

# TO DEFEND THE WORLD, WE MUST DEFEND OUR ACTIVISTS

—PAUL OKUMU, AFRICA PLATFORM

*Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—  
I took the one less travelled by,  
And that has made all the difference*  
**Robert Frost (1874–1963)**

## BEHIND MASS MOVEMENTS ARE INDIVIDUAL SACRIFICES

Many of us can lay claim to some form of activism. We have resisted some attempts from society or political leaders to achieve private gains ahead of public good. We have led online campaigns, engaged in some form of civil disobedience, developed some documents that have shaped global policies, led celebrity campaigns, or contributed to initiatives and ideas that have gone on to change social structures in societies. All these have a critical place in society and are acknowledged as some form of activism.

But this contribution to the 2016 CIVICUS State of Civil Society Report is not about such forms of activism. It is instead an attempt to appreciate the work done by people who are at the forefront of confronting power - corporate, institutional or individual - in ways that many in society appreciate, but would rather not try themselves.

These people are often excluded, including within civil society itself. They are not in our civil society conferences. They are not UN speakers or people who make interventions at High Level Meetings, even though periodically, they may reluctantly be invited to these arenas. These are people who, often with little or no resources or social backup, but with a strong conviction, go beyond engaging in activism, to shaping activism. They do not challenge society: they shape societies. They are driven not by motivations of career, funding or the need for some recognition or public profile, but by the passion and desire to see society take a different path, a road less travelled, but one that they believe nevertheless must be travelled for society to move forward. In the end, real and true activists know that deep within them, society, and not the individuals who control societies, have the power and the final word on how they move forward.

This contribution is about these activists, and this kind of activism.

## RECOGNISING ACTIVISM

One of the most memorable cases in the history of activism, and considered the longest case in British history, is that of Helen Steel and Dave Morris, two British activists who took on the giant of McDonalds in a legal battle that left civil society and the world marvelling at what change can come from conviction and the personal sacrifice of a few.<sup>1</sup> What begun as an ordinary case of environmental activism by a local, independent form of Greenpeace ended only when McDonalds learnt a powerful lesson: that might is not right. The subsequent documentary, *McLibel*, has become a must-watch for anyone in civil society who seeks to move the boundaries of development and political change into real societal transformation.<sup>2</sup>

Helen Steel and Dave Morris made us appreciate the power of activism: that one does not need a crowd, considerable resources or a strong intellectual background to take on powerful actors. All that is needed is a belief that the overall good of society must always override the private benefits of individuals, whether in government, donor circles, civil society organisations (CSOs) or business. However, Helen Steel and Dave Morris remain largely unknown, and their efforts mostly unrecognised.

And so it is refreshing to see that CSOs have, over the past 20 years, had successive great moments of recognition by the Nobel Peace Prize Committee for work that goes beyond traditional development and into the realms of activism. After the first ever Nobel Peace Prize awarded to a coalition of CSOs, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, in 1997, the Liberian Women Coalition followed 13 years later, before the surprise award to the Tunisian civil society quartet in 2015.<sup>3</sup>

What stands out in all these awards is the recognition by the Award Committee that behind coalitions and mass movements are the sacrifices of individual activists, from Jody Williams to Leymah Gbowee: people just like Helen Steel and Dave Morris. The spark that begins the fire of democratic changes around the world is often lit and fuelled on the backs of individuals who, at great personal cost, have resisted attempts to herd society into a paddock controlled by the people in power. Activism is what moves society into territories that it is otherwise too cowardly or too comfortable to confront.

In the past seven years that the Africa Platform has worked with activists, mainly in post-conflict countries across Africa, we have been awed by the courage and sheer passion of activists, many of whom work under circumstances that the rest of society would fear even to live in. Working with activists in these countries has made us appreciate the great personal and often uncelebrated sacrifices activists make to move their countries and societies forward.

## THE COST OF ACTIVISM

From a distance there is great admiration of the bravery of those amongst us ready to defend the cause of others; but even though many of us may call development work activism, we cannot fully grasp the personal costs that come with a

1 'McLibel Case', Jiv Daya Digest, 2011, <http://bit.ly/1U0ZJlv>.

2 'McLibel: full documentary (Official)', Spanner Films, 2005, <http://bit.ly/1OBa89F>.

3 'The Nobel Peace Prize 1997', Nobelprize.org, <http://bit.ly/1W3Y7Bg>; 'Leymah Gbowee – Biographical', Nobelprize.org, <http://bit.ly/1TIM9XH>; 'The Nobel Peace Prize for 2015', Nobelprize.org, <http://bit.ly/1rVTYTs>.

commitment to activism. In many cases there is a short-lived joy when the world pauses to celebrate the courage of activists, often after an award such as the Nobel Peace Prize or the Pulitzer, or when we hear their tales of bravery in the media or from some committed organisations. Often these are stories of their death, incarceration or serious injury and loss. But those moments fade quickly, and the world goes back to await another activism landmark to celebrate, leaving these people and their families to deal with the consequences of their actions.

In rare cases, and they are indeed rare, activists will see a breakthrough result from their conviction to their cause. Jody Williams lived to see the UN ban anti-personnel mines, and Leymah Gbowee lived to see Liberian dictator Charles Taylor sent to jail.<sup>4</sup> But we cannot say the same of Berta Cáceres, murdered in March 2016, or of Jose Claudio Ribeiro da Silva and his wife, Maria do Espirito Santo, or John Paul Oulu, or Myrna Mack.<sup>5</sup> And many of us do not know the fate of Wang Wei Lin, famously known as the Tank Man in China's Tiananmen Square protests.<sup>6</sup>

This is the hidden side of activism, and one that calls on all of us to remember that while development and humanitarian work may be central to the progress of society, it is activists who move society towards sustainable development by looking beyond manifestations of the ills in society and demanding that it addresses the root causes of its challenges. Without support for activism, development work is a short-term solution that cannot meet long-term ills.

## NO ROOM IN THE INN OF PROFESSIONALISED CIVIL SOCIETY

The saddest moments and greatest pain of activists is when they can find no space in mainstream civil society and are excluded, dismissed as loners who lack a constituency, simply because they are not aligned with the many networks, coalitions and platforms that CSOs form to gain legitimacy, solidarity, resources and profile. We in CSOs are committed to representation, but often unwittingly act in ways that make it difficult for activists to share their passion and pain without having to subscribe to some funded or formally structured institution. Standing up, often alone, is not new to activists, and for many their legitimacy rests not in how many people stand with them or how many organisations rally behind them. Activists seldom care to answer the first question many global south actors in development are asked: who funds you?

Our experience with activists has shown that they derive their strength and energy from the knowledge that not everyone is willing to give up personal freedom and comfort for the sake of a higher cause.

Activism, we have learnt, is a calling, rather than a career. Activists delight in standing up to authority and reminding people in power that theirs should be a social contract: that authorities owe their power to the public, and that this is not just some democratic ideal, but is about respect for the collective destiny of citizenry. These are people like the lone Wang Wei Lin, or

4 'Jody Williams – Facts', Nobelprize.org, <http://bit.ly/1TgRISV>; 'Leymah Gbowee - Liberia, 2011', Nobel Women's Initiative, <http://bit.ly/1mFlvQ5>.

5 'Berta Cáceres, Honduran human rights and environment activist, murdered', The Guardian, 4 March 2016, <http://bit.ly/1oS5flQ>.

6 'Wang Wei Lin Tiananmen Square Tank Man', YouTube, <http://bit.ly/209FaLU>.

the young poor man Mohammed Bouazizi, who set himself ablaze in Tunisia in 2010, or Boniface Mwangi, who almost lost his family, or the more than 10 Kenyan activists who the Africa Platform brought together in late 2015 to encourage their South Sudan colleagues, only to end up leaving them in tears about the lonely and costly path of activism in the global south.<sup>7</sup> These are not people looking for recognition, or seeking any funding, and seldom will they fit within the organised, highly structured ways that the rest of us work.

## AN EASY JOURNEY FOR ACTIVISM IN THE GLOBAL NORTH? PERHAPS NOT

In the past, many activists in the global south used to envy their counterparts in the global north. What they saw on television as activism, often in the form of demonstrations, had well funded and well structured machinery that had the backing of several institutions, sometimes including the state, and key resources and communications strategies that rivalled large corporate public relations capacities. For recent anti-bribery demonstrations in Copenhagen, and the Global Climate March, held in September 2014 in New York, organisers had to give several weeks' notice. Protestors had to walk on certain designated streets, have certain media behind them, travel to the venue in certain buses, and stick to certain protected areas designated by the police for a specified period of time. In the end while the many people who took part were proudly called activists, some who regularly see activism in the global south were not sure whether to be amused or frustrated, because in the south this type of organisation, luxury and protocol does not even qualify the activity as a demonstration!

What was even more surprising was the speed at which many global north activists achieved success and attention. Yes, many faced difficulties, and Greenpeace activists who successfully stopped Shell's drilling in the Arctic demonstrated clear acts of courage.<sup>8</sup> But we had been made to believe that in the global north, soft activism was all it took to win political battles.

Not any more. Activists in Europe and North America are today at the centre of a concerted effort by right wing governments and political powers to protect special interests at whatever cost.

We all remember where we were when the Occupy Wall Street Movement was dispersed late at night on the streets of New York. But what marked the beginning of a shift in once progressive Europe was the frozen moment captured by video when two bombs exploded in the middle of a well organised and peaceful solidarity match by activists in Turkey.<sup>9</sup> The symbolism of the event, with over 100 people killed while holding hands in the name of peace, went beyond the fact the attackers were said to be terrorists. It was the realisation that a country that is on the European Union's (EU) expansion list is on a downward path of intolerance. And it didn't take long for us to notice that the rest of Europe is coming down with it.

7 'Mohammed Bouazizi. A Tunisian martyr', Al Jazeera, January 2011, <http://bit.ly/1USBGf1>; 'A conversation with Boniface Mwangi, Kenyan activist and photographer', Index on Censorship, 9 August 2013, <http://bit.ly/1YEKPsR>.

8 'The Arctic 30: How Greenpeace Activists Risked All to Stop Oil Drilling in New Climate Battleground', Democracy Now!, 9 June 2015, <http://bit.ly/1B6kPQ1>.

9 'Nearly 100 dead as Ankara peace rally rocked by blasts', Al Jazeera, 10 October 2015, <http://bit.ly/1NLg7MP>.

On 4 March 2016 the Turkish government forcibly took over the country's largest media institution.<sup>10</sup> Not only was entire Europe silent, but a day later the EU Council of Ministers came out of a meeting with the Turkish Prime Minister to celebrate a deal on managing refugees without making any reference to what Turkey had done the previous day. The irony is that the deal itself was the first major collective EU violation of the international laws on refugees. Despite protests by human rights groups, the praise emboldened Turkey, which on 15 March 2016 expanded its definition of terrorists to include anyone, including elected officials, who opposes the government.<sup>11</sup>

Beyond Turkey, Europe is increasingly becoming hostile to the voice of its citizens. The secret negotiations on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), a trade deal currently under discussion between the EU and the USA, revealed the darker side of Europe, one it has been hiding from the world: when its private interests are at stake, European governments will trample on the rights of anyone, including their own citizens.<sup>12</sup> When farmers were violently repulsed in Brussels in 2015, and protestors similarly treated in Greece and Spain, it was made clear that it is not only the global south that is intolerant of dissent.<sup>13</sup> Under the pretext of fighting terror, France, Germany and the UK went ahead with laws that make migrants live under constant fear of deportation for any activity defined by the government as criminal.

It hasn't ended there. As resources for social support weakened, partly due to EU members eroding their tax bases to compete to offer the safest corporate tax avoidance conditions for multinationals, Europe has become more intolerant. The Finnish government decided for the first time to cut back on its support to the citizens' greatest source of pride, education. Denmark soon followed.<sup>14</sup>

And if CSOs in Europe thought they were safe, providing they kept away from activism, the recent proposal by the UK government to deny funding to organisations that criticise it should be the much needed wake up call to European CSOs that they need more activism at home than international projects abroad.<sup>15</sup> The UK is not alone here. In the past year, several governments, the most vocal being the Netherlands, have adopted a new version of the much maligned 3D strategy, now branded the Coherence Strategy.<sup>16</sup> Initially promoted as a strategy to deliver on development under one policy, in practical cases such as Canada, Netherlands and now spreading to the rest of Europe, the coherence strategy has turned out to be a means to control development actors and make them data collectors for European governments, and to extend foreign and trade agendas. This move is perhaps the greatest threat to the independence of civil society in the history of development.

10 'Turkey's Largest Newspaper Just Got Taken Over by the Government', Vice News, 4 March 2016, <http://bit.ly/1OBcVj7>.

11 'How Europe's Deal With Turkey Aims to Resolve the Migrant Crisis', The New York Times, 8 March 2016, <http://nyti.ms/1XBJlBh>; 'EU/Turkey: Mass, Fast-Track Returns Threaten Rights', Human Rights Watch, 8 March 2016, <http://bit.ly/1UPHOWI>; 'UN and rights groups criticize EU-Turkey 'one in, one out' migrant deal', Euronews, 8 March 2016, <http://bit.ly/1U1jsdf>; 'Turkey's Erdogan Looks to Expand Terrorist Definition to Include Civilians', Sputnik International, 14 March 2016, <http://bit.ly/1VcHZeV>.

12 'TTIP controversy: Secret trade deal can only be read in secure 'reading room' in Brussels', Independent, 14 August 2015, <http://ind.pn/1Mu7Uf4>.

13 'Thousands rally in Spain protest austerity measures', DW, 15 September 2012, <http://bit.ly/23Ya0bl>; 'EU throws lifeline to farmers as protests bring Brussels to a standstill', EurActiv, 7 September 2015, <http://bit.ly/1OBdJ7z>.

14 'OECD warns Finland over education cuts', Uutiset, 29 October 2015, <http://bit.ly/1O9rJlJ>; 'Research and education budgets in shambles in Denmark and Finland', Euro Scientist, 6 January 2016, <http://bit.ly/22KAS0x>.

15 'Sector bodies voice dismay at Cabinet Office lobbying clause announcement', Third Sector, 8 February 2016, <http://bit.ly/1QoPWaX>.

16 'The Dutch Experience. Working on Policy Coherence for Development', Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, May 2006, <http://bit.ly/1XBktEW>; 'The 3 D's of Foreign Affairs', Harvard Political Review, 17 October 2010, <http://bit.ly/1suND0G>.

Sadly, CSOs have gradually lost their bargaining power, due mainly to their narrow funding options, which have largely relied on governments in the global north. A recent Africa Platform analysis of the flow of funds from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), backed by the UK Department for International Development's (DFID) aid tracking tool and other reports revealed that seven governments - the EU, UK, USA, Germany, France, Sweden and the Netherlands - and two philanthropic donors, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation, account for 83 per cent of total funding to civil society today, and together with Japan, 73.6 per cent of funding to all development support around the world.<sup>17</sup> This is despite the fact that the EU and these other countries are known for using aid as an ideological and commercial entry point in poor countries.<sup>18</sup>

In short, CSOs are at the mercy of seven OECD members whose aid is destroying the very social and political structures we are building, and two philanthropists accused of promoting private interests.<sup>19</sup>

## **ACTIVISM, NOT BIG DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, OUR ONLY REMAINING STRENGTH**

Activism is not just under threat; it has no home anymore in the world, unless we fight to protect it.

Global south actors know very well that activism, as opposed to traditional CSO development work, has been their most powerful tool for liberation from poverty and repressive governments. It remains the weapon of choice for a society that knows its future is at stake. Because what Europe calls project areas, global south actors call home; what they call recipients, we call brothers and sisters; what they call victims, we call our mothers and children. The global threat to civic engagement and freedom has shown us that there are no project areas, recipients or victims: we are all family

What global south actors have learnt over the years is that development is politics, and it requires more than programmes and projects. It requires a mobilisation of concerned citizens ready to go beyond helping the poor among them earn a living, to setting them free from the powers that confine them to poverty.<sup>20</sup> It requires a presence and local understanding that cannot be cured by merely moving headquarters to the global south, having federal governance or working through 'partners on the ground'.<sup>21</sup> It cannot be solved by big international projects run by too big to fail organisations seen as too close to their governments.<sup>22</sup>

17 'Aid by donor, recipient and sector', Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, <http://bit.ly/1suNISE>; 'Development Tracker: Search Results for CSOs', Department for International Development, <http://bit.ly/2524xm9>;

18 'Donor Ideology and Types of Foreign Aid', Viktor Brech and Niklas Potrafke, 2013, <http://bit.ly/1TIC1o6>; 'Foreign Aid for Development Assistance', Global Issues, 28 September 2014, <http://bit.ly/1W42XhP>; 'Foreign aid close to record peak after donors spend \$135bn in 2014', The Guardian, 8 April 2015, <http://bit.ly/1FfFQJ8>.

19 'Funding for NGOs', Global Policy Forum, 2012, <http://bit.ly/2525NWe>; 'Gated Development - is the Gates Foundation always a force for good?' Global Justice Now, January 2016, <http://bit.ly/1nySITS>; 'The zombie ISDS', Global Policy Forum, 8 March 2016, <http://bit.ly/1009QkX>.

20 'Amartya Sen's Development as Freedom: Ten Years Later', Denis O'Hearn, Centre for Global Freedom, 2009, <http://bit.ly/2526HCa>.

21 'Our structure and governance', ActionAid, 2 February 2014, <http://bit.ly/1suOdMr>; 'Will the sky fall in when big NGOs move south?', Open Democracy, 1 March 2016, <http://bit.ly/1pnLxix>.

22 'NGOs, States, and Donors Revisited: Still Too Close for Comfort?', Nicola Banks, David Hulme and Michael Edwards, World Development, vol. 66, February 2015, pp. 707-718, <http://bit.ly/1rXxo56>.

Yet as we have so often been reminded, in places as widespread as Egypt, Haiti, India, Somalia, Tunisia and now Turkey and Europe, the state will dismantle activism on its way to silencing all forms of society engagement.

To defend ourselves, we must defend activists. To protect ourselves, we must protect our activists.

## **HOW TO DEFEND ACTIVISM**

Here are four passionate pleas to reverse their current exclusion that the activists we have engaged with have requested of us, and perhaps some of you as well. Some of these may be uncomfortable to hear, and some may appear to lack the intellectual analysis that we tend to use to measure every idea that comes from the outside. But we need to listen to them, because our future depends on our ability to embrace them, bring them closer and refuse all attempts to make them look and act like us. Our future and success in development depends on our continued protection of these people who are increasingly being excluded by our governments, and our own CSO structures and attitudes. I travel to many civil society gatherings, and often I quickly begin to sense why many of the activists around the world no longer find them a safe space to engage.

By working with these people we become a connected world, a protected world and a focused world.

### **EMBRACE, NOT LABEL, ACTIVISTS**

On 24 February 2016, Amnesty International hosted the second ever Hologram Rally in what has become increasingly known as virtual activism.<sup>23</sup> This was the latest attempt by civil society to balance personal safety with civic disobedience in the face of increasingly intolerant regimes. Sadly, what virtual activism has done is to make many people cynical of activists who still believe in a direct personal challenge of the people in power. Today, activists who disrupt meetings or challenge the security apparatus are labelled as extremists by governments and ‘noise makers’ by many CSOs. The trend is to tweet about an issue of concern, write a policy position response signed by hundreds of CSOs, or create hashtags and videos that go viral.

We all know that while these are a good way to reach authorities in a safe way and in a show of solidarity, they do not have the impact that activists who come out to challenge power accomplish.

Soft activism has its place, but only if it is used to back up those still strong enough to confront power. By itself, virtual activism cannot sustain change in ways that physical activism does. Virtual activism may generate public attention and in some cases a response by governments and businesses, but if Greenpeace activists had not occupied a rig in the Arctic, Shell would be drilling there today. The failed Climate March in 2015, and accusations that the 2014 March was a corporate public relations exercise with little success, should lead us back to activism that creates space for activists ready to go beyond simple walks and online petitions.<sup>24</sup>

23 ‘Activists stage holographic ‘ghost rally’ in South Korea’, The Washington Post, 25 February 2016, <http://wapo.st/1XOk2Kw>.

24 ‘How the People’s Climate March Became a Corporate PR Campaign’, Counter Punch, 19 September 2014, <http://bit.ly/1DoJFIX>; ‘Why big NGOs won’t lead the fight on climate change’, ROAR Magazine, 6 December 2015, <http://bit.ly/1Om9POT>.



Instead of asking our activists to tone down their aggression, we should see it as a leadership trait that seeks to remind us all that we should be angry enough to go beyond tweets, solidarity position papers and hashtags, and confront those robbing us of our future. Activists do not need a label; they need our embrace.

## SHEPHERD, BUT DO NOT ORGANISE

Collective action is needed, and no one needs this action more than activists.

But we in organised civil society have increasingly become impediments to activism. It is not just our silence and focus on development work in a narrow sense that has allowed governments to isolate individuals. We have killed the passion of activists by herding them into formal institutions that leave them little room except to be structured like us, funded like us and behaving like us. Yet we know from history that activism has flourished when our support allows the emergence of individuals and groups who not only take on the funders and funded alike, but are also able to break away from the constraints that come with projects, indicators and log frames.<sup>25</sup> We know that the more we place our brands and logos ahead of the work of activists, the less space we will have for true and often spontaneous activism. We are in danger of giving the impression that we like activists, as long as they do not disrupt our work and put our funding at risk. When in 2015 the Government of India was on the verge of banning Greenpeace, an body of international CSOs (ICSOs) expressed frustration that large ICSOs with offices in the country declined to support Greenpeace, on the grounds that it would jeopardise their continued work in the country.<sup>26</sup>

## RECOGNISE THE CONTRADICTIONS FACING ACTIVISTS

Activists battle with the internal contradictions they see in organised civil society. On the one hand, we champion the need for a principled engagement that protects our cause and does not cause harm to the people we serve. Yet on the other hand, we are funded by and have close relationships with donors and corporations that are at the centre of disenfranchising the poor.

How can we be funded by those opposed to what we are trying to build? If you look at the funding sections of the websites of the top CSOs in the world today, you will find listed as supporters companies such as Chevron, Coca Cola, General Electric, Monsanto, Shell, Unilever and the banks that are at the heart of the tax evasion and tax havens that have caused great pain to people in poor countries, and increasingly in Europe. We know that Bill Gates and his foundation stands for things that destroy our effort to help the poor. We know that Barclays Bank supports companies that rob countries of domestic tax revenues.<sup>27</sup> Yet these companies and foundations are still promoted as corporate partners by a section of our civil society.<sup>28</sup>

It goes beyond this. The US government has refused to sign or even follow any international human rights framework that is not in its private interests, while its aid agency, USAID is known for using its network and resources to advance America's

25 'Empathy, Sympathy and Activism: When Confrontation Succeeds', National Center for Science Education, 2 February 2015, <http://bit.ly/1TgXiEQ>.

26 'India Tightens the Noose on Civil Society With Greenpeace Ban', PassBlue, 9 November 2015, <http://bit.ly/1XBOjOt>.

27 'Barclays must stop promoting the use of tax havens in Africa – ActionAid report', ActionAid, 20 November 2013, <http://bit.ly/209XqEI>.

28 'Corporations that NGOs loved and hated in 2015', SIGWATCH, January 2016, <http://bit.ly/1RNPmcN>.



corporate agenda, in ways that have adverse effects on poor countries.<sup>29</sup> The UK actively supports repressive Turkey, and DFID, in partnership with USAID, the Bill Gates Foundation and Syngenta, finances market-driven agricultural practices that effectively kill the livelihoods of the poor.<sup>30</sup> The EU remains the greatest host of tax havens and trade regimes that are closed to poor countries.<sup>31</sup> The World Bank has caused the greatest pain to poor people around the world. Yet these are still our greatest donors and development partners.

This is a contradiction that many activists find too painful to live with.

## BUILD ON ACTIVISM, NOT ON PROJECTS

We surely all agree, as Amartya Sen reminded us, that development is freedom. We all agree that development is almost exclusively about access to and the sharing of resources by society. And we know this is a highly political process.

These are the things that drive activism. So why are many activists not comfortable working with established CSOs?

Because, even when we believe that development is about power and politics, we tend to focus on development as if it is a social problem. We raise funds using the faces of children whose hunger and suffering is a result of a failed political system, not a failed father or mother. We run projects in isolation, and we do not connect the dots, for example, between Ebola and a failed budgetary process in government.

Activists may believe that we truly believe in their cause. But they are not sure we are committed to follow that cause in deed.

These may appear simple demands, and indeed they are. For activists, they are the heart of passion, and of sacrifice.

To save the world, we must come together to save our activists.

29 'USAID in Africa: 'For the American Corporations'', GRAIN, 24 April 2015, <http://bit.ly/1WE0k76>.

30 'Carving up Africa – aid donors and agribusiness plot the great seed privatization', Ecologist, 26 March 2015, <http://bit.ly/1GGpeun>.

31 'EU tax havens drain money from developing nations', EU Observer, 13 November 2014, <http://bit.ly/209YMj1>.