

# Civilian-based Defense

Exploring a Nonviolent Strategy for Deterrence and Defense

Volume 8 Number 5 Autumn 1993

\$4.00 Single Issue

## IN THIS ISSUE

Civilian-based Defense and United Nations  
Peacekeeping: Could This Marriage Work? 1  
*Suzanne Pearce*

The United States Government and Civilian-based  
Defense 2  
*Paul Anders*

Civilian-based Defense and Social Defense in  
Austria 2  
*Klaus Heidegger*

International Law and Civilian-based Defense:  
Questions and Answers 8  
*Carol Paulson*

Association News 10

Lithuanian Defense Update 13  
*Paul Anders*

Around the World 14

Recently Received 14

Books for Sale on Civilian-based Defense 15  
*John Mecartney*

Events 16

Editor's Notes 16

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

EDITOR Paul Anders  
ASSOCIATE EDITOR Kenneth Haynes  
CONSULTING EDITORS Melvin Beckman  
Philip Bogdonoff

Civilian-based Defense Association  
154 Auburn Street  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139-3969, USA  
Telephone: (617) 868-6058 • E-mail (Internet):  
cbda@igc.apc.org  
SUBSCRIPTION: \$15.00 for one year year;  
\$25 for two years.  
Readers are invited to send news, articles, and other  
material for publication.

## CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE AND PEACEKEEPING: COULD THIS MARRIAGE WORK?

*Suzanne Pearce*

When President Clinton delivered his speech at the opening of the UN General Assembly, he called for rethinking the purposes and limits of UN peacekeeping. "As the Secretary-General and others have argued, if UN peacekeeping is to be a sound security investment for our nation and others, it must adapt to new times. Together we must prepare UN peacekeeping for the 21st century. We must begin by bringing the rigors of political and military analysis to every peacekeeping mission." Clinton's emphasis was on limiting and redefining U.S. involvement in peacekeeping, but nevertheless the topic is out there for all to discuss

The dramas of UN peacekeeping have been occupying the headlines for a while: mostly the failure in Bosnia, the quandary of Somalia, and to a lesser extent the successes, in which Namibia and Cambodia are counted. There are currently 80,000 troops involved in 17 missions in 4 continents, as President Clinton reported. By now the concept of peacekeeping, which used to refer to Blue Beret troops lightly armed for self-defense only, has broadened to include various components, such as peacemaking, peace building, and various approaches to preventing or managing conflicts.

The peace movement, agonizing over Bosnia and other catastrophes, is in an intense debate about intervention — whether it is unilateral U.S., U.S./NATO, U.S.-led UN or any other form—and also about the morality and practical wisdom of the use of force. To arm the Bosnians or not? To bomb Serb artillery emplacements or not? To sit by while genocide proceeds? In the nonviolence community, there is a search for new substitutes for the use of military force, for example, the idea

*Suzanne Pearce is coordinator of the Massachusetts chapter of the Lawyers Alliance for World Security and a member of the board of directors of the Civilian-based Defense Association.*

of a "peace army" of trained volunteers to massively intervene with nonviolent methods in a conflict, and also great interest in conflict resolution and prevention. At the University of Texas at Austin the second annual Conference on Nonviolence was held, with a focus on "The UN as a Peacekeeper." In Boston in February, a number of groups led by the World Federalists will organize a conference on "UN Peacekeeping and Peacemaking" in which a spectrum of approaches will be explored including nonviolent ones, and with a strong emphasis on options for the future. The aim is to get many different groups, focusing on disarmament, peace and justice, human rights, world affairs in general, to discuss these issues together, with their own members and with the public.

Peacekeeping is a recent invention compared to war; it is not completely known what it is. Therefore it is important to bring in creative new alternative ideas as part of a rigorous political and military analysis. Does the civilian-based defense (CBD) community have ideas to contribute about the potential relationship between CBD and UN peacekeeping as presently conceived or imagined in the future? Could both be components in a global security system? What international or regional guarantees and backup are necessary to enable a sovereign nation to adopt a CBD policy? Is the UN approach hopelessly top-down and antithetical to the grassroots, democratic, people-power approach? Are proponents of each talking in different worlds?

*[Editor's note: We would like to explore these questions in future issues of the magazine. The Civilian-based Defense Association board of directors is also exploring ways of taking this discussion into the UN community. Please send us your letters and contributions to the ideas raised in this article.]*

# THE U. S. GOVERNMENT AND CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE

Paul E. Anders

How could the United States government promote civilian-based defense (CBD)? It could have various programs to do this. Below are many things that the government would now be unlikely to do. But conditions may change. Witness how quickly the Cold War ended, which many commentators thought would go on for decades. Even if a particular program is unlikely to be adopted, there may in some cases be merit in promoting it to start familiarizing those in the government with CBD.

The United States could agree now to invoke economic and political sanctions against an aggressor if a country defended by CBD was invaded or its government overthrown in a coup d'état.

State Department personnel in various countries could bring CBD to people's attention. This is particularly true of countries where conditions for CBD may become ripe: Slovakia, Macedonia, the Czech Republic, the Baltics, Costa Rica, etc.

Countries defended by the United States can be encouraged to establish a CBD. This would lessen the need for the United States to defend them with U.S. forces. There are many such countries. Outlays are particularly high for U.S. forces in Korea, Japan, and the NATO countries.

The United States Information Service could bring it to people's attention and have publications on CBD in its libraries around the world.

Congress could establish a civilian-based defense college or institute.

Members of Congress could give talks or write articles on CBD, which can then be published in the *Congressional Record*, or they could have articles written by others reprinted in it.

The U.S. government could fund programs for schools and colleges to encourage the teaching of CBD in courses, provide funds for educational materials,

etc.

The Peace Corps could train some of its volunteers to conduct educational programs on CBD in various countries.

People serving in the new national service program could assist nonprofit organizations that educate the public about CBD, such as LEAD USA and the Civilian-based Defense Association (CBDA).

The Defense Department could establish courses on CBD in its schools or include instruction about it in other courses.

The Voice of America could broadcast programs on CBD.

The Library of Congress could establish a collection of materials on CBD.

The U.S. government could encourage the United Nations, Organization of American States, etc., to promote CBD.

In environmental agreements between the United States and other countries, the United States could encourage CBD as an environmentally benign alternative to the military, which wreaks environmental havoc even in peacetime.

U.S. government publications can have articles about CBD.

The U.S. government can hold conferences on CBD or include it as a part other conferences.

The U.S. government can increase funding for research on it.

## How to Get These Things Done

Congress can pass legislation mandating one or more of the programs. (The programs above are referred to below as "the programs").

Citizens can contact administrators or legislators and suggest that they implement a particular program if it is in their power to do so.

Citizens can ask their members of Congress their position on CBD and can petition legislators or administrators to establish one of the programs.

Citizens who favor CBD can seek election to Congress or seek to become policymakers in the federal government.

Conferences on CBD can be held for legislators and officials.

Peace organizations can encourage their members to promote the programs.

When CBD becomes politically opportune, political PACs could back

candidates who support CBD.

Right now the U.S. government could support further experimentation with nonviolence in many situations even if it does not yet support CBD. This could be the groundwork for CBD.

Please let me now what you think about these proposals or if you have others that you would like to add. Some of the suggestions listed in this article may also be suitable in other countries.

---

*Dr. Klaus Heidegger was responsible for the educational program of Pax Christi Vienna and taught Roman Catholic religion in Vienna. He works for an antimilitaristic Austrian magazine (ZAM). This year he is in Somerville, Massachusetts. He volunteers for CBDA and is the father of a 14-month-old girl.*

## CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE AND SOCIAL DEFENSE IN AUSTRIA

Klaus Heidegger

It is useful to give clear definitions for the terms *civilian-based defense* (CBD) and *social defense* (SD), especially in an international dialogue. That's why the main purpose of this article is to help non-Austrians to understand how these terms are interpreted and perceived by individuals, groups, and institutions in Austria. As regular readers of *Civilian-based Defense* will easily notice, development of the concept of SD in Austria is similar to many other European countries.

### Civilian-based Defense or Social Defense?

First, in the German language, we do not have the term CBD. While people in the United States distinguish very clearly between CBD and SD, we can't do that in the same way in German. There we have just the one term "Soziale Verteidigung," which can be either used to mean SD or CBD.

Second, the definition of CBD as it is

used by the Civilian-based Defense Association (CBDA), Gene Sharp, and the Einstein Institution (see, for instance, the definitions on the front page of this magazine or in many articles by Sharp in previous issues, his writings, and books) is very much the same as the definition of *Soziale Verteidigung* generally used from the 1960s to the end of the 1980s. I appreciate that Gene Sharp is so clear in his definition of CBD. You know at once what it is, just as you know that Coca-Cola has a taste that is different from Pepsi. CBD has become in the same way a kind of trademark which stands for a very specific thing.

Third, such a clear definition of SD also prevailed in Austria before 1990. I call it the "classic concept of SD." Essential to CBD and the classic SD is that it is an alternative for military defense based on the preparation of a nation to use nonviolent, civilian struggle to preserve the society's freedom, sovereignty, and constitutional systems against external invasions and occupations as well as internal coups d'état. So before 1990 the meaning of CBD and SD was almost identical.

Fourth, in today's changing European security environment, a new concept of SD has been developed, which I will outline below. Whereas there were almost no distinctions between the classic concept of *Soziale Verteidigung* and CBD principles, there has been a development in the 1990s which has made *Soziale Verteidigung*-SD increasingly different from CBD. To put it another way: The meaning of *Soziale Verteidigung* has widened while the definition of CBD has stayed the same. Because of that it's good that the CBDA now makes this very clear distinction between CBD and SD. On the other hand, SD cannot be seen as a concept or policy different from CBD but it comprises CBD as well. Let me use a metaphor: An apple tree always is at the same time a tree, though not every tree is an apple tree. SD does not exclude CBD. SD may in some cases be CBD, in other cases it doesn't fulfill all the necessary conditions for CBD. SD need not necessarily be a national defense and most of

the time it is not directed against internal coups or against external aggressors. However, it works with the same methods and tactics as CBD does, which are noncooperation and defiance of the rules of an aggressor. Most of the cases which are seen of the new concept of SD would be called "nonviolent struggle" or "non-military struggle" by Gene Sharp.

If we put the policies of CBD or SD in a broader frame of political analysis, we can see that CBD does fit in to the concepts of the main political philosophies, especially those where the influence of a state plays a major role. I think that many



Klaus Heidegger and daughter Miriam

supporters of CBD have a tendency towards social democracy or socialism. On the other hand, SD has increasingly become the policy of the social movements. Such a distinction is made very impressively by Brian Martin who speaks of an *elite reform* on the one hand and a *grassroots initiative* on the other hand (Brian Martin, *Social Defence, Social Change*).

#### Social Defense as Policy for the Social Movements

In Austria we have seen the growth and the fading of different social movements within the last one and a half decades which are of great importance for the development and enhancing of ideas and methods of social defense. In the early 1980s, there was a big peace movement directed mainly against the decision of

Ronald Reagan and NATO to station the then new Pershing II missiles in European NATO countries. There were peace marches all over the country, the biggest one in Vienna in 1982 with more than 60,000 demonstrators. People involved in the peace movement learned how to organize meetings and events and how to produce and distribute leaflets. Other people with a religious background held meetings where they prayed or fasted together. Disparate groups were brought together. Thousands of individuals learned through political experience that you cannot just delegate defense issues to

officials and political representatives and that it is not enough to vote in elections. The peace activists learned to know the contradictions between their own interests on the one hand and the aims of the political and military establishment on the other hand. In my opinion, the experiences facilitated by the peace movement were an education in SD. Similar things can be said about the ecological movement which followed the peace movement in the mid-1980s. At the same time the feminist movement got stronger. Recently another movement has developed, supported by most of the groups in the already mentioned movements and

especially by the Catholic Church in Austria. It is the movement against racism and xenophobia.

To think about SD, you have to consider the social movements. There is another important aspect I have to mention on this point. It is characteristic for the movements to work outside the parliamentary system and mainly in opposition to governmental policies. In Austria SD is a concept that applies to *civil society*, which means that civilians organize themselves to get what they need and to promote their interests as independently from state influence as possible. Gernot Jochheim, a German who published several books and articles on SD, has elaborated the idea of the civil society and the importance of SD for it. If you look at those ideas, you can easily conclude that the new understanding of SD has anarchistic elements.

### General National Defense in Austria

Another point in translating the English term CBD into German that we should notice is the German word *Zivile Verteidigung*. The literal translation of CBD isn't *Zivile Verteidigung*, as many people from abroad unfortunately think. *Zivile Verteidigung* is the official policy of the state to defend Austria with nonmilitary means. It is a part of the policy of the so-called *Umfassende Landesverteidigung*-meaning overall defense, total defense or General National Defense. Additionally there is another translation problem: When we use the German word *zivil*, it can have two different meanings: either as something that is nonmilitary or something that is not state-controlled. The official policy of *Zivile Verteidigung* will be explained below.

In the 1970s and 1980s, Gene Sharp hoped that CBD would be established in neutral countries such as Austria and Finland (See Gene Sharp, *Making Europe Unconquerable*). Sharp thought that the non-aligned and neutral countries of Europe "might relatively quickly adopt civilian-based defense, partially or fully, to increase their defense capabilities. ... Adoption, in full or in part, therefore could happen before major research and other studies have been completed" (*Making Europe Unconquerable*, p.55). Phillips Moulton wrote in his article in the February 1993 issue of *Civilian-based Defense* that Austria is, like Sweden, already developing CBD programs as components of the total defense system. This is an incorrect assessment, which I have heard and read quite often. Yes, there are some similarities between the system of General National Defense and elements of SD and CBD. But if we take a more careful look at it, we can see that the General National Defense system in Austria has not been a way to establish SD or CBD. Actually it tends to prevent it.

The General National Defense system in Austria is built on four pillars: military defense, civil defense, economic defense, and psychological defense. Austrian constitutional law requires preparation for defense on that basis. The coordination between the four levels of defense is made by the Secretary of the Federal Chancellor.

In each region of the country there are regional defense coordination groups. There have been practices for General National Defense which tell us a lot about the real nature of this defense system. In case of a war, General National Defense is a policy in which the whole population has to support the military defense. The Austrian Defense Plan, which was put in force in the 1970s and has the character of a law, describes the tasks of the civilians in the General National Defense. They have to provide the necessary things that the soldiers need to fight well. The population supplies them, for instance, with food and shelter; takes care of the injured; and hides weapons, ammunition, and other military materials. Civilians should help in the reconnaissance and transmission of news. At the same time, the population is seen as a basis for further recruitment.

Austrian defense policy presumes that Austria can't be defended solely by military means. That's why it includes defense preparations also on civilian, economic, and psychological levels. The whole population should be prepared to defend the Austrian nation. Here there is really a parallel to one of the principles of CBD. But it is after all this kind of total system that will always prevent CBD from happening. All the defense is still oriented towards military defense. About 95 percent of all the defense spending is absorbed by the military. Civil, economic, and psychological defense are primarily seen as a way to promote military defense. Psychological defense, for instance, means in practice to tell school children about military ideals or to publish articles about how wonderful the Austrian army is. Economic defense means in reality that Austria should continue with its own weapons manufacturing and that in case of a war all the economy has to be geared to military defense needs. In the same way, the official policy of civil defense does not ask, "How can we defend ourselves without military means?" but "How can the military be supported by nonmilitary measures?" So if there is external aggression, it's up to the military to react. That is the official defense doctrine. Only if all military measures fail could there be a possibility for the nonmilitary means and tactics. However, I wouldn't call that CBD

because there aren't any preparations for the use of methods and tactics of CBD. Civil defense preparations in Austria solely include preparations against threats, such as nuclear catastrophes or natural disasters. That's why organizations such as the Red Cross or the fire departments play an important role for the official civil defense, whereas nonviolent groups are excluded from any participation.

I make three observations: (1) CBD is not primarily a way to support military defense but an alternative to it. (2) CBD is not only a way to react in case the military defense fails but something that could replace military defense. (3) Above all, CBD is a training in nonviolent methods and tactics and not a training for civilians to fulfill the needs of the nation's army. Therefore I say that the Austrian system of General National Defense does not comply with the most essential ideas of CBD. I say this in contradiction to Gene Sharp, who wrote that the total defense systems of the neutral countries in Europe "share significant characteristics with civilian-based defense" (*Making Europe Unconquerable*, p.127). The Austrian system of General National Defense which was praised by advocates of CBD is not the kind of alternative system they presumably hope for. I wouldn't call the Austrian system a mixed system of military defense and components of CBD. This would mean at least a kind of partnership between military defense and preparations for nonviolent struggle.

There are similar concepts of total defense in other European countries. The Austrian system is very similar to those in Germany and Switzerland, and it resembles also those in Scandinavian countries. That is why I am not as optimistic about the Swedish model as some people connected to CBDA are. You can ask many of the conscientious objectors in the countries mentioned and they will tell you that they are disappointed with the total defense systems in their countries. In Germany, Finland or Austria, conscientious objectors have to serve the total defense system and by that support the military system. That is why a small group of conscripts also decide to refuse civil service (i.e. the obligatory service for conscientious objectors, especially work within some rescue or relief organization)

and are forced to be total objectors with all the harsh consequences that are put on them. Many of them are sentenced to imprisonment and suffer from the military, the police, and courts. Isn't it ironic that most of those organizations and groups that committed themselves to the methods and strategies of nonviolent struggle for peace are in fact excluded from the general defense system? Shouldn't the experts in nonviolence stand in the center of every defense system?

### Conscription and CBD

There is another important question to settle. The kind of total defense which was established in the last decade in European countries such as Finland, Sweden, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, and lately also in the Baltic countries and in Slovenia supports the continuation or implementation of a conscription-based defense system. The fact that people are conscripted and forced to serve for a military-dominated defense system—either as soldiers or as civilians—contradicts in my view the policy of CBD or SD, which is based on the free and voluntary will of the civilians. In my opinion, methods of CBD, such as noncooperation of civilians with an aggressor in very grave situations, will work on a broad basis only if it is the free will of the civilians. The same argument is made by Brian Martin who states that conscription for social defence service “would be a travesty of nonviolent action” (*Social Defence, Social Change*, p.30). I think that states can force people to serve in an army, because obedience is one of the key principles of a military logic. A free will, however, contradicts in many ways military principles. This can be made clear if we look at the considerable amount of possible punishments and military sentences, including capital punishment for deserters, by means of which those members of an army who want to refuse orders which are in contradiction to their conscience are intimidated.

There are many more arguments that show us that conscription does not promote CBD or SD or automatically help to prevent coups d'état, as some defenders of conscription argue. The following coups that occurred in Europe since the

## AUSTRIA

### General facts

Republic with a federal structure, consisting of nine provinces; bounded on N by Germany, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia, on E by Hungary, on S by Slovenia and Italy, on W by Liechtenstein and Switzerland; 32,375 square miles. Population: around 7.5 million plus 500,000 foreign migrant workers, their families, and refugees. Capital: Vienna. Language: German plus minority languages (Slovene and Croatian). Coalition government between the Social Democrats and the Conservatives since 1986; five political parties represented in the Parliament. Unemployment rate about 6 percent of the total workforce. Around 75 percent of the population are members of the Roman Catholic Church.

### Main facts about Austria's security and defense system

Constitutional permanent neutrality since 1955, therefore nonaligned; military conscription; obligatory military service for men: 8 months; conscientious objectors' service: 10 months; more than a quarter of the conscripts refuse to serve in the army; General National Defense system which comprises military, economic, psychological and civil defense; recently restructured Austrian Army (Bundesheer): 60,000 including professional soldiers, voluntary soldiers, and civilians employed by the army; in addition each year there are around 30,000 military conscripts; projected mobilization force: 120,000 men.

### Three main political issues

- 1) Will Austria become a member-state of the EC/European Union? Plebiscite on EC-membership in 1994; membership would de facto, if not de jure, end neutrality and mean integration in the Western European Union or even in NATO.
- 2) Integration or expulsion of foreign migrant workers and refugees; amendment of all the laws concerning foreign workers and refugees.
- 3) Economic and social policies in the years of recession; such as discussions about reductions of social benefits or reduction of working time.

### Constituencies for social defense

Main groups and organizations sympathizing or interested in social defense: Fellowship of Reconciliation-Austria, Pax Christi Austria, Austrian Branch of War Resisters' International, Peace Research Institute in Schläining, Peace Office of the Town of Graz, Peace Office of the Town of Salzburg, Catholic Youth Organizations, Austrian Peace Movement, AlpenAdria-Peace Movement.

Second World War were all in conscription-based countries (in Czechoslovakia 1948; in Greece several times; in 1961 the French generals' revolt in Algeria). Did conscription prevent wars or stimulate nonviolent struggle? If we look at the disastrous present wars in former Yugoslavia, in Georgia, or in Azerbaijan, we see countries which had very strong conscription systems. Neither did conscription mitigate these wars, nor did it help to prevent army officers from staging coups, nor did it promote conditions for nonviolent struggles.

The discussion about advantages and disadvantages of conscription compared to

a professional army has been an important issue in recent years in Austria. In my opinion, in Austria the opportunity to build up structures and programs for nonviolent struggle is very much diminished by the fact that thoughts and ideas on defense issues are pressed into the conscription-based General National Defense system. That's why my experience is very clear about the necessity to abolish conscription in order to free minds and hearts to achieve what proponents of nonviolence like Mahatma Gandhi, Franz Jägerstätter, Dorothy Day, Martin L. King, Jr. or Cesar Chavez wanted to achieve.

### The Austrian Debate on CBD/SD during the Cold War

Before 1990, the classic concept of SD—then identical with CBD—as an alternative national defense to military defense was very popular among most of the peace groups (e.g., Pax Christi Austria, the Austrian branch of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the Austrian section of War Resisters' International, and conscientious objectors' organizations), grassroots peace activists as well as academics (e.g., Rainer Steinweg, peace researcher) and among other nongovernmental organizations (e.g., political and religious youth organizations). All over Austria groups discussed plans for defending themselves in the case of aggression. I myself held quite a lot of seminars on SD during the time I worked for the Catholic Youth Organizations of Austria. There were many publications on SD. Many of the conscripts who refused going to the army and wanted to do the civil service were informed about SD and committed themselves to do something for it. SD as it was seen and promoted was a very clear concept. The main theoretical works and writings that were absorbed came from Theodor Ebert, professor of political science at the Free University of Berlin and also a prominent member of the German branch of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. His books were widely distributed. I do not remember any objections to his thesis among the peace activists. On the contrary, they believed that SD is the real thing to work for. So we have to ask why there wasn't any progress in implementing SD.

### Why the Classic Concept of Social Defense Did Not Succeed

First, SD was something the government, the state officials, the political, economic and military establishment, and the leaders of the main political factions never wanted to succeed. I think it was one of the biggest miscalculations in the classic concept of SD to believe that state bodies would ever be willing to implement a system like CBD. Aren't almost all the states based on violence? Isn't it in the logic of the power of the state to keep the power of defense in its own hands and not give it back to the people? Wouldn't empowering people by their learning the

methods of CBD also mean a challenge to the unjust conditions in the capitalistic societies and therefore mean a threat to the political and economic establishment that support the governments? If you look at the way state officials in Austria rejected the concept of SD, you can easily answer each of those questions with yes. In the official instruction materials that are used in the three-week basic course each civil servant has to make at the beginning of his civil service, the concept of SD is mentioned only briefly and in a negative way. There was a study on SD made by the Austrian Defense Academy, under the guidance of Heinz Vetschera, published in 1990, which concluded that SD in many ways contradicts international laws and is not a concept compatible with Austria's defence and security policy.

Second, I think it was a mistake to believe that SD can be implemented without abolishing the military system. Many of the adherents of SD thought in terms of a so-called mixed concept. It means that SD can be built up parallel to and even in cooperation with military defense. One of the outstanding supporters of this mixed concept was Anton Pelinka, professor of political science at the University of Innsbruck. I think it's not only in Austria that the military is the strongest opponent of SD. There must be a decision: Yes for SD means no to military defense. We can't have both. The same kind of argumentation was published in two articles by Steven Huxley in the August 1992 issue of *Civilian-based Defense*. He wrote about the significant opposition of the military powers and arms producers to a comprehensive general disarmament or demilitarization ("Nonviolence Misconceived? A Critique of Civilian-based Defense"). Steven Huxley supported his thesis by looking at the development of the defense systems in the Baltic countries after 1991. I do not agree with all the points he made in this article, but I will underline his assumption that, at least in the long run, the official promotion of nonviolent struggle is incompatible with the simultaneous continuation of an option for military reaction.

Coming back to the real situation in Austria, I have to say about Gene Sharp's vision of building up a civilian-based

national defense system parallel and even in cooperation with the military system that it just didn't work in my republic. I would be glad if it would work in the Baltics. However, considering the history and the nature of the states, I doubt that the abolition of a national army and of military structures without a worked-out CBD is more utopian than the establishment of a civilian-based defense complementing a military defense system. (See "Responses to Steven Huxley" by Christopher Kruegler and Gene Sharp, October 1992 issue of *Civilian-based Defense*). I do see that there were some official declarations in Lithuania which suggests CBD has a chance there. But did those official statements cope with the real tendencies in the new republics of Eastern Europe? We can see in the newly established Eastern Europe countries that the national military buildup undermines the power of the people, which was in 1989/1990 decisive for the overthrow of the old Communist regimes.

Finally, the efforts for SD made by many groups were not crowned with success because we did not ask the right questions. The supporters of SD just asked the same prime question as the military did: How can we prevent an external invasion? In the Austrian context this meant mainly: What can we do against the potential threat of an aggression by the Warsaw Treaty Organization? So our mental horizon limited the defense discussions to just one potential threat. But was this limitation correct? By it we strengthened the fears inside our society which paralyzed an offensive peace policy on the one hand and strengthened the position of the military on the other. Like the military we were pretending to be able to give security in the midst of the Cold War.

### The Perception of SD after the Cold War

In October 1990 a conference on SD took place in Graz, Austria. This was the first and last major conference on this topic to be held in Austria. Committees in various parts of Austria were involved in the preparation work. Many of us had hoped that this conference would help to stimulate the debate on SD.

Those who had supported SD before



1990 split into two groups. For one group SD was now outdated. Peace activists joined together to form the platform *Österreich ohne Armee* (Austria without an army). The alternative which was proposed by this organization wasn't called SD anymore but *comprehensive peace policy*. It was the same with the successful Swiss initiative *Gruppe für eine Schweiz ohne Armee* (GSoA, Group for a Switzerland without an Army), which had stimulated the Austrian antimilitaristic and pacifistic individuals and groups. It was successful, though not in reaching the final goal of abolishing the army (at the plebiscite in fall 1989 there was only a slight majority of votes against the initiative of GSoA) but in promoting lively and broad public discussions about peace matters for months. One of the leaders of the Swiss initiative and member of the Parliament, Andreas Gross, was a speaker at the conference in Graz. In his speech he criticized SD. He sees an internationally oriented comprehensive peace policy as the alternative to replace military defense systems. Such a peace policy includes, for instance, changing the terms of trade in favor of the poor countries of the South, a sustainable economy policy, or an active foreign policy of supporting international peace initiatives. Andreas Gross uses the term *Weltinnenpolitik*, meaning the home politics of the world.

The same shift in the attitude towards SD can be explored in the program papers and statements of the Green Party of Austria, which is represented in the Austrian Parliament (8 seats out of 156). Representatives of the Greens don't use the term SD any more when they speak about peace alternatives, such as reducing the military budget or strengthening the peace capacities of the United Nations.

The second group, to which I belong, attempted a new definition of SD. In my speech at the conference in fall 1990, I tried to make a new definition of SD as it is also done by people in the German *Bund für Soziale Verteidigung* (BSV-Association for Social Defense, which was founded at a congress in Minden in 1990 and is supported by most of the German peace organizations and peace activists). I would like to mention especially Christine Schweitzer of the BSV who is also on the

board of War Resisters' International and an outstanding proponent for a new definition of SD.

Let me list some of the essential parts of that redefinition by putting three basic questions:

1. When does SD start? I think it is not only a concept for a far-away hour that may never come. It is not only a concept against mainly hypothetical threats. SD has become a concept which deals with the actual problems of today. SD—the prepared struggle with nonviolent means and tactics, with noncooperation and defiance—has to be carried out now. In Austria it is done by people who *defend* themselves against a highway that is built through their valley. It is done by groups opposing the negative impacts of the system of conscription. It is done by those who protect foreign workers and refugees against inhuman laws and everyday racism. This leads to the next question.
2. Who are the people involved in SD? It is not the whole nation or all the country that has to be defended and takes part in the defense as in the ideal concept of CBD. It may be only part of society. There isn't necessarily a conformity with the legal government. If we look at the kinds of actual SD in Austria, we notice that all of it is done in contradiction to state policies. This raises the third question.
3. Who is the aggressor? The importance of SD as a reaction against a hypothetical external aggressor or a coup has faded in the new concept of SD though it is still not denied. But the often quite disparate groups of the social movements and also established organizations, like institutions of the Catholic Church, realize that there are new threats and new aggressors. The social movements, e.g., are united against the policy of the government to close the borders even for asylum seekers or against the policy to get rid of many foreign workers who have worked and lived for many years in Austria. So far, methods of SD have scarcely been used to defend the rights of refugees and foreign workers, but they are discussed by many groups. There have been some cases of SD against the building of highways recently. One of the great moments for social movements was the successful resistance against a projected enormous hydroelectric power plant on the Danube. Groups of the ecology

movement illegally occupied the land just when the first Caterpillars wanted to start to raze the forest. When the police had come to remove the protesters, they resisted nonviolently. Finally, the government had to give in and the project was halted.

**Future Conditions for CBD in Austria**  
Until recently there have been good conditions for the implementation of CBD in Austria. First, it has been a neutral country since the end of World War II. This means by constitutional as well as international law that Austria's defense and security policy must not depend on any military alliance. The Austrian neutrality has always been an important sign for a policy of independence. It has been seen especially by the Austrian people as an independence towards the big Germany on the northern border of Austria. That is why neutrality in its strict classic meaning—i.e., not to be involved militarily in any conflict and not to join military alliances or not to allow other armies to station troops on Austrian territory—can play an essential part in the implementation of CBD as a concept in which defense should be built through a nation's own resources.

Second, Austria has a comparatively small army. Austria's defense budget is one of the lowest in Europe. It amounts to one percent of the GNP—that is, about 1.5 billion US dollars. Because of the geopolitical circumstances Austria can't be defended by military means alone. The leading political parties therefore had decided in the mid-1970s to implement the General National Defense.

Third, there are also other conditions useful for a CBD. Austria is economically self-sufficient in most regards. The farmers produce more food than needed in their own country; there are many hydroelectric power plants which are decentralized and can give a secure supply of renewable energy. The only nuclear power plant which was built has never been opened because people voted against nuclear energy. In many ways—especially compared to the United States—we still have a small-scale economy. Even the smallest town in Austria has its own bakery, its own butcher, etc. Such examples show that there have been prime

conditions for CBD in Austria. (For the ecological and economic aspects for CBD, see the articles by Paul Anders and Brian Martin in the August 1993 issue of *Civilian-based Defense*).

But the prospects for a CBD in Austria are fading as fast as water goes down the Danube. We can find one major reason for that deplorable development. The political and economic establishment is striving to make Austria become a member of the European Community (EC) or more precisely the European Union on the principles of the Maastricht Treaty. There are many economic, political, and military consequences which take away the possibility for CBD if Austria joins the EC. On a political level, the decision making in the most essential questions, like foreign policy, will be taken out of the immediate control of Austrian citizens and put into the mighty hands of the EC commissioners in Brussels. On an economic level, the Common European Market with all its freedom for capital will strengthen the big transnational corporations and ruin a small-scale economy that is based on the needs of the local people. By becoming a member of the EC the dependency of the Austrian economy on big German companies will grow enormously. Most of all, defense and security policy will suffer. If Austria joins the EC, it must automatically join the Western European Union (WEU), which is a military alliance dominated by France and Germany. This means that Austria would have to give up its neutrality.

The present government and the leading political factions are doing everything so that Austria will be accepted by the leaders of the club of the wealthy European nations. There are also preparations by the military establishment to fulfill the needs of fortress Europe. The main actual task of the Austrian army is to guard the border against so-called illegal immigrants. At the same time, it has become more and more difficult for foreign workers and asylum seekers to enter Austria legally. This again is just one of many examples of how the political and economic elites and the media that depends on them are ruining conditions for CBD by the policy of integrating in the fledging Western European Superpower.

I regret that the possibility of imple-

menting CBD in Austria as an alternative national defense policy has diminished rapidly. But I do not want to end pessimistically. There are three reasons why I still can be hopeful. First, polls show that almost half of all Austria's voters are against an EC membership for Austria. There has to be a referendum on this topic in 1994. Second, the majority of the people in Austria stick to the concept of neutrality. It is not yet sure that the government and economic elites will succeed in making the people believe that neutrality is consistent with EC membership. Finally, my hope for an Austria without an army and with a people that is capable of defending its human and social rights is based on the fact that groups and individuals have learned and are willing to struggle for their freedom and the freedom of others. I do see many challenges for SD in Austria. There is an old saying: "Austria is a small world where new ideas are tested for the big world." Maybe this new idea which will be tested in Austria is SD that is totally based on the people and not directed and controlled by state authorities. I dream that Austria will be a place where a conscription-based army is totally abolished. I dream that Austria will become a country that engages in international peace politics and helps to establish international systems of peace.

## INTERNATIONAL LAW AND CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE: QUESTIONS AND OBSERVATIONS

Carol Paulson

*Carol Paulson is on the board of directors of the Civilian-based Defense Association. She wishes to emphasize that this article is based on her interpretation of current conventions, which she researched as a layperson interested in CBD, not as someone with expertise in international law. She hopes the questions raised will encourage dialogue on the subject.*

GUNS EQUAL POWER. DEFENSE

WILL BE VIOLENT. RESISTANCE MUST BE ARMED. It should not surprise supporters of civilian-based defense that these assumptions are deeply embedded in international law, creating major difficulties with the application of existing conventions to a civilian-based defense. Would CBD participants be lawful combatants, civilians, or unlawful belligerents? What about the rights and duties of nonviolent resisters under occupation?

### Lawful Combatant Status

It would be difficult to consider an unarmed civilian defense force "lawful combatants" under any of the present categories as laid out by the Hague and Geneva conventions. *Regular forces* consist of two groups: combatants and noncombatants. Combatants are the regular armed forces of the belligerent states, while noncombatants are medical personnel, chaplains, civilian "followers" (such as war correspondents officially attached to the armed forces), and others who do not participate directly in the hostilities. A civilian defense force would not be classified in either of the regular forces categories, because they are neither "regular army" nor support personnel.

The *irregular forces* category has been expanded several times over the years. The 1907 Hague Convention IV gave irregular forces (volunteer corps and militia) the same rights and duties as regular forces provided four conditions were met: (1) that they be under the direction of a responsible person; (2) that they wear a "fixed emblem" visible from a distance; (3) that they openly carry arms; and (4) that they obey the laws and customs of war. The 1949 Geneva Conventions I, II, and III also included resistance movements in this category. This was an important broadening of the classification of lawful combatant that grew out of the experience of the resistance during World War II and the treatment of captured participants. The 1977 Geneva Protocol I enlarged the category even further by recognizing certain kinds of guerrilla activity as lawful. The major requirement now is that irregular combatants must distinguish themselves from civilians by openly carrying arms while engaged in military



activity if they are within sight of the adversary. This emphasis on openly carrying weapons prevents an unarmed civilian defense force from fitting into the "irregular forces" category in its present form.

Another group accorded lawful combatant status under the Geneva Conventions are private citizens in a *levee en masse*. These are "inhabitants of a non-occupied territory, who on the approach of the enemy spontaneously take up arms to resist the invading forces, without having had time to form themselves into regular armed units, provided they carry arms openly and respect the laws and customs of war."<sup>1</sup> Such an uprising is unlawful in occupied territory, and in any case the Geneva Conventions again recognize only armed resistance.

Although it would be impossible to call participants in nonviolent defense lawful combatants under the present conventions, the classification of *civilians* does not quite apply either. At any rate, this would not necessarily be an advantageous classification. Although the practitioners of CBD would not be involved in armed defense, they would, through active resistance and defiance, most definitely be engaged in "hostilities." While civilians are accorded certain protections as long as they remain part of the "peaceful population," those who participate in hostilities become unlawful belligerents and lose most of their protection under international law.

While none of the categories as defined today is truly applicable, it would probably make most sense to classify a civilian-based defense force with organized resistance groups in the "irregular forces" category. Although the requirement to carry arms openly would have to be modified, the activities of CBD practitioners would best fit with those of the World War II resistance movements (which included nonviolent as well as violent resistance). However,

...there is the question of the effect of the lawful combatancy of organized resistance groups within 'occupied territory.' Article 64 of the Geneva (Civilians) Convention, 1949, enables the occupant to subject the population to 'provisions which are essential to enable

the Occupying Power to fulfill its obligations under the present Convention to maintain the orderly government of the territory and to ensure the security of the Occupying Power, of the members and property of the Occupying forces or administration, and likewise of the establishments and lines of communication used by them.' Organized resistance movements in occupied territory will make it their business to violate such provisions as a daily routine. It looks as if Article 64 will have to work outside the area of lawful combatancy by members of organized resistance movements, but the presence of such movements may render the area in which they operate as such *territory which is not occupied* [emphasis mine].<sup>2</sup>

#### Occupation Law

It is difficult to know the precise moment at which invasion becomes occupation, obligating the inhabitants to obey the laws of belligerent occupation or be subject to extreme penalties. Nevertheless, it appears that the intent of the present conventions is to apply the laws of occupation in any case where military forces enter territory not their own and establish an administration of some type, whether or not they actually have "control" over the population. Even in the case of "illegal occupation" resulting from unlawful acts of aggression, the general view is that the "law of belligerent occupation" applies.<sup>3</sup>

The laws of occupation are clearly advantageous to the occupant and designed more to promote order in the occupied territory than to protect the inhabitants. The common belief is that the power of the occupant rests in the ability "to demand and enforce compliance with his orders."<sup>4</sup> The sovereignty of the legitimate indigenous government ostensibly remains in existence but is suspended during the period of occupation, and the occupant is given the privilege to temporarily govern the territory. Three systems of law then apply: (1) the original law of the state (insofar as it has not been suspended); (2)

the laws of the occupant, including decrees, orders, regulations, and legislation; and (3) international law governing war and occupation.<sup>5</sup>

Much has been written about the people's duty of obedience to the occupant. The traditional view is that this obedience should be given in return for the benefit the occupant provides by maintaining order in the occupied areas and "protecting" the inhabitants. In practice, however, the indigenous population often resists to the point that it threatens the preservation of order as well as the security of the occupant. This behavior has led occupying powers to take severe measures against the civilian population, and, following World War II, such practices as collective reprisals and hostage-taking were outlawed in the 1949 Geneva Convention IV, Articles 33 and 34. (The effectiveness of these prohibitions, however, is another matter. Aggressor nations routinely ignore international law and can be expected to take whatever measures they deem necessary to achieve and maintain control in occupied territories.)

The laws of occupation involve rights as well as duties for both occupant and inhabitant.<sup>6</sup> The occupying power may impose rules necessary to maintain order and insure its security. At the same time it may repeal existing laws that threaten its security. A given area may be evacuated if there is a military necessity, but the occupant may not transfer part of its own civilian population into the occupied territory. It may require an oath of neutrality but not an oath of allegiance (although local officials retained can be made to promise to faithfully serve). The occupant may requisition services as long as they are needed for the occupation army, but such services must not put the laborers in the position of helping with military operations against their own country.

Under occupation law severe restrictions and censorship of the media are lawful, as is censorship of the mails and phone calls. Public meetings may be forbidden, travel restricted, and curfews imposed. The playing of the national anthem or other patriotic music may be prohibited, as may be the display of the flag. Under current conventions, the

occupant may also forbid political discussion as well as any teaching that promotes hostility toward the occupying power or its objective or *provokes passive resistance to the occupant's orders*.

Civilians in occupied areas have a right to protection and respect for their persons, religious practices, customs, and manners. They must be treated humanely and protected against violence and threats of violence. The occupant may not alter the status of judges or public officials, nor may he punish them if they refuse to fulfill their duties for reasons of conscience. (They may, however, be removed from office.)<sup>7</sup>

Despite some protections for civilian persons in occupied territory, the laws governing occupation support the maintenance of public order through the firm establishment of the occupant's administration. Civilians who disrupt that order become "unprivileged," retaining only very limited rights. As Richard Baxter points out, "International law deliberately neglects to protect unprivileged belligerents because of the danger their acts present to their opponent."<sup>8</sup> Even though practitioners of civilian-based defense would not pose a physical threat to the occupying troops, they would most definitely threaten the security of the occupying power by openly refusing to recognize its legitimacy and hindering its ability to establish control over the population.

#### The Need for Recodification

Because of World War II, organized resistance movements of the armed type are now recognized as lawful provided certain conditions are met. Unfortunately, the nonviolent resistance that also took place during that war was largely ignored in the subsequent conventions. The exception is Article 68 of the 1949 Geneva Convention IV, which limits the punishment for an offense against an occupying power which in no way is intended to harm members of the occupying force to simple imprisonment.

Clearly, the current laws could not easily be applied to civilian-based defense. Even though case law can fill the gap to some extent,<sup>9</sup> much recodification is needed, including a broadening of the "irregular forces" category of lawful

combatancy to include unarmed resistance and major revision of the laws of military occupation. There must also be acceptance that there is no "duty to obey" the occupant. This is dangerous ground to enter. The legal recognition of civilian-based defense would acknowledge the right of the *general population* to resist the occupant. However, such major recodification would likely be resisted by the large nations, because they have a vested interest in maintaining the traditional assumption that power rests in superior weaponry.

Nevertheless, as interest in civilian-based defense grows (even if nations only adopt nonviolent resistance as one component of a largely military policy), there will be a need to clarify the rights and duties of participants in such a defense during invasion and occupation. In the long run, however, simple revision and recodification is not all that is required. There must also be a questioning of the faulty assumptions evident in current international law—that war is a rationally ordered process, that conflict can be resolved only one way, and that the one with the guns has the power.

#### Notes

1. 1949 Geneva Convention III, Article 4A (6).
2. G.I.A.D Draper, "The Status of Combatants and the Question of Guerilla Warfare," *The British Yearbook of International Law 1951* (London: Oxford University Press, 1952), p. 193.
3. Adam Roberts, "What is Military Occupation," *The British Yearbook of International Law 1984* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), p. 293-294.
4. Gerhard von Glahn, *The Occupation of Enemy Territory* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957), p. 45.
5. Gerhard von Glahn, *Law Among Nations*, 4th ed. (New York: MacMillan, 1981), p. 672.
6. See the 1949 Geneva Convention IV, Part III, Section III relating to Occupied Territories.
7. von Glahn, *Law Among Nations*, pp. 672-695. See also von Glahn, *The Occupation of Enemy Territory*, pp. 45-79.
8. Richard R. Baxter, "So-called

'Unprivileged Belligerency': Spies Guerrillas, and Saboteurs," *The British Yearbook of International Law 1951* (London: Oxford University Press, 1952), p. 343.

9. Roberts, in correspondence with the author, 23 February 1988.

## ASSOCIATION NEWS

### Report on Meeting of CBDA Board of Directors, Sept. 9-12, 1993 Melvin Beckman

*Melvin Beckman chairs the board of directors of the Civilian-based Defense Association.*

The eleventh annual meeting of the board was held at the office of the Civilian-based Defense Association (CBDA) in Cambridge, Massachusetts. On September 9 and 10, board members met with Gene Sharp, Doug Bond, and Christopher Kruegler. Discussions included clarification of terminology used at the Albert Einstein Institution and the Program on Nonviolent Sanctions in Conflict and Defense and how CBDA has related to these two organizations historically. These sessions, arranged by CBDA board member Carol Paulson and Christopher Kruegler, president of the Albert Einstein Institution, were felt to be very useful.

Directors at the board business meeting were Caridad Inda, Mary Link, Suzanne Pearce, Paul Anders, Melvin Beckman, Carol Paulson, George Crowell, Phillips Moulton, Philip Helms, and John Mecartney. They discussed more emphasis on civilian-based defense (CBD) for Canada. George Crowell will be talking with fellow board members from Canada, and perhaps some additional people, to develop recommendations for board action. Directors suggested numerous other activities for CBDA during 1994. Program priorities include

- Magazine production.
- Revision and distribution of the membership information brochure.



CBDA directors Mary Link, Melvin Beckman, Caridad Inda, and Carol Paulson



Left to right: CBDA directors John Mecartney, Suzanne Pearce, and Philip Helms

- Introduction of CBD-related materials, including the magazine, into university and public libraries.
- Exploration of the possibility of gaining nongovernmental organization (NGO) status for CBDA at the United Nations.

John Mecartney and Paul Anders will seek funding for a project on CBD and the environment. Suzanne Pearce distributed copies of a paper she prepared entitled "Bringing the Concept of CBD into the UN Community."

The date and place of the 1994 board meeting was not determined, but Mary Link and Suzanne Pearce will explore the possibility of a consultation or some other type of gathering for members, representatives of area organizations, and possibly United Nations personnel, to be held in conjunction with the board meeting. If a board meeting in the New York area is not practical, the board will meet in Omaha, Nebraska in 1994.

## Canada

*George Crowell*

*George Crowell teaches social ethics at the University of Windsor, Ontario, Canada.*

CBDA board of directors member Normand Beaudet, coordinator of activities for the Centre de ressources sur la non-violence (420 East St. Paul Street, Montreal, Quebec H2Y 1H4, Canada) participated in a collective effort in Quebec which resulted in the publication of a book of 186 pages—*Pour un pays sans armée*—just published (\$15) by Les Editions Ecosociété, CP 32 052, Succ. Les Atriums, Montreal, Quebec H2L 4Y5, Canada. Because Quebec may soon become an independent nation, the book features an appeal to establish a nation without reliance on a traditional military system. With assistance from Pierre

Bisaillon, Beaudet contributed the second chapter, "La sécurité sans les armées." The book could become an important contribution to the future of Quebec and of Canada, and it is my hope that it may soon be translated into English so that its impact can be increased.

Beaudet informs me that he has written two more books that make the case for civilian-based defense CBD. These books are also being published by Les Editions Ecosociété. The first is *La Défense Canadienne: mythes et*

*réalités* (probably \$15 from Les Editions Ecosociété) and the second, *La sécurité Canadienne: les alternatives*. [Editor's note: when we have more specifics on publication, we will print the information.]

As for me, I have continued to present the concept of CBD in my course "Religion and Violence," which had about 85 students in the fall of 1992, and then developing it more fully in my course "The Dynamics of Nonviolent Action," which had more than 100 students this

past winter.

At my suggestion, the War/Peace/ Revolution/Violence Interest Group of the Society of Christian Ethics, under the leadership of John Yoder, will explore CBD at next January's meeting in Chicago. Members of the group have been asked to prepare for discussion by reading any of several works by Gene Sharp or my Project Ploughshares Working Paper. I will be initiating the discussion with an opening statement.

*indirect gauge of trends affecting the possibility for CBD.*

Over the past three issues I have used this introduction to highlight activities that were not reported in the synopses. I want to continue that tradition by briefly describing here an ongoing project at the Program. In January 1993 a team of Program affiliates launched a study to develop a Protocol for the Assessment of Nonviolent Direct Action (PANDA). The PANDA project represents the culmination of a five year effort aimed ultimately at monitoring and assessing the use and

1988 with the notion of getting at a rough "count" of nonviolent direct action, we have conducted a two year pilot study that was helpful in revealing numerous problems with operationalizing the phenomenon of nonviolent direct action. We then spent the next two years assessing the pilot study procedures and results. We also extended and refined the theoretical framework so that it could better inform and guide our empirical effort. But the technology did not exist to make our goal feasible until the recent availability of low-cost, high-powered desktop computing and telecommunications. In particular,

Philip Schrodt's "KEDS" system (Kansas Event Data System) makes it possible to develop automated protocols for "reading" texts downloaded from news wire services. His generous support and cooperation has facilitated our progress.

The PANDA project members use KEDS as a tool to help process the enormous number of news reports that are generated by news wire services and that are used in our

research. KEDS is based upon the World Interaction Events Survey (WEIS) categories of interaction events originally used for assessment of inter-state conflict and cooperation. Project members refined and extended these categories of interaction events to include the concept of nonviolent direct action, a concept which has yet to become standard currency in social science discourse.

This inclusion of nonviolent direct action represents somewhat of an expansion, but more so a refinement, of the original WEIS categories of interaction events; like the original WEIS categories and KEDS system, we too include violent events. Although our focus is on the assessment of nonviolent direct action, our comparative approach requires an inclusive net that "picks up" the full range of



CBDA directors Mary Link and Phillips Moulton

**Protocol for the Assessment of Nonviolent Direct Action (PANDA)**

*Doug Bond, Program Director, Program on Nonviolent Sanctions in Conflict and Defense*

*At a meeting of CBDA board members and the staffs of the Albert Einstein Institution and Harvard University's Program on Nonviolent Sanctions in Conflict and Defense, Doug Bond explained a research project of the Program, the Protocol for the Assessment of Nonviolent Direct Action (PANDA) and gave CBDA board members a tour of the computer operation. We reprint his description of the project from the Introduction to Nonviolent Sanctions Seminars Synopses, Spring 1993, pages 1 and 2. A more widespread use of nonviolent direct action would enhance appreciation of CBD. The PANDA project may thus provide an*

dynamics of actual cases of nonviolent direct action reported around the world. Since 1988 several Program affiliates have been engaged in the design, development, pilot-testing, and refinement of a theory-driven framework that would help make such an ambitious study possible.

Spring Semester 1993 was thus a period of concerted activity and concrete progress toward a mandate originally articulated at a meeting of some thirty international scholars, convened to assess nonviolent direct action around the world. The meeting was held in October 1988, that is, prior to the "surprising outbreak" of the nonviolent revolutions across Eastern Europe in 1989. The mandate was to empirically assess the scope and intensity of nonviolent direct action throughout the world. Since we began in

interaction events, from direct action (both violent and otherwise) to reciprocal exchanges to litigation, and including electoral and other "regular" political activity.

In May, 1993 we invited six outside scholars to assess our research design and adaptation of the KEDS system in a day-long workshop. Their constructive criticisms enabled us to refine and advance the project. By the end of June we began developing data on a trial basis. We are currently (near summer's end) about 25% complete with the data development for the (1990) base year.

### Other CBDA News

Paul Anders

- CBDA member Franklin Zahn has written a book on nonviolent defense of the United States and is looking for a publisher.
- Gordon Thompson, director of the Institute for Resource and Security Studies, recently gave me a round trip ticket to Washington. While there I talked to a former colleague John Isaacs, president of Council for a Livable World; CBDA member Paul Walker, program director of the House Armed Services Committee; Rebecca McCearry, a program officer at the U.S. Institute of Peace; staff at the Lithuanian Embassy; and a minister at the Ecuadorean Embassy. Among other things, I got some useful suggestions about promoting CBD through nonprofit organizations in Washington and through the U.S. government. For example, there might be a niche for CBD in the Department of Defense's Global Cooperative Initiative and in its Soldiers to Teachers programs.
- Member Liane Norman informs us that "what I do for a living these days is to teach boards of directors how to understand fundraising, plan a campaign, and ask for contributions."
- Our thanks to Klaus Heidegger, Rosalie Anders and Scott Paeth, who have been volunteering for CBDA, and to Cathy Flick, who has been posting material from our magazine on computer nets.
- Board of directors member George Crowell has written "Discussion Paper Concerning the Need for Nonviolent Action against NAFTA." His address:

235 Rossini Blvd., Windsor, Ontario N8Y 2Y9, Canada.

- Member Rosalie Anders has written "Sustainability and What It Has to Do with Peace and Social Justice" (*Peacework*, September 1993, p. 10.)

## LITHUANIAN DEFENSE UPDATE

Paul E. Anders

*The Baltic Observer* (Nov. 5-11) reports that Lithuanian Defense Minister Audrius Butkevicius has resigned. He favors including civilian-based defense (CBD) in Lithuania's defense policy.

The new minister is Linas Linkevicius. According to *The Observer*, the new minister said "he will pursue...further development of Lithuania's security, membership in international security structures, and closer military cooperation between the three Baltic countries."

*The Observer* indicated that Butkevicius would soon go to Great Britain for training, that he left his job without hard feelings, and that he considers the new minister a suitable successor. While at the ministry, Butkevicius did not have an officer rank, deciding instead to pursue a career as a politician.

Butkevicius had attempted to resign in September and again in October, when Prime Minister Aldofas Slezevicius said he would not accept the resignation.

Saulius Peceliunas, member of the Seimas (Lithuanian parliament), said Butkevicius wanted to remain in office only until the pullout of Russian troops from Lithuania was completed, which has now happened. On the pullout, Butkevicius said, "We have been marching towards this day for almost four years since the proclamation of our independence on March 11, 1990." He continued, "To be more exact, we have been marching toward this day for the 54 years since Lithuania was occupied by the Red Army."

It was first reported that the resignation was on a list of demands made by forty insurrecting Lithuanian voluntary militia members who had taken to the woods and that they had also demanded the resigna-

tions of the leader of the Volunteer Forces, Colonel Jonas Gecas, and of the military security chief of the Kaunas district, Virginijus Vilkelio.

Peceliunas, a member of the Seimas committee investigating the militia incident, said, however, that much of the media coverage of the militia's action was incorrect. In particular, the resignations of Butkevicius and Gecas were not on the militiamen's list of demands. The militia were protesting the Seimas's consideration of moving the border guards from the jurisdiction of the defense ministry to the interior ministry, which also administers the police. Among other things, they asked that they be permitted to fight organized crime and that the pay of militiamen equal that of army members.

In their insurrection, the militiamen had 140 automatic weapons with them and built a fortified camp, where they remained for a week. Steve Nakrosis reports in the *Baltic Observer* (Oct. 1-7) that

Before peacefully ending the affair, around 50 insurgent volunteers stormed the territorial defense headquarters of the Kaunas command at approximately 6:30 p.m. September 22.

The volunteers entered the building, broke off telephone and radio communication lines, disarmed and beat up the guards and finally stated that they are taking full command...A major conflict was avoided although both...sides were armed ... Butkevicius ... said the attack on the headquarters was an attempt to settle personal scores...Under the agreement reached by the militiamen and the government, members of the volunteer forces will not face criminal charges. However, they may be liable to minor administrative punishment.

A statement by the militia said, "We are seeking democracy. We want citizens to be able to walk the streets without fear, to conduct business free of protection demands and fear of bombings." The Seimas organized a committee to investigate the insurrection. Peceliunas said that

all the political parties in the Seimas signed a statement opposing the volunteers' methods. On the other hand, the elite Iron Wolf division of the Lithuanian army sent a congratulatory telegram to the militia.

There is still interest in alternatives to the military in Lithuania. Rimantas Stankevicius, advisor to Lithuania's National Security Committee, points out that

Since the functioning of a national security system depends not only on the efforts of state structures but on society's potential as well, it would be worthy to recall here the idea expressed by a popular Lithuanian parson, Father Stanislovas, on the day when Pope John Paul II arrived in Lithuania. Interviewed by the daily 'Lietuvos Rytas' on the issue of national security, he said: "as a theologian I think that a state should be guarded by loving people rather than by tanks and machine-guns. Such people are the defense bunkers and defense weapons of a state. A state is destined to collapse without loving people.

With the departure of Butkevicius, it is encouraging to note the sentiments of Stankevicius and Father Stanislovas as we ponder the future of CBD in Lithuania. It is unclear how Lithuanian interest in NATO will affect the fortunes of CBD. The country's nine largest political parties on October 15 issued a declaration to Lithuanian President Brazauskas that "the new political situation in Lithuania formed after the withdrawal of foreign troops demands a distinct position of the political powers on strategical issues of Lithuanian policy, based on agreement and natural trust. We consider that Lithuania is not secure, not being integrated into a collective security system, and we are sure that it is necessary for Lithuania to express its desire to join NATO at top level." The nine parties have an absolute majority of votes in the Seimas.

In mid-November, however, it appears that Russian objections to Eastern European countries participating in NATO preclude its happening at least for now.

U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher is instead pushing a U.S. proposal for a "Partnership for Peace" that would offer only limited cooperation in NATO to all who wanted it, including Russia, presumably the main external object of Lithuanian fears. The main security threat to Lithuania, however, may be elements in its own armed forces, e.g., the insurrecting militia.

*Sources:* On insurrection: *Baltic Observer*, Sept. 24-30 and Oct. 1-7, 1993; statements by Stankevicius and Stanislovas: *Lithuanian Weekly*, Oct. 29-Nov. 4, 1993; statement by Butkevicius: *Boston Globe*, Sept. 1, 1993; on Partnership for Peace: Craig R. Whitney, "Worried Anew, Europe Asks How Best to Keep the Peace," *N.Y. Times*, Oct. 31, 1993.

## AROUND THE WORLD

Paul E. Anders

- **France.** The publication of a French translation of *Civilian-based Defense: A Post-Military Weapons System* (by Gene Sharp with the assistance of Bruce Jenkins) is planned by Collectif Dissuasion Civile, BP 1723, F73017 Chambéry cedex, France.
- **Panama.** Howard W. French reported in *The New York Times* (July 23, 1993) that "After the arrest of the military dictator, Manuel Noriega, in 1990...the Panamanian Army was disbanded, replaced by a much smaller civilian police force."
- **Cambridge, Massachusetts.** Doug Bond, program director of Harvard University's Program in Nonviolent Sanctions in Conflict and Defense, writes in the introduction to the program's *Nonviolent Sanctions Seminar Synopses* (spring 1993, page 3) that  
In March, the Program sponsored an afternoon discussion with Professor Adam Roberts of Oxford University, with a response by

Gene Sharp, Founder of the Program, Senior Scholar-in-Residence at the Albert Einstein Institution, and Center Associate. Roberts addressed the question, "Have Nonviolent Sanctions Reached a Dead End?" He shared with Program affiliates his thoughts on why nonviolent direct action and civilian-based defense have received so little attention in the international relations community of scholars.

Both Roberts and Sharp agreed that changing the way people think about the world is a slow and arduous endeavor. Roberts remarked that he is constantly struck that societies react very quickly to a disaster like Vietnam but are far more reluctant to be influenced by good news or anything successful. This, in Roberts view, is part of the problem in generating policy support for nonviolent struggle.

Perhaps the current lack of major public attention, thought, and policy development on nonviolent struggle is no different from the past. But no longer can the world deny the possibility of entire populations overturning repressive regimes backed by powerful military forces.

## RECENTLY RECEIVED

Compiled by Klaus Heidegger and Paul E. Anders

- Awad, Mubarak. "U.N. Human Rights Conference Leaves Individuals in the Hands of Governments." *Frontline*, summer 1993, p.7. The author explains on the basis of his experiences as a participant at the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna in June, 1993, why we should move the focus of human rights from the state to the individual.
- Committee for the Abolition of the Army. *Manifesto for the Abolition of the Army: For a Different View of Security*. Translated from the French by Traducteurs Sans Frontières. Victoria, British Columbia: Conscience Canada Inc., 1992, pp. 21. "Published in French by the francophone peace tax group in the Spring of 1991...It was originally addressed to Quebecers"



(from Edith Anderson's Introduction). \$2.00.

- de Wandelaer, Jean. "Amérique Latine: Démilitarisation." *Non-violence Actualité*, no. 173 (October 1993), p. 23. A report on the SERPAJ meeting in July in Brazil.
- Rudmin, Floyd. "Bordering on Aggression." *Peace Magazine*, vol. 9, no. 2 (March/April 1993), pp. 20-22. Article based on book of same title (see next item).
- Rudmin, Floyd. *Bordering on Aggression: Evidence of US Military Preparations against Canada*. Hull, Quebec: Voyageur Publishing, 1993. References, index, 192 pages, \$14.95. Has a brief discussion of civilian-based defense.
- Sinn, Hans. "Next: U.N. Reform?" *Peace Magazine*, vol. 9, no. 1 (Jan./Feb. 1993), pp. 18-22. The article was introduced by the statement that "The U.N. needs a fresh mandate. Canadians can start by reviewing our role in Peacekeeping. How about a real "Peace Corps" and 'Green Troops' to handle the global environment?" The article has a brief section about civilian-based defense. The author "is a founding member of Peace Brigades International and a member of the New Democratic Party [Canada] Task Force on United Nations Reform."
- Stanley Foundation. *The UN Role in Intervention: Where Do We Go from Here?* Report of the Twenty-Eight United Nations of the Next Decade Conference, pp. 32. The speeches in this publication ask how the United Nations can and should intervene in national or transnational conflicts. They generally agree that intervention should be in a far broader context than military action.

**Publishers' Addresses**

- Conscience Canada Inc., P.O. Box 86-01, Victoria Central PO, Victoria, BC V8W3S2, Canada
- *Frontline*, Nonviolence International, PO Box 39127, Friendship Station, NW, Washington, DC 20016, USA. Telephone: 202-244-0951. FAX: 202-244-6396. E-mail: nonviolence@igc.org
- *Non-violence Actualité*, 20, rue de Devidet, 45200 Montargis, France. Telephone: 38 93 67 22 FAX: 38 93 74 72
- Peace Magazine, 736 Bathurst St., Toronto, Ontario M5S 2R4, Canada. Telephone: 416-533-7581. FAX 416-531-6214
- Stanley Foundation, 16 Sycamore Street, Suite 500, Muscatine, Iowa 52761-3831 USA. Telephone: 319-264-1500. FAX: 319-264-0864.
- Voyageur Publishing, 82 Frontenac St., Hull, Quebec J8X 1Z5. Telephone: 816-778-2946

## BOOKS FOR SALE ON CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE

John Mecartney

What can be done to spread the great idea of civilian-based defense (CBD)? Because war may not end until people see an alternative defense system, it is very urgent that our idea spread. At a recent meeting with the Civilian-based Defense Association (CBDA) board, Gene Sharp suggested our members read more about CBD, get books about CBD into libraries, organize discussion groups in homes, etc., and that we review books on CBD in this magazine. Where can we secure books? John Mecartney, who has sold books on CBD for over ten years, will sell them to you. The retail price to be charged will mean that CBDA will make the profit.

THE BOOKS LISTED BELOW ARE FOR SALE. Make a check out to NANDI or Nonviolent Action for National Defense Institute and send it to NANDI, PO Box 19900, Detroit, MI 48219-0900. NANDI, which promotes CBD, will remit profits to CBDA. All books are paperbacks except Sharp's *Civilian-based Defense: a Post-Military Weapons System*.

- Olgerts Eglitis. *Nonviolent Action in the Liberation of Latvia*, 1993, 72 pp. How Latvians used nonviolent action (1987-1991) to gain independence. \$4.00.
- Harvard University's Program on Nonviolent Sanctions in Conflict and Defense. *Transforming Struggle*, 1992, 141 large pages. Mostly one-page reports on nine years of the program's Wednesday seminars at Harvard. Includes Gene Sharp, Christopher Kruegler,

Mubarak Awad and many others who make a real contribution to nonviolent theory and practice. A valuable resource. \$10.00.

- Gene Sharp, with the assistance of Bruce Jenkins. *Civilian-based Defense: a Post-military Weapons System*, 1990, 166 pp. Hardcover only. Updated material, good summary of previous works, plus lots of new information and strategies. \$20.00.
- Gene Sharp. "Making the Abolition of War a Realistic Goal," 16 pp. pamphlet, 1980. The best short introduction to CBD, though in light of the strength of the former Soviet Union. (I have sold 5000 of these.) \$2.00.
- Gene Sharp. *National Security through Civilian-based Defense*, 55 pp., \$4.95. 1970, revised 1985. A general overview with 46 pages of research topics. \$4.95.
- Gene Sharp. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*, 1973. A revision and expansion of Sharp's Oxford doctoral dissertation. Best seller of Sharp's books. Its 3 parts are available separately:

Part 1: *Power and Struggle*, 105 pp. Examines the nature and control of political power and gives past instances of nonviolent action. \$3.95.

Part 2: *The Methods of Nonviolent Action*, 349 pp. How political jiu-jitsu works, communications, methods of nonviolent actions, plus several hundred fascinating examples. \$4.95.

Part 3. *The Dynamics of Nonviolent Action*, 450 pp. How to lay the groundwork, what to do when repression occurs, ways to succeed, and how power can be redistributed. \$5.95.

- Gene Sharp with the assistance of Bruce Jenkins. *Self-reliant Defense without Bankruptcy or War*, 1992, 73 pp. An updated statement in light of changes in Eastern Europe, the Baltics, and the former Soviet Union, along with strategies. \$4.00.

Order Form			
Quantity	Title	Unit price	Total
Subtotal			
\$1.00 for each copy postage and handling			
Total			
Name _____			
Address _____			
City _____		State _____	Postal Zone _____ Country _____
Mail to NANDI, PO Box 19900, Detroit, MI 48219-0900, USA			

## EVENTS

• **Peacemaker Congress '93-94: Christian Alternatives to a Culture of Violence**, December 30, 1993-January 2, 1994. International Conf. Center, Chicago, Illinois, USA. Organized by Christian Peacemaker Teams (a program of the Mennonite Church, the General Conference Mennonite Church, and the Church of the Brethren) and by New Call

to Peacemaking (a cooperative program of Brethren, Friends, and Mennonites). Information: CPT/New Call to Peacemaking, 1821 W. Cullerton, Chicago, Illinois 60606, USA; phone: 312-455-1199; FAX: 312-421-5762.

• **Nonviolent Alternatives** announces three programs for 1994:  
 1. The Wholistic Alternative: Gandhian Nonviolence in Theory and Practice, four weeks in India (January & June)

2. Learning Harmony with the Lakota: Unlearning the Dis-Harmony of Racism, three weeks in Lakota communities (June).  
 3. Alternatives to Violence: the Gandhian Experiment, six weeks in India (July-August).  
 Contact Nonviolent Alternatives, 825 4th St., Brookings, South Dakota 57006, USA . Phone: 605-692-8465.

## EDITOR'S NOTES

Paul Anders

- With this issue we officially begin quarterly publication. We have not been able to maintain our six-per-year schedule for some time. We have, however, made the issues larger and have included many substantive articles.
- Special thanks to those who helped with this issue: Klaus Heidegger, Rosalie Anders, Suzanne Pearce, our writers and regular editors, and Caridad Inda, who provided the photographs of the members of the board of directors of the Civilian-based Defense Association that appear in this issue.
- Computer-savvy CBDA member Cathy Flick of Richmond, Indiana, USA, has begun posting material from our magazine on Bitnet and Usenet. Tell your friends with modems.
- Please give us your reaction to our articles. We want to publish your letters.

## Subscription, Membership, Contribution

Civilian-based Defense Association  
 154 Auburn St., Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02139-3969, USA

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Postal Zone \_\_\_\_\_ Nation \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone \_\_\_\_\_ Occupation (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

- I want to BEGIN \_\_\_\_\_ RENEW \_\_\_\_\_ MEMBERSHIP (magazine included).
- \$25 Basic     \$5 Low income
- \$50 Supporting     \$100 Sustaining     \$500 Lifetime
- I want to CONTRIBUTE \$ \_\_\_\_\_ to further the association's work.
- I do not want to be a member but wish to SUBSCRIBE to the magazine.
- \$15 One year     \$25 Two years     \$30 Three years
- Please send an acknowledgement     I do not need an acknowledgement.

**Civilian-based Defense Assn.**  
 154 Auburn Street  
 Cambridge, MA 02139-3969  
 USA

**NONPROFIT ORG.**  
**U.S. POSTAGE**  
**PAID**  
**CAMBRIDGE, MA**  
**PERMIT NO. 58721**

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

Printed on recycled paper

CHECK MAIL LABEL.  
 Top line of label tells when membership or subscription is/was renewable.

