great majority of Kosovo's population. The nonviolent struggle will be analyzed in order to assess its grass-roots support and durability. This will assist in shaping an appropriate response by the international community in ensuring a nonviolent solution. Before analyzing
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the nonviolent struggle, it will be helpful to survey recent political events in Kosovo and the former Yugoslavia.

Formative Political Events - Violent and Nonviolent

The rise to power of Slobodan Milosevic, a Serb of Kosovar descent, in October 1987, was to have devastating consequences both for Kosovo and the Yugoslav Federation. Milosevic, as President of the Serbian Central Committee and League of Communists, championed the grievances of Serbs from Kosovo against Kosovo's ethnic Albanians, and forced the resignation of his rival in December 1987, the President of the Serbian Republic, Ivan Stambolic. He criticized Stambolic for failing to "prevent the total annihilation of non-Albanian nationalities in Kosovo by Albanian irredentists." Milosevic's zealous support for Serb grievances in Kosovo and other parts of Yugoslavia sparked a wave of resignations and dismissals of prominent Serb figures, who contested his Serb nationalism and his condemnation of the 1974 Yugoslav Federal Constitution.

Milosevic's most divisive tactic was to encourage mass demonstrations against political opponents of his plan for amending the Serbian constitution for more Serbian authority over the autonomous provinces of Kosovo and Vojvodina. After 1,000 Serbs from Kosovo demonstrated in Novi Sad, the capital of the province of Vojvodina, in July 1988, for the proposed constitutional amendments, Milosevic praised the demonstrations as "great and invaluable support to Serbian leaders struggling for unity in Serbia and Yugoslavia." But the current Vojvodina leadership accused Milosevic of being a "nationalistic demagogue."

Further demonstrations erupted throughout Serbia and Vojvodina, until a threatened demonstration of 100,000 people in Novi Sad led to the collective resignation of the Vojvodina League of Communists Presidium (poliburo) in October 1988. Demonstrations were also organized in Titograd, the capital of the republic of Montenegro (ethnically Serbian), on the grounds that insufficient support was given to the Serbian demands over Kosovo. These ploys ended in the resignation of Montenegro's State Presidency and the Presidium of League of Communists in January 1989. Meanwhile, in November 1989 a Belgrade rally of up to 1,000,000 Serbs attended speeches in favor of the proposed constitutional amendments scheduled for February 1990.

Following success in Vojvodina, more demonstrations were organized in Kosovo, and together with Serbian pressure, led to the resignations of seven members of the Kosovo League of Communists Presidium (including the President, Kacusa Jasari and her predecessor Azem Vlasi in November 1988). Vlasi was subsequently dismissed from the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia on February 1, 1989. Their resignations sparked the first major Kosovar protest since 1981, when up to 100,000 Kosovar workers and students marched through the streets of Pristina, Kosovo's capital, supporting the reinstatement of Jasari and Vlasi, and the preservation of Kosovos's autonomy under the 1974 constitution. Rahman Morina, the Kosovar appointed to replace Jasari, then became the focus of demonstrators and strikers who demanded his removal, and rejected the planned amendments to the Serbian constitution. Morina's resignation, along with two other pro-Serbian Kosovars in February 1989, drew further counter demonstrations in Belgrade of 700,000 Serbs to protest against Albanian "chauvinism and separatism."

Morina's resignation accompanied "special measures" introduced in Kosovo on 27 February 1989, described as "...one step short of a state of emergency...", by large numbers of soldiers and federal police. These measures augmented the emergency security measures passed by the federal Presidency in October 1987 that had effectively suspended Kosovo's police and judiciary during increased ethnic tension. Later in March, Vlasi and other ethnic Albanian leaders were arrested for counterrevolutionary activities.

On 23 March 1989, under Serbian political pressure and arrests after the "special measures" placed on Kosovo, the 186-member provincial Assembly approved an amended Serbian constitution by a vote of 174 to 10, with 2 abstentions. This set off a further wave of demonstrations protesting the threat to Kosovo's autonomy. By the end of March, according to officials, 29 people had died during clashes with the security forces. Unofficial figures were much higher, amid reports that police had "...fired straight at
The Nonviolent Struggle in Kosovo

We turn now to the Kosovar struggle for self-determination and independence from Serbian rule. The struggle has been chiefly nonviolent thus far, since Kosovars have chosen not to use armed force for to attain their political objectives. Though cases of rioting by Kosovars have been reported by the Yugoslav media,20 these do not appear to be part of a wider, organized struggle by Kosovars.21

The Kosovars' primary political objective during the period of nonviolent struggle falls into three phases. The first began with the effective suspension of Kosovo's police and judiciary in October 1987, leading to demands for the restoration of Kosovo's autonomy under the 1974 constitution. The second phase began with the dissolution of the Kosovo Provincial Assembly in July 1990, led to calls for the recognition of Kosovo as a constituent republic within the Yugoslav Federation. The final phase began with the declarations of independence by the former Yugoslav republics of Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia-Hercegovina and Macedonia, starting in June 1991, turning the Kosovars' political objective to one of recognition of Kosovo as a sovereign and independent state.

Before describing the nonviolent activity waged by the Kosovars, it is helpful to understand that such activity falls into three categories.22 The first, symbolic protest and persuasion, includes activities such as demonstrations, public speeches, rallies, symbolic burials, marches, etc. The second category, noncooperation, is based on noncompliance with unacceptable laws and authority. Strikes, boycotts and civil disobedience exemplify nonviolent noncooperation.23 The final category, nonviolent intervention, refers to disruptive behavior aimed at co-creating parallel institutions for change, e.g., sit-ins, hunger strikes, seeking imprisonment and parallel government institutions.24

Mass Kosovar protest and persuasion has been frequent. A large rally of up to 1,000,000 people was held in November 1988, for example, to hear speeches for the reinstatement of two prominent Kosovars.25 On 24 January 1990 a crowd of 40,000 Kosovars assembled outside the Kosovo League of Communists headquarters and presented a list of demands.26 In September 1990, 5,000 demonstrators gathered outside a hotel where U.S. congressmen were to meet local leaders protesting continued Serbian control of the province.27 On 13 June 1991 Kosovars organized a funeral procession as a public protest for the symbolic "burial of the current violence".28

There have also been diverse activities of noncooperation in Kosovo. On 4 February 1989, a protest strike that had begun with miners developed into a general strike for the dismissal of pro-Serbian members of the Kosovo government.29 A general strike of 200,000 workers, organized by the Independent Trade Union Organization of Kosovo, also brought Kosovo to a standstill in
September 1990. The general strike and various boycotts followed a series of one-hour daily strikes beginning in July 1990, after Kosovars boycotted the Serbian referendum for a new constitution. About 400 polling stations were closed. Schools were also boycotted on the first day of the new school year beginning in September 1990. A year later 6,000 Kosovar teachers refused to instruct the children under the new Serbian curriculum.

Kosovars have also conducted nonviolent interventions. In February 1989, protesting the proposed amendments to the Serbian constitution and appointment of pro-Serbian members to the Kosovo government, 7,000 students from Pristina (the capital) did a sit-in at a sports stadium. Then 1,500 miners staged a sit-in and a mass hunger strike in the mines over 1,000 meters under ground. The hunger strike ended with the resignation of the politicians targeted by the strikers. The remaining strikers had to be brought out on stretchers after 100 had been hospitalized due to breathing problems and exhaustion.

Finally, Kosovars have been successful in creating parallel political institutions. After its dissolution by the Serbian Assembly for rejecting the Serbian referendum for a new constitution and declaring Kosovo a constituent Yugoslav Republic in July 1990, the Kosovo Assembly re-formed itself unilaterally with 111 of its ethnic Albanian, Turkish, and Moslem deputies at a secret session in the Kosovar city of Kacanik on 7 September. The Assembly subsequently declared an alternative constitution for the "Republic of Kosovo" as a full republic within Yugoslavia. Thereafter, following the flight of many members of the Assembly to Zagreb, Croatia, to escape prosecution for their declaration, an Assembly-in-Exile was formed.

Despite Serbian suppression of the growing parallel Kosovar government activities, the Kosovo Assembly-in-Exile organized a referendum on 26-30 September 1991, for Kosovo sovereignty. After a reported 87% turnout and 99.87% approval, a provisional coalition government was elected and headed by Bujar Bukoshi. The referendum was followed by elections on 24 May 1992 - again declared illegal by Serbian authorities and boycotted by the Serbs - in which the Democratic Alliance of Kosovo (DSK) won a majority in the 130-member Assembly and declared its leader, Ibrahim Rugova, President of the "Republic of Kosovo".

Rugova and other Kosovar leaders called for a temporary halt to nonviolent demonstrations after war broke out in Croatia and Bosnia, and limited the nonviolent struggle to the continued development of parallel social and political institutions that seek a negotiated solution with Serbian authorities. Rugova explained this strategy as follows:

"[The peaceful political road is a longer route...because we all know that in other, earlier situations, we suffered a [great deal]... Lives would be lost, and we do not want this."

Conclusion

The above-described wide-ranging Kosovar nonviolence suggests that it is not random and isolated, but an organized and systematic expression of determined resistance to foreign rule. The grass-roots level of organized nonviolence suggests not coordinated efforts by external powers, e.g., the Albanian state, the Austrians or other international entities, but coordinated efforts of prominent Kosovar people, whether trade unionists, cultural and political figures, to protect Kosovar autonomy and self-determination. The Assembly-in-Exile, then, should not be seen as a strategy to weaken Serbia, but as an ongoing dynamic of the primarily grass-roots nonviolent struggle in Kosovo since October 1987.

The evidence of Kosovar nonviolence suggests recognition by the Albanian majority that they cannot achieve their political goals by violent insurrection or rebellion against Serbian rule. It would therefore be tragic if the nonviolent struggle is instead dragged into the wider surrounding military struggle in the former Yugoslavia, with all its horrific images of 'ethnic cleansing'. Serbian military and paramilitary forces have continued to infiltrate Kosovo while the Albanian army has mobilized on the borders of Kosovo and Montenegro in December 1992. Above all, the international community must ensure that an explicitly nonviolent political struggle not be dragged into a wider
military solution to the collapse of the Yugoslav Federation. Therefore, the following four-point plan could prove helpful to the Kosovo nonviolent struggle and a nonviolent solution for its final political status.

Station United Nations observers in Kosovo to ensure that a military solution is not imposed over the nonviolent solution desired by Kosovo's population;

Block Serbian political repression and control exercised over all aspects of Kosovo's legal, political and cultural life;

Encourage international officials to recognize the Kosovo Assembly-in-Exile as a legitimate Kosovar government for self-determination; and

Recognize Kosovo as an autonomous federal unit of the former Yugoslavia, within the European Community-sponsored peace talks to reconcile conflict in the former Yugoslavia.
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Protest Movement in the Process of General Elections:
The Case of a Non-voting Group in Indonesia

by M. Abriyanto and Mansyur

General election is one way of measuring the degree of political participation of a nation. Elections reveal whether there is political awareness among people or whether political engineering has been made by political groups. The latter case is known generally as mobilized participation.

One wonders if mobilized participation is the result of the ruling regime's insecurity. It is common for an established ruling regime, which has the inclination to be authoritarian, to adopt a rigid political system and maintain its power by limiting political participation through repressive mechanisms. The possible by-product of this process is a participation crisis.

Ideally, each political system operates on the basis of democratic principles, where public policy-making is controlled effectively by people through its representatives in a periodic election. The election itself should be based on political equality and conducted in an atmosphere where political freedom is guaranteed.

The indicators of community behavior are varied in showing the electorate's disappointment, or their reluctance to participate. In an election, for example, community members might attempt to boycott the election by conducting demonstrations to expose the existing inequality, or abstain from voting because they feel that the existing political parties are unable to articulate their aspirations.

In Indonesia, especially during the New Order era, some people question the effectiveness of elections. In developed countries, like the United States, it is very common for citizens not to participate in an election because they do not take notice of the existing political system. Ironically, in Indonesia, those who do not use their right to participate in an election actually have a high
political concern and greater goal.

This paper will highlight the protest movement of Indonesia's non-voting group [and explore the effects of its nonviolent actions]. Those who abstain from voting call themselves the White Group, Golongan Putih, or Golput. The term Golput will be used throughout this paper in the place of the non-voting group.

Historical Background

Golput, as a socio-political phenomenon, originated from an atmosphere of inequality. It came to exist when the first election was held in 1971 by the New Order regime. Prior to the election, the political atmosphere had been worsening as a result of conflict of interests among political groups. It was in this atmosphere that Golput developed.

As was known, the military, particularly the army, succeeded in destroying the Communist force, institutionalized in the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI), in a coup attempt of September 30, 1965, and claimed the position of winner and stabilizer. With far better organization and discipline, the military established the New Order regime and consolidated its power by creating a coalition network with various parties.

It was first hoped that a power shift from President Soekarno to Soeharto would take place and create a new atmosphere. At that time, the youth called on the new regime to dismantle PKI, dissolve the 100 minister cabinet and reduce prices (the latter correlated with national redistribution). Besides the so called, Tritura (three claims from people), the New Order also called for a democratic political system.

In actuality, the political engineering conducted by the New Order government was excessive. The legacy of the erstwhile President Soekarno's guided democracy, was characterized by the centralization of power in the hands of the President. The Gotong-Royong cabinet was under his direct control and was comprised of representatives from all political parties, function groups, Ministers and the armed forces. This has not changed much in the present regime. Centralization of power still persists. Its manifestation, however, has changed somewhat as the New Order regime struggles to demonstrate a corporate model. Soekarno's corporate model is less flexible compared to that of Soeharto. As mentioned by Mochtar Mas'oeed, the New Order arose from:

...the grand coalition united by the confrontational attitude towards the Communist [Party which] was involved in the coup attempt. The coalition is comprised of religious groups, students and intellectuals. This coalition is headed by the army, whose generals were the victims of the ordeal takeover. Those absent from the coalition are President Soekarno and his supporters in the other services and the Nationalist party, some of whom are Communist sympathizers.

At a later stage, the coalition faced the danger of disunity when it was confronted with the army's interest to "put away" President Soekarno. With some effort, the anti-reformists in the coalition were subdued, and the army, along with its core coalition members (technocrats, anti-Communist intellectuals and several businessmen with close ties with the state) got their way.

With such a coalition, the New Order evolved a development strategy that clearly relied on [Walt] Rostow's concept of the stages of the economic growth. Politically, the New Order creates a mechanism to be implemented strictly in order to establish stability. An indication of this is the promulgation of Law No. 15/1969, limiting the formation of new political parties and simplifying the existing parties.

Arbi Sanit of University of Indonesia remarks about the first election of 1971 that:

The government, helped by the contesting parties, act[ed] as an election committee. Owing to the government (the President), military officials [were] also directly involved in conducting and securing the election. The neighborhoods (RT) and district society (RW) officials that [were] directly subordinated by village government act[ed] as officers in charge of registration of voters and management [on] the polling day.

Nine parties and the Functional Group, or Golongan Karya or Golkar, (political parties owned by the ruling government), contested the election. It caused one to wonder if the promulgation of the Law No. 15 was aimed at making Golkar the single winner
in the election.

In its efforts to win the election, Golkar manipulated civil service officials under the Home Affairs Ministry in Jakarta, which in 1960 totaled 579,000, with another 755,000 local officials and 815,000 employees in state-owned companies.8

Again, the government promulgated the Law No. 12/1969 banning government officials' active involvement in the political parties and forcing them to be loyal to the government. The debates on the two laws are still continuing since the government promulgated government regulation no. 6/1970 amending the 1969 provision and expanding its substance to embrace all governmental bodies, including judicatures and banks.9

In the first election's campaigning period, the two parties were hurt by fraud and intimidation. Several of the two parties' cadres were arrested, their canvassing speakers dropped down from stages and their mass campaigning [was] cut off, causing them to need to work harder to get licenses to conduct the campaign. On the contrary, however, people were pressed and conditioned to vote for Golkar.

All the phenomena was observed by youth who, at first, supported the New Order. They were disappointed with the policy-makers' performance on the national level saying that they were beginning to act beyond the earlier goal, to set up a democratic government. Most of the youth, who were students from interest groups such as the Legal Aid Foundation, began to express their objections.

Meanwhile, Golput disagreed with these undemocratic practices, and suggested that the people would be better spectators. They protested against the government's move by persuading people not to vote. They argued that the choice not to elect is a right for each citizen, just as the right to elect is was guaranteed by the Constitution. After dialoguing with President Arief Budiman, one of the Golput founders wrote,

...I ask, if I do not agree with the upcoming election, and I write articles indicating my disagreement, if I go to the voting booth to vote, will I be arrested? Or will I be viewed as a loyal opponent? President Soeharto answers that it is my right to do what I want to [do]. The important thing in anti-election

attitudes is that I do not use ways beyond the law, such as sabotaging or hampering others to vote. As long as my attitude is under the law, is it my right?10

Since Golput formally proclaimed its [position] on May 28, 1971, they started to disseminate anti-election ideas, to gain public sympathy, and suggested that people critically think about the election to avoid blind obedience of all the government regulations. "When the rule[s] of the game [are] violated, we should unite ourselves to enforce the existing rule[s] of the game."11

From Protest Movement to Nonviolence Movement

A unique quality of the protest movement conducted by Golput supporters is that they have apparent goals, and that they disseminate their ideas without using violence. They do not intimidate or force people to follow them. In this sense, Golput can be identified with the Western nonviolence movement. Literally, the nonviolence movement can be defined as:

Non-violent action comprises a group of techniques and strategies...in which a group of people decides to go outside of normal socially-validated channels in order to effect changes in what they believe to be unjust, oppressive or exploitative situations.12

In his definition, David A. Albert formulates that non-violence theory is a theory of power based on one single principle:

all power, personal, institutional, social, political or economic, depends ultimately upon obedience, contest and/or cooperation of those over whom the power is wielded.13

Since Golput is not an organization, it does not have formal membership or officers in charge. As a document of Golput states, "This sort of group is not a political, but a cultural grouping in the sense that it is established to form a tradition or culture for a healthy society." In more details, the document says,
Golput is not an organization. It is an identification for those who are not satisfied with the existing conditions, where democratic rules of the game are violated, not only by political parties (as it was shown when they promulgated the Law of Election 1969), but also by Golongan Karya which manipulates government officials and ways beyond the law to win the election, in a democratic society.\(^{14}\)

Golput can be categorized as a nonviolence protest movement. It is important to note, however, that the above theory of nonviolence, in turn, does not limit it to a nonviolence movement that relies on a group or individual [action].

The one thing that should be kept in mind, according to Albert, is how to examine the social powers which exist in the community. By the term "social power," we mean:

The capacity to organize or control, directly or indirectly, the behavior of others through purposeful human action. What is special about non-violence action is that it attempts to cut off the sources of an opponent's power in a conflict situation, rather than combating the final product of these sources, as in organized violent strategies.\(^{15}\)

The sources of social powers identified by Gene Sharp in his monumental works, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*, are:\(^{16}\)

a. **authority** - the perceived right and voluntary acceptance of command and obedience without sanctions;

b. **human resources** - the number, proportion and organizations of people who obey, cooperate, or provide special assistance to the wielder of power;

c. **skill and knowledge** - the quality of human resources at the disposal of the wielder of power can often be as important a source of power as the quantity of such resources;

d. **material resources** - control over property, economics, means of communication and transportation;

e. **ideological factors** - the ability to manipulate the beliefs of others based on a common faith or mission;

f. **psychological factors** - the charisma of a wielder of power and people's habits and attitudes towards obedience and submission;

g. **sanctions** - the methods of obedience available to a wielder of power.

Actions and campaigns conducted by Golput are varied from one election to another (from 1971, 1977, 1982, 1987 to 1992). Sometimes their frequency is very intense, sometimes they are mere repetitions of previous ones.

Thus, the method used to undermine the ruling government's authority is often less significant. But, in certain events, the presence of Golput, such as activities during the election process, undoubtedly, makes the government anxious.

The usual ways taken by Golput to expose their aspirations are: 1) do not go to the voting booths; 2) go to the voting booths, but do not vote; 3) destroy the ballot papers they get.

**The Dynamics of the Golput**

Since its beginning, Golput supporters have been struggling to obtain public sympathies, in one way or another. In the election of 1971, they disseminated the idea that a new authoritarian regime, which attempted to make Golkar a single ruling party, had emerged. At that time, they tried to build a network to various regions and mobilize the politically like-minded youth. They also held seminars and other meetings to critically discuss the problems of development as well as displayed placards communicating the uneven government attitudes towards the contesting political organizations. Some placards say, "Golput's supporters are good spectators," and some others say, "It is a right not to vote."

When Golput, with its "white pentagonal" symbol becomes more familiar to the public, the government, afraid of more people becoming interested in the movement, commissions security officials to oppress the movement. The government considers Golput a dangerous movement and believes that it might cause
instability. Moreover, at that time, the newly created New Order was attempting to get international sympathy, especially from donor countries, in its efforts to attract more foreign investments and aid in Indonesia.

Formally, there was no significant commentary stated by government officials about Golput activities, but intimidation toward the movement's supporters continued to take place. Several Golput supporters were arrested and interrogated, placards were brought down, and seminars and discussions were banned. More extremely, the state-owned radio, Radio Republik Indonesia (RRI), plainly accused that Golput had been penetrated by communists and other subversive elements. So it was predictable that in the 1971 election, the issues launched by Golput focused on the government's efforts to legitimize its power.

The election results revealed that the Golput movement won eight percent of the vote, while the number of validated ballots was 90 percent of the vote, with Golkar as the predominant winner. In its development, Golkar has come to be a hegemonic party. It is estimated that Golkar's triumph is not separable with the excessive government intervention and fraud.

It is also estimated that fraud continues to exist in the overall elections, including the latest one. So far, the government has never seriously investigated the fraud. The cases of fraud, especially those that occurred before the 1992 election, enabled Golput to criticize the government. An observer of the Golput movement says, "...protests launched during the election of 1977 and so forth are based on the considerations that these elections were facilitated by the government [and] legitimize its development strategies, [which are] characterized by economic growth and the widening social and economic inequality it runs."

One thing to [remember] about Golput activities during the 1971 election [was] its critical adoption of national-scale issues like foreign investment, corruption, undemocratic political system and [the] luxurious lifestyle [of some]. Later, these issues became common symptoms in the country. Besides, their nonviolence characteristics were evaluated to be positive. The public did not cynically consider the activities, and the printed mass media often stood behind the Golput supporters.

After the election, when the Golput supporters lost momentum, they campaigned on new issues. Some of the most important issues are the continually increasing power of President Soeharto, the Ministers' roles as the President's assistants, and the limited roles of the House of Representatives and its many provisions. They also watched the role of the President's private assistants and some army officers commissioned to run Pertamina and Bulog, in which the two state-owned companies [came to be a nest for
corruption]. The uncertain situation was then manipulated by students, most of whom were Golput supporters, to pressure Golkar, which, in the beginning had pledged to adopt democratic values. The protest was meaningless because of the lack of coordination, causing their move to cut off the government authority to become less effective.

Not less significant than this, was the students' move to protest the construction of TMII, a recreation center in Jakarta describing Indonesia's beauties and diversities. The construction, ironically, was in coincidence with an internal situation in which the government was facing financial crises. The students connected the project with the involvement of a foundation owned by the President's family.

In 1974, coinciding with the emergence of an issue that several army officers were contesting the assumed Presidency, students struck back. This action, however, was tragically defeated. At the same time another protest, launched by Moslems opposing the Law of Marriage, was also cut off by the government.

Based on the results of the 1971 election, the government promulgated a surprising policy: nine political parties contested in the 1971 election were simplified to two - 1) the Moslem-based United Development Party (PPP) and; 2) the Indonesian Democratic Party (PDI) (a fusion of Christian and nationalist parties), while Golkar continued to exist. This provision significantly undermined the role of political parties.

Further, the government promulgated a law stipulating that all social and political organizations adopt Pancasila as their single principle. This condition led Golkar to win in the next elections.

In the elections of 1977, 1982, and 1987, where the great majority was won by Golkar, those who abstained from voting shared less than ten percent (see figure 2). Nevertheless, the available facts reveal that the Golput movement survived, and continues to express its aspirations.

By 1990, it was known that the government had been anxious about the movement. And prior to the 1992 election, the government promulgated a regulation tightening the conduct of campaigns. The regulation limits a campaign period to 25 days, bans motorcade rallies, conducts campaigns through debates in electronic mass media and curbs the substance of the campaign speeches.

The government's decision to hold the election on a working day (9 June) was criticized by PDI and PPP. The two parties thought that the timing would benefit Golkar as it limited government officials' freedom to vote. The two parties also stated their objection to the composition of the election committee, which was dominated by the government officials. The two parties and private sectors extended a proposal to the government to lead them in the ballot counting, But the government neglected to follow-up.

In their campaigns, the contesting parties exposed big issues like manipulation of power, democratic crises, monopolistic practices and Presidential terms. They said that the New Order should make corrections against its adopted development strategies. They, however, did not point out the person(s) responsible for them. The conditions were not far away from the observations of Golput supporters. Ineffectiveness of the political parties caused Golput supporters to speak louder. The Golput-minded students, at that time, conducted many actions expressing important national issues. This is proof that society becomes more critical in observing political life due to the globalization of information and the amount of youth voting for the first time (17 million).

About the campaign situation, Far Eastern Economic Review says, "...entertainment, rather than election issues, seems to be [the order] of the day as Indonesia prepares for the 9 June parliamentary elections. Pop music, local singers and the occasional skit draw enthusiastic response from the predominantly teen-age crowds at rallies."25

The number of Golput supporters, ever since the 1971 election, is estimated to have risen. It seems, however, that they do not have enough courage to express their views. Those who work for any state-owned firms, or are related with the government works, are afraid to express their views as they definitely know that it is very risky to vote for other than Golkar.

At last the Golput supporters join with the rest of society, hand-in-hand, to improve [social conditions] or seek alternatives to the [existing] political system. The supporters, which in the beginning were limited to urban intellectuals like artists,
journalists, teachers, students, social workers, professionals, bureaucrats and businesspersons, now extends to the lower level of the society as well.

The lower-level society's involvement in the Golput movement incited their unrest due to the land, labor wage, and splendor issues. More than 90 percent of land clearing cases are not perfectly completed: labor is underpaid, the street's splendor is arrested for the sake of development. These cases led [lower social groups] to distrust the government, including the ruling party.

The voices of unrest actually had been anticipated by the two contesting parties and Golput. It seems that PDI is more successful in attracting the voices compared to PPP.

Golput supporters were still passive in the beginning years of the 1990's, while students and social workers were more active in attracting the lower level society. This phenomena is being observed by an institute under the auspices of the University of Indonesia, in cooperation with the special provincial government of Jakarta [the capital city of Indonesia] in mid-1991. In the beginning, the provincial government allowed it, but the research, which had been planned to involve around 1000 respondents, was then called off by one side.

By the end of March 1992, two students of Gadjah Mada University were arrested with the accusation of disseminating "Lebaran (Moslem day) cards" displaying the sentence, "We cannot follow the election as it is unqualified." A week later, a book entitled, Various Views on Golput Political Phenomenon, edited by Arbi Sanit, a lecturer of the University of Indonesia, was published. The book was hailed by the public and reviewed by many in the printed mass media. The book was discussed again in Yogyakarta at the end of April. It is estimated that most of the discussion's 200 participants were Golput supporters. The discussion resulted in an idea to form the fourth party. This is known as the Fourth Group (Golongan Keempat, or Golpat).

Seeing the development of the Golput, the government has made an effort to put the movement in a corner through various statements. For example, the Minister for Youth and Sports, Akbar Tanjung, said that political socialization in campuses has failed as more students become involved in the Golput movement, and do not fully understand the democracy of Pancasila.

Also in April, a study club called Lembaga Studi Bina Bangsa (LSBB) conducted a research study on the Golput movement, in which the majority of the respondents were youths. Unfortunately, the results of the research was published in the printed mass media after the election, so that the effect expected from the research was less meaningful. On May 13, a group of students called itself the "Solidarity Front of Bandung Students" met the chief of the People's Consultative Assembly (MPR) and the House of Representatives (DPR) in Jakarta to state their protest about the restricted "freedom to unite" as it is guaranteed by Article 28 of the constitution. The group identified itself as a Golput supporter. A week later, in coincidence with the commemoration of the Awakening Day of May 20, 1992, students of the University of Diponegoro, Semarang, conducted a demonstration in their campus shouting criticisms of the ongoing political campaigns at the 1992 election. They ended their demonstrations by stating that they were Golput supporters. The aftermath of the action was that two of students that were accused as activators of the demonstration were arrested.

The next day in Yogyakarta, PDI and PPP stated their objections to the provincial government's ban on a motorcade rally by placing their election symbols throughout the city. The Golput supporters, most of them students, tapped the event by raising the Golput symbol, marching and criticizing the provincial government policy. The marchers, followed by mass [media], carried coffins adorned with the sentence, "melancholic democracy." They also displayed placards saying, "Aku ola elu" (I object to vote). The government let the peaceful actions take place, although there were many tanks in the road.

The three day-long raising of the white pentagonal symbols as well as the peaceful actions, obtained public sympathies, and are regarded as the Golput's most successful action over the last 21 years. It seemed that the supporters were able to manipulate the aforementioned sources of social powers introduced by Gene Sharp. Unfortunately, the "Yogyakarta Affairs" were not followed by the similar action in the other places. In Yogyakarta itself, the movement was getting weak. And so, it is worried that the Golput action was only temporary.
The less monumental actions that appeared after the Yogya affair, among other events, occurred in early June 1992, when around 100 students of various higher education institute(s), went to the central Java police station in Smearing and asked the authorized officer to release two students of the University Front of Indonesian People, [who identified themselves as Golput supporters, and went to the MPR/DPR building and attempted to initiate a dialogue with MPR/DPR members].

Entering the cooling-off period, after 25 campaign days, a group of youth of the Pijar Foundation disseminated thousands of opened letters saying, "We choose not [to] elect, and to vote or not it is up to you, to the public, [the] mass media, social and political organizations, and interest groups." It implies that at the foundation of this movement is a Golput supporter(s). At the same time, students of the University of National Jakarta, again discussed Arbi Sanit's book.

Conclusion

The 1992 election results reveal that the number of validated votes was 90 percent (see figure 2), while the rest were invalidated. It is necessary for political observers to know the details about the latter. Is it true that the invalidated votes occur because the ballots are ruined? Or because an elector marks more than one ballot and is absent in the polling booths, as is stated by the government? Is it possible that the remaining ten percent are Golput voters? (see figure 2)

To be more effective in controlling the repressive government policies, Golput must not rely on people's voluntarism to surface once every five years at the time of the elections. It is necessary for its supporters to vigorously mass canvass, persuade people, and build networks. As for now, the Golput movement only focuses on Java island.

It is accurate to say that Golput is a good nonviolence movement. Golput guilefully utilizes the "power of the people" available to Indonesians through their constitutional rights to free speech (despite the institutional propensity to discourage these rights). It should, however, attempt to move away from the feeling of fear plagued by those who have "different views."

Using Allan Cuming's criteria, Golput would still be considered a weak movement. To respond to this, it is necessary for Golput supporters to organize their movement more seriously.

We have, however, exhibited that issues launched by Golput are usually sensitive and national-scale, such as the Presidential terms, independence of political organizations, and improvement of the election system. The challenge is, can Golput, as a nonviolent movement, enhance its role into another movement enabling it to minimize (and if possible, to end) all repressive practices.
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Civilian-Based Defense for the Grassroots

A Review of Brian Martin's Social Defence, Social Change

by

David T. Ritchie

An important offshoot of the growing nonviolence movement is the debate concerning Civilian-Based Defense (CBD). Advocates of CBD argue that the military structures which currently exist within nation-states, and presumably other social groups as well (tribes and bioregions for example), can and should be replaced by training civilians to use nonviolent action techniques in conflict situations such as coups, invasions and occupations. The chief proponents of this post-military system of national and transnational defense are readily recognizable to even the casual observer of the dialogue on nonviolence, and over the past twenty years or so the work of these individuals has gradually determined the conceptual parameters of the debate.

This evolution, spurred primarily by Gene Sharp and his colleagues at the Albert Einstein Institute and the Civilian-Based Defense Association, has taken a decidedly uni-focal course, concentrating almost exclusively on replacing military structures through existing social and political institutions. This viewpoint, in fact, is so dominant that one would have been extremely hard pressed to find any serious alternatives until very recently. This is a severe shortcoming, especially from the perspective of social change proponents and activists, and one which Brian Martin seeks to rectify with his new book Social Defence, Social Change.

Martin squarely addresses the fact that the advocates of this "Sharpi an" discourse totally ignore entire segments of the...
nonviolence movement in order to make their proposals more palatable to the political mainstream. Not only does Martin properly point out that Sharp and his followers are quite obvious in their attempts to distance themselves from activists and others who push for substantive social change,8 but he persuasively argues that true implementation of nonviolent CBD (which he prefers to call social defense) will require fundamental changes to the military-industrial apparatus.

This in turn would require a shake-up of the political status quo, because the present power structure is intimately tied to the economic power of the arms producing conglomerates and the institutions (public and private) which support them.6 In this way, then, the present ruling "elites" would be less willing to implement social defense because it would effectively bring about an end to the political framework which supports them.7 In short, any substantive structural modifications to the social, economic and political mechanisms at work in a given society are sure to substantially impact upon other such mechanisms. That most CBD advocates never so much as address this phenomena - let alone resolve it - is quite troubling to Martin. For his part, Martin goes a long way in showing (rightfully, I believe) that the impact of replacing the military-industrial complex would have a consuming and adverse effect on the ruling elites.8

Beyond this, Martin criticizes the notion that social defense is best left to a small band of researchers, policy analysts and strategists.9 This leads, we are told, to a continuation of the present top-down hierarchies which most social change activists maintain to be the core component to oppression and dogmatic entrenchment. This kind of criticism has been leveled at proponents of "elite" CBD in the past, but with little apparent reception.10 Martin even envisions a scenario whereby a corps of elite professionals who are supposed to implement a social defense system were instead popular movements for social change.11 It is interesting to note that Sharp does not address this possibility in any of his principal writings on CBD.

Martin indicates that the only true way to alleviate the internal systemic pressure caused by implementing social defense is to sidestep existing social institutions altogether, and to turn to the very people and movements that Sharp and his colleagues appear to disdain the most; activists in the peace, feminist, environmental and social change movements. The work that groups in these fields can - and in many instances do - undertake (collectively referred to by Martin as grassroots initiatives) allow for the mass implementation of nonviolent action techniques from the bottom up. This inversion would have a decentralizing effect, thus concentrating social defense strategy (and power) on a community-based level. This is an implementation agenda that several alternative movements will be attracted to,12 and one which sets him far apart from Sharp.

After a short primer on social defense theory, and the chapters containing the themes outlined above, Martin sets out to justify his contentions by using illustrations of the impact that grassroots social defense might have on the feminist and environmental movements. He takes this intellectual project even further, by addressing issues such as the effect of his vision on science, technology and telecommunications.

Herein lies the downside of this generally very important book. While Martin uncovers a glaring and obvious deficiency in "traditional" CBD discourse, he attempts to cover far too many specifics in his alternative theory - at least in a book that contains less than 150 pages. He might have been better off to elaborate further on his very perceptive criticisms of Sharp's work, followed by a more general, yet in-depth, discussion of why grassroots implementation is a more appropriate strategy. The kind of detailed implications which he outlines (such as the effect on police and prisons) could probably have waited until some of the more foundational constructs have been parsed out a little more thoroughly. For example, the final three chapters (which deal with, respectively, substantive political and economic change and shifts in power relationships) could have been expanded to give a fuller discussion on how grassroots social defense would intersect with and affect status quo institutions, as well as theories concerning "elite" CBD.

This having been said, I would reiterate that Martin's book is an extremely important addition to scholarship on social defense. He gingerly touches on many (most) of the integral points concerning social defense, and - as has been said - uncovers a most egregious shortcoming in traditional CBD theory. Individuals
interested in the field should still refer to Gene Sharp's works to
gather the background on the evolution of the ideas that Sharp and
his colleagues have pioneered, but I would venture to say that no
full examination of CBD would be complete without a reading of
Martin's intriguing book. Social Defense, Social Change pushes
the conceptual envelope concerning where social defense can,
might and should be used, and adds an important dimension to the
debate that has been virtually nonexistent up to now.
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Abstract:
Costa Rica claims to be one of the few neutral and nonaligned states to have abolished its military power. It furnishes an historical context for exploring two hypotheses: first, that nonviolent, cooperative international conflict resolution has promoted peace, security, and development, and second, that violent international conflict resolution has promoted war, insecurity, and underdevelopment.

Discussion of the theory, method, and outcome for such conflict resolution will include a new indicator on serial violence as well as data on housing, health, education, and employment. This indicator of conflict intensity measures the percentage of people killed in periodic war over twenty-year time spans, and contributes to the United Nations' General Assembly security and international conflict resolution debate which links peace, disarmament, and development.

The thesis will focus on Costa Rica's border with Nicaragua along the San Juan River, a conflictive border which continues to be a focus of attention as a possible site for an isthmian border canal, and for use as a possible cornerstone in various isthmian peace plans. The United States has withdrawn twice from a world court in the Twentieth Century over conflict concerning this border (associated with intervention by Japan and Israel, United Nations peacekeeping overtures, and European Economic Community trade).

A world order rather than an anti-dependency or a nonviolent approach to resolve conflict dominates international conflict resolution, concentrated especially in four major global zones of conflict including the Western Caribbean. Resorting to violent conflict resolution has fostered an insurgent international arms and drug (cocaine) business similar to that operating in pre-1959 Cuba and a growing international debt. This dissertation will address not only problematic international Iran-Contra issues, but also why an integrated approach to cooperative development in the resolution of conflict will be necessary in the future.
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Abstract:
Power is an area of research common to radical feminism and nonviolence strategy. A comparison of representative Western radical feminist work on the topic of power with Gene Sharp's nonviolence strategy theory reveals two similarities. Both disciplines recognize a societal preference for defining power as control, and both emphasize power from the point of view of the oppressed. However, Gene Sharp's nonviolence strategy theory suffers from a failure to incorporate feminist theories of power. The feminist articulation of power as competence enhances the definition used in nonviolence strategy to one that more succinctly describes why nonviolence works.
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Abstract:
This thesis examines how people in a Central American setting create, understand and manage conflict in everyday encounters. The investigation is based on tape recordings of actual conflict episodes, member talk about conflict and extensive participant observation in various Central American settings. The ethnography describing a folk vision of conflict is accompanied by the application of a phenomenological framework drawing extensively from the sociology of language and knowledge to describe processes central in the accomplishment of conflict at the microsociological level, building toward a general theory of how social conflict and social realities are constructed.

Central to the thesis is an examination of how members of Genesis, a community leadership training group in Puntarenas, Costa Rica created and managed a conflict over the participation of two homosexuals in their project. Based on this episode an examination is made by the members' activity they refer to as ubicarse, or locating oneself and experience. It is suggested that conflict is accomplished by creating "locations": Present experience is "coordinated" in accumulated knowledge deemed relevant and useful for understanding and responding appropriately to the present and emerging future. Genesis' members' conflict language and their talk about conflict is also analyzed uncovering a holistic and circular conception and management of problems. Key strategies used in folk conflict management, confianza (trust) and patas (connections), describe how personal networks are used to both understand and handle problems. Several micro discoveries and processes are compared with macro analogues, based on participant observation in the mediation of the YATAMA/Sandinista negotiations during 1987.

The thesis inductively builds a theory of transvaluation. It is argued that the creation and accomplishment of conflict is better understood when connected to a theoretical framework that endeavors to describe the constitutive process of how social meaning is negotiated and constructed.
Abstract: Humankind creates its own identities by separating itself from "other" living and non-living beings. This practice allows violence to be justified such that it becomes a normal course of action which basically constitutes the violent paradigm.

But the possibility of nuclear war serves as Kuhn's "anomaly" to indicate that violence is no longer justified as a viable method for self-preservation.

To solve this puzzle, one needs to think in a nonviolent paradigm where methods other than violence are used. To provide nonviolent alternatives to the rulers does not necessarily result in nonviolent conflict resolution. Therefore, within the nonviolent paradigm, this study is an attempt to provide the rulers with nonviolent alternatives because they are normally the initiators of violence.

The metaphor "the prince" is used because it strongly connotes the ideas of practicality and reliance on one's own capability to cope with the situation instead of reliance on external sources.

Nonviolent Prince assumes a book form and contains thirteen chapters. These chapters suggest ways to deal with potential oppositions which are the elites, the oppressed or the people and international opponents by using the three basic techniques: conversion, persuasion and nonviolent coercion.

These techniques are proposed with special consideration of the time dimension in politics. Where urgency or immediacy exists, at such times where violence is normally called for, nonviolent alternatives are mostly needed.

Finally, it is concluded that what is mostly needed at present are nonviolent political scientists who are sensitive enough to see the nonviolent character of the discipline of political science and are committed to the creation of nonviolent alternatives.
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1 November 1994

Dear Friends:

Good greetings. The second issue of the International Journal of Nonviolence focuses on nonviolence education. The evolutionary struggle of nonviolence as an academic field has advanced significantly through recent changes in South Africa and the Middle East — changes often considered impossible. Direct nonviolent action is a powerful tool for change and liberation, as well as for ongoing, preventive security concerns. This issue of the International Journal of Nonviolence reinforces the recognition of nonviolence as an approach to peace, with examples as to why training makes the difference between what works and does not work.

The theme for our third issue, that of religion, spirituality, and nonviolence, will further illustrate the enormous possibilities of viable nonviolence in thought and deed. We invite activists and academics, scholars, writers, and students to explore this issue — We welcome your participation.

My colleagues and I in Peace and Conflict Resolution Studies here at The American University join in supporting this important international endeavor.

Abdul Aziz Said
Director
From the Editors’ Desks:

As a small group of people struggling to make a pioneer trade journal, available for the first time on nonviolence, we are very happy to publish this second issue of the International Journal of Nonviolence. Thank you for supporting our work, and please accept our apologies for the time lost.

This second issue of the International Journal of Nonviolence explores nonviolence education and training for civil disobedience and nonviolent direct action. We begin with an article about human needs and rights as our foundation for this issue. The following articles will expand upon the importance of human rights and needs within resource roles, the reason that training makes a difference, and how to empower peace and social justice change through resources and training. Various examples will describe resources and training in action, for example, exercises for action and programs for academics. Book reviews will describe recent publications of nonviolent action in South Africa and the changing resource roles of data-base building and retrieval approaches to conflict resolution through nonviolence. This issue closes with an annotated listing of doctoral dissertations and master theses on nonviolence notably oriented toward training and education.

We would also like to pass on some passages from letters of interest that offer some insight into the work and achievements of the people participating in the International Journal of Nonviolence. From the new state of Uzbekistan, formerly the base for the Samarkand World School of Revolution (the USSR’s “Cold War” equivalent of the US School of the Americas or Fort Bragg for training special forces “hit squads” in the Third World):

Hi & Salaam Aleikum! ... You can join by offering your help in whatever form you are able. Now we have an idea to inaugurate next year a large-scale children’s arts exhibition “American Children Look at the World,” which would enable us and our people to discover America and Americans, their life and culture, etc., through the eyes of children of your country.... Looking forward to hearing from you...
Anatoly Ionesov, Dir., International Museum of Peace and Solidarity, P.O. Box 76, Samarkand 703000, Republic of Uzbekistan.

In addition, close to the right-wing source of the cesium, plutonium, and so forth, surfacing among criminals throughout Europe, Vladimir Sloviak notes that he and Alexandra Koroleva have been organizing through a group called "Eco-Defense" since 1990. They plan to co-organize a Baltic Conference over the Post-Cold War damage and cleanup crisis. They have campaigned with direct nonviolent action in the following places:

- Nizhny Novgorod, Russia. Spring 1991
- Nuclear Power Station
- Zaporozhie, Ukraine. Summer 1991
- Chemical Works
- Lipetsk, Russia, Swedish-built "Viking-Raps" (Karlshamn AB) Summer 1992
- Possible catastrophe at the Ignalina, Lithuania, Nuclear Bomb Plant July 1993
- Destruction of the Samarskaykay
- Luka National Park, Zhiguli Mts. Summer 1993
- Destruction of the Samarskaykay
- c/o EcoDefense, Inform Bulletin, Moskovsky Prospekt 120-134, 236006 Kaliningrad Tel +7 0112 437286; E-mail: codefense@glas.acp.org

Rounding out such insights into nonviolence within a chaotic Slavic "Post Cold War" world, our Nonviolence International (NI) person in Russia, Andrei Kamenshikov (email: omegaandre@glas.acp.org), sends some remarks from St. Petersburg, over conditions in Ingushetia, North Ossetia, and Grozny (capital city of Chechnya), in the North Caucasus. Survivors of war and deportation to Siberia in the past, the Chechen people who comprise a large part of the Caucasian mountain population are threatened with war, hunger, and blockades.

Unfortunately arms and drug dealers from areas like Kaliningrad and Europe to the North, connected to "Chechen Mafia," make things even more tense. Andrei also asks if any one "on the horizon (who knows Slavic Russian) might be willing to work as a stringer in the USA for a peace center in Moscow?" Media coverage of radioactive and chemical-biological warfare agent waste incineration eco-damage, possibly threatening the non-Slav industrialized world beyond, could be a primary focus.

From the green and peace movements of Eastern Africa, led by women sharing in long hunger strikes and intense police beatings:

We ... are trying to reach people like you who might have relevant information on nonviolence. We note that you give assistance. What type? ... For the moment [our own] rulers have a grip on the power and the style of governance they practiced when they enjoyed political patronage from the superpowers of the cold war era. But the post-cold war politics of development in Africa should put people, rather than their rulers, first. By any standard, the current rulers govern as any cruel and occupying force.... [Our] main responsibility is to give immediate physical and moral support and to continue the all-important advocacy role.

Dr. Wangari Muta Maathai, Coordinator, Green Belt Movement and Tribal Clashes Resettlement Volunteer Service (TCR), P.O. Box 67545, Nairobi, Kenya. Njoki Njoroge Ngheu, a colleague of Maathai, notes that such work dates from 1977: mobilizing 50,000 people; planting over 10 million trees (70-80% survival rates); and hunger-striking in Nairobi (e.g., March 1992, with the Mothers of Political Prisoners).

People from Kosovo, a state of former Yugoslavia using nonviolence to resolve violent Balkan Conflict, note that they do have one book available for readers able to understand Kosovar: Ibrahim Rugova, Pavisia Dhe Demokracia (Pristina, Kosovo [fml. Yugoslavia]: Fjala, 1991). See especially his chapter on theoretical struggle: "Pusheti Po lu Friksesohet Zgjedhje te Lira Në Kosovë," pp. 162-73. Reaching Pristina, Kosovo, is difficult, unless via E-mail. We suggest that anyone searching for such insight, work through nationally-based refugee groups.
Finally we note a tentative International Peace University Forum proposed for 1 September to 1 October 1995, in Berlin and Potsdam. We hope that this planned forum will achieve the objective of serving to further the institutionalization of fully-accredited peace and nonviolence graduate and undergraduate degrees in Germany and other countries, and to offer a forum for dialogue over issues varying from Cold War damage and cleanup to NAFTA and Neo-Fascism. This opening Peace University Forum in Berlin and Potsdam will be dedicated to the Fiftieth Anniversary of the End of World War II and the Fiftieth Jubilee of the United Nations. Berlin and Potsdam were the two cultural roots of a divided Germany — struggling now together to face tremendous Post-Cold War damage. If this interests you, please contact the Peace University:

Internationalen Friedens-Universität, Akazienstrasse 27, 10823 Berlin, Germany, and Internationalen Friedens-Universität, Kantstrasse 9, 14471 Potsdam, Germany.

Tentative speakers include: Sting, James Grant, Van Morrison, Boris Yeltsin, Christa Wolf, Desmond Tutu, Elie Wiesel, Hazel Henderson, Henry Kissinger, Johan Galtung, Louise Rinsler, Norman Borlaug, Peter Gabriel, Robert McNamara, Sophia Loren, Teddy Kollek, Gregory Peck, Wassily Leontief, Yehudi Menuhin, Gabrielle Krone-Schmalz, Rigoberta Menchu, the Dalai Lama, Mairead Corrigan Maguire, Oscar Arias Sánchez, Adolfo Pérez Esquivel, the IPPNW, and thousands more. Supporting groups include UNICEF, the Geneva International Peace Bureau, and the UN Universidad para la Paz or UPAZ in Costa Rica.

Human Rights as the Basic Principle for Nonviolence Training

By Luis Pérez Aguirre*

Given the cruel logic of violence in promoting even more violence, the authentic human being can do no less than to oppose violence firmly. One should always revere life, not death or violence. In the face of violence, two principle attitudes are possible: that characterized by resignation — and that devoted wholly to the struggle to further conditions of life without violence, even if not free of conflicts and contradictions. The ultimate purpose of nonviolence can not exceed the means that ought to support and reinforce nonviolence. Ends should emanate from those means used for nonviolent ends.

Through this ambiguity, reflection on what is implied by nonviolence invariably begins by defining nonviolence. It is not passivity, not resignation before injustice, not the ingenuous dream of a society without conflicts. In affirming that nonviolence is struggle, it is more a strategy than a ethereal philosophy, i.e., it’s a practice more than a belief. It is a practice of conflict resolution with the least possible violence. One can cite a great many names of nonviolence associated with famous conflicts: e.g., that of Mohandas & Kasturbai Gandhi, in the liberation of the people of India from British colonialism; that of Martin & Coretta Scott-Luther King, Jr., in the struggle of Black North Americans for their civil rights; and that of César Chavez & Dolores Huerta in the creation of the farm workers union in California, and so forth.

But in our Global South the truth and evidence of reality strikes us everyday via death by hunger. We are trapped in an infernal circle of violence, of contempt for life on all levels, and disrespect for the most elemental rights of a person. The imposed "social and economic order" is cruel and unjust. Disdain for human dignity has become a permanent cauldron from which all types of violence and counter-violence bubble.

In addition to the extraordinarily violent marginalization and oppression for the majority of our people, the inhumane devaluation of those people deprived of their rights challenges our imagination and so demands from us a suitable and effective response.

It is thus that the dilemma arises between violence and nonviolence. We face what the Bishops of Latin America (in the Statements from the Conferences of Medellin and Puebla) called "institutionalized violence" and "institutionalized injustice". At the same time, they demanded a struggle for peace and justice, a demand for life at the roots of a struggle that invited attempts to kill such courageous statements or forced those making such statements into exile from our [Southern] American Continent. The struggle for justice should be carried forward at the same time to vindicate the rights of all, not of a minority or a majority, but all of us. We must defend the integrity of life and create the conditions for which that life becomes manifest.

In this way direct action in favor of life will be converted into actions against unjust and violent [governmental] systems. Our actions will center on the defense of life and adequate means for our defense. Beyond our limitations with the language of nonviolence, therefore, the core of our problem is the clarity with which we organize action toward the defense and promotion of life in all contexts and circumstances. We unequivocally need to affirm that our actions begin with the task of promoting education based upon human rights standards. First of all, life is respected and safeguarded in its integrity through education. Such life manifests itself in all of its potential through the creation of conditions necessary for human rights. Second, our task is to educate about human rights in a systematic manner — to engage action aimed toward long term change, which also support our convictions and indomitable spirit.

There is no other way. But what's the general principle, the common ground from which we can articulate our educative task? Much has been discussed about confronting the absence of common philosophies in which to ground the defense of human rights. Each religious option has its own emphasis as does each ideology. Every culture has its own experiences and each people its own respective histories. We need to determine the lowest common denominator, a common platform over which we can construct common, concerted action by concerned people. On the one hand, such "common ground" could be peace through strength, as some advocate armed struggle [as in WW II]. We know that there is no peace without justice. Others argue that a common minimum should be the value of truth, since there is no truth without liberty, and so forth.

We prefer to articulate the unifying principle for life itself. Aspiring to be radicals, going to the roots of the issues, we prefer to encounter life above all: caring for life, defending and promoting life. The primacy of life as the value and condition of all underlies peace, truth, justice, and liberty. Our educative task in human rights should not part from this sacredness of life itself. No goal, as laudable as it might be, justifies attempts against our integrity of life. Offenses against life kill peace and human rights. Historical writers like de Vitoria and de las Casas noted that a live, though unchristian Indian is more valuable than a dead Christian. Fidelity to life and human rights means that we must denounce violations of human rights, defend the victims of the abuse of human rights, and oppose human attitudes and systems which agitate and provoke violations of human rights. At the same time, affirming life moves us toward a more just society, solidifying a truthful pedagogy of life and human rights.

An educator of human rights becomes nonviolently militant, creating living spaces for the integrity of life. We can clarify the guiding axis of such human rights training and education in three broad dimensions:

A. Integrity of life for each corporal person;
B. Integrity of life for each person in society; and
C. Integrity of the life of people within our creation.

Our immediate task resembles that of the map maker or cartographer, facilitating living spaces with human rights education. Briefly, below, we will proceed to describe some spontaneous strokes for such living human rights through these three broad dimensions.
A. Integrity of Life for Each Corporal Person

The nucleus of the ethical conscience of humanity is fixed or established through societal customs and assumptions, via the respect for the life of each corporal or individual person, one's own life, and the lives of others. In thousands of ways, with rational or superstitious, sacred or secular expressions, all human groups have reached some basic consensus on the ethical value of human life. We can say that the ethical conscience of humanity has developed around our corporal human life.

In the Judeo-Christian tradition, the commandment "thou shall not kill" expresses, in an apodictic, synthetic way, the absolute value of the life of a human being. We should understand and formulate the value of life as the key to "humanization". The demand to humanize all human life, as much as possible, basically means securing and defending the principle of the integrity and inviolability of human life. We begin this global option with the inalienable rights of the person. To defend and safeguard the integrity of human life means that we confirm and accept a complex, integrated synthesis of being human — our rights to sufficient health, education, employment, and housing needs access.

It would be insufficient to revert to an explication of mere biochemical automation, dissociated from neuro-psychological nervous systems. This on its own is insufficient to explain reality separated from the cerebral structure and that, on its own, relatively independent of social influence, from our culture, history, and environment. As much homonization [corporality] as humanization has differentiated the human being from pure animalism. Existence in one's body is a "body" — in that one's life and existential presence is inconceivable without a body.

The integrity of our somatic constitution is an essential category that configures and impregnates all that we are, do, and experience. Our corporality is an innate imprint, from which no human can dispossess another human of being human. The living coalescence of our body, its euphoria and perfection, is the condition of being human. Our body returns to such a condition to experience personal concreteness. It is from this point that human rights proclaim the absolute life of a person and the integrity of its being with respect to being human. Without this integrity, we do not experience the world, because we all need to be human — we need to participate within and without the body and the spirit, in a reciprocal, indispensable living interaction.

To speak of corporal integrity means respecting one's gender and sexual existence. Sexuality is so essential that a human being who is neuter or asexual is unthinkable. All that is truly personal emerges as the discovery that one lives among other beings along a masculin-feminine spectrum. Sexual qualities, stemming from the inalienable rights of each gender, are presented as a factor of identification and as grounds for sexual reciprocity. From here sexuality literally means our common right to health as the ethical need for life, not the "illegal" aberration of torture and mutilation, while facilitating our standards for genetics and military medicine, etc. Ageism, racism, sexism, militarism, and anti-environmentalism are inherently mutilations of our integrity of life. We could further investigate implications of this dimension to our radical, inalienable corporal rights, but we will leave this "window" open, instead covering the vital dimensions and consequences for education about the person, beginning with our integrity of being alive and corporal.

B. Integrity of Life for Each Social Being

To live is to live with others. All human existence is an act of presence. All persons necessarily live together with their fellow human beings. Even to begin to live we need others. Total solitude and absolute isolation are possibilities for the human being, but the human being is social by definition. The person is constructed and configured by the corporal and spiritual presence of others. Without society the human being can not survive. The relations between persons toward this survival are structured in our work for self-sustaining life. Such work is articulated by nation-state legal, social, and technical laws or conventions.

Social presence which we constitute upon living together with others, and that which engulfs us like an atmosphere, is always qualified: it's good or bad, just or unjust, respecting the integrity of life and the rights of each, whether one venerates or violates these rights. Social relations can be created from an atmosphere that is fertile for life or poiso-
ous, killing life. One lives by breathing, inoculating a vital social context. That social context is like something living: everything is contextual, everything a history, a "biology" or metabolism. To live means living within social contexts.

The humanity of social relations requires attention to the justice or injustice that is expressed. Such justice is always referenced by the integrity of social life, by the rights and social duties of individuals and peoples as a corporate person. But the discovery that the other person is like yourself is not enough, nor is the manifestation of one's own identity. The apparition of "us" is necessary in order to exist, living together as a community. Human rights education needs to honor this "community spirit" throughout human relations, from individuals to communities as social bodies.

Contrary to public opinion, human rights do not exist on an ideological level in laws, virtues, etc. They are fundamentally praxis, practical relations between persons, families, or "infrastructural" which we realize as the economic-productive activities which bind living sensibility and corporality. In this sense, it should be noted that social relations must not be economic domination between persons in the process of the production of life or its maintenance. These relations should be to advance equity, justice, and kindness, without which one must dominate [oppress] the other. That is to say, we should be communitarian relatives in our society, practical family/relatives for justice and against inequality, without domination, being partners as much as free beings. Thus the product of communitarian work becomes the liberation of everyone.

Society in context similarly links cultural, social, economic, and political rights to common social justice demanded by the integrity of the life of the person with respect to being social. That justice should always orient change toward a better society, which integrates the humanizing possibilities of the life of each person. Therefore we need to articulate our common good, our ideal configuration of international reality. And this is so because it is defined as the good of the persons, such that all are open to the realization of a unifying creation benefiting everyone. The common good integrates the personal good and the social project at the same time as the measure in which they form a unity of convergence — our community.

The common good is the good of the life of our community. Human rights appear as a practical formulation and progressive history, to complement the basic experiences of international struggle for the integrity of social and personal life. They require as much political recognition as juridical protection toward ultimate effectiveness and social validity. But in all societal cases, they will always have the important function of becoming a critical and utopian factor to motivate social, historical conditions.

C. Integrity of the Life of People within Our Creation

To think of the human person and our rights in relation to connections to our integrity of life implies raising the problem of resource levels for maintaining that life in plenitude. Creation and its international integrity as a tool for defending life emerges via ecological manipulation. We live immersed in an environmental context that has developed over millions of years, in a delicate equilibrium. Life depends on equilibrium in the sustainable use of vital resources. Our planet is part of a marvelously-complicated cosmos, inhabited by a million and a half species of plants and animals living together in equilibrium, in need of the same molecules of air, land, and water. Any change in the equilibrium introduces risks that should be honored with great responsibility.

Since the ancient Incas' pachamama, the Aztecs' cauhiliec, and the Romans' terra mater [mother earth], our earth has always been considered as the mother of life, of sustenance, and of fertility. Here is our common ground, where we live and from where we draw life. Our earth in its natural fertility originates from our primordial "use-value" and from this fundamental richness. Without our "natural" world we could not survive. All life as we know it is the transformation of material born from our earth.

The earth is not only our human landscape, where we eat, dress, and live . . . . Touch our skin — on it we make our house — i.e., ecology, as a word, derives from the Greek word oikma. Our person-society-cosmos dialectic begins here, arising from our cosmic creations, our individual — community habitats. From it we took our wood, to discover
fire for heat, light, and security. We discovered our earth as a cavern, as our [only] home. Earth's stones are our doort, its fruits our food, its animals our friends from which we learned to domesticate proteins and reproduce skins as clothing. Nutritious, our earth is inviting, our maternal protector, but also destructible, annihilate-able, maybe manipulable . . . ; if we live sustainably with our earth.

If we honor our basic universality of human rights standards, we must recognize the reduce, reuse, recycle warnings about our coming catastrophe that we have begun to provoke here. Our industries contaminate our air, land, and water. Our garbage-for-profit kills our fish and vegetables, destroys our atmosphere with toxic gases, perforates our protective ozone layer, and annihilates our natural producers of oxygen, i.e., our rain forests and coral seabeds. Our relentless extinction of our nonrenewable resources for life, our inescapable environmental contamination, forces us relentlessly toward an ecological collapse of incalculable cosmic vengeance, capable of exterminating us forever from our planet Earth.

Thus, whether toward life and nonviolence — or death, hunger, and violence — the application of human rights principles to conflict resolution training can never be renounced without also renouncing the struggle for the integrity of the life of all creation. We must heal the mortal wounds that are inflicted upon our earth, its biosphere, its atmosphere, and its waters. Our struggle, and that of the educator, should not only be against the ecological aberrations that place human life in danger. We should also fight to safeguard and elevate our quality of sustainable equilibrium. Our complete self-realization of the person and people in society must manifest all possibilities immersed in the cosmos. Although there is no single quantitatively measurable reality, an interdependent and balanced system of [bio-]indicators must transcend mere economic development [profit] criteria.

Our global struggle along this path has been highlighted by such insights as a 1969 UNESCO publication expressly entitled: We are Making Our (Only) Planet Inhabitable. To be conscious of this monumental problem puts us face to face with a forgotten value — the unified destiny of our [only] "blue planet". We need to perceive our radical dimension defending our integrity of the person, our life in society and our cosmic integrity: in our nonrenewable, most precious resources, in our treasures of air and water, indispensable for life, in our limited and fragile biosphere and in our delicate equilibrium among all living beings. In 1972, another global statement of human rights consciousness recognizing our radical, corporal dimension surfaced in the "grass-roots" Stockholm "Declaration on the Environment" — a call for action which birthed the United Nations Environmental Program. As the foundation for the United Nations international environmental and human rights agenda, this appeal asserted that we are both the work and artist of the ambient medium that encompasses us, supports us materially, and sustains our opportunities for our ethical, social, spiritual, and intellectual development.

During the long and tortuous evolution of life on this planet, we have crippled ourselves by war, through which, thanks to the rapid acceleration of violent science and technology, we face the unprecedented end of all life. We have the power to transform ourselves and our planet toward life and security through nonviolence. Our right to life itself, essential to the enjoyment of our fundamental human rights, must therefore fundamentally revive our corporal, societal, and international environment.

End Notes

Eds. Note: As a profile, published writer on nonviolence and human rights in Spanish, Aguiro co-led a most innovative "poor and pemi" struggle that finally deposed an Uruguayan dictatorship. Despite repression and unsuccessful guerrilla struggles then led by the Tupamaros, their nonviolence struggle advocated methods later used as well elsewhere, e.g., in the Intifada. See "Nonviolent Resistance and the Pedagogy of Human Rights," pp. 102-116; and (for the Latin American nonviolence movement origins) Mario Cardilho de Jesus (attorney following Mohandas Gandhi), "Firmeza Permanente, Labor Holds the Line in Brazil," 35-47; in Philip McManus and Gerald Schlabach, eds., Relentless Perseverance: Nonviolent Action in Latin America (Philadelphia, PA: New Society Publishers), 1991. In addition, Lawrence Wechsler, using this Uruguayan nonviolence struggle example, as one of the writers cited by McManus and Schlabach on p. 116, went on to write several New Yower magazine articles, supplemented by 3 or 4 major books on human rights (after 1989). As a result Wechsler identifies how this Uruguayan nonviolence struggle led to change in China and Poland (via the Tummar and KOS/Solidarity movements) — i.e., transfiguring the fall of the so-called Berlin Wall. Sometimes called "structural" violence as opposed to "serial" or warfare violence in nonviolence or peace and conflict resolution literature. Beyond the levels of structural violence might lie that of radioactive plutonium, e.g., which although technically inanimate, is said to have a "half-life" of millions of years. Chemical-Biological Weapons (CBW) agents, aimed at the Third World jungle or the desert air in Vietnam with Agent Orange or "Desert Storm" with horrific toxins, rather than Nagasaki and Hiroshima, as it were, are believed to behave something like living plutonium, able to "live" and so reproduce all human life (death indefinitely).

**On Truth as Sceptical and Sustainable**

If... a successful search for Truth implied arriving at an opinion, one ethical or political or religious conception, there would be few examples of success. If, however, it means searching for and following one's own light, the inner voice, success according to Gandhi is normal provided the search is intense and persistent.

God is, because Truth is. We embark upon the search because we believe that there is Truth and that it can be found by diligent search and meticulous observance of the well-known and well-tried rules of the search. There is no record in history of the failure of such search.¹

... [Likewise] what is true... is not invariable, and fallibility also covers personal truth. Therefore your opponent is not only a potential follower of you, but you are also a potential follower of your opponent. There is no ending to this except death.....

... These reflections clearly show that scepticism of the kind expressed by Gandhi is not sufficient to derive norms of nonviolence. Something must be added, for instance the position that ultimately all life is one, so that the injury of one's opponent becomes also an injury to oneself. Nothing would then be gained by violence even if one had the means to ascertain facts and justice absolutely.... The most highly developed philosophical scepticism is not that which denies the possibility of arriving at truth or knowledge, but the scepticism of Pyrrho which requires the maintaining of a basic attitude of abstinence from final theoretical judgement (otherwise known as zeteticism or zetetic Pyrrhonism). This "epoche" or "suspension" is, according to the sceptics, consistent with action, because theoretical certainty is not a necessary
condition of action, even of forceful action.... Can we justify killing if, perhaps, our antagonist is nearer the truth than we are, or if there two ways of seeing the matter?

... In the light of the foregoing it is not surprising that Gandhi characterized himself as a sceptic, an anekāntavādin. This complex term may be analysed in an-eka-anta-vad-in, a person who holds that there is more than one end, that is, more than one conclusion. It is an apt term for the ultimate pluralism of religious, moral, and political views compatible with human experience and reflection. Any human view is fragmentary and uncertain.... According to Gandhi, the path towards an individual's maximum self-realization does not necessarily obstruct the paths of others; on the contrary, mutual aid is possible and desirable.... [This amounts to what Gandhi calls the] concept of nonviolence. Himsa (violence) is avoidable direct influence in the direction of a decrease of level of actual self-realization. Ahimsa (nonviolence) is direct influence in the direction of an increase of level of actual self-realization.... A decrease or increase of self-realization in one individual involves a decrease or increase (not necessarily of the equal magnitude) of the self-realization of others. Thus himsa by anyone against anyone is himsa also against me.

On Violence & Nonviolence Training and Education

... A comparison of the maxims of contemporary violence ... [reveals] ... a theory of basic contrasts of interest .... Power is considered largely to be in the hands of the 'bad', and since violence is taken to be the only adequate means of change, violence is necessary: Self-realization of the 'good' group requires violence used against the 'bad'. Complete self-realization of the 'good' is impossible without violence against the 'bad': Even if brutality is in some sense 'regrettable', it is morally justified when considered as unavoidable:... Contemporary advocates of violence in contrast to Fascist theorists do not see violent activity as an end, but only or mainly as a means to obtain a new social order characterized by harmony and nonviolence.

[In contrast] ... nonviolent actions strengthen the disposition for more (and stricter) nonviolent action, according to Gandhi. But there is, unhappily(!), no irrevocability. At any level one may slide back to violence.... The Gandhian norm that you should move into the centre of a conflict favours intensification of the conflict, because you support the weaker part, the underdog. The norm implies a policy of confrontation, but not of provocation.

... In nonviolent struggles in which the opponent has the necessary status to make free use of police-forces, it is in the long-run interest to try to influence the police in the direction of consistent nonviolence.... The police are, so to speak, interposed between the nonviolent fighters and the real opponent. To behave so as to make the police the main opponent is a grave misunderstanding of nonviolent strategy.... [In other words] ... the police and prison officers are important potential collaborators in Gandhi's view, and the more contact with such people the better. Confrontation are part of efficient communication, not so provocations.

Secrecy of moves, keeping the opponent in ignorance ... is squarely against the norms of (consistent, high-level) nonviolence. Journalists and reporters should be well received, but of course, this does not preclude 'pestering' them because of their distorted reports. The militant nonviolent fighter tries to keep informed about how actions are described in the mass-media, and tries to convert the reporters.... Secrecy stems in part from pessimism: reporters who have been against us cannot be turned into helpers... The mere sight of the place of action and the action itself should as often as possible suffice to reveal its aim. This makes long explanations unnecessary. If a campaign consists mainly of such actions, unfair reporting is difficult even if the journalists disapprove.... The behaviour of Abdul Ghaffar Khan, first in India, then in Pakistan, furnishes many impressive instances.

... Truth cannot possible be a "property of a national cause" ... even the cause "to further universal self-realization".... Truth cannot be monopolized by any cause whatsoever.... However just the cause, one's cause, one's own motives are generally mixed. The resulting tension between belief in justice and one's own mixed motivation makes for reluctance to use violence.... [On the other hand] one has [also] to mobilize all who are willing to fight the system, whatever their level of mental discipline. If leaders were to demand acceptance of Gandhian
norms, too few would partake in the fight. Suffice it to say that [that] the absence of manifest physical person-to-person violence is not enough to characterize a relation as nonviolent.

Gandhi had a toughness and disregard of bloody confrontations which many Christian [or Western] pacifists found bordering on savagery. Polarization of opinion, however painful, is necessary. And with the present productive capacity and manpower a just and nonviolent society can be realized [with] stress on antagonisms, on structures rather than antagonists. If the machinery is ill-equipped to cope with large-scale injustice, direct action must be resorted to. Gandhi did not try to quell communal riots through laws and parliamentary action. There is, in Gandhi's view, nothing sacred about the electoral or legal system. Yet there is, of course, a grave responsibility in suspending or violating the system. Every plan to break a law must be thoroughly discussed and illuminated before its implementation.

**State Fear and Nonviolent Fearlessness**

When Gandhi left South Africa and started work in India, he realized that the masses in India could not immediately be mobilized to political action for independence, for swaraj. From prolonged hunger or undernourishment apathy follows. Gandhi sometimes complained that the most frustrating thing of all was the unwillingness of the hungry to do anything to change their own personal lot. He found that the basic obstacle, when trying to mobilize the masses, was their feeling of powerlessness, uselessness, and insignificance.

[A] basic aim was precisely to get the poor, unemployed, suppressed and passive to realize that they were persons with an identity, a dignity, that they were worth something, and not completely helpless. Gandhi's propaganda for the spinning wheel was first of all a (successful) campaign against the total passivity and resulting lack of self-respect of the very poor. Gandhi ...[may have gone] ... too far in his fight for decentralization and against the creation of big proletariats, but recent developments in the West have made Gandhian value priorities worth serious study. The participation of the poor and underprivileged in the Khadi-movement and vigorous campaigns such as the salt-match with obvious, spectacularly direct relevance for their economic well-being, fostered that minimum of self-respect which was indispensable for meaningful participation in nonviolent campaigns. Self-respect, in short, is a prerequisite for nonviolent mass campaigns.

Fearlessness is indispensable for truth, or love. Gandhi held fearlessness to be a necessary condition of all other high qualities. The long road towards nonviolence cannot be followed, according to Gandhi, if one does not fight cowardice — even when it entails acting with violence. Some quotations are needed in order to follow his somewhat complicated thinking on this point.

I found ... that India, educated India, is seized with a paralyzing fear. If you want to follow the view of Truth in any shape or form, fearlessness is the necessary consequence. We fear consequences and therefore we are afraid to tell the truth.  

If you feel humiliated, you will be justified in slapping the bully in the face or taking whatever action you might deem necessary to vindicate your self-respect. The use of force, in the circumstances, would be the natural consequence if you are not a coward. But if you have assimilated the nonviolent spirit, there should be no feeling of humiliation in you.

One might add: the person with nonviolent spirit does not feel humiliated by insulting behaviour on the part of others. There is no feeling of shame, of reduction in status, of loss of dignity. It is the aggressor that loses in dignity, not the so-called victim. [As Malcolm X put it] ... once a little nobody Indian lawyer was put off a train, and fed up with injustice, he twisted a knot in the British Lion's tail.  

... Does the constructive [nonviolence] approach go against those who ask for an immediate and radical change in society, a change which destroys all present institutions? Not necessarily. A judicial system is "destroyed" by not being used by anybody; the same holds good [true] of voting. If an institution is left to die because a completely different
one is being created, there is a radical constructive, not destructive change. There is no limit to the application of the approach. But inertia of course makes it highly improbable that old institutions can be destroyed overnight. On the other hand, physical destruction has also limited consequences. All prisons might be blown up without the prison system being affected [or abolished].

... [In sum] ... We find two diametrically opposed views of Mohandas K. Gandhi's moral stature. One has it that ethically speaking he was nearly perfect. Albert Einstein said of him, for instance, that generations to come would scarcely believe that such a man actually walked this earth.... Gandhi himself [said that] "I claim no infallibility. I am conscious of having made Himalayan blunders...." 6) [At the same time] Gandhi's utopia is one of the few that shows ecological balance, and today his rejection of the Western World's material abundance and waste [characteristic of the violent nation-state system] is accepted by progressives of the ecological movement ... [who now] ... take his conclusions seriously.... Our question ... [for a globally-sceptical and sustainable existence continues to be]: ... To what extent [was such nonviolence] ... independent of dogma and [violent] myths which today have no chance of being accepted as truths?

End Notes:


3 In this respect Gandhi sides with mahayana Buddhism rather than hinayana Buddhism. The "degree of self-realization" can be equated with degree of freedom, power, "being in itself," substantiality and nearness to God, in Spinoza's *Ethics* (see Naess *Freedom, Emotion, and Self-subsistence*, *Inquiry*, 12, 1969, or the enlarged mimeographed edition, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1971). For readers not acquainted with the notion of "God" and "nonviolence" as the "light" to the "void" please see the classic work of Daisetz T. Suzuki, *Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism* (NY: Schocken, 1963). This concise edition of Suzuki offers a fairly easily accessible, albeit condensed, insight into such Buddhism. Editors Note.

4 A colleague of independence leaders like Sarojini Naidu and Mohandas K. Kasturbai Gandhi. Abdul Ghaffar Khan also spent many years in jail from Muslim nonviolence in action to free southern Asia from European colonialism and neo-colonialism. See his autobiography in particular. Editors Note.

5 Whether from the "fall" of the Berlin Wall or the "Intifada", Editors Note.

6 From the "Vow of Fearlessness," in a YMCA address 1916. See also the well over 100 citations of Gandhi concerning fearlessness and nonviolence in his *Collected Works, Index of Subjects*, Editors Note.

7 *Harijan*, 9 March 1940.


Notes on the Strengthening of Peace Building
Resources for Palestinians and Israelis

By Elise Boulding*

The greatest peace building and conflict resolution resources for societies in conflict, whether in the Middle East or elsewhere, are their own traditional and customary conflict resolution practices at the grassroots level, plus the historical repertoire of adaptiveness to changing situations of each society. Add to this the extent to which each has been able to practice the principle of subsidiarity as the society has grown more complex and stratified — that is, keeping decision making as close to the site of the relevant action as possible while maintaining a free two-way information flow between center and periphery; and finally, the extent to which each society's image of the future allows for growth, development and change in self and in relationships with other societies as part of the continuing historical identity of the group.

Now that Israelis and Palestinians are formally committed to building structural supports and new mechanisms of governance for a future of peaceful coexistence and cooperation, each group will need every resource it can muster to bring about a shift away from status asymmetry and mutual threat behavior, towards problem solving interactions based on status parity. Both Israeli and Palestinian societies have experienced a sharp intergenerational discontinuity in the transmission of traditional conflict resolution behaviors, with the younger generation of each experiencing primarily conflict escalation situations and behaviors. The first challenge is to see what traditional conflict resolution customs can be revived and taught anew in the schools, neighborhood and community organizations, temples, churches and synagogues of each society, with an emphasis on reaching the traditions of both societies within each community. A unique contribution to this examination of
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Conflict resolution practices lies within that part of the Arabic-Islamic heritage rooted in the period of cultural flowering and symbiosis among Muslims, Jews and Christians of Andalusian Spain in the ninth to thirteenth centuries. The creative interaction of scholars, religious leaders, scientists, artists and craft workers from each of these communities, within the framework of the Muslim structures of governance, provides a historical grounding for today's Israeli-Palestinian dialogue groups.

The experience of migrations, population displacements and maintenance of identity in Diaspora, common to both societies, though in different time frames, is both a resource and a handicap for each group. It is a resource in that it provides a historical repertoire of adaptiveness and inventiveness that each developed in order to survive. It is a handicap in that the sheer complexity of each Diaspora prevents the kind of two way information flow from periphery to center and back again that can ensure the full participation of members of each society in forging a new trust-based inter-group relationship among equals required for any cooperative activity. This second challenge has two parts: First, there needs to be more emphasis by the top leadership on grassroots engagement in the process of inventing viable local mechanisms for separate and autonomous problem-solving by Palestinians, such as already exist for Israelis, utilizing customary as well as formal local decision making structures. This is a necessary precondition for cooperative activities between Israelis and Palestinians. Second, there is an urgent need for each of the existing Israeli-Palestinian dialogue and action groups to mobilize all the communication resources of the relevant local, regional and global INGO community to involve currently hostile groups in whatever minimal level of dialogue they are prepared to accept, in order to channel energies into problem-solving rather than recrimination. Since these dialogue-action groups are already overstretched, the INGOs must themselves take responsibility for offering resources.

There is no question but that both the Palestinian and the Israeli societies have strong historically rooted images of a future that is more secure and peaceful for themselves. But how inclusive of the other is each image? How much does each image allow for continued growth, development and change of self and other? The third challenge is to cre-
are settings at the neighborhood level as well as at leadership levels, in which a more inclusive future for both societies can be explored separately and then eventually together, in a non-threatening visualization process. Without some shared aspirations for the future, there is neither motivation nor guidance for joint problem-solving in the present.

Recognizing that each society has a plurality of diverse interest groups, as well as a large constituency of worried and resentful "non-jinters" who know things must change and do not know how to deal with this, it is perhaps useful to think of these non-jinters in relation to two clusters of interest groups: One set rejects dialogue and is determined to preserve its own society by force to the extent necessary. The other set is already open to dialogue and change; its members have already accepted that their national identity and future well-being depends on also accepting a larger, boundary-transcending identity and that security for their own society can only be achieved by working for common security for all societies, including the former adversary. Each cluster seeks to win over the worried middle.

The dialogue-and-change oriented cluster is for the most part well integrated into the international non-governmental community of 18,000 INGOs representing the whole spectrum of human interests and concerns on the planet, including peace, human and social development, human rights and environmental sustainability. The significance of these boundary-transcending networks is that they can interface with governmental and UN structures at every level from local to global, providing, particularly from the scientific and professional INGOs, knowledge resources and problem-solving skills that governments alone, even the wealthiest and most technologically advanced, cannot command. Because they are transnational, their mandate is in theory to serve only the common human interest, and not to team up with adversaries. In practice, this is not always so.

These INGOs are the most significant resource available to Israelis and Palestinians, and Israeli groups already have membership in nearly 2000 of them. Palestine, lacking formal state structure, has only more recently been recognized as an entity to be recorded by the Union of International Associations, yet already there are Palestinian sections for 72 INGOs as reported in the 1991-92 Yearbook of International Associations. A recent survey of the regional orientations and networking ties of regional as compared to global INGOs found in the Middle East indicate not only strong ties within the Arabic-Islamic world, but also numerous ties to Europe, Africa and Asia (E. Boulding, 1993). The same networking pattern holds for international governmental organizations (IGOs) as well. Since each of the land masses adjacent to the Middle East has its own distinctive ways of dealing with conflicts and its own set of economic and social interests overlapping with those of the Middle East, this INGO (and IGO) networking offers the possibility of further sets of distinctive contributions to problem-solving efforts in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process.

There are of course many INGO-supported peace building projects already underway — some of them in existence for decades. One very modest recent example is the Commission on Peace Building in the Middle East appointed by the International Peace Research Association in response to the challenge of the Gulf War. The goal was to explore the relevance of the concepts, models and practices developed over recent decades by the international peace research community (guided by its members from the Middle East itself), to the complex of conflicts represented by the Gulf War, as well as to mobilize research and practitioner energies for work on immediate crisis situations as contrasted to longer-term processes. The Commission report, incorporated into the book (See Reference Notes below), is the product of an illuminating two-year dialogue with scholar-activist members of a growing network of Middle East-focused INGOs. To our own surprise, we found ourselves addressing fellow INGOs in the very lively civil society of the region, as much or more than governments, in our report. Our discovery of the importance of that civil society, and of the role of INGOs in it, have very definitely colored the tone of this brief note.

It should be noted, however, that there are some INGOs with sections in the Middle East, and other INGOs with no sections but a strong potential for contributing to regional peace processes, that have not yet participated in this dialogue process and have not yet put the significant resources available to them into regional activities. One of the purposes of this meeting is surely to arouse those INGOs with contributions to make who are not yet involved, into activity. However, such
involvement must always be in partnership with local and national groups. Peace building, to be viable, must be rooted in local peace concerns and the often invisible peace culture of family, neighborhood and community. If it is not, then outside assistance, however well meant, comes to wear the face of western interventionism.

The following suggestions for projects that can be undertaken locally as well as at other levels, by existing Israeli and Palestinian groups or with the help of supporting INGOs, are directed equally towards activists and policy specialists. Since any major undertaking of joint Israeli-Palestinian action projects at the local level is premature as long as the present asymmetries in status of the two groups persist, it is suggested that the projects described below be undertaken by each group separately, maintaining those communication links between them that seem feasible. This preparatory period of separate projects will be crucial for the readiness of the two groups to work cooperatively once parity of status has been achieved.

PROJECT SUGGESTIONS

Imaging Possible Peaceful Futures

Since it is not possible to work for something that cannot even be imagined, and positive images of the future themselves become dynamic forces that generate action, the use of imaging workshops to generate future scenarios for peaceful coexistence can be empowering for action in the present to Israelis and Palestinians alike. In such workshops, participants are encouraged to create a wish-list of what they would like to see for both societies in a "best possible" future world. Then, after an exercise in the activity of mental imaging, they step into a world thirty years in the future in which their wishes have been realized. Once people have accepted the suspension of disbelief and fear in order to focus on their hopes, the free-flowing fantasies elicited in the workshops reveal some commonality of longings for a life at peace coming through across cultural and religious differences. It is, of course, essential to move on to analysis of the fantasy fragments in terms of the social institutions and structures that would be required to maintain two ongoing, functioning, cooperative societies living side by side. That analysis becomes the basis for action-planning in the present to bring about the envisioned future.

Adapting the South African National Peace Accord Model

The National Peace Accord was designed in a common exercise by white and black South African leaders of various parties and groups that have long been in bitter conflict, in order to defuse enmities, build trust and encourage conflict resolution and problem-solving activities among groups in conflict, as preparation for holding peaceful elections. On the surface, the South African and the Israeli-Palestinian problems would seem to be completely different. In South Africa, the problem is seen as bringing groups that have been kept separate by an Apartheid system into a common political entity with equal rights for all. In the Israel-Palestine situation, the problem is to give political autonomy to a group that has lived under the occupation of another state. What the two situations have in common however is a severe status imbalance between the parties in conflict, (created in the recent historical past), and great enmity between the group holding power and the dispossessed group. It is in relation to these points that the NPA model has value.

An important feature of the NPA is that it is supposed to operate at every level, from national to provincial to local. The goal is for every city, town and village to have local centers for training in nonviolent conflict resolution based on the specific conflicts of that area, with trainers from each racial/ethnic/tribal group in that area. These locally trained NPA teams are then to go to communities of faith, to schools, to the business community and other local groups and offer programs which range from learning how to dialogue with "the enemy" to the skills of literally defusing situations of physical violence. This ideal structure has only been very partially instituted, and fears remain that local violence will get out of hand at election time, regardless of the pleas of national leaders. The model, however, is an interesting one. As part of the peace process, an Israeli-Palestinian Peace Accord Declaration might be formulated that could authorize the creation of separate local nonviolent conflict resolution bodies prepared to defuse local violence where local Palestinians and
Israelis live in open hostility. Rather than creating joint bodies, each local community would have Israeli and Palestinian teams trained separately, and communicating to the extent local conditions allow, being ready for joint trust-building activity when the time is ripe.

**Water Projects**

Water, both indispensable to life and symbolizing spiritual values in every religious tradition, is also a scarce resource and source of conflict and potential violence between Palestinians and Israelis. Creating separate but communicating local councils for water-saving can help create a sense of efficacy and empowerment about water management to replace current feelings of dependency and helplessness on both sides. It can also make equity issues about access to water clearer to those who have taken their rights to water for granted. Such local activity could help create the political environment in which more rational management and sharing of water can go on between the governments of the area, including of course particularly Palestinian and Israeli authorities.

**Zones of Peace**

The end of the Cold War has seen no diminution in the world arms trade, and only a slight diminution in nuclear weapons. The Middle East continues to import high levels of weaponry — contributing to the general insecurity of the region as well as to actual violence in Israel/Palestine and surrounding states. Zone of Peace initiatives represent efforts to reduce levels of weaponry in specific areas, and have from time to time been attempted through unilateral declarations by individual states, through multilateral treaties, and through INGO and grassroots initiatives in given localities. There are by treaty, five Nuclear Weapon-Free Zones, the most common form of the Zone of Peace: Antarctica, Outer Space, the Latin American Treaty of Tlatelolco, the South Pacific Treaty of Ratatonga, and the International Seabed Treaty. They vary in efficacy but each has made some contribution to arms control. There have been proposals for Balkan and Mediterranean zones of peace since the 1950s, including proposals from Egypt, but so far they have come to nothing. It is time to breathe new life into the Zone of Peace Movement in the Middle East.

Basically, the Zone of Peace is a cultural enterprise. It reflects a conception of social and political arrangements that permit human security through a lessened dependence on military defense and an increased dependence on human relations skills and negotiation skills to solve problems. Establishing a Zone of Peace by treaty means providing a legal and regulatory framework that makes demilitarized areas within larger military zones possible. Parallel Israeli and Palestinian Zone of Peace initiatives would not translate quickly into any noticeable demilitarization of the area, but could provide a focus for the large numbers of groups that collectively make up the civil society of the Middle East and their affiliated INGOs, who would welcome a reversal of current militaristic trends.

Closely linked to Zone of Peace strategies, and a step in their direction, are NonOffensive Defense-based security policies. Such policies involve a shift to weaponry that can only be used defensively, not offensively nor beyond the borders of the state. Any initiatives in the general realm of alternative security strategies would provide a welcome backdrop to the many commissions in the region working on problems that depend on substantial demilitarization for their successful resolution, including water scarcity, the protection of fragile soils and tree cover, environmental pollution, and the development of viable labor-intensive production systems in regions of human overcrowding and great poverty. Demilitarization would not only reduce harm to peoples and environments, it would release urgently needed resources for human and social development.

It has been emphasized throughout this paper that projects intended to contribute to the establishment of autonomous and equal social and political spaces for Palestinian and Israeli societies, with the potential for peaceful interaction in solving the problems that confront both societies, need to be established separately in their initial stages in order to avoid the appearance or the reality of manipulation by the more powerful party. However one significant group to be found in both societies has been able to transcend status and power differentials to work together for peaceful solutions to intractable difficulties: women peace
activists. These women have developed their own movement, and also worked together with the older peace and nonviolence movements that have persisted in both Israel and Palestine in the face of great obstacles. The public demonstrations and cooperative activities of such joint Palestinian-Israeli groups as the Women in Black witness to the possibility of genuine partnership relationships in all spheres of life at some future time.

To hasten this time, it is important to work toward including women as equal participants and decision makers in all projects of human and social development and peace building. Their knowledge, experience and skills are essential to the effective carrying out of any human project. Their absence from public life, policy planning and decision making is a persistent contributor, in all times and places, to the many failures in peace and development efforts carried out by males only. Their unparalleled knowledge of local terrain and their orientation to human life and human nurturance provides the only corrective to strategies based on power, dominance, and a drive to win rather than to share, the fruits of the earth.

All the suggestions made here already exist as grassroots and INGO-facilitated projects in some form, however rudimentary — but need to be recognized, expanded and strengthened. Some of them may eventually become part of the formal structures of governance in Israel, Palestine and the Middle East generally. However, governments by definition perceive a narrower range of alternatives than members of civil society, and they also command a narrower knowledge and skill base. The only way forward to a more peaceful future for everyone, is for non governmental bodies to create and test social inventions. At the neighborhood level, this will contribute to the strengthening of existing peace potentials and hidden peace cultures, however weak. Such strengthening in turn will help create the socio-political conditions for governmental peace building activities. Governments can speed up peace processes, but they do not invent them.

INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR ON NONVIOLENCE EDUCATION AND TRAINING

By Glenn D. Paige*

The dedication of the new Jain University for Nonviolence in Ladnun on 26 November 1992, was surely an historic event that augurs well for the future of nonviolent global transformation. Inspired by the saintly Jain scholar-leader Acharya Tulsi, dedicated by the Buddhist Nobel Peace Prize Laureate the Dalai Lama, led by the Gandhian scholar-servant of Sarvodaya Professor Singh, and celebrated by supporters from throughout India and the world, the Jain Vishva Bharati Institute justly claimed its new status as deemed University and set forth on a new journey of nonviolent discovery, education, and service.

For me the most memorable moment of the dedication ceremony was foretold during the luncheon to welcome the Dalai Lama to Jaipur on November 25, when it was said that when he and Acharya Tulsi met the next day in Ladnun it would be as if Lord Buddha and Lord Mahavira were coming together after 2,500 years to exchange ideas. Indeed, in his dedication remarks the next day after receiving his honorary doctor of letters, the Dalai Lama said that he felt that Buddhism and Jainism were very close in spirit. To express it, he leaned over spontaneously to grasp the hand of Acharya Tulsi who was seated to his right on the dais. All within the panel were joyfully moved. An alert photographer snapped the historic picture. Let us hope that it graces this newsletter and will find an honored place in the University's inspirational tradition.

The international dialogue on nonviolence education and training was held for two hours each on November 26 and November 27. First day participants included the Dalai Lama; Acharya Tulsi; Yuvacharya Mahapragya; Sadhvi Pramukha Kanak Prabhaji; Vice-Chancellor Ramjee Singh; Ms. Robin Ludwig, head of the UN Peace Unit, New York; Professor Ramlal Parikh, Vice-Chancellor of Gujarat

*Professor Emeritus of Political Science, Peace Studies Program, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
Vidyapith; Prof. Johan Galtung, renowned as the world's leading peace researcher; Dr. Bernard Lafayette, Jr., President of American Baptist College and foremost trainer in the Martin Luther King, Jr. tradition; Capt. Charles Alphin, the pioneer trainer in nonviolent methods of law enforcement for the Martin Luther King, Jr., Center for Nonviolent Social Change in Atlanta, Georgia; and myself as moderator. Participants the following day included all the above minus the Dalai Lama, Ms. Ludwig, and Professor Parikh.

The discussion focused simply on sharing responses to three principal questions. First, is it feasible to have a universal system of nonviolence education and training for all humankind? If so, why? If not, why not? Second, if so, what are the values and principles that should be taught? Third, by what means can such values and principles be evoked and expressed in educational and training experiences? A fourth question was recognized to follow the first three but was not addressed at this time. That is, how are the teacher-trainers themselves to be educated?

Naturally with ten discussants and very limited time we were able to begin exploration of the first three questions, but not to advance very far in formulating what might later evolve into globally acceptable answers. Without a transcript before me, I can only share what were for me the most salient impressions. Perhaps other participants will kindly share their own views in this and future newsletters.

There was unanimity that it was possible to create a universal system of educating human beings in nonviolence. The striking response of Prof. Parikh was, "It's not only possible, it's inevitable!" In answer to why it was possible, the Dalai Lama's optimism about human nature and global vision stood out. In his view, humans are "gentle and peaceful" by nature. All humans want peace. Furthermore, humanity as a whole is becoming "more mature." This is being brought about partly by instant global communications and is reflected in such things as growing global consciousness about the need to protect the environment and to avoid overpopulation.

As for the second question, there was neither wide exploration of values nor consensual focus upon a minimally required set of them for nonviolent education. As I recall the Dalai Lama's contribution, it was that the principal value to be nurtured is compassionate wisdom, a quality that is rooted in the gentle and peaceful nature of human beings. This is reminiscent of the oft-cited Buddhist peace-seeking values of universal friendliness (metta), compassion (karuna), sympathetic joy (mudita), and equanimity (upeksha) to be expressed in efforts to secure the happiness of all sentient beings.

Jain values such as respect for all life (ahimsa), tolerance of different perceptions of truth (anekant), and non-possessiveness (aparigraha) overlap with Jain-influenced Gandhian values like truthfulness, gentleness, and fearlessness to suggest clear and reasonable principles to guide nonviolence education and training. The third question was raised on the second day. Participants first responded with a review of their own life experiences that engaged them in nonviolence theory and practice. Then they went on to describe their present constructive activities. Capt. Alphin shared his journey from violent gang member through military service to nonviolent policeman. Professors Singh, Galtung, and Lafayette described how their commitment to nonviolent principles and social change had led to their imprisonment.

As the transcript will but inadequately express, each of these was a deeply moving and enormously informative presentation. Their current projects are too extensive for succinct summary here. But they range from joint nonviolence training for gang members and policemen, to urban and transnational training for nonviolent action to remove intolerable conditions of exploitation, to professional education at the M.A. level for peace and conflict resolution careers, and to exploration of how best to build a new kind of university totally dedicated to nonviolent service to life on earth.

The dialogue was not a grim and cheerless experience. There was much smiling and laughter. All who know Acharya Tulsi and the Dalai Lama could expect that. An example came on the second day when Acharya Tulsi was asked to comment on the four presentations that had just been made "by three prisoners and a policeman." He burst out laughing and his infectious joyfulness lifted the spirits of everyone there.

On reflection, the three questions raised in the dialogue, with emphasis on the last two, as well as the unasked fourth, still seem to merit further exploration. It seems to me that at least one set of answers needs to be worked out in a careful and practical manner to demonstrate...
what can be done. Since the theme of the seminar was suggested by Acharya Tulsi, since the preliminary exploration was begun in celebration of the Jain University for Nonviolence, since much practical Jain work has already been done in developing nonviolent meditation (praksha dyana), science of living (jeetan vigyan), and self-limiting social vows (anuvrat), as well as a series of illustrated school textbooks on principles of nonviolent living for children, the University itself might continue to explore it as a major project.

For example, it would be enormously useful if experienced teachers at each level of education could be asked to creatively suggest how best to present the principles of ahimsa, anekant, and aparigraha at that level. Then a cross-level conference of teachers could explore how to make these nonviolent learning experiences cumulatively stronger in spiritual meaning, scientific knowledge, and social skills. Similar efforts could be made to evoke the creativity of children at each age level as well as of parents both separately and jointly with each other and with teachers. Related inquiry into how best to incorporate meditation and anuvrat at each level should be pursued. Other projects will readily suggest themselves.

It would be quite appropriate for the University to become a global leader in developing the theory and practice of nonviolence education. As for training for nonviolent direct action, the University would seem to be well advised to collect documentation and build upon the already extensive experience in this area that has been developing in many places throughout the world. By sending traveling researchers throughout India, and to Southeast Asia, North America, Australia, Latin America, Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and other places where nonviolence training experience has been acquired, the University could readily become a repository of knowledge about and contributor to global training for nonviolent action. Again the University should ask itself what contributions Jain values and methods can make to improve what has already been done.

For me the dialogue was a marvelously informative and uplifting experience, as was the joyful meeting with so many old and new friends from India and abroad. Special appreciation is expressed for the wise guidance given by Shri G.C. Chandalia and for the tireless work of Shri S.L. Gandhi in bringing the international dialogue into reality.

To the new Jain University for Nonviolence, its Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, faculty, students, staff, supporters, and colleagues in nonviolence in India and throughout the world — Congratulations!
WHY TRAINING FOR NONVIOLENT ACTION?

By George Lakey*

Question: What do some revolutionary soldiers in a Burmese jungle, ACT UP members in New York, environmentalists in Germany, coal miners in West Virginia, and aboriginals in Taiwan have in common?

Answer: Participation in nonviolent action training workshops. These groups as well as many others around the world are turning to training to increase the likelihood of accomplishing their goals. Students in Central America, steelworkers in Western Pennsylvania, Buddhist monks in Thailand, environmentalists in Russia, Mohawks in Canada, peace activists in Scotland, pro-democracy activists in the Philippines, homeless people in Philadelphia — these are just some of the groups involved in the past few years.

Is training making a difference in achieving movement goals, in fact, or is it simply a ritual helping participants feel better in an uncertain and scary world? Scientific studies are lacking at this point. In some places, however, movements are so convinced of the value of training that all participants in major confrontations are expected to participate in training workshops first. And we know of at least one dictatorship which felt so threatened by training that it held a training team at the airport to prevent entry.

By "training" we mean learning formats leading to changed behaviors in action situations. Training is different from liberal education because of the emphasis on behavior-in-action: similar to people being trained to be a doctor or engineer, the activist learns the skills and

*George Lakey, 56, has led over 1,000 workshops on five continents since his start while teaching at the Martin Luther King School of Social Change. He has led a variety of nonviolent social change projects, engaged in civil disobedience, and accompanied Sri Lankan lawyers threatened with assassination. Author of five books, he has taught at Haverford and Swarthmore Colleges and the University of Pennsylvania. Acknowledgments: Thanks to Michael Beer, Philip Bagdonoff, Nancy Brigham, Chuck Esser, Vivien Sharples, Lynne Shivers, and Peter Woodrow, for their suggestions and assistance.
Knowledge that prepare her or him to act. By "nonviolent action" we include these major applications:

(a) struggle by social change movements,
(b) social defense of communities and institutions, and
(c) third-party intervention in conflicts. 3

Why training?

To deepen participants' understanding of the issues. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., initiated in 1968 a "Poor People's Campaign" to reduce poverty in the US. Teachers and students at the Martin Luther King School of Social Change designed workshops to explore racism, poverty, and direct action to prepare participants to join the campaign. People who have been victimized by injustice may have a limited (though vivid) understanding of oppression, and need a "bigger picture" to enable them to struggle more effectively for change.4

To prepare participants psychologically for the struggle. The Pinochet regime in Chile depended, as dictatorships do, on fear to maintain its control. In the 1980s a group committed to nonviolent struggle encouraged people to face their fears directly in a three step process: small group training sessions in living rooms, followed by small, "hit-and-run" nonviolent actions, followed by de-briefing sessions. By teaching people to control their fear, trainers intended to prepare the way for the fall of the dictatorship.5

To develop group discipline, morale and solidarity for more effective action. In 1991 members of ACT-UP (a militant group protesting US AIDS policy) were beaten up by Philadelphia police during a demonstration. The police were found guilty of unnecessary force and the city paid damages, but ACT-UP members realized they could reduce the chance of future brutality by acting in a more united and nonviolent way. Before their next major action they invited a trainer to conduct a civil disobedience workshop; they clarified the strategic question of nonviolence and then role-played possible scenarios. The result: a high-spirited, unified and effective civil disobedience action.

The power of nonviolent action is related to the group morale of the participants. Training workshops are often designed to assist a group to make a tighter bond, or even for strangers to develop a new sense of group spirit. In 1964 the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and other civil rights organizations called upon college students from all over the U.S. to register voters and organize freedom schools in "Mississippi Summer." Two week-long training workshops were held in succession in Ohio, each for 400-500 students; community-building was a major focus of the training. Midway in the second workshop the news broke that two of the participants in the first workshop were already found murdered in Mississippi. Despite the almost palpable fear among the students, nearly all of them stayed with the community, completed the training, and went to Mississippi.6 Solidarity issues can come up at many points in preparation for action.

- introduce the option of "jail solidarity": noncooperation with the system in order to protect all members of the group and get demands met;
- sensitize participants to the possibility of "special treatment" by authorities of people of color, non-citizens, juveniles, gays, people with AIDS, etc.;
- stimulate dialogue on the tactic of refusing bail after arrest as having classist implications;
- make sure support people are affirmed (not only those who have been jailed or beaten);
- ask how the action will remain accessible to people with disabilities; and
- introduce the notion of violence as going beyond physical force to include poverty, racism, sexism, etc.7

To revise and develop strategy. In 1973 the New Zealand anti-apartheid movement was divided on how to protest the scheduled rugby tour of the white South African rugby team. Three workshops were scheduled with a visiting trainer both to learn more about how other social movements have used nonviolent action and also to develop their own strategy and tactics. Top leadership of the movement participated.
The result: a strategy (and coordination among leadership) which led to the government canceling the South African tour.

One way that workshops support smarter strategy is through increased understanding of the opponent and other parties to the conflict. Many of the strategic mistakes made by nonviolent movements have been caused by lack of understanding of where the other players "are coming from." Through strategy games and other training tools, participants stretch their knowledge base and their imaginations. To revise and clarify tactics. For success nonviolent strategies usually require tactical flexibility; campaigns often need creative and bold tactical maneuver. Through training, participants learn the overall goals of the action, important logistical and legal information, and share guidelines so people know what to expect from each other. Often in the workshops themselves “affinity groups” are created, which become the fundamental action units or teams. These elements of training set the tone for the action and optimize the chance of tactical flexibility within the larger strategic framework. To prepare participants for decisions they need to make. Although strategies and tactics are chosen by the organization or campaign, some decisions must be made by individuals — for example, whether to risk arrest. Workshops provide legal information, set up support systems for notifying families etc., and assist individuals to decide how to participate in the action.

To develop understanding of the dynamics of nonviolent struggle. In 1989 the United Mine Workers of America decided to go beyond a conventional strike in its dispute with the Pittston Coal Company, launching a nonviolent civil disobedience campaign. The union called together 50 field staff who would be the "lieutenants" in the struggle for a training workshop. While role-playing, the staffs acted on the widely-held belief that direct action is a contest with police to hold "turf" — for example, the road where the coal trucks drive. Though repeated role-plays and careful de-briefing, the staffs learned that nonviolent methods operate through dynamics which are more political than material — that power is too complex to reduce to who physically occupies what, at a particular moment. The coal miners went on to win their campaign against heavy odds, and set a new standard for labor action in the US.

Scholars and researchers in nonviolent action, social movements, group dynamics, and related fields can regard training as a "transmission belt" for conveying knowledge to the field for application and feedback. They can also use workshops as places to learn from activists and generate new hypotheses. To build skills for applying nonviolent action. In Haiti a "hit squad" abducted a young man just outside the house where a foreign peace team was staying. The team immediately intervened and, although surrounded by twice their number of guards with weapons, succeeded nonviolently in saving the man from a hanging. Successful campaigns and interventions need more than sound strategy and high morale: they also need specific skills - which are rarely taught in schools! For example: from the independence campaigns of colonial India of the 1940s to the civil rights marches in Northern Ireland of the 1960s to the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa of the 1980s, movement leaders have faced the challenge of violence erupting, inviting repression, and dividing the movement. (Often agents will even be hired to stimulate violence, as the British did in India and the FBI did in the US movement against the Vietnam War.) A specific skill for such situations is marshaling (also called peacekeeping), and many movements have trained marshals with specific skills to handle such incidents.

To build alliances across movement lines. In Seattle a workshop drew striking workers from the Greyhound Bus Company and members of the militant AIDS protest group Act Up. The workshop reduced the prejudice each group had about the other, and led some participants to support each others' struggles.

One block to uniting potential allies can be the lack of common experience: another can be lack of common understanding of strategy and tactics. These blocks as well as prejudice can be reduced through action training workshops which bring potential allies together. To increase democracy within the movement. In the 1970s the Movement for a New Society developed a pool of training tools and designs which it shared with the grassroots movement against nuclear power. The anti-nukes movement went up against local electrical companies, and some of the largest corporations in America, and the federal government itself
— and won. The movement delayed construction, which raised costs, and planted so many seeds of doubt in the public mind about safety that the near melt-down of the Three Mile Island plant brought millions of people to the movement’s point of view. The industry’s goal of 1000 nuclear plants evaporated. The environmentalists succeeded without creating a national structure around a charismatic leader and even without centralized leadership, because they learned the tools of shared leadership and democratic decision-making, through countless workshops, practice, and feedback.

One way to reduce democracy is for leadership to monopolize skills and knowledge. Training, by contrast, spreads the skills and knowledge around, making possible more broadly shared leadership.¹⁵

Training and a clash of paradigms

Activists start with one arm tied behind them; everyone has been brought up with cultural assumptions which limit the creative use of nonviolent action. The dominant paradigm says: "Power grows out of the barrel of a gun," "Violence is manly," "Violence is intrinsic to working class/African American/Latin culture," "Nonviolent action may have its uses but when more strength is needed, violence is necessary." These limiting beliefs go so deep that even intellectuals have rarely questioned them in a rigorous way. The beliefs are usually held subconsciously even by people who think they have rejected some or all of them on a conscious level. That’s what paradigms do: they condition how we see and know the world.

The potential of nonviolent action is a new paradigm, a new framework for understanding power and conflict. The dictatorships which have fallen because of nonviolent action in the past ten years, and a growing body of research, point to the reality of this new paradigm. Millions of people around the world have acted beyond their knowing in recent years — they’ve done what intuitively seemed right (nonviolent action), but their beliefs haven’t always caught up with them. Enter: "Training," a way to enable groups and individuals to step into the new paradigm deeply enough so they will be creative and coordinate in their application of nonviolent action.

Training Methodologies

Two main training methodologies are in use today: cognitive and experiential. Cognitive training focuses on concepts and information. The trainer wants to expand participants’ options in action situations, and does that through teaching new concepts and sharing case histories from other struggles. If there is limited time for a workshop, cognitive training may consist basically of a briefing: "This is our job and these are things we should look out for." More time enables discussion, case study analysis, scenario development, learning strategic principles — all in order to internalize basic ideas and plans for action.

Experiential training uses a variety of participatory designs to involve the whole person in the learning process — emotional, physical, and spiritual dimensions as well as mental. Some of the many training tools are: role-plays, visualizations (used also by athletes for training), simulations. Although we think of experiential training for nonviolent action as fairly new, non-cognitive methods have been used in the past. In the 1930s nonviolent leader Abdul Ghaffar Khan of the Northwest Frontier of colonial India used marching as a major training design in preparing the Pathans to do nonviolent campaigning.¹⁶

Which kind of training to use — cognitive or experiential — depends on the purposes, the participants, the amount of time available, and the skills of the trainer. Usually a combination of the two modalities will be optimal.

Training in What?

Tactical direct action training came to the fore in the ’60s, in the US civil rights movement. African Americans used training extensively, especially in the deep South where violence and murder were a daily threat. Largely through role-play, activists learned to minimize injury and maximize effectiveness. Because of its usefulness in assisting inexperienced people to deal with danger and unpredictability, tactical training is very popular and has now been expanded into the application of third party intervention in conflicts. Ironically, there has also been a partial backlash among some activists who have experienced work-
shops before demonstrations; having undergone necessarily brief (and sometimes incompetently led) workshops several times, they write off training as "something I know all about!"

**Strategic training** is less popular than tactical training. Strategicizing is a complex art, poorly understood, and not easily taught. (A handicap is that the research base for nonviolent campaigning is still in early development.) Nevertheless, strategy workshops can often be helpful in sharpening ideas and increasing the sophistication of leaders. The most frequently used tools in strategic training are scenario-writing, force-field analysis, and (especially for gaining insights into opponent behavior) strategy games.

**Team-building and leadership dynamics.** A major resource of nonviolent campaigners is the ability to work together. Sporadic isolated acts of heroism do not produce change, however admirable they are. Teamwork, and leadership which builds teamwork, are key areas for training.

Fortunately, nonviolent action as a technique of struggle is diversity-friendly. It can be used across the demographic spectrum (unlike the Marines who look for "a few good [young] men"). A group choosing nonviolent action can with high consistency train with diversity consciousness, bringing out racial cultural and other differences and using them to enrich the united team needed for effective action.

Trainers have a rapidly-growing set of approaches for team-building, inducting methods of conflict resolution within the group and decision-making methods which combine efficiency with democracy.17

**Training as a New Craft for Meeting Old Needs**

Training is not a panacea — it cannot make up for weak strategy, corrupt leadership, or an idea whose time has not yet come. Nevertheless, movements and individuals increasingly turn to training as one resource for emboldening, uniting, and democratizing their struggles for justice. Strategic and tactical work can be done in a training context; the skills and dynamics of nonviolent action can be taught. Trainers are learning from each other and from cognate fields how to assist movements even more effectively.18 There's reason to keep an eye on this new and growing field.19

---

**Endnotes**

1 For some sources for descriptions and evaluations of nonviolent direct action training workshops for nonviolent action, please see *Reconciliation International* 5/4, Winter 1990; Alternatives to Violence Project, 3049 East Genesee St., Syracuse, NY 13224; Nonviolence International, PO Box 39127, Friendship Station NW, Washington, DC 20006. Reports of the author's international trainings sessions are available for $2 plus SASE from Training Center Workshops, 4719 Springfield Ave, Philadelphia, PA 19143, USA.

2 The issues involved in creating reliable research for evaluating training are similar to those outlined by Christopher R. Mitchell regarding problem-solving workshops used for intervening in protracted conflicts. See his essay in Dennis I.D. Sandole and Hugo van der Merwe (eds.), *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practices: Integration and Application* (Manchester, England and New York: Manchester University Press, 1993).


6 The workshops used as their text the book written for the civil rights movement by sociologists Martin Oppenheimer and George Lakey, *A Manual for Direct Action* (Chicago Quadrangle Books, 1965); see chapter on training.

7 For a widely-used example of how these connections are made, see the *Handbook for Nonviolent Action*, War Resistant League, 339 Lafayette St., New York, NY 10012 (1989). The Handbook reflects clearly how organizers for a major nonviolent action sometimes place the event in the context of a larger social movement agenda which includes individual self-responsibility, democratic decision-making, teamwork, and unlearning forms of oppression such as racism, anti-Semitism, sexism, classism, agism, heterosexism, and ableism. Training workshops are then expected to assist participants to make these connections.

8 For descriptions of these strategy development tools, see the *Resource Manual for a Living Revolution*, chapter on planning.
DEVELOPING PEACE AND JUSTICE NONVIOLENT SOCIAL CHANGE AGENTS

By Brady Tyson*

Reviewing Our Mandate: Sustainable, Participatory, Democratic Development

Noah built the Ark before the Big Storm, and he was ready! If the world verges on a global civil crisis between rich and poor, we need to review our mandate for nonviolent training and engagement. Our old, Cold War-patterned ways of thought and action are "out-of-date" – We need to think more creatively and harder to meet the coming storms. Almost all of our pacifist, nonviolent, progressive, developmentalist, democratizing, environmentalist, and conflict resolution movements inherited from the past must cause us great concern and challenge us toward sustainable, participatory, democratic combinations:

- Peace & justice, just as environment & development, belong together!
- Planners, activists & managers — educators/organizers must cooperate!
- Community developers & nation-builders need each other!
- Prophers, teachers & technocrats share the same information!
- Facilitators and empowerment specialists do the same things!
- Acting locally & thinking globally energizes world and community law
- U.S. and non-U.S. "Americans" must redeem ourselves & our nations
- In theory and practice we need to decentralize learning and sensitivity with each other.

---

*Brady Tyson is the Director of International Nonviolence Institute, a research and training center for nonviolent social change. He is also the author of several books on nonviolence, including "Nonviolence: A Beginner's Guide" (2000). Tyson has been involved in nonviolent social change in many countries and is known for his work in conflict resolution and community development.

---

Writing from Rio De Janeiro, Brazil. Retired Professor of International Relations, The American University, School of International Service, Washington, DC, USA. He was also the chairperson of the Development Program there. He is also a member of the National Board of Directors of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), Atlanta, GA, USA.
Defining Our Task—The Rainbow Approach

Contextual and communitarian definitions determine what we mean and how we communicate why we need to dialogue with justice-oriented groups in our post-modern, post-Cold War, post-liberal nation-state world viewpoints. Preliminary definitions must therefore be sharpened and humanized so that we can network powerfully, at the suffering and the happiness, the fears, hopes, anxieties, and aspirations of others. Development is an ongoing process, impossible to describe as “developed” or finished—a process for humanizing all people contextually, in communities. Sustainable development thus implies making the environment healthy for all people, as well as the world itself, looking towards the future as well as the past and present.

Democracy for the future, as an ongoing process, leads to discovering new, uncharted vistas and challenges, through “liberty, equality” and community, always striving for a more just society, a more egalitarian community. Merely voting or non-voting institutions, such as multi-party elections and a liberal press, may also belie growing inequalities on economic levels, where excessive political rhetoric changes little. Labor-intensive participatory democracy does not come from the “top” but from the “bottom”—beyond one or another mental style or ideological agenda domination. Dialogue in participatory democracy in this way breaks through and changes, reforms, or mediates passivity or negative participation in a social struggle. Participation in this context effectively transcends any one social class, religion, or ethnocentric prejudice, because it needs to be theorized and practiced in diversity.

Human rights, articulated throughout the United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights, therefore works on the basis of five civil, cultural, social, economic, and political categories. The UN defines these five categories as “...interrelated, interdependent, and equally-important ...” With the duties and values of such basic communities and communitarian solidarity, as implied by the adherence to such a human rights charter, lie common interests, responsibility and support of each person and member nation-state. Ideally, a community or nation-state has the higher goal of interlinking all human rights, that is, of improving freedom, equality and community, not a propaganda "glue" for pitting one group or individual against another. A community of common values complements the organized efforts of society to promote such common, higher goals and interests. As a cultural community, a nation seeks to promote and protect its national values, its common cultural memories, history and heroes or heroines.

Nation-building problem-solving has gotten hung up on the old Cold War and Industrial Revolution notions that presumed that warlike abilities based on cold steel to kill people will also dominate nature. But now we have Slavic states from the former Russian Empire balkanizing or splitting-up against each other, paralleled by tribalizing African ethno-nationalism, and ethno-centrism in Europe and the Americas. Furthermore, our so-called global market and regional economic blocs now undercut both our concepts of national sovereignty and the sovereignties of world law. Nation-building terms like national infrastructure, institutional superstructure and asymmetrical political culture simply highlight tragic losses of “grass-roots” democracy and human rights values. In other words, nation-builders may be mere managers, not facilitators or peace & justice change agents, whether in group workshops or the wide screen of the world’s mass media meguls. Instead states and nation-states command more human and environmental resources, including matriarchal or patriarchal. Loyalties and a growing planetary notion of senseless sacrifice, than any other organization.

To be a citizen or nationalist may not be the same thing, since being a citizen also demands a common sense of responsibility toward the whole national and planetary community. In this context one’s political culture, built from fears, hopes, values, and educational or religious concerns that stem from dynamic “grass-roots” community. In other words, nationalism, which politicizes patriotism and chauvinism, forges other values than self-determination and national realization. Nation, enemy, and patriotism may all to often be buzzwords for competitive, internalized violence, not the outward looking dream for multicultural, multi-ethnic, plural diver— not the rainbow of varied, complex world views and life-styles advocated by Martin and Coretta Scott Luther King, Jr.

The multi-cultural, multinational, and multi-ethnic rainbow approach to peace & justice builds from the nonviolent change agent, a
An Experiment in Nonviolence Education: The Peacemaker Training Institute

By Francine Blume*

Academics tend to assume that activists are not grounded in theory as they work for nonviolent political and social change. Activists, on the other hand, believe the scholars to be in their Ivory Towers — out of touch not only with pressing social issues but the very real ground-work of social change. There has, however, been significant movement towards bridging this seeming chasm between theory and practice. Professional associations such as the Consortium of Peace Research, Education, and Development (COPRED) actively bring practitioners and scholars together for discussion and dialogue. Research and consulting entities such as the Albert Einstein Institution in Cambridge, Massachusetts and Nonviolence International in Washington, D.C. have contributed greatly towards professionalization of the field of nonviolence training. Some peace and conflict resolution studies programs such as the summer Institute in Social Movements and Strategic Nonviolence at Tufts University in Medford, Massachusetts are beginning to develop further giving potential students an opportunity to combine academic study with practical experience.

But how do we best prepare the next generation of social change agents—both scholars and activists with an exceptional grasp of theory and the implementing skills to promote nonviolent struggle? The Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR), an interfaith pacifist organization over seventy-five years old which has historically made significant contributions to the nonviolent promotion of social justice, saw the need not only to train young adults in nonviolent tactics but to provide the theoretical and philosophical frameworks from which their action could be rooted; hence, they developed the concept of the Peacemaker Training Institute (PTI).

End Note

1. Pacifist is meant to be a direct action, not a passive, or non-resistant approach to peace — just as conflict resolution should be approached through nonviolence rather than violence of one sort or another.

*Francine Blume currently lives in Washington, D.C. She received her doctorate in Peace Studies from the University of Hawai‘i.
After a discussion of the rationale and implementation of the Institute design, this article will describe the development of the program and its participants over the past three years. Although many challenges were successfully met and participants greatly benefited, other ones remained difficult to resolve. If we in the field remain committed to the highest quality of nonviolence education and training, then these challenges must be considered in the development and implementation of future programs. In the interest of contributing to this intellectual and practical dialogue, the following article relates these recent experiences and reflections in the hopes of inspiring others in their innovative efforts to bridge the gap between theory and practice.

Peacemaker Training Institute: Rationale, Design and Implementation

As the Persian Gulf War approached and consumed the majority of FOR’s human resources, FOR, along with the majority of the peace movement, bemoaned that it had been unable to prevent such a terrible catastrophe. There had to be a more effective way for organizers to anticipate, prepare for, and/or prevent the unnecessary violence and suffering. Youth organizers and educators at FOR envisioned a program which could prepare young women and men as catalysts and leaders in nonviolence through skills training, education, reflection, and organizing experience. FOR would invite young people, generally between 18 and 25, with a commitment to learning more about nonviolence and an interest in engaging in nonviolent struggle. The participants had to have both an understanding of theory and practice, and an understanding of the inter-relatedness of global issues with community and family issues.

Tuition would be charged and, in exchange, participants would receive education, food, housing, and training. Coordinators would be hired to implement every aspect of the Institute design from recruitment, to course design and teaching, to administration and financial development for overseeing the daily needs of participants, to liaison within the organization and between community groups. Upon completion of the program, the cadre of trainees would return to their home communities to contribute to nonviolent struggle in their own personally significant and meaningful ways.

Academics

The program was designed with three components for six to eight residential and locally-based full-time participants. The first component involved academic study and personal reflection. Study included a core seminar on “Nonviolent Political Alternatives,” a three-hour college level course focusing on the historical, philosophical, theological, and ideological roots of nonviolence as well as theories of power and process. This course was also offered for credit through a local nontraditional college which attracted a wider variety of students than the PTI participants alone, thus offering an even richer mix of student experiences and perspectives. As a group, PTI participants met weekly for a reflection lunch with the program coordinator to more thoroughly process their learning.

Being the national office of a peace organization located in the greater metropolitan New York area, the Institute was able to take advantage of visiting activists and scholars as well as the rich resources of other international organizations (such as the United Nations) and social justice groups (like Greenpeace and Amnesty International). But there needed to be other dimensions of peace work brought to light throughout the nine months of the training. In the drive to integrate theory and practice, there are some intangibles which are best experienced through site visits and observation. Thus, in addition to the course, each year there were three one-week study trips throughout the U.S. East Coast focusing on the themes of “Peace and Justice for the Long Haul”, “Spirituality and Nonviolence”, and “Politics and Nonviolence.”

“Peace and Justice for the Long Haul” involved visiting different individuals and organizations who had relatively-successful longitudinal track records throughout New York State and the New England region. Hospitality was generally provided by local organizations who would visit with the participants and share their own stories of nonviolence and nonviolent struggle, while also providing for valuable future contacts for the participants.

The other two study trips were similarly structured. “Spirituality and Nonviolence” looked at how individuals act out of their spiritual base to create their vision of a more peaceful world.” Most of this trip
focused on the Philadelphia area where participants were guest of "One Day at a Time," a drug rehabilitation program based on nonviolence for homeless substance abusers. Participants also visited the national office of the American Friends Service Committee, Swarthmore College’s Peace Library, and other organizations for discussions on living one's values, while effectively promoting change. Other spiritual roots were explored outside of the field trip through guest speakers such as Ira Grupper of the New Jewish Agenda and resources in the New York, including members of an Islamic group in Poughkeepsie who go to prisons and train in nonviolence. The last study trip was to the Washington, D.C. area for "Politics and Nonviolence".

Internship

The second and largest component of the program was an internship with FOR in any number of the participant’s program areas. For an average of twenty-one hours a week, participants would work with a seasoned activist as their mentor on projects involving program development, nonviolence training, community disarmament, magazine development and communications, and racial and economic justice with sister organizations such as Children’s Creative Response to Conflict and the Jewish Peace Fellowship. Through these placements participants ideally got exposure to issues of national and international scope, received supervised experience in national organizing, regularly interacted with other activists and organizations of national importance, and then applied the philosophical and theoretical base from their studies in crucial current developments. They also received valuable experience with the organizational dynamics of professional peace organizations. The ability to understand fiscal control, management issues, and organizational development is imperative in making the connection from idealistic neophyte to the hard lessons of real world, day to day operations of a business, whether market-driven or peace and justice-oriented.

Grassroots Experience

The final component of the Peacemaker Training Institute was grassroots experience in a local community project. Here, the idea was to link the global issues to their application at the local level in an area of interest to the PTI participant. Questions of general cross-cultural communication manifested themselves in a special homework assistance and self-esteem building program for children of recent immigrants. Teen violence was addressed in an alternative after-school open gym. The complexity of the AIDS crisis came down to the needs of an HIV-positive child and her family coping with day-to-day challenges of survival. In each of these and other instances, PTI participants redefined the meaning of proactive nonviolent struggle, and sought opportunities to build social justice at the smallest of social levels. Working with families and communities helped the trainees to better internalize these issues and understand the complexity of global issues which affect people in very real ways.

In combination, the three components ideally served to provide an integrated experience of nonviolent education and training in global and local issues through theory, reflection and application.

Challenges

Creating and implementing such an ambitious educational program meant confronting numerous challenges. A number of them were successfully met to the benefit of the students and to the benefit of the organization. Other challenges remained difficult, becoming constraints and eventually led to a change of mission and redesign of the Institute.

Coordinator’s Curricular Challenges

Preparing an academic and experiential program which balanced the needs of the participants with the needs of FOR and the availability of activities in the local area was the most important challenge. Although the trainees shared a commitment to learning more about nonviolence and nonviolent struggle, they were coming to the Institute
with very different educational backgrounds, skills and experiences. For a theoretical base, the core seminar needed to provide learning experiences which would both serve as a foundation and stimulate the more advanced students. "Nonviolent Political Process" attempted to model a nonviolent pedagogy with a feminist process of full participation. The first year, the course was simply a graduate style reading circle led by the coordinator with students reading and sharing their views and material in the field. However, this did not address the need of skills development, nor did it reach students who were at a lower academic level.

The second year developed differently. Topics for the first semester included the following: an orientation to the class process; roots of violence and nonviolence in the physical and social sciences; roots of nonviolence from various philosophical and spiritual perspectives; types of violence and types of peace; theories and practitioners of nonviolence and nonviolent struggle; and future visions of peace and justice. The second semester in the second year was designed for the students to develop and implement a nonviolent campaign using consensus decision-making around an area of mutual concern; practical application of the material learned in the first semester. Each semester, students shared the roles with the PTI coordinator who, as course leader, was responsible for the general framework. They co-facilitated, selected material for study based on mutual interest, kept a written history of the class, chose learning activities, and monitored the affective side of the learning process as "vibes" watchers. Students were encouraged to keep a journal of their thoughts and feelings as their main course project, although others chose to do presentations or write traditional style research papers. Additionally, PTI incorporated thirty-minute mini-trainings to build skills in decision making, facilitation, nonviolent strategy and tactics, public relations and communications, and conflict resolution.

The first semester was very successful but there were some very practical problems with the second semester course design. Although PTI trainers agreed to use consensus as a learning process and a decision-making method, it was difficult to come to genuine consensus with some irregular attendance by a few participants. When the students came to the point of agreement regarding an issue for action, none were terribly enthused about the remaining option and were therefore reluctant to engage in formulating a plan despite being aware of the purpose: i.e. a learning exercise. Working with genuine consensus at best was time consuming and energy depleting, and rather than setting the students up for success, they often felt doomed to failure. The success came when the group finally excelled at the consensus process. They felt the convergence of ideas and constraints, and ironically decided, by consensus, not to proceed with the action. Initially there was a sense of loss and failure, but one by one the students recognized how much they had learned about consensus and felt successful about engaging in that process. They felt the pride and satisfaction of having learned a form of nonviolent decision making and became genuinely excited at their progress.

The study tours were highly successful in terms of participant benefits as well as FOR outreach. They helped the students to compare some communities dedicated, in their own ways, to bringing about peace. Traditional proponents of nonviolent struggle tend to have the assumption that nonviolence is used only for the causes of good as they define them. By meeting with different lobbying groups and candidly discussing their philosophies, agendas, and strategies, participants were given a much different picture. By comparing and contrasting, e.g., two very different groups such as the Friends' Committee on National Legislation and the Conservative Caucus, or Planned Parenthood and Operation Rescue, participants internalized a new understanding of the scope of nonviolent political struggle and a process for understanding the mind set of the opponent. Each participant was asked to write a reflection paper summarizing their experiences and insights as a result of their trips and much travel time was spent in group discussion. One of the problems with the tours however is that they tended to be over-programmed and care had to be taken to allow time for processing and absorption by the students.

As with Mohandas and Kasturbai Gandhi's experiments in truth, any experiment in nonviolence is courageous and touches lives. As with the shift of FOR's Peacemaker Training Institute, we celebrate its contributions and strive to learn from our successes and mistakes. Hopefully, this description and analysis of PTI's experience can inspire and better prepare others in innovative and relevant nonviolence education and training paradigms to continue preparing and learning toward future catalysts of nonviolent political and social change. If it does, then the Institute will have been a success.
BOOK REVIEWS


By Deborah Wheeler*

Besides having a catchy title, *The Purple Shall Govern* is an intriguing collection of testimonies regarding the power of nonviolence in South Africa. The text takes its name from the nonviolent street riots in Cape Town, 2 September 1989, where the South African police attempted to spray purple paint on demonstrators. *The Purple Shall Govern* shares structural similarities with Part Two of Gene Sharp’s *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*. In the acknowledgments to *The Purple Shall Govern*, the authors explain that this textual parallel is real rather than imagined. Sharp’s work provided the foundation for the original research into forms of nonviolent action in South Africa. When a work draws inspiration from a particular body of scholarship, and the debt is made explicit, certain expectations are raised in the minds of readers. Unfortunately, *The Purple Shall Govern* fails to meet such expectations as revealed by: its lack of theoretical sophistication, its ahistorical presentation, and its naive understanding of polemic.

Knowing that Sharp’s text inspired *The Purple Shall Govern*, readers might expect more than a simple A, B, C’s of nonviolence. First, readers might demand theoretical sophistication in analyzing the successes and failures of nonviolent action in the struggle against apartheid, as does Sharp’s work. Second, readers might expect aspects of the struggle in South Africa be contextualized in the global environment of nonviolence, since Sharp’s text provides a worldwide treatment of the subject. *The Purple Shall Govern*, however, while occasionally drawing parallels with nonviolent action in other contexts, only superficially deals with theories and strategies of nonviolence. For example, the text notes that “withholding tax” has been a political strategy for voicing disapproval with a government in many contexts (p. 152), or observes that

---

*Deborah Wheeler is currently teaching at Vanderbilt University.*
"yellow is the colour of resistance by conscientious objectors and anti-militarisation activists worldwide (158)." But such strategies are not placed into any semblance of a theoretical framework which could be used to show how these strategies work to create change in the world, and in which contexts such strategies are most likely to succeed.

A second potential weakness of the text is its ahistorical presentation of events. To prove the potential power of nonviolence in South African history, the authors extract examples of nonviolent political events from the chain of struggle against apartheid, using categories from A (activism) to Z (zabaleza) as an organizational schema. This structure of events violates traditional concepts of history as linear, by clustering categories of action which begin with the same letter, rather than those which share some relationship in time or space. It also seems to weaken their argument about the power of nonviolence in South Africa, because one does not have a sense of where such events fit in the day-to-day struggle against apartheid, nor a clear perception of how such events impact the realities of apartheid over time. Perhaps, however, the construction of a collage of action divorced from its place in history is poignantly symbolic of the nature of nonviolent struggle in South Africa, meaning that nonviolence has failed to be an organized movement in space and time since the 60's when resistance turned violent. Since then, perhaps nonviolence in South Africa has resembled a bowl of alphabet soup. If this is the case, then the presentation is appropriate, that is, true to the history of nonviolence in South Africa, even if it is disorienting to the reader. A time line of the most important nonviolent events in South African history and an analysis of their supposed effects might remedy the apparent lack of context in the text as currently presented.

Just as one might criticize a reader's narrow expectations of linear histories, one might critique the authors' naïve distinction between "history" and "polemic." The reason The Purple Shall Govern is so difficult to read critically is that one is not sure what to expect from it. The guiding philosophy of the presentation is that "the book should be a history rather than a polemic, that it should document rather than preach, and that it should not be judgmental of other forms of struggle (p.8)." The text's thesis, however, seems to be that nonviolence can be a pow-
motive, intention, and desired effect, a state of confusion which might have been avoided had the authors been more forthcoming in their polemic.

These three problems with the text: its lack of theoretical sophistication, its ahistorical presentation, and its naive understanding of polemic, do not render the text useless. On the contrary, *The Purple Shall Govern* reveals something important about the ways in which aspects of nonviolence are embodied in struggle. Moreover, readers of the text come away with a quick glimpse of forms of nonviolent struggle in South Africa. The text could be useful for courses on South Africa and for courses on Nonviolence. The integration of pictures, discourses of resistance, and definitions of aspects of nonviolence from A to Z makes this text accessible even to the lay reader. If one wants theoretically sophisticated treatment of nonviolent strategy, or a rigorous history of nonviolence in South Africa, however, then this is not a suitable text.


---


By the Editors

What Data (Facts, Research Fields,...) Base(s) Do We Use?

If we hope to understand conflict and expect to resolve it we need to study conflict and its resolution — whether through violence, nonviolence, or somewhere between. As we claim to practice nonviolence, we need to harmonize thoughts, means, and ends. D-base network information management systems surround the average activist-researcher, some stretching beyond the bounds of one’s respective "state" department or nation-state of origin. These d-bases for networking and communication, like InterNet and PeaceNet or Eco/GreenNet, link people to people internationally. When given log-in access codes and d-base networks one may be able to link into and retrieve data-bases, like: the U.S. Library of Congress (said to have well over a 100 million books listed and annotated on-line); in-depth retrieval sources accessible by authors, areas, issues, and keywords.

Still, on the other hand, few data bases emphasize retrieval of sources basic to nonviolence, the focus of our present journal, rather than peace generally resolved by "strength". When acting under the claims of nonviolence, our knowledge (or lack of interest) over available data and literature may determine why we approach issues, how we approach issues, and what issues we approach. MM & Z have reviewed general data bases available for conflict resolution research and practice. Whether or not such data bases address practical nonviolence may be another question, as will be seen in the following comparison of their work with that of Glenn Paige and Andrew Young.
Merritt, Muncater, and Zinnes

As acknowledged by MM & Z, the work of Edward Azar via a Conflict and Peace Data Bank (COPDAB) paved a way for researchers to approach conflict data quantitatively. Further data bases emerged later, e.g.: Rudolph Rummel’s Dimensionality of Nations (DON), and Charles McClelland’s World Event Interaction Survey (WEIS), and Charles Herrmann’s Comparative Research on the Events of Nations (CREON), as well as a Global Event-Data System (GEDS), a Behavioral Correlates of War System (BCOW), and various related spin-offs (SESS, SHERFACS, etc.). The authors point to a better solution, their own comprehensive data base, called the "Data Development for International Research," or DDIR — developed at the University of Illinois, Champagne-Urbana. They also reference — through works by other authors in this collection of articles — additional data bases, from the U.S. Department of Labor data bases on union strikes to Hayward Alker’s combination of DDIR with MIT input and from on-line systems (Lexis-Nexis) to CD-ROM systems (FBIS/CIA). Many of these data base programs are accessible through d-base networks like InterNet (Veronica/Archie).

What does this all mean for nonviolence theory and practice? Do such data bases advance nonviolence as well as anti-imperialist and world order-oriented approaches more common to nation states? If not, what elements might be missing from such data bases? First of all, although not specifically addressed by MM & Z, in order to reconcile opposing sides of a struggle, one should use relevant languages; e.g., English, Hebrew, and Arabic, at least; for Israeli-Palestinian problem solving. Lexis-Nexis has some limited use here, but other CD-ROM technology may improve multi-lingual access, e.g., through the French and German equivalents of the U.S. Library of Congress for other national libraries. Compact Disk technology may also provide economic backgrounds, such as commodity trading in Milan, Frankfurt, London, Paris, Geneva, Tokyo, and New York City, with increasing input from Beijing, Bombay, Hong Kong, Moscow, Jakarta, Mexico City, and Rio de Janeiro — or the economic unification records, e.g., of the European Community.

Therefore, first of all, as cited in MM & Z footnotes, DDIR and its predecessors may depend on such English-language sources as the New York Times to structure their data base, i.e. one’s base for one’s theoretical stance. Nevertheless, critical viewpoints from the New York Times might well differ from viewpoints of the Cuban weekly Granma, available in a computerized data base from the University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL. In like manner, the U.N. Disarmament Library in New York, while including both a Cuban and a U.S. viewpoint on conflict resolution, might not take into account nation states claiming to have abolished their militaries. The U.N’s Institute for Disarmament Research or UNIDIR in Switzerland, for instance, found that only the U.S., French, and German library systems support data bases helpful for disarmament and development policy data base research. To improve such research, some countries, such as the Netherlands, have introduced one nation-wide, university-accessible computer system, linking domestic academic libraries and other OECD country national libraries, online.

Although, of course, certain states, such as Costa Rica, which claim to have had a different military history, if catalogued by the U.N., might really strengthen a U.N. conflict resolution approach. Likewise, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, and other related peace research groups, may inventory sources which may highlight nonviolence as an approach to peace. The International Peace Research Association has various task forces which may d-base/network regarding nonviolence, though without a consequently-relevant data-base or retrieval context. Furthermore, Istvan Kende, and others, beginning through the Hungarian peace research community, have sensitized the literature available with attempts to number the war dead from warfare often not as commonly-known in the Third World. Whether or not these efforts will advance data bases for advancing cost-effective nonviolence in a given context may be another matter. There is not only a great difference between networking and d-basing, as it were, but also a great difference between what data bases exist, relative to d-base networks like InterNet and PeaceNet (DAS) or Eco/GreenNet.
Nonviolent Data-Base(s)?

In contrast other writers presume that nonviolent approaches to peace demand a comprehensive knowledge of both nonviolence and violence. Recent works by Glenn Paige, To Nonviolent Political Science, and Andrew Young, A Way Out of No Way, identify ways for both re-thinking and re-vitalizing approaches to the resolution of war and conflict. Paige points to the need for theoretical revolution to guide basic and applied theory through questions and data-searching aimed at non-killing and altruistic nonviolence. Young illustrates how practical nonviolence may resolve issues as diverse as the U.S. civil rights and the Palestinian struggle for self-determination on the world stage. Both writers call for institutional revolution, whether through, e.g., the U.N. University of Peace or the Rainbow Power of the "Beloved Community" advocated by Martin and Coretta Scott-Luther King.

Paige identifies, through examples of political leaders such as Petra Kelly, why nonviolence does indeed speak to power. Starting from the glacial East-West line now melted between both Germanies, Petra used the example of her young sister Grace’s death from cancer linked to the arms race to co-found the German Green Party. If such researchers and political leaders have such a nonviolent political will to face common survival-environmental questions, then perhaps Paige’s call for globally-oriented nonviolent diplomacy may strike some resonating chords. In like manner Young gives us some hope that even the dangerously expensive garbage from chemical, genetic, nuclear, biological, and bio-molecular war agents — whether in U.S., Soviet, or globally-dispersed military sites — may be neutralized, rather than dumped or flung around in ashes from incinerators. The world community will be watching the U.S. very closely over such issues of both peace and justice challenges for global nonviolence.

The editors of the International Journal of Nonviolence invite our readers to strengthen our globally-emerging nonviolence knowledge databases: through suggestions that may be published in this journal. Suggestions for skillful database theory and supportive d-base network practice to access relevant data-bases (via d-bases networks like PeaceNet) — as we struggle together for basic human needs and rights like air, water, health, housing, education, and employment access.
Annotated Bibliography of Nonviolent Action Training

By Michael Beer

Table of Contents

The following bibliography contains basic training resources for those who engage in nonviolent action training. These basic resources are divided into the following categories:

English Language Materials:

History of Nonviolent Action Training
Training Theory and Analysis
Nonviolent Action Training Manuals
Organizing Training
Training of Trainer Manuals
Tools & Exercises
Handouts for participants
  Affinity Groups/Support
  Civil Disobedience
  Conduct/Self Defense
  Dynamics of Nonviolent Action
  Legal
  Peacekeeper
Nonviolent Direct Action Event Handbooks
Organizing Direct Action
Nonviolent Action Training Reports
Directories of Nonviolent Action Trainers

Some materials are available in the following languages: Burmese, Croatian, French, German, Hindi, Japanese, Khmer, Portuguese, Russian, Serbian, Sinhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Tamil, and Thai.

Michael Beer, Director of Training at Nonviolence International.

This bibliography DOES NOT include resources for trainers that can be easily found elsewhere such as case studies, nonviolence or political theory, decision-making, or nonviolence as a “way of life.”

We welcome suggestions to expand the bibliography below. With your help, it could include many more materials from around the world and its major languages. Updated versions will appear in the forthcoming International Directory for Nonviolence Action Trainers, and then posted as a permanent retrievable data base on Internet. Special thanks to April Carter and Michael Randle for their bibliographies as common predecessors to this bibliography, dating from the 1970s. Publications with no contact information are available from the Nonviolence International (NI) and International Fellowship of Reconciliation (IFOR) libraries. “Out of print” and hard-to-find publications available from NI cost $0.25 per page, including postage. An “**” designates a recommended resource.

BASIC RESOURCE ORGANIZATIONS/PEOPLE:


IFOR (International Fellowship of Reconciliation), Spoorstr. 38, 1815
BK Alkmaar, Netherlands, tel. 31 72-123014 fax 151102, <ifor@gn.apc.org>

Training Center Workshops, c/o George Lakey, 4719 Springfield Ave., Philadelphia PA, 19143, U.S.A.
215-729-7458. <peacelearn@ic.gc.apc.org>

MNS (Movement for a New Society), Defunct. Materials available from Lynne Shivers, see below

NI (Nonviolence International), P.O. Box 39127 Washington, DC 20016, 202-244-0951, fax 202-244-6396. <nonviolence@ic.gc.apc.org>

Lynne Shivers, 341 1st Ave., Deptford, NJ 08096, 609-374-0395. Veteran trainer and major repositor of materials particularly from Movement for a New Society (MNS), and the Delaware Valley Nonviolence Training Collective.

WRL (War Resisters League), 339 Lafayette St., New York, NY 10012 U.S.A. 212-228-0450, fax 228 6193, <wrl@igc.apc.org>.

WRI (War Resisters International), 5 Caledonian Rd. London N1, U.K. 44-171-278-4040, fax 278 0444, <warresisters@gwlc.org>.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE MATERIALS:

HISTORY OF NONVIOLENT ACTION TRAINING


TRAINING THEORY AND ANALYSIS


Lynne Shivers, "Training as Part of Nonviolent Revolution," Obtain from Shivers, see above, 1972, 6 pp.


NONVIOLENT ACTION TRAINING MANUALS


Lynne Shivers, "Demonstrations: A Participant Training," Obtain from Shivers, see above. 1973, 6 pp. The only known training manual used to prepare people for legal demonstrations.


ORGANIZING TRAINING
(See Resource Manual for a Living Revolution)


MNS, Medium-Term Training Organizing Collective, "Coordinators Manual of The General Training Program of Philadelphia Movement for a New Society," Obtain from Shivers, see above. 1977, 49 pp. 2-week training. 2/3 on logistics, but includes good section on dysfunctional training aspects.
George Lakey, "How to Design a Workshop," Obtain from Training Center Workshops, see above, 1994, 1p.


**TRAINING FOR TRAINERS**


**TOOLS & EXERCISES**


Clamshell Alliance, "Roleplays." in "We Can Stop the Seabrook Nuclear Power Plant, Occupier's Handbook, April 30," 1977, 1p. Contact NI or IFOR.


* Mari Fitzduff, *Community Conflict Skills*, Northern Ireland Community Relations Council, 6 Murray St., Belfast BT1 6DN, N. Ireland. Tel. +44-1232-439953, fax 235208.


George Lakey, "Tips for Trainers When Working Across Cultural Lines", Obtain from Training Center Workshops, see above, 1994, 1 p.


HANDOUTS FOR PARTICIPANTS

AFFINITY GROUPS & SUPPORT HANDOUTS


APT, "Affinity Groups," 2 pp. & "Responsibilities of Support People," 1p. from "Reclaiming the Test Site," American Peace Test, Box 26725, Las Vegas, NV, 89126. USA, 702-386-9834, fax 386-9335, <aptvegas@igc.apc.org>

MNS, "Support," Obtain from Shivers, see above, 1983, 1 p.

MNS and Pledge of Resistance, "Why Affinity Groups", 1985, 1 p. Obtain from Shivers, see above.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE HANDOUTS

Delaware Valley Nonviolence Training Collective, "Civil Disobedience," 1986, 1 p. Obtain from Shivers, see above.

Dion Lerman, "Civil Disobedience," P.O. Box 1526, Philadelphia, PA 19105, 1995, 5pp.

NONVIOLENT CONDUCT/SELF-DEFENSE HANDOUTS

American Peace Test, "Nonviolent Principles for APT Participants," from "Reclaiming the Test Site," American Peace Test, Box 26725, Las Vegas, NV, 89126. USA, 702-386-9834, fax 386-9335, <aptvegas@igc.apc.org>, 1988, 1 p. Seven principles.


**DYNAMICS OF NONVIOLENT ACTION Handouts**

(includes a variety of visual and step-by-step models that simplify nonviolent direct action)


* APT, "Basic Concepts of Satyagraha," in "Reclaiming the Test Site", 1988, 1 p. American Peace Test, Box 26725. Las Vegas, NV, 89126. USA, 702-386-9834, fax 386-9335, <aptvegas@igc.apc.org>


FOR, "Planning a Nonviolent Campaign," in *Activist Nonviolence: A Way of Life, A Strategy for Change*, FOR, Box 271, Nyack, NY, 10960, 914-358-4601, 358-4924, <fordatl@igc.apc.org>, 2 pp. 4 basic principles of direct action, 5 strategic steps, and some practical guidelines.

* Caridad Inda, "Dynamics of Nonviolent Action," From Cirimex, Fernando de Alba 659, Col. Chapultepec, COD Post, 45000 Guadalajara, Mexico, 11 pp.


* MNS, "Developing a Definition of Nonviolence," Obtain from Shivers, see above. 1 p. King and Lakey stage strategies.


**LEGAL HANDOUTS**


MNS, "A Legal Map." Obtain from Shivers, see above. A flowchart of "legal" steps & choices.


**PEACEKEEPER HANDOUTS**

MNS, "For Marshals," Obtain from Shivers, see above, 1979, 1 p.


Lynne Shivers, "For Peacekeepers," Obtain from Shivers, see above. n.d., 1 p.


**EVENT HANDBOOKS**

(If necessary, contact IFOR or NI for photocopies)

* APT, "Reclaiming the Test Site," 1988, 62 pp. American Peace Test, Box 26725, Las Vegas, NV, 89126. USA, 702-386-9834, fax 386-9335, <aptvegas@igc.apc.org>


MNS, "Stop the Cruise/Pershing II, Organizers Manual," Obtain from Shivers, see above. 38 pp.


* Torness Alliance Handbook, Commonweal Collection c/o J B Priestley Library, Bradford University, Bradford BD7 1DP, Yorks +44-1274-383404


ORGANIZING MANUALS

Mubarak Awad, Laura Barnitz, Organizing Marches, NI, 1992, 30 pp. $3.

Mubarak Awad, Laura Barnitz, and Christine Jackson, Organizing Tax Resistance, NI, 1992, 30 pp. $3.


Clark, Crown, McKee, Macpherson, Preparing for Nonviolent Direct Action, 1990, Peace Pledge Union. 6 Endsleigh St. London WC1H ODX Britain. £1.50.


* Ed Hedeman, Organizers Manual, Obtain from WRL, see above, 1981, 222 pp. $10.

Si Kahn, *Organizing: A Guide for Grassroots Leaders*, National Association of Social Workers, Silver Spring MD, USA, 1991. (e.g., against J.P. Stephens, the company against which "We Shall Overcome" was born).


**TRAINING REPORTS**

(IFOR regularly publishes training reports in its magazine "Reconciliation International")


George Lakey & Michael Beer, "Burmese Students in the USA: A Training Outline," NI, 3 pp. Obtain from Training Center Workshops, see above.

George Lakey, "Guerrilla Training: Nonviolent Style," 1990, 2 pp. Obtain from Training Center Workshops, see above.


George Lakey, "Three Nonviolent Training Events in Asia: Taiwan Activists, Sri Lankan Monks, and Burmese Refugee Students," 1991, 5 pp. Obtain from Training Center Workshops, see above.


Lynne Shivers, "Bedford Hills, NY Women's Prison," Obtain from Shivers, see above. 12-14 March 1983, 7 pp. See Alternatives to Violence Project in the Training Manual section for more information on work in prisons.


* WRI, "Training in Nonviolent Action: Bulletins by WRI," Obtain from WRI, see above. Eight bulletins, 16 pages per bulletin.

DIRECTORIES FOR TRAINERS


Transnational Nonviolence Trainer's List, 1991. Obtain from PBI, WRI, & IFOR, see above.

WRL-Directory of North[ern] America Trainers, Obtain from WRL, see above, 1990, 100 pp.


NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE MATERIALS

BURMESE


"Training Outline for Cells Throughout Burma," Political Defiance Committee of the National Council of the Union of Burma, N1, 1993 pp.

CROATIAN

Howard Clark suggests for Croatian materials, contact <aida.bagic@zamir-zg.ztn.zer.de> Responsible for the training programme of the Anti-War Campaign of Croatia.

FRENCH

For French, good sources are the Mouvement pour Une Alternative Nonviolence. They have produced loads of stuff and have led workshops in most parts of the French-speaking world. Check also with Also the Centre Martin Luther King in Lausanne, Switzerland. The Centre de Ressources sur la non-violence 5770, Cote des Neiges, Montreal, (Qc) H3S 1Y9, Tel. 514-340-9209.

Nous mettons a votre disposition un imposant service de documentation sur la nonviolence et les sujets qui s'y rattachent (2,500 volumes, 35 periodiques, nombreux dossiers.)

Jean and Hildegard Goss-Mayr, Evangile et Luttes pour la Paix. See also various texts from SERPAJ mentioned below, concerning nonviolence and liberation theology. From Les Bergers et les Mages 437, rue de Clichy, 75009 Paris, France.

Jean-Marie Muller, Strategie de L'Action Non-violent, 1981; plus other works, e.g., on Cezar Chavez and concerning mutual work with Lanzo del Vasto (Comunide de l'Arche).


For German, some good sources of suggestions might well be the group Kurve Wustrow and in particular Hagen Berndt who makes a living as a trainer. Kurve Wustrow, Kirchstrasse 14, D-29461 Wustrow, tel: +49 58 43 507, fax: +49 58 53 1405.


**HINDI**

Various language/s publications on Shanti Sena or Peace "Military" of India. From Shanti Sena, Rural University Press, Madurai Province, India.

NV training materials also available in several Indian Languages. from, e.g., Sampoorna Kranti Vidyalaya, Vedchhi 39461, District Sarat, Gujarat, India.

**SERBIAN**

Howard Clark suggests contacting "cat@zamir-bg.ztn.zer.de - that's the Centre for Anti-War Action. I know they have translated one book on conflict resolution." Also for Serbian, try ppm_pancevo@zamir-bg.ztn.zer.de - that's the Peace Movement of Pancevo. They have certainly translated Friendly Classroom for a Small Planet into Serbian.
SINHALESE

"Shanti Sena Training." Various versions from Shanti Sena, Gandhi Gram, Madurai Province India, as well as from Sarvodaya in Sri Lanka.

SPANISH

AVP "AVP Basic Course", 1994, $25, Inc. P.O. Box 2974 Liverpool NY, 13089-2974, 315-453-7311 <candaceavp@aol.com>, nonviolence training as a "way of life"

Carlos Martin Beristain, Francesc Riera. Afirmacion y Resistencia: la Comunidad como Auyo, Virus, c/ de la Cera, 1 bis, 08001 Barcelona, Catalunya, Spain +34 3 329 06 43, 2nd edition 1993. It's mainly descriptions of workshops in Latin America, dealing with questions like fear, etc.

Servicio Paz y Justicia (SERPAJ)-Ecuador, Casilla 17-03-1567, Quito, Ecuador, fax +593-2-230873, or SERPAJ-Chile, Casilla 139, Correo 3, Santiago Chile, Tel. +56-2-672-7608. Numerous works from rap sheets to books.

Jean & Hildegard Goss-Mayr, Evangelio y Lucha por la Paz, Barcelona: Sigueme,. Obtain from Apartado 332, 37080 Salamanca, Spain.

Paul Hubers, Nonviolence in Violence: Approaches to International Conflict Resolution in Costa Rica, PhD. Diss. Long Latinola and global bibliographies for state and non-state political contexts. <nonviolence@igc.org>

SWEDISH

Annotated Abstracts of Theses and Dissertations on Civil Disobedience and Nonviolent Direct Action

By the Editors


Nonviolent People Power as a national independence strategy that pushed out one of the oldest U.S. foreign military bases (stemming from bases in Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, and Pearl Harbor, HI).

Thomas Daniel Rojas, *The Use of Nonviolent Sanctions by the Frente Democrático Nacional (FDN) to Protest the Alleged Fraud During the Mexican Presidential Election of 1988*, Tufts University, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Ph.D. Diss., 1993, 93-22887, 237 pp.

Led by its presidential candidate, Cuauhtémoc Cardenas, after Mexico’s 6 July 1988 presidential election, the FDN used nonviolence to protest Mexico’s ruling party’s abuse of the electoral system. Authors considered: Laura O’Donoherty, Pablo Gómez, Caridad Inda, Cuauhtémoc Cardenas, Pablo González Casanova, Daniel Cosio Villegas, Javier Antonio Madero, and Manuel Villa Aguilera.


Non-binary and non-enemy, i.e., non-opposition and non-divisionary theory as other than ruling realism, binarism, and neo-realism. Ethical theories considered: Buddhist, Aboriginal, French Feminist, and North American.


Comparison of three international approaches to peace, i.e., world order, anti-imperialism, and nonviolence. Authors compared: George Washington Carver, W.E.B. du Bois, and Martin Luther King, Jr. (via Stephen Monroe-Trotter).


Front-line SADCC/economic resistance against apartheid, much of it nonviolent.

Formative exploration of Dutch and German nonviolence, as evolved through the Dutch nonviolence struggle against German Nazi occupation in the 1940s, by the future co-founding editor of the German journal on nonviolence (Gewaltfreie Aktion). Authors' comparison begins with Desiderius Erasmus, through Karl Liebknecht, Clara Meijer Wichmann, and Henriette Roland Holst, to the European nonviolence and ecofeminism opposing U.S. and Russian nuclear missiles.


Pace-setting analytical and pedagogical survey of the pioneer U.S. peace studies programs, as to nonviolence content, by a co-founder of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and later professor at Howard Divinity School.


The U.S. "Gandhi" — A.J. Muste, and his role as the founding teacher of the Brookwood School — the forerunner of the Highlander Folk School, the initial U.S. training school for peace and civil rights movements (attended by and employing, e.g., Andrew Young, Septima Poinsette Clark, and a couple, Martin and Coretta Scott-Luther King, Jr. ('Brookwood' — erased by the politics of the 1940s — being an inversion of the name from a previously-founded English Quaker institution known as Woodbrooke College, by the Frys of Birmingham.)


I/FOR story, including subsequent WRL, ACLU, ACOA, CORE, SNCC, and NAACP, via, e.g., the 1940s Chicago-based Interracial Fellowship House, members of which broke U.S. land ownership apartheid control trends and patterns: including, e.g., A.J. Muste (FOR) and Charles Hamilton Houston (NAACP co-founder and mentor of Thurgood Marshall).


Co-founder of Georgetown Washington (DC) Peace Studies Program — over Suárez (state theorist for just war, replacing Augustine as church theorist for such theory) — Grotius' "law" vs Mennonite nonviolence in the nascent (colonial) nation-state system.


Freedom Rides from Black co-ops and trade unions, a century before "Selma".


Nonaligned negotiation leadership against the US invasion of Southeast Asia, supporting massive neutrality and nonviolence movements in northern and southern Vietnam (as well as Laos).
Tennessee birthplace for groups like the SCLC and anti-nuclear movement work directly against the Manhattan Project, through, e.g., birthing songs like "We Shall Overcome" (born in machine-gun fire from J.P. Stephens, against interracial trade unions from Black and Irish songsters like Guy & Candie Carawan).


The top, pivotal U.S. nonviolence writer during the 1940s, according to E. Raymond Wilson, a World War I veteran and the founding Quaker director of the first registered nonviolent lobby on Capitol Hill, i.e., the Friends' Committee on National Legislation. Swomley covers seventeen national and international nonviolence coalition victories up through the 1950s, which defeated Harry Truman and Grenville Clark (a top legal corporate attorney, frequently quoted by U.S. and European-oriented "Peace and World Order" academic peace studies programs as the original "World Order" theorist). Clark and Truman, in other words, failed 17 times to force the U.S. Congress to mandate universal military training for every "able-bodied" U.S. man and woman university student, by federal law. The earliest of those failed 17 attempts, as first outlined during World War II (by those like Clark and Franklin D. Roosevelt), intended to mandate grade-school military training inclusively, for all state-funded (and able-bodied) grade-school through university-level education, nationwide.

Nancy Jane Kenney, The Gandhian Economy and Indian Economic Planning, Boston: Fletcher School of Diplomacy, Tufts University, Ph.D. Diss., 1956. Not available through UMI.

Sarvodaya — the best-possible theory and pedagogy for the best meeting of human needs access, i.e., the most secure welfare of all the global "beloved community" — through nonviolence, i.e., ahimsa as method, and through satyagraha as practical civil disobedience (politically and economically).


Power of Consciousness-Raising merging Eastern (Tillich) to Western (Weiman) Mysticism, in terms of nonviolence versus prevailing "realist" (racial) pedagogy.

Hein van Wijk, Military Conscription, Military Disobedience, Conscientious Objection, and Conscientious Objectors in the Netherlands after World War II, Ph.D. Diss., Haarlem, the Netherlands: Rijksuniversiteit, 1949. Not available from UMI.

Nonviolent resistance against 1946-1950 Dutch colonial war in Indonesia, preceding U.S. domination of Indonesia and the Pacific (incl. nuclear testing).


ERA author — 15-language study of law and power, from world's first women's rights or eco-feminist congress (Lima, Peru), sponsored especially by Costa Rica in 1893 [the same year that U.S. marines annexed the Queendom of Hawai'i].

Theoretical, pedagogical comparison of anarchist violence (Bakunin) with nonviolence (Tolstoy) by future theorist of Costa Rican "neutrality" and the Costa Rican school of diplomacy professor in human rights (during the 1980s).


Pedagogy of international and nation-state organization evolution, from the theories of John Bellers and later William Penn (early Quakers), the former also opposing also (poor) prisons and capital punishment.


Handwritten, foundational theoretical analysis of pedagogical priorities in/outside Pennsylvania (Quakers), later affecting the U.S. nationwide, as the pedagogical basis for her work advocating the international right of one person-one vote.

**Call for Articles in Our Third Issue**

We will continue our thematic approach to activist and academic insight and scholarship on nonviolence. Our third issue concerns religion and nonviolence, i.e., the roots of nonviolence in the world’s major religions, from nature (wicca) to secular and god-centered religious perspectives. Islam is, of course, the major such world religion since the late 1960s according to international demographers. Please consult the submissions guidelines and criteria below, and note that we seek professionally-written activist, academic, and diplomatic-level work, whether in story, allegory, or analytical styles — with nonviolence being our touchstone and foundation for a sustainable existence. Topical approaches must concentrate directly on nonviolence. Other relevant materials will be considered for publication (including conferences, interviews, and participatory research) if nonviolence-in-context is the focal point. Please send article manuscripts in whatever (your) world language (as defined by the United Nations). We have published one issue/year up to now.

A hard copy and disk copy (if possible, IBM-compatible MS Word or WordPerfect 5.1 or higher) of the manuscript is preferred. Please type or "word-process" your article. If you are U.S.- or European-based, please use a relevant editorial style handbook to make your work uniform in technical details. Send the article/s to the International Journal of Nonviolence, P.O. Box 39127, Friendship Station, NW, Washington, DC 20016 USA. (Fax 202-244-6396) Articles will not be returned unless accompanied by sufficient return postage. Published authors will receive five copies of the journal concerned, including options for offprints (photocopies) of "typeset" published articles.
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1 July 1996

Dear Friends:

Good Greetings. This third issue of the International Journal of Nonviolence focuses on nonviolence and spirituality. As fulcrum areas for our world's religions, our personal and global peace may well depend on how vigorously local and global events evolve and are resolved in such consequential areas as nonviolence and spirituality.

Nonviolence does have a political and spiritual significance. By illustrating the interplay of nonviolence and spirituality in this issue, we hope to inspire our readers to act within their own local communities in ways that change our world globally.

Our fourth issue, in 1997, on nonviolence, ethics, and Islam will address a stubborn problem facing advocates of nonviolence, as to overcoming racism and related discrimination on activist, governance, religious, and spiritual levels, given fundamental changes brought about in nonviolent struggles. We thus invite artists, poets, critics, diplomats, researchers, scholars, students, writers, activists, academics, lyricists, and polemicists to continue exploring these issues with us. We heartily welcome critical and supportive participation.

My colleagues and I in Peace and Conflict Resolution Studies, here in The American University School of International Service, join in supporting this important international contribution toward mutual spiritual change, benefit, and responsibility.

Sincerely,

Abdul Aziz Said
Senior Professor
School of International Service

School of International Service
4400 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20016-8071 (202) 885-1400
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From the Editor’s Desk

If we are to overcome what appear to be unsurmountable planetary problems, then nonviolence may become as natural for resolving conflict as breathing, growing, and aging have been for living through conflict. The articles in this issue of our journal powerfully represent the ability to make a difference in our daily lives, as we mature from violence toward nonviolence in resolving our problems. Our theme for this double issue (1995-1996) concerns nonviolence and spirituality. First coined in Asia during the 1930s, nonviolence describes one’s power to effect mutual change for mutual benefit and responsibility (as articulated in the first issue of our journal).

Yet nonviolence up to now is also hard to see, taste, or measure — as weighed against easily-counted dead bodies left by war. As Mohandas Gandhi noted, nonviolence is not a vacuum, while also not the absence of war or peace, but rather a hard-to-describe power that assumes a critical, irresistible mass of solidarity — during a performance that may sweep millions to direct action, as, e.g., in India then, or in the Philippines and Eastern Europe during so-called “people power” mass actions. In this sense, a-himsa, or tough-love — as coined from the Sanskrit literally by Mohandas Gandhi — has become a method to transcend violence, and may provide safe, renewable power and security. If nonviolence is to influence what we do, then such nonviolence will also bring with it the openness to further research and action, contemplation, and ethical response.

This third issue of our International Journal of Nonviolence will concentrate upon nonviolence and spirituality. The initial, introductory articles by Ateek, Drago, and Rodham Clinton distinguish various approaches to peace through nonviolence, whether through wholistic notions of a spiritual way or scientific certainty. Ideology and spirituality, whether rational or intuitional do guide what we do, how we relate to other people and our world. Within this context of the decision to make a difference through nonviolence, the future impact of peace, spirituality, and nonviolence may affect us, for example, within the potential context of contention (Hurley), discretion (Goodman), and the exigencies of demographics (Elmandjra). Within the context of monotheism, Abbad, Crow, Lederach, Brooks Thistlethwaite, and Solomonow add insight from Muslim, Christian, and Jewish viewpoints. Ramsey, the Hartsoughs’, López-Reyes, Beer & Wein, and Deats conclude with remarks on law, justice, “peaceforce,” and civilization in crisis, under the leading power of nonviolence — complemented by a concluding overview by the Editor-in-Chief and Editor of the Journal, and completed by Nobel Peace Prize Acceptance Speech Selections and a book review.

This issue of nonviolence and spirituality will prepare the way for the next issue of our journal on Islam and nonviolence. We intend to continue to publish articles that impel and encourage people to act, to intervene, to make a difference in some way and so effect long-term nonviolent change for mutual benefit and responsibility.

Please note as well that the subsequently published views and opinions may or may not reflect the editorial views and opinions of the International Journal of Nonviolence, but do reflect the common diversity of spirituality authorizing nonviolence on our planet.
The Way of Nonviolence, A Palestinian Cry for Justice and Compassion

By Naim Stfan Ateek*

Most Palestinians, whether Muslim or Christian, have a strong faith in God. So the assurance that God takes a stand beside the oppressed and the victims of injustice is a source of hope and comfort to them. Hope in the midst of injustice and oppression, however, can produce passivity, and it can be frustrated. Real hope in the God of justice should be an active and dynamic hope, inviting people to become co-laborers with God. A theology of hope for the Palestinians stems from the concept of a God who stands beside the oppressed and with whom the oppressed work for a better day and confront their oppressors with their sin. Hope becomes an incentive for the Church’s leaders to be actively involved with the victims of injustice against their powerful oppressors. In order to do this the Church needs to be cognizant of its Christian tradition regarding resistance to violence.

The fundamental Christian attitude toward conflict and war familiar to Christians in the Middle East is that of Jesus — the way of nonviolence. It is very difficult to study the life of Jesus in the Gospels and not conclude that nonviolence was his philosophy. This is substantiated in the Sermon on the Mount. For Eastern Christians, this is their tradition, their Gospel milieu, their heritage.

Christians in the East have also, however, been exposed to Western Christian attitudes to war and conflict, and have suffered unjustly as a result. The Crusades were “holy wars” fought by the Western church, not in response to injustice but in defense of the Christian faith — a Western expression of the Christian faith drawn largely from the Old Testament. The Crusades left a bitter legacy for the Eastern Christians, who paid a heavy price in successive centuries because they shared with the Crusaders the title “Christian.”

Western Christians developed another attitude to war after the Constantinianization of Christianity in the fourth century — the “just-war” theory. The object of the just war is to vindicate justice and restore peace; it is a war that the state can lawfully wage (while observing certain rules).

Although these views have appeared within the Church in various configurations at different times in history, the just-war theory, subject to a number of developments and modifications, has found favor most often. Yet the only way of life that really makes sense to Eastern Christians is the way of Jesus. To begin with, Eastern Christians, including Palestinian Christians, still live in a pre-Constantinian world. They constitute a minority in the various countries of the Middle East. They have to live their faith and witness, at times daily, in difficult situations. They have to continue to be both salt and light in their communities. While they are not isolated from their fellow citizens who belong to other, more dominant, religious faiths, their frame of reference is the teaching and life of Jesus — in this context, the way of nonviolence.

Having said that, I do not want to leave the impression that the Christians of the East have always been practicing pacifists. Far from it. They have lived for centuries in violent societies, subjected to vicious assaults from neighbors and governments. At times, out of desperation, they have resorted to [violent] force to protest and defend themselves, but on the whole this has proved to be counterproductive, resulting in the massacre of thousands. Their harsh experience has reinforced the validity of Jesus’ way, so I still maintain that Eastern Christians are brought up to understand that the way of Jesus is the way of love and peace. Some of them might debate this heatedly. They might wish to reject it. They might consider it defeatist and weak in light of the growing institutionalized violence around them. But they know that the way of Jesus is not the way of war but of peace.

I have always believed that the Church in Israel-Palestine can play a powerful role in promoting justice and peace through active nonviolent means. I believe that the authorities have done in the past and continue to do all they can do to keep the Church politically dormant because they realize the potential power of the Church in Western circles. The authorities try to control the hierarchy, whether by giving them certain privileges or by subjecting them to subtle forms of blackmail, in order to keep them silent and marginalized.

An example of this is what happened at the height of the Intifada in January 1988, when the heads of the Christian communities in Jerusalem decided to express their solidarity with the Palestinians who were resisting occupation. The heads of the churches said in part:

The recent painful events in our Land which have resulted in so many victims, both killed and wounded, are a clear indication of the grievous sufferings of our people on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip. They are also a visible expression of our peoples aspirations to achieve their legal rights and the realization of their hopes.

We, the Heads of the Christian Communities in Jerusalem, would like to express in all honesty and clarity that we take our stand with truth and justice against all forms of injustice and oppression. We stand with the suffering and the oppressed, we stand with the refugees and the deported, with the distressed and the victims of injustice, we stand with those who mourn and are bereaved, with the hungry and the poor. In accordance with the Word of God through the prophet Isaiah, chapter 1, verse 17:

Learn to do good; seek justice, correct oppression:
defend the fatherless, plead for the widow.

We call upon the faithful to pray and to labor for justice and peace for all the people of our area.

These words were not particularly strong, but they were very clear. Some Israeli Jews and even Arabs expressed themselves in the newspapers in much stronger language. But when the statement of the heads of the Christian communities was circulated to all the East Jerusalem Arabic newspapers, the Israeli censor prevented its publication. It was a clear recognition that the State saw the potency of such a joint statement by the churches.

The challenge for the Palestinian Christian, indeed, for all Palestinians, is that of nonviolent resistance. This cannot be said, however, without certain important qualifications, so that it will not be
interpreted as naive and simplistic. Since the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, and more pronouncedly after the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza in 1967, the Palestinians have faced one of the toughest armies in the world. Since the Intifada of December 1987, Palestinians have been subjected to both State violence and violence of fanatical religious settlers. The State of Israel lives in a state of paranoia. Any resistance to the State, even the most nonviolent resistance, is interpreted as undermining the security of the State. It is destroying itself because of its morbid fear of peace. The State of Israel is at its best in times of war, not in times of peace. The Israeli soldier is well trained to confront the “enemy” at war. His [her] war machine is one of the best in the world. But he [she] is utterly helpless when facing nonviolent resistance. That is why the basic Israeli reaction to it has been to rationalize the Intifada as an act of war in order to legitimize the killings and beatings of so many innocent civilians.2 As a result of so much State violence, the talk of nonviolence seems to many Palestinians totally irrational.

Yet the experience of black people in South Africa is very similar in this regard. The Kairos Document states unequivocally:

... The problem for the church here is the way the word “violence” is being used in the propaganda of the State. The State and the media have chosen to call violence what some people do in the townships as they struggle for their liberation, i.e., throwing stones, burning cars and buildings, and sometimes killing collaborators. But this excludes the structural, institutional, and unrepenant violence of the State and especially the oppressive and naked violence of the police and army. These things are not “violence.” Thus, the phrase “violence in the townships” comes to mean what the young people are doing and not what the police are doing or what apartheid in general is doing to the people. If one calls for non-violence in such circumstances one appears to be criticizing the resistance of the people while justifying or at least overlooking the violence of the police and the State.3

Christians in South Africa were asking questions that it is equally pertinent for Christians in Israel-Palestine to ask:

... Is it legitimate, especially in our circumstances, to use the same word “violence” in a blanket condemnation to cover the ruthless and repressive activities of the State and the desperate attempts of the people to defend themselves? Do such abstractions and generalizations not confuse the issue? How can acts of oppression, injustice, and domination be equated with acts of resistance and self-defense? Would it be legitimate to describe both the physical force used by a rapist and the physical force used by a woman trying to resist as violence? It is simply not true to say that every possible use of physical force is violence and that no matter what the circumstances may be it is never permissible.

The experience of the Church in South Africa is important because it is shared by many Christians in Israel-Palestine. They find it difficult to be nonviolent in a context that breeds so much State violence every day and brings dehumanization, deportation, and all kinds of injustice to the Palestinians, who have every right to be free.

In spite of it all, I still believe that the Christian should choose at every confrontation the nonviolent path — the way of Jesus. Unfortunately, many people find themselves unable to do so. And the Church must continue to press forward, condemning the violence of the state and impressing on its people the need to follow the way of nonviolence.

Nonviolence is dreaded by the Israelis because it reminds them of their situation before their [state] empowerment, appealing to their memory of their own powerlessness and awakening their consciences to deal with those now in their power more justly. If it does not awaken Israeli consciences, I hope and pray that it will help raise the consciousness of many people in the West, both Jews and non-Jews, to what is happening in Israel-Palestine, and provoke an outcry that results in putting pressure on Israel to stop its death-wish policies and to adopt policies that will give Jews and Palestinians a life of peace in the land they both love so dearly.
When the History of Science Suggests Nonviolence

By Antonino Drago*

The Shock of Bodies as a Metaphor of Conflict Resolution

Our experiences of shocks shape our personalities. Learning to stand up and walk, for example, may mean injuries and broken bones as we learn to navigate. We also learn to avoid hurting friends and belongings as we grow up. It is natural to consider shocks between material bodies as a metaphor for how we relate to other people. Such shocks may form our rationales for objective experiences as we achieve some certainty about resolving conflict.

Military language includes many embedded mechanical words, like force, shock, impact, lever, center of mass, and balance of power to describe how we resolve conflict. War also reflects such shocks, through marches, shocks, transpors, explosions, and throwing things, through thermal, chemical, nuclear, and electromagnetic processes, with mechanical destruction meaning the final solution of one kind or another. The mechanical words represent much more than mere analogies; they constitute a sketch for theory and reference in action.

What we will show is that military theory is not the only way to think about conflict resolution in a scientific manner, by comparing the theory of Isaac Newton and Lazare Carnot. Until 1971 Carnot’s mechanical theory was overshadowed by that of Newton (a foremost military strategist of his times).1 Carnot supported defensive military methods, via strongholds whose function was essentially to mitigate casualty numbers. As the chief general of the People’s Army during the French Revolution, he applied his theory to defending the Revolution from European monarchies. He obtained the “Victoire” of 1793.2 Our findings will concern how, as UNESCO has noted, that peace begins in

---
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our minds, from intuiting about nonviolence toward more scientific
nonviolence.

The Newtonian Attitude

Current attitudes require that we bravely face a conflict and then
resist as most as possible given our positions, as if we had to face and
resist shock with a very hard body. Otherwise words like soft, weak,
coward, plastic, elastic, unstable, and little woman surface. This shock
time parallels Newton’s theory on the shock of material bodies. In
Newton’s theory, mainly an astronomical theory of “celestial” bodies,
the crucial notion concerned force as the cause of whatever effects.
Shocks too had to be explained by means of the forces on the bodies in
question. Following widespread Platonist notions then, Newton
described shock through an ideal notion of shock, beginning with a
perfectly hard body, so hard that it keeps a fixed shape whatever the
conflict. For instance, like a stone or sword hitting the human body or
a cannon ball knocking down a wall, this perfectly hard body does not
bounce.

Newton argued that God created perfectly hard bodies in order
to support his mythical thinking on the matter of conflict resolution:

... Bodies which are either absolutely hard, or so soft as to be void of elasticity,
will not rebound from one another. Impenetrability makes them only stop.... All
these things considered, it seems to me, that God in the Beginning formed Matter in
solid, massy, hard, impenetrable, moveable Particles, of such Sizes and Figures, and
with such other Properties, and in such Proportion to Space, as most conducted to the
End for which he formed them; and that these primitive Particles being Solids, are
incomparably harder than any porous Bodies compounded of them; even so very hard,
as never to wear or break in pieces; no ordinary Power being able to divide what God
himself made in the first Creation.5

As a consequence, bouncing bodies were believed to be soft bodies,
partly or entirely elastic, like those subordinate metals molded by the
hammer on the anvil.4 This Newtonian notion of inelasticity also
influenced subsequent development of science, such as the theory of
what is gas.5 In fact such an ideal notion of force and shock even
influenced 18th Century culture and thus subsequent Western notions
of science.6 It is easy to see parallels in both militaristic and so-called
macho attitudes about conflict, as to a perfectly hard body, whether in
the hero or in the enemy.

The Carnotian Attitude

Whether the Newtonian theory of shock works in practice is
another question. Newtonian theory represented a blind alley for
theoretical physics historically, since it was unable to explain the shock
of every kind of body and moreover to explain what energy transfers take
place during a shock.7 As theoretical physics developed, alternatives like
those of Lazare Carnot surfaced. What Newton discarded as a
explanation for celestial phenomena was transformed by Carnot in
1782, as a theory for explaining all then-known mechanical phenomena.
Carnot dismissed ideal notions of force — cause and hard body, in favor
of a scientific theory to explain the interaction among bodies. Instead
of a mythical body, Carnot took into account all bodies, the elastic ones
and the not-so-elastic or not-so-plastic bodies.

Carnot’s theory to explain the shock of bodies of all kinds
derived from explaining the tendency toward the conservation not of
one shape, but of common quantities, i.e., energy, momentum, and
torque, when in the context of shock — the first time in physical
theory.8 An elasticity coefficient ranging, for example from 0 to 1, is
used to characterize bodies with respect to the shock. “Lost or destroyed
momentum” and the “lost energy” are now the major quantities
measured through the shock, as representing a more or less conservative
shock. The most interesting study of shock emerges from a shock when
no energy is destroyed, i.e., when both bodies are elastic bodies.

Mechanical Notions in Conflict Resolution

So how do military and nonviolent theories for conflict
resolution compare, given this history of the mechanical shock between
bodies? Military theories emphasize the imperative of inner solidity, not
that of a gas or a liquid which allows penetration or derangement.
Military hope to survive no matter what the cost to oneself or to the
opponent. The same attitude reflects in the opponent, as two supposedly-hard bodies collide, in what may be a simultaneous auto-da-fe. The opponent with more strength in mass, more materiality, is supposed to win. Winning is enabled by something hard in the way as well, such a helmet, a breastplate, an armored tank, or a formidable wall and portal, including psychological war barriers, all idealized as perfectly hard bodies.

With nonviolence, flexibility may be the basic attitude instead. Rather than relying on mythical ideals as kings, saintly grails, saintly sepulchres, the True God, a superior Aryan race, or the obligation to eradicate Evil, nonviolence turns away from futility and subordination of the victim. Both the opponents are considered as equals, as attention shifts toward unmaterial features which each opponent may share. Images of both opponents are superseded by shared qualities, such as human rights. Energy and momentum turn in a new direction, if both opponents together win commonly-valued contributions.9

Of course, choosing to be an elastic body when the opponent behaves as an absolutely hard body may negate an appeal to common values, like life, humanity, brotherhood, sisterhood, and human rights. Nonviolence risks this possibility, implying chances for suffering, injuries, or worse.

The advantage of nonviolence is that elastic behaviour constitutes the only way for escaping the mutual destruction derived from two blind wills for supremacy. Nonviolence reacts on a higher level, through common, superior reality. The destructive nature of a shock in the Newtonian theory can thus be superseded by an exchange process, which typically constructs and preserves social life and values. Hence shock itself, as perceived, changes toward a mutual interaction, toward a higher level of common life. The notion of hard body as military theory in effect suppresses emotive feelings as irrational, thus leading toward hierarchical and compulsory behaviour; it requires highly specific persons, i.e., vigorous and callous males. Nonviolent theory, in contrast, may be performed by everyone; it democratizes defensive potential by using cooperation and self-reliance, seen as human rights and duties instead of absurd violence.10

But nonviolence requires creativity for solving the problem. It is not true that s/he is my enemy, that s/he can not be a friend.11 By focusing on problem-solving, one can see how to recognize common quantities through which to convert the shock toward a fruitful exchange.

Carnot's transformation theory was defined such that, for a given geometrical arrangement of the bodies, the global motion of the system results to be invertible; in addition, he conceived this transformation as leaving the contact or interaction as invariant. Instead of focusing attention on local effects during shock, Carnot was creative — just as nonviolence requires us to do — for producing a new method. His theory utilized global transformation and conservation as means to describe how shock affects the system of the bodies as a whole. He added to the system a set of invertible transformations through which one obtains, through a suitable equation, the common invariants. Carnot's method is therefore the method of symmetry, the alternative method to differential equations in theoretical physics.12 (Newtonian theory allowed symmetry for only perfectly-balanced bodies, toward competitive tension instead of nonviolence.) One may translate these features by saying that the interaction is not influenced by the transformation, which moreover, does not add irreversibility to a given situation.

Constructing all these potentials within an interaction, one obtains global thinking through an overall appraisal of a given situation. A nonviolent activist may be said to appeal to the conscience of the opponent, what Carnot considered appealing to the properties of a global system of interaction. Conscience here represents tension for being present in all potential interactions. This appeal explains such slogans as "Think globally, act locally" as creativity emerging from outside hierarchical options. Carnot's theory of shock has a counterpart in his strategic thinking about conflict.13

In sum, Carnot proposed a continuous range of potential interactions of bodies, where flexibility, symmetry, and conservation within transformation describe the exchange of energies during shock. Mythical ideals, hierarchies, insensitivity, isolation of hardened responses, and the solidity of nationalism have no place in Carnot's theory.
Ongoing Science and Conflict Resolution

By the mid-1800s, following the theory of Carnot, conservation of energy became recognized as a basic law in mechanical and theoretical physics. During this change, openings arose to allow at last for the kinetic theory of gases and the electromagnetic theories.\textsuperscript{14} Newton's theory of shock was discarded. But its counterpart for human interaction has persisted almost undisturbed until today. Mohandas Gandhi instead perceived the radical notion of winning without breaking the opponent, through what he called his scientific experiments with truth. Lanza del Vasto,\textsuperscript{15} who was a student in India with Mohandas Gandhi, suggested that such new thinking may operate as a foundation for the theologies of all world religions,\textsuperscript{16} beyond the childish war games that have characterized much of world history up to the present. It represents a new paradigm shift, allowing for new development among people at the global level.

At present social, economic, and political sciences still do not suggest more than general ideas for the salient features of conflict and conflict resolution, as the future might hold for global nonviolence and globally-nonviolent systems of governance. International nation-states systems are bound by a lack of commonly-agreed-upon theory of such conflict or conflict resolution. But, as seen above, simply assuming that psychological solutions will work is not the way that conflict resolution schemes have actually worked in practice. We conclude that science and nonviolence and religion must be interrelated, as we evolve with even the specific world languages and the related words in our languages needed for nonviolence universally.
ENDNOTES

3. Isaac Newton, Optik (Londen, 1706) (New York: Dover, 1953), 398-400. Newton took his ideal notion from static conditions of a rigid body, as viewed by the study of statics then.
4. Appropriate gases and liquid body notions came later through theoretical physics.

Remarks of Hillary Rodham Clinton, First Lady of the United States, 125th Birth Anniversary Commemoration of Mahatma Gandhi, Concert Hall (Kennedy Center) 14 July 1995*

My daughter and I will never forget the warmth and hospitality extended to us by the Indian people during our recent visit to the subcontinent. It was an extraordinary and memorable experience for both of us. The images of first seeing New Delhi and looking from my hotel room at the colors and smelling the flowers ....

... We are here tonight to celebrate the 125th anniversary of Mahatma Gandhi’s birth. And in thinking about Gandhi, and what he means to us on the eve of a new century, I am drawn back to the visit my daughter and I made to his ashram. It was one of the highlights of our trip.

Of course, I had some idea beforehand of Gandhi’s life and his contributions. But seeing the places where he and his wife lived, seeing the sheer simplicity of his existence, was profoundly moving to me.

I remember walking into his room, which was bare except for a mattress on the floor, a pair of slippers, a small writing table, eyeglasses, and a spinning wheel. It was the picture of a life pared down to the bare bones of survival.

And then I remember going to the museum library adjacent to this bare, Spartan room, and seeing thousands of his books and volumes of correspondence. This utterly simple material life had allowed for one of the richest spiritual and intellectual lives we have ever known.

So I came away from that visit with an even deeper sense of his life being about giving, not acquiring — about “conquering hate by love, untruth by truth, and violence by suffering.” That same day, a few hours

*Reprinted with permission. We thank Srimati Kamala, ed., The Gandhi Message 29/1-2 (1995) and the First Lady of the U.S., Hillary Rodham Clinton, through Ms. Angela Davis, Press Officer of the First Lady, the White House, Washington, DC, for their kind permission to reprint this article. Hillary Rodham Clinton’s relevant publications include her advocacy-oriented youth and parenting work, It Takes a Village and other Lessons Children Teach Us (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995). Ed. Note.
call was to elicit in people their courage and commitment to higher ideals; to call forth the heroism of those who did not think of themselves as heroes. To teach us that responsibilities are as important as rights.

The more I learn about Gandhi, the more I am struck by the universality of his message. He read from the Bible and the Koran with the same reverence as he read from the Bhagavad-Gita and many other sacred Hindu writings. He often said that his heart leaped at reading about the life of Jesus and that he aspired to live the Sermon on the Mount. He read Henry David Thoreau, whose essay on civil disobedience inspired his strategy of nonviolent change.

And in turn, Gandhi influenced many of his contemporaries as well as those who followed him. Martin Luther King, Jr., said that “Gandhi was probably the first person in history to lift the love ethic of Jesus above mere interaction between individuals to a powerful and effective social force on a large scale.”

Dr. King, often citing Gandhi, led a historic season of nonviolent action in this country.

So we see this historical and spiritual continuum, embodied in the lives of rare and extraordinary people, whose teachings guide us year after year and decade after decade, and on through the centuries as we continue to strive for a better understanding of what it means to be a human being, to live and work together, to help one another realize our own humanity.

Now, there are still some who wonder what Gandhi means for Americans, or Indians, or anyone else, in an age that one social scientist has called “turbo-charged” capitalism. An age when too often we define ourselves more by style than by substance, by the logo on our sneakers more than the generosity in our hearts.

Gandhi gave us principles for behaving and living that not only enable us to improve ourselves, but also to improve our societies. We all have those images of Gandhi — Gandhi from old newsreels, books, photographs, movies, or from his own writings.

Images of him walking with thousands of his compatriots through village after village 200 miles to the sea to make salt in defiance of the salt laws. Images of him organizing his compatriots to clean the latrines and perform other lowly chores in solidarity with the

later, I visited the Self-Employed Women’s Association. Its founder, Ela Bhatt, was a disciple of Gandhi’s, a woman whose own life and work was deeply influenced by his teachings. When I got there, there were hundreds of women under a tent behind the bank building. The bank building was a small structure in which women would come, sometimes walking for twelve hours, to borrow a few dollars to be able to buy a milk cow, to be able to buy a new cart, to be a vegetable vendor. These women, some of whom had walked for hours to meet me, told me about their lives. They talked about how their lives had been transformed because they had gained a small degree of financial independence through SEWA, and a large degree of self-respect and dignity from their solidarity with others. In each of their faces I could see hope; and in each of their faces I could see Gandhi’s legacy.

That day offered an extraordinary sequence of events that represented not only the universality of Gandhi’s teachings and beliefs, but also their timelessness and permanence.

In the months since that visit, I have had many occasions to think about Gandhi, and about how we all need today, as diverse nations and peoples, to celebrate our oneness more. How we need to heed the theme of this evening, “the peace of absolute oneness.” How we need desperately to bridge historical, religious, cultural, ethnic, and racial divides — much as India has done as it has become a pluralistic democracy — we need to find common ground as members of the human family.

Clearly, these are complicated times — times when we see ancient hatreds dissolving and new hatreds arising; when the Information Age holds great potential for communications and understanding among people, but also requires that those people have new and more advanced skills; when an explosion of material expectations is fueling desires and often leading people to unrealizable fantasies and even alienation in their lives.

When we seek to understand this changing, complex, unpredictable and exciting world we live in, often it seems that there are too few places to turn for inspiration and hope.

But there are places, and there are people we can turn to and one of those people is Gandhi, and that is why we are all here tonight. His
untouchables, whom he always referred to as harijans, children of God.
And of course, images of him at his spinning wheel.

I recently came across something Gandhi wrote that I think is gaining in popularity, and it is easy to understand why. It says that “Violence Springs from Seven Root Causes, or ‘Blunders’. ” And he listed the seven blunders as follows:

- Wealth without work
- Pleasure without conscience
- Knowledge without character
- Commerce without morality
- Science without humanity
- Worship without sacrifice
- Politics without principles

If we look at our own society today whether we are American, Indian, or from any other country we see firsthand how right he was. We see ourselves committing the same blunders over, and over again.

Somehow in this year of commemoration, if we, as a global family, could once again commit ourselves to Gandhi’s belief in “the oneness of all that lives” we could perhaps begin to acknowledge our own blunders and work to prevent them from occurring again. We need to remember that his message is that diversity cannot flourish in a society without an underlying spirit of unity. And, as we learn more from the extraordinary research that is being done in genetics, we will learn in the twenty-first century that we are all truly one. Descended from the same, being part of the same, and that the differences that divide us are minor indeed.

I hope all of you will have a chance before leaving tonight to see the statue of Gandhi that was brought here from the Gandhi Center in Washington. It is a bronze of Gandhi sitting at his spinning wheel, a spindle in one hand. And as you look at it think about what he said: “The message of the spinning wheels is much wider than its circumference. Its message is one of simplicity, service of mankind [people], living so as not to hurt others, creating an indissoluble bond between the rich and the poor, capital and labor, the prince

and the peasant.”

How much better our world would be if we were all led by the spirit of Gandhi, and we were all dedicated to the high ideals he aspired to. Thank you very much.

Quotations from Mohandas Gandhi

For me, truth is the sovereign principle, which includes numerous other principles. This truth is not only truthfulness in word, but truthfulness in thought also, and not only the relative truth of our conception, but the Absolute Truth, the Eternal Principle, that is God.

Ahimsa [Nonviolence] is not the crude thing it has been made to appear. Not to hurt any living thing is no doubt a part of Ahimsa. But it is its least expression. The principle of Ahimsa is hurt by every evil thought, by undue haste, by lying, by hatred, by wishing ill to anybody. It is also violated by our holding on to what the world needs.

I believe in the absolute oneness of God and therefore also of humanity .... Mankind [people] is [are] one .... Religions are different roads converging to the same point. What does it matter that we take different roads as long as we reach the same goal? In reality there are as many religions as there are individuals.

Freedom is never dear at any price. It is the breath of life. What would a man [a woman] not pay for living?

In times to come people will not judge us by the creed we profess or the label we wear or the slogans we shout, but by our work, industry, sacrifice, honesty, and purity of character.
His Holiness the Dalai Lama's Nonviolent Struggle for Tibet

By Wilson Hurley*

Tibetans are currently a minority in their own country. In May of 1993, officials of the People's Republic of China devised a policy of flooding Tibet, an occupied country, with Chinese nationals as a "final solution" to their worries over the possibility that the Tibetans might someday rise up and reclaim their country. There are presently 7.5 million Chinese nationals living in Tibet and only 6 million Tibetans. The Tibetans are discouraged from learning about their rich cultural heritage. They are arrested, tortured and often killed, merely for voicing the wish to have their country returned to them. Tibetan families are not allowed to keep a Buddhist altar in their homes. Pictures of their beloved leader, His Holiness the Dalai Lama,¹ are forbidden. Systematically, Tibetans are oppressed by a reign of intimidation and force. As the Chinese officials continue with their policies of terror, the Tibetans continue to suffer horribly and the world stands to lose one of its most precious treasures: the legacy of Tibet's unique spiritual culture.

To understand the Tibetan culture means to understand Buddhism. The fabric of Tibetan beliefs are woven with Buddhist insights and values. Buddha appeared in India over 2500 years ago. He is called "the completely awakened one" because of his ability to see the whole of reality with complete clarity and lucidity. He saw the suffering of beings as they wander from life to life, driven by ignorance, hatred and desire, constantly performing actions that embroil them further in a continuing cycle of misery he called samsara. Moved by limitless compassion, he began to teach those who would listen, not only of their predicament, but also of the path to ultimate freedom and happiness: Nirvana. His teachings flourished through Asia, and many holy sages, practitioners, and pandits transmitted their realizations from generation to generation, keeping these sacred teachings alive and vital. The Tibetans became increasingly devoted to Buddha's teachings (Dharma)

¹Professor and Social Worker in Northern Virginia. Active in U.S. Capital Area Vihara. Ed. Note.
and worked selflessly to preserve them for future generations through both the written form and through the form of direct realization passed from teacher to disciple. While other countries around the world became preoccupied with the expansion of territory and might, the Tibetans pursued the happiness of all beings. They became a gentle and peace-loving people. This made them an easy target when the People's Republic of China entered Tibet uninvited in 1950 and then took control of it by force in 1959.

The invading Chinese claimed to be "liberating" the Tibetans, and served up Marxist propaganda. However, in fact, the Tibetans were subject to barbaric forms of torture and abuse and it seemed that the invading Chinese were more interested in Tibet's rich mineral resources, land mass, and strategic location than they were in the people. In 1960, the International Commission of Jurists [Geneva] reported that "acts of genocide had been committed in Tibet as an attempt to destroy Tibetans as a religious group." The commission charged that Tibetans had been subjected to cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment including murder, rape, and arbitrary imprisonment. Monks and nuns were gunned down daily, often forced to perform humiliating and degrading acts before being killed. Some of the teenage monks were nailed to the floor by spikes driven through their joints. Some were dismembered while still alive. Nobility who showed loyalty to Tibet were wrapped in cloth and burnt alive or were killed by having nails driven through their eyes. Ten thousand children were taken forcibly from their parents and were sent to China for "re-education." Many Tibetans were imprisoned and tortured in work camps. By 1972, an estimated 1.2 million Tibetans had been killed, most of its monasteries and religious institutions had been destroyed. Fortunately, Tibet's leader, His Holiness the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, and about 100,000 Tibetans managed to escape across the Himalayas.

Despite the atrocities mentioned above, His Holiness the Dalai Lama has continued to advocate nonviolence and to lead his people in tolerance and compassion. He has become an advocate for world peace and universal responsibility. For these and other reasons, he was awarded the 1989 Nobel Peace Prize. Once, when touring the United States, His Holiness was asked which historical figures he would most liked to have met. He responded that there were two: Lord Buddha and Mohandas Gandhi. His Holiness was greatly inspired by Gandhi's nonviolent approach to social change. He drew on Gandhi's nonviolent approach when formulating a policy to address Tibet's plight in the hands of the People's Republic of China. Also, it was Gandhi's disciple, Jawaharlal Nehru, who gave His Holiness and the Tibetan refugees land in India to live on following their escape from Tibet in 1959. There are many Tibetans who still want an armed uprising against the Chinese but His Holiness has always opposed a violent approach. Realistically, he can see that the Tibetans are no match against China's military might. More importantly, His Holiness is philosophically opposed to taking human life. Instead he has relied upon world opinion and an appeal for basic human rights in his struggle for the Tibetan people.

His Holiness the Fourteenth Dalai Lama was born on 6 June 1935, into a humble family living in the village of Taktser in Tibet. His predecessor, the Great Thirteenth Dalai Lama, had passed away on 17 December 1933. Tibetans believe that the Dalai Lamas are manifestations of the Bodhisattva of compassion, Avalokiteshvara, and that they take birth only to benefit others. The history of the Dalai Lamas is unique in that the Dalai Lamas were both religious and governmental leaders. They were dearly loved and fully supported by the Tibetan people. There were some extraordinary features to the current Dalai Lama's birth that linked him to the former Thirteenth Dalai Lama.

A high Lama led the search for the Fourteenth Dalai Lama after having received visions indicating the region of Tibet in which to search and a vision of a house with a turquoise-colored roof near a monastery. When the search party came upon a house similar to the vision, the Lama disguised himself as a servant in order to avoid scrutiny. However, a young boy in the home seemed to recognize the Lama, identifying him correctly as Sera-Aga, and in particular, insisted that the rosary worn by the Lama belonged to him. This rosary had belonged to the previous Dalai Lama. When the search party tested the young boy, he was consistently able to select items that were owned by the Thirteenth Dalai Lama from among similar items. These and other features led to the formal acknowledgement that this young child was indeed the
incarnation of the Great Thirteenth Dalai Lama.

His Holiness the Fourteenth Dalai Lama was given rigorous training in Buddhist discipline and philosophy as a child and he excelled in his studies. Along with his intense schedule of training, he was saddled with the responsibilities of government at an early age. He was only fifteen years old when, pressured by the 1950 incursion of Chinese Communist armies into Tibet, he agreed to be named king of Tibet. For the next eight years, His Holiness worked nonviolently to resist the slow, methodical siege of Tibet by the Chinese armies. The Chinese government made and broke many promises concerning preservation of the rights and autonomy of the Tibetans. The Khampa people of eastern Tibet began fighting against the invaders in 1956 and while His Holiness could understand the Khampa stance he did not support it, rather he kept firm to his approach of nonviolent resistance and pursued diplomatic efforts. The Chinese retaliated harshly against the Khampas and escalated their encroachment into Tibet.

Finally, following a stand off between Tibetans and Chinese troops in Lhasa, His Holiness left Tibet on March 20, 1959. He escaped into India where he set up a government in Dharamsala despite requests from the Indian government that he abandon any political activities. His Holiness has continued to work for Tibetan independence from Dharamsala and to lead the Tibetan refugees in exile. Monasteries, schools, and Tibetan communities were rebuilt in India with constant aid and encouragement given to those in need. Many Tibetans died in the hot climate of India as they tried to adjust. Other Tibetan refugees settled in various countries around the world. Almost every Tibetan carried the wounds of lost family members and the destruction of their country and their way of life. Through it all, His Holiness the Dalai Lama has remained as their inspiration and their hope.

Meanwhile, officials of the People’s Republic of China have been waging a full blown propaganda war against His Holiness. They have also used intimidation tactics, for example, in 1989 they threatened to cut all economic ties with Norway should Norway’s king attend the Nobel Peace Prize ceremony for His Holiness. Major world powers avoided open support of Tibet for fear of angering China. Despite such obstacles, His Holiness has continued to make alliances within the international community and has largely won the propaganda war merely by speaking the truth. His message of compassion and wisdom appeals to people of all nations. His simple demeanor and joyful humor disarm those he meets. His profound insights into Buddhism strike a chord in those he teaches. His inquisitive probing into western science and technology make it clear that he has no interest in dogma. At no time has His Holiness swayed from his message of nonviolence.

Inside Tibet, oppression and torture continue. In April 1994, Palden Gyatso, a 64-year-old Tibetan monk who spent thirty years in Chinese prisons and labor camps, testified before the U.S. House Subcommittee on Human Rights. He brought with him several instruments of torture used on Tibetan political prisoners that he smuggled from Tibet when he escaped in 1992. He had purchased these devices from prison guards because he feared no one in the outside world would believe what was happening to Tibetans if he could not show evidence. Tortures he recounted included being suspended in the air with cold water thrown on him during the winter and a fire being lit underneath him during the summer. Prisoners were also frequently beaten with iron bars, tortured with bayonets, and subjected to repeated shocks by electric prods over various parts of the body.

In addition to continuing human rights abuses, China has destroyed much of Tibet’s previously unspoiled environment. In the past, the Chinese had an official policy of killing all “unnecessary” animals and would force Tibetan children to take part in the killing, instructing them to feel no compassion for living creatures. This approach ran totally contrary to the Buddhist precept to avoid killing. Buddhists believe that taking life will eventually lead to rebirth in a lower form of existence, with a shortened life, ill health, and a tendency to continue taking life. Therefore, the Chinese policy of killing wildlife was not only devastating to the environment but was also another assault on the Tibetans’ nonviolent culture. In addition to wiping out much of Tibet’s wildlife, the Chinese have deforested much of the land through forced labor. They have also plundered many natural resources and used Tibet as a site for dumping nuclear wastes. The Chinese have installed nuclear missile bases and have a large military presence in Tibet. Moreover, they have sought to limit Tibetan population growth through
such measures as sterilization and forced abortions.

His Holiness the Dalai Lama has continued to make the world community aware of Tibet’s bleak situation through every means possible. It is only through world opinion and active international pressure that the Tibetans have a chance to regain their autonomy and retain their cultural identity. Meanwhile, the world has much to learn from the Tibetans and their gentle way of life. His Holiness has often expressed his belief that “…humanitarianism is essential to solve global problems; compassion is the pillar of world peace; …each individual has a universal responsibility to shape institutions to serve human needs.”

Indeed, His Holiness has dedicated his life to unrelenting compassionate activity. The Tibetan culture contains countless treasures: methods for training ordinary people so that they become exalted beings like His Holiness, working tirelessly to benefit others. Tibetan culture has what the world needs and the world can offer the support that Tibet needs. It is important to help the Tibetan cause, now more than ever.
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4 Tenzin Gyatso (His Holiness), The Fourteenth Dalai Lama, A Human Approach to World Peace (Massachusetts: Wisdom Publications, 1984), 4-5.
THE FUTURE OF ISLAM

By Mahdi Elmandjra*

In the world of Islam — of which over 80% are now Asian people and about 12% are still Arabic people, or about 20% of the world's total population — a clear distinction must be made between the Arabic word *al ghayb* (i.e., the unknown), which is within the realm of God, and the word *mustaqqbal* (i.e., the future). The latter word in Arabic implies the future anticipation of developments arising from what we do or fail to do today, with violence or nonviolence, that is to say, it concerns forecasts, not prophecies. In fact, the word *mustaqqbal* itself does not occur in the Quran. Instead, the Quran refers to one of its derivatives which is *mustaqqbil*, over the notions of perception, outlook, and future:

... Oh ye who believe, Observe your duty to Allah. And let every soul look to that which it believed before for the morrow... (LIX18) ... Have they not considered the dominion of the heavens and the earth, and what things Allah has created, and that it may be that their own term drew nigh? In what fact after this will they believe? ... (IXL18) ... Have they not seen how we have appointed the night that they may rest therein, and the day light giving? Lo! Therein verily are portents for a people who believe. And (remind them of) the Day when the Trumpet will be blown, and all who are in the heavens and the earth, will start in fear, save him [her] whom Allah wills. And all come unto Allah, humbled. And you will see the hills you deemed solid flying with the flight of clouds: the doing of Allah who perfected all things. Lo! Allah is informed of what ye do .... (XXVII 86, 87, 883)

The Future in the Islamic World

... No soul knows what it will earn tomorrow, and no soul knows in what land it will die... (X-XII134) ... Tomorrow they will know who is the rash liar .... (LIV26)

It should be noted that, whereas the first of the above verses calls for exploring the future with a view to strengthening the believer's faith in God, the second dismisses any form of prophecy or divination. The Quran advises against making presumptuous claims of prescience and foreknowledge, but it also recommends that we make projections and work out different options in order to enhance our ability to cope with the requirements of the future and to improve our well-being. Therefore the future should be approached in a pluralistic manner ("futures"), thus leaving open a wide range of options.

Islam, I believe, is a "vision" of life on earth and also in the hereafter. It carries a message which calls on people to seek command of their own fate and to adopt, for this purpose, a dynamic approach in their political, economic, social, and cultural initiatives. Indeed, mutually beneficial change is an essential ingredient for a better future. One must avoid making any confusion between the concept of *Bid'a* (i.e., heresy) and *Ibda'a* (i.e., innovation). The first is an opinion or attitude which is in violation of the basic tenets of Islam. The second is, on the contrary, an invitation to introduce mutually beneficial changes and innovations in order to stimulate the community's development and vitality. Any living organism or environment which does not accept change is doomed to extinction.

Those who are opposed to change are simply afraid to lose their privileges. That is why they tend to equate change with heresy. This conservative attitude was a determining factor in the decline of the Islamic world and the proliferation of its problems. Attempts to check the imagination and stifle innovative efforts began in the 10th and 11th centuries, when so-called religious scholars closed the door, as it were, to *ijtihad* (research and investigation). How are we going to make up for lost time? It is in searching for an answer that one may realize the importance of the study of the future and the necessity of scouting and scrutinizing the horizons. The Quran (XLI 53) says in this connection:

... We shall show them Our portents on the horizons and within themselves until it will be manifest unto them that it is the Truth.... Allah witnesses over all things....

---

*Professor of Economics and Future Studies, University of Rabat (Université Mohammed V), Morocco. Selections taken from the manuscript for his book, *Première Guerre Civilitationnelle* (Casablanca, Morocco: Editions Toubkal, 1992). In addition to Abdul Aziz Said at The American University School of International Service, Washington, DC, Elmandjra may be one of the rare Arab-African futurists, and as such, also published in non-Arab publications. See also his *Retrospective des Futurs* (Casablanca: Ouyoun, 1992). Ed. Note.
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It is our outlooks of the earth and the future that determine our deeds for which we are answerable to ourselves, to society, and to God. In Islam, people, whatever they do, through violence or nonviolence, should be mindful of the impact of their actions on the rest of life, as well as on the end of time. The study of the future is a fairly recent exercise which began after World War II, in 1946, through the Pentagon (and the Rand Corporation). That is why there is a fairly close academic relationship between strategic military and futures studies. In the late '60s during the worldwide peace movement concerned with the U.S.-IndoChina War, future studies became a distinct scientific discipline. Military institutions and multinational corporations still carry out two-thirds of the research work on the future. Future studies thrive in the industrialized nations, which account for 97% of the world expenditures on future studies, particularly in the fields of training, documentation, and applied research.

With about 80% of the world population, in other words, the Third World accounts for less than 3% of the future studies research output. I have always found it difficult to explain the seemingly paradoxical rule involved here, whereby the more acute and pressing a phenomenon is, like world development, the more we need a long-term approach to deal with it efficiently. In fact, the underestimation of the strategic value of the future is one of the most significant symptoms of what is called underdevelopment. Development actually begins when people have secured the means to ponder over their future and thus reach a consensus on the type of society they wish to build.

Future studies are not a science in themselves, although they make use of exact and social sciences. They are the study of the future from an open perspective, on the basis of alternatives and options, in terms of the various developments of a given situation and with respect to the possible consequences of a particular decision on these developments. This is why we always talk about the futures and not one future, when we set desirable objectives in the medium or long term and so act upon the present. When Einstein was asked, for example, why he was interested in the future, he simply answered, “I intend to spend the rest of my life there.” One of the major functions of future studies is therefore a pedagogical and educational nature, in that it changes mental attitudes and contributes to reducing the time needed to keep abreast with and make use of a rapidly expanding knowledge.

I have always emphasized that cultural values are essential ingredients for development. There is no doubt that Islam is a powerful factor of change and innovation and as such it is bound to play a vital role in the evolution of our society. Such development is all the more likely as more and more people, especially the young, have a thirst for spiritual values to compensate for the excessive materialism of contemporary society. When young Muslims return to their cultural sources, they are seeking guidance from their endogenous values. The Arab Islamic world future depends on the innovative revival of Islam, not upon an Islam of blind imitation which led to the fall of a once brilliant civilization. If the Prophet Mohammed and his companions had failed to imagine and visualize the future, there would probably not be as many as 1,200 million Muslims in the world today.

The Futures of Our World

The world today has many distinct features, salient of which, for futures studies, are an accelerated societal history of increasing complexity due to the shrinking of time and space continua. Our total amount of knowledge accumulation doubles each 7 or 8 years. Every two minutes, there is a new scientific article published somewhere in the world. We are moving from a production-based society into a knowledge-based society, where human resources are becoming more important than raw materials (whose price is in a constant downfall or depreciation of value). Capital is no longer sufficiently profitable unless it is accompanied by “added values” like intellectual input and innovation. The Spanish Ministry of Higher Education, for example noted in a study that training provided by post-secondary or university-level educational institutions in the 1980s did not train students for half of the future job openings that they expected on the labor market by the year 2000.
Cultural Roles in Futures Studies

During the first North-South panel sponsored by the Society for International Development (SID) in Rome in May 1978, I argued that the most determining future aspect in North-South relations would be the cultural values which determine the attitudes of individuals and societies. In other words, the objectives, functions, and structures that should be considered as future solutions must include the redistribution of power and resources, according to values and criteria different from those which brought about the collapse of the current system to begin with. World population facts illustrate this graphically. Internationally, the world population of young people is growing quickly while that of the North has stabilized and is aging — e.g., at least half of the Muslim population is under age 16 and about two-thirds are under age 30.

In the North, advanced technologies such as robotics, cybernetics, biotechnology, space technology, computer science, and artificial intelligence thrive in an industrial sector which devotes about one-quarter of its finances to research and development in addition to staff training (about 8% to 12% to each) regarding the future. Allegations of sharing this turnover, i.e., the so-called “transfer of technology,” is a hoax which more-often-than-not consists in the North palming-off obsolete products on the South at unjustifiably prohibitive prices. Overall technology control demands internally-expended efforts and endogenous research. Research and training for the future is not a commodity which can be purchased or sold, but rather long-term knowledge and creativity.

Information and communication are an ever-expanding activity which now concerns over 40% of the world’s industrial output and 60% of its labor force. The widening gap between the North and the South is increasingly wide already, with the North controlling over 85% of such information-related activities. We have hardly begun to understand the cultural, social, economic, and political impact of this futures sector of informative communication.

Another central conclusion from futures studies into world population trends is that there is a basic need for the economic integration of economically-viable entities. No economic community with less than 150 million inhabitants will make it successfully into the 21st century. Europe (EEC) now has 350 million people; Northern America (NAFTA), 350 million people; South-East Asia, 350 million people. In other words, the earlier assumptions that modernity equals westernization have turned out to be unfounded, especially in light of the Japanese experience. The Nippon Institute for Research Advancement, or NIRA, published a report in 1989, e.g., entitled “The Agenda for Japan in the ’90s.” Here is an excerpt which I quote quite often:

... It has become necessary to look at the world system differently, to put aside a long sustained view of world order based on stratification under [Northern] American rule. The new world order may be called the “Age of Diverse Civilizations”, based on the emergence of an age with multiple coexisting civilizations. Although Westernization led to progress on a worldwide basis in terms of material civilization, Japan's modernization served as evidence that modernization is different from westernization.

Significant Religious and Ideological Trends

On religious and spiritual levels in our world population, given some of the lessons from futures studies, there appears to be a growing tendency for the “immateralisation of matter” and the “materialization of the immaterial”. Another way to put this is that less and less raw materials go into industrial products. Conversely, the “gray matter” input generates more and more added value. One physical example of such “immaterialization” is the increasing utilization of optical fiber (ISDN) which leads to a sharp decrease in the use of copper in miniaturized devices, microprocessors and electronic chips, etc. The industrial base of the world economy is said to be getting more and more immaterial.

In addition, “new” scientific branches like neurophysiology, particle physics, and molecular biology have expanded to challenge Newton’s conventional physics, as mechanical physics fail to explain universal, relativistic reality. Similarly, Descartes’ rationalism and positivism has become an obstacle to the understanding of phenomena beyond the rigid scope of his “method”. The consequence of such
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progress is that there is no longer a clear-cut demarcation line between alleged material and immaterial realms.

All these long-term trend changes also affect and effect change in the world of Islam. One of the great merits of Islam has been precisely in the fact that it abolished the notion of clergy, thus making it possible for the believer to communicate directly with God. Is the scourge of illiteracy still plaguing us just because we cannot afford the necessary means to eradicte it? Or is it because there is no political will to fight it? Or maybe because some rulers are afraid that an educated Muslim society might bring about dramatic changes in the way the Muslim community is being ruled and managed?

As to comparative literacy trends on the world level, that is, the world's leading intellectual levels, up until 1990, regarding progressive and not-so-progressive trends, since the founding of the Nobel Prize Committee — about 540 Nobel Prizes were awarded. Although I have reservations about the selection and nomination procedures which have been applied, I must point out that only three Muslims were awarded the Nobel Prize (i.e., Abdus Salam, Anouar Al-Sadat, and Naguib Mahfuz) before 1990. They accounted for merely 0.05% of the total number of winners. Yet those three belong to a religious (Islamic) community which accounts for over 20% of the world population.

The Crisis of Literacy and Human Rights

We as Muslims have failed to develop our human resources which are the most valuable asset for any society and will be even more so in the future. Worse still is the fact that we deny the right to read and the emancipation of at least half the world's Muslim population, especially its 500 million or more women who are subjected to anti-Islamic policies, in complete disregard for the prescriptions of the Quran which supports all the rights of women. This denial is one of the most serious and pressing problems which must be dealt with promptly and efficiently in the Muslim world.

The denial of literacy and human rights is a major feature of under-development in the Islamic world. This underdevelopment has many aspects, characterized in particular by the local unavailability of
significant demographic data and the problems of ongoing elitism and colonialism. Much economic and sociocultural data on the Islamic world is simply not available. The best data banks and research programs on Islam are to be found instead in the industrialized nations. What is even more striking is that quite a few of these data bank and research program activities are funded by "donations" from our own countries. A stark indication of how badly we are informed about our own affairs occurred early in the 1980s, when the Vatican began the first known estimates about the size of the world Muslim population, on the basis of a Vatican survey, for which it had mobilized 600 people for 10 years, in no less than 200 countries and territories.

Distressing evidence of such denial with respect to our own future is the unique publication 108 years ago by the British orientalist, W.C. Blunt, of The Future of Islam. No other book like it, on Arab futures, was published until 103 years later, by a Pakistani Muslim, Ziauddin Sardar, who published his book in London as Islamic Futures in 1985, the same year that the Vatican published its study results.

Because our ruling elite have no clear vision of the future, they are all too often unaware of the international currents of thought relative to the Arab World and the Islamic World, as these currents shape our reality. These ruling elite also become insensitive to the major preoccupations of their own populations. On the other hand, given this unawareness and insensitivity, these same ruling elites fear that change by any segment of society might impair or restrict its privileges, its authority, and its influence.

Our rulers' attentions are focused on the slightest move by their opposition, convinced as they are, that opposition is intent on toppling them and removing them from power. So much so that when it comes to tackling the ills of society, such intransigent rulers can only improvise patchwork solutions and soothing measures with no lasting effect. In fact they deliberately avoid any long-term planning and concentrate their efforts on time-winning devices, fooling themselves with the illusion that they will foresee oncoming changes and deal with them as they arise. Consequently illiteracy rates in Islamic countries are among the highest in the world. In some countries they are as high as 80%, especially among African women. In most Islamic countries illiteracy...
rates are not lower than 50%.

In this connection, I would like to make it clear that there can be no development of scientific research and, therefore, no progress, without the full restoration of the tradition of Ijtihad (investigative and innovative effort). But the Ijtihad approach must be understood and accepted as an exercise which preserves the fundamental tenets of Islam and discards all obstacles, old or new, which have hindered the emancipation of Islam and kept it in a state of decadence and backwardness. In addition to Ijtihad, it is essential to provide for the establishment and unrestricted exercise of political pluralism and civil liberties.

There is considerable improvisation, carelessness, and nepotism in the way that Arab and Islamic elites run their country's economy. Bribery amongst them is almost standard practice. Their massive bank transfers abroad — which is hardly a secret — are not only an insurance policy against adversity, but also an efficient [colonial-like] tool to manipulate internal policies from the outside, hence a collapse of moral and ethical values. Overall development planning in our countries is frequently based on blind imitation of the Western elites and heavy dependence on Western assistance. It is sad to note that policy makers in the Islamic world make little or no allowance for local or sustainable science and technology in their development schemes. They seem to forget that development is not merely a program for distributing revenue and providing services. As René Mahéu, former Director General of UNESCO, put it, “Development is when science becomes culture” (or “Le développement est la science devenue culture”).

Too many Islamic countries live under political systems where power is monopolized and where freedom of opinion and of speech are restricted. Where repression, denial of basic rights, and violation of human dignity are the daily lot of the ordinary citizen, there is no hope to create a favorable environment for the development of human resources and knowledge and for the advancement of society as a whole. The right to speak, to express one's difference, to innovate, to create and publish one's findings, will remain but an illusion so long as we have not ensured respect for human rights and for the rule of law.

The condition of women in our societies is alarming. The essential role of women in development is not recognized. In hampering the advancement of women, we are doing no less than preventing the emancipation of half our society. It is a crime that we should keep more than half a billion of our fellow citizens in such precarious conditions. If the Muslim society is essentially a backward one, it is mainly because we have confined women into a marginal role. As to historical issues, I, myself, am not a specialist of Islamic law. But when we consult reference books on hadith and so forth, we realize that women historically were frequent legal experts in Islamic law, custodians and relaters of hadith, and soldiers fighting side-by-side with men to uphold Islam.

I must emphasize that there is no future for Islam without effective involvement of women in the community's affairs. There is no prospect for any Muslim society which will continue to deny women the rights granted to her by Islam. I believe that this matter demands urgent attention and consideration from all those who care about the future of the Islamic community and who wish to stimulate our potentialities and creativeness so that we may grasp and cope with the current problems and the challenges ahead. The condition of women leaves much to be desired throughout the world, particularly in underdeveloped countries where this condition reflects the strong relationship which exists between the economic and sociocultural aspects of development, on one hand, and the protection of public liberties and human rights, on the other. Within the Islamic world, Arab countries are even worse off than the others in the fields of education and scientific research.

Women's condition in the Islamic world, and more particularly in Arab countries, is a real challenge for all of us. It calls for serious social surveys and analyses, and requires a great deal of self-criticism as well as the rehabilitation and mobilization of Ijtihad resources. We must take a fresh look at the original sources of our culture, and read again and more carefully, in the light of modern developments, the teachings of the Quran. I am sure we will end up with a deeper understanding of the nature and scope of our problems. We will also come out with a clear vision of the solutions which are needed in the short and medium term in order to cope with the demands and challenges arising from the fast running movement of history. I strongly believe that the status of women is one of the most pressing and challenging issues with which we
are confronted today. We must stand up to the challenge at once, look for appropriate solutions by relying on ourselves and our own resources, mobilize all good will forces, and refrain from imposing on women any conditions other than those required of men.

Critical Trends

There are Muslim minorities fighting for survival, whether isolated communities, left-behind groups, or newly-immigrated ethnicities. Islamic minorities include Muslim workers who emigrated to Western Europe, Muslim populations in the East-Asian Republics of the USSR, and millions of other Muslims in China, India, and the Philippines. If we really care about the development and prosperity of the Islamic world, we must think seriously about the present condition and the future prospects of these minorities, and provide them with the necessary help to preserve their identity and their cultural heritage.

In this context, the Palestinian question is of strategic importance for the whole Islamic world. To liberate the Palestinians from the sufferings they are enduring from occupation is more than just a moral obligation for all of us. We have no alternative but to pool our resources and unite our forces against this challenge. I do not believe we can achieve this objective merely through diplomatic niceties of the “Camp David” style. The preferably nonviolent Intifada might be more effective. Israel is afraid of the future. With unconditional support from the West, particularly the United States, Israel has managed to build up nuclear capabilities and to control space technology. In the meantime, we have remained virtually idle, particularly in these two fields, although we know that 45% of the world uranium belongs to Islamic countries.

The main feature of the international order in the 21st Century, as it were, is the increasing imbalance between North and South, with the former controlling 80% of the planet’s resources, although it accounts for only 20% of the world population. Such a blatant injustice against 80% of the world population can not go on indefinitely. The West simply cannot afford to carry on with the same pattern of industrial development, while ignoring the deteriorating situation in the South. Overutilization by the West of our biosphere has reached intolerable limits and caused serious concern about human survival.

The steadily-increasing Islamic population is reckoned at over one billion strong. In time, by 2020, the size of the Muslim population will equal or surpass the entire world population in 1830. By 2020, there will be between 1.635 and 1.850 billion Muslims, an increase of the world’s largest religion to approximately 25% of the world’s whole population. This prospect is a source of serious concern for the West and the Vatican who have been closely monitoring the demographic trends in the Islamic world since Muslims outnumbered Catholics, as published for the first time in 1985. According to these Western sources, the population of Judeo-Christian religious affiliation in 1980 represented 31% of the world population, as against 18% for Muslims. In 2025, the trend is expected to be reversed, with 25% for the Judeo-Christians (J-C) and 33% for Muslims. Projections for the end of the 21st Century put the ratio at 20% (J-C) and 40% (Muslims) respectively. If trends continue, as they often do for population growth, except for dire war or plague, Muslims, after 4 or 5 generations, could account for 50% of the world population.

In addition, the Western population is increasingly aging. Consequently, it will be economically necessary by the Year 2000 ACE (J-C) for the West to import more immigrants, preferably young and highly qualified immigrants, who will help the West maintain its comfortable living standards. Many of these youthful immigrants wanted by the West will be young Muslims. However, from the Muslim point-of-view, our young people are our best asset and we should and must do everything to meet their needs at home and provide them with adequate education and training, as well as health, housing, and employment.

Those young Muslim people with the educated solutions that the Islamic world needs have instead become culturally alienated in their own country. Others, out of self-imposed censorship, have confined themselves to silence and indifference. The rest have just given themselves up to the best bidders. There is also a spiritual and ethical crisis reflecting the gap and malaise in the race of contradictory value systems: one, static and unable to adjust to the new developments and challenges, the other, alien and inconsistent with the requirements of the
new environment.

If we are deal more effectively with the future, we will need to face one more information and communication trend in the context of the Arab and Islamic Worlds. Western states have outnumbered Muslim countries by a factor of 25 to 1 in publishing books world-wide, according to the most recently documented studies up to 1987, even though Islam is often commonly called the "religion of the book." That ratio increased to 60 to 1 if considering specialists and researchers for the purpose of education and publication. These trends and ratios could also be reversed to some degree in the 21st Century, along with the proportions of world religions and ideologies noted above. What direction will future studies take under such a trend change or reversal? What will the Islamic ethos mean in the world future, where the past may still influence a world technology then driven by cybernetic cultural ideas and technologies?
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The Jewish Tradition of Nonviolence
by Naomi Goodman*

Jewish Tradition is Unequivocal on the Question of Nonviolence

Each life is sacred: When a person preserves the life of one human being, it is thought they have preserved the whole world, while the person who destroys one human being is regarded as though that person has destroyed the whole world (Mishnah Sanhedrin IV, 5). This reluctance to hurt others pervades much of later Jewish writing, especially in the Talmud. Violence is the last resort and is to be used only if no other viable alternative exists. Always, the question is what are the viable alternatives and whether they have been seriously tried? Thus, there is a significant nonviolent strain within Judaism, although it is not a pacifist religion. This basic nonviolence is so constant that no understanding of Judaism is possible without taking it into account.

As Jews, we have a peace tradition and a war tradition. Putting the word peace first is not the customary practice, but peace first expresses the most fundamental Judaic attitude. Peace has always been the ideal, the messianic, the hoped for and prayed for; the goal to which we are taught to aspire, to teach our children and to lend every effort, "... to seek peace and pursue it ...." (Ps. 34:15). Note that "... the law does not require you to run after, or pursue, the commandments, but only to fulfill them, when the appropriate occasion comes .... But peace you must seek in your own place and run after it to another...." (Numbers Rabbah, Hukkat XIX, 27). Further, "... there is nothing that comes before the saving of life except idolatry, incest and bloodshed only ...." (Keth 19a).

The belief in Shalom derives from the purest and highest in Jewish morality. The peace expressed by Shalom encompasses far more than the absence of war. Shalom means wholeness, righteousness,

justice, grace, and truth. Certainly, the modern theological concept that peace is not possible without justice is based on the Hebrew Scriptures. Shalom embraces the totality of human life: including environmental concerns, protection of animals, opposition to all killing. Shalom is the name of God.

The Jewish acceptance of wars of defense stems from nationalism, often extreme and chauvinistic, during the period of the kingdoms, as written in the Scriptures. But it developed, also, from the subsequent history of virulent anti-Semitism, and more recently, from the results of our bloody century, including the establishment of the State of Israel. Jewish writings on the morality of warfare stress various "humane" procedures such as refraining from destroying fruit trees when besieging a city — which were better than the scorched earth practices prevalent in antiquity and carried out without remorse by many nations in our own times, although there is no way to make war humane. The question of whether modern so-called conventional warfare, as well as nuclear attacks, would ever be permitted under Jewish ethics, has been answered in the negative by many theologians. Such quaint practices as permitting a way of escape when besieging a town hark back to a simpler, nontechnological society which had no concept of saturation bombing or other modern inventions. Indeed, modern warfare is so destructive that all biblical and rabbinical precautions are irrelevant when conventional and nuclear weapons are capable of obliterating millions.

The principles of Judaism were codified in the Hebrew Scriptures and have since been interpreted and reinterpreted in the Halakah, the rabbinic interpretation of the laws, and in the Aggadah, the non-legal commentary. Such explication is a continuing process which goes on to this very day.

While self-defense was permitted in Biblical and Rabbinical Judaism, as the law evolved, acts of retribution, revenge, and violence were hedged with all sorts of restrictions. Indeed, Jewish history does not glorify the man or woman of war. "Let not the mighty man [woman] glory in his [her] might" (Jer 9:22) agrees with the peace positions of many prophets such as Isaiah, Micah, and Habbakkuk. David was not permitted to build the Temple, because he was a warrior; that task was given to his son Solomon, as a man of peace (1Chron.22). Victory belongs to God, not human beings. Jewish heroes are not warriors, but the prophets and sages. Jews celebrate Hanukah, not for the military victory, but for the miracle of the oil which was only enough to burn for one day, but instead kept the Ner Tamid, the Eternal Light, burning in front of the ark for eight days until new oil could be brought.

Isaac Bashevis Singer expressed the Jewish attitude to war when he received the Nobel Prize for Literature. He reminded the world and his fellow Jews that...

... the high honor bestowed on me by the Swedish Academy is also a recognition of the Yiddish language — a language of exile, without a land, without frontiers, not supported by any government, a language which possesses no word for weapons, ammunition, military exercises, war tactics, a language that was despised by both gentiles and emancipated Jews ...

There has been much misunderstanding of the Biblical references to "an eye for an eye" (Ex. 21:24, Lev. 24:20) which has been misinterpreted as encouraging vengeance. But "an eye for an eye" established that the recompense for an evil deed could not be greater than the act itself: one could not demand a life for injury to an eye, but only this limited and legal recompense was permitted. This law prevented the escalation of blood feuds, and thus prevented violence. "Vengeance is mine saith the Lord," has meant that vengeance is not an appropriate response for human beings.

Many rabbis have maintained that there is no such thing as legal killing in Judaism. They cite the fact that, although the law permitted capital punishment for murderers, this law was surrounded with so many restrictions that such punishment rarely took place. There had to be two witnesses to the deed, who were required to warn the person involved of the nature of their projected crime and its legal consequences. No circumstantial evidence was allowed "... A Jewish court of sages which executed one person in seven years was called a murderous court. 'One in seventy years' says Rabbi ben Azariah ...." (Mishna Makkot 1:10).

Rabbi David Shapiro has noted in this regard, as to killing and
non-killing, that certain issues in peace and violence were emphasized because:

... The prophets and sages of Israel believed that man must be educated for peace. Though they lived in a world that was rampant with violence .... They sought out ways and means whereby the combative and competitive aspects of human nature could be diverted into more constructive channels .... The Jewish doctrine of Initiatio Dei, which is the religious grounding of [a] man's [woman's] ethical life, signifies just this — that [a] man [woman] is to be the preserver of life ....

As war is not glorified in Jewish tradition, neither is martyrdom. Since Judaism is a life-affirming religion, martyrdom is neither to be desired nor sought, and does not carry the rewards it does in other religions. The Masada mass suicides have been less celebrated in rabbinic literature than in contemporary Israel. Since the survival of the community is paramount, life must be preserved.

The Jewish approach is spiritual resistance, which has been one of the reasons for the survival of the Jewish people. During the many years of Exile, when Jews were a persecuted minority, their survival as a people was aided, if not made possible, by their nonviolent response to hostile governments and hostile local people, despite pogroms and discrimination. Jews fostered nonviolence in community, neighborhood, and family relations by practicing cooperation, mutuality, interdependence, and altruism. Armed resistance for a minority would have been futile; spiritual resistance kept the community together, limited retaliation against them, and reinforced their sense of self and group.

In recent times, the Holocaust is often cited as a reason why Jews should not subscribe to nonviolence. But it is important to realize that violence could not help Jews or other victims. Such a response reflects the widespread, if simplified view that “Never again” means taking up arms, ignoring the relationship of means and ends, and resorting to killing even of women, children, and the elderly. It also disregards the complexities of the Holocaust, where those who went to their deaths were as heroic as those who killed Nazis in various ghettos and camp revolts. There were countless acts of courageous nonviolence, recorded

and unrecorded, where Jews and non-Jews rescued Jews from Nazi killers. There were such successful nonviolent protests as that by German non-Jewish wives who demonstrated before the gates of the Gestapo in Berlin, compelling the release of their Jewish husbands. The people of Le Chambon in France practiced pacifist, nonviolent resistance and saved the lives of over five thousand Jews. There were countless other instances of courageous nonviolence, recorded and undoubtedly many which are unrecorded. Did violent responses help victims? As Elie Wiesel has noted:

... Those who fought — and there were fighters in all the ghettos, in all the camps — did so not in order to win — they knew they could not win in a world that opposed and hated them — but to bear witness to history ... In every ghetto and every camp there were some men and women who fought with weapons, while others fought with words ....

The view held by [cynical] skeptics and critics of nonviolent action draws only one lesson from the Holocaust, and then emotionally or ideologically applies to contemporary threats real or imagined. Possibly it is derived also from the fact that, as we have discussed, absolute nonviolence was rarely demanded by the founders and interpreters of Judaism. True enough, yet quite another view should be recognized as Jewish tradition. Above all, this view celebrates the fact that peace holds the highest priority in Jewish life — what the late rabbi Steven Schwarzhchild described as “... a uniquely powerful system of ethical peacefulness.”

How shall we cope with and rationalize a militarily powerful state (Israel) when and if it commits acts of injustice against a relatively powerless people (the Palestinians) who refuse to be dominated by the Jewish state? In the setting of a mutual tragedy involving both Jews and Palestinians, the historic accord was signed in September 1993. Of course, there are profound differences to overcome, including the opposition and terrorism of fundamentalists on both sides, even as plans for self-rule in the long-occupied territories are being gradually worked out, but a historic process has begun. This accord was based on years of effort by people who believed in and worked for peace, both in Israel,
among Palestinians, and among Jews in many parts of the world, including the United States. They worked to influence governments, by clandestine contacts and the slow building of trust. Those Israelis (and those Palestinians) who seek peace, and their supporters among worldwide Jewry, laid the groundwork for the 1993 peace accords between Israel and the Palestinians.

The Israeli "doves" have been concerned with the safety and security of Israel and have worked for peace so that Israel will have a future. They come from many backgrounds, but are convinced that Israel's survival is not dependent on a greater area, that land should be traded for peace, and that justice for the displaced Palestinians people is both necessary morally and wise politically. They are people who believe in the highest principle of Judaism, that "the person who turns an enemy into a friend" (Abot d'Rabbi Nathan 23) has accomplished the work of God — and protected the Jewish community nonviolently. One can only hope that this reconciliation will proceed and that it will be the beginning of a real peace in the Middle East and will end the unquestioning support of some Jews and some Palestinians for violent actions carried out in the name of collective defense.

The Jewish tradition of peace is often obscured and, when known, has sometimes been denigrated as passive or impractical. But a powerful tradition exists and cannot be denied. Many, perhaps most Jews, would be deeply moved by the words of Rabbi Leo Baeck in Theresienstadt in 1944 when he told a group of his fellow prisoners that our prophets...

... turned against the sort of politics that creates its own moral code, they objected to any justification of right by victory .... True history is the history of the spirit, the human spirit, which at times may seem powerless, but ultimately is yet superior and survives because even if it has not the might, it still possesses the power, the power that can never cease ....
Peace and Pacifism in Islam
By Abdul El-Rahman Abbad*

Islam, the religion of the Muslim world, derives from asalat which stems from the words for peace or security in the Arabic language. As a religion Islam endeavors to establish peace in every aspect of life, as an overall outlook towards life, humanity, and the world as we know it. An ordinary example of this peaceful outlook toward life occurs in how Muslims greet each other, with asalat alaykom or “peace be with you” — not “good morning,” “good afternoon,” or “good night.” On other levels, peace or salaam is one of the 99 names of God or Allah, while Muslim children may also be named Salaam. Like other people on this earth, Muslim are peace-loving, their religion is peaceful, and their means of greeting each other peaceable. By way of example, the Prophet Mohammed said that:

... The young greets the elder, the passer-by greets those already present, and the few greet the many.... (The best Muslim should) ... provide food (to the hungry) and greet those who be or she knows and does not know .... (Even unto the greeting of Allah as to) ... “peace” on the Last Day.3

Muslim people are to spread peace, to generate love, friendship, and intimacy, on one hand, and to defeat grudges and social diseases like envy, hatred, and malice on the other. According to the Shariat, or the law of Islam, two Muslims should not quarrel longer than three days, and then, the one who reconciles first is to be regarded as the better Muslim. Islamic teachings praise tolerance and discourage egoism, violence, and selfishness. Muslims have historically recognized the human right to practice a religion other than that of the official state, whether Islamic or not, and to revere prophets like Jonah, Moses, Abraham, Ismael, and Issa (Jesus). The Judeo-Christian Psalms, Bible, and Torah are to be recognized, according to the Quran, as holy books. Allah, the core of all law and religion, rules all people and nations. In consequence, even the Angels are to prostrate before Adam [and Eve], the father [and mother] of all peoples, male and female, and tribe and nation.4

Muslims are not to force people of defeated countries, such as Jews and Christians, to practice Islam. Places of worship like churches and synagogues were left untouched, and their bishops and rabbis unharmed. The Patriarch of Jerusalem, e.g., in the 9th Century, wrote his Constantinople [now Istanbul] counterpart that, “They are known for justice and they do not oppose us nor use any violence against us.”5 Islam also commands Muslims not to compel Muslim worship among others, and not to use violence but rather dialogue in conversion strategies.6 Mohammed even commanded one of his followers not to compel his two sons toward Islam.7

With regard to appearance, Black and White devotees of Mohammed also recommended respect for the person, beyond skin color. Salman al Farisi, a Persian man, became one of the Prophet’s kinsfolk. Bilal, a Black Ethiopian, was a close friend of the Prophet and one of the callers to prayers. No distinction may be made between Asian or American, African or European, Black, White, or Yellow, as members of one extended family. In addition, it is prohibited to harm animals, to waste wealth or resources, and to monopolize basic needs like food, water, or energy.8

Five Pillars of Islamic Peace and Tolerance

Prayers

A Muslim should be tolerant, comprehensive, humanitarian, and non-aggressive. Five times a day a Muslim should pray, with the obligatory part of such prayers including the word peace or salam sixty-eight times. The Sunnah portion of prayer repeats the same word for

peace 132 times.9 These daily, repeated prayers lead to the building of a peaceful, nonviolent Islamic personality.

**Fasting**

Muslims fast during the month of Ramadan every Hijra year (of the Islamic calendar), during which they do not eat or drink during the daytime. Instead of criticizing others or causing trouble, the Muslim should reply with "I am fasting." During fasting the Muslim becomes accustomed to emphasis on forgiveness and tolerance instead of offensive reciprocation. This nonviolently-oriented worship practiced for one month each year, becomes habitual throughout the year, when complemented by other fast days during the rest of the year.10

**Pilgrimage**

Once a lifetime a Muslim makes a pilgrimage to Mecca, Saudi Arabia, the worship center place of the world of Islam, in the spirit of full equality among all classes of Muslim society, whether ruled or ruler, poor or rich, man or woman, young or old. Each pilgrim or hajj wears unstitched white clothes, so that no one can distinguish between social class or standing. Millions of pilgrims, dressed in white, converge as one heart, one voice, and one body, praying for the mercy, forgiveness, and condonation from God, whether as Africans, Asians, Americans, Europeans, or Australians. A skeptical U.S. black pilgrim noted that

... I have seen here what I have never dreamed of. For one week I shared a tent with people whose hair was as yellow as gold, their eyes as blue as the sky, yet I did not find in their talk anything indicating that the two words black and white meant anything to them more than the mere reference to what both colours are. I have come to a conclusion that this attitude stemmed from the kind of education [that] the religion implanted in their minds and hearts.11

**Almsgiving**

A Muslim willingly pays a small portion of his or her wealth to the poor, needy, and others entitled to alms (Zakat). These alms are not a tax, but a means of creating rapprochement between the rich and poor. According to the Shari'a, alms are the right of the poor to the wealth of the rich. It has happened that a Muslim who could not find a poor person deserving alms might travel to another town in order to give these alms. This alms practice strengthened friendly community relationships and also resolved and replaced grudges, hatred, or violence between rich and poor.

**Testimony**12

Worship and religious testimony in Islam makes a Muslim feel part of the whole community, unable to live without the group. Such witnessing of faith among other people leads one away from egoism and selfishness, and even towards a future Paradise (or Heaven) in the company of such community.

**Peace and Patience or Nonviolence (Sabr)**

Islamic jurisprudence emphasizes peaceful settlement of disputes over hostility or the abuse of human rights. The Prophet's maxim was that: "A Muslim is one from whose hand and tongue others are safe."13 Likewise Islamic jurisprudence recommends that one support a friend or relative, whether right or wrong, by preventing and deterring injustice. Ali ibn Abu Talib, the Prophet's cousin, his son-in-law, and fourth-guide Caliph, e.g., directed Muslims to: "... Punish your brother [or sister] with kindness and repay wrong doing with grace .... If you conquer your enemy forgive him [or her] as a sign of your gratitude for having won ...."14 In other words, as to nonviolent altruism, Ali and Mohammed noted that God asks one to pardon one's enemies, to maintain ties with family renegades, and return good for evil. Each Muslim must wish for the other what he or she wishes for himself or herself.15
Peace and Nonviolence

Family, Community, and Society

Fathers and mothers cosponsor and co-support the family in equal terms. Mohammed taught that women's and men's human rights are to be respected, as well as those of the extended family. Love and mercy rather than fanaticism should guide one's actions. Community neighbors also respond best to love, peace, and mutual trust. Good neighbors should be treated as family members, perhaps even as heirs. Poor neighbors should not go without food and deserve community help, protection, consolation, medical services, and housing and educational opportunities.

Peace and War

Islam and the Quran recommend a truce and forbid war or conflict one-third of each year during the absence of peace. These four months are Muharram, El-Qiada, Dhu Raja, and Dhu El-Hijja. A man called Abdullah, for example, who defied such rules when he captured two Islamic rebels and so deterred Umar Al-Hadrami, was quickly chided by Mohammed for fighting during the months of Al-Haram.

Above all Islam and the Quran forever forbid war or violence in Mecca and in Medina, Saudi Arabia, as Muslim worship places. Each zone of peace in Mecca and in Medina to be used for worship is specified by a circle with a diameter of 28 miles. Likewise the pilgrims are not to harm or condemn any creature during their pilgrimage. There are many examples in Islam for illustrating kindness to animals and for punishing abuse to animals, both through Mohammed and through Muslim behavior. Islamic law even forbids exploiting animals for entertainment, such as in Spanish bull-fighting or in using animal for target practice. Although animals may still be sacrificed at the end of the Hajj or Pilgrimage to Mecca.

War is approved only when for human defense or to uphold Islam, with each war to end when the objective is reached. Offensive war for glory, conquest, heroism, racism, expansion, thievery,
colonization, nationalism, or ostentation are not to be approved. A Muslim soldier believes that orders do not represent God or the cause of Islam. The soldier should refuse such orders. Islamic rulers should allow their people the freedom of choice because, whereas human rules cause wars, God’s rule of law prevents wars, disasters, and sufferings.25

In the same spirit, for just war to proceed, a Muslim leader must first give an enemy people the option of converting to Islam. When for example Qutibah Ben Moslem al-Bahili entered Samarkand in a surprise attack, the Caliph-Umar Ibn Abdal-Aziz (II) responded by appointing a judge, Jumaia’ ben Khater al-Baji, who ordered the army out of the city. The army obeyed the judge.26

Muslim examples of forgiveness also abound, e.g., as when Muslims restored Jerusalem after the Crusaders in 583 (Year of the Prophet, or 1187 ACE). Salah al-Din and his 100,000 soldiers instead asked for ransoms from those who could afford it.27 In some cases Muslim victors fed captives before themselves, refused to torture prisoners, and respected enemy corpses. The Prophet, when he returned to Mecca after forced exile, did not approve vengeance there either and instead abolished war there as noted above. Islam also brought humanitarian changes to prisons and treatment in prisons, such as rehabilitation.28 Islamic law even forbids the taking of hostages, so protecting its citizens from capricious injustice. Any Muslim could also offer sanctuary to a non-Muslim.

It can thus be seen that Islamic nonviolence means that one should resist, stand against the aggressors. It is impossible to justify peace between a tyrant and a victim, because of the inherent violence in any such relationship, wherein a victim must concede human rights to a tyrant. Peace must not contradict Islam. Peace is not the absence of war or violence, but the absence of tyranny, violence, and oppression. Islam must stand against tyranny, a source of war and evil. Islam considers the tyrant ruler to be a coward, a helpless person. Islam cannot stand idly by when life is in dispute, but requires the Muslim to support the victim and to overcome the violence. As the Quran also says, make peace between two enemies, resist the oppressive enemy in defiance of Islamic law, and make peace with those who love justice and respect God.29
Islamic Conflict Resolution: Nonviolent and Contemporary

Islamic principles should characterize accords, treaties, and peaceful ways for solving personal and global conflict. The Covenant of Umar, signed between Caliph Umar Ibn Al-Khattab (I) and the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Sofronius, clearly exemplified peaceful Muslim methods for dealing justly with others and each other.\(^\text{30}\) The Covenant:

... grants [the] people of Jerusalem security of their souls, assets, churches, and crosses. Consequently these churches shouldn't be inhabited nor destroyed and Christians shouldn't be obliged or forced to convert from Christianity or be harmed.\(^\text{31}\)

In addition the Caliph and the ordinary citizen, each born “free”, should receive the same right by law in Islamic courts.\(^\text{32}\)

The Shari'a should guide how each ruler is elected, with the best ruler being the one able to implement God's mandates, not only human rules. Mutual consultation should guide mutual change for mutual benefit and responsibility in the exercise of state and international power.\(^\text{33}\) Judges and the court systems should be honest people, who respect the Shari'a and who resist deviation from the Shari'a. Citizens’ claims and complaints should be heard fairly so that people feel secure from state abuse of power. If a ruler disobeys the Shari'a, the people should not obey that ruler. The people should supervise and criticize rulers because the Shari'a demands it, including such criminal acts as collective punishment and scorched-earth military policies by racist rulers.\(^\text{34}\)

In short we are not to be evil to those whom we fear or ignore. People who fear and try to ignore Islam do not know Islam or the Shari'a. The violent disrespect and misinformation often derived from mass media is not to be trusted or believed. A Muslim is not cruel or bloody, but a person who meets the human needs of fellow human beings. A Muslim greets another Muslim with the words “peace be with you,” not from fear, but from Islam custom and tradition. A Muslim parent likewise cares for both his or her own children and those of the community.

Where in the Shari’a can contemporary nation-states claim ground as Islamic? Often such countries treat Islam as a slogan, not a religion. Sloganeering Islam alienates the Muslim from the Shari’a. Mass media accusations against such slogans result from a narrow view of the Shari’a and of Islam itself. Islam is not a mass way for worship, nor pacification nor alienation, but rather a way of dealing with all the aspects of life: social, economic, political, scientific. Destructive Islamic elites force their people away from development, falsify the reality of Islam, and therefore grossly misrepresent the principles, methods, and practices of Islam.
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Islamic Ethics and “Changing Behavior”

By Karim Douglas Crow*

... Ideas about God are as mortal as S/He was discovered to be. We may well be certain, however, that S/He has lost weight because we have ceased feeding S/His with belief.

Preliminary Remarks

Contemporary discussions of the relevance of religion for resolving conflict and nonviolence appear to display two main trends: 1) Apologies for the historical manifestations of particular faiths which generalize and idealize complex temporal realities; and 2) Appeals to the spiritual legacy of the major religions which selectively appropriate more favorable aspects of higher universal values, while seeking to distill essential attitudes and practices supporting current efforts to instill nonviolence at a practical level. Adherents of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam have all-too-often exemplified both these trends over centuries of rivalry, mutual exchange, and conflict. A third approach, introduced below, may return us to a deeper understanding of Islam regarding notions of integrity, intelligence, and ignorance, and in this way, toward deeper understanding of nonviolence in the heritage of Islam.

What is perhaps new in current thinking is the felt urgency to reach fresh formulations relevant to our world at the close of the twentieth century, prompting the revivification of faith-in-practice and spiritual ideals (i.e., value formation) amidst the degenerating conditions of human life on earth. The positivist contempt for organized religion.


which peaked in the course of this century, and its dismissal of spiritual faith-traditions as irrelevant relics from a less-enlightened past, along with the rise of science, technology, and an all-consuming secular consumerism within modern economic-social transformations, is now increasingly perceived as a blind alley from which humanity must extricate itself in the 21st Century. Our planet is cancerous, and the violence, pollution, and senseless suffering boiling on its thin surface of organic life are symptomatic of a deeper malaise. We must employ all our resources in meeting these challenges so as to achieve a semblance of sustainable development and maintain even a pretense of biological diversity, while keeping alive the hope for dignity and humanity in our communal and international lives.

In the search beyond apologies for, or appeals to the religious past — in favor of a third approach to the relevance of religion — it may be observed parenthetically that the Arabic language appears to lack a specific term for the current global notion of nonviolence (from the Gandhian word ahimsa). This notion is often denoted by the recent Arabic coinage of lā ʿunf (that is, “no force,” “no-violence,” or “no-vehement”) as well as of sabr (stemming from the root for patience and fortitude). This coinage is only partially the case and other sides of the situation need to be re-examined, particularly the diminution in understanding of key notions which were more comprehensively apprehended in the past, as reflected in the often inadequate or misleading nature of contemporary translation attempts by Muslims. A number of Arabic terms do embrace aspects of “nonviolence” and do include the intent of the Gandhian ahimsa, meaning “nonviolence” or “non-injury” (depending upon one’s sources in the literature).

A certain confusion currently reigns in Muslim discussions of nonviolence, arising partly from unfamiliarity with the textual and conceptual bases of such terms, and the overall “conceptual-drift” in contemporary mentality. Mohandas K. Gandhi pointed out this human tendency for terms to stretch in meaning over time, while at the same time he made it a cornerstone for the personal seizure of meaning within his own transformation or adaptation of Hindu tradition. When translating the Bhagavadgīita into Gujarati Hindi, he observed:
... Like man [or the meaning of the human being], the meaning of great writings suffers evolution. On examining the history of languages, we notice that the meaning of important words has changed or expanded .... Thus the author of the Gita, by extending meanings of words, has taught us to imitate him ....

Similarly, the 16th and 17th Century Indo-Muslim translators into Persian of the Upanishads, the Yoga Vasistha, and the Gita, tended to interpret these Sanskrit texts in the light of the fundamental Islamic notion of tawhid.

However far more crippling for a proper grasp of Islamic teachings on peace and conflict is a deeply-rooted blind spot prevalent among non-Muslims concerning the real nature of Islamic thought and practice. This miscomprehension has many reasons including particular medieval historical realities, as well as ignorance. It has been aggravated in recent decades by a concerted effort to demonize Islam as the inevitable antithesis of Judaeo-Christian-Hellenistic cultural values, prompted mainly by the threat posed by Muslim “fundamentalism” and the ideological and strategic exploitation of the term “terrorism” by certain governments. Another factor contributing to the miscomprehension of Islam has been the heedless attitude of many Muslims towards actively promoting an intelligent presentation of their own tradition in language accessible to the common koiné (usage common in the literature) and mentality of our world up to the late 20th Century.

This may be traced to a variety of causes, not the least of which are the persistence of unre representsive ruling cliques whose self-interests are estranged from the communities over whose exercise of power. Yet the growing presence and weight of Muslim minorities in Europe and North America (the Muslim diaspora), not to mention very large, long-standing minority communities in India, China and S.E. Asia, is forcing changes in this ostrich-like mentality. The demographic realities of Muslim populations worldwide make it inevitable that Islam shall play an ever increasing role on the world stage in the 21st Century, and it may well be from among the Muslim diaspora in the West that one should look for fresh and vigorous re-statements of essential facets of the tradition.

How?

What resources are offered us by the ethical teachings of Semitic Monotheism? Others have sketched the primary insights and ideals inculcated by the major streams within this tradition, the “what” and the “why” well-known to thinking and feeling practitioners of these faiths. There exists as well a “how” for demonstrating by what means and through which procedures and techniques humans may transform themselves and their neighbors, while growing in being and understanding. This ethical domain of religious teaching forms the foundation for personal morality, social justice, and harmony on the horizontal level of inter-personal and inter-group relations. It likewise informs more esoteric disciplines addressing the vertical plane of existence within the interior arena of the Self, opening out onto appreciation of, and co-operation with, the Higher Power directing all of existence. Both the ethical and spiritual domains unfold out of an anthroplogy (or an anthroposophy), largely common to the three elements of Semitic Monotheism. The “how” deals with changing behavior and reformation of character, or in somewhat unfashionable religious terminology, with self-purification and integrity of being.

This “how” may be so commonplace and ubiquitous that it often is treated as trite or trivialized by many adherents of these organized religions, e.g. as in the case of the “Golden Rule”. One way of approach suggests itself in the anthropology elaborated in classical Muslim tradition. Here one confronts a refinement and extension of preceding old-Arab, Judaic, and Christian conceptions, punctuated by elements garnered from Iranian, Hellenic, and even Indian traditions, all of which fed into the expanding synthesis of Islamic thought and culture. A Sufi tale about the “Devil” or Iblis recounts how he gambled with God for possession of all the future souls of humans, and won. God laughingly told Iblis that it would be impossible for him to actually collect his winnings, but Iblis countered with a cunning plan: he would insinuate himself into every womb at the moment of conception, then whisper into the ear of each newly formed infant all the moral truths ever known to people. From that moment on, whenever a person hears a truth, they will say: “Yes. I already know that,” thus
deflecting the impact of that truth from changing their life.13

Invoking the Devil is germane for the relevance of Monotheist teachings to nonviolence. One way of taking the lesson of this tale to heart is that we must learn to “hear” truth afresh, to turn our sentimental mawkish listening into a personal seizure of meaning and cognition — which takes us from the “why” of theory to the “what” of nonviolence in action. Semitic Monotheism has been very consistent over three millennia on this point, stressing the pre-condition of proper “hearing” for understanding of its message, and the attention of “heart-comprehension” for faith and right action.14 We in the 20th Century listen frequently with our head (“in one ear and out the other”), testifying to the continuing activity of Iblls.

Islamic expressions of its anthropology of ethics were by no means monolithic, presenting one with a range of alternatives. For example, one stream of thought consists of Muslim “philosophical ethics” largely inspired by Greek models, as embodied, e.g., in the genre of writings entitled sahabītb al-akhhab, or the refinement of character.15 Springing from Stoic and Galenic psychology, as mediated through the translation activity of Eastern Christian authors,16 the Muslim appropriation of this tradition would emphasize three notions: the monist Platonic threefold partition of the soul’s faculties (rational, spirited and appetitive), the Platonic ideal of the four cardinal virtues (wisdom, valor, temperance, and justice), and the dialectical Aristotelian definition of virtue as the “mean” between two extremes.17

Intelligence and Ignorance

A far more popularized tradition of ethics which continues to have a profound impact on the formation of values at all levels of society are the religious teachings, centering on the discipline of the akhlāq (virtuous character-traits) and springing out of the Qur’ān and hadith, sometimes referred to as “hadith-based ethics.”18 An early report assigned to an anonymous bakīm (sage or wise person) outlines an essential feature of this conception of the human being. It takes the form of spiritual advice and sapiential exhortation:
... Take heed and pay attention! Every single person has two internal rulers, one of whom is a sincere counselor, the other a deceiver. The sincere counselor is 'aql ("intelligence" and "self-restraint") while the deceiver is hawā ("passion," "whim," or "desire"). The two are adversaries, whichever one of the two you side with, the other is enfeebled.20

Here, the reciprocal polarity of 'aql versus hawā is tied to an intermediate force, the individual who by choice or exercise of will sides with one thus weakening the other. The onus is on the hearer: aid your 'aql, fight your hawā. This fundamental portrait of the inner person as an internal psychological dualism, not a body/mind duality, was an ancient legacy of Semitic Monotheism,21 also integral to Sasanian Zoroastrian teachings.22 It is echoed in the popular notion of the dynamic of conscience as the struggle between one's guardian angel and the "devil" over one's soul.

The polarity of 'aql-hawā expresses a central dichotomy within the human self, formulated in a number of parallel conceptual pairs employing linked motifs. The underlying tension between good and evil, or light and darkness, was at the heart of this dichotomy of the soul, or the human dialectic, being mirrored within the individual self and in the cosmos. The locus of 'aql is in the heart (qālūb, lūbb) and aligned with spirit (rūh) and light, thus it enjoys a tincture of divine presence. 'Aql is opposed to jahl ("folly" or "ignorance"), as well as to the nafs ("psyche" or "passionate-soul").23 The notion of jahl was originally associated with bidda ("vehement strength" or "irascible temper").24 Jahl came to be a chief opposite to 'aql in Islamic ethical teachings, although the polarity of 'ilm (knowledge) versus jahl achieved a greater prominence in Islamic cultural and intellectual pursuits.25 Thus the dialectical notion of 'aql-jahl can be said to be fundamental in leading one ultimately toward a human predisposition toward "nonviolence" as a poised spiritual trait.

Within expanding Islamic cultural synthesis, this key polarity between 'aql versus jahl, along with hawā - nafs, was not difficult to assimilate to the Hellenistic dichotomy of "reason" versus "passion". At a basic level 'aql reflects wisdom in the sense of moral self-restraint and harmonious conduct in a social communal context, while jahl signifies all that is perverse and discordant in the person leading to inner blindness, conflict, and social disorder. Another level of meaning for 'aql involves the cognitive dimension of faith (imān) in the apprehension of truth and the practice of knowledge.26 At this level "intelligence" or "understanding" balanced in the heart encompasses every positive human quality, namely the "eminent character traits" (mukārim al-akhlāq, as well as maḥāsin al-akhlāq and al-fadā'il) collectively constituting the moral-spiritual dimension of faith.27 The practical ethical norms governing the individual's life were also enshrined under the notion of adab, which has been defined in its general sense as:

... correct knowledge and behavior in the total process by which a person is educated, guided, and formed into a good Muslim — adab (being considered) as the foundation of the soul or personality of the human being as a whole — ... [which anticipates] the integration of all levels of experience, knowledge, character, feeling, and action into a harmonious life.28

The cultivation of character traits remains the basis for the individual's personal engagement with God in service and devotions, and for loving-kindness and charity in the self-sacrificing service of one's fellows. In the inner realm of what is normally termed mysticism, the akhlāq offer the basic building blocks for perfection of the soul and growth in degrees of successive, perceptive cognition of reality (the Sufi notion of mukāshafa, "unveiling", or dhawq, "tasting"). The akhlāq thus form the keystone of the primary facets comprising Islam, beyond works ('amal and a 'mal or "deeds") and faith (imān) — namely the domain of ihsān (lit. "... putting the good and the beautiful into practice").29 Ihsān concerns ikhlās ("purity-of-sincerity" or the internalization of works and faith), as well as taqwā ("god-mindfulness" as the perfection of works and faith), which leads to steadfastness. Muslim exponents devoted a great deal of attention to the listing and description of these character traits.

One early example is provided by the 2nd Century A.H. Imām of the Shi'ah and direct descendent of the Prophet, Ja'far al-Sādiq (d. 765), in the form of a narrative portraying God's creation of 'aql as a spiritual entity out of the light on the right side of the divine throne, followed by His creating jahl from "... the dark briny sea."30 God
Empowers both 'aql and jahl with seventy-five powers or “troops”, as in two opposed armies arranged in contrasting pairs and headed by their Generals Good and Evil. Self-purification from the troops of darkness requires their replacement by the troops of light under the command of 'aql, enabling the faithful to attain the ranks of prophetic character traits. The Imam instructs his disciples to “know” al-'aql and al-jahl and their troops, so as to be guided well. The figures of 'aql and jahl (intelligence and ignorance, or wisdom and folly) are deliberately cast by al-Sadiq here in terms of the Qur'anic treatment of Adam and Iblis, so that the dynamic of their struggle is understood to operate within the arena of the self, while possessing cosmic overtones.31

This integration of the human dimension into the creation myth of 'aql in the throne realm of light served as a fruitful precedent for later Sufi elaborations, e.g., the 3rd Century A.H. Central Asian Master al-Hakim al-Tirmidhi, whose version of the troops of 'aql versus hawa or Iblis lists one hundred pairs.52 Studying these lists of traits discloses a great concentration on human instinctive and affective-emotional life, wherein the social-communal traits intersect and blend with interior attitudes accompanying activity and thought. These Sufi elaborations make abundantly clear that the refinement and cultivation of a person’s emotional life was conceived to be the axis balancing the realization of human possibilities, both horizontally in the social milieu and vertically within the self. Therefore, one of the key components of 'aql or “intelligence” in Islamic ethics must be grasped in terms of how to rectify one’s integrity and to cause one’s human impulses, faculties, and latent powers to flourish, with the purified emotions promoting the operation of a higher intelligence (ma ‘rifah). Scientists have begun to take this entire domain of the human enterprise more seriously, and so to retreat from the positivist view of the human person as merely a biped brain with ancillary emotions.34

**Ethics and Nonviolence**

The core of Islamic ethical practice consists of an amalgam of knowledge, the disciplines of which effect “the moral transformation of the personality” through “a process of grooming.”35 This knowledge-

Discipline mediates a seamless model of the personality, which insists upon the potential of unbroken transitions between a person’s social, physiological, and affective natures. The sum of these parts contributes to a person’s power of moral-intelligence. Adab and akhlâq in this way inculcate and energize the ethical character formation which lays the foundation for the complex moral, and societal authority exhibited by Muslim exponents. The Islamic ethos has dwelt upon the internalization of this behavioral model — with the prophets idealized as the archetype for human endeavor, and God’s character traits eulogized as the goal for the achievement of perfection — a model “assuming the character traits of God” (at-takhalluq bi-akhlâq Allâh).36

Accordingly, Peter Brown, a leading observer of the reciprocity between Islam and other world religions, has discerned that the counter-balancing core of Islamic authority and tradition stems from how it is “...effectively internalized and passed on to others.”37 The chief features of this mutually-reliant internalization of a religious ethical model encompass:

> ...the close observation of the behavior of holy individuals; the creation of habits by dogged observance; careful control of posture, gesture, and tone of voice; the stern and searching discipline of interpersonal relations imposed by a communal life; [and] above all, deep psychological awareness of the quality of trains of thought ...38

The vitality of this tradition has not been exhausted, despite the irascible vehemence of the fundamentalists whose angry roar fills our ears, drowning out the quiet hum of the veritable practitioners of Islam. The call for self-restraint and the transformation of animal impulses will cease to be heard only when violence loses its force for suppressing our internal stirrings to transform our self and our world. But is there sufficient power of attention to heed this call? This is a powerful question to be asked afresh, and not deflected, a question for which the asking of it is itself an answer.

Another obvious question will certainly be posed. Does the ethical model sketched above, and largely shared in common by the three elements of Semitic Monotheism, i.e., Judaism, Christianity, and
the world of Islam, have any practical relevance for local and global nonviolent solutions to the violence and conflict in our present situation? Might it be only another tired recital of an all too familiar litany, what one could call mere utopianism? Or is this objection the whispering of Iblis in our ears?
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**What Can You Bring to the Garden?**

**Let’s Make a Garden**

by Tamara Awad Lobe

Let’s make a garden! A garden of the world!
Children from all over the world can help. What can you bring to the garden? I’ll bring a rice plant, said Xia Liu from China. And I’ll bring an orange tree,” said Tumi from Swaziland. “I’ll bring spice plants,” said Mirmala from India. “I’ll bring maize seeds,” said Ikwe from the Ojibway people of Canada. And I’ll bring rocks,” said Sadako from Japan. “Why rocks?” asked Ikwe.

“Yeah, and I’ll bring something else,” Sadako said with a smile.

Let’s Make a Garden offers a vision of peaceful cooperation among children of many different races, cultures, and nationalities. Lobe has used a creative torn-paper technique to make colorful illustrations for her story of hope and sharing. Picture storybook for ages 4-8 and up. Paper, 40 pages, $7.95; in Canada $11.35.

“Oh, it is all so breathtakingly simple and so beautiful. Why did we not think of it long ago—to let our children plant a garden for the world, then maybe the Holocaust might never have happened, maybe Bosnia, maybe Somalia, Rwanda, maybe... maybe...”—Archbishop Desmond M. Tutu

Tamara Awad Lobe was born in Bluffton, Ohio. She earned a degree from Conrad Grebel College, Waterloo, Ontario, in peace and conflict studies. She and her husband, Greg, have accepted an assignment in Egypt with Mennonite Central Committee, where they will teach English as a second language.

Available through your local bookstore or by calling 1 800 759-4447; in Canada call 519 746-2872 (Provident Bookstores—MC, Visa, Discover). If ordering by mail, please include 10% for shipping—minimum $2.50. Canadian customers, add 7% of total for GST.
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Pacifism in Contemporary Conflict, A Christian Perspective
By John Paul Lederach*

We in the Mennonite Churches of Northern America have had a rather lively debate in the past year over our views on the use of the military for humanitarian purposes in places like the Balkans or Somalia. While we are one of the historic peace churches, we have not exactly been the outpost of the Peaceful Kingdom in terms of our internal deliberations. So how we work at doing humanitarianism, a strength in our tradition, in contemporary settings of protracted conflict, has called us back to reflection on the meaning of peace, pacifism, and how God works in the world.

No small amount of ambivalence can be heard at various points of our discussion, indicative of the times we now live and the challenges we now face. "How do we deliver our cold cup of water to the thirsty and our plate of food to the hungry, when we discover in the end that the food also fuels the war that created the hungry in the first place? How do we respond to the placement of troops to protect food delivery or to create safe havens for the innocent? Are they not more like the police that we have and in many instances, make use of in our own backyards?"

These discussions remind me of a story I heard about a Quaker— (I suppose Mennonites are allowed to tell Quaker jokes at a setting like this) — who during colonial times heard someone breaking into his house in the middle of the night. With considerable trepidation he took out his hunting rifle from under the bed and crept quietly down the hallway to the stairwell, where he found himself face to face with the intruder. "Dear sir," he said as he lifted the rifle and pointed it in the direction of the young man, "please move, for thou standest where I am about to shoot." The story is a metaphor, not only for our Mennonite discussions, but also for the international community's sense of ambivalence in finding proper responses to contemporary conflict.

The task I have before me is to articulate a Christian pacifist perspective on nonviolent approaches to contemporary conflict. I have elected to do that through several mechanisms. First, I will delineate briefly what I understand to be the nature and characteristics of contemporary conflict which provide the parameters of my reflections on what should be done in response and why nonviolence is more suited than military intervention. Second, while there are many potential avenues of response, I will concentrate on outlining three initial areas where I think active pacifism must proactively strategize and respond. Third, in each of these areas I will develop both the theological base for activity from a Christian standpoint, and more specifically from an Anabaptist-Mennonite frame of reference, and make some concrete suggestions about action. The reader should be forewarned that by training and trade I am a sociologist and mediator. So I come to the theological discussion from the standpoint of experience and practice more than from the framework and tools of biblical exegesis.

Characteristics of Contemporary Conflict

It is important to establish the basic parameters of the kind of situations I have in mind when I refer to contemporary conflict and the characteristics they entail. I undertake this only as a working definition and do not pretend to entertain a comprehensive or exhaustive look at the subject, on the contrary it will be rather short, aimed at providing the broad strokes of an overview.¹ I use contemporary conflict to refer to war, that is as Wallensteen has used it, "prolonged combat between military forces," involving at least "1000 deaths" in its current phase.² Currently, this definition would entail approximately 35 situations. While each is unique, there are a number of observations we can make about major characteristics they have in common.

First, the East/West ideological paradigm that was used to

*Professor, Eastern Mennonite College. Mennonite Central Committee, International Conciliation Service, from presentation given for the Perspectives on Pacifism Workshop, at the U.S. Institute of Peace, 20 July 1993. We are thankful to the USIP (Kay Heckler, Sales & Marketing Manager) for kind permission to reprint this article. See his related works, e.g., El Anománeas de la Magistra (Barcelona: Ediciones de la Magistra, 1983); and Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1995). Ed. Note.
consider international conflict in the Cold War Era is, in the Post Cold War Era increasingly less salient, if at all relevant in explaining the nature of these situations.

Second, the vast majority of these conflicts take place in the Southern Hemisphere, or developing 2/3ds of our world, and with an alarming increase in Eastern Europe and portions of the former Soviet Union.

Third, in almost all cases these are not inter- but rather intranational conflicts, that are fought between groups within a nation-state.

Fourth, while intranational in primary composition, the conflicts internationalize to the degree that conflictants inhabit neighboring countries, engage in international weapons trading and supply, produce displaced refugee populations that cross immediate and distant borders, and often contribute to regional instability and even fighting.

Fifth, the lines of conflict identity are increasingly drawn along ethnic, at times geographic regionality, or religious affiliation, as opposed to class or ideology.

Sixth, the conflicts themselves are protracted, or become what at times is referred to as intractable, that is, with long-standing animosities and deep-rooted perceptions and expressions of fear, threat, and hatred.

Seventh, civilian populations are increasingly at risk in these settings either through direct fighting, targeted and indiscriminate reprisals, or indirectly through famine or displacement.

And Eighth, while evolving and under tremendous pressure, formal and governmental international mechanisms for dealing with these conflicts are limited, given the restrictions of intervening in the internal affairs of another country. Herein, we see the evolving redefinition of military resources away from strictly a “defense of national security or interests” and toward a responsibility for policing internal conflicts or aiding humanitarian projects.

With these characteristics in mind, to the question of whether nonviolent responses and approaches are relevant and needed, I answer with a resounding “yes.” I will in the next pages attempt to outline the reasons why, from both a theological and pragmatic basis, based on three areas of discussion that I put forward as suggested proposals for pacifist

based response: promote peacemaking based on sustainable transformation; keep religion in its place; and develop nonviolent peacekeeping.

Promote Peacemaking Based on Sustainable Transformation

To some degree since the advent of the post cold war era we have witnessed with surprising speed the emergence of the world as opposed to the new world order. By this I mean that contemporary conflict underscores the realities that in many parts of the world, people’s sense of identity is not organically tied to nation-state constructs, that globalization (particularly in terms of communication, mass media, and weapons) and localization are linked in a dynamic paradox, and that militarization, more often than not, means less not more security.

These realities further point to the limitations and inadequacies of traditional statist diplomacy in dealing with contemporary conflict. The history and culture of international diplomacy to a large degree is rooted in and emerges with the formation of nation-states. However, the fundamental characteristics of contemporary conflict question the very nature of existing statist structures. Some assumptions on which international diplomacy has been built underscore these limitations, for example:

1. That groups in conflict operate by defined hierarchies of power, making authoritative representation in decision-making and negotiations possible;

2. That political, cultural, and social power bases are subservient, secondary, or an outgrowth of military power, making the key to transformation of conflict a rough equivalent of achieving cease-fires;

3. That conflicts are primarily motivated and sustained by substantive interests, historically defined as national interests;

4. That solutions are best sought in pragmatic terms of compromise of interests, usually understood in within a relatively short time frame.

While each of these holds some basic truths in all situations of armed conflict, the overall frame of reference of international diplomacy
has led to what I would call the "trickle down" approach to peacemaking. A quick way of visualizing this is to consider the population affected by the conflict [on three levels] as what might be called a triangle. This triangle involves a descriptive, analytic scheme with three levels of intervention, including actors and their respective activities. On the one side are those who are directly involved in the conflict, on the other are those who are involved in peacemaking efforts.

**Level 1** involves highly visible, key political and military leaders who are usually locked into positions. Peacemaking and conflict resolution activities are aimed at achieving cease-fires via high level negotiations between representative leaders, often brokered by high profile mediation efforts involving eminent personalities. Two points are important here. First, these activities receive enormous publicity and media attention and the actors involved are constantly dealing with high stake positioning, as well as fluid perception shifts, and are vulnerable to pressure from inside and out to achieve quick results. Second, these processes and decisions often boil down to a reduced and very limited number of people assumed to be representative, acting on behalf, in the best interest, and capable of delivering large numbers of people in the various constituencies.

**Level 2** involves a “middle-range” set of actors, more numerous and connected to multiple sectors and regions within the context. These are often significant religious, ethnic, sectoral leaders, as well as key NGO, PVO, and middle-level military, movement and government officials. Particularly in protracted conflicts with intense religious or ethnic divisions, these leaders may represent regional and/or factional interests that affect given geographic areas of the context, and are often in contact with and influenced [by these contexts], but may or may not feel bound by decisions made at the highest level.

Such leaders are also in more direct contact with day to day operations on the ground in their respective areas. Peacemaking activities at this level could involve the creation of a broader participation in the peace process and establishing an infrastructure and capacity for dispute resolution within the setting and across the lines of conflict. These may involve workshops addressing immediate decision making issues, conflict resolution training, development of peace commissions for dealing with ethnic issues in a given region, or even the formation of mediation or consultant teams built from within the context. The grassroots level [or Level 3], far more numerous but often very fragile, then involves the key local actors like indigenous NGOs, community developers, women’s associations, local religious, health, municipal, and business leaders, as well as those involved in refugee camps. Peacemaking activities here could involve a broad set of efforts from training to the formation of peace commissions that negotiate daily issues and deal with the multiplicity of conflicts taking place at local levels.

I have referred to peacemaking activities at the middle-range and grassroots levels in the tentative form of what might happen, to emphasize that (descriptively in real life situations) [while] the top level is given prominence and priority, middle-range and grassroots activities are seen as peripheral or incidental to success. This comes in part because of statist and international diplomatic biases toward dealing primarily with hierarchies of political or military structures and, toward short-term results especially of seeing peace in terms of cease-fires, and media attention given to eminent figures. In other words peacemaking is seen in terms of trickling down from top level to other subsequent levels of society.

I would argue however that contemporary conflict calls for the development of a framework for sustainable transformation that builds across the population and in many instances from the bottom-up or the middle-out. Transformation refers to movement and change. In the context of conflict it suggests movement away from relationships dominated by fear, animosity, and threat, and toward those dominated by understanding, cooperation, and mutual respect. This includes the traditional concepts of cease-fires and top level negotiations, but goes beyond, encompassing the relational concept of reconciliation. Sustainability suggests the concern not only for how to initiate such movement but how to create a proactive process capable of regenerating itself over time. As a framework, sustainable transformation suggests the need to establish an infrastructure for peace within a setting, the promotion of citizen-based initiatives as legitimate and necessary at various levels, a long-term commitment to relationship building, and a
willingness to seek out and root peace activities in the cultural context of the conflict.

Theological Base

This strategy of envisioning peacemaking as a process of building an infrastructure within a setting can easily be seen as the sociological or political process of promoting social movements. And that it is. However, from a theological perspective it is rooted in a fundamental aspect of the Anabaptist faith perspective: The belief that the Kingdom of God emerges not by the pursuit, nor usurpation of power from on high, even for the best of reasons, but rather through the transformation of people and relationships from below.

Such an approach to a theology of pacifist action is not built on a defense of biblical verses that promote a nonviolent perspective, but rather on a world view of how God is present and acts in history, and how we, as followers and disciples of Christ, are part of that presence. It is the story of the incarnation, of God who had all power and resource at hand, yet chose to bring about change through sacrifice and weakness, by becoming one of us. It is the story of the formation of a community of disparate and even antagonistic members who became the pillars and prophets of a movement that changed the world. It is the story of living by alternative values in the face of overwhelming odds. It is as various Anabaptist authors have coined in the titles of their books, the “politics of Jesus” carried through a “mustard seed conspiracy” in the “upside down kingdom.”

This theology looks at contemporary conflict and believes in the foolishness that change is possible, that it will happen both through individuals and structures, that it will be sustained not by a Moses but by a movement (although a well-placed Moses never hurt), a movement of members willing to risk their own lives for the envisioned change and one that ultimately finds its sustenance in the grace and guiding of God’s spirit.

What Is Needed

I have suggested that a key component in dealing comprehensively with contemporary conflict is the development of a framework for sustainable transformation. Such a framework involves both conceptual and practical tasks. Conceptually, sustainable transformation calls for a reformulation of the overall strategy of peacemaking rooted in several important ideas:

1) Establishing an infrastructure for peace must explicitly promote and link actors and activities across the levels of conflict in a given population. An infrastructure does not assume that peace and conflict transformation will trickle down from top to bottom. On the contrary it assumes that processes and solutions for a lasting peace must provide space for input and implementation across the levels of the affected population. This is especially true in protracted conflicts that are divided by ethnic lines, where power is diffuse, even localized, and where statist structures have lost legitimacy or crumbled.

2) An infrastructure involves communication, logistics, and above all else, people. Thus, what becomes most important in the development of the framework is the establishment of a peace constituency within the setting. Conceptually, this means that the international community must see people in the setting as resources not recipients. In other words, it is crucial to envision citizen-based peacemaking as instrumental and integral, not peripheral to sustaining change.

Strategically, I would suggest that the key to a sustainable framework in contemporary conflict are the middle-range actors. They are placed in a position which is connected and often has the trust of both the top and the grassroots. Interestingly, they have more flexibility in thinking and moving than the top level leaders, yet far less vulnerability in terms of daily survival than the grassroots. To the degree they capture a vision for their role as peacemakers, to the degree they are able to bridge to their counterparts across the lines of conflict in the setting, and to the degree they are empowered as legitimate actors by the international community, they and their networks, understandings of the sensibilities and nuances of the setting, and immediate and ongoing
accessibility, represent an invaluable and irreplaceable resource for sustaining change. It is with them that an effective peace constituency can emerge.

3) In line with first two items is the need to build on the cultural and contextual resources for peace and conflict resolution in the setting. This represents an important shift in thinking, that moves us away from approaching a given setting with a single set of tools for pursuing peace and places emphasis on discovering and empowering the resources, modalities, and mechanisms that exist within the context. Given the enormous devastation, violence, and even anarchy that easily emerges in settings of contemporary conflict, we in the international community have too easily approached these settings as if they were devoid of resources for peacemaking. Far too easily a frame of reference is established suggesting that the most important resources for peace only exist outside the setting. Ultimately, however, the key to sustainable transformation will need to be rooted and developed in the setting.

A Locus or Place for a Peaceforce

Here, a crucial component are the lenses that help us, both inside and outside the setting, to focus on resources and approaches that exist in the context. From understanding and making use of the role of elders in Somalia, to the ironic role of paramilitary networks in Northern Ireland, to the modalities of how confianza [see below] is used and built in Nicaragua, peacemaking must identify and build on local contextual resources if long-term transformation is desired. We must, at the least, be very cautious, if not entirely avoid the natural inclination to adapt people in a setting to preconceived approaches of building peace, and instead adapt processes to enhance and build on contextual resources.

Keep Religion in its Place

If we take seriously the suggestion that dealing with protracted conflict requires an infrastructure, contextualized insetting resources and long-term commitment based on trust and relationship building, then, I would argue that, in virtually every contemporary conflict, religious actors and their formal and informal networks, particularly those with a nonviolent orientation, are surely one of the key loci of sustaining transformation. I use locus explicitly, as is indicated in the playful title of this section. I am suggesting that religion, and more specifically given my subject matter here, the Christian Church, has a place in conflict transformation and must be kept, that is legitimated, in that place. Locus points in the direction of two crucial ideas.

First, religious actors and their corresponding organizational arms, and specifically the Christian church, more often than not find themselves literally located in and on all sides of contemporary conflict. From the Philippines to the Balkans, from Mozambique to El Salvador, religious actors are at the eye of the swirling hurricane. By geographic location, organizational or denominational affiliation or ethnicity, the church is part and parcel of the conflict. Via its members the Church is present and located on all sides, often divided and polarized, while the common faith roots nonetheless cut across the lines of conflict. Such a locus can conceptually and practically represent an obstacle or a resource.

Second, the primary arena of church activity and faith, that of the spiritual, emotional, and relational well-being of people lies at the heart of contemporary conflict. While enormous pain and deep-rooted animosity accompany any war, the nature of contemporary settings of armed conflict, where neighbor fears neighbor and blood is shed by each, the emotive, perceptual, social-psychological, and spiritual dimensions are core not peripheral concerns. The immediacy of hatred and prejudice, of racism and xenophobia as primary factors and motivators of the conflict require that approaches to its transformation be rooted in social, psychological, and spiritual dimensions, that traditionally have been seen as either irrelevant or outside the competency of international diplomacy. In other words, the short- and long-term approach to contemporary conflict must include (if not be primarily oriented) by a framework of reconciliation. In that regard, reconciliation is not merely the focus of a pacifist orientation, it is the focus of conflict transformation. Reconciliation is space that is sought, the seedbed where constructive change can root and grow. This
naturally leads to a short discussion on the theological base undergirding this idea.

Theological Base

On both a theological and practical level I have been interested for some time in the metaphor of “creating space.” For a mediator, that interest comes with the idea that we work at bringing people together, at creating a place where they can meet; however, experiences and encounters with Central Americans over the past 10 years have provided an everyday practical understanding of “creating space” as a highly biblical and theological concept, one that was made clear by those who vicariously work at the task of peacemaking in their volatile and violent backyards and where creating space involves mortal enemies.8

Let me give two short examples of creating space from the lenses of Central America. First of all, during the latter part of the 1980’s, I worked with pastors and lay leaders on local peace commissions who were pursuing conciliation and conflict resolution between the Sandinista army and the Contra forces. At different points in a training program we looked at two portions of Scripture, Psalm 85 and Ephesians 2.

The Psalmist (Psalm 85:103) refers to the return of people to their land, to the opportunity for peace in two short lines. In Spanish, in the King James version, the lines are, “... truth and mercy have met together; peace and justice have kissed ....” These are powerful images representing two paradoxes and four concepts. When discussing images of truth these concepts suggested honesty, revelation, clarity, open accountability, and vulnerability. “We see each other as we are,” one commented. In conclusion, without truth, conflict will never be resolved. Yet, Truth alone leaves us all naked, vulnerable, and unworthy.

On mercy, images emerged of compassion, forgiveness, acceptance, and a new start. It is God’s grace for all of us. Without it healthy relationships would not be possible. Without compassion and forgiveness, healing and restoration would be out of the question. Yet, mercy alone is superficial. It covers up. It moves on too quickly. Justice raised powerful images of making things right, creating equal opportunity, rectifying the wrong, and restitution. “Without justice, one person commented, “the brokenness continues and festers.”

With peace came the images of harmony, unity, well-being. It is the feeling and prevalence of security and respect. But, it was mentioned, peace is not just for a few, and if it is preserved for the benefit of some and not others, it represents a farce. The challenge posed by the Psalmist is how to create a social space where truth and mercy can meet, where justice and peace can embrace. When I asked the participants what we should call the place where truth and mercy, justice and peace meet, one of them immediately said, “That is reconciliation.”

We then worked with a second text, Paul’s description of Jesus in the letter to the Ephesians, a text that provides yet another image that is instructive for our discussion. In Ephesians 2:16 we are told that Christ Jesus created peace when he broke down the walls of hostility that divided us as enemies. Through himself, he created a new humanity, a new humanity out of former enemies. The reactions and conversations between the pastors were lively and based on their experiences as they discussed the verses. There was rarely interpretation of this text as the personal act of atonement, of Christ’s blood shed for me. In each and every one of their minds there was a living correlation of an organic model. Of a person, who out of conviction and love stands between and reaches out to mortal enemies, and who everyday runs the risk of shedding his or her own blood in the search to create in him or herself the link, that space, that reconciles enemies.

In both instances what arises is the metaphor of reconciliation as locus, as space. In the Psalms, the image is of a social space, a place where very distinct, paradoxical concerns meet and are held together. In Ephesians we have the metaphor of space through the person of Christ who breaks walls of hostility and builds bridges between enemies. Through the person that spans the brokenness is a space known as reconciliation. It is with this idea that I say, with a bit of tongue in cheek, keep the Church in its place. In other words, legitimate the role and place, the locus if you will, of a body of people and networks that, by their very definition are present in the midst of contemporary conflict and present to the fundamental needs these conflicts represent.
What Is Needed

These I believe are not lofty theoretical or theological concepts, but in fact can be and are operationalized in programmatic terms. While there are numerous areas we could explore, as an example let us consider the idea of using religious networks strategically. A key area will be how to deal with the realities that in most settings of armed conflict religious networks are present on different sides, and in many cases, as the same institution, spread across the lines of conflict. More often than not this is seen as a problem, that of division, of choosing sides and justifying that choice. Partiality, by and large, is seen as an obstacle. Further, it is argued, these people are too involved, too close to the fray to have the necessary distance to be of use in peacemaking efforts.

As a way of addressing this challenge let me return to my Central American experience and friends, only this time with my sociologist hat on. Over some period of time I have learned to think about conflict resolution in everyday settings according to three key concepts: confianza, cuello, and coyuntura. In brief, confianza is “trust” or “confidence.” It refers to people who I know and rely on, who “inspire my confidence” and in whom “I can deposit my trust.”

Confianza is based on firsthand knowledge of the person and increases over time. It assures sincerity, reliability, and support. The keys are relationship and time. Cuello literally means neck, the connection of head and heart, but is also of many vernacular metaphors in Spanish for “connections” to get things done. In other words, it is the strategic use of my network. When faced with problems and conflicts of an everyday nature Central Americans are more likely to first think “how” than “what” in order to “get out of the problem.” Coyuntura is often translated as “juncture” and/or “timing,” but it really represents a metaphor for placing oneself in the stream of time, space, and determining at any given moment what things mean and therefore what should be done. Coyuntura is “timing” to the degree that timing contemplates the fluidity and art of the possible. In practical conflict resolution terms, it means being present and available on an ongoing basis.

Conflict resolution hinges on such concepts. When experiencing a conflict, Central Americans conceptualize solutions in terms of network resources. They seek help from someone they trust who has the confianza of the other side. This is confianza — cuello, or what I have referred to “insider-parties” as opposed to an outsider — neutral modality of third party intervention. We note several important characteristics. First, these intervenors emerge from within the setting, their knowledge of the context and their relationship are seen as a resource not an obstacle. Second, they are connected on a long-term basis, and are not “in” and “out” of a setting. Third, they are chosen not for their expertise or profession, but for who they are in the network. Theirs is not a service to be performed but rather a relationship in which they are involved.

Finally, in settings like Nicaragua and more recently experiments in Ethiopia and Somalia, a unique approach of this idea is the reformulation of partiality as a resource, where the peacemakers as individuals are close to and trusted by one group or sides but as a peacemaker team form and provide a balance and credibility. Translated as Trusts, Networking, and Timing, these cultural concepts are the “TNT” of Central American peacemaking. Trust suggests a relational-based, holistic approach to mediation that develops over time. Networking suggests that peacemaking is dependent on knowing people and being connected. Timing is the sensitivity to events and the perception about possibilities. Most importantly, all three argue that long-term commitments, relationship building, and consistency are crucial. Together the three concepts understand peacemaking as a process of transformation based on resources from within the conflictive setting that provide connection before and during conflict, and ultimately help to sustain the peace.

Programmatically, then, I would argue for seeking to create an infrastructure and to build a peace constituency within the setting, and obviously with my bias, with the integration and if not leadership of religious actors. Among other concrete things this may involve the following kinds of activities with, for, and by people in the context of contemporary conflict:

1) Promote workshops on reconciliation across religious traditions and affiliations, where people are engaged to seek resources from their own faith
traditions as responses to the conflict, and to create a praxis-oriented ecumenism in terms of conciliation, prejudice reduction and peacemaking.

2) Promote training on conflict resolution and mediation, especially at middle-range and grassroots levels, with a focus on uncovering and building on peacemaking traditions in the setting. Further, such training should be done with participants coming from across the lines of conflict, when and where possible.

3) Encourage and support insider teams for carrying out local and regional mediation and serving as key consultants to higher level negotiations.

4) Encourage the media and sponsor film/radio projects aimed at disseminating peace efforts at middle-range and grassroots levels to broaden the sense of activity and actors in the process.

5) Broaden funding categories in NGOs, PVOs, and governmental agencies to link conciliation and peacemaking activities with more traditional arenas of relief and development.

**Develop Nonviolent Peacekeeping**

In the past few years, particularly with the development of events in Iraq, the Balkans, and Somalia, traditional understandings of peacekeeping have seen a number of important shifts. Not only has the demand increased for international troops to be present in more situations across our globe, but a far more activist role has been articulated. Referred to by General Secretary of the UN, Boutros Ghalia, as a combination of peacekeeping and peacemaking, the UN has pursued a more active preventive diplomacy and mediation program on the one hand, and promoted active military intervention in protecting innocent populations, and aiding relief work, and in some instances, stopping the fighting, on the other. It is to the latter, at times called “peace enforcement units” that I should like to undertake some discussion. I would suggest that while I share the goals of stopping the fighting, protecting the innocent, and delivering aid to the most needy, I remain unconvinced that international military intervention in contemporary conflict is effective or morally justified. Further, I believe that disciples of nonviolence and in particular of Christ must take up the challenge of meeting these goals and must not underestimate the important contribution we have to make.

A starting point is to recognize the limitations of international military intervention in contemporary conflict. In a recent paper discussing the issue of militarization of humanitarian intervention in protracted conflict I identified four initial dilemmas, which I share in brief.

1. As a mechanism employed to achieve immediate disaster goals, military intervention may adversely affect and even impede progress in the long-term resolution of the conflict. Short-term goals on behalf of relief may easily become the primary focus of energy and the gauge of success, whereas long-term transformation of the conflict — the root cause of the disaster itself, becomes increasingly peripheral to immediate concerns. This highlights the “chicken — egg” dilemma of disasters principally caused by protracted conflict, where response to the symptom has the net effect of exacerbating the root cause.

2. This dynamic becomes all the more acute when military intervention on behalf of humanitarian purpose is undertaken without full approval of the parties to the conflict. This can create the spin-off dilemma, where the international troops are easily perceived as a party to the conflict and as strengthening or weakening factions within the setting, thereby increasing the fighting. Further, as has been the case in Somalia and Bosnia, international aid workers not directly connected to the military apparatus may then be easily perceived as allies of the “foreign” intervention, increasing their vulnerability and decreasing their effectiveness. After all, perceptions, whether true or not, are real in their consequences.

3. Military organizational culture will assume a certain independence and superiority of operation and mission. In practical terms all actors and goals become subservient to the military effectiveness and their immediate goals. This will be accompanied by the military protecting itself (often with massive logistical support): establishing hierarchical decision-making for affecting military strategy, but making decisions that affect many nonmilitary personnel and operations; and directly establishing their own relationships with local population and leaders. Further, the military is likely to place primary emphasis on the establishment of relationships with their counterparts in the opposing factions, thus raising the legitimacy of military and faction leaders, enhancing their role in decision making and in defining the peace process. Simultaneously, this may marginalize the role of
humanitarian, civic, women's, religious, and sectoral groups in the affected population, in other words, the very elements in the "middle-range level" most likely to be foundations of long-term infrastructure for sustainable transformation.

4. Outside military intervention will inevitably raise the dilemma of national sovereignty. At one level, when the international community moves to place troops for humanitarian purposes, over local objections, we are faced with the dilemma of the criteria by which intervention is justified and to whom the intervenors are accountable. At a second level, in many internal conflicts, self-determination of minority populations and even declared secession are central issues over which the war is raging. Outside military intervention can easily be manipulated to support or undermine the case of one or another of the sides, simply by where troops are placed, who is chosen to be protected or receive aid, and who is negotiated with in the placement of troops.

In such settings, responding to disasters is rarely seen as neutral, responding with military intervention on behalf of disaster aid only increases the suspicions and volatility.

Nonetheless, while we need to be cognizant and raise these dilemmas, our primary task is not that of reactionary negativism and critique, because a response is needed to the aberrations and exaggerations of contemporary conflict that takes the lives of millions. Ours is the task of being faithful to God's redemptive project that seeks peace and pursues it, and to envision, articulate, and implement nonviolent alternatives that, consistent with this project, are better alternatives for dealing with the violence and atrocities of contemporary conflict than increased militarization.

In articulating such alternatives we can expect to hear two objections. First, nonviolent peacekeeping is ineffective in situations like Somalia and Bosnia, and second, it is too risky, in the sense that the peacekeepers are placed unarmed in heavily militarized zones. To the first I would counter that effectiveness should be judged by a long, not a short-term frame of reference. We need to think in terms of decades if not generations as we approach settings of protracted conflict.

However, the short-term needs cannot be neglected. Thus, I also believe it is possible to develop a nonviolent active strategy and enforcement corps, let us call it the Peaceforce, that would be equally effective to militarized peacekeeping in the short-term but would prove far more effective in the long-term. Effective development of a Peaceforce assumes a large-scale commitment to creating a standing international corps of people trained in nonviolence, riot control, observation, conciliation, and negotiation. It is my belief that, where deployed in large scale, with international legitimacy and rigorous nonviolent discipline, such a body could effectively move to protect vulnerable populations, and assure the delivery of aid, as well as monitor and promote cease-fire and safehavens.

Theological Base

At the various places I have raised the theological bases of pacifism in contemporary conflict, I have done in so broad paradigmatic terms rather than specific biblical exegeses. I spoke of the incarnation and Jesus forming disciples as a Kingdom project of redemption and transformation that works from the bottom-up. I talked about reconciliation as a place and the people of God as providing an incarnation of that space. In this latter instance the paradigm is that of the cross. The reference to Christ in Ephesians as breaking down the walls of hostility suggests that the work of reconciliation itself comes hand in hand with sacrifice and suffering. We Mennonites have often used the phrase, "we are in the world but not of the world."

This points to our theology of nonconformity. However, it has become metaphoric of a pacifist people who have chosen in many instances to place themselves apart, literally, to remove themselves from the sinfulness and violence of the world. I happen to think that the roots of our Anabaptist theology point in the opposite direction. Perhaps it emerges from my own experience of a pacifist who keeps finding himself mixed up with people who have chosen to take up the gun. To be in but not of the world does not mean separation, but rather the presence of something different. That "something different" is the reconciling love of God who for the sake of his enemies gave his only son. In other words, where pacifism is most needed is precisely in the worst of the messes contemporary conflict offers us, and it should be no more or less risky, for us who chose to be present, than for those who carry the gun.


It is encouraging to note that this is not exclusively the view of an Anabaptist pacifist. See the work by, e.g., Joseph Mountville, in W. Scott Thompson, et al., eds., "Transnationalism and the Role of Track Two Diplomacy" in *Approaches to Peace: An Intellectual Map* (United States Institute of Peace Monograph, 1991); and a forthcoming book reflecting research on religious actors and peacemaking conducted by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (ed. Douglas Johnston) which indicate a growing interest in legitimacy for these approaches and ideas in mainstream diplomatic circles.


In the broader discussion of these concepts can be found in *Of Nests, Nails and Problems: A Folk Vision of Conflict in Central America* (U. of Colorado, Boulder, CO, Ph.D. dissertation, 1988); or in the Spanish book *Enredos, Peticiones y Problemas* (Guatemala: Semilla, 1992).

For further explanation see the article by Paul Wehr and John Paul Lederach, "Mediating Conflict in Central America," *Journal of Peace Research* 28/1 (Feb. 1991).

Ethical Dilemmas of Military Intervention in Disaster Relief, the Development of Cooperative Relationships and Implications for Long-term Rehabilitation and Development" in *UNDP/DIPA Disaster Management Training Module of the Disaster Management Training Programme*, June 1993.

There are numerous experiments and proposals around nonviolent peacemaking, since the early 1960s in Southern India during a War Resisters' International Conference at Gandhigram, Madurai Province: from the UN proposals of white-helms and the proposals of the Peace Brigades International (from Toronto, Amsterdan, and New Delhi), to the efforts of Peace Brigades International and Witness for Peace in Central America, and the development of the Christian Peacemaker Teams among the Anabaptist churches (e.g., as used in Hebron to open the University of Hebron, in Israel & Palestine). Ed. Note.
Thus from a theological base I would argue that as a starting point the Church should be about the task of preparing and making available large numbers of people willing to place themselves in contemporary conflict with a nonviolent peacekeeping mandate, and who must be willing to link arms with others who share a common vision.

What Is Needed

As a concrete alternative for a nonviolent peacekeeping force I would offer the following simple suggestions, perhaps launched as pacifist provocation.

1) Under the auspices of the UN, member nations commit themselves to the development of an international nonviolent Peaceforce, a body with capacity and preparation to undertake peacekeeping in contemporary conflict.

2) Peaceforce will number 250,000 members by the year 2000, made up of rigorously trained, smaller, cross-national, and virtually self-sufficient units, who are paid and are committed to five-year assignments after a full year of training.

3) This body will be used to accompany relief deliveries in settings of armed conflict, provide physical presence and protection for vulnerable populations, and actively place themselves in protracted situations to secure and monitor cease-fires, while negotiations are pursued and implemented.

4) Five major peacekeeping training centers will be established, one each in Africa, Asia, Latin America, North America, and Europe, with capacity for training, deploying, researching, and evaluating the ongoing efforts.

5) Financing Peaceforce and these efforts will come from a multilateral base.

A) Each member state of the UN agrees to divert 1% of its annual military budget to the Peaceforce fund.

B) Each year the 10 top arms exporting states will be levied a peace-added tax (PAT) on their gross sales of weapons that year.

C) NGO's, PVO's, donor agencies, and governments agree to a 5% PAT, where 5 cents of each dollar spent for humanitarian aid, relief, or development in settings of protracted armed conflict is sent to the fund.

D) Major religious organizations would create an interreligious Council responsible for establishing an endowment necessary for funding the training centers.

E) Under a campaign titled “Peace Makes Better Business,” transnational corporations will be asked to contribute 1% of their annual profit to the fund.

Conclusion

My argument is, in the end, quite simple. There is enormous need for pacifism in the Post Cold War Era. There is a clear theological and religious or spiritual basis for moving toward, being present with, and promoting alternatives to militarization and violence in contemporary conflict. There is a need to be faithful, creative, and practical. It is incumbent upon us to articulate the vision and pursue it with such pragmatic passion that it makes overwhelming sense to the rest of the world.

ENDNOTES


2 The Peace Research Dept., Uppsala University, Sweden, has used this working definition. See K. Lingred, P. Wallenstein, and K. A. Nordquist, “Major Armed Conflicts in 1980,” in SIPRI Yearbook 1990.

3 I have written a more complete discussion of this analysis as a chapter in my book, Transformation of Protracted Conflicts (London: Macmillan/Ed. Kumar Ruppesinghe, forthcoming). A specific case study outlining the strategy appears in the paper presented at the
Conflict and “Peaceforce” Proposals

By Susan Brooks Thistletwaite

I would like to clearly affirm that the call for a Peaceforce in John Paul Lederach’s article — for “the development of a framework for sustainable transformation that builds across the population and in many instances from the bottom-up or the middle-out” — is congruent with several principles of the United Church, as another example of Christian insight, reinforced in its statement about “Just Peace” [see the Marks or Principles below], especially principles 4 and 10 (though several others are also implied). Principle 4, e.g., states that “Nonviolent conflict is a normal and healthy reflection of diversity; working through conflict constructively should lead to growth of both individuals and nations.” Violent conflict, while it can have the appearance of great movement, is often most accurately described as a kind of freezing or hardening of positions, a hardening that exacerbates when violence on all sides leads to an increase of fear, animosity and threat.

Transformation, then, is the “working through” that “Just Peace” advocates, the work of movement and change. Principle 10 of this “Just Peace” states “Unexpected initiatives of friendship and reconciliation can transform interpersonal and international relationships, and are essential to restoring community.” The proposal for sustainability is a genuine contribution, since even peace advocates, when confronted with the atrocities of war in the former Yugoslavia, the starvation in Somalia, or the invasion of Kuwait, sometimes stop pointing out how this immediate violent conflict is the product of many policy failures and missed opportunities for negotiation in the past. This is when the appeal to military force becomes the most tempting, since it appears to be a direct answer to the complications of the present.

*Prof., Chicago Theological Seminary, from presentation given for the Perspectives on Pacifism Workshop, at the U.S. Institute of Peace, 20 July 1993. We are thankful to the USIP (Kay Heckler, Sales & Marketing Manager) for kind permission to reprint this article. See Susan Brooks Thistletwaite’s relevant works such as, e.g., Sex, Race, and God: Christian Feminism in Black and White (New York: Crossroad, 1989); and co-authored with Mary Porter Engel, Lift Every Voice: Constructing Christian Theologies from the Underside (New York: Harper & Row, 1990). Ed. Note.

There is a tremendous need, as the paper points out, for “an infrastructure for peace within a setting, the promotion of citizen-based initiative as legitimate and necessary at various levels, a long-term commitment of relationship building and a willingness to seek out and root peace activities in the cultural context of the conflict.” “Just Peace” Principle 9 is entirely in agreement: “International structures of friendship, justice and common security from violence are necessary and possible at this point in history in order to eliminate the institution of war and move toward a “Just Peace”. The common key themes here are structure, long-term commitment, and the recognition of the international character of peace making.

The Lederach proposal is fruitful precisely because it does not fall into the “militarization of peace” proposals of so many in response, for example, to the horrible violence in the former Yugoslavia. Shelly Douglas, [for instance] in her otherwise sensitive article in Sojourners in April 1993, calls for a “peace army.” Even suggestions for working through the United Nations tend to ignore the grass-roots and middle-level initiatives that Lederach so rightly emphasizes. The peaceforce proposal, plainly modeled on “Witness for Peace” and other attempts to be actively present and nonviolent in Central America, is a welcome addition to our lexicon of peacemaking.

I was therefore dismayed that even this paper, although it does note the importance of “women’s groups” along with other grassroots organizations, does not include the need to challenge the consciousness of those who would be a force for peace on the subject of the human rights abuses of women and its relation to the culture of militarism. Here, I think, “Just Peace” Principle 3 brings this out a little more clearly, indicating that it is the voices of those oppressed in the struggle for justice and peace to whom we turn to know the meaning of “Just Peace”.

The papers at the conference today are not, nor are they intended to be, a catalogue of the atrocities of war. But, and this is a very big “but” the meaning of the specific kinds of abuses of women in Bosnia-Herzegovina — namely the evidence that anywhere from 20,000 to 50,000 women, primarily, though not only Muslim, were raped publicly by Serbian soldiers to demoralize family members and opposition forces compelled to witness them, raped repeatedly and held...
in “rape camps” in order to forcibly impregnate them — is a large part of why, unless these abuses are analyzed, sustainable transformation will fail.

When the evidence of this systemic gender-based torture of women in the Balkans through rape and forced impregnation reached the international community, calls were made for a war crimes trial. On 18 December 1992, the U.N. Security Council, citing “massive, organized and systematic detention and rape,” voted unanimously to condemn “atrocities committed against women, particularly Muslim women, in Bosnia and Herzegovina.” Many were shocked to find that, even though the United Nations Security Council created a Commission of Experts in October of 1992, and later a Special Rapporteur on human rights to investigate reports of war crimes in the Balkans, including rape, that, by the terms of the Geneva Convention, while rape in war may be defined as criminal, it is not specifically a war crime.

The most promising avenue of prosecution is, in fact, the Convention Against Torture or, perhaps, the Convention Against Genocide, if the rapes and forced impregnations can be shown to be part of a plan to eliminate a group of people as part of “ethnic cleansing.” What I am trying to point out is that, in general, women are not taken to be human beings in the same way men are taken to be human beings. Thus, violations of women are not a human rights violation and so not a war crime. Instead, women are mostly held to be derivative human beings and their persons are part of the property of a community, sometimes almost identical with the land. Thus, trespass on their persons is not a human rights violation, but a violation of the boundaries of the community, a symbol system that is at least as old as the Hebrew Bible, but perhaps even older.

This hierarchy of human value is one of the oldest sources of violence and is certainly a support for “military organizational culture.” Unless and until the changed consciousness of peace activists puts this fact to the fore, transformational strategies will leave out half the human race. Imagination is our greatest ally in the peace movement. Let’s use it. Suppose that peaceforce exists and is deployed in the Balkans today. A peaceforce sensitive to these issues will know that in the Islamic spirit, sexual intercourse is a very serious act. When forced, a woman’s shame is the shame of the whole family, even the community.

Therefore, Muslim women who have been subject to these atrocities, remarkably like their Christian, Jewish, or Confucian sisters, are often strongly condemned if they speak. The thousands of Chinese, Korean, and Philippine women forced to be the so-called “Comfort Women” for the Japanese army in World War II were shamed into silence until Korea sought to use this fact against Japan only recently. What about the institutionalized concentration-camp brothels, the horribly termed “Enjoyment Duty” Jewish women were forced to perform for their Nazi captors? Was their experience named a war crime? What about Vietnam? What about the Iraqi rapes in the Gulf War? How do you transform this?

Well, you imagine that your peaceforce has learned from more than two decades of work to deal with rape and knows to properly identify it as a hate crime. You also know that a major factor in the recovery of a victim of rape is support. “Whether a victim has an intact, responsive support system of family and friends plays a major role in the recovery process.” The victim who is silenced, who is refused entry into her family and community, will most likely not recover. The interpretation of the religious community is particularly critical. Violence is always a spiritual crisis because the victim of violence can lose the ability to find trust and meaning in the world, the deepest sense of religious. To take the experience of violence and integrate it meaningfully into one’s religious life requires that religious communities and their leaders not be silent. They must name this violence against women as wrong and they must clearly place the blame with the perpetrators. They must lead the communities in accepting these women and children they were forced to bear as blameless. To do anything less is to sow the toxic seeds of future violence.

Marks or Principles of “Just Peace”, United Church of Christ, General Synod

1. The Fifteenth General Synod affirms a “Just Peace” as the presence and inter-relation of friendship, justice, and common security from violence.
2. Peace is Possible. A “Just Peace” is a basic gift of God and is the force and vision moving human history.

3. The meaning of a “Just Peace” and God’s activity in human history is understood through the Bible, Church history, and the voices of the oppressed and those in the struggle for justice and peace.

4. Nonviolent conflict is a normal and healthy reflection of diversity; working through conflict constructively should lead to growth of both individuals and nations.

5. Nonviolence is a Christian response to conflict shown to us by Jesus. We have barely begun to explore this little known process of reconciliation.

6. Violence can and must be minimized, even eliminated, in most situations. However, because evil and violence are embedded in human nature and institutions, they will remain present in some form.

7. War can and must be eliminated.

8. The State should be based upon participatory consent and should be primarily responsible for developing justice and well-being, enforcing law and minimizing violence in the process.

9. International Structures of friendship, justice, and common security from violence are necessary and possible at this point in history in order to eliminate the institution of war and move toward a “Just Peace”.

10. Unexpected Initiatives of friendship and reconciliation can transform interpersonal and international relationship, and are essential to restoring community.

ENDNOTES

1I regret to say that in the most recent United Church of Christ General Synod (July 1993), during the debate over the resolution, “In Support of Multilateral Peacemaking Actions to Resolve the Conflict in the Balkans,” that references to the United Nations Protection Force were removed and even language to promote “...a major peace-building effort by church and other agencies...” was changed.

2Such efforts began with the Shanti Sena, Hindi for “Peaceforce,” with some input previously from others like Salvador de Madariaga, with the 1960s innovations in Gandhism, Southern India, during a War Resisters’ International Conference there — later modified as Peace Brigades International (PBI) in the West (first in Toronto, Canada), or, e.g., Witness for Peace, among US religious communities active during Central American conflicts in the 1980s. Ed. Note.


Faith & the Price of Security: Israel & Judaism Entangled
By Allan Solomonow*

The one thing that can hurt us is a fight between brothers [and sisters] or, worse than that, a civil war. This is the worst danger. Every man [and woman] should say to his brother [and sister] this day that all of us will do everything we can to prevent that.1

Israel may be on the brink of the civil war that had been feared seven years earlier by the Prime Minister, the leader of the Israeli right and a former terrorist. A half a century after the conclusion of the Holocaust, how can we understand the mounting violence of Jew against Jew? Two years after an historic peace declaration between two bitter enemies, the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Government of Israel, what accounts for the continuing desperation among some Jews and Arabs?

The assassination of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin by a young Jewish ultranationalist in November 1995 is a reminder of how even the better educated, more cosmopolitan of peoples are vulnerable to the temptations of terrorism. The slaying of Rabin illustrates how effectively the pretext of “religion” can be used to subvert the ethical premises of a religion, in this case Judaism. Casting politics in the guise of transcendent religious ideas has been well-publicized in the Muslim world where “orthodox interpreters” issue edicts that recast broader ethical principles into narrower, sometimes fatal, political judgments. The West has tended to discount its own reliance on religious values as its own rationalization for war and other terrors. The Palestinian-Israeli conflict has not been a conflict of religion, but religious symbols. As the Middle East edges towards peace, those who are threatened by reconciliation have become more apprehensive. Paradoxically, those who have advocated nonviolence are an increasing target of those who are unable to cope with the disintegration of their rigidly defined political world.

Since biblical times, the Jewish people have been essentially devoid of secular power. Through two millennia of exile, Jews have been dependent upon others. The continuity of Judaism has been attributable to the commonality of Jewish teaching and its resourcefulness in responding to diverse challenges. Jewish nonviolence has been the product of both theory and practice: theory through Jewish teaching, and the realities of anti-Semitism and the Holocaust through history experience.

However daunting this sojourn has been, the continuity of the Jewish people reflects an inherent uncomfortableness with the use of [violent] force as a means of solving conflict or providing security — Thus, “Not by strength nor by might but by my spirit, says the Lord.”

Pikuah nefesh, the sanctity of life, is central to Judaism while the use of force is understood to be a last resort and then used only in amounts proportional to the need.

With the creation of the State of Israel, the Jewish people began an experiment to try to reconcile the binding principles of historic Judaism with the inescapable power of a modern nation state. That interplay is evident in the Israeli approach to the peace process but it will continue to confront Israel for many years after full and final peace comes.

Early advocates of Arab-Israeli peace were “a voice crying in the wilderness” when they called for dialogue with the PLO, a halt to the Israeli settlements in the occupied territories, a return of Palestinian land, and the right of Palestinians to a state of their own. At the time, these principles were dismissed as unattainable.

Acting out of their prophetic Jewish commitment, many Jews worked to create Palestinian-Jewish dialogue. Those efforts were greeted with intense skepticism by Jewish leaders who dismissed the activists as traitors. In effect, defining “who is a Jew?” became a political issue. Jews who were previously embraced by the Jewish community for their commitment to peace and justice were defined out of Judaism for

---

applying those same principles to the Middle East.

It was not until Israel's invasion of Lebanon in 1982 that large Israeli protests began to make it possible for American Jews to be willing to publicly express their disagreement with Israeli policies. The right has generally been given a forum because they professed a commitment to "Israel security," while the left has been regarded as willing to compromise that security. This imbalance to the right has distorted Israel's ability to reconcile peace and security.

Following Israel's creation little was heard from those on the right who argued for a God-given "greater land of Israel." This changed dramatically following Israel's occupation of the West Bank and Gaza in 1967 and the ensuing Jewish settlement of the land. Israel's two Chief Rabbis divided over the principle of whether it was proper to give up land for peace. Now some Israeli rabbis are instructing their followers to refuse the carrying out of military orders that would return "Jewish" land to the Palestinian people.

Historically Jewish "terrorism" against Palestinians and their supporters has been excused as "self-defense." That rationale started to come into question with the Hebron Massacre in 1994. Dr. Baruch Goldstein, an ultranationalist settler, killed 27 Palestinians praying in the Ibrahimi Mosque. While condemned by the Israeli government, Goldstein is enshrined as a martyr of the Jewish Right. There was an even greater outpouring of support for Yigal Amir following his assassination of Yitzhak Rabin.

This act is not an aberration. For years the settlers in many West Bank settlements and downtown Hebron have taught their children that proper interpretation of the Torah defines Prime Minister Rabin's actions as traitorous and that it is a mitzvah (a good deed) for a Jew to kill an Arab. As Leah Rabin observed, "What happened wasn't a bolt of lightening from the heavens. It grew from the soil, a very particular soil."

On the threshold of an historic peace, the Israeli Government is increasingly embracing the principles of earlier prophets. Fearful that their assumptions are no longer relevant, the Jewish Right, once insistent on the impropriety of any criticism of the Israeli government, now contends that the less-conservative leaders of the Israeli government are traitors.

How can we engage a solution? Any movement, however halting, towards Israeli-Palestinian rapprochement, must begin by undoing the psychological bonds that have been internalized by Israelis and Palestinians. These bonds go deeply and consequently peace cannot be reached without a catharsis out of which the past and its deeply-rooted images come to be viewed in a broader context. This is not merely a problem of contending with the right.

While the Israeli right is the focus of the current debate now unsettling Jews, it was successive governments of the Labor Party that laid the groundwork for the Right by placing its own immediate political interests ahead of opportunities for nonviolent change.

Each settlement, each house demolition, each denigrating reference to Arabs has added to the intolerance that has permitted the emergence of Jewish assassins. Each failure to restrain settlers, each short prison sentence given for the cold-blooded murder of Arabs has helped to embolden the settlers by tacitly condoning their actions.

Even Israel's popular Peace Now movement, has felt constrained from criticizing the Israeli government, preferring to utilize its new insider status to influence votes at the cabinet level. This has left Israel with no counterlever to the Right on the streets. No wonder the Right has more opportunity to appeal to the still intense Jewish insecurity. The voice for peace has not been as assertive as those with apocalyptic visions.

The Israeli government's acquiescence to religious symbols has made it all the harder to end policies that are neither fundamentally Jewish nor consistent with Jewish historical tradition. "Security" has been transformed into a religious code-word: for most orthodox, if you do not advocate security you are not truly orthodox.

In order to secure the peace process, the Israeli Government must repudiate many of the policies it initiated. How could Prime Minister, the dovish Shimon Peres, have persuaded shell-shocked Israelis that "security" in the '90s must mean something radically different than it meant in the '60s?

One might think that since Oslo, the principles for full and lasting justice and peace in the Middle East would become a topic of
major concern in the United States; yet the response has been deafening silence. Only 31% of American Orthodox Jews back the peace process (less than half of the feelings of mainstream Jews). And a Jewish peace rally in Madison Square Garden had to drop references to the “peace process” to show “united” support. There is scant public discourse on the status of Jerusalem, the future of the hundreds of thousands of refugees, new roads and settlements, or the building of a Palestinian state. This absence of active dialogue on how to shape peace lays the seeds of further terrorism:

... Peace killed Yitzhak Rabin. And silence. We know about the Jews of the hard right. Unable to stand the thought that the war might be over and that territorial compromise usually accompanies peace, they called Rabin “traitor”. Words have consequences, and now they are backpedaling, furiously, to escape the vapor trail of their heated rhetoric. The stain is indelible, and it won’t wash .... Something has gone radically wrong in Jewish life, and it is the divorce of ethics from notions about what constitutes our identity as Jews.2

Israel’s dilemma reveals how vulnerable a faith commitment infused with the spirit of nonviolence is to the pressing desire for the illusion of “security”. The Jewish people, or any other, can be deterred when fear forces a redefinition of our ethical commitment to provide the illusion of short-term escape from perceived threat.

One wonders in retrospect how we would have wanted Germans to act while Hitler ascended to power. Could Gentile — and Jew — have spoken out more effectively, perhaps placing their jobs and lives in jeopardy through protest and defiance? Would nonviolent resistance to mass resettlement in concentration camps have slowed the Nazi juggernaut? What has the Holocaust taught us? Had a Palestinian State been formed in 1948 and the Jewish people found themselves in refugee camps, would they have responded any differently than the Palestinians did?

The Middle East experience of the nonviolent community underscores some lessons for those who find their faith challenged. The role of being a prophetic witness is an integral part of faith commitment and it requires infinite patience. This more than anything is the hardest for the lonely advocates of nonviolence. The Christian Peacemaker Teams in the West Bank under Mennonite and Brethren sponsorship is just one example of a creative nonviolent witness.3

There are also two critical challenges in hearing — and in listening. Our technology has made the nuances of our flow of words into a treacherous river: security, democracy, terrorism, peace. We need to find a way to navigate amongst meanings without getting trapped by words. But it is also hard to listen deeply and remain in dialogue with those who see themselves as our enemies. Those who advocate nonviolence must learn to listen deeply and to remain in dialogue with those who see themselves as our “enemies”.

The groundwork for Middle East peace has been lain by the many who insisted on questioning authority and doing what others were certain was impossible.
ENDNOTES

1 Former Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir (17 Jan. 1989), when ultranationalist Jewish settlers confronted Israeli soldiers at Yakir, a West Bank settlement near Nablus. (Given population dynamics and dogmatism which motivated Yitzhak Rabin to prompt Israel toward peace, one could hypothesize that Israeli civil war will be more likely the more that the country shifts further right, as in the 1996 election. Ed. Note.)


3 (The Christian Peacemaker Teams in Hebron have been active, among other things, in breaking open the front doors of the University of Hebron — long shut with steel-reinforced concrete. Ed. Note.)
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Awaiting the Next Bend: A Chronical of War Tax Refusal

By William Ramsey*

... In everything that bends gracefully there must be an effort at stiffness. Bows are beautiful when they bend only because they try to remain rigid .... Rigidity yielding a little, like justice swayed by mercy, is the whole beauty of the earth .... Do not try to bend, any more than trees try to bend. Try to grow straight, and life will bend you.¹

As I swam with my family and friends last weekend (mid-August 1994) in a river named for St. Francis, I watched the trees bend in the breeze. The day before war taxes² were taken from my paycheck for the first time in twenty years. I felt the river’s current run past me and knew my determination to stop the rush to kill ran deeper than the IRS’s newly-found ability to dip into my paycheck.

In 1992 when the judge sentenced me for unlawful leafletting on Tax Day, placing me on a federal probation with a special condition requiring me to pay my war taxes, he reprimanded me, saying that St. Paul had urged the Christians to obey civil laws. I reminded him that St. Paul had done some of his best writing from jail. The matter ended there. But the judge’s comment was evidence that he understood the source of my war tax refusal.

Getting Started: A Sacred Spark .... A Divine Trust

I had begun my war tax refusal twenty years earlier inspired by members of the Durham (NC) Friends Meeting. I was studying theology, but it was among those Friends that I first heard the phrase,

---

¹Coordinator of the St. Louis Area Program of the American Friends Service Committee. His articles on press coverage of Iraq, Hiroshima, and Central America, have appeared in the St. Louis Journalism Review. His commentaries on U.S. foreign and military policy have been published by *Southern Exposure*, the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, and the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*. Accounts of his war tax refusal have appeared in *Peacework*, *Sojourners*, *Quaker Life*, *Riverfront Times*, *The Catholic Worker*, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, and the *St. Louis Journalism Review*. Portions of the *Peacework* and *Quaker Life* accounts were revised and included in this article. Ed. Note.
“that of God in every person.” As the air war escalated over Indochina, we began to consider our response to that of God in the people who were dying under U.S. bombs and to the pilots who were ordered to drop the deadly ordinance. Paying for these raids became impossible. I became a war tax resister.

My decision was sustained year after year rooted in further reflection on that simple phrase. Jesus called on his followers to lay down their swords. But beyond that call, the heart of the Christian faith is the belief that God can make all things anew. No person or situation stands outside the love of God and the possibility of change. Residing in each of us is a sacred spark that ignites and invites change.

A decade later I found myself in the inner-city of St. Louis living among Catholic Workers. I have always placed my resisted taxes in an alternative fund which makes grants to community groups. My determination to redirect my taxes to the needs of people was strengthened not only by the human conditions around me, but by my companions. Their willingness to place the reign of God first in their lives, trusting that all else would be provided, emboldened my own will.

I began to treat my resources as a divine trust. To allow any of them to be used to kill another seemed a violation of that trust. I refused to file publicly and divested holdings that could be seized. This tentative step toward placing God's reign first brought a new sense of freedom. I was not in charge of the results — only called to be faithful and to trust.

Jailed among the Genteel and Generous

In 1992 after a decade of further resistance, I was on probation and under a court order to pay the taxes. But I discovered that my trust was not misplaced. Scores of people came forward to pay for a legal appeal and organize a People’s Tribunal. They charged that it was the U.S. government that should be placed on probation for its violations of international law in Nicaragua, Panama, and Iraq. Their “indictment” was published as an op-ed in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Conditions of probation for the government were presented to the U.S. Attorney on 15 April 1993, as I delivered word to the probation office that I would not comply with the court order.

In July the judge sentenced me to 30 days for refusing his order to pay the taxes. He probably hoped that my experience in jail would cause a change of heart. It did. My heartfelt commitment to “that of God in every person” was deepened by those I found in jail.

I shared a cell-block with young men off the streets of East St. Louis. Boasts of exploits ... drugs, sex, and guns ... filled the cell. And yet, as I listened to their more quiet moments — gentle talk of grandmothers, aunts, cousins, friends in the “hood” — I heard a longing for relationships that convinced me the spark was alive among them.

One night in our overcrowded cell-block, filled with hungry people, many experiencing withdrawals from drugs, alcohol, and nicotine, I witnessed a generosity that surpassed my understanding. After negotiations with prisoners in an adjacent cell block, a deal was struck. Stamped envelopes were traded for oatmeal cookies. I was taken in by what followed. In the midst of hunger and withdrawal, pressed against one another in this small cell, they carefully distributed the cookies according to the deal. Some of us did not have envelopes to trade.

As I sat marveling at their civility, a man offered me cookies. I looked around. The cookies were being shared with all. The terms of the deal were set aside. Our common hunger and scarcity transfigured by an uncommon generosity. I thought of how food was shared and multiplied among the companions of Jesus, and wondered about the presence of God in that cell-block. When I came out of jail four weeks later I faced another court order to pay war taxes under the threat of an even longer sentence. As I considered how to respond, it was the young men in my cell block — their gentle moments and their generosity which convinced me that despite desperate circumstances God will provide. Just as the waters of the St. Francis River lifted me up and allowed me to swim, I was kept afloat in the face of this renewed threat of imprisonment by those around me both on the inside and outside of jail.

An “Un timely Activist” and Support From Unexpected Places

Doubts about the effectiveness of my resistance and jail time found their way into my considerations. When the judge sentenced me
the first time he said, "The world has passed you by." I was an untimely activist. The judge assured me that the cold war was over and the U.S. military was in the midst of a build-down. The Pentagon was now a humanitarian organization, providing food to the world's hungry and relief to flood victims.

I was tempted to simply dismiss the judge's comments as the product of a self-delusion. Time had not passed me by. I believe that one of the values of my resistance in the early '90s, was in fact, its timeliness. It offered a wake-up call just as the public was dozing off in the delusions fashioned by a military industrial complex that has no intention of fundamental change.

After 20 years of allowing my resistance to go forward, the IRS may have chosen to jail me thinking that a sleepy-eyed public ready to give the U.S. military another chance would hardly notice the jailing of a pacifist. Perhaps they hoped the lack of public support would cause me to waver and doubt the effectiveness of it all.

Instead we were blessed with dozens of signals from unexpected places that my jailing has caused people to open their eyes a little wider to the true function of the U.S. military power. Strangers stop me to thank me for taking a stand. Conservative relatives talked about their reassessments of U.S. military actions. Children and young people in classrooms pondered as they took in my story.

Suburban St. Louisans, untouched by the normal course of our peace work, sought me out for further clarity. Store clerks asked if I was the one who went to jail and offered support. Bureau of Prison investigators, U.S. probation officers, and jailers digressed from the business at hand to explore issues of law and conscience. My jailing seemed to speak a note of caution for those who tend to come in and out of peace and justice. It was fall 1993 and many of us were tempted by the softer tones of the Clinton administration. For some my two decades of resistance underlined that 20 years of elections and promises of reductions in military spending have come and gone, but the end products remain the same—a perpetual theft from poor people and the repeated resort to violence abroad.

Then there were expressions of solidarity from those living and working in low-income neighborhoods. The perpetual theft is not lost on them. They spoke of renewed interest in challenging the costs of the arms race and an expanded trust that the peace movement is a part of their struggle. "You put your money where your mouth is."

My job provides opportunities to talk with international visitors .... Nicaraguans, Haitians, Palestinians. Initially most are surprised that there are U.S. citizens who refuse to pay for U.S. efforts to dominate the lives of others. But then a delight and camaraderie replace the surprise when they realize it's for real and it has history and will not be easily frustrated.

Tested Again and Again

Feasting on all this unexpected support, and encouraged by the determination of those around me, I decided not to let the doubts get the best of me. We would challenge the court order again. I paid my taxes on 15 April 1994 to seven organizations — health clinics, flood recovery, Native American sovereignty, refugee resettlement, peace conversion in Panama, inner-city job training, and low-income housing. People from each project wrote the judge to let him know I had paid my taxes.

More than twenty-five people participated in the preparation of a defense based on international law. Research was pursued, briefs written, motions prepared, and testimony planned. We discovered seven violations of international law by the U.S. military in 1993. In a letter to the judge I claimed that giving my taxes to the seven organizations was the only way I could lawfully meet his order, given my responsibilities under the Nuremberg Principle of individual responsibility for state war crimes.

From April to August of 1994 we waited with no response. Finally it came. The judge and the probation office had wanted to revoke my probation and send me back to jail, but the U.S. Attorney's office had decided not to take my case to court. My probation and its tax condition were withdrawn. Those responsible for the defense celebrated and this chapter of my story closed.

In January of 1995 two IRS Special Agents from the Criminal Division knocked on my door and informed me I was the subject of a
criminal investigation for five years of refusal to pay federal taxes. Had
the IRS begun a criminal investigation when they were unable to jail me
under the special condition of probation?

We decided to try to convince the IRS that this course of action
would only encourage others. A pledge form was devised. New war tax
refusers signed on. As we were receiving the first pledges, I was informed
that the criminal division had decide to close the criminal investigation,
but reserved the right to open it at any time. Another chapter closed?

In July the IRS ordered my employer to disregard my withhold
certificate (W-4 Form) and to begin withholding from my salary. I had
filed a W-4 Form that claimed the children around the world were
dependent on me not to pay war taxes. For 19 years my employer had
not withheld federal taxes. Each tax day I was able to make a decision
about my taxes, unhindered by taxes withheld in advance.

How do I respond to this new effort to force me to pay war
taxes? I have requested that my employer not turn over the withheld
taxes to the IRS, but instead set them aside in a fund to be used for
special projects. There is some legal precedent supporting the right of a
pacifist organization to refuse to forward war taxes to the IRS on the
basis of freedom of religion.

It's too early to expect a response, but my hope is that the Board
of the American Friends Service Committee will exercise the courage of
its convictions and uphold my right not to pay for killing. If they do, it
could assist others who are faced with the same dilemma. If they don't,
I will have to seek (as many other war tax refusers have done) alternative
ways to support my family that don't involve a full-time salaried position.

Collaborators: Lifted and Carried

There is a historical reality that many of us struggling for a more
peaceful and just society in the U.S. tend to suppress. Significant social
change and breakthroughs for peace have occurred in our country and
around the world only after periods of struggle that require personal
sacrifice. Long prison sentences, years of family separations, extended exiles,
and repeated risks of life itself are the drops of water that turn the mill of
change.

Sometimes I find myself thinking that I live in a society which
will, over time, evolve and change without many people taking
significant risks. I delude myself into thinking that our situation is
different from people around the world who daily wager their lives to
create new social realities. Somehow we are a special case.

We can't demand that other citizens set aside delusions about the
special nature of U.S. military power, if we are not willing to set aside
our illusions about the special nature of U.S. peace and justice work.
Knowing the inconvenience that my resistance has and is causing my
family, it frightens me to think about what will have to be wagered over
the long run. My mind quickly seeks the shelter of the daily sacrifices
we all make in our education and organizing work. Won't that be
enough? I hear the voices from jails around the world and of those who
have given their lives saying softly but firmly, "No, it wasn't enough for
us."

And alone I find I am unable to respond to their chorus —
paralyzed by my fear of what it will take to restrain the Pentagon and
protect people. But the final gift of my war tax refusal has been a
renewal of community. My jailing was an opportunity for new
experiments in mutual aid as people in our parish and in the war tax
resistance community took up my household chores, cared for my
children, and picked up on my work. It increased our certainty that we
can be there for each other. And that alone makes it easier to set aside
our illusions and listen to the voices who know the price of change.

As I navigate this new turn of events, I am aware that at each
previous turn, I have discovered a deeper truth and a collective resource.
I know that I am swimming in waters that run deeper and longer than I
can imagine. We are lifted and carried by a current filled with
collaborators. It may very well take us all where we would never venture
on our own. I think I see the next bend coming up. Perhaps it is the long
waited one that will fundamentally and irreversibly change the river's
course.
ENDNOTES

1 From a prose poem by Gilbert Chesterton passed from A. J. Muste to John Swomley, the latter being for many years the editor of the Fellowship of Reconciliation Magazine (and recently reprinted in Fellowship).

2 The portion of government (often income or estate) taxes which would otherwise go to funding war efforts. Cf. Mubarak Awad, Christine Jackson, and Laura Barnitz, Organizing Tax Resistance, Pamphlet No. 2 (Washington, DC: Nonviolence International, n.d.). For original sources please see Phillips Moulton, ed., Journal and Major Essays of John Woolman (New York: Oxford, 1971). Further resources for war tax refusal: More than a Paycheck — the Newsletter of the National War Tax Resistance Coordinating Committee (NWTRCC), P.O. Box 774, Monroe, ME 04951, 207-525-7774 or 800-269-7464; as well as their Practical War Tax Resistance (four part series): 1) controlling Federal Tax Withholding, 2) To File or Not To File an Income Tax Return, 3) How to Resist Collection, and 4) Self-Employment (available from NWTRCC above); War Tax Resistance: A Guide to Withholding Your Support from the Military (incl. history and individual stories) Friends or Quakers, PYM 1515 Cherry St, Philadelphia, PA 19102; as well as their Manual on Military Tax Withholding from Religious Employers (available from PYM above); and Perspectives on War Tax Opposition, Mennonite Central Committee, 215 S. 12 St, Akron, PA 17501.

Nonviolent Resistance in Tabasco, México
By Jan and David Hartsough*

A significant nonviolent movement is building in Tabasco, México. It is a movement in a struggle for the survival of the people who live near the Pemex (-México), Inc, oil installations, a struggle for justice, for democracy, and for Mother Earth. This struggle is not as well known as a sister struggle to the south and east in México, the Lacandon struggle in Chiapas, México, in part nonviolent through the participation of those like the Bishop of Chiapas, Samuel Ruiz García. Thousands of peasants and fishermen, those whose lakes, lands, and lagoons have been contaminated or destroyed by the oil installations, and other concerned citizens, have committed themselves to a long-term nonviolent campaign which they call Resistencia Civil Pacífica. The people in the Tabasco movement are committed to stand up for their democratic rights.

There have been several parts to this campaign. One part is electoral. The election for Governor of Tabasco Province in 1994 was stolen by the PRI (Partido Revolucionario Institucionalizado, the ruling party), which declared their candidate for Governor, Roberto Madrazo, the winner. Many of the people in Tabasco, who had voted for the PRD (Partido de la Revolución Democrática, the challenging party), and López Obrador for their Governor, believed, however, that their candidate had won, and refused to remain silent in the face of this fraudulent election. So they staged a sit-in at Madrazo’s inauguration, lasting for weeks, sur-

*Jan and David Hartsough co-direct Peaceworkers (c/o Global Exchange), San Francisco, CA, and have co-initiated a French, German, Mexican, and U.S. delegation of nonviolent environmental, peacemaking, and human rights groups to Tabasco. Contact: Tabasco Delegation, c/o Global Exchange, 2017 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94110 (email: globalexch@gpc.apc.org); tel. 415/255-7296; tel/fax 415/751-0302; or c/o the Movimiento Ciudadano por la Democracia, Prospenidad 31, Col. Escandon, CP 11800, Mexico City, DF, México (email: mddfl@laneta.apc.org). They hope to organize further participatory research & action delegations, to find and network with specialists who can work with local health, human rights, and environmental groups in Tabasco, and to encourage (interpositioning) teams of people who could peacefully accompany the Tabasco people during their nonviolent civil resistance campaign. Ed. Note.
rounding the government building where the governor was to be inaugurated. They remained nonviolent even in the face of much violent provocation.

Thousands then marched to Mexico City (about 1,000 kilometers, or over 600 miles) to continue their demands for free and democratic elections. Miraculously, while they were in Mexico City, a truckload with 14 boxes of original documents surfaced, proving that the PRI had spent $70 million on the election of Madrazo for Governor in Tabasco, a state of about two million people. (That was more than President Clinton spent for his Presidential Campaign in the entire United States.) This meant that the PRI spent about $250 per vote (a substantial amount for a Third World country), which was illegal under the Mexican constitution. It also raised questions about where the PRI got that money — perhaps as illegal drug money?

Next came more nonviolent resistance locally, in which hundreds of campesinos and fishermen who live near the oil installations in Tabasco blockaded access to the oil installations for weeks. They demanded that Pemex drill no more oil wells until they paid compensation to the campesinos and fishermen, whose land and livelihood has been damaged or destroyed by the oil installations. They organized twelve-hour shifts to blockade the installations around the clock. Over 100 people were arrested and imprisoned with charges which could have put each of them in prison for over 40 years. The Tabasco movement demanded that they all be released without charges and that the government seriously consider their demands, or they would resume occupying the oil wells. After more than a month in prison and hours before the deadline, all the prisoners were released without charges. The movement then gave the government a deadline to show it would meet other nonviolent demands.

On Sunday, 17 March 1996, about 30,000 people — campesinos, fishermen, and “grass roots” people of all ages — marched from all over Tabasco, to the central square in Villahermosa to show their solidarity and commitment for this struggle. To them the outcome of this struggle means life or death for their families, as well as life or death for their communities, concerning oil corporations like Pemex which affect the planet as a whole. They are prepared to research, educate, go on hunger strikes, fill the jails if necessary, and to expose the lies of their government about the gross violations of human rights and extensive environmental destruction in their communities.

SERPAJ Tabasco is developing a training program for community leaders on economic and environmental survival through nonviolence. As a branch of a part of SERPAJ (Servicio, Paz y Justicia, or Service, Peace, and Justice) - Latin America, SERPAJ Tabasco represents a continental, nonviolent peace and justice organization, which promotes:

- nonviolent training workshops to strengthen the understanding of nonviolent struggle by the people involved in this movement — for both leaders and grass roots communities in this campaign. (The PRD leadership is very committed to Resistencia Civil Pacifica.)

- action-oriented events with the local environmental and human rights groups to develop support for the campaign of civil resistance, e.g.: to persuade Pemex to clean up its act, reimburse peasants for the destruction of their lands and livelihood, and to commit itself to working in an environmentally-conscious way to save the earth, while respecting the human rights of people and the planet.

- support for the development of an alternative, less violent economy, through, e.g., cooperative food stores, so that the campesinos need not depend on or support the dominant, corrupt power structure.

END NOTES

1 Similar nonviolent resistance (or violent uprisings) may characterize change in Latin American states like Haiti and the Dominican Republic if current electoral and anti-democratic trends continue. Likewise nonviolent concerns for the environment and opposed to oil corporation actions like those of Shell Oil have led in Africa to the Ogoni movement, led by Ken Saro Wiwa, Sr. (executed by the military leadership) and his son (by the same name [jr.]), and similar movements in the Middle East. Cf. SIPAZ Report, International Service for Peace, Box 2415, Santa Cruz, CA 95063, for ongoing updates; forlatam@igs.apc.org. See also the Nobel Peace Laureate speech selection by Adolfo Pérez Esquivel, a co-founder of SERPAJ, further on in this journal issue.
The Nonviolent Hawai'ian Struggle for Self-Determination
By Ramon López-Reyes*

Introduction

Gandhi began his experiments with nonviolent peacemaking in South Africa in 1906. Thirteen years earlier in 1893 a different experiment was taking place in Hawai'i. On 16 January 1893 the United States invaded Hawai'i, and on the following day, a group of non-indigenous settlers, mostly United States citizens, overthrew the Hawai'ian nation that had been recognized by the United States as an independent State since 1842. The United States' minister in Hawai'i immediately recognized the new government and raised the flag of the United States of America over the Hawai'ian seat of government.

The Hawai'ian Nation did not defend itself with armed violence. This article initially reviews why Queen Lili'uokalani did not defend her kingdom [with violence, but with nonviolence]. Subsequently, this paper examines the nonviolent Hawai'ian struggle for self-determination which suggests a viable case study to assess the role of nonviolence in peacemaking.

The Hawai'ian Queen's Act of Nonviolence

Given the reality of an invasion in support of local insurgents, Queen Lili'uokalani yielded her authority to the United States:

*PhD. Vietnam veteran for 3 years. Participated in the Interfaith Pilgrimage for Peace and Life, beginning in Auschwitz, Poland (10 Dec. 1994) and heading into Hiroshima, Japan, on 2 August 1995. He noted in a letter to the editor that "... What was very meaningful for me was the opportunity to conduct a spiritual ceremony at a large Vietnamese Military Cemetery for the purpose of 'purifying' the battlefields ...." States like Israel and U.S. states like Hawai'i may have among the world's highest per capita and per area-square density numbers of nuclear or omnimical weapons in-storage and in-transit (apart, of course, from ICBM, etc., nuclear weapon concentrations stationed during the Cold War in U.S. states like Louisiana and North Dakota). Hawai'i and Puerto Rico share a U.S.-led history of nonviolence and militarization. Ed. Note.
... I yield to the superior forces of the United States of America .... Now, to avoid any collision of armed forces and perhaps the loss of life, I do under this protest, and impelled by said force, yield my authority until such time as the Government of the United States shall, upon the facts being presented to it, undo the action of its representatives and reinstate me in the authority which I claim as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.

It can be argued that it would have been a foolish thing for Queen Lili'uokalani to have acted otherwise in view of the superior armed force that had invaded her kingdom in support of the insurgents. But she also did not resort to arms because she believed in the justice of the United States, and because of her spiritual beliefs regarding the value of life. Rather than oppose or yield to the insurgents, Queen Lili'uokalani yielded to the United States. This protest to the Government of the United States contains two essential components. First, a commitment to nonviolence and second, a reliance on international law to resolve conflict between states.

The Queen's Commitment to Nonviolence

In her autobiography, Queen Lili'uokalani wrote that she "... cautioned the leaders of my people to avoid riot or resistance and to await tranquilly, as I was doing, the result of my appeal to the power [United States] to whom alone I had yielded my authority ...." Remarkably, her people heeded her instructions, although she noted: "... Many times have I heard that the Hawaiians would no longer submit to their oppressors, that they were about to appeal to fire and the sword; but I have always dissuaded them from commencing any such measures ...."

In 1895, some followers decided to take arms but without the Queen's directive to do so. The rebellion never was executed although a few were wounded. The Queen was brought to trial as were the conspirators. Officials of the new government demanded that the Queen abdicate and relinquish her authority to rule, or they threatened to execute six prominent Native Hawaiians who were implicated in inciting rebellion. Rather than have the blood of her subjects shed, she signed the papers of abdication placed before her.

Beside being astute to yield to the United States and not to the insurgents, the Queen was sincerely committed to nonviolence. This commitment was based on the love of her people. She believed that the greatest sin of the ali'i or nobility was to do wrong to the people. In addition, religious convictions played a prominent role in her life. She knew Christian and Hawaiian spirituality well. The indigenous "goodness of nature" performed a key role in her spiritual understanding. This goodness of nature and Oneness of God (humanity and nature), were the foundations for her practice of nonviolence. She was a sensitive person and music composer who was loved by her subjects, and in turn, she harbored great love for them. She also was a very educated person but perhaps sheltered, and therefore, some might conclude, naive to believe in the "truth" of nonviolence and in the justice of the United States.

The Queen's commitment to nonviolence may also be traced to Hawaiian traditions. As queen, Queen Lili'uokalani represented the highest Hawaiian nobility, that is, she was the highest class of ali'i. High ali'i were considered to be pu'uhonous or places of refuge. A particular place, usually considered sacred, was also considered a pu'uhonua. If a person sought refuge at a pu'uhonua (whether a high ali'i or sacred place), the pursuer could not spill the blood of the pursued. The practice of pu'uhonua existed until 1819, when King Kamehameha I, the first Hawaiian King that ruled over all the Hawaiian islands, died. But seventy-four years later, when Queen Lili'uokalani was overthrown, this practice had long been set aside. Nonetheless, the Queen still personified the highest ali'i, and as such, acted as a pu'uhonua when her people ('ohana) turned to her for refuge. In 1893, the Queen sought to prevent the spilling of blood.

The history of Hawaiian society is fraught with the use of violence. King Kamehameha I launched total war in order to conquer the Hawaiian islands. But after doing this, he instituted a policy of peace which continued unbroken until Queen Lili'uokalani's reign. Notwithstanding an intense commitment to his war god and widespread use of violence and treachery, King Kamehameha enacted the famous decree, Ka Mamala Hoe Kanawai which meant: "Let the old men, the
old women, and the children sleep in peace by the wayside ...."9 This law was pronounced during a heated period of war and saved, on its announcement, the lives of many captives. This decree, however, was rooted in a much older edict, Kanawai, related to the war god. A high chief had the power to say whether the captives lived or died. If he decided that they would live, "... then the defeated side was saved. No one could be killed, no one beaten, not a drop of blood could be shed after the sacred decree has been pronounced ...."10

It is believed that major violence among the chiefs in Hawai‘i occurred after the last migration from Tahiti (between 11th and 13th centuries). This migration brought with it an intense dedication to Kuk‘ilimoku, the war god.11 But the search for the source of Hawaiian nonviolence goes even further back to the edict Kai‘okia which was a "... pledge that the god [Kanemuki] would not again destroy the living things on earth and other breathing things that lived in space ...." This edict related to the separation of the waters from the land, and the pledge that water would not again rise over the land.12

The practice of pu‘uhonua and the edicts to prevent the spilling of blood relates to the central Hawaiian value of pono or right order. Accordingly, Hawaiians developed a practice of ho‘oponopono (to set or make right) in order to maintain harmony in the family.13 This practice can still be found among Native Hawaiians. Ho‘oponopono involves expression of pain, forgiveness, and release of anger, and of utmost importance, the righting of injustice by restitution.14 Queen Lili‘uokalani in 1893 sought to engage in ho‘oponopono with the United States. In short, the Queen as both a devout Christian committed to the Christian principle of love, and as an admirer of United States justice and respectful of United States armed strength, at the same time, was Hawaiian, and could find in her native tradition the source for a nonviolent response to a violent act.

The Queen’s Commitment to International Law

As an educated person who admired the United States, it is most likely that she was acquainted with the Constitution of the United States. Article 1, Section 8, Clause 10 of the Constitution gives Congress the power “to define and punish ... offenses against the law of nations.” Article VI, Clause 2 announces that "... all treaties made or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding ...."15

The United States had put into effect numerous treaties with Hawai‘i.16 Respect for treaties, pacta sunt servanda (i.e., treaties must be observed) is fundamental in customary international law:

... States or other international persons are bound by treaties which have been regularly concluded and have entered into force, and they must be carried out in good faith .... If that rule [pacta sunt servanda] were to be abandoned, the whole superstructure of contemporary international law would collapse, with results for the international community that must be obvious .... It is in fact probably the oldest customary rule and that which is most frequently affirmed ....17

The Queen adhered to pacta sunt servanda and thought that the United States had a similar commitment to its treaties with Hawai‘i. Why shed blood when international law would make things right? Historically, Hawaiians had cause to believe in the justice of the international system. In February 1843, Lord Paulet forced the Hawaiian monarch to cede the Hawaiian Islands to Great Britain.18 The policy of the British Government, however, was to “... strengthen those authorities [native governments] and to give them a sense of their own independence ....”19 The British Government disavowed the seizure of the islands, and in July 1843, Admiral Thomas restored the Hawaiian State.

The Queen was “certain” that the United States Government would act in 1893 no differently than Great Britain did in 1843. Moreover, fifty years had passed and Hawai‘i had entered into treaties with numerous states. Hawai‘i was a full-fledged recognized member of the international community. The United States would surely honor pacta sunt servanda. Did not the President of the United States, twelve years earlier, cordially receive the former Hawaiian monarch? Her initial optimism, however, was misplaced. The Republican
Administration favored annexation and had it continued, it is likely that Hawai'i would have been annexed in 1893. But President Cleveland, elected in 1892, entered the Presidency in March 1893 and withdrew the draft annexation treaty that President Harrison had submitted to the Senate in February 1893. President Cleveland sent Representative James Blount to investigate circumstances in Hawai'i. Blount delivered his report to the President recommending that the Hawaiian Nation be restored. On 17 December 1893 President Cleveland addressed the Joint Houses of Congress, and made reference to the invasion of the Hawaiian Nation and to an “act of war” committed by representatives of the United States. He called upon Congress to correct the wrong.

Clearly, Lili’uokalani must have relished that moment. Nonviolence and justice had triumphed. But not so. The apology was there, but the annexation party was still strong in Congress. Congress commissioned Senator Morgan, an “annexationist,” to investigate the situation in Hawai'i. Morgan’s report painted a different picture; he claimed that the Queen was the blame for the revolution. Congress refused to act on President Cleveland’s appeal. Meanwhile, the newly formed Republic of Hawai'i rejected the President’s “communication” to restore the Queen to the seat of government and waited for a Republican Administration to recapture the Presidency (which it did in 1897, and Hawai'i was annexed in 1898).

On the eve of annexation, Queen Lili’uokalani filed her protest. She reminded the Congress that she had yielded her authority to avoid bloodshed and that:

... the treaty [of annexation] ignores not only all professions of perpetual amity and good faith made by the United States in former treaties with the sovereigns representing the Hawaiian people, but all treaties made by those sovereigns with other and friendly powers, and it is thereby in violation of international law.

The initial elections held in the Hawai'i Territory after annexation brought victory to the Home Rule Party composed mostly of indigenous Hawai’ians. The Party was loyal to Queen Lili’uokalani and sought to forge a Hawaiian “state” within the Territory. This political control evaporated by 1910. The Republican Party successfully attracted politically viable indigenous Hawai’ians and thereby, split the Native Hawaiian vote. Moreover, the continuing weakening of indigenous Hawai’ians through Western communicable diseases further diluted their political power. By the time Queen Lili’uokalani died in 1917, there existed little hope that the United States would again recognize Hawaiian sovereignty. Thereafter, there was little visible activity regarding Hawaiian sovereignty. Nonetheless, Queen Lili’uokalani's call for nonviolence and adherence to international law remained the legacy of the nascent Hawaiian Sovereignty Movement. Since this nonviolent struggle has persisted since 1893, it is safe to conclude that it is one of the longest nonviolent political struggles in contemporary history.

The United Nations Law of Self-Determination and Hawaiian Sovereignty

In 1946 the United Nations, in a manner of speaking, heard the Queen’s call. It passed General Assembly Resolution 66 (I) which placed the Territory of Hawai'i on the United Nations' List of Non-Self-Governing Territories. The United States assumed responsibility under Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter to prepare Hawai'i for self-government to include independence. Once again, the United States had to address Hawai'i in terms of international law, particularly the United Nations Law of Self-Determination. Where the United States failed in 1893, it had, in 1946, opportunity to correct the former breach of international law, if the United States Government were so inclined.

General Assembly Resolution 742 (VIII), which was passed on 27 November 1953, provided factors to assist Administering States to determine whether their non-self-governing territories had attained a full measure of self-government. The Administering State when “... taking into account the right of self-determination of peoples, ...” was admonished to consider that becoming “... full self-governing is primarily through the attainment of independence ....” Resolution 742 (VIII) also proposed that the opinion of the population, as to the status or change in status that they desire, be arrived at through an “informed” process.
During the period between 1946 and 1959, the United States exhibited no interest regarding independence for the Hawai'i Non-Self-Governing Territory. Accordingly, in the plebiscite of 1959 which would determine Hawai'i's form of self-government, the only option put before the people was "statehood" within the Federal Union of the United States of America. This idea of incorporating Hawai'i into the metropolitan United States dates back to 1854. The main objective drawing the United States to Hawai'i was its potential as a military base with which to project United States' imperial interests in the Pacific Region.

The debates which did take place in the United States regarding Hawai'i "statehood" did not focus on the obligations and "sacred trust" of Chapter XI and guidelines of United Nations' General Assembly Resolution 742, but on whether incorporation of an "alien" population would corrupt "America's special qualities." The drive behind statehood in Hawai'i came not from indigenous Hawai'ians but from settler and immigrant populations. The 1947 statehood bill which was introduced in Congress did not receive support and disappeared. Political support finally came when a compromise was made to allow Alaska to be voted into "statehood" separate from Hawai'i. In May 1958 the Alaska bill passed and Alaska became a state. By March 1959 the Hawai'i statehood bill was passed.

Statehood, however, was not yet a reality; the people of Hawai'i still had to approve the congressional action through a plebiscite which was conducted on 27 June 1959. The great majority voted for "statehood". But indigenous Hawai'ians were less supportive, for example, in the only electoral precinct that did not vote for statehood, Niihau, where the majority were indigenous Hawai'ians. Indigenous Hawai'ian opposition to statehood had surfaced earlier. In 1954, it was, for example, claimed that "... the drivers of tourist buses, mostly Hawai'ians and part Hawai'ians, were filling their passengers full of anti-statehood prejudice. The Hawai'i Statehood Commission promptly issued an informative pamphlet to combat the insidious threat ...." From all evidence, the United States did not give any importance to the fact that it had obligations under Chapter XI and Resolution 742 (VIII) to consider independence for the Hawai'i Non-Self-Governing Territory.

The failure to consider independence for Hawai'i was all the more startling given the fact that Hawai'i had once been a sovereign state that was then recognized by the United States. Placement under Chapter XI indicated that Hawai'i had a special status in international law. This status together with a prior exercise of sovereign independence made a valid case for Hawai'i's reversion to sovereignty. Resolution 742 (VIII) held that the opinion of the population of a territory, as to the status or change in status which they desired, whether independence, free association, or integration, be "freely expressed." The Administering State on obtaining this opinion would then act to implement the decision.

The essential question in 1959 was identifying the "self" (the part of the population) that had the right to self-determination and therefore, the right to "freely decide" on independence or not. Hawai'i was placed on the United Nations List of Non-Self-Governing Territories in 1946 because: (1) it was considered not to be a part of the metropolitan United States. (Hawai'i's overseas location, which set it apart from the continental United States, and its distinct Polynesian population and culture were factors for placing Hawai'i on the List of Non-Self-Governing Territories); and (2) because its native peoples were subjugated to alien domination and colonization. Thereafter, the Territory of Hawai'i came under the purpose and principles of Chapter XI of the Charter.

The United States failed its obligation under Chapter XI to keep the interests of the inhabitants paramount by not facilitating an "informed process" and by preventing them from "freely deciding" on the alternative available which included independence. The Administering State made no effort to ascertain what the colonized peoples, that is, the indigenous Hawai'ians, desired regarding their "status or change in status." The United Nations "... established the right of self-determination as a right of peoples under colonial and alien domination ... [because] ... the right of the subjected people concerned cannot be disregarded without international law being violated ...." Throughout United Nations documents, those with the right of self-determination are defined as "colonial peoples," "people under colonial
and alien domination,” and “people subject to colonial exploitation.”\(^\text{29}\) In short:

... it may now be said that there exists in international law a category of entities called “dependent peoples,” which, while not having the personality of states, nevertheless have a certain international personality with the capacity to bring international claims to maintain their rights. Thus, on being accorded recognition as peoples of a dependent territory, a group immediately acquires these rights.\(^\text{30}\)

Although already understood in 1959, the intent of the United Nations regarding Chapter XI territories was clearly defined in 1960:

... The authors of the Charter of the United Nations had in mind that Chapter XI should be applicable to territories which were then known to be of the colonial type. An obligation exists to transmit information under Article 73(e) of the Charter in respect of such territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government.\(^\text{31}\)

The right of self-determination, therefore, was not accorded to the expatriates of the United States residing in Hawai‘i, but to those subjected to “... alien subjugation, domination and exploitation ....”\(^\text{32}\) And it was primarily the indigenous Hawai‘ians who experienced the United States’ invasion in 1893 and annexation in 1898, and who in 1959 were still subject to an alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation. The expatriate population was part of the alien subjugating, dominating, and exploitative element. In fact, the expatriate population was “... the target of the condemnation, ... [i.e.,] the Western immigrant who is deemed to be non-assimilable to the ‘indigenous’ population ....”\(^\text{33}\)

Thus, when the United States held the 1959 Plebiscite, it circumvented the intent of Resolution 742 by including its expatriates among the population who possessed the right to exercise self-determination. Such inclusion was a gross violation of the international law of self-determination that considers only “... non-self-determined peoples as colonial peoples.”\(^\text{34}\)

The Hawai‘ian State has survived for 100 years under an alien rule. Since illegal occupation in international law does not of itself terminate nationhood,\(^\text{35}\) then United States’ continued occupation of Hawai‘i must be considered a permanent state of aggression against a sovereign State. For instance India reclaimed Goa from the Portuguese when it asserted its inherent sovereignty over Goa. The “Goa Doctrine” enunciates that long-termed colonial occupation represents a state of “permanent aggression.”\(^\text{36}\) The permanent state of aggression or “colonialism” has been branded a “crime” by the General Assembly.\(^\text{37}\) This permanent state of aggression is an “... evil ... to be eradicated by all possible means, including, if necessary, armed force ....”\(^\text{38}\)

The Contemporary Nonviolent Struggle for Hawai‘ian Sovereignty

Although the United States has persisted with its permanent state of aggression, the Hawai‘ian people have continued to employ nonviolent means to “defend” themselves against the United States’ “international crime of permanent aggression.” Similar to Queen Lili‘uokalani’s earlier still call upon the United States’ sense of justice, contemporary indigenous Hawai‘ians, having grown impatient with the United States, call upon the United Nations to end the crime perpetrated against the Hawai‘ian people. But regardless of United States actions, it seems certain that indigenous Hawai‘ians will remain faithful to the Queen’s commitment to nonviolence.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to review the Hawai‘ian nonviolent struggle between 1893 and 1993. But it is fair to say that her call remained implanted in the hurt and shame of the indigenous Hawai‘ians. By the 1970s, perhaps as a consequence of the opposition to the government during the war in Vietnam, a nonviolent pro-sovereignty movement took form. Occupation of land, calls for improved management of Hawai‘ian Home[s] lands, legal and legislative activism (which led to the formation of the Office of Hawai‘ian Affairs at the State of Hawai‘i level), demonstrations, and formation of independent nations all became part of the contemporary Hawai‘i pro-sovereignty movement.\(^\text{39}\)

Then in 1993, in what seems a “miraculous” occurrence, both the State of Hawai‘i and the United States Governments acknowledged
the wrong committed a century ago in 1893. The State established an Advisory Commission to recommend to the State Legislature on how indigenous Hawai’ians should proceed with sovereignty. On 23 November 1990 President Clinton signed Public Law 103-150 to “apologize” to indigenous Hawai’ians for the invasion of Hawai’i and for the suppression of their inherent sovereignty during these 100 years. The Public Law recognized a responsibility for “acts of reconciliation” on the part of the United States Government. Queen Liliʻuokalani might have been “stirring” in her grave, but perhaps with cautious enthusiasm, The 103rd United States Congress in 1994 may not have performed any better than did the 53rd Congress performed in 1894. The Queen’s legacy is direct and simple: restoration of the Hawaiian Nation. The Clinton Administration did not attend to the appeal presented a century ago, but discarded the Queen’s legacy in order to keep Hawai’i within the United States?

Now that the United States has admitted to its breach of international law, it is required by international law to act in a prescribed manner:

... the breach of any international obligation constitutes an “illegal act of international tort,” and the commission of an international tort involves the duty to make reparation ...41

At the same time, a claimant pressing for reparations must demonstrate “legal interest.” But:

... If an international tort has been committed directly against a subject of international law as, for instance by the invasion of the territory of another State, it is not necessary for the claimant to prove the infliction of actual damage. The illegal act itself — and even a mere threat of such action — constitutes a sufficient legal interest ...42

The United States’ acknowledgment of its suppression of indigenous Hawai’ians inherent sovereignty also grants recognition of the de jure sovereignty of the Hawaiian State. Moreover, the United States’ admission of invading a friendly state with which it had concluded various treaties clearly provides the Hawaiian State with a “legal interest” to pursue its claims for reparations, or more precisely stated, its claims for de facto sovereignty.

The United States’ admission of a breach of international law obligates it to provide reparation in a specific manner. In international law, the duty to make reparation means:

... obligation to re-establish, as far as possible, the state of affairs as it would probably have existed had the international tort not been committed. The function of this rule is to assist in the restoration of the legal equilibrium which as been disturbed by the commission of an international tort. Thus, in the first place, reparation takes the form of restitution in kind.43

The fundamental form of reparation of international torts (delinquencies) is found in the principle of integrum restitutio, i.e., “... the restitution of the former legal situation.” The primary form of restitution is restitutio in natura, or “... the returning of the thing to the owner, the restoration of the real right ...”44

The critical issue to address is what constitutes the “former legal situation?” Hawai’i has had two “legal situations.” First, it was a sovereign independent State prior to 1893 and second, it was non-self-governing territory between 1946 and 1959. There is reason to conclude that both “legal situations” still exist. Public Law 103-150 acknowledges that “the indigenous Hawaiian people never directly relinquished their claims to their inherent sovereignty as a people or over their national lands to the United States, either through their monarchy or through a plebiscite or referendum.” In other words, the Hawaiian Nation always maintained its de jure sovereignty.

In regards to Hawai’i’s legal status as a non-self-governing territory, General Assembly Resolution 2625 (XXV) notes:

... The territory of a colony or other Non-Self-Governing [Entity] has, under the Charter a status separate and distinct from the territory of the State administering it; and such separate and distinct status under the Charter shall exist until the people of the colony of Non-Self-Governing Territory have exercised their right of self-determination in accordance with the Charter, and particularly its purposes and principles.45

Since the United States failed to fulfill its obligation in accordance with...
the Charter and pertinent General Assembly Resolutions, the legal status of the Hawai‘i Non-Self-Governing Territory remains with a distinct status apart from the metropolitan state. The United States, as the “obligatee,” was to prepare Hawai‘i for self-government under the guidelines of the “guarantor,” the International Community or United Nations. The Hawai‘i Non-Self-Governing Territory, therefore, was and remains the “third party beneficiary.” In the event that the Administering State fails in its duties as “obligatee,” the “third party beneficiary’s” special status as non-self-governing territory continues. At this juncture, the obligation to protect the self-determination of colonial peoples reverts to the “guarantor” or United Nations itself. The United Nations is obliged to perform in the role of “Agent of Protection.”

... The creation of third party beneficiary rights necessarily creates obligations for an “obligatee” and for a guarantor or agency for the protection of the beneficiary rights. In fact the “obligatee” creates the beneficiary rights by undertaking obligations towards the beneficiary; and the relationship between these two is such that the protection of the rights of the beneficiary requires the interpolation of a guarantor.48

In the final analysis, the United Nations that created the special status of non-self-governing territories cannot abandon its ultimate responsibility as “guarantor” of this special status and also of the right of self-determination of the territories that it placed under Chapter XI.

The United Nations, the guarantor of non-self-governing territories is obligated to protect the Hawai‘i Non-Self-Governing Territory from the United States’ permanent state of aggression. Accordingly, the United Nations is called upon to re-examine its promulgation of Resolution 1469 (XIV) which removed Hawai‘i from the List of Non-Self-Governing Territories when the United States informed the United Nations that the Hawai‘i Non-Self-Governing Territory had exercised its right of self-determination.47 Although Resolution 1469 (XIV) shapes the United Nations’ view toward the Hawai‘i Territory, the invalidity of the 1959 Plebiscite and the United States’ admission of an international tort in regards to the Hawai‘i Nation constitute the basis by which the United Nations can rescind or contravene Resolution 1469 (XIV).

The facts reveal that the colonized peoples of the Hawai‘i Territory, the actual beneficiaries of Chapter XI, have not yet been given the opportunity to exercise their right to self-determination. Moreover, the official status of Resolution 1469 (XIV) should not “... suggest, however, that a group has only one chance to exercise a self-determining right, and that once having done so it is forever wedded to its choice, particularly when the legitimacy of the choice is questioned and therefore is equally unrealistic ....”48

The right to modify the status of a Non-Self-Governing Territory remains with the colonized people who were falsely denied this right. Because indigenous Hawai‘ians have not reacted violently to the injustice of the Administering State does not infer that the injustice is any less. The United States did not request United Nations participation in the 1959 Plebiscite largely because the United States was not acting in good-faith in carrying out the requirements of Chapter XI and Resolution 742 (VIII). Rather the United States acted in accordance with its own policy to integrate Hawai‘i into the metropolitan state. Notwithstanding the thirty-five years interval since 1959, the United Nations is called upon by its own law — that ascribe to it responsibility to insure that the act of self-determination is performed in context of the principles and purpose of its Charter — to review how the United States failed to meet its sacred trust towards the Hawai‘i Territory.

In short, the above analysis advances: (1) that the United States continues with its state of permanent aggression against the indigenous-colonized peoples of Hawai‘i; (2) that the United States, by failing to comply with the United Nations Law of Self-Determination, illegally incorporated Hawai‘i into the metropolitan United States in 1959 by means of an illegitimate plebiscite; and (3) that if the United States refuses to comply with international law and restore the “former legal situation,” that is, return de facto sovereignty to the Hawai‘i Nation or voluntarily re-place Hawai‘i on the List of Non-Self-Governing Territories, then the United Nations has the obligation to re-inscribe the territory of Hawai‘i on the list of non-self-governing territories so that the colonized peoples of Hawai‘i, who are the beneficiaries of Chapter XI of the United Nations Charter, will be given the rightful opportunity to exercise their self-determination.
Implications Regarding Peacemaking in the 21st Century

The case of Hawai‘i may dampen enthusiasm regarding nonviolent peacemaking. A century is long time to wait. At the same time, this case is instructive. Queen Lili‘uokalani’s adherence to nonviolence, besides reflecting a spiritual foundation, was based on the belief that a nation, such as the United States, would abide by the principles of international law. The alleged wrongs committed by representatives of a nation would be rectified by the application of international law. The Queen maintained the belief that the “reason” of law rather than the pursuit of national interests should regulate interstate relations and accordingly, provide a climate conducive for the employment of nonviolent behaviors.

Queen Lili‘uokalani’s practice of nonviolence clearly was rooted in her religious beliefs. As a religious person, she believed that a government would be morally obligated to correct a flagrant breach of international law. She closed her autobiography with the following words:

... It is for them (her native subjects) that I would give the last drop of my blood .... Will it be for vain? It is for the American people and their representatives in Congress to answer these questions. As they deal with me and my people, kindly, generously, and justly, so may the great Ruler of all nations deal with the grand and glorious nation of the United States of America.51

Her book, published in 1898, was an international plea for justice. It reflected her commitment to nonviolence and international law.

In this regard the violence wrenching the fabric of Bosnian society apart in the 1990s might have been averted if the Bosnian Serbs had believed that their case for autonomy or secession would have been accorded legal attention, if not by the Bosnian Government, then by the international community. Regrettfully, no attempt was made to bring international law into the peacemaking process. Likewise the Government of Iraq either did not trust international law, or did not relish the slow pace required for legal decision-making, or simply did not
believe that it had “right” on its side. In any case, Iraq resorted to arms to advance its national interests in Kuwait. Violent peacemaking has also erupted in several former Soviet republics. The exclusion of international law by one or both parties represents a major difficulty in inter-state relations. States are then left to the alternatives of diplomacy, arms, or surrender. For the majority of States, neither of these alternatives are truly inviting.

The United Nations Charter and General Assembly Resolutions pertaining to decolonization acknowledge the right to self-defense and the use of force to oppose colonial rule. Therefore, the recourse to arms in Bosnia is nothing new. A new option would have been a request to have international law intervene. For example, can international law replace the violent peacemaking in the Republic of Georgia? Can it prevent a future recourse to arms in Kosovo or Macedonia? But are there leaders with the courage to pursue nonviolent peacemaking in these countries? Will indigenous peoples, for example, in Guatemala, depend on arms in order to change social conditions? Why should indigenous peoples trust the Law of the United Nations? Fortunately, international law will continue to unfold in various directions. The forthcoming Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples will widen the scope of international law and perhaps even include as customary law the contents of indigenous law. For international law to be at the leading edge of peacemaking in the 21st Century, it must be respected and trusted as “just” and not partial to interests of the major powers.

In the 1990s, the 14th Dalai Lama [Tenzin Gyatso] has conveyed a strong commitment to nonviolent peacemaking which he regards appropriate not only for Tibet but also for all struggles involving self-determination. Tibetans persist with the practice of nonviolence in spite of the brutally crushed uprising of 1959. Regrettfully, “…the world pays more attention to bombings and aircraft hijackings by terrorists than to nonviolent resistance on the roof of the world…”52 If Martin Luther King’s nonviolent practice finally gained attention, perhaps the burning of Newark and other cities helped gain that attention. In New Caledonia, the United Nations “paid attention” to claims of colonial oppression after the indigenous peoples resorted to arms in the early 1980s. Shortly afterwards, the United Nations reinscribed New Caledonia (1986) on the List of Non-Self-Governing Territories.53 The Kanaki of New Caledonia resorted to arms and succeeded, or so it seems. Martin Luther King pursued and the Dalai Lama pursues practices of nonviolence, but their success seems less clear in comparison to the feats of arms that liberated Vietnam from United States intervention, and Algeria from French colonialism. Given this comparison, a case can be made for “developmental violence,” that is, “… violence which contributes to reduce the total sum of violence which is inflicted upon individuals, groups and nations.”54

But resorting to arms undermines the very process of international law. The prohibition against the threat or use of force in international relations, embodied in article 2 (4) of the United Nations Charter, has been called the “principal norm of international law of our time.”55 It is true that Article 51 of the Charter provides for the right of “self-defense.” Also, the United Nations sanctions armed interventions and General Assembly Resolutions regarding anti-colonialism endorse armed insurgency against colonial powers.56 Although there is a ring that sounds clear regarding the use of arms, there also is the reality that violent means produce violent ends. “Developmental violence” is no quick solution. But “… only when means themselves are understood to be — and designed to be — more than instrumental, to be, in fine, ‘creative’ [will it be] that the next step will be taken in the evolution of a constructive philosophy of conflict …”57 Look to the means, that is heart of nonviolent peacemaking — Whereas violent peacemaking looks primarily toward the ends.

Hawai’ian experience emphasizes the use of nonviolent means and affirms the linkage between nonviolence and the intervention of international law. As fragile as this link is, it provides humanity in the 21st Century with a hope that the linkage may replace the “time-honored” use of violent means. In the 21st Century violent means may loosen their grip on inter-state relations in that violent peacemaking keeps peoples apart even though there is a need to unite them in the global community.

Hawai’ian experience suggests that a belief in reason and communal responsibility can lead individuals if not nations to pursue nonviolent peacemaking. Therefore, it will be interesting whether the
members of the United States Congress, who voted to “apologize” to the Native Hawai‘ians for the violation of international law a century ago, will follow reason and communal responsibility. Will they comply with their Constitution, particularly Article VI (2), to remedy an acknowledged breach of international law? Will they exhibit the courage to adhere to the international law of restitution and return Hawai‘i to its “former legal situation” either by restoring de facto sovereignty to the Hawai‘i Nation, or by reinscribing Hawai‘i on the List of Non-Self-Governing Territory, so that the United Nations can monitor the indigenous Hawai‘ians’ exercise of self-determination? Correcting the wrongs committed in Hawai‘i by international law would be an example that could have wide reaching repercussions on global peacemaking in the 21st Century.

In the 21st Century tensions which empires, colonialism, and the Cold War long suppressed will be missing. Ethnic minorities and other peoples may increasingly demand self-determination in the 21st Century. Also, nation-states will continue to pursue conflicting interests. Must they turn to armed struggles? Not necessarily. Above, an attempt has been made to link nonviolence with international law as substitutes for violence and arms. Hawai‘ian experiences highlight the viability of this linkage. But the jury is still out on Hawai‘i. A century has passed, and while the heirs of the Queen maintain their dedication to nonviolent peacemaking, they still await the willingness of the United States to submit to the intervention of international law. And if the United States submits, it will reflect a commitment to amend its contradiction and perhaps, prevent the “fall” which traditionally follows the “rise” to great [violent] power — it also will affirm the connection between nonviolence and international law.
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Introduction

Amilcar Mendez, a winner of the Robert F. Kennedy Foundation Human Rights Award has said that “Without accompaniment, I would not be alive today.” With such international accompaniment, a mother of a well-known Sri Lankan journalist, prosecuted the police chief for his kidnapping and murder. Peace teams (PTs) operate in numerous countries such as Haiti, Palestine, Guatemala, Colombia, Sri Lanka, the Balkans, and the United States. Peace teams are third-party civilian organizations which seek to reduce violence and promote just resolution of conflicts.

Success fosters expansion. With the formation of the Shanti Sena in southern India in the 1940s, followed by World Brigades in the late 1950s, civilian peacekeeping has expanded steadily in the 1980s and 1990s. Currently, organizations such as Peace Brigades International, Balkans Peace Teams, and Christian Peacemaker Teams place trained civilians in violent conflicts as an active presence to lower the levels of violence.

As a new field of action and research, Nonviolence International and the Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development (COPRED) perceived an opportunity to bring together peace team veterans, the recipients of peace teams, and other interested parties to improve their work and to grapple with the consequences of a growing movement.

military peacekeeping record, PTs may develop as a serious alternative to military action. However, to date, PT efforts have been small and narrow in scope, while leaving large-scale operations to UN and militaries.

What is and isn't a peace team? As a new emerging field, participants grappled for a helpful definition. Is any action taken by an unarmed third actor a "nonviolent intervention?" Are development agencies also functioning partially as "peace teams?" When does a partial third-party join one side of the conflict?

Non-Partisan versus Advocate-Orientations

Some peace team organizations, such as the Balkans Peace Teams and Peace Brigades International (PBI), place a strong stake in non-partisanhip. Witness for Peace (WFP) and Christian Peacemaker Teams (CPT) take more of an advocacy-based approach. Because of diverse approaches, PTs have had some conflicts when working in coalitions, such as in Haiti. A spectrum of opinion on this issue repeatedly surfaced among consultation participants.

Interventive Versus Partnership Orientations

What constitutes a valid mandate for intervention? The Peace Team experience has been one primarily based on a partnership model, in which the peace teams are invited by significant actors. Elise Boulding and others promoted a partnership model of interaction, rather than an "interventionist" model. Many believe that a capacity building model serves as a guideline for acting in conflicts. Peace teams have traditionally acted to bolster those players in conflicts who are attempting to promote nonviolent resolution. A minority of participants believed that an interventionist model of engaging conflicts (including a mandate from the global governance structure) needs to be seriously considered, if peace teams are going to serve as a better alternative to armed intervention.

Armed vs Unarmed (nonviolent) Peacekeeper Orientations

Using assorted skills, knowledge, and attitudes, PTs strive to utilize moral authority in a particular conflict. Both armed and unarmed peacekeeping interventions seek to use the following moral authority:

- non-partisanship (e.g. International Red Cross Committee);
- effectiveness ... the most important of all;
- risking lives for others;
- team composition sensitivity;
- uniforms (e.g. Shanti Sena); and
- appropriate mandates.

Peace Team Use of Moral Authority

Peace Team use of Moral Authority means:

- freedom from governmental, business or UN geopolitical interests;
- use of volunteers (e.g. CPT, PBI, Shanti Sena, Witness for Peace);
- refusal to bear arms and use violence;
- use of older people (e.g. PBI restricts participants to ages over 25);
- ordinary clothes of people (e.g. Balkan Peace Team);
- modeling exemplary behavior (e.g. Shanti Sena); and
- spiritual/religious authority (e.g. CPT and Quaker Peace Teams);

The first group of characteristics are also often true of some military interventions. The latter group focuses on those characteristics which set peace teams apart.
Journalist and Peace Team Reportage

Journalists and international observers alert and inform the public about conflict situations, and attempt to remain non-partisan. They can serve a crucial function in conflict situations. Journalists collect and the media disseminate information. Third-party journalists can carry out these functions at times when the indigenous journalists are unable to collect or disseminate information. Peace teams have carried out this function on a small scale in a variety of conflicts. Witness for Peace in Nicaragua collected information to disseminate to the United States public, to governments, and to human rights organizations.

Humanitarian Relief Organizations

Many humanitarian organizations have great experience in violent crises. Besides providing immediate relief in the form of food, shelter and medical care, humanitarian organizations are invariably called upon to engage in peacemaking and peacebuilding activities. Most relief efforts involve more than dropping supplies from airplanes. Third-party humanitarian staff frequently place themselves in violent conflicts in order to carry out successful humanitarian missions. Giving food and shelter is a form of empowering local actors. Providing seeds, knowledge and skills for rebuilding are also fundamental building blocks of peace building. Humanitarian relief workers can have a moral authority and power which comes from its role as a provider and helper. At times relief workers have relied on peacekeepers. These organizations have the logistical and crisis experience to assist efforts of Peace Teams. Although not part of this consultation, humanitarian relief organizations and peace teams need urgent dialogue on future collaboration.

What Do Peace Teams Do?

PTs, for the most part, have engaged in micro-interventions and partnerships in violent conflict zones. In reviewing the record of PTs over many years, the following inventory of activities was taken:

A. Peacekeeping Methods

1. Interpositioning: Members of PTs have positioned themselves between armed forces and civilians (and between armed forces) to stop violence. Numerous examples were cited from Haiti, South Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and the former Yugoslavia; 2. Accompanying: This method entails PT members serving as unarmed body guards for citizens who have been targeted by death squads, opposition forces, or national military forces; 3. Observing, witnessing, or monitoring of truces, cease-fires, elections, and human rights conditions; 4. Advocating the global community about the conflict and mobilizing resources; and 5. Showing solidarity with people in conflict through direct action such as hunger fasts or pickets and indirect actions such as mobilizing international boycotts or sanctions.

B. Peacemaking & Conflict Resolution Processes

1. Facilitating negotiations serving as mediators and arbitrators; 2. Communicating between parties or acting as a “go-between;” 3. Training to identify & resolve conflicts; and 4. Influencing decision-makers to negotiate.
C. Peacebuilding Processes

1. Supporting economic development to address poverty and inequalities, also known as "structural violence;"
2. Training in skills of nonviolent struggle to empower actors to reach their goals; and
3. Fostering democratic, civil societies.

Accompaniment: A Driving Force in the Future of Peace Teams

Case studies of nonviolent accompaniment in Haiti, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Sri Lanka provide evidence that PTs serve as a deterrent to those who might wish to torture or kill dissidents. Research shows that those who have used violence against civilians, such as the police or military, often have the perception that a foreigner has power. They do not want to "make a scene" or "make a mess" for fear that the international visitor can reveal the identity of the perpetrators in the media. In areas of Haiti where PTs were stationed, there was less reported violence. A Sri Lankan official told Peace Brigades International that their presence along with the influence of the Swedish Embassy saved the life of a Buddhist monk who is now leads the Burmese Democracy Movement. Much of the expansion of peace teams activity has been grounded in the use of accompaniment.

What are Some Comparative Advantages of Peace Teams?

Cost-effective

Peace teams are cheaper than using military force. Peace Teams typically rely on volunteers rather than paid soldiers. ICRC has paid staff and is a notable exception. PT's have fewer logistical requirements than military forces although protection of those resources may at times be more difficult and expensive.

Micro-intervention Level

Peace Teams have typically operated on a micro-intervention level. Examples include Cyprus, Haiti, Philippines, Colombia, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, El Salvador, Philadelphia (U.S.), and the Balkans. Micro-intervention provides political cover because it does not appear on the public "radar screen." Armed forces typically go in with a minimum mass of weapons and soldiers that preclude the application of small interventions.

Multi-functional

Peace Teams can often get away with combining peacekeeping, building, and peacemaking functions with some advocacy thrown in for good measure. Because PT's are not often seen as a major threat to the status quo, a range of activities and space are available to engage in demonstrations, peace education, journalistic functions, and conflict resolution workshops. PBI has engaged in a strongly non-partisan role "on the ground" but more of an advocacy role abroad.

Flexible

The non-governmental nature of PTs enables them to have greater flexibility in a conflict than official parties. Teams have also gained the trust of poor people's movements in countries such as Haiti where military troops are despised and feared.

Human Resources Oriented

Peace Teams can recruit people who have skills and knowledge from the entire globe rather than limit itself to largely young males (i.e., the military). PTs include significant numbers of diverse races, artists, linguists, teachers, women, engineers, ethnicities, seniors, mediators, nationalities, and university-educated people as participants.
Non-partisanship

Armed interventions, such as in Somalia, run the risk of using the weapons in such a way as to join the conflict rather than stopping it. Peace Teams like the ICRC have a remarkable record of successful intervention in hundreds of conflicts.

Concerns and Opportunities

Neo-Colonialism

A strong concern is that PTs are largely coming from the Northern and Western countries (although the original concept was born in India). With so much violence in their own land, why not try out methods of intervention at home first? Therefore the consultation also addressed examples of U.S. peace teams working on violent conflicts in their own communities. There was unanimous concern against the potential use of peace teams to freeze an unjust status quo.

Dependency

Rather than viewing themselves as saviors, a primary goal of PTs should be to seek out and strengthen existing or indigenous peace movements in conflict areas. Peace teams should form partnerships and coalitions with local groups struggling for nonviolence, peace and justice, and make such groups part of the team. In Latin America, indigenous accompaniment has grown, encouraged by the success of international peace teams. Exit strategies and mission "creep" for peace teams and armed peacekeepers are areas in need of more study and attention.

Peace Team Composition

Differences emerged over peace team composition. Some believed that all peace teams should have a broad ethnic and racial mix. Others voiced the concern that peace teams should be tailored to meet the particular needs of a conflict: for example, inter-religious teams might be more useful in the Balkans, while African teams might be most appropriate in North American cities. We also discussed PTs concerned with issues such as women, martial arts, seniors (or elders), retired sports heroes or celebrities, and performers (i.e. peace troupe).

Preparations

Inadequate preparation of armed and unarmed peacekeepers causes great difficulties on the ground. Armed soldiers are primarily trained to destroy. Civilian peace teams rarely have the resources to provide folks with more than one week of training. Most peace teams require language and cultural competency. In addition peacekeeping often requires timely action, however, peace teams have taken months and years to put in place.

Large-Scale Interventions

The peace team movement has little experience with large-scale intervention or coalitions and partnerships. A large-scale peace walk in the Balkans proved a logistical and political disaster. However, large-scale peace walks in Cambodia found success through a combination of experienced logistical planning and indigenous political guidance. Merely good people with good intentions does not warrant mobilizing a large-scale intervention. If you only have 10 or 15 people, the military may prevent the PT from coming in. But when thousands of people are present, such as was the case in "Hands Around Jerusalem", the PT could not be stopped. That large-scale peace action in Israel had more than 3,000 participants, with 150 international observers. The local people felt tremendous strength and courage.

Death

Are peace teams at greater risk of slaughter? Nonviolence is difficult to practice when you are dead (So is violence for that matter). Historically, nonviolent direct action manifested lower death rates than armed offensive and defensive actions. Whether this dynamic carries
over to the realm of third party nonviolent action is an area for further exploration and study.

Association with Governments

The German government is currently exploring the establishment of a Civilian Peace Corps made up of conscripted youth who seek an alternative to serving in the German military. Debates have raged in Germany about the degree of control and affiliation with the German government over this Civilian Peace Corps. Funding for other peace teams comes from some “Western” governments. Much funding flows from foundations and private donors.

Associations with the United Nations

The United Nations has a mixed record on non-partisanship in peacekeeping realms. In Cambodia and Somalia, the United Nations was perceived to be supporting one side. The UN also is dominated by Caucasian countries and considered too biased in conflicts in support of certain nation states. PT affiliation with the UN may prove at times detrimental to their non-partisanship status in certain conflicts.

The UN is not a monolith. The United Nations Volunteers has placed observers and peacemakers on the ground on a small scale in countries like Burundi. UN increased utilization of peace teams may improve its effectiveness in a variety of conflicts.

Association with Armed Peacekeepers

Use of peace teams in conjunction with armed peacekeepers may have serious drawbacks for the effectiveness of peace teams. A key to a successful joint deployment may be to divide the various functions of the peacekeeping as much as possible to avoid a perceptual contamination of the peace teams’ force potential with that of violent, armed force.

The relationship of the NGO civilian teams to the official forces in war zones must be clarified. For example, there were civilian PTs in Somalia which the UN representative in the region did not know were there. They did not realize such a resource was available to help them in their peacekeeping attempts.

According to some combatants and inhabitants, UN peacekeepers have played the “bad cop” and their political credibility has eroded. There is space for “good cops” such as PTs. UNVs (United Nations Volunteers) are also inviting collaboration with NGO’s demonstrating peace team experience.

Training and Intervention

It cannot be overstated that adequate training and preparation are essential for the PTs. Several centers and organizations offer such training. They are the Peace Brigades International, the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, and the European Center for Peace Studies in Stadt Schlaining, Austria. Some schools of higher learning are investigating training programs of one to five years. The first area of training should be feedback and input from those who have been on the receiving end of PTs, such as human rights workers who have been “accompanied”.

Training currently given to humanitarian aid and development workers could be highly instructive to PTs. There is a need to study the content of their programs and learn how they coordinate their efforts on the ground among the various crisis agencies (Red Cross, etc.). There is a need for a more practical manuals that would answer questions such as: what are the most effective tactics used by PTs: how to detect ambushes, how to navigate in conflict zones, to learn what is basic international law protecting civilians in war zones, and to know what tools are at the disposal of those protecting human rights workers being threatened etc. Some manuals for this, such as the International Peace Academy’s Peacekeepers Handbook, already exist.

Training should entail looking for opportunities for field experience in our own countries; it takes years to understand frustrations and the nature of conflicts. Professional training of PTs must include the following:

Intense analysis of the conflict before intervening;
Clear understanding of missions and goals;
- Cultural sensitivity to the customs of the country/region;
- Language training;
- Preparation and clarity about taking risks, particularly lethal risk/risks analysis;
- Training in rapid response and communication during crises;
- Recognizing danger signals, such as landmines, or when a conflict is spiraling out of control; and
- Skills building in a large repertoire of peacebuilding skills.

Without adequate funding, training and infrastructure, their missions are bound to be sporadic limited. Since the 1930s, PTs have operated with very little money and no training. This lack of training and resources may have grave implications for their success or failure.

That lack of training and logistical resources was turned into an opportunity by Witness for Peace to send thousands of “political tourists” to Nicaragua for short visits. The lack of training and “innocence” about the situation in Nicaragua may have boosted the moral authority of these “ordinary” U.S. citizens to accompany human rights activists and sleep in war-torn villages.

Research Findings

A vast literature exists for offensive and defensive nonviolent action. George Lakey and others postulate that the dynamics of third-party nonviolence interventions (TPNI) differ from offensive (social change) and defensive action (social defense). Research in the field has begun.


A superb report from the Life & Peace Institute in Sweden by Lisa Schirch provides a comprehensive contemporary analysis of peace teams. An interesting and challenging question in the report came from interviewing dozens of organization in Europe which sponsor PTs in the war zones. They focus on how to deal with structural violence before conflict resolution processes will work.

This consultation also generated written reports and six videos from its numerous work groups and common sessions.

We need more research centers, more literature, in-depth evaluations of returning missions, and more exploration of how peacemakers can address structural violence. In Mexico, for example, Sipaz has organized a series of workshops on active nonviolence to challenge structural violence.

Consultation Conclusions and Recommendations

A. Civilian peace teams have shown success despite few resources and are growing.
B. Increased research, resources, and public awareness of peace teams are urgently needed.
C. Peace teams are relatively new and diverse. Differences in goals and approaches provide a diversity of options for successful involvement, partnership, and intervention in violent conflict areas.
D. Proper analysis of direct and structural violence in conflicts must motivate peace team intervention opposed to the dynamics typical of paternalism, neo-colonialism, and widening destruction or poverty.
E. Consultations among peace team veterans and recipients of peace teams interventions are valuable and should be continued.
Invitee Appendix


For more information on consultation work groups and common sessions reports and videos, please contact nonviolence@igc.apc.org.

Religion And The Nonviolent Vision Of A Global Civilization

By Richard Deats*

Martin Luther King, Jr., said, "If we assume that humankind has a right to survive, then we must find an alternative to war and destruction. In our day of space vehicles and guided missiles, the choice is either nonviolence or nonexistence."¹

Shortly before his death he put it yet more forcefully when he wrote in his last book:

... We are faced with the fact that tomorrow is today. We are confronted with the fierce urgency of now. We still have a choice today: nonviolent coexistence or violent annihilation. This may be humanity’s last chance to choose between chaos and community ....²

This choice — between peril and promise — has become even clearer since King wrote these words. The termination of the cold war broke open the log jam of history, ending the division of the world into two hostile blocs. Yet we remain in many ways a “dysfunctional civilization” as Vice President Al Gore expressed it in his book.³ We are addicted to violence, plundering the earth and her resources. National, ethnic, racial, class, and sexual differences, instead of being welcomed as part of the rich diversity and beautiful tapestry of the global village, are in many places the basis for prejudice, discrimination, and outright violence frequently leading to war. Vast resources continue to

*Editor of Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR) Magazine, Box 271, Nyack NY 10960. The U.S. FOR is a branch of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation (IFOR), in Alkmaar, The Netherlands. Deats has lectured and conducted workshops on active nonviolence in over a dozen countries. Prior to his work with FOR he was professor of social ethics at Union Theological Seminary in the Philippines for thirteen years. Ed. Note.
be spent on the technology of death. In the hands of more and more nations, weapons of mass destruction — nuclear, chemical, and bacteriological — place our future in jeopardy.

For the first time in history, the human race has reached the possibility of “omnicide” — to kill everything [living]. We live under the shadow of this destructive potential that, either by intention or accident, could destroy all we hold dear. Short of a final cataclysm, recourse to war continues to take a terrible toll as we witnessed in the gulf war. The initial international response of diplomatic and economic sanctions to Iraq's aggression against Kuwait was a hopeful nonviolent alternative to war. But after a few months, massive, devastating military force was resorted to. Once again, the vitally needed resources to combat disease, hunger, poverty, illiteracy, and environmental deterioration were deferred for the waging of war. So too in the former Yugoslavia, where unspeakable carnage has come in the train of civil strife, threatening to spread like a malignancy into widening areas of the Balkans. If there are things worse than war, war brings them in its train.

But at the same time, even as segments of the human race continue to beat the drums of war, quietly but surely, the use of another kind of power is growing in the world. This power goes by various names: satyaagraha (or “truth force”), Kingian nonviolence, active nonviolence [or direct civil disobedience action] or, as it is frequently called today, “people power.” Just as violence expresses the destructive side of human nature, nonviolence expresses humanity's constructive side, our potential for community and wholeness and goodwill.

In place after place around the world — often when you least expect it — individuals, movements, and groups are experimenting with the power of active nonviolence to resolve conflict, establish justice, protect the innocent, save the earth, proclaim new visions, and build, in the words of Martin Luther King, Jr., “the beloved community.” In its deepest expressions, it comes from the religious affirmation of the sacredness of all life, the unity of the human family and the supreme importance of truth and love.

This is an unprecedented development of immense significance. In one sense, of course, as Gandhi said, “nonviolence is as old as the hills.” This has been documented in the research of Gene Sharp of the Albert Einstein Institution who has traced the way people of widely different cultures and in places all over the world have practiced what he calls “the politics of nonviolent action” in resisting evil and overcoming injustice. Nonviolent protest and persuasion, noncooperation and nonviolent intervention have been used by people who have, in the words of Sharp, “... won higher wages, broken social barriers, changed government policies, frustrated invaders, paralyzed an empire, and dissolved dictatorships ....”

In the twentieth century, however, mass movements of active nonviolence have grown enormously in self-understanding, in numbers, and in effectiveness. Mahatma [Mohandas] Gandhi stands as the pioneer in developing the philosophy of nonviolence combined with its practice on a scale as vast as the sub-continent of India. Not long after Gandhi's death, on the other side of the world, Martin Luther King, Jr., discovered in Gandhi's philosophy the key he was searching for to move beyond individualistic religion to a socially dynamic religious philosophy that propelled the civil rights movement into a nonviolent revolution that changed the course of [Northern] America history.

The Gandhian and Kingian movements have provided a seed bed for social ferment and revolutionary change that have circled the globe and have provided a mighty impetus for human and ecological transformation. We have seen this in the “people power” revolution in the Philippines that overcame dictatorship through the unarmed determination of Filipinos longing for freedom. It was seen in the Solidarity movement in Poland, the “velvet revolution” in Czechoslovakia, the “singing revolution” of Lithuania, the electoral defeat of Pinochet in Chile, and the collapse of apartheid in South Africa. We have witnessed it in the efforts for democratic self-determination all over the world. At this point in history, it must be acknowledged, that we have learned more about nonviolently bringing down dictators and oppressive systems than we have learned about taking the next steps in fostering democratic evolution in society.

Democracy is the institutionalization of nonviolent problem solving in society. Education, conflict resolution, the struggle for justice, organizing for special needs, voting on issues, adjudicating differences, framing laws for reform and change — these are all nonviolent in
essence. And democratic nations are truest to their values when they deal with other nation states nonviolently, through diplomacy, treaties, mutual respect and fairness. The same holds true for the way nations deal with differences and conflict within their own borders as well. Ecumenical and interfaith religious movements contribute an indispensable dimension to the process of democratization, even though for many religion fosters intolerance, bigotry and violence.

If a global, democratic civilization is to come into being and endure, our challenge is to continue developing nonviolent alternatives to war and violent revolution. From the individual to groups, from nation states to the United Nations, we need to build the alternatives that will prepare us for living together as one human family, in harmony with the earth and with ultimate reality. Religion’s high calling is to provide the vision, the inspiration and the values that will enable us to achieve this goal.
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The Convergence of Global Nonviolence in the Middle-East

By Abdul Aziz Said and Paul Hubers*

Nonviolence: How Global?

Violence and nonviolence pattern our approaches to conflict resolution, with more than the usual share of the world's violence located in four global zones of conflict. Along with the Caribbean, Southern Africa, and Eastern Asia, the Middle-East has evidenced the results of violence and nonviolence as a zone of conflict. What are the violent or nonviolent means by which we resolve local and global issues? Clearly, these means range from bombing, burning, killing, torturing, property destruction, and (sub) dominant retaliation, on to less violent means of conflict resolution. Other means such as economic boycotts may be considered as malicious or as nonviolent, while many domestic police measures may be considered as necessary for societal cohesion. In any case, conflictive issues can be settled both by nonviolent cooperation or noncooperation and by violent aggression or resistance. Constructive logic and dialogue may also play a decisive role in creating options to violence, despite rising threats of drought and weapons of ecocidal consequence.

Nonviolence traditionally arises from spiritual communities known for many centuries as sources of such creativity. Eastern and Western examples of such creativity sources stem from Moism (China), Shinzen (Japan), Kimbanguism (Southern Africa), Sufism (within the Muslim world), Jainism (combined with Buddhism and Gandhism, via India), and Anabaptism (the so-called Historic Christian Peace Churches, most common in the Americas). These global strands of nonviolence have often been confused with one or another of the three major monotheistic religions of Islam, Judaism, and Christianity, as well as intuitive spirituality. Yet global nonviolence would appear to answer our most inmost need for personal security, within the ever-receding boundaries of scientific knowledge. At the same time autarkic nationalism offsets tolerance with intolerance.

Public goods often taken for granted in our daily lives, whether, for example, to provide access to clean water or protection from uncontrolled fire, depend upon the voluntary cooperation stemming from nonviolent principles as well. These public goods depend on nonviolent fairness and caring, not on greed or self-interest. In contrast excessive resource consumption upheld through violence contradicts the public needs for public goods, equity, and justice. Given the nonviolent presumption that violence is, by political definition, anti-revolutionary as to the public good, then nonviolence assumptions should also lead us to question the nature of political power, whether violent or nonviolent. It is commonly understood, for instance, that both "Free Market" or "Communist" options for meeting the public good fared poorly during the Cold War, if, e.g., evaluated as emerging gender-balanced concerns for global refugees facing environmental degradation.

The legal roots of nonviolence often begin with concern for the personal right to choose violence or nonviolence in resolving conflict. Tough, even lethal penalties may face people who exercise their human right to refuse to kill for the nation-state. The first global articulation of such a human right to exercise nonviolence occurred during the 1970 Kyoto Conference, as a precedent for global discussions in the United Nations.1 A Dutch representative at a primary UN dialogue questioned traditional “peace” wisdom to the effect that, at least with most nation-states, each youth was expected by the state to: (1) prepare for peace by obeying the national conscription draft; (2) train for peace by learning how to kill in a military; and (3) ensure peace by ecological weapons unrelated to what used to be considered personal security.2

Meanwhile the so-called Blue Helmets of the UN have responded to conflict with a mixture of lightly armed arbitration, mediation, and adjudication, along with bombing and gunfire, alleged to force recalcitrants to the negotiating table. Few “Green” parties, even in Germany, e.g., resisted the bombing of Christian Serb positions in former Yugoslavia, following allegations of “war” criminality. At the

same time, memories of empire and domination fade before the long-lived examples of those who have used altruism above all to resolve conflict. The Ways and Power of Love, or the Lost Power of Love, as scientifically surveyed and measured by Pitirim Sorokin, have provided us with many working examples of the longevity of creative nonviolence. A brief excursion into such historical nonviolence will follow and introduce nonviolence associated with Europe, Africa, Asia, Russia, and the Americas, along with its convergence in the Middle East.

The Historical Convergence of Nonviolence in the Middle-East

Early Sufi, Judaic, and Christian figures associated with nonviolence began to resolve conflict with less violence many centuries ago. Such Sufi writers range from Suhrawardy, Al Hallaj, Al Ghazzali, Ibn Al Arabi, and Rumi Mevlena, to Rab'iat Al-'Adawiyyah (Qaddiyah Al Qassiyah). Parallel Judaic and Christian leaders include Isaac Luria (and others associated with Mishnah and Safed traditions) as well as Isaiah, Thecla, Jeremiah, and Yeshua (or Jesus). Such traditions have respectively produced the nonviolence of Wadad Cortas (Lebanon), Mubarak Awad (Palestine) and Abbie Nathan (Israel). However even the apocryphal versions of writings by those like Thecla may be better known in general by those in the West than the Sufi notions of nonviolence.

Nevertheless, even before the word “nonviolence” — coined by those like Mohandas and Kasturba Gandhi to signify tough or political love — Sufis like Rumi and Rab’iat pioneered in the exploration of such “love” or nonviolence as the source of sustainable political power. As a Sufi martyr who conquered his personal enmity toward his torturers (who cut off both his legs above the knees), Al Hallaj exemplified the Sufi certainty in the focusing power of nonviolence — more certain, more powerful than the grace or glory of his torturer, a violent, militaristic Vizier. Al-Ghazzali described this nonviolent struggle as being “lost in God” — a phrase translated into English as something like “being centered” through direct civil disobedience action. Rab’iat and Ibn Al Arabi in turn employed such focused nonviolence to transform societies torn apart by war through predatory Berber and Abbasid Empires, by way of war-torn concerns involving Egypt, Iberia, the Albigensians, Charles Martel, and the Arabic or Persian Gulf. Both Sufi and Judaic nonviolence emphasized a concern for local community issues, over those of a ruling military elite. Rumi, Rab’iat, Ibn Al Arabi, and Al-Ghazzali, for example, concentrated on the roles of education (madrasa) and community leadership (ulama), rather than the authority of the sultan or military conscription (devshirme) for engendering peace. In addition the Safed era Judaism concentrated upon themes from Maimonedes and the Mishnah, as mirrored in what might be called “conscientious objection” to warfare, given precedents in Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and Jeremiah.

Nonviolence in Europe, Asia, and Russia

Compassionate peace themes from the Middle-East may be found in the Hebrew and Arabic words for peace, i.e., shalom and salam, which the Greeks expressed as eirene (a root word also meaning “peace” and “love”). The Greek notion of peace expressed self-identification with social and ecological contexts, in a process of love and peace, hopefully attained not necessarily with only the power of the plow and sword. Sources of this Greek notion included figures like Seneca, Socrates or Aspasia, and the Skeptics — who gave the word peace more of a nonviolent tinge. Later on, traditional Jainism, Moism, Shinzen, and Anabaptism synthesized these notions: Jainism, for example, within the contexts of Buddhism, Sikhism, and Hinduism; Moism within the contexts of Buddhism, Daoism, Confucianism, Shan Buddhism and Zen Buddhism (and perhaps, to some degree, even in relation to the collective communes of “Maoism”); and Anabaptism within the contexts of Tolstoyan-like Commune ideals.

One of the clearest of these to emerge outside of the Middle East has been the Jain tradition. Jainism flourished especially in Dravidian India, as one of the oldest of these Eastern nonviolent traditions, and was articulated through such writers as Patanjali and Mohandas and Kasturba Gandhi. Patanjali initially pieced together related concepts of the human will, such as peace, power, and compassion, and named this power ahimsa (to be revived some centuries later in Gandhism). Satya
and Asatya, or the being and non-being of truth, as the theoretical basis for nonviolence, emerged in Patanjali's thought as a way to distinguish the illusion of violence from truth and nonviolence. These thoughts supported his advocacy for the cooperative property ownership of public goods and the need for simplicity to resolve conflict whenever possible by nonviolence.

Related tenets of nonviolence can be found in the Chinese writings of Mo Ti, a co-creator of Moism (468-376 ACE), and a predecessor to Confucius according to some historians. Mo Ti called for the local and global exercise of love and cooperation, i.e., nonviolence, as practiced through concerns for nonviolent civilian defense and martial arts skills. Mo Ti discovered the puzzle that also surprised Gandhi and Patanjali as well, namely, that nonviolence functions powerfully, but still as mysteriously as the atom might be said to function for someone without quantum theory and an electron microscope.7

To put this question in yet another unusual way, how does one evaluate the nonviolent power of the Anabaptist Mennonites as the largest societal group on both sides of the Cold War curtains? Both the Soviets and the USA developed analogous structures for exercising military power, based upon military conscription, to be resisted in turn by practitioners of nonviolence like Mennonites throughout the major wars of the Twentieth-Century. Other parallels to such nonviolence can, in turn, be found quite easily among, e.g., the African Kimbanguists, throughout the Congo River Valley and into Southern Africa.8

Nonviolence in Europe and the Americas

Nonviolence themes in Europe and the Americas have been often typified by nonviolence associated with Anabaptism, as well as with native American Andean nonviolence. Anabaptist nonviolence grew and flourished along the trade routes from the East, coursing through the Middle-East, from Palestine through Italy, Switzerland, Germany, England, and the Americas. Articulations of such nonviolence ranged from the early anti-war statements of communities (resisting the Roman Empire) — to those in 1500s Europe (resisting nascent European and Ottoman empires). John Bellers and William Penn became known as early writers on this kind of nonviolence, a viewpoint later to be associated with the innovative ideas underlying the formation of the UN itself. Isaac Hopper, Lucretia Mott, Elihu Burritt, and Henry David Thoreau symbolized such nonviolence by writings that opposed slavery and warlike power.9

Converging Nonviolence in the Middle-East

Nonviolence in practice in the global conflict zones of the Middle-East, Southern Africa, South-East Asia, and the Caribbean developed through the above historical themes. Rumi, Rabi'at, and Ibn Al 'Arabi, in this regard, in the vortex of the wars between the Ottoman Empire, the Great Khan's Empire, and the Holy Roman Empire, exemplified the intensified nonviolent struggle chosen to address intensified violent struggle. Quranic injunctions from the Shariah (the legal code of Islam) and from the Imam (spiritual leaders of Islam) against the immorality of war still validate such advocacy against war.

Nonviolence has progressed since the millennium of those like Mo Ti, even to the point of globally-oriented legal structures founded upon various peace conferences in Geneva and the Hague for poor and wealthy nations. Two examples of such progress can be taken from both Lebanon and from Israel and Palestine. These examples will be introduced below as part of the ongoing discussion over converging nonviolence in the Middle-East. The first example, that of the "Uprisers" or "People-Changers" (Al Muntalikuan in Arabic) and that of the "Vineyard of Peace" (Kibbutz Kerem Shalom in Hebrew) began during the 1970s and 1980s as predecessors of events like the Intifada. The former began through work by people like Theophilus Waldmair in Lebanon, the latter through work by those like Henrik and Shulamit Infield in Israel (after global research and travel).

Building from nonviolent Africa, Asia, and Middle-East insights, Lebanese nonviolence developed within Druze, Sufi, Quaker, Judaic, and other progressive communities. Its nonviolent themes were synthesized from such writers as Mahdiyya, Summaniya, Tijaniyya, Germanos Farhat, Ibrahim Al Nahwi, Ibrahim Al Halabi, Mustafa Al Siddiqi, Abd Al Ghani Al Nabulsli, and Muhammed Ibn Abd Al
Wahhab. A Quaker, Theophilus Waldmaier became one of the leaders in this development, through the building of a peace community called the “Fountain of Peace” (Ain’ Al Salaam) in Brummana, a mountain village overlooking Beirut. Until 1976 Brummana housed a school educating future Arabic leaders, from Northern Africa to the Gulf.10 In Beirut efforts coalesced with Al Muntalikum, an organization influential throughout Lebanon.

Al Muntalikum emerged in Lebanon through the efforts of pioneers like Wadad Cortas, one of the first graduate-level educators in the Arab World who pioneered in advancing graduate education for Arab women. Other groups like Najdeh (a global mutual aid group based in Detroit, Michigan, and Beirut, Lebanon), or the women’s groups which organized around concern generated as students at the American University of Beirut, would carry on the struggle. Al Muntalikum’s 200 core members and 1,000 working membership mobilized local and global resources, and generated such training programs as practical first aid and (reinforced steel-and-concrete) bomb shelter building trades education. It initiated Gandhian-style interest in direct nonviolent action for peace and justice. One of its global projects, supplemented by the Quakers through members of the extended Cortas family, awoke international interest in the desolate future of the poor and repeatedly-made-homeless Shi’a refugees; (later characterized as the Hezbollah question linked to the Litani River water use and the 1982 invasive Israeli war issues in the shadow of Mt. Hermon).

Souheil Khouwli, a co-founder of Al Muntalikum, typified local and global concerns as he worked through human rights groups in Toronto, Canada, and the Qatari Representation in the UN in New York City. Leaving Lebanon as a conscientious objector in the 1970s (from a Muslim family), he was able to travel extensively throughout Northern America, the Mediterranean, and the wider Gulf areas, representing nonviolence groups like Al Muntalikum, before his premature death from a heart attack in 1985. Organizational efforts linked people of various skills and interests, encouraging war resistance despite unemployment, bread lines, deadly roadblocks, indiscriminate shelling, cut telephone lines, broken water lines, nightly “earthquaking” from the bombing and shelling, and disrupted postal as well as other social services. Related Mennonite work (from 1950) and Quaker work (after 1982) advanced simultaneously, through technology and community legal aid work in Israel and Jordan, stemming from two schools in Ramallah, Israel (for girls in 1870 and for boys in 1901).11

Israeli and Palestinian nonviolence progressed through the early 1900s work of those like Henrik and Shulamit Infields, as well as events typified by the 1930s Palestinian events presaging the Intifada in the late 1980s. The Infields searched globally for such examples of nonviolence, through Chinese collectives, Russian kolkhozi (communes), and Canadian Hutterian or Mennonite communal farms. Friends like David Dellinger and leaders from the Japanese green and peace movements added momentum. Unfortunately, Israeli militarization often mitigated the kibbutz-related elements of such nonviolence severely, although Palestinian examples of such nonviolent themes would also contain some cases of violence, as in, e.g., the 1936 Palestinian Strike or the global 1970s Arab oil boycott.12

Ongoing kibbutzes carrying on this nonviolent tradition of the Infields, would be, for instance, the afore-mentioned Kerem Shalom, eight miles south of Khan Yunis, on the southeast corner of the Gaza Strip. Kibbutzes like Neve Shalom and Oz Ve Shalom also emphasized Arab, Israeli, and Palestinian cultural friendship and resistance against war. Kerem Shalom faced obstacles particular to its location and its participants: sandstorms, scorpions, censorship, phone taps, double agents, and poisonous snakes, adjacent to the Palestinian Gaza Strip and Bedouin desert lands nearby. It co-sponsored what many would call the first racially-integrated peace march of 1 May 1976, taking the last position in the march, finally meeting sweat-and-tear-drenched march marshals, likewise linked “arms-locked-in-arms” many levels deep, at Zion Plaza in Tel Aviv. Armed soldiers and armored vehicles surrounded the marchers and marshals, through a multi-mile/kilometer march, with its final marching chant or song of “Shalom — Ken! Harb — Lo!” (understood by Bedouin, Israeli, and Palestinian as “Peace — Yes! War — No!”)13

Kerem Shalom distinguished itself globally through its members’ projects: from that of international educators reaching out to experimental leadership in Cuernavaca, México (like Ivan Illich) and the
Gandhian press and movements of South Asia, to that of the Voice of Peace pirate radio ship in the Eastern Mediterranean (the alternative media source there, operated by conscientious objectors to the Israeli military). One of the Kerem Shalom members, Abbie Nathan became one of its better known members. At first recognized as one of the “top guns” of Israel, as a top-killer-ace jet fighter pilot, he tripped over the nonviolence of writers like King and Gandhi. His career from there on was characterized by long spells in Israeli jails for dialogue toward peace with the Palestinian leadership. Two of his more eventful experiences started with his skills as a pilot: landing a small plane in Cairo’s International Airport, undergoing serious military torture, and then talking with Anwar Sadat, and finally stimulating the latter to fly to meet Menachem Begin for their historic peace talks; along with his guiding a sailboat through an explosive-infested Suez Canal, astounding Egyptian and Israeli military experts, and opening that canal for international travel.

Since it is more often than not young people who kill and die here as military and guerrilla (literally: “small war”) soldiers, it is quite helpful to remember, on the one hand, that the above events occur in a war torn Middle-East context. In other words, youth ten years and younger have fought and continue to fight and die as soldiers in wars involving Cyprus, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Afghanistan, Eritrea, and Ethiopia. At the same time, through similar conflict in zones of conflict elsewhere, children also fight violently in the Western Caribbean and South-East Asia, with sporadic conflict and leftover land mine problems in Southern Africa. Women jet fighter pilots also fly missions in Iran, Turkey, and Israel (where over half of the women are conscripted). On the other hand, Iraq, Algeria, and Morocco count periods in their histories when they allowed unofficial alternative service options to military war, including Egyptian and Syrian exemptions for Jewish adherents. Soviet Muslims may have comprised the largest single block of young people refusing to be soldiers in the Middle-East, before the 1990s Soviet Union breakup.14

Asian nonviolence of a similar pitch or intensity-quotient revolves around India as a pioneer in liberating itself from colonial exploitation, despite the English Empire’s “divide and conquer” strategy tied to much war via India’s borders with China, Bangladesh, and Pakistan. The parallel in Europe to India’s pioneering use of nonviolence may have been Czechoslovakia, now Czechia and Slovakia, during 1968, against Russia. Decisive Gandhism began with a 1924 Vrkom Campaign among Dravidian “Blacks” at the tip of Southern India (the fulcrum for English Imperialism in South Asia), with bloody, pitched battles led by those like Sarojini Naidu (a Cambridge-educated Tamil poetess, following in the tradition of the ancient poetess Avvai). Muslim examples from these struggles include the leadership in nonviolence and prison time by Abdul Khaffar Khan, one of the inspiring writers to reappear (as it were) in the 1980s and 1990s Intifada.15

Concurrent examples of nonviolence mirrored in Middle-East nonviolence might be that of Gandhigram in southern India. Ito-En (“Garden of Light”) and Ohayo-Ajisai-Mura (“Old Japanese Hydrangea Village”) in Japan, and some of the European Green and Greenpeace attempts to revolutionize personal lifestyles. Gandhigram began in the 1940s with the Granand Movement decentralizing land control, around its hospital named Avvai, near Dindigul in Madurai Province — the part of India facing both the Middle East and Eastern Asia. Harsh physical conditions, like those of Kerem Shalom, with famine, vipers, leprosy, scorpions, and tuberculosis, as well as caste and government opposition, molded Gandhigram’s priorities. A Shanti Sena or peace force has operated from here since the deaths of Kasturba and Mohandas Gandhi, not that many kilometers from Kodaikanal, a former English military hill fort now training the Western mandarins’ children managing Gulf oil monies. Gandhigram, Israeli peace activists, and the Japanese cooperatives have relied upon each other during crises, such as the 1930’s invasion of Manchuria and the 1940s and 1980s Israeli eras of militarism.16

Convergent Nonviolence in the Middle East

For nonviolence to impact the international nation-state system often guiding our lifestyles and family planning around the planet, more of the intensive, nation-building and party-building attempts explored above may well guide future global nonviolence. Central themes,
to nonviolence and to transform our culturally-ingrained past of omnicidal violence.
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11 American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), "Chronology of AFDC Work in the Middle-East to Date," Mimeo. (Philadelphia: AFSC Archives, 1982) and from meetings and conversations with Adam Connon-Finnetty, AFSC staff person, and Steven Cary, Director of the AFSC Board of Directors, 1986-1991. Cary noted parallels with AFSC work in Southern Africa, though Zambfa and Mozambique, in particular with Edwarda Mondlane, a co-founder of the state of Mozambique and admirer of the nonviolence work of groups like the AFSC and the War Resister's International on global levels.
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16 Refer note 9 above and (lto-En) Tenko-San, A New Road to Ancient Truth, trans. Marie Beuzeville Byes (New York: Horizon, 1972); and for Gandhigram, Coretta Scott [Luther] King, Jr., My Life with Martin Luther King, Jr. (New York: Avon, 1969), 185-301 passim, especially for references to her views on feminism and nonviolence as well as to interchange between Martin, Coretta, Howard Thurman, and Benjamin Mays.
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Nobel Peace Prize
Acceptance Speeches — Selections*

To express our respect and support for the Fiftieth United Nations Anniversary, celebrating global spiritual dignity and tolerance — as well as the quickly-approaching Centennial Anniversary of the Nobel Peace Prize (in 2001 ACE) — we would like to invite further nonviolence as that graced and awarded by the Nobel Peace Prize, in the carefully chosen and translated acceptance speeches of Nobel Peace Prize laureates which follow below. Inaugurating the 50th U.N. Anniversary, an international roundtable called by UNESCO — Nonviolence, Tolerance and Television — converged on the nonviolent or violent world images which mold our future. The future global peace which we anticipate may well emerge from dauntless images stirred and molded by such inspiring people as the Nobel Peace Prize laureates, with the heroic strength and commitment to make a nonviolent difference on our planet. Although a prize awarded specifically for peace, the Nobel Peace Prize has also been awarded to exemplary people in nonviolence struggles. Selections centered on nonviolence from their Nobel Peace Prize Acceptance Speeches follow. We envision that nonviolence will be well-blessed in the future.

Bertha von Suttner (1905)³

As the first woman to receive the Nobel Peace Prize, she also became one of the most-published anti-war, pro-nonviolence writers in both the German and Russian languages. She briefly met Alfred Nobel, the founder of the Nobel Prizes, before traveling to the eastern coast of the Black Sea, where she began her writing career in Georgia (then Russia). From Vienna, as a co-founder of the European peace movement, she became an able critic of war and an ardent advocate of organizing for peace, because, as she saw it:

... one of the eternal truths [or foundations of global peace movements] is the right to live, ... canonized by the oldest law: "Do not kill" .... [Nonetheless] our militarily-organized society has renounced peaceful options, scorned human life, and urged death ....

Philip Noel-Baker (1959)

A Quaker, Noel-Baker worked with League of Nations staff stalwarts like Salvador de Madariaga, to formulate international and U.N.-related initiatives in world disarmament. The quest for world disarmament within the League of Nations was to be qualified as security, development, and disarmament within the U.N. by such leaders as Inga Thorsson. Noel-Baker begins his speech with the analogy of the heroic struggle of Fridtjof Nansen, in the world's discovery of the Arctic and Antarctic, to pave the way for his entreaty for world disarmament. He notes that the English plans to scare the Germans to the peace table with the so-called Dreadnoughts (bigger and deadlier warships) simply backfired. The Germans simply raced to make Dreadnoughts as well. He then argues that the arms race itself is therefore the threat to world security, noting that:

... Nansen was the first to say, what others have repeated, that "the difficult is what takes a little while; the impossible is what takes a little longer." [Therefore] If politics is the art of the possible, statesmanship is the art, in Nansen's sense, of the impossible; and it is [nonviolent] statesmanship that our perplexed and tortured humanity requires today ...

Martin Luther King, Jr. (1964)

Along with his wife, Coretta Scott (Luther-) King, Martin Luther King, Jr. pioneered nonviolence in the Americas. They were deeply influenced by the examples of Mohandas and Kasturba Gandhi, as well as Folke and Estelle Romaine (Manville-) Berndotte. (Mohandas Gandhi and Folke Berndotte were scheduled to receive the prize together, but they were killed in 1948 before receiving it.) Martin Luther King, Jr., was often quoted over what he considered the world's historical turning point, toward a future or toward nonexistence: that is,
toward nonviolence, through sustainable security, or toward omnicide, through military security. Therefore he repeatedly emphasized how

... Mohandas Gandhi ... [introduced the nonviolent] ... weapons of truth, soul force, non-injury and courage .... I venture to suggest [above all] ... that ... nonviolence become immediately a subject for study and for serious experimentation in every field of human conflict, by no means excluding relations between nations ... which [ultimately] make war ....

Sean MacBride (1974)

*The Imperatives of Survival*

As one of the first leaders of state to oppose the nation-state's right to impose military conscription onto its citizens, MacBride laid much of the framework for such resistance to war for both the International Peace Bureau and the 1970 International Statement in Kyoto (on the right to refuse to kill for the nation-state). Echoing the non-nuclear sentiments of Eisaku Sata (a former Japanese Prime Minister with whom he shared the 1974 prize), MacBride's acceptance speech, "The Imperatives of Survival," invokes spiritual reasons that evoke a non-conscription and non-nuclear bio-ethic:

... The breakdown in public and private morality is in no small measure due to their failure [i.e., the failure of the world's religious leaders] to adjust to the tremendous scientific revolution through which we are passing. Churches, by the very reason of their structures are monolithic and do not adapt easily. But, in many cases they, too, have allowed themselves to become allied or even part of an unjust establishment or system. Often they have remained silent when they should have led the demand for justice; often they have resisted reform when they should have been leading the demand for it. It is the duty of the religious to give an unequivocal lead in the struggle for justice and peace. Those who believe in divine providence should insist that their religious structures provide such a lead.

It is important that rulers and religious and political leaders should realize that there can be no peace without justice .... Why not begin simply by outlawing the use, manufacture, sale, transfer and stockpiling of nuclear weapons or components thereof? Why not now stop completely the production of all nuclear weapons?...

... [And finally] To the rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights one more might, with relevance be added. It is "The Right to Refuse to Kill." Both at the World Conference on Religion and Peace at Kyoto [Japan] (1970) and at the Baden [Germany] Consultation of Churches (1970) very clear-cut Conclusions were adopted .... I have drawn attention to the issues raised in these Conclusions because they appear to be of particular relevance to the present day world ....

Betty Williams and Mairead Corrigan (1977)

The acceptance speech of Betty Williams and Mairead Corrigan was delivered by Betty Williams. Focused on nonviolence, she opened her speech with a description of the birth of the "Peace People" or the nonviolence campaign in Northern Ireland — oriented toward a nonviolent approach to peace, despite decades of ongoing urban warfare. Her sense of English and Irish history, within the global history of violence and nonviolence, prompted her to note that:

... I am aware of all the people who have stood here before to receive this award. We think perhaps particularly of Martin Luther King [Jr.,] whose memory we cherish, and whose ideals and whose voice inspire us still, as they have done for so many millions of people around the world involved, actively engaged, in the nonviolent struggle for justice and peace ....

... It seems to take more courage to say NO to war than to say YES, and perhaps we women have for too long encouraged the idea that it is brave and manly to go to war, often to "defend" women and children. Let women everywhere from this day on encourage men to have the courage not to turn up for war, not to work for a militarized world but [for] a world of peace, a nonviolent world.

To begin to have that kind of real courage, people must begin to breach the barriers which divide them. We are divided on the surface of this planet, by physical barriers, emotional barriers, ideological barriers, barriers of prejudice and hatreds of every kind ....

... The only force which can break down those barriers is the force of love, the force of truth, soul-force. We all know that a simple handshake, a simple embrace, can break down enmity between two people. Multiply such acts of friendship all
over the world, and then the moments of pathetic friendship in the miserable
trenches of the First World War would no longer be exception but the rule in
human affairs.

But such acts of friendship must be backed by dedication. A handshake
or an embrace is not enough: Jesus Christ was betrayed by a kiss. The initial
acts of friendship must be followed, day in, and day out by co-operation in
everything that improves life and prevents violence.

We hear every day about the various crises in human affairs. But the only
real crisis is the one which our predecessor in this great Nobel tradition,
Martin Luther King, Jr., described so well when he said that the question
today was not whether violence or nonviolence, but that the choice was
nonviolence or non-existence.

We are deeply, passionately dedicated to the cause of nonviolence, to the
force of truth and love, to soul-force. To those who say that we are naive,
 utopian idealists, we say that we are the only realists, and that those who
continue to support militarism in our time are supporting the progress
towards total self-destruction of the human race, when the only right and left
will be dead to the right and dead to the left, and death and destruction right,
left, and center, east and west, north and south ....

Adolfo Pérez Esquivel (1980)

A sculptor and university professor in Buenos Aires, Argentina,
Adolfo Pérez Esquivel received notice of the prize while facing death and
torture in prison — as a co-leader of the mothers of the disappeared
(Madres de la Plaza del Mayo) and as a co-founder, with other Latin
leaders such as Creuza Maciel (in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil), of the Latin
American-wide peace movement for peace and justice (SERPAJ or
Servicio Paz y Justicia). The prize may have saved his life. SERPAJ has
intervened with diplomacy and needed goods in wartorn areas such as the
American isthmus and the Caribbean, including Cuban-U.S.
conflict. At the same time, Argentina has often served as a focus for
English domination as has Brazil for U.S. domination, in Latin
America. His words echo a common concern for global needs and
rights, both economic and political:

... I receive the Nobel Prize of Peace ... in the name of all those people of
good will who work and struggle to build a society free of domination .... We

work through the organization Service Peace and Justice (SERPAJ) in Latin
America, for which I am the current coordinator — to inspire and support
our endeavor to achieve a society free of domination, to overcome structures
of injustice, and to embrace the human and the divine in reconciliation with
God ....

... We do not search for a utopian social order. We search for a world
wherein political life is understood as the active co-participation of those who
govern and those governed. We do not believe in consensus achieved through
violent force. We often observe that the abuse of human rights occurs in favor
of the interests of the elite. I declare that there is no superior interest above
that of each [and every] person. I am convinced that people can govern
themselves democratically. In this we place our hope. We believe in the day-
to-day calling of community and participation, invigorating political
consciousness, and profoundly changing and democratizing society —
Change based in justice and constructed in love will lead us to the most
ancient reward of peace ....

... We [thus] implore our God, with infinite mercy, to illuminate our
way and guide us in the way of peace and justice ....

International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW)
(1985)

The IPPNW acceptance speeches came from both the USSR
and the USA, from the respective personal physicians of the state leaders
of these two nations. Evgenii Chazov delivered his address on behalf of
the USSR, Bernard Lown, on behalf of the USA. Both speeches resonate
with stark data on the results of catastrophic warfare. Chazov
represented the State University of Moscow's Academy of Sciences,
Lown, the Public School of Public Health in Harvard University.

The Tragedy and Triumph of Reason

Chazov starts from the assumption that what we civilized people
call realism or rational thought has put us in this predicament, or
civilizational crisis. In his speech, "The Tragedy and Triumph of
Reason," he denotes the beginning of the IPPNW (from early 1980, in
Geneva) as a small meeting of a handful of physicians who realized that
such war was omnicidal. The group then made it clear that:

... We felt the urge to warn governments and peoples that the critical point has passed: medicine will be unable to render even minimal assistance to the victims of a nuclear conflict — the wounded, the burned, the sick — including the population of the country which unleashes nuclear war. Even rough estimates show it would require efforts of at least 30 million physicians, 100 million nurses, and technical personnel. These, of course, are absolutely unrealistic figures. In the world today there are around 3.5 million physicians and about 7.5 million nurses ....

A Prescription for Hope

Lown begins his speech, “A Prescription for Hope,” by pointing to the era of Alfred Nobel, when people trusted in technology to create peace and harmony, “... unlimited potential for human power, inspiring a dream for an end to drudgery and an age of abundance ....” He then compares a history of natural disasters and the potential for thermo-nuclear disaster, with what might be his specific diagnosis of the global disease of military security:

... The medical profession cannot remain quiet in the face of the increasing diversion of scarce resources to the military compared to the meager efforts devoted to combating global poverty, malnutrition, and disease. In 1984 world military spending exceeded 800,000 million dollars, or 100 million dollars every hour .... Two billion people have no access to a dependable and sanitary water supply .... We are already living in the rubble of World War III ....

Oscar Arias Sánchez (1987)

Representing the first country claiming to have abolished its military (1948) and to have established the first version of the World Court (until 1916), Oscar Arias Sánchez organized a peace settlement in his geopolitically-critical part of the world, a part of the world which may have witnessed much of the bloodiest wars anywhere on the planet, up to the 21st Century. His words began with Erasmus, often valued in Erasmus’ native land, the Netherlands (now the World Court base), as someone who fought peacefully for globally neutral and nonviolent peace. To quote Oscar Arias Sánchez:

... [t]o a great extent peace consists in the act of wanting peace with all one’s heart. These words of Erasmus live in the people of Costa Rica. My people live in a country where military aircraft do [normally] not fly overhead, or military tanks [pass by on land], or war ships [float by on water]. One of the people invited here [with me] to receive the Nobel Prize, here with us, is José Figueres Ferrer, the visionary who in 1948 abolished the military of my country, and symbolized a different direction in our history ....

... I receive this prize as one of 400 million Latin Americans who search for liberty, for practical democracy, for a way to overcome misery and injustice. I come from a Latin America scarred by pain, by memories of exile, torture, prison, and the deaths of many men and women. I come from a Latin America whose political geography reveals totalitarian regimes which shame all people ....

... Guns do not shoot in a vacuum. People without hope shoot guns. People dominated by dogma shoot guns. We need to fight boldly for peace, and not to fear the challenges of those who are desperate and without hope ....

If doable, through ongoing Haitian and Costa Rican initiatives, Haiti may become the second country on the planet to claim to have abolished its military.

Tenzin Gyatso, The 14th Dalai Lama (1989)

Because the Norwegian Nobel Institute notified our journal that they had “... no written manuscript of his acceptance speech, ...” we turn to the speech manuscript sent to the Norwegian Nobel Institute. His speech manuscript points directly to *ahimsa* or nonviolence as derived from Mohandas and Kasturba Gandhi. He advocates a “... transformation of all Tibet, including the eastern provinces of Kham and Amdo, into a zone of *Ahimsa* (nonviolence) ....” Noting that Nepal had already called for such a zone of peace, along the border with Tibet — like other such zones in Egypt, Israel, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica (respectively in the Sinai, and along the shared border river Río San Juan)
— he trusts that Tibet in the future will be a world model for the protection of nature and the promotion of peace. On 13 May 1995, shortly before his trendsetting meeting with Helmut Kohl, then Chancellor of Germany, over what amounted to recognition of Tibet (under occupation by China) by Germany, he also spoke of his world dream for turning smaller zones of peace into one global peace — based unequivocally upon compassionate (Buddhist and Gandhian) nonviolence.

Rigoberta Menchú Tum (1992)

As someone whose people in the Americas preceded and survived violent European invasions, Rigoberta Menchú Tum underscores her own violent and nonviolent context: both as to the civilized history of her people and as to the pivotal nonviolent events of 1944 which overthrew one of the most conservative (Nazi-oriented) governments to "rule" her people. In 1954 this government was overthrown by foreign intervention and again downtrodden (foremost through the U.S. CIA and ensuing Israeli "proxy"). She notes that

... [it] is with both sadness and anticipation in meeting you to receive the Nobel Prize of Peace, that I observe that the prize itself must stay in-safekeeping in Mexico City, until peace comes to Guatemala ....

... I interpret this prize primarily as respectful homage to sacrificed and disappeared indigenous peoples, and in honor of the aspiration for a more dignified life, just, free with respect and understanding between peoples — [in respectful homage for] those no longer living or seeking shelter — [in respectful homage for mutual, nonviolent] change instead of poverty, marginalization, exile, and abandonment, in Guatemala, and in all the Americas ....

Future Nobel Peace Prizes

For the last selection, honoring the International Pugwash Movement in 1995 for receiving the Nobel Peace Prize (almost a century old itself), we turn to the archives of Ava Helen and Linus Pauling (soon to be online). As the one person to receive the Nobel Prize twice, once in Chemistry and once in Peace (as noted below), Linus Pauling is best known for his peace work with his wife Ava Helen Pauling (Miller). Furthermore, Linus remonstrated at first with the Nobel Committee that he and Ava Helen should have received the peace prize together, despite the controversial nature of their work in stopping global atmospheric nuclear "tests" for merchandizing war.

Together they organized on many levels for world peace, often echoing the words of Martin and Coretta (Scott-) Luther King, Jr., co-authoring anti-nuclear premises or arguments, and serving as active board members, e.g., to promote groups like the International Pugwash.

At a ceremony honoring Kingian nonviolence in Amherst, Massachusetts, Linus remarked that Martin Luther King, Jr., opposed the hate, the violence, the exploitation, the "unrestrained selfishness" that typified the kind of suppression dominating the planet. He then asserted that we who attempt nonviolence ought to work "to achieve the goals that he pointed out" as Martin opposed, for example, the:

... military might, police might, [and] the power of the assassin ... being used by our country to protect an evil economic and social system, based on inequality and injustice.

Forty million Americans are miserably poor, with income less than one-fifth the average for their affluent fellow citizens. This group, the miserably poor, includes half of our black people, but only one-sixth of our white people.

The world as a whole is worse. Two-thirds of the people of the world live on 10% of the world's income. $100 per year per person.

In South America, Southeast Asia, [and] Greece, as well as at home, we have been using our great wealth and power to oppose progress, to oppose reform.

Now, let us pledge ourselves to follow the path of righteousness, the [nonviolent] path shown to us by Dr. King.

In this sense, throughout their lives and careers, the Paulings echoed the Kingian emphasis on nonviolent change and discourse, and its advocacy of a
organization by far in the world; and it would be a cheap, a very cheap insurance policy for us to have against the destruction of the world in a nuclear war.18

Kingian nonviolence, as noted above in the Nobel speech selection (1964), invoked soulful, truthful, and audacious nonviolence as the curricula core wanted for our global study, investigation, and resolution of conflict and diplomacy leading to war.

Relevant Sources By Nobel Peace Prize Recipients


King, Martin [& Coretta Scott] Luther King, Jr., *Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community?* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967).


Thee, Marek, ed., *Peace! By the Nobel Peace Prize Laureates* (Paris: UNESCO, 1996). Unfortunately this text omits Adolfo Pérez Esquivel (entirely) and many nonviolent options and opinions from the other concerned Nobel Peace Prize Laureates via translation. No explanations is given either for the exclusion from Norway as to Florence Kelley, Folke Bernadotte, or Mohandas and Kasturba Gandhi to recall only a few.
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8. Copyright © The Nobel Foundation, Stockholm 1977. Organizational (e-mail) contact via the office for peace in Ireland, through: peacepeople@gn.apc.org.
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Editorial Book Reviews

Our World and its Natural Needs

We have received many books for editorial review on the issue of nonviolence and spirituality. The three major areas which appear to interest reader and publisher cover what will be described as concern for our world's natural needs, for the artifice of racism, for women and war as a survival issue, and for the fundraising viability of nonviolence. Hopefully the books reviewed below will be of use to the readers in more than a superficial manner, beyond mere calls for peace, but rather aimed at why, how, and what nonviolence will promote peace and justice. One of the most directly applicable books might be that of S.K. Chahal on the future of world religions, in the face of dire predictions of world pollution and related disasters: whether as to nuclear or chemical-biological-genetic war threats and wastes, or global warming and sea-level rise, and so famine, along the coasts of China, West Africa, Southern Asia, and so forth.

Rooted in the Jain, Sufi, and Hindu spirituality of Kabir, Guru Nanak, and the Adi Granth (often associated with the Sikhs), she calls for what she calls "self-realisation through identification." Drawing upon Western sources as well, such as Arne Naess or Baruch Spinoza, and recalling ongoing nonviolence struggles in Asia (where the majority of "us" live), Chahal calls as well for "... seeing God as immanent in every creature, in the whole ecosphere ..." as much as in our own human needs. Analogous writing may be forthcoming from Chiapas, in Mexico, if the various road blockades, the "Fast(s) for Peace," and other such events, mentioned by Tangeman (Orbis, 1995), bear results. In like manner Lobe Awad emphasizes that nonviolence grows from diverse milieus of the divine within us, whatever our age.

Racism as a Human Artifice

Stroupe and Fleming explore racism, religion, and worship in the U.S. Inez Fleming, a black elder in the church, and Nibs Stroupe,
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the white preacher, discuss various attempts to make such spiritual worship real in living community. Stroupe notes such experiences as organizing with the garbage workers in Memphis before and through the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. Much of their most interesting work may stem from their acquaintance with the U.S. prison and capitol punishment system, both arguably among the most violent of any world nation-state. They note, for example, that, since 1930, when the U.S. Bureau of Justice first kept such data, over 90% of the state executions in the U.S. have been African-American looking men (p. 42). Conversely, from 1970 to 1986, as U.S. skin color ratios inside its jails and prisons switched from about 3/5 “white” to 2/5 of “color” (1970) — toward 3/5 of “color” to 2/5 “white” (1986) — U.S. people imprisoned more than tripled in number, becoming the highest imprisonment per capita rate in the world (pp. 63-64). The first and final thoughts to strike the editor concerned how much this book might have resembled that of an earlier book of a similar nature, Black and Mennonite, which left the reader not only with a feeling for racism, but more personal and explicit feelings against racism and for nonviolence.

Amba Oduoye takes the reader into the international context of racism and sexism, or patriarchy, in West Africa. Using the name of Anowa to identify the African woman, as “... a true African child, a daughter of Anowa, the mythical woman, prophet, and priest whose life of daring, suffering, and determination is reflected in the continent of Africa, ...” she targets the human structures of kinship, marriage, economic consumer power, and alleged “maleness” of God. She also notes how socio-cultural norms which demand feminine submission and subordinate behavior may, in turn, promote violence against women and other forms of domestic violence, and calls for more societal structures that instead free “... African women to respond to the fullness for which God created them ....” Along the same lines, but in Hawai‘i, Ira Rohrer, co-founder of the Hawaiian Green Party, similarly examines racism and pollution as obstacles for imaging ecological change. Paige, Guanson, and Simson also point toward nonviolence in Hawai‘i, through the experiences of those like Johan Galtung, Ho‘oipo DeCambra, Anna McAnany, James Albertini, and Lou Ann Ha’aheo Guanson, ranging from botanical medicine and bloody bombing files in Hickam/SYNCPAC Base, to the coalition of the Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific.

Women and War

Linner explores and discloses the lives of women who have fought and continue to fight against nuclear weapons, their use and threat of use. Barbara Reynolds, a Quaker pioneer in such endeavors, and various Hibakusha (victims of the U.S. nuclear bombings in Japan), become a means for Linner to explore such courageous lives. Reynolds co-pioneered the World Friendship Center in Hiroshima for peace activism, medical support, and educational endeavors, including much of the basic translations for such a genre. The U.S. version of this center, at Wilmington College, Ohio, continued such work with its unique “Hiroshima-Nagasaki Memorial Collection.” To quote Reynolds: “... The hibakusha [often Shinren Buddhists] as a group have emerged with a compassion that cannot be explained by human reason or logic. They have been touched by ... a Spirit that loves us and requires us to love one another, that forgives us, and expects us to forgive each other ...” Further work of this sort, especially with such Japanese activists as Tadatoshi Akiba, Hiroshima’s socialist representative in the Japanese Diet (Congress or Parliament) and U.S. or Japanese hibakusha still caught by the bomb, as it were, might provide future interesting explorations well worth attention from even world leaders like Jacques Chirac.

Bennett, Bexley, and Warnock (Panos, 1995) note that current estimates of the world refugee situation indicate that about 85-90% of all refugees flee war or the results of war. Approximately 80% of these refugees may be women and children. To understand these numbers on the personal level, the authors collected stories from 85 women and published the results, whether the women were bystanders, couriers, intelligence, or military fighters in conflict. The study reveals what women (and men) are capable of — both violence and nonviolence. A Liberian woman called Rose, for example, tells her story of establishing both the Liberia’s National Women’s Commission and an Abused Women and Girls Program (Monrovia), despite a membership of 85%
Women have learned to move into openings during war. A woman called Katarina, as director of the Center for Peace, Nonviolence, and Human Rights (Osijek, Croatia), speaks of successful nonviolent action: by mothers in Belgrade (“Bulwark of Love”) co-opted by military violence and by women in ongoing nonviolence work in Osijek — facing down fears of killing and suffering, and breaking the spiral of hatred, by working across all religious and spiritual lines of conflict. A woman in Beirut, Lebanon, called Laure, a lawyer and a grandmother, tells of the powerlessness of women, absent from politics, unions, and many NGOs. Like Katarina, Laure finds that all religions locally-involved need to be included in the creation of a nonviolence movement, whether in organizing marches with people in wheelchairs or in furthering the view that war begins in our minds — while peace grows in our spirits.

Fundraising and Nonviolence Viability

Rajmohan Gandhi (Navajivan, 1992) speaks of the role of Vallabhbhai Patel in fund-raising, as a self-taught attorney, for much of the Indian Independence Movement, led by those like Sarojini Naidu, Jawaharlal Nehru, and Mohandas and Kasturba Gandhi. After the death of Kasturba Gandhi, and before his own death, Mohandas Gandhi even put his property and copyright ownership rights under the care of Mahadev Desai (secretary to Mohandas Gandhi), Vallabhbhai Patel, and Narhari Parikh (secretary to Vallabhbhai). Known as the “... [Indian National] Congress’ principal fund-collector ...,” Vallabhbhai frequently received funds from leading Ahmedabad mill owners, such as the Birla, Hirachand, and Sarabhai families. Given the difficulties for current nonviolence organizations to fund themselves, Vallabhbhai’s life is worth some attention, even as to his work to build Ahmedabad’s hospital, to electrify its power systems, and to co-create the endowment for its college, Gujarat Vidyapith.

Vallabhbhai’s style was distinguished by his way of directly communicating with peasant and diplomat, and driven with infectious humor. During the hardest of the strikes he lived with the workers, sharing their food, washing his clothes, sleeping on the ground, and walking great distances in order to encourage courage and self-restraint as the soul of nonviolent power. His style of diplomacy illustrated this same courage and self-restraint, as he fought to stop China from invading Tibet, exposing warlike and invasive Chinese rhetoric, instead of placating China as did Nehru. The daughter of Vallabhbhai, Maniben, also recorded much of these events of state and organizational building, from the peasant to diplomatic levels, in her (ed.) Sardarshri ne Shradhanjaliyo (Ahmedabad: Navajivan, nd); as yet not translated into English. According to Navajivan Press, many of these works, including the collected, published works of, e.g., Mohandas Gandhi and Vallabhbhai Patel may be available soon on CD, via Bombay.

Finally, Mahendra Kumar provides the reader with an excellently-edited overview of nonviolence thought, methodology, and practice, globally, traditionally, and as to future trends. L.M. Bhole, Ramon López Reyes, and Chaiwat Satha-Anand provide unusual articles aimed at post-Cold War considerations and Islam as globally-centered in Asia. Whether we will really see such zones of peace as those predicted by Asian theorists and activists, may indeed depend on such mundane issues as those inculcated into Mohandas Gandhi by his mother, Pudibai, whose spirituality derived from Jain, Hindu, and Muslim sources — or the tremendous Islamic contributions to the nonviolent struggle to liberate India. Future observers may well wonder why China, for example, “tested” its nuclear bombs in its Muslim province of Lop Nol and dumped its nuclear trash in (occupied) Tibet — or why, given our civilizational crisis, whether a truly global peace movement is possible unless it is both attained and secured by the approach of nonviolence to world peace.

Literature Received for Editorial Review


Selections from Robert Aitken, Johan Galtung, Ho’oipo DeCambría, Anna McAnany, Iraja Sivadas, Anna McAnany, James Albertini, Howard “Stretch” Johnson, Lou Ann Ha’aheo Guanson, and George Simson, on their awakening to nonviolence, their subsequent nonviolent actions, and the lessons learned so far, with suggested readings.


Stroupe, Nibs, and Inez Fleming. Foreword by Vincent Harding. *While We Run This Race: Confronting the Power of Racism in a Southern Church* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995).


Brochures, Letters, & Invitations:

Invitation from UMOAR, Universidad de Oscar Arnulfo Romero. An innovative, rural adult education institution with degree programs in technical and vocational areas, toward training in literacy, community development, and the philosophy of human ecology. They are looking for gifts like books, computers, typewriters, office equipment, and video-TV-radio equipment. c/o VIPSAL N° 727, P.O. Box 52, Miami, FL 33152-5364, USA; and Blvd. Universitario y Avenida C N° 214, Colonia El Roble, San Salvador, El Salvador, tele-fax 503 24 6905.

Invitation from the Italian Peace Movement to aid in the opening in Pristina, the capital city of Kosova Republic, former-Yugoslavia, of a "Peace Embassy" or "Embassy of Popular Diplomacy." Built on cooperation between Italy and Kosova, through donations and long-term volunteers, especially those conversant in Italian. Adult education and human needs/rights objectives in primary schools, secondary schools, and
universities (including Serbian, Albanian, and all-relevant students). Contacts: Alberto L’Abaro, Dipartimento di Studi Sociali, Via Cavour 82, 50129 Firenze (Florence), ITALIA/ITALY; fax 0039 55 2757750 or 0039 55 275 7750; tel 0039 55 275 7749; or The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research, Sweden.

Invitation from the emerging China Environmental Fund for help in supporting sustainable economic and environmental planning in China. Focus on UNESCO-designated “World Heritage Sites” as to ecology, public health, and environmental conversation. (To put it in perspective: About 160 million people visit the national parks annually; cf. Jennifer Jones, Washington, DC, liaison.) Environmental education support programs from primary-school levels. Special programs in Shenyang, Badaling, Jinshanling, and Jiayuguan, managed through Sister Cities programs for Chengdu-Phoenix, Shenyang-Chicago, Wuhan-Pittsburgh, Shanghai-San Francisco, Tianjin-Philadelphia, Guangzhou/(Hong Kong)-Los Angeles, and Beijing-Washington, DC & New York City. Directed by Marc Brody @ PO Box 530, N. Hollywood, CA 91616 USA, Tel 818/761-388, Fax 818-763-3790; or @ Room 306, North Building, #16 Xizimen Nandajie, Beijing, 100035 China, Tel 86-10-602-3322 x 201, Fax 86-10-605-3276. U.S. volunteer participant with interest in “grass-roots” nonviolence: Ned Ruhe, 1310 MacBeth St., McLean, VA 22102 USA, 703/356-3503.

For the artistic opportunities in nonviolence we refer readers to openings in post-Cold War thinking: 1) WoMenwith Hill, Women’s Peace Camp Newsletter, c/o Editor, WoMenwith Women’s Peace Camp, Outside Menwith Hill NSA Base, Kettlesing Head Layby, Near Harrogate, N. Yorks. HG3 2R1 England — Greenham Women “reborn” in struggle against guidance systems for such as the cruise missiles — seeking funds and supportive letters for those “inside;” and 2) Nuclear Resister, ed. by Felice and Jack Cohen-Joppa (Box 43383, Tucson, AZ, 85733), as to ongoing issues that include the Campaign to Free Mordechai Vanunu Newsletter, ed. by Sam Day (2206 Fox Ave., Madison, WI 53711 — seeking donations and supportive letters for Mordechai Vanunu (c/o Ashkelon Prison, Ashkelon, Israel) — as the former Israeli nuclear physicist or “David Ellsberg” who could co-pilot both Israel and Palestine toward a less-nuclearized military future (also an issue with Suzannah York, the CND, and the Bertrand Russell Foundation in England, or Dedi Zucker, member of the Israeli Knesset).

Basic Resources on Nonviolence and Spirituality

Bathke, Peter & Karin Kulow. Israel, Kriegspolitik Antikriegsbewegung (Berlin: Dietz, 1985)

Description of basic nonviolence groups in Israel and Palestine.


Black Mennonite pastor’s discussion of race, spirituality, and nonviolence.

Childs, Lydia Maria. Isaac T. Hooper (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1881).

Story of the first Quaker editor and anti-slavery Philadelphia lawyer.


Delineation of state law and nonviolence during wartime.


Decisive U.S. Capitol Hill lobbying, undergirding present peace movements.

French, Paul Comly. We Won’t Murder (New York: Hastings House, 1940).

Descriptions of nonviolence during a so-called “just” war.


Myths of law and war during and validated in wartime.

Jacob, Yusi Zajmun. La Doctrina de la No-violencia en el Pensamiento de Gandhi (San José: University of Costa Rica, PhD Diss., 1971).

Gandhian and Costa Rican notions of nonviolence.

Militia, conscription, and constitutional issues; benchmark case brought by Quakers.


Selections on principles, validity, viability, spirituality, and societal change.


Peace and nonviolence options.


By a graduate of both the University of Witwaterstrand, South Africa, and The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Concerned especially with Mohandas Gandhi's friendship with Henry Polak and Hermann Kallenbach, in addition to Israel and the Holocaust.


Jewish ideals and experience as inspiration for a nonviolent commitment to life.

Ring, James. The Notion of Truth in the Philosophy of Bertrand Russell: 1905-1918 (Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada: St. Mary's University, PhD Diss., 1968).

God and Truth: from Western to Eastern traditions of spirituality.

Call for Articles

Our fourth issue, on nonviolence, ethics, Islam, and democracy, will address one of the most difficult thematic problems for peace advocates, to reach and change critical issues nonviolently on local and global governance levels. This theme continues our thematic approach toward creative activist and academic insight in common discourse. Often described as problems of racism, terrorism, and extremism, this theme also addresses why peace advocacy so often ends in a bitter replay of domination, revolution, and more domination, such as that found in our globally-widening, so-called “poverty” gap.

Please note that we need professionally-written works, artistic and pragmatic, whether activist, academic, or diplomatic-level work — in story, allegory, or analytical styles — with nonviolence being our touch-stone and foundation for a common, sustainable existence. Topical approaches must concentrate directly on nonviolence (whether for or against it). Other relevant approaches will be considered for publication (including conferences, interviews, and participatory research), if nonviolence-in-context is your focal point. Please send your article manuscripts in whatever your world language (as defined by the United Nations) — preferably by the end of 1996.

Please type or “word-process” your article and use a systematic editorial style handbook. If done on computer, please send both a paper and disk copy of your work (MS Word or WordPerfect 5.1 or higher). Send your article to the International Journal of Nonviolence, P.O. Box 39127, Friendship Station, NW, Washington, DC 20016; fax 202/244-6396; e-mail: nonviolence@igc.apc.org.[us]. Articles will not be returned unless accompanied by sufficient return postage. Published authors will receive five copies of the journal concerned, including options for copies of your published article in paper or electronic format. We are also exploring options and suggestions to complement our journal-in-print, as to publishing our journal online — as “HTML” gives way to broader, timelier, more easily-accessible options — such as “BLACKBIRD” in the future.