

Civilian-Based Defense

EXPLORING A NONVIOLENT STRATEGY FOR DETERRENCE AND DEFENSE

Volume 10 ■ Number 1 ■ Spring 1995 ■ \$4.00 Single Issue

The Militia Movement And Civilian-Based Defense: Opposite Approaches to Security?

by Mel Beckman

An apparently growing number of U.S. citizens fears that its leaders in Washington are trampling the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights by legislating away individual freedoms, by transferring sovereignty to the United Nations and especially by conspiring to restrict the right of citizens to bear arms. They feel a need to acquire weapons, ammunition and field supplies to prepare—with trusted fellow citizens—for the day when they will have to fight. They say they have the right and moreover the patriotic **duty**, to form themselves into militias which are prepared to challenge a government that is becoming the enemy—to challenge it with armed force.

While defense by means of an armed citizens' militia might seem at first glance to be the complete opposite of the idea of nonviolent, civilian-based defense, there may, in fact, be some common ground to explore. I will try to begin that exploration in this article, and also point out some matters of concern about the militia movement.

The Militia Movement

At the time of this writing there appears to be no definitive report on the size of the militia movement in the United States. It is possible that many U.S. citizens are not even aware of its existence, although articles on it have appeared in at least two popular news magazines; *U.S. News and World*

Report (August 15, 1994) and *Time* (December 19, 1994). Christopher

Proponents of nonviolent, civilian-based defense have given serious thought to the same problem that is of such concern to those who advocate citizen militias. We too are very aware that governmental power in a nation can sometimes be seized illegally by individuals or factions not having the consent of the people.

John Farley, writing in *Time*, gives the following assessment:

...Most experts agree that the groups are multiplying and their membership is expanding, though estimates vary. Chip Berlet, who studies militias for Political Research Associates, a Massachusetts think tank, says militia units exist in 30 states, including large organizations in (Continued on page 4)

On The Road For CBD Gene Sharp, Albert Lin Tour Taiwan

Report by Albert J. F. Lin

[Mel Beckman is Board Chair of the Civilian-Based Defense Association. He has been promoting civilian-based defense for many years.]

Professor Lin, a member of the CBDA Board of Directors, accompanied Gene Sharp on the speaking tour described in this article.

Taiwan, a country that is *de facto* independent, still lacks independent status in the international community. This is due partially to the changing realities of international power politics, but mostly to a lack of vision, sense and effort in international politics and relations on the part of the Kuomintang (KMT) government in Taiwan. The government withdrew from membership in the General Assembly of the United Nations (despite being advised to stay on) when the government of the People's Republic of China (PRC) took over its seat on the Security Council in 1971. Taiwan subsequently lost all of its memberships in international organizations such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, etc.


National Security

Emerges As An Issue

National security was not a major issue to the KMT government as long (Continued on page 8)

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

CBD in the Heartland, A Distant Land and Story Land.....	2
Using Stories to Promote CBD	2
CBDA News	3
The Rise of Citizen Militias	7
Additions to the Author/Article Index	10

From the Editor  Peter Bergel

CBD in the Heartland, A Distant Land and Story Land

National militia leaders claim their grassroots groups now exist in every state in the U.S. A recent survey by *USA Today* was only able to confirm the existence of groups in 24 states, yet the trend is clearly bullish. CBDA Board Chair Mel Beckman suggests in our lead article that despite obvious areas of concern regarding the militia movement, those working for a nonviolent civilian-based defense may share some common ground with it. To provide our readers some additional background on the movement, we reprint an article about it from *U.S. News and World Report*.

On the other side of the world, Drs. Gene Sharp and Albert Lin recently introduced both military representatives and the general public of Taiwan to civilian-based defense. Professor Lin reports on that speaking tour and shares his hopes and plans for the

future of CBD in that part of the world.

Suggesting that perhaps we have concentrated too single-mindedly on left-brained research and analysis in our work for civilian-based defense, Al Rhodes-Wickett discusses his literary approach to civilian-based defense work utilizing stories as his medium.

As your new Editor, I am excited by all these approaches to civilian-based defense and look forward to sharing many more with you, our readers. To help me do a good job, I invite you to submit your thoughts in letters to the editor, your research in the form of short papers and your article ideas by phone, e-mail or snail mail. The addresses are listed in our CBDA News section. As a newcomer to this organization, I solicit your help in doing the best job I can for you. My door is open to your suggestions. ■

saying, "Let's look at the historical, political, sociological or theological implications of current policies of national defense as opposed to an alternative known as CBD..." we might simply take off our jackets, look people in the eyes and say, "I want to tell you a story." The stories we tell could be of historical events, or imaginary places where CBD is employed.

Deduction vs. Induction

Do you see the difference? In the academic world, we begin with the theoretical and proceed (though often never arriving) toward the particular. With the public at large, we begin with the particular and move toward the larger idea. And often this larger idea is never articulated by the story teller. Indeed, to do so might be counter-productive.

You see, when we tell a story, we lose control. It is rather like planting seeds. We don't know what will come of it. We cannot predict the results; we can't control how people will assimilate it. Yet, in the narrative, the potential for others to learn is tremendous.

I wonder if this style of communicating is not particularly appropriate for CBD. If we imagine the greatest power being vested in the population at large, then should we not rely on methods that communicate values to the greatest number of people?

Pacem Island

For the last three years, my passion has been the writing of a full length Broadway-style musical called "*Pacem Island*." It is a love triangle set in the context of a nation using CBD to defend itself from a well-trained and -equipped occupying military force (in the script thus far, the name "civilian-based defense" is never mentioned). It's important that CBD not be the story, but only the setting for it. To put it another way, didactic theater is notoriously unsuccessful; the story must come first and whatever new ideas we gain will come only in the wake of a riveting plot. Yet given these limitations, we find in history tremendous examples of

(Continued on page 3)

Using Stories to Promote Civilian-Based Defense

by Al Rhodes-Wickett

It has occurred to me that civilian-based defense is one of the best-kept secrets around. We who are aware of either the name or the concept are few indeed. It is an idea whose advocates have tended to congregate in academic and intellectual communities.

Is this because CBD is too complex for the average person to comprehend? Or perhaps, as we wrestle individually and collectively with the idea, we become so aware of the many unresolved issues that we are reticent to trust it to the population at large.

On the other hand, the public has not demonstrated a great hunger for this subject. A number of books on CBD are available to the public, yet to my knowledge, none are best-sellers. It may be an idea on the fringe—something whose time has not yet come.

Medium Limits Access

My own view is that the public is indeed ready to wrestle with CBD. I

My own view is that the public is indeed ready to wrestle with CBD. I suspect that the medium within which CBD is currently discussed is a limiting factor.

suspect that the medium within which CBD is currently discussed is a limiting factor. I applaud this newsletter. Since I joined CBDA I have devoured every edition. Yet this vehicle will not carry the ideas to the public at large. If there are others who also want to see CBD discussions widened, we must search for new and creative strategies.

Among the many possibilities, I suggest the vehicle of story. Picture a situation where people are gathered under our leadership. Rather than

CBD Stories

Continued from page 2

magnificent new ideas changing the thinking of populations at large.

Aeschylus, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, *Don Quixote*, *A Tale of Two Cities*, *Show Boat*, and in our own time even sit-coms such as *M.A.S.H.* have challenged our assumptions about modern warfare. Recently, *Schindler's List* has confronted us with humankind's incredible capacity both for self-degradation and for compassion in the face of danger. Intellectual analysis is powerful, yet let us not underestimate the significance of story in getting out our ideas.

Let's Tell Our Stories

One final thought: if others agree with these ideas, our ability to tell stories would be strengthened by the inclusion in the CBDA journal of articles of a different type. As stories they might begin by focusing on individual people, telling their story, and then widening the view to describe the conflict in which the story takes place.

An example: we might begin with the image of a German guard from Hitler's "special police" sewing a military uniform. Slowly the story reveals that this uniform is to be worn by the Bishop of Oslo, Eivind Berggrav, so the resistance can smuggle him to various meetings around the city, where he is to support opposition to the German occupation. Such a story might assist many of us as we speak, when opportunity permits, about CBD. ■

[Al Rhodes-Wickett, a member of CBDA's Board of Directors, is a Methodist minister in Los Angeles.]

SPECIAL OFFER

Limited quantities of past issues of *Civilian-Based Defense* are available. Please write to:

CBDA
P.O. Box 92
Omaha, NE 68131 USA
for a listing and order form.

CBDA NEWS



Mark Your Calendar...

CBDA's annual Board meeting and general membership meeting will be held from Friday, June 9th through noon on Sunday, June 11th in Toronto. Details will be mailed to members later on. Non-members can obtain information by contacting CBDA (see below). The proposed June conference in Toronto mentioned earlier has been postponed until further notice.



New Editor Takes Newsletter Reins

We are happy to announce that Mr. Peter Bergel has been appointed to serve as Editor of *Civilian-Based Defense*. Mr. Bergel works at the Center for Energy Research in Salem, Oregon and has been Editor of *The Oregon PeaceWorker* for the past six years.

Besides his editing skills Mr. Bergel is a veteran of many political and public interest campaigns. He is also a trainer of nonviolence trainers and a regular columnist in Salem's daily newspaper, *The Statesman Journal*. His interest in civilian-based defense goes back several decades and he would like to devote some of his busy life to further development of the concept.

Shouldn't Your Friends Be Reading *Civilian-Based Defense*?

Let us know their addresses and we'll send a sample issue. ▽



Board Member Becomes New Program/Fundraising Director

We are also happy to report that Mr. David Gallahan, a member of the Board of Directors of the Civilian-Based Defense Association, has agreed to serve as Interim Director For Program and Fundraising. Mr. Gallahan's educational background is in math, ecology, evolution, and philosophy. He will develop some initial proposals for an expansion of CBDA's activities and a plan for fundraising.



Reach Out And Touch CBDA

Correspondence relating to memberships, subscriptions, requests for information, etc. is welcome. Please continue to send it to CBDA, P.O. Box 92, Omaha, NE 68101. (Phone 402-558-2085)

Letters to the Editor, articles and news for publication (all are needed) should be sent to Mr. Peter Bergel, c/o Center for Energy Research, 333 State Street, Salem Oregon 97301. (Phone/fax: 503-371-8002, e-mail: pbergel@igc.apc.org.)

Suggestions for CBDA programs and/or ideas for fundraising should be sent to Mr. David Gallahan, 511 Spencer Rd., Ithaca NY 14850. (Phone 607-277-3359.)

CBD & The Militia Movement

Continued from page 1

Michigan, Montana, and Ohio, and he suspects there may be units in ten other states. Although there may be hundreds of thousands of people who identify with the patriot movement, Berlet estimates that only about 10,000 people have actually joined the armed militias.

Other writers imply a much larger membership for the militias. *Soldier of Fortune* correspondent, Mike Williams, writes:

Though no exact figure of nationwide membership exists, Larry Pratt, president of Gun Owners of America, wrote over a year ago that he knew of more than 100 organized citizen militias. These ranged from the superbly structured Michigan Militia, which alone has 12,000 members, to small networks made up of a dozen like-minded friends. (*Soldier of Fortune*, April, 1995, "Citizen Militias...Necessary to the Security of a Free State...")

Why do U.S. citizens feel a need to arm themselves? Apparently, the April 1993 siege of the Waco, Texas compound of the Branch Davidians has been one major reason. Eighty-five Davidians, including many children, died in the siege by agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, and the FBI. Militia proponents see that action as an example of government turning on its own people.

The passage of the Brady Bill, outlawing certain kinds of guns in the United States, is said to be another major impetus for the formation of citizen militias. Legislators who supported the bill are considered traitors. Militia proponents see the anti-gun legislation as a threat to the right of citizens to keep arms.

Videos Explain Threat

One can gain some sense of the recruitment effort being made for the militias by viewing the home videos made available by proponents of the militia movement. These videos explain threats which they allege exist

and urge viewers to arm themselves. One such video circulated in the last couple of years is entitled "*America in Peril*." The Christian Underground Hotline (P.O. Box 339, Adrian, MI 49221) lists the video in its catalogue of over 200 "suppressed and hard-to-find, politically incorrect" videos.

The catalogue claims that a million copies of "*America in Peril*" are in circulation. A second film, "*America in Peril II*" is also offered. In both videos the speaker identifies himself as "Mark from Michigan"—a former Army intelligence analyst. He states that his purpose is "to explain the threatened hostile takeover of the United States by the United Nations military forces, to discuss the direction in which this nation is moving, and to cover the operations of the new world order in the United States." In the catalogue Mark is identified as Mark Koernke. Mark's message to his viewers is that we are in great danger. U.N. combat forces are already training inside the United States. U.S. forces are being sent abroad under U.N. auspices as a diversion. The primary purpose of "Desert Storm" (during which showing of U.S. flags and uniform insignia was discouraged) was to determine whether the American people would accept the new world order. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is alleged to have far too much power. Of 3,600 employees, only about 60 are actively concerned with disasters; the others are said to concern themselves with how to administer the country after the future take-over.

Mark condemns the government's suppression of the Branch Davidians in Texas. Attorney General Janet Reno is also condemned. Mark speaks of a government conspiracy to disarm the people in preparation for the new world order and the dominance of the United Nations. He urges his viewers to buy arms, ammunition and supplies before it is too late. He suggests organizing militias from below by finding a few others one can trust and forming small units which can be incorporated into something larger.

Throughout "*America in Peril*"

parts I and II Mark appeals to the duty of real patriots to be armed and ready. His final words in Part I are, "God bless the U.S. Death to the new world order. The republic shall prevail. Goodbye."

At the beginning of Part II, Mark leads his audience in the pledge of allegiance to the flag. To the concluding words of the pledge, "with liberty and justice for all", he adds emphatically, "and we will fight for it."

The People's Teeth

A common theme in the literature on militias is that citizens' access to guns must be preserved at all costs, and government must have a healthy fear of the people. Larry Pratt, Executive Director of Gun Owners of America, expressed this theme in his article in the March 1995 issue of *Guns & Ammo*, entitled "Firearms: The People's Liberty Teeth." He concludes his article with these paragraphs:

When a government no longer fears the people, atrocities become possible such as the murder of members of Randy Weaver's family by U.S. marshals and FBI agents. Emboldened by the lack of resistance when murdering women and children in Idaho, the Feds moved to Waco, Texas, and slaughtered nearly 100 people.

One can only speculate had there been an effective militia in Naples, Idaho, that could have mobilized after the U.S. Marshal murdered Sammy Weaver by shooting him in the back. Had the Feds feared a militia as active as the one in Lexington on April 19, 1775, it is entirely possible that the massacre of Branch Davidians in Waco, Texas, on April 19, 1993, would never have occurred.

Common Ground With Civilian-Based Defense?

Proponents of nonviolent, civilian-based defense have given serious thought to the same problem that is of such concern to those who advocate citizen militias.

(Continued on page 5)

CBD & The Militia Movement

Continued from page 4

We too are very aware that governmental power in a nation can sometimes be seized illegally by individuals or factions not having the consent of the people. Such a future possibility should not be completely ruled out for the United States, despite its long history of stability and rule by law. Militia proponents deserve credit for pointing out a possible deficiency in U.S. security: its lack of a defense (short of civil war) against usurpation of power from within.

Nonviolent civilian-based defense has been suggested as a policy that might serve to deter not only aggression from abroad but also attempts to usurp power within a nation. The defense, in both cases, would require that the citizens of the nation, along with their organizations and institutions, be prepared in advance to withhold cooperation from an aggressor in a variety of nonviolent but effective ways. That very preparedness would be designed to, first of all, deter the enemy's aggressive behavior. Should that fail, planned massive withholding of cooperation would be expected to lead to the defeat of the enemy.

The establishment and continuation of any government depends ultimately on the consent and cooperation of the governed. If a comprehensive strategy could be devised to withhold that consent and cooperation nonviolently, then bloodshed and destruction of property might be avoided. An armed defense would not be needed.

Unfortunately, a nonviolent civilian-based defense plan to deter illegal seizure of the U.S. Government is little more than a concept at the present time—probably because few believe the level of threat merits the effort. On the other hand, nothing I have read in the literature on citizen militias leads me to think that a comprehensive, feasible plan exists for a citizens' armed defense against such a takeover either, even though militia proponents think such a defense is urgently needed. We share common ground in the lack of an overall plan for what we advocate.

Proponents of nonviolent civilian-based defense and armed citizen militias also have in common a feeling of insecurity when all of a country's capacity for the use of coercive force is invested in the government. Gun-owners and those who join militias see their weapons as equalizers—their insurance policy against the government with its reservoir of coercive force. Proponents of civilian-based defense, on the other hand, do not want to depend on guns because they think citizens can more safely exercise coercive force by uniting in planned, nonviolent resistance to illegitimate government. (Some feel that using this kind of coercive force is also more compatible with their religious beliefs about the wrongness of killing or hurting even enemies.)

While we advocate different kinds of coercive force, we agree that citizens do need to retain the capacity to use coercive force. If dialogue and political action fail to provide relief, citizens must be able to resist injustice forcefully.

Self-Confidence

There is one additional area of common ground between advocates of nonviolent, civilian-based defense and armed citizen militias. Faced with the awesome power invested in government, both the militia patriot and the civilian-based defense patriot have self-confidence. They have the ability to be stubborn—to be unyielding. They know that no power can rule for long if the people don't accept it. If they decide to resist, they know that they—along with their fellow citizens—can think of countless creative ways to do it. The power of the people is even more awesome than the power of government.

Some Matters Of Concern

While feeling some kinship with the militia movement, I also am concerned about some aspects of it.

My first impression is that it shows little respect for honest cooperation between nations. Anything done across international boundaries, especially through the United Nations, is too glibly passed

off as some kind of conspiracy to create a world government. In the more populated world of tomorrow, much more global cooperation and planning will be needed, not less. Is extreme patriotism blinding some to the truth that the human race is one, and that the common good of all people must be considered?

Many assertions and charges made by militia proponents seem to be made without realization of how serious they are and that they require substantiation at the time they are made. Presentation of the evidence is weak. Some presentations seem designed to excite and inflame. None of this is conducive to clear thinking about the threats that are alleged. When the presentation isn't clearly objective and calm one is forced to wonder whether paranoia is involved or whether someone is profiting financially from it.

I also have the impression that proponents of the citizen militia are too quick to call people to arms. I hope they give more support to the normal political process than their literature suggests. To issue an urgent call for people to arm themselves, to store arms and ammunition and to go into training immediately is a very serious step and can hardly be justified at the present time. Alex McColl, writing in *Soldier of Fortune* about the defeat of congressional "gun grabbers" in the last election, seems to agree:

The election results show that orderly electoral democracy works, and that there is no need and no justification for armed resistance to legally elected authority. The blessings of liberty, civility, legality and order far outweigh the inconveniences and hardships of putting up with whatever Clinton has in store for us in what remains of his tenure in the White House. Only when the tyranny gets to the point of suppressing the right to criticize the holders of power, or seriously interferes with the electoral process, is there any justification for an appeal to arms. A civil war is a dreadfully destructive tragedy. Ask the people of Bosnia, Sudan, Cambodia or Lebanon.

(Continued on page 6)

CBD & The Militia Movement

Continued from page 5

("Command Guidance," Feb., '95.)

Militias Empower Participants...

In a way, the rise of the militia movement in the United States is understandable. The United States is physically big and heavily armed. The country is connected in many complex ways with every part of the world. Government is big and the bureaucracy is big. The individual citizen is small and is likely to feel rather powerless and unable to have much impact on what happens in the country. Powerlessness breeds frustration and anger. The frustrated and angry citizen sees that the government has all the coercive force at its disposal—all, that is, except for the guns that citizens have a right to keep. That right then begins to seem very precious. The idea of an armed citizen militia to "watchdog" the "big brother" government also becomes appealing. Add to all of the above the enjoyment of guns that so many people have—a fascination similar to their love of cars—and it isn't too hard to understand the appeal of the militia movement.

...But Create New Problems

Nevertheless, when citizens arm themselves to "watchdog" the authorities, they create a new problem. The regular armed security personnel of the nation, who have been deputized by the people, have their job to do and it is a somewhat dangerous job. When they see others arming themselves outside the established system, they are bound to be ill-at-ease. They cannot be sure how these newly armed groups will act nor how much bloodshed would result if an order were given to disarm and disband them. When two groups face off with arms, the level of tension and distrust sky-rocket.

As I understand it, the militias hope that their capacity for using armed force will serve as a kind of low-key threat, a balance to the armed forces and other law enforcement agencies of the country. Those who

control the armed forces and law-enforcement agencies will be on notice that abuses will not be tolerated. Little or no bloodshed should be necessary, and certainly not civil war. But is this, perhaps, an overly-optimistic view? Who can predict what will actually happen? Is it not just as likely that fear and suspicion

When citizens feel that their own government and law-enforcement agencies are abusing the people or taking unconstitutional actions, there are several very practical nonviolent steps which can be taken, each at its appropriate time.

will increase, misunderstandings will occur and hostilities will break out?

CBD: The Benefits Without The Problems

Nonviolent civilian-based defense would be unlikely to create the dilemma described above. If a policy of civilian-based defense were adopted, no arms would be involved on the part of the people, but they would still have at their disposal a powerful coercive force, should it be needed: their pre-planned, organized non-cooperation. However, the authorities and their agents—the armed forces and law-enforcement agencies—would know they are not in physical danger. The level of fear and distrust would thus be much lower. The likelihood of bloodshed and destruction would be remote.

When citizens feel that their own government and law-enforcement agencies are abusing the people or taking unconstitutional actions, there are several very practical nonviolent steps which can be taken, each at its appropriate time. Recourse to armed coercive force should not be needed.

The first step is to **determine the truth** of an alleged abuse or illegitimate action. A simple public meeting

to discuss an issue can usually clarify matters, as long as all points of view are represented and the accused person or agency is given a chance to explain what is being done. In complicated cases, filing suit in court is another way to get at the truth/legality of what is happening and it may also provide relief if one's allegation is sustained.

A second step is to **take political action** of one kind or another to have appropriate corrective legislation passed. One can also organize voter support for politicians who will do what is right.

A third—more drastic—step is to **organize a popular nonviolent struggle** (fight) with the authorities, if it is felt that the political process or court system has failed to preserve justice. A whole range of nonviolent tactics (demonstrations, strikes, sit-ins, etc.) can be planned as part of an overall strategy to coerce the authorities to act as they should on behalf of the people. The strategy may or may not require nonviolent civil disobedience to achieve its purpose.

Finally, a **campaign of civilian-based defense** can be planned as a course of action if the legitimate government has actually been overthrown or if that is judged to be a future possibility. The objective would be to prepare a major part of society to withhold the cooperation the usurper needs to be able to govern.

New Idea For Militia Proponents

The idea of nonviolent, civilian-based defense will probably be new to most militia proponents. Hopefully, it will be considered carefully. If we are really at the stage in the United States where defensive measures are needed to ensure the preservation of legitimate government and the Bill of Rights, then it is important that we devise the best possible defense strategy, the one which will be the most effective and least destructive for the people. We should then consider, side-by-side, the potential strengths and weaknesses of nonviolent civilian-based defense, defense by armed militias and any and all other strategies which might be proposed. ■

The Rise of Citizen Militias

by Mike Tharp

In 1938, Lee Simpson shot three people at his ranch in central Montana. Two were young men he thought had been stealing his cattle, one a deputy sent later to arrest him. After a trial, he was sentenced to death. On the gallows, just before he became one of the last men publicly hanged in America, he was asked if he had any final words. "Not that I know of," Simpson said.

That same willingness to take the law into one's own hands is again loose in the West, especially in Montana, where there is rising resentment against government. This sentiment, of course, is shared by many Americans, but recently some Montanans have begun seeking frontier justice under the rubric of Revolutionary War-era law.

Hundreds--possibly thousands--of Montanans are joining "citizen militias." They are spurred by passage of the Brady law, which applies waiting periods to gun purchases; they fear the law is the first step toward Big Brother's confiscation of their guns. Similar organizing drives have popped up in other states, including Florida, Texas and California. Their agenda is to thwart gun restrictions and fight most government intervention in their lives. Among the claims made by more extremist militia organizers is that a secret cadre of leaders hopes to rule the world through one global government. As evidence, they cite such reports as:

- Unmarked black helicopters appearing in many locations, often threatening local residents by shining lasers into their eyes.
- Gurkha troops and Royal Hong Kong policemen regularly training in the Montana mountains.
- One-hundred-car trains filled with United Nations equipment, and cargo ships ferrying Russian and East German trucks and personnel carriers.
- The Crips, Bloods and other street gangs being recruited and trained to serve as "shock troops" and "cannon fodder" for house-to-house searches conducted by New World Order

officers.

Despite these apocalyptic allegations, so far there has been no violence. Most militia organizers seem to want to keep it that way. John McGlothlen, a 47-year-old sheetrocker in Kalispell, has organized three militia meetings in the western Montana town, with peaceful turnouts of 300, 800 and 150 persons earlier this year. He dismisses the wilder rumors, "They're kind of like sasquatch," he says. Some law enforcement officers, however, are worried that more radical groups may provoke a con-

"We don't want bloodshed. We want to use the ballot box and the jury box. We don't want to go to the cartridge box. But we will if we have to."

-John Trochmann, Militia Promoter

frontation to win converts for their cause. Some gun-toting extremists are planning to go to Washington in mid-September to put "traitors" in Congress on trial before a "citizens" court. There's also concern that in hotbeds of discontent, extremists may elect a sheriff, giving them access to law enforcement databases and intelligence reports.

Militia proponents in Montana cite both the state Constitution, which allows for an unofficially organized militia, and the federal Constitution as legal bases for a citizens' militia. But state authorities dispute these interpretations. Flathead County attorney Tom Esch says militia organizers ignore other constitutional amendments and court cases, which stipulate that the National Guard is the state's only militia and that any militia must be "legally summoned" under civilian-government control.

Legalities aside, feelings are running high. In April, in Eastern Montana, 15 or so men, calling themselves "freemen," placed million-dollar

bounties on a county judge, sheriff, county attorney and other local officials who they felt were infringing on the freemen's rights by seizing and auctioning land that had been foreclosed. Though not directly connected to supporters of a citizens' militia, the freemen share many of their beliefs. Four freemen were arrested on charges including disturbing the peace and threatening a peace officer. But a dozen, mainly farmers and ranchers who had lost their homesteads to foreclosure, were still at large.

Opposition to gun control is the catalyst that spawned growing support for the militias. Many of the state's 800,000 residents believe Montana's crime rate is relatively low because their weapons are a deterrent. "These people understand the Bill of Rights and the right to keep and bear arms," says Bill Boharski, a three-term

Republican state legislator, "and when somebody starts infringing on those rights, they get concerned."

Militiamen and women have other reasons for long-simmering anger against government. Their fears and outrage have been inflamed by two recent incidents, called by some the Lexington and Concord of the 1990s. One is the Branch Dividian conflagration in Waco, Texas, last year; the other is the 1992 stand-off between Randy Weaver and federal agents, which left one agent and Weaver's wife and son dead. To some militia supporters, Waco and Ruby Ridge are evidence that the government is a tool of sinister outside forces seeking to control the United States.

Wide grievances. Groups lobbying for a citizens militia include many types of people. Some are ordinary citizens upset at what they view as growing federal intrusion into their lives and who are threatened by the

(Continued on page 9)

Taiwan Tour

Continued from page 1

as the U.S. government was providing a protective umbrella through the Mutual Defense Pact. It was likewise less important while Taiwan's main potential adversary, the PRC, was busying herself with the aftermath of cultural revolution, internal power struggles, economic transition from a controlled economy to market economy and other modernization programs. The KMT government was more concerned about internal security affecting its legitimacy in the budding democracy.

The all-inclusive issue of national security was excluded from public debate and scrutiny by the authoritarian government in Taiwan, and was never seriously challenged during thirty-eight long years of martial law.

It was only after the opposition organized the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) in 1986 that it was successful in probing into some aspects of the national defense and security of Taiwan. A small group of Taiwanese intellectuals in the States complemented the effort of the opposition through strategic analyses (based on the data and information available there) of military strength, policy and the posture of the PRC as a function of its threat to the national security of Taiwan.

In Canada another small group approached the national security issue from the grassroots. It initiated the annual Urban-Rural Mission Training Programs in 1982—first in Canada and later in Taiwan—with subsequent incorporation of a Nonviolent Action Training Program (1990), a Conflict Management and Resolution Workshop (July, 1994) and a Civilian-Based Defense Lecture-Seminar Series (December, 1994).

Sharp Called In

The initial outreach to Dr. Gene Sharp in 1991 was a very low-profile approach exploring the possibility of his undertaking a lecture tour to Taiwan. The eventual 1994 date proved very timely in three aspects.

◆ First, the mandarin Chinese edition of Dr. Sharp's *Civilian-Based*

Defense was published one week prior to his arrival.

◆ Second, the ruling KMT party had been repeatedly using the threat of invasion by the PRC during elections, to scare Taiwanese voters away from supporting the opposition DPP. The Taiwanese suddenly realized the serious vulnerability of their own national security.

◆ Third, the "blacklist" was abolished in 1992, after some thirty years, and those Taiwanese intellectuals who had been blacklisted were able to join Dr. Sharp and facilitate his lecture tour.

The lecture-seminar tour was designed to provide maximum exposure as well as in-depth understanding. Four major cities—Taipei, Taichung, Tainan and Kaohsiung—were chosen for the public lectures, and Taipei, the capital city, for the additional four lecture-seminars.

Dream Comes True

Ever since learning about Dr. Sharp's lecture to the Thai Military Staff College in Bangkok in 1993, I had dreamed of a similar possibility for Taiwan. It was only by chance that I was able to reach the military establishment through a close friend's special connection and his tireless effort. This helped us present national security and civilian-based defense as a genuinely non-partisan issue of great importance to the public and to the military. The principal of the War College of the National Defense University and I (who had for over thirty years been considered a threat to national security) collaborated over a four-month period to make the lecture at the War College possible.

Dr. Sharp had put lots of effort and thought into his lecture-seminars, in both breadth and depth. The kick-off lecture-seminar was at the War College and was titled "Mobilizing New Power Sources for Deterrence and Defense." It was given to about seventy military officers holding the rank of colonel or higher. The titles of the two public lectures were "Looking at a New Defense Option: Civilian-Based Defense," and "The Potential of Civilian-Based Defense." The four lecture-seminars were titled;

"Strategic Planning for Civilian-Based Defense," "Adoption of a Civilian-Based Defense Component Within a Partially Military Policy," "Defending Against Coups d'Etat," and "Promoting Consideration of Civilian-Based Defense and the Process of Transarmament."

The public lectures were free. However, a nominal registration fee of about U.S. \$20 was charged for the four lecture-seminar series and the two lunches involved. The attendance, ranging from 30 to 70, was lower than expected, due mainly to a poor response by the mass media, even after press releases were sent to them, and to a shorter-than-ideal time interval after the hectic provincial and mayoral elections on December 2nd. The *Commons Daily* in Kaohsiung was the only newspaper which covered the event in that city. Dr. Sharp and I were invited as guests on the English-language talk/call-in show on ICRT (International Community Radio Taipei) for one hour.

Dr. Shane Lee, the director of the independent Congressional Office, was able to facilitate a private non-official public hearing on national defense through a DPP legislator, Mr. H. H. Huang, who also chaired the hearing. Dr. Sharp made an introductory presentation. Respondents were a KMT member of the Legislative Yuan (House—one of the major branches of Taiwanese government), a Taiwanese professor of international relations teaching in Tokyo and two generals sent officially by the Ministry of Defense. The hearing was well-covered by TV reporters from all three networks, yet it did not appear in the highly regulated electronic media which is controlled by the KMT, the military and the government. Only three daily newspapers carried the story, including introductory remarks on CBD.

What Have We Accomplished?

We have completed the first stage of introducing CBD, a brand new and alien concept, to the people of Taiwan. It will continue to be an "eye-opener," a thought-provoking challenge to many people there. Precious seeds have been scattered or

(Continued on page 9)

Taiwan Tour

Continued from page 8

set into the ground. Three important contributions have been made:

1. The public has been initiated into the essentials of CBD as an integral part of deterrence and national defense.
2. The military, including the Ministry of Defense, was serious enough to provide the occasion at the War College and to dispatch two generals to the hearing. That is a breakthrough.
3. There was a broad-based co-sponsorship involving a total of sixteen organizations: the Professors' Association, Teachers' Federation, Presbyterian Church in Taiwan, community educational groups, urban rural mission, a newspaper, a publisher, educational foundations, independent congressional office, the Labour Front, one private university, Chinese Association for an Independent Taiwan, the PEN of Taiwan, anti-nuclear association, the Committee for New Taiwan.

A small component of the second stage of the process was built into the first stage. We video-taped all of the lecture-seminar series, with Dr. Sharp's magnanimous understanding, for subsequent educational programs which are planned. Some of those tapes apparently were shown to the public on underground cable TV channels (sometimes known as

"democracy channels") shortly after the event.

The second stage of the process will involve presenting the concept of CBD for consideration by the wider public in Taiwan. It will be a two-pronged approach. First, more videotapes will be produced and made available to all who are interested. Second, study groups will be organized, utilizing various formats, in some fifteen cities and towns across the country.

The medium and long-range goals of the third stage of the process are to provide some sort of leadership training in preparation for officially organizing the CBD Association in Taiwan. Eventually, members of this Association will have enough wisdom, people-power and financial resources to take on the task of designing the grand strategy for incorporating CBD as an integral, vital component of deterrence and national defense in Taiwan. ■

[Professor Albert J. F. Lin teaches physics at Ryerson Polytechnic University in Toronto. He plans to return to Taiwan in July for 6 months to work on the second- and third-stage organizing he describes. The CBD Association he envisions would be a national Taiwanese association under the umbrella of our international CBD Association.]

"The assumption that only military action can be effective in resisting an opponent using military action is belied by evidences of non-military types of resistance. These have proved so powerful and effective that the will of the military-supported opponent has been thwarted, and significant concessions or major objectives have been won."

—Gene Sharp "The Political Equivalent of War"—Civilian Defense (1965)

Rise of The Militias

Continued from page 7

economic woes in the timber, farming and mining industries. The freemen and some others believe all levels of modern government are illegitimate. Some refuse to pay income tax or carry a driver's license. Red Beckman of Billings, one of the most influential people in the movement, says, "The Federal Reserve Bank, the IMF [International Monetary Fund], the New World Order and all that gang" seek dictatorial control of the world. Some are conservative Christians who support home schooling and are particularly upset about homosexuals. Finally, there are white supremacists and neo-Nazis, whose groups have been growing in the Northwest.

In Noxon, the Trochmanns--brothers John and David and David's son Randy--have started MOM, the Militia of Montana, Alpha Unit. They attend gun shows and other militia's organizing meetings throughout the Northwest, selling their video- and audiotapes, literature and pepper-gas dispensers. Human rights activists in Montana say the Trochmanns have been members of the Aryan Nation and antisemitic Christian fundamentalist groups. The Trochmanns deny that, claiming there are Jews, Asians and blacks in their militia. Sitting in the tiny town's only cafe, the Trochmanns rail against the U.S. government.

Randy: "They've perverted the intent of the Constitution and come up with a bastardized form of illegitimate government."

David: "Three hundred families run the world and plan global conquest."

John: "We don't want bloodshed. We want to use the ballot box and the jury box. We don't want to go to the cartridge box. But we will if we have to." ■

[Reprinted with permission from U.S. News & World Report, August 15, 1994. Copyright, 1994, U.S. News & World Report.]

See page 10 to subscribe to
Civilian-Based Defense.

Civilian-Based Defense (ISSN 0886-6015) is published quarterly by the Civilian-Based Defense Association (CBDA) to provide information about civilian-based defense (CBD) as an alternative policy for national defense and to make available international news, opinion and research about CBD. The Association is a nonprofit membership organization founded in 1982 to promote widespread consideration of CBD and to engage in educational activities to bring CBD to public attention. CBD means protecting a nation against invasions or coups d'etat by preparing its citizens to resist aggression or usurpation by withholding cooperation and by active noncooperation rather than military force. Tactics include strikes, encouraging invading forces to desert, encouraging other countries to use sanctions against the invader, etc. Citizens would learn how to use CBD before aggression starts, which distinguishes it from spontaneous resistance. Prior preparation and publicity would enhance its effectiveness and also make it a deterrent to attack.

Editor: Peter Bergel: 333 State Street, Salem, OR 97301; 503-371-8002; email: pbergel@jgc.apc.org.

Consulting Editors: Mel Beckman and Philip Helms.

Subscriptions: \$15/year or \$25/two years to CBDA, Box 92, Omaha, NE 68101 USA; 402-558-2085.

Readers are invited to send news, articles and other material for publication. ■

Please Recycle
This Newsletter

**PLEASE CHECK YOUR
MAILING LABEL**

The top line of the mailing label on this newsletter will tell you when your membership or subscription is/was renewable.

Printed on recycled paper



CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE ASSOCIATION
Subscription, Membership & Contribution Form

I want to BEGIN RENEW Membership (magazine included) as indicated:

- \$25 Basic \$5 Low income \$50 Supporting
 \$100 Sustaining \$500 Lifetime
 I want to CONTRIBUTE \$ _____ to further the Association's work.
 I do not want to become a member, but wish to subscribe to the magazine.
 \$15 One year \$25 Two years \$30 Three years
 Please send an acknowledgement. I do not need an acknowledgement.

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____

Zipcode: _____ Nation: _____

CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE ASSOCIATION

Box 92, Omaha, NE 68101 USA

**Additions To The Author/Article Index:
Civilian-Based Defense 1982-1994**

In the Index published in the last issue of *Civilian-Based Defense*, the articles which appeared in the August 1992 issue of the publication (Volume 7, No. 6) were inadvertently missed. They were the following.

ANDERS, PAUL "Baltics: Self-Defense or U.S. Umbrella" "Native Americans' Sovereignty" "Around the World."

DRAGO, ANTONINO "An Italian Strategy for People's Nonviolent Defense."

HARTSOUGH, DAVID "Report From Nonviolence Training In Moscow."

HUXLEY, STEVEN "Nonviolence Misconceived? A Critique of Civilian-Based Defense" "Lessons from the Baltics."

JENKINS, BRUCE "Civilian-Based Defense Discussed in Moscow and the Baltics."

POWERS, ROGER "Baltic Defense Officials Consider Civilian-Based Defense at Vilnius Conference."

SCHWEIK ACTION
WOLLONGONG "Telecommunications for Nonviolent Struggle."

SHARP, GENE "Promoting Civilian-Based Defense: Lessons from the History of Development of the Policy." ■

CBDA
P.O. Box 92
Omaha, NE 68101 USA

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
COLUMBIA, SC
PERMIT NO. 332