Redekop, Vern Neufeld, and Shirley Paré. "Towards a Mutual Respect Paradigm of Protester–Police Dynamics." *Beyond Control: A Mutual Respect Approach to Protest Crowd–Police Relations*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2010. 138–166. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781849660907.ch-009>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 10:42 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.

9. Towards a Mutual Respect Paradigm of Protester–Police Dynamics

Police are essentially mandated to establish and maintain geographical and behavioural boundaries for protest crowds. How the boundaries are set and how they are maintained is a function of policies, established practices, strategy, tactics, policing and popular cultures, organization, training, equipment, command structure and the personalities of those involved. These boundaries conform to interpretations of what it means to preserve the peace, protect the property and persons of citizens and government, and obey the law. All of these are determined, in many respects, by the paradigm of protest policing that informs those who make decisions that impinge on police activity at any level. Paradigms function as different lenses that determine how facts and events are interpreted.

Similarly, through experience, protesters repeat successful strategies, practices, and tactics—always pushing the edge of the envelope for something that will make a difference and gain the attention of the targets of their demonstrations. They too interpret what they do through a paradigmatic lens that includes values and expectations around roles and behaviour of police, targets, media and protest itself.

We will develop the concept of paradigms, first, showing how they work, how they change, and what a difference this makes. Then we will develop three different paradigms of protest policing: crowd control, crowd management, and mutual respect. Given significant changes in protest policing over the last several decades, it is clear that not all approaches fit cleanly into one paradigm or another; hence, we will look at the interplay among them. Just as police are essentially reactive in relation to crowds—that is, they only have to take action if their boundaries are threatened—so protesters are reactive in terms of paradigmatic development. That is, protesters orient themselves to the police based on the paradigm of protest policing that they experience. Often governments have a more repressive attitude in dealing with protest crowds than do police. We will examine why this is the case and why it is important that the paradigms of governments in relation to protest crowds are important and how they need to change. Finally we will look at the importance of these paradigms for the public and for the media which reports on protest crowds on the basis of their own paradigmatic lenses.

Paradigms

A paradigm is a way of perceiving a phenomenon as whole; the paradigm determines what the component parts of the phenomenon are, how the different parts are interpreted and what their relationship

is to one another and to the whole. Examples of paradigms are pictures that can be seen in two different ways. For example, the picture at the left could be seen as either two faces or as a chalice. Depending on how it is perceived the different lines take on different meaning.

In the case of a paradigm concerning human relationships, a shift in paradigm can make a huge difference in attitudes, values and actions. A shift in paradigm may depend on the development of a more complex level of consciousness in the same way as some computer software will only run with a more complex operating system. We will give two examples: the shift in policing paradigm from fighting crime to community policing and a shift from a retributive justice paradigm to restorative justice.

In the 1980s there was a movement among police to change the paradigm of policing from a strict law enforcement approach to 'community policing' in which police were to identify with the community as part of the community. This later morphed into problem-solving policing in which police were to look at difficult situations as problems to be solved rather than simply bad people breaking some laws. Careful analysis of the root causes of the problem and creative solutions were rewarded. One Canadian police inspector who took a national lead in community policing used to reward one of his officers monthly on the basis of who had worked with community members to find a creative long-term solution to an intractable problem. This is in stark contrast to police being rewarded for arrests made or cases closed.

Beginning in the 1970s there was a shift in criminal justice from retributive justice to restorative justice. It all started with the Elmira Case in Ontario, Canada. Some boys had vandalized a number of cars and properties in a neighbourhood. Contrary to all expectations, the judge ruled that these boys

should visit all the homes they vandalized and offer to make things right. From this emerged a whole new approach to dealing with crime. It starts with the view of crime as harm done to people (in contrast to breaking a law) and the goal of justice being to make restitution for harm done (instead of paying one's debt to society through being punished by spending time in prison). Programmatically, it finds expression in Victim Offender Reconciliation Programs, Community Healing Circles, Alternative Sentencing, Circle Sentencing processes, Face to Face encounters in penitentiaries, and so on. Restorative justice is now an international movement, even informing such institutions as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa. As we shall see below, a new paradigm in protest policing has the capacity to change dramatically the strategic planning and operational dynamics of dealing with protest crowds.

Three Paradigms of Protest Policing

The three paradigms of policing that are presented below have evolved in a particular way since the 1960s, even though elements of all three can be seen in different historical settings. The first of these is given the name, Crowd Control Paradigm. It evolved as protest crowds became larger and more sophisticated during the time of the Vietnam War; its roots are evident in colonial policing. Referred to as 'hard' policing, it resurfaced with the development of new protective gear for police and a whole new range of less than lethal weapons. Second is the Conflict Management Paradigm which evolved through the 1980s onward with the realization that police could be more effective through the use of 'soft' tactics sometimes referred to as 'negotiation.' Third is the Mutual Respect Paradigm that recognizes a greater degree of mutuality between protest crowds and police. Its emergence can be traced to a series of seminars described in the Case Study of Part 2.

Each of these paradigms has an impact on the following component parts of protest policing:

- Perception of the crowd and the language used to talk about it
- The nature of the challenge
- Strategy
- Tactics
- Intelligence
- Decision making.

- Organization
- Policies
- Values
- Accountability
- Identity

Within each of these paradigms there is wide latitude as to practices and attitudes of those who operate within them. In order to differentiate the paradigms, they will first be presented with their distinctions clearly defined and contrasted. It may seem to be an over simplification at the outset; however more of the subtleties will be developed later.

The Crowd Control Paradigm

The *language* that is used by police to designate themselves and the protest crowd has both a power and an ethical dimension to it. To designate a unit as responsible for crowd *control* makes the crowd into an object. To say it must be controlled speaks of a hegemonic structure where a powerful body is able to determine what the crowd can do. This language harks back to LeBon's notion of a crowd as hysterical, uncontrolled emotional woman who need a strong 'man' to control her. Crowds are seen as essentially problematic; some would even go so far as to call them the enemy. Even though the language of enemy may not be used, the kind of strategic preparation is akin to facing the enemy with whom police are at 'war.' The designation 'riot squad' speaks to the reality of potential riots.

The *challenge* of crowd control is to make certain the crowd is under control all the time. That means that the crowd is confined into its designated area, is held there, and if its behaviour becomes more rowdy than is allowed it is forcibly dispersed. The *strategy* is to have a strong show of force to be certain the crowd knows who is in control. This may take the form of well armed police forming a cordon, the use of shields, and perhaps fences to form a boundary. Beyond that it is to use specialized squads to keep the crowd at bay or to disperse the crowd. Water cannons and tear gas are readily available as are less than lethal weapons that can immobilize protesters who get out of hand. All contingencies are covered in advance.

Tactics of crowd control are quickly reactive to any violent behaviour within the crowds. Should demonstrators prove menacing, they are quickly forced back. Particularly violent protesters are apprehended with enough

force to make examples of them. Any controlling action is in the hands of police. Decision making happens in a hierarchical manner. Emphasis is put on obedience to orders. The organization is paramilitary. Communication with protesters takes the form of directives and orders. Extensive intelligence is used to gauge the threat of a protest crowd and to identify potential troublemakers. Since avoidance of things getting out of hand is of paramount importance, if protest leaders can be isolated from the crowd by denying them entrance into the country or arresting them on spurious charges, so much the better.

Policies

Within a crowd control paradigm, strength is valued. The decisive leader who takes firm action to stop a crowd and the ‘tac troops’ with the fully protective clothing, who know how to advance on a crowd or dart into a crowd to make an arrest would receive the highest recognition. Accountability and loyalty is primarily to the police force/service that wishes to come out looking good at all costs. The identity of the valuable protest police officer is one who is strong enough to not take anything from protesters; and is a well trained professional who can use all the weapons available when commanded to and with great effectiveness.

The Crowd (or Negotiated) Management Paradigm

Within the Crowd Management paradigm protesters are thought of as citizens exercising their right to protest. There may be problems that develop but good management strategies will keep these to a minimum. Given the fact that a crowd is thought of something that needs to be managed, the discursive structure is still hegemonic. Crowds will be directed and every effort will be made to make certain they do things in line with what the police would desire. The language of negotiation is used to indicate that processes of planning, crowd events, and dispersal are arranged through discussion; however, discursive tactics are used to make certain things go right for the police.

The challenge is to facilitate protesters in organizing their crowd events in a way that does not create incidents. It is important at all costs to avoid troubles. The strategy is to use discursive means if at all possible to control the situation. All the means of crowd control are still available but only as a last resort. Confrontation with the crowd is to be avoided at all cost. Latitude in law enforcement, compromises (real and apparent) and a

helpful attitude become part of the strategy of making this paradigm work. The following chart (Figure 9.1), made available by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, shows the tactical options available. Clockwise from midnight tactics are increasingly heavy handed. The strategy within this paradigm is to continually try to keep on the right side of the diagram and to resist clockwise movement if at all possible.

Primary tactics have to do with creating psychological boundaries and maintaining a non-threatening presence. Helpfulness in planning logistics and diverting traffic are used to establish goodwill and to control the situation. There are meetings with crowd organizers; crowd marshals are briefed. There may even be outright collaboration between crowd marshals and leaders and police. At times marshals will even direct troublesome protesters down a lane into the hands of police who are waiting for them.

Intelligence gathering is done first and foremost through permits that crowd organizers need to fill out before a protest crowd event. In the process

Figure 9.1 Risk Diagnosis and Use of Force Options

Source: © (2009) HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF CANADA as represented by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP). Reprinted by permission of the RCMP.

of filling out the form, police will go through a check list of questions to be sure that planning is complete. The process both ensures that there is good planning and that police get enough information for them to plan properly. Information that is publicly available such as pamphlets, web sites, advertisements, etc. is a primary source of intelligence. Greater authority is given to crowd liaison officers to make decisions in concert with protest crowd leaders. Public Order Management Systems are put into place with sophisticated information loops and decision making flow charts. Policies and values emphasize the avoidance of confrontation. Training puts greater emphasis on negotiation and other discursive means of management. There is considerable emphasis on the strategic use of the media to convey information in such a way as to show the police as competently managing a situation in conformity with the public good. There is a greater sense of accountability to the public.

Protest police see themselves as being identified more strongly with the community. They see themselves as professional crisis managers, team builders who can collaborate with crowd organizers and even build a relationship with them.

The Mutual Respect Paradigm

In this paradigm, police view crowds as groups of people who do what they do for a reason. This means they think in terms of crowds being one part of a relational system that includes government institutions and businesses (targets), bystanders and security. To think of crowds as being part of a relational system means that what anyone does has an impact on all of the others, hence the relationship is *dynamic*. The emphasis is put on managing the relational dynamic rather than on controlling the crowd *per se*. The heart of this paradigmatic approach is to set up structures through which all the different parties can communicate with one another, explore the identity dimensions of the issues involved and create dynamic situations that can serve the interests and well-being of all the different parties.

First, the Mutual Respect Paradigm is based on language, dialogue and communication. Not only is language used for communication it also becomes the focus of discourse and analysis. The kinds of words that are used to describe an action put a certain spin on the event and a value judgment on the people involved. A word like 'violence' is value laden. Within this paradigm, there would be open dialogue on the meaning of

violence in different contexts. What exactly is a violent action? If shown a video of certain actions deemed by some as violent, others might say that these were non-violent. For example, one activist has said that the attempts to take down the fence in Quebec City were justified and not violent in that they had no intent to enter the restricted area, yet security personnel took aggressive, ‘violent’ action to limit it. From the security perspective, the fence was deemed necessary for them to be successful in their prime mission of protecting the meeting; any destruction was violent and their actions were justified in the circumstances. The seemingly uncontrolled use of tear gas canisters was considered violent by peaceful protesters who were gassed, yet security personnel found the inaccuracy of the tear gas canisters and their limited scope of vision to be at least partially to blame for their gassing peaceful protesters. The same words used differently by different parties can promote misunderstanding and distrust; on the other hand, when people share their mutual understandings of a given phenomenon they may not always agree but they will respect the perceptions of the other. Words are found to express emotions. Using words to talk about emotions is very different than simply acting on them.

Second, the Mutual Respect Paradigm is relational, emphasizing the building of respect and trust. Dennis S. Reina and Michelle L. Reina have said that in high-trust environments, people are more willing to keep agreements, share information, admit and learn from mistakes, and take on greater responsibility (Reina & Reina, 1999). There is a value to relationships and a sense that respectful relationships in and of themselves are a positive factor in managing the interactions in a way that benefits everyone. All parties share a common commitment to explore the development of positive relationships.

Third, the Mutual Respect Paradigm is sensitive to the identity needs and interests of the various parties. One’s identity needs are those things which are important to support the person’s well-being; the need for meaning in their lives, to be able to take action, to be connected one with another, to be recognized as good and worthy, and to be safe and secure.

Fourth, the Mutual Respect Paradigm values creativity. Creativity involves discovering new, helpful and innovative approaches to meeting the needs of various parties at the same time. It brings together a variety of resources and combines them in a way in which they have not been

combined before. Creativity is a result of looking at the same old problem in a new way. It is inspired by insights and in this case the insights are stimulated by dialogue among the parties. To value creativity is to value open-ended processes that allow creative ideas and approaches to emerge. Creativity within a community also involves discernment. Not every new idea is significant and helpful. In brainstorming, for instance, every idea is welcomed and received equally by facilitator and group. Later, in thinking about the ideas and working with them, some will emerge as being truly insightful and helpful and others will be put on the backburner to simmer until such time as they are needed or inspire other useful ideas.

Fifth, the Mutual Respect Paradigm is driven by principles. There is an ethical culture that is developed through the interaction among the parties involved in the collaboration. The principles that underlie this ethical culture can be identified, written down, taught, discussed and explained. Principles need to be developed collaboratively and, at this time, their formulation is in the early stages.

Sixth, the Mutual Respect Paradigm has about it a spirit of generosity, mutual care and joy. The story is told of a joint Israeli–Palestinian working group on water management. They became close personal friends through their collaboration. While they were together at a location far removed from Israel/Palestine, a suicide bomb was detonated a few blocks from the home of one of the Israelis. Immediately one of the Palestinians was on the phone, calling to his contacts to verify that the family of his Israeli friend was unharmed.

Out of recognition of the importance of each for the other should emerge an attitude of respect. Such an attitude is important for the development of authentic relationships and mutual trust. The same action done with a different attitude takes on an entirely different character. The action of police consulting with protesters is very different if the purpose of the consultation is to enhance police intelligence and establish a way of controlling or managing the crowd as opposed to a genuine desire for protesters to do what they have to do in safety and in an atmosphere free of hassles and violence. As Kratcoski, Verma and Das observe:

No country, regardless of how traditional its values and culture are, will remain static. There is constant change, and often protests,

demonstration and strikes are the mechanisms used to bring about desired changes more quickly. If the police approach such disorder events from the perspective that these are opportunities for peaceful solutions to political or social unrest problems, the outcomes are likely to be productive. (Kratcoski et al., 2001)

Likewise, if protesters respect the mandate given police and the actions taken, they will be able to combine effective protest and maintain the dignity of police and those they are called upon to protect. This reminds me (VNR) of participating in a march to commemorate the Oka/Kanehsatà:ke Crisis of 1990. I was walking with Ellen Gabriel through the golf course. When we got to one of the holes she took the flag marker out of the hole and gently laid it down, remarking that we were not there to hurt anything, just to make a point.

Communication—There are some built-in challenges to effective communication between protest crowds and police. These are a result of their very different characters and organizational systems (and the stages of consciousness of the actors). Complex protest crowds are usually made up of a diversity of groups; these groups work together on the basis of consensus. Police are organized around a hierarchical structure with a command and control leadership style. Nonetheless, given the political will, effective communication can happen. It is important for police to listen carefully to not only the needs and plans of protesters but also to their goals, the issues they espouse and the vision they have for society. Protesters should listen to the challenges facing police. If there are ‘die in the ditch’ boundaries for the police, these should be talked about openly and various scenarios should be worked through in advance. There should be some openness to re-defining boundaries on certain occasions. Where the absolute boundaries are inviolable, they should be explained to protesters along with the rationale. Every effort should be made to arrive at shared understandings of the meaning of boundaries. Solutions to various other problems could be arranged and joint contingency plans developed. During a major crowd protest event, lines of communication should be open such that if something goes wrong on either side this can be immediately communicated and explained to the other side. After an event, a joint de-brief would contribute to mutual understanding and further planning.

Chaos and Creativity—Given the ambiguity described above regarding laws and peace, and given the passions involved to work toward change, it will likely happen that protest crowds will push legality and public order to its edges. As Deborah Sword points out, protest crowds have a tendency to be at the edge of chaos and members of protest crowds may well have a high level of tolerance for such a situation. Out of chaos may emerge either creative blessing or contagious violence. It is important that police school themselves in chaos theory and even work with protesters on role plays and contingency plans to deal effectively with life at the edge of chaos. It may even be that those assigned to work on public order policing be screened according to their capacity to deal effectively with chaotic and ambiguous situations.

Mimetic Structures of Blessing—In many instances protest crowds and police do play mutually empowering roles. It is important to identify the mimetic structures of blessing where they occur. It is also important for police and protesters to explore together what mimetic structures of blessing might mean to them and to jointly commit to the creation and nurture of such structures.

A mandate may be given to a neutral third party organization to facilitate the operationalization of the above points. Unless someone has a mandate to organize joint action it will not likely happen. In some cases there is a high level of distrust on both sides so an initiative from either side would be held suspect. A third party involvement would diminish the sense that police would use joint sessions to control the situation. (This point is derived from a number of seminars that brought police and protesters together see Part Two.) Such involvement would not preclude bilateral communication and negotiation but would help provide a supportive framework. During one of our seminars there was an evening debrief of the protest crowd activities at the Summit of the Americas in Quebec City in 2001. Protesters and police spoke openly about their respective experiences; along the way one of them commented, ‘We usually do our debriefs separately but this is much better!’

With a shared vision of mimetic structures of blessing we can imagine a vibrant dynamic society in which new perspectives are constantly generated and shared in public spaces, where roles of stakeholders are periodically scrutinized, and where different voices of response express divergent views in a spirit of transparency, respect and openness to change.

Paradigms Compared

The following chart offers a concise point of comparison among the different paradigms.

Crowd Control	Crowd Management	Mutual Respect
Crowd thought of as 'enemy' or 'problem' by security	Crowd thought of as citizens exercising their rights; not a problem in itself but causing potential problems	Crowd welcomed as essential component of civil society and generator of creative options for society
Security develops strategy on its own	Crowd leaders consulted by police; joint plan but police strategy and back-up plans are hidden	Crowds, security and possibly targets collaborate on strategy for the event
All the means of antagonistic preparations are used including surveillance and covert intelligence gathering	More emphasis on collecting information through permit forms and publicly accessible information like web sites	Information is shared openly all around; identities and roles are transparent
Security is derived from using the tools of control including less than lethal and lethal means	Security is based on getting agreement on as many points as possible; open lines of communication; clear demarcation of boundaries	Security is derived from trusting relationships based on mutual dignity and respect
Tries to have all contingencies covered before engagement with crowd	Shares responsibilities with crowd marshals and organizers; on occasion collaborate in dealing with instigators of violence	Uses open processes to imagine new and mutually beneficial ways of dealing with conflicts
Security fundamentally responsible to Target	Keeps arms length relationship with target at most; neutral at best	Security responsible for well being of entire population including protesting crowd
Focuses on violent protesters as 'criminals,' 'troublemakers,' etc.	Differentiates among different types of protesters	Tries to understand reasons for extreme emotions and passions
Tries to thwart actions of protesters by closing borders, impeding logistics, harassing and arresting protesters	Expedites movements and organization of protesters	Creates a context for protest effectiveness

Crowd Control	Crowd Management	Mutual Respect
Debriefs a crowd event alone	Communicates informally with crowd organizers	Debriefs a crowd event together; periodic facilitated workshops to reflect on the nature and role of organized protest
Media frames event around conflict between protesters and police	Media portrayal of police violence kept to a minimum	Media frames stories around the creation of mimetic* structures of blessing arising out of mimetic* structures of violence
Targets see crowds as nuisance and threat	Targets reluctantly open to negotiation with crowds; police and/or mediators facilitate the process	Targets see crowds as a sign that some things need to change; as a source of key information about the world
Activists see police and targets as enemy	Police are seen as rendering helpful advice and assistance	Activists see police and leaders playing essential roles
Mimetic* and escalating violence	Violence minimized	Mimetic and expanding blessing
Public gets message that violence is on increase	Low key message to public	Public gets new vision for future possibilities
Public increasingly worried about future		Public re-assured
People are boxed into roles and spaces		People move respectfully into each other's spaces

Relationship among Paradigms

The relationship among paradigms is not straightforward. First, there is considerable *latitude* in the range of actions and attitudes that can be evident within each paradigm. Second, since these paradigms are paradigms of policing, developed from the perspective of the police, it is important to examine *paradigms from a protest crowd perspective*. Third, each paradigm can be seen as reflection of a different level of consciousness; with that realization, insights about relations among levels of consciousness prove instructive. Forth, the development of new paradigms can be seen as creative emergence; looking back one can identify a number of factors that worked together to stimulate paradigmatic change. These four aspects of the relationship will be developed in greater detail.

Latitude within Paradigms

Each of these paradigms allows for considerable latitude in behaviour and attitude. Within the Crowd Control paradigm could be an attitude that is hostile toward protest crowds with repressive behaviour that limits protest crowd activity completely. It would also be possible to have relatively benign and friendly attitudes toward protest crowds as long as they stayed within the behavioural and geographic boundaries with which police would feel comfortable. There are also differences within this paradigm of how police present themselves. This ranges from immediately presenting themselves with protective shields and the ‘Darth Vader’ look to appearing first on bicycles with soft hats. What distinguishes the paradigm is how police understand their task; in this case it is to control crowds that have the potential to get out of hand or to riot.

The Crowd Management Paradigm likewise can exemplify a broad range of approaches. What passes for ‘negotiation’ can range from outright manipulation to get protest crowds to comply with police wishes to a genuine interest in accommodating concerns of protest. Intelligence gathering can range from collecting information that is publicly available to intrusive intelligence that has undercover agents posing as crowd participants or organizers. There is also a range of relative weighting of the component parts of a Public Order Management System. In some cases the negotiation side is dominant and in other cases it may be simply window dressing to camouflage what is in effect a crowd control approach. There is also a distinction to be made among the different kinds of relationships between liaison officers and the command structure. In one instance the liaison officer has direct access to the operational commander and ensures that if there is a change from what she or he has told crowd organizers, this is immediately communicated to crowd representatives. Alternately, the liaison person is thought of by police leadership as a means of collecting intelligence and they think nothing of overriding what might have been agreed upon in negotiations with the protest organizers, nor of withholding significant information from them.

The Mutual Respect Paradigm likewise can be expressed in different ways. It is certainly open to subversion on both sides by people who do not communicate in good faith and choose to use the openness of others in the relational system for strategic advantage. On the other hand, it can be used to genuinely improve the situation for all concerned.

Paradigms from a Protest Crowd Perspective

These three paradigms also apply to protesters and how they view police. The corresponding paradigms are as follows:

Crowd Control : Police as Repressive

Crowd Management : Police as Potentially Helpful

Mutual Respect : Police in a Complementary Role in Advancing Public Goods

The paradigm used by crowds may or may not correspond to that of the police in any given protest crowd–police relational system. We will describe the different paradigms.

In the Repressive Police paradigm, police are seen as enemies of dissent. There is a substantial amount of suspicion towards the police who are seen as doing everything in their power to thwart the efforts, interests and goals of protesters. Police are regarded as potentially violent and special training is given to minimize the effects of tear gas and to maximize the difficulty in either breaking up a protest group or arresting members. Special precautions are taken to keep police infiltrators out of meetings. Information about strategy and tactics is kept as secret as possible. One leader within the protest community even came to a joint protest crowd–police training session primarily to make certain that fellow protesters not divulge too much information. Chosen traumas of the protester community include memories of police violence, people hurt (some killed), exposure to many less than lethal weapons, activists being stopped and turned back at the border for no apparent reason, and brutal arrest procedures. Chosen glories include shutting down the WTO talks in Seattle.

In the Helping Police paradigm, a certain rapport and working relationship has been established between protesters and police. There is a sense that people on both sides know the score – they know and understand the limits of their actions. Protest becomes institutionalized and follows a certain routine and rhythm. If there are to be arrests, this is agreed upon in advance; police acknowledge that the arrests are needed for publicity and everyone plays an appropriate role. The venue for protest is agreed upon in advance. Marshals

within the crowd work with the police at dealing with troublemakers. Those that are relatively inexperienced at organizing protest crowds are grateful for the advice and information they receive from the police.

The Mutual Respect paradigm from the perspective of protesters includes a recognition that

- police have the necessary function within a democracy to preserve the peace;
- police are human beings with a capacity to understand complex issues;
- it is counter-productive for the side-show (police–crowd dynamics) to become the main show;
- it is likewise counter-productive for protest to be institutionalized.

In the light of these observations, there need to be ever new and creative ways of expressing dissent such that the message will get across. In order for this to happen, protesters need to engage police, government leaders, media, and community members in dialogue sessions or workshops aimed at both mutual understanding and the generation of ideas as to how the common good can be improved through the free flow and expression of ideas. The deep-rooted conflict is brought out into the open: some protesters are prepared to put their lives on the line because they believe so strongly in an issue; police are prepared to ‘die in the ditch’ to make certain that some lines are not crossed. Protesters are open to being challenged on their perceptions, values and beliefs without immediately reacting. There is openness to reconciliation of past rifts and victimization and a willingness to develop mimetic structures of blessing.

Paradigms and Levels of Consciousness

Each paradigm can be understood as representing a certain level of consciousness. As such it conforms to general understandings about levels of consciousness. These general understandings include the three principles that

1. The individual is usually operating at one stage of consciousness across a wide variety of contexts. All levels of conscious can be accessed in any one context.
2. Those at a higher level of consciousness can understand the levels below them but those at lower levels cannot understand those above them.
3. Higher levels of consciousness can accommodate and work with increasing levels of complexity that may be present in the environment.

With these in mind we can now present in a more nuanced manner the relationships among these different paradigms.

First on the matter of how crowds are perceived. At an extreme the Crowd Control paradigm is still informed by elements of the old Le Bon idea that crowds are wholes in which individuals lose their individuality and respect strong leaders who direct them. Empirical evidence has shown that this is highly misleading and people continue to have a sense of rational individuality even when participating in corporate activities. However there may be instances of rioting in which mimetic violence catches on; even though, as some observers point out, this may be less often the case than is generally thought. At times when protesters damage property, there may be historical and symbolic reasons for doing that. Elements of Crowd Control can be seen as embedded within Crowd Management Systems, the difference is that they are kept at the level of contingency planning for a worst case scenario. The paradigm itself emphasizes the right to protest, the pragmatic approach dictates that it works better to use discourse to manage the dynamics and the training includes the development of interpersonal skills.

The Mutual Respect Paradigm does not preclude offering practical assistance to crowd organizers as is the case in the Crowd Management Paradigm. Nor does it preclude contingency planning for a potential outbreak of violence. However, these elements take on a relatively less significant role. The emphasis is on working with protest crowds in such a way that their message and its urgency are effectively communicated to targets and the general public. There is an openness to flow with the dynamic as a creative process. There is also transparency about contingency plans and about 'die in the ditch' boundaries. However, there is an openness to negotiate boundaries and even to find safe ways in which the boundaries can be symbolically transgressed. Authentic trusting relationships are valued; these preclude manipulation; hence, the way in which Crowd Control and Crowd Management elements are used may be different.

Development of New Paradigms Can Be Seen As Creative Emergence

What does it take for a group to move from one paradigm to another? Such a movement is essentially a creative act. New paradigms generally take place when there is a convergence of factors, including an indication that

old paradigms are not working. In the 1960s there was a marked increase in the size and number of protest crowds. There was a general trend to use paramilitary forceful means to suppress crowds. As police communicated with one another, techniques were shared and a broad based trend emerged along with a discursive field that included the term ‘crowd control.’ As this became systematized, there was growth in the kinds of equipment, tactics and command structures that would make this more effective. There were also instances where this approach was shown to produce disastrous results. There were investigations into some of these mishaps, recommendations were made, legal and procedural limits were put into place. As a result, it became clear that this paradigm had some basic flaws.

Concomitantly, community policing was emerging as a new paradigm that recovered some of the early principles of the nineteenth century Metropolitan Police of London. As discursive approaches were used with crowds, it was found that these worked much better. Empirical data coming out of crowd research emphasized that crowds were not the product of society riff-raff, rather they were made up of citizens who demanded respect. The idea emerged that there were a few ‘bad apples’ that caused the problem. If police worked with crowd leaders and marshals these could be controlled in a collaborative fashion. In the 1980s and 1990s the Negotiated Management paradigm became better established. However, since September 11, preoccupations with security has had the effect of moving protest policing in the direction of more coercive methods with significantly more emphasis on the use of information strategies (della Porta & Reiter, 2006). There is now a differentiation being made in policing circles between contained and transgressive groups (Noakes & Gillham, 2006). Contained groups, like labour unions, are well-known to police, have their own marshals and can deliver a protest within the bound of agreed upon criteria. The negotiation paradigm is used with them (Noakes & Gillham, 2006). Transgressive groups are thought of as ‘bad’ by police, even though they can be further categorized into those committed to non-violence and those who are open to a ‘diversity of tactics.’ They are not centrally controlled and their actions cannot be predicted. They have a capacity to disrupt the daily life of people living and working in the protest area. They are dealt with by means of an incapacitation paradigm (Noakes & Gillham, 2006) which is a variation on the crowd control paradigm that gained ascendancy in the 1960s but instead of control through confrontation it emphasizes control through over-enforcement of the law, show of strength and through placing

limitations on the capacity of protesters to protest. Based on our research and experience, the increased use of a control paradigm coupled with more passionate resolve among protesters concerning justice issues will inevitably lead to more intense conflict between protesters and police. As will be argued in the next chapters, both dissent and non-violent policing are necessary for a thriving democracy. It is in this context that the Mutual Respect paradigm is advanced.

The emergence of the Mutual Respect Paradigm is new and time will tell whether it becomes accepted in the field. It represents the convergence of a number of factors:

1. A series of encounters with police, protesters, journalists and other stakeholders showing the potential of open dialogue. These will be described in detail in Part Two.
2. Research that establishes the link between protest crowds and complex systems.
3. Research on the development of higher levels of consciousness.
4. Comparative research that shows how the protest crowd–police relational system is clearly linked to the local culture and is a function of values, attitudes, governance institutions, and a history of how the relationship has evolved.
5. Groundbreaking work done by creative police officers who exemplify this new paradigm.
6. Dialogue among protest groups particularly those advocating non-violence and those whose diversity of tactics includes violence.
7. Open-ended workshops with representatives of all stakeholder groups (see Part Two for a description of what is possible.)

An Integral Approach

Ken Wilber has developed a four quadrant model (Figure 9.2) that can shed some additional light on how these paradigms function (Wilber, 2001). A horizontal axis forms a division between individual (above) and collective (below). A vertical axis divides an interior approach to reality (left) from an exterior approach (right). Interior approaches stress how events are interpreted by individuals and groups; exterior approaches emphasize what can be observed empirically. He argues for an integral approach that includes the different approaches at both the individual and collective levels. Wilber's model can be represented in the following diagram.

Figure 9.2 Ken Wilber's Integral Model

Each quadrant contains a significant dimension of reality as follows:

1. Individual Interior—this pertains to how the individual experiences something at a primal level; it includes how the individual interprets experience based their personal reflections, beliefs and values.
2. Individual Exterior—this pertains to how the behaviour (including verbal expressions) of the individual are observed. Knowledge of our observed experiences are categorized in this quadrant.
3. Collective Interior—pertains to how groups experience a given phenomenon; included in this are the cultural values of the group that give particular meaning to what is happening.
4. Collective Exterior—pertains to how the actions and experiences of groups are observed by others.

The dotted arrows going out from the centre indicate how levels of consciousness evolve; they generally are operative within all quadrants.

When we apply this to the three paradigms, the distinctions among them are startling. The crowd control paradigm emphasizes the collective nature of crowds so it is stronger in the bottom two quadrants. Crowds are basically seen as collectives. The individuals of the crowd as represented in the top

two quadrants would be understood to be at a lower level of mentality (riff-raff). The Crowd Management paradigm has been influenced by empirical studies and is much stronger on the right hand side. There is also a greater appreciation for specific individuals—especially organizers, marshals, leaders, and troublemakers. The Mutual Respect paradigm emphasizes all the quadrants. In addition to taking note of the empirical studies, it values the subjectivity of crowd protesters and the multi-valenced messages that crowds wish to convey. It also attends to how police understand and experience their role in relation to protest crowds. A value is placed on the interiority of the actors; this results in a desire for respectful dialogue and a commitment to respectful treatment of all parties in relation to one another.

In the bodies of literature on protest policing, protest and crowds, the various studies can be placed within different quadrants. De Bon and Canelli, writing on crowds, tried to understand the collective dynamics from within; they emphasized the lower left quadrant. Rudé and MacPhail worked on the basis of empirical data so their studies took place on the right hand side looking at both the experience of the individuals and the collective nature of the phenomenon. David Waddington's flashpoint model emphasized empirical studies but also paid attention to how people experienced the various phenomena—as such it had potential for an integral approach. Similarly P.A.J. Waddington's work emphasizes how police experience protest policing (the concept of 'troubles' is key to this) and he attends to the empirically verifiable description of tactics and how these tactics play out in the field.

In the diagram, there are diagonal arrows in each quadrant going from the intersection of the axes out toward the four corners. These indicate lines of development. One aspect of development has to do with level of consciousness; the higher the level, the more complex the situation one can deal with comfortably. At earlier levels of development, individuals and groups tend to think in tribalistic terms, seeing reality only in terms of the primary groups to which they belong. Related to protesters and police, those who are at this level will be inclined to adopt an 'us' versus 'them' mentality. It will be hard for them to see how all the actors fit together into a bigger reality with each playing a necessary role. In so far as the Mutual Respect paradigm is demanding the development of authentic relationships between police and protesters, it encourages the development of the level of consciousness among people in each group.

Implications of the Mutual Respect Paradigm for Stakeholders

The Mutual Respect Paradigm functions within an ethical vision of blessing. This means that there is an ethical imagination operative that envisages the mutual well-being of the various parties involved as they remain open to doing what is in the ultimate long term benefit to both humanity and the biosphere. As we examine the implications to each of the key parties involved, we will look at their role, attitude, orientation and behaviour within this paradigm. We will begin with the police since they are a constant in the face of numerous different protest crowds, the second group. Then we will address the implications of this paradigm for governments, multi-national corporations, the media, bystanders and the general public.

Police

Police will begin within an attitude of thanks for those people who care enough to protest. It is acknowledged that the level of care may vary from those who care to express grievances about their own life situation to those who care about collective rights to those who care about the well-being of third parties who might not have a voice to those people who care about systems. The potential contribution of protesters is

- to make certain that there is a general understanding of the different needs and perspectives out in society at a minimum and potentially to halt destructive policies and behaviours of powerful groups,
- to add creative analyses and perspectives to the common marketplace of ideas, and finally
- to be open to the fact that the very phenomenon of a protest crowd could itself generate some new perspectives or directions for society.

With this orientation, planning and operational decisions are made to optimize the effectiveness of the protest endeavour. Eli Sopow has developed a Public Order Integrated Network Team (POINT) approach to public order policing. He suggests that police use the five emotional factors and the seven organizational factors operative in effective protests to systematically work with protesters to maximize their effectiveness (these are presented on pages 34 and 67). Sopow's POINT approach does not necessarily mean working within the Mutual Respect

Paradigm since this could be done with a Crowd Management mentality. However, it does offer clues as to how those wishing to move into the Mutual Respect Paradigm could operationalize their thinking. In order to make protest effective, they may also need to question assumptions about behavioural and geographical boundaries.

This paradigm also suggests that dialogue and the open, transparent and free communication among parties needs to happen around major protest crowd activities (before, during and after) and periodically between such activities when the focus is on the nature of the relational systems involved.

Protesters

Protesters, like police, operate out of different levels of consciousness. We can distinguish among protesters who see things in absolute terms and wish to control the situation in line with their perspective. Other protesters wish to contribute to public discourse on a given issue; they would like their perspective to be communicated, understood and hopefully acted upon. At another level, protesters would like to be a part of a bigger dialogue within which creative options in terms of ideas, policies and actions that transcend individual perspectives already out there. Within each of these broad perspectives are a wide range of attitudes and behaviours.

We have already shown that protesters are highly motivated by something they feel is unjust or illegitimate. Those that are in a control frame of reference can be motivated to the point that they are willing to do anything, to the point of forfeiting their lives, for the cause of their protest. Mark Juergensmeyer has analyzed religious based terrorism, itself a form of protest (Juergensmeyer, 2001). He has found that each group—from Christians who bomb abortion clinics, to Jews who assassinated Rabin, to Muslims who were involved in the 1993 attempted bombing of the World Trade Centre—had a sense that they had a direct link with the Divine that enabled them to determine what was absolutely good and absolutely bad—the latter going against what they believed was the direct will of God. He shows that they view the world in Manichean terms with a clear distinction between good and bad and an absolute certainty that they know which is which. With a certainty that goes beyond any open discourse, they are convinced that they have a binding alternative to stop what they feel is bad with whatever means necessary even if it means the loss of life and the blowing up of property. This is the ultimate of a control oriented protest.

At the beginning of the Oka/Kanehsata:ke Crisis the protesters blocked a road to prevent the cutting of trees for the extension of a golf course. When they were attacked by the police who wanted to force down the barrier and one police officer was shot, another group of protesting Mohawks blocked the Mercier bridge under the conviction that without this act of protest, their fellow Mohawks would be subject to violent attack at Oka. Another very different example includes the protest crowds that were convinced that the World Trade Organization talks aimed at finalizing the MAI would do something in gross contravention of any standards of social justice. They were convinced that the result would be even greater wealth in hands of multinational corporations and greater poverty and oppression of the working poor. Furthermore, they saw the process itself as being illegitimate. For them, it was absolutely essential for the talks not to go ahead. They succeeded at shutting down those talks. They would have much preferred to be party to other discursive structures that would have given their perspective a serious hearing (Barlow, 2001). It should be noted that protesters came from a variety of backgrounds and with a variety of levels of consciousness. (The perspective advanced above represents the more sophisticated among them. Some workers, for example, protested because they feared a loss of jobs in the United States as factories moved to other countries.)

An overwhelming majority of protest in democratic countries is focused on getting a message across. In 2003 there were demonstrations around the world involving many thousands of people protesting against the pending United States invasion of Iraq. They expressed their perspective and the media reported it, but in this case it made no difference to the actions of the world's only superpower. The 90 per cent of demonstrations that occur without incident are of this variety; they want to express their point. Even those protests that involve a dramatic symbolic act are essentially discursive—they want to communicate a perspective.

There are groups of protesters that do sophisticated social analysis and are aware of the discursive control tactics of the police that pass under the rubric of 'negotiation.' They feel strongly about the potential damage to people and the environment if certain policies are carried out. For them, it is a stretch to think about the Mutual Respect Paradigm for it would involve

trusting that the police would act in good faith. Some of these have been subject to brutal treatment on the part of police. Some of their leaders have not been allowed free access across borders for protest activities both into countries like Canada where democratic expression is valued. For them, the implications of the Mutual Respect Paradigm would be that they would either have to agree to some limits on the behaviour of protest crowds or respect the position of police who must enforce certain boundaries. If the limits they would agree to transgressed the 'die in the ditch' limits of the police, they would either have to negotiate these or at least let the police know how far they would be prepared to go. They could at a minimum work with police on creative scenarios of what would happen at the edge of chaos so as to avoid anyone literally dying in any ditch. If this paradigm was accepted all around, the way would open for protesters to work with the other stakeholder groups at generating new options that would reflect their values.

Government

Governments, like the police and some of the protesters, can work out paradigms emphasizing control or discourse. In fact, often governments are even more in favour of repressive control than are the police or military. John Ciaccia, Quebec Minister of Native Affairs during the Oka/Kanehsatà:ke Crisis, reports that it was the military generals in the context of a cabinet meeting who talked the Bourassa government out of repressive violent suppression of the Mohawk protests (2000). Often a mimetic structure of violence is created between protesters and governments. In order to get a strong message across, protesters might use highly disruptive tactics. In response, control oriented governments vow to not 'cave in' to their demands. As governments dig in their heels around certain issues, protesters feel they have to take more aggressive action. The spiral of violence continues until the police or the military break up the protest, or public opinion sides with the protesters and the government must find a face-saving way to extricate itself from the situation (during the Oka/Kanehsatà:ke Crisis the Government bought the land in dispute to give to the Mohawks).

Within a Mutual Respect Paradigm, governments would welcome protest as a contribution to public debate on an issue. The concepts and critique offered by the protesters would be received non-defensively

by the government and considered on their merit. In certain instances where a well researched protest group has broad based backing and is operating at a high level of concern for either third parties or the public good, representatives of the protest movement could be invited to meet directly with government representatives. The goal would be to use the ideas of protesters creatively to develop better practices and policies.

Governments set broad policy goals for police. It is no accident that the coercive side of protest policing grew during the era of Prime Minister Thatcher who wanted protest activity to be controlled. Likewise, incapacitating actions on the part of U.S. police became more pronounced during the Bush era, which has been marked by a strong desire to use force to control situations. This means that in the coming years, there will be a need for new leaders to set a tone that welcomes dissent and the complexity and creativity that could be derived from divergent public discourse. In the next chapter we will examine the potential for the evolution of new structures of governance.

Multi-National Corporations

Structurally it is almost impossible to hold many multi-national corporations accountable for their actions. By having a strong presence in many countries they can shift capital, personnel and decisions around the globe, finding countries whose laws fit what they want to do such that they can do what they like. Furthermore, those based in Western countries often have enough financial clout that they have significant influence on governments. They operate in a control paradigm, even using the discourse of ‘control’ as they try to ‘control’ market share and resist any government ‘control’ of their enterprises. Within corporations it is all about having ‘controlling’ interest.

Public protest is one way of holding multi-national corporations accountable for their actions. If a resource company is causing suffering on the ground in a southern country and protesters bring that to light near their power base, this can have a significant impact. It was through widespread persistent protest, including demonstrations, that Talisman Oil Company, based in Alberta, sold off its oil interests in Sudan (subsequently there were some second thoughts about this in Sudan because of all oil companies, Talisman had more of a concern

for Sudanese people, a greater openness to moral arguments, and a greater understanding of human rights than some other oil companies.) Protesters have a responsibility to accurately assess the impact of what they are advocating.

Were multinational corporations to accept a paradigm of Mutual Respect with an ethical vision of blessing whereby they would see their role as primarily contributing to the well-being of humanity and the biosphere, they would embrace thoughtful, research based protest as a way of generating what they were there to do even better.

Media

News media can be caught in a control based paradigm as they frame stories as conflicts over control over a situation. If there is outright violence between police and protest crowds it makes for a good story because the images are visually arresting. They too are in competition for control of market share—wanting to get more viewers and readers. What seems to work for news hungry media are stories that emphasize conflict. Conflict is complex and has a capacity to stimulate creativity; hence, media could play an exciting, provocative and constructive role within a Mutual Respect Paradigm. In order to do this they would need to take a step back from the confrontation and analyze the deeper issues at stake.

Bystanders and Public

As immediate bystanders and, in the case of major protests that receive media coverage, the general public become aware of the issues raised through the protest, they can begin to think about the issues. Given the inter-connectedness of complex systems, it may well be that thoughts, ideas and actions generated by people who ‘randomly’ hear of the protest may make a new contribution to the issue. In a Mutual Respect Paradigm, there is an openness to new ideas wherever they may come from. Some of this is already starting to happen through news networks that solicit ideas and comments from their viewers. With internet communication available, protest organizations and government can open themselves to new ideas. The nature of creativity is such that even what might seem like an ‘off-the-wall’ idea can function as the spark that gets people to think of things in a new way.

Dialogue

Nothing can take the place of face to face dialogues among people, dialogues that reveal deeply rooted stereotypes of the Other and consequently bring potential surprises to the surface so they can be dealt with before the event and before the edge of chaos is reached. As will become apparent in the case study in part II, it is amazing what can happen in terms of mutual understanding, breaking down of stereotypes and generation of new ideas when people are given the opportunity to communicate openly with one another in a safe, neutral environment. Universities were created in Medieval Europe to provide a context for open, probing and questioning of ideas. They provided a context for the open expression of ideas and critique of what was happening in society. Within a Mutual Respect Paradigm, universities could play a role at hosting dialogues involving protesters, police and whatever other stakeholders could play a role. The purpose of the dialogues would be to communicate openly about the issues involved, clear the air of misperceptions of the Other and allow for the possibility of generating entirely new ways of thinking about potential opportunities. Creation of a safe neutral environment allows for highly charged emotional issues to be discussed without violence. The basic principles would be that participants would treat each other with dignity and respect and that all would be encouraged to develop a distal self capacity—that is to be able to observe themselves and what is happening to them emotionally and cognitively in response to what others are saying.

Three paradigms have been defined for the protest crowd–police relational system. Each was looked at first from the perspective of police who have mandate within society to maintain order. The crowd control paradigm establishes order through force and the threat of force that includes control tactics and weapons. The discursive management model uses language in the form of offers to help, assumptive precluding, and questions to keep order. The Mutual Respect model emphasizes respect, inclusion and an ethical vision that emphasizes the well-being of humankind (especially the most vulnerable) and biosphere. The bounds of the meaning of control are opened to allow comfort at being at the edge of chaos where there is an openness to flow with new possibilities and be open to the emergence of creative new options for thought, values, ideas and action. As the implications of this new paradigm were explored for the various stakeholders, a new vision for society began to emerge. Historically we can now see that a version of the discursive

management paradigm emerged in a number of historical contexts. First, the Metropolitan Police of London in the 1800s made a categorical shift in approach from a military, repressive approach to one based on discourse and moral authority. The latitude for protest offered by the police in many old democracies is significantly greater than is the case in authoritarian regimes. Protest has been responsible for many significant reforms—the institutions and presence of democratic governments are largely the result of protest. Likewise, the responsiveness of governments to protest has allowed for the evolution of the right to protest and expanded suffrage to include all adult citizens regardless of race, class or gender. Protest has made governments more accountable to the people. We will examine these themes in greater detail in the next chapter as we go a step further by asking what might be the implications of this emerging new paradigm on the institutions of democratic governance.