

Civilian-Based Defense

\$4.00
Single
Copy

Exploring a Nonviolent Strategy for Deterrence and Defense

Volume 13, Number 1

Late Summer
1998

Rethinking the Mandate of the Civilian-Based Defense Association: Readers Respond

Last issue (Volume 13, Number 1, Spring 1998) included the article, "Rethinking the Mandate of the Civilian-Based Defense Association" by George Crowell and Mel Beckman. We invited reader response, and your reactions follow.

The four basic areas for possible Association function detailed in the article are (briefly):

1. We could make use of our newsletter (or "magazine") to provide information on nonviolent campaigns anywhere in the world.
2. We might participate actively in nonviolent campaigns.
3. We should also be promoting the notion that people need constantly to prepare themselves for nonviolent struggle even in situations where there is no immediate need for such action.
4. We would continue explicitly to promote CBD when possible, relevant, and appropriate.

The three suggestions for renaming the Association detailed in the article are:

1. Association for Strategic Nonviolent Action
2. People Power and Civilian-Based Defense Association
3. Association for Nonviolent Action in Conflict and Defense

A number of readers responding have referred to these by number for convenience, and we have reprinted them here for the reader's convenience.

Readers' comments are offered here without substantive editing. Some opening sentences or paragraphs identifying the article and authors, and expressing appreciation for this work, have been omitted for reasons of space. Commentary on other points not germane to the article have also been omitted.



I understand the problem very well : American people are not concerned with CBD, making progress for the organization difficult. However, we feel firstly this project is not good because CBD is a world-wide deal, and second because of the quality of CBD ideal. The quantity of work, which must be undertaken for its specific development won't be made by broadening the mandate to include education, assistance, human rights etc., and the effectiveness of CBD will be lessened.

I understand this is not your intention or goal. However other associations have made the same change, and in doing have lost their capacity to work primarily on Civilian-Based Defense. They would like to promote CBD by nonviolent fundamentalism instead of instrumentalism. That was always a mistake in the history of nonviolence.

You already have in USA other nonviolent associations whereas you don't have CBD instrumentalist groups. Both are necessary and it would be a shame if you abandon your complementary specificity.

Yes you have difficulties, but as a group specialized in communication, we have studied the specific reasons as to why your organization's previous orientations were better at communicating CBD. Our book *La guerre par actions civiles* (The War by Civilian Actions) relates specifically to communication in the context of CBD. Only through reading the book may you fully understand the potential that lies in CBD communication.

If you want to promote CBD, you must first define the target of your communication and the ways and means to reach it. Communication is a very professional job. After the L.A. conference, I realized that your problem stems from your lack of communication strategy, ultimately preventing you from further developing CBD. It is like the Tibetan peoples who had no strategy for civilian resistance, making it difficult for them to win their fight. Our first suggestion is that you think about your specific aim and look for an effective strategy for it. The process is long, but essential. We explain that in the book. The strategies may be different in each country but it is not certain. Before changing your positioning, it would be a shame that you don't explore this potentially rich way of thinking.

Apart from this research, we have other proposals and our second suggestion is in the international field: manage an international coordination for the efforts of CBD development. We can participate in this process. It could be interesting to unite our efforts with those people who wish to promote CBD. To work together in the same direction is one of the foundations of efficient communication.

The third is to focus our efforts on helping the Albert Einstein Institution which I became familiar with last fall at Harvard. Gene Sharp is our common group's mentor. He is perhaps alone in the world in being able to

help people in resistance to find strategies, but who will replace him in a few years? Who has enough expertise? This is a question that must be thought about seriously.

Furthermore, the specificity of the Albert Einstein Institution is research. It has published his studies. But as a research institute, it can't promote his work without help. The Institution does not receive the notoriety it deserves nor does its studies have the results it merits. Promoting is not its expertise. In the USA means for communication and promotion are necessary. Who will help this organization to make it known, to promote its knowledge, to highlight its work? Only you perhaps. My concern is that if you broaden your mandate, you won't be able to fulfil these duties.

The forth is to develop your focus about "nonviolent action" but without changing your aim with CBD. That is a better broadening for your strategy to progress in CBD.

For the name of your organization as preceding, I advise you not to change it. That would change your aim. Other details are important: in your first and third proposal, you use the word "Nonviolent". This is good for its meaning and for initiated people, but not good for communication because of the connotation of this word, which we have studied and is perhaps the same in English. In the second, you use "people power", which I know to be very bad for communicating with military or government people.

*Jean Marichez
France*



The 1980's were a time of optimism in promoting CBD. The massive expansion of the peace movement made many people responsive to the idea of defense alternatives. The pioneering work of CBD writers and theorists from the 1950's on seemed to be bearing fruit. As well as interest from some official quarters, grassroots networks and campaigns were set up in several countries. The Civilian-Based Defense Association has played a pivotal role in this activity, especially through the newsletter which provides inspiration and encourages interaction and support between countries.

With the decline of the peace movement in the 1990's, though, interest in CBD has waned. George Crowell and Mel Beckman have raised many astute observations and suggestions for future directions. They note, quite correctly, that nonviolent action is a vital tool in many social struggles, including opposition to economic domination. I am sympathetic to their view that the mandate of the association should be broadened to cover the waging of nonviolent conflict, as I have long argued that promotion of CBD should be built from the grassroots, linked to the development of skills in nonviolent action and to struggles by social movements.

However, I think that retaining a focus on the military is important. In campaigning on environmental, economic or feminist issues, it is easy to lose touch with the point that military forces are central to the problems of war and genocide and, as well, are the ultimate protectors of systems of economic oppression. CBD is important because it poses an alternative to this central system of organized violence. It is also worth noting that nonviolence theory applies most readily to the case of opposition to repressive rulers and less well to systems of dispersed power such as the market.

If the association broadens its mandate to cover nonviolent action generally, does it just duplicate what's happening already? There is an enormous interest and use of nonviolent action by environmentalists, feminists, peace and antinuclear activists, democracy movements and local communities, among others. Much of this activity is already supported by networks and reported in magazines such as *Peace News*, *The Nonviolent Activist*, and *Nonviolence Today* as well as books published by New Society Publishers and others.

One path for the association is to focus on aspects or implications of nonviolent action that are specifically relevant to CBD. For example, in reporting a rally, strike or sit-in, or describing a campaign, the focus could be on the potential for gaining skills in nonviolent action, building solidarity, creating networks, improving morale, resisting violence and undermining opponents. To be sure, much of this is covered in existing writing on nonviolent action. So perhaps the implications for building a capacity for CBD need to be emphasized. A strategic dimension is important here, though strategy is important in nonviolent action generally as well as CBD.

If the mandate is broadened too much, those with specific interests in CBD may lose interest without the association picking up a new constituency. When Scientists Against Nuclear Arms broadened its mandate to become Scientists for Global Responsibility, this did not stop the decline in activity. So one possibility is to retain a central focus on CBD while making the topic open and relevant to others involved with nonviolence. A name change might help.

In talking about CBD, normally I am relaxed about what name to use, whether social defense, nonviolent defense, civilian-based defense, or some other term. It's a question of what works for a particular audience. In broadening the mandate of the association, though, the term "social defense" may have an advantage. It suggests a defense of and by society. Furthermore, in Europe, so I understand, it refers precisely to the sort of defense against government and corporate attack on communities that a broadened mandate would deal with. Whatever the name, though, it should be short!

Peace researcher Nigel Young has analyzed the rise and decline of peace movements. There are good explanations for the cycles that occur in interest and activism. We can expect that at some stage in the future,

interest in peace issues and, as well, CBD will dramatically increase. A network of activists, sympathisers and researchers will be a vital resource when this resurgence occurs. The challenge now is to keep the network alive and responsive until that time.

*Brian Martin
Australia*



The present mayor of Omaha NE began his term by calling the police force "a paramilitary organization." In this regard and since numerous changes may be ahead for CBDA, it seems to me a mistake not to put at least some effort into exploring and supporting nonviolent policing of a sort independent enough to be notably different from such groups as Neighborhood Watches and Citizen Patrols - different, that is, from groups that primarily involve reporting suspicious actions to existing police forces. This past year and a half have seen here the deaths of three civilians at the hands of local police.

*Roger Burkholder
Omaha NE*



With respect to a name change your first alternative, Association for Strategic Nonviolent Action, is by far the best. In my opinion the word defense should not be included in the name for any organization advocating nonviolent methods. Nonviolence is primarily positive - aimed at improvements - and not primarily defensive. The task at hand for humanists - whether religious or secular - it to work towards a Good Society. The changes we should emphasize are within ourselves or our own society. Military invasion or sudden military coups are not a major concern. Control of nuclear weapons is prevented more by our own US government and by the military-industrial-nuclear-complex than by outside forces. Our efforts to control military force are best directed towards those already established in our own country.

There is another matter I urge you to consider seriously. It is outlined below.

It seems to me that many people fail to consider assertive nonviolence because they believe that it can only be practiced by individuals who will never be violent or even advocate that anyone else ever be violent. This clearly is an untenable position and will be dismissed by most persons without further thought. Martin King strove to get the federal government to bring its potentially violent troops to enforce civil rights in the South. Gandhi did not ask for elimination of all police forces even though by their nature police forces involve at least a threat of violent restraint. A personal pledge to not employ violence may sometimes have great pragmatic value but no reasonable person will advocate that no one should ever be violent under any conditions. Those who advocate greater use of

nonviolent tactics for social reform need to avoid looking like unrealistic kooks to those who might otherwise get their message.

If ecological conditions are at the worst possible extreme, when a large population exceeds the carrying capacity of the environment, there is no way to prevent violence even to the extent of widespread slaughter. Advocating nonviolence under all, conditions makes little sense and most people are quite aware of this fact.

*Charles C. Perkins
Manhattan KS*



I fully agree on the necessity to reorient the Association. Anyway, we must admit that the idea of Civilian-Based Defense cannot progress in a vacuum, if the citizens of a country don't have faith and overall any practice of nonviolence.

I would also change the name of the Association and I would choose the first one suggested, "Association for Strategic Nonviolent Action."

*Serge Mongeau
Quebec, Canada*



My thinking on the article in the spring issue of the newsletter is that points 1, 3, and 4 on page 11 should be pursued to the extent practicable. I feel that it is not appropriate for the Association to directly participate in particular nonviolent campaigns, however much we might approve of their goals. This concern is not primarily based in worries about whether such participation would jeopardize the association's tax exempt status or create a semblance of lack of objectivity. Rather, I feel that truth calls us to recognize that the aggressor is also a victim, and that every victory bears within it the seeds of the victor's destruction.

If the Association feels that active participation in nonviolent campaigns is to be part of its mandate, which may be the right direction, despite my reluctance, then a possible new name might be Association for Support of Nonviolent Freedom Fighters. I like the present name better than the others suggested. I think it better not to change just for the sake of change.

*Edward Pearce
South Mills NC*



I am glad the CBDA is re-evaluating its goals and activities. I have some random comments to add to the group's thinking about its future directions.

Overall, I believe the greatest weakness of the CBDA strategy is that it is trying to do top-down organizing (a problem in and of itself) and on a concept/goal (CBD) which is not even on the radar screen

among nonviolent activists. Some "social marketing" (PR for social causes) may be needed.

Regarding this, I am enclosing again some comments I made in the last two years about focusing on local or regional gatherings and injecting CBD into those events and groups. A more decentralized approach to organizing around CBD would begin to build awareness from the ground up, which I think is the only really long-term workable strategy. (In the same way that CBD will only work on a mass basis, CBD organizing and education should work the same way.)

In general, the CBDA could work more toward bringing CBD into other groups, rather than concentrating the idea within one group. Workshops on CBD, resolutions by various groups, and articles in other groups' newsletters are three examples.

I think some group needs to be a repository of information on a particular concept or idea like CBD, but I certainly support the association's efforts to have a broader view of nonviolent action. The question is how can the association operate with this broader mandate without duplicating the work of other groups like AEI, WRL, FOR, Nonviolence International, Pax Christi, etc. If there appears to be duplication, then perhaps CBDA should instead have its advocates working with these other groups to make sure they incorporate CBD into their work.

The four areas of work for the CBDA all are good ideas. Does CBDA have the people power to do all of these? How about "summer maneuvers" (like what the military reserves do) or some training in conjunction with Training for Change? A "mobile tactical squad" of people who can work as advisors with potential or actual nonviolent action situations to refine the strategy might also be helpful.

Finally, I would encourage CBDA to consult with experienced community organizers about how the association could be structured, what goals and projects are reasonable and do-able, and how a good but unpublicized idea can win significant public support (the Social Marketing piece). I would suspect many CBDA board members and supporters have skills in this regard.

*Larry Dansinger
Monroe, ME*

The following segments are the earlier comments to which Mr. Dansinger refers:

I don't know how CBDA's November conference came out, but I would like to offer another approach to bringing CBD concepts to various people around the U.S. I wrote this in 1996 in hopes the CBDA would take a more decentralized approach then, with a number of smaller but still significant events on a regional, statewide, or citywide level. Perhaps now is a time to try that.

I am certainly a supporter of CBD concepts, but it is one of a number of important issues that I try to focus some interest and energy on. Because little about it is known or happening in Maine and I am not able timewise to begin a campaign, there is not much happening

regarding CBD (at least that I am aware of). The question of how to create new excitement among people who have not been involved in peace and justice issues and greater excitement in CBD among those already involved is a key to the organizing strategy of the CBDA.

With some positive statements from religious bodies already about CBD (Page 7, Spring, 96 issue), what other goals would a national conference especially for faith-based communities have?

As an organizer in the state of Maine, my personal preference is toward bottom-up methods of involving people in an issue. My approach would be to pay people to organize local (one state or metropolitan area) or regional (several states) conferences that would involve new people in the issue. You can also pay people to organize within national religious bodies to bring resolutions to national meetings and establish committees within these denominations.

Perhaps you can get \$20,000 to do a national conference but not local/ regional ones. (Setting aside \$10,000 for speakers' stipends and expenses seems awfully high.) Or maybe you are focused on national approaches because decisions are ultimately made nationally.

I can't offer much in ideas for a national event, since I don't know the players on a national level (I'm sure you're already familiar with FOR, Sojourners, etc.), but I would suspect a regional event in New England would be likely with so many former/current board, staff, resources, etc. I would be willing to help in Maine with something New England-wide and might be able to identify someone who could organize a Maine-New Hampshire-Vermont event if they were paid something for their time.

Larry Dansinger



I agree with your survey of the problems CBD has with the mind-set of most citizens. Your four basic areas mentioned on page 11 all sound good to me.

I am a retired school teacher and was associated with the teachers union, United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA). During their long struggles with the school board many innovative nonviolent actions were taken and continue to occur to this day. If anyone is researching successful campaigns, UTLA has many examples in their history.

Your article made me want to renew my membership in the organization so I can keep in touch as to the latest developments.

*Madonna Newburg
Manhattan Beach, CA*



Some thoughts of your direction search as questioned in the spring 1998 newsletter: I have seen your work as the intellectual end of peace research. You have

been instrumental in developing and coordinating the exchange and compilation of ideas on and definition of nonviolent Civilian-Based Defense.

Now you are considering a wider mission? Perhaps; certainly promoting nonviolent action in place of violence is important. However I would see your role as best working through and with Fellowship of Reconciliation, Peace Action, perhaps War Resisters League and American Friends Service Committee, and others. These folks have programs in place that need support, and they can benefit from sharing in your expertise in strategy. and planning.

I suggest that rather than diluting your focus, that you connect it with folks who are struggling to implement very close parallel ideas, and you be the creative resource that can help their position. Perhaps you can extend your educational and academic activities to interpret the work of the above organizations to the media, and to the academic worlds of sociology and political science. You can also help formulate nonviolent strategy with the boards of these organizations and help them with the public education projects. I see a need to study the public perceptions of successful and unsuccessful nonviolent actions in the news, as well as to publicize the successful nonviolent actions -- such as many peace keeping actions of the UN that do not make it to the media.

The great problem of the Vietnam peace movement is that they did not communicate well with the media. This has improved greatly today, but the message still gets twisted, misunderstood and stereotyped by the media and large segments of the public. For example the concept of standing for a principle rather than being "for" one side or the other in a conflict is often missed by the public. Hence peace advocates are said to be unpatriotic. When the same people protest violence on the 'other side' they are said to have switched their allegiance.

Aren't you in a position to provide this education and interpretation better than Some of those involved more in action?

*Steve Willey
Sandpoint ID*



I want to urge the CBDA members to maintain the present academic focus of the organization and to keep out of local or regional political issues. If the organization adopts the proposed change, its purpose will be severely diluted or lost in the inevitable confusion and swirl of whatever local/regional political issue we step into.

One of the very unique features of CBDA is that it is a coalition group which is can attract adherents from all sections of the political spectrum. Ironically, its national and worldwide goals can only come to realization if it preserves its appeal to a wide variety of political persuasions. I think the consensus of most theoreticians of CBD is that it must have broad acceptance throughout a

society to work successfully. Aligning ourselves with one side or another on local/regional partisan issues in Canada or the United States will likely limit the public's perception of us. It will not help us promote the idea of CBD. A small organization like CBDA can never establish a separate identity if most people have their first contact with us in the context of advocating one side or another of partisan issues. The participants in partisan politics are notoriously unforgiving of anyone opposed to their views. We are not at the stage where we can afford to make enemies, especially if the enemies don't even understand what our purpose is.

CBD is not understood by the public now. It is in its seedling stage. That means it must be carefully nourished in order to grow. This requires the kind of academic nurturing which the organization has up to now engaged in. If it can't grow in that type of greenhouse atmosphere, then maybe it will never grow. But there is no realistic scenario in which it can grow by taking sides in current partisan politics. The idea of CBD is still too small and still too delicate to establish itself successfully in the world of partisan politics. It will be swept away, trampled, lost, and surely misunderstood.

The microscopically slow growth of CBDA has been frustrating for all. It seems that good ideas just don't catch on fast. I encourage individual members to start or join related special purpose partisan organizations if they so choose. But the essential notions of CBD should be preserved in the type of educational organization which CBDA has always been.

*David Grappo
Oakland CA*



[from a letter regarding an article by Mel Beckman in the February 1997 Peacework:]

We need to be promoting action that nearly everyone can do right now. My suggestion is Ethical Consumerism, participating as little as possible in the global system of economic oppression. I started in this direction when I refused to pay federal taxes in order to protest US militarism. I soon reduced my income below income tax liability. Reducing expenses naturally followed. Now I grow much of my own food and don't own a car. I can't give much to charity but I like to joke that gasoline prices have dropped, benefiting multitudes, since I stopped buying gasoline. If enough people participated in this kind of action, we *could* make this country affordable for the poor. For developing Civilian-Based Defense I suggest that we already have an exploitive occupying force, the military-commercial complex. If we can bring *that* under control, the aspirations of tyrants everywhere will be dampened.

*Dale L. Berry
Grants NM*



Consideration of the Proposal, and of responses by readers and members, will occupy a major part of the agenda at the annual meeting of the CBDA Board of Directors in October 1998. Additional comments and responses are welcome, and will be circulated to the

Directors. The Autumn issue of *Civilian-Based Defense* will include a report on decisions made by the Board regarding this Proposal and the future course of the Association.

CBDA Seeks Executive Director

The Civilian-Based Defense Association is seeking an Executive Director. Applications and resumes are being reviewed by the Personnel Committee of the Board of Directors. Interviews may be scheduled by telephone conference call or in person, with the Personnel Committee or the Board itself. The current Position Description follows:

Executive Director

The Executive Director is hired by the Board of Directors. Responsibilities are:

1. To develop proposals for member activities, conferences, publication of literature, and other projects through which the Association can realize its goal of facilitating public study and discussion of Civilian-Based Defense. Programs may be local, regional, national, or international. Proposals are submitted to the Board of Directors for approval.
2. To develop proposals for fund-raising, which may include outreach to individuals, organizations, institutions, foundations, and public entities, both in the United States and abroad. Plans are submitted to the Board for approval.
3. To implement Board-approved program and fund-raising plans, other than production and distribution of *Civilian-Based Defense*.
4. To report in writing (hard copy) to Board of Directors quarterly about the progress of program and fund-raising activities; and to participate in Board conference calls as may become necessary.
5. To ensure that expenditures for program and fund-raising activities remain within the budget set by the Board of Directors.
6. To meet annually with the Board of Directors, and report in writing and orally on the preceding year and current projects of the Association; and to support this annual meeting via necessary arrangements.
7. To perform such other and related duties as may from time to time be necessary to the function and goals of the Association, with the approval of the Board.

This position description is subject to review and amendment by the Board of Directors under the Association Bylaws. The Association is currently considering a proposal to broaden its mandate, which may significantly change the focus, structure, and/or activities of the Association, and necessarily of the Executive Director.

Experience in peace and justice work, knowledge of Civilian-Based Defense, and genuine commitment to the

principles of CBD and the goals of the Association are preferred.

The position is currently vacant.

Salary level is negotiable, subject to these considerations: Current Association income from member dues and subscriptions is not sufficient to pay the Executive Director's salary, and the Association's financial reserves are not sufficient to meet such a salary even initially. Therefore it must be understood that the Executive Director's salary is contingent on fundraising accomplished.

Letters of application and resumes may be sent to:
Civilian-Based Defense Association
Attn: Personnel Committee
P.O. Box 821
Highland MI 48357-0821 USA

Videotape of Los Angeles Conference Available

The Conference on Security, Religion, and Civilian-Based Defense sponsored by the Association and held in Los Angeles in November 1997 was videotaped for the Association's archives. The resulting hours of videotape have been painstakingly edited to produce a more practical, "highlights" tape featuring the major speakers and presenters, including:

Dr. Ronald McCarthy
Rabbi Everett Gendler
Clayton Ramey
Dr. Lourdes Arguelles
Roger Bergman
Rev. Al Rhodes-Wickett
Dr. Albert Lin
Dr. George Crowell

The "highlights" tape is available on a single VHS format videotape cassette, for only \$20.00 per copy. [N.B. One-half this amount represents the cost of producing and mailing the tape, and the other half benefits the Association.] Order from, and make checks payable to:

Kelly S.J. Helms
P.O. Box 108
Highland MI 48357-0108 USA

A Call for Civilian-Based Defense

Colleen McDonald Morken

We're at a special point in time right now. The zeitgeist is ripe for Civilian-Based Defense. In the article "The Changing Nature of Arms Control," John Tirman comments that for a good part of our "nuclear history," the cult of the technical - that is, a focus on the scientific and engineering aspects of war and warfare-held our national imagination as we grappled with the many features of arms control: size, scope, capabilities and everything from doctrine, to deployment, to negotiations, to treaty verification. "Today," Tirman notes, "this focus does persist, but it is being overtaken by more explicitly political approaches."

It is this shift in the prevailing national paradigm, that I believe provides a particularly inviting opening.

Gene Sharp, a prolific author and lecturer on the topic of Civilian-Based Defense, says, "The dangers and limitations of modern military means - conventional, nuclear, and chemical-biological - are too obvious to need repetition. What has not been clear is what alternative we have." Nonviolent Civilian-Based Defense is the alternative I believe to be not only possible but essentially "our own best chance for survival."

My preferred definition of CBD is: "pre-arranged strategic nonviolence in the service of deterrence and defense."

It may be helpful to note what Civilian-Based Defense is not. CBD is not associated with the militia movement. CBD is not antigovernment, nor is it inherently anti-military. It does operate under the assumption that nonviolent defense is far more effective, efficient and far less costly than current military defense strategies. It is not a theology of pacifism - you do not have to ascribe to the belief that nonviolence is morally or ethically superior to violence. CBD is not civil disobedience in the service of a particular interest.

CBD is not an inane simple answer to a hugely complex question. Clarity about the How and Why of the potential effectiveness of CBD will require vast amounts of research, analysis and policy study. For example, our current military policies assume that, when faced with violent behavior, only the threat or use of superior violence will halt the original violence. A parallel assumption CBD relies upon is that repeated nonviolent responses to violence tend to reduce or eliminate that violence. This is an assumption that nonviolent activists understand very thoroughly.

We know that unbelievable and unwarranted acts of violence against civilians (especially females) have

always been perpetrated during wartime. And yet as a nation, we continue to allow ourselves to believe that violence is "necessary" in the face of violence. Riane Eisler, author of *The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future*, looks at our mass media where violence is continually replayed in front of us and she names it as simply a modernized version of public stoning or execution. She considers such public displays of brutality a cultural mechanism which serves to maintain a "dominator" system, rather than a system based on partnerships.

There are many historical accounts of unarmed resistance to invasions and occupations. This information is increasingly becoming available to us as it is being collected and cataloged by scholars, university peace studies programs, and by peace groups. Our long and lustrous human history of nonviolence is being reclaimed. Our recent history of organized nonviolent campaigns (mostly untold in our schools) includes the Civil Rights movement, the United Farm Workers movement, and the Disarmament movement. Here are more examples:

India vs. Britain: From 1930-1947, east Indians utilized nonviolent noncooperation, marches and acts of civil disobedience which resulted in India's independence from a long history of British colonization.

Germany vs. Belgium and France: For nine months in 1923, German civilians creatively noncooperated with occupying French and Belgian troops who had been stationed there after Germany had fallen behind in its reparation payments. Germany believed the occupation to be illegal under the terms of the Versailles Treaty and while their resistance remained nonviolent world opinion was moving toward agreement and support. Transport workers refused to handle trains taking coal to France, operators refused to drive streetcars when soldiers boarded, and shopkeepers refused to sell to soldiers, even closing entirely when troops were off duty. In June 1923, saboteurs blew up a railroad bridge killing ten Belgian soldiers and wounding 40. Favorable world opinion declined, violent reprisals for sabotage ensued and the German resistance ended that September.

Denmark vs. Germany: The unarmed resistance of the Danes by strikes and boycotts against Nazi invaders was mixed with underground violence and sabotage. Danish citizens followed the example of their king and shunned occupying soldiers by leaving public places when soldiers entered. King Christian, on his daily horseback ride, shook hands with citizens and refused to return Nazi salutes. When a swastika was hoisted over a public building the king ordered it down. Nazis stated that any Danish soldier following that order would be shot. King Christian stated, "I will be that soldier," And the swastika

came down. Eight Danish arms factory saboteurs were executed, though Nazi reprisals were certainly less severe in that country than in other Nazi occupied countries.

The White Rose Resistance Movement: A group of German citizens - mostly university students and professors - broke the paralysis of fear in Nazi Germany by their many acts of resistance. They repeatedly typed and posted updated manuscripts of Nazi atrocities and called for resistance from German citizens. Sophie Scholl, a leader in the White Rose, wrote in her diary just days before her execution, "With all those people dying for the regime, it is high time someone died against it."

Czechoslovakians in Prague in 1968 spontaneously organized noncooperation with Soviet invasion forces. The Czechs were so successful in winning the hearts and minds of Soviet soldiers they had to be rotated out every two weeks. Five Soviet soldiers were imprisoned for supporting the Czech resistance.

Nonviolent student demonstrations in Beijing held the world's attention in the mid-1980s. Taiwan may soon be looking at CBD as perhaps its last best hope in its struggle for independence from China. Last year, Albert Lin was elected to Taiwan's Legislative Yuan or Parliament. He campaigned on a platform of adding CBD to Taiwan's strategic defense policy. Student Taiwanese Independence groups continue nonviolence trainings and international outreach.

Lithuania and neighboring Baltic states in 1989-1991, freed themselves from the Soviet yoke and regained their independence through nonviolent resistance and struggle. The English translation of *Nonviolent Resistance in Lithuania, A Story of Peaceful Liberation* is soon to be published.

Since 1989, the Balkan province of Kosova has nonviolently noncooperated with Serbian martial law. Albanians comprise some 90 percent of the population of Kosova and they have strategically boycotted parliamentary elections. The Cabinet is directed from a "government in exile." Albanians speak freely of their parallel administration which runs their own school system, including university, as well as a healthcare system. Some 18,000 teachers and hundreds of doctors are on its payroll. This past December 30, the Protest Council of the University of Prishtina held a Protest Hour in which demonstrators held up a book and a copy of their Protest Declaration outlining their demands for the unconditional release of the university buildings and premises. Nonviolence was maintained despite Serbian police efforts to disperse the protesters. The BBC reported that several student protesters were beaten by police.

El Salvador, following a decade-long civil war, is launching a pioneering effort to establish a sustainable Zone of Peace. Local residents are collaborating to replace a war-induced culture of violence with a culture of peace.

These examples are truly only a smattering of

instances where spontaneous nonviolent civilian-based actions have been effective fully or to some degree. What if, rather than depending on spontaneous actions, we were to direct even a portion of our current military budget into strategic planning and training in nonviolent action? We base our national defense and foreign policy on plans for every imaginable form of warfare. What might happen if we invested our energies, imaginations and resources into planning and preparing to wage nonviolent struggle? In 1995, 4.8 million people were either on active duty in the U.S. military or in civilian military-related jobs. Meanwhile, how many U.S. citizens were involved in disarmament? The truth is we don't know! And because we are not told, we do not tell our children! These are the stories we must continue to reclaim. There is documentation of more than 50,000 German citizens defying the Nazi government. There are far more of us who understand and act on the power of nonviolence than we know.

How do we begin a program of CBD? The process might extend over several years, during which our nonviolent and Civilian-Based Defense capacities would be developed and introduced as one component of the total defense policy. These capacities would be gradually built up and expanded, with the military components being gradually phased out and replaced. Naturally, much could be learned in this process and this growing knowledge base would provide the foundation for further steps. Franklin Zahn's book *Alternative to the Pentagon* provides a very creative and thorough imagining of an invasion on the east coast and a CBD response to it.

As for individual citizens, we might begin by asking ourselves several deep and probing questions. If we do believe, "way down deep," that it is "human nature" to be aggressive or violent, on what do we base this belief? Is the Disarmament movement about the business of cultural transformation or do we rather see our work as a means of reducing the overall intensity, frequency, and quantity of violence? Have we asked ourselves, as did historian Howard Zinn, "Why is it that governments have to go to such lengths to mobilize populations to go to war?" Have we exposed ourselves to texts such as that published in 1995 by Lt. Col. David A. Groomsman titled, *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society?* Grossman concludes, on the basis of history, studies, anecdotes, and his own lived experience in the military, that most human beings possess an innate and instinctive reluctance to kill other human beings.

Consider how CBD might actually become manifest in the U.S.:

1. The adoption of nonviolent action strategies and techniques by the military;
2. The demand from civilians for education and training of civilians in the theory and practice of CBD; and
3. the continued work of the Disarmament community to

creatively dismantle the (so called) legal sanctioning of violence that makes up our current national defense and foreign policies.

Another key aspect of what is provided through the work of the Disarmament community is the "firing up" of our collective imaginations about how we all might do CBD when it comes down to the crunch. If we accept the premise that nonviolence can be *learned*, how might that impact the choices we make regarding what we consider "entertainment," especially if we adopt Riane Eisler's belief that public displays of brutality serve to reinforce our reliance on violence? In his book *Allow the Water*, Leonard Desroches lists the "tools and stages of nonviolence." Self-education is at the top of the list.

Bishop Adolf Proulx from Quebec asks, "Can we

conceive of . . . being condemned to forever make war? . . . The efficacy of nonviolence in stopping wars has been demonstrated many times, and if we applied as much determination in dying for peace as we do in dying for war, the results would be even more spectacular. . ."

It is possible to wage peace. Indeed, therein lies our own best chance for survival.

Colleen McDonald Morken is a teacher and peace activist from Moorhead MN, and a member of the CBDA Board of Directors. This article is excerpted from remarks she made at the King Holiday gathering in Ashland WI, January 17, 1998, and is reprinted from The Pathfinder, the quarterly newsletter of Nukewatch, a project of The Progressive Foundation.

Reflections on Nonviolent Defense

Toshio Terajima

The two concepts, Civilian-Based Defense and social defense, have been usually used to indicate national defense by nonviolent resistance. The former emphasizes strategic use of nonviolence, while the latter connects nonviolent defense with social change towards more egalitarian and more democratic society. Advocates of the former are chiefly academic researchers, though those of the latter mostly consist of peace activists. In spite of these differences, the two concepts are common in insisting use of nonviolent struggle means to defend society. This article adopts the term nonviolent defense in order to stress a common ethic of nonviolence and its relevance to the contemporary world.

Although nonviolent defense policy is already suggested by Gandhi, it has come to be called civilian defense or Civilian-Based Defense and theoretically developed as a realistic alternative to military defense since the 1960s by Gene Sharp and others. The present article explores principles of nonviolence and strategies of nonviolence. The article endeavors to show that without a true sincerity of belief in nonviolence as the morally correct principle, its pragmatic effectiveness in the political arena would be largely diminished.

Strategies of nonviolent struggle have been

successfully employed in the post-Cold War era within the former Soviet Union and the Baltic countries. These contemporary experiences have shown the potential effectiveness of nonviolent strategies within a civil society as a defense against coups d'etat, with the most spectacularly successful example being the movement of Russian citizens to block an attempted coup in Moscow in August 1991. Nonviolent national defense also intends to utilize prepared nonviolent struggle by civilian population as a whole and aims to defeat military aggression. While it is accepted that the shift from military defense to nonviolent defense is the right course of action, at the same time the article stresses the need for greater effort to strengthen those structures of mutual interdependence and cooperation among nations that would render war highly unlikely or impossible. The article concludes that nonviolent defense must be linked to the creation of global civil society.

Toshio Terajima is a member of the faculty of Osaka Prefecture University, College of Integrated Arts and Sciences, and a member of CBDA. This is a summary of Terajima's article in Peace Studies (Heiwa Kenkyū) Volume 22, November 1997. Peace Studies is the annals of The Peace Studies Association of Japan, c/o Prof. Masatsugu Matsuo, Institute for Peace Science Hiroshima University, 1-1-89, Higashisenda Hiroshima, 730 Japan.

Update on Albert Einstein Institution Activities

Bruce Jenkins, Executive Director of the Albert Einstein Institution, reports that the Institution is "assisting Burmese prodemocracy groups in developing a strategy of nonviolent resistance against the military dictatorship in that country." Jenkins was in Thailand earlier this year working on this project.

Jenkins and Gene Sharp, Senior Scholar at the Einstein Institution, conducted a workshop on nonviolent action in India for Tibetan groups late last year. They are also engaged in discussions with democracy activists from Nigeria.

Einstein Institution Fellows are analyzing the use

of nonviolent struggle and resistance by the Palestinian Intifada and by Ethnic Albanians in Kosovo, opposing Serbian domination.

Sharps booklet *From Dictatorship to Democracy* was printed in Indonesian and Spanish this year, and the publication is being issued in Tibetan, Karen, Mon, Chin, and Jing-Paw (the four latter are spoken by ethnic groups inside Burma). Sharp's *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* is being translated into Tibetan.

Civilian-Based Defense

ISSN 0886-6015

© Copyright Civilian-Based Defense Association, 1998

Subscriptions: \$15/year or \$25/two years

Editor This Issue: Phil Helms

Civilian-Based Defense Association

P.O. Box 821

Highland MI 48357-0821 USA

Civilian-Based Defense 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.

Permission is hereby given to excerpt material from *Civilian-Based Defense* for nonprofit use. Attribution is requested and appreciated. Permission for other copyrighted material must be obtained from the respective copyright holders.

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.

Civilian-Based Defense Association
P.O. Box 821
Highland MI 48357-0821



0000

U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
FLINT, MI
48907
SEP 28, 98
AMOUNT

\$1.00
00014360-04

AIR MAIL

