

# Civilian-Based Defense

Exploring a Nonviolent Strategy  
for Deterrence and Defense

## Inside This Issue. . .

Rethinking the Mandate of the CBDA .....	3
Do We Really Want to Abolish War? .....	6
<i>John Mecartney</i>	
The Message of Kosovo: Can We Hear It?.....	9
<i>Glen Gersmehl</i>	
Events of Interest.....	12
Uranium in Ur and Depleted Corporations.....	13
<i>David Gallahan</i>	
Conference on Nonviolence and Social Empowerment.....	17
An Experiment in Deterrence.....	18
<i>Phil Helms</i>	
Reagan and Gandhi?.....	21
Youth and Violence .....	22
<i>a quote from Dave Grossman</i>	
Bombing Yugoslavia Not the Answer .....	23
<i>Stephen Zunes</i>	
Millennium 2000: Walking the Ways of Peace.....	26
The Pact of the Year 2000: No More Killing !.....	27

*Civilian-Based Defense*

ISSN 0886-6015

© Copyright Civilian-Based Defense Association, 1999

## ***Civilian-Based Defense***

ISSN 0886-6015

© Copyright Civilian-Based Defense Association, 1999

Subscriptions: \$15 / year or \$25 / two years; Single copy: \$4.00

Editor: 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.

N.B.: We are sending this transitional issue to the widest readership possible, including expired memberships and subscriptions. If your membership or subscription has lapsed, we'd love to hear from you; we will not be able to continue mailing to expired memberships and subscriptions, for simple budgetary reasons.

# Rethinking the Mandate of the Civilian-Based Defense Association

The last two issues of this publication - Volume 13 Number 1, Spring 1998 and Volume 13 Number 2, Late Summer 1998 - were extensively concerned with a proposal to rethink and expand the mandate of the Civilian-Based Defense Association (CBDA). In the former, we set forth the proposal at full length; in the latter, we offered extensive and representative feedback from members of CBDA and other readers of these pages.

Our publication schedule has been irregular during this transitional period; for this we apologize. We continue to find ourselves in a period of restructuring and reorganization within CBDA, but we believe we are beginning to emerge from this difficult time, and extend our thanks for your patience and continued support.

The proposal to expand the CBDA mandate, as set forth by George Crowell and Mel Beckman, offered four general areas for modification:

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.

There were also suggestions for possible name changes for the organization.

## ***Civilian-Based Defense***

The Board of Directors met in Michigan in November 1998, and considered the proposal, as well as the future of the CBDA and this publication at some length.

We adopted the proposal to expand our mandate in significant part, but we specifically did not adopt the second item in the list above.

We plan to expand the horizons of this publication to include use of nonviolence for social change. Experiential articles and reports recounting campaigns, whether successful or otherwise, are invited. Analysis by leaders or participants need not be academic or wholly scholarly in all cases.

We agreed to a change in publication format, to the digest size you now hold in your hands. We also agreed that a change in publication title is needed, but were not able to settle upon a new title. Therefore, we invite readers and members to offer suggestions, bearing in mind that we do not wish to duplicate or closely approximate the title of some other existing publication. N.B.: When the title change is accomplished, the ISSN will change; this is a requirement. In addition, a minor question: How shall we refer to this publication: as a newsletter, a magazine, a journal, or by some other term?

After careful consideration, we concluded that we could not and should not adopt the second item in the list: that is, active involvement in nonviolent campaigns. CBDA lacks the resources and ability to attempt such a consulting role and we prefer to recognize our limitations and hold to more modest goals.

With regard to the third item - promoting preparation for nonviolent struggle, and the use of nonviolent means in struggles of lesser scope than national defense, we concluded that such patterns of thought, preparation and behavior ultimately contribute to the understanding of CBD, and the favorable reception of the concept. This seems entirely consistent with our mandate, and is incorporated in our plan for the publication.

The fourth item - continued promotion of CBD, required

little discussion. Promotion of and education regarding CBD will remain our primary and highest objective.

After careful consideration, we decided it will be for the best to retain the current name, Civilian-Based Defense Association, relying upon the change in publication title to convey the broader aspects of our revised mandate.

We were also quite clear that we wish to retain and strengthen a close, mutually supportive relationship with the Albert Einstein Institution.

This issue of *Civilian-Based Defense* should be regarded as transitional, rather than as an exemplar of the new format and subject matter. We anticipate that under the expanded mandate, submissions of articles and materials will increase, and it may require several issues before the new look and content are fully in place.

You'll notice that several of this issue's offerings are written by clergy, and incorporate a faith-based perspective on nonviolence, in follow-up to our 1997 conference in Los Angeles.

We specifically invite your submissions, which are essential to make the new format for this publication a reality. Please send us reports on campaigns, developments, and use of nonviolence generally in your area and your movements. Please remember that we cannot reprint articles from other publications without permission, and that many of our readers find accounts by participants far more vital and valuable than wire service or other commercial media accounts.

In addition to articles and accounts, we have the ability to use photographs and graphics, including cartoons. (Remember: we can't reprint without permission, no matter how admirable a syndicated editorial cartoon may be.)

As always, we invite your input and feedback, and look forward to both, as well as your submissions.

*Phil Helms, Chair and Editor*

*As this issue goes to press, it appears a settlement may have developed in Kosovo. We believe the articles herein on Kosovo are still of interest. Thanks.*

# Do We Really Want to Abolish War?

---

**John Mecartney**

---

Why has war not been abolished? Slavery is gone, though people said it would never go. Child labor is almost extinct. But war still flourishes though it could eliminate hundreds of thousands or all of humanity.

Just ask the average persons in the pew as to what they think of war. They will tell you it is unchristian and could end life on this planet. But they usually say, "How else are you going to defend your country?" They see no way but war!

Unless we can show people an alternative defense system to war that is effective, war will never be abolished.

Luckily, we have that system. It is an approach of nonviolent, noncooperation that has historical precedence and is currently being studied by several countries as well as by our military.

The bishops of the United Methodist Church unanimously wrote a letter in 1986, "In Defense of Creation." In the accompanying foundation document, they said:

We encourage special study of nonviolent defense and peacekeeping forces. In testimony to our hearing panel, Gene Sharp of Harvard University reported: "A vast - but neglected - history exists of people who have nonviolently defied foreign conquerors, domestic tyrants, oppressive systems, internal usurpers, and economic masters."

Among notable modern examples are Gandhi's *satyagraha* (soul force) in India,

Norway's resistance during Nazi occupation to keep schools free from fascist control, Martin Luther King, Jr.'s civil rights movement and solidarity in Poland. Every prospect that either military establishment or revolutionary movement might effectively replace armed force with nonviolent methods deserves Christian support.

In a much longer statement the U.S. Catholic Bishops in their 1983 peace pastoral letter said:

Gene Sharp's nonviolent popular defense does not ensure that lives would not be lost. Nevertheless, once we recognize the almost certain consequences of existing policies and strategies of war carry with them a very real threat to the future existence of humankind itself, practical reason as well as spiritual faith demands that it be given serious consideration as an alternative course of action. . .

In 1988 the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church, while saying the U.S. was not ready now to accept nonviolent defense, urged a study of nonviolent, civilian-based defense as an alternative to nuclear deterrence.

In 1960 the American Friends Service Committee published a book advocating nonviolent defense, *In Place of War*. Another peace church, The Church of the Brethren, had their religious education department publish a play written by one of their clergy, "The Eleventh Mayor." The play was written in 1935 and outlined how a city in the U.S. defended itself against an invasion using nonviolent tactics. It assumed that the U.S. took seriously the slogan of World War I when it was called a "war to end all wars." An assumption was that the U.S. was sincere when it signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war. (This treaty is technically in force since it has never been repealed.) The play has been produced over 35 times in the Michigan area by the author of this article and is available from him.

## ***Civilian-Based Defense***

The third peace church, the Mennonites, have initiated with Dr. Ronald Sider of Eastern Baptist Seminary, the idea of an international peacekeeping force to intervene nonviolently in violent situations. In Sider's book, he appeals to evangelical Christians to consider nonviolent defense. He has sketched a scenario of nonviolent defense in the last section of ***Nuclear Holocaust and Christian Hope***. He also has a book on nonviolent action.

While God is portrayed as a god of war in much of the Old Testament, there are references to trusting God and rejecting military alliance by Isaiah. Clearly, Jesus rejected the Zealot method of violence. He corrected the "eye for an eye, life for a life" approach with "love your enemies." For three centuries the Christians refused to fight in the Roman army because of Jesus' statement.

The theological question which must be raised is concerning the nature of God. Is the moral order that God expressed in Jesus one where people are called to do evil to obtain good? Are people called to engage in mass killing in order to secure justice and peace? Do not good trees bear good fruit and bad trees, bad fruit? If people must do wrong to get right, then we have an immoral order. The God we believe in does not rule the universe but some devil. Yet we know this is not true. War could be abolished if the religions of the world refuse to cooperate and adopt a nonviolent defense.

Gene Sharp in his three-volume 1973 work, ***The Politics of Nonviolent Action***, has detailed hundreds of historic events where nonviolence has won over violence. Philip Manus and Gerald Schlaback have cited many illustrations from Latin America in their 1991 book, ***Relentless Persistence***.

*Rev. Dr. John Mecartney is United Methodist clergy, and has worked extensively with the Nonviolent Action for National Defense Institute (NANDI), Methodists United for Peace with Justice, and other groups. He is a member of the Board of Directors of CBDA.*



# The Message of Kosovo: Can We Hear It?

---

Glen Gersmehl

---

The unfolding situation in Kosovo is a multiple tragedy. First and foremost, it is a tragedy for the one and a half million ethnic Albanians who have been displaced, separated from loved ones, killed, injured, and threatened by hunger, exposure, and disease, and by the Serbian police and military forces, or by NATO bombs. . . Like many I've been moved to contribute to refugee aid.

Second, Kosovo raises serious questions about U.S. foreign policy. If non-military means are preferable, why didn't the West offer support to the nonviolent Kosovar leader Ibrahim Rugova instead of undermining his leadership by supporting the KLA (which before long we were calling "a terrorist group")? When we decided to confront Milosevic, why choose a strategy that divides and undermines the indigenous movement for democracy and peace, is only increasing support for Milosevic, and is giving him an excuse to destroy the independent media? So I've written letters and gone to vigils to protest the bombing.

Third, Kosovo represents a failure of U.S. political leaders regarding the range and imagination of our foreign policy options and tools. It is this tragedy I wish to explore further here. On the one hand, the U.S. has fielded state-of-the-art assets across the full spectrum of *military* options.

U.S. capabilities on the *non-military* side of the coin are another story entirely. We support a large, traditional diplomatic corps. We have peacekeeping forces for use after a peace agreement is reached. And we've developed *almost nothing* across the remainder of the nonmilitary spectrum, from peace

## ***Civilian-Based Defense***

team accompaniment and training in passive resistance, to nonviolent intervention and civil resistance. We're talking about ***peacemaking*** methods, the kinds of capabilities relevant to situations like Kosovo.

When I ask U.S. policy experts why we haven't explored these capabilities the answer is silence or cliches like "such methods are impractical" or "the strategies of Gandhi and King worked with the British or in the U.S. but they can't work against someone like Milosevic." True, such means present their own difficulties and challenges.

But consider: In the past decade and a half, fifteen nations comprising 1,782,000,000 people used nonviolent means to achieve major political changes beyond anyone's wildest expectations. Their opponents included Marcos, South African *apartheid*, and eastern European dictators as ruthless as Milosevic. If one extends the time frame back another forty years, more than half of the world's people have experienced major nonviolent social change. "All this in the teeth of the assertion, endlessly repeated, that nonviolence doesn't work in the 'real' world," to quote Walter Wink, an especially articulate proponent of this perspective, in his seminal book, ***Engaging the Powers***.

In 1999 the U.S. will spend \$260 billion on military forces; \$14 billion on all our diplomatic services. And ***almost nothing*** for resources useful in a situation like Kosovo. U.S. foreign policy looks like a carpenter with crowbars and wrenches but no hammer or saw; a baseball team that chooses to play with one infielder.

Kosovo, in other words, is not only a humanitarian tragedy, it is also a tragedy of foreign policy rigidity and narrowness. What can be done? What might a citizen write to Secretary of State Madeline Albright? This is a start:

Billions of our tax dollars pay for consultants to do things like fix Y2K problems. Wouldn't it make sense to hire experts to conduct research and to strengthen our nonviolent, nonmilitary capabilities? What a difference it would make if our budget

allocated for nonviolent options even five percent of what we spend on military ones! If common sense isn't enough of a motivation, how about outrage at the inadequacy of U.S. foreign policy methods and tools over the past decade in Sudan, Somalia, East Timor, Rwanda, Haiti, Bosnia, Burundi, and now Kosovo.

But is there anyone to provide such assistance to the State Department? Groups with at least ten years of experience in nonviolent engagement of conflict include Witness for Peace, Peace Brigades International, Christian Peacemaker Teams, Peaceworkers, Quaker Peace Service and American Friends Service Committee, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Lutheran Peace Fellowship and other religious peace fellowships, as well as groups on/in South Africa, Germany, Central America, and elsewhere.

The most respected peacemakers on the planet are thinking along these lines. In the last two years, every living Nobel Peace Laureate has signed onto an Appeal "for the children of the world" to designate the years 2000 to 2010 as a "decade for building a culture of nonviolence."

After a year of debate, the UN General Assembly unanimously approved the idea. The Appeal calls for discussion, teaching, and experimenting with peacemaking and nonviolence at every level - in schools, communities, churches, countries, and internationally. This vote and the decade have more than symbolic significance: As the UN "Decade for Women" illustrated, such a designation holds the promise of encouraging extraordinary public, media, and organizational attention. Lutheran Peace Fellowship's 1998 petition campaign, and endorsement by eleven synod assemblies and four Evangelical Lutheran Church in America churchwide units are among the most significant grassroots support of the Appeal in the U.S. Other groups are joining with and learning from Lutheran efforts.

The Nobel Appeal offers an opportunity to share a priceless gift in our churches and communities. Mother Teresa, Desmond Tutu, Martin Luther King, Jr., and other Nobel

## ***Civilian-Based Defense***

laureates trace their understanding of nonviolence back to that gift and call: the gospel of justice and reconciliation in Jesus Christ. Can we hear it?

*Glen Gersmehl is national coordinator of Lutheran Peace Fellowship, a nonviolence trainer, and a leader of regional and national efforts for the Nobel Peace Laureates Appeal. Reprinted from Lutheran Peace Fellowship.*

---

## **Events of Interest**

### **Justice, Peace and Reconciliation**

June 18-20, 1999

Augsburg College, Minneapolis MN USA

Lutheran Peace Fellowship institute;

contact LHRA, 5233 N. 51st Blvd., Milwaukee WI 53218

(414) 536-0585 FAX (414) 536-0690 e-mail:

LHRA@ecunet.org

Speakers include Walter Wink, Barbara Rossing, Gladys Moore;

Pre-institute events include Christian Nonviolence seminar

### **United Nations University**

#### **Third International Leadership Programme on**

#### **Leadership in Conflict Resolution and Peacekeeping**

July 28 - August 31, 1999

The University of Jordan, Amman Jordan

FAX +962-6-533-7068 e-mail: un2@ju.edu.jo

Subsidized participation cost: \$3,000 excluding travel costs.

### **So let's get the nuke out of Michigan!**

Grassroots Gathering: July 09-10, 1999

Harlow Lake, near Marquette MI USA

Nonviolent protest and resistance at Trident/ELF base:

July 11, 1999, near Republic MI USA

(616) 864-2203 or (616) 946-3693

### **The Changing Face of the Military**

War Resisters International, 5 Caledonian Road, London N1

9DX Britain +44-171-278-4040 FAX +44-171-278-0444

warresisters@gn.apc.org

August 08-10, 1999, Steinkimmen/Bremen, Germany

# Uranium in Ur\* and Depleted Corporations

---

David Gallahan

---

We have in existence now the most deadly military force the world has ever known. The American military machine is capable of annihilating virtually any target it chooses without human-to-human contact. The American military-industrial complex has vented incredible anti-life force in committing terrible atrocities on the land and people of Mesopotamia. We have realized the science fictional horror of a landscape poisoned for eons with "depleted" (i.e., not good enough to build bombs) uranium.

This action is staged entirely in service to maximizing profits for multinational corporations. Iraq has been devastated to maintain American control of oil fields. This is not about maintaining a "high standard of living" for the American people. This exercise of military power is so that a few unspeakably wealthy entities will be even more so. And it's not just a matter of some people wanting more luxury - the entities primarily involved are not humans, but corporations. Though these collectivist legal entities are run by humans, the critical decision-making structure is not human. It is a complicated meta-human creation with a one-dimensional value system.

Dollar valuation is not sensitive to an array of human values which have now become critical for us humans to attend to. The simple world of our market economy has been taking over our awareness. Money, along with sex and violence, is becoming all we think about. We give our highest respect to pursuit of wealth; but pursuit of wealth is not worthy of respect.

\* Ur, Biblical site in southern Iraq, birthplace of Abraham.

## ***Civilian-Based Defense***

The simple corporate goal of maximum return on capital has given us a human-created world (the economy) wherein the assumptions of Darwinian theory actually hold (unlike in the natural world) so that entities existing within that world are totally selfish (unlike natural entities), and now we see that human life is actually in big trouble. The anti-life force of the American military-industrial complex is actually a tendency of its nature, its nonhuman, corporate power structure.

The deep solution for this deadly situation lies in human awakening, for the means of destruction are wielded by human hands. This puts a lot of responsibility on American military personnel, perhaps. Let's spread this responsibility out somewhat: the American government is clearly involved, but even the American populace has some appearance of being complicit in this situation. And really, we are complicit to some extent; in part by our acceptance of the structuring imposed by money concerns as opposed to other concerns. And complicit by our acceptance of the rule of law: English common law primacy of property rights and corporate rights over human rights. We have given up our human authority to nonhuman agencies.

But we are alive; all these nonhuman structures are not alive. They bear no human responsibility. They exist only in human words and in human activity patterns. We humans are theoretically able to pause and reflect, to wake up and act in ways that are truly life-affirming. We do perceive in more dimensions than just money.

We need to be able to communicate and understand together, to formulate right action counter to the corporate take-over of our lives and world view. Together we can find ways to act that may be unfamiliar, but that actually are quite natural and more fully express our living truth: in harmony with life but contrary to institutional agendas. For in truth we are alive, while those other entities are incorporated in word only, and have not true bodies.

Darwin's theoretical revolution was a sociocultural event

extending Spencer's (et al.) ideas from the realm of economics to the realm of biology. The necessary assumptions for validity of the neo-Darwinian "synthesis" (i.e., that most all evolutionary patterns can be explained by the action of competitive selection) hold much better in the world of economic entities than in the living world of natural entities. One necessary assumption is that the variable commonly termed "fitness" is sufficiently stable and of small enough dimension that it could be measured, or at least has meaningful existence. This is not demonstrably true in many natural situations. However, the one-dimensional, money-value system of the economic world does fit with this assumption of the Darwinian mechanism. Indeed, one may expect that evolution in the economic world would more nearly show the patterning effects of the Darwinian mechanism. Thus we could expect to find that totally selfish entities have evolved in the economic system. Voila: corporations exist which have the simple mission of maximizing dollars irrespective of effects on other ("human") values.

Each corporation is an entity exercising control in human affairs. These multinational entities are joined into a global-scale patterning, a mega-entity that is a force acting with profound influence in most people's lives.

The action of this entity has grown to be dramatically harmful to living systems of all sorts, including lots of people. The nonhuman decision-making structure of this entity is motivated simplistically by only one thing, and unfortunately is insensitive to important human values. Indeed, it is shocking how much this is so and how much it is currently producing untold human suffering and natural devastation. This nonhuman structuring force is now a major determinant of behavior for masses of human decisions.

But this is not the only force acting in human decisions. Our hope for finding life-affirming patterns of global human action (as opposed to the existing economically-based actions) lies in following our human understanding. We need the freedom to be able to decide our actions by what we feel or know

## ***Civilian-Based Defense***

to be right. We need to break through economically dictated constraints.

We need to find our power in communicating decentralized networks such that we can realize this freedom to some extent. One path is to find the strength, the communal individual authority, to realize a general strike. The time has come for us to begin active implementation of civilian-based, nonviolent defense of our human lives and land, defense from this nonhuman controlling entity that has nearly taken over our society. It has not yet taken over entirely, though if we only use its sources of understanding of what's going on (mass media), we are led to believe that it has taken over here on earth. The active life force in the world is not what these entities want to show us. They just want us to be overwhelmed by the horror of the situation so we give up and don't act to change things.

Instead, this is all we can do. Ultimately we have to start to change, ourselves act with real human intention: together loosening the hold of these nonhuman entities, withholding their controlling rights - for nonhuman entities should not be granted human rights and deserve not the power to inflict human suffering.

The weight of human suffering that is currently being borne by the earth must bear some ill for every human body on the earth, harming rich and poor alike. No material wealth can fully assuage the psychic violence we are all subjected to, though oblivious to the mode of action of this violence on ourselves. But realization of the existence of this effect is developing. And the recognition of this entity of destruction - this corporate-governmental decision-making nexus that controls so much of so many lives now - is finally developing also. We have available now an understanding of how these forces have been working (see, e.g., Chomsky: *Profit Over People*, 1999). We just need to unplug and open up real communication. This is true globally, and of course we must act locally: we are who we are, where we are.

Community is the key. Coming together in community



where we are. Finding our voices to express our human values and challenge the reigning corporate agendas. And then taking back our human rights, and withholding human rights from these nonliving entities. Thus (e.g.) we may find that no corporation should hold ownership of land.

We haven't gotten these understandings together yet, but the elements are present amongst us. We just need to get ourselves together thoughtfully, to piece together our realizations. This next step in putting together these ideas toward solution of so many big problems is waiting on our communion (in action perhaps). A vast array of big problems, reduces to not so many systemic problems or faulty assumptions.

We Americans must be able to separate our national identity from our government, so that we can see that our government has been taken over by the corporate decision-making nexus. And thus we can identify this multinational corporate and U.S. government entity that has evolved to be a threat to our true national identity. Having become an incredibly violent power ultimately threatening to all life on earth, this entity has become a clear threat to the American people and the American land. Seeing how we need defense against this threat, we can begin campaigns of mass nonviolent resistance. We must decouple our actions from what this entity tells us to do, instead motivating our actions by what we judge to be right.

*David Gallahan is a member of the Board of Directors of CBDA.*

---

**War Resisters' International  
Conference on Nonviolence and Social Empowerment  
India 2000**

Conference being planned for February 2000;  
book of case studies and tools for social activists to follow.  
Hosted by Swadhina, an Indian women's organization affiliated  
with WRI. For further information:

War Resisters International,  
5 Caledonian Road, London N1 9DX, Britain



# An Experiment in Deterrence

---

**Phil Helms**

---

An office picnic provided opportunity for a rather unscientific experiment in the theory of deterrence through strength.

This Cold War/Arms Race philosophy proposes that a nation may render itself safe from attack by amassing sufficient strength in the form of armaments (particularly nuclear weapons) to persuade any potential attacker that anticipated retaliation will be disastrous. This theory culminates in the Mutually Assured Destruction scenario, in which two superpowers are deterred from war by the realization that both would be utterly destroyed. The theory is complicated by the suppositions that (1) a sufficiently advanced and comprehensive First Strike might enable the aggressor to escape major retaliation, and (2) an effective defense mechanism - anti-ballistic missiles or a "Star Wars" type missile defense system - could block either a First Strike or retaliation.

The announcement of the Thursday picnic and the accompanying sign-up sheet was posted on Monday. Someone added a handwritten notation: "Bring your squirt guns!"

After careful consideration of this declaration of hostilities, I decided to embark upon a test of the theory of deterrence. The first step required an arms race. I decided to obtain a state-of-the-art squirt gun. At a local discount store, I located an aisle in the toy department stocked with a remarkable selection of these murderous-looking implements in all shapes, sizes, and colors which do not occur in nature. I enlisted the services of two consultants - a pair of pre-teenaged boys in

oversized T-shirts, enormous sneakers, and backward caps. I asked them to identify the most vicious water gun on the market. They quickly specified the Super Soaker XP-300 - which was not in stock at this store. They conferred and recommended the Super Soaker XP-150, citing its range (advertised as 50 feet), water capacity (less than the XP-300, but still 48 ounces), dual pressure chambers, improved pump design, and light trigger action. Convinced, I purchased the villainous device.

On Tuesday, I carried the XP-150 through the office in plain sight - a sort of May Day Parade - announcing that I had acquired this terrible weapon as a deterrent for the picnic, and I hoped it would not be necessary to use it. I also announced I would conduct atmospheric testing on Wednesday.

This immediately triggered the anticipated arms race, with coffee break and water cooler discussions of the merits and weaknesses of various brands and models, and planning for weapons of choice at the picnic.

During the lunch hour on Wednesday, I filled the XP-150 and pumped it up to provide pressure. In the parking lot, I "tested" the device, finding the range to be about 35 feet *against the wind*, and noting that the pressure chambers made it possible to spray a continuous stream until the pressure or water supply failed. I concluded this gadget was the water equivalent of a fully automatic assault rifle (it resembled an colorful AK-47). Hosing off a few windshields and knocking a wasp from the wall of the building, I again assured the spectators that (a) the weapon was a deterrent, and would not be used for First Strike, (b) that I hoped I would not have to use it, and (c) that I would fill it with ice water for the picnic.

On Thursday, the picnic took place in the parking lot and adjoining lawn areas. When the squirt guns were produced and the conflict began, I returned to the building, filled the XP-150 with ice water (assuring that a bookkeeper witnessed this), pressurized it, and donned a vinyl rain-poncho in U.N. peace-enforcer blue. As I returned to the parking lot, I again announced the nature of the weapon, identified it as a deterrent, and stated

## ***Civilian-Based Defense***

my peace-enforcing mission.

I was immediately attacked by the staff supervisor with a crude "water cannon." In quick succession, I was attacked by two secretaries and the receptionist with assorted small arms. A brief lull followed before I was ambushed by an alliance of a secretary, a bookkeeper, and the administrative assistant with small arms, followed by an assault by the executive secretary, armed with an earlier Super Soaker model.

Throughout this, though carrying the XP-150 fully loaded and pressurized, I did not return fire. The three-way alliance, then the executive secretary, broke off the attack, observing in puzzlement, "He just stands there and takes it."

Though I did not use it myself, the XP-150 eventually saw action during the conflict after it fell into the hands of a disgruntled postal worker. The local letter carrier, an unrepentant and unreconstructed hippie-type, had the poor judgment to attempt to cross the parking lot to deliver the day's mail and found himself in a crossfire. He employed the XP-150 to return fire, and all parties were drenched.

**Observations and Conclusions:** The theory of deterrence did not operate as generally supposed. Rather than causing potential attackers to refrain, the superior weapon and protective gear made me a target, inviting their attacks and challenging them to soak me through the sides of the poncho. On the other hand, when I declined to respond with mock/watery violence, the attacks ceased, apparently very specifically because I was not returning fire. Finally, the disgruntled postal worker *did* return fire, and found himself even wetter as a result.

Applied to nations, these observations tend to support an analysis consistent with civilian-based defense: Building armies and stockpiling weapons signal not a desire for peace, but an expectation of war. Addition of defensive systems creates an apprehension of planned first strike and invites an attempt to preempt.

*Phil Helms is Chair of the CBDA Board of Directors and editor for several nonprofit organizations, including CBDA.*

# Reagan and Gandhi?

*An excerpt from an address by Ronald Reagan before the United Nations, September 24, 1984.*

There have been tyrants and murderers, and for a time they can seem invincible. But in the end they always fail. Think on it - always, all through history, the way of truth and love has always won. That was the belief and the vision of Mahatma Gandhi. He described that and it remains today a vision that is good and true.

"All is gift" is said to have been the favorite expression of another great spiritualist, a Spanish soldier who gave up the ways of war for that of love and peace. And if we're to make realities of the two great goals of the United Nations Charter, the dreams of peace and human dignity, we must take to heart these words of Ignatius Loyola.

We must pause long enough to contemplate the gifts received from Him who made us, the gift of life, the gift of this world, the gift of each other and the gift of the present. It is this present, this time that now we must seize.

I leave you with a reflection from Mahatma Gandhi spoken with those in mind who said that the disputes and conflicts of the modern world are too great to overcome. It was spoken shortly after Gandhi's quest for independence had taken him to Britain.

"I am not conscious of a single experience throughout my three-month stay in England and Europe," he said, "that made me feel that after all East is East and West is West. On the contrary, I have been convinced more than ever that human nature is much the same no matter under what clime it flourishes, and that if you approach people with trust and affection, you would have tenfold trust and thousandfold affection returned to you."

For the sake of a peaceful world, a world where human

## ***Civilian-Based Defense***

dignity and freedom is respected and enshrined, let us approach each other with tenfold trust and thousandfold affection.

A new future awaits us. The time is here, the moment is now. One of the Founding Fathers of our nation, Thomas Paine, spoke words that apply to all of us gathered here today. They apply directly to all sitting here in this room. He said, "We have it in our power to begin the world over again."

Thank you and God bless you.

---

"Violent movies are targeted at the young, both men and women, the same audience the military has determined to be most susceptible for its killing purposes. Violent video games hardwire young people for shooting at humans. The entertainment industry conditions the young in exactly the same way the military does. Civilian society apes the training and conditioning techniques of the military at its peril. . .

"We began with those who killed within the constraints of the law. Somewhere along the line we began to accept role models who 'had' to go outside the law to kill criminals who we know 'deserved to die,' then vicarious role models who killed in retribution for adolescent social slights, and then role models who kill completely without provocation or purpose.

"At every step of the way we have been vicariously reinforced by the fulfillment of our darkest fantasies. This new breed of role models also has social power: the power to do whatever they want in a society depicted as evil and deserving of punishment. These role models transcend the rules of society, which results in great 'status' to be envied by a portion of society that has come to adore this new breed of celebrity. And of course we have observed a similarity to the [military] learner in the role model's rage. A rage felt by most human beings toward the slights and perceived crimes inflicted upon them by their society, but which is particularly intense in adolescence."

Lt. Col. Dave Grossman, USA (Ret.)  
***On Killing: The Psychological Cost of  
Learning to Kill in War and Society***

# Bombing Yugoslavia Not the Answer

---

**Stephen Zunes**

---

*Note: Although the following article by Dr. Stephen Zunes was written March 23, 1999, shortly before the bombing started, it remains relevant.*

The NATO air strikes against Serbia to end the repression against Kosovo's Albanian majority raise serious strategic, moral and legal questions - and they are likely to backfire.

The cause is certainly just: The Serbian authorities have imposed an apartheid-style system on the country's ethnic Albanian majority and have severely suppressed cultural and political rights. However, this suppression has been ongoing since Yugoslav president Slobodon Milosevic revoked Kosovo's autonomy in 1989. Until a year ago, the Kosovars waged their struggle nonviolently, using strikes, boycotts, peaceful demonstrations, and alternative institutions - indeed, it was one of the most widespread, comprehensive and sustained nonviolent campaigns since Gandhi's struggle for Indian independence earlier this century. However, the world chose to ignore the Kosvars' nonviolent movement.

It was only after a shadowy armed group known as the Kosovo Liberation Army emerged about a year ago did the world media, the Clinton Administration and other Western governments finally take notice.

By waiting for the emergence of guerrilla warfare before seeking a solution, the West gave Milosevic the opportunity to crack down with an even greater level of savagery than before. The delay has allowed the Kosovar movement to be taken over by armed ultra-nationalists who have proven to be less ready to compromise or to guarantee the rights of the Serbian minority in an autonomous or independent Kosovo.

## ***Civilian-Based Defense***

It is a tragedy that the West squandered a full eight years when preventative diplomacy could have worked. It has also given oppressed people around the world a very bad message: in order to get the West to pay attention to your plight, you need to take up arms.

Yet there are problems with current NATO strategy that run deeper than its belated response to the crisis: The threatened bombing led to the withdrawal of the unarmed OSCE monitors, which served as at least a partial deterrent to the worst Serb atrocities. As predicted, violence against the civilian population dramatically increased with their departure. Unable to effectively challenge NATO air power, the Serbs may well take their vengeance on the unarmed ethnic Albanian population should the bombing commence.

The root of the Kosovar crisis, as was the root of the Bosnian tragedy, is the extreme Serb ethnic-nationalism which emerged from the collapse of Yugoslavia. The paranoid view of Serbia as a besieged, isolated and threatened nation put forward by Milosevic and other Serbian demagogues has brought untold tragedy to a once peaceful - if autocratic - multi-ethnic federated system. The best way to undermine such dangerous ideologies is through supporting the growth of a more pluralistic Serbian society, such as encouraging Serbia's burgeoning pro-democracy movement.

Instead, the threat of military action only re-enforces the Serbs self-perception that they are a people under siege, playing right into the hand of Serbian ultra-nationalists. Already, the bombing has given the regime an excuse to arrest leaders of the democratic opposition and shut down their media.

Unlike the 1995 air strikes in Bosnia, the U.S. is not attacking a rebel Serb army in an internationally-recognized independent state, but is attacking Yugoslav forces within their own territory. Not only does this raise serious legal questions, but Serbian history - or at least mythology - sees Kosovo as sacred to their national identity, and the Serbs will be far less likely to capitulate.



Furthermore, as any authority on conflict resolution can attest, workable conflict resolution cannot come from a pre-packaged "settlement" imposed from the outside through threat of force. Even though the peace formula put forth by the Americans and Europeans is quite reasonable, true conflict resolution can only come from the interested parties themselves. At best, an imposed Western formula on Kosovo will result in an uneasy truce in a badly divided society which will not heal the wounds, encourage democracy or lead to real peace.

The Clinton Administration has failed to offer any scenario as to what should occur if the bombing campaign fails to persuade the Serbians to compromise. Unlike with Iraq, the targets are not isolated encampments in flat open desert under cloudless skies. Serbia is mountainous, wooded, often overcast and heavily populated, raising the prospects of the loss of both American pilots and Serbian civilians.

There are also questions about the Clinton Administration's motivations. One does not have to be a Serb apologist to wonder why the U.S. so forcefully pushes for the same rights for Kosovars in Serbia that they oppose for the similarly-suppressed Kurds in Turkey. Indeed, the record of both the current and previous U.S. administrations of supporting repressive armies against occupied and indigenous peoples is scandalous.

This has led to uncharitable speculation that Clinton may be motivated less out of concern for human rights than by a desperate search for a post-Cold War mission for NATO or perhaps even an effort to destroy what remains of Yugoslavia, one of the last European holdouts to a neo-liberal global order.

Unfortunately, with the many missed opportunities for supporting nonviolent conflict resolution and the crisis now in such an advanced stage, it is increasingly difficult to find non-military alternatives.

Still, securing agreement for the re-deployment of unarmed monitors from the OSCE, encouraging direct dialogue between the Kosovar Albanians and Kosovo's Serbian minority,

## ***Civilian-Based Defense***

and increasing support of the democratic opposition in Serbia and what remains of the nonviolent resistance in Kosovo would provide opportunities for resolving the crisis.

On the eve of a new century, the people of the United States and Europe should not be forced by their government to choose between abandoning an entire people to terror and repression or the unwise utilization of military power.

*Dr. Stephen Zunes is Associate Professor of Politics and Director of the Peace and Justice Studies program at the University of San Francisco.*



---

---

### **RELIGIOUS ACTION FOR DISARMAMENT**

**Dec. 29, 1999 - Jan. 2, 2000**

**Las Vegas, NV & the Nevada Test Site**

***Join 1,000 people in a candlelit procession onto  
the Nevada Test Site at midnight, Jan. 31***

**Nevada Desert Experience (702) 646-4814**

**P. O. Box 4487, Las Vegas, NV 89127**

**e-mail: [nde@igc.apc.org](mailto:nde@igc.apc.org)**

---

---

# The Pact of the Year 2000: No More Killing !

If you abhor all forms of violence; if therefore you wish that people would stop killing each other in wars, whatever the "justification;" If you consider it absurd to spend enormous money on weapons and the upkeep of armies and that the money would be better spent on education, removing pollution and eradicating poverty:

Then dare to express it individually for all to see, just with small white paper rectangles 4 cm X 6 cm (approx. 1.5 X 2.25 inches) that you can cut out and stick to your front door, your window and even the windscreen and rear window of your car and on your shop window. Wherever it is visible, it will mean that you support the Pact of the Year 2000 declaring that every human life is sacred. The important thing is to do it now and not wait for others to start.

However, this is just a prelude to a wider demonstration. As we draw nearer to the year 2000, that is after December 21, 1999 (the last winter solstice before the year 2000), these small rectangles will have to be replaced everywhere (except on cars so as not to impede visibility) by white sheets of paper of standard 21 X 29.7 cm dimensions (approx. 8.25 X 11.75 inches [A4]; U.S. supporters may wish to use 8.5 X 11 inch paper [letter]), so that the "vote" becomes spectacular. Until then, other ways of expressing our wish will surely develop, using the color white as a symbol of Peace: flags, fanions, streamers, banners, balloons, badges, ribbons, etc. A tremendous tidal wave showing indisputably the common aspiration for Peace, true Peace, Peace without weapons!

**Le Nouvel Humanisme, Boite Postale n 164  
75664 PARIS CEDEX 14, France  
FAX 01 45 40 08 06**

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



UNITED STATES  
POSTAL SERVICE

0000

AIR MAIL

U.S. POSTAGE  
PHID  
FLINT, MI  
48507  
JUL 20 1993  
PHICENT

\$1.55  
00051270-01

R