

PEACE STUDIES
JOURNAL

Volume 5, Issue 3
November 2012

PEACE STUDIES JOURNAL

Vol. 5, Issue 3

November 2012

Editor: Brian Trautman, Berkshire Community College

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: Drawing on Interdisciplinary Themes that Inform and Influence Peace Studies

- Brian J. Trautman, Pg. 1-3

Neoliberalism and the Non-Profit Industrial Complex: The Limits of a Market Approach to Service Delivery

- Laura L. Finley and Luigi Esposito, Pg. 4-26

Applying Social Movement Theory to Nonhuman Rights Mobilization and the Importance of Faction Hierarchies

- Corey Lee Wrenn, Pg. 27-44

Betty Reardon's Conception of "Peace" and its Implications for a Philosophy of Peace Education

- Dale T. Snauwaert, Pg. 45-52

Simplicity and Social Justice: An Examination of Value-driven Practice in the Mennonite Central Committee

- Emily E. Welty, Pg. 53-71

Pedagogies of Social Justice for Higher Education Community Engagement Programs

- Andria Wisler, Pg. 72-80

This is What Democracy Looks Like: The 2012 NATO Protests in Chicago

- Ellen Birkett Lindeen, Pg. 81-89

Book Review: The Future of Service-Learning: New Solutions for Sustaining and Improving Practice. 2009.

Edited by Jean R. Strait and Marybeth Lima. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

- Deb Sheffer, Pg. 90-93

Book Review: Love and Liberation: An Animal Liberation Front Story. 2012. By Sarat Colling and Anthony J. Nocella II. Williamstown, MA: Piraeus Books.

- Jan Austin Smitowicz, Pg. 94-96

Book Review: Equipping the New African Peacebuilder. 2012. By Titus K. Oyeyemi. Nappanee, Indiana:

Evangel Publishing House. and Film Review: Dear Mandela. 2012. By Dara Kell and Christopher Nizza.

Sleeping Giant Films. Documentary.

- Matt Meyer, Pg. 97-100

Book Review: Gandhi and the Unspeakable: His Final Experiment with Truth. 2012. By James W. Douglass.

Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

- Linda LeTendre, Pg. 101-103

PEACE STUDIES JOURNAL

Vol. 5, Issue 3

November 2012

Introduction: Drawing on Interdisciplinary Themes that Inform and Influence Peace Studies

Author: Brian J. Trautman, M.Ed.

Instructor, Peace and World Order Studies
History Department
Berkshire Community College
1350 West Street
Pittsfield, MA 01201
Email: btrautman@berkshirecc.edu

INTRODUCTION: DRAWING ON INTERDISCIPLINARY THEMES THAT INFORM AND INFLUENCE PEACE STUDIES

This issue of Peace Studies Journal offers empirical and theoretical insights on a diverse selection of topics that contribute knowledge and understanding to the field. The open theme of the issue allowed for a greater level of holistic representation and inclusivity than is commonly found in peer-reviewed scholarly journals. This degree of openness and flexibility produced manuscripts that examine the multifaceted origins of and innovative approaches to negative peace, existing or potential violent conflict, and social, economic and environmental injustice. The issue draws together research and observation on the interconnected root causes of and solution-based nonviolent methods to violence and injustice from an interdisciplinary perspective. The epistemological considerations of violent conflict and peacebuilding offered in this issue will hopefully build and enhance reader's awareness of the barriers to peace and justice and of direct action methods that may reduce and prevent violence as well as support positive peace initiatives, both domestically and globally.

In "Neoliberalism and the Non-Profit Industrial Complex: The Limits of a Market Approach to Service Delivery", Laura L. Finley and Luigi Esposito examine the ways that domestic violence non-profits and human rights non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are increasingly influenced by neoliberalism. Finley and Esposito show that the neoliberalist approach is antithetical to service provision that supports the dignity and humanity of those in need, because

neoliberalism fails to support systemic or structural change that would reduce or eliminate inequalities which would promote positive peace.

In “Applying Social Movement Theory to Nonhuman Rights Mobilization and the Importance of Faction Hierarchies,” Corey Lee Wrenn discusses social movement theory as it relates to the nonhuman animal rights movement. In this exploration Wrenn discusses the roles, motivations and actions of different factions in various contexts, the relationships between and among these factions toward social movement success, and the role of counterframing in subduing radical mobilization and the potential aggravating factor of status contamination.

In “Betty Reardon’s Conception of “Peace” and its Implications for a Philosophy of Peace Education”, Dale T. Snauwaert considers the ethical and political foundations of Reardon’s approach to peace education as introduced in Reardon’s 1988 seminal book *Comprehensive Peace Education: Educating for Global Responsibility*. Snauwaert focuses on what Reardon refers to as the “definitional problem”: defining the meaning of “peace” as foundational to the articulation of a philosophy of peace education. Snauwaert argues that Reardon’s philosophy is grounded in a cosmopolitan and transformational moral and political orientation, one that provides a powerful framework for the development of a philosophy of peace education.

In “Simplicity and Social Justice: An examination of value-driven practice in the Mennonite Central Committee”, Emily E. Welty reports on the ways in which North American Mennonites have understood simplicity as a form of social justice and the way in which this understanding has affected the way in which the Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) works outside North America. Welty examines how simplicity is practiced by MCC volunteers working in Uganda and Kenya and how this simplicity is perceived by the native people.

In “Pedagogies of social justice for higher education community engagement programs”, Andria Wisler builds on the notion that higher education community engagement programs serve as critical levers to transform the current state of civic disconnectedness and social injustice into one of renewed vibrancy and well-being. Wisler outlines the conceptual and pragmatic features of social justice-based higher education programs that champion community engagement. Program pedagogies that might accompany students’ participation in these programs are described. Wisler contends that certain pedagogical building blocks are paramount to rooting transformation in students but as of yet are under-theorized and under-developed.

In “This is What Democracy Looks Like: The 2012 NATO Protests in Chicago”, Ellen Birkett Lindeen shares a first-person narrative of the observations and experiences as a marcher and protester at the 2012 NATO summit protests in Chicago on May 18 & 20. Lindeen’s account includes brief histories of the NATO organization and NATO summit protests since 2001. The paper includes a summary of speakers, organizations, and media information that were witnessed firsthand at two of the major events: a Nurses’ Rally at Daley Plaza and a march from Grant Park to McCormick Place where Iraq Veterans symbolically returned medals. Lindeen also offers connections between the NATO protests in Chicago and Occupy and the future of Peace Studies.

This issue includes three book reviews and one combination book-film review. Deb Sheffer discusses a service-learning oriented book; Jan Austin Smitowicz critiques a book about animal liberation, which includes discussion on the ethic of inter-species respect and appreciation and on

human relationships with other animal species; Matt Meyer evaluates a book and film about the myths and assumptions connected to the contemporary African condition and challenges the Global North to take stock of a new generation of African change agents; Linda LeTendre reviews a book about the back story of Mahatma Gandhi's assassination.

The works included in this issue cover a variety of topics, all of which help improve our ability to confront some of the most urgent conflict and injustice in the world today with nonviolent, growth-fostering, sustainable approaches.

In addition to the authors of the manuscripts that comprise this issue, I want to sincerely thank everyone who submitted a manuscript for consideration. I also want to extend a very special thank you to my friend, colleague and the Journal's lead editor, Anthony J. Nocella II, for inviting me to edit this incredibly dynamic and illuminating issue of *Peace Studies Journal*.

PEACE STUDIES JOURNAL

Vol. 5, Issue 3

November 2012

Neoliberalism and the Non-Profit Industrial Complex: The Limits of a Market Approach to Service Delivery

Author: Laura L. Finley, Ph.D.
Email: lfinley@mail.barry.edu

Author: Luigi Esposito, Ph.D.
Email: lesposito@mail.barry.edu

Barry University
Department of Sociology & Criminology
Lehman Hall 310
11300 NE 2nd Ave.
Miami Shores, FL 33161

NEOLIBERALISM AND THE NON-PROFIT INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX: THE LIMITS OF A MARKET APPROACH TO SERVICE DELIVERY

Abstract

This article examines the ways that domestic violence non-profits and human rights non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are increasingly influenced by neoliberalism. Neoliberalism is an ideology that emphasizes the importance of the market and market-based solutions. As such, social problems like domestic violence are often individualized and pathologized. The authors provide an extensive review of the literature as well as personal experience to demonstrate that the neoliberalist approach is antithetical to service provision that supports the dignity and humanity of those in need. Neoliberalism fails to support systemic or structural change that would reduce or eliminate inequalities. Thus it fails to promote positive peace.

Introduction

In the decades since World War II, the proliferation and influence of non-profit organizations has been astounding. According to the Urban Institute (2012), there are more than 1.5 million non-profits operating globally. The number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) has increased dramatically as well. Currently, the United Nations (UN) estimates there are more than 40,000 total NGOs. In fact, these organizations have become so numerous that in some countries, there has, for quite some time, been a glut of non-profits and NGOs. For example, by 1996, there were more than one-million NGOs in India alone (Blitt, 2003). There are at least 65,000 NGOs operating in Russia, and approximately 260 new NGOs are created each year in Kenya.

Today, these groups provide the bulk of services to persons in need, both in the U.S. and internationally (Allard, 2009). In particular, non-profits and NGOs are the most common vehicles for assisting victims of domestic violence and in the monitoring and promotion of, and the provision of aid to, victims of human rights abuses (Bumiller, 2008; Goodhand, 2006). As such, non-profits and NGOs can be considered essential to the promotion of positive peace, which includes not just the end of violent conflict but the promotion of social justice through collaborative and nonviolent methods, or as Galtung (1996) called it, “peace by peaceful means.” Indeed, these organizations have the potential to challenge alienation, inequity, poverty, racism, sexism, and other conditions that, according to Barak (2004), are at the root of violence. Yet while it is undeniable that many non-profits and NGOs are doing commendable work, most have not reached their full potential as promoters of social change.

Despite all this, there is a relative scarcity of critical literature on non-profits and NGOs. The scholarship that does offer critical analysis of the work of these organizations tends to focus on issues such as their effectiveness (Kilby, 2004), accountability (Reimann, 2005), satisfaction with services (Baines, 2010; Gilmore, 2007) and experience for employees (Baines, 2010). In the last decade, however, critics have begun to point out that non-profits are burdened by some of the same problems as are other institutions; namely, hyper-bureaucracy, competition for scarce resources, and kowtowing to the very states and governments they once critiqued (See for example, Baines, 2010; Blitt, 2003; Eikenberry & Kluver, 2004). Some scholars and activists have referred to this as the Non-profit industrial complex (NPIC). The Non-profit-industrial complex (NPIC) is “a set of symbiotic relationships that link political and financial technologies of state and owning class control with surveillance over public political ideology, including and especially emergent progressive and leftist social movements” (Smith, 2007, p. 8). Drawing first on President Dwight Eisenhower’s criticism of the Military-industrial Complex and more recently on the concept of the Prison Industrial Complex (PIC), the NPIC serves as a “shadow state” doing the work that the government has essentially outsourced to the private sector. In short, vital social services that were traditionally provided by the state have been increasingly delegated to a variety of private entities associated with the non-profit sector. As Allard (2009) notes, “we effectively have privatized a substantial portion of the contemporary safety net” (p. 31). As a result, the government too often absolves itself from taking needed action on social issues.

Further, the NPIC clearly allows for greater use of federal funds that support militarism (Kirk & Okazawa-Rey, 2000). That is, monies no longer directed toward social services because of the NPIC can be used by the government for other things, and in the U.S, the largest portion of federal taxes goes to military funding. According to the War Resisters League (2012), the military received 48 percent of federal outlays in the 2012 budget, with just 38 percent devoted to health and human services, social security, education, food and nutrition, housing and urban development, and other human resource issues. Thus, the NPIC weakens the conditions needed to promote peace.

According to Rodriguez (2007), what is particularly problematic about the increasing role of non-profits in providing social services is that many of these organizations are characterized by a formal, hierarchical, and typically elitist structure. More importantly, these hierarchical organizational structures are encouraged by the state, which has a great deal of influence on the inner workings and agendas of these organizations. As Wolch (1990) explains, “In the United States, voluntary groups have gained resource and political clout by becoming a shadow state apparatus, but are increasingly subject to state-imposed regulation of their behavior... The increasing importance of state funding for many voluntary organizations has been accompanied by deepening penetration by the state into voluntary group organization, management and goals” (p. 15). Gilmore (2007) further elaborated on the concept of the shadow state, explaining that “Legislatures and executive branches transformed [government] bureaucracies basically into policing bodies, whose role became to oversee service provision rather than to provide it themselves” (p. 45). Without a doubt the NPIC has resulted in a strange symbiotic relationship between the state and non-profits/NGOs.

Above all, the NPIC is based on an economic model and ideology that sees the free market as the best tool for structuring all institutions. Often referred to as “neoliberalism,” this ideology demands that all respectable or “worthy” organizations and institutions model themselves after the profit-seeking corporation, which is considered the epitome of professionalism and efficiency (Connell, Fawcett, & Meagher, 2009). In recent years, the state itself has adopted this sort of market ideology and thus has increasingly encouraged non-profits and other private entities to seek “market solutions” to social issues.

This paper adds to the literature critiquing non-profits and NGOs working on domestic violence and human rights by highlighting the ways neoliberalism has impacted them, from structure to ideology. It draws on literature as well as personal experience in both areas to problematize neoliberalism as a model for service provision, asserting that such a model not only limits the quality and type of services provided but is indeed anathema to true social change that would ameliorate human suffering and promote peace in personal relationships and beyond. The point is made that social services, particularly as they relate to domestic violence, ought to be guided by alternative theoretical models that, in various ways, diverge from neoliberalism and its emphasis on market solutions. As argued by Eikenberry and Kluver (2009), the corporate model emphasized by neoliberalism is incompatible with the non-profit model and unsuitable to peacemaking, whether in personal relationships or otherwise. From the structure, to the operating philosophy, to the daily work, neoliberalism sustains the prevailing status quo. It creates competition where there should be collaboration, favors bureaucracy over democratic structures, and fails to promote long-term change. As Schervish and Havens (2001) maintain, providing Band-Aids for problems but failing to address the structural roots of such problems is itself a

form of violence. Neoliberalism re-victimizes those who have been harmed by violence, as it pathologizes individuals' behavior.

This critique of the influence of neoliberalism on the work of non-profits and NGOs should be of critical importance to peace activists and academics. Ideologically, the neoliberal model is antithetical to peacemaking in that it erodes the participatory culture, sense of community responsibility, and voluntary spirit that should be integral to the non-profit/NGO sector (Brainard & Siplon, 2004; Bush, 1992; Richmond & Shields, 2004). As Baines (2010) suggests, the acceptance of neoliberal ideology and practice has "...supplanted discourses of collective care, economic equality, and social solidarity" (p. 14). The formation of strategies, according to Lehmann (1990), has thus shifted from a focus on localized solutions to those that will sound most appealing to funders and provide a return on their investment, resulting in blanket-style approaches to unique community issues, thereby silencing or minimizing local voices. Brainard and Siplon (2004), furthermore, explain that "the soul of the nonprofit sector seems to be up for grabs" (p. 436) while Bush (1992) described keeping the "nonprofit spirit in a profit world" (p. 391) as the biggest challenge facing nonprofits today.

Accordingly, rather than relying on market standards and principles to determine funding and ensure the quality of social services, those who seek to challenge domestic violence and other human rights violations might need to rethink their approach on the basis of non-market objectives associated with promoting solidarity, strengthening communities, and, consequently, moving toward peace and justice. In light of all this, we address the need among non-profits dealing with domestic violence and other human rights issues to build and/or reconnect with an activist orientation that rejects the status quo, seeks more holistic, community-based approaches to service delivery, and prioritizes the need for fundamental cultural/structural change.

Overview of Neoliberalism

Despite increasing discontent with corporate capitalism and a return to what some consider New Deal-style policies by the Obama administration (e.g., Harris & Davidson, 2008; Farmer & Noonan, 2011), neoliberalism continues to be a dominant ideology that shapes social, political, and economic discourse in the U.S. Central to neoliberalism is the idea that the free market should be the organizing center of all human life. This perspective was developed in the early to mid 20th Century by a group of thinkers—notably Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman—who were reacting against Keynesianism and similar theories calling for a regulated economy and a strong welfare state (Harvey, 2005).

Drawing from classical liberal principles and neoclassical economics, neoliberals focus on the individual and contend that, under conditions of freedom, all persons are rational actors who are driven towards competition and constantly make calculations on what will serve them best. Any impediment to this natural human tendency is considered anathema to liberty. Therefore, from a neoliberal viewpoint, the free market—which encourages these presumably natural human behaviors—is not simply an ideology or human construct but rather an institutional outgrowth of human nature and a requisite for freedom. As Milton Friedman stated, any attack on the free market is "an attack on freedom itself" (Friedman, 1962, p. 15).

Furthermore, neoliberals insist that only a free market can enhance the quality of all products and services, motivate people to maximize their full potential, encourage economic growth, ensure

that the right numbers of products are produced at the right prices, and promote prosperity to all segments of society. These outcomes are supposed to be direct results of the competition that characterizes a market economy. Namely, as people compete freely, the market organizes their self-serving actions into an optimal society. The market, in this sense, is considered to be an apolitical entity that, if left unrestrained by political/government interventions, “exists in perfect equilibrium, similar to the way eco-systems self-regulate” (Klein, 2007, p. 61).

Considering all this, a key objective in the neoliberal agenda is to unleash the powers of the free market through policies associated with deregulation and privatization. The key to an ideal order, in effect, is to “minimize government” and hand over as much as possible of the economy (and society in general) to the private sector. Of course, it should also be noted that neoliberalism is rife with contradictions with respect to this matter. Indeed, although neoliberals preach *laissez faire* and loathe “big government,” they rely on the state for all sorts of services having to do with maintaining the capitalist status quo. For this reason, Loic Wacquant (2010) suggests that “small government” is only true for the elite. Wacquant argues that those at the bottom are increasingly subject to big government in the form of surveillance, punishment, and control of their behaviors, particularly behaviors that might disrupt the prevailing market economy.

At the same time, particularly when it comes to issues pertaining to equality and social justice, neoliberals reject the notion of government as “the guardian of the public interest” and instead emphasize competition, self-reliance, and personal responsibility (Giroux, 2004). Because the market is assumed to be a neutral arbiter, people’s social-economic positions are assumed to be fair (i.e. based on merit). Accordingly, whatever adversity particular groups of people might face is assumed to be a product of personal deficiencies. Solutions to their problems, therefore, must result from personal reforms that might lead to greater rewards in the marketplace.

This emphasis on the private realm and self-reliance is rooted in the neoliberal assumption that the concept of “society” is a vague abstraction and that only individuals matter. As Margaret Thatcher, a staunch supporter of neoliberalism famously stated, “there is no such thing as society. There are only individual men and women. . .” (Keay, 1987). Accordingly, it is up to individual men and women to be self-reliant and resolve their own problems (Esposito & Finley, 2012, p. 6). Thus, for example, problems such as poverty, racial disparities, or gender inequality can only be resolved by urging the poor, racial minorities, and women to attain more marketable skills, develop a better work ethic, or adopt more productive values. The fact that poverty, racial disparities or gender inequality are structural problems that cannot be thoroughly resolved simply by making a few personal adjustments is overshadowed by the neoliberal emphasis on personal responsibility. These problems, in short, are assumed to be little more than personal matters that have no bearing outside the particular individuals involved. To borrow from C. Wright Mills, under neoliberalism, all social issues are turned into private troubles (Mills, 1959).

Important to emphasize at this juncture is that neoliberalism is not simply an economic model. That is to say, the sorts of market principles lauded by neoliberalism (e.g., competition, individualism, efficiency, personal responsibility, etc.) are not limited to the economic realm but rather extend to virtually every aspect of social life. The ultimate aim, therefore, is not simply to promote a market economy but rather to create what Eliot Currie has described as a “market society” (Currie, 2006, p. 319).

Within neoliberal market societies, most social institutions and organizations become guided by what is often referred to as “market rationality,”—i.e., evaluating the costs and rewards of their decisions, actions, and institutional/organizational objectives according to a “calculus of utility, benefit, and satisfaction against a microeconomic grid of scarcity, supply and demand, and moral value-neutrality” (Brown, 2005, pp. 40-41). In effect, under neoliberalism, market principles begin to gradually “suffuse the whole social fabric” and marginalize or trivialize non-market values. This is clearly documented by a large literature that shows how neoliberalism has shaped institutions such as education (Giroux, 2005), politics (Harvey, 2005) and healthcare (Murphy & Callaghan, 2009). Thus, for example, schools increasingly become businesses catering to “customers” (as opposed to students) who are offered “marketable skills” as opposed to an education; political candidates are taken seriously only if they can raise enough money; and healthcare is increasingly commercialized and turned into a profit-driven industry as opposed to a fundamental human right. The social service and non-profit sectors have not been missed in the spread of neoliberalism, despite the fact that this market-driven philosophy is too often unresponsive to human needs and antithetical to the structural changes required to promote and maintain positive peace.

Although neoliberalism and the NPIC are problematic in general, Smith (2007) explains, “The impact of the NPIC on the antiviolence movement has been particularly disastrous” (p. 11.) One of the most important movements to end violence is the domestic violence movement, as abuse impacts an estimated one-third of the world’s women. It has been considered the world’s worst human rights problem and is clearly a significant barrier to a peaceful society. Accordingly, the following portion examines the ways neoliberalism has impacted the domestic violence movement.

Domestic Violence and Neoliberalism

One of the biggest concerns for domestic violence shelters is acquiring ample funding to serve victims. Neoliberalism has impacted and, in fact, drives the quest for funding among non-profits (Alessandrini, 2002). Given that neoliberal and conservative funding sources typically require “evidence” of business-like effectiveness and support only “best practices,” funding increasingly supports short-term projects that can be easily measured and do not advocate more radical and necessary social changes (Berman, Brooks, & Murphy, 2006; Hall & Reed, 1998; Richmond & Shields, 2004; Steedman & Rabinovicz, 2006). At domestic violence shelters, this tends to mean simply tallying the number of people served or showing a change in scores from pre to post tests. Such measures do little to assess whether a victim will remain safe or whether social norms are changing.

Scholars have pointed out that for many non-profit social services, government monies constitute the bulk of operational funding. In many cases, such funding sources require recipients to use specific governmental practices (Brooks, 2000; Cohen, 1997; Cunningham, 2001; Hall & Reed, 1998; Teeple, 1995), as is the case with domestic violence grants from the Office of Violence Against Women, or the Office for Victims of Crime. For instance, recipients of funding from these sources must devote a portion of the monies toward sending staff to specified OVW or OVC trainings.

In her address at the 2004 INCITE! Conference, Annanya Bhattacharjee noted the corporate structure and hierarchy of non-profits, asserting that it “makes it easier for young, economically privileged people just coming out of college to start a non-profit than to engage in long-term established movements” (in King & Osayande, 2007, p. 83). Foundations that provide financial support to non-profits seek to shape their efforts in ways that do not “...challenge the capitalist status quo” (Smith, 2007, p. 7). Moreover, Ahn (2007) explained that the boards and staff members of most foundations are white, middle-aged and upper class, “...hardly a broad representation of the American population” (p. 66). Not only are the corporate structures of many NGOs/non-profits hierarchical, but they are often self-serving and lack a deep and long-lasting commitment to any particular cause or ideal. Under this model, the boards of directors for domestic violence shelters are increasingly made up of conservative businesspeople that bring personal connections and financial contributions but not necessarily passion for the cause. Indeed, one of the author’s experiences with the board at a South Florida domestic violence center involved repeated directives to make the agency more “business-like.”

As it pertains to many non-profits and NGOs dealing with domestic violence issues, it is particularly important to note that many of these organizations largely shun feminist objectives. Bumiller (2008), Ferraro (1996), Pleck (1987) and others have noted that domestic violence advocates typically avoid including feminist-based approaches and programs in their requests for funding, as conservative grantors and foundations refuse to fund such work. Consequently, the domestic violence movement has changed in a way that the “...critique of women’s position within the family and the larger culture has been silenced by the rhetoric of ‘family values.’ As the battered women’s movement has become institutionalized and bureaucratized, individual family pathology has been substituted for radical critiques of the status quo” (Ferraro, 1996, p. 80). The result is that programs receive grants largely to serve individuals, but not to change social norms that would reduce domestic violence as a structural phenomenon.

Furthermore, the now typical neoliberal funding formulas rarely cover all the costs of overhead or operations for the increasingly bloated bureaucratic structures. As a result, organizations must constantly be seeking other sources of funding. Rather than devote their resources to the provision of services or to organizing the community, domestic violence shelters increasingly employ, and pay significant salaries to, “development” officers and grant writers. One of the author’s experience was that these employees were paid nearly double the salary of those who worked more directly with domestic violence victims.

As Baines (2010) explained, “scarce funding generates competition among agencies, compelling some to undercut themselves and others in order to continue to provide much-needed programs and retain highly skilled staff” (p. 14). Competition does not help build movements for social change, nor does it meet the needs of diverse communities. Nonprofit organizations focus more on the image they project to funders and the community when they are in a competitive environment (Adams & Perlmutter, 1991; Eikenberry & Kluver, 2004). As a result, these organizations often get territorial over their funds (Guilloud & Cordery, 2007). Consistent with the neoliberal emphasis on competition, the domestic violence movement today is hyper-competitive.

The following personal experience is instructive. A newer non-profit that provides individualized services to victims approached a more established shelter in South Florida seeking to partner so as to better serve the community. Leadership from the older organization agreed to meet, and in the meeting, promised a number of things that would help the two organizations collaborate. Immediately after the meeting, however, the older organization's leaders told staff members they would do none of the things they promised and referred to the newer organization as "our competitors."

According to Baines (2010), "These changes also pose particular threats to the autonomy of nonprofits and their capacity to respond quickly and flexibly to changing social needs, potentially undermining the credibility of nonprofit agencies within the communities they serve" (p. 11). As non-profits compete for both public and private funds, many of them emphasize neoliberal principles such as "cost effectiveness," "customer satisfaction," "job skills," and "efficiency" (e.g., Gordon, 2012). Indeed, grantors typically require such language, as it is said to "prove" the work is successful.

Something else to consider is that in the ongoing quest for funding, non-profits may suffer from "mission creep." That is, instead of seeking only to fund the work that is integral to their mission, organizations may adjust the work they do to fit the funders' requirements (Brainard & Siplon, 2004; Bush, 1992; Richmond & Shields, 2004). In the world of domestic violence, grant writers are paid to find opportunities for funding and advocates then identify how to fit or adapt their work so that it fits the request for proposal (RFP). Rarely do agencies pass on an opportunity, regardless of whether it requires the creation of new programs, procedures, and even staff members.

Another problem is that grantors want to see that the organization they funded used all the monies that were requested. Agencies typically present budgets that are as vague as possible to grantors so that they have wiggle room for spending the funds. Rarely is the funding part of a detailed, long-term plan, and if the end of the grant period is close to ending, agencies will "spend down" the monies on whatever they can get away with purchasing, regardless of its utility or import. For example, one of the authors recalls staff members using grant funds that were about to expire to purchase fancy office furniture after administrators told everyone to "use it or lose it." It is hard to see how such expenditures helped victims or challenged societal norms.

Hierarchical Bureaucratic Structure and Practices

Rodriguez (2007) notes that non-profit organizations feel compelled to "replicate the bureaucratic structures of the small business, large corporation, and state—creating centralized national offices, gathering political (and, at times, Hollywood) celebrities and luminaries onto boards of directors, and hiring 'professional activists' whose salaries depend largely on the effectiveness of professional grant writers" (p. 33). Considering all this, the domestic violence movement has indeed become bureaucratized. As one domestic violence advocate with whom one of the authors worked explained, "The CEO, Board of Directors and upper management appear aristocratic and are out of touch with the true needs and experiences of both employees and service participants." This person noted many actual and symbolic examples illustrating this issue, ranging from top-down decisions made by the CEO and Board, to the four levels of

management at a small shelter, to the CEO's designated parking spot for her Jaguar (something no one else at the agency had).

With respect to typical non-profit workers, Baines (2010) found that most operate independently, typically spending their time on repetitive tasks and rarely receiving feedback from supervisors. Similarly, one of the authors wrote of her personal experience working in a domestic violence shelter with a hierarchical structure. Employees were "specialists" who knew little of the work that others in the agency did. Almost no time was allotted for collaborative work, and the rare input from supervisors was spent in "supervision," which felt like detention. At an agency that supposedly uses an "empowerment" perspective, staff members were threatened with the introduction of a drug testing program and a uniform policy, regardless of there being little if no evidence that drugs or inappropriate clothing were actual problems. Far from empowering, such an approach often results in disillusionment and demoralization.

Also addressing the typical experiences of workers in non-profits, Baumgardner and Richards (2005) found that staff disliked the "hidden hierarchies in a workplace that promotes egalitarianism" (p. 135) and felt disillusioned by the failure of their organization to offer them ample opportunities for voice and inclusion. As might be expected, this sort of environment often promotes tension among workers and discourages interpersonal dialogue. As shown by Dellasega (2007), relational aggression is frequent among and between females employed at domestic violence and other social service agencies. Again, personal experience affirms these observations. Advocates at the domestic violence shelter one of the authors worked at described this in detail, noting that they are discouraged from sharing their feelings during staff meetings and, when they do, are admonished for bringing up anything seemingly negative. As already noted, such bullying behavior is not surprising inside a competitive, hierarchical environment in which employees do not work together but instead against one another to justify their existence.

Another typical outcome of this sort of competitive, corporate-like structure is that case "managers" complete forms and reports to identify the "service targets and measurements of service outcomes," but not on how much has actually changed for those in the community being served (McDonald, 2005). Such an approach is not helpful to those being served nor to employees. As Baines (2010) explains: "These approaches purportedly coach employees in "best practices" and increase professional competencies, but in the name of increasing efficiencies and removing waste and error, these processes standardize work practices, reduce or remove employee discretion, and increase the pace and volume of work as well as the risk of staff burnout, demoralization, and workplace illness and injury" (p. 14).

According to Wolch (1990), the state forces non-profits to plan reactively, instead of allowing them to be proactive. "While there is some overlap between social service provision and social change work, the two do not necessarily go readily together. The NPIC provides jobs; it provides opportunities for professional development. It enables those who do the work to feel good about what we do and about our ability to help individuals serviced in the system. It gives us a patina of caring and concern to the ruling class which funds the work" (Kivel, 2007, p. 130).

Consistent with the shunning of feminist ideals previously mentioned, non-profit organizations are more generally discouraged, if not prohibited, from *any* political activity, thereby divorcing

their work from broader social change movements. As discussed by Ryan (1999), nonprofit executives are overly cautious about engaging in anything potentially political because they “are unsure if they could keep their contracts if they became critics of government or private sector contractors” (p. 136). As an example, INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence formed in 2000 as a feminist group designed to challenge all forms of violence. Although the group never took state funding, seeing it as a form of co-optation, as it grew INCITE! became a 501c3 nonprofit and began seeking foundation funding. Smith (2007) explains that INCITE! “learned the hard way that the revolution will not be funded” (p. 1). After being notified that Incite! had received a significant grant, the organization set about expanding its work, only to receive a letter from the Ford Foundation that it was withdrawing its support due to INCITE!’s support for the Palestinian liberation struggle. As Smith (2007) states, “INCITE! quickly learned from firsthand experience the deleterious effects foundations can have on radical social justice movements” (p. 1-2).

In sum, the NPIC is narrowly focused and competitive, and thus constrains collaborative movement building. According to Smith (2007), neoliberal funding and the NPIC force advocates to define all their work as successful, even if it is not, so as to please funders. This prohibits the critical reflection needed to advance the movement more than incrementally, enabling not change but inertia.

The Perils of Professionalization

Neoliberalism has led to a professionalization of service provision. While hiring and maintaining a specially trained workforce (Kissane, 2010) might sound like something positive, the effect has been to include only those who can do the work “correctly,” and exclude those who are not deemed worthy of inclusion. This “expertization” of social services presumes that those with lived experience are far less wise and capable than those with formal credentials. This tendency, of course, further removes the provision of help from being a community affair and bases it firmly in the hands of those who already have more social capital— i.e., those who are able to acquire advanced degrees.

Smith (2007) explains the danger of hyper-professionalizing social services as follows: “To radically change society, we must build mass movements that can topple systems of domination, such as capitalism. However, the NPIC encourages us to think of social justice organizing as a career; that is, you do the work if you can get paid for it. However, a mass movement requires the involvement of millions of people, most of whom cannot get paid. By trying to do grassroots organizing through this careerist model, we are essentially asking a few people to work more than full-time to make up for the work that needs to be done by millions” (p. 10).

In a similar vein, Kivel (2007) argues that professionalization is a way for the ruling class to co-opt leaders from diverse communities by offering them paid work and thereby aligning their interest in jobs with the continued maintenance of the system. As Thunder Hawk (2007) explained, “People in non-profits are not necessarily consciously thinking that they are ‘selling out.’ But just by trying to keep funding and pay everyone’s salaries, they start to unconsciously limit their imagination of what they *could* do. In addition, the non-profit structure supports a

paternalistic relationship in which non-profits from outside our communities fund their own hand-picked organizers, rather than funding us to do the work ourselves” (pp. 105-6).

Scholars have noted that professionalization and bureaucratization imperil the relationship between non-profit staff and those they are supposed to serve by depersonalizing the work and homogenizing services and programs in ways that they are no longer tailored to the unique and diverse needs of clients, but are instead routine, even rote (Alexander, 2007; Eikenberry & Kluver, 2004; Froelich, 1999; Parsons & Broadbridge, 2004; Salamon, 1993). On this point, Gilmore (2007) suggests that this narrowing of program options has made staff “...become in their everyday practice technocrats through imposed specialization” (Gilmore, 2007, p. 46).

Inadequate Service Provision

The bureaucratization and professionalization demanded by neoliberal funding has not been positive for the provision of services. Staff members at many non-profit agencies are overwhelmed by having to juggle the raising of funds, completing paperwork to justify their programs, adhering to the growing administrative procedures, and still providing service (Mullett, Jung, & Hills, 2002). As a result, time spent with clients in direct services has decreased, and, arguably, so has the quality of that service provision. Perez (2007) describes how the bureaucratization of non-profits impacts the provision of services:

“...the ongoing work to maintain and prospect foundation money, combined with administrative obligations and developing infrastructure, was more taxing and exhausting than confronting any institution to fight for a policy change” (p. 93).

Bureaucracy floods staff in red tape, ensuring they have limited time and energy for their real work, while the neoliberal model tells them this is necessary in order to help. Although the neoliberal obsession with market efficiency is presumably oppositional to the red-tape associated with bureaucracies, what we have here is a bureaucratic structure demanding “market-like” or “business-like” strategies that too often overwhelm service providers, sever their ties as collaborators, and ultimately compromise the quality of service they can provide. Thus, for example, tight agency finances have reduced or eliminated staff meetings and other forums for collective discussion and participation in policy making, and replaced them with reporting and compliance tasks (Baines, 2004a, 2004b, 2006, 2010). As de Almeida (2007) explained, “We are too busy being told to market ourselves by pimping our communities’ poverty in proposals, selling ‘results’ in reports and accounting for our finances in financial reviews” (p. 187). In reaction to these sorts of demands, Madonna Thunder Hawk writes about why Women of All Red Nations (WARN) allowed its tax exempt status to lapse, explaining “No one wanted to sit in the office and write reports with time and energy that could be used to advance our movement” (p. 104).

In her interviews with Canadian non-profit social service providers, Baines (2010) found that staff “felt that working conditions had deteriorated to the point where it was almost impossible to “make a difference”—to do advocacy or provide services in more democratic, communicative ways that had the potential to empower others and encourage client participation in wider social life” (p. 19). Some described the services they are able to provide, with the tight timelines and

long list of others waiting for help, as “soulless.” Little if any time is available to host forums in which staff might collaborate with community members to gauge needs and to brainstorm innovative practices (Baines, 2010). In fact, some service providers Baines (2010) interviewed had actually been disciplined or denied promotions because they advocated for clients.

Consistent with all this, Finley’s (2010) personal experience was of staff at domestic violence centers being required to “keep a healthy distance” between themselves and those they serve. Doing so results in cold, bureaucratic services that typically fail to either inspire or empower. Sometimes it is far worse, as this distance results in re-victimization. One of the authors recalls a domestic violence survivor who sought help from a South Florida shelter via a crisis call to the organization’s hotline explaining, “If I had been any weaker than I am I would have probably committed suicide after talking to the person on the hotline.”

Important to emphasize is that services at domestic violence shelters are rarely holistic. That is, victims might receive shelter and perhaps counseling, but for assistance with legal custody, or medical, educational or other needs, they must go elsewhere. Strict rules prohibit shelter staff from transporting victims, and thus they are on their own to find their way, often without transportation to the places where they can receive the rest of the assistance they need. In fact, as Mink (2002) explains, victims presenting at domestic violence centers are often required to apply for all appropriate benefits before they receive assistance. Thus, victims must become dependent on numerous social services. As Bumiller (2008) explains, “by seeking protection outside the family they are risking the imposition of new forms of control by a multiplicity of laws and agents of the state” (p. 97). Victims either learn to navigate, or in some cases manipulate, these complex bureaucratic systems or they receive no assistance (Abramovitz & Withorn, 1999; Bumiller, 2008).

Sometimes shelters do not even provide victims fleeing abusers with ample food or clothing, despite knowing that most leave with none of these things. One of the authors recalls one victim seeking help at a shelter stating “My roommate is putting paper towel in her shoes because no one will give her a pair of socks,” while others have complained of seeing staff members take home food that was supposed to be for victims and their children. One victim declared, “I avoid asking anyone at the front desk for anything because I feel like I am asking for a liver transplant.” And another summed it up: “This place (shelter) feels like prison.”

Individualizing and Pathologizing Social Problems

Neoliberalism individualizes or pathologizes social problems. Those in need can find relief, albeit partial, from non-profit organizations, but often “only in exchange for their acceptance of the benefits of certain expertise, such as the “right” way to save money, raise children, and maintain employment” (Dean, 1999, p. 128). The approach to service delivery among many of these organizations—especially among those servicing underprivileged groups or groups at risk—is typically guided by the neoliberal principle of encouraging personal reform (assisting the people they are servicing to overcome some type of personal deficiency or pathology) as opposed to challenging the structural conditions that promote their adversity (e.g. McDonald, 2005). This sort of approach is clearly consistent with the neoliberal emphasis on treating public issues as private troubles, and is certainly discernible among non-profits dealing with domestic

violence. According to this model of service delivery, those in need of services are simply “clients.” As a result, Salamon (1993) contends that neoliberalism has promoted a shift from providing services to those in need, regardless of their income, to serving those able to pay. Furthermore, Rosenman, Scotchmer, and VanBenschoten (1999) argue that nonprofits may weed out “clients” who are difficult to serve because of their limited funds, tight timelines, and emphasis on reporting “successes.”

As should be noted, the domestic violence movement started out as a feminist critique of patriarchy and social norms that lay the foundation for abuse in interpersonal relationships. In the 1970s, many radical feminists included a critique of capitalism, noting that the economic system framed the ways patriarchy is manifested (Bumiller, 2008; Ferraro, 1996; Meyer, 2001; Pleck, 1987). By the 1980s, however, the movement shifted, in part due to the conservatism of the Reagan era. Key cases like that of Tracey Thurman and research such as the Minnesota Domestic Violence Experiment shifted the focus to criminal justice as the primary vehicle for protection of victims and holding abusers accountable.

That criminal justice is seen as the primary response to domestic and dating violence is problematic in many ways. First, it reinforces the prison industrial complex (Durazo, 2007; Smith, 2007). Indeed, Smith (2007) noted that some domestic violence organizations even operate out of police departments. One consequence of this criminalization process is that it has inhibited creative grassroots organizing. The typical reaction to abuse is now to call the police and/or obtain a restraining order, yet “rather than protecting women against domestic violence, these policies often re-victimize the survivor by either leading to her arrest (if she so much as scratched her abuser in self-defense) or to the arrest of the abuser without survivor consent” (Durazo, 2007, p. 119). And while the perpetrator came to be viewed as the sole party responsible for domestic violence, the state was viewed as being an ally in the efforts to protect women and hold abusers accountable. Thus, attention is not given to the many ways the state has been and remains the largest perpetrator of violence against women. As Durazo (2007) explains, the domestic violence movement “...was called in to sleep with the enemy, the US state, the central organizer of violence against women in the world. In an effort to maim the movement, the state made its interests seem compatible with the interests of women...” (pp. 117-118).

Of particular importance is that this neoliberal view of abuse reinforces the idea that both the origin of the problem, and the treatment for it, are personal matters. As Durazo (2007) notes, the movement fails to see violence against women holistically, as funding generally supports either domestic violence or sexual assault, not both. Interestingly, Tierney (1982) predicted the medicalization of domestic violence, which is widespread today and presupposes this problem as a personal matter. Durazo (2007), for example, links the current pathologizing of abuse to

“the medical industrial complex (MIC), yet another partnering of the state and capital, co-opts social justice issues by taking them under its jurisdiction. Through policies such as health practitioner mandatory-reporting policies, the MIC interfaces with the PIC to support state and economic interests in the criminalization of violence against women... The MIC and PIC are principally interested in promoting profit, often at the expense and victimization of the most marginalized members of society, such as women of color. Just as the criminalization of violence against women emerged alongside the

growth of the PIC, the medicalization of violence against women is closely linked to the growing privatization and corporatization of health care” (p. 120).

Bumiller (2008) refers to the rise of the “therapeutic state,” noting that it is not just domestic violence service providers that operate on a medicalized model. Rather, it also includes child abuse, addiction specialists, and healthcare providers as well. The typical model of service provision at a domestic violence center sees abuse “as a welfare problem, rather than a structural, gender issue” (MacDonald, 2005, p. 82). Bierria (2007) further explains that in the new professionalized movement, survivors of abuse are pathologized as clients or customers.

Rather than treating survivors as community members who have suffered great harm and indignity, many times professionalized staff treat those they serve as another number in the long line of requests for their time and energy. Here again, abuse is defined as the problem of individual women and their relationships (Berns, 2004; Bumiller, 2008; Ferraro, 1996), and thus women must be counseled or treated as if they are ill. So-called advocates guide victims to make “better” relationship choices, again intruding into their personal lives and diminishing their agency in much the same way as did their abusers (Bumiller, 2008). Sometimes staff members at domestic violence agencies re-victimize their clients by speaking poorly about their mental capacity. One of the authors recalls a victim stating, “I overheard the advocates referring to another resident as ‘the cracked out crazy lady’. It made me wonder what they say about me.” “Good victims,” then, are those whose claims to abuse are undisputed and who accept the medicalized model (Bumiller, 2008).

Berns (2004) notes that the current individual “frame” for the domestic violence movement is “empowerment-based”; that is, victims are told that they have been robbed of their power by their abusers and that service providers will help them take their power back. While this mantra may be an improvement on the previous medicalized emphasis, it still aims exclusively on the individual, not on social or systemic issues, and the onus for change lies squarely on the victim. Power here refers to making personal choices, not harnessing broader social or structural power to effect meaningful social change (Morgen & Bookman, 1988). True empowerment, however, involves, “an understanding that powerlessness is a result of structural and institutional forces that allow for inequality in power and control over resources. Therefore, empowerment should be a process that aims to identify and change the distribution of power within a culture to achieve social justice” (Berns, 2004, p. 154). Consistent with this, Berns (2004) comments that the current understanding of empowerment as solely a personal issue “... may help build support for programs that help victims of domestic violence. However, it does little to develop public understanding of the social context of violence and may impede social change that could prevent violence” (p. 3).

Human Rights NGOs and Neoliberalism

Similar to the domestic violence movement, as human rights work has become increasingly professionalized, many have been deemed “unqualified” to advocate for human rights (Bell & Coicaud, 2007; O’Flaherty & Ulrich, 2010). Some of those people are the very ones who have lived human rights abuses and who have, through their experiences, gained a level of expertise that is not available via textbooks or training (O’Flaherty & Ulrich, 2004). Therefore it is often white, middle class advocates lobbying for the human rights of the “other,” but not necessarily working *with* those groups to effect change (Mitlin, Hickey & Bebbington, 2007). Human rights

NGOs are often led by persons whose leadership is based on charisma and/or a cult of personality. However, despite claiming to involve their members (and some are even membership-based, like Amnesty International, which means members have voting rights on issues and practices), the reality is that "...the least participatory local movements may experience the greatest ease in winning foreign backing," since charismatic leadership resonates with donors" (Blitt, 2003, pp. 326-7). As Blitt (2003) explains, some of these organizations are not run democratically, despite the image they try to project. In fact, some NGOs create policies stressing "shared leadership" or other nice-sounding practices that suggest they will operate democratically, but with no mechanism to hold them accountable. As a result, they often violate their own self-imposed policies.

Blitt (2003) shares an example from Amnesty International. Amnesty had a policy that members were not to investigate cases in their own country. In 1977, the organization violated its own policy when two members of the West German section visited with Red Army Faction prisoners and prison officials in that country. "Although touted as one of Amnesty's core principles, the organization, even early on, felt comfortable enough—or compelled enough—to violate its own self-imposed operational principles to get the "scoop," even at the expense of undermining the sacrosanct impartiality of its local West German chapter."

More recently, Amnesty's U.S section has suffered from divisive in-fighting due to the way financial and priority decisions made by its board were communicated to and received by its membership. A strategic plan that resulted in the elimination of many staff positions and the closure of some regional offices was received by members like a lead balloon, as many members felt the process of creating the strategic plan had not been nearly as participatory as AIUSA's bylaws and resolutions would require. The result of this frustration came out in nasty and mean-spirited attacks on the board via an online listserv. Again, the root cause of this perhaps irreparable splinter is the perceived failure to operate in egalitarian fashion, coupled with the neoliberal ideology that money matters more than principles. Despite the fact that board members are volunteers who are also AIUSA activists, members seem to perceive elitism that may or may not be real. Regardless, the effect is an "us versus them" mentality that further divides the movement.

There may be some truth to the elitist claim, at least within some human rights NGOs. Bruce Montgomery (2002) shows that HRW's credentials were built as founder Robert L. Bernstein recruited largely members of the establishment elite, who could provide both visibility and clout to the movement. Kennedy (2004) explains,

"Professionalization has a number of possible costs...it separates human rights advocates from those they represent and those with whom they share a common emancipatory struggle. The division of labor among emancipatory specialists is not merely about efficient specialization. We need only think of the bureaucratization of human rights in places like East Timor that have come within the orbit of international governance--suddenly an elaborate presence pulls local elites away from their base, or consigns them to the status of local informants, the elites turning their attentions like sunflowers to Geneva, New York, to the Center, to the Commission. To the work of resolutions and reports."

“We’re Number One”: Competition for Funding and Influence

In the competitive world of human rights NGOs, organizations must constantly take on the most titillating, sexy cases so as to demonstrate their importance. Organizations may shuffle quickly between priority issues as they seek to show their relevance, and may bite off more than they have the capacity or expertise to handle in order to maintain funding. Blitt (2003) comments on Amnesty International’s quest to become omnipresent, saying “Amnesty has become the one-stop Seven-Eleven of the HRO world, open 24/7 and protecting every right imaginable under the sun (p. 318). Clearly the organization does not have the ability to adequately address *all* human rights abuses. As such, the work it does well—letter-writing to effect the release of prisoners of conscience—may get passed over for the next item deemed to be more interesting or better able to secure publicity and funding.

The rush to get the scoop, coupled with inadequate staffing and lack of prioritizing accuracy, has led to several disasters of reporting false information. False-reporting, or misleading reports of human rights abuses, can be disastrous. As Blitt (2003) explains, Amnesty’s inaccurate report about Iraqi soldiers murdering Kuwaiti babies in 1990, which was relayed by numerous media entities, helped spur the Gulf War. As Cole (2012) argues, “If we are going to interfere in the lives of others, a little due diligence is a minimum requirement.”

Stooges for the Government and to Funders?

Since the late 19th and early 20th centuries, private philanthropic foundations have supplied a large portion of the monies to non-profits and to some of the NGOs that provide social services and conduct human rights campaigns and advocacy. These foundations do not give solely (some would argue even partly) based on the need to end human suffering or a desire to promote true peace and justice. Rather, foundations typically fund work that is consistent with their political agendas. The emergence of the Ford Foundation in 1936 furthered the prominence of foundations in funding social service and human rights work, both domestically and abroad. The Ford Foundation was, and still is, noteworthy because of its charitable giving, but also for its role in ensuring that social justice movements, such as the US Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s, did not steer too far from conservative, market-based U.S. policy directions (Smith, 2007). In fact, even those human rights NGOs typically viewed as liberal or progressive were influenced by the same conservative influences. As an example, Human Rights Watch (HRW), then the Helsinki Watch, was created in 1978 with start-up costs provided by a \$400,000 grant from the Ford Foundation. More generally, the Ford Foundation provided the bulk of funding for U.S. international human rights work between 1977 and 1991 (McGehee, 1999). It did so as a way of discouraging certain forms of radical social change. Furthermore, Petras and Veltmeyer (2005) document how the U.S government wanted to stave off revolutionary change in Latin America. The US government did so through entities like U.S. AID, which funneled resources to NGOs as a way to seemingly work with local people while, in effect, avoiding any serious project to work with governments in efforts to effect needed structural changes in Latin American societies. These NGOs thus curtailed systemic and radical social change, and instead emphasized economic and social development in the promotion of capitalism. Not surprisingly, therefore, Petras and Veltmeyer (1999) refer to these NGOs as “executing agents of US imperialism” (p. 23). Likewise, Roelefs (2003) asserts that human rights NGOs are “convenient

instruments for imperialism" that are "controlled by elites via funding, integration into coalitions, and overlapping personnel" (p. 24).

Despite denouncing governmental funding, more than 50 percent of human rights NGOs receive the bulk of their funding from governments (Barker, 2007). NGO Monitor claims that human rights groups such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch that claim not to seek government funding actually do so on the sly. Clearly receiving governmental funds constrains these organizations' willingness to speak out and critique their own government's policies and practices. Amnesty International's US Section even hired a former U.S. State Department official as its Executive Director in 2012. The move has proven to be controversial, as she has authored and spoken about topics that continue to reflect a juncture with U.S. military interests that fail to match up with AIUSA's positions and the desires of many of its members.

Likewise, NGOs may tone down or curtail their activities to please non-governmental funders. As with domestic violence non-profits, foundations may shape the priorities and programs of human rights NGOs. Thus, work addressing the ways that corporations, in conjunction with states, deprive citizens of their human rights is a rare component of most NGO's regular work. Funding priorities and techniques in the human rights world are increasingly being set by those with political careers and backgrounds in business or management (Edwards & Hulm, 1996; Wallace, Crowther & Shepherd, 1997).

On the other hand, NGOs have been known to reject work with governments in cases when it might be the most effective way to address human rights abuses. Many NGOs in Haiti, for instance, have refused to work with the Haitian government, citing corruption and ineptitude, but the result is that the thousands of NGOs operating in that country compete against each other and may undermine structural change and capacity-building efforts the government could initiate. Teju Cole (2012) argues that Americans in particular suffer from what he calls the White Savior Industrial Complex. Rather than critically examining the structural causes of poverty, human rights abuses, and violence in other parts of the world (and especially the United States' role in creating some of those problems), Americans tend to feel sympathy when a crisis arises and make a donation (albeit small, as Americans are among the most stingy donors). Cole (2012) asserts, "We can participate in the economic destruction of Haiti over long years, but when the earthquake strikes it feels good to send \$10 each to the rescue fund."

Conclusion

For the past several decades, neoliberals have touted the market as the most rational and efficient mechanism for organizing social life. All institutions and organizations, therefore, should be run similar to corporations competing at the marketplace. In doing so, quality, efficiency, and other outcomes rewarded by the market are maximized. For this reason, embracing a business/market model presumably ensures ideal institutional/organizational functioning.

As discussed in this paper, the same logic is currently being applied to service delivery organizations within the non-profit/non-government sector. Although non-profits and NGOs are supposed to be providing crucial services, most of them are currently being run on the basis of market principles that are demanded by both private and public funders, including the state. Yet

in their quest to compete for funds and ensure a “business-like” operation that appeals to their benefactors, many of these organizations have become increasingly hierarchical and almost entirely apolitical. Indeed, by running non-profits as corporations, all decisions are increasingly made by boards of directors or trustees, while the individuals and communities in need of services have no say in how these services should be delivered (see *Creating Change or Creating Chains*, 2010).

Most importantly is that by embracing a corporate model, non-profits and NGOs—particularly among those dealing with domestic violence and other human rights issues—have turned away from an activist agenda to promote fundamental social change. Particularly as it pertains to domestic violence, since the 1990s, feminism and similar theories that have traditionally informed efforts to end violence against women by challenging prevailing values and social structures have been replaced by a “welfare-oriented” or “clinical” approach that seeks to help individual victims in a piecemeal manner, without addressing the root causes of their abuse (McDonald, 2005). As discussed, the neoliberal emphasis on the individual has encouraged an obsession with personal reform that diverts attention away from the larger structural problems that need to be addressed. As Bumiller (2008) points out, there has been little change in rates of domestic violence or other forms of gender-based violence, which is suggestive that the neoliberal model is not only rife with ideological problems but is also ineffective.

While a full discussion of what should be done is beyond the scope of this paper, it is clear that those working within the non-profit sector must work to revitalize an activist thrust to their agendas. Accordingly, efforts should be made to build closer connections with social movements and other sectors of civil society that seek to challenge human rights abuses, avoid personalizing or pathologizing all social problems, and reject the idea that the provision of services should be run like a business enterprise. Working more collaboratively will help non-profits and NGOs grapple with the challenge of funding, as resources (both financial and other forms) would be shared. Additionally, organizations can return to more grassroots forms of funding, seeking to actively engage communities in what are clearly community problems. These movements can draw on the vast literature and strategies of peacemakers and peace education for guidance (Finley, 2010).

With respect to non-profits and NGOs s dealing with domestic violence, more attention should be placed on placing feminist ideals back at the forefront of their objectives. Structurally and ideologically, domestic violence centers can return, accordingly, to the more collectivist nature of the original shelters, which operated with far less rigid boundaries between those serving and those being served (Bumiller, 2008). The aim is not simply to save individual victims from further abuse (although this is clearly important) but rather to engage in community-based efforts to challenge patriarchal structures and their connection to neoliberal capitalism. This involves an understanding that domestic violence is not simply about a few pathological individuals hurting their relatives or significant others. Furthermore, this problem does not simply hurt individual women (or men) but also their families and communities. The provision of services, therefore, should shift to more holistic approaches that involve engaging entire communities and challenging some of the problems associated with the prevailing market culture. Thus, for example, a more holistic approach to domestic violence would have to involve dealing with a number of different issues that transcend the particular individual “client.” Among many other issues, this would include various efforts to challenge the social construction of masculinity and

its link to ruthless competition and violence; the feminization of poverty; the increased financial strain faced by millions of American families as a result of neoliberal policies; and the erosion of social/familial bonds that has resulted, at least in part, from the sort of extreme individualism encouraged by neoliberalism and the prevailing market society.

References

- Abramovitz, M., & Withorn, A. (1999). Playing by the rules: Welfare reform and the new authoritarian state. In Reed, A. (Ed.). *Without justice for all: The new liberalism and our retreat from racial equality*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Adams, C., & Perlmutter, F. (1991). Commercial venturing and the transformation of America's voluntary social welfare agencies. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 20(1), 25-38.
- Ahn, C. (2007). Democratizing American philanthropy. In *INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.) The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 63-78). Boston: South End.
- Alessandrini, M. (2002). A Fourth Sector; The Impact of Neoliberalism on non-profit Organizations. Refereed paper presented to the Jubilee conference of the Australian Political Studies association, Australian National University, Canberra, October 2002. Retrieved on July 6, 2012 from <http://150.203.224.117/proceedings/2002/alessandrini.pdf>
- Alexander, G. (2007, April 23). The non-profit industrial complex: Is there such a thing as too much civil society? *American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research*. Retrieved August 19, 2010 from <http://www.aei.org/article/25958>
- Allard, S. (2009). *Out of reach: Place, property and the new American welfare state*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Baines, D. (2010). Neoliberal restructuring, activism/participation, and social unionism in the nonprofit social services. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 39(1), 10-28.
- Baines, D. (2004a). Caring for nothing: Work organization and unwaged labour in social services. *Work, Employment and Society*, 18, 267-295.
- Baines, D. (2004b). Pro-market, non-market: The dual nature of organizational change in social services delivery. *Critical Social Policy*, 24, 5-29.
- Baines, D. (2006). Whose needs are being served? Quantitative metrics and the reshaping of social services. *Studies in Political Economy*, 77, 193-207.
- Barak, G. (2004). A reciprocal approach to peacemaking criminology: Between adversarialism and mutualism. Retrieved July 20, 2012 from http://www.greggbarak.com/whats_new_2.html
- Barker, M. (2007, August 3). Hijacking human rights. Z magazine. Retrieved July 15, 2012 from <http://www.zcommunications.org/hijacking-human-rights-by-michael-barker>
- Baumgardner, J., & Richards, A. (2005). *Grassroots: A field guide for feminist activism*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Bell, D., & Coicaud, J. (Eds.) (2007). *Ethics in action: The ethical challenges of international human right nongovernmental organizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berman, G., Brooks, R., & Murphy, J. (2006). Funding the nonprofit welfare sector: Explaining changing funding sources, 1960-1999. *Economic Papers*, 25, 83-99.

- Berns, N. (2004). *Framing the victim: Domestic violence, media, and social problems*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Bierria, A. (2007). Pursuing a radical anti-violence agenda inside/outside a non-profit structure. In *INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.) The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 151-164). Boston: South End.
- Blitt, R. (2003). Who will watch the watchdogs? Human rights nongovernmental organizations and the case for regulation. *NGO Monitor*. Retrieved July 17, 2012 from <http://www.ngo-monitor.org/data/images/File/SSRN-id753487.pdf>
- Brainard, L., & Siplon, P. (2004). Toward nonprofit organization reform in the voluntary spirit: Lessons from the internet. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33, 435-457.
- Brooks, A. (2000). Is there a dark side to government support of non-profits? *Public Administration Review*, 60(3), 211-218.
- Brown, W. (2005). *Edgework: Critical essays on knowledge and politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bumiller, K. (2008). *In an abusive state: How neoliberalism appropriated the feminist movement against sexual violence*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Bush, R. (1992). Survival of the nonprofit spirit in a for-profit world. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 21, 391-410.
- Cohen, M. (1997). From welfare state to vampire capitalism. In Evans, P., & Wekerle, G (Eds.), *Women and the Canadian welfare state: Challenges and change* (pp. 28-67). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Cole, T. (2012). The White Savior Industrial Complex. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved July 20, 2012 from <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/03/the-white-savior-industrial-complex/254843/2/>
- Connell, R., Fawcett, B., and Meagher, G. (2009). Neoliberalism, New Public Management and the human service professions: Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Sociology*, 45(4), 331-338.
- Creating Change or Creating Chains? (2010). The Bilerico Project. Retrieved on July 10, 2012 from http://www.bilerico.com/2010/07/creating_change_or_creating_chains.php
- Cunningham, I. (2001). Sweet charity! Managing employee commitment in the UK voluntary sector. *Employee Relations*, 23, 192-206.
- Currie, E. (2006). Crime in a Market Society. In Francis T. Cullen and Robert Agnew (Eds.), *Criminological Theory: Past and Present* (pp. 318-329). New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- de Almeida, A. (2007). Radical social change: Searching for a new foundation. In *INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.) The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp.185-196). Boston: South End
- Dean, M. (1999) *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. London: Sage.
- Dellasega, C. (2007). *Mean girls grown up*. New York: Wiley.
- Durazo, A. (2007). "We were never meant to survive": Fighting violence against women and the fourth world war. In *INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.) The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 113-128). Boston: South End
- Edwards, M., & Hulme, D. (1996). Too Close for Comfort: NGOs, the State, and Donors. *World Development*, 24(6), 961-973.

- Eikenberry, A., & Kluver, J. (2004). The marketization of the nonprofit sector: Civil society at risk? *Public Administration Review*, 64(2), 132-140.
- Esposito, L., & Finley, L. (Eds). (2012). *Grading the 44th President: A report card on Barack Obama's first term as a progressive leader*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Farmer, S., & Noonan, S. (2011). Post-neoliberalism or deepened neoliberalism? The Chicago Public Transportation Service and elite response during the great stagnation. *Perspectives on Global Technology and Development*, 10, 73-84.
- Ferarro, K. (1996, fall). The dance of dependency: A genealogy of domestic violence discourse. *Hypatia*, 11(4), 77-92.
- Finley, L. (2010). Where's the peace in this movement? A domestic violence advocate's reflections on the movement. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 13(1), 57-69.
- Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and freedom*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Froelich, K. (1999). Diversification of revenue strategies: Evolving resource dependence in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 28(3), 246-268.
- Galtung, J. (1996). *Peace by peaceful means: Peace and conflict, development and civilization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gilmore, R. (2007). In the shadow of the shadow state. In *INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.) The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 41-52). Boston: South End.
- Giroux, H. (2005). The terror of neoliberalism: Rethinking the significance of cultural politics. *College Literature*, 32(1), 1-19.
- _____. (2004). *The Terror of Neoliberalism*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Goodhand, J. (2006). *Aiding peace? The role of NGOs in armed conflict*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Gordon, E. (2012). *It's all about job skills: Neoliberalism, non-profits, and the impact on young people in Seattle, Washington*. Refereed paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of American Geographers, New York, February 24-28, 2012.
- Guilloud, S., & Cordery, S. (2007). Fundraising is not a dirty word: Community-based economic strategies for the long haul. In *INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.) The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 107-112). Boston: South End.
- Hall, M., & Reed, P. (1998). Shifting the burden: how much can government download to the non-profit sector? *Canadian Public Administration*, 41, 1-20.
- Harris, J., & Davidson, C. (2009). Obama: The new contours of power. *Race and Class*, 50(4), 1-19.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Keay, D. (1987, September 23). "No such thing as society." *Woman's Own*, Retrieved July 9, 2012 from <http://www.margarethatcher.org/speeches/displaydocument.asp?docid=106689>
- Kennedy, D. (2004). *The dark sides of virtue: Reassessing international humanitarianism*. Princeton University Press. Retrieved July 15, 2012 from <http://press.princeton.edu/chapters/s7711.html>
- Kilby, P. (2004). Non-governmental organizations and accountability in an era of global anxiety. *Seton Hall Journal of Diplomatic and International Relations*, 5(2), 67-78.
- King, T., & Osayande, E. (2007). The filth on philanthropy: Progressive philanthropy's agenda to misdirect social justice movements. In *INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence*

- (Ed.) *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 79-90). Boston: South End.
- Kirk, G., & Okazawa-Rey, M. (2000). Neoliberalism, militarism, and armed conflict. *Social Justice Journal*, 27(4), 1.
- Kissane, R. (2010). Administrative challenges facing nonprofit work sites providing work or work-like experiences for welfare recipients. *Sociological Perspectives*, 53(3), 373-396.
- Kivel, P. (2007). Social service or social change? In *INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence* (Ed.) *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 129-150). Boston: South End.
- Klein, N. (2007). *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company.
- Lehmann, D. (1990). *Democracy and development in Latin America: Economics, politics and religion in the post-war period*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- McDonald, J. (2005). Neoliberalism and the pathologising of public issues: The displacement of feminist service models in domestic violence support services. *Australian Social Work*, 58(3), 275-84.
- McGehee, R. (1999, December). CIS's war against China. *Friends of Tibet*. Retrieved July 20, 2012 from <http://www.friendsoftibet.org/databank/usdefence/usd4.html>
- Meyer, N. (2001). Now you see it, now you don't: The state of the battered women's movement. *Stop Family Violence*. Retrieved July 14, 2012 from <http://www.stopfamilyviolence.org/info/domestic-violence/now-you-see-it-now-you-dont-the-state-of-the-battered-womens-movement>
- Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mink, G. (2002). Violating women: Rights abuses in the welfare policy state. In Albelda, R., & Withorn, A. (Eds.) *Lost ground: Welfare reform, poverty and beyond* (pp. 95-112). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Mitlin, D., Hickey, S., & Bebbington, A. (2007). Reclaiming development? NGOs and the challenge of alternatives. *World Development*, 35(10), 1699-1720.
- Montgomery, B. (2002). The Human Rights Watch archives. *Peace Review*, 14(4), 455-463.
- Morgen, S., & Bookman, A. (1988). *Women and the politics of empowerment*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Mullett, J., Jung, K., & Hills, M. (2002). Collaboration in nonprofits: Dynamics and dilemmas. *Canadian Review of Social Policy*, 49-50, 155-173.
- Murphy, J., & Callaghan, K. (2009). Economic culture and service delivery. *Journal of Social Work in Disability & Rehabilitation*, 8, 57-64.
- O'Flaherty, M., & Ulrich, G. (2010). The professionalization of human rights field work. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 2(1), 1-27. Retrieved July 15, 2012 from <http://jhrp.oxfordjournals.org/content/2/1/1.abstract>
- Parsons, E., & Broadbridge, A. (2004). Managing change in nonprofit organizations: Insights from the UK charity retail sector. *Voluntas*, 15(3), 227-242.
- Perez, A. (2007). Between radical theory and community praxis: Reflections on organizing and the non-profit industrial complex. In *INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence* (Ed.) *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 91-100). Boston: South End.
- Petras, J., & Veltmeyer, H. (2005). *Empire with imperialism: The globalizing dynamics of neoliberal capitalism*. London: Zed Books.

- Pleck, E. (1987). *Domestic tyranny*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press.
- Reese, E., Vega, E., & Giedraitis, V. (2006). Welfare is not for sale: Campaigns against welfare profiteers in Milwaukee. *Social Justice*, 33(3), 38-53
- Reimann, K. (2005). "Up to no good?": Recent critics and critiques of NGOs. *Political Science Faculty Publications*. Retrieved July 20, 2012 from http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/political_science_facpub/5
- Richmond, T., & Shields, J. (2004, Spring/Summer). NGO restructuring: Constraints and consequences. *Canadian Review of Social Policy*, 53, 53-67.
- Rodriguez, D. (2007). The political logic of the non-profit industrial complex. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.) *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 21-40). Boston: South End.
- Roelofs, J. (2003). *Foundations and Public Policy: The Mask of Pluralism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rosenman, M., Scotchmer, K., & Van Benschoten, E. (1999). *Morphing into the market: The danger of missing mission*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.
- Ryan, W. (1999). The new landscape for nonprofits. *Harvard Business Review* 77(1), 127-36
- Salamon, L. (1993, March). The marketization of welfare: Changing nonprofit and for profit roles in the American welfare state. *Social Service Review*, 67, 1-39.
- Schervish, P., & Havens, J. (2001). Wealth and the commonwealth: New findings on wherewithal and philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(1), 5-25.
- Smith, A. (2007). Introduction: The revolution will not be funded. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.) *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp. 1-20). Boston: South End.
- Steedman, E., & Rabinovicz, J. (2006). Changing dynamics in the Canadian voluntary sector. *Journal of the Royal Society for the Promotion of Health*, 126, 275-279.
- Teeple, G. (1995). *Globalization and the decline of social reform*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Thunder Hawk, M. (2007). Native organizing before the non-profit industrial complex. In INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.) *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* (pp.101-106). Boston: South End.
- Tierney, K. (1982). The battered women movement and the creation of the wife beating problem, *Social Problems*, 29, 207-220.
- Urban Institute. (2012). Nonprofits. Retrieved July 20, 2012 from <http://www.urban.org/nonprofits/index.cfm>
- Wacquant, L. (2010, June). Crafting the neoliberal state: Workfare, prisonfare, and social insecurity. *Sociological Forum*, 25(2), 197-220.
- Wallace, T., Crowther, S., & Shepherd, A. (1997) *Standardising development: Influences on UK NGOs' policies and procedures*. Oxford: World View Publishing.
- War Resisters League. (2012). Where your income tax money really goes. Retrieved July 20, 2012 from <http://www.warresisters.org/sites/default/files/FY2012piechart-color.pdf>
- Wolch, Jennifer R. (1990). *The Shadow State: Government and Voluntary Sector in Transition*. New York, NY: The Foundation Center.

PEACE STUDIES JOURNAL

Vol. 5, Issue 3

November 2012

Applying Social Movement Theory to Nonhuman Rights Mobilization and the Importance of Faction Hierarchies

Author: Corey Lee Wrenn, M.S.

Adjunct Professor, Liberal Arts Department
Rocky Mountain College of Art + Design
1600 Pierce St.
Denver, CO 80214

Instructor, Sociology Department
Colorado State University
B271 Clark Building
Ft. Collins, CO 80523

Email: corey.wrenn@gmail.com

APPLYING SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY TO NONHUMAN RIGHTS MOBILIZATION AND THE IMPORTANCE OF FACTION HIERARCHIES

Abstract

This paper offers an exploratory analysis of social movement theory as it relates to the nonhuman animal rights movement. Individual participant motivations and experiences, movement resource mobilization, and movement relationships with the public, the political environment, historical context, countermovements, and the media are discussed. In particular, the hierarchical relationships between factions are highlighted as an important area for further research in regards to social movement success. Specifically, the role of counterframing in subduing radical mobilization and the potential aggravating factor of status contamination is explored.

Introduction and Definitions

This article aims to address major themes in social movement theory (SMT) in their applicability to the modern nonhuman animal rights movement with a special consideration of the relevance of hierarchical relationships among factions. A multitude of social movement definitions exist, but, for the purpose of this paper, a social movement will refer to conscious, sustained efforts to enact social change using extra-institutional means (Goodwin and Jasper, 2003). This definition is distinct from consensus movements that tend to be widely supported by the public and the state and are largely free from opposition (Schwartz and Shuva, 1992). This also distinguishes social movements from interest groups that also enact social change but rely heavily on legitimated channels for social change, namely through political lobbying (Clemens, 1997).

As such, the nonhuman animal rights movement, active since the mid-nineteenth century, can be considered a social movement as it has struggled to improve conditions for nonhumans despite considerable resistance using moral suasion, consumer boycott, protest, and other forms of direct action (Beers, 2006; Guither, 1998; Jasper, 1992). Furthermore, the nonhuman rights movement might be considered as part of a larger wave of “new” social movements characterized by a democratic structure, rejection of traditional means for social change, and claimsmaking focused on rights and quality of life (Dalton and Kuechler, 1990). Political power, no longer monopolized by the state, is increasingly wielded by organizations (Tilly, 1984). The abolitionist faction of nonhuman animal rights, in particular, highlights the need for democratic access to decision making. For instance, a prominent abolitionist theorist, Gary Francione, explicitly rejects the need for professionalization or leadership: “We do not need large organizations whose employees get fat salaries and subsidized travel. Every one of us can be a ‘leader.’ If we are to succeed, every one of us *must* be a leader, an important force for change. Every one of us has the ability to affect and influence the lives of others” (2007). Indeed, this tension between moderate and radical movement structure characterizes nonhuman liberation efforts. Francione’s comment critiques a modernized social movement that has largely professionalized and harkens to the power in grassroots mobilization and individual contribution traditionally associated with collective action on behalf of nonhumans.

Earnest mobilization for the protection of nonhumans began in Victorian Britain and America, where wealthy aristocrats, involved with other moral crusades and having the resources to spare, became concerned with the treatment of urban working horses and the particularly abhorrent methods used by cities to “dispose” of stray dogs.¹ Gradually, concern for nonhuman welfare extended to other species as well. Upton Sinclair’s novel, *The Jungle*, while intended to raise awareness to worker conditions (and while ultimately most effective in raising awareness about food safety), was successful in revealing to the public the previously shrouded reality of slaughterhouse operations. Writing a decade before him, in 1892, Henry Salt penned a treatise on rights for other animals, drawing on the human rights mobilizations of his time that recognized the personhood of those considered property. Many other human rights activists and reformers of the nineteenth century had seriously considered the treatment and use of other animals. The communal Alcott house of New England, *Fruitlands*, operated not only as a stop on the Underground Railroad, but required veganism of its residents (Francis, 2010). Not only

¹ In New York City, for example, dogs were corralled into a large cage and drowned in the river (Beers, 2006).

were the flesh, eggs, and lactations of other animals eschewed, but even their labor and manure. Vegetarian and vegan experiments did abound during this era, sometimes following trends in romanticism or religious purity, but other times explicitly recognizing the correlations between the experiences of humans and other animals and the desire to extend moral consideration (Davis, 2010).

Thus, the human social reforms over the past two centuries were hugely influential in early mobilization efforts for other animals. As the nonhuman animal rights movement has struggled for legitimacy, it perhaps quite intentionally draws on human rights discourse to garner claimsmaking strength. Connection to human rights has indeed been successful for other disadvantaged movements in bolstering their legitimacy (Brysk, 1994). While many applied abolitionist anti-slavery rhetoric to nonhumans (Beers, 2006) and suffragettes eagerly adopted vegetarianism as congruent with their challenge to patriarchal oppression (Leneman, 1997), it was not until the mid twentieth century that nonhuman liberation gained a significant political presence (Guither, 1998). As activists of the Civil Rights movement began to challenge the exclusion of women, homosexuals, and African Americans from the rights discourse, so too did nonhuman advocates who pushed the boundaries of moral consideration to include other species as well. Women's rights advocates, for example, call for the accommodation of gender nuances and specifically female interests (rape, domestic violence, sex education) in human rights claimsmaking (Stephen, 1997). Similarly, then, advocates of other animals insist on the accommodation of species.

Just as the inclusion of these new human demographics required a reconstructing of eligibility requirement, protest strategies, and goal demands to reflect new demographics, the extension of rights to other species necessitated new considerations as well. Importantly, for any oppressed group, but particularly for nonhuman animals, just who is being represented and who can be counted as a representative has required definition and is still without consensus. Animal advocates of yesteryear focused largely on highly visible, urban nonhumans who were not used for food. But, a century later, with the rise of factory farming systems and the subsequent release of Peter Singer's *Animal Liberation* in the early 1970s, nonhuman advocates began to widen their circle of concern to include nonhumans raised for food as well. Indeed, the very notion of a human/nonhuman (and human privileging) divide in the hierarchically constructed realm of moral consideration is being challenged (Adams and Donovan, 1995; Wolfe, 2003).

While the scope of nonhuman animal representation varies by individual and organization, most liberationist advocates and groups today focus on any number of species impacted by human activities. While human interference tends to be a prerequisite for representation, however, groups may also discriminate based on a litany of qualities when determining how far to cast their net of representation. For example, according to Francione, "animals" are differentiated from non-animals in their capacity for sentience or self-awareness. Francione's definition of sentience also requires an ability to feel pleasure and pain and to hold interests and preferences. Any animal that is sentient would be eligible for representation. This is coupled with Regan's notion of a "subject of life" whereby, to be included under rights mobilization efforts, a nonhuman animal would need the ability to "perceive and remember," "act intentionally in pursuit of their desires or goals," and possess "beliefs, desires, and preferences," a "sense of their own future," and a "psychophysical identity over time" (Regan, 2004, p. 264). However,

Regan's notion of animality tends to be overly particular and necessarily excludes many sentient beings about whose subjective experiences we have little understanding. Moreover, as Francione argues, many of these characteristics exclude sentient beings (including many humans) who might still benefit from protected rights regardless of their capacity for complex cognitive functions listed in Regan's definition. Therefore, it is perhaps wiser to adhere to Francione's more inclusive definition which relies on sentience alone in affording rights. And, for those nonhuman animals for whom we are uncertain in regards to their sentience, Francione suggests we err on the side of caution and include them as well. This definition is important because once an animal is regarded as non-sentient or not a subject of life, it follows that other rights holders might justifiably use them as resources.

As illustrated in the debate over moral inclusion, what is "animal" is socially constructed. Consequently, the nonhuman movement varies on its representation of animals. Some attempt to represent all sentient animals, including humans and insects. Others focus only on nonhuman animals and exclude nonhumans of lower complexity. Still others focus primarily on popular species such as monkeys and apes, cats and dogs, or whales and dolphins. But generally, nonhuman animal rights advocates seek to extend those rights traditionally granted to humans—the *consideration of interests*—to incorporate other sentient beings who share a capacity to suffer and thus possess interests to speak of. Like other oppressed groups who have struggled for inclusion in rights discourse, newcomer claimsmaking will reflect that demographic's unique interests and identity. So, while women might struggle for the consideration of sexual violence in the rights discourse, nonhuman animals, alternatively, might have a vested interest in not being used exploited as food, labor, test subjects, or entertainment.

The types of interests that should be considered—and, likewise, who is considered an appropriate proxy in representing nonhumans—are additional points of contention. The hugely diverse nonhuman animal rights movement sees advocates taking a variety of stances with regards to human-nonhuman relationships. To be considered an advocate, it is not enough that one simply represent the interests of nonhuman animals. Such a definition would suggest that vivisectors and farmers that practice good "husbandry" might be considered advocates. Similarly, "conservationist" sportsmen that mobilize to protect hunting habitats might also be included. Therefore, for the purposes of this article, nonhuman animal rights activists will be defined as those who seek to relieve nonhumans from their oppressive conditions with a focus on *individual* rights for nonhumans that are unrelated to whatever function they might serve humans or the ecosystem. Such a definition would exclude any who do not seek to liberate nonhumans, who treat nonhumans as objects and resources, or who view nonhumans holistically as part of a larger ecosystem with no claims to rights as individuals. Thus, many nonhuman and environmental "protection" groups (the Humane Society of the United States and the Sierra Club, for example) would be excluded.

With the definitions of nonhuman animals, nonhuman advocates, nonhuman rights, and the nonhuman movement attended to, we can begin to locate nonhuman advocacy within the sphere of social movement studies. Such an exploration might be organized in a number of ways (by following the historical progression of social movement studies, by discussing clusters of related theories, etc.), but this paper will deconstruct SMT as a micro-level/individual experience, a meso-level/group experience, and, finally, as a subject of larger, macro-level influences. While

participation in a social movement is sometimes a personal decision and personal costs and benefits will be experienced, the decision to participate is often mediated by social pulls (a critical mass, networks, a culture, etc.). The individual and group experience of collective action must always contend with larger social (or natural) influences such as political regimes, competition among social movements, environmental disasters, historical forces, etc. Thus, the nonhuman animal rights movement, typical of other movements, recognizes that the choice to mobilize for nonhumans is ultimately an individual choice (particularly for this group, as many are recruited with no preexisting networks) and that the individual will experience profound identity transformations (some of which may indeed be negative). This movement also recognizes the importance of strategy in professionalized organization and the nurturing of a movement culture to foster group cohesiveness, movement strength, and resourcefulness. But macro-scale realities also shape a movement, and nonhuman advocates must face prevailing ideologies of speciesism, countermovement from nonhuman exploitative industries, competing movements and factions, and a globalizing capitalist economy that entrenches animal use.

Individual Participation

Ultimately, any social movement is comprised of individual participants. Some may be comprised of only a few committed and resourceful persons, while others might lay claim to hundreds of thousands of perhaps more loosely committed members. The experience and resources the participating individual has available to contribute (and could potentially gain) also varies, as do their motivations and expectations. In nonhuman animal mobilization, the personal motivations vary considerably. Because nonhumans lack the ability to mobilize on their own behalf, humans have intervened as proxies. This inherent disconnect between nonhumans and their representatives creates a potential disincentive to participation that is somewhat unique to the nonhuman movement. Yet, many oppressed groups, such as human slaves, children, and women, have been historically without voice or power and would be severely limited in their ability to mobilize as well. Fortunately, social movements (the nonhuman animal rights movement included) have been able to circumvent this disadvantage and create meaningful change for their constituency (Beers, 2006). Of course, this is not to say that human slaves, women, and other disadvantaged subjects of social change have not been able to act on their own behalf. Even nonhuman animals have been active participants in their emancipation as documented in countless instances of resistance (Hribal, 2010).

Regardless, even for those in more privileged or advantageous positions, social movement participation almost always entails a certain degree of cost and risk that must be overcome. Thus, the decision to participate is not simply a knee-jerk reaction to grievances, but is thought to require some degree of consideration. Given that significant disincentives would be expected to incapacitate social movement mobilization, social movement theorists have expended considerable attention to uncovering what motivates certain individuals to participate and others to free-ride (to abstain from participation but to nonetheless reap the benefits achieved by others who participate and incur those costs and risks). Some have applied a basic theory of rational choice which frames the decision to participate as one that is made by weighing potential costs against potential benefits. Potential costs for the nonhuman movement, for example, might include significant social stigmatization (Iacobbo and Iacobbo, 2006), legal persecution (Lovitz, 2010; Potter, 2011), and limited socioeconomic or geographic access to vegan alternatives

(Harper, 2010). If the advocates do not stand to gain any direct benefits from liberating nonhumans, these costs might be amplified. The collective good that advocates hope to achieve—equal consideration for all sentient beings—might not resonate with a deeply speciesist society. As such, many advocates also reiterate the interconnected nature of oppression for humans and nonhumans alike and also draw on the desire for environmental and human health benefits that would directly benefit the larger public.

Fortunately, researchers have identified several other potential individual benefits from social movement participation that could compensate for these costs and risks and encourage collective behavior. First, the achievement of a critical mass is thought to encourage participation (Chong, 1992; Gerald and Oliver, 1993). When enough individuals are participating, risks and costs are distributed more widely and are significantly diminished for each person. Critical mass also creates a culture that normalizes that social movement behavior. Similarly, individuals are more likely to participate if they suspect success is likely and that their involvement will be influential (Finkel, Muller, and Opp, 1989). Second, individuals are thought to undergo some degree of political learning. That is, individuals will consider their past experiences with mobilization to determine the utility of future participation (Macy, 1990). Again, the perception that their involvement was influential is important. It has also been considered that extreme repression can sometimes overpower any individual hesitations related to risks and costs, encouraging mobilization despite the disincentives (Opp and Roehl, 1990). What's more, some individuals may participate to *intentionally* face the risks of participation. Some researchers have argued that the celebration of risk-taking and sacrifice for the greater good actually works as a status reward (Willer, 2009).

To be sure, the identity gained from participation can become a powerful incentive. Prestige and reputation gained from participating can override immediate self-interest (Muller and Opp, 1986). Likewise, as seen in lesbian and gay mobilization efforts, the community and sense of belonging that a movement can elicit becomes a potent motivator (Armstrong, 2002; Bernstein, 1997). Animal activists also report experiencing heightened self-confidence and enriched, more meaningful lives (Gaarder, 2008). It should be noted, however, that this acquired identity can also become a detriment. Many nonhuman activists, for instance, are labeled by the public, countermovements, and the state as irrational, terroristic, or overly emotional. Indeed, emotionality plays a controversial role in nonhuman advocacy. While emotion is hugely important in motivating participation for any social movement (Goodwin, Jasper, and Polletta, 2001), it is particularly salient in nonhuman animal rights participation (DeCoux, 2009). But emotion can also work to delegitimize movement claims if participant identities are gendered and negatively perceived. This is a common occurrence in the largely female nonhuman animal liberation movement (Einwohner, 1999; Gaarder, 2011). So, while participation in nonhuman advocacy is largely motivated by an emotional response (Jasper and Poulsen, 1995), the negative stereotypes of irrationality attributed to female participants are notable risks to consider (Gaarder, 2008). For this reason, many advocates of nonhumans adhere to highly rational, reasoned arguments to counter the risk to identities (Groves, 2001). Furthermore, identity can also deter recruitment in creating an identity that is too exclusive. Creating a vegan or liberationist identity, for example, necessarily otherizes the larger, speciesist public who also act as the activists' recruitment pool (Maurer, 2002). This occurs *within* the movement as well. The abolitionist faction, for example, has been criticized for protecting exclusivity at the cost of

alienating and repelling other nonhuman advocates (Yates, 2012). Radical factions that, by their nature, criticize moderated movement activity and must protect and differentiate their position from that of the moderate group could be creating a negative and unwelcoming identity.

Given high opportunity costs and the potential for identity and emotion to become detrimental, group solidarity becomes critical in sustaining participation. Individuals must be bound together in some way to sustain and protect their involvement. Nonhuman advocacy, in particular, is heavily reliant on networks to recruit and maintain members (Cherry, 2006). Increasingly, transnational networking has become an important resource for nonhuman animal rights advocates, particularly for smaller, radical factions. Thus, advocates struggle to create an identity that is nurturing to participants, while, at the same time, not so exclusive that it discourages new participants from joining. As we have seen, advocates must also contend with outside counterclaims to their identity that can undermine the movement's authority. Strong, inclusive networks, then, carry much potential in reducing costs associated with participation and overcoming free-riding (Diani, 2004).

Social Movement Agency

While individual decisions and contributions are important in understanding how movements coalesce and sustain, social movements are ultimately collective endeavors. Group processes vary significantly between social movements, and how a movement mobilizes available resources is linked to its ability to attain its goals (McCarthy and Zald, 1977). Consequently, resource mobilization theory has dominated the social movement literature as a means of analyzing movement agency in determining outcome (Jenkins, 1983). Just as individuals are expected to participate given some degree of rational consideration, movements, too, are thought to behave more or less rationally when navigating their environments in pursuit of social change. Movements negotiate externally with the public, the state, other social movements, and countermovements. They also exhibit factionalism and tussle internally among themselves for the power to create meanings and to frame problems. Resource mobilization presumes that grievances are normal and therefore looks beyond individual incentives to participate, grappling instead with the difficult problem of how collective action manipulates resources to achieve goals (Foweraker, 1995).

As such, movements have some ability to manipulate societal culture and create supportive ideologies that legitimize their claims-making (Eckstein, 2001). Significantly, nonhuman animal rights mobilization, since the nineteenth century, has been successful in creating a culture that is much more sensitive to nonhuman animal interests (Beers, 2006; Ryder, 2000). Since the 1970s, the concept of nonhuman animal "rights" has become increasingly familiar with the general public. The mainstreaming and normalization of concern for nonhuman animals, intentionally produced by decades of mobilization efforts, has certainly created an environment much more conducive to future movement activities. However, over time, these movement activities also run the risk of falling into certain path dependencies whereby movements become locked into procedures and repertoires initiated many years prior. Deviation from these routines becomes increasingly difficult as time passes and movements become invested in particular behaviors. The cultures and ideologies they have fostered begin to cement. For example, a movement that has historically structured itself for the purpose of mobilizing financial donations will have

difficulty adapting to mobilize grassroots activism (Oliver and Marwell, 1992). Piven and Cloward (1977) are particularly critical of organization for these reasons. Organizations, they argue, are prone to internal oligarchy, external cooptation, moderated tactics and goals, and the unfortunate rejection of influential radical mobilization. Professionalization aggravates these tendencies as moderation is especially favored to maximize constituencies. A related effect of moderating is the diversion of significant percentages of acquired resources to self-maintenance (Edwards and Marullo, 1995). This is where Francione's criticisms of professionalized nonhuman animal rights organizations can be placed. Francione (1996) underscores moderated goals and tactics as a significant compromise to nonhuman animal rights. Out of regard for "purely pragmatic self interests," he argues, "[...] large, wealthy animal organizations [...] are more concerned with the size of their donor bases than with the moral message that they promote" (Francione and Garner, 2010, p. 74). Bearing out Piven and Cloward's concerns with organizations, abolitionism is blunted by hegemonic movement powers. So, both path dependency and active moderation could be at work in coalescing professionalized movement power to the point of self-imposed inflexibility. In such situations of stunted movement activity, however, those excluded radical factions are actually critical in refocusing movement goals and inspiring tactical innovations (Gerlach, 1999; Wrenn, 2011).

While radical factions play an important role in social movement health, they have not always been welcomed favorably. Factionalism tends to be underscored as a significant detriment to movement success, particularly in that it diverts crucial resources to infighting (Benford, 1993). As we have seen, the abolitionist animal rights faction has been criticized for its extreme exclusivity that may be severely limiting its ability to expand (Yates, 2012). Thus, to measure movement success (or lack thereof), it is certainly important to examine variations in resource mobilization between movements. But, also, the interactions among internal factions are a critical component as well. The nonhuman animal rights movement is not unlike many other social movements in its exhibition of many sharply divided factions (Zald and Ash, 1966). It is typical for movements to splinter and regroup in reaction to conflicts over perceived problems, accepted solutions and tactics, and methods in mobilization (Benford and Snow, 2000). So, for example, while advocates are united under the shared aim of nonhuman animal advocacy, they are sharply divided over the end goal of either liberation or reform and over the legitimacy of various tactics (direct action, violence, nonviolence, vegan outreach, etc.). Critical of the moderated tactics and goals of the professionalized nonhuman movement, Francione (1996) has outlined a radical, abolitionist approach that refocuses nonhuman advocacy on eliminating nonhuman animal use entirely with a particular emphasis on veganism as a moral requirement for achieving this end. In line with Piven and Cloward, Francione explicitly rejects the need for organizations, and, in fact, explicitly discourages their use altogether.

While agendas and claimsmaking certainly differ, how resources are mobilized by nonhuman animal rights factions varies considerably as well. As we have seen, the mainstream movement, having largely professionalized, tends to focus on the more dependable solicitation of financial donations and media representation. The direct action or "militant" faction, namely represented by the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) and symbolized by iconographic ski-masked men dressed in black, often relies on property damage (Foreman and Haywood, 1993; Love and Obst, 1971), open releases (*An Animal Liberation Primer*, n.d.), intimidation ("haunting" and "harassment" as they call it) (Morgan, 1980), and even direct violence as amply illustrated in handbooks on

munitions, bombs, and other weapons (*Improvised Munitions Handbook*, n.d.). Through physical harm to other humans, destruction of property, and emotional terror, this faction hopes to create social change through force and fear. Such a tactical repertoire also tends to reject the utility of nonviolence. This is explained in one essay promoted on an online ALF library:

The ideology of nonviolence creates effects opposite to what it promises. As a result nonviolence ideologists cooperate in [...] continued repression of the powerless [...]. To minimize violence we must adopt a pragmatic, reality-based method of operation. (Meyers, 2000: 1).

Not surprisingly, such an approach requires that they operate in relative secrecy. Subsequently, this faction receives little, if any, public support from the professionalized and moderated mainstream organizations (Guither, 1998).

The abolitionist faction, alternatively, rejects both the moderate claimsmaking of the mainstream movement and the violent tendencies of the direct action faction, relying instead on nonviolent vegan outreach and moral suasion (Francione and Garner, 2010). Both moderation and violence are thought to be counterproductive. The compromises of professionalized organizations are seen to undermine goals of nonhuman liberation in supporting exploitative industries and creating consumer complacency. Violent liberationist tactics, on the other hand, are thought to alienate the public, incite state repression, and run counterintuitive to values of peace, equality, and respect (Hall, 2006). Drawing on the abolitionist language of the anti-slavery movement that preceded it and recognizing the intersectional nature of oppressions for both humans and nonhumans alike, abolitionists call for a complete cessation of nonhuman animal use with a preference for education, outreach, and the adoption of veganism (Boyd, 1987).² In many ways, Francione's abolitionist approach does mirror the human abolitionists of the past, particularly in its reliance on moral suasion and nonviolent tactics. Yet, human abolitionists did sometimes utilize violence and were often involved in legal mobilization (Quarles, 1969). What's more, the work of human abolitionists is far from done (slavery in so many ways resurfaced in sharecropping and later in the discriminatory prison system). Advocacy today focuses on desegregation, combating racist ideology, improving educational opportunities, and securing other basic freedoms (Davis, 2006; Lewis, 1995). Nonhuman abolitionists, however, remain focused on attacking the property status of other animals. Though, like their human abolitionist counterparts, nonhuman abolitionists do emphasize the importance of attacking oppressive ideologies that support institutionalized enslavement and speciesism.

The Social Movement Environment

Thus far we have seen the relatively rationalized behaviors of individuals, movements, and their factions in determining the formation and structure of collective action. But, clearly, the nonhuman animal rights movement, like any social movement, does not operate in a vacuum. Here, proponents of political opportunity structure challenge the shortcomings of resource mobilization in failing to account for macro-scale realities (Koopmans, 1999; McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald, 1996). There will always be some degree of environmental influence that lies outside the control of the individual and the group that either provides or impedes

² The appropriation of human abolitionist language has garnered some degree of controversy in that Francione, who developed the terminology for nonhuman animal rights purposes, has largely failed to place the term historically or within the discourse of ongoing human abolitionist mobilization (The Vegan Police, 2011).

opportunity. Furthermore, movement agency is highly influenced by that movement's history (Eckstein, 2001; Rubin, 2004) and its relationship to larger cultural forces and the social movement climate in general. The nonhuman movement, for instance, has a solid history of responding to highly visible cruelties suffered by urban species. This has certainly worked to maintain a movement that is largely concerned with reforming human-nonhuman relationships. Liberationist claimsmaking only surfaced in response to the energy and influence of the Civil Rights movement. Thus, the movement's history has created particular path dependencies in goals and tactics that continue to structure the movement's decision making today.

Political climate, too, will shape a movement's structure and trajectory. In the mid-nineteenth century, for example, the nonhuman movement gained legitimacy in drawing on the claimsmaking discourse of the relatively successful human abolitionist movement (Beers, 2006). The American Temperance movement, and subsequently, the Progressive movement, also created a political and cultural environment conducive to drawing attention to nonhuman animal issues. Later, riding the success of the Civil Rights and environmental movements of the 1960s, the nonhuman movement experienced a renaissance as the public was especially receptive to claims that extended concern to the nonhuman realm. Recently, however, the post-September 11th atmosphere has heightened state sensitivity to disruptive domestic activism. For instance, the 1992 Animal Enterprise Protection Act was amended in 2006 and renamed the Animal Enterprise *Terrorism* Act, effectively criminalizing any nonhuman activism that financially interferes with nonhuman industries (Lovitz, 2010). So, while activism on behalf of other animals carries on, participants and potential participants alike are keenly aware of the increased risks associated with their activism (Potter, 2011). This could be deterring and muting collective action to some extent (Lovitz, 2010). Certainly, then, political opportunities, or lack thereof, can influence a movement's ability to successfully mobilize. Other large social and environmental factors could also impact a movement's success. The Western health crisis associated with rich diets high in nonhuman animal products has introduced many to vegan and vegetarian diets (Marsh, Zeuschner, and Saunders, 2012). Likewise, the growing concern over climate change has increasingly come to include nonhuman animal agriculture as a primary culprit (Goodland and Anhang, 2009).

Another influential factor in the social movement environment, and largely outside the control of participants and groups, is the inevitable mobilization of countermovements. Often concerned with preserving the status quo, countermovements emerge to protect taken-for-granted social structures and ideologies (Jasper and Poulsen, 1993). Thus, social movements are often obligated to address the counter-claimsmaking and adjust their framing and repertoires accordingly. As Jasper and Poulsen (1993) uncovered when exploring nonhuman animal rights interactions with opposing mobilizations, countermovements can become a key variable in explaining movement successes or failures. So, the nonhuman rights movement must combat countermovement mobilization in addition to fighting for resources, recruitment, and social change. Exploitative industries work to actively defame nonhuman activists (Gorski, 2011), portraying them as detriments to human well-being, hindrances to scientific progress (Smith, 2010), or, as noted above, violent extremists. Much of this countermovement activity is conducted by highly organized and well-funded agribusiness, bio-medical industries, and recreational "sportsmen" (Sorenson, 2006) with powerful ties to the state (Lovitz, 2010).

Movements must also contend with public perceptions and media portrayals (Gamson, 2004). As discussed previously, countermovement and public misconceptions about a movement's identity can become problematic. However, the media's selection process can be particularly troublesome when deciding which movements and protests will be covered with a tendency to favor powerful interests and the status quo (Oliver and Myers, 1999). However, movements must utilize the media as it is an invaluable resource in diffusing claimsmaking and mobilizing participation. Moreover, independent media outlets offer venue and voice for otherwise marginalized groups (Ryan, 2005). The abolitionist faction, as we have seen, is largely excluded from the larger nonhuman movement's claimsmaking process, but, abolitionism is able to utilize affordable, free-access media resources like self-printed literature or the Internet to overcome internal movement barriers. The Internet, in particular, "[...] has lowered the opportunity costs of communication and has facilitated networking among similarly minded activists, who can bypass the large organizations and their efforts to control the discourse about issues" (Francione and Garner, 2010, p. 67). That said, the power regained from circumventing traditional channels and instead utilizing online forums might result in a situation of cyber-balkanization, as increased control over claimsmaking can lead some groups to promote their agendas to the absolute exclusion of opposing approaches (Alstynne and Brynjolfsson, 2005). The abolitionist movement, in its problems with exclusivity, must certainly contend with this. However, the very nature of abolitionist nonhuman rights claimsmaking—that being the vested interest in monitoring professionalized and violent organizations and tactics—combats, to some extent, the potential for cyber-balkanization. Indeed, abolitionism is very often engaged in rigorous debate with other groups and individuals within the nonhuman animal rights arena (Francione and Garner, 2010).

Yet, despite the power in media representation, movements need to be wary of how media bias can misconstrue the movement to their detriment. While culture and ideology can be products of social movement mobilization, preexisting counter-ideologies and unreceptive cultures are a social reality that movements must address and attempt to resonate with. The nonhuman animal rights movement in particular enjoys extremely few positive media representations. In fact, many liberation or vegan claims are ignored entirely, or reframed in ways that support the interests of nonhuman exploitative industries (Blaxter, 2009; Cole and Morgan, 2011; Freeman, 2009; Freeman, Beckoff, and Bexell, 2011). However, media coverage continues to be a favored tactic in the nonhuman movement. People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), for example, operates under the assumption that any coverage, even if negative, must be good for the movement in eliciting attention and perhaps provoking the audience to consider the issues (PETA, n.d.). Regardless, resonance with an indifferent or unfavorable public sphere is a leading challenge for nonhuman rights activists.

The Impact of Factionalism

The nonhuman animal rights movement, then, is a collective group that must contend with a multitude of factors in its goal for achieving nonhuman liberation. Some of those factors are within its control, but many are not. Importantly, however, this movement also faces the additional challenge of inter-movement competition. While many social movements experience the problems associated with competing for limited attention and resources with similar organizations in their field (indeed, many organizations within a field will actually begin to

homogenize as a successful strategy becomes standard) (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983), the nonhuman movement must contend with radical factions that are not only sharply critical of the moderated professionalized organizations, but are also competing for resources and claimsmaking space. To be clear, other movements have experienced this phenomenon, as radical mobilization is certainly not unique to the nonhuman animal rights movement. The women's movement, for example, enjoys a robust, moderate collectivity (generally associated with the most prominent group, the National Organization for Women), but contends with radical feminists who worry that the moderated movement has lost sight of important goals and ignores root causes of gender inequality. The women's movement, however, explicitly values difference, encourages all to participate, and gives weight to a variety of concerns (Lindsey, 2010). As a result, it has been suggested that the lack of unity and the leniency towards dissenting opinions have inhibited the success of the women's movement (Epstein, 2003).

Despite its place in the wave of new social movements, the nonhuman animal rights movement has no such cultural appreciation for democratic leadership. It appears that, in accordance with Piven and Cloward's apprehensions, organizational oligarchy has manifested to the detriment of movement progress. Radical factions are largely excluded by hegemonic organizations like PETA, Farm Animal Rights Movement (FARM), Farm Sanctuary, and Vegan Outreach. Indeed, these professionalized organizations are increasingly allocating resources to counter abolitionist claimsmaking and block their access to spheres of discourse. For instance, in the summer of 2012, dissatisfied with the moderated messages promulgated by the Animal Rights National Conference that is annually hosted by FARM to spotlight the agendas of professionalized organizations, a group of abolitionists attempted to hold their own smaller convention in the same venue at the same time as the larger conference. After initially accepting their reservation, the hotel later shut down the abolitionist event at the behest of the Animal Rights National Conference organizers (LaVeck and Stein, 2012). FARM later released a statement intended to "clear the air" and defame the offending radicals as "sideline pundits" (FARM, 2012).

Thus, inter-movement tensions are a particular problem for collective action on behalf of other animals. The radical abolitionists experience a significant amount of hegemonic exclusion and countermovement retaliation from the dominant animal groups despite their critical role in maintaining overall movement health. But, also, and perhaps not unrelated, abolitionists must contend with the phenomenon of status contamination. As larger organizations increasingly frame radical advocacy as deviant, unrealistic, and divisive, effectively demonizing radical tactics (Francione and Garner, 2010), one might expect that fewer advocates would be willing to identify with the abolitionist faction; the status of radical mobilization thus devalued and diminished, participants would presumably disassociate. Alternatively, as professionalized organizations also co-opt many of the important symbols and claims made popular by radical advocacy and mold them into something congruent with their favored moderate tactics, radical activists must also concern themselves with the potential for their status as radicals to be "contaminated" with moderate claimsmaking. In some ways, therefore, radical activists must engage in their own disassociation to protect their status, although, this might serve to aggravate the already disconcerting problem of hyper-exclusivity.

Discussion

The individual decision to participate in collective action is, to some extent, a result of carefully weighed costs and benefits. Identity, emotion, and networks can influence these decisions and help counteract the potential to free-ride. At the collective level, movements can bring about change through strategized mobilization of available resources and the active creation of meaning, culture, and ideology. As resource mobilization theorists have emphasized, how a movement frames problems and solutions can impact a movement's identity and its ability to succeed. Yet, conflicts over framing often encourage factionalism. Factionalism can operate as a useful motivation for the movement, but it can also act as a major drain on resources. In the larger context of movement activity, movements operate in a fluctuating, reflexive relationship with their environment. They could be paralyzed or invigorated from particular political, economic, social, or ecological climates. Likewise, their actions and repertoires might be restricted by certain path dependencies that have crystallized over the course of the movement's history.

In regards to the nonhuman animal rights movement, it appears that factionalism, as a reflection of power hierarchies within the movement, could be the greatest impediment to goal attainment. Particularly, the active countermobilization on behalf of the professionalized organizations against abolitionism might prove a useful site for further exploration, as would the extreme exclusiveness perpetuated by the abolitionists themselves. Issues with status contamination might also be a latent effect of these inter-movement tensions that could be polarizing factions and hindering recruitment. Likewise, though not discussed in this paper, the possibility of concentrated power in the abolitionist faction (despite claims to reject professionalized organization and leadership in favor of democratic participation and grassroots mobilization), could help to explain limited movement success. On the other hand, the literature on path dependency might inform goal attainment. The professionalized nonhuman rights movement, for example, a product of approximately two hundred years of tradition, routine, and investment in reform, has had difficulty innovating tactics and claimsmaking. The abolitionist faction, in relying on nonviolent moral suasion and vegan outreach, provides a radical alternative to the moderated repertoires of the mainstream nonhuman animal rights movement. Radical factions might offer an important challenge to debilitating movement path dependencies. The opportunities for future research in factional influence, then, are numerous. A more thorough investigation into nonhuman animal mobilization could powerfully inform studies in social movement interactions and outcome.

References

- Adams, C. and J. Donovan. (Eds.). (1995). *Animals & Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Alstyne, M. and E. Brynjolfsson. (2005). Electronic Communities: Global Village or Cyber-Balkans? Modeling and Measuring the Integration of Electronic Communities. *Management Science*, 51.6, 851-868.
- An Animal Liberation Primer*. 3rd Ed. Retrieved from <http://www.conflictgypsy.com/2011/04/an-animal-liberation-primer-3rd-edition/>

- Armstrong, E. (2002). *Forging Gay Identities: Organizing in San Francisco, 1950-1994*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Beers, D. (2006). *For the Prevention of Cruelty: The History and Legacy of Animal Rights Activism in the United States*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
- Benford, R. (1993). Frame Disputes Within the Nuclear Disarmament Movement. *Social Forces*, 71.3, 667-701.
- Benford, R. and D. Snow. (2000). Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 611-639.
- Bernstein, M. (1997). Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103.3, 531-565.
- Blaxter, J. (2009). As Seen on TV—or Seen Off? Towards a Vegan Media Critique. *Critical Society*, 1, Winter, 7-14.
- Boyd, B. R. (1987). *The New Abolitionists: Animal Rights and Human Liberation*. Taterhill Press.
- Brysk, A. (1994). *The Politics of Human Rights in Argentina: Protest, Change, and Democraticization*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Cherry, E. (2006). Veganism as a Cultural Movement: A Relational Approach. *Social Movement Studies*, 5.2, 155-170.
- Chong, D. (1992). Reputation and Cooperative Behavior. *Social Science Information*, 31.4, 683-709.
- Clemens, E. S. (1997). *The People's Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890-1925*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Cole, M. and K. Morgan. (2011). Veganphobia: Derogatory Discourses of Veganism and the Reproduction of Speciesism in UK National Newspapers. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 61.1, 134-153.
- Davis, A. (2005). *Abolition Democracy: Beyond Empire, Prisons, and Torture*. New York, NY: Seven Stories Press.
- Davis, J. (2010). Prototype Vegans. *The Vegan*, Winter, 18-19.
- Dalton, R. and M. Kuechler. (Eds.) (1990). *Challenging the Political Order: New Social and Political Movements in Western Democracies*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Diani, M. (2004). Networks and Participation. In D. Snow, S. Soule, and H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (pp. 339-359). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- DeCoux, E. (2009). Speaking for the Modern Prometheus: The Significance of Animal Suffering to the Abolition Movement. *Animal Law*, 16.1, 9-64.
- DiMaggio, P. and W. Powell. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48.2, 147-160.
- Eckstein, S. (2001). Ed. *Power and Popular Protest: Latin American Social Movements*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Edwards, B. and S. Marullo. (1995). In a Declining Social Movement: The Demise of Peace Movement Organizations in the End of the Cold War Era. *American Sociological Review*, 60.6, 908-927.
- Einwohner, R. (1999). Gender, Class, and Social Movement Outcomes: Identity and Effectiveness in Two Animal Rights Campaigns. *Gender and Society*, 13.1, 56-76.

- Epstein, B. (2003). The Decline of the Women's Movement. In J. Goodwin and J. Jasper (Eds.), *The Social Movements Reader: Cases and Concepts* (pp. 328-334). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.
- Farm Animal Rights Movement. (2012). *Clearing the Air*. Retrieved from <http://farmusa.org/ClearingTheAir.htm>
- Finkel, S., E. Muller, and K. D. Opp. (1989). Personal Influence, Collective Rationality, and Mass Political Action. *The American Political Science Association*, 83.3, 885-903.
- Foreman, D. and B. Haywood. (1993). Eds. *Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching*. 3rd Ed. Chico, CA: Abzug Press.
- Foweraker, J. (1995). *Theorizing Social Movements*. Boulder, CO: Pluto Press.
- Francione, G. (1996). *Rain without Thunder: The Ideology of the Animal Rights Movement*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- (2001). *Introduction to Animal Rights: Your Child or the Dog?* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- (2007). Some Thoughts on National Organizations. *The Abolitionist Approach*. Retrieved from <http://www.abolitionistapproach.com/some-thoughts-on-national-organizations/>
- Francione, G. L. and R. Garner. (2010). *The Animal Rights Debate: Abolition or Regulation?* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Francis, R. (2010). *Fruitlands: The Alcott Family and Their Search for Utopia*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Freeman, C. P. (2009). This Little Piggy Went to Press: The American News Media's Construction of Animals in Agriculture. *The Communication Review*, 12.1, 78-103.
- Freeman, C. P., M. Bekoff, S. Bexell. (2011). Giving Voice to the "Voiceless": Incorporating Nonhuman Animal Perspectives as Journalistic Sources. *Journalism Studies*, 12.5, 590-607.
- Gamson, W. (2004). Bystanders, Public Opinion, and the Media. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kriesi (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (pp. 242-261). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Garder, E. (2011). *Women and the Animal Rights Movement*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Garder, E. (2008). Risk & Reward: The Impact of Animal Rights Activism on Women. *Society & Animals*, 16.1, 1-22.
- Gerald, M. and P. Oliver. (1993). *The Critical Mass in Collective Action*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Gerlach, L. (1999). The Structure of Social Movements: Environmental Activism and Its Opponents. In J. Freeman and V. Johnson (Eds.), *Waves of Protest: Social Movements since the Sixties* (pp. 85-98). Lanham, MN: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Goodland, R. and J. Anhang. (2009). Livestock and Climate Change: What if the Key Actors in Climate Change are Cows, Pigs, and Chickens? *World Watch*, November/December.
- Goodwin, J. and J. Jasper. (Eds.) (2003). *The Social Movements Reader: Cases and Concepts*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.
- Goodwin, J., J. Jasper, and F. Polletta. (Eds.) (2001). *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Gorski, P. (2011). Strategic Oppositionality to the Animal Rights “Antis”: Identity-Building and the United States Sportsmen’s Alliance. *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 9.3, 64-82.
- Guither, H. D. (1998). *Animal Rights: History and Scope of a Radical Social Movement*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Groves, J. (2001). Animal Rights and the Politics of Emotion: Folk Constructions of Emotion in the Animal Rights Movement. In J. Goodwin, J. Jasper, and F. Polletta (Eds.), *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements* (pp. 212-232). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hall, L. (2006). *Capers in the Churchyard: Animal Rights Advocacy in the Age of Terror*. Darien, CT: Nectar Bat Press.
- Harper, B. (2010). Race as a “Feeble Matter” in Veganism: Interrogating Whiteness, Geopolitical Privilege, and Consumption Philosophy of “Cruelty-Free” Products. *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 8.3, 5-27.
- Hribal, J. (2010). *Fear of the Animal Planet: The Hidden History of Animal Resistance*. Petrolia: AK Press.
- Iacobbo, K. and M. Iacobbo. (2006). *Vegetarians and Vegans in America Today*. Westport: Praeger.
- Improvised Munitions Handbook*. (n.d.) Volume 1. Philadelphia, PA: Frankford Arsenal. Retrieved from <http://www.conflictgypsy.com/content/Munition1.jpg>
- Jasper, J. M. and D. Nelkin. (1992). *The Animal Rights Crusade: The Growth of a Moral Protest*. New York: Free Press.
- Jasper, J. M. and J. Poulsen. (1993). Fighting Back: Vulnerabilities, Blunders, and Countermobilization by the Targets in Three Animal Rights Campaigns. *Sociological Forum*, 8.4, 639-657.
- Jasper, J. M. and J. Poulsen. (1995). Recruiting Strangers and Friends: Moral Shocks and Social networks in Animal rights and Anti-Nuclear Protests. *Social Problems*, 42.4, 493-512.
- Jenkins, J. (1983). Resource Mobilization Theory and the Study of Social Movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9, 527-553.
- Koopmans, R. (1999). Political. Opportunity. Structure. Some Splitting to Balance the Lumping. *Sociological Forum*, 14.1, 93-105.
- LaVeck, J. and J. Stein. (2012). Justice for Animals, Respect for Advocates: Ideas too Dangerous for Corporatized Animal Advocacy? *HumaneMyth.org*. Retrieved from <http://www.humanemyth.org/room1212.htm>
- Leneman, L. (1997). The Awakened Instinct: Vegetarianism and the Women’s Suffrage Movement in Britain. *Women’s History Review*, 6.2, 271-287.
- Lewis, D. L. (1995). *W. E. B. DuBois: A Reader*. Henry Holt and Company, Inc.
- Lindsey, L. (2010). *Gender Roles: A Sociological Perspective*. 5th Ed. Prentice Hall.
- Love, S. and D. Obst. (1971). *Ecotage! An Environmental Action Book*. New York, NY: Pocket Books.
- Lovitz, D. (2010). *Muzzling a Movement: The Effects of Anti-Terrorism Laws, Money & Politics on Animal Activism*. Brooklyn, NY: Lantern Books.
- Macy, M. (1990). Learning Theory and the Logic of Critical Mass. *American Sociological Review*, 55.6, 809-826.

- Marsh, K., C. Zeuschner, and A. Saunders. (2012). Health Implications of a Vegetarian Diet: A Review. *American Journal of Lifestyle Medicine*, 6.3, 250-267.
- Maurer, D. (2002). *Vegetarianism: Movement or Moment?* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- McAdam, D., J. McCarthy, and M. Zald. (1996). *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyers, W. (2000). *Nonviolence and Its Violent Consequences*. Gualala, CA: III Publishing.
- Morgan, R. (1980). *Love and Anger: An Organizing Handbook*. Westport, CT: Animal Rights Network.
- Muller, E. and K. D. Opp. (1986). Rational Choice and Rebellious Collective Action. *The American Political Science Review*, 80.2, 471-488.
- Oliver, P. and G. Marwell. (1992). Mobilizing Technologies for Collective Action. In A. Morris and C. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers of Social Movement Theory* (pp. 251-272). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Oliver, P. and D. J. Myers. (1999). How Events Enter the Public Sphere: Conflict, Location and Sponsorship in Local Newspaper Coverage of Public Events. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 38-87.
- Olson, M. (1968). *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Opp, K. D. and W. Roehl. (1990). Repression, Micromobilization, and Political Protest. *Social Forces*, 69.2, 521-547.
- People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals. (N.d.) *Animal Rights Uncompromised: PETA's Tactics*. Retrieved from <http://www.peta.org/about/why-peta/peta-tactics.aspx>
- Potter, W. (2011). *Green is the New Red: An Insider's Account of a Social Movement Under Siege*. City Lights Publishers.
- Quarles, B. (1969). *Black Abolitionists*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Regan, T. (2004). *The Case for Animal Rights*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rubin, J. (2004). Meanings and Mobilizations: A Cultural Politics Approach to Social Movements and States. *Latin American Research Review*, 39.3, 106-142.
- Ryan, C. (2005). Successful Collaboration: Movement Building in the Media Arena. In by D. Croteau, W. Haynes, and C. Ryan (Eds.), *Rhyming Hope and History: Activists, Academics, and Social Movement Scholarship* (pp. 115-136). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ryder, R. (2000). *Animal Revolution: Changing Attitudes Toward Speciesism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Salt, H. (1980). *Animals' Rights: Considered in Relation to Social Progress*. Clarks Summit, PA: Society for Animal Rights, Inc.
- Schwartz, M. and P. Shuva. (1992). Resource Mobilization Versus the Mobilization of People: Why Consensus Movements Cannot be Instruments of Social Change. In A. Morris and C. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers of Social Movement Theory* (pp. 205-223). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sinclair, U. (1906). *The Jungle*. London: Penguin.
- Singer, P. (1975). *Animal Liberation*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Smith, W. (2010). *A Rat is a Pig is a Dog is a Boy*. New York, NY: Encounter Books.

- Sorenson, J. (2006). Doctrine of Demons: Attacking Animal Advocacy. *Green Theory and Praxis*, 1.2, April.
- Stephen, L. (1997). *Women and Social Movements in Latin America: Power from Below*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- The Vegan Police. (2011). *Abolitionist History 101: Animal Abolition and Racism*. Retrieved from <http://theveganpolice.com/main/?p=1397>
- Tilly, C. (1979). *Social Movements and National Politics*. CRSO Working Paper No. 197. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Willer, R. (2009). Groups Reward Individual Sacrifice: The Status Solution to the Collective Action Problem. *American Sociological Review*, 74, 23-43.
- Wolfe, C. (2003). *Animal Rites: American Culture, the Discourse of Species, and Posthumanist Theory*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Wrenn, C. (2011). Resisting the Globalization of Speciesism: Vegan Abolitionism as a Site for Consumer-Based Social Change.” *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 9.3, 9-27.
- Yates, R. (2012). The Abolitionist Approach is not Fit for Purpose. *On Human-Nonhuman Relations*. Retrieved from <http://human-nonhuman.blogspot.com/2011/12/abolitionist-approach-is-not-fit-for.html>
- Zald, M. and R. Ash. (1966). Social Movement Organizations: Growth, Decay and Change. *Social forces*, 44.3, 327-341.

PEACE STUDIES JOURNAL

Vol. 5, Issue 3

November 2012

Betty Reardon's Conception of "Peace" and its Implications for a Philosophy of Peace Education

Author: Dale T. Snauwaert, Ph.D.

Professor, Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership
Judith Herb College of Education Health Science and Human Service
The University of Toledo
Mail Stop #921
Toledo, OH 43606-3390
Email: Dale.snauwaert@utoledo.edu

BETTY REARDON'S CONCEPTION OF "PEACE" AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR A PHILOSOPHY OF PEACE EDUCATION

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to explore the ethical and political foundations of Reardon's approach to peace education as introduced in *Comprehensive Peace Education* (Reardon, 1988). This exploration focuses on what Reardon refers to as the "definitional problem," the critical task of defining the meaning of "peace" as foundational to the articulation of a philosophy of peace education. It is argued that Reardon's philosophy is grounded in a cosmopolitan and transformational moral and political orientation, and that orientation provides a powerful framework for the development of a philosophy of peace education.

The purpose of this paper is to explore Betty Reardon's conception of "peace" and its implications for a conception of peace education—in other words, to address what she refers to as the "definitional problem" and its implications. Reardon has produced a large body of work over the course of 50 years of reflection.¹ A complete discussion of her evolving conception of peace, and an overview of critical responses to it, is beyond the scope of this short article. However, her book, *Comprehensive Peace Education* (Reardon, 1988), constitutes an enduring foundation for her conception of peace, and thus, this article will focus its attention on that foundational work. A complete exploration of her conception of peace and peace education would be of great significance for the field; this brief article constitutes a beginning of that larger project.

Betty Reardon is an internationally renowned peace scholar and peace educator. She has been instrumental in the establishment of peace education institutions and programs around the world. Her work has defined the fields of peace studies and peace education. The exploration in this article will focus on what Reardon refers to as the "definitional problem," the critical task of defining the meaning of "peace" as foundational to the articulation of a philosophy of peace education. It will be argued that Reardon posits an authentic, positive of peace, from which a transformational and cosmopolitan conception of peace education follows.

Education and Social Value

Reardon's basic premise, upon which she builds her approach to peace education, is the recognition that there exists an intimate relationship between education and society. From this perspective, education is a social institution and practice that is driven by social values. It has long been recognized that education is contingent upon the specific social and political organization of the society within which it is situated (Dewey, 1916; Freire, 1970; Gutmann, 1999; Jaeger, 1953; Plato, 1979). For example, Aristotle maintains that citizenship and civic education are logical expressions of the constitution (*politeia*) of the society (Aristotle & Everson, 1988). The *politeia* is not merely the formal juridical structure of the legal system; it comprises the basic structure of values that define the society's view of the world. Reardon succinctly articulates this perspective: "Most . . . agree that there is no neutral education. Education is a social enterprise conducted for the realization of social values. The question is what values are to be realized through education, and how (Reardon, 1988, p. 23)." The recognition of the connection between education and social value suggests that education is an intentional activity, and being intentional it is both ethical and political, for it necessarily involves choice, and choice in turn requires ethical and political justification.

If education is driven by social values, what values (and in turn social purposes) are the most important? What values are most fundamental to the *politeia*, and thus to the formation of an educational philosophy? Values pertain to individual *and* social goods that are necessary for human flourishing, for the enjoyment of a good life. They are thus expressions of basic human needs. What needs are so essential for a good life that they constitute social values? Of course, the thick identification and instantiation of needs and values are culturally relative; however, it is often acknowledged that there are basic needs that are universal (Bok, 1995; Shue, 1980; Walzer,

1996). Subsistence, security of person, and freedom are examples of these needs (Shue, 1980). If a society fails to guarantee the fulfillment of these basic needs, it cannot be considered to be well-ordered, decent, and/or just. Is “peace” a fundamental social value? Is it the most important social value? Should peace be comprehensively infused throughout the educational experience? These questions lead us to the definitional problem.

The Definitional Problem – How should “Peace” be defined?

One of the core purposes of *Comprehensive Peace Education* is to explore the meaning of peace. Reardon writes:

A basic assumption of this book is, as I have said, that practitioners of peace education must begin to define and delimit the field: We need to reach some general agreement on its central concepts, educational goals, and preferred instructional approaches . . . *The definitional problem* (my emphasis) seems to be one of achieving conceptual clarity without closing off a continued open inquiry into what constitutes peace, how it can be achieved, and how we can educate students to work for it and to live in it as the normal state of human society (Reardon, 1988, p. 11).

The definitional problem is critical, for the definition of peace determines the legitimacy of peace education. If “peace” is necessary for human flourishing, and is thus a fundamental social value, then an education for peace is of paramount importance. In a spirit of open inquiry, Reardon articulates a conception of “authentic peace” founded upon the now common notions of negative and positive peace.

Negative peace is “defined as the absence of war, achieved by the prevention and/or the general reduction and eventual elimination of armed conflict (Reardon, 1988, p. 6).” Reardon argues that a fully actualized state of negative peace would entail the abolition of war as an institution (“the war system”) (Reardon, 1988, p. 25).

Positive peace includes but transcends negative peace. It entails not only the elimination of armed aggression but also the positive establishment of justice. It constitutes a social order free of all forms of violence, including structural violence, as well as the establishment and sustainability of fundamental and wide spread social fairness. Positive peace can be understood as the realization of the complete range of human rights: civil and political *and* economic, cultural, and social. It is essential to point out that for Reardon (and many others) positive peace entails a conception of global justice that transcends the boundaries of individual nation states; it necessarily applies to all human beings. The following statement is indicative:

The major areas of concern in the domain of positive peace are the problems of economic deprivation and development; environment and resources; and universal human rights and social justice. Peace education seems to have subsumed all of these areas into the general concept of global justice . . . “justice,” in the sense of the full enjoyment of the entire range of human rights by all people, is what constitutes positive peace (Reardon, 1988, p. 26).

Her conception of peace is profoundly influenced by feminism, specifically insights into wholeness and integrity (Reardon, 1988, p.10). This ontological perspective generates an understanding of life that is interrelated and interdependent: life is understood as an interdependent web of relationships within which positive peace is imperative. This feminist ontology in turn leads to the inclusion of all life in the moral community, thereby bringing the moral consideration of the natural world and ecological balance under the positive peace umbrella.

On the basis of both negative and positive peace Reardon posits the notion of “authentic peace” as the foundation of an education for peace. Authentic peace is conceived as the abolition of the war system and the establishment of global justice and a global civic community. Reardon maintains that the “most urgent current need of human society” is “the need for the exercise of global responsibility in the ordering of a just, peaceful, and viable global polity (Reardon, 1988, p. ix).” She elevates authentic peace to the most fundamental social value and thus the foundational value mandating the comprehensive infusion of peace throughout education.

The Transformational Approach to Peace Education

Based upon her conception of authentic peace she defines the educational task in holistic and transformational terms:

. . . the general purpose of peace education, as I understand it, is to promote the development of an authentic planetary consciousness that will enable us to function as global citizens and to transform the present human condition by changing the social structures and the patterns of thought that have created it. This transformational imperative must, in my view, be at the center of peace education. It is important to emphasize that *transformation*, in this context, means a profound global cultural change that affects ways of thinking, world views, values, behaviors, relationships, and the structures that make up our public order. It implies a change in the human consciousness and in human society of a dimension far greater than any other that has taken place since the emergence of the nation-state system, and perhaps since the emergence of human settlements (Reardon, 1988, p. x).

The transformational approach transcends but includes the two other prominent traditions in peace education: the reform and reconstruction traditions. The reform approach is devoted to the prevention of war, including the control and balance of arms. The reconstructive approach seeks to reconstruct international systems, to abolish war, and to achieve total disarmament. Its primary objective is structural and institutional change and the establishment of global conflict-resolution, peacekeeping, and peace-building institutions. The transformational approach aims at the rejection of all forms of violence, including structural violence and injustice.

The goal of the transformational approach is to make violence unacceptable, not only in interactions among individuals but also in interactions among nations, and to make violent

consequences unacceptable in foreign-policy planning. The changes sought are behavioral and institutional but also, and primarily, changes in thinking and in the formation of values. It is the transformational approach that, in my view, holds the most promise for the future of peace education (Reardon, 1988, p. xi).

In turn, different pedagogies follow from the three approaches to peace education. While the reform and reconstructive approaches generally employ an instructional pedagogy that emphasizes the need to inform, to transmit information and to develop skills needed for reform and reconstruction, the transformational approach employs a pedagogy that elicits learning. (Reardon, 1988, p. xii) Reardon describes this approach as follows:

[transformational] peace educators . . . describe their goal as eliciting (not imposing or inculcating) positive re-sponses, recognizing that education is not so much a process of imparting knowledge as it is "drawing out" the capacity to learn . . . In eliciting awareness, the intent is to strengthen capacity to care, to develop a sincere concern for those who suffer be-cause of the problems and a commitment to resolving them through action. Awareness infused by caring becomes concern that can lead to such commitment when one action is followed by other actions, and when action for peace becomes a sustained behavioral pattern, part of the learner's way of life. The objective is to elicit an ongoing and active response to the problems of peace and a commitment to their resolution. . . this cycle of care, concern, and commitment is the core of the peace learning process (Reardon, 1988, p. 21-22).

Reardon maintains that a transformational peace education should draw out "a new mode of thinking that is life-affirming, oriented toward the fulfillment of the human potential, and directed to the achievement of maturation as the ultimate goal of . . . positive peace (Reardon, 1988, p. 53)." This philosophy of peace education posits a pedagogy that is process-oriented, inquiry-based, reflective, experiential, dialogical/conversational, value-based, imaginative, critical, liberating, and empowering (Reardon & Snauwaert, 2011).

A Cosmopolitan Perspective

One's definition of peace, and hence one's approach to peace education, is logically interconnected with one's conception of the *polity*, both domestically and internationally (Brown, 1992; Doyle, 1997). This connection is implicit in the interrelationship between education and social values. It is generally recognized that there are three main traditions of international relations theory: Realism, International Society, and Cosmopolitanism (Jackson, 2005; Wight, 1991). Reardon's conception of authentic peace grounded in international human rights and justice can be understood as situated within the Cosmopolitan tradition of international relations theory.

Realism asserts an international moral skepticism: the belief that ethics has either dubious or no relevance to the action of states. It maintains that relations between nation-states are purely political, in the sense that they exclusively concern interests and power, not what is right or good *per se*. This skepticism is based upon the three following understandings of the international

arena: (1) the international arena is an anarchy, a condition wherein there exists no higher legal or moral authority than individual states; (2) that war is by its very nature unlimited; and (3) states act out of exclusive self-interest (without moral concern for others). Thus, the core assumptions underlying the moral skepticism of Realism are anarchy, unlimited war, and the imperative of self-interest. From the perspective of Realism, peace can only be achieved through the maintenance of a balance of power (Cady, 1989; Doyle, 1997; Smith, 1986).

The international relations theory tradition of International Society (Bull, 1977; Nardin, 1983; Rawls, 1999) maintains that States and Peoples adhere to various principles of morality and law in their relations with each other; these principles are grounded in diplomatic custom and treaty arrangements. In the modern era (since the treaty of Westphalia) it has been generally recognized that there is inherent equality between States and Peoples, that States and Peoples possess a right to self-determination, and that there exists a universal obligation of nonintervention. From this perspective, international justice is a valid notion applicable to relations between States and Peoples; justice is constituted by a mutual respect for the equal sovereignty of each society. Injustice is therefore defined as the crime of aggression, the violation of nonintervention (Bull, 1977; Nardin, 1983; Rawls, 1999).

The Cosmopolitanism perspective finds its moral grounding in a basic commitment to equal respect for persons, a respect that transcends cultural and political boundaries. This commitment generates a global moral community and polity, wherein every human being, and possibly everything living being, has moral standing and thus deserves moral consideration. Both individuals and states are obligated to act in accordance with this commitment (Beitz, 1979; Brown, 1992; Held, 1995; Kant, [1795]1983; Maritain, 1958; Nussbaum, 1996, 1997a, 1997b; Pogge, 1989). Cosmopolitanism transcends the atomistic power relations of Realism and the state-centric orientation of International Society in favor of a global perspective of peace grounded in the full realization of human rights. The principles of human rights, as manifestations of the cosmopolitan perspective, posit the existence of a global ethic founded upon universal respect for human dignity. Our shared humanity carries with it a moral imperative to respect the dignity of every human life, regardless of communal affiliation. The scope of justice is therefore global. This imperative is grounded in the customs and principles of democratic societies and the transnational human rights regime. These principles and conventions establish human dignity as having a higher moral standing than any consideration of national sovereignty. National sovereignty is not absolute; its validity is contingent upon adherence to the principles of respect for human dignity codified in terms of human rights. Individuals have a basic human right to live in a just and peaceful social order (Beitz, 1979; Brown, 1992; Held, 1995; Kant, [1795]1983; Maritain, 1958; Nussbaum, 1996, 1997a, 1997b; Pogge, 1989).

The conception of positive peace, entailing a conception of global justice grounded in human rights, and by logical extension, Reardon's conception of authentic peace is situated within the cosmopolitan tradition. Given that the purpose of the transformational approach is the elimination of all forms of violence, including injustice on all levels and the thought patterns that give rise to it, it is consistent with a cosmopolitan perspective. From an ethical perspective, Reardon defines *cosmopolitanism* as the value of "universal moral inclusion" grounded in respect for human dignity (Reardon & Snauwaert, 2011). She maintains that cosmopolitanism

“best articulates the normative goals of our evolving field . . . the vision of universal moral inclusion that inspires the normative goals of peace education; a vision in which all human beings are accorded respect of their fundamental human dignity (Reardon & Snauwaert, 2011).” From this perspective, peace education is driven by the cosmopolitan values of both universal human dignity and moral inclusion.

Conclusion

In summary, from Reardon’s perspective, as articulated in *Comprehensive Peace Education*, (1) there exists an intimate relationship between education and society; education is an intentional activity, and being intentional it is deeply interrelated with the society’s political and ethical background culture. Given this relationships education necessarily involves choice, and choice in turn requires ethical and political justification. The ethical and political values inherent in the culture of the society shape the fundamental purposes of education. In turn, Reardon argues that peace is the primary social value, and therefore the basic purpose of education should be the transformation of the social order and its implicit patterns of thought in the direction of authentic peace, a conception of peace that is grounded in a cosmopolitan ethical and political orientation. In this sense, the conception of peace education that follows from her definition of peace is both transformational and cosmopolitan. Reardon offers a profound vision of peace and peace education. She articulates the core elements of a cosmopolitan and transformational approach to peace education. By pointing us in this direction she has given us a rich framework to build upon.

References

- Aristotle, & Everson, S. (1988). *The Politics*. Cambridge [England] ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Beitz, C. R. (1979). *Political Theory and International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bok, S. (1995). *Common Values*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Brown, C. (1992). *International Relations Theory: New Normative Approaches*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bull, H. (1977). *The Anarchical Society*. London: Macmillan.
- Cady, D. L. (1989). *From Warism to Pacifism: A Moral Continuum*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: an introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: The Macmillan company.
- Doyle, M. W. (1997). *Ways of War and Peace*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Gutmann, A. (1999). *Democratic Education* (revised edition ed.). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Held, D. (1995). *Democracy and the Global Order*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Jackson, R. (2005). *Classical and Modern Thought on International Relations: From Anarchy to Cosmopolis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jaeger, W. (1953). *The Greeks and the Education of Man*. Annadale, NY: Bard College Papers.

- Kant, I. ([1795]1983). *Perpetual Peace and Other Essays* (T. Humphrey., Trans.). Cambridge: Hackett.
- Maritain, J. (1958). *The Rights of Man and Natural Law*. London: Geoffrey Bles.
- Nardin, T. (1983). *Law, Morality, and the Relations of States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (1996). *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (1997a). *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (1997b). Kant and Cosmopolitanism. In J. B. a. M. Lutz-Bachmann (Ed.), *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal* (pp. 25-58). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Plato. (1979). *The Republic* (R. Larson, Trans.). Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson.
- Pogge, T. W. M. (1989). *Realizing Rawls*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1999). *The Law of Peoples*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Reardon, B. A. (1988). *Comprehensive Peace Education: Educating for Global Responsibility*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Reardon, B. A., & Snauwaert, D. T. (2011). Reflective Pedagogy, Cosmopolitanism, and Critical Peace Education for Political Efficacy: A Discussion of Betty A. Reardon's Assessment of the Field. *In Factis Pax: Journal of Peace Education and Social Justice*, 5(1), 1-14.
- Shue, H. (1980). *Basic Rights: Subsistence, Affluence, and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Smith, M. J. (1986). *Realist Thought from Weber to Kissinger*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.
- Walzer, M. (1996). *Thick and Thin: Moral Argument at Home and Abroad*. South Bend, IN: Notre Dame University Press.
- Wight, M. (1991). *International Theory: The Three Traditions*. London: RIIA and Leicester University Press.

¹ Betty Reardon's Collected Papers is part of the collection of the Canady Center for Special Collections, The University of Toledo Library; a finding guide to the Reardon Collected Papers is available at: http://www.utoledo.edu/library/canaday/HTML_findingaids/MSS-226.html

PEACE STUDIES JOURNAL

Vol. 5, Issue 3

November 2012

Simplicity and Social Justice: An Examination of Value-driven Practice in the Mennonite Central Committee

Author: Emily E. Welty, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor, Peace and Justice Studies
Department of Political Science
Pace University
41 Park Row
New York City, NY 10038
Email: ewelty@pace.edu

SIMPLICITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE: AN EXAMINATION OF VALUE-DRIVEN PRACTICE IN THE MENNONITE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

Abstract

In this paper I explore the ways in which North American Mennonites have understood simplicity as a form of social justice and how this understanding has affected the way in which the Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) works outside North America. During the course of an extended study of MCC and its peacebuilding and development work, I examined how simplicity is practiced by MCC long-term North American volunteers working in Uganda and Kenya and how this simplicity is perceived by Ugandans and Kenyans. I frame my argument within the social psychology theory on social justice and use this to analyze how simplicity takes two primary forms within MCC – seeking to live like local people and frugality and that both of these forms offer both benefits and constraints to the organization and the beneficiaries.

Many people who are committed to social justice see living simply as a way to make their daily lives consistent with their larger ideals. But what does simplicity as a form of social justice mean when it is operationalized in an international faith-based non-governmental organization (NGO) working in East Africa? Is simplicity a personal choice about material consumption or is it something that can be widened to inform institutional culture?

In this paper I explore the way in which North American Mennonites have understood simplicity as a form of social justice and how this understanding has affected the way in which the Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) works outside North America. During the course of an extended study of MCC and its peacebuilding and development work, I examined how simplicity is practiced by long-term North American volunteers working in Uganda and Kenya and how this simplicity is perceived by Ugandans and Kenyans.

The Mennonite Central Committee is a faith-based NGO which operates in 56 countries and focuses on relief, development and peacebuilding work. The primary work of the organization is partnering with local organizations which are supported both through funding and seconding North American volunteers for three to five years. I spent several years studying MCC and the way in which Mennonite values drive its work. As part of my research, I spent a year in Uganda and Kenya interviewing MCC volunteers as well as local partners and beneficiaries.

This article analyzes what it means for an international NGO to privilege and value the idea of simplicity as a form of social justice. I frame this discussion within the social psychology literature on social justice, relative deprivation and equity theory. I extend this theory by examining Mennonite thinking about simplicity as a form of social justice. Then I explore simplicity within MCC as an institution and the two different expressions of simplicity that I discovered. In one understanding, simplicity meant MCC volunteers should live as close to the local standard of living as possible while the other understanding meant volunteers should live as frugally as possible. This exploration of simplicity as an expression of social justice contributes to peace and justice studies as it broadens the theoretical investigations of humanitarian aid work and represents the interdisciplinary nature of peace and justice studies by drawing upon sociology, religion and psychology. The study of simplicity as a personal or institutional policy represents a new way to question power and privilege.

Conceptions of Social Justice - a theoretical framing

"Social justice" is a term that one hears frequently in Mennonite circles as well as in both universities and nonprofits working for the betterment of society or peace in the world. However, precise definitions of "social justice" vary and all too often the term becomes a placeholder for "the good things that should be done to improve the state of the world". Many books claiming to be about social justice do not define the term but rather allow it to serve as the proxy for "good things".

Theoretical understandings of social justice often implicitly link the term to "peace" or "conflict transformation". Deep social inequality (itself a form of structural violence) often intensifies or creates conditions in which physical violence is used to "level the playing field" or "even the score". Peace historian David Cortright defines social justice as the understanding that economic

justice and development are inextricably linked to peace (Cortright, 2008). Social justice is also what scholars such as Johan Galtung define as "positive peace" or the understanding that without the presence of justice, lasting and sustainable peace is impossible (Galtung, 1996). While the field of peace and justice studies is relatively new, scholars have been challenging and questioning what it means to live in a just society for much longer. Political theorists such as Aristotle, Jeremy Bentham, Immanuel Kant, Karl Marx and John Rawls have wrestled with questions concerning social justice and how to negotiate between competing moral claims or desires (Sandel, 2009; Jost and Kay, 2010).

Social psychologists have a stake in the study of social justice because "the subjective experience of justice or injustice has important attitudinal and behavioral consequences" (Tyler and Smith, 1997, p.595). Social psychology argues that awareness of injustice and willingness to struggle against it (engaging in advocacy or protest) is explained in part by relative deprivation - the idea that individuals evaluate their own socioeconomic power in comparison to those around them (Walker and Smith, 2001; Tyler, Boeckmann, Smith, and Huo, 1997; Runciman, 1966). When there are changes in the socioeconomic status of a group, an individual is likely to change their perception of their socio-economic condition relative to the group. My research looks not at the increased advantages of a disadvantaged group but at how an advantaged group might willingly forgo some of their privilege after close contact with the disadvantaged.

Individuals or groups are likely to perceive social injustice and advocate for greater access to power or resources based on their evaluation of the degree of social justice enjoyed by those closest to them. Relative deprivation theorists explain, "members of disadvantaged groups are more likely to compare themselves to other disadvantaged group members such as their family and friends or to their personal experience and expectations than to advantaged group members. Therefore, they may not think of themselves as disadvantaged" (Tyler and Smith, 1997, p.597). When comparing oneself to those outside of one's group, research shows that people are generally more likely to compare themselves to those in worse condition than themselves in order to preserve feelings of self-worth (Wills, 1991; Wood, 1989). In the case of MCC, I will demonstrate that while relative deprivation causes MCC volunteers to change their behavior, the Ugandans and Kenyans were less bothered by the differences in wealth (Leach, Iyer and Pedersen, 2006).

Equity theory dictates that "people who feel that their rewards and contributions are not consistent will experience distress - either guilt if they have too much or anger if they have too little" (Tyler and Smith, 1997, p.599; Adams, 1967). Emotional responses may also include sympathy, pity, anger, self-satisfaction, fear or moral outrage (Montada and Schneider, 1989). Strong feelings of moral outrage or guilt drives people to change their behavior or to change the social situation. As I will show, this sense of guilt and shame served as one of the strongest motivations for MCC volunteers to adopt simplicity practices.

A commitment to social justice may require questioning how people ought to behave when resources and power are unevenly distributed. Distributive justice theory examines how resources from a relatively advantaged group are redistributed to a relatively disadvantaged group (Jost and Kay, 2010; Tyler, 2000; Deutsch, 1985). Central to this thinking are principles of equity and an equality of outcomes which should supersede divisions in gender, race, class, or

nationality. My case study of MCC examines the way in which the organization creates and reinforces a particular notion of social justice (that of simplicity) which is an attempt to bridge the divisions of race, class, ethnicity and nationality which divide the North American volunteers from their East African friends and neighbors.

Mennonite Understandings of Simplicity as Social Justice

In order to understand how MCC volunteers have practiced their commitment to social justice in the field, it is necessary to examine how Mennonites understand social justice. Social justice theorist, Tom Tyler writes, "The especially striking thing about social justice is that it is a social concept that exists only in the minds of the members of an ongoing interaction, a group, an organization, or a society" (Tyler, 2000, 117-118). All of the world's major religious traditions address social justice and urge individuals and communities to consider how to work for a more just, compassionate world (DeYoung, 2007; Windley-Daoust, 2008; Qutb, 2000; Jacobs, 2010; Watts, 2010). Mennonites have long been distinguished by their approach to peace and justice issues as pacifism is a key component of their faith. Refusal to serve in the armed forces and a commitment to a peacemaking on a local, national and international level are hallmarks of Anabaptism and Mennonites. However, Mennonite theology and thought also embraces a specific understanding of social justice which emphasizes simplicity as a marker of what it means to live in right relationship with one's neighbors and the planet. Despite their deeply communitarian tradition, Mennonite responses to systems of social injustice have been less focused on social protest or community organizing and more focused on individuals adopting a life of simplicity. Simple living and reduced material consumption have been ways in which Mennonites exercise social responsibility in a world of inequality.

Early Dutch Mennonite Pieter Pietersz's writings reflect early understandings of simplicity. He urged Mennonites to avoid overeating and drinking, vain fellowship and business deals which involved "large buying and selling transactions" but rather "to be content with dry bread and be satisfied with a little"(Dyck, 1995, p. 130,131). He wrote: "a Christian must, for better or worse, go through his world with limited means, with a clear intention to follow Christ, and forsake all worldly pleasures, living soberly and disciplined, and seeing their treasure only in the kingdom of God" (Dyck, 1995, p.130). This expression of simplicity, particularly evidenced by choices regarding dress and social life, continues to be followed today by the Amish community and many Old Order Mennonites in North America.

By the 1950s, many outward symbols and practices of simplicity faded as Mennonites became assimilated into North American society. In 1958, prominent Mennonite theologian Guy Hershberger addressed the issue of simplicity by examining the relationship between economics and social responsibility. Hershberger worried that economic prosperity was co-opting Mennonites, making them ignore injustice and lose a sense of humility in the midst of abundance. True Christian life entailed a return to simplicity or "the sober life" in which "every Christian uses his earthly occupation, whatever it may be, not for ... what he may obtain through it, but rather as a means of serving God and the church" (Hershberger, 1958, p.329). These sentiments echoed Walter Rauschenbusch and the social gospel movement which was gaining prominence at the time.

Intriguingly, a watershed moment in Mennonite thinking about social responsibility and discipleship came not in a theological or scholarly tome, but in the guise of a cookbook. Doris Longacre's *The More with Less Cookbook*, (1976) made "more-with-less" a proxy phrase for social justice. It contained more than 500 recipes to help Mennonites scrutinize their food consumption patterns, advocate frugality and eat less calories, animal protein, sugar and processed foods. It quickly became the most popular Mennonite book ever published by Herald Press, now in its 47th printing.

Sensing that she had tapped into something crucial in the Mennonite consciousness, Longacre followed-up on the book's success with *Living More with Less*, a practical guide to everyday actions for social justice. It opens: "This is a book for people who know something is wrong with the way North Americans live and are ready to talk about change. This is a book about rediscovering what is good and true. This is a book about beauty, healing and hope, a book about getting more, not less" (Longacre, 1980, p.15). This highlights a key point about simplicity. Mennonites are not concerned with living more-with-less only because they value frugality or thrift but because simplicity is considered to be a path to experiencing fuller, more meaningful faith. Longacre (1980) described the book as "unapologetically about ... small decisions" (p.15); most entries describe small acts of frugality, framed around the larger locus of living faithfully. This demonstrates a key tenet for the Mennonite conception of social justice - small, individual actions matter.

The more-with-less phenomenon demonstrated heightened awareness about personal choices reflected in the broader world, with books like E.F. Schumacher's *Small is Beautiful* (1973) and Francis Moore Lappe's *Diet for a Small Planet* (1971). However, unlike these books, the more-with-less ethic described responsible consumption as a religious, not just ethical, endeavour. *Living More with Less* represented a way for newly urbanized middle class Mennonites to live out their faith practically. Active discipleship could be practised not just by farming or wearing traditional Mennonite head coverings but by washing and reusing aluminium foil, imposing a self-tax on sugar and coffee or cycling to work. The book's popularity was reflected in many similar Mennonite books released in following years including study guides, guidelines for leading more-with-less retreats, camps and holidays (Dregni, 1983; Barkman, 1981; Handrich, 1981; Chapin, 1998; Friesen, 1981; Sider, 1980; Gish, 1973). These books urged Mennonites to rethink and re-examine their diets, clothing, recreation, possessions and habits to discern if they were following Jesus in day-to-day life.

In the 1970s and 1980s, Mennonites began to scrutinize North American lifestyles against the larger backdrop of global poverty and inequality. Mennonites like Ronald Sider highlighted economic justice to argue for simplified North American lifestyles as a path towards discipleship. His book *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger* (1980) argued:

It is a sinful abomination for a small fraction of the world's Christians living in the Northern Hemisphere to grow richer year by year while our brothers and sisters in the Third World ache and suffer for lack of minimal health care, minimal education and even just enough food to escape starvation (p.99).

Sider evaluated how international trade, investment, consumption of non-renewable resources and food security policies contributed to injustice and global inequality. He called Christians to repent by living a simpler lifestyle, less complicit in structural violence.

The 1995 Confession of Faith highlights Mennonites' stewardship of both spiritual and temporal resources, including the earth itself. This represents a new formulation of simplicity, connecting environmentalism and economic justice with biblical faithfulness and personal responsibility. The commentary notes:

Our tradition of simple living is rooted not in frugality for its own sake, but in dependence on God, the owner of everything, for our material needs... We do not need to hold on tightly to money and possessions, but can share what God has given us. (*Confession of Faith in a Mennonite Perspective*, 1995).

This represented a shift in Mennonite understandings of stewardship, in which simplicity is not just frugality (saving money as a matter of good principle) but responsible care for God's gifts and creation.

Sider (1980) observed that if affluent Christians "were willing to live even moderately simple lifestyles, they could make a truly enormous contribution to the reduction of hunger and starving in the world" (p.27). This reflects a very specific understanding of global poverty and development – dependency/underdevelopment theory – or the idea that "they" are poor *because* "we" are rich. This kind of thinking is no longer dominant in the world of humanitarian aid but has persisted among Mennonites. Even though there may be no direct link between the lifestyle choices of one North American and the material poverty of a Ugandan, Mennonites continue to perceive simplicity as a practice which, even if largely symbolic, addresses inequality.

The simplicity ethic insists that abundance cannot be measured in possessions or material wealth, but in relationship with God and other people. While Guy Hersberger (1958) problematized abundance by calling it a "dilemma", Mennonite simplicity typically celebrates abundance but distinguishes it from wealth or affluence. Early Mennonite Pieter Pietersz wrote: "being blessed is different than being rich, for riches deceive but the blessing is true... It is a godless seduction to consider money and possessions as a blessing in themselves" (cited in Dyck, 1995, p.134). Abundance as affluence or materialism is rejected in favor of prosperity and fulfillment grounded in meaningful work, faith and community. Wealth is seen as isolating individuals from the deeper, more meaningful life found in communal relationships.

The community also provides oversight, discouraging errant expressions of Mennonite individuality. Sider identifies two "pernicious dangers" threatening Mennonite simplicity – legalism and individualism. Of these, he considers individualism more dangerous and urges the gathered community to mitigate this impulse. Sider (1980) posits that Mennonites should meet weekly in "fellowship groups" to examine each other's expenses with "gentle thoughtfulness" (p.33).

The simplicity ethic nurtures an embrace of social justice as anti-materialism, urging dependence on other people and on God, rather than on things. Material objects are important only insofar as

they deepen community or relationships with God. Thus, stewardship recognizes: “All we have comes to us as a loan from God and is only temporarily in our possession. The possessions we have are not to be grasped and hoarded, as if we controlled our own security and destiny (Roth, 2005, p.94). Social justice becomes a way of practicing responsible ownership of possessions: discerning the difference between necessities and luxuries and forsaking luxuries. This is determined by asking the questions “what is enough?” or “what is sufficient?” Necessary things are prized strictly for their functionality, not for their style or beauty. ‘Luxuries’ (everything from fashionable clothing to beef or sugar) are to be avoided as they risk detracting from a life of discipleship. Thus, Mennonites are urged to engage in fasting, auditing their supermarkets for imported goods or boycotting anything that is not “fair trade”.

The Mennonite foundation of MCC means that the organization has institutionalized Mennonite values by creating guidelines and frameworks which privilege and reflect particularly Mennonite understandings of the world. Simplicity as a form of social justice has impacted many MCC policies.

Simplicity in MCC – living like local people

MCC volunteers want to share life with the local people in the community and believe that an abundance of material possessions hinders these relationships. Therefore, MCC thinks quite carefully and intentionally about what structures, policies and emphases are needed to guide volunteers towards meaningful shared life in their host community. The MCC volunteers' commitment to social justice drives them to try to "live like local people" by matching their material possessions and use of resources to those of their neighbors. This is an attempt to shift the central referent from a North American lifestyle to an East African one by urging volunteers to reconsider what is necessary to live a good life.

According to the MCC policy handbook (2008), “support while in service will not be at levels that allow a worker to advance economically.” MCC volunteers are intended to embrace “a healthy, comfortable, simple lifestyle that is as close to the living level of local program partners as possible”. This reflects a classic more-with-less Mennonite simplicity that believes less material comfort results in a more fulfilling life but it also draws on a classic theory of social justice - relative deprivation. This worldview essentially asks the privileged MCC volunteers to willingly reduce their standard of living as a way of narrowing the relative gap between themselves and their East African hosts. There are three purposes to such a policy - to reduce the anxiety that the volunteers may feel about their privilege in the context of poverty, to model a view of social justice in which resource distribution is less uneven and to reflect a Mennonite vision of the way the world should be. Interestingly, while this policy may save resources for MCC, this is not the rationale for the policy.

Finding housing for North American volunteers that is both comfortable and locally appropriate was a challenge in both Kenya and Uganda. Some volunteers moved to rural areas that had not hosted expatriates before while others moved to a well-populated city where housing was both expensive and in short-supply. I observed the MCC-Kenya and MCC-Uganda programs struggle to find housing for volunteers that fit MCC's conception of contextually-appropriate and simple housing. The official MCC policy is sufficiently vague and open to interpretation: “MCC

provides each Service Worker with the essentials for healthful living. This includes housing that is appropriate to the work setting and in which the Service Worker can relax and live healthfully.” (MCC International Policy Manual, undated, p.59). With each placement, MCC must balance the desire for the volunteers to fit into the community with comfort.

When Stephanie and Matt Kistler moved to Najile in Kenya, MCC and the local partner (Presbyterian Outreach Mission Church) built a new house for them. The result was a house that was comfortable with amenities like electricity and running water that were extravagant in comparison to the homes of the Maasai neighbors but quite simple by North American standards. Nonetheless, many MCC volunteers feel self-conscious about their housing and worry that it is not locally appropriate. One person confessed, “If we could find something else that was safe, I would move. I like having a hot shower and electricity but I don’t need a flush toilet. And I really don’t need a house that has rooms beyond just a bedroom and kitchen. I feel guilty whenever I think about the living room” (personal communication, May 6, 2009). This demonstrates a strong Mennonite simplicity at work – even when the person complies with MCC policy on housing, she still worries that she is not being simple enough. Simplicity in MCC is not just a matter of policy; it is a matter of religious belief.

In one orientation session, country directors showed new volunteers a list of items they might need in their new homes but gave them one overall guideline – if you need something, go and see if your neighbors have it. If they do, then it is probably something that you need (the implication here being that MCC would pay for it) and if they don’t, then you should think carefully about how important this item really is (the implication being that the item is a luxury and you should either not buy it or should use your own money for it.) One volunteer deliberated over whether she could or should buy placemats – she felt placemats would convey a sense a welcome that she associated with home but knew that her neighbors did not have them. At the time I left the field, she was still pondering whether placemats were appropriate for living locally or not. This level of consciousness about whether something is a luxury or a basic necessity reflects a distinctively Mennonite approach to social justice and simplicity.

The expectation to live in a manner that is appropriate in a local context is both an explicit requirement imposed by MCC as well as something the volunteers expect of themselves. In some cases, volunteers have imagined such reduced standard of living during their assignment, that they are pleasantly surprised by some of the available amenities. One couple spent the first week of their assignment in an apartment with no water – imagining that this was normal and preparing them for rural life – before discovering that the landlord had forgotten to show them how to activate the plumbing! Their desire to align their behavior with what they imagined to be a local standard of living actually created unnecessary hardship.

Simplicity is also an important consideration with transportation. NGOs in East Africa are often caricatured by their use of large white Land Cruisers. Mennonite simplicity prevents MCC from adopting this custom as it conflicts with notions of living in a way consistent with their East African neighbors. MCC believes “experience has shown that vehicles can get in the way of good relationships” (MCC, 2000) and thus strongly encourages volunteers to use public transportation. The majority of the MCC-Uganda team used public buses, shared taxis and boda-bodas, the ubiquitous motorcycles which function as private hire transportation in the region. On

the MCC-Kenya team, there were private vehicles leased to each of the couples. However, this did not mean that the simplicity ethic was absent - it was expressed in terms of the guilt the volunteers felt about driving cars. One member of the MCC-Kenya team confessed, "I don't know why I have this car – I don't need this car and I don't want this car. But at the same time, it would be really hard to figure out how to get rid of it" (personal communication, June 11, 2009). Those with access to private vehicles compensated for this luxury by offering rides to people waiting on the side of the road. I witnessed the country representatives offer rides to Maasai women headed towards Najile during some of our trips to visit partners. While both admitted this was not something they felt comfortable doing at home in Canada, they believed this was a locally-appropriate way of using a private vehicle.

The expectation to live like the local community also extended to health care. When volunteers contracted malaria or other minor ailments, they sought the local medical care used by their African friends and colleagues. However, in more serious cases, workers were strongly encouraged to come to the capital city (Nairobi or Kampala) to be treated. This is a case in which MCC policy tries to balance the pragmatic need for its workers to be well with the desire to live by local standards.

Mennonite simplicity was evident in the way in which MCC volunteers dressed. They typically wore Western attire that is comfortable and informal, much like their expatriate counterparts working throughout the developing world. The implicit message that MCC communicates is that volunteers should wear casual, clean clothing which is not ostentatious. Mennonite culture particularly encourages wearing second-hand clothing or homemade clothing as noted in more-with-less literature. However, this is an instance in which Mennonite norms may contradict the norms of the host society. In Ugandan and Kenyan culture, "smart", fashionable clothing is not only valued but often seen as a sign of respect for others (Marantz, 2001). MCC volunteers often found that their second-hand clothing was not on par with the way their Ugandan or Kenyan colleagues dressed. I spent one day accompanying a MCC volunteer searching for a professional long-sleeved collared shirt that he could wear to business meetings. "I just didn't know I would need to dress like this", he confessed. Another worker noted, "I am much more poorly dressed than the other teachers at my school. Fashion here is important – it is not something that MCC prepares you for actually." (personal communication, June 11, 2009). The short MCC country-specific field guides for Kenya and Uganda were vague and simply noted that clothing was available for purchase locally. This advice conveys Mennonite simplicity but fails to emphasize the importance of fashion – a blind spot for MCC which concentrates solely on social justice without regard for other cultural norms.

MCC volunteers in East Africa are an intriguing case study of relative deprivation as a way of identifying social injustice. While most of the volunteers were already committed to social justice or peacebuilding before their service with MCC, it was the context of working in Uganda and Kenya that caused the shifts in their behavior. The comparison referent of resource use shifted from a North American experience to an East African one. Relatively advantaged North Americans changed their personal behavior and tried to reduce their degree of privilege while living among relatively disadvantaged people. However, it is almost impossible for an expatriate to match the lifestyle of the average Kenyan or Ugandan. Nonetheless, MCC believes it is important to live simply by choosing particular aspects of local life and adopting them – an

adaptation of Mennonite simplicity. How each individual volunteer decides to do this is a matter of both personal choice and institutional policy.

Simplicity as Frugality

Social justice is about subjective individual judgements about what is fair or moral. In addition to comparing themselves with local Africans, MCC volunteers also defined and practiced simplicity in their daily subjective decisions about how to spend money. Frugality – the idea that there is moral value to spending as little money as possible— is the other way Mennonite simplicity is framed in MCC.

Frugality is sometimes presented as an effort to be good stewards of MCC resources. Volunteers are quite aware that MCC does not receive large amounts of government funding and that funding comes through relatively small contributions by individuals and families. MCC constructs a particular way of talking about stewardship using the imaginary character “Mrs. Klassen”. MCC instructs volunteers to imagine a MCC donor named Mrs. Klassen (a common Mennonite surname) and ask whether she would approve of various purchases. In some explanations, Mrs. Klassen is elderly and raises money for MCC by quilting. This imagining of a particular person and how she might want her money spent encourages volunteers to be deeply aware of how they spend organizational money. This stands in stark contrast to some employees of other NGOs which receive most of their money from large governmental grants and feel few scruples about accountability to particular individuals. When I interviewed employees of several other international NGOs and asked whether they had an equivalent of Mrs. Klassen, no other organization had.

One of the instances in which Mrs. Klassen is most frequently referenced is in personal drawing account (PDA) decisions. Each expense by volunteers must be categorized as either a MCC expense or a personal expense. MCC covers the costs of worker health care, food, lodging, work-related transportation and other basic expenses related to the service assignment. Volunteers keep records of all of their expenses, categorize and report them monthly. Expenses that are not considered necessary to the volunteer’s assignment are supposed to be extracted from the PDA. Each volunteer receives a small monthly contribution to their PDA from MCC to be used for anything that is not considered essential to the service assignment. At the time of my research, MCC volunteers received \$74US per month. Thus, while travel expenses to work are covered by MCC, visiting friends is charged to PDA. Each MCC country office has slightly different expectations for what constitutes a PDA expense. There are very few policies in print and thus, volunteers often develop elaborate theories and justifications for what each deems a luxury and therefore a PDA expense – providing intriguing examples of Mennonite simplicity.

During the course of my fieldwork, I realized that most volunteers had what I came to view as their “totem PDA item” – a particular thing that they agonized over and were unsure whether it represented a luxury (PDA) or a necessity (charged to MCC). Among the totem PDA items of the volunteers I interviewed were: tuna fish, juice, ice cream, Italian food, salad dressing, cranberry sauce, raisins, cheese and cold water. One person told me that he really loves the refreshing taste of cold water and wants to buy a bottle of it when he leaves work each day. However, he knows he could drink tepid filtered water at his home and therefore questions

whether a bottle of water should be PDA. The complexity of moral thinking concentrated on this small decision indicates that buying bottled water is not just a matter of a purchasing choice – but a religious value.

PDA is not only used for food items but this seemed to be the arena where there was the most ambiguity. There were also volunteers who agonized over non-food items such as the person who deliberated for several months about whether or not MCC should purchase the toaster that he longed for or the person who decided whether a book was PDA based on its topic and relevance to her assignment. According to MCC policy, even the purchase of air-time for cell phones must be divided into MCC vs. PDA categories, sometimes even within a single phone call. If one volunteer calls another and they discuss both personal issues as well as work-related issues, the cost of this call should be divided between PDA and MCC accounts. In reality, almost none of the volunteers took the accounting to this level but all were aware of this institutional expectation – a bureaucratic structure designed to enforce Mennonite simplicity. Many volunteers used self-determined formulas for deciding whether or not an expense represented PDA. One worker explained how she decided that juice was a luxury:

I start by asking whether it is essential to my life and then I think about how long it lasts. For juice, it only lasts me about one or two days but it costs the same as two kilos of flour and more than a kilo of sugar or a dozen eggs but those things are more essential. If I bought it as much as I wanted it, I would be buying it every day so, to me, that is a symbol that I am too attached to it and I should see it as a luxury. I feel beholden to the people who give money to MCC and when I think about that person who gives money, I don't want them to think I am wasting their money by buying juice. (personal communication, February 14, 2009).

Another person used a personal formula to sort out PDA ingredients from food and household ingredients within recipes: “I make granola and if I put something in that is really outlandish in it, then I charge it to PDA.” (personal communication, February 21, 2009). In both of these understandings, there is a need to define what constitutes a necessity and a luxury. Neither person entirely denies themselves the luxury item but both appear to have a sense of guilt attached to luxury that they atone for by charging the purchase to PDA.

I pressed one volunteer to explain why she felt that her totem PDA item was a luxury rather than something MCC should provide: “Because we are living a life of simplicity, we can't have everything that we desire. We have to give up things; we have to draw the line somewhere. So everyone draws that line and picks certain things. I just try to make sure that I am not buying the very nicest things that exist here. That is how I decide.”(personal communication, February 14, 2009). Another couple found the whole process of determining PDA so exasperating that they privately used their own personal bank account to purchase many items in order to avoid MCC reporting requirements and justifying their purchases to other volunteers. Two older volunteers dismissed the question of PDA by referencing their previous wealth in North America and claiming they did not need to make more money. It seemed volunteers past retirement age felt less anxious about earning and saving money than younger workers who had fewer assets and savings.

In both Kenya and Uganda, the people overseeing the accounting structures governing PDA and MCC expenses were more relaxed about it than the rest of the MCC team. MCC-Uganda country representative, Dale Herman, summed up his PDA philosophy “We don’t give a list [of what should be PDA]. We talk about it, we give guidelines and we let people use their own consciences.” (D. Herman, personal communication, February 21, 2009). The MCC accounting structure is designed to protect workers against fluctuating currency rates and inflation by guaranteeing that basic necessities are met regardless of cost. One Mennonite with a long institutional memory of MCC noted that originally the policy of PDA was an attempt to prevent workers from trying to live too simply, skimp on basic necessities and become ill. If this is true, this is an example of MCC creating an institutional policy to regulate the power of a Mennonite value by ensuring that volunteers neither ignore nor overemphasize simplicity. Nonetheless, during the current financial crisis, MCC sought to save money and one pair of country representatives asked their team to consider eating less meat. This is interesting because practically speaking, the amount of money saved by asking a handful of people to eat less meat is not possibly sufficient to fund additional programmes. This is an expansion of the Mennonite embrace of dependency theory – the idea that in some way even the diet of North Americans is responsible for the poverty of Africans. However, on a deeper level, while impractical, this is an entirely appropriate *Mennonite* response to a financial crisis which entails asking oneself and one’s community to use fewer resources – an understanding of simplicity which dictates that global deficits or poverty should be addressed in personal economic decisions.

Reaction from Ugandans and Kenyans to Mennonite Simplicity

I asked local MCC partners about their perception of MCC’s simplicity and discovered that the way in which I asked about simplicity greatly affected the answers I received. When asked *whether* MCC volunteers value simplicity, most local partners said this was an important value in MCC and elaborated that particularly when compared with other international NGOs, MCC adopted a much simpler lifestyle.

One of the Kenyan co-workers of Alvera and Jacob Stern, MCC volunteers in Kola, observed: “When we think about living simply and in solidarity with local people, we know that the Sterns live with unity with us. People don’t fear them in any way. When the community thinks about Mennonites, they think that they really listen instead of telling people what to do and that they live simply.”(personal communication, May 1, 2009). Another Kenyan partner noted: “If you compare MCC to other NGOs, MCC lives very simply. The fact that the office is very small proves this to me. I also know that the workers live with people they work with, they don’t all live in Nairobi like other NGOs.”(personal communication, May 1, 2009). Both of these comments demonstrate that particularly when compared to other expatriates and international NGOs, MCC volunteers live simply and this simplicity is interpreted as an act of solidarity.

I was often with volunteers as they were served local food and Kenyans or Ugandans were visibly pleased and praised them for eating local foods such as ugali and posho and not needing utensils. This was not a sacrifice on the part of the volunteers who understand such behavior to be an expectation. However, it seemed very satisfying for the local people who witnessed it.

When I phrased my question differently and rather than asking *if* MCC values simplicity, asked whether MCC's focus on simplicity was useful or valuable, I got different answers. When asked to consider the utility of MCC's simplicity, many questioned the usefulness of this value. One partner summed up what I heard echoed by many others:

One of the beliefs of MCC that most puzzles me is this one. The MCC workers have to swear that they will live a poor life; I think they must swear to live like ordinary people. This I do not understand. People look up to me, people look up to them. They must find a way to help us and how can you help us when you cannot even help yourself. It does not appear that MCC even allows them to support themselves! (personal communication, February 12, 2009).

For this person, MCC's simplicity caused local people to question how helpful the organization could be if it could not even afford to provide good lives for its own employees. Other Ugandans and Kenyans told me that the local community feels pity for the volunteers as they earn less money than their co-workers at the same local organization. At times, the feeling goes beyond pity to something bordering on resentment, particularly for partners who feel tasked with the responsibility of protecting the volunteer as part of their role as local hosts:

There was one MCC couple here and they really wanted to live simply, like local people but it just didn't work. They were the centre of attention all the time in this community. Security-wise, we worried about them all the time. It was nice that they wanted to be with us but it would have been better for us if they lived some place safe with other foreigners where we would not worry so much. What you have to understand is that this is a North American thing to choose to be simple. For us, we don't have a choice. Everyone is simple (personal communication, May 26, 2009).

While volunteers are often eager and willing to take public transportation, this is not necessarily the preference of the local partners. I accompanied Christina Buckwalter, a literacy trainer teaching in two slum areas outside of Nairobi, and we used public transportation. This caused visible anxiety for at least one of the partner schools who felt nervous that something might happen to us in the course of our journey and they would feel responsible. The compromise that Christina reached was taking a matatu to the closest stop, being met by one of the teachers and walking to the school with him.

MCC values living simply and in solidarity with local people and it does not see it as problematic that MCC volunteers may live more simply than some of their Kenyan or Ugandan co-workers. MCC expects its workers to defy African expectations of opulent North American lifestyles. In this way, MCC imagines its simplicity to be a prophetic social justice witness to others. However, MCC fails to see that the simplicity ethic creates an additional burden on local partners. Kenyans and Ugandans feel encumbered by the additional responsibilities and worry of having an expatriate attempting to "live simply" in their context.

The North American volunteers selected the Ugandans and Kenyans around them as their referent and therefore, reduce their standard of living and simplify their lifestyles in response. The Ugandans and Kenyans, however, do not see the North Americans as central referents and consequently do not seem to resent the initial differences in lifestyle. Moreover, when the North Americans voluntarily simplified their lifestyle, the response was not gratitude but rather confusion and in some cases, annoyance.

The Benefits and Constraints of Simplicity as Social Justice

Mennonite simplicity is both institutionalized within MCC (in MCC policies and the accounting system of PDA) and internalized (as volunteers struggle daily to decide how to live simply). While MCC creates institutional structures to reinforce simplicity, many workers come to MCC with this ethic already in place because it is a core Mennonite value. People who do not value simplicity are screened out of the organization earlier by interview questions that evaluate applicants based on their belief in simplicity.

Beyond being a core Mennonite belief, simplicity adds very little value programmatically to MCC. MCC embraces this value for religious reasons rather than pragmatic ones thus, MCC is acting on principles which are value-based rather than financially or efficiency-driven. Practically speaking, it makes little financial difference to MCC whether volunteers embrace simplicity. Any money saved by living frugally is miniscule compared to the costs of running peacebuilding and development programs. Thus, simplicity only has worth in terms of the Mennonite value system driving MCC and the way in which it is related to a greater sense of social justice.

In terms of distributive justice, it is interesting to note that the Mennonite conceptions of simplicity do not mean that few extra resources generated by the frugality of the volunteers are then directly redistributed to the Ugandans and Kenyans. The financial impact of Mennonite simplicity measures is diffused across all MCC programs. Mennonite simplicity does explain why MCC uses comparatively less resources than other international NGOs but this effect would be difficult to calculate. This case of simplicity as social justice is unusual because it is a case in which the advantaged are choosing to give up some degree of privilege but that sacrifice does not mean that disadvantaged people around them automatically receive more.

Simplicity represents an attempt by MCC as an institution and MCC volunteers as individuals to grapple with the problems of power inherent in its work – a primarily white, North American organization operating in the developing world. Emphasizing simplicity is a way to emphasize solidarity and demonstrate a willingness to suffer in order to experience greater degrees of integration in the community. Most MCC volunteers accepted that that they would never experience life as a fully integrated Kenyan or Ugandan and would always be seen as “*mzungu*” [white person] but felt it was still worthwhile to simplify their lives. One person self-evaluated herself in this way: “We live simply compared to how we would live if we were still at home but we still live quite richly compared to people around us”(personal communication, May 1, 2009).

It appears that the simplicity ethic benefits MCC volunteers psychologically and spiritually. The psychological benefit of simplicity is its role as a boundary marker between MCC and other

NGOs or expatriates. Volunteers believe that simplicity is something that makes them special and better able to relate to local people than other outsiders. When asked how simplicity was perceived by her African co-workers, one said: “They give us affirmation. They say, ‘you are not like other *mzungus*, you are African in many ways. You are not like the others.’ So this is an affirmation of me as a person, I am really getting to know the culture by living like this.”(personal communication, February 14, 2009). This demonstrates simplicity’s psychological benefit to North Americans, as it provides a sense of affirmation and comfort that they are relating in an authentic way to the Africans around them. The danger is the temptation to feel self-righteous when comparing oneself with those other expatriates who appear to be in violation of this norm.

The second benefit of the Mennonite simplicity ethic is the genuine belief that there is a spiritual benefit to simplicity and those who live more-with-less find their lives enriched. During 2008 MCC/EMM East Africa retreat, “living more-with-less” was a frequent theme. The facilitator, Jonathan Larson, a former MCC volunteer in Southern Africa, urged participants to consider that “in order to live more-with-less, we have to understand the depth of what we lose and what we have lost” and celebrate the gifts that come from these losses. (J. Larson, personal communication, December 16, 2008). Participants articulated what they lost in their service assignments and what they gained. Among the losses, they named: “living far from home and friends”, “not having options or opportunities”, “inability to cope with our surroundings”, and “grief and powerlessness”. However, MCC volunteers also named the “more” which emerged: “Instead of thinking about what I want or what I need, I just wait to see what God offers me”, “I have had to learn to consciously lay aside my own needs and wants in order to be part of accomplishing another’s goals”, “being humble”, and “the ability to operate in multiple cultures”. As evident from these responses, MCC volunteers are aware what they give up to live as volunteers in East Africa but are willing because they share the Mennonite belief that great blessings are found in relationships rather than materialism.

Another spiritual benefit of the Mennonite simplicity ethic was the increased gratitude that volunteers felt for many elements of their lives. When talking about PDA or weighing whether something is a luxury, many talked about things that they felt grateful for – often simple things such as hot showers or running water. This is a sharp contrast to the reaction to amenities that I observed in the expatriate employees of some other NGOs which was often a sense of entitlement that took these amenities as a given or felt dejected by their absence.

However, there are also drawbacks to the simplicity ethic and it appears to aggravate rather than ease anxiety for some people. One volunteer frankly told me, “This simplicity thing is starting to get to me. I feel guilty a lot of the time and I feel like I am questioning every single thing that I buy” (personal communication, January 28, 2009). Another reported unhealthy weight loss before allocating more food items into the MCC account and away from PDA.

The biggest risk of the Mennonite simplicity ethic is its occasional reluctance to acknowledge power. One volunteer told me he selected MCC to fulfill “my predominant dream of living in Africa, with Africans, *as an African*” (personal communication, August 19, 2009). Mennonite simplicity may offer a useful critique of ostentatious displays of wealth as an abuse of white privilege but it often fails to see the way in which over-identification with local people is also an

abuse of the power of expatriates. For this volunteer to claim that he wanted to live “as an African” presents both a distorted picture of what being “African” means as well as a failure to responsibly acknowledge his power and position as a white, North American man. bell hooks (2001) calls this type of behavior an attempt to “eat the other” which she describes as imperialist, racist and an unjust way of asserting power and privilege. This is not an act of solidarity but an act of cultural appropriation and, in the case of this person, sometimes led to behavior deemed inappropriate by local people which MCC failed to curtail. This volunteer pursued dating relationships with young Ugandan women in his desire to pursue life “as an African” with no sense of how his affections would be perceived by the woman’s community. The volunteer’s behavior did not openly violate any MCC policy – despite the fact that two of the young women would be seen as off-limits in a professional educational setting. However, several MCC volunteers and local partners felt uncomfortable with his behavior. Another dismissed it saying, “I just assume that he operates on a different understanding of what it means to live like local people than the rest of us.” In this case, Mennonite simplicity allowed the behavior to be excused and ignored.

Conclusions

When Mennonite simplicity is at its best, it represents an honest attempt to engage in development work with sensitivity and solidarity. However, unchecked simplicity risks creating unrealistic and unhealthy asceticism and appropriating the idea of “African-ness” for one’s own self interest. The simplicity ethic that I observed at work in MCC in the field reflected a “more-with-less” paradigm in which there are perceived spiritual benefits to living with fewer material comforts. MCC volunteers critique the excesses of North American materialism and individualism by trying to live in a way that is comparable to Kenyans and Ugandans. These two interpretations – frugality and solidarity – represent a very Mennonite way of addressing inequality and creating meaning and are also predicted by the existing social psychology literature on social justice.

Despite being a religious community with a distinct communitarian orientation, the Mennonite approach to social justice demonstrated in MCC is quite individualistic. The MCC volunteers that I interviewed identified the vast disparity between the lifestyles of the their Kenyan or Ugandan friends and co-workers and their own North American lifestyles as evidence of injustice in the world. Their sense of guilt and shame about the distribution of wealth and power in the world was reinforced by a Mennonite theology which advocates for simplicity as a form of religious obligation. Rather than organizing a social movement to directly challenge perceived injustices that they sense around them, the MCC volunteers instead directed their attention inward.

The relative deprivation theory of social justice begins to explain why MCC volunteers adopted increased vigilance about their personal expenses during their time in East Africa. It is significant that most of the volunteers were not adopting these behavioral modifications before they began their MCC assignment and most did not continue these habits after their MCC term had ended. However, the theory alone does not explain MCC volunteers’ adoption of simplicity in Kenya and Uganda. There were hundreds of other North American aid workers who were also in East Africa but not adopting these practices. It was the contact with close Ugandan and

Kenyan friends which was compounded by a solid Mennonite theology of simplicity that prompted these.

During their terms of service, MCC volunteers began to compare themselves primarily to East African friends and colleagues rather than to their North American friends and family at home. This exposure, reinforced by MCC policy, caused MCC volunteers to deepen their commitment to a life of simplicity. However, the Ugandans and Kenyans frequently found these behavior changes puzzling and, at times, inconvenient. While the shift from North America to East Africa was quite dramatic for the MCC volunteers, the central reference point for Ugandans and Kenyans remained unchanged.

Mennonite theology and the MCC institutional policy stemming from it, offers a way for Mennonites and MCC volunteers to make sense of the cognitive dissonance that comes from living with privilege in a suffering world. The emphasis on the value of simplicity offers a way for the advantaged North American to change their behavior to cope with the anxiety and guilt that is heightened when living in close proximity with suffering.

However, by emphasizing "simplicity" as a core principle of social justice but failing to precisely define it, MCC leaves individual volunteers to wrestle with how to decide if they are living simply or engaging in luxuries. In the Mennonite worldview, simplicity is valued and luxury is seen as an extravagant self-indulgence. While in North America, these terms may have felt accessible and clear but when the terms of reference shifted to the Ugandan or Kenyan context, the volunteers were forced to re-assess their own subjective understandings of consumption. In the absence of clear MCC standards for simplicity, MCC volunteers perpetually examined their lifestyles and created continually moving targets of Mennonite simplicity. This may not be an entirely healthy practice for individuals but for MCC as an institution, it ensures a constant discernment process in which simplicity is always under consideration. While MCC considers how best to save money in its global programming, the machinations regarding simplicity are primarily carried out at a micro-level and concern the small, ordinary life choices of individuals. In this case, simplicity is a manifestation of the larger ethos of social justice which grounds the work of the organization.

While the MCC volunteers were sincere and dedicated in their practice of simplicity, ultimately these behavioral changes were cosmetic and did not actually change the vast inequalities that exist between North America and Africa. This is not to say that simplicity was meaningless. In fact, while the changes were largely symbolic, they were meaningful for the MCC volunteers. Contemplating simplicity and struggling with their own sense of privilege provided a way for the volunteers to psychologically and spiritually cope with the profound social injustices they were confronted with during their service term.

References

Adams, J. (1966) "Inequity in Social Exchange" *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. (2) 267-299.

Barkman, S. (Ed.). (1981). *The Commonsense Almanac: the Mennonite Guide to living simply and better*. Manitoba: Derksen Printers.

- Chapin, A. (1998). *A Simple Christmas*. Scottsdale: Herald Press.
- Confession of Faith in a Mennonite Perspective* (1995). Newton: Faith and Life Press.
- Cortright, D. (2008). *Peace: a history of movements and ideas*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Deutsch, M. (1985). *Distributive Justice*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- DeYoung, C. (2007). *Living Faith: how faith inspires social justice*. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Dregni, M. (1983). *Experiencing More with Less*. Scottsdale: Herald Press.
- Dyck, C. (1995) *Spiritual Life in Anabaptism*. Scottsdale: Mennonite Publishing Network.
- Friesen, D. (1981). *Living More with Less Study/Action Guide*. Scottsdale: Herald Press.
- Galtung, J. (1996) *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilisation*. Oslo: PRIO.
- Gish, A. (1973). *Beyond the Rat Race*. Scottsdale: Herald Press.
- Handrich, J. (1981). *Living Lightly: new priorities for home economics*. Akron: Mennonite Central Committee Hunger Concerns Office.
- Hershberger, G. (1958). *The Way of the Cross in Human Relations*, Scottsdale: Herald Press.
- hooks, b. (2001) "Eating the Other: Desire and Resistance". In M. Gigi Durham and D. Kellner (Eds.), *Media and Cultural Studies: Key Works*. New York: Blackwell.
- Jacobs, J. (2010) *There Shall Be No Needy: pursuing social justice through Jewish law and tradition*, Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights.
- Jost, J and A. Kay. (2010) "Social Justice: history, theory and research" in *The Handbook of Social Psychology, volume two, fifth edition*, editors Daniel Gilbert, Susan Fiske and Gardner Lindzey. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Press, 1122-1163.
- Lappé, F. M. (1971). *Diet for a Small Planet*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Leach, C., A. Iyer, and A. Pedersen. (2006). "Anger and Guilt about Ingroup Advantage Explain Willingness for Political Action" *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 32(9) 1232-1245).
- Lind, M.B., and C. Hockman-Wert, (2009). *Simply in Season*. Scottsdale: Herald Press.
- Longacre, D. (1980). *Living More with Less*. Scottsdale: Herald Press.
- Longacre, D. (1976). *The More with Less Cookbook*. Scottsdale: Herald Press.
- Maranz, D. (2001). *African Friends and Money Matters*. Dallas: SIL International.
- Marpeck, P. (1978) *The Writings of Pilgram Marpeck*. (W. Klassen and W. Klassen, Trans.). Scottsdale: Herald Press.
- Mennonite Central Committee. (undated). *International Policy Manual*. Unpublished.
- Mennonite Central Committee. (2008). *Policy Handbook: International Programs Service Workers*. Unpublished.
- Mennonite Central Committee. (2000) *Projects with the Kitgum Diocese*. Unpublished.
- Montada, L. and A. Schneider. (1989) "Justice and Emotional Responses to the Disadvantaged" *Social Justice Research* 3(4) 313-344.
- Qutb, S. (2000) *Social Justice in Islam*. Oneota, NY: Islamic Publications International.
- Roth, J. (2005). *Beliefs: Mennonite Faith and Practice*. Scottsdale: Herald Press.
- Runciman, W. (1966). *Relative Deprivation and Social Justice: a study of attitudes to social inequality in twentieth-century England*. New York: Routledge.
- Sandel, M. (2009). *Justice: What's the Right Thing to Do?*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Schrock-Shenk, D. (2002). *Basic Trek: venture into a world of enough*. Scottsdale: Herald Press.
- Schumacher ,E.F. (1973). *Small is Beautiful: economics as if people mattered*. London: Blonde and Briggs.

- Sider, R. Ed. (1980). *Lifestyle in the Eighties: an evangelical commitment to simple lifestyle*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Sider, R. (1977). *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Tyler, T. (2000). "Social Justice: outcome and procedure" *International Journal of Psychology*, 35(2) 117-125.
- Tyler, T., R. Boeckmann, H. Smith, and Y. Huo, (1997) *Social Justice in a Diverse Society*. Oxford: Westview.
- Tyler, T. and H. Smith, "Social Justice and Social Movements" in D. Gilbert, S. Fiske and G. Lindzey (Eds.) *The Handbook of Social Psychology, volume two, fourth edition*, (pp.595-629) Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Walker, I. and H. Smith. *Relative Deprivation: specification, development and integration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Watts, J. (2010) *Rethinking Karma: the dharma of social justice*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington.
- Wills, T. " Similarity and self esteem in downward comparison" In J. Suls and TA Wills (Eds.), *Social Comparison: contemporary theory and research* (p.51-78) Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Windley-Daoust, J. (2008). *Living Justice and Peace: Catholic Social Teaching in Practice*. South Bend, IN: St. Mary's Press.
- Wood, J. (1989) "Theory and research concerning social comparisons of personal attributes" *Psychological Bulletin* 106(2) 231-248.

PEACE STUDIES JOURNAL

Vol. 5, Issue 3

November 2012

Pedagogies of Social Justice for Higher Education Community Engagement Programs

Author: Andria Wisler, Ph.D.

Visiting Assistant Professor and
Director Program on Justice and Peace
Georgetown University
1421 37th Street NW
Poulton Hall, Suite 130
Washington DC, 20057
Email: akw28@georgetown.edu

PEDAGOGIES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROGRAMS

Abstract

This article builds on the view that higher education community engagement programs serve as critical levers to transform the current state of civic disconnectedness and social injustice into one of renewed vibrancy and well-being. An outline of the conceptual and pragmatic features of social justice-based higher education programs that champion community engagement is offered. Thereafter, I describe pre-, during- and post- program pedagogies that might accompany students' participation in these programs, given the programs' defining characteristics of promoting social justice, and including reflective and collaborative components. These pedagogical building blocks are paramount to rooting transformation in students but as of yet are under-theorized and under-developed despite the programs' home in an educational venue.

Introduction

In recent years community engagement programs have blossomed on college campuses across the country. Such programs stem from evidence of a decline in civic health and participation and rise in social injustices in the United States (Putnam, 2000; NCoC, 2009). The reasons for why the US finds itself in this state of civic distress are varied, from the economic recession to the isolating effects of urban sprawl to the corporatization of education. The programs' foundings stem in part from the mission of higher education to serve the public good. This mission has long been woven into the fabric of American history and, as such, the preparation of an effective citizenry has long been a purpose of tertiary schooling in the US (Wisler, 2009).

This article builds on the hypothesis that higher education community engagement programs serve as pivotal levers to transform the current state of civic disconnectedness and social injustice into one of renewed vibrancy and community well-being (Jacoby, 2009). Community engagement programs are defined by "the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context or partnership and reciprocity."¹ Another characteristic of such programs is their pursuit of social justice – in comparison to charity – as they seek to transform long-term problems and conflicts, rather than cease with meeting individuals' or groups' present needs. To explicate this characteristic, I utilize Maas Weigert's two-tiered approach to social justice: the "personal obligation and right of each of us, based on our talents and gifts, to make a contribution to the common good" and simultaneously "society's obligation to remove barriers so that each person has the potential to contribute to the common good"² (Cook & Maas Weigert, 2011). Beyond these defining characteristics, community engagement programs are distinguishable from community service or volunteer opportunities by their insistence on *sustained* student participation rather than on students' participation in a one-time event – and by their collaborative and reflective components, which encourage participants to foster intellectual linkages among actions, theories, conflicts, and root causes.

Given their potential to foster participants' habits and commitments towards lifestyles built on social justice, community engagement programs draw on the untapped potential of the millennial generation which boasts a 43% service rate, far exceeding that of the precursory Baby Boomers before them. (NCoC 2009, p. 1). Two examples of community engagement programs, both housed at the Center for Social Justice Research, Teaching and Service at Georgetown University include After School Kids (ASK) and DC Reads.³ ASK is a tutoring and mentoring program for adjudicated youth in Washington, DC. Through the program, Georgetown students are paired with youth in the juvenile justice system and provide activities aimed at reducing recidivism rates among its participants. The mentors model and instill the capacities and attitudes necessary for the youth to successfully transition to adulthood, offer academic tutoring, expose

¹ For further description of the community engagement classification, a list of institutions that meet the classification, and analysis on the difference between community engagement and service learning, see http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php.

² See <https://commons.georgetown.edu/blogs/socialjustice/> for the full interview on social justice and documentary video between Bernie Cook and Kathleen Maas Weigert from which this quotation comes.

³ See <http://csj.georgetown.edu>.

youth to opportunities, and nurture strengthened interpersonal communication skills. Through the DC Reads program, Georgetown students offer literacy tutoring to low-income children in DC's public, first through third grades who are not reading at grade level.

This nurturance of social capital, building of social justice, and experience of human connectedness does not come instantaneously or without effort on behalf of the community engagement program coordinators and participants. A great deal of care and thoughtful design is required to meet the goals of a community engagement program to cultivate strong community partnerships, create high-impact in the community, and nurture growth opportunities for students through their participation. From the experience of this author, however, one shortfall in discussions, presentations and literature is consideration of the pedagogical development of activities that focus on ensuring students' preparation to enact social capital through democratic, inclusive, empathetic, and dialogical norms and sustaining their vision over the length of the program. Pedagogical attention is required in order to provide students with foundational preparation upon which these community health benefits will grow.

Given this need, this article attends to pre-, during-, and post- program pedagogies recommended to accompany students' involvement in higher education based community engagement programs, given the programs' defining characteristics of utilizing a social justice framework and including reflective and collaborative components. A strong pedagogically sound backbone of the program helps to nurture the seeds of the long-term transformation of students. It is the hope that such personal transformation will, over time, positively affect the breadth and depth of social justice through students' lifelong engagement in their communities. As of yet, pedagogy for community engagement programs, as typified above, has remained under-theorized and under-developed despite the programs' home in an educational venue – colleges and universities. The field devoted to the development of such programs is in its infancy, and thus prone to shortcomings. However, a contributing factor to this dearth of thought and action is that pedagogy has for too long been partitioned to classrooms, and to the discussions of teachers and professors about students and information. Community engagement programs fall under the purview of an assorted cast of higher education players, many of whom are not formal classroom-based educators. Community-based learning (CBL) and similar programs, in which students' work within a community is embedded into a college course have inspired attention to and innovations in pedagogy (see Crews & Weigert, 1999; Butin, 2005). These learning and teaching activities – although in relationship to the students' community work – remain classroom-based.

College and university students participating in community engagement programs come from a myriad of majors, familial, socio-economic and educational backgrounds, comfort levels related to social justice work, which all impact their participation. This diversity of the program participants is often not as richly mirrored in a typical college classroom, which can be narrowed to students of a certain educational track, such as minor or major or year/grade, among the numerous factors regulating a student's enrollment in a course. The diversity of students participating in a community engagement program contributes to the rich environment for inter-cultural, trans-disciplinary, and cross-grade learning and teaching work in which student participants "experience the experience" of community engagement together.

The pedagogies described both theoretically and in pragmatic detail below can be instituted during the community engagement program's participant training, group check-ins, post-program follow-ups, and commutes to and from program sites. Overall, pedagogies should create opportunities for student participants and leaders, university program administrators, accompanying professors, and community partners to model the type of society, rich with the benefits of social justice, which participants are striving to create: dialogical, empathetic, inclusive, and democratic.

Preventing categorizing “the other” through film-based dialogues

Community engagement programs offer an opportunity for participants and partners to learn how to work together. This exercise in relationship building can serve as one way that disparate groups and individuals in a society or on a campus learn how to live together. In preparation, students should have opportunities, prior to on-site community work, to dialogue on human differences and commonalities.⁴ Through these preparatory activities, students learn to notice and appreciate the diversity within their own group, as practice for seeing and valuing the diversity of the groups and individuals with whom they will soon be partnering in the community. A student participant may share his/her self-identification with the community of the program's focus. Another student may reflect on his/her experiences being distanced or engaged with similar communities growing up. These activities aim to prevent the slide towards “othering,” a general assumption-based categorization of whole groups of people or certain communities, which may lead unprepared students to utilize a dichotomous “us and them” rhetoric.⁵ Moreover, the binary-based thinking that leads to ostracization and exoticization of “those people” located in a certain ward, township, building, or neighborhood can be impeded.

The use of media in today's classrooms and other pedagogical venues has grown exponentially. Many resources are available at no charge on-line or can be borrowed from local libraries. Two film resources, available free on-line, that can provide the impetus for a dialogue on human commonalities and differences among college students in preparation for community engagement include “The danger of a single story” and “Time for school”. The first film, “The danger of the single story”, by Nigerian novelist and literacy advocate Chimamanda Adichie, is available on TEDtalk. The twenty-minute film captures a captivating 2009 talk by Adichie in which she “tells the story of how she found her authentic cultural voice – and warns that if we hear only a single story about another person or country, we risk a critical misunderstanding.”⁶ Students find both humor and solidarity in Adichie's college memories. They find empowerment in her honest portrayals of when she was the unknowing creator of a single story and the unwarranted subject of a single story. Adichie's injunction on all people – regardless of background or education – leaves few untouched by the responsibility to actively deconstruct single stories of student participants and community partners alike.

⁴ Thank you to a reviewer of this article who brought my attention to the Sustained Campus Dialogue Network (<http://sdcampusnetwork.org>), one of few processes that provide opportunities for students to delve deeply into issues of diversity and inclusion through dialogue and a deep self-awareness followed by a plan of action to address the issues beyond themselves to serve their communities.

⁵ A recommended reading on this topic is *The Other* by Ryszard Kapuściński (Verso, 2008).

⁶ See http://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story.html.

This TEDtalk viewing can be matched with a circle-based dialogue, in which each participant (university administrators included) offers an observation, statement, reflection, or question inspired by the film to the group. While participants might be prompted to fall into a clockwise or counter-clockwise rotation around the circle, it is encouraged that participants each take a turn in a random order, with each person making an offering before a participant speaks twice. The latter detail is fundamental when intentionally creating a dialogical rather than discussion-based environment which, given the etymology of the word *discussion*, refers to “breaking up” rather than moving “through” (*dia*) words. This shift of pedagogical practice is subtle enough to reinvest participants into a customary sharing activity, rather than to wait their turn as the speaker’s voice moves predictably around the circle.

The second resource comes from the Public Broadcasting Series (PBS) and is a 12-year documentary project on global education entitled “Time for School.”⁷ This award-winning series offers a longitudinal view at the education of seven students in just as many classrooms and countries. First filmed in 2002, and then updated in 2006, and again in 2009, the series follows students from childhood to teenage years, as they maneuver the obstacle course of war, disease, abandonment, and gender discrimination, to pursue high school graduation in 2015. The vignettes are short enough to view quickly, and provide strong illustrations of direct, structural, and cultural violence around the world. Given the aforementioned diversity of students participating in a community engagement program, education and schooling in particular is one shared experience on which they all have opinions, ideas, and judgments. The episodes in this series sharpen the focus on human commonalities and differences that Adichie’s TEDTalk initiates. For each student in the series, post-viewing discussions arise regarding privilege, barriers to educational access, and entitlement, which are helpful as a pre-community work orientation. Dialogues led by trained facilitators⁸ on such topics provide students with opportunities to grow in comfort, vocabulary, and aptitude in talking about difficult topics; these capacities will aid them in developing empathy, necessary for building relationship through the community work.

The dialogue circle, as described for the debriefing activity after viewing “The danger of the single story,” is also a useful tool for examining students’ impressions of the “Time for school” episodes. Another pedagogical instrument is called “the spectrum.” This is a process where the extremes of two positions may be written either on a chalk or white board, or physically through the bodily placement of students in the room, or individually drawn and deliberated on a piece of paper and then shared in pairings of students in the group. The spectrum acts as a barometer to measure a student’s reactions to part of or the whole film; for example, an agree/disagree spectrum might ask students to speculate on the relevance of a society’s claims for not educating its girls. While some students jump to polarized conclusions and mark themselves on either far end of the spectrum, most will resonate with and recognize the complex nuances of the question or statement that prevent any easy yes/no answer. (“Four corners” can be used instead of a

⁷ See <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/wideangle/episodes/time-for-school-series/introduction/4340/>.

⁸ As pointed out by a reviewer of this article, the individuals leading dialogues should be properly trained to do so; s/he must be able to debunk stereotypes, deescalate the momentum of a heated turn, maintain balance of participation, follow the conversation flow, and anticipate and maneuver silences. Universities should invest in appropriate training of coordinators/directors and student leaders of community engagement programs for this purpose.

standard line for the barometer in order to obstruct the creation of false binary.) This activity can illuminate the complicated nature of advantages – such as access to education – which are often taken for granted by college student participants, prior to their engagement in community work.

Blogging the “real world”

During the time frame of the community engagement, students should continue activities that encourage reflection, critical thinking, fun and humor, and connections between their community work and the “real world.” There is a habit among some college students to devalue their time in college as “not the real world.” Even when their “real world” encompasses a community grappling with social injustices, there is an over-simplified idea that the “real world” awaits when the graduation ceremonies end, bosses replace professors, and paychecks replace assignments. Whereas it is essential for students to learn historical and contemporary details about the context of the community in which they are working, it is equally important that students continue to make connections between that community and others around the world. This prevents students from viewing the community with which they are working as an anomaly in an otherwise perfect “real world” and helps them to realize valuable lessons from similar communities that could be adopted and adapted. Thus, the “real world” must be opened from the inside (campus and community) out (other parts of the world) without students losing grasp of the specific context.

Maintaining this balance between context-based community learning and making connections to a wider arena of social justice practices can be hindered by time constraints. Especially helpful for community engagement programs with a design of a minimum of four months (the typical length of a college semester) is the use of a blogosphere. A dedicated blog forum for a community engagement program provides a venue for students and administrators to post newspaper articles, videos, web pages, poems, and academic papers that relate to the community engagement work. A student working in an urban shelter-based ESL program might post his/her reflections on an article drawing connections with a refugee camp literacy program in another country. Another student engaged in restorative justice work in a local jail might post a resonating newspaper article on the “peace vs. justice” debate within the international community. Depending on the objective of the blog and the dynamics of the program, administrators might consider welcoming community partners to partake in the online conversation.

Humane relationships

Throughout the duration of the community engagement program, pedagogies should be used that invite participants to focus on the transformative value of “humane relationships” (Reardon, 1998). These opportunities offer time to model human relations throughout the work, particularly with the community organizations and individuals partnering with the program, but also with the society at large. A myriad of activities inculcate this value, and give students time to practice living it. While the practice of enacting humane relationships may sound peculiar, it is important to remember the dominant and conscious messages of peer competition (winning) and personal excellence (independently and at all costs) that many students in privileged arenas have received throughout their academic careers in order to simply get into their college of choice. These

messages can clash with the missions and commitments required of community engagement programs. Whereas it is not uncommon that students were told to be secretive about their accomplishments, to seek individual gain and to prioritize economic and honorific advancement, community engagement programs request participants to work collaboratively for the common good in pursuit of social justice.

A simple twist to an activity at the beginning of the program commitment can offer an easy and valuable occasion for breaking down the monotonous drone of students' introductions: name, major, hometown, and nothing more. Participants are asked to introduce themselves through an "artifact" on their person, with the accompanying explanation that an artifact, typically thought of as a relic or museum exhibition piece, continues to have new meaning – and thus live – as its story is told. Thus, a student might pull his Lifeguard certification card out of his wallet and describe the pressures and rewards of a beach summer job. Another participant might offer a scarf or other piece of clothing passed down to her by a grandmother who first introduced her to knitting or sewing. Yet another might draw upon his sneakers to share his commitment as a student athlete. Given the invitation, students will choose to share a story of importance with his or her fellow program participants. (And, for program administrators, extra pieces of information – for example, having a CPR-trained student, a knitter, and a basketball player – may become conveniently useful at some moment of the program.) The *telling* of these stories can be related to the importance of *listening* to stories which students will do during community engagement, as well as the significance of re-telling of stories that they hear from community members as they share about their community engagement work with family members and friends.

Another activity that students appreciate is the simple practice of Reardon's (1998) transformative value of humane relationships through an exercise called the cosmopolitanism web. Similar to the artifact exercise described above, this activity provides students with a personal moment to share details about themselves beyond the standard roll call, and to simultaneously connect to a peer's self-identification (thus, also building on the dialogue about human commonalities and differences detailed above). A student or facilitator begins by introducing him/herself through writing his/her name in a circle on a large chalk or dry erase board; to this circle he/she attaches three more circles, each containing a word or phrase describing him/herself (e.g. vegetarian, a piano player, a transfer student, a big sister, etc.). Another student (again, in random order) connects his/her name in a circle to one of the circles already on the board – showcasing a similarity – and also adds two more new descriptive details in circles. The students follow by offering their name, connecting it to any circle on the board, and offering two more. The activity becomes a visual representation of social inter-connectedness and symbolic border crossing, as circles and lines in various chalk and marker colors connect names and new fun facts of the participants.

Reflection

Preparing students to enter thoughtfully and compassionately into a community engagement program is critical in the aim to "strengthen their civic muscles" (Putman, 2000, p. 40). As important is the provision of space for students to reflect on their experiences, and draw greater emotional and intellectual understanding as a result. The critical need for reflection throughout students participation in community engagement programs is one that is widely understood

among practitioners and rooted principally in the theories of John Dewey and David Kolb which suggest that engagement, combined with reflection, leads to greater understanding of content (Connors and Seifer, 2005).⁹ The importance of reflection is not just evident in theory, however, but has been established by numerous studies on the impact of service and community engagement experiences on participants. “Providing students with an opportunity to reflect upon, or ‘process’ the service experience with each other is a powerful component of community service and service-learning” (Astin et al 2006, p. 46). Reflection plays a unique role in creating several short and long-term benefits for the student, and specifically reflection “during college makes a unique contribution to post-college civic engagement” (p. 73).

The potential benefits of incorporating reflection within pedagogies accompanying community engagement programs are many, and critical to the overall effort of cultivating students’ competencies and values that build social justice. A helpful service reflection tool kit notes among these benefits the following: giving meaning to the experience; creating a sense of accomplishment which inspires further action; clarifying values; preventing the reinforcement of inaccurate perceptions or biases; building community among participants; facilitating group problem solving; and encouraging participants to think critically about root causes of issues experienced. In short, reflection helps students to take deeper meaning from their experiences; to build connections with peers, community members, faculty and staff and, to develop the skills, competencies and values necessary to be active and engaged members of their communities in the long term (Northwest Service Academy, n.d.). Broadly speaking, reflection strategies can be as individualized as independent journaling, as collective as group sharing sessions following a site visit, and as prompted as to include guided readings, films, or lectures as starting points for generating conversation. For more specific ideas on reflection prompts, strategies or methods, the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse (www.servicelearning.org) contains a wealth of resources on the subject.

Concluding Thoughts

Given the assertion of the decline in the country’s civic health vitality in the last twenty years as observable across various sectors of the US,¹⁰ new and more players must take responsibility for modeling social capital, nurturing social justice, and creating commitment inspired by human connectedness in our youth. This article stems from the view that higher education based community engagement programs are sites rich with potential for the development of skills and capacities for social capital and social justice in a generation that has only witnessed and felt the effects of their decline. College and university participants may not have had upbringings rich with the benefits that a socially connected neighborhood, city, and country offers. Thus, these programs offer student participants necessary and compelling opportunities to learn about the diverse health, economic, educational and social benefits of an interdependent society, and to devote their energies to a new form of community wealth.

Although broadly considered “good,” it is important to keep a critical, evaluative eye on community engagement programs, in order to ensure their continued assessment for improvement. One recognizable shortfall is attention to the pedagogical development of

⁹ See http://www.servicelearning.org/instant_info/fact_sheets/he_facts/he_reflection/.

¹⁰ See <http://ncoc.net/287>.

activities for students' preparation and sustained focus for the duration of the program, to envision and enact democratic, inclusive, empathetic, and dialogical norms. As community engagement programs continue to take shape and root across higher education settings, stakeholders can take valuable learnings, especially in terms of pedagogy, from complementary praxis-based fields such as Peace Education, Critical Education, and Popular Education. These fields, akin to community engagement programs, facilitate conversations of pedagogy outside of classroom walls, beyond standard teacher populations. Thus, an added value of this pedagogical attention is the social connectedness nurtured among professors and university staff members who find innovative the means to link theory to practice and encourage pedagogical innovation inside and outside of standard classroom settings.

References

- Astin, A. W. et al (2006). *Understanding the effects of service-learning: A study of students and faculty*. Available at: http://www.heri.ucla.edu/PDFs/pubs/reports/UnderstandingTheEffectsOfServiceLearning_FinalReport.pdf. Last accessed: August 1, 2012.
- Butin, D. (2005) (ed.) *Service learning in higher education: Critical issues and directions*. New York: Macmillan.
- Cook, B. and K. Maas Weigert. 2010. Interview: Social justice and documentary media. Available at: <https://commons.georgetown.edu/blogs/socialjustice/>. Last accessed August 1, 2012.
- Cousineau, P. (1998). *The art of pilgrimage*. York Beach, ME: Conari Press.
- Crews, R. and K. Maas Weigert. 1999. *Teaching for justice: Concepts and models for service-learning in Peace Studies*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Jacoby, B. 2009. *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices*. Jossey-Bass.
- National Conference on Citizenship (NCoC). *Civic Health Index 2009*. Available at: <http://www.ncoc.net/2gp54>. Last accessed August 1, 2012.
- Northwest Service Academy (n.d.). *Service reflection toolkit*. Available at: <http://encorps.nationalservicerresources.org/resources/documents/ReflectionToolkit.pdf>. Last accessed August 1, 2012.
- Putnam, Robert. 2000. *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Reardon, Betty. (1988). *Comprehensive peace education*. New York: Teachers College.
- Wisler, Andria. 2009. "'Of, by, and for are not merely prepositions': Teaching and learning Conflict Resolution for a democratic, global citizenry." *Intercultural Education* 20(2): 127-133.

PEACE STUDIES JOURNAL

Vol. 5, Issue 3

November 2012

This is What Democracy Looks Like: The 2012 NATO Protests in Chicago

Author: Ellen Birkett Lindeen

Associate Professor, English and Peace Studies
Communications and Library Services
Waubonsee Community College
47 Waubonsee Drive
Sugar Grove, IL 60554
Email: elindeen@waubonsee.edu

THIS IS WHAT DEMOCRACY LOOKS LIKE: THE 2012 NATO PROTESTS IN CHICAGO

Abstract

This paper is written as a first-person narrative of the writer's experiences as marcher and protester at the 2012 NATO summit protests in Chicago on May 18 & 20. The account gives brief histories of the NATO organization and NATO summit protests since 2001. This account includes speakers, organizations, and media information witnessed firsthand at two of the major events. These two key rallies of the weekend were a Nurses' Rally at Daley Plaza on Friday, May 18 and a march from Grant Park to McCormick Place where Iraq Veterans symbolically returned medals. The paper concludes with some connections between the NATO protests in Chicago and Occupy and the future of Peace Studies.

“Never doubt that a small group of people can change the world; in fact, it is the only thing that ever has.” Margaret Mead

“The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing.” Edmund Burke

May 18 was hot - very hot. We didn't realize it at the time, but it was just the beginning of a very hot summer. This was the Friday of the NATO conference weekend in Chicago; the actual NATO conference days were Sunday and Monday, May 20 & 21, and originally the G8 conference was to take place on Friday and Saturday, May 18 & 19, in Chicago as well. This was intended to be only the second time in history for a joint NATO summit and G-8 conference. However, the evidence of planned protests convinced President Obama to move the G-8 conference to Camp David in Maryland. After all, Chicago is President Obama's home town, and he needed everything to go well.

On Friday, my husband and I took the Northwestern train line from our suburb to get to Daley Plaza in downtown Chicago for the first event of the weekend. I could be described as an activist educator. I started the Peace Studies course at the community college where I teach and have served on the board of a national peace and justice organization. On the other hand, my husband taught US history for 36 years in high school, which means he was teaching about war more than peace. In jest, we have been referred to as “War and Peace.” Nevertheless, much of the time, he joins me at rallies, marches or events. We feel that there is much to be grateful for in this country, but much is not the way it should be. Rather than complain, we often choose to participate in rallies to “stand up for” what we believe, in addition to voting and campaigning for candidates we support. The most important issue for us is education, and funding for it is a fraction of that of the military. While there is often disagreement on how much of the budget is spent on the military or education, in both the discretionary or non-discretionary budgets, the difference is astounding. In the U.S. budget, the military gets between 27% and 50% of the funding, depending on whether one puts current wars, military contracts and/or veterans benefits all together, and education gets about 2%. On this Friday afternoon, we chose to support the rally of the organization of National Nurses United, whose mantra was “Healthcare, not Warfare.” We support funding for life, not death. In the case of this rally, we wanted to make the statement that healthcare should receive adequate funding compared to warfare.

We told few people that we were going, and some of the people we know would have been surprised. While our politics are known to our good friends, many are unaware and quite content to have society and spending and budgets remain the way they stand. They are leading comfortable lives and do not want to get involved in politics. We are very political beings, yet on the surface we do not look like the image of protesters that the media likes to portray. Outside the peace and justice community, large numbers of people think that activists either have purple Mohawks or don't have jobs. We knew we might be treated poorly, but we did not mind. Police brutality, well known since the 1968 Chicago Democratic Convention, is notorious in Chicago and their level of intolerance has become legendary. The ability to protest seemed to us a duty as much as a right. We'd participated in Occupy Chicago and Occupy Memphis in the past year and, as educators, plenty of other protests, but had not yet been arrested or sprayed. We knew about the possibilities and believed the risks were worth taking for the good of the cause.

The nurses' rally, organized by National Nurses United, had over 3,000 people. The atmosphere was exhilarating with thousands of nurses and their supporters of all ages, sizes, skin colors and backgrounds. Most protesters were dressed as Robin Hood-like elves to support a so-called Robin Hood tax on financial institutions' transactions in order to offset the cuts in health care and social services. The event was about more than funding for healthcare. Last year's Occupy movement has shown that there is a strong discontent in the American public with current policy and tax structures. At this first event of the NATO weekend, the program served as a clearing house for many issues, not simply a protest against the military industrial complex. There were excellent speeches by peace groups, union leaders, and a short, lively play that parodied the G-8 conference at Camp David featuring actors as "heads of state" playing a game of "cards" that involved gambling with the lives of people and nations. The show was very funny, yet thought-provoking. The fact that so many issues and causes were being addressed may seem confusing, but the mood was uplifting. The atmosphere was joyous and all-encompassing. During that one beautiful afternoon, all of us were there to stake our claim on the American dream and we believed that with nonviolent protest, we could change the status quo. We all felt optimistic. At one point, several business women, who were clearly not part of the protest but simply checking it out, were moving through the crowd and saying, "thank you" to nurses. I was mistaken for a nurse as one said to me, "thank you for doing this – this is great."

The high point for me came when Tom Morello, former guitarist of Rage against the Machine, took the stage to sing protest songs and had the crowd join in. During the rally, Morello sang Woody Guthrie's "This Land is Your Land" and explained that some verses had been deleted to make the song more acceptable. Apparently, we hadn't heard all the words when we learned it as school children (Partridge 2002). He taught the crowd these "lost" verses:

*There was a big high wall there that tried to stop me;
Sign was painted, it said private property;
But on the back side it didn't say nothing;
This land was made for you and me.*

*Nobody living can ever stop me,
As I go walking that freedom highway;
Nobody living can ever make me turn back
This land was made for you and me.*

*In the squares of the city, In the shadow of a steeple;
By the relief office, I'd seen my people.
As they stood there hungry, I stood there asking,
Is this land made for you and me?*

We all sang and felt the momentum created by the singing. The nurses association had applied for a permit a year earlier to hold this rally and then a week before the event, Mayor Emanuel tried to revoke it. The backlash against him and the potential infringement on freedom of speech made him change his mind, and he allowed it to take place. The mayor need not have worried; there was NO violence.

On the train ride home, a middle-aged professional woman eagerly asked us if we'd seen any protesters. We replied, "we are protestors," and she seemed shocked. We talked with her and explained that we believed in nonviolence protest as did the other people we were with today, and then we talked about military and education budgets. She had come from a luncheon that was celebrating charter schools, one of the trends in educational reform. We do not agree that they are the answer. Charter school teachers in Chicago cannot be union members, and often business people end up making academic decisions. Charters also do not hold their teachers to the same standards in certification, and often they end up serving only those who can afford a private school or their own transportation. We believe in PUBLIC education and do not support schools that syphon funds away from the public schools. We did not change this woman's mind; she clearly thought that charter schools were the key to the future. We stayed friendly and cordial. As we talked, this woman even gave me a rose from a floral centerpiece she was bringing home from the luncheon. I interpreted this as a peace offering. We could not agree, but we could agree to disagree and inhabit the same planet and try to work out the problems of education. Perhaps, in the future, she will think differently of those involved in protests.

I was hopeful about news coverage of the rally that night; the whole event had been a beautiful example of "what democracy looks like." However, the only coverage on television was about a fight that had taken place on Michigan Avenue, blocks away from the nurses' rally. This news was presented as if the fight was a part of the rally or instigated by the protesters. Clearly, one way to control the dialogue about protests is to make people afraid of the protestors. An additional disappointment was the print and electronic press the next day. The review of the rally said that apparently the crowd didn't know the words to the song, "This Land is Your Land" so Morello needed to teach it. This clearly missed the whole point Morello made about the suppression of ideas by the deletion of some of Guthrie's verses when the song went into the mainstream. The fact that the mainstream press spoke little about the protests throughout the weekend, and primarily spoke of them in negative terms, points to several facts. The mass media is almost entirely owned by big corporations who have an interest in maintaining the status quo and making change look difficult or impossible. Another fact is that fear and violence get more television audiences than positive, organized acts of nonviolence. Additionally, lack of credible, honest coverage makes clear that any kind of societal change from protest is going to take much more than rallies or marches.

This NATO summit setting was unique in several ways. This was the first time the United States hosted a NATO summit outside of Washington, D.C. Add to that the long-standing bad reputation of the Chicago police force and the fact that the recently-elected mayor, Rahm Emanuel, was previously President Obama's Chief of Staff, and this could have been a recipe for disaster. However, no disaster occurred. A question I kept hearing during the protests was, "Why are these rallies and protests taking place during the weekend of the NATO summit, anyway?" A long tradition of protest against NATO exists. NATO was formed in 1949 "to counter the threat of post-war communist expansion as the Soviet Union to extent its influence in Europe (BBC Profile). NATO - the North Atlantic Treaty Organization - originally had 12 countries, but now has 28 member countries (including all G-8 nations except Russia) with four more in the first steps toward membership. Then, as now, the alliance was militarily dominated by the United States. Countries want in for security reasons; Article Five of the NATO constitution declares an attack on one member is an attack on all.

NATO was set up in the post-World War II atmosphere of anxiety, but after the 1991 collapse of the Soviet Union, NATO no longer had a purpose. Since then, NATO has used its defensive role to justify “out-of-area” activities, such as Bosnia in 1995 and Yugoslavia in 1999. There was considerable conflict within NATO over the US invasion of Iraq in which NATO took no part, but NATO did take command of the international peacekeeping force in Afghanistan in 2003. The imposition of a no-fly zone over Libya in March 2011 posed problems for the alliance because some Arab governments distrusted it, but after a period of disagreement and confusion, NATO took control which some argue led to the subsequent defeat of pro-Gaddafi forces. NATO allies have agreed to deploy a missile defense system to cover all of the territory of its European members, complimenting US plans for a missile defense shield (NATO Profile). Many protestors wonder who or what frightens the US enough to set up this defense shield. The US military budget is very close to the same size as the military budgets of all other nations on earth COMBINED. Something is clearly wrong. This is not just unethical; that expenditure of resources is far beyond any link with reality.

The NATO website says “Peace and Security are our mission.” It also says NATO is a political and military alliance. Many would argue that “peace” is not part of its mission, and military should be listed before political. Legendary Chicago activists Bernardine Dohrn and Bill Ayers talked about the week’s protests in Chicago on *Democracy Now*. Dohrn, clinical professor at Northwestern Law School says, “[Chicago] is being treated as really a practice military zone ... [while] we don’t have money here for community mental health clinics, we don’t have money for public libraries or for schools, we don’t have money for public transportation... We want peace and not permanent wars abroad and military war games and [the] national security state at home.” (qtd.in Goodman 2012). This sense of betrayal and indignation is seen in protests against NATO throughout the years.

The NATO summits do not take place at regular intervals, but whenever a new strategy or plan is to be proposed. There was no summit in 2011. In 2010 in Lisbon, 30,000 peaceful protestors marched with the slogan, “Peace, Yes, Nato, No.” In 2009, the joint French and German conference in border cities of Strasbourg and Kehl was a disaster. Fifteen thousand German troops and 9,000 French troops were assembled and ultimately used tear gas and water cannons against about 100 protestors, while between 25,000 and 40,000 protested peacefully. The 2008 NATO summit in Bucharest was also marred by massive repression. The government had 27,000 police, snipers and military deployed. Some officials broke into a factory rented by protestors and took them away before they were allowed to protest. The situation was reminiscent of their recent totalitarianism which only ended in 1989 with the Romanian revolution. The slogan of this protest was “Stop the War, Stop Nato” (NABNYC, 2012).

Summits in Brussels, the NATO Headquarters, in 2001 and 2005, drew huge crowds of European protestors. At the 2001 summit, protestors had signs that said George W. Bush was wanted for crimes against humanity and the planet; this was not long after he removed the US from the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change. At the 2005 NATO Summit in Brussels, the mantra was “W is for Not Welcome” (NABNYC, 2012). The histories of these previous summits provide some background for the Chicago NATO Summit and its protests.

Due to Chicago's reputation for police brutality, the 2012 NATO Summit was frequently referred to as a "test" of the city, the new mayor, the president's hometown, and the force (Peaceful start to NATO protests, 2012). The weekend offered many opportunities, not just for protesting, but for taking classes and going to talks about nonviolence. Workshops and courses were offered throughout the city, in churches and public places, sponsored by 8th Day Center for Justice, American Friends Service Committee, Christian Peacemaker Teams, Midwest Anti-War Mobilization, Pace e Bene, Veterans for Peace, Voices for Creative Nonviolence, War Resisters League, and White Rose Catholic Worker (Chicago Coordinated Nonviolence Training, 2012). We were unable to attend these trainings, but the following week heard British clergyman Dr. Giles Fraser speak at St. James Cathedral before he returned to the UK. Dr. Fraser, who resigned from the staff of St Paul's Cathedral over their treatment of the Occupy the Stock Exchange protestors, spoke at and attended trainings on nonviolence (Dean Invites Chicago, 2012).

The biggest event of the weekend was the Sunday rally and three mile march from Grant Park to near McCormick Place where the heads of state were meeting. We headed downtown for this, and again it was HOT! This gathering was at least twice the size of the Friday rally. Tom Morello had started the impressive line-up of speakers before we arrived. We heard Kathy Kelly and Jesse Jackson, union leaders and Code Pink, Veterans against War, and Iraq and Vietnam Veterans against War. I especially remember a man from Pakistan who pleaded for the end of drone attacks. People were moved by him, and I wondered how we could be killing other human beings in this high tech yet cowardly way. While we were waiting in a line to get more water for our bottles, we met a professor from Bradley University who had traveled to Chicago to be part of the opposition to NATO. She was as passionate about education as we were. Campaign workers from the Green Party talked to us while we were there. We talked with the Bradley colleague after the Green Party canvasser left us. We both stated that we would be voting for Obama, not because we were pleased with all his policies, but because things would be worse with Romney. We agreed that the votes Nader took from Gore gave Bush the election which caused us to get into two wars. We were not idealistic; we were realistic.

The overall atmosphere in Grant Park was quite festive, with booths representing every progressive organization I could name. We saw ACLU Observers in orange t-shirts, and people for Free Bradley Manning, Pax Christi, Stop the Drone Attacks, The Seeds of Peace Collective, Free Tibet, Occupy Chicago, South Siders for Peace, End Military Animal Labs, Justice for Trayvon, I Stand with Wisconsin, Peace Action, as well as all the teaching organizations that had offered nonviolence training. The Occupy movement has this same multi-faceted, loose organization. People are sometimes confused about Occupy, but that broad perspective is also a positive. If someone is not happy with a situation, this platform – in almost any city in the US – provides access for speakers and audience. Just as many of the world's ills were the subjects of protests at the NATO summit in Chicago, so too are these painful realities getting more and more attention in everyday life, and for those reasons, Occupy has persevered. The lessening of media coverage of Occupy is a concern, but I believe the people at these events still benefit from participation. They meet others who feel as they do, get information how they can continue to work for the change they seek, and their voices are heard.

The last speaker in Grant Park was Jesse Jackson, Sr. and he was amazing. I had heard him previously at my college where he reeled in our largely non-political students with his words and

cadence. He did it again – and this to a huge crowd dispersed all over a park seeking shade before beginning the march. I taped him so I could watch it again and share his message. He told us that we march AGAINST violence, and FOR healthcare, for jobs, for justice, for peace, for veterans, to end the war, to declare that this land is our land. He reminded us that veterans are home, but they need a home when they get home. We need healthcare, not warfare. We need a peace machine, not a war machine; education, not incarceration. He ended with, “Let nothing break your spirit. We’ve come too far. This is our time.” We were all ready to march. It was midday and the sun was scorching, but the people were enthused as they assembled and began to move, led by the Iraq veterans (Peterson & Saphir, 2012).

The route was clearly marked and lined with an abundance of police officers. Some were on horseback, while others were standing with batons across their chests. Some stood on segues and others lined the route with bicycles. The best part of the walk for me was meeting people, seeing the creative signs that people made to share, and hearing what brought people and organizations there. We met a high school educator from Evanston early in the march, but this was a vast and continuously moving crowd and it was not easy to stay in place to talk to anyone. My husband and I walked much of the route beside a Muslim couple. The man continuously chanted in a soft voice, “Peace – right now. Peace, right now.” There were protesters being pushed in wheel chairs, and there were bystanders along the way with supportive signs as well. I gave the peace sign to all the police officers I saw. Some smiled, some nodded, and some ignored me. There were some marchers ahead of us, who were yelling hateful words through a bull horn, and this made us uncomfortable, but this was the exception to the rule. My favorite signs were “We will not be silent” (in Arabic and English); “Peace on Earth” made from a grocery sack; a peace sign made out of flowers; “Stop the Racist Hate: Muslims are Welcome Here”; “No to Warmakers”; “Fund the Wounded, not War”; “Build Bridges, not Fences”; “Diplomacy: Good Enough for North Korea, Good Enough for Iran.” A handmade plastic drone “flew” over the march - supported by its builder; and a large beach ball-size created “world” held aloft ahead of us – kept things in perspective. The “official” number of protestors given by the city was 2,000. Those on the ground estimated 10,000. Most likely the number, based on post-march analysis, was between 5,000 and 6,000 (Foley and Merchant, 2012).

The goal of the march was to reach a stage near McCormick Place, where a ceremony was to take place. This stage was as near as the crowd could get to the world leaders. At this ceremony, we witnessed brave soldiers from all branches of the services “give back” their medals, because they did not want to be part of the killing anymore. They did not want to be recognized with an award for what they had been made to do. These veterans were angry, not because they had to go to war, but because they had to do those horrendous things for lies. One soldier said, “There’s nothing heroic about killing people. There’s nothing heroic about people dying.” A total of 45 veterans spoke, and then each literally threw the medals over a perimeter fence set up by the Secret Service in the direction of the NATO meeting. A NATO representative did not respond to the soldiers’ request to formally receive the medals (Foley and Merchant, 2012). Near the end of the veteran’s speeches, a line of officers marched through the crowd in riot gear. Nothing we could see had been going wrong, but that action seemed to instigate some shoving problems. What we saw was that people were forced into a corner where they needed to push back to feel safe. The press said, the Blac Bloc, about 100 self-proclaimed anarchists dressed in black with their faces covered, had chanted “What do we want? Dead cops!” as it left Grant Park at 2 p.m.

(Janssen et. al., 2012). Later, some Blac Block members were arrested, after four cops had been injured, one stabbed in the leg. Although this violence was a disappointment to those of us who had hoped for no instances of violence, overall the march had gone well. We as marchers felt that we could walk and talk and sing and give others the peace sign, and we were safe.

Whether the protests will make any difference in the lessening of the global military industrial complex is yet to be seen. Rallies and marches can be effective public displays of discontent with the world as it is, but for them to actually make a difference, more balanced media coverage will be necessary. In the case of NATO protests, many of us hoped to provide a clear objection to the militarized world we live in. Boeing was boarded up in Chicago, so that made the news. That action may simply be seen as the way that protestors stopped business. Most media outlets do not help in the work for peace. The only coverage that I saw about the NATO protests in Chicago was negative. What can ordinary people do who want to stand up against massive military spending?

Perhaps the burgeoning field of Peace Studies is the best hope of getting the message out at a grass roots level in academia, especially since the field of Peace Studies has entered community colleges where more than half of all higher education now occurs in this country. Gene Sharp, a leader in the field of peace studies and at times credited for the Arab Spring uprising, explains *198 Methods of Nonviolent Action*. These include marches (38) and renouncing honors (53). We participated in or witnessed both of these methods. Change can be brought about in many peaceful ways, and that is what the NATO weekend represented to me. We attended rallies and marched, but I also teach peace. Often the students that I teach become more engaged with the world and attend protests. As Marian Wright Edelman, African American lawyer and founder of the Children's Defense Fund said, "Democracy is not a spectator sport." We cannot know when a public action is going to occur that will cause great change, but this has happened: in the Civil Rights movement in the US, to end apartheid in South Africa, to remove the British in India, to remove Pinochet in Chili, to free Poland from the Soviets, and the list goes on and on. Occupy has not changed the world, but it does have people talking about injustices. The NATO protests may be considered a success or a failure, but they allowed many like-minded people to come together to demonstrate for what they believe in. Indeed, the weekend was an example of "this is what democracy looks like."

References

- "Chicago Coordinated Nonviolence Training." *American Friends Service Committee*. Accessed 15 May 2012. <http://afsc.org/resource/chicago-coordinated-nonviolence-training>.
- "Dean invites Chicago to occupy St. James Cathedral during NATO." 11 May 2012. Accessed 30 August 2012. <http://occupychi.org/spiritual-affairs/event/dean-invites-chicago-occupy-st-james-cathedral-during-nato>.
- Foley, Ryan J. and Nomaan Merchant. (2012). NATO summit: protestors, police face off in largest rally against Chicago summit yet. AP. Accessed 12 June 2012. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/05/20/nato-summit-chicago-protesters_n_1530789.html
- Goodman, Amy. (May 2012). "As NATO meets in Chicago, Bill Ayes & Bernardine Dohrn condemn "militarized arm of the 1 percent." *Democracy Now*. 16 May 2012. http://www.democracynow.org/2012/5/16/as_nato_meets_in_chicago_activists

- Janssen, Kim, et al. (2012). "Inside Sunday's violent clash between 'Blac Bloc' anarchists, cops." *Chicago Sun Times*. 21 May 2012.
- NABNYC. NATO protests: the world says no to NATO. Blogspot. Accessed 10-14 July 2012. <http://nabnyc.blogspot.com/2012/06/nato-protests-world-says-no-to-nato.html>.
- NATO Profile. (2012). *BBC News*.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/country_profiles/1549072.stm#leaders
- North Atlantic Trade Organization. (2012). NATO-OTAN. "What is NATO?" Accessed 16 July 2012. <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/index.htm>
- Partridge, Elizabeth. (2002) *This Land Was Made for You and Me: The Life & Songs of Woody Guthrie*. New York: Viking, 85.
- "Peaceful start to NATO protests." (2012). Staff Writer. *Chicago Tribune*. 18 May 2012.
- Peterson, Kyle and Ann Saphir. (2012). "Thousands protest in Chicago at NATO summit." Reuters. 20 May 2012. Accessed 6 June 2012. <http://news.yahoo.com/chicago-protests-eve-nato-summit-raucous-peaceful-044154096.html2>.
- Sharp, Gene. (1973). "198 methods of nonviolent action." *The Politics of Nonviolent Action, Vol.2: The Methods of Nonviolent Action*. Boston: Porter Sargent Publishers. Accessed 3 September 2012. <http://www.aeinstein.org/organizations103a.html>.

PEACE STUDIES JOURNAL

Vol. 5, Issue 3

November 2012

Book Review: The Future of Service-Learning: New Solutions for Sustaining and Improving Practice. 2009. Edited by Jean R. Strait and Marybeth Lima. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Author: Deb Sheffer, Ed.D.

Assistant Professor, Master of Arts in Teaching Program
School of Education
Hamline University
1536 Hewitt Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104-1284
Email: dsheffer01@gw.hamline.edu

BOOK REVIEW: THE FUTURE OF SERVICE-LEARNING: NEW SOLUTIONS FOR SUSTAINING AND IMPROVING PRACTICE. 2009. EDITED BY JEAN R. STRAIT AND MARYBETH LIMA.

This book is a collaboration of service-learning professionals who offer a variety of perspectives and experiences regarding the topic of service-learning. It examines the future of service-learning, including the issues and challenges as well as what may happen to service-learning in the next several years. The book, which could be considered a guide to service-learning, is conveniently divided into three parts. Part I addresses the institutional and administrative issues of service-learning. Part II examines service-learning as a stimulus for research. Part III debates the future evolution of service-learning.

Under the umbrella of Part I, Chapter 1 offers critical questions and directions for future practitioners. Chapter 2 discusses how to institutionalize service-learning, for example, where service-learning is located on campus and the reasoning of service-learning placement institutionally. The authors describe four commonly accepted organizational practices of service-learning on college and university campuses. In addition, the authors provide examples from a variety of institutions, their reflections on the benefits and challenges, and explain the range of approaches that colleges and universities have used to institutionalize service learning. Their institution examples consist of public, private, two-year, and four-year institutions,

demonstrating how each structure best reflects the needs of the institution. There is no one right way. The authors also examine the three main benefits and challenges of service-learning office placement. The chapter concludes with the authors' recommendations for the future of service-learning.

Chapter 3 confronts the topic of maintaining service-learning programs and explores a method of service-learning that focuses on increasing mutual-dependence as the basis of powerful partnerships. Not too long ago, service-learning has been considered a field, an educational or instructive method, and a movement. However, even with differing definitions and scholars priorities, these concepts of service-learning share a central focus about the place and state of service-learning within educational organizations. They are all built upon principles of best practice that include the importance of equally beneficial partnerships described by collective preparation and leadership, clear roles, consistent communication, assessments, and accountability. Yet, strengthening campus-community partnerships is a major area for improvement. Most higher education institutions lack the shared identity and commitment to community development. As long as campus and community partners see themselves as fundamentally separate, brought together only by individual relationships and their common interest in certain projects, their investment in each other will be inadequate.

Chapter 4's premise is that maintaining support from campus administrators is essential for guaranteeing that service-learning continues to prosper as a fundamental practice. As service-learning has developed and become a critical characteristic of the civic engagement movement, the importance of seeing service-learning less as an individual outreach program and more as an essential strategy for increasing comprehensive institutional goals has become even more evident. Getting a commitment and maintaining support from campus administrators is critical for making certain that service-learning continues to grow well as an important and necessary institutional practice. The authors offer five guidelines to help achieve this outcome.

Within Part II, service-learning as a springboard for research, the authors in Chapter 5 look at promotion and tenure issues in service-learning: Are faculty passed over for promotion and tenure because of their roles in service-learning and community engagement, or is this an assessment not based in real practice. The chapter reviews findings on this topic based on research and practice of the first generations of service-learning and community engagement. In the end, the authors frame service-learning and community engagement as scholarship and provide ways to document and evaluate community-engaged scholarship.

In chapter 6, the author states that there is considerable evidence regarding the positive outcomes of service-learning as well as a variety of models and guidelines for best practice. At the same time, the author poses a number of challenging questions that remain, including some that get at the core and purpose of service-learning. She raises these difficult, unresolved questions hoping to stimulate a discussion or inquiry. Some examples include what counts as service-learning; is service-learning available and suitable for all students; and does service-learning perpetuate the status quo. The author asserts that how we answer these questions will affect the future of service-learning in many ways. Despite the complex questions, the author believes in its potential to positively affect students, communities, and higher education.

Chapter 7 investigates the psychological effects of service-learning. The author examines the ongoing discussion regarding the impact of service-learning on students' attitudes and beliefs. He states that recently, there has been an attempt to use service-learning as a means to promote civic and political engagement. The author continues stating that schools are caught in the middle with learner and community needs on one side and the government and community expectations on the other. The author discusses the social-psychological factors in attitude change, Contact Theory and the minimum conditions needed to reduce prejudice, and the new developments in Contact Theory.

The focus of Chapter 8 is the funding of service-learning, and it is geared toward faculty, community partners, as well as service-learning directors. The author acknowledges that service-learning programs cost money to run, and the work will not be done as well, or at all, without adequate funding. The chapter centers around four major areas: How to determine if you need funding, and how much; Overview of funding options; Developing a fund-raising plan; and Writing successful proposals. The chapter includes practical tools, such as tables and charts, to assist in developing and executing a plan.

Part III, future models of service-learning and service-learning partnerships, starts with Chapter 9 and a look at the English and the Republic of Ireland to illustrate paradigms in international service-learning. The authors provide evidence regarding the strong association that can exist between engaging in service-learning activities and developing skills related to critical reflexivity in future practitioners. The authors confirm that these skills are of critical importance for ongoing professional development. As a result, the pedagogies represented in this chapter are valuable in their sense of interconnecting pre-service, in-service, and the educational community in constructing knowledge.

The author of Chapter 10 reports that higher education is using online learning at an increasingly rapid rate. As well, she states that as faculty members teach more online courses, they struggle with the difficulties of integrating exploratory learning through different methods and formats. Faculty need to be taught how to use service-eLearning and they need to be provided with some items to consider when implementing service-eLearning. The author lists the key features in service-eLearning: Community partners; Institutional resources; Course content; Service-learning to service-eLearning; Student interaction and ownership of course content; Technology issues; Reflection; and Faculty guidance in learning process. Within the chapter there is a Service-learning Planning Sheet, a Screen Shot for Technology Resources for Learning, and a step-by-step guide on how to begin using the technology resources for learning.

Chapter 11 looks at the issues of the underrepresented peoples in service-learning. The writers give voice to the students of color whose experiences are often missing from service-learning both in scholarly literature and in classroom discussions. They affirm that the demographics of our institutions are changing and service-learning is different for students of color. Service-learning can no longer be about giving to people who are less fortunate. They state that more of the students in service-learning classrooms have life experiences that parallel the lives of the community members they come across in service. The writers maintain that educators can no longer assume that experiences in the community will be new or different for all students.

The author of Chapter 12 recounts that a long time ago the act of researching was only for university scholars. The scholars were the ones who had the knowledge and expertise to lead studies that investigated a variety of topics, including service-learning. In addition, it was acknowledged that mathematically based, scientific studies were the best approach. However, the author says that the focus has turned and now includes the participants of service-learning programs, to empower the participants as equally important measures of research and evaluation. The author states that service through research can lead to the enrichment of learning and provide meaningful social actions and social change.

The final chapter, Chapter 13, presents a case study of a school created as part of the Bill and Melina Gates Foundation Initiative to ensure that all students graduate from high school ready for college. It is a case study of a community-generated vision for a charter school, governed by its students, showing unique civic engagement possibilities. The author maintains that when academic service-learning is defined as servant leadership and active civic engagement, student achievement increases.

Throughout the book, there is an underlying uncertainty about social justice education and where that would fit. The authors share some of the critical questions that service-learning scholars have asked for a long time. Is service-learning about social change or social justice, and if not, should it be? Do the community agencies or institutions used as service-learning sites operate in ways that aim to free exploited groups, or do they offer services to these people without challenging the status quo of power and privilege? Can service-learning be established as an accepted part of higher education, and at the same time, uphold social justice by opposing the existing framework of power and privilege?

The authors share that many people describe service-learning as just a way to apply academic subjects to the real world. They state that this approach only partly describes the goal of service-learning. Many of the authors believe that without moving forward toward social justice, the service provided is somewhat meaningless. For example, if the type of approach used by an institution is one of charity versus justice, this will affect the kinds of work that students perform and what they learn from their service.

In closing, the authors state that the purpose of their writing is to summarize the key concepts in service-learning that they believe will be important during the upcoming years. They know that the future holds complicated challenges, as well as many opportunities. They are encouraged by the continued resourcefulness and commitment demonstrated by the community partners and service-learning educators to approach such issues effectively.

The book is a practical, hands-on look at service-learning organized in a user-friendly format. It offers useful ideas, examples or models, and provides guidelines for the everyday practitioner. Andrew Furco sums up the book by stating that their combined contributions produced an important book that portrays a realistic picture of what is needed to establish, preserve, and sustain innovative service-learning programs.

PEACE STUDIES JOURNAL

Vol. 5, Issue 3

November 2012

Book Review: Love and Liberation: An Animal Liberation Front Story. 2012. By Sarat Colling and Anthony J. Nocella II. Williamstown, MA: Piraeus Books.

Author: Jan Austin Smitowicz

Blog: www.TheRewildWest.com

Email: JanSmitowicz@gmail.com

BOOK REVIEW: LOVE AND LIBERATION: AN ANIMAL LIBERATION FRONT STORY. BY SARAT COLLING AND ANTHONY J. NOCELLA II.

For Liberation, For Love

Love and Liberation: An Animal Liberation Front Story by Anthony J. Nocella, II and Sarat Colling is a nice little novella. It is the story of Gabrielle and Andre; they recently bought their first house together in a nice neighborhood of Houston. He is in medical school. She has a good job as an accountant. They live close to all the amenities materialistic middle-class Americans treasure: Best Buy, Wal-Mart, The Gap, and all their big box ilk. Gabrielle and Andre are primed to settle into a dull, normal life of zombified domestic blah and fade away into meat-and-pollution-induced sickness and old age. But then one late night changes everything. Gabrielle is out walking her beagle and she witnesses an Animal Liberation Front action in progress; a new burger joint is about to have its grand opening across the street. Two masked individuals spray-paint the building, smash windows, and throw Molotov cocktails inside.

Gabrielle is compulsively fascinated by this scene. She begins to ask around and read local newspaper and internet articles about the incident. She learns about the ALF. Over time, she and Andre educate themselves extensively about animal suffering and the praxis of inflicting economic damage to animal-exploiting industries, and the couple is driven to begin fighting directly for the voiceless nonhumans.

Love and Liberation (It's only fitting that I review this novella; I was incarcerated for a nonviolent marijuana-related "crime" from 2010-2012, and there I began signing off all letters with this very epithet!) is a sort of story-within-a-story. From the very beginning, we know that

Gabrielle ends up in prison. She is typewriting a memoir in her own cage, recreating her personal arc from normal drone to militant animal liberator. We read her story in her own voice. The prison sequences are sparse and short, but contain a lot of good information. Gabrielle mentions how the majority of her fellow inmates are people of color and poor, and how America's loathsome prison-industrial complex is rooted in racism and slavery (in prison I was *forced* to work--even though I'm disabled--and made less than a dollar an hour as a janitor).

There's one big concern I have with the story, and it comes from a real-life strategic standpoint. As Gabrielle first toys with the idea of becoming an animal liberator, she visits a website for an ALF Press Office and sends them an email, about how she's interested in joining the ALF, and asks if there is a local chapter. Now, this is *not* unrealistic. Not at all. I've seen it myself--on Facebook, Myspace, political message boards--people publicly asking how they can get involved in illegal activity. This is *disturbingly* common. It is not the realism I have a problem with, but rather that the colossal stupidity and naiveté of her questions are not addressed in the Press Office's reply. Emailing someone, or even worse, posting publicly, about committing actions that our government considers *domestic terrorism*, is a massive violation of security culture. It is understandable naiveté, but that doesn't make it any less dangerous. After Gabrielle sent her message to the Press Office, I hoped they would respond with something like, "It is dangerous to talk about becoming involved in illegal activity in ways that can be monitored or surveilled. Here is a link to a primer on security culture, which we recommend you read and reread until everything in it becomes second nature. Good luck and be careful." Instead, they merely direct her to the ALF Guidelines section of their website. This is a deleterious seed to be planting. As activists we have to be conscious of these dangers, and we *must* point out any breeches of security culture, then stamp them out like sparks that may--and often do--become wildfires.

Gabrielle and Andre start small. They carry Sharpies with them around town and tag anti-meat slogans wherever they can. Then they go to the construction site of a new live-animal pet store, pull up the survey stakes, and sabotage the machinery. One great aspect of all this is that they practice what sounds like very good security strategies. They put plastic bags over their shoes, make certain there is nothing in their pockets that could be dropped at the scene of the "crime," and afterwards they throw out all their clothes used during the action. Before long they decide to up the ante: They will try to liberate twelve rhesus monkeys from a university laboratory (although it is the same university Andre attends; perhaps it would be safer to, as has been written in many places, not "shit in one's own backyard." Meaning not attack a place to which you are affiliated.) Aside from that, they are even more careful for this high-risk action. They buy equipment--walkie-talkies, police scanners, night-vision goggles, and so on--from a variety of pawn shops, thrift stores, and garage sales, always using cash.

The night of the laboratory raid, it is raining. "The rain," Gabrielle writes in her memoir, "was desirable because it decreases the chances of being seen..." (89-90). This is a nice little touch of detail. And it reminds me of something I read in *Eco-Defense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching*, edited by Dave Foreman, while researching my currently unpublished novel *Redwood Falls*, about how the weather can provide saboteurs with advantages--specifically, in this case, how fog can help dampen the sound of hammering nails into trees to protect them from logging (18-32). Two main characters in my novel do quite a bit of tree-spiking.

The end of the novella is morally complex, and may inspire interesting discussions about the appropriateness of the character's actions. One of the best parts of the story is when Gabrielle is

about to be sentenced for her “crimes” of compassion. She makes a rousing, unapologetic speech to the court: “Under the administration of President Obama, the government has continued with its volatile ‘eco-terrorist’ legislation, labeling animal rights activists and environmentalists as a ‘top domestic terrorist threat’ ...while right-wing groups toting guns and threatening politicians are exempt from this labeling” (98). This is significant because it broadens the scope of the story. It is no longer just about animals, but about the Earth, and touches on government corruption and hypocrisy and collusion with murderous corporations. “As long as these deplorable industries are standing,” she continues, “there will be compassionate people to torch the cages, dungeons, and pits of despair...” (99). Here’s to hoping that not only do her words prove prophetic, but that these types of actions will increase dramatically in the years to come, both in intensity and frequency.

Perhaps it is passé to quote the Forward in a review, but I’m hardly the traditional sort. “We know vegans among us,” Peter Young writes, “who spend *months* learning to bake vegan donuts, yet so few who dedicate even a small portion of this time to learning the craft of infiltrating labs” [emphasis added] (10).

I sincerely hope that *Love and Liberation* helps inspire people to realize the level of resistance and intensity it’s going to take to do serious, *permanent* damage to animal and Earth-exploiting industries, and to the industrial megamachine as a whole. Realize it. And then act accordingly. Whether one is an active resistance member, or a resistance supporter, everybody has a role they can and *must* take on.

For liberation and for love.

References

Foreman, Dave and Bill Haywood, eds. *Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching*. 1985. 3rd ed. Chico, CA: Abzug Press, 1993.

PEACE STUDIES JOURNAL

Vol. 5, Issue 3

November 2012

Book Review: Equipping the New African Peacebuilder. 2012. By Titus K. Oyeyemi. Nappanee, Indiana: Evangel Publishing House.

Film Review: Dear Mandela. 2012. By Dara Kell and Christopher Nizza. Sleeping Giant Films. Documentary.

Author: Matt Meyer, M.A.
Email: mmmsrnb@igc.org

Matt Meyer is a New York-based educator-activist, co-editor of the two volume Africa World Press series Seeds of New Hope. He serves as co-convenor of the War Resisters International Africa Working Group and UN NGO representative of the International Peace Research Association.

BOOK REVIEW: EQUIPPING THE NEW AFRICAN PEACEBUILDER. BY TITUS K. OYEYEMI.

FILM REVIEW: DEAR MANDELA. BY DARA KELL AND CHRISTOPHER NIZZA.

As initiatives extolling the power of nonviolent action increase across the African continent, and indigenous methods of conflict resolution are being experimented with and asserted (Meyer, 2012), it is not surprising that new films and books are being produced which spotlight the possibilities for grassroots social change. Two striking examples now available to activists and scholars outside of the continent are Titus Oyeyemi's *Equipping the New African Peacebuilder* (2012) and Dara Kell's brilliant film *Dear Mandela* (2012)—both courageous pieces of work which seek to break down myths and assumptions about the contemporary African condition. Spanning experiences and perspectives starkly different from one another, these two new resources challenge those of us from the Global North to take stock of a new generation of African change agents.

Rev. Dr. Titus Oyeyemi, a Nigerian educator who has long been associated with Christian peace-making efforts, has put his thoughts about Africa as “the future land of peace” into a comprehensive curriculum intended for practical use across at least the English-speaking parts of

the continent. With a decidedly religious emphasis, the book begins situated in the work of Oyeyemi's Africa Foundation for Peace and Love Initiatives, the organization which has helped build school-based clubs, peace education centers, and a post-secondary peace institute in many of Nigeria's conflicted states. Oyeyemi asserts that tribal/ethnic hatred and identity conflicts, some of them with a history dating back to ancient times, form the basis of most violence in Africa today. Quoting Nicholas Hayson (2002), chief legal advisor to South African former President Nelson Mandela, Oyeyemi agrees that this trend goes beyond the continent; indeed, more than ninety percent "of all armed conflicts in the world during the 1990s were classified as 'identity-based conflicts.'"

Some of Oyeyemi's conclusions seem premature at best, such as the notion that "most [African] tribes or ethnic groups are only 'bidding their time' until they can secure the opportunity to avenge the past against the other." Nevertheless, Oyeyemi does much more than present a (neo)liberal view of the continent's self-effacing post-colonial woes. His analysis includes substantial sections on the negative historical impact of slavery, colonialism, neocolonialism, and geopolitics—what Oyeyemi suggests "reared its ugly head in Africa immediately after independence." Laying most blame at the doorsteps of the USA, the Soviet Union, and China, Oyeyemi attempts to chart a non-aligned view which favors "a theology of peace education." And though some of his religious citations have a decidedly Western foundation, he is clearly looking to build an adaptable framework which would empower local communities across spiritual lines and which could easily be replicated across the geographic divides of conflict-produced borders.

The strengths of *Equipping the New African Peacebuilder* are most pronounced as Oyeyemi leads us through specific reviews of what is possible. His course listing of available peace studies curricula of Earlham (Friends), Goshen (Mennonite), and Manchester (Brethren) may seem repetitive to a US audience, but it is included to suggest to African colleagues what interdisciplinary work has been done to form the basis of peace studies best practices. From there, he details the ways in which current African conditions appropriately provide the basis for an Afrocentric peace. The peace process—from seeking it to obtaining it to internalizing and improving upon it—is likened to the popular education/organizing precepts of Paulo Freire and Myles Horton: *We make the road by walking* (1990). In Oyeyemi's conception, to be sure, this road has a universal quality but is uniquely African; he uses the Yoruba word *Atola* to describe the ways in which African peace—though not yet a fully developed or existing concept—can be envisioned and built upon.

The books' weaknesses are in its rhetorical flourishes: sections built on belief or ideological inclination which remain unsubstantiated by concrete evidence, research, or applied methodology. I would caution the reader not to dismiss the book quickly because of these gaps. Oyeyemi is an important voice amidst a growing number of African religious activists and peace educators working to put into practice a vision for radical transformation. His peacebuilder's curriculum is a significant contribution to these efforts.

From the west to the south of the continent, a series of growing movements are developing in the heart of Africa's other major super-power; South Africa's poor people are forming alliances and engaging in militant actions which are this generation's first major foray into the political scene. In *Dear Mandela*, the work of the organization of shack-dwellers (which the government refers to as "informal settlements") is spotlighted in spectacular fashion. With riveting dialogue, intense

music, excellent and varied cinematography, and a gripping story which keeps the viewer on the edge of one's seat, it is easy to forget that this vital piece is in fact a documentary. This must-see film focuses on three local members of the Abahlali baseMjondolo (AbM) who—among other things—build and re-build people's homes, provide counsel to people on their basic rights, mobilize demonstrations, petition government, take a case to the Constitutional Court, provide security to their leadership (one of whom must go underground because of the level of oppression), and generally carve a political space for those who lives remain little changed after the end of political apartheid.

Why, they ask in an open cry to the beloved Mandela (who they liken to Christ), have some benefitted greatly since the democratic elections of 1994 while others have received little more than promises about the possibility of improved economic conditions? How can local police and politicians use rubber bullets, tear gas, and sometimes even live ammunition, as well as all manner of discrediting propaganda, to repress and dissuade people struggling for the rights guaranteed in their newly-established constitution? Is it possible that so much of what Mandela spent twenty-seven years in prison for has still not come to pass in this beleaguered and idealized "rainbow nation?"

In a private discussion with this author, Mnikelo Ndabankulu (one of the protagonists of *Dear Mandela*) added that it was clear that when the government wanted to build a major stadium for the World Cup, monies and labor were found to construct new buildings in record time. The questions of priority-setting in the current period are largely questions of political will. They are questions, however, which cut to the heart of the nature of South African society and social change. On the one hand, some have already given up on the possibility of meaningful change through electoral politics, as noted by AbM Youth League general secretary Zodwa Nsibandwe. They, rather, are "working to build democratic people's power from the ground up." That work, as documented by supporter Jared Sachs (2012), has led to "some of the most active civil disobedience protests since 1994." On the other hand, though some in the African National Congress (ANC) roundly criticize all street protesters and condone repression against them, the assessment of life-long ANC leader Pallo Jordan suggests that the successes of the movement against apartheid has led the older generation to "an attitude of complacency," and a too-often inclination to "go along" with the status quo to "get ahead" as far as personal gain (2012).

Dear Mandela, soon to be available on DVD via www.dearmandela.com, is significant for at least two reasons. It shows not only that the struggle continues, but that the complexities of South Africa's multi-generational movements, and history of resistance and repression, is being grappled with by young campaigners who most in the Global North have barely heard of. It also demonstrates that, despite a fury which is double-barreled by the combined injustice of poverty itself coupled with the fact that post-apartheid society raised hopes for fundamental change, AbM and other new formations still rely on creative nonviolent tactics and strategies to build for a new tomorrow.

Sociologist Michael Neocosmos (2011), in a review of "Mass mobilization, 'democratic transition,' and 'transitional violence' in Africa," powerfully describes how many Western governments, multinational agencies, and even international non-governmental organizations "descend from on high like clouds of locusts, voraciously eating up the new shoots of 'people power.'" This process, he keenly notes, fails to move societies from authoritarianism to democracy, but rather creates a process of "de-politicization" and exclusion. The poignant

feature common to both Oyeyemi's *Equipping the New African Peacebuilder* and *Dear Mandela* is their determined independent outlook and optimism. Africa's solutions to Africa's problems will be coming from unarmed, grassroots, indigenous acts of civil resistance. These two recommended resources point the way forward for solidarity and future action.

References

- Freire, Paulo, and Horton, Myles (1990) *We make the road by walking: Conversations on education and social change*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press
- Hayson, Nicholas (2002) *Negotiating the political settlement in South Africa: Are there lessons for other countries?*, Track Two, Vol. II, No. 3, p. 5.
http://ccrweb.ccr.uct.ac.za/archive/two/11_3/index113.html
- Jordan, Pallo (2012), *On the massacres at Bisho and Marikana*, speech delivered September 7, 2012, King Williams Town: Bisho Memorial Lecture.
- Kell, Dara and Nizza, Christopher (2012) *Dear Mandela*, Sleeping Giant Films in cooperation with Sundance and the National Film and Video Foundation, South Africa.
- Meyer, Matt (2012) *New Pan-African nonviolence network formed*, Retrieved August 8, 2012, Waging Nonviolence, <http://wagingnonviolence.org/2012/08/new-pan-african-nonviolence-network-formed/>
- Neocosmos, Michael (2011) *Mass mobilization, 'democratic transition,' and 'transitional violence' in Africa*, Retrieved March 31, 2011, Pambazuka News, <http://pambazuka.org/en/category/features/72163>
- Oyeyemi, Titus (2012) *Equipping the new African peacebuilder*, Nappanee: Evangel Press
- Sacks, Jared (2012), *South African protest politics: the case of Sweet Home*, Retrieved September 27, 2012, Pambazuka News, www.pambazuka.org/en/category/features/84370/print

PEACE STUDIES JOURNAL

Vol. 5, Issue 3

November 2012

Book Review: Gandhi and the Unspeakable: His Final Experiment with Truth. 2012. By James W. Douglass. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Author: Linda LeTendre, MSW
Email: linda@scolex.org

Linda LeTendre is a member of the Saratoga Peace Alliance. She is on the steering committees for the Upper Hudson Peace Action and the Women Against War, the Capital District chapter of Code Pink. Linda writes the blog "Waging Peace" for The Daily Gazette.

BOOK REVIEW: GANDHI AND THE UNSPEAKABLE: HIS FINAL EXPERIMENT WITH TRUTH. BY JAMES W. DOUGLASS.

Truth With Consequences

If you have ever wondered why peace making is so hard, why people scorn you for nonviolent witness on behalf of peace and justice, James W. Douglass' latest book helps to explain why.

With superlative research and an excruciating attention to detail (there are 30 pages of notes for a story that is only 113 pages long) he tells the back story of Mahatma ("Great Soul") Gandhi's assassination; those in power in India in 1948 had enough information at least 10 days before to arrest the assassins and prevent the murder of the beacon for nonviolence for the entire world. To rub salt in a worldwide wound, the ensuing trial was allowed to become a character assassination of the victim and evidence proving the guilt of Vinayak Damodar Savarkar as the orchestrator behind the trigger man, Narayan Vinayak Godse (a Hindu fundamentalist), was not admitted into the court proceedings.

Douglass' book shows us that the assassination was the struggle between violence (Savarkar's and the State's way of change) and nonviolence (God's and Gandhi's way) writ large. Both are a means towards change. Gandhi objected to violence "...because when it appears to do good, the good is only temporary; the evil it does is permanent." Gandhi called his truth search "satyagraha" ("soul force" is our best translation) – how good overcomes evil in the world. He took his tactics from the best Hindu scriptures and Jesus' Sermon on the Mount (on which he meditated daily) and led a successful popular resistance movement against the British occupation

of India. “Do or die” (literally do satyagraha or die trying – no in between) was their mantra. One lived *and died* as if the truth, as if God, mattered. “Satyagraha-ists” stayed true to the truth and did not fight back – did not become what they set out to confront. The modern world had never seen anything like it and it has never been the same since. His satyagraha inspired the resistance to apartheid in South Africa, it was the backbone of the American civil rights movement and the undergirding of Eastern Europe's nonviolent overthrow of communism. His name is still revered to this very day in the peace community and his ideas are still taught today at every workshop on nonviolent civil disobedience.

People of the sword, those who put their faith and trust in violence, not only believe that nonviolence will fail us - it will also put us at greater peril. To illustrate, a story in the September 17, 2012 edition of “The Saratogian” on Peace Week in the city of Saratoga Springs had this on-line comment from “patrolcarr”: “All this 'Peace Week' is, is a bunch of people living in a bubble getting together to sing Kumbaya. You people will be the end of us all.” In this paradigm of trust in violence the tactic is to “disarm” the nonviolent, either through denigration, character assassination, prison or death to show that nonviolence will not work.

Gandhi knew he would be killed; he was beaten and stoned on a number of occasions, he was threatened with death several times. Gandhi personally knew both his assassin and the mastermind behind the act. After a previous failed assassination attempt, Gandhi invited Godse, after he was released from jail, to come and live with him for a week in his ashram so they could talk.

And the evidence suggests that Gandhi knew on January 30th, 1948, the day of his death his death was imminent:

“When Gandhi finally broke away from counseling Patel at 5:10 [PM], he was told that leaders from the Indian peninsula of Kathiawar were outside requesting an appointment with him.

‘Tell them to come after prayer,’ he said, ‘I shall see them- if I am alive.’”

He was dead only minutes later.

At the time he was planning to go to Pakistan on peace mission. More than a million people had been killed in the civil war that was raging between Muslims and Hindus as Pakistan split off from India (something which Gandhi desperately wanted to stop). Hindu extremists, like Savarkar and Godse were enraged by Gandhi's campaign of walking, praying and fasting for an end to the violence. His campaigns were known to be very powerful and had a measure of success. Savarkar and Godse had to act quickly, they tried to kill him very shortly before the assassination with a bomb and when that failed they regrouped and were successful only a week or so later.

Douglass teaches us what we're up against; it is not the “patrolcarrs” of the world but the “principalities and powers” as the Gospel names it. Thomas Merton called it the “Unspeakable”. In the case of the peace makers, we're not only up against the fears of “patrolcarr”, but governments and corporations that can feed and manipulate that fear, and harness it, for the profit that can be made off of war. These are the principalities of fear and greed.

I had the good fortune to speak by telephone with Mr. Douglass about the book while organizing a discussion for the aforementioned peace week. I joked that we should say “Hello” to the FBI and/or NSA agents listening in. He commented that they were listening to people but not to us. “They only spy on you when you become effective”, he noted. Cold comfort indeed. And more evidence of the “unspeakable”.

“Gandhi and the Unspeakable” should be read in the context of Douglass' book “JFK and the Unspeakable: Why He Died and Why It Matters”. This seminal work on the assassination of President Kennedy, who was killed by a myriad of forces aligned with the military-industrial complex to stop his work for peace and disarmament, helps us see our history through a clean lens and only then can we see the truth of our times and understand where we are today and why. Douglass gives us the insight to recognize and understand the importance of our moral decisions in the here and now.

Douglass is in the process of researching (he is a highly respected researcher) and writing two more books about the pivotal moments in our collective history: the assassination of Robert Kennedy and, the assassinations of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Malcolm X. He once pointed out to me that four of our most progressive and effective (in the sense that they could connect with and organize what we today call the 99%) political leaders were assassinated within five years of each other and no one ever stood trial for the murders. No one was ever held accountable – at least not in the way those who commit nonviolent civil disobedience are held in our courts today. Douglass sat through the entire 1999 civil trial the King family brought against the government for wrongful death. The jury of six blacks and six whites found that King had indeed been a victim of assassination by a conspiracy involving not only the Memphis police but US government as well. This verdict affirmed Ray's innocence, which the King family always maintained. To show that they were not pursuing the case for financial gain but for the truth only, the family requested only \$100 in restitution. He was next to a reporter from “The Guardian” when the verdict was announced and the reporter turned to Douglass and said, “This was the trial of the century, not the OJ trial.” More evidence of the “unspeakable”.

He “detoured” with the Gandhi book. He had not planned to write the book, but the Holy Spirit had other ideas. In a conversation with Fr. John Dear, SJ, he learned that their mutual friend, Arun Gandhi, grandson of the Mahatma, believed that his grandfather was assassinated with the complicity of the Indian government by a very powerful conspiracy and had the evidence to back up his suspicions. Douglass “...realized it meant a parallel between Gandhi's murder and the plots to kill Martin Luther King and Malcolm X that I was researching for a book.”

Gandhi said, "Nonviolence is absolutely necessary for a good result." We live in “interesting times” as the Chinese would say. We are killing each other and the planet with our greed and fear. Change is desperately needed if we are to survive as a species. The choice between nonviolence and violence is the most important issue facing each and every one of us. Martin Luther King, Jr. once said, “Our choice is no longer between violence and nonviolence, but between nonviolence and nonexistence.”

And like Gandhi, we have little time left to make our choice.