Series on Co-operatives & Peace
VOLUME TWO

CONCERN FOR COMMUNITY:

The

RELEVANCE

of

CO-OPERATIVES

to

PEACE

IAN MACPHERSON & YEHUDAH PAZ

Edited by JOY EMMANUEL

Concern for Community: The Relevance of Co-operatives to Peace

Cover design and layout by Colin Swan

Concern for Community: The Relevance of Co-operatives to Peace / by Ian MacPherson & Yehudah Paz, Edited by Joy Emmanuel

Published by: Joy Emmanuel – Turning Times Research and Consulting
Joy.turningtimes@gmail.com

ISBN 978-0-9949191-2-0 (PRINT)
ISBN 978-0-9949191-1-3 (PDF)
ISBN 978-0-9949191-0-6 (EPUBS)
Concern for Community: The Relevance of Co-operatives to Peace

This publication is available as a free book or by donation to:

The Ian MacPherson Legacy Fund, see: The Canadian Association for Studies in Co-operation: http://www.coopresearch.coop/ian-macpherson-legacy-fund/

Or to the Yehudah Paz Co-operative Development Fund, see: The Arab-Jewish Center for Equality, Empowerment and Cooperation – Negva Institute for Strategies in Peace and Development: http://en.ajeec-nisped.org.il/

For our children and our grandchildren

Dr Ian MacPherson – 1939 – 2013

Dr Yehudah Paz – 1930 - 2013

Praise for Concern for Community: The Relevance of Co-operatives to Peace

Concern for Community: The Relevance of Co-operatives to Peace is an important work, both for setting forth the thinking of the late Ian MacPherson and Yehudah Paz – an important objective in its own right – and for the relevance of that thinking at this particular moment in history. It's a joy to read the developed reflections of two scholars so central to co-operative thought in the 20th and into the 21st Centuries. That in itself is a gift to those who want to build on a lifetime of scholarship, on two lifetimes of scholarship. It is all the more remarkable to see their work juxtaposed as this book does, and to realize how the writing of each benefited from the reaction of the other. While the focus of the book is the nexus between co-operatives and peace, they take the time to place the co-operative model in context, which makes the case they build for the natural affinity between co-operatives and peace even more compelling. The co-operative movement has not yet been awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace, but this book makes one hopeful that it might one day be more fully acknowledged for its role in promoting an ideal longed for with more urgency in recent days.

Charles Gould
Director General of the International Co-operative Alliance

Two striking memories come to mind when thinking about the extraordinary partnership of Yehudah Paz and Ian MacPherson. The first is of these two men sitting in my living room in Kibbutz Beeri. Beeri, an un-privatized kibbutz situated on the border of the Gaza Strip, is perhaps one of the ultimate examples of an all-purpose co-operative. The setting seemed more than appropriate for the ongoing discussion of these two giants of the world co-operative movement.

The second memory is connected to having to make an on-the-spot decision on November 14, 2012 at the outbreak of one of the wars in Gaza. Ian had just landed at the Tel Aviv airport, having been invited to speak at the conference launching the Israeli chapter of the Society for International Development taking place the next day. In addition to addressing the conference, he and Yehudah had planned to spend a week working on the final stages of this book. The sudden outbreak of the war forced us to cancel the conference. As Yehudah also lived on a kibbutz adjacent to the Gaza Strip, there was no way for him to host Ian or for the two of them to concentrate on the work at hand in another venue. Sadly, we were forced to book Ian a return flight to Canada which he boarded almost immediately upon arrival.

These two great men continued their work through correspondence. Exactly one year later, when Yehudah's health wavered and he was awaiting surgery, he was concerned that he hadn't heard from Ian that week. He asked us to help make a call to him from his hospital bed. Unbeknownst to him, we had just received the devastating announcement of Ian's sudden death. With great trepidation, we conveyed this news to Yehudah. In less than a week, tragically, Yehudah was also gone.

We at NISPED, the Negev Institute for Strategies of Peace and Development, founded by Yehudah Paz in 1998, are deeply grateful to Joy Emmanuel for her determination to bring this book to fruition and not let the authors' work be for naught. I see this book as part of their legacy – the legacy of two men who deeply believed in co-operatives as a value-based tool for development as well as the role that the co-operative movement could play in brokering peace. In addition, Yehudah's activism over many decades has influenced thousands here in Israel and around the world to engage in the promotion of co-operatives, peace building, and human sustainable development.

Vivian Silver
Former Co-Executive Director, AJEEC-NISPED

This book is without doubt an enormous contribution to the co-operative practices and studies on peacebuilding in communities around the world. It is a second volume in the Co-ops and Peace series after the first volume published in 2007 (*Co-operatives and the Pursuit of Peace*) to which I contributed an article on the Japanese co-op's endeavors for peacebuilding and development assistance. Fellow co-operators should read this book to understand how co-operatives have fought to build peaceful communities by mitigating conflicts through co-operation among people who had different backgrounds. In addition, this book contains chapters on the essence of the co-operative approach that constitute core elements for advancing Co-operative Studies as a developing field of inquiry proposed by Ian MacPherson. For this reason it is worthy for researchers to read. Taking this opportunity, I do appreciate Joy Emmanuel (editor) for her tremendous work in sorting through papers and editing this book after the unexpectedly sudden passing of its authors in 2013.

Akira Kurimoto
Professor of Co-operative Programme
Institute for Solidarity-based Society
Hosei University, Tokyo

It is an honour for me to recognize this publication on behalf of the Co-operative Development Foundation of Canada (CDF)*and the Canadian Co-operative Association (CCA)*. I am among the many who have learned from these two giants in co-operative thinking.

Current and future co-operative leaders owe a sincere thank you to Dr. Ian MacPherson and Dr. Yehudah Paz for their lifetime of contributions that now include insights about co-operatives and peace. There is no doubt that co-operatives globally, regionally, and locally must consider the issues they outline in this book. Although we sincerely miss them, Ian and Yehudah will continue to inspire the movement.

It is a remarkable book that combines the ideas, studies, and lifetime perspectives of two eminent co-operative scholars, advocates, and leaders. Ian and Yehudah remind us that co-operatives must

evolve, change, develop, and advance to remain relevant to meeting the challenges of the 21st century.

Although co-operatives demonstrate community impact and citizenship, Ian and Yehudah challenge leaders to assess if they are doing enough. They encourage readers to look beyond the boundaries of economic and social imperatives to build constructive community links including with peacemaking networks. "There is great potential for co-operatives and the movement to further conflict resolution and the promotion of peace."

Typical of their leadership, they do not tell us how. Even the title, "Concern for Community" is a call to action for today's leaders and will inform leaders of tomorrow.

CDF and CCA work with co-operatives in many countries that lack economic, social, and cultural stability. Canadian co-operatives support this work. This book provides perspectives and context on the role that co-operatives can play. Leaders and students of co-operatives and peacebuilding networks alike should read this book with a view to building ties that contribute to building a better world – a more peaceful world.

Jo-Anne Ferguson, Past Executive Director of CDF and CCA

**CDF raises funds and rallies volunteers to work with CCA and other partners to build the foundation for a secure life with time-tested co-operative principles.*

This book reflects the long standing conviction and a life-long commitment of its authors Ian McPherson and Yehudah Paz to the co-operative movement and its ability to contribute to human development. Co-operation is more than a method of production - it is a reflection of progress towards a humane society, which is not possible without peace.

Sonja Novkovic
Chair, ICA Committee on Co-operative Research

Yehudah Paz and Ian MacPherson were intellectual giants in the field of Co-operative Studies, and their work on co-operation and peace offers major new insights into how co-operation can overcome the

national, ethnic, and religious differences which has led to so much tragic human conflict. I urge both the publication and the widest possible marketing of their work.

Professor Anthony Webster
Northumbria University
Joint author of: Building Co-operation: a Business History of the Co-operative Group 1863-2013

There is no peace without co-operation and there is no co-operation without peace. The co-operative model of enterprise is one that has around the world aligned itself so often to the cause of peace, because it flows from the values of those involved. This book is not just a description of co-operation and peace but a contributor to it, offering hope and encouragement in a world of conflict, inequality, and environmental stress.

Ed Mayo
Secretary General
Co-operatives UK

This is a welcome and timely book from two key co-operative thinkers and activists, Ian MacPherson and Yehudah Paz. Fortunately it has been completed, after the untimely death of both authors, for it addresses a critical issue for humanity – the much-neglected subject of co-operation in building and sustaining the conditions for peace. The book provides not only an important overview and introduction to co-operation and peace but also brings new insights and perspectives to bear. It assesses historical interconnections in relation to contemporary forms of co-operative action. Peace and war are not conceptualised as a simple either/or but as part of a continuum involving social upheaval on the one hand and conflict resolution and social inclusiveness on the other. It is an area in which co-operation as a social process, not just a discrete set of formal organisations, has a significant role to play. MacPherson and Paz speak to the world

today and their reach is clearly transnational in responding to the challenges of globalisation. Yet they provide an account grounded in specific case studies of co-operative social movements and peace initiatives. As a new area of critical scholarship it promises to become a key text for thinking about the future.

Dr Tom Woodin
Reader in the Social History of Education
UCL Institute of Education

Acknowledgements

Production of this book has truly been a cooperative effort!

First and foremost, I wish to acknowledge the work of Dr. Ian MacPherson and Dr. Yehudah Paz. Ian and Yehudah are the authors and inspiration behind not only this book but a number of initiatives around co-operatives and peace. In the last few years of their lives, both Yehudah and Ian dedicated precious resources of time and energy to encourage the international co-operative movement to acknowledge and claim its legacy of contributing to social peace and cohesion in communities around the world. Their commitment and voice brought attention to the diverse contributions of co-operatives in addressing social tensions of the past and present, but their vision was to the future and the role that co-operatives can play in addressing the on-going challenges and conflicts of our times.

Appreciation goes out to Yehudah's and Ian's families for their willingness to support the continuation of this work through production of this book and their trust in the process.

Having the support of Mervyn Wilson, former Chief Executive and Principal, Co-operative Collage, UK, has been invaluable for

supporting the larger vision of this publication. Mervyn's contribution helps form a bridge from where Yehudah and Ian left off to the next stage of development.

This publication might not have proceeded without the support of the Co-operative Development Foundation of Canada (CDF) and the Canadian Co-operative Association (CCA). CCA and CDF have been strong supporters in promoting the role of co-operatives and peace through their many international projects. Their assistance with the publication of Volume One in this series, *Co-operatives and the Pursuit of Peace* (2007) was key to its successful launch. Their support of this volume speaks highly of their on-going commitment to this crucial area of co-operative thought and practice.

Financial support from The Department of Foreign Affairs Trade and Development is gratefully acknowledged. Special thanks to staff at CCA and CDF—Jo-Anne Ferguson (now retired), Erin Mackie, and Katherine Clark. Thank you for your care and valued assistance!

Many thanks to all the co-operative researchers and practitioners who contributed cases studies for this publication. Their work adds reality, colour, and depth to demonstrate the many diverse ways co-operators and co-operatives are helping address tensions and outright conflict in their communities.

Expert technical assistance with the layout of this publication was provided by Colin Swan who generously agreed to work on the production of this volume. Colin was also the layout editor for the first book on co-operatives and peace. His skill and dedication to his craft are obvious and are greatly appreciated.

Anne Hilker provided expert attention as the copy editor for this book. An editorial review by Dr Julia Smith was also appreciated. Any errors or omissions left standing are those of the Editor.

To all those who contributed in one way or another to this book—thank you! May this collective effort continue to grow and contribute to the vision of the authors and the hopes of co-operators everywhere who endeavour to create more peaceful communities.

Joy Emmanuel
Editor
November 2015

Acknowledgment from MacPherson and Paz Families:

The families of Ian MacPherson and Yehudah Paz wish to sincerely thank Joy Emmanuel for her determination and the dedication needed to publish this book: *Concern for Community: The Relevance of Co-operatives to Peace*.

The book was completed because of Joy's devotion to her research and to her great interest in co-operatives and peace.

Many thanks to all those in the co-operative sector who helped her complete Ian and Yehudah's book that they so diligently co-authored in the last years of their lives.

We hope that *Concern for Community* will be enjoyed by Ian and Yehudah's colleagues and by many readers in the future. We believe that both Ian and Yehudah would be very pleased with Joy's exceptional effort in the publication of their book.

Contents

Mervyn Wilson

Foreword

Ian MacPherson and Yehudah Paz were two of the most significant thinkers and practitioners of co-operative education in the late twentieth and early twenty first centuries and both worked hard to build a global network of co-operative educators through their active support for the International Co-operative Alliance and its specialist committees.

This volume shows clearly that they followed a tradition with deep historic roots going back to the thoughts of Robert Owen and other pioneers of co-operation. To those pioneers co-operation was not just about another – albeit better – form of business. It was a means to bring about a better and fairer form of society where humanity worked together to eradicate poverty and deprivation. This wider vision is described with remarkable clarity in the objects of the Rochdale Pioneers listed in their *Law First*, their rules or by-laws developed through debate in the months before they opened their store in Toad Lane in December 1844.

Throughout the history of the modern co-operative movement there has been debate on the purpose of co-operative education and

what its content should be. At one end of the spectrum of opinion is a business perspective – that co-operative education is about investing in the development of loyalty to the business and all activity should be assessed by the business benefits such activities bring. At the other end of the spectrum is a view that the role of co-operative education is to develop co-operators, people who understand and share the values that underpin co-operation, understand the rights and responsibilities of membership, and how to apply those principles in their everyday life – helping to build a more co-operative society.

In line with that wider view of co-operation progressive co-operators and their societies pioneered citizenship education, promoted internationalism and international exchanges, and were champions of the cause of peace. In the years that followed the Great War co-operators, and women co-operators in particular, were amongst the most active campaigners for peace. That period also demonstrated the challenges in the struggle for peace. Probably the best example of this is the divide between those committed to pacifism and those who saw the dangers posed by the rise of fascism in Europe and a need for collective security. These divergent views are illustrated in two films made in 1938. *Peace Parade* is a record of a parade through central London organised by the London Co-operative Society with a "no to war" message whilst *Advance Democracy*, part of a joint venture between the Education Committees of four of the co-operative societies in London is a clear call for a popular front against fascism and in defence of democracy.

Co-operators also saw the need for co-operative education to address issues of exclusion as reflected in the very title of Joe Reeves (one of the most important co-operative educators in the UK movement in the 1920s and 1930s, and the driving force behind *Advance Democracy*) influential publication – *Education for Social Change*.

This volume of essays by Ian and Yehudah takes the view that peace is not simply the absence of war. It is testimony to that wider vision of co-operative education for a better world, of education for social change.

Ian and Yehudah were the driving forces behind the establishment of the Co-operative Institute for Peace and Social Cohesion. The

very title reflects their understanding of the need to create conditions where conflicts are resolved by dialogue based on mutual respect and recognition of diversity rather than through violence. Both also recognised the fragility of the world we have inherited and the need for today's generation to understand their responsibilities to safeguard it for the sake of future generations.

Ian and Yehudah's ideas and vision were also shaped by their experience working with excluded communities – Yehudah with traditional Bedouin communities in the Negev and Ian with the indigenous communities in Arctic Canada. In keeping with extensive practice in co-operative education they combined practitioner action with academic reflection. Through this they inspired others, in particular young people, stimulating academic interest and wider international co-operative development projects. These projects demonstrate that co-operation and co-operatives are as relevant today as they have ever been.

The advances in technology seen in the last fifty years have created a globally interconnected society. But those very advances in technology can also exacerbate issues of exclusion fermenting intolerance that can all too easily create a climate where sectarian violence can emerge. Conflicts and tensions are no longer confined to the countries and regions they originated in. Conflict and violence together with poverty displace millions of people across the globe. The flight and plight of millions resulting from a combination of conflict, repression, and poverty is now the focus of global attention.

The collection of initiatives that Ian and Yehudah were working on until both passed away is testimony to the clarity of their understanding that co-operation is an essential factor in building peace and that social inclusion – reflecting the co-operative values of equality, equity. and solidarity is a prerequisite of the co-operative commonwealth they aspired to.

Mervyn Wilson
September 2015

Joy Emmanuel

Editor's Foreword

Dr. Ian MacPherson and Dr. Yehudah Paz began this book in earnest in 2009, but their conversations and planning go back much further.

By 2006 they were already preparing for a significant international gathering of co-operative leaders and scholars on the theme of *Co-operatives and Peace*. That year, the British Columbia Institute for Co-operative Studies (BCICS)[1] at the University of Victoria, Canada, hosted this international gathering. At that time, Dr. MacPherson was the director of the Institute, which he also founded in 1999. Over thirty co-operative leaders and academics representing 16 countries gathered to share and discuss the role co-operatives have played, and are playing, in creating more peaceful communities.

Co-operatives and the Pursuit of Peace (2007) was the first volume in this series and came out of that conference. It included presentations shared at, and sharpened through, the lens of discussion at that gathering.

1 The name of the Institute was later changed to The Centre for Co-operatives and Community Based Economy.

Over the years, Yehudah and Ian worked away on this book as well as other co-operative and peace initiatives. Living on different sides of the planet and operating in almost opposite time zones, they kept up their long distance conversations and made good use of a few opportunities to meet in person at conferences or through very occasional visits.

Ian and Yehudah shared a common bond in their passion for co-operatives, but their particular relationship drew on a second deep well: their common commitment to nurture what they saw as the inherent link between co-operatives and creating more just, peaceful societies. The potential for co-operatives and the co-operative movement to play a significant role on the stage of world history in this respect was abundantly evident to them both and is reflected in their writings.

Drawing on their many years of direct experience in the co-operative sector and their solid academic contributions to the field of Co-operative Studies, the authors lay out their insights on the subject of co-operatives and peace. From a review of the historical record to the 1995 revision of the international principles, the authors illustrate how peace has been a significant theme in the life of the international co-operative movement. From an analysis of current co-operative activity, to identifying a growing role for co-operatives to play in building people-to-people, cross-conflict relationships, they explain how the co-operative movement has developed a set of values and practices that build on a concern for community and form a natural link to building a more just and peaceful world.

Finally, and perhaps as an important part of their legacy, the authors raise the question of whether co-operatives are still relevant to matters such as conflict resolution and peacemaking in this global era. While their answer is a resounding "Yes!" they also point out the strengths and lessons to be learned if co-operatives are to fulfil their potential. Given the historical record of co-operatives, the extensive local and global networks they create, and their deep roots in community, the authors argue that co-operatives have much to contribute to peacebuilding and sustainable human development in the 21st century.

How this Book Came to Be

Every book has a story behind it. Given the circumstances around completion of this publication, it feels appropriate to share some of the story behind this book with the reader. It has been a privilege to work on this project and an honour to complete this task on behalf of the authors.

I had the opportunity to work with Ian at BCICS. This work included helping to coordinate and host the 2006 Co-operatives and Peace conference and then co-editing with Ian the first book in this series on *Co-operatives and Peace*.

I was engaged to edit this current volume and was working on the book at the time of Ian and Yehudah's unfortunate passings in 2013—sadly within 10 days of one another! Although they worked on the book over several years, Ian shared that they were having trouble "blending their voices." Given the limited opportunities for them to work on the manuscript, writing proved to be a lengthy and uncertain process. Working on the book, when and as they could, around multiple other projects and precious family time, they also had to contend with failing health and less and less time to connect.

I was aware that the manuscript was well underway, but it was not until after their passings that I had the opportunity to view the results of their years of work. With permission of both Yehudah's and Ian's families (for which I wish to express my deepest gratitude), I was able to continue working on the book. After a thorough review of all the available files, it was clear that the manuscript was near completion but not quite finished. There was a book here but it still needed a structure and some finishing touches.

Although several versions of the order and selection of chapters were considered, in the end it was the contents of a personal email exchange between Yehudah and Ian that informed the final and current chapter order. Oddly enough, the subject heading of the email was titled "The lost comments." It is dated March 2012 and was addressed to Yehudah from Ian. It read:

> *I think we have a good idea for the book. I think we can blend activism with academic enquiry to create a volume that will attract some interest and hopefully make a modest contribution. We need to be both practical and visionary—not the easiest thing to*

accomplish. I think we should have five "parts" to the book. They are as follows:

1. *The essence of the co-operative approach. I think you have much of this in your writing. We might be able to add in something like I did in the Venice paper. I think there is a real need here, and elsewhere, to identify as best we can the nature of co-operative ideology and distinctiveness. I think we also need to make it even clearer that we are looking not only at war/peace in its ultimate sense but also social upheaval and social inclusion as part of a continuum.*
2. *Why the co-op movement (co-operative model) is especially relevant today. You have identified key points here, especially when you discuss your paradoxes. I would suggest that the paradoxes you discuss do have their historical counterparts; in fact, they have long been with us—a good way to link the past and the present.*
3. *What the past suggests. This part is rather long but builds on the perspectives you have raised.*
4. *The contemporary situation. Here we should address what can and specifically should be done both in situations of conflict where the people-to-people peace process can be so important but also in a broader sense of what the movement needs to pay attention to in order to fulfill its potential.*
5. *The case studies. I think these will flow nicely from the above.*

Although the "Venice paper" is mentioned above, it was not included in the master files and was not at first a consideration for the book until "The lost comments" surfaced. As good fortune would have it, a copy of the "Venice paper" was included intact in Ian's collection of papers. That fortunate coincidence allowed this chapter to be included in the present volume. In addition, a second paper surfaced which appeared to be an early version of a first chapter for the book and was a complimentary fit to the "Venice paper." In this "lost chapter" (now Chapter One) and the "Venice paper" (Chapter Two), Ian lays out the distillation of his insights around the development of the 1995, Co-operative Identity Statement and the significance of Principle Seven: Concern for Community. Both chapters speak to "the essence of the co-operative approach," as mentioned

above in Ian's email and raise fundamental tenants of the field of Co-operative Studies and how this applies to the subject of co-operatives and peace.

In other chapters, Yehudah lays out his extensive understanding of the global context and challenges which co-operatives must engage to be effective community builders and peacemakers. While acknowledging the work that is already being done, he sets out clear guidelines for strengthening the role of co-operatives at the peace table.

There are two significant omissions that the reader may find. First, Ian's historical review ends in 1930. There was some evidence that an additional chapter was to come but the writing stopped at this point. Second, unfortunately some references are missing – even for one or two direct quotes. I ask the reader to forgive these omissions. Due to the historical nature and limited access to some of the sources it was not always possible to provide a full reference if one was missing from the master document. Efforts have been made to check quotes and sources where possible.

Omissions aside, two further additions to the book should also be noted. An opportunity arose to include in the case study section a proposal by Dr Paz on an initiative for strengthening the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. This essay directly illustrates how Yehudah saw civil society organizations, such as co-operatives, playing a direct role in building cross-conflict relations and supporting struggling communities while rebuilding trust among former enemies. It is a complimentary piece to his chapter on New Perspectives on Conflict Resolution where he discusses the stages of conflict resolution and how the people-to-people peace process can work.

As the book took shape, a further unanticipated addition was the collection of short pieces now included in the Appendices. This supplemental section started with the 1995 ICA Co-operative Identity Statement and grew to include other relevant and recent ICA statements and resolutions on co-operatives and peace. This includes the statement on Co-operatives and Peace which was the message from the ICA for the 2006 International Co-operative Day (Appendix Two) and resolutions on co-operatives and peace passed by the General Assembly of the ICA in Geneva in 2009 (Appendix Three) and

in Cancun in 2011 (Appendix Five). Yehudah and Ian were involved in promoting both of these resolutions.

Additional appendices were added which reflected the broad scope of the co-operatives and peace initiatives that Yehudah and Ian were working on. Appendix Four includes the proposal they made to the ICA in 2011 on the formation of an *Institute for Co-operatives, Peace, and Social Inclusion*. Appendix Six is the final vision paper they submitted to the ICA in November 2013 as a report on the further development of the Peace Institute.

The contents of the last report includes a glimpse into how they saw this book fitting into that larger vision. "[We] are completing work on a theoretical/historical volume on co-operatives and peace that, it is hoped, will serve as a point of departure for the work of the Institute."

It is the hope of the editor that assembling these various "pieces" in this volume may indeed serve as a foundation for carrying forward with this worthwhile pursuit to which Yehudah and Ian were dedicated.

The authors lay out a strong case for the relevance of co-operatives to the process of creating peaceful communities and long-term sustainable human development. What happens next is up to the reader, the co-operative movement, and co-operative leaders everywhere. The invitation is to reflect on the insights offered here through the writings of these two giants in co-operative thought and give weight to their call for co-operatives to play a strong and significant role in creating a more peaceful world.

Joy Emmanuel
Editor
November 2015

List of Acronyms & Editorial Note

AJEEC-NISPED – Arab-Jewish Centre for Equality, Empowerment, and Co-operation at the Negev Institute for Strategies of Peace and Development
BCICS – British Columbia Institute for Co-operative Studies, University of Victoria, Canada (now the Centre for Co-operatives and Community Based Economy).
CMF – Center for Microfinance
CIDA – Canadian International Development Agency
CCA – Canadian Co-operative Association
ICA – International Co-operative Alliance
IFTU – International Federation of Trade Unions
ILO – International Labour Organization
NGOs – Non-governmental Organizations
UN – United Nations
UNGC – United Nations Global Compact
UPEACE – United Nations University for Peace
USSR – Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
UWC – United We Can – Recycling Co-operative

WIN – Women in Need Community Cooperative, Victoria, British Columbia

Editorial Note

The reader will find the word co-operative spelt at times with a hyphen and at other times without. Either spelling is correct. In some countries, the word co-operative is hyphenated and in other countries it is not hyphenated. Some co-operatives will hyphenate their name (such as the Canadian Co-operative Association) others do not (such as WIN Community Cooperative). Every effort has been made to present an accurate representation of the term as used in a specific context.

When the term is used to refer to cooperative behavior, it has not been hyphenated.

Yehudah Paz &
Ian MacPherson

Introduction

There are books that seek to explain and analyze; others propose new programmes for action. In this book we set out to do both. Through this volume in the *Co-operatives and Peace* series, we propose new programmes of action for co-operatives engaged in many different forms of peacebuilding in communities around the world.

The International Co-operative Alliance defines a co-operative as an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social, and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly-owned and democratically controlled enterprise[1]. By *peacebuilding* we refer to a range of practices from every-day activities involved in the running of a co-operative and expressing the co-operative principles in daily operations; to inter-regional, inter-agency, people-to-people peacemaking processes where political agents and civil society players, such as co-operatives, work together to resolve violent conflicts and rebuild communities.

1 See: International Co-operative Alliance, http://www.ica.coop/coop/principles.html.

The co-operative movement, or what in earlier times was called "Co-operation,"[2] can draw on a long and diverse history of co-operative practice. The enormity of the movement and the different ways co-operatives may engage in peacebuilding raises interesting questions for Co-operative Studies—a developing field of inquiry that seeks to understand Co-operation in its own terms and not just as a reflection of other forms of enterprise or as a limited alternative to major ideological systems of the last two hundred years. Co-operative Studies looks at co-operatives in different contexts and tries to understand how diverse settings and circumstances influence the ways in which co-operatives function. One of these "contexts" is within societies dealing with conflict, such as communities under stress due to internal pressures and divisions or dealing with growing tensions because of social inequalities or in regions besieged by outright conflict. How co-operatives have responded and how they may contribute in the future to addressing these social conflicts is the subject of this book.

To this end, we examine the role which co-operatives have played and are playing today in furthering the peace process in a variety of settings. We also look at the role co-operatives can play in the future and delineate specific contributions they can make. We make the case for the inclusion of co-operatives in the thinking about conflict resolution and we hold that on a practical level co-operatives should have a voice in peacemaking negotiations for they have much to bring to the table. We maintain that their inclusion and active participation ought to be a concern not only of co-operators and the co-operative movement, but also for all stakeholders seeking to identify effective means, directions, and modes of sustainable human development as part of conflict resolution policies and practices.

2 The use of the term "Co-operation" rather than "co-operative" suggests the open-ended rather than the institutionalized way in which many co-operators viewed their movement in the early twentieth century. See also, Jack Craig's typology of "Co-operation" discussed later in this book and Terry MacDonald, Greg Wallace, and Ian MacPherson, *Co-operative Enterprise: Building a Better World* (First Edition Design Publication, 2013), p. 7.

The Relevance of Co-operatives to Peace

The question of the relevance of co-operatives and the co-operative movement to conflict resolution will be explored from several points of departure. In Part One, *The Essence of the Co-operative Approach*, we discuss how peace and social well-being are embedded within the movement's core values and principles and encompass what is distinctive about co-operative ideology. In exploring this theme, we discuss the development of the 1995 Co-operative Identity Statement and the implications of Principle Seven: Concern for Community.

The commitment to communities and their well-being was recognized formally at the Manchester Congress in 1995 when the International Co-operative Alliance adopted Principle Seven: Concern for Community, which encouraged co-operators and co-operatives to work for the sustainable development of the communities they serve. It was perhaps the most important change made in the principles at that time. This commitment to communities is important in understanding how co-operatives have contributed and are contributing to the creation of a more peaceful world, and it helps to explain how they could contribute more. Peacebuilding happens in communities not on battlefields. In the end it is what people think and do in communities that matters. And it is in this context that co-operatives can make their greatest contributions. Through their values, principles, and practices co-operatives encourage building capacity to bridge crippling divisions through the pursuit of specific, mutually-beneficial, attainable goals. Effective co-operatives encourage the honing of skills necessary to build consensus and foster the conciliation process needed for people with differences to work and live together.

In Part Two, *Why the Co-operative Movement is Especially Relevant Today*, we turn our attention to a discussion of major trends and paradoxes of our times and ask if co-operatives can provide an effective response to these complex social tensions. We hold that co-operatives are relevant to addressing these challenges of the global era. Co-operatives are worldwide, socio-economic institutions. This means that they are frequently found on "both sides of the border," or at least in the "near neighbourhood" to areas where conflict exists.

Co-operatives exist in all of the major socio-economic systems. We argue that along with being composed of value-based enterprises, the scope and diversity of the movement positions it to develop both theoretical and practical approaches to such concepts as the *unity of diversities* and *diversity within unity*. The relevance of both concepts to conflict resolution will be explored.

In Part Three, *What the Past Suggest*, we examine the contention that *cooperation* is as significant a component and determinant of social existence and organization as is *competition* and we explore how this is directly relevant to the discussion of co-operatives, peacebuilding, and conflict resolution. We examine the historical record and highlight the roots of cooperative behaviours that have been an intricate part of the human story. We explore how the co-operative movement naturally contributes to building a more peaceful society because of how it historically developed as a people-centered movement that embraced an inclusive set of values and principles. In this regard, we look at the history of these attempts and at the successes (and failures) achieved.

The Contemporary Situation is the focus in Part Four where we examine the emergence of new perspectives on conflict resolution and how they have opened up a meaningful role for civil society organizations, such as co-operatives, to play in the long-term and complex role of establishing peace and rebuilding communities after violent conflict. Employment of co-operatives and other civil society players in the people-to-people, direct conflict resolution process is not only possible, but it can make a significant difference to lasting peace through sustainable human development.

Finally, a series of case studies in the last section of the book will provide concrete expressions and explore various dimensions of the themes discussed in the previous chapters. The case studies are drawn from countries in various parts of the world and demonstrate a variety of ways co-operators and co-operatives engage in peacebuilding and sustainable development. They are evidence supporting our position—co-operatives can contribute and are contributing to building a better world.

We hold that co-operatives have been and still are relevant to the creation of more peaceful societies in the 21st century. We define

modes, strategies, and tactical approaches which make it possible to further translate co-operative principles into concrete practices so that co-operatives may more fully embrace their natural role as peacebuilders.

Why this Book was Written

This book is an expression of two of the deepest commitments and beliefs that its authors share: to the co-operative movement and its ability to contribute to sustainable human development, and to the achievement of just and secure peace everywhere that it is possible to do so.

We came to realize the potential importance of co-operatives for a more sustainable and peaceful future through our longstanding involvement with co-operatives. One of us (Yehudah Paz) has been a member of a kibbutz, an Israeli agro-industrial, multi-purpose co-operative village for a *short but intense period* of some sixty years. The other (Ian MacPherson) has served on various local co-operative and credit union boards since the 1960s. As an academic, Ian has spent much of his time researching the co-operative movement, particularly its history. Both of us have been involved in co-operatives at the regional, national, and international levels over the last thirty years. Our commitment to the co-operative movement and to co-operatives has run deep. It continues to be deep, but not without fair criticism of what co-operatives have done (or not done). We share concerns about how their futures might develop.

As such, this book is not only an expression of our convictions and hopes, but a tool which will help co-operatives—the concrete expression of our convictions—to make yet a greater contribution to the realization of our hopes.

To Whom is this Book Addressed?

This book is addressed to the broad world of *peacemakers*, not only to those who lead the United Nations bodies, the international agencies, and the government departments dealing with the promotion of peace, but also to the agents of civil society—women's groups, business and labor organizations, academic bodies, and many more—

who are concerned with and active in the promotion of sustainable human development and conflict resolution.

Equally, this book is addressed to the co-operative movement, to the world's co-operatives, to co-operators everywhere. The assumptions under which we address the *co-operative family* are that if a commitment to peace and the promotion of peace are truly integral and inherent aspects of co-operative values, co-operative self-perception, and co-operative history, and if analysis shows that the relevance of co-operatives to conflict resolution is now greater than ever, then it should be not only possible for co-operatives to play a greater role than they do, but it is incumbent on them to do so. It is incumbent on them to adopt the programmes of action through which they can most effectively do so.

Thus, there are two audiences we address.

First, we address the world of peacemakers, presenting a case for seeing co-operatives as effective and important partners in conflict resolution and asking them to give co-operatives a place at the peacemaking table—not as a courtesy, but out of recognition of the pragmatic contributions which co-operatives can make.

Equally, we address the co-operative world itself. We ask it to follow its own historic path, which seeks pragmatic action where value-guided concerns point the way.

Our discussion is, we believe, of interest both in its theoretical analyses and in its pragmatic application. We are equally convinced that this inquiry sets out a relevant and important response to one of the most pressing challenges facing society today—building a more co-operative, peaceful world.

Section I

THE ESSENCE OF THE CO-OPERATIVE APPROACH

Ian MacPherson

The Claims of Co-operative Thought

Both the co-operative form of organisation and the co-operative movement in general draw on a long history of social, economic, political, and cultural diversity. That variety can obscure underlying similarities across different types of co-operatives and different national experiences. More positively, it means that groups of people facing difficult situations can draw on a wide range of possibilities that can meet almost every need from the cradle to the grave.

The capacity to transcend differences in the common interest, to adapt within many kinds of situations, and to meet all kinds of needs is what makes the co-operative model useful in communities affected by tensions and division, such as places where harsh economic and social inequalities prevail. In situations, where there are acute shortages, it may only be through some form of joint activity, such as a co-operative, that people can meet their most pressing needs.

The key questions to ask are: What kinds of co-operatives can be most helpful for people living and working in communities divided by conflict? Do people in these communities have the human and fi-

nancial capital to develop these co-operatives? Can they find ways to overcome or bypass the tensions within their communities through co-operative enterprises? Do they have the special kinds of leadership needed to make what they wish to create possible? Do they have adequate advisory and support services with which to form and stabilize new co-operatives or to transform existing ones?

The fact that co-operatives can play special roles amid tensions and turmoil is a natural outcome of what they do and how they function. It is not an aberration. As we demonstrate in the following chapters, co-operatives have directly and indirectly contributed to the development of more peaceful communities in many situations.

What needs to be better understood is that a concern for social cohesion and for the building of a more peaceful world is fundamental to the co-operative quest. This can be better understood by considering how co-operative leaders and involved members have understood and defined their movement in the contemporary world.

The most complete understanding of the *co-operative difference* was achieved through the adoption of a Co-operative Identity Statement at the Manchester Congress of the International Co-operative Alliance in 1995. (*See Appendix One*.) The Statement was the culmination of a seven year process in which an estimated 10,000 co-operators around the world deliberated on two related challenges. The first challenge was to identify the values on which their organisations—and hence their movements—were based. The second challenge was concerned with reviewing and rethinking the principles on which co-operative activities should be based.

The Identity Statement included: a definition of a co-operative (the first time the diverse global movement had been able to reach such an understanding); and two lists of values, one referring to the values that lead to the unique organisational features of the co-operative enterprise, and another that tried to capture the ethical values on which co-operatives should operate their affairs. It is enlightening to consider that process and the Identity Statement from the perspective of how co-operatives can contribute to building a more peaceful world.

The process took place amid the ending of the Cold War, which proved to be very difficult for the co-operative movement interna-

tionally and, in some instances, locally and nationally. However mistakenly, many who came to Manchester were understandably influenced by the idea that old ideological power struggles, which had paralyzed much of the world for a century, were finally over. The Berlin Wall had fallen, the Soviet empire had crumbled, and *perestroika* was transforming the political life of the centrally planned economies. A new era of peace, a "New World Order" was emerging (so some argued), and the duty of co-operative leaders was to envision how co-operatives could contribute to that transformation. How could past mistakes regarding the role of the state be corrected? How could co-operatives play a more effective role in developing countries? How could co-ops position themselves within dominant capitalist economies to make their unique contributions?

In other words, as in past co-operative experiences, the fundamental discussions over purpose and philosophy took place in the context of the great issues of the day. Thus, though much of the discussion at Manchester referred to issues associated with expanding co-operative effectiveness, the debates were indelibly linked to the possibilities of war and peace in the coming millennium. This is the context in which to understand the discussions that preceded and took place at Manchester.

Many realized, even as the clouds of the Cold War were apparently lifting, that there were other threats to social peace, to relations among different kinds of people, and to international affairs in general. Some of those threats were relatively clear at the time; others would become clearer in the decade that followed. A primary concern was the changing role of the state taking place in different ways around the world. In some countries it consisted of a turning away from the welfare state enthusiasm of the post-Depression, post-World War Two era. In others cases, it was the consequence of the "structural adjustments" promoted by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. The most dramatic shift which raised unsettling questions was the end of centrally-planned economies—the originals and the imitators—with all that meant for the social and economic fabrics of the nations involved.

Whatever the reasons for rethinking the roles of the state, the consequences included expanding opportunities for international trade,

declining national control over economic growth, and the extensive cross-border migrations of people. All of these developments could, and in many instances did, have potentially significant impact on the social cohesion of communities, either because they successfully welcomed the economic changes or because they did not. It was argued (and widely believed) *globalisation*, as the process was commonly called, could ultimately help promote more harmonious relations among peoples by overcoming the prejudices of localism and enhancing the natural advantages each region and locality possessed. In the short term, though, it often meant the undermining of established patterns of associations—in communities and within work places—and the rapid mingling of often very diverse peoples. All too often, globalisation appeared to contribute to the emergence of social discord and intense economic competition rather than mollify these trends. If peace meant the fostering of harmonious relationships—a better understanding than just the avoidance of war—then the record associated with the major changes globalization brought to our times was definitely mixed.

There were—and there would increasingly be—other specific reasons for concern. The list is very long but is indicated by the following, all associated with serious tensions within communities and across nations, all disruptive of social peace: the issues associated with the HIV/AIDS pandemic undermining the stability of many communities; lack of employment opportunities for many young people in both northern and southern countries, leading to inter-generational conflict and, in some instances, riots in the streets; growing ethnic and religious tensions reflected in riots and wars in several countries; deepening pressures from mass movements of people reawakened different kinds of racism many had thought were in decline after the excesses of the first half of the twentieth century; deepening environmental degradation, contributing to a cultural divide around the world; widening economic disparities nationally, regionally, and internationally; and dangerous isolation of some states outside much of the diplomacy of our age, with all the risks such isolation invites. The tensions have been shown in sharpest relief by the multi-faceted problems of terrorism and related threats to peace, highlighted by the attacks of September 11, 2001 on the World Trade Centre and

other sites in the US, and other violent outbursts in Asia, as well as by the disastrous wars in the Middle East and Africa. All of these are sad rejoinders to the naïve euphoria that accompanied the end of the Cold War in the early 1990s.

And what is the co-operative response to all these challenging mega-trends of our times? The answer is gradual and subtle. It is tied into the way the co-operative movement understands its roles, sees its mission, and fosters development. It starts with the nature of the co-operative identity. The root lies in definition, the acceptance of underlying values, and the application of co-operative principles. Co-operatives cannot resolve all the world's big problems, but they can make a major contribution stemming from their past achievements and a fuller appreciation of what they can accomplish.

The essence of the co-operative way starts with a deeper understanding of the definition of a co-operative than was customarily accepted. The fact that co-operatives are autonomous means that they should dissociate themselves from organisations—political, social, and economic—that would use them for other purposes. Co-operatives should not be tools for others. They should be available for all kinds of purposes and not restricted by legal or other means from pursuing the goals their members wish to pursue. Their multi-party ownership—their collective objectives—are particularly important in building peace because they invite participation across differences: Catholics can work with Protestants in developing co-operative housing, Jews can work with Muslims in selling fruit, Singhalese can work with Tamils in creating financial organisations, Bantu can work with Boer in creating employment through co-operatives. They do so by continuously working on the democratic way in which their co-operatives operate, which, much like political democracy, is not so much a way of applying abstract concepts as it is for striving to live in ways that are democratic, inclusive, share power, and are accountable. One important additional step is to be constantly culling the undemocratic tendencies we all possess to different degrees.

Definition of a Co-operative

A co-operative is an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social, and cultural needs and

aspirations through a jointly-owned and democratically-controlled enterprise.
Manchester Congress
International Co-operative Alliance. 1995[1]

The co-operative approach to building peace is obvious in the values that underlie how co-operatives are organized and the practices they adopt to apply those values. They are ultimately built on self-help and not on the forms of dependency and clientage out of which many kinds of tensions sooner or later arise. Co-operatives are based on values of equality and equity that constantly strive to rise above differences of ethnicity, religion, politics, and gender. They posit a commitment to solidarity with others based on a common humanity. Those values, the basis of co-operative principles, are a key source of co-operative effectiveness; they provide an endless, evolving context within which co-operatives can work for better understandings and mutual aid among all kinds of people.

Co-operative Organisational and Ethical Values
Co-operatives are based on the values of self-help, self-responsibility, democracy, equality, equity, and solidarity. In the tradition of their founders, co-operative members believe in the ethical values of honesty, openness, social responsibility, and caring for others.
Manchester Congress
International Co-operative Alliance, 1995[2]

The co-operative approach is also evident in the ethical values co-operators around the world have adopted to guide their organisations. Organisations that hope to meet needs in divided communities can only be successful in the long run if they are honest in how they serve their members and communities—a concept that is not simple in either conceptualisation or application—and if they are honest in examining the ways in which they conduct their business, even going beyond the *triple bottom line* of economic, social, and environmental considerations. For the same reason, co-operatives that strive to live

1 See: http://ica.coop/en/whats-co-op/co-operative-identity-values-principles.
2 Ibid.

their commitment to social responsibility and caring for others—not so much out of charity as to foster greater self-responsibility and empowerment—can play important roles in building peace.

Co-operative Principles
Principle One: Voluntary and Open Membership
Principle Two: Democratic Control
Principle Three: Member Economic Participation
Principle Four: Autonomy and Independence
Principle Five: Education, Training, Information
Principle Six: Co-operation among Co-operatives
Principle Seven: Concern for Community
Manchester Congress
International Co-operative Alliance, 1995[3]

These values inform the principles on which co-operatives are based, their democratic structures, their view of membership, their efforts to meet the needs of their members, regardless of differences among them, their commitment to education and training, their willingness to join forces with all kinds of co-operatives, and their concern for the communities they serve. These values inevitably should contribute to building peace within communities and across societies, indeed throughout the world. Ultimately, the connection between co-operative thought and the struggle to achieve peace is undeniable.

3 Ibid.

Ian MacPherson

Concern for Community

In 1995 when the International Co-operative Alliance (ICA) adopted the Statement on Co-operative Identity the revised set of co-operative principles included—for the first time—the Seventh Principle titled: Concern for Community.[1] It read: "Co-operatives work for the sustainable development of their communities through policies approved by their members."[2]

Where did this principle come from? Why did it emerge at the Manchester Congress? Was it a *new* principle? What is the historical record on the role of community within the co-operative movement? Where does the emphasis on community fit within the general pattern of co-operative thought? What are the connections between communities and co-operative conceptions of membership? What are the issues that those connections raise? What does it mean for how co-operatives function today and for how co-operatives contribute to a more peaceful world? Here we will address these questions.

1 This paper was presented by Dr. MacPherson at a conference in Venice, *Promoting the Understanding of Co-operatives for a Better World*. March 15-18, 2012.

2 See the International Co-operative Alliance, http://www.ica.coop / coop /principles.html.

Where did the community principle come from?

The immediate background for including the Concern for Community principle within the revised principles can be traced through a series of documents. The report that Alex Laidlaw prepared for the ICA's Moscow Congress in 1980 might be chosen to start our review. To a significant extent, that report can be seen as an effort to mobilize the international movement so that it could better respond to the emerging problems confronting communities around the world. Laidlaw emphasized the building of a "conserver society"[3] in order to reduce the impact of individuals and communities on the environment. He called for the development of more co-operatively-based communities, particularly through housing and social co-operatives, as a way to meet current social and economic pressures.[4] These issues, notably among them the environmental issue, were reemphasized four years later at the ICA's Hamburg Congress.[5]

At the 1988 Stockholm Congress, the president of the ICA, Lars Marcus, called on the international co-operative movement to address its most fundamental issues of purpose. He was concerned that the movement seemed to be losing its appeal in the face of growing competition from capitalist firms, which were then basking in a burgeoning, though naïve, faith in the power of the pursuit of untrammelled self-interest to resolve the world's major problems. One of the issues Marcus raised was "caring for others."[6] He asked if it should be thought of as a mark of co-operative distinctiveness. It was a question that brought up the issue of how co-operatives related to their communities—those close to home and (arguably) far away.

It was a question picked up by Sven Åke Böök, who chaired an ICA committee created in the aftermath of the 1988 Congress. Böök and the committee he worked with were charged with investigating

3 Patrizia Battilani and Harm G.Schroter (Eds), *The Co-operative Business Movement: 1950 to the Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p. 113-114.

4 Alexander F. Laidlaw, *Co-operatives in the Year 2000: A Paper prepared for the 27th Congress of the International Co-operative Alliance* (Ottawa: Co-operative Union of Canada, undated).

5 *International Co-operative Alliance, XXVIII Congress, Hamburg, 15-18 October, 1984* (Geneva: International Co-operative Alliance, undated), pp. 63-75.

6 See Lars Marcus, "Co-operatives and Basic Values: A Report to the ICA Congress, Stockholm 1988," *XXIX Congress, Stockholm, July 1988, Agenda & Reports* (Geneva: International Co-operative Alliance, 1988).

what co-operators around the world believed were the main values informing their movement. Over the next three years, they participated in sessions discussing value questions that (according to ICA estimates) involved some 10,000 people around the world. In those sessions questions concerning the relationships between co-operatives and communities were frequently raised, notably by young people and women, and particularly in such countries as Japan, Colombia, Sri Lanka, Canada, and Kenya.

For Böök, this common preoccupation with communities was a reflection of what he came to call *the co-operative spirit*, which he believed should infuse *co-operative organisational cultures*.[7] The discussions heard by Böök and his committee colleagues clearly demonstrated the desire for the mutual benefit of members and not just their individual benefit. Marcus's query about whether caring for others should be a hallmark of the movement was clearly answered.

In the report he subsequently wrote, Böök stressed the importance of co-operatives striving for the social and economic emancipation of people, the creation of what he called a *humanistic economy,*[8] and an increased commitment to social responsibility—all ideas with significant implications for communities, and all concepts that demonstrated caring for others. As he idealistically wrote:

> *All the basic co-operative values are permeated by responsibility for the community as a whole in the perspectives of social and economic justice (equity). The motives behind the formation of co-operatives, now as before, has been to contribute to a better society at large. Co-operatives are, by their basic constitutions, organisations for this: people take the economy in their own hands, take care of each other and search for ways to embrace wider parts of the community.*[9]

Following the submission of Böök's report at the 1992 ICA Tokyo Congress, another committee prepared documents on how to final-

7 Sven Åke Böök (edited by Margaret Prickett and Mary Tracey), *Co-operative Values in a Changing World, Report to the ICA Congress, Tokyo, October, 1992* (Geneva: International Co-operative Alliance, 1992), pp. 206-207.

8 Ibid, pp. 206-215.

9 Ibid, p. 215. To some extent, this quotation suggests that co-operatives were essentially idealistic organisations. It should be read, however, in the context of the full Böök report, which frequently addressed very practical issues, insisted upon the need for providing members with good value, and insisted upon the necessity of effective management.

ize the discussion of the essential co-operative values for the Manchester Congress three years later. That committee, chaired by the author, soon came to the conclusion that the values deemed most important should be emphasized as part of a document, an Identity Statement that addressed in a general way the distinctive nature of co-operatives. The committee created a definition of a co-operative, a rather obviously important dimension of identity, but one that the movement had been unable to agree upon for over a century. The committee engaged in a lengthy discussion on which values (of the many raised by the work of the Böök committee and discussed in the book that he wrote on the subject) should be emphasized. Finally, the committee revisited, altered, and augmented the basic principles as they had been developed in 1937 and 1966 and as they were viewed at the time, keeping in mind how they related to the values that had become the most important for the international movement to emphasize. It is in that context that the community principle was written.

In preparing the Identity Statement, the committee worked through some fourteen drafts, seeking consensus on the nature of co-operative identity—not an easy task given the diversity of the international movement. The committee received advice from a panel of fifty prominent co-operative experts from over thirty countries. Our work builds on what members of the Böök committee had done in meeting with some 10,000 co-operators in various meetings held around the world. In our work, as in theirs, concern for community was a common topic, a widely accepted principle that the committee believed the international movement should acknowledge and implement in its work. There was no doubt by the end of the consultation process that the community associations of co-operatives and the co-operative movement were vitally important in the minds of engaged co-operators.

Through this lengthy process, the committee framed the seventh principle. It indicated the significance of community ties in the values that it determined were crucially important for the movement. Specifically, it included the values of *caring for others* and *social responsibility*, both of which have obvious community orientations. It also included *openness, solidarity, equity*, and *equality*, values that argu-

ably imply, and speak directly to, how co-operatives should function within communities. To be open means that co-ops should accept people "*without gender, social, racial, political, or religious discrimination*" who can use the services they provide; co-ops have a responsibility to welcome as many people as they can serve from the communities in which they exist. Solidarity means working with others. Though some suggested this meant only with other co-operators and co-operatives, many more involved in the sessions that discussed the Identity Statement believed it also meant collaboration with other individuals and organisations with similar values and aims. Equity and equality can mean, for some, the ways in which co-operatives strive to conduct their internal affairs with members and employees, but for many it also included the ways in which co-operatives deal with the non-co-operative world; such values, it was argued, cannot be bottled up, to be used selectively in some contexts but not in others.

The community dimension of co-operative activities, therefore, is an important part of the Statement of Co-operative Identity. It was one of the most obvious themes that emerged during the six years of discussions on the nature of co-operative identity during the 1990s, which was the last time the international movement undertook such a serious, sustained examination of the essence of co-operative organisation and theory.

Was the Community Principle New?

Because the community principle was an addition to the list of co-operative principles as they had been defined in the previous listings of ICA principles, it is, in one sense, reasonable to consider it a new principle. That does not mean, though, that it is an aberration bereft of historical context. It is in fact an articulation of a dimension of the co-operative movement that has been widely honoured throughout the movement's history.

Within the British co-operative tradition, for example, the community principle can be traced back to the work and thought of Robert Owen. Owen's efforts to turn the textile town of New Lanark into a pleasant and rewarding industrial community with good housing, a vital education programme involving early childhood and

life-long learning, and the distribution of consumer goods at fair prices became an international model for community-building. It sparked numerous imitations in intentional communities (in some contexts referred to as utopian communities) in the United Kingdom, Europe, and the Americas. That impact continues to play out through hundreds of intentional communities around the world[10] and, to some extent, within the co-operative housing movement. It even had a direct impact on the Rochdale Pioneers, one of whose projects was the development of "a self-supporting home colony of united interests,"[11] an objective that for complex reasons has never received the attention it warrants. It also influenced the Rochdale Pioneers and their associates in their commitment to education, reading rooms, lecture halls, public lectures, popular publications, and women's guilds—all for the enhancement of communities as well as for the benefit of their members.

Within the French tradition the movement's roots can be traced back to the French Revolution and to the social concerns that the revolution unleashed: the visions of a new society and the dream of democracy. Thinkers like Saint-Simon, Étienne Cabet, and Charles Fourier addressed, in their different ways, how communities should be structured so as to reflect aspects of that tradition and to better meet the demands of the modern age. Fourier's work in particular had a significant impact on the development of intentional communities in several countries, communities that had a greater impact on the international co-operative movement than is generally acknowledged. During the turmoil of the 1840s, groups of workers in France formed worker co-ops that were local responses to the general march of industrialism and the consequent restructuring of class and institutional relationships—the rapid transformation of existing communities and the creation of new ones. All of these developments had a significant impact on the Paris Commune of the early 1870s and the development of *Associationisme* as a political and intel-

10 For a listing of thousands of intentional communities around the world (those that are known and willing to be listed) see The Fellowship of Intentional Communities: http://directory.ic.org/ic1ist/geo.php. The number of such communities, which can be seen as evidence of a co-operative ethos, has never been established. Doing so would be challenging, but the number would appear to be high.

11 Arnold Bonner, *British Co-operation* (Manchester, Co-operative Union, 1970), p. 522.

lectual force. Charles Gide and the School of Nimes at the turn of the twentieth century emphasized social concerns and community revitalisation through moral commitments. Their approach was very influential within the international movement for several decades.[12] The French tradition, like all traditions, was deeply embedded in its society and its history.

Similar community concerns can be found in the historical development of other European movements. It is a movement deeply embedded in Italy's social, economic, and political history that has developed its own distinctive co-operative forms and energy.[13] The Germans emphasize the work of Raiffeisen and Schulze-Delitzsch and their struggles to provide community-based credit services for specific groups and classes during the 1850s and 1860s.[14] The financial co-operatives they created played vital roles in the modernisation of the German countryside and in the economic development of the bourgeoisie.

Agricultural co-operatives as they spread through Denmark and Germany in the late nineteenth century can be seen as reactions to the crises facing rural communities as they were transformed by technological change, evolving agricultural practices, and the development of market economies. Their historic commitment to rural community-building in Europe and in other parts of the world was noteworthy amid the cresting of different kinds of agrarianism from the late nineteenth century onward. It was reflected in their associations with rural education movements, women's issues, social reform, and youth programmes. It can be seen in the ways in which rural co-operatives supported community banking developments, from the

12 Charles Gide, *Consumers' Co-operative Societies* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1923); Jean-Francois Draperi, "The Ethical Foundations and Epistemological Position of Co-operative Research," in Ian MacPherson and Erin McLaughlin (Eds), *Integrating Diversities within a Complex Heritage: Essays in the Field of Co-operative Studies* (Victoria: New Rochdale Press, 2008), pp. 323-344.

13 Vera Zamagni, *Italy's Cooperatives from Marginality to Success*, www.helsinkLfijiehc2006/papers2/ZamagnLpdf.

14 Jan-Otmar Hesse, "Co-operatives in Germany in the 20th Century, an Overview and Some Hypotheses" *Enterprises et Histoire*, #56, pp. 49-61; DGRV, http://www.dgrv.de/en/cooperatives/historyofcooperatives.html ; Michael Prinz "German Rural Co-operatives: Friedrich-Wilhelm Raiffeisen and the Organization of Trust, 1850-1914", ed.net/XIIICongress/Papers/Prinz.pdf.

Raiffeisen movement in Germany and Argentina to the credit union movement of the Canadian Prairies.

National movements in other countries stressed the community dimensions of their own co-operative traditions, many of them—as in the cases of Japan, Korea, and India—pointing to the ritualized collaboration of their rural ancestors during periods of planting and harvesting.[15] Today the role of co-operatives in rural communities and in urban neighbourhoods is obvious and important. African and Latin American co-operators recall the kin group and community traditions of their Indigenous peoples, the co-operative developments associated with European settlements, some of the imperial interventions into colonial life, and, in some countries, associations with early trade unionism.[16] Many of the countries of the Global South experienced their first great experimentation with formal co-operative development during their independence periods when these transitions were linked to community development, nation building, and the founding political leaders. The results of those experiments, as in the case of most imperial and early post-imperial efforts, were mixed.

Thus, we can see the connection with communities is a fundamental dimension of the history of the international co-operative movement. It is not a recent development.

Where does *Concern for Community* Fit within Co-operative Thought?

There is a tendency within the international co-operative movement not to emphasize the role of ideas or what might be called co-operative ideology. This is largely because people involved with co-oper-

15 Madhav Madane, "Co-operatives and Community Culture," *Review of International Co-operation*, Vol 99, No.1; Larry L. Burmeister, "State, Industrialization and Agricultural Policy in Korea," *Development and Change* No. 21, October, 2008, pp. 197-223.

16 F.O. Wanayama, P. Develtere, and I. Pollot, "Encountering the Evidence: Co-operatives and Poverty Reduction in Africa" *Working Papers on Social and Co-operative Entrepreneurship*. (Leuven: Katolieke Universiteit Leuven, 08.02, 2008); Patrick Develtere, "Co-operative Movements in the Developing Countries," *Annals of Public and Co-operative Economics*, Vol. 64, Issue 2, pp. 179-208, and Patrick Develtere, "Co-operatives and Development: Towards a Social Movement Perspective," *Occasional Papers* (Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, University of Saskatchewan, 1992).

atives tend to be preoccupied with practical issues—such as how to make a given co-operative or set of co-operatives more effective, how to compete within an unforgiving marketplace, or how to secure the kinds of government policies that will allow the movement to grow.

Raising ideas risks incurring divisions, given that the movement includes so many different kinds of co-operatives, numerous national and cultural roots, and people with sharply divergent political and religious loyalties. Straying into what might be thought of as political or religious fields can be dangerous and counter-productive—the reason why so many co-operative movements publicly insist on political and religious neutrality. Ideas can be dangerous, including ideas about how co-operatives can and should relate to their communities.

The discussions of the 1990s can be seen as an attempt to reverse that trend by referring to the movement's intellectual heritage. It did so through its statement on co-operative values. That inclusion made the Identity Statement significantly different from the two previous ICA listings of co-operative principles. The earlier versions had been essentially terse rules for the operation of co-operatives, drawn largely from the experiences of the consumer movement. They offered little in the way of an understanding of the rich ideological dimensions of the co-operative tradition, partly because to do so in the context of the 1930s and 1960s would have been to invite intense debates (those two decades were especially notable for their ideological ferment).

Unfortunately though, the 1937 and 1966 revisions of the co-op principles did not communicate very well the co-operative promise; they also undervalued the movement's intellectual force, most particularly for people outside the movement. They provided rather weak bases for making the case for co-operatives amid the ideological wars and the struggles over public policy during the twentieth century, especially in comparison with other ideological systems.

All of this was somewhat different during the 1990s, when the collapse of the centrally-planned economies of Central and Eastern Europe seemed to mark the end of fierce ideological debates—the "end of history" as Francis Fukuyama rather simplistically put it at

the time.[17] But it is why, in 1995, it was possible to address some of the fundamental issues that had plagued the international movement for many decades. It is also why it was necessary to do so. The apparent vanquishing of the Soviet economic and social experiments seemed to mean the victory of the liberal, capitalist model, which for co-operatives raised the possibilities of becoming de-emphasized through government policies or of disappearing through increasing imitation of capitalist approaches. Ultimately, the only defences against those possibilities had to be as clear a statement of identity as possible, the celebration of co-operative successes, and the careful protection of co-operative vitality within government policies—in short, the enhancement of the "co-operative difference." And it is in that context that the question of relationships with communities becomes of further importance.

Attempting to provide an overview of co-operative thought is a daunting, even risky, endeavour, given the movement's remarkable diversity. The following list, however, is an effort to present assumptions that have been—and arguably still are—commonly found throughout the movement and in a wide range of contexts.

1. Human beings are capable of continuous and accumulating personal development, particularly if they are influenced early enough by cooperative ideas and strategies.
2. Co-operative education is essential for the movement's effective and sustained development.
3. Human beings specifically have to learn what some in the nineteenth century called "associative intelligence"[18]—the desire and ability to cooperate effectively with others, involving understandings and skills that have to be consciously learned.
4. Communities are more capable of mobilizing significant human and financial resources for their economic and social betterment than is often recognized.

17 Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: Avon Books, 1992).

18 Ian MacPherson, "Encouraging Associative Intelligence: Co-operatives, Shared Learning and Responsible Citizenship," *Co-operative Learning and Responsible Citizenship in the 21st Century* (Manchester: Co-operative College, 2003), pp. 11-19.

5. Co-operative organisations of all types should work together whenever possible in order that the full potential of co-operative entrepreneurship can be realized.
6. Democratic processes are applicable to economic activities and in fact can be superior to autocratic practices in running businesses.
7. Co-operatives should be aware of the social consequences of what they do and how they function. They should seek to minimize any negative effects on communities that they might have.
8. Invested capital is entitled to a fair and specific return but any surpluses from the operation of a co-operative should primarily reward use, participation, or patronage (though some would argue also for the additional rewarding of employees when surpluses are significant).[19]

The emphasis on learning, education, and development in the first three of these assumptions suggest the importance of the relationship between a co-operative, its members, and their communities. The assumptions about the capacity to mobilize resources and the importance of co-operatives collaborating with each other suggests the potential power co-operatives can amass and the social as well as financial capital they can create for members and for their communities. The emphasis on democracy and social responsibility suggests the ways in which co-operatives should function: transparently, inclusively, and responsibly—all qualities important for community wellness. The last assumption on capital reaffirms the centrality of people and the importance of membership. It points out perhaps the two most obvious ways in which co-operatives differ from capitalist firms: the limitations on returns to capital and the importance of member participation.

19 For some elaboration, see Ian MacPherson, "What is the End Purpose of It All? The Centrality of Values for Co-operative Success in the Market Place," in Harm Schroter and Patrizia Battilani, *The Co-operative Business Movement 1950 to the Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

What are the Connections between Community Involvements and Membership?

Ultimately, it can be argued that engagement with community is rooted in co-operative ideas of membership.

According to *The Oxford English Dictionary*, the idea of membership became common in the early nineteenth century—in other words, at about the same time as the co-operative movement began to assume significance. It was used largely by organisations that today we would say belong to the *social economy*, including fraternal societies, religious organisations, mutuals, and friendly societies, as well as co-operatives. It was a manifestation of a desire to use collective and community resources to protect people from the negative aspects of the economic and political changes of the times and sometimes to allow people to take better advantage of them. It was based on bonds of association that were different from those that characterized joint stock and partnership firms; it asserted both the importance of individuals and the collectives to which they belonged.

Today the word *membership* is employed rather casually. Often it is used as a marketing tool by all kinds of economic organisations, including credit card firms, department stores, airlines, aquariums, and automobile associations. They use it—without necessarily defining what they mean by it very well—in order to entice greater customer loyalty through affinity programmes offering reduced prices on goods and services, rebates on purchases, travel rewards, and special advertising efforts. Other organisations with strong social dimensions, such as golf and curling clubs, fraternal organisations and service clubs, use the term because they want to highlight particular services and special obligations. They want to enhance the loyalty of the people they serve. They wish to build the social relationships that are central to their survival and success. In doing so, they retain some of the word's original meaning.

The co-operative notion of membership carries some aspects of both kinds of membership, but it includes much more. Minimally, it involves three dimensions of member engagement, though the depth of the commitment varies from co-operative to co-operative and from context to context. One kind of engagement comes when

members purchase their membership or ownership share. In the case of some worker, social, and agricultural co-operatives, members are required to invest substantial amounts of money as a condition of membership. In consumer and community-based co-operative banking, the amounts are typically small. Arguably, requiring larger investments could be a useful way in which to attract more member capital. It could also encourage greater interest and involvement by some people. It is a dimension of membership that needs to be considered more widely, strategically, and creatively.

Secondly, the co-operative idea of membership involves the distribution of surpluses (or profits) in proportion to a member's participation. Typically, co-operatives emphasize this aspect of membership most frequently because they believe it is one way to attract and keep members.

The third dimension of co-operative membership includes ownership rights and obligations, most commonly exercised through the election of directors for specific co-operatives, but also through participation in focus groups and community information sessions and careful perusal of literature provided by the co-op. There are, however, considerable variations in how effectively and conscientiously co-operatives engage their democratic life. There are often differences in the amount of information that is supplied, differences in how candidates for elected positions are authorized and presented, various ways in which elections take place, and differences in how democracy is sustained between elections. As in the larger society, so too in co-operatives—democracy is always a work in progress. Clear absolutes are rare and, when claimed, are usually questionable.

Co-operatives also differ in the extent to which members wish to be engaged and, in fact, the extent to which co-ops invite member involvement. Different kinds of co-operatives, for example worker co-ops and insurance co-ops, invite variable degrees of engagement. A member will likely want and need to be involved with a co-op that has a daily impact on his or her life, such as a housing co-op, a worker co-op, or a producer co-op. In other types of co-operatives, there is relatively little perceived need to be involved as a member, for example an insurance co-op where participation is normally a once a year event, when one pays for the services one wishes to have.

Much also depends upon the attitudes of co-op leaders, elected and employed, and whether they believe members to be a challenge to be overcome or a resource to be developed. There are also problems in how much of a co-op's business and what aspects of it can be communicated and discussed publicly. Participation and transparency are not absolutes; they are variables determined by circumstance, personalities, and practice. Like many aspects of the co-operative world, they can only be worked out "on the ground" through the ways in which a co-operative chooses to conduct its affairs and is able to undertake them.

These dimensions of co-operative membership, however, are not the whole story about the ways in which members relate to their co-operatives. There are also vitally important dimensions that relate to culture. How members engage in a given co-operative depends to some extent on the society in which they live. Patterns of association with co-operatives can be very different in, for example, Sri Lanka, Japan, Argentina, Finland, and Quebec. Historic bonds, kinship ties, social relationships, and economic circumstances all can affect how co-operators act and how co-operatives operate, how they define the issues they individually and collectively face, and how they propose to deal with them.

In other words, much depends on the kinds of *identities* that members bring to their co-op, and rarely are those identities apparent in a monolithic form. Rather, membership diversity is the norm in most co-operatives, particularly if they are currently growing and are successfully attracting members from different communities and across generational divides. Thus, diversity comes largely from the community connections that are important.

With member diversity comes a multiplicity of membership or community pressures. Co-op members cannot be readily categorized through what economist call rational choice theory, at least in its most simplistic variations. The starting point for much co-operative activity is the group, not the individual, a complication for rational choice analysis, which tends to concentrate on individual choice. Governance systems and experiences further complicate matters. How members vote within co-operatives (frequently crucial in determining how they operate), is not always easily predictable. Members

select their directors for complex reasons. They can debate fiercely what to do with surpluses: to distribute them exclusively to themselves (the members), or to some community activity to fund expansion projects, or to build reserve funds in anticipation of difficult times. The well-publicized debates within the Mondragón co-operative movement over international expansion are a case in point,[20] as are arguments within small co-ops seeking to move into nearby neighbourhoods or to expand existing operations.[21]

In short, when members participate at annual meetings or in consultative processes, they do so as individuals who may or may not be motivated primarily by personal economic or status considerations. Invariably, they will participate as individuals carrying several identities, any or all of which might affect how they view their co-operative and envision how they wish to relate to it in the future—and how it should relate to their communities. This complexity can be the cause of significant uncertainties; if dealt with effectively, it can also be a considerable source for institutional success, a way of reaching out to various communities and finding new needs that can prudently be met.

In a thought-provoking and graceful book,[22] Amartya Sen has set forth some of the complexities associated with identifying individuals. All too often, he argues, people are characterized by one form of identity (for example, religious commitments, political beliefs, or geographic location) and that becomes the way in which they become understood. It is a misleading tendency because, in reality, everyone is a mingling of identities. Generalizing from any one of those identities is fraught with error. For example, Sen suggests a "Hutu laborer from Kigali may be pressured to see himself only as a Hutu and incited to kill Tutsis, and yet he is not only a Hutu, but also a Kigalian, a Rwandan, an African, a labourer, and a human

20 For an example drawn from a non-co-operative source, see "All in This Together: How is the Co-operative Model Coping with the Recession?" *The Economist*, http://www.economist.com/node/13381546.

21 For example, Peninsula Co-op, near Victoria, British Columbia, has been engaged in a fifteen-year struggle over expansion in the rural region in which it lives. The debate can be followed in the local press, though the coverage has tended to be biased in favour of the co-op's opponents.

22 Amartya Sen, *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2006).

being."[23] One can readily think of everyone else in the same way, as a mixture of many identities, including all those who become members of co-operatives.

It is possible to think about a co-operative identity perhaps by considering the extent to which people accept and are motivated by such ideas as the assumptions outlined above. Other personal identities will always intervene, and this fact has long been a feature of co-operatives and their relations with communities. For most of the movement's history, for example, it was commonplace within many co-operative circles to emphasize the importance of the working class. In some circles it still is. One can argue that is the common framework, the essential lens, within which many consumer co-op movements in Europe, the Americas, and Asia have been viewed, and their origins and development explained.[24] Similarly, one can argue that rural identities, varying by type of agriculture and culture, have shaped most co-operative movements in the countryside, that local, regional, religious, and political values have shaped community-based co-operative banking developments, and that the social values and bonds of communities help define social co-operatives wherever they exist.

When thought of in this way, co-operatives become carriers of multiple identities in which issues of paramountcy can easily arise, especially when mixed with identities flowing from ethnicity and national feelings. Identity matters tend to surface most vigorously when co-operatives face crises. It then becomes clear how members perceive their co-operative and which identity predominates. If members see it as a business that has a life of its own and operates like a conventional business, then *demutualisation* can easily become the preferred option.[25] If they see it as an organization with important

23 Ibid, p. 4.

24 The British consumer co-operative experience has been seen through the lens of working class culture. See, for example, Johnston Birchall, *Co-op: The People's Business* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), Stephen Yeo, and particularly Peter Gurney, *Co-operative Culture and the Politics of Consumption in England*, 1870-1930 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996).

25 Getu Hailu and Ellen Goddard, "Sustainable Growth and Capital Constraints: The Demutualization of Lilydale Co-operative Ltd." *Journal of Co-operatives*, Volume 23, 2009, pp. 116-129; Roger Herman and Jorge Sousa, "Factors Influencing Demutualizing and Mutualizing Conversions of the Co-operative Organizational Form." Paper delivered at

social and community objectives, then the measurement of success will be judged by a variety of criteria and not just by financial performance. The results, almost certainly, will be significantly different.

The diversity of member identities suggests that one needs to be cautious in assuming that joining a co-operative necessarily means a serious commitment to a single co-operative identity. It probably means a willingness to explore the co-operative model and to consider how it might be better and more widely applied. It might include some interest in co-operative thought. A well-functioning co-operative will respond to such interests through information and educational activities (about the movement as well as about itself) because it represents an important opportunity that may not frequently arise. Unfortunately, that opportunity is not always seized diligently enough, and many members do not understand the unique qualities of the organisation they have joined. Thus, the possibility for deepening a co-operative identity is often not fully explored.

Put another way, co-operatives are meeting places for people with many identities. Some of them are long-standing, such as those associated with the working classes and rural people, and those that are derived from ethnic backgrounds and national feelings. Others are of more recent origins, typically associated with causes deeply felt, such as environmentalism, food security, and gender issues.

All of these identities can and should be accommodated within co-operatives, but it is not always easy to do so. Deeply-felt social causes can carry strong feelings of identity and people supporting them can be very demanding in their pursuit of immediate results. They can also be tied to different kinds of communities, whether defined by territory, belief, gender, or history. The challenge then will be to negotiate reasonable and responsible responses to them within the context of organisations that must also operate one or more business activities. It is not easily done. On the other hand, such associations can be—as in the cases of local food security and

the meetings of the Canadian Association for the Study of Co-operation, Saskatoon, June 2007.

environment—important signals as to how markets are developing or could be developed.[26]

Member's reflections of their communities, therefore, are vitally important, even determinative, in deciding the fate of a given co-operative. Those reflections are rarely constant. They can help identify purpose and they can create "institution-saving" opportunities.

What can be Learned by Listening to Community?

In the years since the Manchester Congress, it is remarkable how many co-operative organisations have paid increased attention to their community programmes. It is notable how proudly many of them monitor their community contributions. It is notable how important community activities are to co-operative employees, who often volunteer their time to help make the community programmes of their co-operative employer successful. In short, the sponsorship and encouragement of community programmes has now become a common way in which co-operatives regularly demonstrate their "difference."[27] Indeed, the emphasis given to community activities by the Manchester Congress in 1995 has had a significant impact overall on the international movement.

Co-operatives may respond to the needs of their communities in many ways. For example, they often sponsor educational activities, scholarship programmes, youth camps, training sessions, or sports and cultural activities. These programmes can be justified as a form

26 An important North American example would be the organic food industry. In the 1960s and 1970s numerous groups in the United States (and to a lesser extent in Canada) developed the organic food industry. Its early advocates developed numerous local food co-ops devoted to organic food production. Many of them formed small wholesales that were marginal business enterprises. The older, more established consumer co-ops largely ignored them—and, to be fair, the new co-ops looked somewhat disdainfully on the old order ones. Gradually, though, as public interest in organic food grew, the larger private chains responded to the growing demand. What started as essentially a co-operative undertaking became increasingly dominated by non-co-operative retailers. Today, the biggest retailer of organic foods is Walmart, which draws its supplies largely from corporate farms. It was a significant missed opportunity for the co-operative movement, largely because of poor strategy on both co-operative sides, some supply problems, but also because of a failure to read what membership wanted or could be taught to appreciate.

27 For Canada, for example (which is not exceptional in this regard), see the community engagement pages on many co-op websites.

of advertising and as a way to promote member loyalty, which in turn can translate into increased business for a given co-operative.

There is another kind of member engagement. It is concerned with using a co-operative's social power and perhaps some of its economic resources to encourage community development, particularly economic development. That was partly in mind in Manchester when the commitment was made to the *sustainable development* of communities. The selection of the word "sustainable" was partly because many co-operatives, especially in rural areas and declining urban districts, were developed to help people create the kind of businesses that would strengthen their communities, as market forces and population shifts affected their stability. It was also a carryover from the World Commission on Environment and Development (the Brundtland Report) in 1987.[28] That report did much to publicize the idea of sustainability and debates over what that word meant and how it could be achieved were not particularly divisive by 1995.

Some of the most effective contributions of co-operatives to community sustainability arise out of co-operatives listening to their communities as they expand or diversify their own business activities.[29] This possibility is one key aspect of a co-operative's competitive advantage. It means that they can listen to the multiple identities their members provide—as members of a specific group, as inhabitants of a given community, or as people devoted to specific issues (such as food sustainability or environmental projects). This in turn can translate into expanding existing business activities or entering into new ones. It is not a trivial asset. That said, it can also mean that co-operators see themselves as being in the member development business as much as they are in a specific kind of business; however, the more co-operatives listen to their members, the greater the possibility of success.

28 *Our Common Future, Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development* (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987).

29 For example, in a local consumer co-operative on whose board the author sat, a series of member meetings were called when the co-op was facing a bleak future. Several ideas were produced about how the co-op could expand its services and meet members' needs. Many of these suggestions were followed; they still are being followed. Today, that co-op is the sixth largest in western Canada.

Co-operatives can be developed as organisations that find effective ways to mobilize resources, human and financial, in order to meet specific needs through a unique kind of enterprise structure. Given that the co-operative model can be infinitely applied to many kinds of economic and social enterprise activities to meet diverse community needs, the potential for new co-operatives and new co-operative forms is virtually endless. The only considerations would be: making sure that a community's needs are genuine, ensuring that good information and expertise are available, finding ways to create pools of capital to be prudently administered, and developing sound business and member engagement approaches.

What does this Mean for how Co-operatives Function Today and For the Future?

A co-operative's engagement with its community is not a frill. It is part of the way it should think about its business and a significant aspect of how it relates to its members. It is an important part of co-operative distinctiveness. It means that co-ops cannot ignore the social consequences of what they do. It means they have a responsibility to care for the communities in which they exist—both in what they do and how they choose to do it. It means they have to be transparent in their work within their communities. It means they should strive within prudent limits to work with others in contributing to community wellness. It is a duty, a way of doing business, and a way of building co-operative possibilities. It is a distinctive approach to co-operative entrepreneurship and to building more peaceful communities.

Section II

WHY THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT IS ESPECIALLY RELEVANT TODAY

Yehudah Paz

Are Co-operatives Relevant in the 21st Century?

Few would challenge the co-operative movement's claim to historical significance. No one doubts its very real contributions in the past, both in industrialized and in developing nations. However, the issue before us is this: Is the co-operative movement relevant to the 21st century? Is the co-operative movement important for the future of men and women, as well as nations and regions, in the modern era? More specifically, what, if any, is the special role and contribution of the movement to be in responding to the challenges of this century and contributing to a more peaceful world?

To avoid confusion, let me immediately set out my view. I believe that co-operatives and the co-operative idea are more relevant today than ever before and that the 21st century could be the co-operative movement's finest hour. I come to this belief not only because I am a member of a co-operative. I have been a member of my kibbutz, an Israeli agro-industrial, multi-purpose co-operative village for a "short period" now—just over 56 years. I also believe this because the realities of today's co-operatives are truly impressive.

It is often surprising for me to discover how little knowledge people have about co-operatives—even leaders of nations and international bodies. It seems that almost every one of them is surprised to learn that the International Co-operative Alliance is the world's largest non-governmental organization (NGO) representing close to one billion individual members.[1] Together, co-operative members with their families have such numerical weight that the Secretary General of the UN has said that co-operatives touch the lives of almost half the human race.[2] Few leaders know that co-operatives exist in every sort of socio-economic setting—in industrialized, newly industrialized, developing economies, and in those in transition from centralized to free market conditions.

Yet this reality, however large in scope, is not in itself a proof of relevance, nor is it an indication of the truth of my contention that co-operatives have much to offer the nations and people of the world in response to the opportunities and the challenges of the 21st century. How then can their relevance be demonstrated?

In looking at the potential contribution of co-operatives to modern society and in particular, how they might contribute to the ultimate goal of peace and long-term, sustainable human development, I shall focus on some of the basic socio-economic trends emerging in our times and ask: Are co-operatives relevant to these issues? Do co-operatives have a significant role to play in responding to these challenges? Do co-operatives have a role in the future? I believe that co-operatives are potentially and realistically an important response to the challenges these issues pose; however, I also contend that for co-operatives to realize this potential, they must evolve, change, develop, and advance. Let me identify and name the issues themselves. If co-operatives are indeed of real relevance to the challenges of our times, then the place of co-operatives in today's and tomorrow's society will be readily apparent.

First, a word of caution. We are dealing with issues on an analytical level and with a global perspective. Inevitably, specific conditions—political, social, economic, cultural, historical, or linguistic—of each

1 For more information see the International Co-operative Alliance website at: http://ica.coop/en/facts-and-figures.

2 Ibid.

nation and area will affect each issue and will mold and shape it in special ways. It will not be possible to take into account all the many variations which concrete reality introduces into each of the areas of concern raised here.

Further, this is by no means a complete list, but I believe these to be central trends. Three of the issues are by nature paradoxes. I use the term "paradox" here to describe a situation in which two seemingly different, even opposite trends or forces exist side by side, so that reality in all its complexity includes both of them simultaneously. The other two central trends may be considered "areas of critical concern."

I believe that in addressing the complexities associated with these paradoxes and issues, co-operatives can make their most important contributions to societies in the 21st century. They can help bring peace and greater social inclusion as the tensions inherent in these global trends increases and the issues become more manifest.

Paradox One: Unity versus Diversity

The first of these paradoxes pertains to contrasting social forces of unity (or centripetal as in attraction toward a central or unifying focus) and diversified trends (or centrifugal forces which support resistance to identifying commonalities). As globalization proceeds, these two apparently contradictory historical social trends are operating at the same time, frequently in the same place, and often with seemingly equal or near equal strength. They are the forces that are simultaneously pulling us together and unifying us (centripetal) and pulling us apart by emphasizing diversity (centrifugal). On the one hand, centripetal forces are at work in our society to produce ever-greater trans-national unity, ever-stronger globalization at both regional and national levels. Yet at the same time, centrifugal forces act to emphasize differences, specificity, and national, even local, identity.

At no time in the history of humankind have the forces leading to greater unity among all the divergent nations, peoples, tribes, and cultures of our world operated with greater strength, immediacy, and impact than they do today. Science and technology have virtually eliminated distance as a barrier to communication and exchange. We are all next-door neighbours in communication terms. News from

everywhere is available instantly, in real time, to all those interested. Mass communication also produces a growing body of shared mass culture. Travel distances have shrunk to the point where almost no location is more than a 24-hour journey away from any other.

Equally dramatic is the end of geographic constraints on knowledge. Ours is the age of the explosion of knowledge. The flow of knowledge in our time is a tidal wave of information. For example, of all the scientific papers written throughout human history, the vast majority first appeared during the last 25 years. Virtually all this knowledge belongs to everyone, everywhere. We live in an age informed by global data banks containing information we can scarce comprehend or even measure. The Internet makes all this knowledge available globally and links all of us, everywhere, across barriers of space and national borders. Information is a primary currency of our times.

Economics dwarfs even information technology in its globalization and in its centripetal implications. Not only are food, raw materials, manufactured goods, and services traded globally—no matter where produced—but money moves around the world instantly, while financial markets, stock exchanges, and banks are increasingly integrated globally. The giant multi-national companies, whose total wealth can exceed that of many nations, represent the institutionalization of the free-market, worldwide modern economy. In addition, each and every day the total value of money utilized in currency and in stock market transactions exceeds $1 trillion! We live in a vast, integrated, global economic system.

But just as the centripetal forces of globalization would appear to be an irresistible force uniting us in the homogenized *global village*, they are countered by another potent force, the centrifugal thirst for identity. Internationalism and globalism have been matched by an equally powerful growth of national and ethnic-group sentiment. We see a worldwide emphasis on national culture, language, history, and heritage. In places where ethnic or national identities were submerged or repressed by the cultural weight and political strength of dominant groups, many have had a vigorous rebirth.

When home, history, culture, language, and religious faith are all involved, as they often are, the centrifugal thirst for identity can be-

come almost overwhelming, sometimes positively, but in many cases in a violent and destructive manner. That wonderful mosaic of human diversity, the galaxy of our cultures, civilizations, historical heritages, beliefs, and social patterns has emerged both as a specific need of men and women everywhere, and as a reorganizing and growing aspect of modern reality. The search for identity, the search for roots is as real as is the emerging global village.

These centrifugal tendencies are deeply entwined in the prevalence, rapidity, scope, and unpredictability of change. Today's explosion of knowledge forces us periodically to revise both our understanding of reality and our grasp of seemingly eternal truths. New technologies continually re-shape the greatest and the smallest aspects of our daily lives. The rapidness of change and the associated complexities are a prime source of the uncertainty and lack of security about the future, which characterizes this global era. As these complexities find expression, the impact of these fast-paced, unpredictable global trends cannot but strengthen the need for attachment to the familiar certitudes and the established traditions in national and ethnic identity.

The quest and need for identity is surely one response to that sense of alienation and powerlessness that we feel in our encounter with the faceless and increasingly powerful economic and political bureaucracies of our times. These bureaucracies dominate ever-widening aspects of our lives. We cannot relate directly and humanly to them; we cannot effectively influence them. Sometimes we cannot even understand them. But they have come to dominate our lives. Inevitably, this leads to that search for the known and understood familiarity of the group and the nation, for the comprehensible dimensions of the community, for the sense of belonging and being recognized as an individual.

Here then is the first paradox: On the one hand, we have the centripetal forces of globalization as they play out in science, economics, knowledge, and communications drawing us deeper into the unity of the global village; and on the other hand, we have the ever-growing search for identity and the centrifugal forces of diversity, which push us into the search for roots and for relationships in community. Both forces work powerfully, and at the same time across most, if not all, of our world, pulling us in different directions.

And how are co-operatives relevant to this paradox and to its resolution? The answer is clear: co-operatives are one of the most effective and appropriate bridges linking these contrasting social forces. Why is this so? It is because co-operatives are at once both the most local and equally the most trans-national of institutions.

On the one hand, all co-operatives are rooted in a particular place. They are part of a particular community, and grow up within and as an expression of the local scene, a national culture, and a shared ethos. They are permanent bodies and do not vanish overnight as some multi-national companies have been known to do. Multi-nationals are prepared to move on quickly from almost any community if there are higher profits or lower wages or other market advantages to be found elsewhere. Co-operatives are part of the community and they stay. Co-operatives are at home with the centrifugal forces of diversity and identity.

On the other hand, co-operatives are also a worldwide phenomenon. As economic units they can—and more and more they do—link up across the borders with other co-operatives so as to reap the benefits of economic globalization. Some insurance co-operatives, for example, have both regional and international unions that work together for economic success. In Scandinavia, consumer co-ops in Norway, Sweden, and Denmark have formed a regional co-operative union, Nordcoop,[3] whose business interests reach out beyond national borders. In the world of tomorrow and the Internet, co-ops have achieved the ultimate recognition of a domain name: "dot coop," alongside of "dot org" and "dot com."

Co-operatives can be both centripetal and centrifugal, unifying and allowing for diversity—global and local—with all the weight that carries in addressing this paradoxical divide. Moreover, co-operatives are values-based, socio-economic institutions whose focus is on human beings rather than on finance capital. In this, they run counter to the dominant market forces. Co-operatives can march with the tides of change while retaining a focus on human relations and values—this is a cornerstone of sustainable human development.

Finally, co-ops are by nature and structure the antithesis of alienation and powerlessness, which the giant bureaucracies of modern

3 For more on Nordcoop see: https://www.nordcoop.pl/.

economic and politic systems evoke. This is so because, in essence, the real purpose of a co-operative is to give men and women the possibility of becoming, at least in some aspect of their lives, the masters of their own fates, the shapers of their destiny, the subjects and not the objects of their history. Co-ops in this sense can serve as agents of human empowerment—the opposite end of the spectrum from the dehumanizing deprivation of social control that multi-nationals engender.

As far as our first paradox regarding bridging the complex, and in many ways contradictory forces of globalization and identity, the relevance of the co-operative movement is clear. Its ability to respond to the challenges raised here gives support to the idea that the 21st century can indeed have a co-operative presence and make a significant contribution to creating more productive, stable, and peaceful future societies.

Paradox Two: The Necessity of Government Even With Its Limitations

Our second paradox deals with the need for governance, on the one hand, and the limitations of government, on the other hand. Complex modern societies require governments; they require sophisticated and effective institutional frameworks. We may sigh at the weight of some bureaucracies or be irritated at the mountains of trivial regulation to which they give birth. We can try to make them more efficient, more inclusive, and transparent, but we cannot do without them.

Moreover, we cannot replace government with the free market. We are well aware of the power of enterprise, the continuous push toward innovation and productivity that the free market possesses; however, we are also aware of what the free market cannot do. It cannot, and will not on its own, promote social justice, greater equity, and greater equality, nor will it preserve the environment. On the contrary, on its own, the free market frequently acts to damage the environment, reduce equity, and weaken human dignity. So we need to impose rules of action and of restraint on the free market, and we need to harness its creative energy within a framework of social

responsibility and social morality. We need to give the free market a human face. And that is the province of government, indeed, the job of good government.

One of the great examples of the positive strength of government is the welfare state. The idea that government has a responsibility for the health and the welfare of its citizens, for the care of the disadvantaged and the elderly, this is a great advance indeed. We sometimes forget what life was like before the advent of the welfare state. Many people lacked basic medical care; they lacked eyeglasses and dental care, for example. Similarly, a lack of services was true for care of the elderly and disadvantaged until the welfare state came into existence. Yes, we need government; however, the paradox is that we have also learned over past decades something about the limitations, the weaknesses, and the difficulties of big government.

Government is bureaucratic. It hampers and limits innovations, and it bogs down and cannot move forward. Big government is top-heavy and can hold back social advance by its sheer weight. Ironically, nowhere is this more true than in relation to the welfare state itself; medical services, care of the sick and the elderly, and other services are enmeshed in government red tape; people must wait weeks, months, sometimes years to obtain services. Innovation can be held back and wait times can be long.

Here is our second paradox: government is an excellent agent for determining the boundaries, for setting the rules, for controlling the excesses of the free market; but government is a poor agent indeed for delivering services and for operating businesses. Government can be a very useful agent in mobilizing the necessary funding for socially valuable activities and for determining social priorities; but governments are also known for cutting funding to vital social programmes. Thus, we find, even with its limitations, we need government in order to fully harness the strength of the free market and give the free market a human face, a social face.

Are co-operatives relevant to this issue? Do they have a role to play in the resolution of this paradox? The answer, again, is yes. Two of the most fundamental keys to resolving this paradox concerning the necessity of government with all its limitations are the importance

of the decentralization of power and the privatization of certain economic services to the realm of the social economy.

We are increasingly aware of the need to move power down from bureaucratic, centralized structures to the community level. Government must set policy and guarantee it gets implemented, but community empowerment, local control, and the direct involvement of those concerned—the stakeholders—are the keys to the effective delivery of welfare and other social services. It is no surprise, therefore, to learn of the growth of a new area of co-operative endeavor, namely in the delivery of social services. New kinds of co-ops are springing up in many parts of the world to deliver such services as health care, care of the aged, provision of recreation and leisure activity, even of education. This is happening at all levels of education, from pre-kindergarten to post-graduate university. In this sense co-operatives are providing a democratic and people-centered method of service delivery, which can link up effectively with the setting of standards and the raising of money—the government's domain of responsibility.

As far as privatization is concerned, we find examples where government gave up trying to manage a business, and the workers and managers of that business took it over by forming a co-operative. For example, the English weekly magazine *The Economist*, which is a bastion of conservative thinking, recently praised the development of such co-operatives in the privatized electricity industry in Argentina. Co-operatives are locally rooted, and they understand and respond to community needs, so why not "privatize" these services to co-ops when that is possible, rather than to the free market?

The case of social services is equally clear. Why turn health care or other social services over to private companies whose essential purpose is to increase their profits and not necessarily services? Are they the best agents for carrying out the social responsibility that is the foundation of the welfare state? Again, the relevance of co-ops is clear; their place in resolving this 21st century paradox is apparent, realistic, and important.

Paradox Three: Poverty Amid Great Wealth

Our third paradox is that of increasing poverty alongside the creation of great wealth. The innovation and thrust that are characteristic of

the global free market produces rapid economic advance and the creation of excess wealth. The global free market, in and of itself, is not productive of greater equity, social justice, or solidarity, nor is the free market capable of fully answering the need for development and alleviation of poverty. The global free market has maintained, even exacerbated, the gap between the rich and the poor, between developing and industrialized nations, and even within them.

Here then is our third paradox: great economic growth accompanied by limited human development. We have increased wealth, yet we have had only limited increase in the satisfaction of meeting basic human needs, such as, food, clothing, shelter, health, education, welfare, employment, culture, personal security, and freedom. The realities of the growing gap between the rich and the poor are all too well known. Yes, on some fronts progress has been made; for example, illiteracy is down on a worldwide basis,[4] and hunger has been eliminated in many, but not all parts of the world.[5] Yet poverty prevails in many places. Indeed, UN sources report 20% of the human race—1.2 billion people—live in poverty, over one-half of them in dire poverty.[6] Poverty is defined as a per capita income of under $1 per day.[7] And in a world with over $1 trillion in currency and stock exchange transactions every day and where money is being made on every single one of the millions of transactions, in that same world and on every day, over 40,000 children and youth die of diseases related to bad water, poor sanitation, or malnutrition.[8] Globalization and the free market have produced a jump in wealth, but at the same time they have produced a jump in the social and economic gap.

The role of co-operatives in the face of this paradox of increasing poverty amidst excessive wealth is clear. Co-operatives have always been, and continue to be, a community developmental tool making it possible for people, even the very poorest people, to participate

4 See UNESCO, http://www.uis.unesco.org/literacy/Pages/data-release-map-2013.aspx.

5 For more on world hunger see The United Nations World Food Program: https://www.wfp.org/hunger.

6 For more information on efforts by the United Nations to eradicate poverty see, http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/poverty.shtml.

7 For more on rates of world poverty see, http://www.globalissues.org/article/26/poverty-facts-and-stats.

8 See World Health Organization – child mortality rates, http://www.who.int/pmnch/media/press_materials/fs/fs_mdg4_childmortality/en/.

directly and effectively in development. On this note, it is important to emphasize that development without direct participation of the masses of people is often development for the elite only. Co-operatives help level incomes; they counteract the kinds of economic growth in which development is only for the elites.

How are co-operatives relevant to this paradox? Co-operatives by their nature are businesses and can thus draw on all the power, the innovation, and the entrepreneurship of the free market. Co-operatives are also value-driven, principle-guided businesses, committed to the welfare of their members, be they "users" or "producers," and to the welfare of their communities. Further, we now know that if development is to be successful, it must be comprehensive and integrative. Economic growth is central to development, but it is not, in itself, development. Development must include and link together the economic, the social, and the cultural. Development must deal with social and economic empowerment of people if it is to be successful.

Co-operatives are economic institutions, yet they focus on the needs and aspirations of their members. This makes co-operatives more effective agents of comprehensive and integrative development.

Further, we have learned through bitter historical experiences on almost every continent that there is a basic link between democracy and development. Dictatorships may make some advances, but recent history teaches clearly that the tyranny of political dictatorship is linked to economic weakness, great inequality, and poor development. The political empowerment of people is a fundamental key to development. By their basic nature, co-operatives are democratic institutions and as such are promoters of democracy within their society. Co-operatives are clearly one of the relevant responses to the challenges this paradox poses, namely to improve and sustain the quality of life and human development throughout the 21st century.

Critical Issue: The Nature of Capital

A fourth issue of significance as we move into the 21st century is the nature of capital. When we speak of capital in an enterprise or a business, we usually think of two things: physical structures, such as equipment, buildings, machines, vehicles, etc., and financial resources. Both of these are vital for any enterprise; however, more and

more we are witnessing a real change in the type of capital needed for business success in today's world and a change in the way profits—or surplus—are distributed.

Yes, money and equipment are important, but increasingly, the real capital, the real resource is human capital—the *human* resource of the minds, creativity, and innovation of women and men involved with that enterprise.

One cannot over-estimate the value of human capital. The rapid pace of change in an increasingly, knowledge-based, globally-linked economy means that old, hierarchal arrangements (the old order of management, ownership, and workforce) are no longer realistic or applicable—the shift is toward human capital and the resulting innovations as the basic resource for successful economic activity.

New kinds of relationships—based on partnership rather than hierarchy, on participation and consultation rather than on giving orders, on sharing rather than on commanding—are the order of the day. Here, co-operatives are a good response to the challenges which rapidly changing, knowledge-rich, human-resource-based enterprises pose. In co-operatives the central focus is on people—they are the core-component, supported by and not dominated by financial capital and equipment. Capital is needed, equipment and buildings are important, but the heart of the matter is people. This is familiar ground to co-operatives.

It is also relevant to note that a business model intended for the maximization of profit for the benefit of individual shareholders is significantly different from a model intended to serve the needs of its members while balancing this with serving the collective good. The way that financial capital is employed within the investment-driven model contributes significantly to the phenomena of the rich getting richer while the poor get poorer. This trend feeds much of the current unrest around the world over widening income gaps within societies and across generations.

Co-operative capital is significanctly different from the capital of investor-driven enterprises. It is not listed (with very few exceptions) on the stock markets, meaning that its value is unaffected by market gossip, media hype, or spectulative pressures. It receives a known and limited return, which means that co-operatives can use their sur-

pluses for many purposes, including developing their enterprises or responding to community needs.

The decision as to how co-operative capital is employed are made through a democratic process (minimally involving the elected leadership but sometimes involving the entire membership) and are made on the basis of service to members and/or their communities. It is, in reality, a form of social capital. In many co-operatives, for example, the capital placed in a reserve fund is indivisible in the sense that it is viewed as a form of collective capital rather than as capital that can be divided for the individual use of members should a co-operative dissolve. In such circumstances, the reserve fund is intended to be used to assist in the development of the co-operative movement or to help like-minded organizations. This co-operative response goes against the trend of prioritizing private gain. It emphasizes rewarding capital fairly while also using it for common interest through organizations that demonstrably and responsibly meet the real needs of people in their communities.

Critical Issue: The Search for Ethics in Business

A last challenge we feel is important to name is an issue that has become the subject of front-page headlines in almost every country: the issue of ethics in economics. For almost two centuries, we have been taught that economics, like physics or mathematics, is a *value-free* science. We were told that ethics were for social issues, but business was, by nature, a science. Ethics were for Sundays and for the family, not for the weekdays and the market place. Yes, there was always a concern, greater or smaller, for the social responsibility dimension of business; however, that always took second place to the main concern of business, which is profit.

Today, the viewpoint that economics is value-free is challenged to its roots by the realities of such multinational companies as Enron and Vivendi and other businesses across the globe that are facing the harsh truth that they are going down the drain in economic terms. Simply put, they are failing in business terms because of their unethical behavior. We now know that ethics is not only an important issue, it can be a determinate factor in the success of an enterprise. It is now becoming clear to many that economics is not a natural science

influenced by forces beyond human control, but a social science, shaped and formulated by human beings, serving them and guided by their decisions.

Ethics are key to healthy, effective economic and business systems, and that is the heart of a co-operative's *raison d'etre*. A co-operative is a business, but it is a special kind of business. It is a business that operates within a framework of ethical values and according to a set of principles. It is a business that sees service to its members as a value, as well as a mode of operation. It is a business that is structured to provide clear accountability over how resources are used and how surpluses are divided. Co-operatives and the co-operative idea are highly relevant to this as to other challenges of the 21st century.

Realizing Potential: The Importance of Innovation, Education, and Loyalty

When we examine these key paradoxes and issues of our times it is clear that we can legitimately and realistically confirm that co-operatives can offer an effective response to addressing these challenges. If co-operatives are to address these challenges, however, then there are certain practices they must embrace to realize this potential. I will touch briefly on three of these practices: innovation, education, and loyalty.

First, innovation is key to the growth of the co-operative movement in the 21st century. If co-operatives are to realize their potential, they must be creative and innovative in a variety of ways. The past and its traditions are valuable; but, co-operatives must be innovative too, especially in terms of entering new fields of activity. We have already mentioned entry into the social services—health, welfare, and education—as good examples of new areas of expansion, but there are others areas as well. A few examples follow.

We are witness to a real explosion of growth, particularly in the U.S., of co-operatives whose members are small businesses. They are similar to the initial agricultural co-operatives that made it possible for multiple, small holder, small enterprise farmers to form market co-ops, supply co-ops, and credit co-ops. Some of these new, federated co-ops provide research and development assistance with mar-

keting and other services, which allows their members—the small co-ops—to compete more effectively in the broader market and with bigger competitors. Taking this model to another level, co-ops could also benefit from being more innovative in developing transnational, regional, and global economic ties. Two such examples of innovation in co-operative development are: Coop Norden consumer co-operative in Scandinavia and the insurance co-ops linked in the ICA's specialized insurance organization—the International Co-operative and Mutuals Insurance Federation (ICMIF).[9]

The development of "dot coop" is another important co-operative innovation. Adoption of a co-operative trademark could contribute greatly to promoting co-operatives. More innovation must follow. If co-ops want to utilize the potential that new technologies open up for them, they must develop new kinds of co-operative structures appropriate for their area of business. Employees working together to co-operatively take over a business when government or the private sector steps back could be another emerging approach to explore.

The second area to focus on in realizing the co-operative potential for growth in the 21st century is that of education. Education and Human Resource Development (HRD) must become much more central to co-operative activities than is the case today. We must train our elected co-operative leaders if they are to make wise decisions in the face of rapid change, fierce competition, and the existence of a wide range of possibilities for expanded co-operative development. If we are to realize our potential, we must decide that our guiding principle here will be: the higher the office and greater the level of leadership, the more training and education will be given. Similarly, our managers and executives must not only have more training in economics and management but also specifically in co-operative management, in co-operative philosophy, co-operative principles, and approaches. This training is necessary if we are to avoid the dangers of being effective businesses but failing at being effective co-operatives. If we lose our focus on co-operative education, we lose not only our business advantages as co-operatives but also our ability to realize the potentials discussed here. Moreover, we must educate our

9 For more on the International Co-operative and Mutual Insurance Federation, see, https://www.icmif.org/.

members and inform them so that they can truly and effectively take part in making their co-operatives the member-centered institutions they can and should be. We must innovate and we must educate!

Third, to succeed we must also remain loyal to the co-operative vision and purpose. We must be loyal to our own true self, to the co-operative values and principles, the co-operative commitment to members, and the co-operative involvement in community. For example, in dealing with governments, co-operatives must say: *Give us full autonomy to make our own decisions and to serve our members. Give us a chance to be true to our co-operative self, and we will, in this independent way, make the maximum contribution to our communities and our society*. In this sense, the more we are true to ourselves, the more we can realize our potential as a fundamental part of society's response to the challenges of the 21st century.

Finally, let us be loyal to ourselves in the sense by which we are, in some ways, our own paradox. We are, on the one hand, pragmatic realists, rooted in the reality of business and enterprise; on the other hand, we are visionaries, guided by a belief about the way society ought to be, could be, and should be. We see how we can work toward positive change through our co-operatives. Vision is a true life-necessity, one too often lacking in our world today.

If we wish to realize our 21st century potential, let us be loyal to our paradoxical co-operative nature. Let us keep our feet firmly on the pragmatic ground while continuing to fix our eyes on the stars of a social and human vision of a more peaceful world.

Section III

WHAT THE PAST SUGGESTS

Ian MacPherson

As Old as Humanity

The cooperative impulse is as old as humankind.[1] The search for peace stretches back to the misty times of early human experience. We should not think that the paradoxes and issues discussed in the previous chapter raise entirely new questions. Nor should we think that we can find no value in understanding what people in the past have thought about peace and social inclusion, however differently they might have expressed their views, however different their context might have been.

Many studies in metahistory (the study of the grand vistas of human history), social biology, archaeology, anthropology, behavioural psychology, and sociology have demonstrated the underlying importance of cooperative strategies and techniques in the development of

1 In this chapter in particular, the reader may wonder about the spelling of the words cooperative and co-operative. Cooperative (un-hyphened) is used when reference is to the behaviour of a social actor; co-operative (hyphenated) is used to refer to a social enterprise that is jointly owned and run by its members as defined by the International Co-operative Alliance (See: http://ica.coop/en/whats-co-op/co-operative-identity-values-principles).

human society.[2] Some studies even argue that over the broad sweep of human history and despite the carnage of the twentieth century, human beings have steadily become more collaborative and cooperative, or at least have become less frequently embroiled in violence on individual and collective levels.[3]

Such emphasis on the cooperative dimensions of human life forms a counterpoise to the emphasis on competition that has become popular in much of the world over the last 150 years. The notion of cooperation is in striking contrast to the usual idea of the *survival of the fittest* as advocated by Herbert Spencer, and others, in the nineteenth century.[4] Cooperative dimensions of human life challenge the Social Darwinist perspectives that became common in the early twentieth century. Theories of cooperation also question the current self-indulgent views of the power of individual self-interest to shape a better world for everyone, or at least for so called *deserving people*.

This also does not mean that one should migrate unthinkingly to the other end of the spectrum and deny the importance of competition among human beings. It does, however, mean searching for a more reasonable balance between humankind's competitive and cooperative instincts. It does mean recognizing the complexities and varieties of human motivation and instinctive behaviour. It means understanding that there is a need for a kind of cooperative individualism as people engage with others within communities. It means considering the cooperative option more seriously, especially in light of the central paradoxes and issues discussed earlier.

2 For example see Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1973); A. Allan Scmid, *Conflict and Co-operation: Institutional and Behavioral Economics* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004); and Stephen Pinker, *The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence has Declined* (New York: Penguin Books, 2011) all of which present perspectives in which it is interesting and instructive to reflect on humankind's collaborative, communitarian, and co-operative dimensions.

3 See Steven Pinker, *The Better Angels of our Nature: Why Violence has Declined* (New York: Penguin Books, 2011) for a discussion of how violence in its various forms has actually declined over the long stretches of history.

4 Briefly within co-operative circles, there was some sentiment for trying to blend co-operative progress with the ideas of Spencer. The idea was that the "fittest" would mean those people who learned most thoroughly the benefits of cooperating together. It was a striking contrast to the way in which Spencer's ideas were commonly understood and applied.

Back to the Past

While the most common discourses have been preoccupied with accounts of imperialism and competition, struggles for dominance and control, wars and conquests, these discourses are not the entire story that should be told and may not even be the central plot.

Looking back we see that even during the first millennia of human existence, human beings used collaborative and cooperative practices as well as heroic individualism to achieve dominance over bigger, faster, and stronger animals. As human beings developed skills and knowledge, they collaborated to help overcome natural adversities caused by climate, natural enemies, and physical geography. Collaboration made it possible for human beings to engage in early agriculture and to build small communities. Over time, as human settlements progressed, working together facilitated the construction of roads, the drainage of land and, eventually, the processing of food through mills and common pastures. Cooperation made possible increasingly more complex agricultural practices, the construction of urban places, and the creation of trade networks, sometimes, as in Latin America, China, and Italy, beginning millennia ago. In more recent times, as the European diaspora occurred, settlers applied the community-based approaches they already knew to the opening of new lands, while Indigenous peoples used their own forms of collaboration to resist them. One can argue that cooperative relationships in building communities, advancing trade relations, the development of manufacturing, and bridging historic differences made possible early globalization of economic and social relationships.

History also provides many examples where people were forced to work together by local leaders, such as lords of the manor in medieval times, or compulsory compliance with military service as required by some levels of government over the ages. While hardly the most desirable form of cooperation, such "directed" cooperation can sometimes work—at least for a while. They should not be entirely discounted as cooperative endeavours, even if their record of accomplishment has been mixed.

The reasons for people working together cooperatively are diverse and complex. Developing collaborative and more formal coopera-

tive relationships has never been easy in the past. It is not easy in the present. It is not likely to be any easier in the future. People did not necessarily come together for romantic, idealistic reasons as early anthropologists and others liked to theorize; for example, the eighteenth century observer Jean-Jacques Rousseau characterized the "natural man."[5] The adoption of cooperative approaches typically emerged from less altruistic understandings. People commonly embraced cooperative endeavours because of economic crises and the struggles fostered by competition, both within specific communities and across communities. Sometimes people could see how collaboration and cooperation could offer savings in what they bought or greater efficiencies in what they produced and sold. Sometimes, it was because they could not see any other, easier options by which their goals could be achieved—and in many instances, perhaps, there were no other solutions.

People usually had to learn how to cooperate, particularly if it was on any significant scale extending beyond family or kin groups. Thus, in the European Middle Ages, when guilds showed craftspeople and others how to work together, they insisted on long and hard apprenticeships, and not just because the physical skills could be challenging or difficult to learn. There was also a need for a socialisation period steeped in cooperation.

Developing cooperative approaches has been strongly tied to other kinds of educational activity, both formal and informal, as a way to promote and encourage collaborative and democratic approaches. This association with education was particularly strong in the development of the formal, institutionalized co-operative movement.

Locating Co-operatives

As the preceding illustrates cooperation has deep roots in our human story. Cooperation also takes many forms. The Canadian sociologist Jack Craig found it useful to divide cooperative activities into five types, a typology that helps provide a way of grasping the totality

5 For more on Rousseau's theories see, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jean-Jacques_Rousseau.

of what we refer to here as Co-operation.[6] Craig's list includes the following:

- *Traditional* –forms of cooperative activities people regularly undertake, often on a cyclical basis, such as when Indigenous people collaborated to hunt and fish, or when rural people helped each other during the planting and harvesting of crops,
- *Spontaneous* –forms of cooperative activities people engage in when they spontaneously decide to undertake joint activities for reciprocal and mutual benefit; for example, to collectively purchase a service, food, or supplies together,
- *Automatic* –forms of cooperative behaviour people engage in instinctively, such as helping people in need on the street or assisting seniors—or the kind of cooperation often derived from religious teachings or philosophical belief,
- *Directed* –forms of cooperation required by the state or some other formal authority with which the individual is expected to comply, such as, organized sports or military operations,
- *Contractual* –forms of cooperative behaviour adopted in democratic organizations such as co-operatives registered with governments and subject to government regulations—formal co-operatives that have been widely established for very many purposes.

The relationships among these forms of Co-operation raise a number of interesting and important issues. They suggest how pervasive and common are cooperative traditions, practices, and strategies, and how embedded they can be in different cultures and circumstances. Many of the most effective co-operatives—notably in rural regions or strongly bonded urban neighbourhoods, and among ethnic and religious groups—have their roots in these diverse forms of cooperative activity.

It is interesting to examine how various forms of Co-operation relate to the development of "contractual co-operatives." The distinctions are not as sharp as it might at first appear. Given the diverse, complex and improvised co-operative heritage, researchers have

6 See Jack Craig, The Nature of Cooperation (New York, Black Rose Books, 1993); and Terry MacDonald, Greg Wallace, and Ian MacPherson, *Co-operative Enterprise: Building a Better World* (First Edition Design Publication, 2013), p. 7.

traced the origins of formalized, or contractual co-operatives to various times and places. Some researchers have viewed co-operatives, for example, as natural inheritors of collaborative cultures that arose through the hunting and fishing activities of Indigenous peoples, the historical traditions of Germanic tribes, the emergence of the monasteries, the development of guilds in the late European Middle Ages, or the creation of mutual insurance schemes in the European Renaissance. Other observers have focussed on the association between the roots of contractual co-operation and the mutualistic/reciprocal traditions of many forms of agriculture, such as rice cultivation in Asia, corn production in the Americas, or grain harvesting in the feudal economies of Europe.

Many observers have linked the roots of formal co-operation to the rise of class-consciousness during the Industrial Revolution and the rapid urbanisation that accompanied it. Here we see another side of cooperation revealed as, with some justification, co-operatives can be seen as "weapons" in class warfare, one of the ways in which the weak mobilized against the strong.

The search for co-operative institutional forms for economic activities has been a complicated process, one that has taken centuries to reach its current stage of development—one that is in fact still a work in progress. It is easy to see how people have built on cultures of collaboration, such as "traditional" or "spontaneous" cooperation to create credit unions, mutual benefit organizations, and marketing activities. To a lesser extent, state programmes have also encouraged co-operatives, for example, by creating compulsory marketing and credit organizations.

The roots of the modern day co-operative movement date back to the late 1700s and reflect all the forms of Co-operation discussed here. Co-operatives therefore must be seen as part of multi-faceted efforts to develop and sustain a range of organisations that could effectively provide goods and services in the market place; organisations that differed from the corporate model because of their distinct underlying purpose, ownership structures, governance relationships, internal business practices, and in how surpluses were distributed.

Co-operation and Peace

Co-operation has always been evident in communities, regions, and countries torn, or threatened by civil strife and disasters; indeed, examples of spontaneous cooperation and mutual support amid times of turmoil are among the most heroic stories in human history. They include such acts of kindness as assistance extended by some victims to fellow sufferers during the Holocaust; ways in which refugees band together to provide mutual support for each other; instinctive collaboration among people whose communities are being bombed or who are otherwise under attack; and ways in which people cope in times of natural disasters. People under severe pressure can often more readily appreciate the value in what they can accomplish together. They utilize whatever cooperative practices they have inherited or have the vision and understanding to improvise.

In considering the impact of Co-operation upon peace making processes, contractual co-operatives are particularly important. They can help foster traditional, spontaneous, and automatic cooperation. For example, they can encourage people within communities to utilize co-operative strategies to meet a wide range of their social and economic needs. They can influence how governments develop policies to assist their citizens in meeting their social and economic needs through community-based efforts. They can support the development of different kinds of co-operatives, as in fact they should do, if they are to honour the principle of "co-operation among co-operatives." They can help train leaders to provide leadership not only for their specific co-operatives but also for their communities and for other co-operatives. They can encourage people who work for them to contribute to their communities in varying ways. In short, they can be agents of economic change, social cohesion, community mobilization, and empowerment.

The fact that co-operatives can have deeply imbedded roots in cultural relationships and social networks is also important. Such connections can contribute significantly to the effectiveness and permanence of co-operative organisations. They can help build the kinds of relationships that bring stability through providing networks of understanding based on family and culture. These types of connections

foster greater social cohesion within communities that co-operatives serve.

When we look at the historical record, we see that working co-operatively is both a learned behaviour as well as an inherited human trait. It does not happen easily or without significant effort. Learning how to work together for mutual and reciprocal purposes is an important aspect of the human experience, indeed, a story as old as humankind. Co-operation can be viewed as a counterpoise to competition, but it should also be recognized as both a creative and innovative force, one that needs to be better understood, more readily acknowledged, and more carefully nurtured. Co-operation is perhaps ultimately the only effective antidote to the extreme competition that can threaten the very existence of human beings. Encouraging it should be one of the most logical ways to help ensure a more peaceful world.

Ian MacPherson

Co-operation and Peace before 1895

Although cooperative strategies have been evident in human history since its beginnings, Co-operation as a distinct force, as a philosophy, as a movement, perhaps more accurately as a series of movements, and as a specific set of institutions did not become prominent until the early nineteenth century, though a few co-operatives did appear in the late eighteenth century.[1]

People started to create formal co-operative organisations in the early 1800s largely through the pooling of financial and human resources. They were interested in providing themselves with more reliable, cheaper food and with producing larger, more dependable crops for the developing market place. People wanted to carve out more important roles for labour, and they saw the benefit with developing credit and savings facilities for "ordinary" people. By the late nineteenth century, the numbers and kinds of co-operatives had increased remarkably, if unevenly, in a number of European countries.

1 For example, in Scotland. See William Lawson, *People and Places: A Short History of the Scottish Wholesale Society Limited in Centenary Year 1968* (Glasgow, S.C.W.S. Printing Department, 1968).

In the process they often demonstrated a significant interest in peace issues, as they were understood at the time.

Collaboration for Mutual Benefit: Early Co-operative Thinkers

One of the key early co-operative thinkers was Robert Owen (1771-1858). Owen can be seen as an important transitional figure between the common embrace of cooperation in eighteenth century thought and the rapid growth of co-operatives during the nineteenth century. Owen matured during the French Revolution and lived through the Napoleonic Wars. He knew the human and economic costs of those conflicts, and he was repelled by wars, believing them to be a denial of how *Reason* should direct the affairs of humankind. Even though his mills prospered from the demands for cloth that the wars produced, he was shocked by the impact of war.

Ironically, Owen also developed an appreciation for how governments and society in general had come together to wage war. He saw the development of massive military and political power, all accumulated essentially for destructive purposes. He mused on what the possibilities would be if that same sense of purpose and organisational skill could be marshalled for peaceful pursuits for the general good. He wrote:

> *Union and cooperation in war obviously increase the power of the individual a thousand fold. Is there the shadow of a reason why they should not produce equal effects in peace; why the principle of cooperation should not give to men the same superior powers, and advantages, (and much greater) in the creation, preservation, distribution and enjoyment of wealth?*[2]

It was an idea, of course, that would appeal in many circles then and afterward, but it had particular resonance among co-operators because in a fundamental way their movement was primarily concerned with reshaping how human resources were applied and how surpluses from their efforts could be identified and used. The starting point for much co-operative activity was the recognition of the cost of the poverty and ignorance characterizing much of Europe and fo-

2 Owen - No reference available.

menting social discord and violence. The most obvious examples of deepening and unnecessary poverty could be found in the emerging industrial towns and cities. Much of Owen's work was directed at alleviating that poverty, as was that of several co-operative movements that emerged, in particular those to be found in the United Kingdom and France.

For Owen and many co-operative leaders who followed him in the United Kingdom (such as the Rochdale Pioneers, George Holyoake, Margaret Llewelyn Davies, E.O Greening, and Beatrice Webb), the underlying causes of the turmoil, anger, and tensions of the modern era, and of war itself, was how the industrial system was undermining the bonds of community and distorting human relationships. This idea was captured in the hymn *Community*, commonly sung at Owenite gatherings in the 1830s and 1840s:

O happy time, when all mankind
Shall competition's evil see;
And seek with one mind
The blessings of community

When social love's benignant flow
Shall peace on earth, goodwill restore;
And Charity, like ocean's flow,
Connect and compass every shore.

Then will the claims of wealth and state;
This goodly world no more deface;
Then war and rapine, strife and hate.
Among mankind will have no place.

Then will mankind, in common share
The gifts their industry supplies
And prove, escaped from selfish care
The joys of heaven beneath the skies.[3]

3 For more on Owen's life and work see, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_Owen.

For Owen and many who followed him, the great human error associated with industrialism was the elevation of individual interest to a level where it overwhelmed and undermined the common interest. As Owen himself wrote:

> *From [the] principle of individual interest have arisen all the divisions of mankind, the endless errors and mischief of class, sect, party, and of national antipathies, creating the angry and malevolent passions, and all the crimes and misery with which the human race has been hitherto afflicted.*[4]

While one might argue that this perspective was somewhat simplistic, it was no more simplistic than the contrary idea: that the key to a better world could be found through individuals pursuing their own interests irrespective of the common good. Moreover, the idea pushed by Owen was a powerful one within the co-operative traditions that emerged as the nineteenth century wore on. The beginnings of the belief that people had to transcend their individual selfish goals and to learn to co-operate—to exercise their associative intelligence and to create peaceful societies—was one of the motivating forces for various co-operative educational activities within co-operative organisations.

Co-operation and mutual-aid were also the seminal idea behind much of the intentional community movement as it emerged throughout the nineteenth and twentieth century. Within that movement particularly, the idea of developing peaceful communities as sanctuaries from the violence of the outside world, was replicated many hundreds of times throughout the North Atlantic world in the twentieth century and beyond. Many of those communities, like the ones Owen himself helped develop, tried to balance the claims of work with the pleasures of books and dance, music and learning. Such pleasures were not diversions; they were affirmations that there was more to life than the pursuit of personal wealth.

Most directly, Owen was the inspirational force behind the development of New Lanark near Glasgow, a remarkable, if flawed, attempt to develop a socially responsible, enlightened community. It became a model for many intentional communities founded in the nineteenth century. New Lanark featured: a strong educational

4 Robert Owen, *Report to the County of Lanark*, 1820.

programme from early childhood through adulthood; a store whose profits were used for social benefits; housing that, given the standards of the times, was attractive and healthy for workers and their families; and, over-all, an aesthetically-pleasing environment. Following the development of New Lanark, Owen devoted much of his life and fortune to four great projects: the development of intentional communities along the lines of New Lanark, the promotion of trades unions as one way to achieve greater equity in economic relationships, the creation of consumer co-operative societies to ensure high quality food at fair prices, and the development of the Association of all Classes of all Nations, his most specific contribution to fostering peace.

The Association of All Classes had a brief life (1835-39) and directly affected only a small number of people, largely through its weekly journal The *New Moral World*. It nevertheless provided a powerful vision of a more peaceful world that has had some continuing impact. It can be seen as the first attempt at creating an international co-operative organisation, one that, rather idealistically, called for the "fundamental transformation of society, characterized by common property and the elimination of competition between individuals."[5] In promoting the Association, Owen argued that the "progress of knowledge" meant that "mankind" had reached:

> *…a position in which the well-disposed, intelligent members of society may say, war and bloodshed and violence shall henceforth cease; peace and good-will, charity, reason, and kindness, shall in future direct the conduct of men; the animal propensities shall no longer govern human affairs; but, instead thereof, the moral and intellectual powers and faculties shall rule the destinies of the entire population of the world.*[6]

One can see in all of these strands of Owen's work some of the key ways in which co-operators have contributed to a more peaceful world: the alleviation of the lot of impoverished humankind, the enrichment of communities, the quest for greater fairness in economic

5 W.P. Watkins, *The International Co-operative Alliance,* 1895-1970 (London: The International Co-operative Alliance, 1970), pp.3-5.

6 Gregory Claeys, *Owenite Socialism: Pamphlets and Correspondence, 1832-1837* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2005), p.423.

activities, the encouragement of the intelligent and fair consumption of necessities, and the search for appropriate ways to think cooperatively on a global scale. It was not so much a direct, concerted approach to deal with specific divisive situations as it was a gradual, focussed effort to create environments in which peaceful pursuits of the common good could flourish.

Much of Owen's life was devoted, with limited success, to the development of more satisfying communities, ones that he hoped would help create more equitable and fulfilling places of residence and work. After having attracted widespread interest for his contributions to New Lanark, he helped start several communities in the United Kingdom and the United States. They were all committed to providing the spatial, educational, and social relationships that could ensure greater harmony among peoples, many of whom were escaping from the accumulating social and economic pressures of the times. This emphasis on developing more peaceful communities was why he and his followers chose names like "Harmony" and "New Harmony" for their communities.

Owen was far from the only voice arguing that a "new moral order" was needed to address the great issues created by industrialism. In France, in the first half of the nineteenth century, for example, there were three other thinkers with important perspectives on how a more just, peaceful, and moral world could be developed out of the social and economic turmoil of the time.

Charles Fourier (1772-1837) was one such individual. Fourier was a somewhat erratic but very influential thinker on the nature of peaceful communities. Like Owen, Fourier vigorously attacked the social alienation associated with the emergence of industrialism. He proposed the formation of communities, which he called *phalanxes*. Like New Harmony and other Owenite communities, they were to be communities of limited size (to be precise: 1,620 people[7]). They would be made up of people possessing gradations of wealth and they would welcome a rich mixture of personality types. Fourier developed an elaborate system for the populating of phalanxes so as to ensure compatibility among its residents and to allow them to achieve what he called *unityism*, or the capacity to reconcile one's

7 See, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles_Fourier.

own happiness with the happiness of the group. He wanted the residents to be both the owners of the phalanx and wage earners within it, thereby reducing (so he believed) the accumulating tensions between bosses and workers in the emerging market place. The people undertaking the least desirable jobs would be paid the most, and they would have the best housing. People would live in grand hotels called *phalanstères*. Women would enjoy full rights, for, as he wrote, the "extension of women's rights is the basic principle of all social progress."[8] Relationships among people would be facilitated by the free exercise of *passions*, including sexual passion. All would speak a common tongue, a Harmonian language. For Fourier, peace and rich communal life came from small concentrations of people living *close to the land* and organized so as to respect, and benefit from, each other's differences. In such communities, many of the causes of social unrest and tensions would be reduced. Social peace would reign.

The direct, personal efforts Owen and Fourier made in helping develop intentional communities generally produced disappointing results. Most of the communities with which they were directly involved failed within a few years. Their writings and examples, however, sparked numerous community experiments throughout much of the world in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, from kibbutzim to communes, and from eco-farms to student housing co-ops. The two men, stand at the beginning of substantial intentional community movements which now includes thousands of such communities around the world. Today there are over 1500 intentional communities in the United States alone.[9] Many of those communities have had, and still have, a particular concern for peace according to their own vision, many of them aspiring to be "islands of harmony,"[10] and catalysts for the achievement of social peace.

8 Some scholars credit Fourier with coining the word "feminism." See Leslie F. Goldstein "Early Feminist Themes in French Utopian Socialism: The St. Simonians and Fourier," *Journal of the History of Ideas,* 1982, Vol.43, No. 1, p.92.

9 See Fellowship of Intentional Communities: http://www.ic.org/directory/intentional-communities-by-country/.

10 For example, the Canadian experience is suggested by the website: www.PlanetFriendly.net and the international experiments by the Intentional Communities website: http://directory.ic.org/. There are thousands of such communities all over the world. One can readily find discussions of how Owen and Fourier influenced the development of many of these communities, even after the passage of some 170 years. It is also easy to find a strong

It can also be argued that the writings of Owen and Fourier influenced the development of co-operative housing projects as they started to emerge over the decades in cities as diverse as Edinburgh, New York, Buenos Aires, Toronto, Berlin, and Seoul. More generally, they also influenced efforts to build better communities in the twentieth century through the "City Beautiful" movement.[11] If one believes that peace ultimately begins in communities, then Owen's and Fourier's ideas and their impact can be seen as sincere efforts to foster social peace.

Auguste Comte (1798-1857) was another major thinker who significantly influenced the French and international co-operative traditions. In 1822, he published *Plan de travaux scientifiques nécessaires pour réorganiser la société* (The *Plan of scientific studies necessary for the reorganization of society*). In it, and in subsequent writings, he provided models for enquiry and organisational development that co-operative thinkers for decades would attempt to follow in addressing social and economic issues in a systematic manner. These were models that would encourage the use of science, especially social science. It was not a big step to move from his approach to "come, let us reason together," arguably, the primary guideline for co-operative development. In a more general sense, Comte provided the co-operative movement with the idea that careful analysis steeped in altruism–or the obligation to serve others by placing their interests above one's own–would ensure a more peaceful world. His ideas profoundly, if subtly, influenced some of the most important thinkers in France and elsewhere for decades after his death, including many within co-operative traditions.

The fourth major figure usually associated with Co-operation's early history was Claude Henri de Rouvroy, compte de Saint-Simon (1760-1825). His approach differed from Owen and Fourier in that he was less concerned with communities and more concerned with how the larger society could be more effectively and ethically orga-

commitment to peace in many of these communities, a significant number of which were developed by people fleeing from wars or the possibility of wars (e.g., the communes of the 1960s in North America). For example see the story of Delta Co-op in Argenta, British Columbia: https://www.uvic.ca/research/centres/cccbe/resources/galleria/stories/DeltaCooperative.php.

11 See City Beautiful Movement: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/City_Beautiful_movement.

nized. He believed that Europe in particular was in a state of crisis, moral as well as social, political, and economic. He envisioned a reconstruction of society led by a meritocracy made up of scientists and industrial leaders, whom he assumed would rise above selfish preoccupations and provide direction in keeping with the general interest. It was a kind of analysis that was similar to that found in many co-operative circles during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Saint-Simon believed that the aim of society in general was to work for the social and economic improvement of the poorest classes. He believed that if people embraced the great social *principle of association*, in contrast to the *principle of antagonism*, they could build a better society, where the benefits would flow outward from families to communities and from nations to the world. He was among the first to envision a united Europe, seeing it as a natural progression through the creation of new scientific truths, including those derived from the development of the scientific examination of politics–the domain of political economy. These ideas particularly influenced the development of the French co-operative movement, notably because of his emphasis on the power of "associationisme,"[12] and his quest for a moral basis for the emergence of a *new* European society, one befitting the capacities and promise of the new age that was dawning.

Along with Owen, Henri Saint Simon can also be seen at the forefront of the careful analysis of macro-scale social and economic trends; indeed, they are considered the "fathers" of social science in their respective countries, including the analysis of what contributes to human betterment and development. They were not only concerned with understanding the main trends of the time but also with identifying the kinds of institutional development that could best meet contemporary human needs, and the best ways to link ethical concerns with economic development. They were both searching for ways in which the crisis of contemporary European society (class competition, warfare, and personal anomie) could be resolved. They were attempting the difficult task of thinking internationally,

12 For a discussion on the impact of *associationism* see Bernard H. Moss, "The Origins of the French Labor Movement 1830-1914," in *The Socialism of Skilled Workers* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1976).

of understanding how the local reflected the global, and vice versa. Their quests for appropriate institutions and their international orientation became fundamental to co-operative thought, ultimately inevitable to co-operative action, and central to the contributions Co-operation has made in creating a more peaceful world.

The popularized ideas of these four men—Owen, Fourier, Comte, and Saint-Simon—found their way in varying degrees, to the streets of France, beginning most obviously in 1830, when the riots of those years prompted the growing working class to take direct action. The aftermath of the Napoleonic wars, and the dislocation being felt as industrialism became common, led many leaders of the working class to consider how work could best be organized so as to ensure family stability and community peace. These considerations ultimately led workers to form workshops in 1848, when revolution broke out in several French cities and in other cities across Europe. It was the beginning of the worker co-operative movement. One of the movement's chief goals was to integrate the workplace into family and community life. Another goal was to counteract the growing class divisions that were undermining the social peace of so many European towns and cities.

The culmination of this development was the Paris commune, which formed amid the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71. While this might be seen as a desperate step used by the working classes in an essentially violent confrontation, it must also be seen as a visionary attempt to form an economically and socially transformed society based on co-operatively inspired neighbourhoods and communities, the harbinger of a new age as dreamed of by Owen, Fourier, and Saint-Simon.

The role of these communitarian activities has tended to be underestimated within the co-operative world largely because of the way in which most of the institutions of Co-operation have tended to become fragmented by economic activity, government regulation, institutional interests, and national or ethnic loyalties. Moreover, the impact of the intentional community movement was weakened by the fractured and often isolated ways in which many of them developed, such as a tendency among many of them to become self-absorbed with their own issues. However, their experiences were

important in raising issues within all the main co-operative movements–consumer, worker, agricultural, fishing, and financial. They reinforced the emphasis on *community* that was to be one of the hallmarks of co-operative activism from the movement's earliest years.

This communitarian dimension becomes important in considering how co-operatives contribute to encouraging a more peace world. It is through working within communities—as defined by geography, interests, and associations—that co-operatives can most effectively help people transcend their differences, intentionally and unintentionally. It is through their communitarian emphases that co-operatives and the co-operative movement can make some of their most important contributions to the development of more peaceful societies.

The Search for Social Peace

The work of Owen and Saint Simon contributed directly to the development of two of the major co-operative movements of the nineteenth century: consumer and worker co-operatives, both of which must be understood within a context of social ferment, class warfare, and political struggles. The leaders of those movements lived within societies that were struggling to maintain or to foster social peace; that is, in the traditions associated with Owen and Fourier, they were coping with struggles among classes, the violence triggered by abject poverty, and the tensions associated with the emergence of increasingly intolerant ideological positions. Moreover, they tended to argue, as did many within the international movement as the nineteenth century came to an end, that the sources of many wars lay within economic and social differences. National governments fought wars because of the stresses caused by their internal social turmoil and in response to pressures from the captains of industry, even if they cloaked it in messages about the honour of the fatherland or the pursuit of some higher ideal.

The consumer movement emerged first in the United Kingdom as a consequence of the social and economic unrest in the years after the Napoleonic Wars. This was the time associated with the Battle of Peterloo and other instances of civil unrest, including the challenges of Chartism and the numerous public outbursts calling for political

reform. By the 1840s, the resultant tensions were straining the bonds of *peace and good order*. It was in that context that the consumer co-operative movement, after years of experimentation, found its most prominent formula for success in the model developed by the Equitable Pioneers in Rochdale, England, starting in 1844.

Reflecting much of what would characterize a successful co-operative endeavour, the Rochdale model was built on significant member involvement, as well as good business practice, notably the management of credit and the emphasis on reliable, high quality goods and services. It aspired to inclusivity and was one of the first movements to recognize the equality of women. In fact, it tried to reach out across religious, political, and social boundaries as well as gender divides, though for several decades it was not able to always do so consistently or without controversy.

One of the issues that created problems for openness was whether or not the consumer movement was essentially a working class movement. The association with the working class emerged early, naturally enough given the movement's Owenite origins and the acute consumption problems confronting the working class. Of all the groups or classes the movement could readily serve, it was the urban working class that could most obviously benefit. The idea that co-operatives were the special weapon of the working class gathered support as the decades went by in the nineteenth century. It was strongly advocated by such luminaries as George Holyoake, J.T.W. Mitchell, and Beatrice Webb (nee Potter). As the nineteenth century carried on and the twentieth century dawned, working class groups in other lands would also embrace the concept.

In the long run, the movement did embrace open membership, including those from other classes, as long as they accepted that the distribution of surpluses would be primarily based on participation rather than invested capital. Extending membership to other classes was regretted by some people who had strong working class sympathies, but, arguably, it was a direction that was implicit in the movement's underlying philosophy. It was, nevertheless, a difficult issue that raised the question of the movement's universality, not an unimportant dimension of its capacity to create a more peaceful world. In the end, the basis of the movement was human beings as persons, not

their identification through class affiliation or because of the wealth they could bring to the enterprise.

Ultimately, therefore, the Rochdale model took a *broad church* approach that would help form the basis—given the important role that consumer co-operatives would ultimately play in international circles—of one of the movement's claims as a contributor to social peace. The consumer movement was remarkably practical. It preached a kind of devotion to the "task at hand" the procurement of good food and good services at reasonable prices, provided by people receiving fair compensation. Such commitments also help explain why the model brought together an extensive group of associated enterprises: factories, farms, warehouses, and shipping centers. By 1900, the group of enterprises the consumer movement fostered were providing a quarter of the British population with their consumer goods. It was a model that would be adapted in many forms in other countries.

In France the workers' movement grew somewhat fitfully but by 1884 became large enough to form a national organisation. One of the movement's most celebrated efforts, an iron foundry owned by Jean Baptiste André in Guise, provided a model for how workers could assume responsibility for their workplace, while the residence associated with it, the *familstère*, became an important effort to organize a *phalanstère*, as envisioned by Fourier. It became a well-celebrated link between work and community, a flowering of the Fourier tradition. The dreams of the worker movements of 1848 and 1870 were kept alive.

At the same time the French consumer movement grew significantly, largely within working class communities, and it too formed a national association in the 1880s.[13] A few of the consumer movement's most earnest and best-known supporters organized what became the School of Nîmes in southern France. It included a number of individuals who would become strong advocates of the co-operative movement as a way to strengthen social peace and in time peace among nations as well. Among them were Édouard de Boyve and

13 Johnston Birchall, *The International Co-operative Movement* (Manchester: Manchester United Press, 1997), p.38.

Charles Gide, two men noted for their commitment to Co-operation as a social force that had the capacity to create a more peaceful world.

As the nineteenth century wore on, many leaders within the French and, to a lesser extent, the British movement became supporters of worker co-partnerships, forms of enterprise in which workers shared in profits and could have a greater influence in management of the company. This approach to worker empowerment shared many of the objectives and values of worker co-operatives, and the ties among advocates of the two approaches became close, particularly in France. There were also some leaders within the consumer movement in both France and the United Kingdom who favoured the development of worker co-partnerships within consumer co-operatives as a way of honouring labour and of contributing to social peace. That idea; however, was not universally welcomed.

It can also be argued that the co-operative banking and agricultural movements emerged in part because of social animosities and class differences amid deepening economic tensions. The early development of the banking movement took place during the 1850s in what would become part of Germany when it was created in 1871. The early co-op banks developed because of the widespread economic, social, and political problems in the 1840s that culminated in the Revolutions of 1848. The two great German protagonists of co-operative credit, Friedrich Raiffeisen and Hermann Schultze-Delitzsch, were responding to the economic problems they saw around them and the social discord this created. Like many co-operative banking advocates who followed them in other countries–such as Luigi Luzzatti in Italy, Edward Filene in the United States, Alphonse Desjardins and Moses Coady in Canada–they believed responsive and responsible banking organisations could provide the economic stability that would lessen the chances of civil strife. For all of them the essence of economic stability and social peace rested in communities, in the fair development of economic opportunities, and in creating deeper bonds among people pursuing common goals regardless of past differences.

Similar attitudes were reflected in co-operatives serving rural populations in the way they developed in several European countries, beginning most notably with Denmark in the last half of the nine-

teenth century. Rural co-operatives were devoted primarily to securing farming supplies at fair cost and to selling produce at appropriate prices within the developing market systems. Co-operatives reflected the concerns of their members around the pressures on women and youth, and the community in general as rural economies and social conditions changed. Many of the agricultural co-operatives that developed as part of the European settlement process in the Americas and Africa became particularly involved in community issues. In many instances co-operators successfully bridged ethnic, religious, and social differences. This was not so much directly, but rather through the ways in which co-operatives could unite economically as commodity producers from diverse backgrounds and make their views known to governments. Many co-operatives were built on rural traditions of neighbourliness and mutual help at planting and harvesting time, as well as during periods of adversity, aspects of what can be called—with respect, not disdain—the "rural myth."[14] Many co-operatives were responding to the problems associated with rural out-migration as young people, in particular, left for the possibilities offered by growing cities or opening regions in other parts of the world. As the years went by, many rural co-operatives also demonstrated a capacity to join forces in order to meet a wide range of needs—for consumer goods and health services, for the procurement of better livestock and equipment, and for the social needs of women and children—all important dimensions of stable and peaceful rural regions.

It can be concluded, therefore, that co-operatives and co-operative movements emerged during the nineteenth century within the context of wars or the threats of wars. Co-operatives manifested a desire for fostering peace, as in the absence of war, but more commonly, they were preoccupied by threats to social and communal peace—the effects of continuing and deepening social and workplace disruptions within communities. Co-operatives tried to address the challenges of their times by designing alternative ways to develop economies through democratic processes, systems of clear accountability, community responsibility, the mobilisation of community resources, and the rewards of engagement, not just investment. Co-

14 See Populist Moment: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Populism.

operatives reflected a widespread desire to develop economic organizations that would contribute to social harmony through better communities. That quest was a fundamentally important dimension of the international co-operative movement as it grew during the nineteenth century.

Structural Propensities for Encouraging Peace

The forgoing highlights how the theme of peace can be seen in the thinking of some of the key intellectuals who helped shape Co-operation and co-operative movements in the nineteenth century. It also describes some of the concrete ways in which co-operatives of various types encouraged the practices of peace, mostly by addressing issues undermining social cohesion. We can see through this discussion that the co-operative contributions to peace are not just concerned with ideas and attitudes, they are also a matter of structures that by their very nature contribute to the encouragement of peace.

On a local level co-operatives are community-based institutions that, by their principles, offer open memberships to people able to use their services.[15] That means they are inclusive and can often bring together individuals who otherwise rarely associate with each other, even people who may otherwise be strongly antagonistic because of economic, historical, religious, or cultural reasons. As case studies presented in the latter part of this book will demonstrate, this pragmatic collaborative approach for mutual benefit is arguably a major way in which co-operatives contribute to peace and community harmony.

Co-operatives often reflect the cultural groups within which they exist; in fact, they often have strong cultural commitments. They typically celebrate those cultures in an open and positive way, especially ethnic cultures. In doing so they can readily make distinct cultures more understandable and acceptable to others, including people who

15 Some co-operatives (for example, worker and housing co-operatives) have limits on the number of members they can accommodate. Most co-operatives, however, are open to anyone who can use their services and are willing to accept the responsibilities of membership (usually not very onerous). This practice, which follows the co-operative principle as it has come to be articulated over the decades, was not always universal and one can find some co-operatives that do not adhere to it as completely as one might like. Overwhelmingly though, it is the practice of most co-operatives today.

had previously been critical or unsympathetic. Co-operatives have made important contributions to social cohesion because of this capacity to make cultural pluralism possible, positive, and "normal."

Traditionally, co-operatives seeking to pool their resources and meet common needs have favoured the development of federations. Co-operators have used federations as a way to reach out across regions within countries and create national frameworks for common objectives. This offers the benefit of consistency with co-operative values and principles. Federations are generally based on democratic processes and allow a capacity for growth and flexibility in contractual relationships, even though negotiating shared power is not necessarily easy, even among co-operators. Nevertheless, all over the world, in virtually every country with strong movements, co-operators have created federated structures. Co-operatives have worked within these structures over considerable time, often for decades, and in some instances for more than a century. Through a network of federations, the co-operative movement has been able to support international co-operative organisations which are also based on democratic practices, though arguably, the movement has had many challenges creating strong global networks.

As co-operatives worked together locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally, they deepened understandings of co-operative practices and were able to resolve many competitive conflicts. In the process co-operatives struggled, with varying degrees of success, to deal fairly with the producers and consumers involved to ensure fair compensation for those who did this work. Through forging of these sometimes complex and difficult relationships, co-operatives have been able to create structures and practices that reflect a high level of democratic practices and permanently contribute to the development of more peaceful communities. It is a contribution the movement has been making since the middle of the nineteenth century.

Education for a Co-operative Culture

From the movement's earliest days, some co-operators have fully appreciated the complexity of what local co-ops and federations or associations of them were trying to accomplish. Co-operators understood that the most committed among them were, in effect, reach-

ing for a new way to see the world. Co-operators realized that they would need to change attitudes, as well as practices. They would need to go beyond providing better food at lower prices, honest savings and credit institutions for everyone, fair remuneration and dignity for labour, stability for the countryside, and increased security for urban communities. To encourage co-operative habits and ways of thinking, co-operators needed to inculcate within the co-operative membership base a deeper understanding of what was possible. That is partly why all branches of the movement have historically placed such emphasis on educational programmes.

In the United Kingdom advocates for strong commitments to education, such as E.O. Greening and George Holyoake, were among the most important leaders of the late nineteenth century. Such advocates for co-operative education helped shape the British movement and other movements were influenced in turn.

In France the emphasis on education was central to the emergence of *asociationisme*, a multi-faceted school of thought that had a profound influence on both the French movements and French political culture. Within the co-operative world Charles Gide became perhaps the most prominent exponent of this perspective during a long career as an economist, co-operative theorist, and peace advocate starting in the 1880s.[16] The School of Nimes became one of the most important centres in the world for the study of co-operatives and co-operative thought. In many parts of France there were also anarcho-syndicalist movements established *bourses du travail* among working people, places where co-operative subjects were frequently studied.

The same commitment to educational activities can be seen in Denmark. Here, co-operative educational activities became enmeshed in the Folk School Movement. This movement spread to other Scandinavian countries during the late nineteenth century and encouraged interest in co-operatives.[17] The movement developed valuable ties with adult education efforts, notably in North America and several countries in Europe; this included the Workers' Educational Association in the United Kingdom.

16 See Charles Gide, http://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles_Gide.

17 See Folk Schools, http://www.ipc.dk/about-international-stuides-ipc/what-is-a-folk-high-school/.

It was these structural and educational elements that made it possible for co-operatives to contribute to building greater harmony and social peace, and that carries forward today. It is important to remember, however, that co-operatives are very rarely established explicitly to create peace. Rather, they make most of their contributions because of how they operate when they conform to their values and principles, and when they build the structures that make them successful. When functioning properly, it can be claimed that co-operators almost invariably tend to create social peace as a by-product of what they do and how they conduct their affairs.

The movement's main contributions to a more peaceful world during its early years, therefore, were associated with its efforts to encourage social peace within communities. As the case studies included here will demonstrate, those contributions took place, and continue to take place, in many different contexts. They can be seen in many countries and among co-operatives involved in a wide range of economic activities. They can be seen within many different cultural contexts and amid diverse ideological perspectives.

Thinking Globally

At the same time, through the central organisations it created, the movement began to think about wider issues of international relations and the development of a more peaceful world. Co-operators built on their local efforts to create central, federated organisations capable of having a profound influence on the wider society. As the institutionalisation of the movement developed during the late nineteenth century, its leaders and some of its members began to pay attention to the wider political situations. Increasingly, they thought about the great issues of war and peace among nations. They were generally opposed to the build-up of armaments. They questioned the growth of empires in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, much of which was accomplished through military conquest. The women's guilds, which started to appear in the 1880s, tended to be particularly opposed to these kinds of militarism,[18] a point of view they would sustain for decades.

18 See Women's Guilds, http://www.cooperativewomensguild.coop/.

Co-operative leaders and organisations began to discuss the formation of an international co-operative organisation as early as the 1860s, a remarkably early time given that even the most established movements were less than twenty years old. In 1869, the first International Co-operative Congress was held in London; British co-operators were joined by delegates from France, Germany, Italy, Denmark, Sweden, and Greece.[19]

In the following years, French co-operators were the most persistent proponents of an international organisation. They were led during the 1870s and 1880s by Édouard de Boyve, a particularly visionary and articulate advocate. For de Boyve and many others within the French movement (and some in the English movement),[20] the movement's historic role was to develop organisations in which capital and labour could co-exist, in fact, in which each could and would support the other. De Boyve and others believed that uniting capital and labour in this way would help ease the workplace tensions that were intensifying as capitalism developed, tensions that frequently boiled over into riots in the streets. This vision, which embraced worker co-operatives, also encouraged the formation of organisations in which workers shared in the profits, even the management of the firms in which they worked, a system called worker *co-partnership*. It was a powerful vision in some circles—notably in France, Italy, and the United Kingdom—from the middle of the nineteenth century through to the early twentieth century.

Co-partnerships were, however, only one of the visions emerging within the co-operative world during the late nineteenth century. Another vision was rooted in the consumer movement, particularly in the United Kingdom. As the local consumer co-ops were learning how to work through their wholesale, some—notably J.T.W. Mitchell, the Co-operative Wholesale's chairman from 1874 to 1895—imaginatively envisioned the creation of a large, multi-faceted structure, one that might be thought of as a conglomerate in modern terms. In time, the Co-operative Wholesale Society would organize

19 *Report of the First International Co-operative Congress*, held in the Hall of the Society of Arts on the 19th, 20th, 22nd, and 23rd August 1895 (London: International Co-operative Alliance, undated) p. 2.

20 In England, the most prominent advocates of this vision of Co-operation's potential contribution were Edward Vansittart Neale and E.O Greening.

open banking and insurance subsidiaries, operate farms, run factories, and provide funeral services. It would ultimately even own tea plantations in Ceylon (Sri Lanka) and a large farm in Saskatchewan, Canada. It would undertake the provision of many other services that could be operated profitably for the members of local co-operatives. It was one of the most imaginative business innovations in nineteenth century business history.

These differing visions, which were augmented by powerful perspectives emanating from rural and co-operative banking movements, meant that the international movement struggled with identity issues. The competition was also intensified by the fact that each vision was strongly supported by national movements: consumer co-operatives in the United Kingdom, worker co-operatives in France, banking co-operatives in Germany, and agricultural co-operatives in Denmark. The importance of these country-based loyalties in an era of bristling, arrogant nationalism can scarcely be overestimated. No less than the world outside it, the co-operative movement of the late nineteenth century had to find its way around the kinds of sentiments and competition that generally threaten, and ultimately undermine, peace.

The important point, though, is that, partly for business reasons, partly because of altruistic enthusiasms, several national movements became interested in developing international co-operative associations. Delegates from other countries attended the national congresses of the English, French, German, and Italian movements. Some co-operators even came from new movements in the United States, Mexico, and Brazil. As these exchanges took place, more co-operators became interested in creating an international co-operative organisation.[21] By 1895 there was enough interest, especially in England and France, that it was possible to form the International Co-operative Alliance.

The creation of the International Co-operative Alliance was overshadowed by struggles over the way in which it might be formed, over how it would operate, and which version of co-operatives would be the most important. As a result, those who brought it to life had

21 See William P. Watkins, *The International Co-operative Alliance, 1895 to 1970* (London: International Co-operative Alliance, 1970).

problems in achieving a powerful and compelling international vision. To some extent, the movement at the time, and for subsequent decades, would reflect the challenges that commonly beset international initiatives on behalf of peace: overcoming the limited identities of nationalism, competition among institutions, differing sets of beliefs, and the impact of personal agendas. People do not entirely change or immediately see the world differently from their compatriots simply because they have joined a co-operative.

The costs of the debate were high. Between 1860 and 1890 many of the advocates for the international organisation argued for lofty goals, particularly through the harmonisation of labour/management interests and the creation of social peace. The tensions that erupted, however, meant much of the more idealistic objectives were dimmed as leaders from national movements and different kinds of co-operatives struggled to create an organisation in which they could all participate freely and without rancour. They partly succeeded in doing so, but it would take four decades before they could agree on the nature of co-operatives, and there would always be problems in developing a strong and coherent programme. It was not the last time within co-operative circles that struggles over institutional formulations dimmed the visions of powerful minds and diminished the possibilities that otherwise might be pursued.

A Model for Addressing Social Pressures

The involvement of co-operators and co-operatives in the search for a more peaceful world was evident from the movement's beginnings. It can be seen in the thought of its most prominent intellectuals. It can be found within the intentional community movement. The connection between co-operatives and peace can be seen in the last half of the nineteenth century when significant groups of people—notably pacifists and feminists—within national movements were becoming engaged in peace issues. More importantly, the co-operative movement was demonstrating that it was a model for addressing many of the most difficult issues of the times. It was helping people with limited economic power to accumulate resources that would enable them to buy goods cheaper and sell more profitably. It was help-

ing resolve the paradox regarding the conundrum of poverty amid plenty, what was called the *social question* in the nineteenth century.

The movement could also point to many other accomplishments. It had demonstrated a remarkable entrepreneurial capacity that promised to help distribute goods and incomes more fairly—in itself this was a significant contribution to social peace as it provided a way in which many social pressures could be reduced. At the same time, the movement could claim that it was about more than providing reliable goods at fair prices. It had demonstrated through the creation of second and third tier organisations how individual co-operatives could move beyond local loyalties and create structures that could even start considering global associations, though doing so seriously proved far more difficult than one might have imagined. The co-operative members had shown that democratic process could work in business, an important alternative—arguably even a corrective—to political democracy and a way to humanize economic development.

Each of the accomplishments discussed above became a signpost towards a positive future; but the signs indicating that destinations had been reached were well out of view. Some of the issues, most obviously the efforts to harmonize the interests of labour, management, and capital, were largely unresolved. Bringing these three factors of production together involved traversing the big ideological quagmires of the time. Doing so challenged emerging, powerful understandings of how businesses could be best organized. It would be a problem for the ages, including our own.

Ian MacPherson

Co-operation and Peace, 1895 to 1919

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, European nations were following, as if in some programmed sacrificial ceremony, a deadly sequence of bluffs, confrontations, and arms races that would lead into World War One. Many co-operators viewed these developments with a mixture of anger and fear. They believed their co-operative movement could provide a better alternative for how human beings dealt with each other. They argued that the descent into war was caused largely by the competitive predispositions inevitable within capitalism, excessive nationalism, and imperialism, traits the co-operative movement could blunt, if not eradicate. Co-operators viewed with alarm the hostilities arising too easily from economic competition among nations, particularly countries in the northern part of the world. Co-operators were aware of the ways in which European nations, propelled in large part by economic ambitions, had risked violence, engaged in conflicts, and subjugated whole populations of people as they rushed for the spoils of Africa and Asia.

Above all, many co-operative leaders were acutely aware of how capitalism had generated class tensions between those who inherited much or accumulated wealth rapidly, and others who were dispossessed by rural change or who worked for inadequate wages in the new industrialism.[1] Co-operators had witnessed the social violence of class warfare that had become commonplace in many northern societies; many of them, in fact, had been caught up in it too. Clearly sympathetic to the plight of the working classes and the rural poor, co-operators were repelled by the growing divisions among capital, management, and labour. Co-operators thought there must be a better way to harmonize the legitimate claims of these aspects of production. They were appalled by the violent confrontations that were common as workers struggled to form unions or went on strike for higher wages and better conditions. Co-operators sought a better way.

Even in its early history, the co-operative movement had leaders who understood the complex nature of peace, that it was not just the absence of war. Co-operative leaders understood: Peace had to be rooted in communities and societies, peaceful communities could be achieved only when people were able to use co-operative techniques to help resolve many of the differences that divided them, and ultimately, the goal was to encourage more people to work and live together in mutuality.

Such radical ideas were not unique to cooperativism. Advocates of many other ideologies—most obviously Marxism, social democracy, anarchism, and interventionist Liberalism—shared these views to varying degrees, albeit sometimes mixed with more violent and confrontational approaches. The basic ideas of collaboration for mutual benefit and working to overcome differences, however, were deeply embedded in the international co-operative movement as it had developed during the second half of the nineteenth century. These principles were indeed central concepts for the movement, and they should not be thought of as mere echoes of what others were advocating. These beliefs can easily be found within the worker and consumer co-operative movements as they emerged. These tenants of co-operative practices provided important guidelines for many who

1 ICA Review, Congresses.

started agricultural and banking movements. In fact, these values were inevitable corollaries of the co-operative emphasis on democratic structures and open membership.

Put another way, co-operative movements ultimately carried within them tendencies towards inclusion, including, though sometimes begrudgingly, those outside the social class within which they were most commonly created. They also gradually, if somewhat fitfully, moved towards greater inclusion in the ways in which different types of co-operatives related to each other—not an easy development given the differences that had become apparent in the late nineteenth century.

The Global Reach

Within the International Co-operative Alliance, Henry W. Wolff, who served as President from 1895 to 1907, was perhaps the most vigorous proponent of greater co-operation among the different kinds of co-operatives. He was essentially a very practical person and knew that the co-operative way of doing business could be widely applied for the benefit of all kinds of people. He was convinced, therefore, that the ICA and national movements had to support the development of all kinds of co-operatives. He promoted this view within the ICA, and spent his own money travelling throughout much of Europe enlisting support for the ICA from different kinds of co-operatives. He particularly concentrated on gathering support from the emerging co-operative banking and agricultural movements on the European continent. He published several very practical books on those two kinds of co-operatives, books that did much to promote these types of co-operatives around the world. He also demonstrated a remarkable international perspective and reached out to co-operative enthusiasts in the Americas and Asia. He made a particularly significant contribution to the development of the Indian co-operative movement.[2] He stands as one of the most determined advocates for a strong and multi-faceted international movement between 1895 and the time of his death in 1930. For Wolff, the co-operative promise

2 See Rita Rhodes, *Empire and Co-operation: How the British Empire used Co-operatives in its Development Strategies 1900-1970* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1912), pp. 117-130.

could only be fully achieved if all forms of co-operative organisation were involved.

Though Wolff does not seem to have been particularly committed to the peace dimension of co-operatives (perhaps he was too immediately practical for that), his efforts to make the ICA into a broad and welcoming "church" were profoundly important for the various contributions co-operatives would be able to make to the search for peace. Indeed, one of the co-operative movement's great assets in the pursuit of peace would be its ability to meet a wide variety of needs. Co-operatives could be utilized for many purposes, and they could serve in many different contexts. Wolff, through his support for co-operative diversity, helped make that flexibility a recognized possibility. Wolff's approach also reflected an important, if not always honoured, tendency within co-operatives: the approach that emphasized the common interests of people rather than dwelling on the incompatible differences that separated them.

Wolff felt co-operators should seek to reach over class barriers even though they were often originally motivated by class grievances. They should demonstrate a belief that human beings, through education and learned experiences and through the cultivation of associative intelligence, could transcend many of the tensions that characterized the modern world. Wolff thought co-operatives should demonstrate how the democratic control of economic activity at the local level could be expanded outward through national and international federations and alliances, thereby expanding the ways in which people could work together in mutual interest. Some might dismiss these ideas as being hopelessly idealistic, even trite; but for co-operators they are eminently reasonable. One could argue that Wolff, who had an exceptional interest in the international movement, was simply reflecting developments that were occurring in non-European parts of the world. He just recognized them earlier than others.

At the dawn of the twentieth century, co-operative movements were developing throughout the world. This growth was occurring largely within three main, often inter-connected contexts: major transitions of rural populations, urban expansion during the new industrialism, and colonial development. These shifting contexts created immense pressures and opportunities for co-operative develop-

ment. They also posed challenges that, in retrospect, the co-operative world was too fragile and uncertain to meet with adequate sophistication and sufficient forethought. These macro-level shifts also raised very complicated issues about how co-operatives could help create a more peaceful world and how co-operatives could organize themselves to rise to the challenges of the day.

Global Rural Transition

Global rural transition is one of the great themes in world history from approximately the mid-nineteenth century onward. With its emphasis on new machinery, more scientific practices, and improved livestock and plants, the impact of the Industrial Agricultural Revolution that had started in the eighteenth century was rapidly gathering momentum. Increased production and early specialization dramatically altered what rural areas could harvest for market. Railroads and steamships meant that commodity production and distribution—notably in grains, livestock, tea, sugar, and flax—became global in scope. The opening farmlands in the Americas and the increasing cultivation of vast regions within the colonies in Africa and Asia offered alluring possibilities for supplying the new industrialism and increasing urbanisation.

At the same time, older farming areas around the world had difficulty keeping pace with agricultural change and out-migration, particularly areas in Europe and the older rural regions of North America. They faced deepening crises associated with declining populations and farms that were too small for modern modes of production. These communities also faced, not unimportantly, assaults on rural culture associated with the rise of cities and the celebration of urban lifestyles. The song "How are you going to keep them down on the farm?" spoke to more than visiting "Paree" when it was released in 1919.

The co-operative movement offered at least partial relief to the growing challenges and problems of rural life. At the very least, it can be claimed, co-operatives were adopted to help alleviate the tensions many farm families faced, tensions often hidden to outsiders by the apparent bucolic charms of the rural byways. The Danish utilization of co-operatives in the modernization of the countryside be-

came a widely imitated approach in many parts of the world. In Ireland, Horace Plunkett's work was useful in promoting co-operatives among farming people. Raiffeisen's efforts to create rural savings and credit organisations were being replicated in several countries—notably where German settlers came to live, but also under the names of *caisses populaires* and credit unions in Canada and the United States.

Within older communities, co-operatives could help stabilize economies by providing ways in which farmers could specialize and move their produce to markets. Perhaps even more importantly within recently settled communities, they could help overcome many of the adversities typical of new settlements: organizing commodities for market, mobilizing capital among cash-poor farmers, and helping overcome loneliness, most particularly among women and young people. In short, they helped address the economic stress and social pressures of the countryside, important issues at the time. Cooperation became key to economic engines for the *new agriculture* being born out of the technological, scientific, and communication changes of the age. Co-operatives were also important buttresses for the threatened cultural life of rural people.

Urban Expansion and Co-operative Development

The continuing expansion of industrial societies in the early years of the twentieth century provided fertile ground for co-operative development. The consumer movement expanded significantly. In the United Kingdom, the idea that the co-op would protect the consumer interests of the working class, while the union would provide protection in the workplace, and the newly-formed Labour Party would provide support in the political arena (an idea most forcibly put forward in the United Kingdom by Beatrice and Sydney Webb) gained widespread support, even if this position could be seen as contradicting the movement's inclusionist tendencies.[3] Throughout

3 There were at least two (arguably more) competing inclusionist views within the international movement. One of them was the view, urged particularly by Charles Gide of France, that the consumer movement would expand to include all kinds of people—workers, farmers, men, women, socialists and capitalists, liberals, and conservatives. Everyone, after all, was a consumer. Moreover, through what a later age would call vertical integration, consumer co-operatives could own much of the economy—farms, factories, housing, health facilities, even undertaking services—leaving little to be pursued outside of co-operative networks.

Europe strong consumer movements emerged in such countries as Scandinavia, Germany, and Italy. Europeans, especially British immigrants, contributed to the beginnings of overseas consumer movements, especially in Canada, the United States, Australia, and India. Housing co-operatives and another sympathetic movement, the City Beautiful movement, sought to transform the ugly neighbourhoods of industrial cities through co-operative strategies.

The results could be seen in cities such as Edinburgh, Brussels, Paris, and New York. Community-based financial co-operatives were beginning to appear to help meet the needs of the urban poor, a welcome escape from the pawnshops and moneylenders of the time. Worker co-operatives became somewhat more common, especially in Europe, but they remained controversial and realized only a part of the promise they had shown a few decades earlier. In the general co-operative movement, as in the broader society, a willingness to allow the workers "a place at the table" could not readily be found. Nevertheless, despite the limited growth of worker co-operatives or worker co-partnerships, in cities as in rural areas, co-operatives helped reduce the strife all too common in daily life. Co-operatives helped provide some social stability and economic development. In an era of unparalleled and deepening urban turmoil, they helped create a measure of social peace.

Colonial Development

The roles of co-operatives within European empires overseas also became important. Co-operatives fit into imperial frameworks well, perhaps surprisingly well given the social tensions endemic to much colonial life. On the one hand, they were self-help organisations that could be useful in helping Indigenous peoples adjust to international commerce and to create more stable local economies based on agriculture and small-scale industrial production. Co-operatives could also help Indigenous peoples to escape the clutches of exploitive

The other kind of inclusivity recognized that people from different backgrounds in many different circumstances formed co-operatives of many different types—consumer, banking, worker, agricultural, and many others. The challenge for this perhaps more realistic understanding was how to bring them together, building on their common modes of operation, and similar commitments.

moneylenders and participate effectively within a cash-based economy through the development of co-operative banking. Co-operatives could contribute significantly to the development of staple trades (such as, sugar, tea, and grains) that could be of immense financial benefit to the empires, perhaps even a reasonable justification for the costs of colonies. If co-ops functioned correctly, they could be *schools for democracy*, though not many people in the early twentieth century anticipated the arrival of that form of government in the colonies.

The ways in which the imperial powers administered the development of co-operatives in their colonies varied significantly. The British, for example, placed responsibility for co-operative development within the colonies, relying upon registrars to maintain strong paternalistic control often through large numbers of public servants. The French, in contrast, kept much of the control over co-operatives in the hands of public servants in Paris. The results, though, were nearly everywhere the same: governments intruded significantly into the affairs of colonial co-operatives, meaning that member engagement rarely achieved the desired level to assure sound co-operative growth. The price for that weakness would prove to be very high in many colonies, most particularly in Africa.

Nevertheless, co-operatives, were a moderating influence within the often harsh worlds of imperial economies, politics, and social relationships. On the one hand, co-operatives were instrumental in helping build colonial economies, and they did give some "colonials" a degree of power and influence they otherwise would not have possessed; however, they also helped create the kind of social capital within communities that was needed for their protection and development in a rapidly changing and increasingly tumultuous world.

Peace and Ideological Ferment

Some co-operators became active within various peace organisations in the late nineteenth century. By 1900, several prominent co-operators were associated with the International Peace Bureau, located in Berne, Switzerland.[4] The international movement's first public debates on the issue of peace occurred at the ICA's Manchester con-

4 See Peace Bureau, http://www.ipb.org/web/index.php?mostra=content&menu=Home.

ference in 1902. It followed a report by Hodgson Pratt, a British co-operator from the worker movement who was best known for his work as a pacifist. In 1880, he had founded the International Arbitration and Peace Association, which had as its primary goal the promotion of arbitration as a way of settling disputes among nations.

Just before the Manchester Congress, Pratt had presided over the eleventh Universal Peace Conference in Monaco where the idea of working class groups, including co-operatives, coming together to promote peace had been discussed.[5] His report to the ICA Congress was intended to foster that kind of association. Charles Gide, the eminent French co-operator and economist who had shown an interest in peace issues since the 1880s supported him warmly and moved that the ICA join with the Bureau in its campaign for universal peace. His motion was carried unanimously. That position was reconfirmed at the ICA's Budapest Congress in 1904.

As institutionalized co-operative movements developed in Europe serving numerous purposes, they invariably reflected many different cultures and local identities. In the process they invariably had to come to terms with all the rich variety of ideological systems of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, sometimes called "the Age of Ideologies."[6] The relationships with, as well as the differences from, the major ideological camps, therefore, was a common theme in the international movement, at least until late in the twentieth century. Co-operatives were typically on the fringes, sometimes at the centre, and most often targets for co-option by the various ideological camps that flourished from the late nineteenth century onward.

The strained relationship with Marxism was perhaps the most difficult of the ideological struggles. Certainly it attracted the most attention. The debates with Marxists had first surfaced in the 1880s, but they deepened sharply in the first decade of the twentieth century. In 1907, the Second Socialist International met in Stuttgart,

5 Rita Rhodes and Dionysius Mavrogiannis, *Thematic Guide to ICA Congresses 1895-1995* (Geneva: International Co-operative Alliance, 1995), pp. 17-18.

6 See, for example, John Schwarzmantel, *The Age of Ideology: Political Ideologies from the American Revolution to Postmodern Times* (New York: New York University Press, 1998) and Henry D. Aiken, *The Age of Ideology: The 19th Century Philosophers* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1957).

Germany. Many co-operative leaders attended, and many others followed its discussions in the press where it was widely reported. At that meeting, Lenin and hard-line Russian Bolsheviks vigorously challenged—more vigorously than ever before publicly—the more gradualist kinds of socialists.

There were several issues percolating in the background, such as growing European militarism, the centrality of class warfare, the desirability of formal linkages between trade unions and socialist parties, and the need to oppose all kinds of imperialism. The debates were intense, often bitter, and the resultant splits ran deep; in fact, some would never be bridged. This was important for the co-operative movement, which included many, particularly in some consumer and worker co-operatives, who were sympathetic to at least moderate forms of socialism. It also included others, particularly in the banking and agricultural movement, who decidedly were not.

The more strident and revolutionary tone of the Stuttgart Congress, and others that followed over the next few years alarmed many within co-operative circles and reverberated throughout many national movements. The increasingly acrimonious and competitive arguments became an important context within which the position taken by many co-operative leaders to the rise of Marxism should be understood. They elicited a series of negative responses within many co-operative circles, but most particularly from co-operators in Germany. One of them was Heinrich Kaufmann, the General Secretary of the Central Union of German Distributive Societies. In 1910, he wrote an article for the *Bulletin*, which included the following statement:

> *Co-operation will undoubtedly fulfil its inherent functions alone and irrespective of any political party for the simple reason that from its very nature it cannot do otherwise…Co-operation can never be used as a weapon in the class struggle.*[7]

His statement was given particular prominence in ICA circles, and stands as a representative perspective of many in the mainstream of co-operative organizations for the remainder of the century. It also coincided generally with the views of the leadership of the ICA and the powerful British movement at the time. The Marxist issue, how-

7 Kaufman, *The Bulletin*, 1910.

ever, was not an easy one to resolve; it would preoccupy the movement for some eighty years, if not longer. In the meantime, other global pressure became more intense.

There were also other voices from Russia. In 1910, the *Bulletin* printed a letter from Leo Tolstoy, whom it described as a "celebrated author and ethical philosopher." It had been sent to Professor Vachan Totomianz. Tolstoy wrote:

> *You are right in thinking that I maintain, and shall never cease to affirm, that the religious regeneration of the individual is the only radical means of combatting the dominating evil of the present struggle and the oppression of the majority of the people by a leisured minority. But, none the less do I believe that the establishment and furthering of the work of co-operative societies is nowadays the only form of social work befitting a moral individual who has no wish to be an oppressor. I agree with you that the co-operative movement can ameliorate the conditions of the worker, but I cannot allow that this movement has the power of itself to evolve a religious spirit.*
>
> *I am certainly of [the] opinion that co-operative organisation is one of the best forms of activity of our times. All those who are anxious to devote their youth to serve the people can throw themselves into the movement. If I were young, I would do the same, and I hope even yet to do something on co-operative lines for the peasants whose welfare I have at heart.*[8]

The Approach of War

By 1912 the situation in Europe was deteriorating rapidly. Serbia, Bulgaria, Greece, and Montenegro, backed by Russia, ended the European empire of the Turks in the First Balkan War of that year. Not much was really settled however, as the war did not resolve how the region would be divided, and Serbia was especially dissatisfied because it did not have access to the Adriatic Sea. Another war, which became known as the Second Balkan War, was inevitable. At the same time, the Austro-Hungarian Empire was showing signs of debilitating political and economic weakness and another vacuum in

8 *The Bulletin*, March 1910, p.36.

the power system of Europe was developing. As the situation worsened, the rest of Europe sorted itself into networks of contesting allies, creating the situation whereby any significant incident could spark a war of unprecedented dimensions—as, ultimately did happen two years later when Archduke Ferdinand was assassinated in Sarajevo.

There were no easy answers to the complexities of the Balkans and the widening, entrenched obligations by virtually all the significant countries of Europe, no effective answers at all. Amid the growing tensions, however, the Executive of the ICA tried to identify what was at stake from a co-operative perspective. In 1912, it issued the following resolution:

> *The Executive Committee of the International Co-operative Alliance, in view of the state of war existing in Eastern Europe and the grave outlook, desires to remind co-operators in all countries that Co-operation has peace among all nations as one of its essential principles. The Executive, therefore, in the name of co-operators generally, expresses the hope that war may not spread to any Powers not yet involved and that peace and good government may soon be established in the areas affected. Co-operators in all countries are earnestly required to use every endeavour to bring and maintain peace and concord between the nations of the world.*[9]

Peace was a widespread concern within the movement when the delegates gathered at the ICA's Glasgow Congress in 1913. Sir William Maxwell, the "Grand Old Man" of the Scottish movement presided over the conference, his interests in peace issues had been evident for some years. He possessed considerable skill at bridging differences within the movement, notably between workers and consumers, and he had a remarkably broad and expansive vision of what the movement could accomplish. It is no surprise, therefore, that in his address to the Congress, Maxwell included the following statement on peace when he outlined the ICA's main objectives:

> *It [the ICA] has the…higher aim of establishing peace between nations. If, in fact, as we believe, wars are caused above all by economic causes, and are continued in the struggle for profit, would*

9 As quoted in Rita Rhodes, *The International Co-operative Alliance During War and Peace, 1910-1950* (Geneva: International Co-operative Alliance, 1995), p.29.

it be vain to hope that co-operation, which has for its ideal the abolition of profit, could establish peace?[10]

The delegates to the Congress warmly welcomed Maxwell's idealistic words and his obviously deep and sincere commitments. His speech was widely remembered within the movement for decades afterward. In Glasgow, his speech led to a rather remarkable series of statements by representatives from many European countries, including Adolf von Elm from Germany. The burden of what was said was that the movement should seek to retain contacts across the divisions that were emerging in Europe and even find ways to encourage collaboration among movements in countries at war, an appeal that echoed thinking within the international trades union movement. It also set the precedent that the international movement would try to follow amid many other conflicts in the century that was to come.

The Congress of 1913 was also an affirmation that the movement had an existence of its own that, for co-operators, should prevail over the calls of nationalism and other ideologies. Congress welcomed the delegates from Germany and passed with great enthusiasm the following statement on the war:

The Congress emphasizes once more that the maintenance of peace and goodwill among all nations constitutes an essential condition for the development of Co-operation and the realisation of those ends which are aimed at by this movement. The Congress further desires to impress upon the public opinion of all nations the fact that the reason for the continuance of armaments and the possibility of international conflicts will disappear as the social and economic life of every nation becomes organized according to co-operative principles, and that, therefore, the progress of Co-operation forms one of the most valuable guarantees for the preservation of the world's peace.

The Congress, therefore, exhorts the people of every country to join our movement and strengthen their power. The International Congress of the Alliance declares itself in amity with all the co-operators

10 Congress, 1913.

of the world, and welcomes any action they may take in this direction or in which they may participate.[11]

Delegates enthusiastically welcomed the statement and celebrated its passage with spontaneous chants of "We will not fight Germany!" The 1913 Congress demonstrated a strong commitment to pacifism, evident in many speeches and a common tendency among co-operators to blame the drift toward war on the excesses of capitalism.

Six months later, war broke out. It was, in the slogan of the day, "The war to end all wars." Sadly, brave speeches in Glasgow had not had much effect.

War Breaks Out

World War One was a traumatic experience for much of the international co-operative movement. It created tensions within and among national movements, dividing those who were skeptical about why the war was being waged from those who, immediately or in time, were moved by nationalistic sentiments and beliefs. The war also sharply reduced the income of the ICA just as it was gathering momentum for some international activities. The war badly disrupted communications among co-operators and their organizations—the kind of contact that was the ICA's lifeblood. Leaders from the British movement were the only ones who could be meaningfully involved in the ICA on a regular basis, meaning that it was difficult for the ICA to make statements on behalf of the Alliance's broad membership with any degree of confidence. In early 1915, the ICA General Secretary Henry J. May, recalled some of the immediate challenges the war occasioned:

Six months ago when we were suddenly overwhelmed by the outbreak of war, the Executive of the Alliance were confronted with the task of determining the lines on which the work of the I.C.A. should proceed during the continuance of the European upheaval. George Jacob Holyoake had once declared that the British Co-operative Movement would hardly withstand the shock of a great war, and in the first excitement of that reversion to the barbaric

11 Rita Rhodes and Dionysius Mavrogiannis, *Thematic Guide to ICA Congresses 1895-1995*, published in the ICA series Studies and Reports, p. 36.

arbitrament of the sword, it was felt by some that the Alliance of Co-operators in the various countries must be shattered by such an unspeakable conflict.

They [the Executive] remembered, with a sharp pang at the thought of the change which twelve short months had wrought, the happy and successful gathering with our comrades from many lands which had taken place in Glasgow at the International Congress of 1913.

They thought of the resolution on International Peace; of the eloquent speeches with which it was supported by our colleagues from Holland, Germany, France, Norway and Great Britain; of the wonderful demonstration with which the delegates received the announcement of the President that it had been carried without dissenting voice or vote. And as they thought of these things there flashed through their minds an instant of doubt. Could it be that that great demonstration at Glasgow was only a 'pious expression of opinion' after all, and not a consummation devoutly to be wished? Doubtless our Continental colleagues have had similar moments of scepticism in view of the destruction of our cherished hopes. But with them as with the Executive, to realise the doubt was to dismiss it with scorn, and to acknowledge that the noble declaration of the Glasgow Congress remained a true reflection of the ideals of our movement and the earnest desire of the workers of all the countries in the Alliance. They realised also that our democratic organisations, both national and international, had failed to avert the greatest and most calamitous war in history, not because of any defects in their aims or principles, but because they had been overtaken by the influences and power of the old order of capitalistic imperialism before the new system of society which it is the main business of Co-operation to establish, had been sufficiently developed to make the will of the people prevail.

The thought of that failure was the one consideration necessary to resolve their doubts as to the future. The Alliance must go on even as the co-operative movement must go on in all the countries. That it had failed to-day was only the proof of the need of more energetic and whole-hearted effort on the morrow of the war.

In the meantime, two duties stared them in the face: the first, to use every endeavour to keep in touch with all the members of our

> *International family, belligerents and neutrals alike, as far as the laws of the land and the circumstances permitted, and to continue our interchange of ideas and information on our own special work; the second, to prepare our organisation to render all possible aid to any of the members of the Alliance that may need it, as a result of the war, to re-establish themselves or even to maintain their existence during the hostilities of the nations.*[12]

This determination to keep in touch with co-operators across enemy lines was a common and pervasive theme in international co-operative circles during the war. Percy Redfern, the editor of the English publication *The Wheatsheaf*, captured the sentiment well:

> *However we look at it, there is much hope for our international co-operative faith. At the lowest we may count upon a kind of rhythm, even in the contradictions of human action. The warring nations will swing back to amity; in the nature of things it is stronger than antipathy, more necessary and more lasting. And whatever suffers by the waste and economic depression of the war, the co-operative societies in the different countries quite possibly will suffer least. He that lifts the sword, perishes by the sword; it is in truth the meek who inherit the earth. Empires rise and fall but people are indestructible, at any rate by human hands. And institutions that are of the soil, of the people and amidst the people, pacific and constructive institutions which the people need for the building up of their lives, these humble and constructive institutions cannot be rooted out. Whatever changes the treaty-makers may effect in the political map of Europe, the co-operative societies will persist and necessarily, internationally.*
>
> *To-day we are checked, but tomorrow we shall go forward.*[13]

As the war deepened, the ICA was forced to reduce its services to members but did keep in touch with the German movement, largely through the efforts of G.J.D.C. Goedhart, a Belgian co-operator and ICA President from 1921 to 1927. Along with May, he was largely responsible for trying to bridge, as much as possible, the divisions that emerged when co-operative movements found their countries at war with each other. It was all part of trying to keep open lines

12 The *Bulletin*, February 1915, pp. 17-18.
13 The *Bulletin*, December 1914, p. 285.

of communication within the international movement and demonstrate that Co-operation could be, and should be, above the fray. It was a narrow and difficult road to follow during the turmoil and passions of World War One, but it was a vital one for the ICA.

In an article he later wrote for the ICA *Bulletin*, Goedhart indicated what this effort—this appeal to Co-operation's higher mission—meant in very concrete terms:

> *It, therefore, behooves us to watch closely against any acts or words which may impair our usefulness as a national or international force for social reform and peace.*
>
> *The co-operative journals of all countries have a heavy responsibility placed upon them in this matter, but they have also a high destiny to fulfil. They can, by their moderation in questions of present controversy and hostility, do much to preserve friendly relations between all sections of our great movement. This is essential to a prompt resumption of our work when the diplomatists, statesmen and generals have concluded the peace.*
>
> *The co-operative press is now a considerable force and can use its "platform" for definite propaganda, not only in economic relations, but in strengthening the democratic foundation of a permanent peace. The only peace which is likely to have any continuity must be based upon the goodwill and acknowledged brotherhood of the peoples. If any evidence of this were wanting, it could be found in the anxiety which all the belligerent leaders exhibited as to the attitude of the proletariat towards the conflict, when the war became imminent.*
>
> *Many of us are profoundly convinced that if our working class institutions had been a little more developed, they would have been able to defeat both militarism and secret diplomacy and have prevented war. The future, however, is left to us, and we have to build anew with greater strength and determination to cement the ties which bind us, in spite of differences of language, race and creed.*
>
> *We have to strengthen the relationships which existed before the war, which still exist, and which have received their most striking and pathetic confirmation on the battlefield itself.*
>
> *The co-operative press has a noble part to play in this work. Let it preach principles, not of war, but of peace; not of reprisals or even*

of legal rights, but of fraternity and mutual work for the benefit of mankind.[14]

In other words, the movement was greater than the transitory nature of national interests.

This faith in the capacity of Co-operation to rise above clamour and battles to help achieve a more peaceful world was echoed many times during World War One. It was well articulated by Anders Oerne, a prominent and tough-minded Swedish co-operative theorist and leader, in an article he wrote in 1914. Oerne stated:

It is no Utopia to expect enormous things in the interests of peace from the extension of Co-operation. The International Co-operative Alliance, together with the Workers International, has hitherto been the organisation which has been able to fight most energetically against the cult of war. With its more than six million members, it has marched energetically at the head for the brotherhood of the nations, and has not neglected to uphold, with particular strength the economic re-organisation of Society as a condition for peace. That neither one nor the other of the two mentioned international unions have been able to prevent the outbreak of the present war is easily accounted for in the present stage of development. Neither will the International Co-operative Alliance be able to give any absolute guarantee of peace during the following decade; but if all good forces are gathered together, we may be very near the goal by the end of that period. In spite of the indifference and apathy which the movement has had to struggle against in times past, it has in less than ten years succeeded in doubling its forces. The next decade ought, with this horrible awakening, to make our movement three or four times larger than now, and in both Germany and England bring the majority of inhabitants under a co-operative regime.

It has proved itself in time of need and even former adversaries of the co-operative movement have had to admit its importance. Thus in Germany, to a great extent, the municipal authorities have worked together with the distributive associations in order to organise the supply of provisions. The co-operative associations have everywhere, owing to their anti-speculative character, gone on pretty

14 The *Bulletin*, February 1915, pp. 19-20.

well during the stirring times of crisis, while private enterprises of gigantic dimensions have swayed to and fro as dry reeds before the cyclone. This points to a co-operative period of prosperity, unknown before, after the treaty of peace, if this comes before the forces of the combatants are totally exhausted and their possibilities of development crushed. It should be the task of the international organisations, above all the International Co-operative Alliance, which ought, with probably better success than the political unions, to hold together during the catastrophe, to influence public opinion in the countries at war for a treaty before the last irremediable damage has happened; and afterwards we must with our eyes fixed on our great aim—peace and co-operation among and within the nations bring the masses under the dominion of Co-operation. This will be very arduous work, but at the same time it will have a better result than fighting against the war with words.[15]

Co-operation in War Time

As the horrors of war became daily news, the ICA and many national movements came under increasing pressures to provide relief for people particularly affected by combat. Most movements responded generously to the appeals they received. The ICA focused its relief efforts on assisting needy German and Austrian families in the United Kingdom and encouraging support from the German movement for British and French citizens trapped in Germany when the war broke out. In Great Britain the ICA provided help for detainees in internment camps and for others who were allowed to remain in their homes but denied work. Doing so helped meet some pressing needs but also demonstrated the co-operative desire to transcend differences. May reported on these activities in *The Bulletin* of 1915.

Just a word as to the appeals which have been made for the relief of distress in this and other countries. Here for a moment we must turn our glance inwards, for while we are, so far, preserved from the horrors of war upon our own territory, we have the privilege of contributing of our substance to the dire needs of those who bear the brunt of the distress. We have little knowledge of what

15 The *Bulletin*, November 1914, p. 267.

other countries are doing in this matter, but we know that British co-operators have contributed handsomely to the National Relief Fund. Their gifts to the French and Belgian relief in more than one form have been very generous.

There is also the appeal of the Alliance on behalf of "innocent alien enemies," as they are technically called. Many societies have responded, and several have given handsome donations. The Emergency Relief Committee in London, on which the Alliance is represented by the General Secretary, distributes about £450 to £500 per week in relieving such cases and has been actively working since the first week of the war.

Similar appeals to those of the Alliance have been made in Germany for the relief of French and English residents there, and the work has received much support from those who have the spirit of goodwill which the co-operative, like every other noble ideal, invokes.

The Alliance has, however, still to face the necessity of a wider appeal than has yet been made. When once again we settle down to peaceful ways our first duty will be to ask not only British societies, but co-operators in all the neutral countries to at once establish a fund for the re-building of Co-operation in the devastated areas.[16]

Perhaps the most widely appreciated role the movement played during the war, however, was the way in which it helped governments distribute consumer goods as fairly as possible and to combat profiteering. Henry May described this kind of contribution in 1915:

The outbreak of war has in nearly every case resulted in dislocation of trade, the rush of consumers to make large purchases, demands for share capital, and general excitement or panic. It is also clear that everywhere the co-operative society has been a moderating influence, not only in restoring confidence and a quiet mind, but in keeping down prices.

The authorities, both State and Municipal, have gained an insight into, and respect for, the co-operative movement as a means of supply which can be relied upon for honest dealing and true patriotism in crises like the present.

16 The *Bulletin*, May 1915, p. 81.

Nothing could demonstrate more clearly than the experience of the last nine months the willingness of some men to organise trade and industry solely for personal gain and dishonest profiteering, no matter what the cost in money, suffering, or life to their fellow creatures and even their fellow countrymen. It has been equally demonstrated that the co-operative system is the only one which seeks the highest well-being of the community and is worthy of adoption as a national plan.

The recognition of Governments is no doubt an advantageous thing, and the steps which have been taken to use the movement for national purposes during the crisis will give us 'greater claims on the soul of the nation' when war is passed.

We must not, however, delude ourselves into the belief that our difficulties with State Departments and the instinctive opposition of those who have always looked askance at Co-operation is passed away.

True, we have put forth tentacles which are finding holding places here and there, which will, if we are wise, be difficult to dislodge. But when once again we come to normal times the old antagonisms will begin to reassert themselves, and we shall find, as a prominent co-operator in Austria recently remarked that 'In the hour of difficulty the workingman has no other friend than his brother worker.' The war has tested and confirmed the view of many that our movement could withstand great strain if only it were well established on truly democratic lines. In all places where the Rochdale basis or principle has been fully carried out and any reasonable time for establishment has been afforded previous to the present conflict, the societies have steadied themselves after the first shock and promise to resume their normal course in normal times.[17]

Charles Gide made similar claims when the French movement met in Paris in 1916:

[D]uring the war, the distributive societies not only in France, but in all the belligerent countries, have achieved far more than even their most ardent apostles expected of them. They have not only exercised a practical influence in restraining the rise in prices, and in assisting the Government in its difficult work of fixing maxi-

17 The *Bulletin*, May 1915, p. 82.

mum prices, a matter in which the State authorities were very inexperienced, but they were also successful in coming to agreements with the municipalities, in respect to the organisation of the sale of certain commodities. For instance, in Paris the sale of frozen meat was organised in this way.[18]

One German academic gave a similar report about how the movement had served in his and neighbouring countries:

Where would we have been in this war, where would Germany, a besieged fortress, have been without Co-operation?

In fact, it may be said that Co-operation has proved itself to be a method of organisation which is the best adapted to the necessities of a state of war, and, moreover, it has not been found wanting in resources with which to meet any of the economic calamities. It is equally superior to the anarchic regime of free competition as it is to the coercive regime of public administration. Even in the areas which have been devastated by invasion, in unhappy Belgium and in the North of France, the distributive societies have served as places of refuge to the populations, and, generally speaking, have been respected by the enemy. Owing to the services rendered by the societies, their resources have naturally been rapidly exhausted, both as regards goods and funds.[19]

Rejoice and Rededicate

Along with many others, co-operators rejoiced when the war ended in November 1918. An editorial in the ICA's *Bulletin* a month later probably captured well enough their general mood:

'We are free at last. For four years Belgium has suffered hunger, martyrdom, and imprisonment, yet has never been disheartened, confident in the cause of right and democracy.'

Such are the stirring words with which our Belgium friends open their first communication to the I.C.A. since the outbreak of the war….

18 The *Bulletin*, November 1916, p. 243.

19 Quoted by Gide in his speech to the French Congress, The *Bulletin*, November 1916, p.243.

> *Most gladly do we echo their relief, their confidence, and their determination to renew the struggle for the consummation of our great ideals.*
>
> *For four years the machinery of our International Alliance has been moving 'dead slow,' sometimes it has almost stopped, obstructed, nearly dismembered by the breakdown of civilisation and the tumbling in the dust of strife and the horrors of the battlefield, of all the hopes we had ever held of achieving equity, justice, and brotherhood.*
>
> *Now the war clouds have lifted, the faint streaks of the dawn are widening towards the fullness of day. The nightmare of slaughter and grief gives place, not to despair, but to the calm sorrow at the failure of humanity which will be the strongest incentive to surmount the difficulties which have been strewn in our path.*[20]

"The strongest incentive," was also deeply sobering, more sobering than the editorial allowed. The war, on many levels one of the great tragedies in human history, had shaken the co-operative world. The confident, determined session on peace at the Glasgow Congress in 1913 must, for many co-operators, have seemed a long time ago and rather futile by 1918. So much had happened in the interval.

Nevertheless, the war had demonstrated the value of co-operative enterprise in a number of ways, particularly in its capacity to ensure the fair distribution of consumer goods, a contribution that helped people with less wealth live as well as possible. In some countries rural co-ops had proved useful in mobilizing agricultural production, and the food crises during the war encouraged many governments to pay more attention to rural issues. It would lead to policies in the post-war period that would generally help co-operatives. During the war, co-operatives had demonstrated that they had marched generally to a higher ethical standard than the private companies, particularly those that had engaged in war profiteering.

The war had badly disrupted some national consumer and banking movements. It meant that the ICA, essentially isolated in London, had lost some of the precious momentum it had been gathering in the years prior to the war. The dream of greater global significance persisted, but the war—the passions and hatreds it had raised, the

20 The *Bulletin*, December 1918, p. 232.

lingering animosities and damage that remained—made the search for "equity, justice, and brotherhood" harder than ever to achieve.

The following twenty-five years would more than demonstrate the harshness of that bitter truth. The enthusiasm of the Glasgow Congress in 1913 would still be remembered, but it would be more difficult to rekindle.

Ian MacPherson

Co-operation and Peace, 1919 to 1930

The ending of World War One with its 37,000,000 casualties and 16,000,000 dead[1] inevitably raised the issue of how such conflicts might be avoided in the future. One option widely proposed in the international co-operative movement was for co-operatives to become more directly involved in the political process. That would mean that co-operative practices and values could be more widely utilized in trying to address serious divisions and the co-operative movement's peace-making capacities more generally recognized. Becoming directly involved in politics, however, was not an easy decision for many co-operators because of long-standing commitments to political neutrality in many parts of the movement.

In the United Kingdom, for example, getting involved in the political option had been hovering in the background for some years, arguably going back to the 1880s and 1890s when the government started talking about taxing co-operatives. It was an issue that raised very fundamental and complex questions about the essence of co-

1 Necrometrics.com (March 2, 2013). See: http://necrometrics.com/20c5m.htm.

operatives, the nature of their capital, and the ways in which they tried to grow. During the war, however, there were several reasons why increased political activities were considered more seriously, especially in the last two years of that conflict—1917 and 1918.

First, there was widespread recognition that the current limitations of democracy had contributed to the political and class competitions that had ultimately produced the war, a war that few "common people" wanted. One way to avoid such conflicts in the future would be to expand democratic practice, even, maybe most especially, into economic matters. Co-operators were already demonstrating by their practice that the deeper and more widespread democratic processes were, the greater the possibilities were for working together and transcending differences.

Second, and even more than in the past, co-operatives needed to protect their interests. Governments were desperate for funds to pay for the war effort and other expenses. Governments sought to tax them in the same way as for-profit enterprises, even though their basic purpose, use of surplus, and financial structures were significantly different. The key issue was whether or how dividends should be taxed. It became a burning issue in several countries, most particularly in the United Kingdom, France, and Canada.

A third reason why co-operative leaders considered involvement in the political arena was that despite what co-operatives had contributed to the war effort, governments still largely ignored them in planning for the future and in promoting national economic development, except for the agricultural section in some countries. In particular, the British and French movements were angry that they were largely ignored as the plans for reconstruction after the war were started. They thought their size and wartime contributions should have garnered them more respect.

Fourth, many co-operatives were associated with other movements that were becoming more aggressive politically, and their activism intrigued many co-operative leaders. Labour and socialist parties were the most obvious of these. A series of farmers' political parties in Canada, the United States, and Australia were also important forces. These newly formed parties developed because of rural dissatisfaction with existing political systems. They wanted improved

political process,[2] and more policies and programmes to promote rural development. These emerging farm parties were also generally supportive of the development of co-operatives. One could argue that co-operatives had become the distinctive economic arm of the agrarian movements that were active in these times.

Fifth—and for the more ardent co-operators, the most important reason why political engagement was a consideration—was that the co-operative voice was not being heard in the peace processes that followed the war. Thomas Killon articulated this perspective as well as anyone in his Presidential Address to the 1918 English Congress. In the process he made some of the arguments for the creation of an independent co-operative party:

> *Reconstruction after the war is now a popular theme, but is it to be reconstruction hand in hand with vested interests, who will never be prepared to serve the people in the same lavish manner they serve themselves? Or is it to be reconstruction on real co-operative lines, with the producer, distributor and consumer united, and acting as one interest for the well-being of all? Should not all workers of this country—and the workers of the world, if you will—combine with this industrial, commercial, and economic object in view? So long as we are divided in social aspirations, political aims, and economic and labour theories, our progress will be slow and inefficient. We now hear the cry of a wider Labour Party. Why not at the same time a wider Co-operative Party, acquiring fields, factories, mines, workshops, transport service, etc., to make ourselves, first of all, self-supporting regarding the material needs of life? If a wider people's political party can help us, by all means give it a chance by faithful adherence to its democratic principles. But, when we have achieved that, we shall still be wanting in the essential possession of the means by which we must live—that is, in co-operative production, exchange, and distribution.*
>
> *Democracy is now on its trial. If it has a clear vision of what it should be aiming at, and if wisely led, I believe that no power*

2 In the United States and Canada, the rural outburst advocated a wide range of political reforms, including the weakening of partisan (and party) loyalties in favour of more freedom for elected members of legislatures to represent the wishes of their constituents, and the introduction of such innovations as referenda, recall legislation, and citizen-based initiation procedures.

> *can interpose its will to stay the onward march to social and economic victory. Just as we are endeavouring to destroy militarism as a dominant factor, just as surely will we destroy vested interests, which form a blot upon our social system, and which prevent a true development towards a higher and nobler condition of human welfare.*
>
> *Besides unity we need education. We need education that would give us confidence in managing our own affairs, and in competing with the education of those opposed to us. We need education to equip us for all essential functions of life—education that will give us true culture, knowledge of our own and other countries that will endow us with language to converse with men and women of other nations, whether it be for moral upliftment or trade and commerce; that will give us science to apply to our own co-operative industry.*[3]

This line of thought tended to support another option for creating global peace: the development of the League of Nations.[4] While a few questioned the League's claim to represent the will of the people (some argued that the ICA had a much better claim because of the numbers of people it represented and the ways in which it could reflect their wishes), the international movement in general strongly supported the development of the League. Despite flaws in how it was constituted, the League could be visualized as a place where disputes among nations might be peacefully resolved. Co-operative movements around the world, the International Co-operative Alliance, and many prominent co-operators supported this option, seeing it as an extension of what they were trying to accomplish through international Co-operation. They were, however, limited in what they could actually contribute to the League's development. Unfortunately, about the time Albert Thomas was named as the first Director General of the International Labour Office (ILO) in 1919, the co-operative movement's limitations started to become obvious.

The International Labour Organization was one of the most important organisations created to advance the economic and social

3 The *Bulletin*, June 1918, pp. 114-115.

4 See: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/League_of_Nations.

goals of the League of Nations.[5] Albert Thomas was a prominent French politician, a strong supporter of trades unions, a highly respected co-operative leader, and a member of the ICA's Central Board. He was an untiring and deeply committed co-operator, a man who, as he himself remarked, had "the greatest and fullest confidence in the virtue and efficacy of the co-operative spirit."

In 1920 Thomas created a co-operative unit within the ILO. Its task was to encourage the co-operative movement to help the League in meeting its four main objectives: the promotion around the world of the right to work; the provision of "decent employment" for women and men; the expansion of social protection for all; and the strengthening of tri-partisan collaboration among labour, employees, and governments in securing of industrial peace. Co-operatives could be significant contributors to achieving these goals because of their capacity to create employment, to stimulate local economic activity, to be decent employers, and especially because of their abilities to bridge differences within the economy. The last objective had been one of the movement's main goals since the mid-nineteenth century.

Thomas's support, and his expectations for the movement, did not end there. He wanted the co-operative movement to play a considerable role in helping define peace after the War. He persistently prompted the ICA to become proactively engaged in the conferences and discussions associated with the Peace Treaty, a complicated diplomatic process that went on for many years in Paris and other cities. While Henry J. May, the ICA General Secretary, seems to have been sympathetic to Thomas's appeals, the ICA board was tentative; it was unsure of the support it would have from the ICA membership given the hiatus in meetings throughout the war years.

Moreover, a new and complex set of issues had emerged at war's end with the creation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). The key concern was how the USSR was treating, and was going to treat, its co-operatives. Did it control them too much? Did members have an effective voice? Were their elected officials able to provide independent leadership?

5 The ILO is a specialized agency of the United Nations devoted to promoting social justice and international standards of human and labour rights. See: http://www.ilo.org/global/lang--en/index.htm.

Debates over these questions would fester within the ICA for some eighty years;[6] and became a serious impediment to sound co-operative growth throughout the twentieth century. The debates produced significant divisions both within national movements and between them. The debates derived from how people and organisations viewed what was happening behind the "Iron Curtain" and later in China. Divisive debates created simplistic and contrary understandings of what co-operatives were about in both the USSR and countries opposed to it. Counter-productive views encouraged perspectives that reduced co-operatives to being mere adjuncts of government programmes or, outside of the USSR, to seeing them as being merely useful approaches when mainstream market systems failed. Contrasting perspectives also created unfortunate divisions on how co-operatives were viewed in southern countries. This meant that co-operatives could easily become lost amid the intensity of the debates between Marxist and non-Marxist systems, as if that were the only context that really mattered. It is understandable why the ICA board, even in the early 1920s, wished to remain in some ways aloof from international discussions about the League.

The ICA board's position on limited engagement in the great discussions and debates of the day was confirmed when the ICA held its Congress in Ghent in 1924. The Congress, which was quickly immersed in debates over whether there should be collaboration with various USSR initiatives as a form of what was perceived as international solidarity with the working class,[7] had little choice but to emphasize the classical co-operative position on political neutrality. As a result, while Congress affirmed a position of limited engagement, the ICA focused on trying to influence some of the economic and social debates of the time—especially as they affected labour relations within co-operatives and relationships among different kinds of co-operatives.

One can only look back at that positioning and, while realizing the complexities involved in trying to do more to help create peace, ask an historical: What might have been? Was a significant oppor-

6 See W.P. Watkins, *The International Co-operative Alliance*, 1895-1970 (London: The International Co-operative Alliance, 1970), pp. 128-129.

7 Ibid, pp. 145-148.

tunity missed? It is not just an academic question or one that refers only to the 1920s; it highlights the complexity of the international movement becoming involved in the most controversial, contemporary, international issue of that time. Achieving consensus within the movement has never been easy. Reliance on Congresses, or even on annual meetings, to broker compromises and reach agreements has been, and continues to be, cumbersome. Moreover, the movement has always possessed differences of opinion, many of them deeply tied to diverse communities and contexts around the world. The most obvious contributions have come from expanding and improving upon how co-operatives can transcend differences among people as they pursue common interests.

In any event, the ICA followed a more moderate and subdued approach to the great issues of the post-World War One world. Rather than trying significantly to alter the geopolitical situation, it focused on working for peace through co-operative economic action and on creating peace through explaining the underlying philosophies and methods of operation of co-operative practice. The main elements of its approach can be discerned in the ICA's annual report for 1925 posted in the January 1926 issue of the *Bulletin*:

> *The Alliance had also intervened with clear expressions of its views and inferentially with a claim for the Movement to be heard in the Councils of Europe, Inter-allied and International, on the subjects of Economic Reconstruction, Disarmament, Stabilisation or Exchange, etc.*
>
> *The post-war exuberance of republican and revolutionary ideas in Europe, supplemented by the active campaigning of the Soviet Republics, added a complicating element which has not only provoked resistance on the part of the moderate sections of our Movement, but has actually retarded the impetus which the war conditions gave to the co-operative idea.*
>
> *The Ghent Congress, therefore, declared a truce to the external activities of the I.C.A and brought the Movement back, at a single bound, to its initial tasks of documentation, statistics, and the promotion of its purely co-operative aims.*
>
> *And so it comes about that the question of Free Trade, Disarmament, Universal Peace, and all questions capable of a political*

interpretation are, for the time being, relegated to a subordinate place, if not actually excluded from the programme of the I.C.A. We are not here concerned with opinions, but rather with recording facts, and this must be regarded as the net result of the modifications in policy, which have taken place during the last eighteen months.

Relations with international trade unionism were fostered from 1921 to 1924 by a Joint Committee of the I.C.A. and the I.F.T.U., which prepared a plan of mutual work. Considerable progress was made, but a check was given to this development by a demand for the inclusion in these relations of the 'Profintern' by the Red Trade Union International of Moscow, with its policy of class war and the united labour front. The unity of the workers, however desirable in the abstract, would be purchased at too high a price for the Alliance if its policies of political neutrality and evolution were to be sacrificed. The activities of the I.C.A. in this direction are to be governed by the resolution of the Ghent Congress, which virtually dissolves the Joint Committee and only approves the continuance of the joint relations with 'International Federations of Trade Unions' in such specific matters as may arise from time to time, and subject to each question being previously submitted to, and approved by, the Central Committee of the I.C.A.[8]

Sustaining an Ideological Position

The reality though, was that the ICA could not escape internal discussions about the rise of Marxism in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; nor could the issue be ducked within most national movements. It was not a new issue. It was the culmination of ideological struggles that stretched back some forty years. It would not be easily resolved.

As far as the Russian Revolution was concerned, the ICA at first sought in the Bulletin to present both sides of the debate as to what was happening, focussing essentially on what the Revolution meant for the ICA and for what had been a rapidly growing Russian co-operative movement.

8 The *Bulletin*, January 1926, pp.2-3.

On the cautious or critical side, the *Bulletin* printed critiques by Professor V. Totomianz, a stalwart ICA figure from the co-operatives of the Tzarist regime. In 1918 he wrote:

> *The gist of our differences with the communists on the question of co-operation resolves itself into the following: Co-operators are convinced that the co-operative movement as a free and self-governing organisation, which unites its members and administers to their needs, is still necessary in Russia in order that the country may live and the people still utilise the conquests of the revolution.*
>
> *The measures which the Soviet power applies to the co-operative movement strip it of its essence, leaving but a mere name, and converting it into an adjunct of the economic apparatus of the State which is clumsy as it is, and has already proved its inefficiency.*[9]

On the other hand, the ICA printed articles from co-operative leaders sympathetic to the changes being wrought in the Soviet Union. One was authored by Margaret Llewelyn Davies from the Women's Guild in 1920, when sympathy for the USSR was widespread in many co-operative circles in Europe and North America:

> *It is a pleasure at this moment to give the leading place in co-operation to the great Russian nation. What international help can be brought by their gigantic achievements in retail and wholesale societies, in the association of flax growers, the Siberian creameries, their educational and social activities, their foreign trade, and the Narodny Bank, which is the financial centre for this immense co-operative system. Throughout the Revolution the co-operative movement has maintained its stability, and it is not too much to say has saved the economic situation. It has been accepted by the Soviet government, while still working on an independent basis, and it has continued its work in other parts of Russia.*[10]

The ICA also published reports from Russian co-operative leaders that made it more difficult to evaluate the situation in the USSR, such as the following published in 1926:

> *It seems patent that at the present time Co-operation is one of the most important forces operating in the life of the Russian people. Not only is an economic reconstruction of the country inconceiv-*

9 The *Bulletin*, 1918.

10 The *Bulletin*, January, 1920, p. 27.

> *able without Co-operation, but it can be brought about only with the assistance of the great movement. Since on the side of Co-operation stands the experience of the New Life, it possesses a ready machinery for business operations; it holds within its midst the best technical ability of the people; its business has suffered the least from the civil war. And, what is most important of all, it is trusted by the population who, in their trying period of life, learned to make use of its resources. The future work will proceed along the course already marked, and it is not in the power of anybody to alter it as the development of the Co-operative Movement in Russia is determined and directed by the whole system of existing life in the country.*[11]

The differences apparent in these three views suggest the challenges the ICA faced then (and for several decades) in coming to terms with the roles of co-operatives within the USSR and what ultimately became its client states. There were many observers who were strongly supportive; there were many others who were not.

Furthermore, there were always difficulties in understanding exactly what was happening within the USSR. There were always people from the Soviet co-operatives who came to ICA meetings and who seemed to be determined co-operators attempting to do what they could under the circumstances. How should the ICA respond to them? Ignore them? Try to help them? Insist on absolute co-operative purity in a world where there was relatively little co-operative certainty? Such issues were only easy when ones opinions were firmly implanted, you lived far away, and you never conversed seriously with the sincere co-operators who struggled with the restrictions imposed on them by strict government regimes.

In contrast, there were no doubts, nor any vacillation in how the ICA responded to the rise of Fascism, beginning with its emergence in Italy in the early 1920s. The controversies began shortly after Mussolini took over in 1922.[12] The Italian political system was quickly and deeply polarized and the movement inevitably became caught in the turmoil that ensued. Much of the consumer movement, located

11 The *Bulletin*, May 1920, p. 101.

12 See Rita Rhodes, *The International Co-operative Alliance During War and Peace, 1910-1950* (Geneva: International Co-operative Alliance, 1995), pp. 129-120.

in the north with Milan as its centre, was closely tied to the political left, including the unique force that was Italian communism. When the Fascist forces intimidated, then persecuted and destroyed left-wing organisations and movements, they sought to limit and sometimes destroy the co-operatives they believed were involved. Most of them belonged to the *Lega Nazionale*. All told, some 4,000 co-operatives were destroyed, while another 3,000 were forced to join the *Ente Nazionale*, a new national organisation headed by an elderly Luigi Luzzatti and developed by the government.[13]

Henry May, who had close relationships with the Lega, was alarmed by these developments, as were many on the ICA board. Some degree of his anger and depth of his feeling were captured in an article on the Italian situation that he wrote in 1926:

> *It is necessary to insist that Co-operation and Fascism represent aims and ideas that are diametrically opposed to each other because in Italy today, after four years of the Fascist regime, which has expressed itself towards the Co-operative Movement in terms of coercion, violence, incendiarism and assassination, the Fascist authorities have the effrontery to suggest that in principle they are identical. Nothing can be further from the truth. It has been said with a certain amount of justification, that Bolshevism is the Fascism of the extreme 'left', and that Fascism is the Bolshevism of the extreme 'right', and it might be added that the more they differ from each other the more they are alike. But to bring the comparison more close, Fascism is the dictatorship of the chauvinistic bourgeoisie, while Co-operation stands for the democratic liberty and independence of the community….*
>
> *We need not detail here the accounts of the terror of Fascism, which we have gathered from widely different sources and from authorities which left us no room to doubt their genuineness. This we can say, that from the reports which filter through into the general European press only a very inadequate idea can be obtained of the true conditions, and so far as the sorrow and suffering are concerned, the half has not been told.*[14]

Henry May expanded with his attack on Fascism one issue later:

13 Ibid, p. 140.

14 The *Bulletin*, April 1926, pp. 97-99.

> *The history of Italian Co-operation, which begins with the radiant morn of national independence and unity, is a succession of magnificent struggles carried on by the strength of faith, by humble sacrifices, and in a spirit of honest and cordial fraternity. It is one with the history of the "Lega Nazionale delle Co-operation," which comprises the aspirations, resolutions, hard-fought battles and victories of Co-operation, which, until the time of unheard-of-violence, has been the hospitable refuge and the flag of all Italian co-operators, the laboratory, the college, the busy factory, the furnace, and the steam-hammer from which have emerged all proposed legislative measures and the various kinds of organisations most characteristic of our work, Workers' Co-operative Societies, and collective farming—in short, all the magnificent patrimony of vigorous activity which had placed Italy amongst the most advanced countries in the evolutionary role of economic solidarity.*[15]

Though relations with the Italian Fascists did improve somewhat as the 1920s ended, it was only a temporary reprieve as the 1930s would reveal.

Identifying and Pursuing the Co-operative Way

The turmoil associated with war and the ideological challenges that followed in the wake of it exposed a major flaw in how the international movement sought to foster peace. Even though most co-operatives and co-operative movements followed common practices and had similar roots, there was no readily available, standard authority to guide them; there was no generally accepted, simple, explainable orthodoxy that outsiders could consult to understand the movement's distinctiveness. The movement appeared to be essentially a pragmatic blending of experience, practice, and thought, not an ideological framework that could be readily understood and applied. This was partly why the movement could not rise to the occasion as Albert Thomas had hoped and help shape the post war world. This dilemma was also why the ICA as an institution was weak, despite the best efforts of some very capable and admirable leaders. This is why it was unable to carry out programmes that obviously would

15 The *Bulletin*, May 1926, p. 132.

have been of great benefit to the movement, and why it was able to make only limited contributions to long-term efforts to create a more peaceful world. There was a demonstrable need for greater cohesion within the movement, especially at the international level.

However, the movement did possess people with strong viewpoints, some of whom spoke to issues of peace, particularly the achievement of social peace within and among communities. There were many who stressed the reforming capacity of the co-operative movement, a capacity that could help develop more perfect democracies. An example of this emphasis can be found in the following excerpt from the *Bulletin*:

> *The original and beneficent object of trade – that is, the satisfaction of human needs – has been lost sight of in a capitalist system, whose motive is that of profit-making, and whose method is that of autocracy.*
>
> *A co-operative system, based on organised consumption, restores the original object of trade. It is one which accepts the economic interests of the whole body of consumers as the purpose of trading. It functions without making profits, distributing the surplus on trading transactions in proportion to purchase. It makes capital the servant, not the master in industry; it governs by popularly-elected boards of directors. One member, one vote, is its rule, regardless of the number of shares held. It thus forms a true democracy, where industry is carried on by the people for the people.*[16]

Others also celebrated the promise of Co-operation to develop a fairer world. One of them was Emmy Freundlich, an Austrian Member of Parliament. She played a prominent role in the ICA for many years, particularly, but not exclusively, in issues concerning the involvement of women and the furtherance of peace initiatives within co-operatives:

> *What do Co-operative Societies seek to attain through their democratic economic activity? They endeavour to set up a new economic organisation, which is opposed to the constitution and aims of the present economic organisation of capitalism. The present capitalist system begins with production, and tries to make the biggest possible profit; the economic and political aims of its organisations*

16 The *Bulletin*, 1926.

and activities are subject to this one aim. He who has money builds factories, produces goods, and tries, by means of advertising and selling agencies, to find a market for his manufactures. He does not produce to meet the demands either of the individual or the community, but simply to make profit. Even wasteless and superfluous goods are manufactured, which frequently entail a wastage of raw materials and of goods already on the market provided there is any hope of profit.[17]

In 1926 Charles Gide wrote an article in which he tried to explain the universal appeal of Co-operation and its capacity to contribute to peace. He explored some of the reasons commonly advanced—race, economics, religion—only to conclude:

[T]here is no inferiority of race, neither economic poverty, nor religious belief which can disqualify such and such a people in the Co-operative Movement. All are admitted into the house; all, as in the parable of the great Feast in the Gospel, are invited to enter. There must be, therefore, some truly human motive in Co-operation. I mean by this something superior to all the divergences which occur between men, nationalities, or history—which calls all men to it.

This motive is two-fold, as, indeed are all motives of human activity, both material and moral. It is, first, the desire to lighten the burden of life, to increase well-being and comfort. It is also the desire for greater justice; the desire to create an economic organisation, which shall be free from the obsession of profit-making and from exploitation of the poor by the rich, and also – for this still exists – from the exploitation of the rich by the poor. Now there are motives which every man, whether white, yellow, or black, intelligent or ignorant, believer or atheist, ought to understand and feel…

One must not be in the category of those who declare themselves satisfied with the common lot as soon as they are satisfied with their own lot, for in that case they think it useless to search for better things. Neither must one be in the category of violent people; by those I mean the people who believe that injustice caused by force

17 The *Bulletin*, September 1926, p. 258.

can be cured by force, for in that case they disdain the slow work of Co-operation….

There must be faithfulness in little things, such as daily purchasing and cash payments. It is often the little tasks which are the most difficult to fulfil, and the most neglected.

Finally, there must be the pacifist spirit in the fullest meaning of the word; the spirit which refuses to resort to force in the relations between fellow-citizens and in international dealings.

This is sufficient to explain why Co-operation does not progress in every country. But – by little steps or big steps – all the same, it progresses.[18]

Others took a simpler and more direct approach:

The development of the Co-operative movement is continually hindered by three main causes:

1. *The general and complete ignorance of outsiders about the aims and machinery of the Movement.*
2. *The lack of knowledge on the part of a large section of the members themselves as to the organisation and the social influence of Co-operation, together with consequent lack of enthusiasm for its development.*
3. *And this is the cause which rather results from the preceding one—that many persons are elected as directors and members of committees of management of the societies who do not appreciate the Movement more highly than as a means of producing a dividend to the shareholders and remuneration to the committees.*[19]

A long series of contributors stressed the importance of attracting true co-operators to the movement, as the following quotations suggest:

A final condition of success in Co-operation is even more fundamental. It is a supply of what the advocates of the movement call "co-operative men." The scheme depends not merely on economic thrift, but on integrity, fidelity, and disinterestedness. A completely self-seeking man cannot be a good co-operator. Obstinacy and willfulness have wrecked co-operative undertakings almost as frequently as deception and fraud. In other words, Co-operation

18 The *Bulletin*, March 1926, pp. 70-71.

19 The *Bulletin*, 1922, p. 78.

> *presupposes common sense, forbearance and co-operative spirit and can be successful only when such qualities exist. Without them it fails as a business; and with them its successes are something more than business successes. Co-operation, in fact, is a form of moral education, an expression of social ethics, a way of trade which might write over its stores: 'Bear ye one another's burdens:' 'Ye are members one of another.*[20]

This sentiment was echoed again in a further comment in the *Bulletin*:

> *Progress in international Co-operation can only be brought about in so far as the co-operators in the different countries become far-sighted, confident in each other's loyalty and faithfulness, and convinced that the realisation of a universal co-operative commonwealth, established on the principles of brotherhood and equal rights, is the destiny which humanity is created to attain.*[21]

There were other viewpoints that stressed the essential practicality of the movement, its basis in the everyday world:

> *Let us here…refute the idea, which is only too current, that theory precedes practice. Men manured their fields long before there was such a thing as agricultural chemistry; they did it from experience before they did it by rule. To pass from one stage to another, the scholar who made a speciality of vegetable physiology had first to study the reports of cause and effect between the manuring and the growth of plants; then the theorist, having assimilated the results of his study, says to the agriculturist: 'The best manure in such a case is that which yields the fullest harvest with the least expenditure of money and labour.' The scholar starts by studying the reasons for various phenomena; the theorist then instructs the practical man as to how he must act to obtain a certain result. The one studies natural laws, the other- draws from practical rules - the discoveries of the former. There is no form of human activity which has not been made the subject of a theory. Theory is the result of practice; it is useless unless it is actuated by and adapts itself to practice.*[22]

The most pervasive message was a call to *keep the faith*, to continue building the movement so it could help reshape the world. Perhaps

20 The *Bulletin*, April 1913, p. 104.
21 The *Bulletin*, 1913.
22 The *Bulletin*, March 1915, p. 42.

the message was communicated so often because of perceptions that many people in the movement were losing confidence in what the movement could accomplish:

> *If the followers of a movement clearly perceive its aim and set themselves to attain it, the movement makes progress. If, however, the goal is no longer apparent, if this light is extinguished, each goes his own way; there arises then a difference of opinion, and a divergence of will. The spirit being absent, the body dies.*
>
> *The chief thing is, then, after all, to explain our aim, in order that Co-operation may not wander from the right road to progress towards this goal is to be animated by the co-operative spirit. There is no need, mark you, to inculcate a theory, a simple, practical rule, which may change according to circumstances.*
>
> *But what is this goal?…By replacing economic enterprise, which aims at individual profit, with collective enterprise in which all can join with equal rights, Co-operation tends to inaugurate a new and democratic economic organisation, in which each one will at the same time be owner and worker, and in which economic interests will become united, instead of being opposed as they are to-day. Every effort in this direction is in agreement with the co-operative spirit. The spirit animating a movement must be supported by several individual qualities; its adherents must possess a discerning intelligence, an energetic will and, we may here add, a human sympathy, for sentiment is an invincible social force. These intellectual, moral and human qualities are necessary to any social movement, and we must seek to develop them in the followers of the co-operative movement….*[23]

Given a range of views such as these, it is easy to see why a meaningful consensus was difficult to achieve.

Back to Business and Communities

Amid the various views as to what the movement was fundamentally about, co-operators and their organisations, like most people in the

23 The *Bulletin*, 1915, p. 43.

1920s, returned to what the American President Cal Coolidge called "normalcy." For them, that meant strengthening local co-operatives and building their central institutions. In the war-torn parts of Europe, notably Germany and France, it meant restoring the health of co-operatives badly damaged in the war and not particularly favoured by governments after it, despite what they had done to contribute to such social peace as could be achieved during the conflict. In the USSR it meant trying to sustain what had been a strong movement amid the vacillating policies of first Lenin and then Stalin. Throughout the movement, it meant designating some resources, never enough, to co-operative educational activities, most grandly in the case of the Co-operative College in the United Kingdom. In some national movements, it meant early experimentation with the production of co-operative films and the expansion of publications of various kinds: newspapers, pamphlets, children's literature, and books.

Returning to "normalcy" also meant trying to resume efforts at fostering international co-operative trade, a project that the ICA along with several national organisations had been trying to promote since the ICA's Second Congress in 1897. It was argued then and subsequently that doing so would not only produce cheaper foods and consumer goods but would also encourage peaceful relations across national boundaries. There was considerable enthusiasm for this project prior to World War One, though very little had actually been accomplished. During the war, enthusiasm declined as national movements wrestled with production dislocations, shortages of supplies and the ending of trade between belligerents. Moreover, as the passions of war escalated, national co-operative wholesaling and manufacturing activities were swept up in the emotions and their idealistic goals were pushed aside, sometimes forgotten.

Moreover, the cause of international co-operative trade did not gather much momentum after the war for a number of reasons. One reason was that the organisations primarily responsible for it, the national wholesales of Europe, responded sluggishly to the idea. They could be accused of narrow, national self-interest for not doing so, and there was some truth in that charge. To be fair, though, collaboration was not easy. The wholesales were significantly differ-

entiated by size and sophistication—the British and French wholesales being large and complex, the wholesales of Scandinavia, the Low Countries, Italy, and Germany being relatively small and new. Finding common projects useful to all was more difficult than was originally assumed. In several cases, especially in the aftermath of the war, the wholesales were confronting very difficult competitive situations because of inadequate funding, aggressive competition, and boycotts by private suppliers. They were also adversely affected when financially-challenged national governments raised tariffs in order to protect industries and production systems trying to recover from wartime economies. The dream of an integrated international co-operative economy remained just that—a dream.

There were further efforts to revive the idea of international co-operative trade in the late 1920s, but little progress was made. By that time the national wholesaling organisations had become even more enmeshed in national marketing systems, especially the modernization of agricultural production and processing, perhaps the most obvious form for such trade. The relationships between consumer and agricultural co-operatives were fraught with controversy as farmers created larger and larger co-operatives, even appearing to reach something like monopoly status in some commodities. The producer/consumer split became one of the most complex issues confronting the international movement during the 1920s and 1930s. In the end, it was not easy to identify ways in which co-operatives could use trade to develop more peaceful relationships around the world.

What Can Be Learned?

The co-operative response to World War One and the decade that followed it was diverse and complex. As we think back on it, what might we conclude about how co-operators thought about peace and how it might be encouraged?

First, the events of that period reaffirmed the movement's long history of searching for a way to create a more peaceful world. Many co-operative leaders articulated this quest, and it surfaced strongly as World War One became inevitable and finally erupted. Though often overwhelmed by the bellicose emotions of the conflicts, the dreams of a more peaceful world based on Co-operation remained

evident. These ideals helped the movement sustain connections across the deep divisions war had produced, notably between the Allies and Germany—a rather remarkable accomplishment given the feelings of the time. The search for more collaborative ways to work together internationally continued in various ways and despite the many debates that followed the conflict.

A second realization many co-operators came to was the belief that war occurred because of the undue competitiveness of capitalism and the ways in which economies developed under the influence of capitalist industrialism. The war was not just a matter of competition among nations and their leaders; it ran to the heart of the societies that modernity had created. That realization encouraged many co-operators to reflect seriously—and in diverse ways—about the underlying values of their movement. Surely, if co-operatives and the co-operative movement could become more effective, if they could be more deeply involved in fostering Co-operation, then there would be a greater chance in the future of avoiding what 1914-18 and 1919 in the USSR had wrought.

A third observation we can make is that co-operators and co-operative movements stressed the importance of encouraging co-operative responses to social cleavages and economic stresses at the local level within communities. Their contentions had been demonstrated by the ways in which co-operatives had been able to help overcome the problems caused by food shortages and profiteering during the conflict. They were evident in the ways in which consumers and farm people had been able to mobilize resources in their own as well as general interests. They were evident in the ways in which co-operatives had been mobilized in the community interest and had been able to reach across class and ethnic cleavages. There was reason to think that the movement had the capacity to contribute to local peace and development of more integrated communities.

A fourth take away is that many co-operators were directly engaged in peace activities of one kind or another, including pacifism. There was a strong relationship between the two movements when the war started but it declined as the war passions grew. It did not, however, disappear.

Further, though the International Co-operative Alliance tried to represent the views of various kinds of peace advocates within the movement, it was hard pressed to do so. Part of the challenge was that co-operative peace advocates were not always dominant within their organisations, and the ICA was, for the most part, the representative voice of institutions. The only organisation strongly oriented to pacifism was the International Women's Guild. Others articulated less extreme and varied ideas about peace. Finding an agreeable and clear consensus verged on the impossible.

Finally, some co-operative leaders believed that the movement could make a significant contribution to peace through developing international co-operative business activities, but doing so was difficult. The idea was nevertheless attractive and plausible: people who collaborate and work together for mutual advantage through democratic co-operative process will not easily engage in war, even if they differ on many matters.

As co-operators assessed the impact of the war and rebuilt their co-operative structures from the ground up, the stage was getting set for the next decade of world events. There were two overwhelming trends in the 1930s: the Great Depression and the seemingly inevitable descent into another world war. Both trends profoundly affected the international co-operative movement. Both trends profoundly affected how co-operators thought about—and tried to implement— peace.

Section IV

THE CONTEMPORARY SITUATION

Yehudah Paz

New Perspectives on Conflict Resolution

In recent times, we are witness to the emergence of significant new perspectives on conflict resolution. These new perspectives seek to set out conceptual approaches and practical programmes designed to create reasonably secure, attractive, and constructive alternatives to conflict. These approaches relate not only to modes and methods of bringing violent conflict to a halt, but they point to ways of moving from violent conflict to the cessation of violence, to post conflict co-existence and forward to the resolution of conflict. Risking slogan-like simplicity, the people-centered approach discussed here takes us from enemies to neighbours, from neighbours to partners, and from partners to friends.

These new perspectives do not seek to replace the conventional modes of conflict resolution, which are the province of governments, political leaders, and international frameworks and constitute the political processes of conflict resolution. They provide, however, a critical complimentary process. Most significant among these new perspectives are the people-to-people peace process, and the recognition of the link between conflict resolution and sustainable human

development. Both new approaches to conflict resolution recognize the centrality of civil society as a major factor in the determination and execution of peace policies at local, national, regional, and global levels.

While we draw warmth from the end of the Cold War, the bitter winds of conflict continue to blow, chilly and threatening in many parts of the world. The United Nations marks more than 30 violent conflicts taking place in the world today; it counts more than 3 million lives lost in violent conflicts and more than 20 million refugees (over 85% of the victims come from civilian populations). Conflict, which is anything but new, is also anything but over.

The Centrality of Civil Society

The people-centered and sustainable human development approaches we discuss here are appropriate across a wide variety of geo-political, socio-economic, and cultural settings. Perhaps most significantly, these approaches recognize the challenge of daily living that conflict imposes on people whose personal and national well-being depends on a successful outcome.

The term "civil society" is in some measure a concept that has not been fully delineated. Here we take it to mean that wide range of associations, organizations, and movements through which people organize to advance their interests; satisfy their social, economic, political, cultural, and other needs; and seek to influence policy or governance in line with their concerns and beliefs. In general, people act together through these organizations so as to gain some measure of control over aspects of their lives. Civil society groupings vary in size, scope, longevity, breadth of concern, and involvement in concrete activity. Some are small local bodies numbering tens of members; others are global in scope and count tens of millions of members. Some civil society organizations have a history stretching back over decades or more; others are yesterday's children. Some aspects of civil society are focused on a single issue; others propound a variety of ideas or engage in multiple activities. They include such a mix of organizations as: co-operatives, NGOs, trade unions, women's and youth organizations, community groups, volunteer associations, church-focused bodies, civic associations, and more. In so far

as is practical and possible, they are non-governmental, voluntary, autonomous, and self-managed; however, the degree to which each of these elements is actually achieved varies greatly.

However amorphous, multi-faceted, and variant the components of civil society may be, and indeed are, these social organizations remain distinguishable from the classic power centers of government and of economic power as it manifests within the private sector. Their representation of, and relevance to, issues facing modern society as well as their growing organizational competence, numerical strength, and global presence have significantly enhanced their acceptance at a variety of levels. Indeed, in such areas as protection of the environment, gender equality, defense of human and social rights, and more, they are clearly front and center. Integration of civil society players into societal systems of governance is a recognized, though as yet not consummated, concern of national and international institutions and governments.

Co-operatives as a Component of Civil Society

In many areas of these discussions on civil society, we treat all of the multiple civil society formations as a single whole; however, one sector needs to be clearly delineated, and that is the co-operative sector, and the various movements and co-operatives that are its components. The "Statement on Co-operative Identity" adopted by the International Co-operative Alliance gives the following definition of a co-operative:

> *A co-operative is an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social, and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly-owned and democratically-controlled enterprise.*[1]

This definition places co-operatives squarely within the ranks of civil society. Elaboration on other sections of the Co-operative Identity Statement make abundantly clear the status of co-operatives as both a non-governmental, people-centered institution and a special form of socio-economic enterprise, whose value commitment, organizational and ownership structure clearly mark it off from capitalist free-

1 See ICA: http://ica.coop/en/what-co-operative.

market, stock-ownership economic structures. Co-operatives are indeed a component of civil society, a part of the social economy, and rank among the people-centered, mass-based organizations seeking to give women and men control of significant aspects of their lives and their destinies.

Within the multifaceted ranks of civil society, co-operatives occupy a special place in terms of their relevance to the peace process. Conflict is a global concern; co-operatives, perhaps more than any other civil society formation, are a truly global phenomenon. The more than 660,000 co-operatives linked to the apex organization of the International Co-operative Alliance have more than 800,000,000 members and constitute the world's largest NGO organization.[2] Co-operatives can be found in almost every country on the face of the earth and in all major economic frameworks—both developing and industrialized nations as well as in nations transitioning from centralized to free market economies. Co-operatives exist in almost every sphere of social and economic life including: agriculture, industry, transport, housing, construction, banking, insurance, food supply (including the wholesale and consumer retail co-operatives), handicraft production, electric power production, hi-tech, production of organic food and other natural products, mobile phone provision, and many other sectors. They also exist is such varied fields as: education, welfare, health, sport, culture (music, art, theater, dance, etc.), the press and other forms of media, and more. Of all the components of civil society, co-operatives are not only the largest single component and the most widespread geographically; they are also found in the most wide-ranging domains of social activity, economic activity, and human concern. Given their scope, co-operatives are a part of almost any scene or set of circumstances in which conflict can emerge and for which conflict resolution is a necessity.

Co-operators subscribe to the principle of open membership and of non-discrimination on political, national, religious, racial, or gender grounds. The relevance of all this for our theme is clear: co-operatives are rooted in their specific economic, social and cultural reality, but they are also part of a trans-national, indeed a global co-operative alliance, which links them to other co-operators across borders of

2 See ICA, http://ica.coop/en/facts-and-figures.

varying kinds. These links promote the development of mutually-beneficial regional and international ties.

As explored in these chapters, the co-operative movement has included the promotion of peace in its programme of activity from its earliest days. This is an ongoing commitment that is still very alive and is exemplified by the adoption of several comprehensive peace-promoting resolutions adopted at the General Assemblies of the International Co-operative Alliance held in Geneva, Switzerland, November 2009 (see Appendix Three) and in 2011 in Cancun, Mexico (see Appendix Five).

Of course no claim can be made which ignores the fact that co-operatives and co-operators have been involved in many conflicts and have at times given voice (not necessarily as co-operators, but nonetheless) to hatreds and fears. They have been the perpetrators, as well as the victims, of violence and conflict. But if one looks at the co-operative scope, the co-operative reach, and the co-operative value system, one cannot but be impressed with the great potential of co-operatives and the co-operative movement for the furtherance of conflict resolution and the promotion of peace. This is true as this global movement with its multitude of sub-units celebrates more than 120 years as an international body. It should also give co-operatives a significant place at the table when it comes to the global quest for peace.

The People-to-People Peace Process

The people-to-people peace process can be summed up as follows: the process of conflict resolution undoubtedly depends on and derives from what is generally termed the "political peace process" that involves the initiation and active engagement of governments and of political institutions (national and frequently international), both in the initial stage of conflict resolution and on an ongoing basis. This is true of conflicts between nations and between ethnic, religious, tribal, or social groups within one country. It is important to recognize; however, that government and political agreements, although carefully crafted and effectively underwritten by international agencies or major powers, cannot by themselves serve as the creators and guarantors of a lasting peace. Such a process of conflict resolution

must consist of more than carefully phrased documents. It must rest on more than formal agreements and political guarantees. Peace will take root and flourish only in conditions of growing mutual confidence, of deepening mutual understanding, and where there is effective cooperation. Moreover, conflict resolution must find concrete and immediate expression in the economic and social realities of people's lives. The achievement of all of this requires direct interaction between broad sectors of society on both sides of the conflict. For this to come about, the organizations and institutions today grouped under the heading of "civil society" (i.e. the voluntary, non-government, people-centered organizations) must become actively involved in the peace process. What is required is the development of a civil society, people-to-people peace process parallel to the political peace process carried out by governments and political institutions.

Stages of Conflict Resolution

One may look at the involvement of civil society in conflict resolution—as in this people-to-people peace process—from a number of angles. Perhaps the most appropriate would be to focus on what may be viewed as a three-stage process to conflict resolution, and an examination of the role which civil society and the people-to-people interaction plays in each stage. The three stages may be loosely named as: initiation, peacemaking, and resolution. Together they make up a pattern of expanding the peace process over time, expanding the scope of peace-bridging activities, and advancing more realistic hope for a permanent solution.

In the discussion that follows, all the usual caveats apply: the separation into stages is essentially analytical rather than purely descriptive, and these stages are not rigidly separated from each other; the process moves backwards and forwards again so that there is a persistence of early elements in later stages and so forth. Nonetheless, this approach will aid in explicating our particular interest—namely the role of civil society in the people-to-people peace process and how co-operatives are well suited to be central players.

Stage One: Initiation

The earliest stage in the peace process at which civil society may play a significant role may be termed *initiation*. Below, we provide a general description of the process and how co-operatives can play a role. The reader will see how vital the people-to-people bridging is to establishing peace at the local, community level.

The first tentative approaches to dialogue may take place in a wide variety of contexts. We are aware of cases where the pioneers in the process were businessmen, and in other cases they were academics from different fields of study. Sometimes groups and individuals who share interests or concerns beyond the conflict arena find that their shared commitments can set the stage for the initiation of dialogue. Sometimes political-ideological frameworks at either national and/or international levels can provide the opportunity and the venue for initial interactions. Examples of such frameworks include: organizations dealing with gender issues and women's rights, concerns around ecology and environment protection, youth organizations, university and research groups, trade unions, co-operatives themselves, and other initiatives. Cultural activities or sporting events could also be the settings employed as an initial meeting ground.

In reflecting on first stage peace initiatives that we have observed, we offer the following observations. At first most of these initiatives were largely or even wholly divorced from government or political frameworks. Indeed, they frequently took place in the face of opposition and condemnation by the authorities and some protagonists paid with prison sentences (some even with their lives) for their perceived temerity in seeking dialogue. But if the political climate changed (sometimes influenced by these solution-seeking initiatives), or when leaders gained power who were more open to the concept of conflict resolution, an alliance (frequently of convenience) was sometimes built between civil society and government. The matter frequently proceeded from a see-no-evil, hear-no-evil, hands-off attitude through to tentative and growing involvement, for example, first "getting full reports" and later "augmenting and channelling" the flow of the dialogue. Further on came the utilization of civil society channels as a setting for para-governmental and even near-

governmental interaction and finally, came the adoption of dialogue initiatives by political forces on both sides as *theirs*.

This pattern also gives us indications of possible future roles which civil society can play at later stages of the peace process. At least two elements are worthy of mention in this regard. Firstly, civil society can continue to serve as an initiator of further dialogue with its counterparts on the "other" side on issues considered to be too difficult or controversial (particularly in terms of the internal politics of one or both sides) for governments to handle (or to handle publicly) at a particular time. Moreover, civil society interaction may serve as the frame of reference for the development of a new solution (or a battery of alternative solutions) in areas of concern where sensitivity, weight of history, or potential explosiveness makes inter-governmental negotiation difficult or even impossible. Thus, civil society can continue to serve as a *trailblazer* for political institutions even while formal discussions are underway. Here, and elsewhere as we shall note, this function of civil society acquires particular relevance when the backward-stepping phase of conflict resolution's nature—two steps forward, one step back—is playing out.

In the peace process, trailblazing is an ongoing activity. The growing awareness, acceptance, and involvement of civil society's variegated cohorts in this aspect of conflict resolution is an important new development.

Stage Two: Peacemaking

The next stage in the process of conflict resolution comes when the possibility of peace has become, in meaningful measure, a reality. It may be termed the era of making peace—rather than merely talking about peace. As such, the stage begins with the first formalizations of the end of the conflict—for example, the signing of a peace treaty, agreement on new forms of governance or social organization, and entering into an era of transition from talking to action. In so far as this movement from the exploration of possibilities for ending a conflict to an attempt to actually do so is not based on a victor-vanquished relationship (i.e. unconditional surrender), its framework of compromise is, in greater or lesser measure, tentative, fragile, and at risk. This is true even when the end of hostilities or rebellion is her-

alded by impressive public demonstrations, replete with appropriate oratory, and the initiative has garnered wide-ranging international support. What is required is the creation of a new, shared, social and economic reality between the parties, in addition to the new political reality. In this the people-to-people peace process can be relevant in a variety of ways.

One of the most significant roles civil society agents can play is in the deepening of mutual understanding and knowledge of "the other," their society, culture, economic needs, as well as their aspirations, hopes, and ideals. If peace is to begin to become reality, then attitudes must change from the dehumanizing enemy to the human neighbour. The first steps towards this can best take place within a framework of dialogue and direct interaction between broad sectors of society. Civil society players on both "sides" can provide such a framework.

In general, because the peace process has now taken on some measure of reality, civil society players can now begin to undertake concrete joint activities and programmes, inclusive of, but not limited to, discussion and interchange. They can develop joint projects, initiate training activities, and undertake cultural programmes. They can at last begin to build a framework for cooperation. This process frequently begins in areas where the problems to be faced are by their nature cross-border ones, such as: environmental protection; effective usage of rainfall runoff and reconstituted wastewater; or prevention of malaria, rabies, and the like. Further interaction can develop between counterpart groups who share a specific and in some measure ideological interest, such as concern with gender issues, trade unionism, co-operatives, youth matters, and the like. Common research, academic interests, and academic familiarity with trans-national discourse make this a fruitful area for interaction. The world of culture, the arts, music, theater, and dance lend themselves to these activities, as does the world of sports. Certain areas of concern, such as health, appear to be of such immediacy as to command a strong moral imperative as regards joint endeavours.

Altogether, across a broad spectrum of interests, concerns, and needs—including economic and social development, education, health, welfare, women's rights, ecology, youth issues, culture, the

arts, community development, academic matters and more—the people-to-people peace process can function and bring together components of civil society from both sides of the former conflict in a creative exchange. The formal, politically-achieved, end-of-conflict process makes this kind of people-to-people interaction possible; it, in turn, serves to give the political-peace process an effective base and framework for broad-scale involvement and advancement of the peace agenda.

A number of potential problems must also be tackled if this civil society cooperation is to succeed. For people-to-people activity to be effective, it ought to be carried out on a basis of real partnerships which extend to all significant aspects of the project. This is often easier said than done, despite all the good will in the world. The economic, numerical, institutional, and financial strengths of civil society partners may be very different, reflecting inequalities that exist between the nations, ethnic groups, or social organizations engaged in the resolution process. This situation is common when there is internal conflict but it is frequently the case in cross-border conflicts as well. This gap can give birth to *cooperative-defeating* patronizing behaviours, frequently heightened by misdirected and insensitive good will. It can call forth fears of domination and unwelcome intrusion, not only within the area of joint endeavour, but beyond it as well. These misunderstandings can lead to a desire to postpone such cooperation to some (relatively distant) day when there is a greater measure of equivalence between the partners.

Civil society institutions aware of these pitfalls will seek to avoid them in a variety of ways. They will insure that joint projects aim to be true partnerships at all levels of leadership and control—including financial. Cultural sensitivity should extend to consideration of the language(s) used, venues chosen for project activity, training programmes, scope and content of public relations, publicity, and so on. The hesitancies and fears that this lack of symmetry engenders must be recognized and responded to as quickly and as far as is possible.

Engagement in the people-to-people agreement, which is initiated in the early stages of post-conflict reality, may be challenged on the part of one of the participants on the grounds that it constitutes too great a normalization of the relationship between former enemies in

view of the early stage of a peace process. This relates, in one sense, to the more general issue of the relationship between the political peace process and the people-to-people activity. But here too, the parties involved must demonstrate awareness and sensitivity. Emphasis can be placed on the fact that progress towards peace, however small scale, opens new, specific, and delineated areas for legitimate cooperation between former enemies. Even if the movement is at that first stage of "from enemy to neighbour," this already means that things are possible which were previously unthinkable. The fact that most civil society bridging relationships are between civil society players on both sides of the conflict will enable them to move forward in a way that will weaken or possibly eliminate the real or perceived danger of normalization taking place too early.

In truth, normalization is the name of the game—the long-range goal of the process of conflict resolution. Its achievement, however, is also clearly related to the advance of the political peace process and obviously cannot be achieved by the people-to-people process alone. It is well for participants in the people-to-people process to be aware that a premature assumption that it has been achieved, or an attempt to impose its parameters before their time has come, can be counter-productive.

During the peace-making stage, there is also an area of internal concern to which civil society must address itself—that is the broadening and expansion of the *peace camp*—in other words, the base of support for the peace process must continue to grow. The critical nature of this activity is most readily apparent in a transition period when acceptance of the first and relatively minor concessions is key, and the peace process requires gradual build-up to more major concessions whose acceptance will be increasingly difficult for a broader sector of the population. Inevitably, those fundamentally opposed to the peace process will intensify their opposition to it as it moves forward; in extreme cases this will include provocative acts, renewed violence, and terrorism. The renewal or intensification of violence will also heighten the questioning of the validity of the peace process, which is, of course, a basic aim of those initiating the violence.

For conflict resolution to move forward, the base of commitment to it must expand so that in the final-stage, the majority of the popu-

lation deem even the most painful compromises acceptable, even in the face of escalating violence designed to raise doubts as to the possibility of real peace.

Civil society can make a special contribution to the necessary efforts required to broaden the base of support for peace. It can serve as a vehicle for the promotion of dialogue with sectors of the population not numbered in the peace movements or in the pro-peace political parties. It can draw those on the fence or at the margins of the peace process into direct contact and interaction with *the other*, with the hope, at least, of shattering the myth of *our enemy forever* and perhaps lead to the discovery of some measure of commonality. The people-to-people peace process creates concrete and practical partnerships whose mutual advantages can be made apparent to the doubters. Civil society must utilize all of the avenues and more in undertaking to broaden the base of support for the peace process.

A key question at this stage is how the people-to-people peace process relates to and influences the political peace-making process. The new perspective discussed here maintains that the political peace process alone is often unable to insure a full and lasting peace and that the expansion of mutual understanding and commitment to shared areas of engagement, which the people-to-people peace process can add, constitutes a major contribution to that goal. Further, one notes that the people-to-people process frequently serves to bolster and maintain the thrust towards peace when the political process slows down, grinds to a halt, or even slides backward. The underpinning of bottom-up civil society involvement can help maintain the momentum of the process, can foster informal and semi-formal contacts between the parties, and can even, in some measure, assist in revitalizing it. But should the political peace process reach an insurmountable impasse or come to a halt for an extended period of time, this would undoubtedly lead to a major contraction, if not to an actual cessation, of the people-to-people engagement.

There are also occasions when pressure exerted by political powers on civil society players has the effect of slowing down, or even temporarily stopping, the people-to-people process; this may be either as a response to a political pause or as a ploy in the negotiating process itself. On the other hand, the peace process is often not only given

the green light but a good push forward when the political skies are blue. In their polyphonic dialogue, the voice of the political peace process is pre-eminent and dominant, but the weight of civil society is not negligible and indeed grows as civil society interaction develops.

The dialogue between the two parties is also characterized by what may be termed differences in tempo. People-to-people demonstrates a relatively steady and consistent pace of slow advance; the political process is frequently one of rapid advance matched by rapid retreat, of marked ups and downs, of moments of breakthrough and others of despair. The interplay between the two disparate groups of actors is an important aspect of the peacemaking process. Or, if one may use a musical metaphor, it is here that the *basso continuo* nature of the people-to-people process, as contrasted to the melodic flights, including ups and downs, of the political peace process becomes most clearly evident and where the people-centered process can most effectively make its special contribution to conflict resolution.

In looking at the civil society-government relationship, one ought to note that in many situations it is not possible to speak of the two as wholly distinct and separate groupings. When one is dealing with the resolution of struggles for national independence, for the recognition of ethnic identity, or for major social realignment, what one finds is essentially a spectrum, a continuum linking the wholly political with the almost autonomous. In these circumstances civil society institutions and organizations in health and education, economics and welfare, culture and youth activity all exhibit some measure of political coloration—almost nothing is wholly non-political or non-governmental in nature.[3]

In the long run and in the broad picture, it is the political power that has the last word. But the voice of the civil society is heard, and more and more, civil society—and thus co-operatives—can have a significant role in shaping that word.

3 A parenthetic note to illustrate the point: In Israel to this day, the great majority of football teams are still identified as the "workers" or the "centrists" or the "rightists" from city x or town y, thus anachronistically reflecting a long bygone era in which ideology determined where one played and which team one supported. Here, even sport, once upon a time, was a political/ideological statement.

Stage Three: Towards Resolution

In moving through the earlier stages, we follow the process going from enemy to neighbour and from neighbour towards partner, with the ultimate goal being to move toward friendship. At this point, we consider elements that contribute towards full partnership. We might think of this as the move towards conflict resolution in its fullest sense.

Characteristics of the resolution stage include: a meaningful degree of permanence and security from the danger of renewed conflict; a high level of effective cooperation between the parties; major attitudinal changes; and perhaps even the emergence of formal frameworks for partnerships, such as regional economic unions or large scale trans-national development projects. It is in this context of extensive partnership, over a wide and diverse range of concerns common to the parties, that conflict resolution becomes a realistic possibility for former enemies.

One notes that there are those who view the peace process essentially as a permanent framework for the separation of former enemies along the lines of "good fences make good neighbours." However, movement towards resolution beyond the cessation of violence cannot grow out of a programme of purposeful and deliberate separation. Geographic and economic rivalries (perhaps ethnic and cultural ones too) will still be present. Their long-term resolution requires continuing cooperation between the parties. The potential benefits such cooperation can produce make its deliberate avoidance a self-defeating proposition.

Of course, any programme of cooperation must take into account the legitimate concern of those involved for the preservation of their identity. It must avoid the danger of economic, social, cultural, as well as political domination and/or exploitation and must serve the development needs of all parties. Nonetheless, it is important to emphasize that resolution is a process of encouraging mutually beneficial interaction—not of extensive separation.

Attitudinal Change and Conflict Resolution

While attitudinal change is important at each stage of the conflict resolution process, at this third stage it is central.

The requisite changes include the acceptance of the essential humanity of *the other* (de-demonization) and the readiness to treat him as friend, not as enemy (which he was indeed until the peace process began, as you had been his). This shift is to treat the other now as a legitimate partner in dialogue. There must be mutual recognition that the other has needs, aspirations, and fears that must be addressed; the other party has concerns with physical security and legitimacy, acceptance on the basis of equality, economic well-being, and a hopeful future for one's children are real and relevant. There must be mutual recognition and acceptance of concerns relevant to national, religious, ethnic, and cultural identity.

When advanced attitudinal change has occurred, one comprehends the fact that the other views reality, particularly that reality which affects both parties, from a different vantage point, with different assumptions, and with different conclusions. In this context, the *truth* about an event consists not only of the facts as such (to the extent that these can be really ascertained), but equally of the conceptual filters, presumptions, and historical perspective through which these facts are observed and evaluated. This ability to see shared realities through the eyes of the other, the ability to comprehend their narrative, is an important step in conflict resolution. If learning is really about broadening horizons and enlarging perspectives rather than merely accumulating facts, then it is this sort of learning which is requisite for true conflict resolution. Civil society —and thus co-operatives—working through the mechanisms of the people-to-people peace process, can play a significant role in furthering this kind of attitudinal change.

Yet another aspect of this attitudinal shift is understanding that recognition of the other's legitimacy—as a human being, as a group, as a point of view—does not necessarily imply a lessening of one's own legitimacy or of the validity of one's own point of view. Recognition that another viewpoint may actually, and even legitimately, exist does not imply acceptance of that viewpoint. It does, however,

imply that the viewpoint of the other party must be taken into account. Here, it is necessary to move from a confrontational, all-or-nothing perception of the situation in which "my gain is your loss" and vice-versa (win-lose), to a perception which recognizes that the compromises which lead to conflict resolution can, while preserving a core legitimacy for the views of both parties, also insure the future of both. This can translate into greater gain for each party (win-win). Once again, civil society interactions can provide an effective role in the development of these perceptions.

One further aspect of this process of changing attitudes and perceptions relates to the place of history in the process of conflict resolution. This is a topic which surely commands more space and explanation than can be given here. But there are one or two aspects of this matter that should be noted.

In a sense, the initiation of a process of conflict resolution depends on the willingness of both parties to suspend historical analysis and debate—for the moment—and take the present reality as their point of departure. In this sense they must project their thinking towards what the future can be like rather than seeking to assign blame (or credit) for how the present came about, particularly, when the alternative responses to that query engages such intensity as to form an almost insurmountable barrier to resolving the conflict. Yet such a suspension can be but temporary. The burden and implications of the past are of such weight—at the personal no less than at the formal and institutional level—as to command attention and demand response. We ignore history at our peril, not only because, as Gertrude Stein's aphorism would have it, "History teaches that history teaches" but also because nowhere is history more real, more current, more meaningful than in the minds of the parties to a conflict, particularly a violent one. One might therefore say, conflict resolution may need a suspension of thinking about history in order to get underway, but it cannot proceed towards its goal without relating to the past. In a sense the readiness to do so, to deal with the relevance of the past experience, to confront the pain, the injustice, the failure, and the guilt—all of which lie to some measure with both sides to any conflict—is the true measure of progress at the human and subjective levels towards conflict resolution. The lesson of South Africa in this

regard is clear: the greater the injustice and the deeper the pain, the more directly they must be faced if their legacy is to be overcome. The relevance of the frameworks of interaction created by civil society through the people-to-people peace process to this dimension of conflict resolution is critical.

Building Last Peace through Sustainable Human Development

Conflict resolution opens a window of opportunity for the rapid advance of sustainable human development across a wide range of social and economic concerns. Some of these are derived directly from the realities of the cessation of violent conflict. For example, in virtually every conflict resolution situation there exists a population which, after years of military service, or near-marginal existence because of the proximity to violent conflict, now enters a stage in which such normal and civilian concerns as jobs, housing, etc., become not only realistic but pressing. Indeed, the reality of held-back development, now free to move rapidly forward, is characteristic of most countries and groups moving out of conflict situations.

Resources—financial, natural, institutional, as well as human—that were once earmarked for conflict-related use are now potentially available for development. Land areas, infrastructure components for roads, railways, ports, and airports, or communication can all be more and more freed of the constraints of conflict and can be used for development. It is vital to recognize the fact that one of the most important aspects of every conflict resolution process is the widely held hope that peace will serve as the basis for a major leap forward in meeting basic human needs. For this important reasons, it should be apparent that sustainable human development is a significant and an integral part of any effective process of conflict resolution. This is true in regard to the resolution of conflicts between neighbouring countries, but no less so in regard to conflicts between groups or sectors within one country.

Development expectations are not limited to the realm of the socio-economic—central though this may be. They also extend to the process of democratization and the protection of human rights.

The price to be paid for the failure to link conflict resolution and sustainable human development is a high one indeed. The closure of this window of opportunity leads not only to the loss of a perhaps irretrievable possibility for rapid development but also to serious endangerment of the peace process itself. Without development, significant sectors of the population, just recently liberated from the conflict situation, may be tempted to turn to crime or return to the conflict once again. Where people see little change in their lives and in their hopes for their children, the danger of a drift towards the renewal of old hatreds, toward religious fanaticism, and nationalistic extremism, is all too real. Where there is no advance toward development, the slippery path from despair to hatred, and from hatred to violence, is all too real a threat. The failure to seize the opportunity for development that the initiation of the peace process provides could well constitute a very real base and background for the loss of the peace process itself.

Development linked to conflict resolution reflects similar concerns and issues that would be relevant to development in non-conflict situations. This is true in regard to the need to focus on ecologically sustainable development or, for example, the need to give priority to the human-centered aspects of development, such as the enhanced satisfaction of basic human needs for food, shelter, education, health, welfare, culture, employment, human rights, and other freedoms.

Post-conflict reconstruction needs to be a central element in the political/governmental peace process and should include a variety of activities and projects carried out jointly between yesterday's enemies and today's partners. If civil society is enabled to fulfill the role of a full partner in the peace process it can make a significant contribution toward insuring, as far as possible, that development is indeed human-focused and ecologically responsible. Civil society can help promote democratization and social welfare, empowerment of women, rural as well as urban advancement, and give priority to human resource development in terms of health, education, and community building. Further, civil society can help insure the inclusion of broad sectors of the population in the development process through the direct involvement of mass based, grass roots, people-centered organizations. But beyond these classic roles, all of which are of real

significance for development, there are other contributions which civil society can make in the people-to-people peace process.

In the peace building stage, it is important to establish truly joint partnerships in civil society peace-building projects. This is equally relevant in development partnerships whether these are large-scale or small initiatives, economic or social in nature. Here, the weight of asymmetry between the partners may find expression not only in the teacher-pupil relationship but also in the employer-employee one as well—for example, in a joint business venture where one partner provides capital and know-how and the other supplies the labour. Such businesses may have some developmental significance, but the danger that may be perceived to prosper through the use of cheap labour is all too real and all too counterproductive in terms of peace. It commands attention and continuous, conscious action to reduce asymmetry and build real partnerships.

A focus on empowerment and democracy that is prominent in civil society's peace building initiatives is also of critical importance for development programmes. Similarly, regard for cultural and linguistic elements is another area of significant importance.

Intense and lengthy conflict situations are inevitably accompanied by a greater or lesser weakening of democracy, few guarantees of human rights, and loss of freedom of expression. In some cases, conflict extinguishes these freedoms or prevents their emergence. Protection of these basic rights are the concerns of many civil society organizations. The participation of civil society in the development process gives hope that democratic practices will not be forgotten in the rebuilding stage.

In large-scale conflicts, there is also an important role for international civil society agencies and other nations to play both in terms of recognition and resources to support the full realization of contributions civil society players can make at the negotiation table. These outside parties may play important roles as facilitators, as furnishers of venues and other resources, as providers of assistance, guidance, and good advice, as guarantors, and even more. They may serve as a powerful determining agent in bringing about peaceful solutions.

The issue of granting NGO's and civil society the degree of autonomy which is their right and also a pre-condition for maximizing

their contribution, while at the same time building frameworks of constructive partnership between them and governments, is key to post-conflict development activity. Civil society is more than merely a potential partner: It is a partner whose direct involvement is a critical element for the success of lasting peace.

A Final Word

This examination of the role of civil society, of how the people-to-people peace process may be utilized in each stage of conflict resolution and the importance of linking sustainable human development to this peace building process has given weight to our contention that these new approaches can make a significant difference to the pace and strength of establishing lasting peace agreements. This approach reflects a change in view around the role of civil society and its growing significance to the peace process and also demonstrates how co-operatives can address many of the most important areas of human concern that must be attended to in building a lasting peace.

Peacemaking and peace preservation are not easy or simple tasks; attempts to achieve them often fail or achieve only partial or temporary success. These tasks require patience and persistence, they rest on the deepest of commitments and draw on a rich reserve of optimism. The pursuit of peace requires the effective utilization of all the means and modes that can be assembled to ensure its progress and its long-term success.

Civil society, and certainly the co-operative movement, have the potential to play a central and positive role in conflict resolution. It is incumbent on them to take up the responsibility of realizing this potential. It is equally incumbent on the nations of the world and the international peace-promoting and peace-maintaining institutions to recognize the importance of the people-to-people process and the significant contribution co-operatives and other civil society players can make to the resolution of conflicts and building lasting peace.

Section V

CASE STUDIES ON CO-OPERATIVES AND PEACE

Vanessa Hammond

Case Study One: Relighting the Candles: Co-operative Giants of North-West Ireland

Irish myths and sagas are full of giants and heroes. When we think of co-operatives as an effective tool to overcome community difficulties, we come across three real-life giants in the recent history of North-West Donegal, in Ireland.[1]

The areas of Gleanncholmcille[2] in west Donegal and Kilclooney,[3] both have a rich archaeological and historical past stretching back at

1 With Acknowledgements: To the memory of Fr. McDyer and for the community development insights in *Fr. McDyer of Glencolumbkille - An Autobiography* (Dingle, County Kerry, Ireland: Brandon Book Publishers Ltd., 1984). To Liam Ó Cuinneagáin and Professor Michael Herity, for their lectures on Fr. McDyer at the 2010 Oideas Gael Summer School and to Liam, for the text of his 2010 lecture to the Scoil Shamhraidh Mhic a'Ghoil. To Tim Cranley, for his presentation at the 2010 Oideas Gael Summer School. To the residents of An Cashel, Gleanncholmcille, for their enthusiastic discussions of community development and for their co-operatives.

2 Glencolumcille is the English spelling. It means the Valley of Columba of the Church, founded by a 6th century prince of the Ui Neill's who became a monk and founded many other monasteries in Ireland and on the island of Iona off the west coast of Scotland.

3 Like many Irish names, this name originated in the early years of Christianity in Ireland, perhaps 1,500 years ago, and refers to a small monastic cell, maybe a church for the community, founded by a monk whose name has been remembered as "Cooly" although this has probably changed over the centuries.

least 5,000 years. Like all of the more remote areas of Ireland, these communities have weathered difficult times. The communities have known centuries of absentee land-lordism, suffered climate changes that decreased the yield of many tiny farms, seen the famine of the 1840s, along with the loss of the brightest and strongest young people to the lure of richer lands, witnessed the unsettled politics of Ireland in the early 20th century, and experienced the overall economic stress of two world wars.

In these situations, there was not outright conflict between opposing groups, but rather growing unrest among local residents regarding a pervasive atmosphere of conservatism (*We've always done it this way*) and a government attitude that sparse resources should be focused on more *promising* areas.

Nonetheless, positive change has been achieved in both communities.

Father James McDyer (1910 – 1987)

In November 1951 Fr. James McDyer, then 40 years of age, was appointed to the parish of Gleanncholmcille. He was appalled by the poverty and hopelessness and set about identifying the basic infrastructure needs of the community. To address these concerns, he needed a visible project. In twelve weeks, starting in January 1953, he and local residents, both Catholic and Protestant, built a parish hall which would seat over 100 people. The hall became his work base and is still the centre of village life.

Next Fr. McDyer started on other infrastructure projects, such as a proper road to replace the track to Killybegs (the nearest town), a water supply system, and electrical power. He created occasions to bring Gleanncholmcille to national attention by planning community events, such as the Agricultural Show he initiated in 1954. He gained widespread coverage for the event by inviting celebrities of the day to open the exhibition.

His aim was to stimulate the local economy. Once the basic infrastructure was in place, he started on his largest project: the establishment of the Errigal vegetable processing co-operative. With much political manoeuvring, he finally received approval for a grant

from the national community development organization[4] on condition that the co-operative raise matching funds of £28,000. This was achieved in 1962 by local people and others throughout Ireland buying shares in the co-op, as well as through contributions coming from overseas. The next challenge was to get the farmers' consent to lease their land. Although this struggle is still remembered with some resentment, the vegetable processing co-op was finally established. In recent years, the co-op was converted to a fish processing plant under private ownership but it is still a major employer in the community.

Starting in 1966, Fr. McDyer encouraged the establishment of co-operatives centred on the traditional skills of weaving as well as for knitting, and the building of a Folk Village and Holiday Village. These community attractions and centres of economic stimulus still celebrate the history of the Glen and provide employment through serving around 40,000 tourists annually. In the 1970s, this was followed by a building co-op that gained contracts from the local council.

Fr. McDyer also supported the work of Liam Ó Cuinneagáin and Joe Watson in establishing the Oideas Gael College which grew to attract around 1,500 students and visitors to the Glen every year.

In reflecting on the work of Fr. McDyer, Liam Ó Cuinneagáin points out that Fr. McDyer was at times forceful rather than persuasive and that he did not appreciate the Irish landowners' attachment to their land. Ó Cuinneagáin suggests that Fr. McDyer's work could have benefitted from the services of those with extensive management and financial expertise. He concludes; however, that "He lived his life to the full and followed the Christian pathway in a way that few of us could achieve." [5]

Fr. McDyer never saw co-operatives as an end in themselves, but as a tool to move communities from despair to sustainability. He used his enormous energy, the contacts he had developed at university, and partnerships with government and private business for the benefit of the people of his parish and for all the people of poor, rural western Ireland. With hindsight it could be argued that he might

4 Cómhlucht Siúicre Éireann.

5 "Fr. McDyer – A Pioneering Champion of Community Development" lecture at the Scoil Shamhraidh Mhic a'Ghoil, No Gleanntaí (fada on the "i") 24th July, 2010.

have achieved even more if he had adhered more closely to the formal co-operative principles and been more consultative and democratic. Yet, the reality is that this giant of the Valley was deeply mourned at his death in 1987 and is still remembered on a daily basis. He truly lived his belief that it is "better to light ten candles even though nine of them are extinguished...than forever curse the darkness."

One of Fr. McDyer's supporters was the Gleanncholmcille journalist Francis Ó Cuinneagáin. It is his son Liam Ó Cuinneagáin who, after becoming a school headmaster (principal) and teacher at University College, Dublin (UCD), formed a partnership with Professor Joe Watson, a Belfast Presbyterian who was teaching at UCD, to establish Irish language schools for teenagers. Under the guidance of this educational giant of the Glen, these short summer courses for young people have grown into the Oideas Gael[6] College which in turn, has rekindled the work started by Fr. McDyer and gained an international following that would have been unthinkable before the age of mass transport and the internet.

Liam Ó Cuinneagáin

Liam Ó Cuinneagáin's approach is totally different from that of Fr. McDyer. Ó Cuinneagáin was the consummate expert in customer service and persuasion rather than demanding and imposing options. For example, at the start of each Irish language course he starts by motivating the students and teachers reminding them that enjoyment of the experience is just as important as the knowledge gained during the course. These language courses run from absolute beginner level to refreshers for those who use Irish in their professional lives. Courses in hill walking, traditional cultural activities, fiddling, painting, and archaeology are offered each summer and by special arrangement throughout the year. This makes a very significant contribution to the earnings of the residents of the Valley.

Although Oideas Gael is not a co-operative, the work it does supports all the local co-operatives by bringing visitors to the Valley, raising the national level of Irish language competence and enhanc-

6 Extensive information on Oidea Gael, although not on Liam Ó Cuinneagáin, can be found at: http://www.oideas-gael.com/en/.

ing the appreciation of all aspects of Glen culture from art to fishing. While we often think of co-operatives supporting their communities, Ó Cuinneagáin has ensured that the increased sustainability of the community actually works with the co-operatives for the greater benefit of all residents. He too has lit many candles and kept many others alive.

One candle Ó Cuinneagáin relit is the "Rural Show." It was started by Fr. McDyer in 1954, but became dormant in 1998. Through persuasion and the establishment of a committee representing the community at large Liam worked in the background to have the show reinstated. In 2010 that goal was achieved and the community of about 1,500 hosted the "Big Show." Over 2,500 visitors from across North-West Ireland and as far afield as Australia, Brittany, and Canada enjoyed viewing the several hundred entries in categories from sheep dog trials, to art, and baking. Ó Cuinneagáin even ensured that Columba, patron saint of the Valley, organized brilliant sunshine for the whole day!

Writing the story of Ó Cuinneagáin's achievements for the co-operatives in his community is a much more difficult task than naming the contributions of Fr. McDyer. Although Ó Cuinneagáin established fewer co-operatives than Fr. McDyer, his method of achieving progress was truly co-operative in his use of consensus across and beyond the community. He involved a wide range of people sufficiently that they developed a sense of ownership and participation. He was endlessly teaching and motivating, and offering support for the co-ops in and beyond the community. He was always working for the good of all in Gleanncholmcille, while showing compassion far beyond its borders. This jovial giant lit and relit many candles and continues to motivate others to do the same.

Tim Cranley

Towards the end of the last century, when much of Ireland was enjoying the affluence of being a "Celtic Tiger," the more remote areas were experiencing the loss of community services. Tim Cranley, a geologist living in Donegal, took what was intended to be a leave of absence from his work and set about motivating the community to develop the services no longer being offered by government. He

and a group of like-minded residents were particularly concerned about the lack of faculties for youth, the potential for tension between youth and the rest of the community, and of deep resentment by the community towards government about the plight of seniors.

After some research Cranley and his volunteer colleagues decided that the co-operative form of incorporation would provide a business model that could enable the community to retain control of an enterprise and develop a sense of ownership through the purchase of shares. At the same time, co-operatives had the formal structure needed to attract donations and grants. With these objectives in mind, they set out to create the Narin Portnoo Rosbeg Community Co-operative.

Five thousand years ago our ancestors erected spectacular monuments throughout Ireland. One of these nearby Neolithic structures inspired Cranley's group to name the Narin Portnoo Rosbeg Community Co-operative's building the "The Dolmen Centre."[7] They gained the interest of others, such as Liam Ó Cuinneagáin and Professor Michael Herity,[8] whose support, combined with much planning and hard work, won the favour of government at the local, national, and European Union levels. The support and growing interest in the project from these parties, in turn encouraged regular injections of enthusiasm from the community and helped maintain their interest in the Centre.

The co-op has evolved, with a remarkable vision and much hard work, into an outstanding organization. The Dolmen Centre building is *green*—costing about 30% more than the original construction estimate but costing around 30% less per year to maintain it compared to a conventional structure. Wind turbines and solar panels provide all the energy for the building. Local granite, lumber, and tweed have been used in its construction because of their beauty, to

7 Kilclooney, Narin, and Portnoo, Donegal, Republic of Ireland see: http://www.dolmencentre.com/.

8 Professor Michael Hertity taught Archaeology at University College, Dublin, where he was Chair of the Department of Celtic Studies. He is a specialist in the Irish Stone Age and was elected President of the Royal Irish Academy in 1996. He is a tireless worker for the greater public understanding of Ireland's unique archaeological diversity and richness, and a strong supporter of the sustainable development of communities that recognize the richness of the country's cultural heritage.

support the local economy, and to remind locals and visitors of the rich resources right at their doorstep. The aim of the co-op, demonstrated in every aspect of the building and the welcome given to all, is that it should be equally inviting for all, both residents and visitors. Through cooperation and hard work, this small community has enabled the co-op to provide meeting rooms and a large gym, which also serves as a theatre and reception hall. Weekly events include yoga, drama, and parenting groups. A family resource centre undertakes outreach in the community. Youth programmes, including a club room with a pool table and TV, have helped eliminate vandalism in the community. With the support of the Health Board, seniors are brought in twice a week for morning refreshments, activities, a four course lunch, and afternoon teas. A playground and astro-turf field are used by the whole community. The coffee shop and small store provide an informal meeting place and excellent training for people wishing to work in the tourism sector.

While a high level of professionalism and careful financial management are evident, the whole co-op has the feeling of community, participation, and welcome—something that many areas in Ireland have not been able to achieve. This is particularly remarkable in an area that has seen sectarian tension and economic depression in the recent past. Instead of accepting the difficulties of the last century as inevitable, Tim Cranley and his colleagues drew on the example of the kind of community effort that would have been needed 5,000 years ago to build, without even rudimentary metal tools, the magnificent dolmen monument on the hillside and to position its 22 ton capstone. Like Fr. McDyer and Liam Ó Cuinneagáin, Tim Cranley is a giant among co-operators in Dhun na nGall (Donegal) lighting and relighting candles of hope that can be seen throughout rural Ireland.

A Co-operative Light in the Midst of Poverty

Co-op developers and community activists everywhere can learn much from these co-op giants of rural North-West Ireland.

In each of these situations, the community was in obvious need of action, but no easy path was evident, nor was there an obvious hope of success; however, as effective leaders, these men were able to gain

the support of enough people to achieve the momentum necessary to create visible results. The early leaders gradually created the infrastructure and developed the skills needed for credibility and survival, and they motivated others who would be able to assume leadership at the right time. These early rural co-ops were very different from the prevailing Irish norm of large-scale agricultural or consumer co-ops.

They also differ from the usual image of co-ops in the context of conflict. In these areas there was no visible enemy and no open conflict. The struggle was against poverty, disempowerment, abandonment by the higher powers (whether state or church), and most ominously, was the struggle against hopelessness.

Not only have these inspiring co-op leaders built hope and success in their own communities, they are also an inspiration to other co-operators to boldly light candles—even if some will be extinguished. This is better than just complaining about the dark of hopelessness.

Postscript

Building on these strong co-operative roots, a co-operative inspired vision continues to grow in the form of an informal international network of co-operators working for the wellness of vulnerable individuals and communities in Ireland, Canada, and the United Kingdom[9].

9 The Informal International Network of Co-operatives (IICON) is in development. Further information is available from firstownershipcoop@gmail.com.

Smita Ramnarain

Case Study Two: Local Peacebuilding by Women's Savings and Credit Co-operatives in Nepal

Co-operatives are platforms of collective action for social welfare. In many places in the world, co-operatives—be they agricultural, industrial, or savings and credit co-ops—have fostered a strong sense of community, participation, empowerment, and inclusion among its members.[1]

Given the operating principles of co-operatives—transparency, flexibility, pride in local ownership, democratic functioning, and a concern for community—it can be argued that co-operatives and allied services have a significant role to play as brokers of peace, social harmony, and human development in communities torn by conflict and social discord.

Scholars of conflict and peacebuilding have pointed to the irony that conflict and violence are also exercises in collective action, but

1 The author would like to thank the Canadian Co-operative Association (especially Anna Brown) for their generous support of this project and permission to use some of the findings from the Nepal report in this chapter. Thanks are also due to CMF Nepal (Sushila Gautam and Naresh Nepal, in particular) for their assistance in organizing field work. Mimu Raghubansi provided excellent research assistance, for which heartfelt gratitude is expressed.

of a perverse kind.[2] Through fear, mistrust, suspicion, hatred, and prejudice, personal or inter-group conflict erodes a sense of well-being, security, and inclusion among people. A pressing challenge in peacebuilding, therefore, consists of finding ways to restore the interpersonal or intergroup relationships that have been eroded as a result of conflict.[3] The seeds of divisive social behavior that have erupted into conflict must be replaced by a reconstruction of relationships, an identification of shared mutual concerns, a building of new institutions, and creation of a vision of community in order to catalyze peacebuilding.[4]

In such contexts, co-operatives have often emerged as sources of *positive social capital*,[5] restoring interpersonal relationships, promoting the inclusion of minority and neglected groups, and providing an alternative vision of society. Co-operatives are agencies that seek to remedy structural injustices such as poverty, discrimination, and exploitation that often contribute to direct violence. Co-operatives also aim to promote reconciliation among fractured social groups by fostering positive dialogue among members of these groups, thereby providing an alternative to violence.[6] Through the co-operative principles, co-operatives are able to (re)build trust among members of the community, an essential prerequisite for sustainable peace.

This case study focuses on peacebuilding and conflict mediation by women's savings and credit co-operatives in Nepal, in the aftermath of the ten-year long Maoist conflict (1996 – 2006) and during Nepal's transition to democracy. Through interviews and focus group discussions in women's savings and credit co-operatives in Nepal, we aimed to gain further information on how women members had become empowered through co-operative membership, to emerge

2 C. Tilly, *From Mobilization to Revolution* (New York: Random House, 1978).

3 J.P. Lederach, "Beyond Violence: Building Sustainable Peace," in E. Weiner (ed.) *The Handbook of Interethnic Coexistence* (New York: Continuum Publishing, 1998).

4 V. Volkan, "The Tree Model: Psychopolitical Dialogues and the Promotion of Coexistence," in E. Weiner (ed.) *The Handbook of Interethnic Coexistence* (New York: Continuum Publishing, 1998). See also, Lederach, 1998.

5 For a definition of social capital see: http://www.hks.harvard.edu/programs/saguaro/about-social-capital.

6 E. Sentama, *Peacebuilding in Post-Genocide Rwanda: The Role of Co-operatives in the Restoration of Interpersonal Relationships*, PhD Thesis (Gothenburg University: School of Global Studies, 2009).

as peacebuilders within households, in their neighbourhoods, and in the community in general.

Background

Co-operative organizations have had a long history in Nepal since the establishment of the Department of Co-operatives (DOC) in 1954 under the aegis of the Ministry of Agriculture. The first co-operatives in Nepal were created in 1956 in the Chitwan district as part of a flood relief and resettlement programme. At the time, they were provisionally registered under an Executive Order of the government and were legally recognized after the first Co-operative Societies Act of 1959 was enacted. Co-operatives have since emerged as a vibrant part of Nepal's economy, operating in as many as 12 different sectors, ranging from savings and credit unions to dairy, multipurpose, agriculture, and health co-operatives.

At the same time, Nepal has also had a history of social exclusion and severe caste and ethnic discrimination. Given the grievances emerging as a result of persistent poverty, social inequality, and unequal development, Maoist ideology began to gain ground, spiraling into a full-blown violent civil conflict in 1996. From 1996 to 2006 Nepal's Maoist conflict—between the security forces of the then monarchical government and the cadre of the Communist Party of Nepal—claimed around 12,700 lives,[7] led to the widespread destruction of infrastructure, involved many human rights abuses, and disrupted the daily lives of residents in many communities. In addition to this explicit violence, insidious forms of structural violence are deeply ingrained in the Nepali social structure, which disadvantages certain individuals or groups politically and economically through their systematically unequal access to resources, political power, education, health care, and safety. Structural violence can also normalize iniquitous institutions in society and thus contribute to the creation of grievances that legitimize direct violence, as seen in the Nepali context.

Women face the direst consequences of both direct and structural violence. For instance, women in rural areas were seriously affected

7 E. Douglas, *Inside Nepal's Revolution*, National Geographic Magazine, November (2005).

by the disruption from the Maoist conflict as men were killed, disappeared, migrated, or joined the fighting. Not only did they have to deal with fear and insecurity but in many cases they also had to emerge as the sole supporters of their families. From a structural violence point of view, gender discrimination, domestic violence, and sexual harassment are grave concerns that can affect all women in times of peace but it is an especially serious threat in times of war.

The Maoist conflict ended in 2006 with a cease-fire agreement between the Maoists and the government. One significant consequence of the cease-fire was the transition of Nepal from a monarchy to a democratic republic. Subsequently, elections were held in 2008 for the formation of a Constituent Assembly to formulate a new constitution that enshrined the principles of democracy and federalism. In recognition of the fact that women's participation in the people's movement played a vital role to establish democracy in Nepal and that women's interests needed to be represented in the new constitution, a campaign for political education called *Our Campaign* (Hamro Aviyan) was organized in 50 women's savings and credit co-operatives across twenty districts in Nepal. The project—coordinated by the Center for Microfinance (CMF) and jointly funded by the (then) Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and the Canadian Co-operative Association (CCA)—aimed to develop women's co-operatives into *schools of democracy* to enable members' full participation in the Constituent Assembly elections. Through the project, 22,433 women co-operative members participated in training delivered through 720 workshops prior to the Constituent Assembly elections. In this way CMF and its affiliated co-operatives worked towards creating the social infrastructure for a new, participatory democracy to develop in Nepal.

In 2011 follow-up research was undertaken to evaluate the impact of the project and the relationship of these women's co-operatives and co-op members to peacebuilding and conflict mediation. The project sought to examine the ways in which the specialized training and citizen-centered advocacy campaigns carried out under *Hamro Aviyan* had (a) made women co-operative members aware of their socio-political rights and obligations under the new democratic system, and (b) enabled women co-operative members to emerge as

conflict mediators and peacebuilders in their families, neighbourhoods, and communities. The research project focused on documenting specific examples of conflict mitigation and peacebuilding by women's co-operatives and their members. The findings from this project are discussed below.

CMF Barahi Mahila Multi-Purpose Co-op Nepal. Photo: Sarah Shima

Main Findings

The most pervasive form of conflict that women interviewed in this study dealt with in their lives was strife within their households due to poverty, deprivation, and lack of resources. These conflicts occupied the thoughts of many respondents on a daily basis. However, women co-operative members reported that since joining the co-operative, their increased ability to contribute financially to the household also augmented their bargaining power in intra-household negotiations and enhanced the respect family and community members gave them. Women also stated that the exposure and productive work the co-operative engaged women in helped them to gain confidence, face injustices, and challenge discriminatory practices in their families,

such as polygamy, discriminatory dowry practices, female feticide, unequal property and inheritance rights, and domestic violence.

While women members individually tried to address instances of conflict and violence in the home, co-operatives have also tried to intervene at the village level to ensure peace and prevent instances of violence, especially violence against women. Besides taking active measures to protect violence-affected women from further abuse, several co-operatives have undertaken public awareness rallies and established paralegal committees to provide legal advice to women members (and sometimes even non-members). They have also intervened in cases of human trafficking, alcoholism or drug abuse, and gender and/or ethnic discrimination. Indeed, collective action has emerged as a valuable weapon in women's pursuit of justice and peace. Women have come to realize that their combined efforts as a group can be more effective than working on their own to seek social transformation, especially in contexts where gender and cultural norms are rigid and where the struggle of individual women may remain isolated or too feeble to challenge the *status quo*. It is through their collective and organized strength that Nepal's co-operatives have mobilized and established that women are able to make their voices for justice and peace heard.

During the Maoist conflict and its immediate aftermath, some co-operatives also faced direct threats of violence or extortion. In such cases, attempts were made to discourage the forces of violence from adversely affecting the co-operative and its members. In most cases, it was the transparent financial dealings of women's co-operatives and their emphasis on local development and fairness in their means of operation that protected the co-operatives from Maoist or government interference, extortion, or other serious setbacks. In the post-ceasefire period and during its transition to a democratic multi-party system, Nepal has faced immense political instability leading to sporadic incidents of political violence, especially in the *Terai* (plains) region. Women's co-operatives have also intervened, albeit in circumspect ways, in such cases of generalized social violence.

The voter education and advocacy campaigns had a significant impact on women co-operative members. Some members stated how the voter education campaign helped them during the Constituent

Assembly elections to realize the importance of their vote, to make the right decision and get involved. Through the narratives of co-operative members, it became clear that after the training, many women's co-operatives and their members came to realize the stakes they had in influencing constitution-making processes to be able to better represent their interests. Since that time, to varying degrees, many of the women's co-operatives and their members have also attempted to continue to press for these changes at the local and central levels of government. They have been contributing directly and indirectly to countering deeply entrenched structural violence, and to building enduring peace, unity, and social harmony. Women emphasized that such trainings were a way to break the cycle of ignorance that characterized most women's lives in a country such as Nepal, where opportunities for women are limited. Further, by focusing on social issues such as women's rights, children's rights, democratic principles, social inclusion, and equality, the training fed into the day-to-day running of the co-operatives themselves. This made the co-operatives more democratic and participatory spaces in the community.

Women's Co-operatives and Peace in Nepal: Discussion

There are several reasons why the women's savings and credit co-operatives in Nepal have been successful in building peace to the extent that they have.

1. Co-operatives provide economic support

At the domestic level, women cited the lack of financial resources as a prime cause of conflict and strife. Upon joining the co-operative, however, women were able to save small amounts from their incomes (if they were earning) or save from their household management purse (if they were not working). They could then deposit the money into their savings accounts, and use it in times of need for education, buying property, or in cases of health or financial emergencies. Not only did the women no longer have to depend on the whims of their family members for making certain purchases, but access to financial resources became important for their bargaining power within the home. Finally, and perhaps most crucially, there was a link between a

women's economic independence, as supported by the co-operative, and an increase in her own confidence and in gaining respect of others around her.

2. Co-operatives were a source of collective strength and mobilization

In largely patriarchal societies such as Nepal where women individually occupy a subordinate position to men and where male domination extends to all aspects of the public and private spheres, these women's co-operatives were able to achieve their objective of supporting their members through united, concerted action to empower themselves. As a result, the women's savings and credit co-operatives in Nepal have become a refuge for women who have faced discrimination and persecution.

3. Co-operatives were platforms for women's voices

A significant contribution to peacebuilding and reconstruction in Nepal has been the attempt of co-operatives to mobilize women's voices and build their self-confidence. Instead of suffering social injustices silently, the women co-op members were now able to organize themselves for the prevention of violence, especially gender-based atrocities and injustices. As a result of being able to develop their voices, these women have also been able to articulate their needs to policy-makers, fight for their rights, and speak in solidarity with other women who have been victims of violence and injustice.

4. Co-operatives were practitioners of political neutrality and 'good politics'

One reason the women's savings and credit co-operatives have succeeded to the extent they have in ensuring the cooperation of external agents in building and maintaining peace has been due to their commitment to political objectivity and neutrality. In Nepal, holding the training sessions in remote villages in a milieu of general insecurity, suspicion, and political instability required the courageous action of co-operative members, some of whom also came under threat. In

certain areas various political parties also approached co-operatives for (non-optional) financial contributions. However, women trainers were—with patience and persistence—able to convince the party cadre soliciting "donations," as well as the larger community, of their commitment to non-partisan politics.

The women's co-operatives did not shy away from political engagement or from ruffling a few feathers in the pursuit of justice, awareness, and peace. However, women in these co-operatives did differentiate between negative politics (i.e., politics that are all about power play, petty corruption, and vote mongering) and the positive politics espoused by the co-operative (i.e., politics that focus on the pursuit of democratic principles and the elimination of structural inequities).

It is also important to point out the challenges women's co-operatives in Nepal have faced in their pursuit of peace. Certain problematic traditional and cultural practices are remarkably sticky and difficult to change. A related challenge arose when education and awareness projects were short term rather than being integrated into the working structure of the co-operatives themselves. While this integration happened in a few co-operatives, it did not in others.

A further challenge surfaced when we considered the situation from a feminist perspective and realized that the women's co-operatives were providing peacebuilding services to the community and that the labour going into provision of this service remains unpaid and unrecognized. While many women co-operative members engage in conflict mediation and peacebuilding work as part and parcel of their community activities, we must also wonder if the gendered social expectation that women perform peace work places an additional burden on them in terms of their uncompensated time and skills.

These larger questions admittedly have no clear solution. However, they may be addressed more thoroughly if peacebuilding by co-operatives was recognized as an important service and brought to center stage rather than being designated as an ancillary activity or a by-product of a co-operative's other activities. The expansion of education programmes and integrating peacebuilding and conflict

prevention into co-operative education would go a long way in addressing some of these challenges.

Julia Smith

Case Study Three: Community Credit Unions in Sierra Leone: Building Peace by Fostering Trust and Equality

Sierra Leone's civil war (1991-2003) both started and ended in Kailahun District. Children were forced to be soldiers and families were scattered in refugee camps. All normal business activity ceased during the conflict. The roads fell into disrepair, almost all infrastructure was destroyed, and the jungle reclaimed much of what had been productive farmland.

In 2010 the region was one of the poorest places in the world, with one of the highest infant and maternal mortality rates. Illiteracy was over 80 percent. Local government, civil society, and community groups were attempting to foster development, but their efforts were frustrated by a lack of resources, few incentives to co-operate, and corruption.

Economic development was constricted by lack of access to affordable credit and secure saving services. Various microfinance projects charged anywhere between 20 and 100 percent interest for loans. Farmers were exploited by many produce buyers who provided loans for inputs on the condition that the farmers sell to the buyer's com-

pany. The buyers then purchased the crops at a low price, ensuring the farmer remained dependant on them for future loans.

A variety of dubious microcredit schemes, which were implemented during the emergency response phase following the war, created suspicion of savings and loans programmes. There were countless stories of projects that disappeared over night with local people's money. The word "co-operative" was particularly mistrusted, due to widespread corruption and mismanagement amongst farmer co-operatives prior to the war and the closing of co-operative banks during the war.

Credit Union Development

In 2009 SEND West Africa, a regional non-governmental organization, introduced the credit union concept to community members in Kailahun District. Based on positive feedback, SEND agreed to facilitate the establishment of three community-based credit unions in chiefdom headquarter towns. The goal was for these credit unions to be self-sufficient within 10 years.

SEND provided the basic infrastructure and resources for the establishment of the credit unions. A Credit Union Development Officer and three accounts clerks were hired, office space was leased, and sensitization activities conducted. Consultants from the Credit Union Association of Ghana and SEND Ghana assisted in training staff and sharing their experiences.

The first community credit union in Sierra Leone, the Luawa Chiefdom Co-operative Credit Union, was incorporated in Kailahun Town on June 8, 2009. The following month the Upper Bambara Community Co-operative Credit Union was established in Pendembu Town, and the Kissi Tongi Community Co-operative Credit Union was opened in Buedu Town. All the credit unions were registered with the Department of Co-operatives.

During the first year and a half, the credit unions elected their boards and committees (loans, education, and supervisory) and began soliciting members. Membership grew to over 300 in total. In May 2010 the credit unions disbursed the first loans to members, charging three percent interest per month on a reducing balance. Members used loans to build homes, pay school fees for their chil-

dren, and invest in their businesses. By September 2010 a financial audit and social assessment produced positive results.

Credit Unions Foster Trust and Equality

When members of the Upper Bambara Credit Union were asked why they formed the credit union, they gave the following reasons:

- *It will help to build peace in our communities.*
- *It builds unity and familiarity between community members.*
- *It can increase health in the community.*
- *To work towards a common goal.*
- *To reduce poverty.*
- *It will build self-confidence and trust in the community.*
- *To promote women working side by side with men.*

These answers demonstrate the variety of impacts the credit unions had in fostering trust and equality in this post-conflict context.

One female credit union member explained that the credit union "brought peace in the home" as it provided a secure place to save so that her husband could not spend cash on palm wine and cause fights. Another member noted how the credit union promotes development: "The credit union increases the ability of parents to pay school fees by helping them to save, preventing children from dropping out, and so will improve education in the community."

The loan process provides a practical example of transparency and fairness. One member noted, "When I go to the money lenders they make me tell them all my business, all my secrets. Then they still deny me, and I feel angry and shamed. When I go to the credit union I fill in a form and the loan committee reviews it. I feel like a proud business women."

The credit unions promote the economic equality of women and men through a microfinance programme. As many women do not make enough from their small businesses to join the credit union, they are encouraged to form groups. These groups then join the credit union and are able to apply for microfinance loans, serving as collateral for one another. These revolving loans are tailored to benefit the types of businesses (such as soap-making) the women engage in. The aim is for the women to grow their businesses through micro-

finance loans so that eventually they can individually join the credit union and benefit from larger loans.

The credit unions are working with local leaders to promote good governance. In all the credit union communities, traditional chiefs and district councillors have become members. Because these leaders must abide by the same membership and loan policies as all members, fears of corruption are diminishing, and democratic principles are being nourished. Board and committee members receive leadership training and are encouraged to take an active role in community governance. One board member stated, "As leaders we need to be eye opening of what is going on in the community to inform development and provide education for our people."

In September 2010 the credit union boards and committees developed business plans, setting targets and strategies, to increase membership and savings, and to improve overall governance and operations. The goals were ambitious—they hoped to grow credit union membership by more than 200 percent in the next year—demonstrating a belief in the potential of the credit union model.

The credit unions still have to combat fear and mistrust on a regular basis, but it is becoming easier as they continue to abide by their plans and policies. As one member said, "These are the things that were said in the first sensitization workshop about what the credit union would do and we have seen it is so."

Nerea Lizarraga Gabirondo
and
Begoña Arregi Mondragón

Case Study Four: Mondragon, Co-ops, and Peace

Mondragon was born out of the co-operative movement begun in 1956, when the first industrial co-operative was set up in the Basque region.[1] Its corporate philosophy is set out in its co-operative values:

- Cooperation
- Participation
- Social Responsibility
- Innovation

The stated mission of Mondragon Co-operative is: the production and sale of goods and services, as well as distribution of goods; adoption of democratic methods in the group's organisation; and distribution of the profits generated in solidarity to the benefit of its members and the community.

Mondragon began operations in 1956 in the town of Mondragón, in the province of Guipúzcoa, Basque Country, Spain. Mondragon now comprises 257 companies and organisations. They are all com-

1 Background information on Mondragon was drawn from: J.M. Ormaetxea. *Origenes y claves del cooperativismo de MONDRAGON* (Aretxabaleta, Gipuzkoa: Otalora, 2007).

mitted to the creation of greater social wealth through the satisfaction of their customers, the creation of employment, technological and business development, continuous improvement, encouragement of education, and respect for the environment.

From this solid foundation, Mondragon is facing the future, determined to continue developing one of its most valuable features: its position as a world leader in co-operative labour.

Mondragon is divided into four organisational areas: finance, industry, distribution, and knowledge. Mondragon is currently the largest business group in the Basque Country and the tenth largest in Spain. It has a major international presence with production plants throughout the world.

Any account of the origins of the Mondragon co-operative movement must consider the effect of the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939). On the Basque front, the war lasted until 1937, and in the town of Mondragón it left shortages, hardship, and a certain degree of poverty. This was to have a profound impact on the young people from the area.

Education as the Key to Progress

The new regime ushered in major changes in education. Religious education, which had been outlawed under the republic, became a pivotal subject. The Brothers of the Order of St Viator came to the town of Mondragón in 1939 and set up an apprentices' school. Here they taught around thirty children, many of whom would go on to be the pioneers of the Mondragon co-operative firms. The apprentices' school had very close ties with Unión Cerrajera, the largest company in the area.

In 1941 Jose María Arizmendiarrieta arrived in Mondragón. Born 100 years ago, on 22 April, 1915 at the Iturbe Basque traditional house in Markina, Arizmendiarrieta was a vigorous young priest, cheerful and athletic by nature. He began teaching social issues at the Apprentices' School. Arizmendiarrieta was determined to provide working opportunities for all the young people in the town, and to this end he set up the Professional School in 1943.

> *A people cannot be constructed without its history, but neither can its history be made of hysterics. A people must seek health and*

vigor, both physical and moral, and it will be successful in this to the degree that it acts consciously and responsibly, aware of where it wants to go and what it takes to get there. Serving the people and serving oneself from the people are not the same thing.[2]

The trauma of the civil war left a certain sense of dejection in its wake, which Arizmendiarrieta, as the young people's confessor and advisor, was anxious to help them shake off. As a result, from 1942 to 1958, when the co-operatives were beginning to take centre stage, he extended his teaching, with boundless generosity and intensity, appealing at all times to the idea of fair and commutative distribution.

The saddest inheritance we have received from the world that preceded us is the lack of opportunities for education and training, moreso than the inheritance of economic inequality.[3]

Arizmendiarrieta designed a collective education programme for a group of children that combined a vocational education-for-life-in-the-firm approach with social work involving elementary tasks disassociated from any personal gain, all devised within the context of ecclesiastical schooling.

The best way for a community to be dynamic, to flourish with all manner of projects and initiatives, is by giving broad opportunities to all those willing to cultivate their higher faculties.

We must socialize knowledge in order to democratize power.[4]

The first master technicians, who were later to become the first co-operative members, graduated from the Professional School in 1946 and were given important posts in the company Unión Cerrajera.

Arizmendiarrieta believed that these young people should further their education and began to look for ways in which they could take the five-year degree course in industrial technical studies without having to attend class, only sitting through the exams. The option was accepted by the university in Zaragoza. And so, from 1946 to 1953, the group completed their studies while at the same time working at Unión Cerrajera.

Between 1947 and 1954, a number of disputes arose between the management of Unión Cerrajera and the employees, who would lat-

2 J.M. Arizmendiarrieta.
3 J.M. Arizmendiarrieta.
4 J.M. Arizmendiarrieta.

er create the co-operatives, with the company trying to impose certain criteria by force, even resorting to the use of violence. The final break came when Arizmendiarrieta unsuccessfully sought to have the company give the workers a share in the capital.

> *After the broad sharing of knowledge, inevitably comes the broad sharing of wealth and even power; we might say it is the necessary prior condition for democratization and for the social and economic progress of a people.*[5]

The first steps were also being taken to find a new means of emancipation. Arizmendiarrieta set up Astec under the aegis of the Professional School where he tested the students' skills and weighed the best strategy to follow. At the same time he looked around for companies whose manufacturing licences were in a position to be sold or transferred, as well as taking a number of other steps all geared towards a clear goal: to create a company that was organised in a way that was more participatory and showed greater solidarity.

Ulgor Workshops

In 1955 someone who knew about the project mentioned an advertisement in the newspaper looking for buyers for the Otalora workshop near Vitoria (very close to Mondragón). The workshop manufactured domestic appliances. Following negotiations, it was agreed to pay the owner 400,000 pesetas (USD $2,956.00)[6] for the business, which would provide ownership of a licence and a wide scope of activities to pursue.

It was hardly an epic beginning. Purchase of the company alone required a large quantity of capital. It was a major test, too, of the credibility of those who criticised the status quo, inertia, and social hierarchy of the traditional company.

> *We need a revolution based on work, not on myths. We must achieve union on a foundation of truth, never of lies, hypocrisy and error. To 'the all-consuming consumer society,' which can leave us drugged on mere material well-being and in whose ledger man is counted as a thing and not as a person, the cooperative move-*

5 J.M. Arizmendiarrieta.

6 Calculation based on the following values: euro/ESP = 166.386 and USD/euro=0.8131 (exchange rate on 1 July, 2010).

ment responds, among ourselves, calling on us, ourselves, and helping us, ourselves, to participate and act as human persons. And, as such, we bet on our own initiative and responsibility, our own creative capacities from our very first creative cell or organism at work, that is, our own enterprise. This is how we can unleash a new mindset bent on economic transformation and generate a new socioeconomic order in keeping with the dignity of man and the demands of human communities.[7]

The Transaction

The first challenge was to raise the 400,000 pesetas. The developers did not have that quantity of money themselves. However, they were successful with a loan application to the Bank of San Sebastian, with the local town pharmacist and a painter acting as guarantors. The two became members of Ulgor, as did the manager of the bank; there appears to have been a certain degree of confidence in the undertaking.

The sale was signed in October 1955, and a representative of the developers, Luis Usatorre, took possession of the workshop together with two students from the Professional School recommended by Arizmendiarrieta, they were: Jesús Bengoa and Jose Cruz Etxebarría. Some months later they were joined by another two developers, Jesús Larrañaga, in administration, and Jose María Ormaetxea, in production management. At this stage the firm was still not a co-operative. It did not become one until three years later (1958), when an inaugural general meeting was held, approving the co-operative statutes of Talleres Ulgor, S.C.I (Sociedad Cooperativa Industrial)—as labour co-operatives were known at the time.

The Start of Business

The co-operative initially sold a large number of kitchen stoves—but they did not work well. They based their model, still sold under the Otalora name, on the best stove on the market, made by Urania, but it was a poor copy. They also had a policy of not manufacturing

7 J.M. Arizmendiarrieta.

products that were already being made by any other manufacturer in the area.

The developers were faced with a series of difficult tasks to which they were not familiar. They had inherited eight employees from the previous owners, they now had to do invoicing, organise the sales network, establish a payroll system, and deal with the banks to meet their bills.

The developers had to ensure that the company was running at a profit by the time it moved to Mondragón the following year. In doing so, they called on the "multi-portfolio" skills of some of the staff from the previous firm and sought other ones, too. Business boomed, despite the dubious quality of the stoves (many were sent back and the company received some less-than-flattering correspondence as a result). The developers knew they were going through a necessary learning period and that the Otalora stove model was only the first stage on the road.

During that period there was full employment; however, there was also low wages, regulations, tight government control of all aspects of the economy, and mistrust of certain areas of the old industrial tradition. One of the major administrative difficulties faced by anyone seeking authorisation to open a new company was the yearly inspection of new investments of any companies making any change in location. Even so, the company had little trouble in gaining a licence to move Ulgor to Mondragón in June 1956.

As a provincial capital, Vitoria had more services and public life and thus held out the prospect of incorporating more staff in the future. However, Mondragón had a whole generation of educated workers steeped in the values of social solidarity, and there was a need to meet the promises made to the future co-operative members, so it was here that the roots of that *white rebellion* lay.

Speed in decision making was a key element. In just one year the company was bought; the model of stove was changed; a new industrial building was acquired, designed, and built; a new product started to come off the production line; a licence was signed to produce selenium plates (not being manufactured in Spain at the time); the factory moved from Vitoria to Mondragón; and the first profits were obtained.

The developers learned that every mechanism has its own physical, mechanical, and functional logic; nothing could be left to chance when something was being made whose ultimate origin lies in technology and research.

The workforce was growing too. By the end of 1956 there were 24 partners working in the firm; a year later there were 47. However, lack of experience obliged them to adopt some of the labour models of their competitors.

By 1958 Ulgor was well consolidated with considerable business figures and a production range (domestic appliances, electronics, foundry, and automobile accessories) that showed promise for the future, after just three years of frenzied activity.

The company had first begun its policy of applying for manufacturing licences in 1956, when it successfully bid to make selenium plates by Niepenberg, followed, with considerable success, by Fargas and Contigea products. The idea of buying the technology came after experimenting with making their own selenium. They were very aware that in the modern industrial world, it was vital to research and develop techniques and products not widely available on the market.

This realization meant not only copying the shapes and applying them directly, but getting to the heart of the technologies and to the origin of each of the procedures used in the different stages of production, and to achieve greater levels of quality in functional performance in order to avoid the risk of maintaining an expensive and disempowering technological dependence. It was for this reason that the co-operative put so much emphasis on the learning process; when representatives were required to travel to the licensee companies to study production, the company chose the most capable technicians possible.

> *We should not forget that the bourgeoisie overcame and deposed the aristocracy when it achieved greater knowledge. Thus, the proletariat will be in a position to begin its own reign when it is capable of substituting or relieving the bourgeoisie because of its greater technical and cultural education and abilities.*[8]

8 J.M. Arizmendiarrieta.

Caja Laboral

It was the long-sighted Arizmendiarrieta who saw the need to create a financial institution. Looking back at the financial history of other Basque companies, he could see that the bonanza at Ulgor and Arrasate would not last forever and that one day there would not be enough of a surplus to make the necessary investments.

Caja Laboral Popular was set up in July 1959 to provide financial, technical, and social services to the co-operatives and their members. The first branch opened in Mondragón.

One reason for founding Caja Laboral was that by pooling services and activities, it would help consolidate the business and social life of the co-operatives in the region.

It was decided that the financial institution should take the legal form of a credit co-operative, given that the capitalisation thresholds required of these institutions were minimal, they were, in practice, uninspected and, although they respected the law, they had wide room to manoeuvre. This legal leeway was of great help in testing out a *sui generis* model of institution which needed to be based on genuinely co-operative foundations, and which would, in turn, aid in many ways in the creation of a prosperous co-operative movement—thus helping enrich the community of potential depositors.

In its early years the bank struggled to keep up with the times, partly because it lacked good management. Arizmendiarrieta found a solution to the problems, putting the chairman of Ulgor at the head of Caja Laboral as well. From that moment on the bank did important work on two fronts: opening new offices and capturing new depositors with original co-operative practice. In 1962 the first branch was opened in a town close to Mondragón. Thereafter, it continued to expand, with up to 10 new offices opening each year.

Between 1959 and 1963 Ulgor, Arrasate, and Funcor joined as founding co-operatives. They were followed by Urssa, Lana, and Viviendas y Contratas. The group of relatively spontaneous associations centring on Caja Laboral, required training; this was achieved in different ways. For example, when one company had to send staff on business abroad, a delegation of three or four people would be sent along so that the trips could be used to resolve issues that af-

fected various co-operatives. As the credit co-operative at the centre of the development of new firms, Caja Laboral Popular became the central piece in the Mondragon co-operative group by 1986. It lead in the financial mediation among the associated co-operatives and private savings. Because of the services it offered (auditing, development, studies, etc.) it dominated the business division of the group.

In 1990 with the creation of MCC (Mondragon Corporación Cooperativa), Caja Laboral ceased to be the parent company in the group and became the practical head of the financial division.

Conclusions

Education, a passion for creating, and an adherence to certain moral precepts that had to be established following applicable rules became standards of Mondragon co-operatives. They are the reason why it was so necessary to develop the Talleres Ulgor, the original co-operative of the Mondragon co-op movement, following these principles:

- Solidarity
- Worker participation in the running of the company
- Worker ownership of the production assets
- Sovereignty of labour in the company's decisions
- Democracy in the company
- Equitable distribution of the company's profits
- Equality of opportunities for all workers
- Democratic control
- The company as an engine of social change.

Ulgor was the pioneer in the industrial co-operative movement. It was a company with a committed ethical base established as an indispensable axis from which would arise first other producer and service co-operatives; then the "Eskola" (the germ of the present Mondragon University), Lagun-Aro and Caja Laboral; and later Ularco (a local group of co-operatives associated with Caja Laboral), the Mondragon Cooperative Group, and in 1991 Mondragon Corporación Cooperativa, now Mondragon Group.

During its first decade of operations (1956-1966), Ulgor accounted for 80% of the production and the personnel and an even larger proportion of the profits of all the co-operatives associated with Caja

Laboral. This lead position was key to the subsequent process, since the managers at Ulgor understood the importance of following, to the letter, the dictates of their moral convictions, with the tireless encouragement of Arizmendiarrieta. Ulgor distributed profits in favour of other co-operatives in a process known as profit conversion. It prioritised application of a social works fund to create the Eskola (present day Mondragón University); Ulgor lead its managers to take charge of Caja Laboral and the Eskola and its larger workforce gave it the necessary critical mass to allow Lagun-Aro to take off from the start with a qualitative spreading of the risk.

Lagun-Aro was set up to provide a social insurance service since, at the time (1959), co-operative workers were deemed to be self-employed and were not covered by the national social security scheme.[9] The result was the establishment of a mutual benefit organisation covering different areas of requirements: "compensatables" (the classical health care benefits); family benefits; and disability, birth, and death benefits. Alongside these, they studied what were termed bonus benefits, affecting retirement and old age, bereavement, and orphanhood.

The applicable legal documents, management models, and systems of working relations were tried out in Ulgor and later extended to the other co-operatives.

> *The cooperative movement is [an] economic initiative that becomes [an] educational initiative, or, it is [an] educational initiative that makes use of economic activity as a vehicle for transformation. We must convince ourselves that authentic wealth lies in the full development of our personalities. Until we achieve this, even if we*

9 The first steps in the area of national social welfare were taken by the Social Reforms Commission (1883), which was entrusted with examining matters that affected the improvement and welfare of the working class. The first piece of social welfare legislation, The Labour Accidents Act, was passed in 1900, and in 1908 the National Welfare Institute was set up, which was to integrate the savings banks that managed social assurance schemes that were set up. The assurance mechanisms subsequently culminated in a series of social assurance schemes, including Worker's Retirement (1919), the Compulsory Maternity Insurance (1923), the Forced Unemployment Insurance (1931), Sickness Insurance (1942) and the Compulsory Old Age and Invalid Insurance (1947). The protection offered by these schemes soon proved inadequate, leading to the appearance of other mechanisms, in the form of labour mutual assurance associations, organised by specific labour sectors, intended to cover areas not included in the existing protection. For more information, see: www.seg-social.es.

have reached a just distribution of material goods, we will continue being slaves. [10]

10 J.M. Arizmendiarrieta.

Smita Ramnarain

Case Study Five: SEWA's Co-operatives and Peacebuilding in Gujarat, India

Given the large civilian populations increasingly implicated in social conflict in recent times, there is a greater realization that the emphasis in endemically conflict-afflicted societies should be on increasing their capacities for conflict resolution and on the building of sustainable peace.[1] Peacebuilding involves a comprehensive set of strategies, approaches, processes, and stages needed for social transformation of a conflict-affected society toward more sustainable, peaceful relationships.[2] While the foundation of peacebuilding lies in transforming human relationships, peacebuilding includes a focus on structural elements which are requisite for such a transformation. These may consist of building just, equitable, and

1 The author would like to thank the Canadian Co-operative Association, (especially Anna Brown) for their generous support of this project and permission to use some of the findings from the SEWA report in this chapter. Thanks are also due to the staff of SEWA Federation in Ahmedabad, Gujarat – Lalita Krishnaswami, Labhuben Thakkar, and others – for facilitating this project at the ground level. On the ground, Rashmi Joshi provided invaluable research assistance, for which the author is immensely grateful. All names are used with the permission of the interviewees.

2 J.P. Lederach, "Beyond Violence: Building Sustainable Peace" in E. Weiner (ed.) *The Handbook of Interethnic Coexistence* (New York: Continuum Publishing, 1998).

transparent governance modes and structures, ensuring grievance-redress and dispute-resolution processes and systems, creating effective legal and human rights institutions, and promoting participatory models of future development. Co-operatives—with their emphasis on the principles of democracy, transparency, equitability, inclusion, and social justice—have also recognized the important peacebuilding role they can potentially play in many conflict-affected contexts.

Before proceeding, it is crucial to clarify what exactly is encompassed by the term *conflict*. For the purposes of this study, we define conflict as:

> *A disagreement between two (or more) parties involving a perceived or actual physical, mental, or emotional threat to either or both parties' needs, interests, or concerns, or more generalized friction arising out of structural circumstances beyond the control of individuals or groups.*

Using this definition of conflict, it is possible to have multiple levels of analysis of conflict within this study:

1. At the micro level (i.e., the domestic or intra-household level) conflict may pertain to: domestic violence, lack of access to productive resources, and lack of decision-making powers, which can also be attributed to larger structural violence against women;
2. At the meso level (i.e., the inter-household, neighborhood, or local community level) conflict may pertain to: communal, caste-based or gender-based violence, crime, exploitation, ethnic exclusion, and/or economic deprivation;
3. At the macro (or national) level conflict may pertain to: general problems of law and order, political instability, rife corruption, lack of transparency, inequalities of wealth and power, lack of access to democratic rights, and/or dysfunctional democratic institutions.

This chapter presents a case study of the conflict mediation and peacebuilding strategies undertaken by the Self-Employed Women's Association (SEWA) and its allied co-operatives in the state of Gujarat in India. In addition to the prevalence of domestic strife and violence at the intra-household level and structural forms of violence such as gender or caste discrimination, Gujarat has also seen severe

communal rioting in the recent past between Hindus and Muslims. The case study presented here examines how SEWA's co-operatives and its members have attempted to mediate conflict and promote peace through their everyday activities, at household, neighborhood, and community sites.

Background

The Self-Employed Women's Association (SEWA) was founded in 1972 as a trade union based on Gandhian principles. The trade union was initially formed in order to take up issues faced by self-employed women, including:

1. Home-based workers in textiles, crafts, and petty commodity production (such as weavers, potters, artisans, incense, *bidi* / South Asian cigarette makers, quilt makers, patch workers, embroiderers, metalworkers, masons, etc.)
2. Women traders and service providers (such as vegetable and fish producers and vendors, cleaners, home care workers, agricultural and construction workers, health and child care workers, etc.)
3. Street vendors and hawkers eking out daily existences through petty trade—in Ahmedabad's (and India's) large and dispersed informal sector.[3]

The SEWA union sought to organize these women for economic self-reliance. The union also sought to provide avenues to self-employed women for stable and meaningful employment and access to financial, health care, and social security services. SEWA also succeeded in organizing and promoting several co-operatives, despite outdated or non-existent laws and policies regarding co-operatives, and the difficulties of co-operative registration and recognition. Starting with the Mahila SEWA Sahakari Bank in 1974 (now simply known as SEWA Bank) the number of co-operatives under SEWA grew to 33 in 1992. At this point the members realized the need for an apex body to oversee and support all the co-operatives under SEWA's aegis. The SEWA Federation was thus set up in 1992 as an apex co-operative body with the objectives of providing support to the co-operatives, ensuring

3 K. Rose, *Where Women are Leaders: The SEWA Movement in India* (London: Zed Books, 1992).

the active participation of members, and acting as a focal point for a nexus of co-operatives at the state level. The Federation also sought to promote women's active participation and leadership within the male-dominated co-operative movement in India. Since the time it was formed, the number of member co-operatives in the Federation has increased from 33 to 103 in 2009,[4] just over four percent of the total number of women's co-operatives in the state of Gujarat.

In addition to the various initiatives around co-operative development, livelihood protection, and skills enhancement undertaken by SEWA Federation and its allied co-operatives (with support of the Canadian Co-operative Association), there were preliminary indications from project evaluations that confirm SEWA's co-operatives and members have emerged as important agents for peacebuilding and conflict resolution at the household, neighborhood, and broader community levels. These indicators point to SEWA as being a platform for combating injustice, exploitation, discrimination, and other forms of structural and physical violence. Besides the prevalence of (oftentimes socially sanctioned) domestic violence or conflict (wife beating, sexual violence, dowry-related violence, verbal abuse, altercations, etc.) at the intra-household level,[5] severe communal violence has also erupted in Gujarat on several occasions in the recent past. Communal riots in Gujarat in 2002 left Ahmedabad city economically and socially paralyzed for several weeks. The longer-term consequence of this violence has been the erosion of mutual trust between Hindus and Muslims in the wake of violence.[6] Given this context, it becomes important to know if and how SEWA's co-operatives, as well as their individual members, have functioned to restore this eroded mutual trust and respect between communities in Gujarat. Further, the interviews and focus group discussion also reveal women's perspectives on the peacebuilding role of co-operatives and the impacts of co-operatives on their daily lives.

4 SEWA Federation Five Year Report (Ahmedabad: SEWA Federation, 2009).

5 L. Visaria, "Violence against Women in India: Evidence from Rural Gujarat" in a *Summary Report of Three Studies* (Washington DC: ICRW, 1999).

6 S.Varadarajan, *Gujarat: The Making of a Tragedy* (Delhi: Penguin, 2002).

SEWA's Co-operative and Peacebuilding Strategies

From the narratives of members of the women's co-operatives, it emerged that they have used a variety of strategies to mediate and resolve intra-household strife. Women cited poverty and economic stress as the primary source of intra-household conflict before they joined the co-operative. Indeed, many women joined a co-operative in order to find work, so that they could eliminate this source of daily tension in their lives. Besides making ends meet and being able to provide for their families, women interviewees also stated that the stability of income, the assurance of a livelihood through the co-operative, and the increase in their standing in the household as an earning member, enabled them to mediate conflict within their households more successfully.

A more significant issue for the co-operatives was that of structural inequality; caste, religious, or gender-based discrimination, and social exclusion. In general, SEWA's adherence to the Gandhian principles of equality and inclusion made the co-operatives an egalitarian and safe space for members, regardless of their caste or religious backgrounds. Further, co-operative members also adopted Gandhian principles in conflict mediation and peacebuilding. Given that many women co-operative members worked in unorthodox occupations and in the informal sector, they had to deal with sexual and other petty harassment in the workplace. Leading by example and persistence in the face of such opposition was an effective Gandhian technique used by the women in many instances, especially in the vegetable vendors' and construction workers' co-operatives. One co-op member states how the women members of the construction co-operative were subject to a lot of mocking by male construction workers in the initial stages of joining the crew but that this behavior changed once the male construction workers realized their efficacy in performing the work required.

> *Now people don't make comments that these are but women, what can they know about building things? They have seen that we can work just as well as men. They leave us alone.*
> *- Maniben Parmar, construction workers' co-operative member*


Members of SEWA's co-operatives in India. Photo: SEWA

Sometimes the women also employed strategies of peaceful collective action to oppose injustice and exploitation.

> *Earlier the police would come and ask us to remove our shops. We would have nowhere to go. Or they would ask us for money. They would harass the women and call them names. The last time they did that, we protested and did not budge from our places. Now they trouble us less. In some time we will also be moving away to our own marketplace, which the co-operative helped us secure.*
> *- Shantaben, Matsyagandha fish vendors' co-operative member*

Women co-operative members also reported an increased awareness of social injustice and a desire to oppose discriminatory practices when the occasion arose, sometimes despite high personal costs. There were also occasions when women co-operative members were able to inspire and galvanize the larger community into action for peace. In the aftermath of the communal riots, SEWA co-operative members organized five relief camps in the most affected parts of Ahmedabad city. SEWA Federation also supported many of the riot-affected women through livelihood schemes. From the money they earned through

these schemes, women could feed their families and their children by purchasing small quantities of grain, lentils, oil, and sugar.

> *Since the Muslim women could not come out of their camps, we Hindu women would take work to them. We would do so when the curfew was relaxed. When we went to the largely Muslim camps, the women there would protect our representatives and make sure no harm came to them.*
>
> *- Preetiben, Design SEWA co-operative member*

As the above statement reveals, the women of SEWA spread a message of peace and communal harmony through their relief and rehabilitation work, despite the atmosphere of hostility and fear that prevailed in 2002.

Discussion

Given the above context, the question arises: What enabled the members of SEWA Federation to build peace in various ways in their communities? From the narratives of SEWA's members, the following reasons emerge for the success of the co-operatives in promoting peace at the micro, meso, and macro levels:

Collective Action and Peace

A significant source of women co-operative members' peacebuilding skills comes from having a body that supports women's efforts socially, economically, legally, and politically—such as the co-operative. Where women are relegated to a subordinate position in society as individuals, women co-operative members find that collective strength and unified action that co-operatives bring about increases the capabilities of women. It enables women not only to work for their livelihood, but also to resist exploitation, to fight against injustices and social ills, as well as to mediate conflict and build peace at every level.

Awareness and Empowerment

Women stated that being part of the SEWA co-operative gave them more awareness of societal norms of right and wrong, as well as the confidence to know that they were right in pressing for justice. Women respondents also emphasized the use of their social aware-

ness and empowerment to help the community, particularly other women facing violence or discrimination.

Paying it Forward

The awareness and exposure women gained as a result of being part of the co-operative also resulted in the development of an acute social consciousness in some women. Women used the growing awareness of their rights to ask for justice due to them. Women co-operative members were very clear in the interviews and focus group discussions about peace not being about passivity and tolerance of injustice. Rather, in accordance with the principles of Gandhian thinking, the women were of the opinion that injustices must be fought against when necessary, although through non-violent means (especially via the Gandhian tool of *satyagraha*–loosely translated as "insistence on truth").

Conclusion

This case study illustrates how members of SEWA Federation and its allied co-operatives participate in peacebuilding and conflict mediation in their daily lives. From the narratives presented in the text, it is evident that conflict, violence, and strife are an intimate part of women's social realities. It was clear that the women themselves realized the embeddedness of violence and injustice in various social contexts—in the home, workplace, and society at large—and understood that true peace is possible only when these injustices and sources of conflict can be addressed. The case study also reveals the various ways in which women members of SEWA Federation and its allied co-operatives have addressed intra-household conflict, communal violence, and other social problems. Employing Gandhian principles and collective action, these women members have been able to build peace within their own households, as well as in their communities. Further, these stories illustrate how women's co-operatives have emerged not only as important sites for women's mobilization against injustice, but also as resources for peace and well-being in contexts of generalized social violence, conflict, or disharmony. The ways in which women have used co-operatives as platforms for peacebuilding and mediating conflict reveal women's organized strength.

Jutta Gutberlet and
Crystal Tremblay

Case Study Six: Peace and Social Inclusion: Experiences with Recycling Co-operatives in Brazil and Canada

Recycling co-operatives can provide an important space for the social inclusion of marginalized and excluded individuals working in the solid waste and recycling sector. Experiences in Brazil and Canada for example have shown that through collective and democratic forms of organization, individuals have the opportunity to pursue meaningful and dignified work, build greater self-esteem, improve their living and working conditions, and hence contribute to their community.

Collective forms of organization in the resource recovery sector, including co-operatives, associations, and social enterprises can often help individuals overcome extreme conditions of poverty and social injustices. Co-operatives can help reduce conflict and provide a space for dispute resolution. Selective collection, separation, and recycling have become widespread survival strategies for many informal workers, particularly those people experiencing social and economic exclusion in the Global South.

Recycling co-operatives build social capital and its members over time establish strong networks within the community, often build-

ing bridges with government and industry, while providing a valuable environmental service. Those arrangements, which empower the recyclers, help maintain their autonomy, and enable human social development, are particularly key in the process of peace-building in the community.

United We Can - British Columbia

A case study of the *United We Can* (UWC) bottle depot, a social enterprise located in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside, reveals that this form of organization significantly improves the economic and social well-being of informal street-level recyclers (also known as *binners*). In an area marked by extreme poverty and social exclusion, this activity is an important survival strategy for individuals struggling with a variety of social and economic barriers, physical and mental health predicaments, and sometimes quite desperate everyday life situations. UWC is recognized by the binning population as part of their community, a shared space that is built and operated for and by binners (UWC offers temporary work for approximately 350 binners on a rotational basis). For many, UWC provides a supportive environment that encourages social interaction, self-realization, and acceptance. The competitive nature of this activity can often create conflict over territories and resources, giving way to disputes and violence in the streets. As a strategy for reducing conflict, the Binners Association formed through this social enterprise created a *Binners Code of Conduct* - collective guidelines to ensure respectful and territorial behavior while on their *traplines* (material collection routes). Sharing these common spaces builds community, promotes opportunities for growth and empowerment, and contributes to peace and well-being in this community and in society at large.

This organization has also fostered alliances with local government, working together to support an effective inner-city recycling programme. The Urban Binning Unit (UBU), a bicycle-supported cart, was developed in collaboration with binners as part of this strategy. This innovative initiative is aimed to improve the efficiency of the collection and transport of recyclable materials, while promoting a positive image (see photo 1). The UBU is quieter than the typical shopping cart that has been the root of considerable complaints, and

it improves the image of binners by creating a sense of identity in the community and by facilitating awareness for the service they are providing. UWC provides a successful example of how social economy forms of organization can significantly improve the quality of life of the informal recycling sector through capacity building, empowerment, and building bridges with the rest of society.

Binner using the UBU during selective waste collection in Vancouver. Photo: Crystal Tremblay

Catadores in Brazil

In Brazil, there are approximately 600,000 informal recyclers (*catadores*). Most of them work independently and are not yet involved in co-operatives or associations. Generally they experience poverty, stigmatization, and lack of self-esteem. The catadores work under extremely unhealthy and risk-prone conditions, in the streets, on landfills, and dumps. Although they contribute significantly to cleaning up the environment and extending the lifetime of landfills these benefits are not recognized by most local governments and the wider public. Most of the unorganized catadores are too poor to be able

to wait for a monthly return from their work and therefore sell their collected material to middlemen, who pay very low prices. These workers are exposed to extreme weather conditions (heat, cold, rain), disputes over the materials to collect, discrimination, and homelessness. Some of them even suffer from violence in the street. The headlines in several newspapers in Brazil and abroad tell the shocking stories of recyclers being verbally and physically abused and even killed. Unorganized recyclers are extremely vulnerable to exploitation and aggression.

Fortunately, in the Global South, and particularly in Brazil, the phenomena of organized recycling co-operatives and associations in charge of collection and separation of recyclable material is rapidly growing. Today, almost every city in Brazil has at least one organized group of people collecting and separating recyclables. Nevertheless, the support given by local governments to these groups remains sporadic. Today, only 327 out of the 5560 municipalities in Brazil adopt a resource recovery policy and out of these less than half (142) of the municipalities collaborate with co-operatives.

Capacity building involving organized recyclers during a field visit in a recycling co-operative in Londrina, Brazil. Photo: Jutta Gutberlet

Thriving partnerships between local governments and catadores, exist for example in Londrina, Diadema, Belo Horizonte, Ourinhos, Ribeirão Preto, and Araraquara, and they demonstrate the wide-ranging social, economic, and environmental benefits from organized recycling. These cases underline the necessity for inclusive public policies that integrate co-operative run selective collection and separation into their waste management programme. Often the social benefits for the community from these arrangements are not even assessed and are taken as a given. Most co-operatives also work with those individuals who are unemployed, homeless, or have a physical or mental health predicament. The solidarity among co-operative members can help individuals recover from substance dependence and provide support in hardship situations, contributing to the restoration of their citizenship and dignity. The door-to-door collection of recyclables performed by catadores builds social cohesion; it empowers the recyclers themselves as being important citizens, contributing to community health and indirectly to community peace.

There are many differences between organized recycling groups in terms of number of participants, level of organization, degree of integration into government programmes, and availability of infrastructure and tools. However, it is the spirit of collaboration and solidarity that motivates all of them. The co-operative is more than a working space, it is also a space where disputes are resolved and understanding peace is cultivated. The majority of the recyclers are affected by lifelong social and economic exclusion. As a result, they have been excluded from education, healthy nutrition, professional development opportunities, and overall livelihood improvements. They often live in underserviced, poor neighborhoods on the city periphery, where they face violence, crime, negligence, omission, and ignorance on a daily basis. Working in a co-operative opens up new possibilities to access formal education and professional training programmes. Over the past years, the federal Secretariat of the Solidarity Economy in Brazil (SENAES) has provided significant funding to enhance the capacity-building process of organized recycling groups throughout Brazil (see photo). This educational process is an important step to expand citizenship and to form community leaders that can contribute beyond resource recovery and enhance the social

and human development process within the country. In 2012, the federal government of Brazil passed new legislation in support of co-operatives, this will also benefit recycling co-operatives. The federal law "12.690/2012" guarantees basic workers' rights, related to minimum monthly income, and maximum working hours/day. This new law on decent working conditions for co-operatives also streamlines the bureaucratic procedures for the formation of new co-operatives, facilitating a process, which in the past has been prohibitive for many groups that wanted to become a co-operative.

The majority of the organized recyclers are women. In the co-operatives they see an opportunity for learning, progressing, and even taking up leadership roles. The collective approach of building social cohesion among the group has been the decisive factor for why many of the members stay in the co-operative. Remuneration is often not the main attraction to co-operative recycling. The earnings remain meager because the environmental service is not remunerated. On average most recyclers still earn less or equal to a minimum wage. It is the sense of belonging and the trust-building process of working as part of a collective that stirs hope amongst those workers and particularly the women, encouraging them to be part of the co-operative.

In Brazil women still suffer from male dominance and violence or abuse at home. Many of these maltreated women don't have a place to go or someone to listen to them. In the co-operative they can feel safe and are encouraged to share their stories. Many of the conflicts the recyclers experience in everyday life stem from ignorance among the general public or officials they encounter. The co-operative sets out an environment that builds on solidarity and cooperation, and ideally its members work in that spirit. This form of organization promotes opportunities for the group to help overcome stress, conflict, and quarrels between individuals in the group. Here the members learn how to resolve disputes and how to find solutions to their individual and collective problems. The co-operative space is a form of learning environment, in itself shaping communication skills and helping those individuals to overcome exclusion, disempowerment, or hopelessness.

Collective approaches in recycling, such as co-operatives, associations, or social enterprises, are not final and definite solutions,

but rather elements in a transformative process towards a more just and fair society. These ways of organized resource recovery represent a challenging path with political, social, and economic barriers to overcome. Most important and yet often not recognized by the authorities or the general public, however, are the opportunities provided to members to be encouraged to gain a stronger voice, and to become involved in building better communities. These forms of social economy are spaces for emancipation through communication and education. Out of these development opportunities, many new leaders have emerged and have become agents who are part of the wider societal project of making a difference in life.

Neil Nunn

Case Study Seven: Victoria Women in Need Community Cooperative: Re-defining the Meaning of Peace in the Lives of Women

For the last 20 years the Victoria Women in Need (WIN) Community Cooperative, located in Victoria, British Columbia, Canada, has been dedicated to bringing peace to the lives of women in need of support. This is done primarily by "creating opportunities for women and their families to be self-sufficient, employed, inspired, socially and environmentally aware, and connected to their communities."[1] As a community co-operative, WIN strongly believes in the equal value of all individuals and is dedicated to empowering women.

By no means is violence against women a new social issue. However, since the late 1960s and early 1970s, various social movements centered on women's issues have brought concerns related to violence against women to the forefront, revealing the severity and the pervasiveness of the crisis. Since this time, various organizations and individuals of all genders have envisioned and worked towards creating a world that exists free from gender-based violence. As an organi-

1 See WIN: http://www.womeninneed.ca/win-cooperative.

zation, the WIN Community Cooperative imagines and contributes to creating a world that exists free from gender-based violence and abuse.

In contemporary Western society, gender-based social problems become normalized and are generally obscured from sight. Located in downtown Victoria, WIN Community Cooperative plays an important role in making violence against women visible and is motivated to actively seek solutions. Since the extent of violence and the cost to human life that results from violence targeting women and domestic abuse can be equated to many wars and civil conflicts, to address this globally pervasive form of violence is to address a profound need for peace worldwide. Overall, WIN is committed to creating conditions for peace in the lives of women and communities through transformative works.

Violence against Women

We need not look far to affirm that a crisis regarding violence against women does indeed still exist today. Two relatively recent historical Canadian tragedies are proof of that: the 1989 Montreal Massacre and the Robert Pickton murders in the Greater Vancouver region. These crimes represent the largest massacre and serial killing in Canadian history and in both cases women were directly targeted as the victims. The crisis of missing and murdered Aboriginal women in Canada is another stark reminder of the systemic violence and oppression that targets women, and further reflects the extent of the normatively-obscured hyper-violence against women in Canadian society. Without question, such obscured violence is inextricably enmeshed with race, class, and ongoing legacies of colonization.

As a recent 2013 Statistics Canada report entitled *Measuring Violence against Women: Statistical Trends* demonstrates women are more likely than men to be victims of violent crimes. Men are responsible for 83% of police-reported violence committed against women, and nearly half the time the accused was the victim's intimate partner and over a quarter of the time it was an acquaintance or friend. These figures resonate with the Simon Fraser University Centre for Violence Against Women and Children findings that showed in 2004 women were eight times more likely than men to be victimized by a spouse,

and three times more likely to be killed by their spouse. These findings clearly reflect the trend in today's society that many women face—harsh manifested realities of unequal social relations—mental and physical abuse, rape, spatial control, and murder. The prevalence of masculine social domination sees many individuals disempowered (most commonly women and children) and in situations of crisis. This also stands as a salient reminder of the link between gendered oppression and broader notions of violence in society, since most—if not all—questions of violence are manifestations of broader systems of control.

The Story of WIN

Originally, WIN was founded to bridge the gap between temporary emergency shelter and the, at times, daunting goal of re-establishing a more permanent life. The original founder, Charlotte Semple, having herself experienced the realities of an abusive relationship, was motivated to create an organization that would help to address this paucity in support services and assist women who found themselves in intolerable circumstances in rebuilding their lives. Since the beginning, WIN Community Cooperative has been dedicated to bringing peace to local communities by focusing on supporting women seeking to transition out of abusive domestic situations. Over the last two decades WIN has contributed to and assisted thousands of women in the process of rebuilding their lives and serves as an example of the significant role a co-operative can have in shaping its local community.

Since its inception, WIN has been dedicated to collective efforts that involve and inspire the community to become more socially and environmentally aware and that allow individuals from the community to become part of the process of social transformation by volunteering for the organization and/or donating their goods to the cause.

The Victoria Women in Need Society was first incorporated as a non-profit society and opened the doors of its first resale shop in 1991. Since this time WIN has operated as a completely self-supporting organization. In 2005 the Women in Need Society incorporated into a community co-operative and has created a business

model specifically tailored to meeting the needs of the organization, blending the non-profit workers' co-op and social co-op business models. Since this development, WIN has become recognized nationally as a model of success for a self-supporting, not-for-profit social co-operative.

WIN Community Cooperative

As a not-for-profit social co-operative, WIN is dedicated to the co-operative values that bring community, social responsibility, equity, and care for others to the forefront of their vision. The co-operative business model was originally chosen to guide the organization as it offered employees an opportunity to have input and take part in shaping the future of the organization, as well as to develop social governance skills. Of course, the focus of WIN extends beyond assisting women and their families to transition out of crisis situations by aiding in creating opportunities for women to be self-sufficient. WIN offers this achievement of self-sufficiency through bursary programmes, creating employment opportunities, and providing other supports for making the transition from temporary shelter to living independently.

WIN Community Cooperative has three resale shops that generate revenue to finance local operations and various community-building projects. Through the resale shops WIN at once diverts unwanted goods from landfills, and uses these goods to create employment, training opportunities, and to fill the material needs necessary for women to rebuild new lives. WIN provides emergency clothing, children's items, and household goods to women in crisis through its many self-sufficiency programmes. WIN's self-sufficiency programmes include the following:

- *The New Start Program* has supplied more than 2000 women with the items essential to starting a new home after leaving a transition house.
- *The Self-Sufficiency Program* provides financial assistance to women who are transitioning to self-sufficiency through training, education, personal development, career development, co-operative business development, and other forms of support that may be transformational in a woman's life.

- *The Gift Certificate Program* offers women and their children in need of support gift certificates for clothing, household and children's items, and other essential goods.

Creating employment in supportive working conditions has always been a priority for WIN. Over the last decade and a half, WIN's stores have employed an average of 25 women in any given month and has also created volunteer opportunities for hundreds of women within local communities.

Moving Forward Together, Peacefully

It is rare to find any organization that has taken such a unique approach to positively changing the lives' of women facing adversity. As an organization WIN envisions "a world in which all women have equal voice and opportunity to pursue their life's purpose in healthy, sustainable communities."[2] WIN contributes to this vision by being guided by, and instilling the belief that, behind all power inequalities all individuals, regardless of gender, race, and class, have equal value in their community. Through its good work and ability to mobilize the support of community members, WIN Cooperative has created conditions for peace in local communities by contributing support and meeting the needs of women suffering from gender-based oppression. WIN Community Cooperative is a brilliant example of how the non-profit and co-operative community development model can be mobilized as an instrument for the creation of more peaceful communities.

2 See WIN: http://www.womeninneed.ca/win-cooperative.

Yehudah Paz

Case Study Eight: Towards the Renewal of the Israeli-Palestinian Peace Process: The Role of Civil Society

Few would challenge the assertion that we find ourselves at a major crossroads in the long search for a resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and for a just and durable peace in the Middle East. Public pronouncements abound, proposed dates for the completion of negotiations are announced, Palestinian and Israeli leaders meet. But in reality, the peace process does not significantly advance. The internal Palestinian and Israeli political situations have led to a very great measure of peace-process-paralysis on both sides, for reasons related directly, indirectly, and in some cases even only marginally to the conflict realities. We can (hopefully) still maintain that a majority of both Israelis and Palestinians regard the achievement of peace as a desirable and achievable goal. Nonetheless, the peace process often appears to be locked in a holding pattern.

However, paradoxically, there is also another aspect to today's realities. More and more voices (Palestinian, Israeli, regional, global) demand that new impetus and immediacy be given to the search for a Palestinian-Israeli resolution and indeed for a regional conflict resolution. Wider and wider circles emphasize the need to resolve

this conflict now, "once and for all." There is a growing awareness that violence leads only to a dead-end for both sides, and cannot yield even a one-sided permanent outcome other than further violence. The international community clearly understands that it cannot move forward towards the resolution of a whole series of major regional and global issues unless and until Israeli-Palestinian peace is achieved.

Here then is the paradox: on the one hand, a virtual paralysis of the Palestinian-Israeli peace process at the governmental level in the face of an unstable status quo; on the other hand, intensified need and renewed possibilities for its revival and growing pressure, both local and international, for significant movement in that direction now.

In the face of these realities, here is the specific issue we address: how can civil society, non-governmental agencies, contribute meaningfully to the resolution of this paradox, to the renewal of the peace process and to its continued maintenance until a permanent agreement has been achieved? Further, how can those Israeli and Palestinian civil society organizations, which have long been active in people-to-people peace activities, play a strong role in resolving such a paradox?

This paper sets out a proposal by which civil society can effectively respond to these challenges. To do so is a moral imperative; to do so effectively and quickly is a directive clearly enunciated both by the possibilities of success and by the weight of these issues which are our daily realities.

Civil Society, the People-to-People Peace Process, and Conflict Resolution

In the final analysis, conflict resolution rests on the political peace process, which is the work of governments, political powers, and international agencies. However, the furtherance of mutual confidence and understanding and the initiation of joint programs and activities (such as, the people-to-people peace process, which is the province of civil society), are also important elements in the furtherance of peace. One may say that they serve as a base, a basso continuo, on which to

rest the more "melodic" (i.e. up and down) flow of the political process. Over the past number of years a significant number of Palestinian and Israeli NGO's have been active in the people-to-people peace process with a considerable measure of success in a wide range of endeavors. They include organizations and individuals drawn from academic, economic, business, community, medical, educational, and public service fields of activity; from the arts, media, and more.

Civil society is a growing force in modern society. It has played a major role in shaping political, economic, and social change nationally, regionally, and globally, in areas such as ecology, women's rights, globalization issues, and more. Civil society is today a major player on the world scene, parallel to the political and economic groupings and the international agencies. In seeking to mobilize civil society, we are looking to a sector with proven potential for the initiation of change.

We note that Palestinian-Israeli civil society bodies have frequently played an important role in the political peace process in addition to involvement in the people-to-people peace framework. At times, the initiation of dialogue between Israelis and Palestinians was undertaken by elements of civil society. Significant negotiations were carried out by such groupings. Political powers have frequently turned to civil society organizations to advance political interaction. Civil society bodies have often sought to point out directions for the political peace process, and have achieved a real measure of success. Thus, while the initiative here proposed is far-reaching, it is not unprecedented.

We also note that there exists a broad general approach to the achievement of peace, which the above-mentioned groups generally accept despite their variety of political and ideological backgrounds. One might say that the "boundary conditions" of this approach fall within the parameters set out by the following: the Quartet's road map;[1] the Clinton proposals of 2000;[2] the Arab League Initiative of 2002;[3] the Geneva Initiative,[4] and the Ayalon-Nusseibah[5] agree-

1 See, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Road_map_for_peace.
2 See, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Clinton_Parameters.
3 See, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arab_Peace_Initiative.
4 See, http://www.geneva-accord.org/.
5 See, http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Peace/peoplesvoiceplan.html.

ment. While these differ somewhat, they do share a wide range of commonality and we further note that both Palestinian and Israeli political bodies have voiced approval for at least some of these proposals. The peace-promoters would agree that these initiatives represent the interest of the vast majority of both the Palestinian and the Israeli people who are willing to achieve a just and secure peace, based on the two-state solution and the end of the occupation which could lead to the end of the prolonged conflict that has claimed the lives of thousands on both sides. It is suggested that this approach, which sees the five above-mentioned peace proposals as the broad outline within which peace can be found and to which we subscribe, characterizes our project as a whole, and that this initiative serves to offer guidelines for a range of potential civil society partners.

The Proposal

Our basic objective is the mobilization of civil society to act as an effective force pressing for the immediate advance of the Israeli-Palestinian peace process, and working, on an ongoing basis, to insure that this process continues until a permanent, just, and secure peace is achieved.

A core group for this initiative will be the Israeli and the Palestinian peace-promoting civil society bodies, which includes organizations, groupings, and individuals. Further, we will reach out to major civil society organizations, including those with global and regional frameworks.

In working towards the realization of this objective, we propose the following:

1. The organization of a civil society summit, to give voice to these goals and to seek ways to work towards their realization. As noted, the core participant group will consist of Israeli and Palestinian peace-promoting bodies. They will be joined by civil society leaders and by central figures drawn from international civil society groupings. The summit will act as a forum calling for the initiation of effective peace negotiations and for their continuation until permanent and secure peace agreements are reached.

2. The civil society summit meeting is of great importance, but it will not meet the challenge of its objectives if it is a one-time event, however impressive. It is therefore suggested that one of the tasks of the summit meeting will be to create a permanent civil society network whose task will be to continue the work of realizing the objectives that found expression at the summit. The concrete dimensions and functioning of this body will be outlined at the summit and it will begin functioning as soon as is possible.
3. One of the most important aspects of the civil society summit will be the provision of information about the multiplicity of Israeli-Palestinian civil society peace-promoting activities and the mobilization of support for them from the other civil society agencies taking part. To this end, a session of the summit meeting should be devoted to exploring frameworks of cooperation between the various civil society groups, including, but clearly not limited to, the mobilization of institutional and financial support for the work of the Palestinian and the Israeli civil society groups. Similarly, the conclusions of the summit meeting and the tasks assigned to the permanent body will include proposals for ongoing effective interchanges, as well as for the mobilization of support for the Palestinian-Israeli people-to-people peace activities.

This list is indicative and not exhaustive. Further elements will be added.

This is undoubtedly a far-reaching proposal. One would hesitate to launch such an idea were it not for the points noted at the outset. The need is pressing and immediate. The ways forward are identifiable and realizable. The present stalemate is rife with future dangers and cannot be accepted as an inevitable reality. We are all required, by conscience and by concern for our existential future, to seek to move towards peace. Here is, we believe, one way—and an effective one—to move in that direction.

John R. Whitman

Case Study Nine: Co-operatives and the United Nations University for Peace

The structural characteristics of co-operatives that align with the principles and objectives of the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC)[1] and the United Nations Principles of Responsible Management Education[2] also appear to advance the mission of the United Nations University for Peace[3]. By *structural*, I mean the organizational structure of co-operatives, as distinct from their particular business purpose. These structural characteristics of co-operatives necessarily cause them to behave differently from the investor-owned business model designed to maximize financial returns to investors,[4] and, as is argued here, co-operatives do so in ways consistent with the teachings of the United Nations University for Peace.

1 See, http://www.unglobalcompact.org/, cited 16 May 2015.
2 See, http://www.unprme.org/index.php, cited 10 June 2015.
3 J.R. Whitman, *Cooperatives, the United Nations Global Compact, and the Principles of Responsible Management Education.* (In preparation).
4 S. Novkovic. Defining the co-operative difference. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 2008, Vol. 37, pp. 2168-2177.

In this essay I review the mission of the United Nations University for Peace, recount the beneficial qualities of the structural nature of co-operatives, and propose that the teaching of Co-operative Studies should become a mainstream element of teaching about peace, particularly at the University for Peace.

The United Nations University for Peace

According to its web site, the United Nations University for Peace (UPEACE)[5] is a graduate school for peace and conflict studies established by charter in 1980 and based in Costa Rica. Its mission is:

> *To provide humanity with an international institution of higher education for peace and with the aim of promoting among all human beings the spirit of understanding, tolerance and peaceful coexistence, to stimulate cooperation among peoples and to help lessen obstacles and threats to world peace and progress, in keeping with the noble aspirations proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations.* [6]

It is precisely this goal of stimulating cooperation as a means by which to advance peace and progress that provides the rationale for teaching about co-operatives within the context of imparting practical methodologies for achieving peace and responsible economic development. Among the degree programs offered at UPEACE is the Master of Arts Degree Program in Responsible Management and Sustainable Economic Development. While this program appears to be suitable for the teaching of co-operatives, neither the required nor the elective courses mention co-operatives. This apparent lacuna has been brought to the attention of the University[7] and has inspired the preparation of this essay.

The Structure of Co-operatives

The intrinsic character of co-operatives involves at least three structural requirements: 1) that they are owned by members who benefit from the co-operative; 2) that these members democratically deter-

5 See, http://www.upeace.org/, cited 16 May 2015.
6 See, http://www.upeace.org/about/mission.cfm, cited 16 May 2015.
7 Personal communication, 17 July, 2010.

mine the policies of the co-operative on a one-person, one-vote basis; and 3) that any financial surplus from the co-operative is distributed according to the wishes of the membership. These features have several salutary implications.

First, the fact that the business is owned and controlled by its members for their benefit virtually eliminates problems associated with freedom of association and collective bargaining, forced labor, child labor, and discrimination (except perhaps in cases where the members of a co-operative engage hired employees and may exercise discriminatory practices in doing so). These problems are all addressed as principal concerns of the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC).[8]

The democratic control of the business by its members also provides a structural constraint on the likelihood of violating human rights, environmental degradation, and engaging in corruption—also concerns of the UNGC. The democratic process of engaging the members of a co-operative in deliberating its policies, including how surplus earnings are distributed, would require that violation of any of the UNGC principles would be based on a collective decision-making process, a conceivable but unlikely outcome.

There are also other beneficial qualities of co-operatives that stem from their structural characteristics. Briefly, these include: empowering workers in a co-operative with a voice concerning the policies that affect them; the ongoing education and training of members to prepare them to make well-informed decisions concerning the co-operative; informing the general public about the benefits of cooperation; contributing to the sustainability of communities, particularly their local communities; outperforming other models of economic organization in start-up success,[9] job retention and survival in economic recessions;[10] and reducing poverty.[11] Finally, financial returns

8 See, http://www.unglobalcompact.org/, cited 16 May 2015.

9 See for example Canada, http://www.coopscanada.coop/en/international_dev/about/facts, cited 16 May 2015.

10 J. Birchall and L.H. Ketilson, *Resilience of the Cooperative Business Model in Times of Crisis* (Geneva: International Labor Organization, Sustainable Enterprise Program, 2009).

11 J. Birchall, *Rediscovering the Cooperative Advantage: Poverty Reduction through Self-help* (Geneva: International Labor Office, 2003). S.M. Marxuach, *Building a Nation of Owners: Utilizing Credit Unions to Increase Financial Access and Expand Asset Ownership in Puerto Rico* (San Juan: Center for the New Economy, 2004).

remain in the community rather than leaving it or even the country as in other shareholder-based companies where financial returns can flow to outside or foreign investors and stakeholders. In short, ownership, control, democratic decision-making, and distributing earnings back to members rather than have them flow to outside investors are all structural characteristics of co-operatives that matter, and do so significantly.

Mainstreaming Co-operatives in the University for Peace

As stated at the opening, this essay examines how the structural characteristics of co-operatives may contribute to achieving the mission of the United Nations University for Peace. This provides a rational for the teaching of co-operatives at UPEACE. We now explore what resources are available to assist in doing so.

To facilitate wider adoption of teaching the co-operative model, Equal Exchange, a fair trade co-operative based in Massachusetts, has funded the creation of a Curriculum on Co-operatives[12] to be made freely available to professional graduate schools—indeed all educational institutions—in any discipline worldwide.[13] This curriculum provides a full-semester graduate course on co-operatives, as well as half-course and short workshop formats. The curriculum is intended to encourage schools of business management and law, as well as other professional schools, to offer courses on co-operatives and ultimately to mainstream such courses, resulting in their graduates being better prepared to work for co-operatives, to patronize co-operatives, and, for those entrepreneurially inclined, to start co-operatives.

This curriculum could provide the foundation for mainstreaming the teaching about co-operatives at UPEACE and, indeed, other educational programs that promote peace as well. The curriculum, available since 2011, is offered through the Creative Commons license arrangement, which allows free noncommercial use and modification of the material.

12 See, http://equalexchange.coop/ee-and-you/education/for-your-classroom/curriculum, May 2015.

13 See, http://cooperative-curriculum.wikispaces.com/, cited 16 May 2015.

Conclusion

This essay has examined how the structural characteristics of co-operatives can contribute to achieving the goal of stimulating cooperation among people through the United Nations University for Peace. UPEACE as well as other programs that teach peace are thus encouraged to offer courses on co-operatives as a means by which to promote peace through cooperation and advance responsible economic development.

Section VI

CONCLUSIONS

Yehudah Paz

What Can We Conclude?

Peace has been on the agenda of the co-operative movement since its inception and it has been expressed in a variety of ways throughout that time. It is a significant strand in the weave of co-operative thought and practice. Its place derives from fundamental assumptions about the nature and social construction of human society which underlie all cooperative endeavours. On this basis, the goals and objectives which co-operatives and the co-operative movement have set out to realize will inevitably and naturally include the promotion of peace. The co-operative model is a framework for the realization of values. It is a framework through which concrete and successful economic and social enterprises can operate based on value-based principles. So too, in approaching the issue of peace, co-operatives have operated not only at the level of principle but also concretely and practically in the real world and in its marketplaces.

Thus, aspects of both co-operative thinking and practice must be considered in our assertion that peacemaking is central to the growth of the co-operative movement; that co-operatives are relevant to mat-

ters of peacemaking and conflict resolution at the level of neighbour-to-neighbour within and across communities, regions, and nations; and that co-operatives have something to bring to the peacemaking tables of governments and other stakeholders.

In its most basic form, the co-operative commitment to the promotion of peace derives from the belief that human beings can best satisfy their needs and aspirations by working and acting together—on the basis of shared values rather than by competing with each other, while being guided by narrowly defined self-interest. Competition, however powerful its potential for the generation of some kinds of economic and social advance, inevitably carries with it the danger of descent into conflict. In fact, conflict is frequently regarded as an inevitable associate of human advancement, to be managed as much as possible. Similarly, the acceptance of self-interest as the essential motivator of human progress carries the danger of presenting human relationships as a zero-sum game in which my advance (the perceived engine of the totality of human advance) may well be attained but at the price of your non-advance—a situation ripe for conflict at many levels.

The co-operative ideology holds that joint endeavour is the most fruitful mode of activity for the satisfaction of personal and collective needs and goals. Solidarity replaces self-interest as the dominant mode of relation and interaction between people. Values define and delineate the patterns of economic and social organization and activity in the co-operative model. This is in striking contrast to the profit-driven competitive free-market model. In a competitive construct of society, whatever the intrinsic significance of social values for the proponents, those values are regarded as essentially extraneous, superfluous, and irrelevant to the effective operation of the economic activity, and indeed much of the social process. The engine of progress is powered by self-interest, and achievements are measured in terms of profits.

The co-operative model, which seeks to respond to needs and aspirations through joint endeavour, sees conflict as its opposite and harmony as its modus operandi. It recognizes the reality of rivalry and of differing claims on resources and goods, on wealth and access to culture, recreation, and welfare. But co-operatives seeks to chan-

nel and manage this conflict through the creation of undertakings whose joint ownership and democratic control imply a commonality of concern which governs and channels rivalry and proposes a mode of resolution which rests on democratic processes to identify compromises and accommodation.

We have argued that co-operatives are relevant to addressing the challenges of the modern day political, social, and economic paradoxes of our times. Co-operatives are at once both global and rooted-in-place, they have created frameworks of regional, national, and global significance. This makes it possible for co-operatives to serve as a bridge between disparate elements.

As long as co-operatives follow the principles of open membership and member engagement, and live up to the values the movement espouses, they will be agents for collaboration within communities, promoters of associative intelligence, and ambassadors of peace. The importance of these objectives for contributing to a more peaceful world cannot be overestimated. Long ago co-operators realized that selfish isolation was not sustainable; that human beings only reach their full potential within communities.

Co-operatives collectively offer the possibility of an alternative global network of economic and social power based on democratic practices, a concern for community, and a concern for social justice. Co-operatives are one of the most effective ways to transcend differences at the local, regional, and even the international level and build the kinds of collaborative networks and practices that will contribute to building a more peaceful world.

Appendix One

ICA – Co-operative Identity Statement – Manchester, 1995

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Manchester, England – September 1995

Definition

A co-operative is an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social, and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly-owned and democratically controlled enterprise.[1]

Values

Co-operatives are based on the values of self-help, self-responsibility, democracy, equality, equity, and solidarity. In the tradition of their founders, co-operative members believe in the ethical values of honesty, openness, social responsibility, and caring for others.

1 See: International Co-operative Alliance: http://www.ica.coop/coop/principles.html.

Principles

The co-operative principles are guidelines by which co-operatives put their values into practice.

1st Principle: Voluntary and Open Membership: Co-operatives are voluntary organisations, open to all persons able to use their services and willing to accept the responsibilities of membership, without gender, social, racial, political, or religious discrimination.

2nd Principle: Democratic Member Control: Co-operatives are democratic organisations controlled by their members, who actively participate in setting their policies and making decisions. Men and women serving as elected representatives are accountable to the membership. In primary co-operatives members have equal voting rights (one member, one vote) and co-operatives at other levels are also organised in a democratic manner.

3rd Principle: Member Economic Participation: Members contribute equitably to, and democratically control, the capital of their co-operative. At least part of that capital is usually the common property of the co-operative. Members usually receive limited compensation, if any, on capital subscribed as a condition of membership. Members allocate surpluses for any or all of the following purposes: developing their co-operative, possibly by setting up reserves, part of which at least would be indivisible; benefiting members in proportion to their transactions with the co-operative; and supporting other activities approved by the membership.

4th Principle: Autonomy and Independence: Co-operatives are autonomous, self-help organisations controlled by their members. If they enter into agreements with other organisations, including governments, or raise capital from external sources, they do so on terms that ensure democratic control by their members and that maintain their co-operative autonomy.

5th Principle: Education, Training, and Information: Co-operatives provide education and training for their members, elected

representatives, managers, and employees so they can contribute effectively to the development of their co-operatives. They inform the general public—particularly young people and opinion leaders—about the nature and benefits of co-operation.

6th Principle: Co-operation Among Co-operatives: Co-operatives serve their members most effectively and strengthen the co-operative movement by working together through local, national, regional, and international structures.

7th Principle: Concern for Community: Co-operatives work for the sustainable development of their communities through policies approved by their members.

Appendix Two

ICA – Message on the 84 International Co-operative Day & 12 United Nations International Day of Co-operatives – 2006

PEACE BUILDING THROUGH CO-OPERATIVES

July 1, 2006

Co-operatives have at their core a set of values and principles designed to advance the cause of peace. The values of solidarity, democracy, and equality have helped many millions of people throughout the world build social harmony through a more secure economic future.

Co-operatives play a role in helping to address problems which lead to conflict. They arise out of the need for economic stability whether it is through securing employment or affordable housing, access to credit or consumer products, insurance or markets, or a myriad of other needs. By ensuring that people have real alternatives to the failures of markets or governments, co-operatives help provide structures which engage and involve people. By providing a path of inclusion rather than exclusion, co-operatives empower

people to help themselves and hence help eliminate many of the conditions which can lead to conflict within and between communities.

Co-operatives too offer a real alternative in helping to resolve conflict and significantly contribute to rebuilding communities after wars or civil strife by creating conditions to lessen the resurgence of conflict. They can create the real long-term basis for a sustainable and inclusive peace through their democratic structures. For example, the Palestine and Israeli co-operative movements are currently working together on a range of agricultural marketing projects designed to assist Palestine co-operators to improve their livelihoods and by doing so build links between people. Housing co-operative movements are assisting in projects in Bosnia and Serbia to help rebuild communities through the creation of co-operative housing and with it dialogue among peoples. A variety of movements have also been very active in assisting with long-term tsunami reconstruction efforts in Indonesia, India, and Sri Lanka including in some areas of on-going conflict.

The International Co-operative Alliance (ICA), as the organisational expression of this global solidarity, has a history of over 110 years of putting the co-operative values into practice and actively promoting peace. The ICA has sought and continues to seek to be inclusive of diverse political, economic, social traditions acting as a bridge to greater understanding and support among its members encouraging co-operatives to collaborate among each other using the co-operative model throughout the world. It works actively with a range of international agencies including the United Nations and its own members to promote co-operative development, particularly in regions subject to conflict. The ICA believes that promoting sustainable human development and furthering the economic and social progress of people through the co-operative model of enterprise will contribute to international peace and security.

The ICA calls on all co-operators throughout the world to take the occasion of this year's International Co-operative Day to celebrate all that co-operatives have done and are doing to make the world a safer and more secure place for all.

****

The International Co-operative Alliance is an independent, non-governmental association that unites, represents, and serves co-operatives worldwide. Founded in 1895, the ICA has 224 member organisations from 91 countries active in all sectors of the economy. Together these co-operatives represent more than 800 million individuals worldwide.

Appendix Three

ICA – Resolution on Co-operatives and Peace – Geneva, 2009

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Geneva, Switzerland – November 2009

The ICA at its General Assembly in Geneva in 2009 adopted the following resolution on co-operatives and peace:

RECALLING that global peace is the shared goal of all mankind, but peace on earth is a goal as yet unachieved,

AWARE that violence and hatred threaten peace between groups and communities no less than between nations and states,

REAFFIRMING that understanding, trust, confidence, and joint endeavour are fundamental to the peaceful resolution of conflicts,

REMINDING that enduring peace can only be realistically achieved when conflict resolution is linked to sustainable human develop-

ment, so that peace brings people a better life today and a greater hope for tomorrow,

RECALLING that the International Co-operative Alliance (ICA) has been committed to the advancement of peace since its birth in 1895,

EMPHASISING that co-operative thought is rooted in the search for a more peaceful world and co-operative values further that search,

NOTING that the ICA and its member co-operatives have successfully engaged and linked together people divided by social, economic, cultural, political, and religious differences through projects and organisations devoted to the common good,

REAFFIRMING that the co-operative model, through its emphasis on inclusion and democratic process, has proved to be an effective way in which tensions can be reduced within communities, in nations, and across regions,

CONSIDERING that co-operatives and co-operative organisations can effectively create and support people-to-people initiatives which are central to achieving peace,

FURTHER CONSIDERING that co-operatives and co-operative organisations can serve as effective agents in linking sustainable human development and conflict resolution,

REAFFIRMS its longstanding and ongoing commitment to the furtherance of peace everywhere in the world and its readiness to contribute actively to its achievement,

CALLS on the peacemaking institutions—international agencies, governments, and civil society bodies—to recognise the ICA and the co-operative movement as effective partners at the table of the peacemakers, and

ENCOURAGES co-operatives around the world to further develop their peace-building activities and to make better known their work in promoting peace and social inclusion.

Appendix Four

ICA – Presentation on a Rationale for a Co-operatives and Peace Institute – Cancun, 2011

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Cancun, Mexico – November 2011

Since its formation in 1895, the International Co-operative Alliance (ICA) has demonstrated its commitment to building peaceful communities through a long series of resolutions on the subject. On November 20, 2009, the ICA General Assembly meeting in Geneva carried on this tradition by unanimously adopting a resolution entitled "Co-operatives and Peace." This resolution reaffirmed the commitment of the ICA and its co-operative members to the advancement of peace, and called on co-operatives to continue to expand their peace-building activities. It called on the peace-making institutions—international agencies, governments, and civil society—to recognize the special and significant contribution that co-operatives and co-operative values can make to people-to-people peace activities, to the processes of social inclusion, and to the promotion of sustainable human development. It called on the world's peacemak-

ers to seat the ICA and the world's co-operatives at the peacemaking table as full and effective partners.

Furthermore, the application of ICA principles invariably contribute to a more peaceful world by promoting co-operatives that are "open to all persons able to use their services and willing to accept the responsibilities of membership, without gender, social, racial, political or religious discrimination."[1] They urge co-operatives to "work for the sustainable development of their communities,"[2] a goal that can only be achieved if people live together peacefully.

Background

In June 2006 the British Columbia Institute of Co-operative Studies (BCICS) at the University of Victoria, Canada held a conference on the theme of co-operatives and peace. Forty participants, drawn from around the world, discussed how co-operatives were demonstrating a continuing and valuable commitment to the promotion of peace in a wide variety of contexts. They discussed two parallel patterns of development, each important in its own right, both requisites for the furtherance of world peace. On one hand, they considered the ongoing process of how the movement has theoretically and analytically responded to changing political and social conditions over more than a century. As a second perspective, they examined the ongoing development of programmes, policies, and practical activities, at the national, regional, and global levels, designed to translate these widening conceptual horizons into practical realities.

In the course of these discussions, new understandings of the peace-making potential of co-operatives grew and new tools and methods for the development of that potential were proposed.

Through this conference and in follow-up meetings, participants came to the conclusion that the historical achievements, the value-commitments, and the potential for practical contributions of the ICA and the world's co-operatives all made it imperative to develop

1 See Principle One, International Co-operative Identity Statement, http://www.ica.coop/coop/principles.html.

2 See Principle Seven, International Co-operative Identity Statement, http://www.ica.coop/coop/principles.html.

an institutional framework for the furtherance of the co-operative's role in conflict resolution.

Thus was born the proposal to create a Co-operative Peace Institute.

The Work of the Co-operative Peace Institute

An institute devoted to the study and promotion of co-operative contributions to peace and social cohesion would evaluate and demonstrate the importance of the international movement's commitments to peace. It would increase understandings of how those contributions are undertaken, learn from successes and failures, and generally enhance the possibility of co-operatives contributing to a more peaceful world.

Specifically, the Institute would encompass the following:

1. Examine and explain the historic commitments to social cohesion and to social, economic, and political peace espoused by generations of co-operative thinkers and leaders, such as Friedrich Raiffeisen, the International Women's Guild, the Rochdale Pioneers, Toyohiko Kagawa, Jawaharlal Nehru, James Warbasse, Nils Thedin, Alexander Laidlaw, Moses Coady, Lars Marcus, and many other co-operative thinkers and leaders throughout the decades.
2. Be a centre for thinking, planning, and evaluating co-operative peace activity.
3. Develop tools and techniques for effective co-operative participation in conflict resolution activities.
4. Examine the specific roles that co-operatives can play within the broad framework of civil society engagement with peacemaking activities.
5. Be a centre for the initiation and furtherance of specific programmes and projects relevant to the co-operative contribution to conflict resolution.
6. Be concerned with the role of co-operatives in the people-to-people peace process.
7. Demonstrate contributions co-operatives make to effective peace through sustainable human development.

8. Undertake case studies on co-operatives and co-operative movements that have attempted to bridge differences within their memberships caused by race, gender, political commitments, and economic interests. These case studies would explore a number of possible issues, but particularly:
   I. Best practices in developing inclusive organisations whose members manifest significant differences,
   II. Illustrate what types of co-operatives function most effectively in war-torn or socially disrupted societies, and
   III. Show what is necessary for co-operatives to function in communities in crisis.
9. Give voice, in a variety of ways, to the co-operative potential in the field of peace.
10. Facilitate the involvement and utilization of co-operatives and of the ICA in the world's peace-promoting forums and frameworks.
11. Legitimize, honour, and encourage the co-operative movement in its efforts to reach across differences within communities, across nations, and between nations.
12. Help facilitate relationships with movements and international programmes for peace and economic development with which the international co-operative movement has (or arguably should have) common cause, notably within the United Nations and its agencies, international development circles, and social/religious organisations concerned about peace.
13. Contribute to the more effective operation of co-operatives that are serving significantly diverse memberships by documenting best practices and by encouraging exchanges about experiences.

Proposal for a Co-operatives and Peace Institute

It is proposed:

1. That the international movement, through the ICA and member organisations, support the establishment of an Institute for Co-operatives, Peace, and Social Inclusion.
2. That the ICA and/or its member organisations support the establishment of the Institute on a five-year trial basis, including the raising of sufficient funds to sustain a modest secretariat,

the development of a web site, the development of research/information materials, and the preparation of applications for funding to foundations, research organisations, and co-operative organisations.

3. That the Institute have an Advisory Board drawn from the co-operative movement and from other relevant bodies. The meetings of the Advisory Committee would ordinarily take place electronically or in conjunction with ICA meetings.
4. That the Institute have sustaining members, consisting of organisations and individuals who make a commitment to support financially or in-kind the work of the Institute for more than one year.
5. That the Institute have associate members (institutional and individual) who participate in its activities.
6. That the Institute will have a small Secretariat to carry out its activities and to ensure that momentum is sustained.
7. That the Institute work closely with the sectoral and thematic committees of the ICA, but particularly the Committees on Gender Equality and on Co-operative Research, in carrying out its activities.
8. That the work of the Institute would be reviewed in the fourth year by three people, one selected by the ICA, one person mutually agreed upon by the ICA and the Institute (director and Advisory Board), and one person with an interest in peace issues but not directly involved with co-operatives.
9. That the Institute would undertake the following specific tasks:
   a. The development of resources (for example, basic information, case studies, papers, training modules) concerned with how co-operatives contribute to peace and social inclusion,
   b. The development of regional interests in the subject,
   c. Sponsorship of workshops and conferences,
   d. Contributions to the meetings of the ICA and its sectoral/thematic committees,
   e. Publications, and
   f. Engagement in peace meetings and assemblies, as appropriate.

Conclusion

The proponents of an Institute for Co-operatives, Peace, and Social Inclusion believe that it should be an integral element in the ICA's programme for the Year of Co-operatives. This is so for a variety of reasons. If an important goal of the ICA for this most important year is to further the recognition of the significance and potential of co-operatives, surely the explication of just that fact in relation to what is clearly a most major global concern, namely that of the promotion of peace and of conflict resolution within and between nations, is clearly relevant and important.

If the ICA and the co-operatives seek (deservedly) a seat in the major councils of the world and of its regions, surely this includes those councils dealing directly with conflict resolution.

If the ICA seeks recognition for the relevance of values for economic and social planning and activity, surely that relevance extends to the critical sphere of conflict, internal or trans-border. If the ICA enunciates the concept that "co-operative enterprises build a better world," surely a significant contribution to conflict resolution is a most meaningful way to build that better world.

And if co-operatives emphasize that their enterprise activity is also, by design and in practice, a way to effectively bring about social change, for what area is such change more immediately and directly relevant then shifting us away from hatred and violence as methods of interaction among peoples and nations?

In a word, the creation of the Institute would constitute one of the more directly relevant and clearly visible ways of utilizing the Year of the Co-operatives for the purpose of expanding the knowledge and evaluation of co-operatives and for their presence in major international frameworks.

Appendix Five

ICA – Resolution in Support of Co-operatives and Peace Institute – Cancun, 2011

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Cancun, Mexico – November 2011

At the ICA Congress in 2011 in Cancun, the following resolution was passed in support of a Co-peratives and Peace Institute:

Recalling the resolution adopted by the International Co-operative Alliance (ICA) General Assembly in Geneva, Switzerland on 20 November 2009 in which it:

Reaffirmed the longstanding commitment of the ICA to the furtherance of peace everywhere in the world and its readiness to contribute actively to its achievements;

Encouraged co-operators around the world to further develop their peace-building activities and to make better known their work in promoting peace and social inclusion;

Called on the peacemaking institutions—international agencies, governments, and civil society bodies—to recognize the ICA and the co-operative movement as effective partners at the table of peacemakers;

Reaffirming this commitment and recognizing the need to fulfill it through effective programs and concrete activities;

Welcoming the initiatives and joint endeavors of co-operators and co-operative movements in countries around the world in seeking to initiate and further such programs and activities and encouraging them to continue and to expand their efforts;

The General Assembly asserts its support for the establishment and development of the Co-operative Institute for the Promotion of Peace and Social Inclusion.

The General Assembly looks to the Institute to serve both as a framework for the development of programmes of co-operative activity in these areas and as a focal point for thinking, analysis, and research about them.

The Institute will operate within the framework of the policies, principles, and decisions of the ICA and will report periodically to the ICA Board and to the General Assembly.

The General Assembly calls on the institutions of the ICA and on the co-operative movements, organizations, and institutions throughout the world to work closely with the Institute in developing its frame of activity and to give it all possible support in its undertakings.

The General Assembly emphasizes the importance of co-operative peace-building and social cohesion strengthening activities in building a better world. It urges national and international institutions working towards these goals to do so in partnership with the ICA, the co-operative movement, and the Co-operative Institute for Peace and Social Inclusion.

Appendix Six

ICA – Report on The Co-operatives and Peace Initiative – Cape Town, 2013

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Cape Town, South Africa – November 2013

The Co-operative Initiative for Peace and Social Inclusion grew out of research and community engagement at the British Columbia Institute for Co-operative Studies (BCICS) at the University of Victoria starting in 2006, which included a significant international seminar on the theme of co-operatives and peace. Part of the work that came from that gathering can be accessed from a book entitled *Co-operatives and the Pursuit of Peace*.

The idea of building on this work and developing an initiative to pursue the theme more broadly and in greater depth started when the longstanding commitment of the co-operative movement to the furtherance of peace was once again endorsed by the International Co-operative Alliance at Geneva in 2009. It gathered momentum

after the proposal to create such an Institute was endorsed at the General Assembly in Cancun in 2011.

The Initiative is being developed as essentially an on-line project linking people and organizations around the world interested in how co-operatives, directly and indirectly, contribute to more peaceful communities and in furthering the contribution that co-operatives can make to that end.

It exists to undertake research and to create a resource base for the careful analysis of such situations and for the preparation of materials useful to people operating or hoping to operate co-operatives in divided communities or struggling to overcome the problems created by war and social/economic tensions. It will seek to aid them in planning relevant initiatives and in developing approaches and activities that can best utilize the special contribution that co-operatives can make to conflict resolution and to post-conflict reconstruction. It will also serve as a resource base for the involvement of co-operatives and the co-operative movement in national and international frameworks working to promote peace and social integration.

Some of the topics that are being considered for close examination are:

1. Co-operatives and the migrations of people. Tensions sometimes arise when large numbers of people migrate (as is currently the case), especially when there are differences in culture, religion, ethnicity, and race.
2. Co-operatives bridging differences in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia.
3. Co-operatives and inter-generational conflict. How have co-operatives brought generations together? How are they doing so? How does this issue vary in different contexts around the world?
4. Peace as a concept within the history of co-operative thought.
5. Co-operatives in past conflict situations. How they were affected. What was their experience? What did they do that was effective as the conflict ended? And afterward?

6. How different religions view co-operatives and how the similarities within those views might help to bring together groups now split apart.
7. The role of co-operatives and the co-operative movement in national and international frameworks promoting conflict resolution.

The work of one or more of the above topics will be undertaken by individuals and organizations associated with the Institute. So far, nearly forty individuals have expressed an interest in being associates and we will be adding more. They come from seventeen countries on all the continents. We would welcome suggestions as to whom we might invite as associates, including representatives from universities, research organizations, and co-operatives.

Our First Publication

Ian MacPherson and Yehudah Paz are completing work on a theoretical/historical volume on co-operatives and peace that it is hoped will serve as a point of departure for the work of the Institute.

Why have an Institute?

On one level, the value of this initiative is self-evident: The world has traded one form of threat to peace—the dangers of an international conflict among super powers armed with weapons that could easily destroy the world as we know it—for another, derived from numerous points of contention associated with religious, economic, ideological, and political competition. Those points of contention are commonly community-based. Organisations like co-operatives can be useful in overcoming the differences on that level. We need to understand how they have made, are making, and will make their contributions. At the same time, working constructively and prudently to enhance the capacity of co-operatives to contribute to a more peaceful world will demonstrate once again that co-operatives operate on both economic and social levels for the benefit of humankind.

Authors and Contributors

The Authors

Dr. Ian MacPherson (1939 – 2013)

Dr. Ian MacPherson was a leading figure in the field of Co-operatives Studies, an historian, a scholar, and a co-operative activist. He was chair of the International Co-operative Alliance's committee that revised the Co-operative Principles in 1995, and he wrote the docu-

ments whereby the ICA developed its "Identity Statement for the Twenty-First Century" at the Manchester Congress. Ian also played a leading role in founding the Canadian Co-operative Association in 1987.

Ian wrote and co-edited some twenty books as well as over 150 articles on co-operatives, including *A Century of Co-operation* (2009), the commemorative book marking the 100th anniversary of Canada's organised co-operative movement. He presented over 300 papers at numerous conferences in many countries. Most of his work was concerned with the Canadian and international co-operative movements and with Co-operative Studies as a distinct field of enquiry.

Ian was an elected co-operative official for over forty years. He received several awards from the provincial, national, and international co-operative movements. In 2005 he received the Rochdale Pioneers Award, the highest honour the ICA bestows on co-operators who have contributed to the movement.

In Canada, Ian served as president of both the Canadian Co-operative Association (CCA) and Credit Union Central of British Columbia (now part of Central 1 Credit Union), as well as on the boards of various consumer, financial, and health care co-operatives.

In 1976 Ian joined the faculty of the University of Victoria and later served as chair of the history department. From 1992 to 1999 he was the university's Dean of Humanities and stepped down from that position to found and head the B.C. Institute for Co-operative Studies, since renamed the Centre for Co-operative and Community-Based Economy. He was also a founder of the Canadian Association for Studies in Co-operation (CASC), a multidisciplinary research organization which brings together co-operative academics and practitioners.

Ian also valued time with his family, including his wife Elizabeth, their two sons and their partners, three dear grandchildren, and a large extended family.

Dr. Yehudah Paz (1930 – 2013)

Throughout his life, Dr. Yehudah Paz worked for peace, political justice, and the cause of international co-operation. Dr. Paz was the founder and Chair of the Arab-Jewish Centre for Equality, Empowerment, and Co-operation at the Negev Institute for Strategies of Peace and Development (AJEEC-NISPED). The Negev Institute is a centre for education, training, and project development in societies undergoing fundamental processes of transformation.

Dr. Paz had a B.Sc. in Economics, a M.Sc. in Sociology, and a Ph.D. in Social Philosophy. He earned degrees at Columbia University, the University of London, and the Jewish Teachers Institute. He was the author of numerous studies, monographs, and articles in English and Hebrew. Translations of his works have appeared in over eight languages.

Yehudah was born in New York in 1930 and immigrated to Israel in 1950. In 1951 he was one of the founders of Kibbutz Kissufim in the Negev Desert. Yehudah served in many leadership, managerial, and educational positions in the kibbutz, the Israel co-operative movement, and the International Co-operative Alliance, and was the first Israeli ever elected to the ICA's Board—serving from 1993 to 2005. He served the ICA as chairperson of the Human Resource Development Committee for many years and was also a member of the Standing Committee of the Asia-Pacific region. One of his most significant contributions, which he and Ian also worked on together, was working to create the Cooperative Learning Center, an online portal and framework that provides access to research material and studies on co-operatives in dozens of universities.

Yehudah was Chairperson of the Department of International Relations of the Central Union of Co-operative Studies in Israel and academic Director of the Israel Co-operative Collage.

Yehudah promoted peace and development in the Middle East by working closely with co-operative leaders of Palestine to advance the growth of co-operative enterprise in that country. He received numerous citations, awards, and honors from academic institutions, co-operatives, and other organizations across the world. Two of his most prestigious awards were the Rochdale Pioneers Award from the ICA (2005) and the Golden Dove of Peace Prize from the Institute for International Research Disarmament Archives (IRIAD), in Italy (2006).

Yehudah enjoyed many years of family life with his wife Ruth, four children and a large flock of grandchildren.

Contributors

Arregi Mondragón, Begoña has a Bachelor of Business Administration from the University of Deusto in San Sebastián, Spain. She worked for Ikerlan S. Coop. Research Centre as a scientific collaborator from 1992 to 1997. She has been the person in charge of training for continuous improvement and was the improvement team's Coordinator at Geyser-Gastech S.A. from 1997 to 2001. During this time, she worked for Fagor Electrodomésticos S. Coop. as improvement teams Coordinator. Presently, she is a researcher on Knowledge Management at MIK S. Coop., Mondragon Innovation and Knowledge. She is also a teacher at Mondragon University. She is working in knowledge creation and exchange, innovation, new organizational models, organizational strategies, and the social economy.

Emmanuel, Joy is the Principal of Turning Times Research and Consulting – specializing in co-operatives and community economic development and working for a more just, caring, and sustainable world. Joy is a co-operative developer, researcher, writer, and Community Economic Development practitioner. Joy was Senior Researcher and Project Manager at the BC Institute for Co-operative Studies (BCICS), at the University of Victoria where she had the

opportunity to work with Ian for several years. While at BCICS she worked on co-op projects from the local to the international level. She has edited and contributed to several books on co-operatives, including co-editing with Ian Volume One in the Co-operatives and Peace series, *Co-operatives and the Pursuit of Peace,* 2007. Joy has served on the board of a half dozen co-ops, including CoopZone the national association of co-operative developers in Canada. She is a former board member of the Canadian Association for the Study of Co-operation (CASC), and served for four years on the Research Advisory Committee of the Canadian Community Economic Development Network. As well as working in the co-op sector, she presently works in the affordable housing field and is involved with the intentional community movement.

Gutberlet, Dr Jutta is a professor in Geography at the University of Victoria (UVic), Canada. She has a PhD in Geography from the University of Tübingen in Germany on social and environmental impacts at the industrial pole of Cubatão, Brazil. She has worked with the UN Food and Agriculture Organization in Rome and Quito, Ecuador and at different universities. In 2005 she created the Community-Based Research Laboratory (CBRL) at UVic. Her research is on the multifaceted, interdisciplinary aspects of solid waste production and consumption. Between 2005 and 2012 she was the director of the Participatory Sustainable Waste Management project (PSWM), a university-community partnership program, to develop co-operative recycling in the metropolitan region of São Paulo, Brazil. She has published widely and has contributed to numerous educational materials.

Hammond, Vanessa is a leader in the co-op sector in and beyond Canada. Currently she is Chair of the Health Care Co-operatives Federation of Canada, Vice-President of the Victoria Health Co-op in British Columbia, and on the Board of the International Health Co-op Organization. During the past year she has spoken on wellness, social service, and health co-ops in Barcelona, Geneva, Dublin, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Birmingham, Maynooth, and presented to the all-party caucus on co-operatives of the Canadian federal gov-

ernment. Educated in South Asia, Ireland, England, Canada, and Wales, she has a BA in Anthropology from the University of Toronto, and is a master's candidate at the University of Wales. Vanessa has worked in 65 countries helping to establish co-operatives and is working with governments to prepare legislation to formalize the status of co-operatives.

Lizarraga Gabirondo, Nerea is a graduate in Humanities-Business from the University of Mondragon and in Business Studies from the EHU-UPV (University of the Basque Country). Currently, she is a Business Coach and member of the leadership team at the University of Mondragon. She has devoted the past 15 years to research in the field of Business Management in the Corporate Centre of MONDRAGON Group where she participated in the development of the Corporate Management Model. Since March 2003 she has been a researcher at MIK, S.Coop (a research center within the University of Mondragon) where she has participated in projects around innovation in management models and business organization in general and in cooperatives in particular. She is also involved with the establishment of new businesses, studying the phenomenon of entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship in the MONDRAGON Group. She has presented at national and international conferences.

Nunn, Neil is a PhD candidate at the University of Toronto in the department of Geography and Planning. Neil's research interests broadly revolve around four topics: waste and waste management, masculinities, emotional and more-than-human geographies, and anti-colonial theory. Between 2009-2011, Neil served as the Social Economy Hub Student Network coordinator.

Ramnarain, Dr. Smita is Assistant Professor of Economics at Siena College, Loudonville, New York, USA. Her research focuses on the political economy of development, gender issues, and post-conflict reconstruction. She is especially interested in the role of community-based organizations such as co-operatives in fragile and war-torn economies. Her scholarly articles on these themes have appeared in *Gender, Place, and Culture*, the *Community Development*

Journal, and the *Economics of Peace and Security Journal.* The case studies contributed to this volume emerged from a project carried out in collaboration with the Canadian Co-operative Association in 2011 on the contribution of women's co-operatives to peacebuilding, and women's livelihoods and welfare.

Smith, Dr. Julia earned a PhD in Peace Studies from the University of Bradford, UK in 2015. She was a Technical Advisor at SEND, Sierra Leone, in 2010, where she helped to develop the Livelihoods Development Project. Julia worked as the Gender and Development Officer on a Canadian Co-operative Association-funded internship at the International Co-operative Association regional office in Nairobi, Kenya, in 2004-05. She has worked on numerous other peace and development projects in Africa, North America, and Europe. She was a Rotary World Peace Fellow in 2008-09, and is currently a Postdoctoral Fellow at Simon Fraser University, British Columbia. Julia is a proud member of a number of co-operatives.

Tremblay, Dr. Crystal is a Social Sciences Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) Postdoctoral Fellow with the Institute for Resources, Environment and Sustainability at the University of British Columbia. Her research is multidisciplinary and arts-based, focused on environmental governance, livelihood enhancement, citizenship, and participatory public policy. She has a doctorate from the Department of Geography at the University of Victoria. She has worked with communities in Canada, Latin America, and Africa using arts-based action research as a tool for enhancing citizenship, governance, and livelihoods, particularly around issues related to water, sanitation, and waste. She is also the Research Director for the UNESCO Chair in Community-based Research and Social Responsibility in Higher Education and Associate Director of Research at the Institute for Study and Innovation in Community-University Engagement at the University of Victoria.

Wilson, Mervyn is the former Chief Executive Officer and Principal of the Co-operative College, UK. He worked in co-operative education for over 40 years prior to his recent retirement. This in-

cluded work with co-operatives throughout the UK and globally including serving on working groups on governance and co-operative principles for the International Co-operative Alliance. Mervyn led work to develop a distinct co-operative element in the state education sector leading to todays 800 plus co-operative schools in England as well as exploring co-operative models for the further and higher education sectors. Mervyn is a Trustee of the Co-operative Heritage Trust, a trustee of two co-operative schools and a Fellow of the RSA.

Whitman, Dr. John R. teaches and consults in entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship, leadership, and nonprofit and co-operative management. Dr. Whitman has taught at American University, Babson College, Georgetown University, Harvard University, Northeastern University, and University of Alabama. He developed a wiki Curriculum on Co-operatives funded by Equal Exchange, conducted research on the co-operative model with the US Overseas Cooperative Development Council, co-founded the Museum for Black Innovation and Entrepreneurship, and was a member of the Board of Directors of the Hoya Federal Credit Union. Dr. Whitman published peer-reviewed articles in *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, authored book chapters on the social economy, and co-authored *Understanding The Social Economy of the United States* and *Delivering Satisfaction and Service Quality in Libraries.*

Series on Co-operatives & Peace
VOLUME TWO

CONCERN FOR COMMUNITY: *The* RELEVANCE *of* CO-OPERATIVES *to* PEACE

IAN MACPHERSON & YEHUDAH PAZ

Edited by JOY EMMANUEL

"Peacebuilding happens in communities not on battlefields," claims Dr Ian MacPherson. "It is in this context that co-operatives can make their greatest contribution to building a more peaceful world. Through their values, principles, and practices co-operatives encourage building capacity to bridge crippling divisions in order to pursue specific, mutually-beneficial, attainable goals."

"Peacemaking is central to the growth of the co-operative movement," asserts Dr Yehudah Paz, "and co-operatives are relevant to matters of peacemaking and conflict resolution at the level of neighbour-to-neighbour within and across communities, regions, and nations. Co-operatives are one of the most effective ways to bridge differences and build collaborative networks centered on common goals."

Concern for Community: The Relevance of Co-operatives to Peace contains the distillation of the authors' insights on how peacebuilding is core to the co-operative model of enterprise. "This book is part of the legacy of two men who deeply believed in co-operatives as a value-based tool for development, as well as the role of the co-operative movement in brokering peace," states Vivian Silver, Former Co-Executive Director, AJEEC-NISPED, Israel.

"The co-operative movement has not yet been awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace, but this book makes one hopeful that it might one day be more fully acknowledged for its role in promoting an ideal longed for with more urgency in recent days." Charles Gould, Director General of the ICA