

NEWS-OPINION

A PUBLICATION OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR TRANSARMAMENT STUDIES

EDITORS: Melvin G. Beckman, Julia A. Kittross, Philip D. Bogdonoff

DEFINITION OF TERMS

By Julia A. Kittross

In our first issue (Nov. '83), a short definition of civilian-based defense was included. What follows is an attempt to clarify that definition and distinguish between "nonviolent action" and "civilian-based defense".

NONVIOLENT ACTION

There are many popularly held notions about nonviolence. Many have a vague impression that nonviolent action is passive; that those adhering to nonviolence don't do much--instead they let things happen to them.

This is false. Correcting this misperception must be the first task for those interested in learning and teaching about nonviolent action and civilian-based defense. George Lakey pointed out that nonviolent action is defined both by "what it is not, as well as by what it is"--much like the "horseless carriage" in the automobile's early days. Nonviolent action is obviously not violent; but it definitely is action. There is little that is inactive or passive about nonviolent action, and if that idea can be correctly promulgated, this newsletter will have served a useful purpose.

If nonviolent action is action, what kind of action is it? A generic term, nonviolent action covers many different methods of protest. Actionists using nonviolent action do so "without employing physical violence (and) refuse to do certain things they are expected or required to do; or do certain things they are not expected, or are forbidden to do."²

NVA is based on a simple premise: people can withdraw support and cooperation from an authority with which they do not agree. By doing so, people can then change the authority's actions.

All governments are dependent for their existence upon the cooperation, obedience and submission of the people they rule, and...consequently non-cooperation, disobedience and defiance through nonviolent techniques may not only...coerce the despotic governments, but also...destroy them.³

These "nonviolent techniques" have been categorized into 3 types: 1) protest and persuasion; 2) noncooperation, and 3) intervention. The first class, nonviolent protest and persuasion, is mainly symbolic. It seeks to publicize dissent through many acts, among them picket lines, vigils, public meetings, literature, renouncing honors and humorous pranks.⁴ It is usually the first step in a large nonviolent campaign as an effort to encourage people to choose sides and to build and demonstrate solidarity. One example of nonviolent protest and persuasion was a simple, but moving act. Norwegians, during the Nazi occupation of their country, wore paperclips on their lapels, signifying "stick together". Fifty-four methods of nonviolent protest and persuasion have been identified by Gene Sharp. Each helps show that the actionists are either for or against something or are urging the opponent to take more direct action.

The second class of nonviolent action is noncooperation: social, economic and political. Noncooperation makes it difficult for the opponent to operate the system being attacked. In extreme cases, the system itself can be destroyed. Actionists deliberately stop cooperating with the person, activity, institution or regime with which they are opposed. They may stop work, refuse to buy certain products, disobey unjust laws, ignore members of opposing groups. Social, economic and political relationships are severed between the actionists and the opponent. The most common example of noncooperation is the strike, both limited and general. A general strike in Guatemala City in 1944 broke General Ubico's resistance to demands he resign. A boycott of the Montgomery, Alabama bus system by Black Americans sparked the beginning of the civil rights movement. More than symbolic, nonviolent noncooperation is correctly perceived as directly threatening the power it is directed against.

The third class of nonviolent action, nonviolent intervention, consists of actions that challenge outright the opponent. The forty-one methods described in Gene Sharp's The Politics of Nonviolent Action differ from the first two classes in that this type actually intervenes in the situation. Among the five subclasses (psychological, physical, social, economic and political)⁵ are acts of sit-ins, nonviolent obstruction and the establishment of a parallel government. One instance of nonviolent intervention was the "Vykom Satyagraha" in 1924 in India. Challenging a ban on untouchables using a road that passed a Hindu temple, groups of the lower caste and other sympathizers insisted on traveling that road, in spite of beatings by both higher caste and police. A barrier was set up, but the resisters stood against the barrier for one year--their bodies sending a message which caused the road eventually to be open to all. Sit-ins held in segregated cafes in the U.S. South are a more familiar act of nonviolent intervention.

Combined, these three classes make up what has been identified as 198 separate methods of nonviolent action. Nonviolent action, though generally unplanned and only recently analyzed, has accomplished success because of many reasons. The most important, I believe, is because nonviolent action serves the same function as violence does. It offers a substitute means of action to fulfill the desire to struggle for a principle or a way of life. Nonviolent action, however, does not destroy the "principles and and humanity on whose behalf the struggle was launched."⁶ Violent war of tomorrow has the potential to destroy everything.

CIVILIAN - BASED DEFENSE

Civilian-based defense is the term which describes planned nonviolent action by a group against a power considered illegitimate. A repressive regime, an attempted coup d'etat or an invader can be resisted nonviolently--through the institution of a civilian-based defense campaign.

Civilian-based defense (CBD) is a national defense system based upon action by civilians. It is a nonviolent defense strategy viewed as an alternative or as a supplement to military defense, a system with the potential to be as or more effective than traditional defense systems. CBD attempts to defeat military aggression by using resistance by large numbers of civilians to make it impossible for the invader to establish and maintain political control over the State--to protect social and political institutions.

Massive and selective refusal to cooperate with the opponents is coupled with support for the legal government. Paul Wehr writes that the actionists' goal should be to "protect social and political institutions through...denying their use to the invader, and...reinforcing them to persist in modified ways during the occupation."⁷

To institute civilian-based defense as an official policy against a foreign invader using conventional attack forces, a nation must first learn not to equate occupation with defeat. Breached boundaries do not necessarily prevent struggle.⁸ A people practicing CBD are primarily concerned with preserving their freedom and society, and by struggling to do so, are contributing to their defense in much greater numbers than would be the case with military resistance.

As an alternative to military resistance CBD performs many of the same functions as a military defense system. A clearly defined adversary, pre-planned strategy, trained leaders and participants, attempts to intercept enemy communications and to undermine all other acts by the opponents, and even "battles" are part of a CBD campaign. In order to achieve the ultimate goal of expelling the invader, a State exercising nonviolent national defense seeks to maximize the costs and decrease the benefits to the occupier while minimizing the debilitating impact on the population. Civilian-based defense is designed to make it impossible for the adversary to achieve his objective.¹⁰

There are a number of areas for argument concerning CBD which must be addressed through serious investigations of the system. Where can CBD be instituted? How effective is it? Can it serve as a deterrent? Can CBD be "mixed" with traditional defense systems? How absolute should nonviolent noncooperation be? Where will future study offer the most rewards? Questions such as these all need careful scrutiny. (Future editions of CBD News-Opinion will address these questions and more.)

Despite the differences of opinion among theorists, all proponents of CBD agree on a minimum goal: that research and investigation must be carried out in order to judge civilian-based defense's workability and to relate CBD to the defense problems of specific countries. Ultimately, civilian-based defense must--like military planning--rely on training, education and intelligence, as well as insightful planning. If we undertake that task, those seeking a more peaceful and just world may have a better chance at achieving it.

FOOTNOTES

¹George Lakey in the introduction to Direct Action (pamphlet) by April Carter.

720 N. 82nd St. E-112
Scottsdale, Arizona 85257

April 22, 1983



A.T.S. BOARD OF DIRECTORS: L. to R., Melvin G. Beckman, Robert A. Irwin, Mary B. Carry, Margaret A. Schellenberg, Bery J. Engebretsen, Herbert W. Ettel, Rachel M. MacNair, Julia A. Kittross and Christopher Kruegler. Not pictured are Joseph Spotts and Lloyd J. Dumas. Board meeting, April 23-24, 1983.

I would like to express my concern about the technique of polarization discussed in footnote #9 of Julia Kittross' article (March, 1983 issue). Creation of a we/they attitude toward an opponent almost always results in a de-humanization of that opponent. "They" become objects, not deserving of empathy or respect. The bigotry and intolerance created by these attitudes leads directly to justification of violence. One of the strongest and most threatening weapons of CBD is its potential to turn the opponent's own people, troops and supporters against him; to instigate defections and conversions within his own ranks. The effectiveness of this weapon could be badly damaged by a deliberately polarizing campaign. There are better, less dangerous ways to create a unified spirit within a campaign, ways that do not lead to the very psychology of violence that we are trying to avoid, and that do not undermine the possibility of turning enemies into friends.

With respect and support,

CARY FLECK

LETTERS

The Australian National University
Post Office Box 4
Canberra ACT 2600
Australia

March 16, 1983

A few years ago, social defense was virtually unheard of in Australia. The small action group Canberra Peacemakers has been studying social defence, and trying in a few ways to see how it might be promoted. We produced a broadsheet on the subject, and this has led to a lot of interest around the country. We approached the local community radio station 2XX about the role radio could play in a political or military crisis. A workshop was run to develop responses by radio workers and supporters for such a crisis, and a leaflet prepared on this for posting in the station. At the moment we are preparing a leaflet especially for distribution to Australian government employees. In the future, we hope to involve community groups and movements - such as feminists, environmentalists, members of Christian communities, and gays - in sorting out the connection of social defence to their own interests, and promoting social defence in their own ways.

For your information, the "Social Defence" broadsheet was first produced by Canberra Peacemakers, and then slightly adapted and published by the Social Defense Project in Canada, with our permission.

- BRIAN MARTIN

(Ed. Note: In a subsequent letter, Brian Martin reports that the leaflet for government employees has been produced and is being distributed. They have also run a workshop in which four groups were to relate social defense to their own interests. The four groups were: Christian communities, environmentalists, a screen printing collective and peace activists. Canberra peacemakers hope to learn from these and other projects how local organizing around social defense can best proceed.)

(Ed. Note: cf. article "Polarization?", by Julia Kitross, elsewhere in this newsletter.)

P.O. Box 1222
Walla Walla, WA 99362

I suggest that those of us in the U.S. who are working with the idea of a civilian-based defense, both as a superior defense system and as a prerequisite to any serious progress in ending the arms race, should probably acknowledge that it is unlikely that such a system will be investigated or deployed by the very government which has an interest in maintaining things as they are. Therefore, if development of such an alternative defense system is to occur, it will require the initiative of private groups. I propose that such development begin and submit the following calendar for discussion.

1) Existing groups (or individuals) undertake now the task of preparing a civilian-based defense plan for their own community. The plan at this stage would not be intended for presentation to or adoption by the local government; it would rather be intended to shift the focus of at least some of us from general theory to particular problems of implementation. The plan should be as detailed as possible. Groups might draw on experts in their community (ex-military, radio operators, computer programmers) as resources--if not as members of the working committee, then as guests for one or more sessions.

2) A nationwide conference of CBD researchers is held at which those plans which have been drawn up may be seriously discussed, with the aim of formulating a model for designing a community defense system. A committee might be designated by the conference to refine a model for circulation and further criticism.

The model would suggest an approach for creating a community plan; every actual plan would, of course, reflect the unique community for which it was developed.

3) As a result of the conference, those participants who have not yet developed a plan for their own community are encouraged to do so, possibly making use of the model that has been developed.

4) Two interconnected movements now develop simultaneously.

a) A local movement aimed at developing a plan for every community; discussion of the plan within the local community (considered by some as an adjunct to nuclear defense); a de facto civilian defense system comes into being in communities throughout the country. For the first time it is now politically realistic to consider discarding the inferior system.

b) A national or (preferably) international movement: follow-up, correspondence, articles, meetings culminating in a second, major conference focusing on coordinating local, national, and international defense systems. The conference serves as both a networking and general educational event, with heavy publicity, associated lecture tours, videotapes, etc.

- BARBARA CLARK

(Ed. Note: A.T.S. directors, at their April Board meeting, wished to exclude no group, not even government or the military establishment, as being potentially supportive of the idea of civilian-based defense.)

HOW YOU CAN HELP

Read Defense Without the Bomb, the report of England's Alternative Defense Commission. Review it for a local publication. A copy of the report can be obtained from International Publications Service, Taylor & Francis, Inc., 114 E. 32nd St., New York, N.Y. 10016. Price: \$10, plus 3% for handling.

POLARIZATION?

Cary Fleck (cf "Letters" section) has identified one of the many arguments within the civilian-based defense field. In the short article she referred to (CBD: News-Opinion, vol. 1, March, 1983, #2) I stated that polarization, according to Anders Boserup and Andre Mack, needs to occur for a non-violent resistance campaign to be successful. This was the conclusion of the authors in their book War Without Weapons. However, I neglected to elaborate on the debate surrounding this point. There are those who agree with Cary Fleck that nonviolence should be

practiced in a "positive" manner. Johan Galtung, for example, suggests "mixing" both positive and negative aspects of nonviolence; actionists should resist occupiers while they are in uniform and on-duty, but also could invite the off-duty soldiers home to both show respect for the individual and to attempt to convert the occupation troops. There are cases where nonviolent campaigns drew moral and even political strength from "loving" their adversary, including of course, Mohandas K. Gandhi. Other people believe that it is too difficult to require actionists to make that differentiation, and that becoming friends with the off-duty occupiers, the resistance becomes muddled, fragmented, and collaboration more common.

We invite comments on this "positive" vs. "negative" nonviolence discussion and expect to publish more opinion on this as one of the areas of CBD needing further research and clarification.

- JULIA A. KITROSS

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

PRESENTATION TO EVANGELICAL GROUPS

Some 1400 evangelical Protestants met in Pasadena, recently, to discuss moral implications of the nuclear arms race. A.T.S. member Ronald J. Sider, a professor at Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary and co-author of Nuclear Holocaust and Christian Hope: A Book for Christian Peacemakers (Intervarsity Press, Downers Grove, Ill. 60515, 1982, 368 pp., \$6.95), presented the concept of civilian-based nonviolent defense. According to a Los Angeles Times Service story by Russell Chandler, the presentation was well-received.

KING-HALL BOOKLET TRANSLATED

Professor Ivo Rens, University of Geneva, has translated and prefaced Sir Stephen King-Hall's booklet Common Sense in Defense. It will be published in French under the title of "Defense nucleaire, non-sens militaire."

VOLUNTEERS REQUESTED

Richard Fogg, Director of the Center for the Study of Conflict, Stevenson, Md. 21135 (Ph. 301-828-4844), is looking for volunteers to do library research on civilian-based defense in response to nuclear threats and aggression. Write for a list of possible research topics.

SPEAKERS BUREAU BEING ORGANIZED

The Association for Transarmament Studies is developing a list of U.S. speakers who are qualified and willing to make presentations on civilian-based defense. To obtain the list send a stamped, self-addressed envelope to A.T.S., 3636 Lafayette, Omaha, NE 68131.

"TRANSARMAMENT NETWORK" - PHILADELPHIA

This A.T.S.-affiliated organization recently coordinated successful ISTNA (International Seminars on Training for Nonviolent Action) seminars at five colleges and universities: LaSalle, Swarthmore, Haverford-Bryn Mawr, U. of Pennsylvania, and Villanova. They have also sponsored numerous public presentations of the video series "Alternatives to Violence". Both the seminar and the video series contain extensive material relating to civilian-based defense. For information about the ISTNA seminar, write to: ISTNA, Box 515, Waltham, MA 02254. For information about the video series, write to: University City Science Center, 3624 Science Center, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104. "Transarmament Network" members may be contacted at 4724 Warrington Ave., Phil., Pa. 19143. (Ph. 215-729-4663).

EUROPEAN POLITICAL PARTIES AND C.B.D.

Support for the policy of civilian-based defense is beginning to be written into the official positions of several European political parties, specifically: West Germany's Green Party, Denmark's Socialist People's Party, Norway's Socialist Left Party, and the Netherlands' Social Democratic Party, Democrats 66, Evangelical People's Party, Radical Party, and Pacifist Socialist Party.

RESEARCHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

For several years, Dr. Alex Schmid, (Center for the Study of Social Conflicts, State Univ. of Leiden, Hooigracht 15, 2312 KP Leiden, the Netherlands) has been corresponding with the international community of researchers in the field of nonviolence and civilian-based or social defense. As Research Coordinator of the Dutch Advisory Group on Research into Non-Violent Conflict Resolution and Social Defense in 1980, he felt a need to get in touch with foreign developments. By mailing questionnaires to the researchers and then compiling their answers in booklet form (November, 1982), he was able to create an effective link between a scattered community of persons interested in C.B.D. He has recently mailed a new questionnaire and respondents will receive the compiled answers - again, in booklet form. Dr. Schmid is currently responsible for the research on social defense which was recently funded by the Dutch government. (cf story in November, 1983 issue of "Civilian-Based Defense: News and Opinion").

HOW YOU CAN HELP

Are you acquainted with a group or an institution which might be able to provide funds for specific programs of A.T.S.? If so, please send us information about the potential funding source, criteria for grants, method of application, etc.

SPECIAL ISSUES OFFERED

"Social Alternatives" wish to offer a special set of three issues (including one double issue) for \$12 plus \$3 airmail. One of the issues is entitled "Peace and Transarmament". The three Peace issues include articles by Gene Sharp, Kenneth Boulding, Ralph Summy, Keith Suter, Susan Ryan, Harry Redner, Brian Martin, Christian Bay, Joseph Camileri, George Lakey, Glenn D. Paige and Robin Burns. Available from Social Alternatives, Dept. of External Studies, University of Queensland, 4067. AUSTRALIA.



"Damn it, Eddie! If you don't believe in nuclear war and you don't believe in conventional war, what the hell kind of war do you believe in?"

Drawing by Ed Arno; © 1983 The New Yorker Magazine, Inc.

BOOK REVIEW

DEFENSE WITHOUT THE BOMB

BY LAUREN WOJCIECHOWSKI

Defense Without the Bomb: The Report of the Alternative Defence Commission was published last April in Great Britain (Taylor & Francis, London. 311 p.). Sponsored by the Lansbury House Trust Fund and based at the School of Peace Studies at Bradford University, the Alternative Defence Commission was established in 1980. Frank Blackaby, now Director of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), was the initial chair of the Commission. Its sixteen members came from various political parties, trade unions, academic institutions, and religious communities. April Carter, Mary Kaldor, and Michael Randle were among those who served on the Commission.

The Commission was established to answer an important question: If Britain were to reject its present defense based on nuclear deterrence, what alternatives would

exist for the country's defense? The Commission's report assesses the possible initiatives that Britain could take to decrease the possibility of East-West conflict in Europe. The report is an in-depth look at the factors that must be considered to develop a defense for a nuclear-weapon-free nation. Throughout, the Commission notes that not only is defense a necessity, it is also expensive and requires commitment and sacrifice from citizens. Defence Without the Bomb evaluates the sources of threat to Britain, the possibility of a non-nuclear Britain remaining within the NATO alliance, and the type of defense best suited to Britain's social, political, economic, and geographic character. The report also gives specific recommendations for the transition from a nuclear to a non-nuclear defense.

The Commission considered that the greatest sources of threat to Britain stem from the two super-powers in the event of a war in Europe or in the case of world war. Although the chances of the Soviet Union invading Britain are considered slim, it is imperative to consider and plan for the possibility. As the May 8, 1983 Manchester Guardian Weekly pointed out: "Throughout the Commission's report there is hope of reciprocity on the Soviet side (to disarming), but no reliance on it."

Once Britain rejects nuclear deterrence as both immoral and ineffective, the first question it would face is whether or not it should remain a part of NATO. The Commission suggests a conditional membership in NATO as a first option. Britain would recommend the following steps and consider withdrawing from NATO if they were not carried out:

- 1) Acceptance by NATO of a policy of no-first-use of nuclear weapons.
- 2) Withdrawal of short-range, 'battlefield', nuclear weapons.
- 3) Withdrawal of 'theatre' nuclear weapons.
- 4) The decoupling of the U.S. strategic nuclear deterrent from NATO by ending reliance on U.S. nuclear weapons as an element of NATO strategy."

If these conditions were not met, Britain has at least two options: 1) A European Defense Association could be formed independent of the U.S., or, 2) Britain could become a non-aligned nation.

Whether or not Britain remains in NATO, forms a new defense organization, or becomes "independent" along Sweden's lines, the Commission emphasizes the country's need for a purely defensive system, or what they call a "defensive deterrence". Not only would this imply nuclear disarmament, but it might also include dismantling long-range bombers, tanks, Trident submarines, and other weapons with an "offensive character".

Several kinds of defensive systems are explored by the Commission, including guerilla warfare, territorial defense (army "reserves" used as a "Home Guard" to defend regions), frontier-based defense (the present conventional strategy), and civilian-based defense (called "civil resistance"). The Commission concludes that the defense system should claim a "high entry price" from an invading force. To do this, it advises continuing a strong frontier-based defense coupled with territorial defense tactics (based on Sweden again), and preparing the civilian population for non-cooperation with the enemy. In addition, the Commission urges that civilian-based defense be studied much more "seriously" than at present. It rejects guerilla warfare due to the danger it poses to civilians.

The transition from a nuclear to a non-nuclear defense can be accomplished without catastrophe, the Commission suggests, and the report proposes numerous initiatives that Britain and her allies could take to encourage detente and disarmament in Europe.

Defence Without the Bomb is a useful and stimulating addition to the literature on alternative defense systems. Its eight chapters are titled:

- Thinking about defence.
- What threats should a defence policy meet? Britain, NATO and Europe
- British non-nuclear defence: the military options.
- West European defence: the military options.
- Strategies against occupation:
 1. Protracted guerrilla warfare
- Strategies against occupation:
 2. Defence by civil resistance
- Transition

Defence Without the Bomb outlines specific policy proposals for one nation while encouraging the reader to think seriously about defense in general. It is another vote for the mixing of both military and non-military defense systems within the growing field of literature on alternatives to surrender or annihilation.

(Defence Without The Bomb can be purchased from Taylor & Francis, 114 E. 32 St., New York, N.Y. 10016. \$10, plus 3% for postage.)

HOW YOU CAN HELP

Please send us names and addresses of persons or groups who you think might like to join A.T.S. or subscribe to this newsletter. We send one-time introductory material to persons suggested to us.

STEPS IN CONSIDERATION OF CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE

BY GENE SHARP

Those individuals and groups which conclude that this alternative defense policy merits wider attention and consideration may take any of a variety of steps to achieve that end.

The aim of these activities - this is very important - is to extend knowledge, stimulate thought, and encourage a continuing evaluation of this policy on the basis of how adequately or otherwise it is able to meet the perceived defense and security threats of particular countries and parts of the world. As this is a policy, not a doctrine or set of beliefs, the aim is not to gain converts and "believers." It also must not be tied to some philosophy, creed, or proposed political panacea.

This policy needs to be presented relevant to a variety of political viewpoints and perspectives, depending on developing assessments of its capacity - in comparison with military policies - to deter and defend against various dangers.

Recognition of the reality of a variety of past, present, and possible future dangers of national and international origins is important as a starting point. Presentations which naively deny such dangers, or which attribute innocence where it doubtfully exists, will be understandably dismissed by many concerned people.

Civilian-based defense is still in its youthful, immature, stage of development. Its analysts are still identifying likely problems in its application. An attitude of exploration, recognition of its many problems, and advocacy of efforts to seek solutions to those problems is therefore necessary. Those problems need, in due course, to be compared to the often neglected problems of the practice of military deterrence and defense policies. This attitude of searching for possible solutions to difficult problems will bring respect and encourage thought by others about new possibilities.

Efforts to bring wider attention and consideration to civilian-based defense need to be focused exclusively on the policy and its relative ability to help prevent attacks and to defend against them if they occur. Those efforts, therefore, must be separated from expositions of the assertions of the total convictions of individuals or the comprehensive political perspective or world view of organizations. Those will, appropriately, be expounded on other occasions and in different

60
contexts. There is room for people and groups with differing beliefs and various broader insights and programs to consider the potential of civilian-based defense.

We need to approach the efforts to gain wider attention and consideration of this policy with the attitude that we all have much to learn. Also, our efforts need to be of the highest quality possible to contribute to maximum effectiveness.

Some steps toward consideration and evaluation of civilian-based defense can only be taken at more advanced stages, which have been reached in a few European countries. In the United States, Canada, most European countries, and elsewhere, however, the basic steps in information and exploration need to be the primary activities to lay a sound foundation for more ambitious later steps.

Each of these steps produces positive gains, extending and deepening the understanding of nonviolent alternatives in the society. However small any particular steps may seem, they are therefore gains which contribute to long-term lasting changes.

The following are among the steps which may be taken:

1) Self-education and thought by individuals and groups already interested. Individual study and study groups to gain both a basic introduction and an in-depth understanding are highly important. These will prepare people to be able to evaluate for themselves this policy proposal, and if they find it important to be more effective in future steps to spread information and promote consideration of the policy. This step is basic.

2) Informal public educational efforts include a variety of specific tasks:

A) Promotion and sale of pamphlets and books on civilian-based defense, and encouragement of libraries to make them available.

B) Promotion and use of the videotape series "Alternatives to Violence" for meetings, discussion groups, and the like, and encouraging cable and educational television stations to broadcast them. (These are funded by the U.S. Department of Education.) Enquiries about the programs, and sales and lease of tapes, should be sent to: W.T.L. (Distribution), Box 351, Primos, PA 19018.

C) With quality material and skillful approaches by informed persons, newspapers may sometimes be persuaded to publish articles on civilian-based defense, review books on the policy, or call attention to pamphlets about it. Reporters will sometimes prepare stories

on meetings and lectures, and interview speakers visiting the city or campus. Occasionally, feature articles or op ed pieces may be accepted, either original ones or excerpts or reprints of existing publications.

D) In connection with conferences and visiting lecturers, radio and television stations will often broadcast short or feature interviews with specialists on civilian-based defense.

E) Discussion meetings and study groups aimed at persons previously unfamiliar with the policy - both with appropriate readings - may be organized. These may aim to reach the general public, or primarily members of the sponsoring organization, as international relations and foreign policy groups, unions, churches, peace groups, defense policy bodies, and political organizations and parties.

F) The holding of special lectures for the general public and on campuses (perhaps in combination with other activities).

G) On occasion, given the receptivity and wise and careful planning, one to two day conferences on civilian-based defense may be effective. These may be primarily addressed to the general public, students and faculty, or people with particular interests. Diverse viewpoints need to be presented.

3) Personal development of skills for future work on civilian-based defense may be important in the long-run development and consideration of the policy. In addition to in-depth self-education, persons may seek to improve their capacities as public speakers and writers, for example, in making contacts with various organizations and the media, and in becoming future researchers and analysts.

4) Formal educational courses and programs, at all ages and levels, may be important in conveying information and encouraging thought about alternatives to violence, even in the field of national defense. Sometimes this material can be included within existing courses - as attention to nonviolent struggles as part of events in a period of history - and at other times new courses of various possible types may be introduced. The aim of these is not to gain converts, of course, but to spread information and understanding, and to stimulate students to think for themselves about these and other options. Teachers' guides and workshops may be helpful in this work. Video-tapes and reading material mentioned elsewhere can be of assistance here also.

5) Money to finance research, analysis, and preparation of educational resources is urgently needed, since the established foundations never include nonviolent alternatives as a program to which they allocate funds for grants.

6) Local, state and national organizations might establish special commissions or committees to study and evaluate civilian-based defense with a view to determining whether or not it merits their continued attention and inclusion in the areas of concern of the body. The types of organizations which might set up such study bodies include foreign policy and international relations groups, defense policy groups, councils of churches, individual denominations and religious groups, trade unions, organizations of educators, and political groups and parties (Republican, Democratic, and other)

The above six steps, carried out thoroughly and effectively, will provide the necessary groundwork for later larger-scale steps toward consideration and evaluation of civilian-based defense. Also highly important are new studies of the nature of nonviolent struggle, strategies and problems of civilian-based defense, the nature of threats against which the policy might have to operate, and various related fields. Such research and policy studies will greatly assist educational work and public consideration of the policy.

The combination of the basic steps in information and exploration and, at more advanced stages, the steps toward consideration and evaluation will prepare the way for a new stage. That is the explicitly political consideration and evaluation of the capacities, problems, merits, and potential of civilian-based defense in comparison with existing and other optional policies. Then a variety of steps in consideration become possible; state and federal appropriations for research and policy studies, committee hearings in the House of Representatives and Senate, working bodies within the Department of Defense and Department of State, and perhaps other federal departments, consideration and action on the local and state governmental levels, establishment of one or more privately organized "alternative defense commissions" with highly competent and respected participants, and other measures. A variety of preparatory and accompanying grass roots activities may be required in those connections. In other countries the political steps would differ somewhat.

All this is, of course, still prefatory to the first steps toward adding a civilian-based defense component alongside existing military capacities, and to the more advanced stages of the transarmament process.

In the case of the United States it is almost inevitable that the democratic societies now allied with the U.S. would need to develop an adequate self-defense capacity, as through civilian-based defense, before the U.S. would take significant steps toward reliance on civilian-based defense itself on the international level. It could, however, fairly early share research, policy studies, and technical information with countries exploring the policy or adding a civilian-based defense component. It could also add this

By not assessing the actual functions of the present U.S. military force structure, and the relation of CBD to each of these (as did General Atkeson in his 1976 two-part article on CBD, and as I have done in one of the articles supplied with my study guide on "U.S. Defense Policy"), their discussion of the relevance of CBD to the U.S. takes on, despite its merits, a slightly otherworldly tone.

This flaw makes it hard to write a realistic scenario for their final chapter. They accomodate far too much to the surprisingly widespread popular delusion that there "could very likely" be a Soviet invasion of the U.S. (See pp. 232-3, 274 -- but also note 4 on pp. 351-2.) Even labeling this (p. 289) a "worst possible" scenario helps little. As the Boston Study Group put it in The Price of Defense (Times Books, 1979), "the main feature of the present U.S. military policy is the fact -- too extraordinary to be believed by novices and too familiar to be discussed by experts -- that there is no military threat to the United States against which the country can and does defend." Nuclear weapons aside, "there is no conventional military threat to U.S. territory. Neither the Soviet Union nor any other country can mount a non-nuclear attack on this country" (pp. 12-13). To do a serious critique of their scenario, one would need to transpose it to a more realistic setting.

Their scenario assumes a resistance effort predominantly influenced by evangelical Christians using (in Boserup and Mack's terms) a "positive" rather than a "negative" approach, seeking to win over or transform rather than simply defeat the opponent. Leaving aside the plausability of this assumption, Sider and Taylor give no adequate argument (to my mind) to counter Boserup and Mack's argument against the feasibility of such a "good will" approach. (But to their credit, the authors explicitly acknowledge their disagreement with others on this point and cite Boserup and Mack's discussion in a note. See pp. 260,267, and note 23.)

A smaller point: defense against coups d'etat is scarcely (if ever) mentioned in the book. This aspect of CBD should not be forgotten; certainly not in the U.S. a mere decade after Watergate.

In relation to the scholarly literature on the subject, two comments:

First, I fear that the authors' use of the term "nonmilitary defense" (as on p. 235: "The Politics of Nonviolent Action (contains many examples of nonmilitary defense.") may further the frequent confusion between the

improvised use of nonviolent struggle for national defense or other purposes, and civilian-based defense, the prepared use of nonviolent struggle for national defense by a population deliberately trained in advance (of which there are sadly no examples yet, in Sharp's Politics or anywhere else!) Hence, to say (p. 256) that "Nonmilitary defense exists" tends to mislead concerning the extensive research and policy development that CBD's most judicious advocates consider necessary before transarmament can begin; CBD does not exist, at least in the sense of being ready for implementation now.

Second, I think the authors have not adequately acknowledged all their borrowing of Gene Sharp's arguments. But as they would surely acknowledge, their is more a work of popularization and persuasion than a competing scholarly contribution.

While I have criticized the premises of Sider and Taylor's discussion of CBD for the United States, this should not obscure the value of their work. Each discussion of CBD that takes reasonable care to represent it accurately seems to me potentially helpful in broadening public discussion. I think all members of the Association for Transarmament Studies should look forward eagerly to arguments for investigation and development of CBD by Catholics, humanists, conservatives, socialists, liberals, feminists, isolationists, world order advocates, and anyone else. Each group's arguments will be likely to vary. Opinions will differ about the functions our country's national security policy does and should fulfill. Debate over these issues already exists and should continue in many forums, including among those interested in CBD. Meanwhile, each new contribution deserves both frank criticism and welcome.

Bob Irwin is a director of the Association for Transarmament Studies. He is also active with Movement for a New Society and is editorial assistant to Gene Sharp.

HOW YOU CAN HELP

Introduce your minister, priest, rabbi, teacher, etc., to the idea of CBD. Send us names for our mailing list.

RETURN MAIL FORM

ASSOCIATION FOR
TRANSARMAMENT STUDIES

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

_____ ZIP _____

TELEPHONE () _____

ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION, IF ANY.

I want to join the Association. My dues are enclosed.

- _____ \$5.00 Basic
- _____ \$7.50 Couples
- _____ \$2.50 Students & Low Income
- _____ \$25.00 Organizations and Institutions
- _____ \$100.00 Sustaining

I want to subscribe to the Newsletter only. \$4.00 annually.

An additional contribution of \$_____ is enclosed to further the work of the Association.

MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO: Association
for Transarmament Studies, 3636
Lafayette Avenue, Omaha, NE 68131.
Dues and contributions are tax-
deductible.

THE ASSOCIATION FOR
TRANSARMAMENT STUDIES
3636 Lafayette
Omaha, Nebraska 68131

RECOMMENDED RESOURCES

War Without Weapons: Nonviolence in National Defense, by Anders Boserup and Andrew Mack. Eng. Ed., Schocken Books, 200 Madison Ave., N.Y. 10016. Paper, \$3.95

Social Power and Political Freedom, by Gene Sharp. Porter Sargent, 11 Beacon Street, Boston, MA 02108, 1980. Paper, \$8.95

Making the Abolition of War a Realistic Goal, by Gene Sharp. Pamphlet. World Policy Institute, 1981. \$1.50

Making Europe Unconquerable: A Civilian-Based Deterrence and Defense System, by Gene Sharp. World Policy Institute, 1983. 777 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017. (Available soon) Paper, \$6.95

YOU CAN HELP:

1) Find out whether your city's public library has the above books. If not, request that they be ordered. Do the same for school and church libraries.

2) Ask an organization to which you belong to stock the above books for resale in your area.

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
OMAHA, NE
PERMIT NO. 582