

Civilian-Based Defense: News & Opinion

EXPLORING A NONVIOLENT STRATEGY
FOR DETERRENCE AND DEFENSE

Volume 7 • March 1991 • Number 3

IN THIS ISSUE

Stockholm Conference Examines Civilian-Based Defense	Front
Paul Anders Appointed Executive Director, CBDA	2
Windsor, Ontario Chosen as Fall Conference Location	2
Civilian-Based Defense: A Change in Great Expectations	3
News & Announcements	3
Editorial	4
Book Review	5
Should German Soldiers Be Deployed Worldwide Under the UN Flag?	7

**Civilian-Based Defense:
A Change in Great Expectations**
see page 3

CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE: NEWS & OPINION, ISSN 0886-6015, is published by the Civilian-Based Defense Association to provide information about CBD as a possible alternative policy for national defense and to provide a vehicle for the exchange of international news, opinion and research relating to CBD.

CO-EDITORS: Melvin G. Beckman
Philip D. Bogdonoff
Robert Holmes

Address: 154 Auburn Street,
Cambridge, MA 02139, USA.
Telephone (617) 868-6058

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$15.00 per year.

PUBLISHED January, March, May, July, September and November. Readers are invited to send news, articles and other material for publication. Submission deadlines are the first day of February, April, June, August, October and December.

CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE ASSOCIATION is a non-profit membership organization founded in 1982 to promote more widespread consideration of civilian-based defense as a possible alternative policy for national defense.

STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE EXAMINES CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE



EDITOR'S NOTE: This article, and the accompanying one entitled "The Swedish Commission on Nonmilitary Resistance," appeared in the Winter 1990/91 issue of *Nonviolent Sanctions*, a publication of the Albert Einstein Institution, 1430 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA. Reprinted with permission.

"Nonmilitary Resistance: Part of a War-Deterring Defense?" was the title of a one-day conference held in Stockholm, Sweden in October. The invitation-only conference was jointly sponsored by the Commission on Nonmilitary Resistance of the Swedish Ministry of Defense, the Swedish Institute of International Affairs, and the Royal Military Science Academy. It was attended by

nearly 120 representatives of the Swedish Parliament, governmental departments, social organizations, political parties, research organizations, and the media. Nearly one-third of the participants were military officers, including the chief of the Defense Staff.

Principal speakers were Roine Carlsson, minister of defense of Sweden; Gene Sharp of the Albert Einstein Institution; and Raymundas Rayatskas, vice-president of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences.

Sharp presented a paper entitled "A Civilian-Based Resistance Component: A Contribution to both Deterrence and Defense." In it he briefly sketched four often-cited historical cases of improvised nonviolent struggle for defense (German resistance to the 1920 Kapp Putsch against the Weimar Republic; French resistance to an attempted coup d'etat in Algeria in 1961; German government-sponsored resistance to the Franco-Belgian occupation of the Ruhr in 1923; and Czechoslovak resistance to the Soviet invasion and occupation, 1968-1969). Sharp went on to outline his analyses of nonviolent struggle, civilian-based defense, and possible strategies for its use in defense crises. In the third part of his presentation, Sharp addressed the issue of transarmament (the gradual transition from military defense to civilian-based defense), the problems of mixing military and civilian forms of defense, and the applicability of civilian-based defense in today's changing European security environment.

In addition to Sharp's and Rayatskas' presentations, several conference participants had been asked in advance to comment on "nonmilitary resistance." (The Swedes generally use this term when referring to civilian-based defense; however, officially, this term includes both armed and unarmed forms of resistance carried out by groups not incorporated into the Swedish defense forces.) The selected commentators represented a cross section of thinking from the Swedish military and foreign policy establishments about nonmilitary resistance (NMR).

A former commander of the Royal Swedish Air Force felt that NMR would indeed help to deter war, but only as a complement to a strong military defense posture. The ex-commander cited a failure in communication between advocates of NMR and members of the military and called for further dialogue between the two.

Bo Hultdt, director of the Royal Swedish Institute of International Affairs, drew a parallel between civilian-based defense (CBD) and the doctrine of Mutually Assured

(continued on page 2)

PAUL ANDERS APPOINTED EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CBDA

On February 26th the directors of the Civilian-Based Defense Association appointed Mr. Paul Anders to the position of Executive Director. He succeeds Mel Beckman who served as Director from 1982 to 1990. With the appointment of Anders the office of the Association will move from Omaha to Cambridge, Massachusetts. The mailing address of the organization will now be: 154 Auburn Street, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA. Telephone: 617-868-6058.

Mr. Anders received his B.A. from Spring Hill College in 1961 and his M.A. in history from New York University in 1968. From 1968 to 1970 he was a graduate student in history at the University of London. He taught history briefly at Hartnell College. Before coming to the Civilian-Based Defense Association he served as research director of the Council for a Livable World, which advocates nuclear arms control and disarmament. Prior to working at the Council he was a researcher at the Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies.

Mel Beckman will continue, for the time being, to edit *Civilian-Based Defense: News & Opinion*. The editorial office address will be 3636 Lafayette Avenue, Omaha, NE 68131. Telephone: 402-558-2085.

WINDSOR, ONTARIO CHOSEN AS LOCATION FOR FALL CONFERENCE ON CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE

The Civilian-Based Defense Association will host its second major conference on CBD this Fall, September 6-8, at Holy Redeemer College, 925 Cousineau Rd., in Windsor. The Association's annual Board Meeting will take place after the conference. The gathering is expected to attract interested people from both Canada and the United States. Participation from other countries will also be welcomed. It is hoped that the conference will be useful for both scholars and the general public. To inquire about the conference and/or to be placed on the mailing list of prospective participants, write to: Windsor Conference Planning Committee, c/o the Civilian-Based Defense Association, at our new Cambridge address.

STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE (continued from page 1)

Destruction (MAD): with both CBD and MAD, a country places its civilian population on the line. Hultdt saw CBD as the antithesis of Sweden's current peripheral defense policy, in that war would first have to enter the country before CBD could be implemented, whereas peripheral defense plans aimed to keep an aggressor out of the country. Hultdt concluded however, that "under certain conditions" (not spelled out) CBD was a viable and useful form of resistance.

The chief of the Defense Staff, Vice Admiral Torsten Engberg, said that all citizens should be involved in the defense of their country in one way or another, and thus all forms of defense were useful and welcome. Engberg felt that NMR could certainly contribute to deterring aggression against Sweden in that it would raise the potential costs of military occupation. However, Engberg continued, NMR could do this only as a complement to a strong military defense policy. Engberg endorsed the commission's efforts in exploring NMR and called for moving towards "stage two" of this exploration, the development of an effective NMR defense. Moreover, Engberg said that the defense establishment should finally support this research.

Helena Nilsson of the Center Party felt that the numerous social organizations in Sweden were quite willing to see NMR incorporated into the country's Total Defense system. She felt that there was much pressure for NMR to be taken out of the hands of the national politicians and implemented on the local level.

Jan Olsson, a member of the National Psychological Defense Board (Sweden's Total Defense system is comprised of National Boards of Military Defense, Economic Defense, Psychological Defense, and Civil Defense) said that much still needed to be learned about the environment in which NMR would operate: what psychological factors are vital in nurturing NMR in a society which has been militarily defeated and occupied? Olsson called for more research into this area.

Gunnar Gustafsson, general director of the Commission on Nonmilitary Resistance, concluded the conference with the remark that "perhaps now we can remove the question mark from the title of this conference and replace it with an exclamation point." Gustafsson felt a broad consensus had emerged from the proceedings: NMR was an accepted complement to Sweden's military defense posture. Now, Gustafsson said, Sweden must take the next, more important step of developing the deterrent potential of NMR and anchoring it into Swedish society.

The consensus which emerged from the proceedings was indeed a positive one: like the unanimous 1986 parliamentary authorization for the creation of the commission, there appears to be unanimous support for the further development of nonmilitary resistance as a complement to Sweden's predominantly military defense policy.

THE SWEDISH COMMISSION ON NONMILITARY RESISTANCE

The Swedish Commission on Nonmilitary Resistance was officially established within the Swedish Ministry of Defense on June 1, 1987. The ordinance establishing the commission formulated the commission's purpose as follows: "1) to further conditions for non-military resistance through advice and recommendations to authorities and individuals; 2) to deal with questions of international law, psychological and other conditions of nonmilitary resistance; and 3) to further research within the field."

The Commission's recent activities have included:

- encouraging five majors from the officer's training college to conduct case studies of possible civil resistance in their own communities.
- organizing annual one-day seminars on nonmilitary resistance for those performing alternative civilian service.
- encouraging the National Research Institute to conduct a three-year study on the possible psychological effects of occupation and war on the Swedish population. The study is to be financed by the commission, the National Research Institute, and the Supreme Commander's office.
- launching a "novel project" in conjunction with the Swedish United Nations Association, encouraging young Swedish authors to write about life and resistance under a military occupation.
- conducting seminars on nonmilitary resistance at the National Defense College.

CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE: A CHANGE IN GREAT EXPECTATIONS

By Mary-Jane Fox (Ms. Fox is a research assistant at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York.)

For all the sincere and enthusiastic attention and research CBD has enjoyed in the past, it seems to be at an impasse in the present. As Chris Kruegler reported in his keynote speech to the CBD consultation in Washington D.C. this past November (see *News & Opinion*, January 1991, for a report on the consultation), there is good news as well as bad news. The bad news is that CBD is a policy without a country and the good news is that it has survived because it has been unread. Pretty gloomy stuff. It all sounds like bad news to me, the truth of the matter being that, for whatever reasons, CBD has not seemed to progress at all.

In addition to this lack of progress, there is an impatience that not only visits itself upon proponents of CBD specifically, but supporters of nonviolent action (NVA) in general. Although there is nothing wrong with being anxious to reduce suffering, save lives, and save the world, impatience or lack of careful, long-term thinking will only lead to unrealistic expectations for CBD, which can only do more damage than good. We are apt to be disappointed when we expect too much, and worse than that, the idea is then likely to be discredited. It becomes reduced to making excuses when it doesn't "succeed" according to current expectations.

But perhaps there is a way out of this impasse, a way to view CBD with different eyes and make its future a bit more hopeful. It may be worth considering that "Great Expectations" (a la Dickens) for CBD have been disappointing not just because the concept has been unread by the outside audience, but has also been misread by those within the field. To expect something out of CBD may not be so wrong, but what is expected might be wrongheaded. There is not much of an impasse at all if the concept is viewed with a wide angle lens, aimed from a new direction.

The problem is that it should not continue to be judged as it is currently, with "success" determined by CBD's incorporation into a country's defense system. It may be too much to ask at this point in history, and at this point in its development. No wonder there is disappointment in the field, for by using that method, one lines up all the countries in a row, like dominoes, and watches them fall one after the other as CBD's failure to integrate into individual defense systems is announced. To continue on the same track is to invite and then guarantee disappointment, for by determining CBD's progress according to the boundary lines that make up different countries, we also bind up how to determine CBD's success. If CBD continues to be measured by that particular yardstick, then it is doomed indeed. The progress of CBD needs to be measured in a different way so that the expectations can change. Besides, clamoring for "official" status may prove to be ultimately unwise anyway.

If the expectations change, the concept will be more prepared to respond to tough challenges from the outside world. To do so it needs a better working model, one that everyone can understand, but is not oversimplified to the point of error. Very distinct and recognizable lines need to be drawn, for example, illustrating the difference between the nonviolent action practiced by the Danes in WWII, the Czechs in 1968, and the CBD concept which so many people are anxiously waiting to see adopted and put into use. And since "nonviolent action" is the rubric under which CBD falls, then it is nonviolent action itself that needs continued research, since what will be found true for NVA can also be applied and adapted to the more specific idea of CBD.

A more historical perspective is needed as well, one that understands the totality of what nonviolent action asks a people to do. It is not only another way of dealing with conflict, merely requiring an intellectual about-face; but a more complex revolution, a re-ordering of the individual, the society, the species. It reaches down below the surface of our being and chokes the very roots of what many of us believe is "only human." It asks us to think and behave in ways to which many people are not accustomed.

Nonviolent action challenges not only the military machines of late twentieth century nations, but also a very old and deeply entrenched state of mind: a hideous monster made up of all the hatred, vengeance, plunder, pillage, spoils, profit, suffering, death, weapons, strategies, and even military bureaucracies that have accumulated since the dawn of homo sapiens. It is not reasonable to expect a mere thirty years of concentrated research on theory and case studies to compete and then even begin to make great gains on a way of being that is thousands of years old. To expect so borders on arrogance. How many years, and how much writing should it take for the idea to begin to stand up to thousands

(continued on page 4)



NEWS & ANNOUNCEMENTS

JAPAN

An article entitled "The Logic of Civilian-Based Defense," by Toshio Terajima, was published in the Bulletin of the University of Osaka Prefecture, Sakai, Osaka, Japan (Vol. 39, March 1991). The article examines some cases of nonviolent national resistance and the feasibility of civilian-based defense. It picks up on several of Sharp's ideas and discusses some of the problems involved in abandoning reliance upon arms. While the article sees the shift from military defense to nonmilitary defense to be the right course of action it also stresses the need for greater effort in peacetime to strengthen those structures of mutual interdependence and cooperation among nations that would render war highly unlikely or impossible.

ITALY

Part three of *La Sicurezza dell'Italia* (1989, Casa Editrice Marietti S.p.A., Via Palestro 10/8, 16122 Genova), contains a discussion of civilian-based defense. The section is entitled "La discussione in Italia sulla difesa territoriale e la difesa a base civile." Authors whose essays are featured in part three include M. Clelia Spreafico, Paolo Farinella, Paolo Miggiano, and Stefano Piziali.



PLEASE NOTE NEW CBDA ADDRESSES/ TELEPHONE NUMBERS

The new address for the Civilian-Based Defense Association is: 154 Auburn Street, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA. The telephone number is 617-868-6058. Please make this change in your records.

For matters related to editing and writing of the newsletter, please contact the Editor, *Civilian-Based Defense News & Opinion*, 3636 Lafayette Avenue, Omaha, NE 68131, USA. The telephone number is 402-558-2085. Please do not send membership dues or subscription requests to the Omaha address. They should be sent to the office in Cambridge.

EDITORIAL

In the months ahead our readers might consider asking their governments for official inquiries into the decision to use military force to counter Saddam Hussein rather than the force of international economic and social sanctions. The need to resist his aggression was widely accepted but the choice of means was not. Many, in fact, were very disappointed that the sanctions which were employed were not given time to be effective. This being the case it is legitimate to ask the various governments involved to "total up" the results of the decision to use military force and to make some assessment of what might have happened had the other course been followed. We have known for a long time that violence begets more violence. Was the Gulf war not a graphic example of that? We need to challenge our governments to admit it. It would be inaccurate and irresponsible to simply blame Saddam Hussein for everything bad that has happened (or is happening) since his invasion of Kuwait, when much of it might not have occurred except for the decision to use massive military force against him instead of non-military sanctions.

Melvin G. Beckman



WORDS TO REMEMBER

"Neither (nuclear) deterrence nor non-violence ignore the realities of contemporary weaponry. Both seek to cope intelligently with the problem of nuclear weapons, though in very different ways: on their own terms as does the former, or on completely different terms as does the latter. But this also means that non-violence is something more than an approach to the somewhat parochial, and perhaps even unreal problem of defending the small wealthy countries of Western Europe against hostile Soviet designs. At a deeper level non-violence, like guerrilla warfare and other asymmetric strategies, provides a valid, if not unproblematic, answer to one of the central problems of our age: how to put an end to the hegemony of the nuclear powers; how to annul the nuclear threat by rendering it obsolete and useless. In short: how to leave the nuclear age behind."

From the conclusion of *War Without Weapons, Non-Violence in National Defense*, by Anders Boserup and Andrew Mack, 1974.

CBD: A CHANGE (continued from page 3)

of texts on war and weaponry? How much time is legitimately required in order to completely reverse the thoughts, habits, and practices of beings who have been living with these patterns for so long? The task ahead should not be over-simplified.

SOME NEW IDEAS

Having jumped on the bandwagon calling for further development of the idea, the next step is to jump off and put some new (or perhaps old and forgotten) ideas on the table. They don't pretend to be fully developed theses, but are only thoughts perhaps worth consideration. I have in mind three areas, and will discuss them as briefly as possible. In my readings and conversations with other people, none of these ideas seem to have surfaced.

I. As mentioned earlier, distinct lines need to be drawn between what could be referred to as the different "types" of NVA, with NVA understood as a method used in different capacities under different conditions.

As it stands now, nonviolent theory ranges anywhere from illegal and seemingly spontaneous mass demonstrations to state-sanctioned strikes to state-supported nonviolent civilian militias; a soup-pot of nonviolent activity. Perhaps the conditions under which NVA takes place can be organized as follows:

a) People living under a dictatorship or any form of tyranny who organize themselves into any form of opposition to it could be said to be operating under pre-democratic or de facto democratic conditions. This is so since they are technically already practicing one of the foundations of a classical democracy, which is the active participation of the populace, or, rule by the people. By collectively agreeing to undertake a certain activity they have made an agreement that is democratic in nature.

b) The second type takes place when a people practice resistance or voice their opinions through allowable nonviolent activities, be it in the form of strikes, sit-ins, referendums, demonstrations, etc. This only takes place within a system that utilizes democratic principles to one degree or another, it not really mattering which label is assigned to that form of government. The degree to which the activities are not allowed is also the degree towards which that government in fact actually leans towards some form of dictatorship.

c) The third type would be CBD, that is, organized civilians either wholly or partially responsible for the nonviolent defense of their country. It is supported and sanctioned by a government that not only believes the people have a right to voice their opinions through various activities, but goes even further and believes in them for the maintenance of the country's integrity as well.

II. Within these three types runs the common thread of democratic practices or principles, be they permissible or not. There is, then, a democratic condition (or pre-condition), be it "de jure" or "de facto," required for effectiveness in any of the three "types" of NVA.

What constitutes a democratic condition can be understood as the citizenry more or less seeing themselves as equals actively engaged in their own governing. In the case of Czechoslovakia in 1968, certainly their efforts were the efforts of a large underground, de facto democratic condition (this is, of course, not the whole story, but perhaps one important aspect of it). Non-union workers on strike outside their factory is a different example of de facto democratic condition, de facto in that they have no legal union representation to speak for them, and so they speak for themselves.

At the other end of the scale is the idea of a citizen militia as the epitome of democratic conditions, when the state officially supports the entire populace (not only the military institution) to collectively and nonviolently defend their own territory. This is an example of democratic principles operating officially (de jure) and in praxis (de facto), in all national concerns, even defense.

Unfortunately, there is a down side to this idea which also merits serious consideration.

III. Perhaps CBD supporters should be content with a more organized grass-roots movement and not lean so much towards "official" status. There may be some very good reasons why it would be unwise to systematize and officially incorporate CBD into a country's defense system.

First of all it could lose its potency when caught up in the bureaucracy of any institution that has so much influence over so large an amount of the population and so important an object as the country's integrity. No doubt CBD would have to fall under guidance or

(continued on page 5)

BOOK REVIEW



Civilian-Based Defense: A Post-Military Weapons System

By Gene Sharp, with the assistance of Bruce Jenkins. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ. 1990. 166 pp. \$20 hardcover. Not available in paperback.

Review by John M. Mecartney, Coordinator of the Nonviolent Action for National Defense Institute, Detroit.

All who are interested in a better way of settling international disputes and overthrowing dictators than by violence should have this book in their libraries. It is the only current and comprehensive book available on the subject of nonviolent action as a deterrence and defense system.

Even if one has read each of Sharp's previous books this book is needed because 1) it updates one on the latest developments relating to nonviolence defense in Eastern Europe, the Philippines, China, etc.; 2) it summarizes the essence of Sharp's previous works with current comments as well as materials from other sources on pre-revolutionary war America, El Salvador, etc.; 3) it includes much new information, especially in the last chapter, on the way that civilian-based defense can be implemented; 4) it is the best written of all Sharp's books, perhaps in part due to the assistance of Bruce Jenkins.

Sharp likes to use the word "struggle" to differentiate the approach of CBD from that of people who think peace can come in a quiet way. Sharp reminds readers that there will always be conflict because there will be people and nations that seek to dominate or take resources from others.

The basic concept with which he deals is that power does not come from the "barrel of a gun" as Mao used to say — but from the people. Only when the citizen of a country give their assent to a government or to an invader can these rule.

Sharp has come a long way from his strong advocacy of pacifism in the forties and fifties, as secretary to A.J. Muste, and editor of the British *Peace News*. In his 1980 prize-winning essay, *Making the Abolition of War A Realistic Goal*, he writes, "Mass conversions to pacifism will not occur" and "unilateral 'disarmament' — abandonment of defense capacity — is no alternative to the war system and is not possible." (He might have made an exception of Costa Rica.) In his current book he says the pacifist view is that "war itself is worse than any political evil . . ."

Sharp holds that the support for CBD must be more broad than that of the peace movement if it is to become national policy. Therefore, while still speaking to groups within the peace movement, such as Pax Christi, Sharp has specialized in appealing to the masses of people who are not pacifists and to military leaders. He uses military terminology and his pragmatic arguments can be understood by higher officers in the military in any country. He often speaks with them and featured them at the Einstein Institution's "National Conference on Nonviolent Sanctions in Conflict and Defense," February, 1990.

Believing that CBD should not be the captive of any one ideology he has appealed to conservatives as well as liberals with success. For example, conservative Catholic ethicist, George Weigel, has said that Sharp is the first person in the "peace movement" who has dealt realistically with power in relation to defense. Conservative Republican Senator Mark Hatfield wrote an introduction to Sharp's 1980 book, *Social Power and Political Freedom*.

This latest book by Sharp should have strong appeal to the pragmatism of the average American and especially to the military mind that is open to the possibility of a better defense.

In this book Sharp deals with the question of deterrence. CBD can deter because it could convince the possible attackers that the consequences of invasion would be too costly. It could also harm the invading country economically, hurt its international relations, and prove unsatisfying for the troops who could not achieve success in conquest. He could also have said that the invading troops might learn the approach of nonviolent resistance and take it back home to overthrow their own government. Most leaders with hopes of conquest abroad might be deterred.

One of the points of Sharp's previous book, *Making Europe Unconquerable*, which is repeated here, is that deterrence with CBD is much superior to nuclear deterrence. If either works, all is well. But if nuclear deterrence does not deter then nuclear war must be used, to the possible destruction of both sides. If deterrence with CBD does not work, then the CBD "fighting capacity" is actualized. If successful, democracy is restored or the

(continued on page 6)

CBD: A CHANGE

(continued from page 4)

approval at some bureaucratic level, and as such, is bound to be watered down in the bureaucratic process.

Secondly, if CBD were a well-known and highly publicized, perhaps even glamorized, aspect of a country's defense system, it would completely lose its very important element of anonymity in the eyes of the offending party. It has often been pointed out that one advantage of NVA is its ability to seem invisible to an invading force, and that if it can not be identified it is not so easily undermined. An official and visible CBD system would be subject to an opponent being able to interfere with the running parts that, under less visible conditions, would be vital to CBD's effectiveness. It would be one more identifiable object for the enemy to plan to undermine, and could begin to do so well ahead of any anticipated invasion.

Maintaining unofficial status may leave CBD without much of a capacity for long-term planning, but that may be better than the destruction of the CBD "headquarters" that is bound to exist should CBD become institutionalized. Attached to this issue is the idea of defense versus offense. It needs to be brought to the forefront since nonviolent activities are not necessarily only defensive. They can, in fact, be used by an invading power in order to weaken known, institutionalized, nonviolent civilian resistance.

It may also be best left outside the official government organ and kept as separated, shall we say, as church is from state. No doubt CBD would be likely to fall into the same corruptions religion had when no separation of church and state existed. Take into account the disintegrating role of religion as a separate power, and perhaps CBD can take up the slack and serve as an additional counterforce in the event of a coup or the rise of a dictatorship. Consider also how often nonviolent action and religion have worked together in many historical cases.

PARTING THOUGHTS

Spring cleaning. It is time to cull through the stacks and decide which ideas go and which ones stay, for there certainly has been some wonderful scholarship in the field. But it is also time to put new ideas on the table, toss them around, and perhaps eat a few words here and there.

(continued on page 6)

CBD: A CHANGE
(continued from page 5)

Of course, this sort of talk may create a disturbance in the minds of some, but perhaps some aspects of it are valid. And perhaps those aspects should be examined to determine whether they might provide a path to a new way of thinking about NVA. Even if researchers disagree with the ideas, maybe, at the very least, more discussion will evolve and the expectations will begin to change.

NVA needs to mature, and for some reason, it is still dragging around the same old baby blanket. The time has come for it to grow up and latch on to something more than that which merely feels good. Calls for new blood have been put out for a long time, and little has emerged. We need to pull NVA up out of a rut that has existed far too long, examine new territory clearly, and re-examine old ideas more creatively. To continue on the same old track is to promote inertia and eventually smother the idea altogether.

Throughout the book Sharp deals well with the major questions which arise about nonviolent defense, including why nonoffensive defense does not work as well as CBD.

BOOK REVIEW (continued from page 5)

country defended. If CBD does not defend there are still people left to try again at another time. The nuclear threat has been much lessened from the USSR. However, with proliferation it may come from other sources.

One of Sharp's many strengths is his tendency to not overstate the power of CBD. In areas where he does not feel CBD would work well, he calls for more research. Even if it does not work in one small area, this does not rule out its general relevance.

Sharp points out that aggression for land or genocide has been countered, in the past, with nonviolent action. Even the Nazi conquerors had to conclude that they needed the cooperation of the Slavic inhabitants of Eastern Europe — whom they considered subhuman — if they were to carry out their plans for extermination. And Sharp claims that the aggressors' home population, other governments, and international bodies could, in the past, have halted the genocide. However, he points out, with the advent of new "fast-kill" technology there might not be time. Sharp calls for more analysis and research while pointing out that some nonviolent resistance against the Holocaust in Nazi-conquered areas was successful.

Admitting that conventional CBD does not work when an aggressor tries to seize specific naval bases, airports, or mineral resources, Sharp advocates civilian-based "forward strategy." This involves spreading the news about how CBD works to dissatisfied groups in the aggressor's country. Uprisings could result and the invasion might be cancelled or prevented.

Sharp considers training necessary for true CBD. He does not consider spontaneous acts of nonviolent resistance to be CBD. Yet he does cite them as useful illustrations of how nonviolent struggle worked, at least temporarily, without planning. He asks how well military defense would work if there were only last-minute improvisation.

The four best illustrations from history, also cited in *Making Europe Unconquerable*, are discussed as historical prototypes: the overthrow of the Kapp Putsch in Germany in 1920, the defense of French democracy in 1961 when threatened by French military in Algeria, the German defense of the Ruhr against the invasion of the French and Belgians in 1923, and the eight-month resistance to the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968-69. All but the 1961 incident were part of Sharp's original masterpiece, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*, though with less elaboration at the time.

The famous Hitler quote that is so powerful an argument (If Hitler admitted that nonviolent action would work, who can disagree?) was previously found only in *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* and in the essay, *Making the Abolition of War a Realistic Goal*. But it is given again in this 1990 book. Hitler wrote in July of 1943 that "ruling the people in the conquered regions is, I might say, a psychological problem. One cannot rule by force alone. True, force is decisive, but it is equally important to have that psychological something which the animal trainer needs to be master of his beast. They must be convinced that we are the victors."

Throughout the book Sharp deals well with the major questions which arise about nonviolent defense, including why nonoffensive defense does not work as well as CBD.

The "dessert" chapter of the book is the final one, "Toward Transarmament." Here Sharp fills in what has been lacking in his past books — a plan for getting from here to there. He deals with motives that can inspire people to move toward CBD. He says that change in human nature is not required, nor a change in the international or social system. (Larry Gara, in his *Active Nonviolence* slideshow, says that we must have a better society before we can defend it with

nonviolence.) Sharp disagrees with Gara, as he writes, "All societies should have a capacity to deter and defeat attacks in a conflict-ridden world, by means that do not themselves threaten the population with either years of paramilitary conflict or quick, massive annihilation." This will come about only when people realize that one should not give up struggle (what many think is meant by "disarmament") but should arm themselves with something better (the meaning of "transarmament").

Sharp has argued that the use of CBD along with military action limits the effectiveness of CBD. Yet he says that it is likely to come about in the United States (as it has in Sweden) as a component of the mostly-military total defense plan. And we should support that. Only when those responsible for the defense of the country can have

(continued on page 7)

SHOULD GERMAN SOLDIERS BE DEPLOYED WORLDWIDE UNDER THE U.N. FLAG?

Excerpts from an article submitted by Gert Bastian, General (retired), a former member of the German Bundestag.

The only reason given for setting up the German Federal Armed Forces 35 years ago and for their existence for the past three and a half decades was the latent danger of an attack by the allegedly far superior forces of the Warsaw Pact. Only by contributing its own forces to the multinational defense enterprise, NATO, was the German Federal Republic to be able to achieve protection and security. This argument seemed to be so convincing that no further justification of the need for the Federal Armed Forces was required. It would, of course, have been difficult to invent compelling reasons. It was therefore very convenient that no such reasons were needed, because the frightful vision that had been conjured up of an extremely aggressive and militarily superior USSR was quite sufficient to ensure that the majority of voters continued to approve of the ever-increasing military budget.

... It was hard to accept that the developments in the East, ranging from a willingness to make unilateral advance concessions in respect of disarmament to democratization in Central and Eastern Europe, from the Soviet Union's consent to unification under NATO protection to the unilateral dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, suddenly knocked the bottom out of the threat scenarios people had built up for decades against their better judgement and raised doubts about the purpose and aim of the Federal Armed Forces.

To all those who were now worrying with furrowed brows about the credibility of their defense planning games, Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait and the Western response to Iraq's breach of international law, which was from the outset geared to war, must have appeared to provide a way out of their dilemma. The military and those politicians and media barons who implicitly believed in the armed forces and had always condemned conscientious objectors as shirkers and all those who advocated nonviolent means of crisis management as cowards came into their own again.

It was therefore hardly surprising that, in the euphoria over the feeling that "we are somebody again," military enthusiasts of every hue immediately put forward concrete ideas about all the new tasks which could be assigned to the Federal Armed Forces . . . For decades German forces could be deployed within the framework of NATO exclusively for the purpose of national defense. The commitment to this principle was swept away almost overnight by sheer avidity for the right to participate in military operations worldwide . . .

There should, however, be no question of the Federal Armed Forces even participating in UN peace-keeping operations . . . simply because such operations should be conducted by the soldiers of the smaller and preferably non-aligned UN members states so as to rule out from the outset any dominance by larger powers . . . These smaller countries are not guilty of the sins committed by the colonial powers, and their commitment to safeguarding peace in such UN operations cannot be misinterpreted, and therefore does not give cause for any counter-productive distrust . . .

There can, of course, be absolutely no question of soldiers of the Federal Armed Forces being deployed under a UN mandate or within the framework of a NATO or WEU rapid deployment force favored by the Federal Government! A convincing peace and human rights policy, coupled with a readiness to engage in ecological and economic cooperation and to show greater solidarity with the Third World countries would enhance our standing and serve our interests much more effectively than military adventures, which would merely make us the accomplices of major powers . . .

Should the Federal Republic compromise itself by taking part in acts of violence which occur only because nonviolent conflict settlement, which would indeed be possible, is not given a chance? Because the international community is not willing to force every lawbreaker to his knees by totally ostracizing him politically, economically, culturally, and morally — which would, of course, be possible given the close links and interdependencies which exist today?

No and no again! As long as the Federal Armed Forces still exist and have not been replaced by a better means of safe-guarding peace, their deployment for any purpose other than national defense must continue to be ruled out!

BOOK REVIEW

(continued from page 6)

confidence in CBD will it be likely to be adopted as a sole defense. It could be expanded by stages, as its usefulness is seen, Sharp says.

There may be some countries which can adopt it at once, however. The man who years ago suggested the name "civilian-based defense" to Sharp — Major General Edward Atkinson (ret.), told me at the Einstein Conference that one possible place where CBD could be used today would be in the new state of Palestine when it is achieved.

While this review has focused primarily on defense against foreign aggression, the power of CBD to defend a country against seizure by a dictator should not be neglected. General Leonard V. Johnson, who heads the Plowshare Peace Center in Canada, holds that, with the decreased threat of aggression from the USSR, the major use of CBD could be to prevent dictatorships.

Sharp's analysis is outstanding — not only because he has studied military strategy so well — not only because he has carefully researched the neglected aspects of history not taught in a militaristic culture — but especially because he is a brilliant sociologist and political scientist who understands how society works. For many years he taught sociology and political science at Southeastern Massachusetts University.

When one reads this book, which I feel will become a classic, one will see a vision of the *real* "new world order." President Bush had a chance to show this new world order by using non-military sanctions, but instead, gave war a new lease on life. However, the dream remains.



TRANSLATORS NEEDED

If you can volunteer to translate articles and letters into English from another language please write to the Editor, Civilian-Based Defense; News & Opinion, P.O. Box 31616, Omaha, NE 68131, USA.



**WINDSOR, ONTARIO
CHOSEN AS
LOCATION FOR
FALL CONFERENCE
ON CIVILIAN-BASED
DEFENSE**

see page 2



**CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE: NEWS & OPINION
Subscription Request**

\$15.00 One Year Subscription.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ Zip Code _____

Nation _____

**CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE ASSOCIATION
154 AUBURN STREET
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139
U.S.A.**

**Civilian-Based Defense: News
PO. BOX 31616 & Opinion
OMAHA, NEBRASKA 68131 U.S.A.**

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

**PLEASE CHECK YOUR
MAILING LABEL**

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

CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE AND PEOPLE POWER

AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE AT WINDSOR, ONTARIO ORGANIZED BY

THE CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE ASSOCIATION

Friday Evening to Sunday, September 6-8, 1991

This Conference will bring together people who have worked on promoting civilian-based defense and people engaged in various forms of nonviolent direct action. But anyone interested in civilian-based defense is cordially invited, including people of all political persuasions and the military.

Civilian-based defense would defend a nation by nonviolent struggle against an invasion or coup d'etat, through sanctions and noncooperation with an invader or usurper. Civilian-based defense has the potential to replace war. It could have a profound impact on a world looking for ways to achieve peace.

The conference will feature an exciting variety of presentations, workshops, and opportunities to talk with other participants in small groups and informally.

CONFIRMED SPEAKERS AND PRESENTATIONS

Dr. Gene Sharp will give the opening keynote address, "Relevance of Civilian-Based Defense for the 1990's," and also another presentation, "Promoting Civilian-Based Defense: Lessons from History." Dr. Sharp is founder of the Program on Nonviolent Sanctions, Harvard University. Among his many publications are Making Europe Unconquerable: the Potential of Civilian-based Deterrence and Defense, Civilian-based Defense: A Post-Military Weapons System, and National Security Through Civilian-Based Defense.

Mubarak Awad will speak on nonviolence in the Palestinians' struggle. He is director of Nonviolence International.

David Yaskulka will discuss introducing civilian-based defense to the military and conservatives. He is the codirector of the Center for Common Security.

Location:

Holy Redeemer College and Retreat Centre
925 Cousineau Road
Windsor, Ontario

Registration information is on the Back.

CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE ASSOCIATION

154 Auburn St.
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
USA
(Phone: 617- 868-6058)

The college is just south of Detroit, Michigan. It can provide room and meals for a maximum of 115 people, although meeting rooms can accommodate up to 600.

Please Post

(over)

Registration Form

Name _____ Phone Number _____

Street Address _____

City _____ State/Province _____ Postal Zone _____

Organizational Affiliations _____

To help us plan; Why are you interested in this conference, What do you hope to get out of it, and what sort of workshops would you like to have?

SEND ME MORE INFORMATION

I CANNOT ATTEND, BUT I ENCLOSE A CONTRIBUTION TO HELP THE CONFERENCE.

I PLAN TO ATTEND, CHECK FOR MY PARTICIPATION IS ENCLOSED.

1.Registration only \$60 Canadian \$50 U.S.

2.Registration, single room, and meals
 \$160 Canadian \$140 U.S.

3. Registration, double room, and meals--cost per person
 \$145 Canadian \$125 U.S.

I would like the vegetarian option.

AFTER JULY 15 ADD \$10 TO YOUR CHECK.

CHECKS PAYABLE TO:

CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE ASSOCIATION

154 Auburn St.

Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

USA

(Phone: 617- 868-6058)

CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE: NEWS & OPINION
3636 Lafayette Avenue
Omaha, NE 68131
402-558-2085

May 1, 1991

TO MEMBERS & SUBSCRIBERS
OUTSIDE U.S.A.

DEAR FRIENDS,

Greetings once again from Omaha, Nebraska! We hope you will enjoy the enclosed issue of our newsletter.

As always, we invite you to send opinion articles, letters to the editor, book reviews, and news about what is happening in your country in regard to the notion of civilian-based defense. We do not want your participation to be a burden. If you cannot write easily in English please send something in your own language and we will try to find a translator here. If you would prefer to send an audio tape with your comments that would be quite acceptable.

Please indicate always whether or not we may publish what you send us and include your phone number so that we may call you if we have questions. Unless you place some restriction on what you send us we will assume that it may be used in some way in our publication.

Our next issue will be a combined May/July issue. We will accept material for it until June 15th. Please note the survey on the back of this page. Your help with it will be most appreciated.

Thanks for your interest in our work. We appreciate your participation very much.

Sincerely,



Melvin G. Beckman

P.S. Please note that our organization's address is changed: 154 Auburn Street, Cambridge Massachusetts, 02139. Telephone: 617-868-6058. But send newsletter items to me in Omaha. If you have been sending me a publication related to CBD, please have the address changed to the address at the top of this page. Thank you!

FUNDING SURVEY

In the past decade, both public funds (from governments or government-related agencies) and private funds (from non-governmental organizations and institutions) have been granted in a number of countries, to facilitate research, publications, and conferences relating to civilian-based defense. In the May/July issue of Civilian-Based Defense: News & Opinion we would like to publish a listing of the CBD-related projects for which grant-funding has been received in the various countries. This listing will be useful to individuals and groups wishing to apply for grant-funding in the future. They will be able to show that there are indeed precedents for the funding they request. The listing may also help to prevent duplication of efforts and facilitate contact between persons and groups seeking grants. The listing will distinguish between public and private funds granted and between past and current funding.

To produce this listing we need your help. We ask you to give us information about each CBD-related project for which you know public or private funding has been received in your country since 1980:

COUNTRY: _____ YEAR FUNDING WAS RECEIVED: 19____

SOURCE OF FUNDING RECEIVED: _____

THIS SOURCE IS: ____PUBLIC _____PRIVATE

RECIPIENT OF THE FUNDING: _____

AMOUNT OF FUNDING RECEIVED: _____
(In terms of one's own currency. Dollar equivalent optional)

NAME OF PROJECT AND/OR
PURPOSE OF THE FUNDING: _____

Please copy this page and use a separate sheet for each project funded. Additional information, beyond that requested above, will be welcomed. For example, one might supply the name, address, and telephone number of someone who could give more information about the project funded. One might also tell the results of the project, such as reports or publications which came from it. Please type or print all information you give and thank you so much for helping!

Mail to: Civilian-Based Defense: News & Opinion, 3636 Lafayette,
Omaha, NE 68131 USA, by June 15, 1991.