Redekop, Vern Neufeld, and Shirley Paré. "Practical Suggestions for Community-Based Initiatives." *Beyond Control: A Mutual Respect Approach to Protest Crowd–Police Relations*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2010. 219–238. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781849660907.ch-013>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 09:43 UTC.

Copyright © Vern Neufeld Redekop and Shirley Paré 2010. You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

13. Practical Suggestions for Community-Based Initiatives

The word ‘practical’ and its cognate ‘practice’ are derived from the Greek word *prassein*, meaning to do or to act (Barnhart, 1971). Those that have reflected on the meaning of action have shown that an action is complex (Melchin, 1998; Ricoeur, 1992). It takes on meaning within a certain cultural context. It includes, embedded within it, intended consequences. Actions, looked at in hindsight, are revealed to have many consequences that were not intended. Actions may be simple or they may be part of action chains or they may become ongoing practices (MacIntyre, 1981). Those who deliberately take certain actions to affect change, usually do so out of a significant analysis and reflection about what is going on (Freire, 1970). There evolves a pattern of action and reflection such that subsequent actions reap the benefit of accrued wisdom.

Processes leading to this book can be seen from this perspective. First came the challenge from Richard L’Abbé to do something. The initial action did not come out of a vacuum. Rather it meant taking a well developed methodology, Community-Based Conflict Resolution, and applying it to a new situation. Advisory council meetings provided occasion for reflection on what had happened and planning subsequent actions. The chain of actions described in Part Two became the basis for a much more profound reflection, including years of research, resulting in Part One.

Readers of this book will be from many contexts around the globe. They will be playing any of the various roles described above. Hence, the practical suggestions, suggestions meant to enable people to start to take action, start with questions that prompt initial reflections about who should and could do what. Eventually we will get to more precise descriptions of possible actions based on our experience. These are not meant to be recipe cards or techniques that guarantee certain results. Rather they should be thought of as imagination stimulators—as ideas that can generate ever new ways of approaching the challenge of bringing to life the Mutual Respect Paradigm of Protester–Police Dynamics.

We are not alone in suggesting a process approach to relationships between police and others in the community. In November, 2008, the Lokahi Foundation in the United Kingdom sponsored a two day residential

event marked by large and small group processes. It included police and community members. The focus was not on protest crowds but rather on relationships between police and the Muslim community. Evaluations of the event were overwhelmingly positive. (Lokahi Foundation)

We will begin this chapter with an overview of the roles of the parties involved in the crowd relational system; crowd organizers, targets, security, media, and bystanders. We follow with a set of principles developed during our seminars which could represent a first draft of principles that would be adapted to serve the reader's community. We then provide some suggestions for the Mutual Respect Protest Crowd–Police Process that is about how to use this book and how to proceed designing your own project or intervention. We provide two sample processes to get you started. This chapter concludes with our heartfelt wishes for your democratic, non-violent and passionate expression of your unique self, your unique opinion, your unique difference.

What are the Roles of the Different Parties?

There is first of all a shared role for all the parties to come together in a neutral spot and in good faith interact with one another to first understand each other's perspective and then to work together at defining what mutually respectful creative dynamics might mean practically. Within any relational system, people are uniquely empowered by their roles and positions to say and do things appropriately that others could not say or do. What follow are reflections on potential roles of different groups of people.

Role of Crowd Organizers

Crowd organizers are generally leaders within activist organizations. They are usually highly motivated, with a strong concern for their cause. Because of past interaction with security forces, many of them have been subjected to physical violence by being beaten, tear-gassed, sprayed or arrested. By agreeing to enter into cooperative relationships that involve police, they risk losing credibility among their own people. On the other hand, if they see the validity of some new approaches, they are probably the only people with a capacity to convince other activists to enter into a new approach. If they go out on a limb to try a new approach and their goodwill is used against them, it could be extremely difficult to try something new again.

Activists generally like to proceed on the basis of consensus; they try to communicate with one another about what is going on and avoid (where possible) what others might be opposed to. Processes of arriving at consensus provide a useful backdrop for relationally creative dynamics. The challenge is to engage enough activists in dialogue with other stakeholders to really effect a new way of doing business. Since the style within many protest groups is not a top-down command structure but an engagement with grass-roots, it is not sufficient for leaders to simply decide that a new approach can be implemented. Enough opinion leaders from the diverse groups committed to demonstrating at a given event need to have a positive experience interacting with police and politicians in order to create widespread acceptance of a new way of doing things.

Since buy-in is not based on a command structure, communication is very important—a new approach must be communicated clearly and accurately. Communication is a back and forth motion such that leaders quickly get feedback from others in their groups and leaders of other groups. Consensus oriented processes can be time consuming. Any consensus position never reflects all the individual opinions on a given subject—activists are not unified in their opinions—but their opinion usually does reflect what people can live with. A given consensus position among activists includes the right to dissent and to express oneself publicly. There is also general agreement on the types of injustices that need to be exposed. Diversity of opinion is found when talking about strategies and tactics.

Demonstrators have an interest in getting their message across effectively to political and business leaders and to the public at large. They also have an interest in not getting hurt in the process of communicating their message. In many respects the onus is on the target groups and the security groups to convince them that their interests will be truly served through a cooperative approach.

Role of Target

Targets are generally people or groups of people who believe that they have a legitimate right to make decisions on the subjects that are being considered either by virtue of being democratically elected, duly appointed or otherwise in a position to take action (e.g. corporate executives). They study, consult and discuss with as many people and organizations as they feel necessary and are able to, by virtue of time, before entering into decision-making discussions.

From the government perspective, there is a time and place to listen to public opinion and, at the time of a Summit, negotiation or decision-making meeting, the duly responsible individuals feel they consider fairly all opinions they have gathered prior to the meeting. Each activist does not need to be listened to at the time of the meeting for his or her opinion to be considered. Furthermore, arriving at a conclusion contrary to one or more groups' opinion does not mean that their opinions have not been considered fairly. The issue for many activists is that they do not trust that they have been heard sufficiently for their opinion to receive fair consideration.

Targets of crowd protest may feel defensive and out of the defensiveness try to protect themselves. In *Dealing with an Angry Public*, the authors point out that often, angry protesters have very good reasons to be upset. They offer a set of principles for business and government leaders, which if implemented, would help significantly in reducing the level of emotion within crowds. These are:

- Acknowledge the concerns of the other side.
 - Encourage joint fact finding.
 - Offer contingent commitments to minimize impacts as they occur; promise to compensate knowable but unintended impacts.
 - Accept responsibility, admit mistakes, and share power.
 - Act in a trustworthy fashion at all times.
 - Focus on building long-term relationships. (Susskind and Field, 37–38)
- (With appropriate adaptations these could be applied to activists, media and police as well.)

Certain individuals in the target community believe that crowd violence is strictly a police issue. This has contributed to the perception that target communities (e.g. politicians and government officials) are avoiding responsibility and puts them in danger of being scapegoated and dismissed by the wider community. If the underlying perception of some activists is that they do not feel represented by the democratic process of the country then the participation of elected and other government officials becomes critical to the resolution process.

It is always a temptation for target groups to hire media consultants who can frame issues in such a way to get public support. They can be quite adept at getting appropriate experts lined up for media interviews who can slant information in their favour in an attempt to discredit the message of

protesters. If the ethical vision guiding business and government is shaped by a desire to create long-term mimetic structures of blessing such that the well-being of all will be enhanced, it becomes in their interests as people on the planet to listen carefully to those messages from protesters that are based on good research and a thoughtful assessment of current trends, even though the message may be critical of their institutions.

Beyond acting on these principles, political and business leaders can play a constructive role in developing communication processes that enable effective dialogue with crowd protesters. This dialogue could involve meeting with groups of representatives, using closed circuit television to have a two-way exchange or having a series of consultations in advance of a major event. They can also work creatively on new systems, institutions and structures that can attend to the needs and interests of all parties.

Some activists observe that governments are extremely responsive to the influence of people in the business community. To them, policy regarding the environment seems to be developed to protect the economic interests of large corporations which happen to be major contributors to political parties. The Mutual Respect Paradigm opens up the issue of what really influences public policy and what is perceived to have an influence. Trust is extremely important and trust begins with dignity and respect.

Role of Security

As public employees, security personnel have the responsibility to protect everyone in the crowd scenario from harm and violence. Additionally, they must protect the democratic process of decision-making while at the same time facilitating the legitimate expression of dissent. As long as crowds are peaceful the role of security can be peaceful. Security personnel have experiences and memories of violent activists and are wary of the possibility of someone who appears peaceful becoming violent. They also have information about those intent upon using violence and a public responsibility to act upon that information in the interest of the public peace. However, there is always the possibility that their information is inaccurate or that their interpretation of that information may be faulty.

It is risky for security forces to let down their guard. It is risky for them to abandon the tactics that have proven effective in getting the jobs done in earlier times. It is risky for those who want to give a cooperative approach an honest try to stand up to the *status quo* and lead the way. When the old

approach has been seen to be efficient and effective in quelling disturbances it is difficult to replace it with an untried and unproven approach. Sometimes a show of strength has intimidated members of a crowd and quelled the mimetic violence that may have been instigated by the 'two percent.' Many security personnel are seeing the spiral of escalating violence with the use of crowd control tactics and are willing to take whatever risk is necessary to turn around the dependence on defensive tactics. One police participant at Quebec reported that the fence reduced the incidence of toe to toe confrontation with angry protesters and that this was a good outcome—one that allowed them to remain more neutral. Few on the other side who were angry at the fence and demonstrated in a haze of tear gas would agree that the fence was a good thing.

Security services have been thrust into the forefront of dealing with crowds that feel passionately about local and global injustices. They have been asked by leaders to control crowds, shielding leaders and the buildings they are using from those who might wish to make their voices heard, and perhaps occupy buildings and/or disrupt sessions. They have used a variety of techniques—from intelligence gathering, to passive security structures, to negotiations and the use of less than lethal instruments of control, to more aggressive ways of holding crowds in check. The combination of the violence of protesters and the matching violence of police, or to some the initial violence of police and the angry response of crowds have succeeded in introducing a growing mimetic structure of violence into the relational system involving protesting crowds and police. Within this climate, even well intentioned initiatives by police to communicate with protesters in advance of an event are held suspect. Some police are caught in an internal conflict between doing their job, which involves following orders, and sympathy with the issues which protesters are flagging. For example, a police officer, who is a strong supporter of his own union, might have to act against violence on a picket line.

The Mutual Respect Paradigm poses a number of challenges for police. First, if a given scenario has been agreed upon by all parties, there may be unexpected factors that warrant an abrupt change of tactics calling into question the good faith involved in the agreement. These factors could include intelligence reports concerning anticipated violence, legal requirements invoked by new realities or commands issued by those not understanding the Mutual Respect Paradigm. Second, in the post

September 11 reality there is an ever present fear of terrorism. Some of the actions on the part of security might be more to prevent terrorism than to deal with demonstrators. Third, police often cannot talk about what they know because information is classified. The Mutual Respect Paradigm suggests that ways can be found to address these challenges through new communication structures.

There are now in place police negotiators who embody the Mutual Respect Paradigm as they work to facilitate the effective communication of protesters' issues. Their mandate should be strengthened. Police leaders should learn from their experience. All those involved in public order policing and critical incidents should be trained in a way that gives precedence to this paradigm and reinforces the role of police negotiators. This training should include workshops run by third parties and that include representation from the protest community. A key issue to be on the agenda for the training sessions is how to be respectful without institutionalizing protest to the point that it becomes banal and ineffective.

Media

The media are the eyes and ears and sometimes the brains for people in the general population who are not close enough to physically watch the action. They determine what is to be seen on television, heard on the radio, or described in print. How they frame the coverage determines what gets emphasized as being significant and what gets passed over or mentioned in a way that trivializes it. Often politicians base perceptions on what the public feels about a given situation on what is covered in the press and broadcast media and how it is framed. This means that besides covering the news, the media also indirectly make the news. Given this power, different sides manipulate the media as events are staged for the camera. The reality is that media needs stories; journalists have tight deadlines; the easiest way to get a good story on time is to focus on violence or on a clear polarization of positions.

However, given their very crucial role, it is important that media personnel be included in explorations of the Mutual Respect Paradigm and understands what it is all about so that if there is a new reality it can be 'seen,' 'heard,' and presented. Media can play an important role in contributing to mutual understanding of the different parties involved through coverage that brings to light the deeper motivations behind various actions. In fact,

the General Conference of UNESCO passed a declaration of fundamental principles urging media to work actively to promote peace and international understanding. One of its principles is the following:

With a view to the strengthening of peace and international understanding, to promoting human rights and to countering racism, apartheid and incitement to war, the mass media throughout the world, by reason of their role, contribute effectively to promoting human rights, in particular by giving expression to oppressed peoples who struggle against colonialism, neo-colonialism, foreign occupation and all forms of racial discrimination and oppression and who are unable to make their voices heard within their own territories.²¹

The spirit of this principle would serve to reinforce the role of media in promoting a culture in which relationally creative crowd dynamics would work. As well, it emphasizes the importance of giving expression to many of the voices of oppressed people that are taken up by many of the activists.

Journalists try to be balanced in their reporting by talking to those on the different sides of an issue. They have discretion about the questions they ask and the particular answers they report. Used in the interests of mutual understanding and creativity, this discretion could lead to an examination of underlying interests and perhaps overlapping interests that could be met creatively in such a way that neither side would lose. If, in their questioning, they would ask about solutions to the problem, they might get some interesting answers. The 'good story' then would be about why some obvious mutually beneficial solutions are not being implemented.

Role of Bystanders

Bystanders are those not directly involved in crowd action but who are affected by the dynamics. As Ervin Staub points out, bystanders can have a huge impact on the behaviour of other stakeholder groups by voicing encouragement or discouragement of certain actions. After the November

21 Article II-3, DECLARATION ON FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES CONCERNING THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE MASS MEDIA TO STRENGTHENING PEACE AND INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING, THE PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND TO COUNTERING RACIALISM, APARTHEID AND INCITEMENT TO WAR (1978) Adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on 22 November 1978. Taken from Albert Blaustein, Roger S. Clark, Jay A. Sigler, Human Rights Source Book (New York: Paragon, 1987) 338.

2001 G20 gathering of finance ministers, for example, the police report received far more commendations than criticisms for their efforts from the public in a 10 to one ratio, even though a number of demonstrators got hurt in the process. This reflects a public preoccupation with security. The responses to the police have an impact on what they do in the future.

Bystanders are not a coherent group. They are implicated in different ways so we will describe potential roles for different bystander groups.

Immediate Bystanders

Immediate bystanders are those living in close proximity to the crowd–target–police dynamics. In the case of major events like the Quebec Summit of the Americas or the G8 meeting in Genoa, their living and working areas may be cordoned off and they may need security passes to get to home or work. There is also the possibility that tear gas comes into their windows or that protesters smash windows and engage in looting. They may be sympathetic to the concerns of activists, they may support the positions of political leaders on a particular issue or they may be neutral. Since they are affected, it is fair that their concerns be taken into account in managing crowd–target–police dynamics.

Society

Sometimes large communities of people are affected by the violence associated with crowd dynamics since these dynamics are a reflection of society as a whole. People are led to ask, ‘Is this the kind of society I wish to live in?’ Such questions may be prompted by the actions of any of the parties.

The Mutual Respect Paradigm can be seen as enhancing the development of civil society.

Moral Authorities

Moral authorities and religious leaders have a role to play in interpreting what is happening and offering teachings, paradigms and arguments in support of new constructive and cooperative approaches. The Anglican Bishop at the Strategic Leaders Seminar played a valuable and constructive role.

Role of Neutral Leadership Institutions

In instances where feelings are strong and distrust high, there is a need for trusted third party institutions to be involved in creating a safe space for

dialogue, creative scenario development and debriefing. Our experience has been that a university offers a safe space for interaction. People working on developing cooperative approaches to crowd dynamics must be able to maintain the trust and esteem of all affected parties. No one is ever neutral, but it is possible for people to conduct themselves with sufficient neutrality that both sides continue to feel comfortable. Those trained as Third Party Neutrals make a point of doing reality checks to be sure that neither sides perceives them as favouring the other side.

People accept new paradigms if they help understand the truth of a situation. Actions based on new paradigms will continue if they are effective and will die out if they are not. A good understanding of a new approach and suitable processes of dissemination are important for them to take hold. In the case of the Mutual Respect Paradigm, it is important that people of the different stakeholder groups be gathered together in a neutral place and be allowed to explore each others' experiences and understandings in a climate of safety and through processes guided by a neutral trainer. For this to happen, initiatives need to be launched by neutral institutions such as universities in order to create the new climate needed for a new approach.

In addition to broad-based initiatives to enhance cooperation, some people are needed on the ground to attend to particular conflicts that might arise. In his book *Getting to Peace*, William Ury writes about those who 'witness' as a means of creating a third side in a conflict situation. He writes, '... destructive conflict does not just break out but escalates through different stages, from tension to overt conflict to violence. By watching carefully, we can detect warning signals, which, if acted on, can save lives.' Witnesses may be there simply to try to pacify the situation or to enhance communication and reduce violence. Groups like the Non-Violent Peace Force work systematically to create a safe neutral space for those in conflict. In some parts of the world there are Civilian-Based Peace Forces that do not use violence. Christian Peacemaker Teams play an important role as witnesses. Any of these groups might have a role to play in protest crowd-police dynamics. There may be other forms of third party intervention involving processes such as mediation or conciliation to deal with conflicts within particular relational systems. People in this situation get unique glimpses into the life situations of various parties and hence can present a perspective sensitive to the experiences and feelings of both sides of an issue.

It is important that leaders with a broader vision be engaged in the process since there are bound to be setbacks and pitfalls. An example of someone of vision working on a new approach is Sheriff Douglas Call of Genesee County, New York. In the 1980s, he had a vision for victim-offender reconciliation in the case of serious crime. The first case they attempted failed. Instead of giving up, he chose to work on victim support. The result was that when victims' needs were attended to, nine times out of ten they wanted to meet with the perpetrator. The result was creative and constructive sentences that enabled offenders to take steps to make things right with victims and the community.

What are the Rules?

In order for Mutual Respect to work, the various parties have to come to terms with the basis on which they can work together. One way to accomplish this is for them to agree on principles of engagement. These following principles are a first step only and should be developed through facilitated processes involving all stakeholders.

Principles

1. Treat everyone with dignity and respect.
2. Engage a neutral process leader to lead joint planning and debriefing sessions.
3. Develop creative scenarios, with each stakeholder group participating, on how to handle contingencies; communicate these widely to groups.
4. Hold joint debriefing sessions after major events to develop lessons learned.
5. Put in place joint problem-solving structures to handle unforeseen circumstances
6. Share as much information as possible.
7. Clarify the meaning of terms and actions such as violence and non-violence.
8. Respect role specific codes of conduct.

In his book, *Living with Other People*, Ken Melchin (1998) makes a number of observations that are helpful in thinking through how we should act within a Mutual Respect Paradigm. First, as the title suggests, we must acknowledge that we all need to live together on this planet. We are not simply going to get rid of any of the groups described above. Second it is

important to note which direction we are going in terms of progress or decline. Third, when we think of what is right and good we think in terms of different levels—what is important to me, what is important in the relationship and what is important in terms of social structures.

As people think through their approaches to crowd dynamics from their own perspectives, it is important that they think about what kind of society or community they would like to see evolve and what kind of relationship they might like with each of the players implicated in crowd dynamics.

Mutual Respect Protest Crowd–Police Process Suggestions

Ultimately Mutual Respect involves people from different stakeholder groups working together. This book could be used as a catalyst to bring people together for a process in which they accomplish several things together:

- They develop a common understanding of the concept of Mutual Respect in Crowd Dynamics
- They get to know and understand one another better
- They generate new ideas around what it would mean for them to collaborate.

There are several potential uses for this book over and above the pure learning of the concepts contained. First, the book could be distributed strategically to people and informally people could start talking about what they thought about it. Second, the book could be used for a process to establish a basis for working together. If it is to be used for a process, the following questions need to be addressed: Whose process is it? Who should be there? Who will lead the process? How long is the process? What happens in the process? We will offer some ideas about what to consider in relation to each of these questions. The answers are meant to give you ideas about how to proceed.

• *Whose process is it?*

Use of this book starts with you being concerned about crowd dynamics in some particular context. You could be an activist, a police officer, a bystander or a government leader. Whoever you are, you would do well to find like-minded people in each of the stakeholder groups who might work with you on an ad hoc steering committee. Talk to people about the book; give it to

them to read; find out if they are interested in exploring the concept with you. Ideally you would find some institution that everyone feels comfortable with to sponsor the process. With an initial small group of 4–8 individuals you may wish to try out your own process (see below for options).

- ***Who should be there?***

Initially it is important to involve people with considerable leadership skills who are respected within their own organizations or communities. It is desirable to have a good sense of balance among the stakeholder groups. Out of a group of 20, the following would be a desirable group: 6 activists, 6 police, 2 politicians, 2 civil society moral authorities (respected elders, religious leaders, academics, leaders of service clubs, judges, etc.), 2 journalists, 2 business people, residents or community association leaders from the vicinity of a potential crowd. There should be a gender balance.

- ***Who will lead the process?***

The process should be led by a neutral facilitator with whom all of the participants will feel comfortable. There should be a neutral co-facilitator who acts as observer, attending to how people in the group are doing and taking notes to be included in a report on the process. This frees the head facilitator as well as the participants.

- ***How long is the process?***

The process could be one segment of about three hours, three days or a series of segments spread out over a period of time.

- ***What happens during the process?***

The purpose of the process is to facilitate dialogue among members of each of the stakeholder communities. We will give a sample process of three hours, The Crowd Dynamics Dialogue, that will allow community members to assess the potential value of the Mutual Respect Paradigm as presented in this book. We will also provide a sample process for three days, The Crowd Dynamics Seminar, with 12 segments. The Mutual Respect process is evolving and with each successive seminar new approaches are incorporated into the training. We are committed to ensuring that you have the newest and latest information.

Crowd Dynamics Dialogue

The Crowd Dynamics Dialogue is a three hour process. It is assumed that everyone has read the book in advance. *The crowd dynamics dialogue process is confidential unless individuals agree to talk about it outside of the process.* We will outline supplies and equipment needed, make suggestions for ground rules, provide process details including welcome, check-in, opportunity for discussion of the book, four tasks, and circle closing.

Needed: flip chart and markers, Tape, 30 Coloured stick-on dots or 10 pieces of paper.

Ground rules:

1. Treat one another with dignity and respect.
2. Speak the truth with an attitude that you may not have the total picture yourself.
3. Listen carefully.
4. Respect the process and the guidance of the process leader.
5. If you need to leave before the process is over, let the facilitator know in advance. Explain to the group if it seems appropriate.
6. Give one another equal air time.

Process:

Welcome and introduction—5 minutes

Circle Check-in (Each person explains briefly why they are there)—20 minutes

Ask: What are your overall impressions of the book? Discuss—10 minutes

Ask: Are any concepts unclear? Discuss and clarify.—15 minutes

(If someone does not understand a word or concept ask who in the group thinks they understand. Let them explain. Ask the group if this is clear to everyone. Go on to the next question.)

First Task: Pair people up by chance: Divide the number of participants in two, number them off to that number and then number them off again. Those with the same number are to work together.

Turn to the chart comparing the Crowd Control, Crowd Management and Mutual Respect paradigms. Discuss with your partner each of the items of comparison and work together at selecting the three you think are most significant. Write the three numbers on a slip of paper. When the time is up, give the paper to the facilitator.—20 minutes

Break:—15 minutes (During the break, the facilitator puts the results of the vote on a flip chart. Alternately the chart can be enlarged to 11x17 inches. Each pair can be given three coloured dots which they then stick beside their three choices.)

Review the results of the vote. Let people comment.—10 minutes

Second Task: Number people off into groups of four. Each group appoints a reporter. Ask each group to work on the following questions*—30 minutes (give 5 minutes warning before end-time)

What difference would the Mutual Respect Paradigm make in your community?

What are the possibilities for working together as you prepare for the next event?

What are the challenges to working together and how could these be addressed?

Gather the group together and ask each group to report on what they came up with in 3 minutes or less. Total discussion time—15 minutes.

Third Task: Ask the group if there are any actions that need to be taken as a follow-up to this session. Record on the flip chart. Ask who should follow-up. 10 minutes

Fourth Task: Ask the group, if there were another similar session, who should else should be invited. Record on flipchart. 5 minutes

Circle debrief. Go around the circle letting each person talk about insights, dreams, questions, thoughts about the process or feelings that they might have.—20 minutes

***Note:** Remember that dialogue among participants is a primary goal and if a good dialogue begins, that may be more important than covering all of the questions.

The Crowd Dynamics Seminar

The Crowd Dynamics Seminar is a three-day process. As with the Crowd Dynamics Dialogue, it is assumed that everyone has read the book in advance. *The crowd dynamics seminar process is confidential unless individuals agree to talk about it outside of the process.*

The following table gives an overview of topics that could be covered. We recommend a selection of topics customized for the particular participants and contexts of the seminar. The person leading the process should have training as a Third Party Neutral and as a trainer. Such training can be obtained at institutions like the Canadian Institute for Conflict Resolution (information is available at www.cicr-icrc.ca).

	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3
Segment 1	Introduction Census	Roles of crowds, security and government within society	Creative scenario development
Segment 2	Human Needs	Why is there violence	Lessons learned
Segment 3	Paradigms	Dreams and challenges: Crowds and targets	Action plan
Segment 4	Questions you always wanted to ask	Dreams and challenges: Crowds and security	Answers to questions and closure

Census: On the front page census includes names, roles and favorite something (suggest something neutral such as a book/ favorite holiday/ favorite piece of furniture). On the back page the questions could be to list protest situations you have known; what is the most important/ difficult aspect of the crowd relational system? As these questions are not attributable to individuals they provide the opportunity to bring up topics that could contribute a dialogue on the issue later during the seminar process. It creates safety by not requiring depth of conversation in the beginning.

Human Needs: An overview of Redekop’s Human Identity Needs Theory provides common language and a foundation upon which to discuss emotions.

Paradigms: Differentiating among the control, management and mutual respect paradigms provides brief historical background, opportunity for questions and clarification about experiences, roles and goals.

Questions: Many times security personnel and activists have never had an opportunity to exchange ideas in a safe space. These questions provide for that opportunity early on in the training so additional opportunities will be more likely to be taken later on.

Day Two

Roles: Links back to Paradigms and provides a common model upon which to base questions and clarification. Defines the ‘us’ and ‘them’ of the conflict and differentiates between the issues being protested and the conflict on the streets between security and activists framing the roles and players.

Why violence?: An opportunity for deeper introspection about roles. Facilitator cautions about blaming. Theory about structures of violence provides clarity about the consequences of violent incidents.

Dreams—crowds and targets; crowds and security: Begins to develop a concrete positive objective and focus for future relationships within the mutual respect paradigm for activists, targets and security. It also provides a framework for media stories.

Creative scenario development: brings the dreams into more tangible potential as real possibilities are explored.

Lessons learned: can be personal or theoretical.

Closure: can include exchange of contact information

Event Preparation

With adequate preparation time both dialogue and seminars can be used to prepare a community for an international event such as a G8 or G20 in which major demonstrations are expected. The following guidelines represent possibilities. They require a committed cadre of people including seasoned trainers (two of which are experienced with training content), adequate funding, facilities in which to train/ conduct dialogue(s), and community support. Some suggestions include:

1. Establish a steering committee or advisory council that reflects the diversity of the relational system as much as possible.
2. Plan the funding, marketing, media coverage, ongoing research and evaluation of project.
3. Establish timelines.
4. Manage media and marketing.
5. Establish gathering process with one coordinator.
6. Start the project with one or more dialogues. This establishes a cadre of people who are aware of the paradigm and from which to draw for subsequent seminars.
7. Conduct one or more strategic seminars to establish community support and from which to draw potential trainers.

8. Conduct train the trainer training, if necessary.
9. Gather for operational seminars and conduct as many as possible. The objective is to include everyone who wants to be included.
10. Conduct ongoing research and evaluation during the project.
11. After the event, conduct debriefings, focus groups and post-event evaluations.
12. Conduct follow-up interviews with participants.

Train the trainer sessions could also be conducted so that organizations can conduct their own internal dialogues and seminars. Pre-event preparation is aimed at exposing the maximum number of people to the Mutual Respect Paradigm so that a single untoward incident will not result in excessive reaction by anyone in the relational system. Conflict is inevitable—how we deal with it can be respectful and fair.

Conclusion

The world over, citizens have opinions that differ from those of their governing bodies be they democracies or not. They want to express these differences not only during election time but also at times when they believe they can influence decisions that will bring irreversible change to their communities. They want to be safe when they speak out. The freedom to express difference varies from one community to the next, from one democracy to the next and even among dictatorships, and the ability to do so is a measure of the respect and dignity afforded a community. The continuum of dynamics between protest crowds and police that we have presented as three paradigms provides for perspective so that communities can measure how they fit into the world of protest activities. We hope that in learning about how to work out effective protest crowd–police dynamics, community leaders can choose to make less violent choices.

Protesters use a range of strategies and tactics from peaceful marches to violent, chaotic activities to bring attention to their message. Police have responded in ways that ensure they keep the peace, sometimes with a very heavy hand. Targets have both ignored protesters and learned from them. Bystanders have sometimes taken on leadership roles that further the dialogue. The media have learned to frame police–protester crowd conflict in ways that build trust. At Saint Paul University, we have worked out a process that supports safe peaceful interaction among all community stakeholders; a process that respects differences and different opinions and

provides for community members to work together to effectively place their dissenting opinions in the public domain. We were pleasantly surprised at how little effort it took to bridge the gaps in our own community, not that our own community is totally 'there' but that significant dialogue created the will for our community members to work together for safe peaceful expression of opinion. We were confident that the CBCR process dealing with communities in conflict was transferable to many venues and now we have demonstrated that it readily applies to communities in conflict over protest. The process is recommended for all communities with the will to support peaceful protest.

As we researched the literature, we learned that what we did intuitively is totally supported and we found answers for some of the reactions we observed. As the global community comes together, activities in one part of the globe influence all of the rest. We have described the mimetic contagion and concepts of complexity and levels of consciousness that makes this so. In a complex world that can no longer rely on cause and effect the only recourse for peaceful coexistence is dialogue and creatively building relationships. Exactly how this is done will differ from community to community and it will be up to community members be creative in their efforts.

It has been an honour to work in this area. Our belief is that people the world over have the ability and creativity to protect communities from repressive violence associated with their expression of difference and, with the will to do so, every community can provide for peaceful passionate protest.

This page intentionally left blank