

Finally, WFP is having an intangible but important long-term impact. Even its modest success has opened the eyes of untold thousands to a non-violent alternative for resisting violence. The influence of thousands of returning volunteers excited about the potential of non-violent direct action is working its way through American churches like yeast in dough. Nor is the impact limited to the US. News of this effort has spread to many countries. Perhaps the comment of a (non-pacifist) Baptist leader in Nicaragua typifies the educational impact of WFP in many places: 'I didn't understand non-violence at first. I came to understand non-violent action for peace by the testimony of the witnesses [WFP volunteers] in a place where the people were being violated by force of arms.'²⁶

WFP is one subplot in a living, growing story of courageous pioneers seeking alternatives to lethal violence.²⁷ WFP's part of that developing story demonstrates that non-violent resistance to guerrilla warfare is possible.²⁸ The Philippine People's Revolution, to which we turn in the next chapter, shows that non-violent revolution is also realistic.

From: *Nonviolence: The Invincible Weapon?*, by Ronald Sider,
1989.

3 WHEELCHAIRS vs TANKS

I have decided to pursue my freedom struggle through the path of nonviolence. . . I refuse to believe that it is necessary for a nation to build its foundation on the bones of its youth.

Benigno Aquino¹

The most stunning non-violent victory since Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King occurred in the Philippines in early 1986. Praying nuns, nursing mothers and old women in wheelchairs turned back bayonets and tanks. In four breathtaking days in late February, Filipino 'people power' toppled President Ferdinand Marcos, one of the world's most durable dictators.

Marcos and his Opponents

The story of course began much earlier. Marcos won the presidential election in 1965. In 1972, he declared martial law, which was not lifted until 1981. Even then, extra-legal powers enabled him to continue his repressive role.

Marcos used dictatorial powers to amass great wealth for himself, close friends, and cooperative foreign companies.² To promote his development policy based on export crops, he ruthlessly suppressed workers who demanded decent wages and land reform. (Towards the end of his rule, the average wage for a sugar-cane cutter

working thirteen to fourteen hours a day was \$7.00 a week.) Both Amnesty International and the International Commission of Jurists documented thousands of political prisoners in Marcos' jails. Electric shock torture, water torture, extended solitary confinement and beatings were common. Such measures propped up a system where a tiny portion of the population received a huge percent of the nation's total personal income.³

While Marcos and company stashed billions in Swiss banks, the majority of the people suffered grinding poverty. Three quarters of the people lived below the poverty line. Seventy-seven percent of all children under six suffered from malnutrition.

Not surprisingly, a Marxist guerrilla movement gained increasing acceptance. A tiny group when Marcos declared martial law in 1972, the Marxist-led New People's Army had grown into a strong national movement by the mid 1980s. Many prominent people felt civil war was inevitable. It might take ten years of bloody battle, they guessed, but no other course seemed viable.

But the assassination of Senator Benigno Aquino on 21 August 1983 ignited a fire that brought revolution by different methods.⁴ Aquino held the double honour of being Marcos' most prominent political opponent and longest-held (1972-1980) political prisoner. Reading Jesus and Gandhi in prison, this conventional, self-serving politician experienced a renewal of personal faith and a transforming commitment to the poor and non-violence.⁵

Released in 1980 to obtain heart surgery in the US, Aquino prepared himself for the right moment to return home to challenge Marcos' repressive dictatorship. The non-violent tactics he intended to use were abundantly clear in a statement made to the subcommittee on Asian

and Pacific Affairs of the US House of Representatives on 23 June 1983:

To gather empirical data and firsthand information, I travelled to the Middle East, Southeast Asia, and to Central America. I interviewed the leaders of the most 'successful revolutions' and talked to both the victors and the vanquished, the relatives of the victims and the survivors. I have concluded that revolution and violence exact the highest price in terms of human values and human lives in the struggle for freedom. In the end there are really no victors, only victims . . .

I have decided to pursue my freedom struggle through the path of nonviolence, fully cognizant that this may be the longer and more arduous road . . .

I have chosen to return to the silence of my solitary confinement and from there to work for a peaceful solution to our problems rather than go back triumphant to the blare of trumpets and cymbals seeking to drown the wailing and sad lamentations of mothers whose sons and daughters have been sacrificed to the gods of violent revolution. Can the killers of today be the leaders of tomorrow? Must we destroy in order to build? I refuse to believe that it is necessary for a nation to build its foundation on the bones of its youth.⁶

But Aquino was not to return to his prison cell when he stepped off the plane at Manila International Airport on 21 August 1983. Instead, he dropped dead in a hail of bullets in an assassination almost certainly approved by President Marcos.

The Beginnings of Non-violent Opposition

The country erupted in outrage. Spontaneously, the first major non-violent demonstration in the Philippines occurred. Day and night, millions moved past his coffin in grief and silent defiance. Two million people

marched peacefully in an eleven-hour funeral procession that persisted through sunshine and rain, thunder and lightning.⁷ And they responded enthusiastically when Aquino's mother and widow begged them to continue the struggle non-violently.

But this emotional outpouring did not immediately alter political reality. Marcos was still the dictator. The growing Marxist guerrilla movement (NPA) increasingly appeared to many as the only alternative as Marcos continued to crack down on opponents.

To be sure, there were a few courageous voices promoting a non-violent alternative. As early as the sixties, some poor communities organised non-violent struggles and won small but significant victories. Since the early 1970s, Francisco Claver, bishop on the desperately poor, guerrilla-infested island of Mindanao, had been promoting non-violent liberation of the poor. Marcos' army called him a Marxist. The Marxist guerrillas claimed he supported the army. Bishop Claver quietly continued forming Base Christian Communities committed to a non-violent search for justice in his diocese. He also promoted the study of non-violent social change among a small circle of Catholic bishops.⁸

Then in February 1984, a short visit by two veteran non-violent trainers crystallised more widespread interest in non-violent alternatives. Hildegard and Jean Goss-Mayr had worked for decades promoting non-violence in Europe and Latin America. Both Archbishop Dom Helder Camara of Brazil and the Nobel Prize winner Adolfo Perez Esquivel of Argentina have traced their commitment to non-violence to personal encounters with the Goss-Mayrs.⁹ As they travelled through the Philippines in February 1984, they concluded that the hour was late for any non-violent effort. But they also sensed a widespread yearn-

ing for some realistic alternative to the agony of civil war.

On the last day of their visit, Butz Aquino (brother of the assassinated Benigno Aquino) met privately with them. Butz Aquino was an active leader in the ongoing protests against the dictatorship. Privately with the Goss-Mayrs, he confided his personal wrestling with the option of armed revolution:

A few days ago the arms merchants visited us and said to us, 'Do you think that with a few demonstrations you will be able to overthrow this regime? Don't you think you need better weapons than that? We offer them to you. Make up your mind.' . . . You see it is providential that you have come just at this point of time, because ever since this visit I am unable to sleep. Do I have the right to throw our country into major civil war? What is my responsibility as a Christian politician in this situation? Is there really such a thing as nonviolent combat against an unjust system like that of Marcos?¹⁰

In response the Goss-Mayrs challenged him to decide for himself. But they warned that vigorous preparation for non-violent resistance is essential: 'Nonviolence is not something you do spontaneously and without preparation.'¹¹ They volunteered to return to do seminars if invited.

The invitation came within weeks. In the summer of 1984, the Goss-Mayrs returned for six weeks of seminars on non-violence. They ran seminars for leaders among the political opposition (including Butz Aquino), labour unions, peasants, students, and the church. Bishop Claver organised a three-day seminar for twenty Catholic bishops. Everywhere, the Goss-Mayrs advocated a twofold non-violence: non-violent opposition to the structural violence in Marcos' economic and political system, and abandonment of the inner violence in one's own heart.

The seed of the violence was in the structures, of course, and in the dictator. But wasn't it also in ourselves? It's very easy to say that Marcos is the evil. But unless we each tear the dictator out of our own heart, nothing will change. Another group will come into power and will act similarly to those whom they replaced. So we discovered Marcos within ourselves.¹²

AKKAPKA, a new Philippine organisation committed to non-violence, emerged from these seminars. AKKAPKA (formed in July 1984) is the acronym for Movement for Peace and Justice. It also means 'I embrace you' in Tagalog, the national language of the Philippines. Led by Father Jose Blanco, SJ, AKKAPKA held forty seminars on non-violent social change in thirty different provinces all over the country in its first year.¹³

The numbers seriously interested in using non-violent methods grew rapidly in late 1984 and 1985. Three weeks of seminars in Protestant circles by the American ethicist Richard Deats swelled their ranks. Even so, they were hardly ready for the surprise of 3 November 1985.

Marcos' Announcement and AKKAPKA's Initiatives

On that day, Marcos suddenly announced presidential elections for 7 February 1986. While the ideological left decided to boycott the elections, AKKAPKA quickly devoted all its energy towards trying to guarantee a fair election. They focused on three activities: encouraging the people to vote, preparing poll-watchers, and organising prayer tents.¹⁴

People intimidated by years of violent governmental

repression needed to be encouraged to cast fear aside, reject government bribes, and vote according to their conscience. Regularly, in previous elections, armed thugs had intimidated voters and stolen ballots. So AKKAPKA joined other religious and civic organisations to help train half a million men and women, young and old, priests and laity, to defend the ballot boxes non-violently even if attacked by armed soldiers or thugs.

AKKAPKA also set up 'prayer tents' in ten highly populated areas. One was located in the heart of Manila's banking community. Day and night, from mid-January 1986 to the end of the crisis, people came to these prayer tents to fast and pray. Hildegard Goss-Mayr, who saw these prayer tents in operation in early 1986, has underlined their importance:

We cannot emphasize enough the deep spirituality that gave the people the strength to stand against the tanks later on. People prayed every day, for all those who suffered in the process of changing regimes, even for the military, even for Marcos . . . It makes a great difference in a revolutionary process where people are highly emotional whether you promote hatred and revenge or help the people stand firmly for justice without becoming like the oppressor. You want to love your enemy, to liberate rather than destroy him.¹⁵

Almost immediately after Marcos announced the 'snap' election, more and more people began to call on Cory Aquino, widow of the assassinated Benigno, to challenge Marcos at the polls. Unwilling at first, she reluctantly agreed, announcing her candidacy on 5 December 1985, just two months before the election. In the short, intense campaign, she discovered massive popular support. Clearly she was on her way to a decisive electoral victory.

Marcos, however, used massive, unparalleled fraud to steal the election. According to the Philippine Conference of Catholic Bishops, there was widespread vote-buying, intimidation of voters, dishonest tabulation of the returns, harassment, terrorism and murder.¹⁶ In Metropolitan Manila alone, six hundred thousand people could not vote because Marcos' agents had scrambled the voters' lists.

Tens of thousands of non-violent poll-watchers with NAMFREL courageously placed their bodies in the midst of all this corruption and violence. (In the 1984 parliamentary elections, an independent organisation called NAMFREL had emerged to conduct an independent quick vote count and prevent some of the worst dishonesty.) Strong international support strengthened their hand in the 1986 presidential elections. They deployed their thirty thousand volunteers at the most critical polling stations. Six hundred nuns, nicknamed the 'NAMFREL Marines' went to the most problematic locations. During the day of voting and the subsequent vote count, these non-violent volunteers risked death many times. Twenty-four hours a day, they formed human chains and literally tied themselves to ballot boxes so the boxes could not be stolen.¹⁷

NAMFREL's quick count showed Cory Aquino with a substantial lead. But the official tabulation placed Marcos ahead. Then, as the parliament (Batasan) prepared to declare Marcos the winner, thirty young computer workers involved in the official vote count left their posts on 9 February to protest the deliberate posting of dishonest returns. That daring act ended any credibility still enjoyed by the official returns.

The Bishops Speak Out

At this desperate moment, the Philippine Catholic Bishops Conference decided to issue one of the more daring political pronouncements of modern times by an official church body. On 13 February, the bishops denounced the elections as fraudulent. They declared that Marcos' government could not command the people's allegiance because it lacked all moral foundation, and they called on the faithful to resist this evil with peaceful non-violence.

'We are not going to effect the change we seek by doing nothing, by sheer apathy,' the bishops insisted. In their pronouncement, read from pulpits all across the country, the bishops dared to propose non-violent resistance:

Neither do we advocate a bloody, violent means of righting this wrong. If we did, we would be sanctioning the enormous sin of fratricidal strife. Killing to achieve justice is not within the purview of our Christian vision in our present context.

The way indicated to us now is the way of nonviolent struggle for justice.

This means active resistance of evil by peaceful means—in the manner of Christ . . .

We therefore ask every loyal member of the Church, every community of the faithful, to form their judgment about the February 7 polls. And if in faith they see things as we the bishops do, we must come together and discern what appropriate actions to take that will be according to the mind of Christ . . .

These last few days have given us shining examples of the nonviolent struggle for justice we advocate here . . .

Now is the time to speak up. Now is the time to repair the wrong . . . But we insist: Our acting must always be according to the Gospel of Christ, that is, in a peaceful, nonviolent way.¹⁸

Hildegard Goss-Mayr believes this declaration by the bishops was the first occasion, at least in modern times, when a Catholic Bishops Conference publicly called on the faithful to engage in non-violent civil disobedience to overthrow an unjust system.¹⁹ Cardinal Sin, the Catholic Archbishop of Manila, called it 'the strongest statement any group of bishops has produced anywhere since the days of Henry VIII [in the early sixteenth century]'.²⁰

As the bishops' statement reverberated around the Philippines, Cory Aquino was meeting with 350 key advisers to plan a campaign of non-violent resistance. The Goss-Mayrs joined Cory Aquino, Cardinal Sin and others to devise scenarios and develop an extended, non-violent campaign of marches and boycotts designed to overthrow Marcos. A crowd of one million cheering supporters wildly applauded as Mrs Aquino launched her campaign of civil disobedience on 16 February. The tide had turned.²¹

Marcos, however, was determined to stay in power. He announced his intention to meet force with force. The struggle would be long and tough.

'People Power'

But surprise struck again on Saturday evening, 22 February. Unexpectedly Juan Ponce Enrile (Marcos' Minister of Defence) and General Fidel Ramos rebelled. Denouncing the fraudulent elections in a news conference, they declared Mrs Aquino the rightful President, and at 9.00 p.m., with only two hundred armed defenders, they barricaded themselves inside their camps in the middle of Metropolitan Manila. Their two hundred soldiers were at the mercy of Marcos'

army of 250,000. The President could destroy them at will.

At that moment, Butz Aquino and Cardinal Sin unleashed 'people power'. Late on Saturday night, Butz Aquino called cause-orientated groups to fill the streets outside Enrile's and Ramos' campus. 'We will surround the camps and protect them with our bodies,' he announced boldly.²²

Cardinal Sin went on the radio Saturday evening and urged the people to surround the camps. 'Go to Camp Aguinaldo and show your solidarity' with Ramos and Enrile, 'our two good friends', the Cardinal pleaded.²³ Within hours, thousands of men, women and children ringed the gates of the camps, blocking any potential movement by Marcos' army. Marcos would have to kill civilians if he chose to attack.

Before he went on the radio, Cardinal Sin called three orders of nuns. To each, he said: 'Right now get out from your cells and go to the chapel and pray . . . And fast until I tell you to stop. We are in battle.'²⁴ No troops attacked the rebels on Saturday night.

By Sunday morning the streets around the camps were overflowing with people. Families came with children and picnic baskets. In spite of the danger, the mood was festive. All over the city, taxi and truck drivers spontaneously volunteered to shuttle people to the scene of action. Ramos and Enrile went on the air to beg for more civilians to flood the streets to act as a buffer between themselves and Marcos' soldiers. They fully expected an attack. According to a professor at the Philippine Military Academy, it was this surge of 'people power' that made the difference. 'It was the first time in history', Lieutenant Colonel Purificacion said, 'that so many civilians went to protect the military.'²⁵

The non-violent soldiers of this 'classless revolution'

came from every walk of life.²⁶ Rich bankers, top executives and business men drove their cars to the camps. The poor walked. Men and women, children and grandparents, priest and nuns, flooded the streets. Pregnant women with babies in their arms came ready to defy advancing tanks.

Sunday afternoon at 3.00 p.m. the tanks came. A large force of marines with tanks and armoured personnel carriers headed for Enrile and Ramos' little band of rebels. Rumbling through the streets, the huge machines stopped only a kilometre from Ramos' headquarters, blocked by thousands of bodies ready to die rather than let them continue.

Amado L. Lacuesta, Jr, just one of the hundreds of thousands of civilians in the streets, offers a powerful eyewitness account of the people's raw courage.²⁷ As he squeezed his way through the densely packed street, he finally got close to where General Tadiar of the marines was negotiating with the civilians who totally surrounded his tanks and armoured personnel carriers (APC). The sea of kneeling people were praying, some holding small statues of the Virgin Mary. General Tadiar demanded that the people let him through, but they refused. Just then Butz Aquino arrived, clambered up on the APC and explained how people power could avoid bloodshed.

As the soldiers pushed Aquino off the huge machine, its engines roared. Weeping and praying, the people expected to be crushed. At the very front were three nuns, kneeling in prayer an arm's length from the throbbing motors. The metal mountain jerked forward once, twice, then stopped. The crowd cheered wildly. As a military helicopter made a low sweep, the people offered cigarettes to the soldiers, who looked away with a mixture of disdain and uncertainty. Again the

engines roared and the machine jerked forward. Men pushed against the advancing metal wall as the nuns continued to kneel in prayer. Row after row of densely packed bodies stood ready to be pulverised by tons of metal. But again the towering monster halted. This time, after more hesitation, the APC swivelled and retreated to the deafening roar of thousands of relieved cheering voices.

Cardinal Sin tells the story of bedridden, eighty-one year old Mrs Monzon, owner of Arellano University. Everywhere she went, she used a wheelchair. But Mrs Monzon insisted on joining the people in the streets in front of the camps. When the tanks came, she wheeled in front of the advancing monsters. Armed with a crucifix, she called out to the soldiers: 'Stop. I am an old woman. You can kill me, but you shouldn't kill your fellow Filipinos.' Overcome, a soldier jumped off the tank and embraced the bold non-violent resister. 'I cannot kill you,' he told her, 'you are just like my mother.' She stayed in the street all night in her wheelchair.²⁸

The marines finally withdrew without firing a shot.

Monday brought more high drama. At dawn, three thousand marines succeeded in dispersing part of the crowd with tear gas. But seven helicopter gunships with sufficient firepower to obliterate both Ramos' rebel troops and the surrounding crowds landed peacefully and defected. At 9.00 a.m. Marcos appeared defiantly on television for a few minutes and then disappeared as rebel soldiers seized Channel 4 TV.

Romeo Lavella, Jr, who lived near Channel 4, tells what he saw just after rebels seized the station.²⁹ Hearing scattered gun shots, he rushed into the streets where swarms of people stood between two groups of heavily armed soldiers. The pro-Marcos loyalists had

more than twice as many men as the rebels who had just seized the station.

As sporadic gunfire erupted, a pick-up truck with a priest praying loudly slowly inched forward. As he prayed the Rosary and sang the Ave Maria, the people did the same. In the truck were statues of the crucified Christ and the Virgin Mary. Awed, the soldiers stopped shooting. As another priest and civilians helped negotiate an agreement between the soldiers, the priest and people continued to pray and sing. Channel 4, meanwhile, stayed in the hands of the people.

Hundreds of thousands jammed the streets in front of the camps on Monday. From Cardinal Sin's four auxiliary bishops to unknown slum-dwellers, the people defied the guns and tanks.

One particularly striking encounter occurred in front of the Polymedic Hospital near the camps. Several trucks with gun-wielding soldiers and two APCs slipped past the crowd by displaying yellow streamers (Cory Aquino's campaign colour). A moment later, however, the crowd discovered their mistake and people rushed to seal the street. Middle-aged ladies prayed loudly as helicopters hovered overhead. As the people stood their ground, the massive machines halted. Nobody would retreat. L. P. Flores' eyewitness account of the soldiers' reactions reveals the mystery of 'people power':

The people pressed their bodies against the armor. Their faces were pleading but they were clothed in nothing but raw courage. In that decisive and tense moment, the soldiers atop the armored carriers pointed their guns of every make at the crowd but their faces betrayed agony. And I knew then, as the crowd, too, must have discerned: the soldiers did not have the heart to pull the trigger on civilians armed only with their convictions. The pact had been sealed. There was tacit agreement: 'We keep this

street corner, you retreat.' And true enough, the armored carriers rolled back and applause echoed.

The face of that soldier struggling in agony for the decision to shoot or not, on the verge of tears, will forever remain in my memory.³⁰

Dozens, indeed hundreds, of similar personal struggles ended with soldiers accepting flowers and embracing civilians. The battle was over. By Monday afternoon, a majority of the armed forces had abandoned Marcos. On Tuesday morning, Marcos stubbornly went through an inaugural ceremony, but his power had evaporated. Late that evening, he fled. Mrs Aquino was President.

Evaluating a Non-violent Success

It would be naive, of course, to suppose that unarmed civilians in the streets singlehandedly overthrew Marcos. International pressure (including President Reagan's belated decision to abandon Marcos) and the revolt of the army were clearly important. According to an editorial in the *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, however, it was massive non-violent resistance that made the difference.

When the revolution now popularly called People Power began, it was triggered by two Filipinos – Juan Ponce Enrile and Fidel Ramos. But neither of them would have survived if the people had not put themselves between the attackers and the leaders of the revolt.

People all over the world then saw the unbelievable.

Filipinos charging at giant tanks with Volkswagens. Nuns and priests meeting armored cars with Rosaries and prayers. Little children giving grim soldiers flowers and urging them not to fight for Marcos. People linking arms and blocking tanks, daring them to crush their fellow Filipinos, which they did not.³¹

Reading through the many eyewitness accounts in *An Eyewitness History: People Power, The Philippine Revolution of 1986*, one is amazed by the centrality of prayer and religious devotion. Sister Teresa was one of the Carmelite nuns ordered to fast and pray by Cardinal Sin. 'We never forgot even for an instant that we were doing battle. We daily called God in prayer to assist us all: those outside and we inside.' The radio accounts of the struggle in the streets, Sr Teresa confessed, shaped their prayers.³²

Praying nuns and non-violent resisters armed only with religious symbols had obviously functioned as an effective deterrent:

People were willing to die but not to kill. And I thought that even if some soldiers were willing to shoot the people, they were not willing to shoot the crucifixes. Many of them come from the provinces where they were raised to fear God. They could never shoot at people who were praying. They could have shot people who were throwing stones, as they did during the rallies. But this was the first time that they were confronted with prayers. They did not know how to react. I think this was crucial to the whole nonviolence stance.

The people were there to defend the camp. They were not aggressors. We cannot pray and be violent at the same time. The religious character of the revolution made the revolution very unique. If you took away the religious flavor of the revolution, you would have removed the essence of it.³³

Professor Randolph David, Director of Third World Studies at the University of the Philippines, concluded in amazement: 'I have been a student of revolutions, but this is the first time I have seen an assault led by the Virgin Mary.'³⁴

Undoubtedly the previous training in non-violence had played a genuine role, although the convergence of

the masses to protect the rebel soldiers was essentially a spontaneous emotional response rather than the result of careful organising. Not surprisingly, non-violent leaders like Father Jose Blanco, the founder of AKKAPKA, believe the Philippine revolution points the way for the rest of the world:

What does God wish us to proclaim to the world through our nonviolent revolution? Simply this: the political problems of people can be solved without recourse to arms or violence.

The world's problems are best solved if we respect the humanity, the dignity of every human person concerned. The desire to be violent or to use violence can be tamed and diminished, if we show love, care, joy to those who are unjust and wish to be violent. Violence addresses the aggressor. Nonviolence searches out and addresses the humanity in the enemy or oppressor. When that common humanity is touched, then the other is helped to recognize the human person within and ceases to be inhuman, unjust, and violent.

One does not have to be a Christian to reach out to the humanity in the other.³⁵

Such optimism needs tempering. One successful non-violent revolution does not banish war. Nor dare one overlook the special circumstances that helped non-violence succeed in this unique situation. Furthermore, simply overthrowing Marcos did not create economic justice in the Philippines. A year and a half later, it is still unclear whether President Cory Aquino will be able to correct the structural injustice that has created so much poverty in her country.

But the Filipino people did depose a powerful dictator with virtually no bloodshed. Precisely in a context where many had concluded that the only viable path was years of bloody revolution, non-violence produced a stunning victory. Non-violent revolution *is* possible.

- Central America* (New York: Norton, 1984), p. 11. See also Richard Millett, *Guardians of the Dynasty: A History of the US Created Guardia Nacional de Nicaragua and the Somoza Family* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1977).
- 6 LaFeber, *Inevitable Revolutions*, p. 18.
 - 7 See my article 'Why Me Lord?'. For a very critical view of the Sandinistas, see Humberto Belli, *Breaking Faith: The Sandinista Revolution and Its Impact on Freedom and Christian Faith in Nicaragua* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1985). For a positive evaluation, see James and Kathleen McGinnis, *Solidarity with the People of Nicaragua* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1985), pp. 5-25. See also Mario Vargas Llosa's lengthy study, 'Nicaragua', *The New York Times Magazine*, 28 April 1985, p. 37.
 - 8 In conversations with Arnold Snyder (see n. 4).
 - 9 *New York Times*, February 22, 1985.
 - 10 Figures cited in WFP Documentation Project, *Kidnapped by the Contras*, p. 42.
 - 11 Sider, 'Why Me Lord?', p. 22.
 - 12 See Amnesty International, *Nicaragua: The Human Rights Record* (London: Amnesty International, 1986), pp. 32ff., and Americas Watch, *Human Rights in Nicaragua: 1985-6* (Washington: Americas Watch, 4 March 1986), pp. 86ff.
 - 13 Quoted in Snyder, 'Witness for Peace', p. 5.
 - 14 Cited in WFP Documentation Project, *Kidnapped by the Contras*, p. 40.
 - 15 Snyder, 'Witness for Peace', p. 15.
 - 16 The copy I possess has the title: 'Manual del Compaciente Por La Libertad.'
 - 17 See note 25 below.
 - 18 Snyder, 'Witness for Peace', pp. 19-20. In this whole section, I am relying on Snyder's eyewitness account.
 - 19 *Ibid.*, p. 21.
 - 20 For the following story, see WFP Documentation Project, *Kidnapped by the Contras* (see note 10 above).
 - 21 Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 9.
 - 22 Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 6.
 - 23 Quoted in Snyder, 'Witness for Peace', p. 36.
 - 24 Quoted in WFP Documentation Project, *Kidnapped by the Contras*, p. 47.
 - 25 Estimates published by WFP in a 1986 promotional letter.
 - 26 Quoted in Snyder, 'Witness for Peace', p. 38.
 - 27 A complete evaluation of WFP would go way beyond this brief sketch. Among other things, I believe WFP has been too hesitant to criticise Sandinista violations of human rights and

democratic freedoms. WFP has, however, challenged the Sandinista government a number of times. For example, in meetings with Sandinista officials, including President Ortega, representatives of WFP have criticised various aspects of government policy, including mistreatment of Miskito Indians, failure to provide for conscientious objectors in the draft law, incommunicado detention of prisoners, and President Ortega's trip to the Soviet Union.

When President Ortega suspended certain civil liberties in October 1985, the WFP November-December newsletter said, 'We oppose the decision to suspend civil liberties . . . We are deeply saddened by developments in Nicaragua restricting human rights.'

In 1985 and 1986 WFP loaned a staff person, Mary Dutcher, to the Washington Office on Latin America. Using WFP resources, she produced two widely publicised reports entitled 'Nicaragua: Violations of the Laws of War by Both Sides'. These reports criticised human rights violations by both the contras and the Nicaraguan government.

In the summer of 1985, when WFP delegates were kidnapped by the contras, a WFP spokesman, Dennis Marker, criticised several specific Sandinista practices during a nationally televised interview on the McNeil-Lehrer Report.

- 28 For two other recent treatments of WFP, see Joyce Hollyday, 'The Long Road to Jalapa', and Jim Wallis, 'A Venture of Faith', in Jim Wallis (ed.), *The Rise of Christian Conscience* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), pp. 30-46.

Chapter 3: Wheelchairs vs Tanks

- 1 Quoted in Douglas J. Elwood, *Philippine Revolution, 1986: Model of Nonviolent Change* (Quezon City, Philippines: New Day Publishers, 1986), p. 19.
- 2 For much of the following data, see Ricki Ross, 'Land and Hunger: Philippines', *Bread for the World Background Paper*, No. 55, July 1981.
- 3 According to Virginia Baron, 'The Philippine Example', *Fellowship* 53/3 (1987), p. 4, two per cent of the population received fifty-five per cent of the total personal income.
- 4 My sources for this chapter include the following:
 - Monina Allaray Mercado (ed.), *An Eyewitness History: People Power, The Philippine Revolution of 1986* (Manila: The James B. Reuter, SJ, Foundation, 1986). Hereafter cited as *People Power*, this magnificent book of eyewitness

- accounts and splendid pictures also contains short synopses of developments and valuable historical notes (pp. 308–314) on which I have relied for many of the historical details.
- Several articles in the March 1987 issue of *Fellowship* 53/3.
 - Peggy Rosenthal, 'Nonviolence in the Philippines: The Precarious Road', *Commonweal*, 20 June 1986, pp. 364–367.
 - Elwood, *Philippine Revolution 1986* (see note 1).
 - Bel Magalit, 'The Church and the Barricades', *Transformation* 3/2 (1986), pp. 1–2.
- 5 Hildegard Goss-Mayr, 'When Prayer and Revolution Became People Power', *Fellowship* 53/3 (1987), p. 9.
 - 6 Quoted in Elwood, *Philippine Revolution, 1986*, p. 19.
 - 7 Mercado, *People Power*, pp. 10, 304.
 - 8 Goss-Mayr, 'When Prayer and Revolution Became . . .', p. 8; Rosenthal, 'Nonviolence in the Philippines', p. 366. For earlier examples of nonviolence, see Esther Epp-Tiessen, 'Militarization and Non-Violence in the Philippines', *The Ploughshares Monitor* 7/2 (1986), p. 3 and Richard L. Schwenk, *Onward Christians! Protestants in the Philippine Revolution* (Quezon City, Philippines: New Day Publishers, 1986), p. 37.
 - 9 Rosenthal, 'Nonviolence in the Philippines', p. 364
 - 10 Quoted *ibid.*, p. 365. See Hildegard Goss-Mayr's account in 'When Prayer and Revolution Became . . .', p. 9.
 - 11 Quoted in Rosenthal, 'Nonviolence in the Philippines', p. 365.
 - 12 Goss-Mayr, 'When Prayer and Revolution Became . . .', p. 9.
 - 13 *Ibid.*, p. 10.
 - 14 *Ibid.*
 - 15 *Ibid.*
 - 16 See the bishop's official declaration, quoted in Mercado, *People Power*, p. 77.
 - 17 *Ibid.*, pp. 43, 67, 68, 71.
 - 18 Quoted *ibid.*, pp. 77–78.
 - 19 Rosenthal, 'Nonviolence in the Philippines', p. 367.
 - 20 Quoted in Elwood, *Philippine Revolution, 1986*, p. 5.
 - 21 Rosenthal, 'Nonviolence in the Philippines', p. 367; Mercado, *People Power*, p. 67.
 - 22 Quoted in Mercado, *People Power*, p. 106.
 - 23 Quoted *ibid.*, p. 105.
 - 24 Quoted *ibid.*
 - 25 Quoted *ibid.*, p. 120.
 - 26 *Ibid.*, pp. 1, 109, 122; and Elwood, *Philippine Revolution, 1986*, p. 14.
 - 27 Cited in Mercado, *People Power*, pp. 125–127.
 - 28 Cited *ibid.*, p. 127.
 - 29 Cited *ibid.*, pp. 203–204.

- 30 Quoted *ibid.*, p. 207.
- 31 An editorial in the *Philippine Daily Inquirer* 27 February 1986, quoted in Mercado, *People Power*, p. 246.
- 32 Quoted *ibid.*, p. 254.
- 33 Vicente T. Paterno, quoted *ibid.*, p. 257.
- 34 From a statement on Philippine television after the revolution, and shared with me by Melba Maggay, an evangelical Protestant leader deeply involved with the struggle.
- 35 From his 'Epilogue' in Mercado, *People Power*, p. 306. See Gene Sharp's more cautious but similar comments in 'Philippines Taught Us Lessons of Nonviolence', *Los Angeles Times*, 4 April 1986, Section 2, p. 5. AKKAPKA continues promoting non-violent social change in the Philippines. See Richard Deats, 'Fragile Democracy in the Philippines', *Fellowship*, Oct.–Nov., 1987, pp. 14–16.

Chapter 4: Multiplying Success

- 1 Richard B. Deats, 'The Way of Nonviolence', in Thérèse de Coninck (ed.), *Essays on Nonviolence* (Nyack, NY: Fellowship of Reconciliation, n.d.), p. 18.
- 2 Figures from Walter Wink, *Jesus' Third Way* (Philadelphia: New Society Publishers, 1987), pp. 41–42.
- 3 *Ibid.*, p. 42.
- 4 I do serve on WFP's Advisory Board, but I do not mean to suggest that my speech prompted the emergence of WFP later that year.
- 5 Quoted in de Coninck, *Essays on Nonviolence*, p. 2.
- 6 Adolfo Perez Esquivel, *Christ in a Poncho: Testimonials of the Nonviolent Struggles of Latin America*, ed. Charles Antoine, trans. Robert R. Barr (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1983), p. 32.
- 7 David A. Hoekema, 'A Practical Christian Pacifism', *The Christian Century*, 22 October 1986, p. 918.
- 8 I owe this point to Wink, *Jesus' Third Way*, pp. 56–57.
- 9 Bernard Häring, *The Healing Power of Peace and Nonviolence* (New York: Paulist Press, 1986), pp. 83–84.
- 10 No. 533 of their declaration, quoted in Esquivel, *Christ in a Poncho*, p. 52.
- 11 Penny Lernoux, *Cry of the People* (New York: Penguin Books, 1982), p. 447.
- 12 Quoted in Häring, *Healing Power*, p. 34.
- 13 Quoted *ibid.*
- 14 Pastoral Statement of the National Conference of Catholic