turning the tide
NONVIOLENT POWER FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

Making Waves

QUAKERS

Turning the Tide programme of Quaker Peace & Social Witness

Nonviolence for social change

Issue 25 **Autumn 2013**

Editorial

The largest public protest in human history took place in 2003. Here in Britain, the oppostion to the invasion of Iraq was by far the biggest public outcry there has ever been in these islands. And let's face it, given our proud history of dissent, resistance and protest, to go with the shameful history of violence, oppression, corruption and greed, that makes it extraordinary. In 2003, we felt we had failed, though some said that whilst we hadn't prevented this war, we might have stopped the next. In 2013, the Westminster parliament unexpectedly voted against military action in Syria and this led to the United States eventually backing down from its threat. What happened in those ten years? What happened to hearts and minds?

What has gone relatively unremarked was that the unprecedented outcry in 2003 was about the unfashionable issue of peace. A great many more people became aware of government processes of manufacturing consent for war and their dubious reasons for doing it. Many more people are cynical about it, and the pece movement is stronger for it. Perhaps that explains recent government policies to cultivate love for our military, equating soldier with hero and involving the military in aspects of society like education, police and security services, politics and business.

When we talk of social change, we're talking of something deep; something more than political. It's to do with the way we are, what we do and the way we do it, how we relate to ourselves, each other and the world. Ultimately, it's about morals, ethics and values and, if we recognise that, then we open up to the realm of the spirit. Maybe transformation is a better word than change.

It's not a linear process: let's not be tempted into thinking that we have to change ourselves first before we can engage with the dirty, messy world. Everything impacts upon everything else. Just as personal spiritual work can lead to social action, so can activism lead to spiritual reflection. It's dynamic, where both are essential and connected. Transformation is an holistic process with each part feeding the other, individually as well as socially.

This is the quiet and strong story of nonviolence. It doesn't make headlines, unless grudgingly as in the case of the Syria vote, so there is a massive history of nonviolence ready and waiting to be revealed, as our article on reclaiming the nonviolent side of history suggests (page 2). We feature one example, the long, slow and determined campaign to eliminate conscription in Spain (page 4) and eventually abolish the Spanish military! This unreported history of nonviolence involves countless unnamed, heroic individuals. One of these in recent times was our comrade, Howard Clark, who died suddenly in December 2013 (page 11).

This issue of Making Waves also contains what we might describe as evidence of transformation. Read about a deep training experience hosted by Turning the Tide and led by Training for Change (page 9), new thinking on how to work with groups on strategy (page 7).

Steve Whiting
Turning the Tide

Reclaiming the nonviolent side of history

Mary Elizabeth King

Around the time that my book *A Quiet Revolution* was published in 2007, detailing the Palestinians' use of nonviolent resistance, I recall that *The Atlantic* was publishing an article by Jeffrey Goldberg. In it, he asked, "Where are the Palestinian Gandhis and Martin Luther Kings?" - or words to this effect. Upon reading this, the question burned for me: How can historical reality be so ignored, and how can history be told in a way that is so one-sided?

The violent responses to Zionism have been assiduously documented. Yet in archives, newspapers, interviews and conversations, I found numerous uncelebrated Palestinian Gandhis and Kings. Indeed, I identified at least two dozen activist intellectuals who had worked openly for years to change Palestinian political thought — many of whom would be deported, jailed or otherwise compromised by the government of Israel for their efforts. More to the point, the 1987 intifada was only the latest manifestation of a Palestinian tradition of nonviolent resistance that goes back to the 1920s and 1930s. Similar oversights have occurred in the histories of peoples all over the world.

A young historian of Polish origin, Maciej Bartkowski, has edited a book that revisits 15 struggles for national self-determination, which have until now been understood primarily in terms of violent struggle and armed insurrection. Re-examining these major historical campaigns for independence or liberation, *Recovering Nonviolent History* makes clear how much we owe to the efforts of average people fighting for independence or liberation with civil resistance. The popular mass movements presented by Bartkowski and the authors — of whom I am one — reveal that people-power struggles have been significant, if overlooked, in the molding of collective national identities and institutions.

The people of Ghana, for example, possess a deep tradition of philosophical and strategic nonviolent action that is rarely acknowledged; they won independence through boycotts, organizing associations, "intelligent compromise" and strikes. Indeed, few areas of the world have experienced the extent and intensity of strategic nonviolent action as has Africa, yet such interventions are not normally described in terms of nonviolent struggle. Mozambique, for instance, was home to a freedom movement that from 1966 onward liberated parcels of land from colonial control, which were supplanted by parallel popular political processes. These zones became miniature "states-in-the-making" that could compete with the power of the Portuguese. Even though armed struggle played a role and is often highlighted in historical accounts, it actually held secondary significance.

In conventional histories, violence is generally celebrated and eulogized; national memorials glamorize death, bloodshed and warfare. A different picture is beginning to emerge, however. Nonviolent, organized action has been able to undermine the authority and domination of imperial powers, thwart foreign forces, and weaken military occupiers or their domestic representatives. Often facing severe oppression and reprisals, people who engage in civil resistance have aided the survival of their societies, toughened their resilience, constructed fledgling economic and political institutions, and won greater self-determination.

This past spring, I asked my students at the University for Peace main campus in Costa Rica to choose a chapter from Bartkowski's book, write an essay and present the story of a recovered history. An Afghan student who had spent time in Iran chose the chapter on Persian nonviolent movements going back to the late 19th century. In the nationwide tobacco protests between 1891 and 1892, for instance, men and women stopped consuming imported tobacco for their water pipes, particularly as it became clear that a foreign Christian firm had come to control Iran's tobacco trade. Mass demonstrations occurred in major cities. In Shiraz, a leading member of the clergy called for noncompliance with the order to sell tobacco grown for export to the company. A fatwa, or decree, issued in the name of an Iranian leader of the Shia community, deepened a growing boycott and

had the effect of widening civil disobedience. As a result of popular unity and pressure, eventually the government canceled its arrangement with the foreign firm.

As often happens, the Iranian movements did not so much reject violence explicitly as they drew on Iran's history of popular resistance in carrying out various forms of nonviolent action. Such traditional techniques included taking *bast* — inviolable refuge — in mosques and diplomatic legations, closing bazaars, petitions, shop closings, mass demonstrations and boycotts of foreign goods. Demonstrations by women in local protests against prices of basic foodstuffs were sometimes effective, based as they were on concepts of Islamic justice.

These orchestrated actions offer a new perspective on Iran that counters the presumption of a violent society often emphasized by Western leaders today. What if Western diplomats were to pursue contact by acknowledging the histories of Iranian people power? What if media accounts about Iran told stories of the Iranian Gandhis and Kings?

A pupil from the United States who had traveled to Tahrir Square for a month of interviews was engrossed by the book's account of the deep roots of Egyptian civil resistance. Egypt's hidden history includes 1919 women's leadership of demonstrations in opposition to the British occupation of Egypt. Here, women had an advantage: The British police commander wrote about a demonstration of "the native ladies of Cairo" that frightened him, because "stopping a procession means force and any force you use to women puts you in the wrong."

In the struggle against the British, Egyptians employed nonviolent methods such as speeches, marches, nonviolent sieges, alternative institutions and covert publications. In class, we had already discussed the right to resist as it evolved in the concept of the social contract in 18th-century Scottish Enlightenment thought; it was thus an electric moment to learn of the Egyptian religious scholars' 1905 *fatwa* stating that "according to the rules of Islamic Sharia [law], people have the right to install rulers and to impeach them if they deviate from the rules of justice and take the path to injustice."

In the British colonies of what is now the eastern United States, at least nine of the original 13 colonies had achieved de facto independence a year before the outbreak of the war of independence. Walter H.

Unidentified photographer (Pinterest)

Woman addressing a group of Egyptians amid a nascent rebellion against British colonization. May 24, 1919

Conser and a team of scholars working in archives on both sides of the Atlantic have documented this largely nonviolent political process, which Conser presents in Recovering Nonviolent History with potent brevity. His chapter should be taught in every U.S. high school.

"A history of military operations … is not a history of the American Revolution," John Adams warned in 1815. "The revolution was in the minds and hearts of the people, and in the union of the colonies; both of which were substantially effected before hostilities commenced." Colonists made their independence a reality through a programme of non-importation, non-consumption and non-exportation of British products. They set up extra-legal committees that assumed the functions of governance. "In reality," Conser writes, "political independence from Britain was evident before the Battles of Lexington and Concord in April 1775."

American schoolchildren, however, are drilled in the narrative of military victory in the war — with little or no attention, for instance, to the more politically significant defeat of London's Stamp Act by civil resistance. My students were surprised to learn how persistently neglected has been this dimension of history in U.S. classrooms. They were not shy about suggesting that such disregard may be linked to the contours of the U.S. presence in the world today, with the ambition emanating from Washington of fostering democracy abroad with cruise missiles or drones.

Stories of women's activism especially aroused the interest of my students. This subject is most often obliterated from official histories and authorized historical analysis. African peoples, for instance, often had deep traditions of women's leadership predating the colonial period; some practices for resolving conflicts were reserved for women alone to fulfill. Yet these customs were repeatedly expunged by imperial importations of a submissive role for women. The recovery of these nonviolent histories, in particular, is a conversation that has only begun.

How we human beings think of ourselves as being able to make social and political change is shaped — or distorted — by how we understand the past. Some Palestinian families, for instance, have actively preserved memories and awareness of how their relatives and ancestors had struggled without violence to preserve their way of life during the 1920s and 1930s. These memories affected how they perceived their own ability to be instrumental as change agents, even under military occupation after 1967. The building of peace demands that the history and practice of civil resistance be studied and taught, because it influences what we learn from the past, but also how we comprehend, interpret and plan, in the present and for the future. Rediscovering history through the lens of nonviolent struggle can change how we situate ourselves as historical actors. If we want a more peaceable world, we should realize that what has become widely accepted as history can hide the stories of average people, who through nonviolent struggles have shaped the contours of their destiny.

Mary Elizabeth King is professor of peace and conflict studies at the University for Peace and a Rothermere American Institute Fellow at Oxford University.
This article appears with permission openDemocracy.net and Waging Nonviolence.
http://www.opendemocracy.net/transformation/mary-elizabeth-king/reclaiming-nonviolent-history
http://wagingnonviolence.org/feature/reclaiming-the-nonviolent-side-of-history/

The Insumisión movement against military service in Spain: legitimate disobedience

by AA MOC (Alternativa Antimilitarista, Movimiento de Objeción de la Consciencia)

In December 2001 across Spain, the last conscripted recruits left military barracks for good. Their nine months of obligatory military service was complete and the Spanish conscription system officially eliminated. While the end of conscription was wrapped up in a discourse about the 'modernisation' of the army, the key factor was three decades of continuous action by a broad social movement. The campaigners used sustained civil disobedience from the beginning, and by the 1990s obligatory military service was wholly and socially discredited.

Thus the disappearance of conscription was a huge social victory. In the 1970s, when the movement had just begun to organise as a pacifist and anti-militarist force of civil disobedience, this was impossible to imagine. By the second half of the 1990s applications for substitute service reached a million and there were thousands who resisted military service as well as the alternative service, the *insumisos*.

First steps: From the Jehovah's Witnesses to anti-militarist objectors

During Franco's dictatorship, many Jehovah's Witnesses refused to perform military service because of their religious beliefs and suffered long prison sentences without particular protest for social change or challenging the military institution. In the early 1970s an antimilitarist and self-organised

movement was born. The first cases of public disobedience organised support campaigns, publicised recruitment refusals, and used the media to invite the public to reflect on the justice of disobeying. They also connected alternatives to military service to the upkeep of impoverished neighbourhoods. In this way self-organised civil service improved upon the workings of the State. With the refusal of the first legislation regarding conscientious objection for religious reasons in 1977, the Conscientious Objectors Movement (MOC) was founded. MOC provided titular unity to an existing network of groups that had been collaborating and the main drivers of disobedience over the last 30 years. During the 1970s more objectors were sent to military prison, but, this repression did not break up the movement. On the contrary, it made it grow and increased its public influence.

From objectors to insubordinates: los insumisos

In 1980 the Minister of Defence stopped the

imprisonment of objectors while a new law was written which would recognise conscientious objection and institutionalise an alternative service. Conscientious objectors were being sent directly to the 'reserves', which meant a secret amnesty was in place. The movement built its strength during this period, denouncing the anticipated new law quelling civil disobedience while simultaneously maintaining disobedience to conscription.

The law was approved in 1986 and substitute service went into effect in 1989. By then, the civil disobedience movement had radicalised and deepened its antimilitarist stand. Civil disobedience and nonviolence were now tools not only for ending conscription but also for forcing the disappearance of the military system, and radically transforming society. MOC and other networks announced that they would refuse the alternative service that the Law on Conscientious Objection purported. On 20 February 1989 the first 50 *insumisos* publicly appeared, and so began a new phase of civil disobedience known as *insumisión*.

Repression's 'Boomerang Effect'

Insumisión began as a campaign developed by hundreds of objectors, but with ever-growing support by different sectors of society. The 'boomerang effect' from the repressive imprisonment of the *insumisos* (the sentences were for 2 years) meant the figures continued to rise during the early 1990s. There was a wide network of support groups, pre-incarceration trainings, and solidarity through self-incrimination, where people charged themselves for having aided the *insumiso* in their disobedience. According to Spanish law this is a crime should also be prosecuted and sentenced equally as *insumisión*. In reality however, no self-incriminated person was ever prosecuted. Given the popularity of *insumisión* the government decided to assign all the imprisoned objectors to open prisons, something that a very disobedient part of the movement fought. They refused to return to the open-prison, obliging the prison authorities to send them back to closed, standard regimen prisons. Later, in 1995, the government replaced prison sentences with 'disqualification' or 'civil death'. By now *insumision* was so widespread that it was 'normal', and the majority refused recruitment did so without any coordination with the movement.

The system collapses

At the same time, alternative service was taken up by more and more young people as something 'easy',

eventually leading to the collapse of the system since there never were enough substitute posts to meet the demand. The movement succeeded in getting many NGOs and associations to refuse to offer alternative service posts, which strangled the alternative service programme. This contributed to the collapse of the civil and military recruitment system and in 1996 the government announced the end of military service in 2003, and in fact this was brought forward to 2001. Military officials said instead of conscription they would form an army of professional soldiers. This announcement caused the disbandment of a large part of the disobedience movement against obligatory military service, since many felt that the principle objective had been achieved.

Ekologistak Martxan y el Grupo Antimilitarista de Bilbao (KEM-MOC)

A flashmob taking action outside a bank against the financing of war and the destruction of the earth. October 12th 2013, Plaza Circular, Bilbao.

'*Insumisión* in the barracks' and the end of military service

Many others remained however, and they organised and carried out new forms of disobedience to recruitment, such as the so-called *insumisión* in the barracks. This invited those incorporated into military ranks to become objectors and returned to the debate about a 'modern and professional' army and the public campaigns against recruitment.

The *'insumisión* in the barracks' was a transition campaign towards a new landscape with no military service or insumisión. Meanwhile MOC re-focused its energy on criticism of military spending, counter-recruitment and campaigns for the closure of military bases. The conscientious objection and the *insumisión* movements are examples of civil disobedience movements, with widespread social impact and achievements.

Insumisión demonstrated that civil disobedience has immense power for social transformation. We have tried to capture this energy by sharing our story: here in *Making Waves*, in a video we produced last year, *Insumisión: 20 years of disobedience*, and in 2001 a book *In Legitimate Disobedience*. Our intention is to provide inspiration and share our disobedience experience with the years of campaigns to come.

Watch the video at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4rk0sQ94yig&feature=youtu.be

Download the book as a free PDF at http://www.antimilitaristas.org/spip.php?article1997

Or write to< julene.eiguren@gmail.com> for copies of the video or book.

For more general information see http://www.antimilitaristas.org/

Strategy and grassroots campaigning

Denise Drake

Zip, zap, shazam: whipping together a strategy

Recently after facilitating a campaign group's strategy day I heard one of the visionary, key and stalwart group

members remark 'I always think these strategy days are going to be a bit more of a zip, zap, shazam-process whipping together a plan, but it rarely is.' As both a facilitator and activist, I agree – it is rare – and I think that's because although we all come together to work on the same issue, we each view the issue through our personal lenses about how change happens, how we want to contribute and what we think is most effective.

Another layer of complexity is how our past experiences motivate and mark our involvement in groups. Are we confident and certain of ourselves because we're known to be the 'strategy heads' or do we bring a valued gift or resource to groups? Or are we the often undervalued but much needed tea-maker and soother of difficult relationships within groups? Or the philosopher, the one to turn every suggestion inside and out (much to many's exasperation and annoyance) yet ensuring every detail has been assessed for risk, success and failure likelihoods, and so on.

Personal motivations and grassroots campaigning

Personal motivations are important in determining what grassroots campaigning groups decide to do and can accomplish. Compare: campaigning NGOs draw up role profiles and hire people with specific skills to carry out their plans; on the other hand, grassroots activist groups rely on people wanting to do the things the group has decided to do. Given the transient and ephemeral nature of activist groups, new people getting involved may find the strategy unworkable for them, or incredulous about the effectiveness of the group's strategy. Others may be disappointed and frustrated to discover the group doesn't really have a strategy; they have a line up of activities in mind and do what those assembled in the moment fancy doing. And any of these approaches may be in direct conflict with those who view these as perfectly workable strategy!

We are motivated in multiple ways when joining activist groups: visions of a better world; a desire to put values in action; a sense of collectivity and efficacy in doing something; a longing for connections and friends. Too often however groups form plans without considering individuals' motivations and gifts. Why are we here, what do we offer the group, what do we hope to get out of the group? If the group does have a thought-out and mutually agreed strategy plan, it's often what the most influential person(s) in the group want to do, or what the group has always done (marches, rallies, information stalls, direct action, etc). While these are not categorically bad approaches, I've been involved in enough groups to know that they don't always bring out the best in everyone, or create conditions where people boldly step into their power, while simultaneously growing collective effectiveness in tackling the issue. I've seen campaigns succeed or move closer to the goal, while at the same time also damaging and burning-out group members, which surely is not part of any activists' vision of 'another world'.

European Training Exchange on Strategy in Belgium November 2012

In November 2012 Turning the Tide was part of a team organising a strategy training exchange in Belgium. 39 grassroots trainers from the UK, Ireland, Spain, France, Germany, Sweden, Poland, Ukraine, Slovenia and Russia took part. We came together to challenge ourselves to do strategy differently. There was a generous and rich sharing of strategy exercises and ideas, and space to develop new ones to address specific situations colleagues faced. We also compared notes on the socio-political landscape activists groups in our countries face. Worryingly we note a common and growing fear of difference and sentiments of fascism. We also scraped away at the surface layers of our local issues, to see that although they might look different at first glance, really at root are the same causes: neo-liberalism's ever-creeping stain of structural adjustment programmes (the cuts) and an ever-expanding security-obsession and militarisation of our communities. All this within the context of a growing atmosphere and reality of scarcity of resources in a crumbling capitalist, fossil fuel dependent world.

Facilitators, strategy, and workshops

We also talked about the role of facilitators in shaping the culture of the social movements we belong to, and how to be the change we seek in our campaigns, at home with family and friends, at work and in the

workshops we do with groups. We also noted similar experiences with groups and attitudes to strategy.

They ask for a strategy workshop, but what they need is a workshop on how to work effectively together. – A common experience of many was groups initially requesting a strategy workshop, but in the course of conversations with groups during the planning stage it becomes clear that actually what is going on is an inability to work effectively together. There are issues of power and rank within the group, different approaches and beliefs about what is 'best' to do, and this affects their ability to communicate with each other. They may need a strategy workshop, but first they need a session on how to work effectively together.

To have a strategy plan, or not? And if yes, how to implement it. Another shared dilemma was about if and how groups use strategy. Imagine, a group succeeds in sitting down together to do strategy. In many cases this act alone will be a huge accomplishment, and further, imagine they develop and agree a strategy for their campaign. Three things typically then happen: 1. The plan is never consulted or really used again. So much time, energy, effort and tears have gone into making the plan, it may have left a bad taste in some people's mouths, or activities are unrealistic or not anyone's cup of tea – but they look good on paper. 2. Other groups cling to their strategy no matter what happens, ignoring unexpected opportunities that emerge; it's not part of the plan, so it's out. 3. Or groups are so intent and focused on doing what they do, they don't pause to evaluate and adjust their strategy as the situation develops. They don't pause to observe the big picture and reflect on how do we complement each other, what are others also doing on the issue?

Another question we asked ourselves was just how strategic are we facilitators in our workshops? At the beginning of the week Turning the Tide ran a session for the whole group which asked people to list the important elements in workshop design and describe their workshop process from beginning to end. As might be expected there was a range of responses, and we were not looking for a definitive 'right or wrong' approach. We wanted to survey the field and learn from each other.

Goals were something mentioned by nearly everyone, but an example of a key element that may have different meanings and significance to people. Also interesting was that with a bit of dissection similarities can be spotted in our approach to workshops and the campaign strategies we encounter in groups. Goals, for TTT, are the guiding principles of a workshop. When TTT gets a workshop request we take the time to discuss the context and need with the group and help them to re-frame it if necessary. We then set simple, clear workshop goals and agree them with the group. Next we design a workshop plan, with activities that connect directly to the goals. TTT facilitators also keep in mind back-up activities, and are flexible and willing to change the plan if it doesn't seem to be moving the group towards the goals. At the end of the workshop we return to goals to assess how well we met the group's needs. For others at the training exchange, goals are vague signposts suggesting themes and treated much more loosely. They are used if useful, set aside if not. And then for others goals are super-essential, so much so that the carefully prepared activities cannot change. The facilitators don't believe in veering too far from the prepared plan.

The strategy exchange was a rich and dynamic meeting for those that attended and that energy has been carried to the grassroots we work with, and spirals forth in our movements and workshops. A working group called 'personal skills for strategy' was established at the Ypres meeting and has continued to explore questions around power, rank, personal skills and strategy, and movement culture in follow-up meetings. Get in touch with TTT if you'd like to know more.

Denise Drake is an artist,activist, facilitator and programme coordinator for Turning the Tide.

Training for change in Margate

In January 2013, Turning the Tide hosted a 9-day training event led by Erika Thorne and Daniel Hunter, training elders from the Philadelphia-based training collective, Training for Change. It comprised two workshops, Training for Social Action Trainers and Advanced Training for Trainers. Denise Drake and Steve Whiting asked two participants, Hannah Lewis and Phoebe Spence about their experiences.

1. How would you describe your Margate training experience to other trainer/ facilitators?

PS: This was my first experience of Direct Education. It's not easy to explain, but I've found myself reflecting on it in other situations, like a 3-day Changemakers event I went to, and I also recently heard an announcement that the local Labour Party is using the Changemakers approach, which is a kind of directed listening. It's not the same sort of holistic approach as Direct Education.

HL: Before the workshop, I'd been realizing I was on a kind of plateau with my facilitation and training, and wondered where to go to next. Margate did a lot for me. It was a transformational experience for me and expanded my thinking about what facilitation is, how subtle behaviours can affect what's going on in a group. It made me reconnect to facilitation and training and made me excited seeing such brilliant trainers who were very clear about their choices and their leadership was something I wasn't getting from other trainers I work with.

PS: Yes, the leadership the facilitators offered – wow! I don't have a lot to compare it with, but their modeling of how to deal with a group, how to realise what is happening in a group was very helpful. I don't yet have the head for this, or even really know what to look for, but they were very skillful facilitators. It was an excellent introduction for me as a beginner. And even though I'm new to this, and light years away from the other participants, I was made to feel OK and that I was right where I am suppose to be

2. What stood out for you? What worked well? What do you wish had been done differently?

PS: The high quality of facilitation without doubt. And what an opportunity! Something like this doesn't come around too often. So what else stood out? The facilitators, the participants, it was such an energizing and creative space.

HL: What stood out for me was how Daniel and Erika worked. They seemed very resilient and caring for themselves so they could process their stuff, their strong feelings outside the workshop and not bring it into the group. There was an absolute rigour about them – not always going to the pub, taking themselves away from the us, Erika doing her stretching exercises in a way which was visible and a lesson for us, but also good for her. They were clear about how much energy they were willing to give, when to be friendly and when to stand back, but also always available for us. Towards the end of the workshop, Daniel noticed that I was hovering around as if I wanted to speak to him, but he made it clear that the move must be mine. Later we talked about it and he said that he thought we'd be natural allies, friends in a different situation, but he decided that at that moment he needed to be in the trainer role to be of maximum use to me.

They were very clear they don't negotiate with the group; they are committed to the learning goals and not to individuals in the training. One of the things that stood out for me was their reflection of our self-deprecating culture, and how damaging it is to tell ourselves we're rubbish. Oh, and the dangers of not dealing with conflict. And seeing everyone grow during the course of the workshop, and feeling relationships becoming more authentic.

PS: I saw that too during the short weekend workshop I attended. The onus was very much on us to take responsibility. We all did our own growing. I've always been quite apologetic but I feel less apologetic now. I feel I can take on more responsibility.

What worked well for me were the practice sessions in small groups of 4-5. Everyone was very supportive and I felt exhilarated. I felt ok about making mistakes.

What could have been different? I wish I'd had more

courage to take bigger risks. I was only there for the first weekend, maybe if I'd stayed the whole week …?

HL: Daniel and Erika worked well! One exercise that stands out for me was Team Types, where we identified our personality types within the group. It shed a light on what was going on in the room. It worked really well, and Daniel and Erika's choice of when to bring it in was key. Another thing that worked well was the venue: away from the big city, by the thrashing sea. Lots of people there are trainers who are putting their skills into practice and so this is movement building – using and sharing.

Another good thing was one day I was feeling pretty shitty and I was supported to feel that and to see it as a learning opportunity. I had this idea that to learn I had to happy and skippy, and that's not true. It helped me that day, and since to understand it's not my job as facilitator to make participants change how they are feeling.

What could have been different? I wish some others could have been there, there are some really excellent trainer/facilitators who weren't there and if they had – it would have been even more brilliant! Although the Noticings sessions were good, I wanted to know more about how they work it all out, I wanted to be in Daniel and Erika's meetings. It would be great to have another of these trainings, only bigger, with more people. Maybe get a big grant to enable more people to have this experience.

PS: I agree, it would be great to have another one. I noticed when I first arrived and met Erika, she was very clear about her needs, her choice of room etc. Responsibility was placed on us participants. Margate did feel like another place – surreal. The sea, the weather. It took us out of our usual lives.

3. What has been the impact on you as an activist trainer/ facilitator?

PS: I've learned a lot about being willing to take risks. I'm competent at organizing but I'm learning something about group process. But I do need an opportunity to do more, and Hannah and Kathryn work together so there's an opportunity for them to buddy and support each other. I'm trying to move along, but I am where I am, just need to wait and see what happens next.

HL: As a trainer, I generally feel more confident I can make decisions on behalf of the group based on what I'm observing. And I have a framework that helps me to know what's best for the group. I also understand better that if I choose to ask the group I will only get responses only from those who feel confident about responding in the whole group, I'll hear from the mainstream of the group. And it may be OK to only hear from them sometimes, but I've got greater awareness now about that. I knew about the mainsteam-margin concept from reading the Lakey book and before that from Arnold Mindell, plus meeting George Lakey last summer. It's a concept I knew before, but it's become higher up there on our list of what a group needs to pay attention to. Also recently I've learned how much of a chronic mainstreamer I am and want to be conscious of not preferencing the mainstream and not excluding the margins.

PS: Yes, I found the Mainstream-Margins stuff a very exciting way of looking at a group, and I think we talked about it in the Turning the Tide year-long course. I'd like to have a chance to do more with it.

HL: As an activist I've been slow to learn that not everyone is having the same experience. It's helped me be more aware and understand that unless I ask how others are feeling, I really don't know of what's going on for them.

Any final comments?
HL: I'm very grateful to Steve and Denise for making it happen. It's a massive gift to our movement.

PS: Might we do something like this ourselves sometime in the future?

More information: http://www.trainingforchange.org/

Hannah Lewis and Phoebe Spence are Turning the Tide Resource People. Hannah is an activist and member of the Seeds for Change training collective.

Howard Clark (1950-2013)

Rene Wadlow

Howard Clark, long time co-editor of Peace News and "coordinator" of War Resisters International (WRI) died November 28th, 2013. WRI's older term for the post "general secretary" had been phased out in the early 1970s to give the impression that the headquarters did not depend on only one person, but terminology does not always change reality. In practice, there was little staff to "coordinate" and the national branches were too diverse in goals and organisational culture to be coordinated, beyond cooperation for holding important Triennial conferences, during which Howard became the daily news presenter keeping the challenges of world events in front of the participants.

Howard faced the issue of re-directing a movement in the post-Cold War years. War Resisters International, as others in the peace movement, had its activities structured by the 1945-1990 Cold War between the USSR and the USA. WRI had been active in anti-nuclear weapons efforts, against the trade in arms to countries in conflict, and in finding ways of bridging the Cold War divisions, in part in some joint activities with the Soviet-led World Peace Council, yet also supporting individual objectors and dissidents in the Soviet bloc. The struggle against the US-led war in Vietnam had been an important focus. As an organization with much British leadership, the tensions in Northern Ireland were also ever-present (1).

With the 1990s, Howard faced the issue of how to keep faith with the WRI tradition of individual conscientious objection (CO) and at the same time responding to broad social aspects of armed violence, especially the armed conflicts resulting in the break up of the Yugoslav Federation.

I knew Howard basically on the CO issues which had become an agenda item at the UN Commission on Human Rights, which met in Geneva. However, as countries dropped conscription in favour of a professional military or developed alternatives to military service, the only COs left were members of the Watchtower Society (Jehovah's Witnesses), whose theology seemed strange to Howard, all the more so that in some Watchtower publications, the returning Jesus seems less nonviolent than the first time around!

Howard was more tuned to broader social change - "Nonviolent Revolution" became a subtitle on the Peace News masthead and Making Nonviolent Revolution was Howard's most widely circulated booklet within WRI, starting in 1977 with the third edition in 2012. Howard worked closely with Gene Sharp and George Lakey, both of whom put the emphasis on nonviolent actions for broad social change.

Thus we were both heavily involved in looking for ways to limit the conflicts starting in the early 1990s with the disintegration of Yugoslavia. Howard early recognized the importance of the nonviolent efforts of Ibrahim Rugova in Kosovo, an effort to create a total alternative society once Slobodan Milosevic had ended in 1989 the autonomy of Kosovo within the Serbian Republic and modified the education system. Howard's book on Rugova and Kosovo is an important contribution to the study of nonviolence (2). Howard was often frustrated by the lack of peace movement interest in Rugova when nonviolence seemed a real possibility for deep social change. After the 1995 Dayton Accords, which deliberately left the Kosovo issues aside, there was the rise of an armed Kosovo faction, leading to harsh Serbian repression, NATO bombing of Serbia and the end of any possibilities of good-faith negotiations in Kosovo, a troubled situation still with us, Rugova having died in 2006.

After Howard retired as coordinator of WRI in 1997, in

part to get married and follow his wife to Spain, he was elected chair of WRI, a post he held at his death. His drive and analytical mind will be missed.

Notes
1. For a good history of WRI from its founding until the mid-1970s, see Devi Prasad's War is a Crime against Humanity: The Story of War Resisters' International (London: War Resisters' International, 2005, 555pp.)
2. Howard Clark, Civil Resistance in Kosovo (London, Pluto Press, 2000)

René Wadlow is a member of the Fellowship of Reconciliation and representative to the United Nations, Geneva, of the Association of World Citizens.

A book of condolences for Howard can be found on the WRI website at http://www.wri-irg.org/ForHoward
Here is the Turning the Tide entry:

Howard still had so much to give

Howard Clark was a good friend of Quaker Peace & Social Witness and Turning the Tide, and we are shocked and saddened to say goodbye to a wonderful friend, colleague, peace academic, researcher, author, activist and trainer, and a warm and wise human being. Howard still had so much to give the movement here in the UK, Spain where he lived, and internationally through his work as Chair of War Resisters International. Howard and Quakers danced in and out of training, peace-building and movement-building grassroot networks of mutual support for more than 40 years. We will miss his presence, wise contributions, big vision, story-telling and sense of humour. Our sympathies are with WRI and Howard's family, we hold you in the light during this sad time.

Turning the Tide

Making Waves has been produced using open source software developed by people that believe in the principles of freely shared software for all.

All articles were sourced from LibreOffice (download free at https://www.libreoffice.org)
Layout and print preparation was done in Scribus desktop publishing software (download free at http://scribus.net/canvas/Scribus)

Paper copies were printed by Upstream, an environmentally responsible print and design co-operative: http://www.upstream.coop

turning the tide
NONVIOLENT POWER FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

About Turning the Tide

Turning the Tide aims to advance the understanding and practice of nonviolence and its use for positive social change, using the experience of contemporary and previous nonviolence movements.

Turning the Tide provides
- introductory experiential workshops exploring active nonviolence
- tailor-made workshops for groups: themes can include campaign strategy, effective group working, empowerment, spirituality and activism, facilitation, group process and preparing for nonviolent action
- resource materials, a journal *Making Waves*, a website www.turning-the-tide.org and a nonviolence resource library

Making Waves is edited by Steve Whiting and Denise Drake

Text available in large print
020 7663 1064

Turning the Tide, Friends House, Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ, UK
+44 (0)20 7663 1064/1
denised@quaker.org.uk or
stevew@quaker.org.uk
www.turning-the-tide.org

Turning the Tide is a programme of Quaker Peace & Social Witness
www.quaker.org.uk/qpsw