



Pacific Call Volume 36, Issue 2 June 2016

225 N 70th St, Seattle WA 98103 206-789-5565 <http://www.wwfor.org>

***WWFOR** seeks to replace violence, war, racism and economic injustice with nonviolence, equality, peace and justice. It links and strengthens FOR members and chapters throughout Western Washington in promoting activities consistent with the national FOR statement of purpose. WWFOR helps members and chapters accomplish together what we could not accomplish alone.*



The Fellowship of Reconciliation Centennial & 58th Pacific Northwest Regional Seabeck Conference Friday – Monday July 1 - July 4, 2016

The Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR) USA, Oregon FOR, and Western Washington FOR

invite you to participate in a celebration of the 100th Anniversary of the founding of the Fellowship of Reconciliation in the United States. Our conference will include nationally known keynote speakers as well as numerous workshop options for those interested in gathering to discuss current peace and justice concerns in our local communities, the nation, and the world.

Register Now as the Conference is filling up <http://forseabeck.org/>

If you need help, email registrar@forseabeck.org (link sends e-mail) or call 530-844-3838 (between 9am-5pm (PDT), Monday - Friday) for assistance.



Why Is the “Force More Powerful” More Powerful?

by John M Repp

People coming to FORUSA's one hundredth anniversary celebration at Seabeck, Washington, this coming July 1 through July 4, will get to hear Erica Chenoweth and Jamila Raqib, two of the most knowledgeable people on the planet on the subject of mass nonviolent civil resistance. <http://forseabeck.org/>

In 2006, Chenoweth was getting her PhD in political science, writing her dissertation on why and how people use violence to achieve political goals. Then she received an invitation to a week long workshop put on by the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict <https://www.nonviolent-conflict.org/>. She accepted the invitation as a challenge. At the workshop, she expressed scepticism, assuming violent methods of political struggle were the only viable ones. Nothing in her graduate study had contradicted that idea. In fact, until she attended the workshop she had never really heard much about nonviolent civil resistance. At the end of the workshop, Maria Stephan, soon to be Chenoweth's co-author, approached her and suggested she study the question empirically. Again, Chenoweth accepted the challenge.

Chenoweth spent the next two years collecting data on all the major nonviolent and violent political campaigns since 1900 from all over the globe and then ran the statistical tests. Her results blew her away. From 1900 to 2006, nonviolent campaigns were twice as likely to succeed compared to violent ones. She and Stephan published their results in a peer reviewed journal <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2008.33.1.7> and then they wrote a book [Why Civil Resistance Works: The Logic of Nonviolent Conflict](#) (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011) Here is Chenoweth's TED talk <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YJSehRIU34w&feature=youtu.be>

What Chenoweth and Stephan did was to use the methods of contemporary social science, including regression analysis (finding out the relationship between variables/causes i.e. which is cause and which is effect and the weight of the different causes) to empirically prove the following; 1) Mass civil resistance campaigns over the period 1900 to 2006 were twice as likely to achieve full or partial success than violent campaigns. 2) Mass civil resistance over the same time period has become progressively more successful while violent campaign's success rate has declined. 3) After a successful mass civil resistance campaign, there is a better chance that democracy will be expanded compared to the case with violent campaigns.

The central argument (i.e. why the “force more powerful” (Gandhi's phrase for nonviolent civil resistance) is more powerful) concerns the “challenge to participation”. With nonviolent campaigns the barriers to participation are much lower. 3.5 percent participation of the society virtually guarantees success. With nonviolent campaigns, more people, young, old, male, female can participate. Young men usually dominate violent campaigns. With the higher participation comes

more diversity of the participants, more resilience of the campaign in the face of repression, greater tactical innovation, more disruption to the status quo, and the more likely there will be loyalty shifts in bureaucrats and security forces, the endgame of civil resistance.

Chenoweth and Stephan expand our knowledge of strategy by explaining how methods of struggle or tactics can be classed in two ways: concentrated and dispersed. An example of “concentrated” would be a large demonstration or a building occupation, while a “dispersed” tactic would be a stay-at-home strike or a boycott. Repression works better against concentrated tactics, while dispersed tactics are more difficult to repress. A resilient campaign can alternate between the types of tactics to keep the opponent offguard. Keeping the initiative is very important strategically.

Chenoweth became a widely proclaimed academic after her work, but then she experienced threats against her. Why? I think because her work undercuts our government's and the right-wing's rationale for our regime changing wars like Afghanistan, Iraq, and many more over the years. We say we want to expand democracy when what really is going on is that our corporations want to expand their markets and their profits and the “security managers” (probably the niche Chenoweth was headed for had she not engaged with the history of civil resistance) want more control, aiming at hegemony

Chenoweth and Stephan acknowledge that Gene Sharp's work on the theory of nonviolent struggle was seminal. Over 40 years ago Sharp published the same conclusions that Chenoweth and Stephan found. His 3 volume [The Politics of Nonviolent Action](#) (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1973) is a virtual handbook for nonviolent activists, with the famous 198 methods. Gandhi was a great practitioner of nonviolent action in the 20th century, but he was never able to systematize his insights. That is the niche Sharp occupied.

Sharp used old-fashioned historical analysis rather than the statistical methods of modern social science to prove the point. A part of Chenoweth and Stephan's book contains what they call “case studies” i.e. historical narrative followed by analysis. Those parts of the book are very good.

Sharp wrote once that it is unfortunate that we use the word “nonviolence” to describe different concepts. He uses the word “principled nonviolence” to describe the deep moral beliefs, often anchored in religious principles, exemplified by people such as FOR members. “Nonviolent action” or “nonviolent struggle” is used to describe the mass actions that he and Chenoweth/Stephan describe. The mass of people participating may not have deep moral beliefs about nonviolence. They just want to achieve their political goals. Chenoweth and Stephan use the word “civil resistance” to describe the goal-directed political action outside the normal democratic channels of elections and lobbying (if that is allowed) but excluding violence. There is overlap between the two concepts signified by the word “nonviolence.” since people having deep principled nonviolent beliefs often lead mass nonviolent struggles. Gandhi and King are good examples.

Throughout their work, Sharp and Chenoweth/Stephan use

words like “power”, “force”, “conflict”, and “struggle” that many FOR members may find troubling. Chenoweth sees civil resistance as a form of unconventional warfare using different “weapons”, while FOR people often sing a popular peace song with the lyric “we will study war no more”.

Jamila Raqib will also be a keynote speaker at 2016 Seabeck. She is the Executive Director of the Albert Einstein Institution <http://www.aeinstein.org/>, founded by Gene Sharp, which is dedicated to advancing “the worldwide study and strategic use of nonviolent action”. She explains very clearly how the power of nonviolence works in her TED talk. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZJodZcGfTVE>. Usually, we think “the power” is in the ruler’s hands. But it is also true that power requires the cooperation and assistance of people at all levels. Gandhi said: “the British have not taken India; we gave it to them”. Essentially, power is a relationship. This is the insight upon which nonviolent struggle is based. And, if the ruler or ruling institution abuses their position and becomes oppressive, the followers, helpers, and cooperators can withdraw their support and cooperation. This very human phenomenon has operated from time immemorial, but historians have downplayed it, maybe because “when it bleeds, it leads.”

Raqib collaborated with Sharp in the book Self-Liberation A Guide to Strategic Planning for Action to End a Dictatorship or Other Oppression (2010). FOR members can expect to be challenged at this point. We read in Self-Liberation: “In conflicts between a dictatorship, or other oppression, and a dominated population, it is necessary for the populace to determine whether they wish simply to condemn the oppression and protest against the system. Or, do they wish actually to end the oppression and replace it with a system of greater freedom, democracy, and justice?Many good people have assumed that if they denounce the oppression strongly enough, and protest long enough, the desired change will somehow happen. That assumption is an error.” Self-Liberation, page 1).

Sharp and Raqib maintain that the more knowledge people have about the history of nonviolent struggles all over the world and the more thoughtful the planning, the better the chances of success of the campaign or movement. Because we know oppressive governments and institutions also study nonviolent struggles in order to be able to defeat them, for the people to keep the initiative, it becomes even more important to study and plan campaigns and above all be creative in the use of the “force more powerful”.

In addition to her keynote address, Raqib will lead a workshop on civilian-based defense, a form of nonviolent action little known in the peace community. She will tell us, among other things, about how environmental activists fighting climate change have been applying civilian-based defense with great success. Chenoweth will lead a workshop on “violent flanks”, groups within a nonviolent movement that resort to violent tactics that can affect the outcome, and how to deal with them.



Page 3 Erica Chenoweth



Jamila Raqib

A Vietnam War Veteran’s Poem

intro by the editor, poem by Larry Kerschner

President Obama recently announced a 65 million dollar, 13 year long “commemoration” of the American war in Vietnam. In announcing this program, he said “As we observe the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam War, we reflect with solemn reverence upon the valor of a generation that served with honor”. Many veterans and peace activists think that the effort is being undertaken “to whitewash what really happened and to glorify the Vietnam War as a noble effort.” http://www.olympiafor.org/tv_programs.htm The purpose of the government’s “commemoration” campaign is to make it easier for the U.S. government to fight future wars of aggression. There are too many people still alive who remember the Vietnam war and what it did to a generation. Let them speak.

The Olympia Fellowship of Reconciliation’s May 2016 TV program counters the government effort with truthful information that the Pentagon does not want you to know. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O0bvHWQNWwQ&feature=youtu.be>

The two guests on the Olympia TV program were combat veterans in Vietnam. Like so many others, as young men, they were ordered to go to Vietnam where they were put into a “kill or be killed” situation and then praised when they did kill. We now understand that when a country does this to its young men it is a “moral injury” and causes post-traumatic stress disorder, PTSD. Below is a poem written by one of the guests, Larry Kerschner.

driving I remember
to note
sites which would be good for an ambush
walking I watch the ground for
dirt which may have been disturbed
in the laying of mines
nearly forty years later
I still expect the bullet
to hit that spot
just below my left scapula
that always itches
like a target
nearly forty years later
I remember when we were boy warriors
thrown together far from home
(gun smoke thick as fog
hot brass litter
the lamb-like smell of napalm
burnt indigenous personnel
pile of bodies
slowly moving limbs in rigor
green thick jungle vines
sticky red clay mud in monsoon season)
if he wasn't part of that
piece of me that couldn't come home
maybe I could
remember my friend's face
nearly forty years later

Bankers Caught in the Act by John M Repp

Since the financial crisis of 2007-2008, many people have taken a closer look at how that system works. The goal is to create a better monetary system, one more stable and one we don't need to bail out from time to time, at great expense to ordinary people.

I recently found an academic article on the web that proves empirically, with a scientific experiment, that individual banks create money out of thin air. This they do when they make a loan. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1057521914001070> This is the idea Ellen Brown, a founder of the Public Banking Institute, has been writing about for years. Unless you like reading academic papers, I suggest at most, reading the abstract and the last paragraph. In the last paragraph, the author gives his recommendation for a more accountable monetary system.

The experiment was possible because the author and his fellow researchers convinced a small cooperative bank in Germany to allow them to see exactly what went on inside the bank's accounting and management systems after one of the researchers borrowed 200,000 Euros. EU banks are regulated so they all follow the same procedures, so the experiment holds for all banks in Europe, and I believe, the rest of the world. The researchers learned that the bank did not withdraw the amount of the loan from any other internal or external account. It simply credited the borrower's account with the loan principal. A bank employee manually changed the number in the borrower's account, adding 200,000 Euros.

Most professional economists today declare such a theory of money creation to be a "crackpot" or "utopian" idea. They believe what most people believe, that banks take the money people have deposited with them and use that money to make loans. No new money is created. The economists would ignore the conclusions of this academic paper. And they would attack anyone holding this theory of money with *ad hominem* "arguments", or they use logic to deduce from accepted assumptions that the idea is wrong. But they have never actually investigated the facts, in the whole 5000 years of this kind of banking. This paper investigates the facts.

Many progressive people I have met cannot believe that banks create money out of nothing. I understand the difficulty. It is not what we have been taught. What about the videos or pictures of the government printing money? We have all seen that with our own eyes. Actually, what we see is the Bureau of Printing and Engraving printing cash, which they sell to the Federal Reserve, for 8 cents a bill regardless of the denomination. The Federal Reserve is a huge consortium of private banks with just a few public ones. The Fed distributes the cash to individual banks. Cash and coin is just 3% of all the money in circulation.

The implications of the theory that banks create money are huge and very positive. The private banking industry "privatized" the control of money creation in our country long before neo-liberalism. Money creation should be a power of a

sovereign people. The private creation of money could be declared unconstitutional. Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution gives the power to Congress. Unfortunately it uses the word "coin" to express the idea. But the intention of the Founders is clear if we consider the fact that the Continental Congress started issuing money in June 22, 1775. Emperors and kings had the sovereign power to create money, why shouldn't a democracy have it as well? And why can't we the people today have full sovereignty?

If the Congress takes back the power to create money, why can't they pay off the \$15 trillion debt? Why do we have to cut social programs to balance budgets? Looking to the future, we could pay for the transition off fossil fuels without more taxation. We can afford free education at all public schools. We can afford a universal health care system. We can have full employment. This is no utopia. People will still get sick, and have conflicts.

I must say the author of the paper, rather than wanting to return the sole right to create money to a central government, suggests 1) a network of small credit unions combined with 2) local authorities being able to create debt-free money. The second function could be done in the U.S. by Congress creating money and then revenue sharing with local jurisdictions. This returns the sovereign right to create money closer to ordinary people. OH! The cry will be heard all over by gold bugs and fiscal conservatives. That would be inflationary! The people will want too much! They cannot be trusted! But the author and more and more economists think the key is what the new money is spent on. If it is spent on real wealth creation that meets the needs of people and the people earn a good living and can pay for the real wealth they create, it will not be inflationary.

Right now, we have the unholy alliance of huge private banks and in the U.S., the Federal Reserve, creating massive amounts of money that is then used, by those same banks, to speculate on world markets. The returns on that speculation are higher than investments in needed public infrastructure, education, and health care. Except when they are not, like in 2007-8. Then we bail them out.

**Letter to the Editor
or Why I Allowed Myself to be Arrested Blocking the
Road to Bangor** by Larry Kerschner

Several of us, members of the Ground Zero Center for Nonviolent Action, were arrested for blocking the road to the Bangor Submarine Base in celebration of Mother's Day. I have been asked why I would allow myself to be arrested like this..

My only answer is that until enough people are awakened to the realities of the world we are living in there is no choice. Americans, through ignorance and lack of concern and or vision, are willing to accept the death of millions to maintain our level of comfort. Fr. Richard McSorley, a Jesuit priest, put it succinctly. "*The taproot of violence in our society today is our intent to use nuclear weapons. Once we have agreed to that possibility, all other evil is minor in comparison. Until we squarely face the question of our consent to the use of nuclear weapons, any hope of a large scale*

improvement of public morality is doomed to failure.”. It is necessary that the American underclass, meaning all of us except the top 0.1%, embrace democracy, stop being apathetic and quit being obedient.

The US and Russia have thousands of nuclear missiles aimed at each other with hair-trigger alerts meaning a launch within 15 minutes. The Obama administration has budgeted one trillion dollars over the next ten years to refurbish our entire nuclear arsenal with design plans for smaller thus more easily used tactical nuclear weapons.

There remains an insane illusion within the US that a nuclear war can be won. Our leaders forget the words of President Eisenhower who recognized that the use of nuclear weapons is just another form of suicide.

The nukes used on Japan are considered small by today's standard. Ten kilograms of plutonium, enough to make a weapon similar to that dropped on Nagasaki, when fissioned would generate a temperature of about 10 million Celsius. Following a one megaton nuclear explosion the surrounding 13,000 square miles would be uninhabitable for at least a week. The surrounding 120 square miles would be uninhabitable for one year.

The Trident submarine base at Bangor, up the road on Hood Canal, 20 miles west of Seattle, is the home of about 1,300 nuclear weapons. The Bangor base is the home of nine Trident submarines able to deploy the Trident D-5 missile system. Each of the Trident submarines carries 24 Trident D-5 missiles. Each D-5 missile contains eight 475 kiloton W-88 independently targetable warheads. The King's Bay Trident Base in Georgia has five Trident submarines.

Additionally, the US currently deploys 1,150 nuclear warheads on 510 land-based Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBM) mostly mounted on Minuteman III missiles. Each Minuteman III missile can be armed with up to three nuclear warheads. The Minuteman III warheads can be either W-62 warheads (170 kiloton) or the more powerful W-78 (335 kiloton) warhead.

How evil and insane to use our tax dollars to maintain this murderous system that, if used, will indiscriminately kill millions. Ask yourself why are we as a people continuing to be a terrorist state?

How to Tell TPP Is a Bad Deal

by [Stan Sorscher](#) Labor Representative, Society for Professional Engineering Employees in Aerospace

first posted on Huffington Post Jan 05, 2016, published with permission of the author

How do you tell if the 12-country Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) is a good deal or a bad one? Consider the recent climate summit agreement in Paris. Nearly 200 countries negotiated the deal, more or less in public for the world to see. All signatory countries wanted a sustainable planet where their citizens could prosper. The climate change deal in Paris is [not air-tight](#). Still, it is a significant political, social and moral commitment by leaders of most countries in the world to do better.

TPP [defines bad rules for globalization](#). It sets up skewed power relationships for dealing with climate change, inequality and many other important public policies. Labor and environment show how power relationships work in trade deals. Going back to NAFTA, the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) enforces labor and environmental provisions in trade deals. The U.S.-Peru trade agreement was a high point in language for environmental protections. However, the [World Bank estimates that 80%](#) of logging in Peru is illegal. The [USTR has never enforced](#) environmental protections in Peru or anywhere else. What about labor? First, what ARE the labor protections? No child labor, no forced labor, the right to form unions, no discrimination for religion, race, country of birth. By modern standards, we take these basic human rights for granted. Didn't we win these fights generations ago?

We have trade deals with Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras and Peru, where labor standards are at the level of life-and-death. Guatemala is arguably the [most dangerous country in the world](#) for labor leaders. [Violence against workers in Colombia](#) is still common.

Last year, a jaw-dropping and sobering performance from our negotiators lowered trust in the USTR close to zero. On May 8, 2015, [President Obama spoke at Nike](#) in Oregon about labor rights. Irony aside, the speech was eloquent and inspiring. And if Vietnam, or any of the other countries in this trade agreement don't meet these requirements, they'll face meaningful consequences. ... If you're a country that wants in to this agreement, you have to meet higher standards. If you don't, you're out. If you break the rules, there are actual repercussions.

Four days later, the Senate approved language saying that [all countries in any new trade agreement must meet basic standards](#) for human trafficking. As it happens, six of the 12 TPP countries have serious problems with human trafficking. Of the six, only Malaysia



ground zero center for nonviolent action

<http://www.gzcenter.org/>

Cont. from page 5

failed to meet the Senate's standard for inclusion in TPP. Two weeks after the Senate vote, shocking press reports from Malaysia described mass graves, bodies showing signs of torture and 28 camps where refugees were held in pens for human trafficking. This was the second large-scale discovery of mass graves on the Thai-Malaysia border that month. More reports followed. The Prime Minister of Malaysia is [suspected of corruption in a \\$700 million investigation](#) in the U.S. and other countries. Official corruption extends into human trafficking and jungle camps.

The USTR and Obama administration could have put meaning into the President's lofty promise at Nike. They could have said, "Malaysia is out of TPP. When Malaysia deals effectively with human trafficking, they can dock into TPP like any other country." Instead, on July 27, the official U.S. government [upgraded its ranking of Malaysia](#) regarding human trafficking, without explanation or justification. Presto! Malaysia is qualified to stay in the TPP. [Reuters reported that political pressure](#) inside the State Department evaluation process [pushed up Malaysia's score](#). President Obama's eloquence at Nike will be cold comfort to Rohingya refugees in Malaysia and Thailand who are sold from one human trafficker to another. Similar glowing promises for labor standards, going back to Gerald Ford, are lost on the families of murdered labor leaders in Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras and Peru.

The power relationships in TPP will be great for [factories in Vietnam, where 90,000 workers make Nike's shoes](#). TPP will be great for Hewlett-Packard, Intel, AMD, Dell, Apple and other electronics producers, who use components from Malaysia, [where 28% of workers in the electronics industry](#) are subject to forced labor. Producers of palm oil, textiles, and garments in Malaysia can continue to use child labor. Thailand and Indonesia want to join TPP, alongside reports of official complicity in [21st century slavery in their fishing industries](#). It's clear that [the Obama administration has no real interest in enforcing labor or environmental laws](#). It's shameful to promise 21st century standards, then accept conditions in Malaysia, Vietnam, Colombia, Peru, Guatemala, and Brunei as global norms.

So, what is the difference between the Paris Climate Summit and TPP?

In 2014, over 300,000 environmentalists [marched in New York City](#) to make the case that climate change was a top priority. In Berlin, 250,000 Europeans sent the same message, leading up to the Paris summit. [Pope Francis made climate change a moral issue](#). UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon calls climate change [the defining issue of our time](#). Significantly, [China is racing to capture wind and solar energy](#). Developing countries see energy policy as

their must-have connection to future prosperity. A generation of voters and activists followed the open public process for negotiating the Paris agreement. They could see themselves and their interests reflected in the deal. Inequality is another overriding global issue. [President Obama made inequality a defining challenge of our time](#). As we take on climate change and income inequality as global issues, we see that TPP is worse than a step in the wrong direction. [TPP locks in toxic power relationships](#) that will block positive change for a generation or two. TPP was negotiated in secret, keeping civil society at arm's length. TPP clearly reflects interests of global investors, defining a version of [globalization "of, by, and for the 1%."](#) House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi said we should start over with a [new paradigm for trade policy](#). She and many others would support a deal that does as much for workers and the environment as it does for global investors. That's exactly what we should do. ▼

If you want to be inspired, find someone with a computer and look at this two minute video of the recent Breakfree PNW actions in Anacortes, May 13, 14, and 15 2016.

<https://youtu.be/PFUJvGdjnjY>

