

Civilian-Based Defense

Exploring a Nonviolent Strategy
for Deterrence and Defense

Inside This Issue. . .

The Challenge of Terrorism..... 3

The Legality of War and Taxpaying 4
Robert G. Randall II and Ed Pearson

The Test of Faith 9
Edward C.M. Richards

CBDA Bookshelf 17

Two Curricula
Technology for Nonviolent Struggle
Our Gandhi
Nonviolent Soldier of Islam
the Left Behind series

Civilian-Based Defense

ISSN 0886-6015

© Copyright Civilian-Based Defense Association, 2001

Volume 16, Number 2

Summer-Autumn, 2001

Civilian-Based Defense

ISSN 0886-6015

© Copyright Civilian-Based Defense Association, 2001

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

Editor: Phil Helms

Civilian-Based Defense Association

P.O. Box 7285

Flint MI 48507 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.



The Challenge of Terrorism

Granted, that may be a tasteless graphic.

As this issue goes to press, the world is in shock over the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks which destroyed the World Trade Center, damaged the Pentagon, and may have taken 5,000 lives. We in CBDA join in mourning the tragic loss of so many innocent lives.

It is clear that the U.S. military and intelligence services were unable to prevent these attacks, and in fact were apparently unaware anything was going on until the attacks took place. At this writing, the investigation seems to be identifying some individual suspects, but has not identified a nation or organization behind them, despite continued speculation involving the ubiquitous Osama Bin Laden.

How might we, as a nation, apply the principles of nonviolence generally, and Civilian-Based Defense specifically, to the challenge of terrorism, and of attacks such as these? We invite readers to offer their considered responses. If the number and quality of responses merit, we'll publish a selection in the next issue.

About this issue: We have obtained permission to reprint a classic, World War I vintage essay by a conscientious objector, illustrating his real-world answers to the unanswerable questions posed in his era. Because of the length of this essay, we will print the second half next issue. Sorry for any inconvenience this causes.

This is a combined issue, for a variety of reasons, including the editor's schedule, budget, content, etc. All subscriptions will be extended accordingly, even if this is not yet reflected on your mailing label.

The Legality of War and Taxpaying

**An E-Mail Dialogue between
Robert G. Randall II
and Ed Pearson**

Comments by Robert G. Randall II appear in italics.
Comments by Ed Pearson appear in normal type.

What keeps us from adopting another premise and taking the position that war is illegal -- that paying taxes to support war is illegal? Where does one group of humans get their authority to tell another group of humans that it is legal to make war and pay taxes for war and illegal not to make war and not pay taxes for war?

The short answer, in our case, is via what Rousseau called the social contract. The paradox of civilization is that it exists to remove us from a "state of nature", which can also be viewed as a state of "the big eat the little" or "might makes right" or "kill or be killed", and yet has so far only accomplished that partially, moving the natural state of war outward from the individual or interfamily level to the inter-tribe, inter-city, inter-nation, or inter-alliance levels. Along the way, killing and homicide became feuding, then group fights, and finally war, and war has become larger and larger and ever more terrible in scope, both geographically and technologically.

War has almost never, however, been illegal, except within a body politic, and even today the most forward and progressive international law allows for war. I will concede, however, that movement is definitely in the direction of outlawing it.

For me, a big idolatry of our age is law. We confuse law with morality. Immorality has now become OK so long as it is not

illegal. And illegality has become a way of ruining people even if the offense is immaterial. I find it just as irrelevant to debate the legality of war as it would be to debate the legality of slavery. Slavery became illegal when those who found it immoral became able to force that view on those who found it expedient. War will become illegal in the same way. The approach we need to take, in my opinion, is not the confusing one of arguing legality, but the straightforward one of stating that war -- and paying for war -- is categorically wrong. Heaven knows, we've a long way to go to even get a consensus about that!

2. When I look at our human species as I imagine God might, I find it hard to make the IRS and the tax collector my enemy -- someone to be thwarted or outwitted. [snip]

I agree with everything Ed wrote in this section, except the above equation of thwarting and outwitting tax collection with making the tax collector my enemy. True, the tax collector is not my enemy. But the collection of tax from me, in violation of my religious belief and for purposes which kill people, is wrong and deserves to be outwitted and thwarted to the fullest extent I can do so. I think most of us in the nonviolence movement understand separating an opponent from the opponent's action: we can love the actor while opposing the action. In the process of doing this, the possibility opens for a transformation of the opponent, myself, and, amazingly, the action too!

3. The truth is that everyone who uses money, wittingly or not, contributes some amount of tax money to war and preparations for war. War tax resisters are also war tax payers. There are no exceptions!

*This is very true -- and very painful, of course. It is a truth which can be mitigated, however, by at least doing the very minimal action of **not** writing a check to the government! I may not be able to avoid all complicity with war, but I can certainly avoid some complicity, and I find that my conscience is more comfortable if I at least know that I have done what I can do for now and am working toward doing more.*

Another truth is that as things are now, there are very few taxpayers ready, willing and able to confront the IRS and be

Civilian-Based Defense

perceived and treated as outlaws.

Again, I agree. And what will bring people to the point of such willingness? I don't think it will be deciding that war and war taxpaying is illegal, because the government will not agree and they will still be treated as outlaws. Rather, it will be realizing that the law is wrong and a higher authority -- be it God, conscience, humanity, or whatever -- requires violation of an immoral law, even in the face of being treated as outlaws. It is upon the practiced violation of immoral law that almost every major social advance has been accomplished in this country, from the suffragist to the labor to the civil rights to the anti-war movements.

It makes more sense to me to start with the premise that not paying taxes for war is moral, legal and with a little creativity, can be fun. This may very well make a difference in the long run. By changing our basic premises, can we make paying taxes for peace more attractive to the average taxpayer than paying taxes for war? I think so. Can you agree? If not, why not?

*Again, I agree with every word of the above except the confusion injected by "legal". We certainly should make war tax redirection more fun! And I think we could do a lot more to emphasize the attractiveness of **paying** into our alternative funds; there isn't much need to make paying taxes to the government any less attractive than it already is: we only need to make it morally unacceptable.*

There is a strong movement in Europe right now which is moving in the direction Ed desires. It gives me hope. It is the Trident Ploughshares movement which is challenging the British Trident system as being illegal. A similar movement is challenging NATO first strike policy as illegal. These movements are having some small successes. However, we should note that they are very specific in their foci and have some recourse to international law statements on nuclear weapons (particularly the 1996 World Court opinion). This is a far, far cry from being able to claim that war itself is illegal, much less the maintenance of a military (which is really what we will, after all, not pay for).

You generally described a process whereby legal change

can take place.

Slavery became illegal when those who found it immoral became able to force that view on those who found it expedient. War will become illegal in the same way. The approach we need to take, in my opinion, is not the confusing one of arguing legality, but the straightforward one of stating that war -- and paying for war -- is categorically wrong.

I agree and would like to expand a bit on the idea of declaring war illegal. Please note, I said **declare** not argue. You will recall the sixties Vietnam "war" slogan, "Suppose they gave a war and nobody came."

What do you suppose could happen if peace taxpayers agreed to declare that war is illegal? And what if we acted on that declaration? Why can't we maintain that we don't wish to break the law by paying taxes for illegal wars? What is there about the premise that war is legal that makes it more attractive and binding than the premise that war is illegal? Why not fix the responsibility for proving that war is legal on those who would make war? I am convinced that when a sufficient number of taxpayers decide and declare that wars are not only wrong, immoral, hurtful, painful, unethical, etc. but also illegal that that view will prevail. I believe that a firm resolve, strong convictions and new premises are necessary to help us find a viable path toward peace on Earth.

Lately we have been reading and hearing more and more about the nonexistence of income tax laws. Greater numbers of taxpayers are asking the IRS to show them the **specific** laws that require them to file a federal tax return, pay federal income tax or have tax withheld from their earnings. I believe the basis for the growing popularity of this movement has to do with the promise of not having to file tax forms or pay income tax. At first glance, this approach may seem selfish, but when it is coupled with the effort to go back to first principles in our Constitution and outlaw the Federal Reserve System, I find it more attractive. My experience with government authority has proved to me that asking questions and seeking answers in writing makes it harder to maintain "legal" fictions. Surely a questioning, growing and

Civilian-Based Defense

increasingly popular public opinion about the legality of tax laws helps all taxpayers. Why don't war tax resisters and peace taxpayers ask the IRS to show them the laws that require them to violate their conscientious religious beliefs just as the "Project Toto" organizers (www.givemeliberty.org) ask to see the copies of the laws that require taxpayers to fill tax forms and pay income tax? I believe that citizens who are willing to read, discuss, question and understand for themselves the laws they are required to obey is a powerful force for good that cannot be denied.

Does this movement toward greater clarity in Constitutional and tax laws present an opportunity for those interested in war tax resistance and peace taxpaying to communicate the peace taxpayers position to Congress and the IRS? Could it be that peace taxpayers can become the good guys in the eyes of the IRS by offering to pay their full share of tax, but only for peace? I certainly hope so. I know that I regularly offer to pay my federal tax for peace. The fact that our government hasn't yet decided to accept my peace tax payments is a problem -- one I am willing to help solve.

I see the need for human beings to better understand and describe the process whereby certain individuals leave the place of being willing to prepare, pay for and fight war and move toward a place where war is no longer an option or appears legal to them. Maybe this is where our religious leaders, spiritual advisors and peace psychologists can help us. I am still looking for ways to gather their wisdom, experience and insights and find ways to gather and focus their attention on why people work and pray for peace while they continue to prepare, pay for and fight war.

Thanks to CBDA member David R. Bassett for bringing this exchange to our attention, and to Ed Pearce and Bob Randall for permission to reprint their dialogue here.

The Test of Faith

A Chapter in Non-Resistance

Edward C.M. Richards

Reprinted by permission from
the *Atlantic Monthly*, May, 1923

During the war, in almost all the larger countries involved, there were groups of people who, for religious reasons, could not see their way clear to take part in it. These people were sometimes members of an organized religious group, such as the Mennonites, Quakers, Seventh-Day Adventists, and the like; but in other cases they were isolated individuals, who took the same position against war, but were not affiliated with any organization whose creed opposed participating in war. Many of these people suffered severe persecution for their beliefs. Some of them went to jail for considerable periods; some of them died, or were killed there; some went into non-combatant service, or into the Red Cross or relief work; some went out on the North Sea at the dangerous work of mine-sweeping; others undertook other work which they felt was suitable in demonstrating their beliefs.

I have met and talked with a considerable number of these conscientious objectors, not only in the United States, but in other parts of the world, and have heard their stories. I have found that my own story is apparently unique in one respect. All the conscientious objectors with whom I talked had certain beliefs-which varied a good deal with different personalities concerning the Christian method of dealing with violence. For the most part, however, during the war these men were not called upon to face personal violence -- at least, not in a way to test out the various supposititious cases brought forward as arguments against the non-resistant position by people who opposed the idea of pacifism as impractical. Because, to a certain degree, my case is different from the usual run of conscientious objectors, I have been led to believe that it might

Civilian-Based Defense

be well to contribute my story, as a partial answer, at least, to these supposititious arguments. In order to do so, however, it will be necessary for me to state briefly my own position in connection with war and non-resistance.

As I understand the teachings of the New Testament and the life lived by Jesus Christ, the fundamental bases of Christianity are, first, a belief that Jesus Christ and God were, in some mysterious way one; that is, that the picture of personality and character demonstrated by Christ is a true picture of the personality and character of God. The second basis is that absolute power and utter love, as combined in the character of Jesus Christ, are a fundamental fact, in which the man who is trying to follow Christ can trust. In other words, the man following Christ can rely upon a Divine Power which has power over all things. This Divine Power is fundamentally the power of utter love. These two bases are the fundamental principles on which the follower of Christ rests his belief.

The working out, practically, in everyday life, of the above mentioned ideas goes much deeper than the ordinary church member or religious person thinks; and in its ultimate end it goes much farther than anybody except Jesus himself has ever put into practice. In regard to war, it means that the Christian pacifist believes that the forces of love are stronger than the forces of hate, and that, in order to overcome evil, -- really overcome it, -- one force, and one only, can be used: that is the force of love. Such a position eliminates the possibility of partaking in war; for war fundamentally believes in the use of evil means to attain a good end -- I must kill people in order to bring about democracy, freedom, self-determination of nations, and so forth. I must do what we all recognize to be evil, and what we punish men for in times of peace, and do it in the belief that good will come from it. Such a position is a contradiction of terms to the Christian pacifist., who believes that the only way of overcoming evil is with good.

What then should I do, holding such beliefs, in the spring of 1917, in the United States? Many sincere men believed that the most Christian thing to do was to give their lives in the front

trenches, believing that they, in that way, were helping to do away the evil of war. To hold my position honestly, and meet such men face to face, it was necessary for me to be willing to do something at least as disagreeable and dangerous, and to do it with the motive of keeping people alive, of bringing about reconciliation and good-will between hostile factions, and to do it using only methods which were uplifting and helpful and beneficial to everybody concerned. I had to be willing to get killed, but to do so loving everybody and trying to help everybody, including the Germans, the Turks, and all other people. Then, and only then, could I meet the sincere men whom I knew, who were risking their lives in the trenches. My belief was that such a programme of the use of good means could produce only good results, and that all I had to do was to insist upon continuing the use of good means, refusing to use evil means. I feel more convinced now, in 1922, than ever, after seeing the results actually obtained by fighting, that my position in 1917 was correct; and I have met a number of people who have been pretty well brought around to my point of view by the events of the last four years. Such was and is my position as a Christian pacifist in regard to war.

In 1917, I frankly expressed my convictions in regard to the Christian participating in war, and found very frequently that people wanted to push me into answering supposititious cases. Two of these cases were as follows:

1. 'You say you will not use evil means, even to attain a good end. Do you mean to tell me that, if you were in a room full of women and children, and some of those wild Turks and Kurds from the mountains of Turkey should come and begin to break in the door, you would stand aside, like a coward, and let them come in, refusing to fight to protect the women and children? Would not fighting be right in such an emergency, and would not the Christian be doing the most loving thing, even toward the Kurds and Turks, by killing them to prevent their assaulting the women and children?'

My answer to this, while I was in America, was that I felt that I was a *Christian* pacifist, not just a pacifist, and that I

Civilian-Based Defense

believed that, if I honestly tried to follow the teachings of Christ, God would never put me in a position where I would be unable to act in a spirit of real love toward everybody concerned, including the Kurds and the Turks. As for the killing of the latter in a spirit of love, the thing in itself is an absurdity. Nobody deliberately wills to kill those to whom his loving, affectionate heart has gone out. Love is not so constituted. I have now a small boy. I love him very much. There may come a time when my son may determine to do something wrong. As his father, I have the right and the duty to urge upon him a different course of action. I may even punish him if, in so doing, the punishment may be beneficial to him; but everyone will admit that it would be wrong for me to kill my son, in order to prevent him from doing evil.

The attitude of the Christian pacifist toward the Kurd or the Turk would not be different. My position in regard to this supposititious case was that I could not guarantee that no one would be killed or injured or assaulted: that did not rest in my power; but I believed that, if I continued to act in a spirit of love toward the intruding Turks and Kurds, -- mind you, not in a spirit of subservience or cowardice, -- I should be using the most effective means to prevent the killing or assault from taking place. As long as I continued to use the right means, I could be sure that I was doing the very best thing that I personally could do, and I could then count on the real Divine Power of God Almighty to direct the thoughts, wills, and acts of the Kurds as He desired. Also, I could safely leave the situation in His hands. If we were killed or assaulted, in spite of any refusal to fight, I could then count on it thus being God's will for us all to die or be assaulted, and that our death or injury would be more effective in bringing about the Kingdom of God on earth than any other thing we could possibly do.

2. The second supposititious case was this: 'What about the drunken or crazy man running amuck? What would you do if you saw a drunken man armed and lusting for blood in the midst of a crowded street? Would you not be justified in killing him as you would a mad dog?'

My reply to this case was that a man is a man and not a

dog; and that whether he is drunk, or whether he is mad, does not alter the case. He still is a man, and, if I believe in the life and death of Christ, I must believe that Christ came to save drunken, evil mad-men as well as others. As he put it, 'I come not to bring the righteous but sinners to repentance.' I therefore can no more picture Jesus Christ shooting down a wild, drunken madman running amuck, that I could picture him in the trenches in Flanders sticking a bayonet into the stomach of a German, or squirting liquid fire into the faces of a group of Austrians. The man Christ Jesus, as I see him in the New Testament, was not that kind of person. Moreover, I believed that there would be a better and more effective way of handling the drunken madman than by killing him; because, when I killed him, I could do nothing more for his soul; and fundamentally a Christian pacifist must consider loving his enemy as well as protecting his friend.

II

These supposititious cases were very commonly brought up, and are still commonly brought up, by those who wish to show that Christianity and war can be reconciled. I felt that the above answers to the supposititious cases were adequate and right from a Christian point of view, but somehow I felt called upon to give myself an opportunity of demonstrating in action that such a method of handling the cases would work. I felt that I should be an active pacifist, not a passive one; and so I went to a friend of mine who was well posted on the Near-Eastern and the general world situation, and asked him to tell me what in his judgment was the most dangerous and disagreeable part of the world at that particular time.

He at once answered me by saying, 'West Persia.' At that time, 1917, in West Persia a combination of war and a mixture of racial antipathies and religious fanaticism, which had come down through hundreds of years, existed in a marked degree. The country had been the fighting ground of the Turkish and Russian armies since the beginning of the war. Mohammedanism, with all its complications, was very strong. Massacres and flights of peoples had taken place, and were

Civilian-Based Defense

liable to occur at any time. At the same time, the country was very backward in its culture, there being no sewers in the cities, no sanitation of any kind, only a few hospitals run by American missionary doctors, and most of the worst diseases were continually present and often raging smallpox, cholera, typhoid, paratyphoid, typhus, relapsing fever, malaria, pernicious malaria, and a number of other diseases not only were common but were a pressing concern. On top of all this, law and order were very weak in this section of the world; and altogether I believe from experience that my friend was right when he named West Persia as the worst place in the world at that time.

I therefore volunteered to go to West Persia, to assist in the relief work. I agreed to pay all my own expenses and to accept no salary. I did not expect ever to come back again, as it did not seem probable that I could stay alive in such a country for more than a few months; so I made my will, put my affairs in order, said good-bye to my family and friends, and started for Persia. This was in May, 1917.

The long journey through Norway, Sweden, Finland, across Russia, and through the Caucasus, to Persia, was slow; but finally I arrived safely in a city of some 50,000 inhabitants in West Persia -- Urumiah. Here I was put in charge of the orphans, the industrial relief, and was made secretary of the Relief Committee. During the summer, autumn, and early winter, I was very busy riding from village to village over the plains, visiting, classifying, and arranging for the feeding, clothing, and general care of the 500-odd orphans scattered throughout this stricken area. ..I organized some of the refugee Assyrians into a cloth-industry, giving several hundred women work in carding and spinning wool, and arranged for the building of twenty-five native hand-loom. I soon had them weaving the native cloth which for countless generations has been an important material for men's clothing in the high mountains of Kurdistan. We finally worked the -production up to 1000 Turkish *arshines* of this cloth per week. (One Turkish arshine equals 29 inches.)

Later on, as need arose, I took charge also of cleaning up the streets of the city of Urumiah (my first and only job as

street-cleaning commissioner). This developed, among other lines, into one very unpleasant task: namely the collecting and reburying of bodies dug up by the dogs in the graveyards, and partly eaten. The cleaning-up and keeping clean (as far as possible in such an unsanitary country) of the yards filled with refugees also fell upon my shoulders, as did the complete care of the relief transportation equipment of autos, horses, carts, harness, and the rest.

All these activities kept me very busy during the remainder of 1917, and on into the spring and summer of 1918.

In July, 1918, the situation around Urumiah was very intense. The ill-will stirred up by the war, the persecutions, the massacres, the assaulting of women and the carrying-off of girls, had intensified to a terrible degree the age-long hatred between the Syrians and Armenians on the one hand, and the Turks, Kurds, and Moslems on the other. The country had suffered terribly from the destruction of property. There were thousands of people who had been driven from their homes and were refugees. By far the most destitute and miserable of these were the refugee Kurds, who were Mohammedans, in the streets of the city; and the great majority of people throughout the region were by no means beyond the need of relief.

The Russian army had been withdrawn following the Bolshevik revolt, and with their withdrawal the two factions in the city of Urumiah -- on the one hand, local Mohammedans, and on the other hand, the Armenians and Syrians -- had each determined to gain military and political control over the country. In this the Syrians and Armenians were greatly assisted by the Russians, who not only armed them but organized them into battalions, and even left some officers to drill and direct them. The Moslems also secured what arms they could; and on the twenty-second of February, 1918, there was a clash ending in the capture of the city by the Armenians and Syrians. This control spread over the great part of the Urumiah plain and, as it spread, the most disorderly element among the Syrians and Armenians took advantage of the situation to take revenge on the Mohammedans. This resulted in so much massacre,

Civilian-Based Defense

robbery, and indiscriminate killing, that the great mass of Moslems of the surrounding regions got together an armed force, to overthrow the control of the Armenians and Syrians in the city.

For months this fight kept up, the city and plain being practically surrounded by hostile Moslem bands, while, in the centre, all sorts of evil things were being perpetrated by those in control. Finally, the assistance of the regular Turkish army was obtained by the surrounding Moslems, and with their advent on the scene, with artillery and a better organized body of men, the Armenians and Syrians were finally forced out and compelled to run away to the south, hundreds of miles over the Persian mountains, to the English forces operating from Mesopotamia and Southern Persia. On the morning of July thirtieth, this great flight to the south of 75,000 to 100,000 people began, and the test of the first supposititious case took place about ten o'clock in the morning.

All the Americans except Dr. and Mrs. W.A. Shedd decided to stay in Urumiah, rather than to attempt to go with the Syrians and Armenians. We had been living in the College Compound, an area about the size of an ordinary city block,-surrounded by a mud wall varying in height from five to fifteen feet, and situated about two miles from the city. Inside this area were the dwelling-houses of the missionaries and some of the native assistants, a boys' college, and the hospital, together with outhouses, stables, and so forth. With the exception of myself, all the Americans were missionaries, the relief work being carried on practically altogether through their efforts.

Throughout most of the period when the Armenians and Syrians were in control, a number of Mohammedans, both Kurds and local Persian Moslems, had come into the College Compound, to seek protection from the disorders which reigned outside. At the time of the flight the number of these refugees was only a few hundred. These were camped out under all sorts of shelters, or no shelter at all, in different parts of the Yard. A road coming down from the mountains of Turkey passed directly in front of the College Compound and continued on to the city.

To be concluded next issue. . .



CBDA Bookshelf

Reviews and Notices

Two Curricula:

Training for Nonviolent Conflict Transformation

translated from the German

We received this publication in English translation in chapbook form from Bund für Soziale Verteidigung (Federation for Social Defense; BSV). We have subsequently received the text by e-mail, after the English printing was exhausted.

The first of the two curricula is "***Curriculum 'Volunteers' Training for Civil Peace Service,***" a 12-month course which was originally developed by BSV and Forum Ziviler Friedensdienst (Forum Civil Peace Service; FZF). This was originally printed in 1996, and was the first published curriculum of its kind in German. It was subsequently translated into Dutch, and has now been translated into English at the suggestion of the European Network for Civil Peace Service.

The second curriculum is "***Curriculum 'Training for Conflict Transformation / Civil Peace Service,***" a four-month course developed by the Joint Working Group for Training in Civil Conflict Management / Civil Peace Service, a coalition of German peace organizations which receives governmental funding for its work.

Contact BSV through their website: www.dfg-vk.de/bsv.

Technology for Nonviolent Struggle

Brian Martin

London: War Resisters' International, 2001

ISBN 0903517-18-3

We received a perfect bound, trade paperback edition of this book for review. However, the book is available free of charge at the website:

<http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/01tnvs/>

in two formats: html and pdf (A4, 100 pages). The trade paperback is available for purchase; information on the website.

In this effort, Brian Martin opens discussion on the adaptation of technology to purposes of nonviolent struggle, including national defense. He frames his thesis in terms of two propositions and two conclusions:

1. Methods of social action without violence can be extremely powerful — indeed so powerful as to be a possible alternative to military defense.
2. Technology, which is now massively oriented to military purposes, can be reoriented to support nonviolent action.
 1. Nonviolent struggle, which is normally seen as primarily a social and psychological process, has vital technological dimensions.
 2. Reorienting technology to serve nonviolent struggle would involve a wholesale transformation of research directions, technological infrastructure and social decision making.

Martin expands these conclusions in logical and orderly fashion through his text, which is particularly readable and accessible for readers relatively new to the field. It seems clear that he intends this as a spark for additional research and discussion; he suggests alternative approaches to the subject matter, as well as additional lines of thought for exploration. A most worthwhile addition to the library on nonviolence.

Martin is associate professor in Science, Technology and Society at the University of Wollongong, Australia, and is a member of CBDA and regular contributor to these pages. His other publications are listed, and his research described, on the website noted above.

Our Gandhi:
Child of Fear to Man of Freedom
Mylo Schaaf
(Nilgiri Press, Tomales CA)
ISBN 1-58638-000-1

We have received an announcement of this book publication, but have not reviewed a copy. According to the release:

“Mylo Schaaf, a close friend of Eknath Easwaran, wanted to share Easwaran’s portrayal of the life story of Mahatma Gandhi with the ten children who attend her Quaker meeting. She read and re-read *Gandhi the Man*, making notes, then told the story to the children from her notes in sessions of about ten minutes each. In this way she was able to present a lengthy, complex narrative to a group ranging in age from six to 14. After each reading, the children made drawings portraying the various episodes. Most of the drawings were created by several children working together. The children were able to make tangible on paper such elusive concepts as changing fear into fearlessness and enemies into friends.”

This book resulted from this process, and includes 17 full page, color illustrations by the children of Marin Friends First Day School.

The work on which Schaaf’s project is based is:

Gandhi the Man:
The Story of His Transformation
Eknath Easwaran
(Nilgiri Press www.nilgiri.org)

Nonviolent Soldier of Islam:
Badshah Khan, A Man to Match His Mountains
Eknath Easwaran
(Nilgiri Press, Tomales CA, 1999)

Again, we have received a news release on the publication of this book, but have not had opportunity to review

Civilian-Based Defense

the book. The release reads, in significant part:

“There is hope for a violent man to be someday nonviolent, but there is none for a coward.” Mahatma Gandhi understood the secret that violent energy, harnessed and redirected, can solve individual, national, and international problems. Nowhere is this transformation of destructive energy more dramatically exemplified than in the story of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, a Muslim ally of Mahatma Gandhi in the Indian struggle for independence.

Nonviolent Soldier of Islam is Eknath Easwaran’s compelling account of the life of this dynamic hero. Khan was born in India’s rugged North-West Frontier Province, into the Pathan tradition of vendetta and blood revenge. Turning his back on violence, Khan formed the world’s first nonviolent army, persuading 100,000 Pathans to throw down their guns and join his *Khundai Khidmatgars*, “Servants of God.” During times of peace they started schools, opened medical clinics, and mediated disputes. But peaceful interludes were short. British anxiety about the strategic Khyber Pass, made them react with unequalled ferocity to Pathan efforts at independence. With dramatic courage and effective nonviolent strategy, the Khudai Khidmatgars faced the worst the British had to offer.

The problems of violence today call for new approaches, and interest in nonviolent methods is coming from many quarters of the globe. Accordingly, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed 2000 as the Year, beginning of the Decade, of Nonviolence. Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan’s life stands as a powerful testimony to three lessons essential for our world today: that nonviolence can be followed by those who have a tradition of violence, that it can work effectively against ruthless repression, and that it has a natural place in Islam.

Author Eknath Easwaran understands nonviolence, its potential for solving problems and its spiritual roots. He grew up in Mahatma Gandhi’s India, walked with Gandhi and corresponded with Badshah Khan. With more than a million copies of his books in print and translations into 20 foreign languages, Sri Easwaran is respected around the world for his writing on nonviolence and spirituality.

Left Behind

Tim LaHaye and Jerry B. Jenkins

(Tyndale House Publishers, Wheaton IL)

ISBN 0-8423-2912-9

Series consists of eight books; number nine is scheduled for publication in October, 2001.

Left Behind: The Kids

Book One: The Vanishings

Jerry B. Jenkins and Tim LaHaye with Chris Fabray

(Tyndale Kids; Tyndale House Publishers, Wheaton IL)

ISBN 0-8423-2193-4

Series consists of 16 books, with more in production.

These two interwoven series nearly defy categorization. They may, however, be termed Christian science fantasy without doing violence to the authors' efforts and intentions. (This reviewer relies upon the classic rule of thumb attributed to the late editor John W. Campbell in terming these fantasy rather than science fiction. However, the term "science fantasy" designates a sub-genre with trappings of technology and "real world" orientation in contrast to high fantasy's use of magic and mythology.) That much said, readers disinterested in faith-based content may wish to pass up these best-sellers.

The authors seem to practice some division of labor: LaHaye is a minister and scholar of Biblical prophecy, while Jenkins is a well-known and prolific writer. It appears that LaHaye has thus provided an outline of "Last Days" or "End Times" events, and the explication of scripture and prophecy by several characters, and Jenkins has provided the narrative structure, character development, etc. In the juvenile series, these two are joined by Chris Fabray, whose role is not clearly specified, leaving the suspicion that he may be the primary author, drawing heavily on the adult series.

The two series begin by introducing characters shortly before the Rapture, the bodily disappearance of the faithful, simultaneously around the world. Chaos ensues. The overall

Civilian-Based Defense

structure of the plot follows the sequence of events set forth in prophecy in the Biblical books of Daniel, Ezekiel, and Revelation, as interpreted by LaHaye and converted into narrative by Jenkins. In brief, the Rapture is followed by the rise of the Antichrist and the Great Tribulation, a seven-year period of wars and assorted disasters of global scale and colorful nature.

The Antichrist, a Romanian politician with the improbably name of Nicolae Carpathia, rises meteorically through a series of undemocratic maneuvers, to the presidency of Romania, then to the post of Secretary-General of the United Nations. Under his leadership, the U.N. is transformed into the Global Community; the nations of the world are disarmed (90 percent of armaments destroyed; 10 percent transferred to the Global Community); a single global currency is established, and in due course, a single world religion is postulated. Later, the Global Community requires all individuals to receive a microchip and accompanying tattoo (the Biblical "mark of the beast") in order to engage in commerce ("buying and selling"). This entails a loyalty oath to Carpathia, and to the world religion ("Enigma Babylon"). Those who refuse the mark are summarily executed.

From the viewpoint of a student of nonviolent struggle, this translates: the world has been conquered and is governed by an oppressive dictator. An initially small band engage in resistance to the new world government, beginning relatively simply by holding proscribed worship, smuggling Bibles, and the like, but progressing to extensive use of high-tech communications, including publishing via the Internet, and development of a world-wide black market economy, with production, lines of supply, transportation and distribution, etc., all outside official and recognized channels. For the kids, aged 12 to 16 at the opening of the story, resistance is on a smaller scale, but parallel, as the authorities at Nicolae Carpathia High School ban Bibles and the kids launch an underground newspaper and find creative ways to distribute it, etc.

It may be noted that an early attempt at armed resistance by the U.S.-based militia groups ended in utter disaster.

Enjoyable reading, and food for thought, both spiritually and tactically.

Civilian-Based Defense Association Membership and Subscription Form

- My name and mailing address on the mailing label on the reverse of this page are correct.

Name

Address

City

State and Zip Code

Nation

Telephone

- I want to join the Association:
- \$25 Basic
 - \$5 Low Income
 - \$50 Supporting
 - \$100 Sustaining
 - \$500 Lifetime
 - \$50 - \$1,000 Associative
(for Organizations and Institutions)

Note: Membership includes the Association's magazine, **Civilian-Based Defense**.

- I wish to subscribe to the magazine without membership in the Association: \$15
- I am enclosing an additional contribution of \$_____ to further the work of the Association.
- Please send an acknowledgement.
- I do not need an acknowledgement.

The Civilian-Based Defense Association is a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization under Section 501(c)3. All amounts specified above are in U.S. Dollars (USD). The CBDA address is on the reverse of this page. Comments? Use available space on the reverse of this page. Thanks.

**Civilian-Based Defense Association
P.O. Box 7285
Flint MI 48507 USA**

