

225 N 70<sup>th</sup> 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.

**WWFOR Fall Retreat November 16, 2019 9am to 5pm**

**“Facing Climate and Nuclear Catastrophes; Acting to Protect Life on Earth”**

**St. John’s Episcopal Church 114 Capital Ave. SE (across from the Washington state capitol) Olympia, WA  
Doors open at 8 am. Morning refreshments, and lunch provided. Cost is \$25 per person (or pay what you can)**

The keynote will be “The End of Ice: Bearing Witness and Finding Meaning in the Path of Climate Disruption. Author and journalist Dahr Jamail, on the necessity of listening deeply to the Earth as the planetary crisis accelerates.”

**Dahr Jamail** is a fourth-generation Lebanese-American journalist, who worked as an independent American reporter in the Middle East. In late 2003, weary of the overall failure of the US media to accurately report on the realities of the war in Iraq for the Iraqi people, he went to the Middle East to report on the war himself. Dahr spent more than a year in Iraq, and has also reported from Syria, Lebanon, Turkey and Jordan. He has also reported extensively on veterans’ resistance against US foreign policy, and is now focusing on anthropogenic climate disruption and the environment.

Currently, Dahr lives in Port Townsend, when he is home. He is a feature writer for Truthout (<http://truthout.org/>) His stories have been published in *The Guardian*, *The Nation*, *The Huffington Post*, and *Al Jazeera*, among others. In January, 2019, he published the book *The End of Ice: Bearing Witness and Finding Meaning in the Path of Climate Disruption*.

**Peter Lumsdaine** works with Washington Physicians for Responsibility’s Nuclear Weapon Abolition Task Force. He has a background in environmental protection/justice, and has worked in resource conflict zones throughout the world. He also focuses on the ecological/human societal impacts of rapidly accelerating electronic technologies on earth. In February, 2019, Peter visited Olympia with the Golden Rule Sailboat Project.

**Derek Hoshiko** is a fourth-generation Japanese-American climate and social justice organizer from Island County, WA. He works with For the People—Community Supported Organizing, and is launching a bold project, Rapid and Just Climate Action—to stop global warming within ten years by building broader, more inclusive movements. Derek was a keynote speaker at the South Sound Climate Convention in Olympia in April 2019.

In addition to the different perspectives of the three speakers, attendees will have a choice of several workshops, focusing on action. These will include presentations from Sunrise, the Olympia Coalition to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, and Olympia Public Power.

Jean Gant Delastrada, Planning Committee chair

**NOTICE: ELECTION BALLOTS COMING SOON:** *The governing Board of the WWFOR is the Regional Council. Soon you will receive a ballot with the nominees and volunteers who are willing to serve for the 2019-20 program year. Most ballots will be sent by email. Those who receive a hard copy of the Pacific Call will receive a ballot by mail.*

**IS IT TOO LATE?** by Larry Kerschner

Is it too late for America to elect a President who cares more for our children and our future than for those who care only about money and power? Can we elect a Senate not owned by the insurance companies, Big Pharma, Wall Street and the arms manufacturers?

In 900 days in the White House, Donald Trump has told over 10,000 lies. Last month, Secretary of State Pompeo declared that Iran is “the largest state sponsor of terror” with no evidence. Also with no real evidence, Democrats have pushed the position that Russia interfered with our elections. The International Research Agency, who Mueller claims to be behind this dastardly attack by Russia, spent \$44,000 on Facebook ads before the election. This was a drop in the bucket of the total media budget for Trump-Clinton of \$81,000,000.00.

We are told to look at those evil people who “hate our democracy” and want to control our elections but the United States is the country with the long history of attempting to influence elections in other countries— it’s done so as many as 81 times between 1946 and 2000, according to a database amassed by political scientist Dov Levin of Carnegie Mellon University. In 1953, the CIA organized a coup to overthrow Mosaddeq who had been democratically elected by the People of Iran. In 1968, Martin Luther King said “The United States is the greatest purveyor of violence

in the world”. That hasn’t changed since then.

Both political parties make up the left and right wings of the single war party. Why do both major parties want to blame foreigners for our problems? The Republicans want us to fear Iran and the Democrats want us to fear Russia. Both Parties produce an enemy to make sure the American people aren’t paying attention to what is really happening in the world. Neither wants us to look at the real problems that are destroying our country.

These problems include the energy crisis due to reliance on fossil fuels which has added to the climate crisis of global warming; the economic crisis in which many have to work two and three jobs to make ends meet while 1% massively increase their wealth; the constitutional crisis due to an outdated Electoral College; and the Imperial outreach with 800 military bases around the world. The Pentagon is spending two trillion dollars to rebuild every nuclear weapon and delivery system. What could go wrong in a world so focused on attacking enemies?

Donald Trump is a narcissistic racist autocrat who has overfilled the Washington D.C. swamp with the most corrupt administration since Ronald Reagan. The supposed leading Democrat Joe Biden is Hillary 2.0, anointed by the East Coast corporate-media complex. Most of the Democratic contenders are beholden to one corporate lobby or another. While there is no perfect candidate, there are some who are looking out for the people instead of themselves.

## Movement Building is a PARTY

by Bruce Pruitt-Hamm (*the underlined words are links to Internet sites. For the print edition, if you want to know what the links are, email Bruce at [bp Pruitt-Hamm@gmail.com](mailto:bp Pruitt-Hamm@gmail.com) )*

**Introduction :** This article addresses an overarching lesson, enshrined in a mnemonic acronym, learned while attending the 2019 James Lawson Institute (“JLI”) in Portland, Oregon. The 90 yr. old Rev. James Lawson is perhaps the closest we get to having access to Martin Luther King, Jr., if he had lived until today.

The Rev. James M. Lawson Jr. met the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. in Ohio at Oberlin College in 1957, while King was lecturing. At the time Lawson, having returned from 3 years of teaching in India, was preparing for graduate work. Lawson explained to King that he had decided while in college that he would become a Methodist minister and go south to dedicate himself to dismantling segregation and racism. Fascinated by Lawson’s experiences in India, King noticed that they were both the same age, 28. He implored Lawson to come south. ‘Don’t wait! Come now! You’re badly needed. We don’t have anyone like you!’ Lawson is now 90 yrs. old.

Joining Lawson was Dr. Mary King (not related to MLK), on staff with SNCC in the 1960’s, now serving as Director of the JLI and a professor of peace and conflict resolution at the UN University for Peace. Joined by 17 highly intelligent and experienced presenters and facilitators, the 32 participants spent 4 days of training from 8:30 AM to 8:30 PM at Portland State University April 24-28, 2019.

The JLI had 3 goals, to: 1) learn, from case studies of nonviolent struggles, the fundamentals of how to devise powerful campaigns of nonviolent action to address 21<sup>st</sup> century issues and circumstances; 2) share insights and research about the “operative techniques” of nonviolent action; and 3) prepare practitioners to create wise strategies, including communication strategies, for the work ahead.

During the Institute, Lawson insisted that the mass movement needed to accomplish the vision of the Beloved Community envisioned by King was going to be made up of strategic campaigns, not just a random assortment of tactics and “one-off” protests. Using theory and tactics inherited and embellished from Gandhi’s campaigns, Lawson revealed that the enormously successful Nashville lunch-counter sit-in campaign in 1959-60 was explicitly planned, not a spontaneous student protest as depicted by the media. We watched a [30 minute documentary](#) (26:24 to see just the Nashville component of A Force More Powerful )about that campaign several times in order to distill its deep wisdom. We heard academic research and eyewitness anecdotes from Lawson and King that illustrated the “ground crew” of women and non-famous actors whose critical role in planning and preparation of these campaigns has been ignored by popular history. Thus, a primary focus of our time was spent on how to plan, as well as execute, strategic nonviolent campaigns.

What are “the fundamentals of how to devise powerful campaigns” of NVDA that we learned at JLI? After analyzing the Nashville campaign with Lawson and King, participants were asked to consider this question. In a small breakout group, I offered the mnemonic “PARTY” to help us keep these fundamentals in mind. The mnemonic was shared and appreciated. Thus, this article attempts to provide further details and resources using the PARTY framework, relevant to

“creating wise strategies...for the work ahead.” Like many frameworks, it appears sequential, but is actually a dynamic process repeated throughout the campaign as campaign organizers adapt to changing conditions. Thus, our mantra: “Plan, Act, Recruit, Train; Learn from What Happens and then Do it Again”...all pointed toward an ultimate YES! that serves as our North Star.

Below each of the 5 parts of this framework are a few tools, many shared during the JLI, some from related resources, followed by a listing of resources for further study by those activists who are serious about becoming “architects of the movement.”

Did the JLI accomplish its 3 goals? I think so, if nothing else, it taught us to PARTY!

**Planning and Preparation:** Central to the effectiveness of the nonviolent direct action (“NVDA”) campaigns of the 50’s and 60’s in the U.S. black freedom movement, per Lawson, was “planning and preparation”. Perhaps more than any other lesson, Lawson repeatedly and emphatically advised us to do serious preparation and planning, to strategize, not just “act”. He also saw weaknesses in modern protests that were not part of an ongoing campaign. To heed this advice, we should hereafter stop referring only to NVDA and add references to NVDAC (Nonviolent Direct Action Campaigns).

Lawson warned against getting stuck in reactive protest and encouraged us to strategize and then take the offense, anticipating and planning for the likely responses from opponents, neutrals and allies. The training emphasized the importance of timing or sequencing, and the need to escalate to achieve campaign objectives. Of critical importance was identifying the “target constituencies” who make up the “pillars of support” upon whom the targeted powerholders depend to maintain their power. Further, to also identify “allies” and “neutrals” in a “spectrum of allies” who could be educated and motivated by communications strategies designed appropriately for the target audience of any tactic used.

Some Tools: [8 Stages of MAP](#) , [5 stages of Strategy for a Living Revolution](#) , [6 stages of NVDAC by ML King](#) , [Pillars of Support](#) , [Spectrum of Allies](#) , and [SMART model](#) .

Resources for Strategic Planning of Campaigns: [Step by Step Guide to Strategic Campaign Building- Marovich](#) ,[How We Win-Lakey](#) , [NV Action Handbook- WRI](#) , [Sharp, Waging Nonviolent Struggle](#) , [This is an Uprising](#) ,and [CANVAS Curriculum](#)

**Action:** NVDA is nothing without “action”. Then again, building a house is nothing without actually doing some building. But this doesn’t mean one can dispense with planning or adapting the design as underlying conditions become known. So too, with campaigns of social change. We plan, we act. We adapt, plan and act again as our tactics and methods produce reactions.

(continued on page 3)



James Lawson and Martin Luther King at Nashville

Cont. from page 2

In JLI we learned that the Nashville organizers used the lunch-counter sit-in tactic very consciously, emphasizing nonviolent discipline (through training and otherwise). However, it was used as an initial tactic to dramatize that what most folks thought was “normal”, i.e. segregation, was deeply immoral and needed to change. When the anticipated vigilante and official repression ensued, the participants didn’t break ranks or turn violent. The public became aware there was an issue. When well-dressed students were arrested, their parents and relatives in the community were aroused to action. Public attitudes started to change. When the home of the leading black lawyer defending the students was bombed, those who were apathetic or neutral moved toward the movement. The repression backfired and strengthened the campaign. The campaign escalated to include a boycott of downtown stores. Ultimately, the “moderate” Mayor was pressed to choose, morally, whether refusing service to a paying customer because of skin color was right or wrong. He said it was “wrong” and the “silent majority” saw the dikes of Jim Crow were breaking and the lunch counters were soon integrated. The campaign objective had been accomplished. With it, a significant step taken toward the larger goal of ending explicit Jim Crow segregation, like the apartheid of South Africa, and driving it into the dustbin of history by creating a sea-change in public sympathies.

Some Tools: [Sharp’s 198 and growing “methods” of NVDAC](#) , Resources: [AFMP: The Nashville Campaign](#) , [Beautiful Trouble](#) , [Beautiful Rising toolbox](#) , [Waging Nonviolence](#) , and [Nonviolence News](#)

**Recruiting:** Researchers Erica Chenoweth and Maria Stephen have shown that nonviolent campaigns for fundamental changes in governments are twice as likely to succeed as violent campaigns.(Chenoweth study; TED talk ) The key to this difference, they believe, is participation in the movement. Nonviolent campaigns allow more people to participate in a wide variety of tactics. Recruiting people to join a guerilla army usually means only young men in good health with few, if any, dependents can even consider participation.

A nonviolent campaign takes full advantage of this and builds recruitment strategies into the campaign plan from the start. Lawson informed us that most of the students who later came to lead the Nashville campaign and the sit-ins were actually recruited “one on one”. Thus, the first “action” of a nonviolent campaign organizer is to select and recruit the initial core group, much like union organizers would find natural leaders among the workers they were trying to organize and then support them to emerge as the leaders of the union organizing effort.

Subsequent “recruits” were drawn to the Nashville campaign by the actions themselves, drawing the picture of well dressed, well-behaved, integrated, peaceful young people contrasted with brutish thugs conducting bullying operations while police looked on without intervention. These actions combined the concepts of the “picture demonstration” and the “dilemma demonstration” to great effect. The media of the day, newspaper and increasingly television, was publicizing that contrast...and the formerly apathetic were choosing sides.

“Branding” and communications strategies in the Information Age must, by necessity, be adapted from the late 1950’s when the Nashville campaign was planned. At JLI we learned the importance of knowing who your audience is and designing your communications strategy to move them from indifference to action. As the Serbian activists who nonviolently overthrew the

brutal dictator Milosevic summarized:

“The goal of your communications campaigns is to move people from indifference to your movement and your vision of tomorrow, to interest, to knowledge, to dedication, and finally to action for your movement and your vision of tomorrow....In order to communicate messages, you need to decide whom you want to impact (the target), what needs to be said (the message) and how to communicate things that need to be said (the messenger). You also need to know the effect that your message and messenger are having, so you can adjust accordingly (feedback).”

Thus, if your campaign has an event or action of any kind, remember to plan your communication strategy for the target audience. For those who are moved from knowledge to action, find ways to gather contact information and get them involved. An excellent way to do this is through “training”.

Beyond recruiting targeted populations into the movement, we must also be vigilant for several serious threats to recruitment.

First, we have the problem of “violent flanks”, people who express sympathy for the goals of the campaign, but choose to use violent, offensive or otherwise detrimental tactics that disrupt and/or mitigate the strategic design of our tactics. Tom Hastings and Phillippe Duhamel each gave excellent presentations on this topic. They emphasized the seriousness of the problem, cited the research about this phenomenon and strongly encouraged campaign organizers to develop and require a nonviolent discipline, emphasized thoroughly through training and communications, to make clear that any violence was instigated by others, not the campaign.

Second, repression, either from vigilantes or from government sources such as police or military, were discussed. The key point was to expect repression, prepare for repression and design the campaign so that when repression occurred, it would backfire and actually make the sympathies of the target population (aka pillars of support) swing to the movement. In the Nashville campaign, the bombing of a black lawyer’s home proved pivotal in swinging public sympathy toward the campaign, which likely would not have occurred with violent tactics being used before or in reaction to the bombing.

Third, the ranks of campaign activists may be depleted from burnout and alienation. In terms analogized from military campaigns, this refers to “troop morale”. The “calling out culture”, when it involves “shaming and blaming”, was acknowledged to have detrimental impact, as was a refusal to dismiss the oft-hidden, but powerful, dynamics of “micro-aggressions” that leave people with societally marginalized identities feeling “less than”, “left out” or worse. The remedies were discussed and key lessons included: 1) conflict avoidance is not the same as conflict resolution; and 2) a model of “calling in” to contrast with “calling out”; bringing an oppression or personal issue to the fore but with the goal of insight, forgiveness and redemption, rather than shaming and shunning.

**Training:** Key to the success of the Nashville campaign was training. This is as basic to NVDAC’s as it is to military campaigns. Without training, discipline suffers. Without nonviolent discipline, repression appears more justified and moving the needle of public attitude and participation becomes more difficult. Training goes beyond instilling the commitment to nonviolence and preparing participants for repression (official or vigilante). There are special skills needed for the wide variety of tactics employed in a NVDAC. For example, when participants are trained how to run efficient, democratic (and dare I say “fun”) meetings, you lose fewer participants to burn-out. When civil disobedience actions include training in what to expect in the legal system, your participants experience less fear and anxiety.

=====

## Making sense of NAFTA and its replacement

**Why we need new economic policies before we can fix trade deals** by Stan Sorscher (edited and abridged for print edition, see <https://wwfor.org/making-sense-of-nafta-and-its-replacement/> for the whole article.)

In 2016, Donald Trump's trade message was very simple: the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was the worst trade deal ever negotiated. He has renegotiated NAFTA, rebranding the deal as the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA). We never quite understood his objection to the original NAFTA, and we don't understand how USMCA fixes it. You need to squint to see the difference between NAFTA and its replacement.

"I have a gut, and my gut tells me more sometimes than anybody else's brain can ever tell me," Trump has said. His gut instinct said NAFTA was bad. Unfortunately, gut instinct is typically simplistic, often impulsive, and by definition not strategic or coherent.

We need to think of our domestic policy and trade policy together. Tariffs, like trade deals, make sense only as tools within a larger coherent strategy. Trade policy should reinforce the principles in our domestic policy. If trade policy is not working, it's a fair bet that our underlying domestic policies aren't either.

Since 1980, the prevailing political message has been, "Markets will solve all our problems. Government is the problem."

The term for this is neoliberalism. Neoliberalism "frees" markets by shrinking government, dismantling social programs, and cutting investment in education and research-and-development.

Many of our biggest problems — climate change, growing income inequality, health care, food safety, and workplace safety — are textbook **market failures**. Neoliberalism responds with its universal prescription — make business succeed and well-being will trickle down to the rest of us.

NAFTA is a direct reflection of those principles. In free trade orthodoxy, **investor interests** are more important than public interests. The NAFTA model blurs national identities and national boundaries, devalues the idea of public interest, and merges our domestic economy into the global economy.

GE, Apple, Exxon, General Motors and other large global companies move production to low-wage countries, putting the short-term interests of their investors above the long-term well-being of everyone else. The consequences are predictable — deindustrialization of our economy, inequality, a scary weakening of social cohesion, and political instability.

NAFTA cannot be "fixed" incrementally. We need a new approach to our domestic policies, and a new trade policy to match. China has approached globalization very differently. Their "Made in China 2025" strategy is a comprehensive manufacturing strategy that targets 10 industries of the future. China's One Belt One Road program is an equally impressive global infrastructure strategy that strengthens China's export strategy.

We used to make public investments in infrastructure, education, and research in new technologies. Prior to 1980, we had national strategies to invest in education, infrastructure, and R&D. We took stewardship of the environment and made workplaces safer. We managed those important public interests, in balance with investor interests, using national strategies.

In the '30s, the Great Depression discredited laissez faire capitalism. President Franklin D. Roosevelt felt huge popular pressure to "do something." He introduced the New Deal, which was fundamentally a statement that government

played a legitimate role in managing the economy — to address market failures and improve well-being.

The New Deal was a trial-and-error exercise in industrial policy, with some steps forward and some steps back. We strengthened rights for workers, created the Securities and Exchange Commission to regulate corporations, modernized the role of the Federal Reserve, brought electricity (infrastructure) to rural America with the TVA and Bonneville Power Administration. We built airports, bridges, tunnels, levees, waterways, and other public works, we opened national parks, and established social safety net programs like Social Security, unemployment insurance, and workers' compensation.

In the post-war period, we created the Marshall Plan which rebuilt Europe's economy, to our advantage. A generation of soldiers went to college with the GI bill. We built the interstate highway system, passed Medicare and Medicaid, successfully managed the space program, subsidized higher education generally, and invested billions in basic science and R&D. Perhaps our last great exercises in industrial policy were public investments that led to the Internet, GPS, and global communications.

Social cohesion improved with civil rights legislation, rights for women, and fair housing. We created the EPA, with a mandate for clean air and clean water. These national policies raised living standards, and shared prosperity (with significant exceptions).

We need to acknowledge several principles:

- 1) The neoliberal approach is exhausted socially, politically and economically.
- 2) The purpose of an economy is to raise living standards and improve well-being generally.
- 3) The purpose of a political system is to make sure the economy raises living standards and improves well-being generally.
- 4) Every country has its national identity and legitimate national interests.

You can have national interests without being nationalist. Every country in the world has an industrial policy. Japan, South Korea, and Singapore made extraordinary leaps from third-world status to first-world status, using well-crafted national strategies. China has elevated industrial policy to a fine art. Germany, the Nordic countries, and others have pretty good ones. Ours sucks.

Industrial policy is the philosophical opposite of free trade. The U.S. Trade Representative's General Counsel once explained that his job under neoliberal trade rules was to search the earth for industrial policies and oppose them. That's why NAFTA cannot be fixed incrementally.

We need national strategies to address the defining problems of our time: inequality, deindustrialization of our economy, and climate change.

THEN, we can write a new trade policy that manages legitimate national strategies in the global economy.

Democracies settle such questions in elections.

The Green New Deal could be our next big industrial policy — with trial-and-error like Roosevelt's New Deal of the 30's. We have obvious infrastructure challenges that will require public investment. Curiously, the most interesting items in USMCA are modest industrial policies.

Our health care system is arguably among the 3 or 4 biggest market failures in human history. We could approach public health with a coherent strategic national policy that makes us more competitive economically. New policies for taxation, patents, intellectual property, corporate governance, and local economic development could leverage production in the U.S.

The 2016 election broke the spell of "free trade" neoliberalism. In 2018, candidates won with policies that put people first. Candidates for 2020 are just now proposing serious national strategies for the economy and environment. We will see more.