# TABLE OF CONTENTS

2. Contributing Authors

6. Introduction to the Issue: Resilience ........................................................................................................... Laura Finley
8. Letter from the Co-Chairs .......................................................... Geoffrey Bateman and Margarita Tadevosyan
10. Resilience: My Car Accident Story .......................................................... Laura Finley
13. A Reflection from Uppsala, Sweden .......................................................... Zoe Schuck
15. They Say I’m Resilient ................................................................................................................ Laura Finley
16. Was It Always Like This? ............................................................................................................ cora àllune
17. More than 14 Years on Death Row .......................................................... Maria DeLiberato
20. One Hundred Years of Robotics: Fostering Resilience in Response to Technological Disruption ........................................................................................................ Jo Ann Oravec
26. A Child of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) ............ Jonathan Hutto
39. The Resiliency of the Jewbans ........................................................................................................ Laura Finley
42. When Hate Comes to Campus-The Psychology of Hate: Responding to Bias, Bigotry, and Racism ................................................................................................................ Allan M. Hoffman
53. Nonviolent Civil Resistance and Cultural Preservation: The Case of Algeria ................................................................................................ Nicolas-Bilal Urick
59. Rebirth ................................................................................................................................................ Randall Amster
60. Resilience and Its Discontents ........................................................................................................ Randall Amster
62. Resilience Is a Byproduct of Survival: An Interview with Shingai Njeri Kagunda ................................................................................................................ Gabriel Ertsgaard
65. Peace Through Art: Pursuing Paradigm Shifts ........................................................................ Yehuda Silverman
67. Watercolor Tears ................................................................................................................................ Elsa Barron
68. Peace Chronicle Content Submission Information
69. Save the Date: PJSA 2023
CONTRIBUTORS

Laura Finley, PhD, is Professor of Sociology & Criminology at Barry University in Miami Shores, Florida. She is the author, co-author or editor of 32 books and has two to be released in 2023. Finley is also author of 44 peer-reviewed journal articles and numerous book chapters. In addition, she is a syndicated columnist with PeaceVoice. Dr. Finley is also actively involved in a number of peace, justice and human rights movements and was the 2022 recipient of PJSA’s Peace Scholar Award. She served as Board Co-Chair for many years.

Geoffrey Bateman (he/him/his) has been involved in PJSA for almost ten years. He is Associate Professor in the Department of Peace and Justice Studies at Regis University, and teaches courses on homelessness, LGBTQ+ activism, nonviolence, and research and writing in the community. Over the past few decades his community-based work has included HIV prevention, fighting the gay ban in the military, and working for marriage equality. From 2012 to 2020, he served on the board of The Gathering Place, Denver’s only daytime, drop-in shelter for women, children, and transgender individuals experiencing poverty and homelessness. For the past five years, he served as Associate Dean for Student Support and Experiential Learning in Regis College. His current scholarship examines queer nonviolence through the work of LGBTQ+ writers, activists, and movements. His recent publications focus on the intersection of vocation, queerness, and social justice, including essays “Queer Callings: LGBTQ Literature and Vocation,” and “Queer Vocation and the Uncommon Good.”

Margarita Tadevosyan is a Research Assistant Professor and post-Doctoral research fellow at the Jimmy and Rosalynn Carter School for Peace and Conflict Resolution. She is a scholar-practitioner of conflict resolution with over a decade of experience of convening and facilitating Track II dialogue projects in the South Caucasus. Her primary area of research interest is locally-led peacemaking and peacebuilding work, with a particular emphasis on relationships developed between local actors and international organizations. Dr. Tadevosyan has worked in the post-Soviet space, in particular in the South Caucasus, engaging with Armenian-Azerbaijani, Armenian-Turkish, and Georgian-South Ossetian conflict contexts. She received her PhD from George Mason University’s Carter School for Peace and Conflict Resolution in 2019. She also holds Masters Degrees in Peace Operations Policy and Conflict Resolution, as well as a Certificate in Peace Research from University of Oslo.

Zoe Schuck is a senior peace, justice, and conflict studies major at Gustavus Adolphus College in St. Peter, MN. I am originally from McMinnville, OR, and I have a love of rain, yarn crafts, my three-legged cat Leeuwenn and all things cozy. At Gustavus, I am a member of the Gustavus Choir and liturgist for our Sunday worship community. I served briefly on the board of the Lutheran Peace Fellowship and now serve as a campus organizer for the Minnesota DFL. I was also an exchange student at Uppsala University in Uppsala, Sweden in the spring of 2022, where she wrote the piece included here.
Niko Coady is a recent graduate from the University of New Brunswick, with a Bachelor of Arts in Psychology & Gender and Women’s Studies. She has a certificate in Family Violence Issues, and has volunteered for several years within the sexual violence prevention and intervention spaces within her communities. She currently works as a Partnership Coordinator with REES. Niko is passionate about ending sexual violence on post-secondary campuses and hopes to empower survivors through her work and her writing.

Cora àllune is a graduate from Berea College in Berea, KY where she studied peace & social justice as well as women & gender studies. As a freelance writer, her publications are of both creative and informative nature with special focuses on sustainability, activism, LGBTQIA+ rights, and BIPOC in Appalachia. Her intention is to wield vibrant, artful arrangements of words for the purposes of education, pleasure and representation. Cora will earn her doctorate on implementations of restorative justice in criminal and educational institutions and hopes to conduct research regarding the lexicon of restorative justice theories and practices.

Maria DeLiberato is the Executive Director of Floridians for Alternatives to the Death Penalty (FADP). Maria is also an Assistant Public Defender for the Sixth Judicial Circuit in Clearwater, Florida, handling capital trials and resentencings.

Maria began her career as Assistant State Attorney in Miami-Dade County, where she prosecuted serious felony cases in the Career Criminal Unit and experienced firsthand the impact of violent crime. During her time as an Assistant State Attorney, she witnessed the limited ability of the criminal justice system to meet both the need for personal healing and restoration for crime victims as well as for accountability from those who harmed them. She then spent nearly 13 years at Capital Collateral Regional Counsel (“CCRC”), representing individuals on Florida’s death row in their post-conviction appeals. Among the many cases she handled at CCRC was the representation of Clemente Aguirre, who was exonerated after serving 14 years in custody, 10 of them on Florida’s death row. Today, Aguirre is a member of the FADP Board of Directors.

Jo Ann Oravec (MA, MS, MBA, PhD) is a full professor at the University of Wisconsin at Whitewater. She is also affiliated with the Holtz Center for Science and Technology Studies at UW-Madison. She has written over eighty peer-reviewed articles on computing, peace studies, ethics, public policy, disability studies, and related topics. She is currently working on artificial intelligence and lie detection research. Her publications include Good Robot, Bad Robot: Dark and Creepy Sides of Robotics, Autonomous Vehicles, and AI (Springer) and Virtual Individuals, Virtual Groups: Human Dimensions of Groupware and Computer Networking (Cambridge University Press). Her next book, on the “smart home of the future,” will be published in 2023. Jo Ann was the first chair of the Privacy Council of the State of Wisconsin, the US’s first state-level council on information privacy issues. She was a visiting fellow at Oxford and Cambridge. She can be reached at oravecj@uww.edu and http://oravec.org
Jonathan W. Hutto, Sr., is an anti-oppression community organizer and author who has made substantial contributions within both non-profits and grassroots organizations for over a quarter century. Jonathan embraced his calling as an Undergraduate Student at Howard University in the late 1990’s. In 2006, as an enlisted member of the United States Navy, he co-founded the Appeal For Redress from the Iraq War, which was awarded the 2007 Letelier Moffitt Human Rights Award from the Institute for Policy Studies. He can be reached at jonathanhutto99@gmail.com

Dr. Allan Hoffman, is an educator and health services executive with over 40 years of extensive executive level experience leading and managing higher educational and health care organizations. His experience includes serving as president, CEO, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Health Sciences and Nursing, and tenured professor. His faculty appointments include family medicine, medical education, public health and healthcare administration. Currently he serves as a member of the Registry for College and University Presidents which is an organization dedicated to higher education placing experienced key executives for interim roles.

Over his career he also has served as Founding President of the proposed College of Osteopathic Medicine and Health Sciences which was committed to serving the needs of underserved populations by ameliorating health disparities, President of the Santa Barbara Graduate Institute, CEO of the Arizona Campuses of Ottawa University, Dean and Professor, California State University, and interim president of Mount Carmel College of Nursing, Columbus, Ohio, interim Dean of Health Sciences, University of California, and interim president of the Institute for Clinical Social Work, Chicago, Ill. Allan is fully committed to and values Social Justice working to end bias, bigotry and racism and preventing violence in the community. While serving as Dean of the College of Health Sciences, he was the founder and first Director of the Center for the Prevention of Community Violence at Des Moines University. The Center was established to be a research, programmatic, and community resource. He received a Certificate of Special Congressional Recognition for his work in violence prevention and an Award from the National Office of Drug Control Policy for the work of the Center.

Allan has published on violence prevention issues and provided volunteer service in the US, the Caribbean region, East Africa. He has provided volunteer services with Empower Tanzania working with the Maasai Tribe in Tanzania on a project to prevent Gender Based Violence. His publication on Domestic Violence: A Global View (Greenwood Publishers) was featured by the United Nations during the global initiative on preventing violence against women and children. Dr. Hoffman is the recipient of numerous awards and honors associated with his teaching and his efforts to prevent violence and resolve conflict creatively.

In addition to his front-line experience working in higher education leadership, Dr. Hoffman has researched and published on key issues in higher education leadership with a focus on innovations within higher education, leadership, managing and total quality improvement. He has provided consulting services to schools, colleges, and healthcare organizations in multinational settings. His most recent book, Innovations in Higher Education, is part of the Higher Education Series of the American Council on Education. He is the recipient of numerous awards for his teaching leadership and service, served as a coach and mentor particularly to under-represented persons interested in entering higher education leadership roles.
Gabriel Ertsgaard is the Interviews Editor for The Peace Chronicle. He earned his Doctor of Letters from Drew University with a dissertation on environmental themes in a medieval legend. He previously taught university English courses in the United States and China. His criticism, poetry, and fairy tales have appeared in various print and digital publications.

Nicolas-Bilal Urick (he/him) is a junior and McCabe Scholar at Swarthmore College studying Peace & Conflict Studies and Arabic Language & Literature in the Honors program. In addition to these academic endeavors, Nick is a Mellon Mays Undergraduate Research Fellow; the culture editor and archivist for an on-campus publication, Voices; a Writing Associate Fellow in creative writing and Arabic; and an active contributor to Playgrounds for Palestine and Palestine Writes. He is particularly passionate about the intersections between nonviolent praxis, migration scholarship, and structural violence theory. You can find him reading related French, Arabic, and Russian literature in his free time. He calls Deir Dibwan, Palestine, and Wilmington, Delaware home.

Randall Amster, J.D. Ph.D., is Co-Director and Teaching Professor of Environmental Studies at Georgetown University and is the author of books including Peace Ecology (Routledge, 2015). Amster served as Executive Director of PJSA for many years and is still an active member.

Yehuda Silverman, PhD, is a peacebuilding pracademic (practitioner/academic) who specializes in conflict prevention, analysis, and transformation. He is currently an Instructor at Northwestern University’s Civic Education Project, a UNESCO MGIEP Master Trainer, a Facilitator at the International Center for Religion and Diplomacy through a dialogue program (Qisasna: Our Stories) between USA and Yemen students, and a Global Solutions Sustainability Challenge Coach for IREX. He also mentors emerging peacebuilders through Initiatives of Change and is a Faith For Our Planet Fellow at Duke University. His PhD is in Conflict Analysis and Resolution with a concentration in International Peace from Nova Southeastern University, and he is also a certified Facilitator in Intercultural Dialogue from the UN Habitat and Kingian Nonviolence Conflict Reconciliation from the University of Rhode Island.

Elsa Barron is an environmental peace and security researcher, writer, person of faith, and youth activist. She is also the host of the podcast, Olive Shoot, which highlights reasons for hope in the midst of the climate crisis through many approaches to environmental peacebuilding. She hopes to follow in the footsteps of advocates who use art to captivate, in addition to the mind, the imagination.
INTRODUCTION TO THE ISSUE: RESILIENCE

LAURA FINLEY

Resilience means lots of things to people. Merriam Webster dictionary refers to resilience as a noun, and defines it as 1) the capability of a strained body to recover its size and shape after deformation caused especially by compressive stress; and 2) an ability to recover from or adjust easily to misfortune or change. Resiliency, or demonstrating resilience, is a verb—it is active and thus reflects personal agency. I chose resilience for the theme of this issue, as I see it as connected to so many of the topics of interest to peace and conflict studies scholars, educators, and activists. Individually, we can exhibit resilience when living through difficult experiences and recovering from rough times. Collectively, we can help build resiliency through support, encouragement, love, and yes, activism.

Submissions in this issue are diverse—individual and systemic, multi-disciplinary, personal and scholarly. From Sociology to Religion, Peace and Justice Studies to Communications and more, contributors offer unique insights from various perspectives. Contributors address personal hardships and how they were handled, how to support others dealing with challenging times, and what can be done to prevent certain types of violence.

After an opening letter by PJSA Board Co-Chairs Geoffrey Bateman and Margarita Tadevosyan, the first piece is my contribution, about remaining resilient after a horrible car accident that resulted in serious injuries. Next, Peace and Conflict Studies student Zoe Schuck shares a heartwarming story about the beauty of small sacrifices amidst the chaos of Ukrainian people who have been displaced from their homes due to war. Niko Coady’s poem brings awareness to how survivors of trauma feel when they are referred to as resilient. Coady’s work offers us an important way to think about victimization. Similarly, corre álume’s poem addresses the challenges of surviving an abusive relationship. Maria DeLiberato’s entry about her work to help death row inmate Clemente Aguirre highlights the resilience exonerees face through the legal process as well as the perseverance of the counsel that represents them. DeLiberato is the Executive Director of Floridian’s for Alternatives to the Death Penalty. Next, JoAnn Oravec discusses the threats to humanity being faced by robotics and Artificial Intelligence, including how they are changing our daily lives in terms of employment, how our food is produced, weapons of war, and more. Oravec offers hope for resisting intrusions into our human identity.

Jonathan Hutto, an awardee of PJSA’s Social Courage Award, documents his lifetime of resistance, including his activism as a student at Howard University and with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). Next, I share the story of the Cuban Jews, or Jewbans, who have twice started new lives with new language, cultures, employment and more yet have been
tremendously successful, especially in South Florida. In his submission, Alan Hoffman focuses on hate—the roots of it, and how we can resist it. Next, Nicolas-Bilal Urick shares two pieces about global issues and resilience, one on the Oslo Accords and the other on the resilience of French-Occupied indigenous Algerians. Next, Randall Amster, former Executive Director of PJSA, provides a critical reminder that resistance and resilience should go hand in hand and shares hopeful words on rebirth while Yehuda Silverman offers uplifting ideas on building peace through art. Elsa Barron completes the issue with her haiku reflections.

I am proud to say the art included on the cover was created by my best friend, Gisbert Heuer. Art of Gis began during the pandemic, when Gisbert’s vocal studio was not able to open. He chose to begin sketching and creating photographic collages as an outlet during the difficult time. In many ways he embodies resilience, having grown up in East Germany and watched the Berlin Wall crumble, then starting new in the U.S. The cover image is a collage he made of himself and his adopted German Shepherd, Dayze. The two found each other during the pandemic and have provided love and support throughout.
Greetings, PJSA!

As 2022 comes to an end, we reflect on this past year’s accomplishments, missteps, and remaining challenges. This past year was difficult and devastating for so many: with the war in Ukraine, continued tensions and the unfolding humanitarian crisis in Nagorno-Karabakh, simmering tensions in Kosovo, and continued instability in Ethiopia. These are just a few of the dozens of urgent conflicts that we confront globally. Domestically, we faced equally troubling challenges, as we continued to navigate the evolving COVID pandemic, especially fraught for those with chronic medical issues, and grappled with the overturning of Roe vs Wade, ongoing racial injustice and police brutality, the climate crisis, immigration injustice, renewed scapegoating and targeting of the LGBTQIA+ community, and gun violence, to name but just a few of the most salient issues, all of which remain highly divisive issues and instigate tensions within the United States.

Within this environment, PJSA’s work and the space it creates for our members—including scholars, students, practitioners, educators, advocates, and activists—allows us to share, strategize, and learn from each other. Such support is simply invaluable. As the new co-chairs of the board, we approach 2023 with anticipation and hope for the possible renewal that a new year can bring. We look forward to supporting you all and shepherding the work of this association as we all continue in the struggle to address these global and domestic challenges.

The focus of this issue of the Peace Chronicle—resilience—couldn’t be more timely nor relevant given the violence and injustices we face. We are deeply grateful for this issue’s guest editor, Laura Finley, one of the immediate past co-chairs of the PJSA Board, for her choice of theme and her wise and insightful curating and editing of submissions. We hope that you find what follows both acknowledges the sometimes painful realities that necessitate the cultivation of resilience and inspires you in your ongoing work to practice resilience in your own work. Our gratitude, too, for editor and PJSA Board Treasurer, Wim Laven, for his ongoing work on and support of this publication.

For those of us who were able to attend PJSA’s annual conference this past October, I think all would agree that it also strengthened our individual and collective sense of resilience. Fostering a much-needed sense of community, the conference engaged us on multiple levels and inspired conversation, shared new knowledge, and renewed friendships. The sessions were impressive, and we are grateful for the dedication, hard work, and thoughtful preparation, of Niki Johnson and Michelle Collins-Sibley (conference co-chairs), Michael Loadenthal (PJSA Executive Director), and all of the students and members of the University of Mount Union who worked tirelessly to make the conference a success. Thank you!
The day prior to the conference, the PJSA Board also had a very vibrant meeting. We are pleased to announce some important restructuring to the board positions and roles to ensure effective and efficient operations. The changes and updates will be posted on the webpage, and you can review them to learn about these changes.

Finally, we are happy to announce that the 2023 annual conference will take place at Iowa State University. We are looking forward to a productive, energetic, and collaborative 2023, where we continue to work together for a more just and peaceful society.

In solidarity,
Geoffrey Bateman and Margarita Tadevosyan
RESILIENCE: MY CAR ACCIDENT STORY

LAURA FINLEY

On July 21, 2020, just after dropping off some books at the public library, a driver going the wrong way on a one-way street plowed into me. T-boned on the driver’s side, my car flew off the street, into a parking lot, hit the back of a gentleman’s car and a light post before finally coming to a stop. I had no idea what had happened, as I never saw her coming. Today, I look for drivers who may be going the wrong way on one-way streets but at that time I did not think to do so. My driver’s side door was smashed in and could not be opened. There was glass all over me. And then I looked down at my right leg, which was facing all the wrong direction. Something was very messed up. A witness came to my car and told me what had happened and asked if I was OK. I said “I think my leg is messed up.” Bit of an understatement. He tried to lift me out over the console but was afraid of hurting me more. He and several others called 911. I had him grab my phone, which had fallen to the floor, and I called my husband, who works less than a mile from where it happened. The person who hit me came over, saying “I’m sorry” over and over and that’s the last I saw of her. The ambulance arrived and they used the jaws of life to pry me from the car and gave me a mask for the ride to the hospital, as this was all in the early months of the pandemic. My husband ran there, literally, and collected my purse from the car. In the ambulance, they asked me questions to make sure I wasn’t in shock. I recall being asked who the President was and responding “Donald Trump, unfortunately,” which made them laugh.

My husband took an uber and met us at the emergency room, as he was not allowed to ride with us. At first they were not going to permit him to stay with me, as no visitors were being allowed due to pandemic protocols. They decided to make an exception once they took me back to an area to await x-rays to see what was broken, as that area was not very full. While we waited, we watched footage on the local news of the jaws of life removal and my car being hauled onto a tow truck. A few hours later, a surgeon came and told me I had broken my right clavicle and pelvis in two places when the car hit my door and that my right femur was broken from my leg slamming into the console. I would definitely need surgery on the femur. The other fractures may or may not require surgery, he needed to examine them further. My first question, as a lifelong runner, was when would I be able to run again. He said it might be a year or two. That was devastating. They also said that they were getting me a room and the surgery was set for the following morning. My husband had to leave because absolutely no visitors were allowed on those floors.

That was a painful night. It was also challenging as I was given a roommate who was super pleasant during the day but at night, when she was in pain, she bellowed. All night. I don’t remember the
surgery, as I was anesthetized, of course. In the next few days, I had several more x-rays to see if the other injuries were going to require surgery and to see if the rod was successfully implemented in my femur. I was told I did not need additional surgeries, that the clavicle and pelvis can often heal without it but that it was possible in future things could change and that I would likely have arthritis in these areas later in life. The surgeon and physical therapist said I would be able to go home once I could walk using a walker. So that was my mission. I managed that two days after the surgery and was elated, although nearly passed out. Only to be told that my hemoglobin was quite low, and they had to get it up to normal range before I was released. I was pissed. My husband had planned to drop off some books and clothes and I asked him to smuggle in some alcohol. Probably not wise, but definitely needed! Finally, I got the OK to go home after four nights hospitalized.

Initially, I could barely walk using the walker. My husband and daughter did everything around our apartment and pushed me in a wheelchair to the pool area so I could be outside some. Many friends called, texted, posted on social media and even sent flowers and other gifts, but because of the pandemic few were able to visit. My husband and daughter had work, so there were some pretty lonely days. I started physical therapy three weeks after the accident and worked my ass off. In a short time, I was able to move from the walker to a cane. COVID did bring me the lucky opportunity to keep teaching remotely, as I could not drive and otherwise would have had to take leave from my teaching job.

While I was healing, we were advised to look into legal action against the girl who hit me. It turns out she was only 19, and she was overheard telling the police that “she takes that way to work every day,” meaning she drives the wrong way on a one-way street often. She was clearly culpable, and my injuries were clearly the result of her actions. It seemed a slam dunk. We were not interested in getting rich off this young woman but having been informed that my bills would not be fully covered by my auto or health insurance and that I will likely never be “completely” healed, it seemed like some kind of compensation might be due. However, Florida law does not require drivers with cars that are paid for to hold bodily injury liability coverage and since this driver did not carry any, there was no legal action we could take, and she paid nothing towards my bills. I am not sure whether she receive any traffic citations, although it would be hard to imagine that she did not. Suing her could have been an option but seemed silly, as the attorney found that she lived with her mother, worked in a low wage job, and they had no assets. Nothing to recover, and it would have been another pain in the ass.

I am a very positive person, I believe, but this was a tough period. I tell this story in this issue about resilience, however, to acknowledge the moments when I struggled but also to give myself some credit for when I remained strong. I sobbed a few times, thinking of the bills, the things I could no longer do and might never do again in the same way, coupled with all the other things that got cancelled during COVID. In all, to date I have paid about $8,000 out of pocket for this accident. Could have been worse, but it is hard to think that way sometimes. I was angry that someone could do something that resulted in this kind of harm and pay nothing to cover damages. Yet I also did not want to live in anger. I was sad because I was homebound and lonely and couldn’t even take my dogs out to walk.

But, I am still standing. I can run, although it might never feel quite the same. I can and do other forms
of exercise, though. My physical therapist called me a “poster child for recovery” because I walked unassisted only a few months after the accident, and I can honestly say that is because I worked really hard. I ran less than six months later, albeit SUPER slowly and awkwardly. When I was able to drive, the first route I drove was the one I was on when the accident happened, because I needed to overcome that fear. I have thought about writing a letter to the driver sharing my thoughts but thought better of it—-I want to believe that day was a wake up call for her and that she is a better driver today.

I still am a nervous driver and car rider. The sound of metal on metal kills me. I look several times when crossing a one-way street to make sure no one else is going to hit me. And when I am cold, the metal in my leg starts aching. As noted, I’m several thousand dollars down for something I should never have had to pay for.

Yet I am resilient. And I am forever thankful to my husband, my daughter, my family, my neighbors and my friends who helped however they could. This shitty experience definitely showed that I have a lot of love in my life and for that I am forever grateful.

Resilience takes so many forms. I may not be a lot of things, but I do think I am resilient and for that I feel proud.
A REFLECTION FROM UPPSALA, SWEDEN

ZOE SCHUCK

In most of Europe right now, a Ukrainian passport functions as a ticket on public transport: simply showing a Ukrainian passport to the driver or conductor will pay the fare. I know this because it has been posted on almost every timetable, transport app, and platform I have seen in the last two months. I found it a nice sentiment; one less thing to worry about for those who needed a break the most. But to be honest, I never considered it could be more than a sentiment, especially in eastern Sweden. Living in the “Scandinavian socialist utopia”, it seemed unlikely those fleeing from the violence would make it this far north without serious assistance - assistance that historically, the Swedish government has been somewhat sparse with. Nonetheless, the idea of providing transport for people that need it made me feel good. I appreciate the student discount on my monthly bus pass, so I could only imagine the difference that a waived fare would make for those whose lives had just been turned upside down.

About a month ago when I got on the bus into the city center, a young boy, no more than 6, was crying to his mother and clearly frustrated about something. She consoled him, and I knew they weren’t speaking Swedish, but I couldn’t tell what exactly the language was. All I knew was that my heart broke for this little boy - maybe it was a bad day at school, maybe he had lost a favorite toy, but his mother did the best she could to wipe his tears and make him feel better. It was clear this wasn’t a fit over something not going his way - his sadness clearly came from a place of pain. Oftentimes bystanders assume crying children are dramatic, or bratty, or any other number of terms that exist to dismiss outward emotional expression. But this boy was none of those things. And the way his mother comforted him was proof; his pain was reflected in her consolation, and as many wonderful mothers do, she took it on for his sake.

A few weeks after that, on the bus headed back home from the city center, a mother and young son boarded and flashed what looked to be a passport to the driver. She looked stressed, and a bit disheveled, but her son hopped onto the bus holding a daffodil with a big smile. He smiled at me. I smiled at him. They sat, she smiled at him, and it seemed that some relief washed over her face. We rode to our respective stops. The two of them stood by the door, and the little boy with the daffodil in one hand and his mother’s hand in the other jumped off the bus. And away they walked.

Today, again sitting at the bus stop, a little boy in a Pokémon hat walked up to me and smiled. “Hej!” He said. “Hej!” I replied. Kids do that I suppose. He sat by me on the bench, and I gave up my place for his mother who was close behind. In her hand was an envelope with a heart drawn on it. As we boarded the bus, she opened the envelope and showed the driver a passport. In this moment, it all clicked. This mother and son I had been seeing;
they are Ukrainian refugees. The nice sentiment of a passport for a fare, it was for them. And I couldn't have felt more blind.

She likely speaks no Swedish, and he is only learning. I don't know what they've been through. I don't know if he's even been able to start school, and I don't know why he was crying that day. I don't know if the mother has found work or if she will ever be able to return to the place they call home. I don't even know their names; after all, the knowledge I have was gifted only through coincidence, bus stops, and facial expressions. The extent of their story is something I simply do not, and likely will never, have the chance to know.

But what I do know is this: That little boy, with his daffodil and Pokémon hat and great big smile gives me hope. Greeting strangers at bus stops and picking flowers on sunny days - despite all that he and his mother have likely been through, he still shines so brightly.

I'm a Peace Studies major; I study, pray, and fight for peace. And for me, that little boy is a reminder why. But this story would have no beginning, middle, or ending if it weren't for the small sentiment of a waived bus fare. Something so seemingly small made all the difference for this mother and son. Peace cannot exist without grace and sacrifice. And for this mother and son, and countless other refugees, the sacrifice of 13 Swedish Kroner (about $1.50) from Swedish taxpayers each time they ride the bus is how they can build stability here in Uppsala. So I suspect I would be hard-pressed to find a Swedish taxpayer who would take issue with a mother and son seeking refuge via public transport. (I also don't think they would mind that the little boy picked a flower either, but that's for another day).

Most people never think about these small sacrifices, especially if they don't stop to read the postings at the stops and stations. They are something I know this mother thinks about though, and something she will think about for many weeks to come. Her son's joy and innocence will protect him for now, and I can only pray that peace will come and protect him forever. But for now, I hope that bus rides and Pokémon hats and flowers will be his shield - and keep his innocence safe as an inspiration for all of us. We could all use it right now. And maybe a daffodil, too.
They say I’m resilient

Niko Coady

People say I’m strong. They can’t imagine how I deal with the day to day. How do I move on? How do I continue to laugh, to smile, to enjoy the simplest of joys?

Survivors are told they are brave, resilient, impenetrable. But our resilience is in the moments we are willing to be exhausted. To show our anger, our trauma, our isolation, to those who say we are strong.

Resilience gets put on a pedestal. It is something we admire, and hold up high, and covet. But my resilience is not something I chose. It’s not something I wanted, or want, or would choose to be recognized for. People say survivors are incredible because of their strength. No. Survivors are people, and they have to be strong to survive.

To me, resilience isn’t about getting back up after you are pushed down, or smiling in the face of adversity, or continuing to move even when everything hurts. It’s about sharing that the systems around us are continuing to cause pain. It’s about allowing yourself to grieve the adversity you have been forced to face. It’s about asking the people in your life to lend a hand and pull you back up, because you don’t want to be strong anymore.

We have to stop forcing survivors to be resilient, and start asking our institutions to minimize retraumatization.

Of course, we can recognize resilience. We can see that people have to get back up time and time again through adversity. But I believe we should take resilience off the pedestal. Let’s covet change, growth, and empathy. Covet the traits that allow us to give people spaces where they do not have to be resilient.

People say I’m strong. But I just had to survive.
March 15, 2021
Was it always like this?
Worrying about the password on my phone, if it’s long enough.
Checking the levels of the liquor in the freezer, looking for evidence of secret sips when I’m in the other room. Listening for the stick of the refrigerator seal. We never did get that fixed.

Because I remember other things, too. Our hands in the dirt, coaxing beautiful flowers and vegetables from the earth. Burning Kentucky summers and driving to the reservoir with the windows down. Vibrant greens in the treetops and sweet love making between mauve silk sheets. Lovely words written in blue ink, woven into heartfelt letters waiting for me on the bedside table. Your breath on my neck as the sun tosses, wakes, and spills onto our street.

But then, the rest comes flooding back.

Me, doubled over at the kitchen sink in grief, sinking to my knees with a sadness too great for my body. Gasping for air that was never coming. Hoping for sobriety that didn’t come soon enough.

You scream at me, and my vision blurs as a glass whizzes past my face-- narrowly missing me and crashing to the floor. My focus leaves you and your sound, and instead I feel my feet planted in the home we built together.

The walls we painted.
The colors we picked.
The books we stacked.

And I wonder, was it always like this?

Over a year later, I’m sitting in a different home.

December 6, 2022
5, 255 days. More than 14 years. For nearly a decade and half, Clemente Aguirre-Jarquin remained behind steel bars—caged and condemned to die for brutal murders he did not commit. While they trapped his physical body, his mind remained free. Clemente never gave up proving his innocence, despite the government using its overwhelming power to stop the hidden truth from coming to light; to maintain their convenient, yet wrongful conviction.

I had the honor of representing him for the last nine of those years. I was in the courtroom in 2018, standing next to Clemente when the State finally dropped the charges against him, a full 6 years after DNA results came back excluding him and pointing to the real perpetrator. That day in court, Clemente asked to speak. Clemente, not even five feet tall, rose from his chair. In a soft, calm voice, he turned to the prosecutors, the people who had stolen from him the prime of his life, and said, “I do not have hate in my heart.” I will never forget the strength and resiliency I witnessed from this man.

In 2003, Clemente fled the increasing gang violence in his home country of Honduras. His older sisters already had already emigrated and, he too, wanted to join them in Florida. After a grueling journey, he arrived. Working three jobs, sending money back home to his impoverished mother, Clemente began to make new home. He was a pool shark and known for his wide smile, and friendly disposition. They nicknamed him “Shorty.” Life was hard for Clemente, but he made the most of it and worked hard. He became friendly with his next-door neighbors in the trailer park in which he lived. They’d have cookouts and drink together.

June 17, 2004. The day that changed everything. Clemente had been in the country a little over a year. He was young, a bit impetuous, and had not yet taken steps to secure residency in the US. That morning, he went to his next-door neighbors’ home, as he had done many times before. He had worked late the day before, followed by the bar for some rounds of pool. He was home now but wanted to continue drinking. His neighbors always had an open-door policy and generous with sharing beer.

As soon as he entered, he knew something was wrong, very wrong. He saw blood. He saw the body of one of his neighbors practically blocking the door. He walked further into the trailer. He saw the body of another one of the women living in the trailer. Both looked like they had been stabbed. He saw a knife laying on some boxes. Clemente knew two other people lived in the home. Were they still alive? Was the killer still there? Panicked and afraid, Clemente picked up the knife and moved through the home, getting blood on his shoes and making tracks. He checked both women for signs of life. Now, their blood was on his clothes. After finding no one else in the house, he left. He was in shock. He didn’t even realize he still had the knife in his hand.
dropping it in the front in the yard. He didn’t know what to do.

Clemente was in the country illegally. If deported to Honduras, he would likely be killed. He had fled because he was under increasing pressure to join a gang. His best friend had been murdered in the street. The gang members told him he was next. Calling the police meant being deported and so he went home. He waited and worried.

Once the bodies were discovered police swarmed the area. Clemente eventually went to them. He told them what he knew. That he went there, that he was scared, that he touched the bodies and the knife and that he did not call the police. He thought telling the truth was the right thing to do. He offered his DNA, his blood, his hair, everything. He wanted to prove his innocence. Like many in the criminal justice system, Clemente’s cooperation caused the police to have tunnel vision. They had an easy suspect. Open and shut case, nothing more to look into. Like many who think they can explain their innocence to police, it did not work. It would be 14 more years before Clemente would breathe free air again.

Clemente’s lawyers did not believe him. They did no investigation, never asking for DNA testing. They never even bothered to call his mother in Honduras. He was convicted and condemned to death. His first couple years on death row were filled with tears and anguish. He saw other inmates being led off by guards to be executed. He did not speak English. He didn’t understand the system. He didn’t know that he had years of appeals before he was eligible for execution. Clemente thought those same guards would come to take him away like had seen many times before. But he did not give up.

I first met Clemente in the summer of 2009 when my office was appointed to represent him. He was skeptical. Too many lawyers had already failed and ignored him. I was no different in his eyes. It took some time, but he soon learned that we were ready to fight for him. We joined forces with the Innocence Project, and ultimately won a motion for DNA testing. We tested over 100 bloodstains, and not a single drop belonged to Clemente. What we did find were 8 drops belonging to the actual killer – who was the daughter/granddaughter of the victims. We would later find out she told multiple people she had killed her family.

We asked the State to drop the charges in light of this new evidence. They said no. We presented all this new evidence to a judge in 2013, arguing that it was enough to overturn his conviction and grant him a new trial. After 2 weeks of evidence and testimony, we were hopeful. Three months later, she denied our motion. I had to call Clemente to tell him this news. He was dejected, frustrated. And yet, he stayed hopeful. He knew he had a team to fight for him. And fight we did. Three years later, in October of 2016, a unanimous Florida Supreme Court
Court overturned his conviction and granted him the new trial he deserved. It would take two more years of fighting before that day in November of 2018 when the State finally dropped the charges, and Clemente was free. In every painting he did in prison, including the one that sits on my desk as I write this essay, he painted two birds flying. He said they represented the day that he would be free and be reunited with his mother. I was lucky enough to witness this beautiful reunion at the Orlando airport that next month - the first hug from a mother to her son in more than 15 years. And I’m reminded of his strength and perseverance every time I look at this painting. They are finally flying free.
ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF ROBOTICS: FOSTERING RESILIENCE IN RESPONSE TO TECHNOLOGICAL DISRUPTION

JO ANN ORAVEC

To call for social and personal resilience against the encroachments of robotics and artificial intelligence (AI) may seem like the plot of a science fiction film rather than an urgent practical recommendation. However, the theme of ubiquitous robotics and AI applications in everyday life has indeed moved from science fiction speculation to real-world implementation. Deaths, injuries, and major resource damage have resulted from some of the applications, leading to serious questions about the responsibility of developers and implementers (De Pagter, 2021; Oravec, 2021). Disruptions from substantial changes in employment situations have engendered kinds of “automation anxiety” as well (Akst, 2013), along with many racial and class biases related to the problematic use of AI applications (Noor, 2020). As robots, autonomous vehicles, and other AI-enhanced entities become bigger factors in developed and developing nations, individuals are also being presented with questions as to what it is to be fully human in settings increasingly framed and controlled by intelligent technologies. This short essay explores why robotics, autonomous vehicles, and AI are relevant to peace and justice-related research and curricula at an assortment of levels, from how individuals are given care, food is delivered, and military explosives are detonated to the philosophical consideration of humanity’s relationship with intelligent technologies. It proposes some ways that these issues can be introduced to students, workers, and community participants in order to expand the voices expressing themselves on these matters.

Infusing countless numbers of humanlike robotic and AI-enhanced entities into societies that already are strained in terms of equity, human rights, and basic safety may certainly present formidable issues, and some level of peril is to be expected. In some troubled wartime settings, many individuals have already experienced robot-inflicted terror, as autonomous drones and “killer robots” have affected their basic existences. Wernli et al. (2021) characterize societal resilience as the “capacity of societies to maintain their core social functions and reduce the social impact of a shock” (p. 1). The notion of “human resilience” extends these capacities to the defense of essential human functions, including the ability to experience joy and love. Robotics and AI initiatives can indeed challenge the resilience of societies if they are not carefully implemented. Maintaining awareness about how intelligent technologies are shaping our
ives is increasingly a part of societal and human resilience, both on the level of the individual and of the society as a whole. Many forces keep individuals from attempting to obtain a critical distance from technologies; robotics has been associated with positive futuristic advances by marketers and developers, and questioning its value is often construed as being uninformed (Payr, 2019). Significant cultural differences have also emerged that provide challenging complications; some nations are more involved with robotics than others, often reflecting economic and social priorities. Resilience is indeed needed to maintain human values and support human rights in the face of sociotechnological changes and disruptions; however, this resilience may be hard to come by as the changes that occur are framed as essential or inevitable by those with power and economic clout. However, many of the critical issues involved in such technological shifts have been displaced in public discourse by other important societal concerns, such as inflation and economic inequality.

Rather than well-tempered resilience, sabotage against robots or even related violence against other humans can be unfortunate outcomes as technological disruptions leave some individuals with reduced employment and reputational options. Forms of “robo-rage” are already emerging, with individuals acting out their aggressions and frustrations by attacking autonomous vehicles or delivery robots (Oravec, 2022). Those who express fears and misgivings in terms of robotics and other technologies are often considered unknowledgeable and even as “Luddites,” combaters against a supposedly inevitable technological permeation into everyday life (Jones, 2013). The prospects that “robophobia” would make individuals less equipped to deal with modern society have resulted in a number of research and training initiatives (Woods, 2020). Many managerial efforts are devoted to reducing the resistance of workers to dealing with robots, attempting to achieve “optimal synergy” between the two (Libert, Mosconi, & Cadieux, 2020). Simple narratives that present robotics as unproblematic companions of individuals have also emerged (Payr, 2019). The notion that skilled individuals or university and college students will not need to worry about losing their jobs to automation may dissuade individuals from focusing on the potential ills of technologies; some education in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) subjects has been often presented as inoculating individuals from suffering the brunt of technological disruption.

One hundred years of robotics

Matters of humanity’s relationships to robotics have been salient for a long while. Nearly one hundred years ago, the play RUR (Rossum’s Universal Robots) stimulated thinking about the associations between workers and robots (Čapek, 2004). Automated and mechanical characters were a part of fictional treatment and theatrical demonstrations for many centuries; “three thousand years of robots” have been documented by historians (Cave & Dihal, 2018).

Long before the RUR treatment of robot issues, the Luddites placed technological change as a problem in their confrontations with 19th century labor issues (Jones, 2013). In past decades, vigorous discussions of how automation would affect society often blossomed, often triggered by the developers of technological initiatives themselves, such as Norbert Wiener’s 1954 The Human Use of Human Beings. Wiener was deeply fearful of the social and ethical implications for the “cybernetics” that he pioneered. The inventor of the first chatbot, Joseph Weizenbaum, wrote Computer Power and Human Reason (1976), which outlined his reservations about the encroachments of artificial intelligence upon
society. Donna Haraway’s (1987) “manifesto for cyborgs” presented a pioneering perspective on how humans and robots would meld. A renewal of passionate discourse in which the needs of humanity are outlined and the impacts of robotics and AI projected may indeed result in intense controversies but could help ensure that important factors are not being overlooked. Many unforeseen or disregarded negative aspects of robotics and AI applications are emerging as these technologies increase their roles in automating various aspects of workplaces, homes, and communities.

In the past hundred years, robots have often been associated with terrifying images, with fearsome movie robots and combative Battle Bots leaving indelible traces in some cultures. Creepiness in the realm of robotics and AI has been given a name, that of the “uncanny valley” phenomenon (Mori, 1970), with individuals often more repelled by robots the closer they become in image to human beings. In recognition of such strong feelings, some researchers have endeavored to find ways to make robots more friendly and accommodating, even though these efforts may eventually endanger humans as they drop their guard when dealing with potentially-lethal industrial or transportation robots. Campaigns that include highly positive images of robotics are indeed emerging; for example, marketers of high tech products and services are already characterizing a future for society of robotics and automation in which there are few negative dimensions. However, in order to be resilient against potential disruption, societies need to enable their participants to explore the negative sides of robotics and automation as well as whatever benefits may be provided. Automation-related disruptions that require substantial retraining and relocations are already occurring in certain occupations.

How can students, workers, and community participants engage in effective discourse about robots and AI? Teachers, researchers, and community leaders can enable individuals to avoid trite answers to the question “will a robot replace me?” and frame issues in ways that capture the nuances of these very complex and emerging situations. For example, in educational contexts specific examples of robot and AI-related injuries and fatalities can be integrated into curricula for non-engineering majors along with students who study robotics in the classroom as part of a technologically-skewed academic program. Reflection on the question of the biases and stereotypes that AI can reinforce over time can also aid in enlightening students as to the social impacts of high technology. Students should be empowered with historical context and technical background to contemplate these emerging issues; science fiction can also be of help in fleshing out some futuristic scenarios for discussion and debate. Some developers of robots have utilized design and implementation strategies that emphasize values and reflection (Seibt, Damholdt, & Vestergaard, 2020), and provide useful models for how developers can assimilate the interests of their communities into their efforts. Individuals can produce and share “robot blogs” or diaries that narrate the changes over time in their own perspectives as they explore these technologies or encounter them in the workplace. Producing these blogs may reveal insights about the future of humanity itself as well as its technological imprints.

Robots as essential workers

Of special interest to the peace and justice studies communities is how robotics are reframing certain kinds of employment, and how the voices of those involved should be heard in how these changes take place. Such commonplace necessities as food...
preparation and delivery, lawn care, and facilities cleaning have been transformed in many settings with the use of robotics and AI technologies. The Covid pandemic served to demonstrate the importance of “essential workers” in societies, but also stimulated the implementation of many initiatives to replace humans with robots and other intelligent entities such as chatbots and drones. Autonomous vehicles and complex robotics installations in military operations are also playing larger roles in many venues, often exacerbating societal stresses as the power of “killer robots” to destroy is guided by algorithms rather than by human decency. The potential for robots apparently to “outclass” and displace humans in job performance and even in some social interactions presents psychological as well as economic issues. With today’s “compulsive robotics” many individuals are forced to deal with robots and other AI-enhanced entities as a part of their employment or participation in certain organizations, potentially disempowering them and creating a kind of “learned helplessness” in terms of technology.

The choices that educational institutions, manufacturing facilities, and community outreach centers make in terms of technologies deliver strong messages about the future for their participants. Perspectives on technological inevitability can become learned helplessness if individuals are not allowed to question the kinds of technologies they use in their working and playing environments. Important questions raised by participants concerning the security of the robots’ operations and the privacy of any humans involved are often unanswered. The numbers and extents of deaths and injuries inflicted by robots and other AI-enabled entities are increasing, fomenting worker fears in many manufacturing, service and transportation settings (Oravec, 2021, 2022). Occasional news stories about a robot that breaks a child’s finger at a chess match or about an employee who contends that a particular AI system has become sentient often emerge in journalistic channels and social media; science fiction movies with rogue robots are commonplace in theatres and in streaming services. However, what is often lacking is a focused attention on the current state and future potentials for robotics and AI research and development, the kind of attention that teachers and community leaders can inspire in their students and their communities. Critical decisions about robotics and AI implementations are already being made in public policy and legal venues, from courtrooms where liability for robot-involved accidents are being determined to legislative efforts that determine how many tax dollars will be spent for robotics and AI research (Bertolini & Episcopo, 2022).

Some conclusions and reflections: The role of peace and justice studies

Humans have debated the prospects for modern robotics for more than a hundred years, with the play RUR (1923) stimulating controversy even when the field of robotics was in its infancy. Many of the debates on the extent to which automation should be encouraged by governments have been contentious, with the value of human employment and other activity weighed against whatever projected productivity gains automation might provide. What kinds of discussions of robotics and other intelligent entities in society will emerge in the next centuries, and who will initiate this discourse? Today, the discussion of robotics and automation issues is often displaced by politically-charged rhetoric that bypasses concerns about the appropriateness, safety, and security of robotic implementation as well as the resilience of the societies facing potential disruptions. Themes of technological inevitability are laced with the positive
futuristic images provided by marketers and corporate leaders, many of whom will personally benefit from economic investments in these technologies.

From anti-robot attacks to human-robot marriages, “killer robots” to robots that make errors performing surgeries, individuals will soon confront substantial social and ethical challenges concerning robots and AI. Some of the concerns that individuals have about robotics are anticipatory and speculative, since the impacts of robotics and AI are just emerging; however, the concerns often reflect considerable personal insights along with well-supported economic and social projections. Peace and justice studies educators, researchers, and practitioners can help to shape public discourse by empowering individuals to think critically about the impacts of technological development and implementation especially in military and security arenas. With so many political, economic, and social issues, the focused attention of the public to the prospects for robotics and automation may be difficult to maintain, but is essential to ensuring fair and just societies to come.
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Resilience, both in the personal and political sphere, has defined my adulthood and adolescence dating back to when I was a 4th grader in southwest Atlanta, GA. The divorce of my parents in early 1987 exited my mother, late brother and I from the Black Middle Class, spiraling us to a transient existence where we moved on average annually for the next eight years. By the fall of 1993, my mother and I were living in very reduced circumstances with her sister in Chattanooga, TN. The clock was ticking and I knew that school was my sole opportunity of lifting my little boat to Higher Ground somewhere.

Deeply internalizing the words of Rev. Jesse Louis Jackson that my attitude determines my aptitude, I worked myself to the bone those last two years of high school, capturing the attention of my guidance counselor, who became the most pivotal adult in my young life. I informed Mrs. Provine of my aspiration to attend Howard University (HU) despite not having any college savings nor serious family preparation. Despite the odds, I was successful in obtaining roughly $14,000.00 in outside scholarships over four years with just enough funds, combined with federal financial aid, to finance one year at HU. I gambled that if I could get to “The Yard” I would find a way to graduate.

As an Enlisted Sailor in the United States Navy, it would take that same resilience and fortitude to survive within the most oppressive environment I have ever endured in this life. In response to a hangman’s noose being dangled in front of my face off the coast of Iraq while deployed aboard the USS Theodore Roosevelt, in solidarity with a small multi-racial core of Sailors, I initiated an Equal Opportunity (EO) complaint bringing about a modicum of justice. The Anti-Racist struggle on the Roosevelt, based on the history of the Vietnam era GI Movement documented by David Cortight’s Soldier’s In Revolt, served as the initial spark and catalyst for the 2006-07 Active Duty Appeal for Redress. Utilizing Department of Defense (DOD) regulations along with the Military Whistleblower Protection Act, myself, along with Marine Staff Sergeant Liam Madden launched a global campaign organizing over 2000 Active, Reserve and Guard servicemembers to send protected communications to members of Congress calling for an end to the wars and occupations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Our movement was highlighted throughout the major press including the Emmy Award winning 60 Minutes in a show titled “Dissension in the Ranks: Appeal for Redress,” which ran in February 2007 and can be viewed at this link. Our movement was also covered by Nation 26 Peace Chronicle.
Magazine in a front cover story titled “About Face: The Growing Anti-War Movement In The Military” That article is available here. In 2007 I was honored and humbled to receive the Social Courage Award from the Peace and Justice Studies Association (PJSA) along with our Movement being bestowed the coveted Letelier-Moffitt Human Rights Award from the Institute for Policy Studies. Persons interested can find my acceptance speech for the latter award here: [LM 2007 Domestic Awardee: Appeal for Redress Acceptance Speech](#).

For all of my adult life, I’ve been an intentional risk taker, challenging oppression within both the society and institutions where I have labored and matriculated. Whether confronting overtly racist petty officers within the United States Navy or covert racist supervisors, volunteers and interns within the non-profit industrial complex, my lived experience in the words of the late Anti-Fascist Paul Robeson confirms that “The Battlefield is everywhere” (Hutto, 2022).

My introduction and formal training in political risk-taking is due to two veterans of the progressive Black student movement within the United States: Tuskegee and HU Student Activist Leader Nik Eames and the late Chairman of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (MFDP) Lawrence Guyot.

Big Brother Nik is the linchpin of my early training in student mobilization and organizing on progressive issues encompassing both campus and broader community interests. My Resident Assistant (RA) Freshman year, Nik served as the campus student coordinator for the 1995 Million Man March Day of Absence. Nik’s road to HU came through Tuskegee University where he was expelled for leading campus demonstrations for student rights while he had served as Vice-President of the Student Government in the early 1990s. By Spring 1996, Nik was selected as Chief of Staff for the incoming HU Student Government and brought me onboard as the Volunteer Coordinator for the upcoming 1996-97 school year.

As the Volunteer Coordinator, I became the de facto lead organizer for Operation Vote Bison. The brainchild of my Big Brother, Vote Bison was conceived as the campus-wide voter initiative seeking maximum voter registration, education and turn-out. Along with envisioning Vote Bison, Nik had done some preliminary research on student voting within DC elections. It was Nik’s vision for the HU student body to achieve its utmost impact by winning local representation based on a progressive student-youth agenda. Nik was laying the groundwork for me and him to make an unprecedented campaign for elected seats within the District of Columbia local government.

Following Nik’s lead as a 19-year old Sophomore shortly before the Fall semester commenced, I took out petitions via the DC Board of Elections and Ethics filing my candidacy for the Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) Single Member District (SMD) 1B06. Comprising roughly 2000 residents, the SMD I was organizing to represent encompassed my dormitory along with the athletic dorm within the adjacent neighborhood known as Pleasant Plains. Upon achieving ballot status, I began to campaign for the ANC within the midst of coordinating Vote Bison as a Full-Time student majoring in Political Science.

It was while campaigning one Saturday morning early October 1996 that I bumped into a pillar of history laboring in the present. I still see him sitting in front of the Howard Plaza Dormitories with his unassuming demeanor handing out campaign literature. The leaflets read, “Vote for Lawrence Guyot for ANC 1B04.” These were not your ordinary flyers.
Unbeknownst to me, the elder I was talking to was not only recorded in most of the books and documentaries listed but I later learned he was one of the original 16 Field Staff members of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) coming out of Tougaloo College. Reading through the listed literature revealed to me the gray-bearded heavyset gentleman having been the Chairman of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (MDFP) which challenged the seating of the all-White Male Segregationist Democratic delegation from Mississippi in Atlantic City-1964. Digging into the literature further revealed this civil rights veteran being viciously beaten within an inch of his life by racist White sheriffs for attempting to bail out of jail three women civil rights workers in Winona, Mississippi, one of whom was the late Fannie Lou Hamer. I also learned the MFDP was the first Civil Rights organization to oppose the Vietnam War (SNCC, N.Dc).

Over time, a bond of love and deep admiration ensued between me and Guyot. For the first time in my young life, I had met and began to develop a relationship with an elder who at the age of 57 would prove to be just as committed, courageous, daring, and principled as he had been decades earlier in the frontline Civil Rights battles. Here was an elder who actually embraced what I was doing not simply from a patronizing or idealistic position, but from the standpoint of being right there in the thick of it with you. Here stood an elder I considered a mentor. On that day, I met an elder who related to me as a comrade which was an extension of the intergenerational principles he internalized as a young freedom fighter working alongside movement veterans such as Ella Baker and Bayard Rustin.

The foundation of our ANC campaigns came from the success of Vote Bison in registering over 3000 students to vote with 1800 in the District of Columbia. Despite the student base we had built, the support of Guyot and his wife Monica was critical to our success. On election day, I organized a march from my dormitory of over 100 first-time student voters to the polling precinct. There we were initially met with community opposition challenging our voting credentials until Guyot intervened, saying "Let the Students Vote!" Monica loaned me her car to help transport voters and in return we encouraged Howard students residing in Guyot district’s to vote for him. Upon the final vote tally, I won election to the commission by 11 votes defeating a seasoned community advocate.

Early February the following semester I hit the ground running, organizing a community meeting within my SMD. It was here for the first time I felt the serious disdain vocal community residents had for Howard University (HU). This was a majority Black working class community (gentrified today) still recovering from the rebellion in the aftermath of Dr. King’s assassination nearly 30 years prior. One resident voiced she had no respect for HU and the university had not played a leadership role in the community. However, it was one James Walker, alluding to a rumor of HU gating itself off from the community, that gave a foreshadowing of the political battle that would eternally shape my view of politics and the role of lay people in impacting public policy when he said, "By putting up a fence around the University, they are saying that they don’t want us to be a part of their community and we have been a part of this community for years. If we are shut out, then we don’t know what’s going on with Howard and we cannot support them or give them our input about certain situations. When Howard was visible in this community that was a great benefit" (Hilltop Staff, 1997).

What I heard from residents that day conflicted with the deep internalized worldview I held of the university. Howard is the only Historically Black
College and University (HBCU) federally chartered with the specific mission of providing education and uplift to the freedmen and women post the abolition of chattel slavery. Despite its historical foundation, that first community meeting laid bare for me the deep class division between the Black bourgeoisie on the hill and the then majority Black working class residents that lived in the surrounding neighborhoods. That meeting also began to challenge my purpose for attending Howard and in whose interest would I be utilizing my education. At that very moment, I was overly optimistic in assuring residents that Howard did not have any foreseeable plans on the table to close itself to the community.

It was during this same Spring semester Guyot came to my defense again upon my successfully being chosen as President of the Howard University Student Association (HUSA) for the upcoming 1997-98 school year. Several residents seriously questioned my ability to serve the interest of both the student body and the neighboring community, best exhibited by Conrad Smith when he said, “He can’t be an ANC representative and a student president. Right now the residents can’t contact Hutto, they don’t know where he is and he doesn’t show up to our civic meetings. But he’s not doing anything because he’s spending all of his time on campus.” Guyot countered the statement of Smith, foretelling the immediate future when he said, “Hutto is a natural leader. He has qualities needed to be a leader of the students and the residents so I don’t see why he wouldn’t be able to do the things he has committed to do” (Hilltop Staff, 1997).

In early July 1997, confirming the fears of vocal residents, I, along with my fellow commissioners, received a mailing from the National Capital Planning Commission announcing Bill 12-307 “The Howard University Street Closing Privatization Act.” Transmitted to the DC Council by then Mayor Marion Barry on behalf of HU, the bill, if passed, would privatize the public streets within the central main campus granting the university sole ownership. The university administration’s rationale was to create a “city within a city” towards enhancing security for students, faculty and staff along with having better control of traffic and access.

There were two major challenges the potential street closings posed for progressive-minded students based on recent history. The first involved street vendors, overwhelmingly small Black businesses, that provided goods and services to the university community. Despite the cordial relations between students and vendors, university officials exhibited a tepid and at times hostile relationship with the vendors. In response to the university having vendors through the DC government removed from the campus late 1993, HUSA, under the leadership of President Terri Wade, staged a protest at the campus Martin Luther King celebration where the keynote address was given by President Clinton. In defense of Terri and protesting students who received criticism from a broad sector of the campus despite their success in negotiating the return of a smaller number of vendors, Guyot stated publicly, “Today, we heard from two presidents. We heard the President of the United States talk about national freedom and expression and we heard the President of the Student Government who we should be more proud of because academic freedom is about inquiry, the search for truth, honesty and integrity” (Hilltop Staff, 1997).

The second challenge dealt with the right of students to protest on 6th Street where the Mordecai Wyatt Johnson Administration building is located. The A-Building was the base of the 1968...
Student Takeover which led to the university incorporating a more focused Black curricula along with student and faculty participation at all levels of the university, including the Board of Trustees (which was rescinded in the Summer of 2021-Students-Faculty and Alumni Trustees were removed by the Board Executive Committee) (Hutto, 2021).

In 1989, progressive students once again seized the A-Building in response to the Chairman of the Republican National Committee (RNC) Harvey Lee Atwater, the architect of the Willie Horton Racist election strategy, being named to the Board of Trustees. An enduring memory of that takeover was DC Mayor Marion Barry arriving on campus and pulling back the SWAT Team, which had been called in by University officials via DC’s Police Chief, from forcefully entering the A-Building thereby potentially creating a travesty reminiscent of Jackson and Kent State in the early 1970s.

Nik and I confirmed a meeting with the Vice President of University Administration Dr. Harry G. Robinson III. to discuss the street closing bill. This meeting confirmed for us both the resoluteness of the university administration along with the pledged support of the DC City Council exhibited by Ward 1 Councilmember Frank Smith who was present. This was not a meeting for the purpose of discussion nor negotiation but to inform us on how the university envisioned moving forward once the streets were acquired. Dr. Robinson spoke of security checkpoints for visitors along with beautification initiatives towards enhancing the aesthetic of the campus. Needless to say, Nik and I were treated more like observers and not stakeholders in this process, despite the departing words of Councilmember Smith to us, “we want to make sure you boys are onboard.”

Afterwards Nik and I conferenced with Guyot, who had recently become Chairman of our ANC. Guyot was clear, he was opposed to the street closings in large part due to the university owning substantial holdings of vacant, boarded up and dilapidated properties within the LeDroit Park district where he resided. Many of these properties had become eyesores and a haven for vermin, drug addicts and crime, which ill-affected students living both on and off campus. I was not as initially unwavering as Guyot due to my own insecurities of my perceived place in the world. I expressed to Guyot both my support of the vendors and the right of students to protest within the internal campus in solidarity with his stated position. Nevertheless, I also conceded the fear I felt within as to what would happen to me as result of this advocacy, a trepidation based on not having anything to fall back upon if I failed as a university student.

Based on his history as a SNCC Veteran who risked his life countless times in the deep south, Guyot pressed me to have a broader perspective of the university’s relationship to the community and nation at large. Essentially, Guyot was challenging me to be a reformer and not simply one to soak up the rewards of public office for personal gain.

At our July ANC Meeting, based both on the resolved position of the university administration coupled with the tutelage of Guyot, I introduced a resolution to oppose Howard’s Street Closing application. The votes were unanimous in opposition followed by the overwhelming support from both the Pleasant Plains and LeDroit Park Civic Associations. This was a serious calculated risk being that as Student Government President, I had yet to fully engage the student body on the issue.

Several weeks after the ANC vote the most unprecedented and reactionary shift in local
democracy took place in over a century. Led by NC Senator Lauch Faircloth then Chair of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District, nearly all of the day-to-day operations and power of the local Government, first granted to DC residents via the Home Rule Charter of 1973, was shifted from the City Council and Office of the Mayor to the DC Financial Control Board. The rationale of Congressional leaders including President Clinton centered on the city needing to balance budgets consistently over a four-year period to prevent insolvency. However, from the perspective of DC residents this was a draconian attack laced with Racial Overtones given that the local gov’t was led and operated by a Black Majority. Mayor Barry best personified the people’s collective scorn calling the congressional action “The Rape of Democracy.”

It was not lost on me the contrast in Mayor Barry’s disposition to that of DC Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton and former Howard University Administrator/famed Sociologist Joyce Ladner. Ladner, a SNCC Veteran on the frontline of the Civil Rights struggle alongside Guyot out of Tougaloo College, was mute on the issue given her position as a Control Board member (SNCC, N.Db). Norton, who 30 plus years prior was part of the legal counsel for the Freedom Democrats in Atlantic City, hailed the shift in power as a Big Win for the city.

Guyot, in contrast to nearly all of his DC SNCC comrades--a number of whom were locally elected or in appointed positions within the Barry administration--was on the ground organizing city-wide against what he called “Tyranny upon the people.” Guyot launched “Democracy for America’s Capital” shortly after the creation of the Control Board to rally forces against the intrusion he saw forthcoming. To counter Guyot’s unyielding stance, forces loyal to Delegate Norton launched the “Stand Up for Democracy” Coalition. Shortly after the launch of Stand-Up, a massive demonstration on Capitol Hill was called for Wednesday Sept 3rd.

It was during the lead up to the Stand Up Rally that our Student Government held a retreat with Executive officers and staff right before the start of classes. The retreat was built as a time for us to jell together as a unit. The agenda encompassed internalizing office protocols along with our programmatic platform for the upcoming school year. I vividly recall having a very limited role with the agenda being chaired and run by our Chief of Staff. At the midway point, our Political Director Big Brother Nik became unsettled and outwardly agitated the meeting saying, “All this focus we have on the campus and our people in the city are being trampled upon by the Federal Government. We need to organize students in mass with our people in the District for the Stand Up Rally.”

There was strong hesitancy to what Nik was pushing for. Both the Vice-President and Chief of Staff voiced a reluctance on organizing students to vacate class at the start of the school year. Nevertheless, I voiced my support for Nik’s call, believing we had a moral responsibility to act. An Executive Leadership conference ensued where it was made clear that while HUSA would endorse a march from campus, Nik and I would have to lead the planning and organizing on our own. Following our retreat, the Hilltop Student Newspaper published an editorial titled “HU Students Have Lost Democracy Along With District” vindicating Nik’s stance by directly stating “Hutto, Eames and student voters must not stand by the rape of democracy in Washington, DC” (Hilltop Staff, 1997).

Working with our Volunteer Coordinators, we blanketed the campus with flyers along with phone banking our volunteer list calling for an Emergency Mobilization Meeting the Tuesday night before the
proposed march from campus to Capitol Hill. We called on Guyot to help us fire up the base along with giving a strong grounding on the important role of students in breaking down barriers and struggling for justice. That planning meeting was packed with mostly freshmen from throughout the country, many of them learning for the first time about the plight of citizens within the nation’s capital. We put out the call for everyone to assemble on the steps of Frederick Douglass Memorial Hall at 7am.

That next morning, nearly 200 mostly freshman students were ready to march. The enthusiasm in their eyes epitomized the spirit of an elder Abolitionist Douglass urging young people to Agitate, Agitate, Agitate! As we proceeded down Georgia Avenue we caught a glimpse of Famed Boxing Promoter-Howard Alumnus Rock Newman. He left his Rolls Royce at the detail shop and came marching in the front with us. As we approached the Capital with Congresswoman Maxine Waters speaking, the chant was "HU FOR HOME RULE-HU FOR HOME RULE!" Within moments, I was hoisted to the microphone where in the spirit of the 1972 Black Political Convention, I asked the crowd WHAT TIME IS IT and in unison everyone shouted back IT’S NATION TIME! (Special Salute to Rock Newman who took care of all of us in a special way that day, ensuring our public transportation, buying everyone lunch at Sweet Georgia Brown’s and providing all of us cab rides back to the campus.)

It was also at this meeting I learned the foundation of Smith’s worldview. He was beyond elated at the site of Howard students marching for DC Democracy. With a seriousness in his eyes, he recounted what drove him as a young man from segregated Newnan GA towards becoming an organizer for SNCC. A veteran of the Atlanta Student Movement out of Morehouse College, Smith volunteered with SNCC in Holly Springs Mississippi the Summer of 1962 before his Senior year. Right before his planned return to Atlanta, Smith received a newspaper clipping of a local Black man found in a river dismembered with a handwritten note attached stating, ‘This is what happens when you Civil Rights workers come and then leave.’ Smith’s Summer project became a full-time six-year commitment (SNCC, N.Da).

A week after the Stand-Up March HUSA hosted an on-campus discussion titled “The Closing of Public Streets and Alleys on Howard University’s Campus and its Effect.” Ta-Nehesi Coates was the assigned staff writer from the Hilltop Student Newspaper, and I served as moderator for the forum.

This panel, which was the opening salvo of engaging the campus community, confirmed the student body as being the battleground for how this issue
would be decided. Guyot wasted no time in staking out his position saying, “Howard has made a proposal that is ludicrous on its face. Why should a wall be built between neighbors?” In response to a student’s inquiry on security, Guyot literally cut a line of demarcation saying, “I do not support apartheid in the name of safety.” I still remember the nearly 30 seconds of deafening silence due to Guyot utilizing the word “apartheid” to describe the administration’s position.

Dr. Hazel Edwards, representing VP Harry Robinson’s office, countered Guyot saying, “Howard is merely asking for the right to take the streets and make it a more user-friendly environment. We are not putting up walls or barriers.” Karen House, Special Assistant from the President’s Office stated that an armed robbery of a HU student had taken place every week since the start of classes. However, it was sophomore Business Major Robert Hall, crowned Mr. Howard University during Homecoming, who gave the sharpest rebuke to Guyot’s position saying, “We are very concerned with statements we are making to the community, but there’s another bit of communication that’s happening. When we have Drew Hall students being beaten with bats, when we have students held at gunpoint what is the community saying to us? We are living in one of the highest crime districts in the country.” By the end the crowd of mostly students was clearly divided on the issue.

Despite the evident divide of the forum, The Hilltop put forth a position via its Editorial Page validating progressive students and community advocates along with shaping the issue to the broader student body which proved pivotal. Leading with the statement “Barricades are not the best way to Increase Security on Campus” the Hilltop stated that Howard could not escape the reality of its surroundings which it is an integral part of. The editorial ended by saying, “If Howard is to deal with the issue of safety, it must address the conditions that fuel violence in the area and not stigmatize its community that also suffers. We must first expand our notion of community and foster a relationship with residents that will lead to cooperation on issues of crime” (Hilltop Staff, 1997).

The following week was the first General Assembly meeting of the year, where I planned to bring the issue before the elected student leadership of the university from all the schools and colleges. My vision was for the student body to speak as a collective voice to the university and the community at-large including the DC City Council. In preparation I requested position letters from all stakeholders including the local ANC and the university administration. The day of the meeting, I had position letters both from ANC-1B Chairman Guyot and from Ward 1 City Councilmember Frank Smith, however the university administration neglected to send a letter foreshadowing their disposition before the student leadership.

Thirty-one student representatives from 13 schools and colleges gathered that Tuesday evening in Douglass Hall along with representation from the university administration, Graduate Student Trustee Matthew Watley, representation from the Campus Police, Guyot and a host of students. I vividly recall successfully lobbying Dr. Alvin Thornton, Chair of the Political Science Dept, to excuse two graduate
student leaders from a class that conflicted with the meeting.

Once quorum was established, Trustee Watley effectively raised a parliamentary inquiry in regard to the agenda ensuring adequate time was allotted for the Administration and Trustees to address the assembly. Right before I was to give the state of the Student’s Address, Vice President Harry Robinson attempted to bogart the agenda and speak to the assembly. As the chair, I alerted Robinson he was out of order and that he would be able to address the assembly within his allotted time. At this point, Robinson is fuming and bolts out the meeting ensuring the administration’s subject matter expert on the issue was not present for the discussion and vote from the Student Leadership.

Fourteen students that spoke on the record including Trustee Watley, 10 spoke against the street closings with three speaking for it and one requesting data. Undergraduate students Shantrelle Lewis and Bienvenido Lebron both questioned high crime areas not being included within the university’s application. Graduate students Baruti Jahi and Jamal Jones Dulani both spoke to student leaders learning of the issue due solely to my being an ANC member. International Student Association (ISA) President Neville Welch of Guyana spoke in support of vendors and the right of protest on 6th Street. Graduate student Kim Richardson supported the closings while opposing the building of a fence and/or wall towards the community. Undergraduate student Kimberly Cooke desired data from other gated off HBCU’s in terms of their crime rates and community relations (Neither I nor the administration had such data).

During the time allotted for Trustees and Administration, Trustee Watley advocated strongly for the closings, believing it was best for the University to err on the side of safety and security. Due to VP Robinson’s abrupt departure, I asked VP for Student Affairs Dr. Steve Favors to speak on behalf of the administration to which he declined. At this point, Dean of Students Raymond Archer stated that while in attendance as a spectator, he would entertain student questions to the best of his knowledge on behalf of the administration. Archer’s most salient point was there not being any actual plans for a fence and the University President opposing it although the logistics were uncertain.

The final comments to the assembly were given by Vice-President Shawn Harvey and me, which was reflective of our panel discussion a week prior. Harvey spoke in support of the closings citing her lived experience of being robbed her first week on campus. In solidarity with Watley, Harvey believed if the closings could save one student from the anguish and nightmares she endured, then it was worth it. I spoke against the closures believing our university had a moral obligation, as an extension of its historic mission, to choose interdependency with our neighbors towards finding plausible solutions to our common challenges.

After over 90 minutes of debate and discussion, a motion was made and properly seconded to reject the administration’s street closing application. The vote was 20 students in favor of the motion, 6 opposed with 4 abstentions. Motion was then made and properly seconded empowering the Executive Branch of HUSA to represent the General Assembly at the upcoming City Council Hearing to which the vote was unanimous (District of Columbia Africana Archives Project, N.D.).

A letter was expeditiously transmitted from the Executive Branch of HUSA to the Chairwoman of the DC City Council Linda Cropp outlining the position of the student body. It was around this time
I received a direct phone call in the student government office from DC Mayor Marion Barry. I’ll never forget it, upon picking up the receiver a voice with a quasi-southern drawl said, “This is Marion Barry, I’d like to speak with President Jonathan Hutto.” I was beyond elated yet kept my composure. “Jonathan, I’ve been following your advocacy. I’d like to meet with you and a delegation of your choosing here in my office.”

I asked Big Brother Nik Eames, Graduate Student Jamal Jones Dulani and Lawrence Guyot to accompany me to the Mayor’s Office. Upon entering, Mayor Barry was on the phone and asked us to have a seat at his worktable. He then put his hand over the receiver and whispered to me, “I’m listening to Pat (HU’s President) right now, he knows you all are here.” Once he got off the phone, he looked directly at me and asked, “Now what do you want me to do?” I instinctively shot from the hip requesting he withdraw the bill based on the united opposition of the student government, the ANC and local civic associations. The Mayor responded, “Ok, I’ll withdraw the bill” without any other questions or pushback.

The aura of this meeting then shifted, with Barry speaking on his Student Movement history coming out of Memphis, Tennessee in the late 1950s. As President of the NAACP Student chapter at LeMoyne College, he was almost expelled for challenging the racist Chairman of their Board of Trustees, who defended segregation on city buses two years after the Montgomery Bus Boycott victory. Barry proudly spoke on accepting a graduate scholarship to study chemistry at Fisk University in Nashville where under the tutelage of James Lawson he was a frontline member of the Nashville Student Movement alongside other luminaries such as Diane Nash, Bernard Lafayette and John Lewis. He spoke of the pivotal role they played in carrying on the Freedom Rides and the importance of Ella Baker in pulling together all the Student Sit-In movements throughout the country for a key conference at Shaw University that would change the trajectory of the Civil Rights Movement. Barry educated me on his being the inaugural Chairman of SNCC along with having first come to DC in 1965 to lead the organization’s efforts locally. Upon listening and soaking up this history, I realized that in spite of Barry being the Mayor, he had more solidarity with us than Howard University’s administration. Barry and Guyot turned that meeting into a training historical school on advocacy and student activism. Needless to say, I missed all my classes that day in the Political Science Department (SNCC, N.Dd).

Following our meeting with Mayor Barry, in a seeming act of retaliation validating both our advocacy and the earlier activism of HUSA President Terri Wade (Akua Zenzele), 6th Street Vendor Gibril Mansaray was arrested by Howard University police and charged with assault with a dangerous weapon and subsequently barred from vending pending an upcoming trial. According to Brother Gibril in a letter dictated to me, he was approached by Vice President Harry Robinson and the head of Howard Police on the same day we were meeting with Mayor Barry. Gibril states VP Robinson alerted him to 6th Street being closed on Friday for Convocation but he could work the Saturday football game. The morning of the game as he turned onto 6th Street, Gibril states that a Howard University police officer immediately attempted to stop him. Due to his truck carrying hundreds of pounds, he could not come to an immediate stop. Once he brought his truck to a halt, nine HU Police Officers were running towards him in pursuit. Gibril describes an Officer pointing a gun at him and his 14-year old son, putting his hands on top of his truck while officers went through his pockets taking out this business
money and personal belongings. Gibril, a devout Muslim describes a hostile xenophobic situation with officers telling him you’re not making any money today, that he doesn’t belong on campus and that he should go back to Africa with the monkeys (District of Columbia Africana Archives Project, N.D.).

On October 2nd 1997, Mayor Barry transmitted a communication to DC Council Chairman Linda Cropp stating, “The university’s request for approval of its street and alley closing application has severely divided the surrounding neighborhood and campus community, pitting students against students, neighbors against neighbors and the community against the University. Fortunately, we have received requests not only from the University, but also from the students, asking that Howard’s application be withdrawn from consideration by the Council. In order to provide an opportunity to foster greater dialogue and understanding between the respective parties, I hereby request the withdrawal of Bill 12-307” (District of Columbia Africana Archives Project, N.D.).

Undergraduate Student Ta-Nehisi Coates covered the bill withdrawal for both The Hilltop and the Washington City Paper. In response to Coates, I was quoted as saying, “The ANC voted unanimously against it, the civic association is against it. The General Assembly, which represents all the students at Howard, voted against it. Everybody was pretty much united against the bill. The only people that supported it were the applicants-Howard University’s administration” (Coates, 1997).

Guyot’s mentorship to put principle before personhood began to manifest itself. That following February, The Hilltop awarded our student government an ‘A’ grade stating via its editorial page that “we had restored a voice to students at Howard and more importantly shown students that their voice is instrumental in reminding the administration why they’re here” (Hilltop Staff, 1997). Two weeks later we hosted Howard-NAG Alumnus and former SNCC Chairman Kwame Ture (Stokely Carmichael) for his last “Fireside Chat” to the Student Body from Andrew Rankin Memorial Chapel. The Propagator of “Black Power” who also raised the rallying cry of “HELL NO We Won’t Go” against the Draft in Vietnam affirmed the counsel his comrade gave me when he stated, “Once you fight for the people, the people will always fight to protect you but your fight must be honest, it must be dignified with integrity and without no compromise at all. That next month The Hilltop endorsed my campaign for Undergraduate Trustee stating, “Jonathan Hutto is able to work within the system of the administration building while still retaining his revolutionary spirit and eye for positive change. He combines the activism and commitment to students needed in a trustee, with a love for Howard, which is needed to represent the University” (Hilltop Staff, 1997). The voting undergraduate student body selected me by a 59% margin. That summer Howard announced the LeDroit Park Initiative, a partnership secured with Fannie Mae, to revitalize the 45 dilapidated properties the university owned within the neighborhood with a specific focus to first time homebuyers of middle and working class incomes (ICIC, N.D.). I still hear Guyot’s voice, “Jonathan if you’re principled first, everything else will fall in place.”

The Veterans of SNCC, sparked by that initial chance meeting with Lawrence Guyot, had a resounding impact on my young life all that way into middle adulthood. The late “Mayor For Life” Marion Barry not only affirmed my risk taking but he also inspired me to initiate a successful effort, from my capacity as HU’s Undergraduate Trustee (1998-99), to
posthumously honor his comrade Kwame Ture with an Honorary Degree from his Alma Mater at the 1999 Commencement (Kwame Ture Society, 2021).

Nearly a decade later as an Enlisted United States Sailor, another SNCC Chairman, the late Congressman John Lewis, came to my aid during the anti-racist struggle in my shop against the hangman's noose and other forms of related intolerance. Lewis was also one of the first Congressional members to support our active duty Appeal For Redress to end the wars of occupation in Iraq and Afghanistan (Hutto, 2020).

It's been a decade since Guyot transitioned from this life. One of my last vivid memories was bumping into him at the unveiling of the HBO “The Nine Lives of Marion Barry” documentary in Silver Spring Maryland Summer 2009. There he was with a bag full of literature working the room on the pressing issues of the day. As expected, I was given a thick packet of information along with a sample DVD copy of the documentary. It had been some years since we had struggled together. Our deep affection and appreciation for one another was beyond evident as he told me, “Jonathan I'm very proud of you.” I had no idea this would be one of the last few times I would see him.

Late 2012 I received a phone call that Guyot was seriously ill and to see him immediately. I knew Guyot to be a very proud man, so I called him for a simple chat. Guyot’s mind was beyond sharp although he was coughing quite a bit. This was not unusual, although this time it sounded quite different. The morning when I called before leaving for his home, Guyot’s daughter Julie told me her father had transitioned. For the first time in my adult life, I was deeply affected in a way I had never felt before. I cut a thick slice of red velvet cake and drove to Guyot’s house, giving the cake to Julie and expressing my deepest love. As I slowly drove back home, I began humming lyrics from Sweet Honey and The Rock “They are Falling all Around Me, the strongest leaves of my tree.” I kept saying to myself that day and beyond, “Guyot I’m going to try and sing your song right.” I summoned the strength to write a requiem to him which was published five days later in The Washington Post titled “Lawrence Guyot: Soldier of the People, Mentor for the Youth” (Hutto, 2012).

Today the street Guyot lived on in Ledroit Park for three decades is now his namesake, Lawrence Guyot Way. Guyot was a staunch integrationist and defender of working and low-income people. I suspect he would take exception to the massive gentrifying of his ole neighborhood given his consistent advocacy for maintaining rent control. Howard’s once run-down properties have long been refurbished but unlike the late 1990s students can hardly afford to rent and live anywhere adjacent to the campus. In the Spring of 2018, this housing crisis coupled with administrative improprieties sparked a nine-day student takeover of Howard’s A-Building (named the Kwame Ture Student Center during the occupation) led by the activist student group HU RESIST. Our advocacy in 1997 against the Street Closings moved me in a profound way as I was dropping off supplies to the occupying students.

I deeply internalized lifelong organizing principles having struggled alongside Guyot, principles he internalized after having fought and survived pitched non-violent battles against the apartheid segregated southern order.

- Be a Risk Taker and Give FORWARD (not back)
- Rely on the strength and Power of directly impacted People themselves, help to build and facilitate their Power.
• Don’t harbor Power, reject Hierarchy and Centralized Authority

Hutto, J. (2022, May 10). The battlefield is everywhere. Institute for Anarchist Studies.

• The real essence of Politics is the struggle for POWER. Within Struggle, one must choose sides


• Solidarity, Interracial and Intergenerational Struggle is Imperative


• There is an intrinsic link between Information and Power


• Strong People don’t need Strong Leaders (Ella Baker)

ICIC. (N.D.). Howard University’s strategic anchor engagement continues to benefit D.C.’s LeDroit Park neighborhood.

• Power begins at one’s level of conception. What you conceive, you can do.

Kwame Ture Society. (2021, July 19). The story behind Kwame Ture’s last fireside chat at Howard University. Medium.

• The Power of Agency—one can wield and build power from anywhere within the society once you’re politicized and operationalized.

SNCC. (N.Da). Frank Smith.

• Work and organize yourself out of a job. Train directly impacted to do your job. Know when you’ve given the total and full measure.

SNCC. (N.Db). Joyce Ladner.

• Understand you’re making a contribution to the People’s Struggle, that you’re not indispensable to the People’s Happiness.

SNCC. (N.Dc). Lawrence Guyot.

• Always make room for others. Know when to get the heck out of people’s way.

SNCC. (N.Dd). Marion Barry.


I love you eternal Guyot. I miss you but you’ve never left me. I appreciate you deeply for all you gave. I will struggle to keep singing your song right. LONG LIVE the spirit of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC).
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Growing up in rural Michigan, I knew very little about Cuba. And I never gave any real thought to there being a Jewish population on the island. I knew no one Cuban and honestly, did not know anyone who was Jewish. Things changed when I moved to South Florida, an area that is home to many Cubans, many Jews, and Cuban Jews, or as they are called, Jewbans. Jews helped shape Miami, and the Jewbans have been particularly influential and, as a whole, are a very successful demographic. Most of the Jewbans came to Cuba from Eastern Europe, where they were fleeing persecution. More than four years ago I began dating a Jewban, to whom I am now married. I have learned a lot from his family. Sadly, in fall 2021, his father passed away from a combination of blood cancer and COVID-19. As the family gathered to mourn and share stories, my husband noted that it might be interesting for someone to write about his family. I responded, “I write some things.” Hence I began plotting a proposal to study his family and write a book while on sabbatical. I was granted sabbatical for Spring semester, 2023. I have started my research, which will include 30-40 interviews with family and other connections as well as a review of archival material. Here, I describe one of the themes that has emerged in the data to date: resilience.

My husband’s family all left Eastern Europe, all but one from Poland and another from White Siberia (now Belarus), starting in the 1920s. They were leaving due to fascism and religious intolerance and had intended to end up in the U.S. Cuba was merely a stopping point, they thought. The U.S subsequently passed the Immigration Act of 1924 that severely limited the number of Jews allowed into the country, thus his family and many others ended up staying in Cuba. By that year, there were an estimated 24,000 Jews in Cuba. More Jews fled Europe and landed in Cuba, with perhaps 25,000 Jews on the island.

This was a dramatic change of life, obviously. The weather was very different, as Eastern Europe was cold for many months of the year and Cuba being a hot, tropical island. While there were some Jews already in Cuba, most of the island practiced Catholicism. Food was dramatically different than what was typically eaten by Jews living in the shtetl’s. According to my new family, learning a new language was the most difficult part, as none of them knew even a word in Spanish, the language spoken by most Cubans. They spoke Yiddish and Hebrew. Yet, starting with nothing, the family started successful businesses, including rope, lumber, and jewelry.

Things all changed again as Fidel Castro came to power. At first, some Jews supported the revolution, as Fulgencio Bautista’s administration was deeply corrupt, and Castro did not initially explain that he was promoting a communist agenda. But in 1959, atheism was declared the national language.
making it difficult for Jews to practice their religion. Then came the nationalization of industry and the seizing of land and businesses, prompting many Jews to flee Cuba. Most went to the U.S, with a sizable group ending up in Miami. Again, a new climate, new foods, new language and new employment.

My in-laws landed first in Kansas, as an uncle lived there. They struggled to learn English but did so and ended up very proficient. They worked in whatever jobs they could, despite my father-in-law having a degree in Engineering. They were startled to find overt racism in the U.S, as Cuba’s constitution guarantees equality and thus racism, while it exists, is not public. Plus, in Cuba, the Jewish community largely stayed together, attending Yeshiva and for the most part, marrying within. A few years after my in-laws came, their parents also came to the U.S and everyone located in New York City. My mother-in-law’s father was a jeweler and swallowed a diamond so that he would have something when he got here. The families worked together to start a jewelry business in Manhattan, and it grew to become very successful, with several storefronts run by members of the family. Their work ethic and resilience had paid off once again.

My husband and his siblings were born in New York and were raised in large part by their grandmothers, as their parents worked long hours at the businesses. The family all decided to move to Miami after my father-in-law’s dad was held up in a third robbery attempt. They re-started their business in South Florida and did very well, having several stores in downtown Miami. They passed along to their children, and then to their grandchildren, the pursuit of education, the need to work hard, and the ability to endure hardship and still be successful.

There is far more to tell of this fascinating journey. I am excited to learn more, and deeply admire the Jewbans and especially my husband’s family for their resilience and their warm and loving personalities.
David's paternal grandfather had to change his name from Ycko Szczygiel to Isaac Schiegel after moving to Cuba.

His paternal grandmother was Nachama but changed her name to Consuelo in Cuba.
Introduction
Educational organizations do not exist in a vacuum unaffected by social issues in the larger community in which they exist. The news media, numerous online social platforms, and other communication sources stress and focus on hate. Overt expressions of hate have now become acceptable forms of communication. Recent issues of racist and hateful activity have emerged and have forced educators to become actively engaged in effective intervention and negotiating conflict creatively.

How can teachers cope with this the dynamic shift in classroom and school behavior? This paper presents examples of defining the psychology of hate as a specific learned behavior that differs from other psychological emotions and presents viable and workable solutions.

Why Do People Hate?
As an educator, therapist and humanist, I have often wondered why people hate. Is hate an innate characteristic that is deeply rooted in our DNA or is it a learned behavior? Is there a specific psychology of hate and, if so, does it differ from other emotions? Before actually addressing the question of why people hate and what can be done to counteract hate, let’s review some of the current data of hate as it presently exists.

The Southern Poverty Law Center in a publication, Responding to Hate and Bias at School, describes several situations that are relevant to this analysis.

- A swastika 20 feet in diameter is burned on the pavement at a Jewish high school.
- A noose is found hanging from a goal post on a high school campus.
- A group of white high school students dress in banana suits for a basketball game and taunt… black students with racists slurs.
- a Sikh student has his turban pulled off and his hair is cut by his fellow students.

These are selected examples of the current situation in schools and in the community. There are many others I can cite.

Has There Been an Increase in Racial and Religious Prejudice?
In their annual report on Hate, the Southern Poverty Law Center has documented that over 733 active hate groups presently operate in the US.
It has been hypothesized that racial and religious prejudice played a critical role in the election of President Donald Trump. Seeking to answer this question, researchers Benjamin C. Ruisch and Melissa J. Fergusson examined the results of over 13 studies, having over 10,000 participants, that sought to determine if change in Americans religious and racial prejudice changed after the 2016 election of President Trump. After an extensive review of data, the researchers found that racial and religious prejudice increased among those that supported Donald Trump, while prejudice decreased among those that opposed him. Based on a review of these studies, the authors concluded that research clearly suggests the presidency of Donald Trump substantially reshaped the typography of prejudice in the United States. (Changes in Americans Prejudice During the Presidency of Donald Trump in Nature Human Behavior February 21, 2022)

What is Hate?

Hate as defined in the Marriam Webster dictionary (February 2022) is an intense hostility and aversion and extreme dislike or disgust directed specifically to an individual or group. Although this definition provides a basis for explaining hate, it is not comprehensive enough to gain an understanding of exactly what hate is. Hate is a highly emotional state and stable feeling within those that are experiencing the emotion of hate. Hate differs significantly from other emotions such as anger. Hate is an active, relatively stable emotional feeling that does not dissipate over time. Anger on the other, may be short lived and directed more toward an individual or a situation rather than the entire group. Hate in comparison is an ongoing and continuous state where the hater may fixate on another person or an entire group. Hate maybe directed toward an entire group. Haters tend to focus on what someone is rather than what someone may have done.

What is the Current Scope of Hate?
The US Department of Justice (2017) in their most recent report has estimated that over 250,000 hate crimes are committed each year in the United States between 2004 - 2015. The US Department of Justice estimates that a vast majority of hate crimes go unreported. Of those crimes, the DOJ estimates that over 48% are racially motivated. The DOJ hate crime notes that crimes are committed on the basis of the victims perceived or actual race, color, national origin, religion, sexual orientation and gender, gender identification or disability. Hate is generally within the spectrum of human emotions.

Can Hate be Sustained by the Hater?

In a 2016 study authors Nor Keithley and Emil Renaud suggest that hatred is directly correlated when one group tends to dehumanize another group by viewing them as less civilized or evolved as themselves. (Backlash: The Politics in Real World Consequences of Minority Group Dehumanization in Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin-Nov 2016,) Dehumanization is critical factor that may predict hostile or violent actions against a group that is hated. Hatred, as previously noted, is an intense emotional feeling directed toward an individual or group. Dehumanization provides the hater with a rationale to direct their hate to others. In the examples of hate actions described in this document, the perpetrators of hate dehumanized their victims and believe they deserve to be mistreated because of their differences.

Why Do People Hate?

According to a study in the Good Therapy blog (2022) people hate an individual or group when the following occurs:

- have learned hatred from parents, from their community, or from their social groups
- feel envy or want what the other person has
- have contempt for another person or feel them
to be inferior to themselves
- are humiliated or mistreated by another person or group
- feel a sense of powerlessness (GoodTherapy.org May, 2022)

We know that hatred is a learned behavior. People are not born hating another person or group. The question becomes as educators, members of the community dedicated to peace and justice, as law enforcement, clergy and members of the community, how can we counteract hatred and end bias, bigotry, and racism? The Southern Poverty Law Center, an organization that tracks, reports and helps prevent hate in America has identified 10 factors that are relevant to this discussion and can be implemented to fight hate:

1: ACT Do Something
In the face of hatred, apathy will be interpreted as acceptance by the perpetrators, the public, and — worse — the victims. Community members must take action; if we don’t, hate persists.

2: JOIN FORCES
Reach out to allies from churches, synagogues, mosque, schools, colleges, clubs, and other community and civic groups.

3: SUPPORT THE VICTIMS
Hate crime victims are especially vulnerable. If you’re a victim, report every incident — in detail — and ask for help. If you learn about a hate crime victim in your community, show support. Let victims know you care.

4: SPEAK UP
Hate must be exposed and denounced. Help news organizations achieve balance and depth. Do not debate hate group members in conflict-driven forums. Instead, speak up in ways that draw attention away from hate, toward unity.

5: Educate Yourself
An informed campaign improves its effectiveness. Determine if a hate group is involved, and research its symbols and agenda. Understand the difference between a hate crime and a bias incident.

6: Create an Alternative
Do not attend a hate rally. Find another outlet for anger and frustration and for people’s desire to do something. Hold a unity rally or parade to draw media attention away from hate.

7: Pressure Leaders
Elected officials and other community leaders can be important allies. But some must overcome reluctance — and others, their own biases — before they’re able to take a stand. The fight against hate needs community leaders willing to take an active role. The support of mayors, police chiefs, college presidents, school principals, local clergy, business leaders, and others can help your community address the root causes of hate and help turn bias incidents into experiences from which your community can learn and heal.

8: Stay Engaged:
Promote acceptance and address bias before another hate crime can occur. Expand your comfort zone by reaching out to people outside your own groups. Hate usually doesn’t strike communities from some distant place. It often begins at home, brewing silently under the surface. It can grow out of divided communities — communities where residents feel powerless or voiceless, communities where differences cause fear instead of celebration.
9: Teach Acceptance
Bias is learned early, often at home. Schools can offer lessons of tolerance and acceptance. Host a diversity and inclusion day on campus. Reach out to young people who may be susceptible to hate group propaganda and prejudice. Bias is learned in childhood. By age 3, children can be aware of racial differences and may have the perception that "white" is desirable. By age 12, they can hold stereotypes about ethnic, racial, and religious groups, or LGBT people. Because stereotypes underlie hate, and because almost half of all hate crimes are committed by young men under 20, tolerance education is critical.

10: Dig Deep Within Yourself:
Look inside yourself for biases and stereotypes. Commit to disrupting hate and intolerance at home, at school, in the workplace, and in faith communities. Acceptance, fundamentally, is a personal decision. It comes from an attitude that is learnable and embraceable: a belief that every voice matters, that all people are valuable, that no one is “less than.” (Southern Poverty Law Center-Ten ways to fight hate: A Community Response -August 2017)

Hate, specifically hate crimes, seem to have become the norm in American culture and society. As peace activists we must identify hate in all its forms and work to help communities develop strategies to cope and counteract hate wherever it occurs.
THE OSLO ACCORDS: “A CATASTROPHE, NOT A PARTY”:
OFFICIAL POLITICS AND THE PROTRACTION OF
ETHNONATIONALIST VIOLENCE IN THE ISRAELI OCCUPATION OF PALESTINE

NICOLAS-BILAL URICK

Introduction
The Israeli occupation of Palestine has persisted for nearly seventy-five years. The ethnic cleansing operation has claimed an estimated 150,000 lives since 1987 and catapulted more than seven million Palestinians into refugee status, representing the world’s largest displaced population (American Friends Service Committee 2022). State and interpersonal violence have increased with the years, marked most prominently by Israeli bombings, military assaults, and the demolition of historical and cultural sites. The ethnonational identities of Palestinians and Israelis now exist largely in opposition to each other; for many, to be Israeli is to oppose a Palestinian state, and to be Palestinian is to oppose an Israeli state (Nasser 2004, 122).

Until the Oslo Accords, the political peace process in Palestine followed a long, arduous path of almost immediately failed negotiations. The international community, in fact, celebrated Oslo as the first transformative attempt to resolve the conflict politically and nonviolently (Gidron, Katz, and Hasenfeld 2002, 131). I will argue, however, that the Oslo Accords encouraged armed combat and rigidified Israeli and Palestinian ethnonational identities, ultimately exacerbating intractability.

The Israeli Occupation of Palestine and Intractability
Historians most often date the Israeli-Palestinian war from the 1948 establishment of the Zionist state in Palestine. The state’s foundations wrought havoc on the indigenous population: Israeli military forces expelled 80% of Palestinians from their homes or terrorized their communities into flight. From 1949 onward, Israel and the Kingdom of Jordan continually tattered Palestinian land through settlements and annexations, culminating in the 1967 war between Israel, Jordan, Syria, Egypt, and Palestine. Throughout combat, the Israeli army illegally occupied the Palestinian territories in the West Bank and Gaza (American Friends Service...
Committee 2022). After the war, periods of armed warfare ebbed and flowed, interspersed with various unofficial proposals for peace. However, guerilla wars and the occupation’s military assaults undermined negotiations and produced cyclical destruction. These intense waves of violence increased physical and mental divisions between Palestinians and Israelis; not only did Israel construct the apartheid wall, separating Palestinians and Israelis and expropriating indigenous territory, but perceived divides began to permeate all life (Kriesberg 2001, 375).

As violence persisted, external commentators subjectified religious belongings in the region as sites of warfare, referred to as “Clashes between Jews and Muslims”; Western support for Israel “as the sole democracy in the Middle East” promoted civilizational cleavages and construed Palestinians as “barbaric”; and Israeli military supremacy highlighted the material depletion of the Palestinian people and thus the necessity of their struggle. Together, these imposed divisions bred hardened boundaries. All corners of life across Israeli and Palestinian territories entertained the war; increasing populations, including Palestinian and Jewish communities abroad, grew to see those on the “other side” as existential enemies. Palestinians and Israelis harnessed their oppositional identities to lay ethnic claims to Palestinian lands; any loss of land on either side meant an assault on identity-based integrity. Rigid illustrations of the “other side” became central to maintaining political purchase. Israeli leaders proudly touted Zionism as the official “ethnonationalist” state ideology, supported by the perverse, ahistorical slogan “for a people without a land (the Jewish people), a land without a people (Palestine).” The Palestinian Liberatory Organization (PLO) called for a “Nationalist identity and ending the Zionist incursion” (Kriesberg 2001, 376).

A land-based conflict thus became almost strictly identity-based, with each group’s claim of belonging seen as denying the legitimacy of the other’s. Israelis infamously chanted, “Death to all Arabs,” and while Palestinians rightly characterized the conflict as “the Zionist destruction of our home” (Sen 2015, 163). Although both groups felt righteous in their sloganeering, they were not immune from violent retaliation. The conflict’s thus intractability only progressed with time; the struggle grew increasingly characterized by violence, polarized collective goals, and the persistence of warfare despite diverse peacebuilding and peacemaking efforts.

Nonetheless, practitioners in the peace process persisted (Kriesberg 2005, 68-71). Eventually, Yasser Arafat, leader of the PLO, and Yitzhak Rabin, Prime Minister of Israel, convened in Washington, D.C., to sign the 1993 Oslo Accords. Their handshake was broadcast across international television as a “Historical turning point in making peace between Israelis and Palestinians” (Kriesberg 2000, 63). The handshake, however, meant less for peace than it did for violence: Palestinians sat in in occupied territories and watched their supposed leader shake hands with the political embodiment of their destructed livelihoods (Oren and Bar-tal 2006, 10). Israelis watched their fearless chairman agree with a “terrorist” (Sprinzak 1993, 8). That fateful 1993 morning confirmed one thing: the Israeli occupation of Palestine was not truly a fight between states. Top leadership could not effectively transform it through high-level, official approaches (Chigas 2005, 129). It became clear that the occupation produced a war between two peoples whose identities became progressively antagonistic through that handshake.

The Oslo Accords, Official Politics, and the Peace Process

Circa 1993, violence was known, and peace was a
mystery in the Israeli occupation of Palestine. The Oslo Accords represented a manifestation of what John Paul Lederach calls “The Willingness to Risk”: “To step into the unknown without any guarantee of success or safety” (2010, 39). Although micro-level dispute resolution previously occurred, joint, consensual decision-making was uncharted territory, seen as disrespectful to both sides' ethnonationalism (Kriesberg 2001, 384). The Oslo Accords attempted to break that fearful logic; unfortunately, they engendered the peace process’ demise.

After a series of mediated back-channel negotiations, Yitzhak Rabin recognized the PLO as the official representative of the Palestinian People, and Yasser Arafat recognized the Israeli state. The Accords followed a gradual framework: the Israeli state would cede military control of the West Bank and Gaza over five years in exchange for Yasser Arafat disarming the PLO (Malik 2001, 136). While apparently in favor of “shared security,” these agreements failed to find popular credence.

Upon the Accords’ signing, Rabin and Arafat rejoiced. Rabin announced to a large public audience: “We the soldiers who have returned from the battle stained with blood ... we who have fought against you, we say to you today in a loud and clear voice: ‘Enough of blood and tears! Enough!’” The word “stained” should have been telling. Yasser Arafat exclaimed, “Our two peoples are awaiting today this historic hope, and they want to give peace a real chance” (Sen 2015, 164). These state leaders seemingly glimpsed resolution. But it remained ignored that the war was not between two state figureheads. It could not be dismissed by farcical diplomacy. It was, and is, a war between two peoples.

Some Israelis supported the agreement, while others, especially members of religious fundamentalist groups, felt that Rabin acquiesced to the “terrorist Palestinians” (Sprinzak 1993, 10). Many Palestinians were left dissatisfied. The PLO did not consult other Palestinian liberatory organizations or representatives of civil society before the agreement. Militant Israeli nationalists were exclusively included, validating their efforts while marginalizing the Palestinians’. Diverse assemblages of Palestinians, therefore, felt that core elements of their struggle were abandoned: Arafat discarded the right of return for refugees by failing to raise it in negotiations and recognizing the Israeli state, founded on the principle of a Jewish majority; both the Israeli Likud and Labor parties refused discussion of military withdrawal from Jerusalem, the historic holy land and capital of Palestine; and Israel maintained control over borders, security, and water resources. Most of all, perhaps, Israel retained and extended its settlements illegally tattering the West Bank (Quigley 1998, 175-178).

Identity-based grievances only festered beneath these dissatisfaction. We can thus understand the Oslo Accords’ failure through the ensuing, mutual rejection of official politics, the increased rigidification of Palestinian and Israeli identities, and the rise of divisive symbolisms.

The Failure of the Oslo Accords

The Oslo Accords lacked meaningful political maneuvers conducive to conflict transformation (Kriesberg 2005, 91). After their general exclusion from initial negotiations, a television broadcast was the only measure employed to legitimize the Accords amongst Israeli and Palestinian populations. This media, distinctly disconnected from its viewers as a non-interactive form, failed to build confidence that the Accords faithfully represented the people.
The Accords also lacked a process for dealing with future disagreements or issues. Lederach suggests this is key to “generating nonviolent solutions to ongoing episodes of conflict and launching long-term visions of change” (2010, 46). Instead, leaders misguidedly viewed the “post-accord” phase as a confined period (Lederach 2010, 44), complete with a handshake and encouraging words. Furthermore, the Oslo Accords consolidated the institutional separation of Palestinians and Israelis; it proposed a voting apparatus for Palestinians via the Palestinian Authority (PA) but failed to “establish institutions with engagement from different sides in the conflict,” crucial for relationship building after periods of large-scale violence (Kriesberg 2005, 93).

In this vacuum of legitimacy and shared institutional space grew Hamas, a Palestinian resistance group founded on armed struggle. Where Arafat and Rabin failed to garner trust, the leaders of Hamas succeeded (Sen 2015, 165). Behind Oslo’s facade, the Palestinian people experienced the perpetual Israeli economic assault on their territories, the continued settlement movement, and the human rights abuses enshrined by the Israeli army. Hamas managed these exact dissatisfactions, presenting itself as the “only organization capable of inflicting rightful costs sufficient to destroy Israeli control of Gaza and the West Bank” (Sen 2015, 166-171). Simultaneously, voluntary conscription in the Israeli military skyrocketed. The Israeli population seemed to embrace this greater communalization of the already omnipresent military, with various grassroots organizations crowdfunding for the forces (Sen 2015, 172). The growing purchase of violent organizations communicated the peace process’ utter rejection.

Hamas built entrenched support amongst Palestinians in Gaza and encouraged their struggle against Israel. The liberation group institutionally provided for the people; it ensured food, clothing, and shelter for its members and offered year-round education to children (Sen 2015, 166). The group thus became a vital part of the community and, therefore, a key part of communal identity. It ensured that the spirit of violent resistance against Israel grew potent in the collective Palestinian consciousness (Sen 2015, 166). The voice of Abu-Basil from the Al-Baqa’a refugee camp aptly describes the consolidation of this identity: “We refugees remain ‘fatherless.’ The political negotiations don’t know us. They aim at resettling refugees outside of Palestine, leaving us orphans. The Oslo Agreement has forgotten us and will never make up for our land. We will win it with blood and vitalize our identity” (Farah 1999, 244). The Israeli government further militarized their population by releasing regular press warning the people about “the terrorist Palestinians” and building illegal homes in occupied Palestine (Sprinzak 1993, 9).

Thus, while the Accords aimed to ease the tensions between Israelis and Palestinians via mutual recognition, they increased violence and rigidified identity boundaries. The spread of militant identity precipitated increased violence. Waves of protests in favor of an independent Palestinian followed the Accords, which the Israeli forces met with crushing aggression (Said 2007, 291). As Palestinians were protesting to protect their land and identity, constant repression naturally encouraged their resistance (Sen 2015, 170). Increased violence also communicated to both sides that their existence remained threatened by the other’s presence (Northrup 1989, 68).

Northrup explains the dynamics of ethnonational identity threats in conflict: “Each side perceives the fulfillment of the other’s national identity as equivalent to the destruction of its own identity.”
It is no surprise, then, that these protests culminated in the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin by Yigal Amir, an Israeli extremist who concluded that Rabin endangered the Jewry by recognizing the Palestinians (Blau 2015, 12). The conflict thus grew increasingly self-perpetuating through these dehumanizing politics: Hamas launched an attack on Israeli territory, feeling threatened by Israeli extremism; Hamas’ action undermined Israeli support for the more “moderate” Labor party, pushing the constituency towards Benjamin Netanyahu, who opposed a Palestinian state and Israeli withdrawal; Palestinians resisted the continued Israeli denial of their sovereignty; Israeli citizens responded with military violence. Israeli violence reigned supreme, with their troops routinely assaulting civilians. Ultimately, the Oslo Accords laid the foundations for these eruptions and ensured the consolidation of oppositional identities, evidenced by mutual rejection of subsequent negotiations (Jones 1999, 105-128).

Oslo Accords thus failed to encourage “constructive change,” or the movement from relationships of fear to relationships of love. The former is notably defined by self-justification and violence (Lederach 2010, 176), evidently characterizing the years following Oslo; the latter is defined by openness, mutual respect, and dignity (Lederach 2010, 176), none of which were embraced after the Accords. The absence of constructive change also resulted from simply reaching an “agreement” rather than attending to damaged relationships (Lederach 2010, 118). In fact, the negotiators behind the Accords explicitly avoided “revisiting old grievances” (Rothman 1997, 122). Oslo thus failed to integrate Lederach’s “peripheral vision,” focusing on a definitive agreement and ignoring the obstacles presented by dangerous relationship patterns (Lederach 2010, 34, 120).

The Oslo Accords, therefore, stopped at official “recognition” and separation rather than encouraging the two populations to embrace interdependence, the “tap-root of non-violence” (Lederach 2010, 35). It is no surprise that the post-Oslo world brought an Israeli political and cultural scene inundated with the symbolism of Rabbi Meir Khane, a religious fundamentalist who denied the very existence of Palestinians and denounced negotiations (Sprinzak 1993, 7). Hamas leaders constructed a welcome gate to their summer camp, composed of a wooden replica of a gun, placed between a key and the Quran, meant to symbolize that “negotiations will never work” (Sen 2015, 165). Ethnonationalist violence dominated by Israeli aggression persists nearly two decades later.

**Conclusion**

One need look no further than Hanan, a refugee internally displaced in Nablus, to understand the consequences of the Oslo Accords: “Return is still a possible dream, but the struggle for return will be very bloody because Oslo made everything difficult” (Farah 1999, 223). Rather than a vanguard of official, nonviolent politics, the Oslo Accords represent a regretful story of failed high-level negotiations. As neither Palestinians nor Israelis saw their ethnonational aspirations “fairly managed” through the Accords, violent resistance gained political purchase and strengthened identity boundaries.

As Kriesberg suggests, transparent communication with Israeli and Palestinian constituencies, accompanied by shared governance, might have garnered support for the Accords before their devolution. John Paul Lederach enters the conversation, asserting that the failure to address historical grievances and create a system of nonviolently managing new conflictual eruptions limited the possibilities of constructive change and interdependent relationship building. These pitfalls
inhibited the reconciliatory process described by Liechty and Clegg, as evidenced by increasingly tense ethnic relations, separation, and the proliferation of divisive symbolism. As Yasser Arafat once artfully professed: "I come bearing an olive branch and a freedom fighter’s gun. Do not let the olive branch fall from my hand. I repeat: do not let the olive branch fall from my hand" (UN 1974). Perhaps through examining the strengths and weaknesses of the Oslo process, practitioners can grasp their olive branches, hand-in-hand with their constituencies, and set a hopeful precedent for the transformation of intractable conflicts.
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NONVIOLENT CIVIL RESISTANCE AND CULTURAL PRESERVATION: THE CASE OF ALGERIA
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Introduction
The history of nonviolent civil resistance in the Algerian struggle for independence remains harshly under celebrated. In Arab and Western scholarship alike, the focus remains on the violent rebellion spearheaded by the Algerian Front for National Liberation (FLN). Algerians themselves celebrate their courageous guerilla warfare daily through monuments, statues, and slogans dedicated to honoring the “Country of a Million Martyrs” (Rahal 108). While this violent resistance clearly undergirds contemporary political and cultural sentiments in Algeria, it did not lay the foundations of Algerian nationalism; early nonviolent civil resistance nurtured a strong sense of “Algerianness” amongst the population. Before, during, and beyond the FLN’s violent insurrections, native Algerians organized mass emigrations, spiritual practices, boycotts, and independent institutions to culturally enliven the colonized population (Chabot and Vinthagen 523). Their nonviolent initiatives visibly defied the “Franco-Algerian” paradigm, reconstituting and reifying indigenous values and identities through persistent resistance.

Drawing on seminal theoretical texts, this paper analyzes the understated cultural role of nonviolent civil resistance in the Algerian liberation struggle. Plentiful cases exhibit this relationship between nonviolent praxis and the cultural preservation of occupied peoples, but for illustration’s sake, this paper will highlight the Algerian case.

The Roots of Cultural Preservation in Algerian Resistance: Elite Defections and The Paradox of Repression

The Algerian citizenry embraced nonviolent civil resistance against the French occupation as early as the 1830s, far before violent rebellion engulfed the nation. Algerian farm workers intentionally spoiled their products and refused to work on French-annexed plots. Their early acts of product destruction exemplify nonviolent intervention, intended to “disrupt attempts at continued subjugation,” while their labor boycotts represent noncooperation, harnessed to “disrupt the status quo” (Shock 16). The army met their efforts with “overt violence” (Smithey and Kurtz 3), routinely beating protestors with clubs, raiding Algerian villages, and forcing their men to engage in newly
arduous labor (Palaj 42). In response to this visible repression, many Algerian elites affiliated with the French government joined their proletarian counterparts in organizing noncooperation through a mass exodus (Palaj 59). Smithey and Kurtz suggest that these defections could be expected, given that overt repression is “most likely to cause moral outrage within the broader population, and, therefore, more likely to precipitate backfire” (3).

The paradox of repression, through which “the repression applied by the state rebounds and undercuts the state’s power” (Schock 42), thus unfolded. These government-allied Algerian elites, who might otherwise be considered active opponents of decolonization on the “spectrum of allies” (Chenoweth 108), used their financial and social capital to secure migratory permissions for persecuted workers and withdrew their support for the government. Social scientists cite elite defections as critical to a movement’s momentum, as they detract from the reigning authority’s ostensible legitimacy (Chenoweth 107) and offer an opportunity to “overcome… [socio economic] divisions, in opposition to a common opponent” (Smithey 34). Together, the paradox of repression and elite defections also reflect Frances Fox Piven’s “disruptive power” (Piven 20) as insurgents deteriorated the cooperation between the French authority, the Algerian elite, and farm laborers.

These defectors formed the civil resistance organization, “Hijra,” whose symbolic name refers to the Prophet Muhammad’s migration from Mecca to Medina to escape persecution (Rahal 111). As many Algerian elites also held past religious prominence, Hijra’s collective action framing proved essential. The group attracted large swaths of Algerians by posturing the organization as fulfilling Islamic prophecy. Kurt Schock might refer to this as “frame amplification,” through which “beliefs that inhere in the oppressed populations are activated that heretofore have not inspired collective political action” (Schock 28). With their Islamic orientation, the organization arranged transportation for Algerians across socio-economic classes to settle in Muslim countries, creating resistant cultural assemblages abroad rife with iterations of the contemporary Algerian flag (Rahal 112).

Mass exodus gained a potent political meaning and embarrassed the authorities, given elite participation and the visibility of these actions—with Algerians departing from large cities or regions. The French government quickly recognized these waves of emigration as threatening colonial power, institutionalizing regular surveys to analyze migration flows and closing consulates that provided migratory permissions (Maïche 45). Hijra remained flexible through “tactical innovation” (Schock 52), as elites facilitated larger volumes of illegal migrations across the Moroccan and Tunisian borders, thus underscoring the French authority’s instability (Maïche 46). The movement’s creativity and tactical innovation displayed their strength and viability, encouraging greater participation amongst hopeful Algerians. This dynamic once again reflects “backfire,” as “increased mobilization [is] a direct indicator that repression has backfired” (Chenoweth 2018, 35). The departure of entire tribes, families, and villages challenged French social order, hindered the labor force, and amplified Algerian culture. This early nonviolent resistance nourished a productive Algerian culture abroad, with those inhabiting new enclaves sending funds to Algerians unable to flee.

Noncooperation and Parallel Institutions
Inspired by Hijra’s momentous migration initiatives and defecting elite, those in Algeria embraced the spirit of domestic noncooperation. As the French government began to build “Franco-Algerian” housing complexes—both as a method to colonize
the Algerian mind and discourage migration through subsidized housing—Algerian nationals simply refused to leave their village homes (Rahal 112). This refusal once again challenged the French rule’s stability while highlighting the distinct characteristics of Algerian homemaking, complete with hammams and harems. Noncooperation did not stop at housing projects: Algerians boycotted French medical services and refused Western education by homeschooling their children. These boycotts eventually attracted the elite, who exalted the slogan “Refus Scolaire” to communicate their dissatisfaction with French higher education (Rahal 114). As Kurt Schock states, “methods of noncooperation undermine the state’s power, resources, and legitimacy” (Schock 16). Thus, by embracing boycotts, the Algerians deprived the French of their cultural, political, and economic wealth; they could no longer rely on Algerian schoolchildren convinced they were French, their consolidation of Western semblant space faltered, and their control of Algerian bodies—both elite and laboring—deteriorated. The French strategy of indoctrination, while meant to create a newfound Europeanness, ultimately encouraged greater Algerian unity, representing another form of backfire (Smithey and Kurtz 5).

Lee Smithey and Lester Kurtz might describe this dynamic as “enhanced backfire,” through which insurgents frame repression in direct contrast with their own culture and values (Smithey and Kurtz 313). While French housing projects, educational institutions, and medicine enshrined coercive structural violence, Algerian boycotts exemplified voluntary, nonviolent, and unifying community-building. For example, Algerians intentionally built their housing complexes without gates, while French enclaves controlled Algerian movement through closed, barbed-wire walls. Eventually, elite effectors also created parallel educational and medical institutions (Maïche 285). These institutions fulfilled the Algerians’ yearning to formally learn their history and practice more traditional forms of medicine, which “met community needs that the existing system did not” (Chenoweth 47). Through these parallel institutions, Algerians could “subvert an oppressive system and support communities affected by it” (Chenoweth 50) and “build the type of society within the institutions that they wanted to create in their world at large” (Chenoweth 52). Algeria, therefore, began to appear more “Algerian.” Inspired by their “deep emotional connections” to their culture (Smithey and Kurtz 117), increasing volumes of native people began to refuse, resist, and endure French repression (Rahal 118).

Additional manifestations of noncooperation flourished under prominent Sufi Brotherhoods, likewise composed of Algerians across economic classes. They resisted through a culture of nationalism, a diversity of tactics, and their nonviolent religious philosophy. With the belief that weak spirituality enabled foreign conquest, the Sufi Brotherhood emphasized the slogan, “Islam is my religion, Algeria my Fatherland, and Arabic my language,” calling for comprehensive rejection of the French colonial paradigm (Clancy-Smith 6-7). Their messaging represents a powerful form of symbolic mobilization, through which the Brotherhood “critiqued the dominant belief system [Western thought] that legitimizes the status quo and provided a belief system [Islamic Nationalism] that legitimated noninstitutional political action” (Schock 27).

The Brotherhoods built spaces of educational and religious Islam inherently opposed to French secularism, including special Muslim burial grounds protected by nonviolent resistors. Instances of violent grave-robbing by French authorities...
contrasted with the nonviolence of protestors, who allowed the rubble of uprooted graves to fall upon them (Clancy-Smith 214-216). Their actions “boldly dramatized the dissonance between authorities’ repression and the nonviolence of disciplined activists” (Smithey and Kurtz 313); the visibility of these actions beside publicly frequented spaces elicited mass participation, the “single most important influence on a civil resistance campaign’s success” (Chenoweth 83). Large groups of new constituents published articles that contributed to Algerian nationalist history, held massive rallies with speakers rejecting French rule, and opened independent schools (Rahal 117). The independent schools also acted as parallel institutions (Chenoweth 50) that taught Arabo-Muslim history and values. These nonviolent actions—in the forms of protest and persuasion and creative nonviolent intervention—were considered necessary for shaping nationalist discourse in the citizenry by enhancing their education and connection to Algerian culture (Rahal 117).

Eventually met with intense censorship and surveillance, members of the Sufi Brotherhood grew disaffected and began violent revolts against the French gendarmes. The nonviolent Brotherhood leadership quickly responded, creating a “container” (Haga 342) for aspiring military rebels to safely release their anger alongside their comrades (Clancy-Smith 253). The Sufi Brotherhoods likewise pursued “methods of dispersion” to circumvent repression and limit concentrated violent insurgency (Schock 51), organizing campaigns during which activists painted “Algeria Libré” across city walls, clandestinely distributed nationalist leaflets, and orchestrated flash rallies at public squares before the police could intervene (Rahal 118). The lack of a single target and the continuous flow of these actions sufficiently undermined the state’s rule. Kurt Schock would suggest that these activists made the challenge “too widespread to be controlled by state repression” (Schock 53). It is likewise important to note that while the Sufi Brotherhoods prioritized the Arabic language, they dispersed their slogans in French to maintain their challenge’s legibility to authorities (Rahal 120).

Throughout these healing and diversifying processes, the organization’s leader gained the opportunity to form an agreement with French authorities; he maintained his constituency’s nonviolence in exchange for religious autonomy (Clancy-Smith 229). This government concession might represent a form of “nonviolent coercion,” through which “change is achieved against the government’s will as a result of the challengers’ successful undermining of the government’s power, legitimacy, and ability to control the situation” (Schock 42). Thus, nonviolent action spurred viable cultural resistance, through which Algerians could attend religious schools, embrace Algerian-Muslim nationalism, and fundamentally redefine their nation’s meaning.

Withdrawal and Healing

While organizing fervent nonviolent resistance in public space, Algerians built intimate resistance in their familial homes and private spiritual domains, especially when faced with the FLN’s growing violence and the French authority’s subsequent repression. Seemingly non-political practices underwent politicizing transformations as Algerians pursued resistance through the “internal Hijra”—a form of noncooperation that encouraged an “emotional and psychological withdrawal to the inner domain” (Rahal 113). Homes became intimate spheres of cultural refuge, perseverance, and practice. Sufi and Suni leaders clandestinely traversed households in indigenous villages, guiding meditations, prayers, and reflections on Algerian identity (Entels 15). Religious leaders notably
discouraged Algerians from hating the French, focusing on how their religious ideologies enshrine universal love (Entels 17). This practice of cleansing “internal violence” maintained the movement’s nonviolent health and nurtured beloved community (Haga 255-256). Affirming the universal humanity that grows through beloved community, many French officers respected Algerians’ religious autonomy and refused to interrupt religious practices (Entels 18).

As religio-cultural refuges grew, women became their central agents. Erica Chenoweth might suggest that the involvement of women proved essential to nonviolent resistance, as they offered opportunities for tactical innovation and conveyed the struggle’s universality (2021 96-97). Women’s clothing particularly became symbols of cultural resistance to European domination (Fanon 35). As the French attempted to “unveil the Algerian woman,” showing her embrace of “progressive, Western values,” a massive increase in veiling onset and the entire body constituted a site for resisting foreign disruption (Fanon 45). The transformation of veiling practices in defiance of French colonial authority represents a key instance in which personal and collective identity presentations align, “such that participation in movement activities feels natural and compelling” (Smithey 33). Despite repression, participation in veiling consistently increased “in defense of shared collective identities,” a common phenomenon observed by Smithey and Kurtz (176). The Algerian woman’s costume, therefore, reflected a growing cultural nationalism. Withdrawal to the home, and cultural healing therein, revealed the absence of a colonial mechanism for thwarting intimate nonviolence, essential to Algerian perseverance (Clancy-Smith 239).

Conclusion

Although often ignored, nonviolent civil resistance in Algeria laid the foundations for a formidable and defiant cultural nationalism. The Algerian struggle highlights the intersections between civil resistance tactics and collective identity, as women and men, elite and laborers, the diaspora, and domestic constituents embraced their Algerianness in direct challenge of French repression. By maintaining effective collective action framing, a diversity of tactics, and nonviolent discipline, Algerian insurgents encouraged elite defections from the occupying European regime, accumulated the resources for parallel institutions, and developed widespread forms of cultural expression. Ultimately, they left the French authority with a dearth of legitimacy.

While the FLN’s fervent violence eventually subsumed the indigenous struggle, it is arguable that their political success depended on the early cultivation of nationalism through nonviolent civil resistance. Their struggle—spanning noncooperation, protest and persuasion, and creative nonviolent intervention—strengthened the Algerian socio-political and cultural fabric despite oppressive colonial policies. Future research might focus on the various other forms of powerful nonviolent resistance in early colonized Algeria, such as the formation of oppositional political parties, the motivating features of Islamic reformism, and the rise of Algerian trade unionism. Additional explorations might also explore the FLN’s early commitment to nonviolence. All these forms of nonviolent resistance nurtured and reaffirmed the culture of Algerian nationalism that thrives today.
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The fantastical fragrance of desert rain
Taut upon the thorns and thistles
Prickled wafts of pellucid jojoba
Damp fires searing ancient mounds
Minted effluent from juniper dreams
Soothed by expectant bursts of horehound
Caught in the scavenged musk of middens
Archeologies of droplets tossed and found
Aerosol memories carrying futures untold
Pistils and stamens unfurled with desire
Luminous sheens pine for humid affection
Pungent ghosts of all that has transpired
Ecstatic proclamations of possibilities
Sparsely strewn about valleys of hope
Vast grasses fed from above and below
Embodied energies of liquefied smoke
Redolent bubbles often seen and herded
Nary a word from penitent cactus stones
Listening for the mournful trills of quails
Smoothing brittle edges of tattered bones
Resilience is a vital attribute, conceptually and pragmatically speaking. In a world where it often seems that the only guarantee we have is greater instability due to escalating crises at all scales, our capacity to roll with the punches and cultivate creative responses is paramount. Still, despite the need for a resilient stance in these hard times, it is worth inquiring whether our adaptive nature can work against us as well.

Specifically, it is important at the outset to integrate resilience with resistance, and likewise to advance beyond regarding resilience as a form of absorptive capacity. Too often, we look to communities to stay strong in the face of calamities and tragedies, with less attention paid to the structural drivers of these events and a misplaced media fascination with the aftermath of crises rather than obvious precursors. Again, this doesn’t undermine the necessity to be resilient, but instead asks that we balance the ledger between causes and effects, focusing at least as much on the supply side of crises as we do on the response side. In its most vibrant sense, resilience is solidarity and networking, community and dignity, mobilization and imagination. Yet it cannot substitute for systemic change at the roots of problems.

In the environmental realm we often hear about strategies falling into categories of either mitigation or adaptation. Ideally and impactfully, these can coincide—as for instance with developing ‘green energy’ (i.e., contributing less carbon emissions while preparing for a post-fossil world), or with a community blocking a toxic facility (i.e., imposing costs on harmful industries while building participatory networks).

With this in mind, here are a few points of reflection on resilience, including some cautions and caveats:

Frontline communities often are expected to be paragons of absorption and resistance. Whether coping with acute crises (like the poisoning of municipal water sources in Flint, Michigan, and elsewhere) or the ‘long emergency’ of structural inequalities and the allocation of disparate environmental burdens, communities on the front lines of struggle sometimes are viewed through a lens of either neglect (i.e., “that’s terrible but at least it isn’t happening where I live”) or elevation (i.e., “how inspiring they are!”). Neither of these responses is sufficient, and can escalate the expectation of resilience as absorptiveness.

The extent to which we normalize crises can deflect attention from official malfeasance. In the aftermath of many ‘natural’ disasters, we often see activist networks (or more broadly ‘civil society’) filling the void left by inadequate official structures—and perhaps in the process propping up a deficient system. This can take the form of horizontal
coordination and an ethic of care manifesting as ‘disaster solidarity’ in an acute crisis, which is a necessary and powerful lifeline in such instances. Yet these emergent prosocial responses should not become an invitation to court further disasters and erode already-thin safety nets.

*Resilience is a collaborative endeavor, but in an atomized world it can tap into ‘survivalist’ impulses.* Individuals cannot be expected to muster the fortitude and resources necessary to survive (let alone thrive) in a world plagued by more frequent and severe crises across the social and ecological realms. Nor can communities be expected to function in relative isolation when it comes to confronting threats that are systemic in nature, from police violence to climate displacement. The model isn’t to develop ‘fortress societies’ with militaristic and separatist overtones, but rather to aim for collective stability.

*Some ‘shocks’ simply are not absorbable and should be met with resolute refusal to be condoned.* Even the most resilient systems have their limits, societally and ecologically speaking. The existential threats posed by nuclear weapons, runaway climate change, and enforced inequality fall outside the realm of any expectation of being resilient. We all have to make choices every day about what we will resist and what we will accommodate, but increasingly the willingness to embrace the latter seems to outstrip the former. These micro-moments of daily life often occur at the ‘pillars’ of where and how power operates.

*Resilience is viable when coupled with strategies to mitigate the drivers of crises at their roots.* Harking back to the core theme of this missive, any sense of resilience-as-adaptation should be coupled with an equally robust sense of resilience-as-mitigation. In this sense, we can view resilience not merely as a responsive framework but as a preventive, proactive, and prefigurative one as well. The time to cultivate resilient capacities is now, before crises fully subsume the lifeworld—and in so doing, maybe they won’t. It’s wiser to muster the resources needed to avert crises than to be ruined by the costs of courting them.

In the end, we can affirm that resilience is a beneficial aim and should be cultivated; it is also, however, a cautionary tale about the need to draw a complete picture and balance reaction with effective action. If we do so, it may even turn out to be the case that being extraordinarily resilient now will help usher in a world where we can be ordinarily resilient and devote more of ourselves to thriving than to surviving.
RESILIENCE IS A
BYPRODUCT OF SURVIVAL:
AN INTERVIEW WITH SHINGAI
NJERI KAGUNDA

GABRIEL ERTSGAARD

Shingai Njeri Kagunda is an Afrosurreal/futurist storyteller from Nairobi, Kenya with a Literary Arts MFA from Brown University. Shingai’s work has been featured in the Best American Sci-fi and Fantasy 2020, Year’s Best African Speculative Fiction 2021, and Year’s Best Dark Fantasy and Horror 2020. Her debut novella & This is How to Stay Alive from Neon Hemlock Press was the Ignyte Award winner in 2022. She is the co-editor of Podcastle Magazine (a Hugo Award finalist for Best Semiprozine) and the co-founder of Voodoonauts.

GE: Could you tell us about your background and path to becoming a speculative fiction writer? What is the story of how you became a storyteller?

SK: I have always been very deeply fascinated with other worlds and stories. Since I was old enough to read by myself, I was always in a book and living in the world of its characters. When I wrote my own stories, it was not only a way to live other lives, but also to take my life into other worlds. For me it was about empathy and curiosity. Literature is a tool for building empathy. It allowed me to experience lived histories outside of my own, which gave me more understanding for those experiences when I encountered them in this lifetime.

I did English literature in college, and I was immediately obsessed. In my undergrad literature classroom, there was a professor who said, “We’re not going to learn about dead white men. We’re going to learn about African thinkers, philosophers, poets, writers, and storytellers.” That opened up a whole world of possibilities when it came to who the storytellers who looked like me were before me, and how their stories gave me permission to live. I wanted to be able to do that for other people.

GE: There’s a lot of high quality work being created by African speculative fiction writers right now. Would you like to talk about this moment in African speculative fiction?

SK: Black people have always been telling speculative stories. One of the most interesting things for me was realizing that we didn’t need to separate our stories between literary and fantasy. It’s inherently part of the storytelling culture to combine the spiritual and the physical, or the tangible and metaphysical aspects of lived experience. Black and African people have always been telling these stories for and to each other. Now the only difference, in this moment, is that the rest of the world is paying attention.
It’s really cool because there’s a lot more room for diasporic connection. We’re not only telling the stories in the small communities we’re in; we have access to each others’ stories across the globe. We can find the similarities, the differences, and the nuanced ways our roots have expanded into different things.

There’s a wider range of intersectional issues being talked about in the stories that are being authored right now, and I think that makes sense. When Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o and Chinua Achebe and other writers during the anti-colonial revolutions were coming up, they were writing about the most urgent and pressing issues of their time. Now African and Black speculative fiction writers are writing about the most pressing issues of our time, which are still very close to that history. The history of colonization is still in the conversation around intersectional identities. The stories that are coming out are challenging the bigger societal narratives that decide that we are only one thing, or that we can only write about one thing.

GE: How do you feel your own travels have influenced your storytelling and how you understand yourself as a storyteller?

SK: Living in different parts of the world has messed with my identity as a storyteller! That’s the honest answer. I have always seen myself as a Kenyan storyteller. But being away from home, I lose access to the immediate perspective of the here and now of the people that I’m telling the stories about. That’s been a “con” of the movement. A “pro” has been coming back to empathy and learning from other lived experiences outside of my own. This has made my characters more well-rounded, has given me different types of stories to tell, and has allowed me to think on a bigger scale about the types of stories that I want to tell. It has become a lot more important for my stories to encourage Black diasporic conversation.

I try to go home at least once a year. It is definitely part of the work of grounding and fruiting in that part of my identity. I also think about carrying home with me wherever I go. I’m bringing Kenya with me into this experience. I’m bringing Kenya into this space, some part of it. That offers a lot more perspective when it comes to what home means for me, and how home comes across in my writing.

GE: Our theme for this issue is “resilience.” How does resilience play out in your work and life?

SK: I think resilience is a byproduct of survival. In a lot of my work, the conversation is around dehumanization in a society that doesn’t see you as valid or as a full person because of the structures that be—be they from capitalism, or the history of colonization, or whatever else it is. I’m thinking of my novella & This is How to Stay Alive which explores queerness and not seeing queerness as part of humanity or the full human experience. What happens in that situation is that you are just trying to survive. You are doing everything that you can to prove that you are a full human being and that you are valid in the fullness of your humanity. It forces you to be resilient because there’s not really an alternative.

The history of oppressed groups of people rings so loud and so clear with resilience, because they’re still here today. They’re still shouting and crying and doing whatever needs to be done to say, “I am human. I am here. I will be seen—if not by you, then by myself and my community.” That definitely shows up both in my written work and in my life.

This year has been especially difficult for me as an immigrant in America. As someone who works in a
predominantly white space as a Black person, I have constantly and consistently had to push back and say, "I am human." What has sustained me is having people and community who say, "I see you even if they don’t. And you have it in you to see yourself." Those are some of the things that come up for me when I think about resilience.

**GE:** You mentioned your novella & This is How to Stay Alive. You’ve written two versions of that story, first a short story and then the novella, and these versions have different endings. Does the novella supersede the short story, or do they represent alternate possibilities?

**SK:** I would definitely go with the second. One of the things that I was trying to get across with this story is that there are multiple versions of the story—there always have been and always will be. I didn’t actually think about the differences when I was writing them. With the short story version, there was so much pain, so much Black, queer pain, and there wasn’t enough time to sit with both the joy and the pain for me to be okay leaving it ambiguous. Showing the fullness of that lived experience means showing that there is hope and joy existing side-by-side with the pain and hurt. Hence the happier ending.

Within the novella, I had a longer amount of time to delve into the history, into the generational trauma, into the processing and the actual grieving itself. I could show how long that took and sit with the characters as they were going through it. This made it more okay for the ending to be ambiguous because we had processed a lot of the pain throughout the story together. I definitely think that they exist side-by-side as different possibilities, and I’d love for readers to imagine alternative possibilities to the ones that I’ve presented.
PEACE THROUGH ART: PURSUING PARADIGM SHIFTS

YEHUDA SILVERMAN

After taking this picture at the Étienne Brûlé Park in Canada, I looked deeply at the image which presented itself on my smartphone. I had no idea that this specific visual would emerge. When at the park, I noticed only part of the scenery, and I did not have a full picture of what that image would be like until the photo was taken.

In life, we meet people during certain moments, and we do not usually see the full image of them. Some may be going through challenging times and may also have complex layers to themselves. These interactions are only a snapshot of their life, and when we meet them, we are also looking at them through our own lenses. The picture that any individual can be is a process that develops overtime, and sometimes through our own lens, the individual is distorted based on our own internal schema.

We cannot completely know what people are going through in their life. Peace education, particularly
when learned from an early age, can help cultivate a deeper understanding of the self, which in turn, may foster resiliency, compassion, and understanding towards humanity. As a pracademic, this particular journey is a constant one of lifelong learning.

When I was an undergraduate student, I believed that people who had PhDs were experts in their field. Though in the conflict resolution field, there is always something to learn, and many pathways to continue developing.

As our world is becoming more technologically advanced, we should continue recognizing the emerging elements that can generate further conflicts. One of the more heightened concerns is the rise of online hate speech, particularly amplified by people with millions of followers, which has the capacity to quickly seep into the offline realm and impact people physically too.

Peace education is urgently needed throughout our world, because if everyone learns about nonviolent communication and how othering emerges, further conflicts could be prevented. These foundations should begin at an early age, specifically as youth are quickly becoming connected to the online world, and at times disconnected from their physical realities.

We have the capacity to change the picture we see in front of us, and the impacts that we make can create positive ripple effects. As peace education continues to develop, the importance of involving art in this field could potentially lead to further transformations. The more frameworks that we include and share, the more possibilities for individuals to continue developing may emerge. Art can provide a platform in reimagining peace, and further applications in technology can create numerous opportunities in forming new paradigm shifts for social change.
WATERCOLOR TEARS

ELSA BARRON

This assembly of haikus is a personal journal of resilience throughout a year's time. It is a reflection on loss, yet its most resounding theme is love. Subjects wander from international headlines to personal encounters, touching on war, the courts, climate change, Amtrak rides, and a pair of checkered rollerskates. Like flowing watercolors, these encounters intermingle and create a yearning for something beautiful in the midst of chaos.

Winter
Invasive thoughts

There is a war on
But you are thinking too much
Today is sunny

Overheard on the train

Your health and safety
Benefit from bison meat
Heartfelt genocide

Love, support, kindness
Like tobacco on the teeth
Rot straight to the core

A healthy fry bread
Consecrated by the Lord
Is broken for you

Reflections on the (NY) Times

Can you imagine
Getting the COVID vaccine
In Syria now?

We will inject you
With a life-saving serum
While the bombs explode

Spring

A wartime purchase
A perfect pink pill
For the things that rolled away
Checkered rollerskates

Self-portrait

Why no mask today?
Just invisible you say
It was always on

Summer
Shireen Abu Akleh et. al

To bury the dead
Under the barrel of guns
It is victory

Roe

My ten-year-old self
Upon viewing the future
Screams a heretic
Fragility's mold
Who I was to who I am
Granite into glass

Season's greetings

Just a one-point-five
Two-point-five, two-point-seven
Degree bliss-filled world

Fall
On the way to COP27

Plane is a cartoon
Filled with busy minds, but souls?
Watching BBC

With a beach party
We usher indecision
And try to forget

The way from COP27

In delicate silk
Amidst tipping and collapse
We Waltz to thunder

The way

Yearning to create
Emotions drip like painted
Watercolor tears
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