

Suggested Answers for the Relay Race

Card	Suggested Answer	Some Considerations
You announce publicly you will sleep in a threatened organizer's house during the night and answer the door whenever anyone knocks.	<i>Likely to Protect Lives</i>	Basic round-the-clock accompaniment! The fact it is "public" can be key, as well as being the first face the security forces might see if they knock on the door.
You walk down the streets calmly and without fear.	<i>Unclear</i>	Though walking down the street <i>can</i> be presence, it depends on the degree to which simply walking is "non-cooperating" with the game of fear. Just walking down the street may be nice, but it may not actually be a strategy for protecting lives.
At the organizer's rally, you address the crowd and speak publicly about the benefits of nonviolence and why their cause is just.	<i>Likely to Endanger Lives</i>	Taking a strong side for the protestors challenges one's nonpartisanship stance and moves one from being "third-party" to taking sides. Losing the third-party status may reduce the effectiveness of other actions teams are taking (like accompaniment).
You observe the organizer's protest and note any unusual activity, wearing bright colors and being a big visible presence.	<i>Likely to Protect Lives</i>	This is classic "observing" and, by being a visible presence, is likely to <i>deter</i> violence.
You call up the government and yell at their officials.	<i>Likely to Endanger Lives</i>	Inflaming the government reduces their willingness to negotiate with you, may result in your being expelled, and risks reprisals. You also don't want to "burn bridges" because you never know where solid information may come from.
As things get very tense, you interposition yourself between security forces and organizers.	<i>Likely to Protect Lives</i>	Interposition: a potentially risky method, but given your international stature has been shown to work in protecting lives.
You have quiet meetings with police officers about their role, encouraging them to quit.	<i>Unclear</i>	Meddling with the police force can question nonpartisanship and backfire. On the other hand, the experience of some peace teams is that strong conversation with police (when a relationship is established) can help decrease violence in the area.
You write down stories you hear about violations of international law.	<i>Likely to Protect Lives</i>	This sort of observing can help protect lives through international awareness of the situation and the political pressure that may bring.
You attack the security forces with sticks.	<i>Likely to Endanger Lives</i>	<i>Uh, yeah... pretty bad idea.</i>

<p>You organize a civil disobedience action against the government's policy of abducting innocent people.</p>	<p><i>Likely to Endanger Lives</i></p>	<p>While civil disobedience (CD) might raise the <i>issue</i> of the government's policy, it will reduce your perception as an outsider and nonpartisanship. That decreases your reliability as a <i>third-party</i> intervenor, making NP a more acceptable target for violence and undercutting the value of NP's protection for those who are relying on it.</p>
<p>You spend time helping the organizers set up their offices and give them technical assistance.</p>	<p><i>Unclear</i></p>	<p>Like "walking around" it may be a nice thing to do – it certainly would be helpful to the organizers. On the other hand, this is another case where nonpartisanship can become questioned. If NP is seen as working too closely with who it is protecting it becomes entangled in the situation and thus less respectable from the government's perspective.</p>
<p>You have private meetings with the government officials explaining your role as an international presence and your intention to report anything that happens publicly.</p>	<p><i>Likely to Protect Lives</i></p>	<p>In order to make deterrence effective, the perpetrator (whoever that is) needs to <i>know</i> what the consequences for their violence would be! This interaction makes that possible.</p>