Redekop, Vern Neufeld, and Shirley Paré. "Mutual Blessing ." *Beyond Control: A Mutual Respect Approach to Protest Crowd–Police Relations*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2010. 123–137. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781849660907.ch-008>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 08:05 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.

8. Mutual Blessing

From the framers of constitutions to spiritual leaders, people have created language that provides a vision for human well-being—from ‘life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness’ and ‘peace, order and good government’ to ‘let justice roll like a river’ and ‘I have a dream that ... little black children and little white children will walk hand in hand.’²⁰ These all contribute to a discursive field that can be related to the concept of mimetic structures of blessing. These are structures in which the attitude, actions and orientation of the parties in a relational system are directed toward mutual well-being (Redekop, 2002).

The transformation of mimetic structures of violence to mimetic structures of blessing includes both the reduction of violence and the hold that violent impulses have on people, on the one hand, and the development of a context in which creative new options can emerge that enable all parties to both thrive and contribute to the thriving of one another, on the other. This transformation is the goal and the process of reconciliation.

As noted in the introduction, for some people, ‘blessing’ can be a problematic word (Redekop, 2007). When we use it to designate mimetic structures of blessing, we mean a pattern within a relational system whereby people contribute to the mutual wellbeing of one another. Blessing includes generosity, care, willingness to understand, and empowerment. Mimetic structures of blessing are joyous, creative and life oriented. In mimetic structures of blessing, people include the Other positively within their identity make-up. The advantage of using the concepts of mimetic structures of violence and mimetic structures of blessing as categories of analysis is that it gets away from the discourse of blame which can be another form of violence and form the basis for scapegoating.

Much of the mandate, vision and orientation of both protest crowds and police is the building and maintaining of mimetic structures of blessing. Protest crowds that speak of injustice are oriented toward trying to reduce the violence that adheres within various relational systems. They have a vision

20 These phrases come from the Constitution of the United States of America, the legal mandate for Canadian peace officers, the book of Amos in the Hebrew Bible, and a speech of Martin Luther King, Junior, respectively.

of blessing. Police, as peace officers, are oriented toward protecting people who might be victimized; they are trying to prevent violent outbreaks that destroy property. In a democratic environment, they are trying to uphold the constitution, the rule of law, and the orderly change of government that provide a context for a non-violent approach to governance. These are police and protesters at their best and in response to their respective callings. However, they, like people everywhere, are not immune from mimetic structures of violence.

In this chapter we will develop further the concepts of mimetic structures of blessing and of reconciliation. We will then try to identify where these are present within the protest crowd–police relational system and how they might be extended. This will prepare us for the discussion of paradigms in the following chapter.

Mimetic Structures of Blessing

Parties may create mimetic structures of blessing in one relational system and participate in mimetic structures of violence in other relational systems. Some protesters may use the discourse of care in relation to the environment, for example, but use hostile words and actions in relation to police. Police, for their part may express brotherly and sisterly solidarity with other police, marching in support of ‘fallen comrades’ on one hand and use violent actions against ‘bad apples.’

The concept of mimetic structures of blessing suggests a broad ethical vision that transcends antagonistic polarities. It does not preclude conflict but offers a framework in which conflict is transformed into creativity and ever new options. It suggests an orientation of mutual respect and even care without prescribing how that might be expressed.

In this section we will examine the connections between mimetic structures of blessing and emotions as well as the links with creativity, complexity, and level of consciousness.

Blessing and Emotions

Probably the biggest single obstacles to mimetic structures of blessing are the emotions and the subsequent interpretations and impulses that support violence. We will examine these first, looking at some of the ambiguities

associated with them. We will then look at how mimetic structures of blessing can address these emotions and finally talk about the emotional payoff if mimetic structures of blessing are created.

In chapter three we talked about the emotions that are stirred up with a threat to human identity need satisfiers:

security–anger,
action–depression,
connectedness–sadness,
security–fear, and
recognition–shame.

We also said that a large number of emotional combinations can be invoked through a threat to a combination of need satisfiers.

Within a mimetic structure of violence, identity needs are repeatedly, and sometimes continuously, threatened. There is not only a primary emotional reaction to a given threat, but there is an immediate calling up of emotional memories associated with a similar threat in the past such that the emotional impact is intensified. If people are locked into a hegemonic structure in which they are at the mercy of a dominant group, every time they try to advance themselves relative to this group they are put down. Each time, they feel powerless to do something and angry at the injustice of it all. Each time, the feelings grow stronger, resentment deepens and turns to hatred. Hatred is a combination of emotions that prompt an orientation and commitment to do violence to one's Other. At an extreme it wishes the death of one's Other.

Those whose identity is wrapped around their superiority in relation to others are threatened at the identity level when the Other tries to identify with them. They do all they can to keep in their superior position and as tensions and threats escalate they can become imprisoned in their own security systems. They refuse to have any contact with the Other for fear of losing their superiority. When protesters refuse to meet with police or police refuse to meet with protesters there are some elements of fear of sharing strategies and fear of losing their superiority involved. The fear reflects a mimetic structure of violence.

In the face of injustice inspired anger, fear, resentment and hatred, the last thing that people want to hear about is reconciliation and blessing. These emotions function as a firewall against any real consideration of these

concepts and the actions that might lead to them. The only things that can overcome this emotional firewall in people locked in a mimetic structure of violence are

- an experience of positive emotion-charged action such as a gesture of generosity or hospitality which then can grow mimetically, or
- a cognitive and volitional transformation whereby they decide to embark on the reconciliation/blessing journey even though it flies in the face of what they are feeling.

In order for the latter to happen, they have to have a conceptual understanding of blessing (in whatever words it might be expressed) and an imagination that is open to its pursuit. In the section on reconciliation we will explore further how this might come about.

It is important that the very process of creating a mimetic structure of blessing be deeply respectful of the emotional realities of the parties involved. At times these are at the level of post-traumatic stress syndrome. There is a complex emotional dance that is involved that demands sensitivity to the emotions that exist without allowing those emotions to dictate future relationships. If people, who are emotionally vulnerable or charged, interpret outside actors as asserting pressure on them to change they will feel re-victimized and the emotional firewall will grow stronger than ever.

Destructive emotions drive mimetic structures of violence. However, because they hijack cognitive, volitional, heuristic and hermeneutic capacities of the mind, they can disguise themselves in the language of logic, justice and objectivity. They may say, 'Reason over passion,' but their behaviour shows how reason is prompted by passion. How they think, what they commit to, what they discover and how they interpret reality are all driven by their emotions. If they hate their adversary, that hatred will captivate their imaginations such that they will not even see gestures of goodwill, nor will they hear conciliatory words, nor will they imagine a positive future together.

If the firewall is penetrated by goodwill and parties proceed in a process of reconciliation, there will be an emotional pay-off. As relationships are built up and trust re-established, fear diminishes. As stories are shared, historical memories are re-framed. Not only are destructive emotions reduced, but positive emotions like self-respect, self-confidence, and joy are increased. Emotional transformations are some of the hardest goals to achieve. There

is neither formula nor technique that makes it easy. However, when they occur they provide some of the greatest satisfaction ever.

Protest crowds are driven by emotions—positive and negative—that are inspired by injustice. Some protesters harness their care for third parties by pressing for a message to be heard and change to be implemented at the level of policy and practice. Other protesters are driven by hatred that is nursed by a history of bad experiences. These emotions are operative in the primary relational system that includes the protest crowd and the target. However, if the police are perceived to be in solidarity with the target, are seen to be thwarting effective protest, or are experienced as being violent toward the protest crowd, the destructive emotions can be directed toward the police. Dealing with the emotional side of protest crowds in a way that will enhance mimetic structures of blessing in all relational systems is itself a complex undertaking.

Complexity, Creativity, and Consciousness

Complexity, creativity and level of consciousness are interconnected concepts that can work together to build mimetic structures of blessing even in the most unlikely circumstances. It has already been argued that protest crowd events are themselves complex systems. As such they are beyond linear control, can evolve to the edge of chaos where anything can happen, and are subject to significant change with minor interventions at the right place and time.

Complexity

Numerous aspects of a large protest crowd, such as a G-8 protest, constitute a complex system. The issues combine different intertwined aspects of globalization. The perceived target is multi-faceted—multinational corporations, corrupt governments, multilateral financial institutions—even though the immediate target, the government leaders, is more focused. The protest crowd has an array of affinity groups, many of them concerned about different issues—labour, poverty, environment, human rights. Security involves multiple police forces/services from all of the different countries represented. Military force may be implicated as a back-up plan. Surveillance and intelligence gathering are multi-focused and could involve several agencies. The bystander population reaches out in concentric circles to a global media audience, as media from many countries are present.

The protest crowd–police relational system is complex even in smaller more focused crowd situations. The complexity may be a little less obvious but it is there. First, in terms of discourse about the issue, there is a flurry of communications through the internet. Communications from Government are meant to ‘sell’ a given policy. Critiques are evident in the media, but also whizzing through internet connections. Organizational information is received by members of affinity groups but police also receive the same information and interpret it differently. There are ethical ambiguities built into the dynamics as well. Protesters may be attuned to a high ethical standard in terms of the issues but may revert to a different standard if they get into a good guy–bad guy mentality towards the police. The police may agree with the issues of the protesters but they ‘have a job to do’ which may involve limiting the scope and effectiveness of the protest. On one hand, police can differentiate between a protest against human rights abuses and a racial supremacist group that spreads hate; on the other hand, it is not up to police to determine who can protest and about what.

There are legal issues as well. We have already shown that police are not always rigorous about law enforcement in the context of a protest crowd because to do so indiscriminately could cause ‘troubles.’ However, this raises questions around which laws are enforced, or if the enforcement of some laws could be used to manipulate a crowd, or perhaps if the appearance of enforcing a law might allow police to arrest a protest leader who has broken no law. The cumulative effect of all this complexity is that protest crowd events are positioned on the edge, the border, if you like, of not only chaos, but of cultural norms and limits. As such, they are at the confluence of change.

Creativity

Creativity involves new combinations of things and ideas, re-framing and re-interpreting reality and the emergence of new paradigms and world views. A simple illustration of creativity, that is combining things in new ways, was the placement of a motor, already developed, into a carriage which became a ‘horseless carriage’ that evolved into an auto-mobile (self-moving) or car. In the realm of ideas and art similar things happen. In the 1930s in Saskatchewan, Tommy Douglas took his concern over poverty and health and combined it with the concept of publicly funded programs

to support the common good. His position of Premier in the provincial government enabled him to institutionalize publicly funded hospitals and eventually medical care for everyone in the province. This became the model of Medicare for all Canadians.

Creativity can lead to a change of paradigm, or way of perceiving reality. Charles Darwin took observations about similarities and differences in plants and animals and re-interpreted the data within a unified theory of evolution. Similarly, Copernicus took the intricate measurements of the different positions of planets in the sky and re-interpreted the same data as had previously used to plot complicated circles in the sky to see the planets simply as moving around the same centre—the sun.

In the next chapter we will use the concept of a change of paradigms to look at the protest crowd–police relational system. For the time being, we are looking at a shift of paradigms as one dimension of creativity. As data is reframed and new paradigms are developed creativity pushes us in the direction of new insights and the emergence of new levels of consciousness and worldviews. The very nature of creativity as insight and emergence of new ways of thinking is such that the results can never be pre-determined. Insight happens in an open system and usually through the interaction of diverse perspectives.

Creativity can be oriented toward violence or toward blessing. Command economies of weapons development can create the means to hurt and destroy populations in new ways. On the other hand, research into the prevention and cure of diseases can enhance the lives of many. Similarly the dynamics of protest crowds interacting with government and business leaders could produce new solutions to old problems or they could deteriorate into violent confrontations in which everybody loses except those who have a vested interest in nothing changing or the conflict continuing.

New Levels of Consciousness

Over the last several decades, a great deal of work has been done around the emergence of new levels of consciousness (Wilber, 2001). This has included developmental psychologists measuring cognitive development and moral thinkers looking at stages of moral development, anthropologists examining cultural development, and integrative thinkers combining insights from all of these into integrated models of levels of consciousness. One of the latter, Richard McGuigan, used developmental theories of Robert Kegan and Ken

Wilber to examine the question of levels of consciousness and conflict. He demonstrated that the more complex the conflict, the higher level of consciousness was needed to deal with it effectively—that is, creatively, without letting it deteriorate into violence (McGuigan, 2006). This suggests that if all of the parties involved in protest crowd–police dynamics have an openness to learn from each other and from the complexity of the situation they could deal with it more productively, allow new and creative options to emerge and grow in their own levels of consciousness. Much of this has, in fact, happened within a number of democracies as the interactions between protest crowds, governments and police has moved societies into universal suffrage (from only propertied white males being allowed to vote initially) and to such things as a recognition of the right to collective bargaining on the part of labour unions. These developments can be seen as creative, emergent and transforming.

Since the transformation from mimetic structures of violence to mimetic structures of blessing can be framed as reconciliation, in the next section we will present elements of reconciliation—aspects and processes that need to be present in varying degrees to move destructively conflictual parties closer to a situation where they can co-exist tolerantly and further to where they can enhance the well-being of one another.

Reconciliation

Reconciliation is concerned about long term relationships. As such, it can be understood as both a goal and a process (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 2004). Reconciliation as a *goal* may have spectrum of outcomes, ranging from an agreement to stop all forms of violence, to living with as much distance between the parties as possible, to tolerant co-existence, to mutual respect, to friendship and a desire for mutual well-being (Sluzki, 2003). Reconciliation aims to deal with the aftermath of *past* victimization and prepare parties for a peaceful *future* together.

At times, parties needing reconciliation are separated geographically and psychologically. In other instances such as the populations of such conflicted areas as Northern Ireland, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Rwanda, South Africa and Israel–Palestine, antagonistic parties to a deep-rooted conflict continue to live as neighbours. In these cases the need for reconciliation at levels from political leadership to grass roots is particularly acute (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 2004).

Reconciliation as a *process* may be understood as a complex set of exchanges that include a number of elements. At times, the process is directed through a conscious well-defined effort to achieve reconciliation, in other instances, the process may take place at the tacit level with different actors intuitively taking a variety of initiatives. Invariably, the process will include some or all of the following elements (Redekop, 2002):

- 1) Vision and mandate: either one of the parties or a third party has a vision and desire for reconciliation and obtains a mandate to work to that end.
- 2) Safety: the safety of the parties needs to be assured. This means that overt violence must be halted. Sometimes a legal framework needs to be in place to assure the safety of potential victims. Safety also means that the parties do not intimidate each other (Redekop, 2007b).
- 3) Immediate survival needs: reconciliation processes can be demanding both cognitively and emotionally. Hence it is important that parties are assured of having their immediate physical and emotional needs sufficiently met to function through the process.
- 4) Teachings: the process of reconciliation is directed by a framework, values, root metaphors and mental models that provide motivation and insight to keep the process going. Teachings may take the form of stories of previous reconciliation processes, traditional proverbs and customs, or analytical insights. Education for reconciliation includes the development of skills (Huyse, 2003) and generation of new beliefs and attitudes about both the conflict and the other party (Bar-Siman-Tov, 2004).
- 5) Gradual Reciprocated Initiatives in Tension-Reduction (GRIT) (Osgood, 1966): one party may decide to make a low-risk gesture of goodwill; if the other party reciprocates with a similar gesture the first party may take another positive initiative (Osgood, 1966). Gradually the tension dissipates and the parties are prepared to enter into another level of discourse to address the deep-rooted conflict.
- 6) Dialogue: at some point parties will enter into a dialogue in which they are motivated to truly understand one another. Dialogue means that meaning flows freely between the parties (Bohm, 1997). There is also open disclosure of the emotional dimensions of the conflict.
- 7) Truth-telling: in addition to the dialogue there may be a need to formally establish the truth of what occurred. Ideally this will lead

to a shared acceptance of the same presentation of the history of the conflict. Analysts, historians and lawyers may play a role in this and it may involve a formal process (Lederach, 1997).

- 8) Expressions of acknowledgement, remorse, and apology: eventually those who have committed acts of violence will understand the impact of these acts on the other party. As they acknowledge a) what they have done, b) the hurt it has caused, c) feelings of remorse over having caused the harm, and d) a desire to not commit the same acts in the future, they will be able to offer an effective apology (Redekop, 2007a).
- 9) Expressions of victimization, openness to forgiveness: those victimized will express to the perpetrator and third parties what they have experienced. As they hear an acknowledgement of their hurt from the perpetrator along with apologies and expressions of remorse they may become open to forgive. Forgiveness means to give up an impulse or right to make the perpetrator suffer in response to the suffering caused by the perpetrator, implying moral judgment, the humanity of the perpetrator, and a desire for a renewed relationship (Bole, Drew Christiansen, & Hennemeyer, 2004; Shriver, 2001).
- 10) Justice and mercy: justice involves making some judgment about what would restore a sense of balance to the relationship. Where violence has involved theft or destruction of possessions, these can be restored. When there is emotional pain, torture, or loss of life, it is impossible to return parties to their previous state. Some things may be done by way of compensation or compensatory actions to alleviate the loss. Strict retributive justice could result only in another round of violence. Some form of mercy or generosity of spirit may be combined with positive balancing measures to craft a profound forgiveness (Lederach, 1999).
- 11) Re-orientation: at some point the parties will re-orient their relationship. This re-orientation may demand inner changes of identity, attitude and orientation in relation to the other (Bar-Siman-Tov, 2004). Both parties and the relationship itself will be transformed such that both parties will contribute to mutual empowerment.
- 12) Healing of traumas and memories: in order for the reconciliation process to be sustained and for both parties to flourish, it is important that as much as possible emotional traumas and memories be healed.

Reconciliation rituals may play a role in this process (Schirch, 2005; Redekop, 2007a) as can various forms of therapy (Herman, 1997), cognitive reframing and spiritual disciplines and practices (Hermann, 2004).

- 13) Re-defining terms of the relationship including transformation of structures: reconciliation is not complete if the structures left in place continue to victimize. For example, hegemonic structures, in which one party systematically dominates another party, involve economic, political, physical, and/or discursive dimensions. Action has to be taken in each of these areas to address systemic imbalances. New laws, customs, economic regulations and institutions may be needed to sustain the reconciliation process (Kriesberg, 2004; Redekop, 2008).

Reconciliation is not a linear process; rather it is cyclical and iterative. Not all of the elements above may be present each time and some may have to be addressed repeatedly. Reconciliation can be understood as a freedom from mimetic (imitative) structures of violence that take on a life of their own and a freedom to create and nurture mimetic structures of blessing or peace, in which new life-enhancing options are systematically generated.

In cases where there has been a history of violent exchanges between police and protesters, like the G-8 Summit in Italy where a protester was killed by police, there may be a need for reconciliation processes. The above elements could be used to design a process to work toward that end.

Protest Crowd–Police Relational Blessing

What would it mean for there to be mimetic structures of blessing in the protest crowd–police relational system? First off, what it would *not* mean would be an absence of conflict; neither would it mean that the relationship would be prescribed. Rather it would mean a dynamic relationship that interacts respectfully with inevitable conflict in creative and transformative ways. The attitude of the players is what is important. The very fact that protest crowds are pushing the edges, often in the interests of extending mimetic structures of blessing to people violently victimized means that there is a tension with the status quo and with peace understood as tranquility. As we showed in chapter two, expression of dissent is an important part of a thriving community, organization or political system. This means that police as a party in the relational system can express dissent at protest activities

just as protesters may critique police tactics. In our examination of the meaning of mimetic structures of blessing for protest crowds and police we will first examine the current situation to see if there is evidence of mimetic structures of blessing within this relational system. We will then look at the challenges of blessing and the potential of blessing as a supra-ordinate goal. Finally we will stress the importance of mimetic modeling by all parties.

The Presence of Blessing

Within repressive regimes that see dissent as a threat, the inherent dynamic in the protest crowd–police relational system is a mimetic structure of violence. However, in democracies where temporary assemblies to protest is a right, there has been an evolution in the relational systems such that consistently 90 per cent of protest crowd activity happens without incident. In most of these instances, protesters see the police as playing a helpful role in making the demonstration happen without a problem.

The Challenge of Blessing

While the 90 per cent statistics sound appealing and represent a higher level of consciousness than the situation in countries where all expression of dissent is put down, there still are a number of challenges to be faced if there are to be truly mimetic structures of blessing. First, much of this police helpfulness comes out of a paternalistic, controlling attitude. Police are more sophisticated in getting crowds to do things their way without a show of force. Notwithstanding this, the ‘velvet glove hiding an iron fist’ approach is not devoid of violence. Second, there may be a different mentality on the part of public order police whose job it is to develop good relationships with protest crowds and front line police officers who might see things differently. For example one of the police officers in our seminars reported about a fellow police officer, lacking in training and sensitivity, who referred to protesters as ‘the enemy.’ When protests turn chaotic, both protesters and police on the front line make their own decisions on what to do second by second. There is no time to consult with leadership about strategic and logistical options. Yet what happens at the moment of confrontation reflects on each group and may set in motion some significant new developments—oriented either toward violence or blessing. This suggests that as much as possible, as many as possible from all sides should be given the chance to participate in training sessions together (see the final chapter).

Another challenge arises from the very different organizational styles of the two groups and communication and leadership issues that arise. Police are organized in a hierarchical manner; at times policing decisions are made at a level that may not be aware of understandings reached between police liaison officers and protest leaders. This problem is a function of internal communication, leadership and decision making. Similarly the diversity of affinity groups on the protest side and the emphasis on consensus means that negotiations can be complex and with a large number of players with diverse perspectives, miscommunication can happen. The 'spokes' who may be present for the negotiation may not speak for all the affinity groups. Third, the very presence of police tactical troops, their equipment and their training are designed for violent engagement with protest crowds. The visible presence of these officers is a symbolic form of violence; if they are hidden, their presence still works at a tacit level, leading some to refer to a 'superficially soft hat' mode (King & Waddington, 2006, 95).

There is cutting edge thinking taking place around the concept of morphogenic fields that could eventually be helpful in analyzing the influence of unseen troops on the behaviour of protesters. Morphogenic fields are information fields that influence all who have morphic resonance (Sheldrake, 2003). For example, if a group of people think and feel a certain way, they establish a morphogenic field such that those who are sensitive to this field could be affected by it. There is currently scientific research going on regarding these fields. If the early research in this area is correct, it would suggest that preparations for violence by the police or having a violent orientation can influence a situation by increasing the potential for violence. On the other side, there are protesters who are convinced that the use of violence is essential to their effectiveness. This intent can influence the field around them and consequently influence police officers in that field.

A final challenge is that police and protesters have trouble seeing the humanity of one another. This is a result of differences in mentality, physical and psychological distance between the groups, the use of masks to hide faces, and a rhetoric of 'us' versus 'them.' Dehumanization makes it easier for either side to be violent towards the other.

Police are to a greater or lesser extent responsible to the government that ultimately provides their budgets. Some governments have little tolerance for dissent, or little tolerance for protests that might cause them to lose face or control especially in the presence of foreign visitors. If police are directed

to either repress protest or keep it so far away as to be benign, they may have to use violence to fulfill operational goals imposed upon them. This raises the paradox that on the one hand it is essential for police to be subject to democratically elected governments; on the other hand, it is essential that police not become instrumental in imposing partisan or capricious policies of a government on a population. (It is noteworthy that Rowan and Mayne, as the first commissioners of the Metropolitan Police of London were able to model an approach to policing that carved out a space at the centre of the paradox.)

Finally, real violence is a fact of protest crowd–police interactions. Police can violently arrest protesters. Even before an event, the detention of leaders is a form of violence. Baton charges, intimidating tactics, and the use of less than lethal weapons—all are forms of violence. On the protester side, throwing stones and Molotov cocktails are forms of violence as is forcibly pushing back a police cordon. On both sides, there is discursive violence through language meant to put-down, intimidate, dehumanize and demonize the other parties.

Blessing as a Supra-Ordinate Goal

What is advocated here is that if the building of mimetic structures of blessing based on justice becomes the overarching goal of all the parties, that, in and of itself, could be transformative. It could form an ethical vision to guide assessments of strategic goals and ultimately operational plans and on the ground tactics. In so far as protesters are visibly working towards mimetic structures of blessing, police would be oriented to helping them achieve their goals. Likewise, governments, multi-lateral organizations and multinational businesses could also be challenged to work for mimetic structures of blessing. If things are framed this way and if the importance of dissent, complexity and creativity were to be affirmed as part of the process of blessing, protest crowds could be embraced as an essential part of collective evolution to higher levels of consciousness.

Mimetic Modeling

It is not likely that the concept of mimetic structures of blessing will be understood and embraced by all parties at the same time. In the mean time,

given the power of mimesis, any individuals and groups who are committed to moving in this direction can have an impact by modeling, in a congruent way, their understanding of mutual blessing. Little did the Buddhist monks, peacefully protesting in the 1970s realize the impact they would have on Sharon Welsh, then an angry anti-war protester using a rhetoric of violence to talk about peace (refer to her story at the end of chapter two).

Having developed key concepts of mimetic structures of violence, identity needs, hegemonic structures, destructive emotions, trauma as well as mimetic structures of blessing, reconciliation, complexity and creativity, we are now in a position to see how these translate into paradigms of protest policing. Knowing how government, multinational business, and multi-lateral organizations are implicated as targets of protest and how bystanders and media play important role, we are in a position to explore the implications of these concepts for all the parties involved.