

COPY

DP

**AUSTRALIAN RESEARCH COUNCIL
DISCOVERY PROJECTS
APPLICATION FORM FOR FUNDING COMMENCING IN 2006**

PROJECT ID: DP0664325

Total number of sheets contained in this application	28
--	----

Information on this form is collected in order to make recommendations to the Minister on the allocation of financial assistance under the Australian Research Council Act 2001 and for post award reporting. The information collected may be passed to assessors for the purposes of obtaining a peer review assessment of the application. It may also be passed to the National Health and Medical Research Council, the National Occupational Health and Safety Commission, the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources, the Department of the Environment and Heritage, the Department of Education, Science and Training, the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and the Department of Veterans' Affairs for the purpose of checking eligibility. In other instances, information on this form can be disclosed without your consent where authorised or required by law.

PART A—ADMINISTRATIVE SUMMARY

A1 ORGANISATION TO ADMINISTER GRANT

University of Wollongong

A2 PROJECT TITLE

Tactics of social transformation

A3 PARTICIPANT SUMMARY

Chief Investigators (CI), Partner Investigators (PI) and ARC Fellows (APD, ARF/QEII or APF). Participant details are provided in Part B.

Person number	Family name	Initials	Organisation	Role	ECR
1	Martin	B	University of Wollongong	CI	

A4 REQUESTED SUPPORT

A4.1 Component(s) sought

Tick each relevant box.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Research Grant (personnel and project costs other than Fellowship salaries)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Australian Postdoctoral Fellowship (APD)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Australian Research Fellowship/Queen Elizabeth II Fellowship (ARF/QEII)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Australian Professorial Fellowship (APF)

Number sought

0
0
0

A4.2 Years for which support is being sought

Year 1 X Year 2 X Year 3 X Year 4 Year 5

A5 SUMMARY DESCRIPTIONS

A5.1 Summary of Project

A plain language summary of the aims, significance and expected outcomes (approx. 100 words).

In struggles over policies and practices, in politics and personal life, proponents and opponents of change use a variety of tactics. A general model of tactics for and against social transformation will be developed by examining a set of diverse case studies in the areas of police beatings, defamation, sensory deprivation, genocide, alternative cancer therapies and bullying at work.

A5.2 Summary of National/Community Benefit (For Publicity Purposes)

A plain language summary of the national/community benefits expected to arise from this research (approx. 100 words).

Society benefits when reforms are introduced that prevent or challenge injustice. This can be achieved more reliably when change agents understand tactics used to foster or oppose change. The aim of this research is to develop a theory of tactics for institutionalising change in response to perceived injustice.

A6 CLASSIFICATIONS AND OTHER STATISTICAL INFORMATION

A6.1 National Research Priorities

National Research Priority	Priority Goal(s)
None-Selected.	

A6.2 Keywords

injustice	nonviolent action
social action	strategy
social change	activism

A6.3 Research classifications (listed from highest % to lowest %)

Research Fields, Courses and Disciplines (RFCD)	%
369999	50
370107	50

Socio-Economic Objective (SEO)	%
750699	100

A6.4 Country/ies of international collaboration

UK	USA	

A7 ADDITIONAL DETAILS

A7.1 Have you submitted a similar application to any other agency? Yes No **X**

A8 RESEARCH STUDENTS

The ARC is interested in reporting the number of Research Students that would be involved in this project if it is funded

Number of Research Student Places (FTE) -

PhD

Masters

Honours

A9 CERTIFICATION

The administering organisation must obtain the required signature(s) before submitting this application to the ARC.

Certification by the Deputy/Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) or their delegate or equivalent in the administering organisation

I certify that—

- I have obtained the written agreement of all participants to submit this application.
- The Head of Department has approved this application.
- This organisation supports this application and if successful will provide basic infrastructure and the items listed in the budget for the project.
- I have obtained the written agreement of other organisations involved in this application to provide the agreed support.
- Approval of the Partner Investigator's participation to the extent indicated has been received from her/his employer.
- I am prepared to have the project carried out in my organisation under the circumstances set out by the applicant(s).
- The amount of time that the investigator/s will be devoting to the project is appropriate to existing workloads.
- The project can be accommodated within the general facilities in this organisation, and sufficient working and office space is available for any proposed additional staff.
- All funds for this project will only be spent for the purpose for which they were provided.
- The project will not be permitted to proceed until appropriate ethical clearance has been obtained.
- I will notify the ARC if there are changes to named personnel after the submission of this application.
- I consent, on behalf of the participants, to this application being referred for peer review to persons who will remain anonymous.
- To the best of my knowledge, the Privacy Notice appearing at the top of this Application Form has been drawn to the attention of all the participants whose personal details have been provided at Part B.
- To the best of my knowledge all details on this application form are true and complete and that no information specifically relating to applicant track or publication records is false or misleading.
- I understand that it is an offence under the *Criminal Code Act 1995* to provide false or misleading information.

**Signature of DVC/PVC(R) or
delegate or equivalent (in black ink)**

Name and Title (please print)

Date

Sharon Hughes

SHARON HUGHES
MANAGER, RESEARCH SERVICES OFFICE

01/03/05

PART B—PERSONNEL

B1 Person number

1

B2 ABBREVIATED DETAILS

GAMS ID	G50703
---------	--------

Family name	Martin	Role	CI
First name	Brian	Second name	
Title	A/Prof		
Department/school/other	Science, Technology & Society		
Organisation	University of Wollongong		

B3 POSTAL ADDRESS

Department/school/other	Science, Technology & Society			
Organisation	University of Wollongong			
Postal address line 1	Northfields Avenue			
Postal address line 2				
Locality	Wollongong	State	NSW	Postcode 2522 Country Australia

B4 MEMBERSHIPS/ASSOCIATIONS

B4.1 Are you a current member of the ARC or its advisory committees? Yes No **X**

B4.2 Are any of your relatives or close social/professional associates members of the ARC or its advisory committees? Yes No **X**

If Yes, name of the ARC member(s)

B4.3 a) Are you associated with a Commonwealth Government-funded research Centre? Yes No **X**

b) Are you applying for a Fellowship, which would be held within a Centre? Yes No **X**

B5 DO YOU HOLD A CURRENT ARC RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP?

(eg APD, ARF/QEII, SRF, APF, FF)

Yes No **X**

B6 AFFILIATIONS

If you are applying as a Chief Investigator, are you currently drawing salary from a non-higher education sector organisation that is primarily funded for research from Commonwealth or State Government sources?

Yes No **X**

B7 QUALIFICATIONS

B7.1 PhD qualification awarded

Discipline/Field	Physics		
Organisation	The University of Sydney		
Country	Australia		
Month and Year awarded	08/1976	(or) Date Thesis Submitted/ Proposed Submission Date	

B7.2 Other qualifications (including highest Qualification if not PhD)

Degree/Award	Year	Discipline/Field	Organisation and country
BA	1969	Physics	Rice University, USA

B8 ACADEMIC, RESEARCH, PROFESSIONAL AND INDUSTRIAL EXPERIENCE

Current and previous appointment(s)/position(s) - covering a maximum of the past 10 years

Position held	Organisation	Department	Year appointed and status
A/prof	University of Wollongong	Science, Technology & Society	1986, Continuing

B9 ADDITIONAL FELLOWSHIP DETAILS (not applicable)

B10 RESEARCH RECORD RELATIVE TO OPPORTUNITIES

B10.1 Most significant contributions to research field

In the study of nonviolent action, I have made several pioneering contributions:

- articulation of the grassroots orientation to social defence (community nonviolent resistance to aggression) (e.g., Martin 1993);
- critique of Gene Sharp's theory of power (Martin 1989);
- analysis of nonviolent action in and against bureaucracy (Martin et al. 1997).
- analysis of the the role of science and technology in nonviolent struggle (Martin 2001a);
- formulation of nonviolent strategy against capitalism (Martin 2001b);
- analysis of the role of communication in nonviolent struggle (Martin and Varney 2003).

In the field of what can be called information issues, I have developed a broad critique built around the idea of corruptions of information power, covering mass media, intellectual property, surveillance, defamation, celebrities and other issues (Martin 1998). This work goes beyond previous critiques especially in developing strategies for action.

In the field of free speech, I have promoted the concept of suppression of dissent as a conceptual tool to analyse the exercise of power against dissidents including whistleblowers and paradigm breakers. Again, I pay special attention to strategies for action (e.g., Martin 1999a, 1999b).

In science and technology studies, I have analysed power in science, especially in scientific controversies (e.g. Martin 1979, 1991); my general approach is widely recognised in the field.

Overall, my most important contribution has been developing conceptual tools that are linked to grassroots strategies to challenge various forms of domination, all of which are relevant to the proposed project.

Brian Martin. 1979. *The Bias of Science* (Canberra: Society for Social Responsibility in Science).

Brian Martin. 1989. "Gene Sharp's theory of power," *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 213-222.

Brian Martin. 1991. *Scientific Knowledge in Controversy: The Social Dynamics of the Fluoridation Debate* (Albany: State University of New York Press).

Brian Martin. 1993. *Social Defence, Social Change* (London: Freedom Press).

Brian Martin, Sharon Callaghan and Chris Fox. 1997. *Challenging Bureaucratic Elites* (Wollongong: Schweik Action Wollongong).

Brian Martin. 1998. *Information Liberation* (London: Freedom Press).

Brian Martin. 1999a. *The Whistleblower's Handbook: How to Be an Effective Resister* (Charlbury, UK: Jon Carpenter).

Brian Martin. 1999b. "Suppression of dissent in science," *Research in Social Problems and Public Policy*, Vol. 7, pp. 105-135.

Brian Martin. 2001a. *Technology for Nonviolent Struggle* (London: War Resisters' International).

Brian Martin. 2001b. *Nonviolence versus Capitalism* (London: War Resisters' International).

Brian Martin and Wendy Varney. 2003 *Nonviolence Speaks: Communicating Against Repression* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press).

B10.2 Refereed publications, 2000-

The full text of most of these publications is available at
<http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/>.

Books

- * Brian Martin and Wendy Varney. *Nonviolence Speaks: Communicating Against Repression* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2003).
- * Brian Martin. *Technology for Nonviolent Struggle* (London: War Resisters' International, 2001).
- * Brian Martin. *Nonviolence versus Capitalism* (London: War Resisters' International, 2001).

Book chapters

Brian Martin. Strategies for alternative science. In: Scott Frickel and Kelly Moore (eds.), *The New Political Sociology of Science: Institutions, Networks, and Power* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005, in press [accepted 24 November 2004]).

Brian Martin. Agricultural antibiotics: features of a controversy. In Jo Handelsman and Daniel Kleinman (eds.), *Yearbook of Science and Technology in Society* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, in press [accepted 22 July 2004]).

* Brian Martin. The Richardson dismissal as an academic boomerang. In: Kenneth Westhues (ed.), *Workplace Mobbing in Academe* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004), pp. 317-330.

Brian Martin. Defending without the military. In: Geoff Harris (ed.), *Achieving Security in Sub-Saharan Africa: Cost Effective Alternatives to the Military* (Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, 2004), pp. 43-55.

Brian Martin. Australia: Whistleblowers Australia. In: Richard Calland and Guy Dehn (eds.), *Whistleblowing around the World: Law, Culture & Practice* (Cape Town/London: Open Democracy Advice Centre and Public Concern at Work, 2004), pp. 194-198.

Articles in refereed journals

— — — * Brian Martin. The beating of Rodney-King: the dynamics of backfire. *Critical Criminology*, 2005, in press [accepted 30 January 2005].

* Brian Martin. Boomerangs of academic freedom. *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor*, 2005, in press [accepted 27 February 2004].

Noriko Dethlefs and Brian Martin. Japanese technology policy for aged care. *Science and Public Policy*, 2005, in press [accepted 21 December 2004].

* Brian Martin. Researching nonviolent action: past themes and future possibilities. *Peace & Change*, Vol. 30, No. 2, April 2005, pp. 247-270, in press [accepted 28 November 2004].

Brian Martin. The politics of a scientific meeting: the origin-of-AIDS debate at the Royal Society. *Politics and the Life Sciences*, Vol. 20, No. 2, September 2001, pp. 109-120 [accepted 24 November 2001; actual publication date 2005, in press].

Juan Miguel Campanario and Brian Martin. Challenging dominant physics paradigms. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, Vol. 18, No. 3, Fall 2004, pp. 421-438.

* Sue Curry Jansen and Brian Martin. Exposing and opposing censorship: backfire dynamics in freedom-of-speech struggles. *Pacific Journalism Review*, Vol. 10, No. 1, April 2004, pp. 29-45.

* Brian Martin with Will Rifkin. The dynamics of employee dissent: whistleblowers and organizational jiu-jitsu. *Public Organization Review*, Vol. 4, 2004, pp. 221-238.

Brian Martin and Brian Yecies. Disney through the Web looking glass. *First Monday*, Vol. 9, Issue 6, June 2004, http://firstmonday.org/issues/issue9_6/martin/.

Brian Martin. Dissent and heresy in medicine: models, methods and strategies. *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol. 58, 2004, pp. 713-725.

* Schweik Action Wollongong [Brian Martin, Sharon Callaghan and Yasmin Rittau, with Chris Fox]. Nonviolence insights. *Social Alternatives*, Vol. 23, No. 2, Second Quarter 2004, pp. 70-76.

* Brian Martin. Iraq attack backfire. *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 39, No. 16, 17-23 April 2004, pp. 1577-1583.

* Brian Martin. Illusions of whistleblower protection. *UTS Law Review*, No. 5, 2003 [published mid 2004], pp. 119-130.

Lyn Carson and Brian Martin. Social institutions in East Timor: following in the undemocratic footsteps of the West. *Portuguese Studies Review*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 2003, pp. 123-136.

Brian Martin. Investigating the origin of AIDS: some ethical dimensions. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, Vol. 29, No. 4, August 2003, pp. 253-256.

* Sue Curry Jansen and Brian Martin. Making censorship backfire. *Counterpoise*, Vol. 7, No. 3, July 2003, pp. 5-15.

* Brian Martin and Steve Wright. Countershock: mobilizing resistance to electroshock weapons. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival*, Vol. 19, No. 3, July-September 2003, pp. 205-222.

* Brian Martin and Wendy Varney. Nonviolence and communication. *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 40, No. 2, March 2003, pp. 213-232.

Hellen Megens and Brian Martin. Cybermethods: an assessment. *First Monday: Peer-Reviewed Journal on the Internet*, Vol. 8, No. 2, February 2003, http://firstmonday.org/issues/issue8_2/megens/index.html

* Brian Martin. Dilemmas of defending dissent: the dismissal of Ted Steele from the University of Wollongong. *Australian Universities' Review*, Vol. 45, No. 2, 2002, pp. 7-17.

* Brian Martin. The difficulty with alternatives. *Social Alternatives*, Vol. 21, No. 3, Winter 2002, pp. 6-10.

Edward Woodhouse, David Hess, Steve Breyman and Brian Martin. Science studies and activism: possibilities and problems for reconstructivist agendas. *Social Studies of Science*, Vol. 32, No. 2, April 2002, pp. 297-319.

Lyn Carson and Brian Martin. Random selection of citizens for technological decision making. *Science and Public Policy*, Vol. 29, No. 2, April 2002, pp. 105-113.

* Brian Martin. Nonviolence versus terrorism. *Social Alternatives*, Vol. 21, No. 2, Autumn 2002, pp. 6-9.

* Brian Martin. Nonviolent futures. *Futures*, Vol. 33, 2001, pp. 625-635.

Brian Martin. Activists and "difficult people." *Social Anarchism*, Number 30, 2001, pp. 27-47.

Brian Martin. The burden of proof and the origin of acquired immune deficiency syndrome. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Series B*, Vol. 356, 2001, pp. 939-944.

* Brian Martin, Wendy Varney and Adrian Vickers. Political jiu-jitsu against Indonesian repression: studying lower-profile nonviolent resistance. *Pacifica Review*, Vol. 13, No. 2, June 2001, pp. 143-156.

Brian Martin. A passion for planning. *Social Alternatives*, Vol. 20, No. 2, May 2001, pp. 27-29.

Brian Martin. Behind the scenes of scientific debating. *Social Epistemology*, Vol. 14, Nos. 2/3, 2000, pp. 201-209.

Brian Martin. Research grants: problems and options. *Australian Universities' Review*, Vol. 43, No. 2, 2000, pp. 17-22.

Brian Martin. Design flaws of the Olympics. *Social Alternatives*, Vol. 19, No. 2, April 2000, pp. 19-23.

* Brian Martin. Defamation havens. *First Monday: Peer-Reviewed Journal on the Internet*, Vol. 5, No. 3, March 2000, http://firstmonday.org/issues/issue5_3/martin/index.html

* Wendy Varney and Brian Martin. Lessons from the 1991 Soviet coup. *Peace Research*, Vol. 32, No. 1, February 2000, pp. 52-68.

* Wendy Varney and Brian Martin. Net resistance, Net benefits: opposing MAI. *Social Alternatives*, Vol. 19, No. 1, January 2000, pp. 47-51.

B10.3 Ten career-best publications

Brian Martin and Wendy Varney. *Nonviolence Speaks: Communicating Against Repression* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2003), 230 pages.

Brian Martin. *Nonviolence versus Capitalism* (London: War Resisters' International, 2001), 187 pages.

Brian Martin. *Technology for Nonviolent Struggle* (London: War Resisters' International, 2001), 160 pages.

Brian Martin. *The Whistleblower's Handbook: How to Be an Effective Resister* (Charlbury, UK: Jon Carpenter, 1999), 159 pages.

Lyn Carson and Brian Martin. *Random Selection in Politics* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1999), 161 pages.

Brian Martin. *Information Liberation* (London: Freedom Press, 1998), 189 pages.

Brian Martin. *Social Defence, Social Change* (London: Freedom Press, 1993), 157 pages.

Brian Martin. *Scientific Knowledge in Controversy: The Social Dynamics of the Fluoridation Debate* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), 266 pages.

Brian Martin. *Uprooting War* (London: Freedom Press, 1984), 300 pages. Also published in Italian.

Brian Martin. *The Bias of Science* (Canberra: Society for Social Responsibility in Science, 1979), 100 pages.

B10.4 Other evidence of impact and contributions to the field

International recognition of my work is indicated by translation of my publications into many languages (Japanese, Korean, Chinese, Indonesian, Bengali, Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, German, Croatian, Romanian, Norwegian, Swedish, Finnish, Russian) and by speaking tours arranged for me in Italy (1991), Netherlands (1993) and Japan (1998), with talks and workshops for both researchers and activists. In 2002 I gave the keynote address on both days of a symposium on nonviolence research held at the University of Tromsø, Norway.

In addition to the publications listed above, in the past five years I have also authored significant articles in the nonrefereed journals *Civilian-Based Defense*, *Philosophy and Social Action* and *Interaction*.

I have extensive practical experience in social action groups, especially Canberra Peacemakers and, since 1986, Schweik Action Wollongong, including leadership in community research projects such as, in 2003, "Defending Muslims in Wollongong." In Whistleblowers Australia I was national president for four years (1996-1999) and am currently international director. My website on suppression of dissent (www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/dissent/) is widely recognised as a valuable source of information. I have given personal advice to many hundreds of dissidents over the years, experience that contributes to my research in the area.

Journalists, including many from outside Australia, contact me about two dozen times per year for interviews or background information.

I frequently receive unsolicited letters from people previously unknown to me expressing thanks for my work. Some extracts:

- A US graduate student: "I wanted to tell you that I admire your work very much."
- A young activist: "I just wanted to send my gratitude for your many works on the subject of nonviolence and express the excitement a student has when finding others who have the same views and the great amount of dedication it takes to write about these views."
- An Australian undergraduate student: "After reading your article I felt impressed to write and to say thank you for your work. I have found it to be of great use."

B10.5 Any aspects of your career or opportunities that are relevant to assessment and that have not been detailed elsewhere in this application.

Not applicable.

PART C—PROJECT COST

Costs should be quoted exclusive of the GST.

C1 BUDGET DETAILS

C1.1 YEAR

1

COSTING				
Column 1	2	3	4	5
Source of funds	ARC	University	Other	Total
DIRECT COSTS				
Personnel (Salaries + On-costs)				
CI Martin @ 0.3 FTE + 30.36% on-costs	0	36226	0	36226
Research Assistance (casual) 4 days/weeks @ rate 5 + 17.21% on costs (1560 hours @ \$31)	48360	0	0	48360
Total Personnel (a)	48360	36226	0	84586
Teaching Relief				
Total Teaching Relief (b)	0	0	0	0
Equipment				
Total Equipment (c)	0	0	0	0
Maintenance				
Specialist books, etc	1000	0	0	1000
Total Maintenance (d)	1000	0	0	1000
Travel				
Airfare UK-Aus rtn (economy)	2200	0	0	2200
Accommodation 2 weeks @ \$250 per week	500	0	0	500
Incidentals (transfers, transport, etc)	500	0	0	500
Total Travel (e)	3200	0	0	3200
Other				
Recruitment costs for RAs	500	0	0	500
Total Other (f)	500	0	0	500
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (g)	53060	36226	0	89286
INDIRECT COSTS				
CIs, PIs and any researcher Level A or above x multiplier				
CI Martin		33327	0	33327
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (h)		33327	0	33327
TOTAL COSTS (i)	53060	69553	0	122613

C1 BUDGET DETAILS
C1.2 YEAR
2

	COSTING			
Column 1	2	3	4	5
Source of funds	ARC	University	Other	Total
DIRECT COSTS				
Personnel (Salaries + On-costs)				
CI Martin @ 0.3 FTE + 30.36% on-costs	0	37675	0	37675
Research Assistance (casual) 4 days/weeks @ rate 5 + 17.21% on costs (1560 hours @ \$31)	48360	0	0	48360
Total Personnel (a)	48360	37675	0	86035
Teaching Relief				
Total Teaching Relief (b)	0	0	0	0
Equipment				
Total Equipment (c)	0	0	0	0
Maintenance				
Specialists books, etc	1000	0	0	1000
Total Maintenance (d)	1000	0	0	1000
Travel				
Airfares US - Aust rtn x 2 (economy)	5600	0	0	5600
Accommodation 2 x 2 weeks @ \$260 per week	1040	0	0	1040
Incidentals (transfers, transport, etc)	1000	0	0	1000
Total Travel (e)	7640	0	0	7640
Other				
Recruitment costs for RAs	500	0	0	500
Total Other (f)	500	0	0	500
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (g)	57500	37675	0	95175
INDIRECT COSTS				
CIs, PIs and any researcher Level A or above x multiplier				
CI Martin		34661	0	34661
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (h)		34661	0	34661
TOTAL COSTS (i)	57500	72336	0	129836

C1 BUDGET DETAILS
C1.3 YEAR
3

COSTING				
Column 1	2	3	4	5
Source of funds	ARC	University	Other	Total
DIRECT COSTS				
Personnel (Salaries + On-costs)				
CI Martin 0@ 0.3 FTE + 30.36% on-costs	0	39182	0	39182
Research Assistance (casual) 4 days/weeks @ rate 5 + 17.21% on costs (1560 hours @ \$31)	48360	0	0	48360
Total Personnel (a)	48360	39182	0	87542
Teaching Relief				
Total Teaching Relief (b)	0	0	0	0
Equipment				
Total Equipment (c)	0	0	0	0
Maintenance				
Specialist books, etc	1000	0	0	1000
Total Maintenance (d)	1000	0	0	1000
Travel				
Airfare UK - Aus rtn (economy)	2300	0	0	2300
Airfare US - Aus rtn (economy)	2700	0	0	2700
Accommodation 2 x 2 weeks @ \$280 per week	1120	0	0	1120
Incidentals (transfers, transport, etc)	1000	0	0	1000
Total Travel (e)	7120	0	0	7120
Other				
Recruitment costs for RAs	500	0	0	500
Total Other (f)	500	0	0	500
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (g)	56980	39182	0	96162
INDIRECT COSTS				
CIs, PIs and any researcher Level A or above x multiplier				
CI Martin		36047	0	36047
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (h)		36047	0	36047
TOTAL COSTS (i)	56980	75229	0	132209

C2 JUSTIFICATION OF FUNDING REQUESTED FROM THE ARC

Personnel For each of six case studies, I plan to use one or more research assistants for periods of concentrated investigation. They will collect references and analyse them to select examples of tactics, find potential interviewees and participate in some interviews, and participate in discussions and workshops to formulate, test and refine the theoretical framework.

Because the RAs are usually involved through to the final stages of completing and submitting papers, funding is necessary though all three years of the project. From my present project, I have found that one year's RA work at two days per week is, on average, enough to provide suitable support for one case study, hence the request for RA support for four days per week over three years for six case studies.

Maintenance A small amount is required for purchasing books and videos about the case studies, and for telephone interviews.

Travel Meetings with international collaborators are vital to the project. As described in E7, my preference is for collaborators to visit Wollongong, to work with me and meet with students and RAs involved with the project. I have requested funding for one international visit by an international collaborator to Wollongong in 2006 — since I expect to have study leave and be able to travel in that year — and two such visits in each of 2007 and 2008. The funding covers air fares, accommodation and incidentals.

C3 DETAILS OF NON-ARC CONTRIBUTIONS

The primary contribution from the University of Wollongong is the CI's salary.

PART D—RESEARCH SUPPORT

D1 RESEARCH SUPPORT OF ALL PARTICIPANTS

Details provided for all Participants listed in Section A3—

- The current proposal is listed first.
- ARC-funded projects for which reports (including Progress and Final Reports) required in the *Conditions of Grant/Funding Contract/Funding Agreement* have been submitted should be indicated by a double asterisk after the Description.
- Asterisk (*) refers to any items that are in the same area of research as this application.
- Support types (**Sup type**) are 'C' for current support, 'R' for requested support, 'P' for past support.
- The ARC Project ID applies only to past and current ARC grants.

Note, details should be provided for **all** sources of funding, not just ARC funding.

Description (All named investigators on any grant held by a participant, project title, source of support, scheme)	(*)	Sup type	ARC Project ID (if applicable)	2004 (\$'000)	2005 (\$'000)	2006 (\$'000)	2007 (\$'000)	2008 (\$'000)
Tactics of social transformation	*	R	DP0664325			53	57	56
Martin, Theory and action for opposing political repression, ARC Discovery **	*	C	DP0346386	30	30			

D2 REPORT ON ARC DISCOVERY GRANT DP0346386, "Theory and action for opposing political repression," 2003-2005

The aim of the project is to investigate and reformulate the concept of political jiu-jitsu, a term used to describe the phenomenon that violent attacks on peaceful protesters sometimes generate greater support for the grievance group. I tested the generalised concept, which I labelled backfire, by using case studies from diverse areas. In working through case studies and through extensive discussions and talks, I gradually focussed on five main methods by which attackers inhibit backfire.

Considerable progress has been made on a range of case studies.

- **Electroshock weapons:** I have collaborated with Steve Wright, the world's leading authority on the technology of repression. We have had one paper published (Martin and Wright 2003) and completed a second paper during his visit to Wollongong in February 2005.

- **Censorship:** I have collaborated with Sue Curry Jansen, an expert on censorship at Muhlenberg College in Pennsylvania. We have had two papers published (Jansen and Martin, 2003, 2004).

- **Academic freedom:** I wrote a paper of the dismissal of Ted Steele from the University of Wollongong (accepted for publication in *Workplace*) and a chapter about the dismissal of Herbert Richardson from St. Michael's College, University of Toronto (Martin, 2004).

- **Iraq attack:** my backfire analysis of the conquest of Iraq was published (Martin, 2004). I have collected much additional information on this case study.

- **Rodney King:** I wrote a backfire analysis of the beating of Rodney King by Los Angeles police. It has been accepted for publication in *Critical Criminology*.

- **Whistleblowing:** my analysis of whistleblowing using the framework of political jiu-jitsu was published (Martin with Rifkin, 2004). Another article is submitted for publication.

- **Social movements:** I am collaborating with David Hess, professor of Science and Technology Studies at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, on backfire and social movements. He visited Wollongong in May 2004. Our joint paper is currently under revision for the journal *Mobilization*.

- **Psychology:** Greg Scott (research assistant) analysed the sexual harassment case involving Anita Hill and Clarence Thomas as a backfire process. Our paper is in preparation. In 2005, I am working with Samantha Reis (research assistant) on psychological theories and backfire.

- **Environmental conflicts:** Hannah Lendon (student apprentice researcher) and I wrote a paper on backfire dynamics in oil spills and nuclear reactor accidents. It is submitted for publication.

- **Defamation:** Truda Gray (research assistant) and I wrote two papers on how defamation threats and suits can backfire; they are submitted for publication.

- **Vietnam war:** Truda Gray and I have begun working on a backfire analysis of the Vietnam war generally and of various events and campaigns within it.

- **Gandhi:** I wrote a paper on the 1930 salt march in India for the Gandhi conference at ANU. It is in the hands of the conference organisers for submission to *Borderlands E-journal*.

- **Terrorism:** I wrote a chapter on terrorism backfire for a book being edited by Ralph Summy and Senthil Ram on terrorism and nonviolence.

- **Refugees:** Sharon Callaghan and I prepared a paper on backfire and treatment of refugees for the December 2004 conference on Education and Social Action at UTS.

- **Backfire book:** I have made substantial progress on a book on backfire dynamics titled *Backfire: Justice Ignited*. Two large chapters are complete. One covers the historical cases of the salt march, the 1960 Sharpeville massacre in South Africa and the 1991 Dili massacre in East Timor. The second covers relevant theory. Most of the remaining chapters will be based on papers already written, but extensively revised and updated to take into account the latest refinement of the theory. Each such chapter will highlight lessons about backfire drawn from the particular case studies. A final chapter will draw together elements of the theory. I have received a book contract from Rowman & Littlefield (February 2005) with the final manuscript due in September.

The project has proceeded largely as planned, though the selection of case studies is different from and more diverse than originally envisaged. The use of case studies has worked extremely well to test and elaborate the theory. My collaborators have provided many contributions, especially in seeing the relevance of the theory to new areas and in subjecting the theory to critical scrutiny.

PART E — PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Tactics of social transformation

E2 Aims and background

In struggles over policies and practices, in politics and personal life, proponents and opponents of change use a variety of tactics. A general model of tactics for and against social transformation will be developed by examining a set of diverse case studies in the areas of police beatings, defamation, sensory deprivation, genocide, alternative cancer therapies and bullying at work.

Proponents and opponents of change use many different tactics, but in most areas there is little theoretical work to classify and assess such tactics. To develop a general model, it is useful to examine specific episodes when there is a clear-cut pressure for change. The diverse cases chosen for this project are ones where pressures for reform resulted from a widespread perception of injustice. Examples are the aftermaths of the beating of Rodney King by Los Angeles police in 1991 and the defamation case by McDonald's against two activists.

By studying and comparing cases from a range of disparate domains, it is possible to build a theory of tactics that captures the main methods used but is not tied to any specific arena. Theory-building will also draw on analyses of tactics in specific fields, such as agenda management by governments. A general theory of tactics is important to supplement structural theories of change and to offer practical guidance for those seeking to promote change in a principled fashion.

From campaigning to institutionalisation

Campaigners collect information, build organisations, lobby, canvass neighbourhoods, write letters, hold rallies and organise boycotts. Their intent is to change attitudes, policies and practices. But campaigners often stop short of engaging with the policy and practice stages of the change process, when new social relationships are institutionalised or, in many cases, blocked, because these stages typically proceed out of the public eye, for example in the offices of politicians or bureaucrats.

For example, environmentalists opposed to the damming of the Franklin River organised groups (Tasmanian Wilderness Society), produced leaflets and videos, lobbied, promoted a "No dams" ballot write-in, and blockaded construction work. Yet the actual stopping of the dam depended on the election of a Labor government in 1983 and then a favourable decision by the High Court, both of which were largely out of the hands of the anti-dams movement.

Social movement researchers have investigated, among other things, human and material resources available to activists (resource mobilisation theory), systems of meaning used by movements (frame analysis), and opportunities available within the political and economic system (political process theory). Some of this work is valuable for understanding movements from the outside (e.g. Goodwin et al. 2001; Jordan 2002; McAdam et al. 2001; Starr 2000). But social movement theory has paid less attention to tactics used by movements and has little to say to activists about how to be more effective. Those who do look at tactics (e.g. Shaw 1996) seldom draw connections to theory. The whole area of tactics is open for theorisation.

To get closer to the connection between social action and institutional change, it is useful to turn to grounded theory, namely theory that is emergent from close examination of observed phenomena. Gene Sharp, the world's leading nonviolence scholar, examined hundreds of campaigns and developed a framework that he calls the "dynamics of nonviolent action" which is, in effect, a grounded theory of the typical stages through which nonviolent campaigns proceed (Sharp 1973: 447-814). Concerning the final stage, "the redistribution of power" among actors and in the system, Sharp (1973: 777) says "very little research has been carried out on these subjects." He gives many examples of how activists are empowered through action, but says comparatively little about system change.

On the basis of decades of experience with social movements, Bill Moyer developed an eight-stage model of social movement success that is compatible with Sharp's framework. For example, "trigger events" in Moyer's scheme are similar to political jiu-jitsu in Sharp's. Moyer's seventh stage, "success," includes outcomes such as "new laws and policies" (Moyer et al. 2001: 45). However, as Moyer is at pains to emphasise, many activists pull out long before this: stage five is "perception of failure." Moyer focusses on strategies at the success stage and does not include a detailed assessment of tactics.

More generally, it could be said that activists know a lot about getting issues onto agendas but know less about how to pursue the messy process of system reform. When target organisations make apparent concessions and introduce new policies, this is often enough to allay public concern and take the steam out of movements.

Few movements attain unambiguous success. For example, the 1980s movement against nuclear weapons collapsed after the end of the cold war, and was in decline even before that, despite the continued existence of thousands of nuclear weapons and ongoing proliferation. Though it can be said that "objective conditions" prevent some movements from making significant progress in particular circumstances, nonetheless it seems plausible that a better understanding of tactics by parties to a struggle would improve effectiveness in cases where different outcomes are feasible.

The topic of struggles over institutionalisation of social change is incredibly wide-ranging and multi-faceted, indeed daunting. To make progress, I intend to start by concentrating on episodes that are relatively well defined, building on my studies of "backfire."

Backfire

My current ARC research focusses on one of Sharp's stages in the dynamics of nonviolent action, "political jiu-jitsu," in which a violent attack on nonviolent protesters rebounds to the advantage of the protesters by generating support from the grievance group, third parties and even members of the attacker group. An example is the 1991 Dili massacre, witnessed by western journalists and captured on videotape, which caused enormous outrage internationally and led to a tremendous growth in worldwide support for East Timorese independence.

I generalised the concept of political jiu-jitsu by examining the tactics used by attackers to prevent or reduce outrage. By examining a wide range of cases, many outside the violence-nonviolence template, I have found that five techniques are commonly used by those perceived as responsible for perpetrating injustice:

- covering up the events, for example by censorship;
- devaluing the target, for example through racism or labelling;
- reinterpreting the events through lies, spin and genuine alternative viewpoints;
- using official channels, such as experts, courts or formal inquiries, to give the appearance of justice (though seldom the substance);
- intimidating and bribing outraged people to discourage them from taking action.

I have applied this model to topics as disparate as censorship, defamation, dismissal of academics, whistleblowing, sexual harassment, police beatings, torture, environmental disasters and war. This is called the backfire model: it looks at actions used that inhibit or amplify reactions against something perceived as unjust. When inhibition fails, the action can be said to backfire against the perpetrator.

The backfire model is, in essence, a grounded theory of tactics: opponents of injustice, predicting that the standard techniques of inhibiting outrage will be deployed, can act accordingly to prevent or reduce the effectiveness of those techniques. For example, if organisers of a rally anticipate that police might attack protesters, they can prepare for cover-up by having plenty of cameras, witnesses and communication devices, prepare for devaluation by dressing and behaving respectably, and so forth. By examining a diverse range of cases, common techniques can be uncovered.

Tactics of institutionalising change

The proposed project examines tactics at the stage of institutionalising change. For example, Moyer (2001: 45) notes that a characteristic feature of stage 7, "success," is "powerholders try to make minimal reforms" — a tactic analogous to using official channels to inhibit backfire. By analogy to the stage of backfire, the following techniques provide a starting point for analysing tactics at the institutionalisation stage:

- covering up the process of change and/or the reality of (little) change;
- devaluing feared alternatives, and devaluing advocates of change;
- reinterpreting the situation as already having changed adequately, or powerholders making change and claiming full credit for it (Moyer (2001: 76);
- making symbolic gestures to give the appearance of change or due process;
- intimidating and bribing people to say or accept that change is adequate.

The aim of the project is to examine tactics used in practice, whether these and/or others. To do this, it is very effective to scrutinise particular cases drawn from a wide range of fields. This is a refinement of grounded theory, as used by Sharp and Moyer to highlight stages in social movement struggles, to a different level: the tactics used within a stage, specifically the stage of institutionalising change.

In the area of whistleblowing, most of these sorts of tactics are apparent at the level of policy (Martin 2003):

- downplaying evidence that whistleblower laws help very few whistleblowers;
- devaluing methods of employee empowerment, and cutting whistleblowers out of policy development (many whistleblower laws are drafted and passed without consulting whistleblowers);
- reinterpreting the situation as already having changed adequately;
- using whistleblower laws and anti-corruption agencies to give the appearance of change.

Because institutionalisation is such a complex process — messy and often hidden — it is fruitful to begin by picking cases where there is a highly concentrated pressure for change, namely cases that generate immediate and widespread outrage, such as the beating of Rodney King and McDonald's defamation action against Helen Steel and Dave Morris. Such cases are highly visible and relatively well bounded. Therefore, they are more likely to reveal tactics used to prevent or foster change, whether in Los Angeles police procedures or in corporate use of defamation laws. With the insights about struggles over institutionalisation from these cases, application can then be made both to less dramatic struggles and to more complex ones.

To speak of tactics can sound narrow. The wider issue is strategy, namely an overall plan of action based on analysis of the present, a vision of the future and a programme of action designed to move toward that vision. By analysing tactics in the context of social

struggle, the project puts tactics in the broader framework of bringing about change and thus deals centrally with strategy.

In some fields, research into tactics has been carried out. An example is the study of agenda management by governments, in which they act in ways designed to limit public outcry from policies that affect some sectors of the population adversely (Harding 1985). Also valuable for investigating tactics are studies of symbolic politics (Edelman 1971), spin doctoring (Michie 1998) and the psychology of persuasion (Jowett and O'Donnell 1999).

Another important area is the use of "discursive strategies" such as by feminists to promote ideas of gender equality, think tanks to promote ideas of neoliberalism, and advertisers to promote consumerism. In terms of Sharp's model, these fit at the stage of "laying the groundwork." In terms of tactics, they are fundamental because they provide the rhetorical and conceptual resources by which particular actions succeed or fail. In the project, I will relate tactics to the baseline of attitudes, concepts and resources on which they stand or fall, leaving the detailed analysis of long-term strategies for changing this baseline to a future time.

E3 Significance and innovation

The **theoretical significance** of this project lies in developing a theory of tactics for struggles over institutionalising change. This includes identifying, categorising and classifying tactics on both sides (or multiple sides) and putting them into a wider picture of change dynamics.

Most studies of change — such as social movement theory — do not examine tactics in a coherent way. Structural theories, such as Marxism or political process theory of social movements, focus on social structures and have few tools for examining tactics. Actor-oriented theories, such as the group dynamics framework common in pluralist analysis, do look at actions, but without a consistent incorporation of power asymmetries, and in any case have not developed a generalisable analysis of tactics.

Once formulated, a theory of tactics can be used for analysing and illuminating diverse struggles in ways not previously done. For example, the theory can be applied to topics such as terrorism or sharing music files, indeed anything where people perceive an injustice and seek to bring about a new set of beliefs, practices and/or policies.

The **practical significance** of the project lies in its provision of useful conceptual tools for understanding struggles over the institutionalisation of change. For example, social movements will be better able to predict moves to resist or coopt change and so to formulate strategies to counter them. Currently, activists pay little attention to social movement theory because it "remains distressingly weak in providing practical information for activists compared to its emphasis on developing complex, and perhaps irrelevant, theoretical models" (Stoecker 1996: 7). The grounded theory developed through this project will be designed to maximise practical insight: its categories will be general, while its specific application will require the localised understandings of participants.

The practical significance will go well beyond social movements. The model can also be applied in areas where individuals encounter personal injustice, such as bullying or sexual harassment. In this case, the institutionalisation of change means a new set of behaviours by potential perpetrators. This will be similar to the way my current project on backfire has led to practical advice for individual targets of defamation actions that has been much appreciated by many correspondents.

In principle, the theory developed in the project can be used either by proponents or opponents of the institutionalisation of change. After all, sometimes those trying to bring

about change are, in the eyes of others, creating greater injustice. That means that it can be used effectively by "conservatives," namely those defending a status quo. These "conservatives" might be supporters of indigenous traditions in the face of corporate globalisation or might be defenders of a university employment policy in the face of critics. By its design, the theory will be most useful to those who can convince others that an injustice has been done.

E4 Approach

To develop a grounded theory of tactics used in struggles over institutionalisation of change, it is crucial to pick revealing case studies. Many struggles over change are exceedingly complex and lengthy, with many key events occurring out of the public eye, which means that it is hard to detect recurrent patterns in tactics used. To overcome this obstacle, some case studies chosen are relatively bounded in domain. The availability of ample information is also crucial.

Attacks that backfire are especially useful for this purpose, because they create an urgent, visible demand for change and produce large quantities of documentation from partisans on both sides, which is especially useful for perceiving tactics and counter-tactics. The beating of Rodney King led immediately to an inquiry that made specific recommendations for reforming the Los Angeles Police Department. Thus, the aftermath of the King beating is a prime case for analysing tactics for and against institutionalisation of change in policies and practices concerning police use of force in Los Angeles and elsewhere.

It is also valuable to select cases from diverse domains, for example ranging from interpersonal behaviour to global politics. In this way, methods common to divergent arenas become apparent, as do techniques specific to particular domains.

The cases proposed for investigation have been chosen with these considerations in mind. Of course, research frequently leads in unexpected directions, so it is possible that as the project proceeds, initial findings will suggest choosing different case studies.

In detecting, classifying and systematising tactics used by parties to a struggle over policies and practices, determining whether tactics have actually been successful is a secondary consideration. For example, in looking at struggles over police use of force after the King beating, the primary task is to examine the tactics used by those supporting and opposing change in Los Angeles police policies and practices, not to determine whether these have actually changed since 1991, though that may well be apparent.

I have chosen six areas that appear to fit these specifications. Another important consideration is that I have studied these already and/or am engaged in collaborations with experts in the field.

- Police reform after the beating of Rodney King.
- Defamation law and practice after the *McLibel* case.
- International policies and practices after the 1994 genocide in Rwanda.
- Resistance to use of sensory deprivation techniques following their use in Northern Ireland in the 1970s and in Guantánamo Bay and Iraq since 2001.
- US government policy on alternative cancer therapies after the arrest of John Richardson in 1972.
- Organisational responses to bullying at work in Australia following widespread attention to the problem in recent years.

Most of these cases are old enough so that they have largely run their course in response to the original triggers and therefore reveal a full gamut of tactics, but recent enough so that there will be many people with first-hand knowledge who can offer insights.

I have studied policy and practice concerning whistleblowing very closely for quite a number of years, and have a good sense of tactics used. But because I have been so close to this issue, I would rather use whistleblowing dynamics as a source of background information, to inform my study of other issues, rather than as one of the formal case studies.

Police reform after the beating of Rodney King

The beating of Rodney King by Los Angeles police in 1991 is the world's most famous case of police brutality. Immediately after the beating, a commission of inquiry was established by the police and city government. Its recommendations were widely acknowledged as worthwhile. But were they implemented? In looking at this case, my goal is to examine tactics used by the police and by reformers to oppose or promote reform of police practice.

In my current project, I examined the King beating as a backfire process, looking at the techniques used by the police to reduce outrage, and why they mostly failed in this. In doing this I drew on ten books and many articles about the events. But for police reform, the documentary record is far thinner. As well as examining official reports and media stories, I plan to interview key participants and commentators, coming from both sides of the issue. The aim is not a comprehensive account of the dynamics of reform, but rather collection of tactics used in the reform struggle. The aftermath of the King beating is an intriguing case for looking at tactics used to obstruct reform because, unlike many other cases, there was no substantial social movement pushing for change.

The King beating led to attention to police use-of-force procedures across the United States. I will also examine secondary literature on reform struggles in cities other than Los Angeles.

Defamation and the McLibel case

In the late 1980s, McDonald's sued Helen Steel and Dave Morris, members of the group London Greenpeace, for defamation over the leaflet "What's wrong with McDonald's?" This became the longest running court case in British history. It was a public relations disaster for McDonald's, which was seen by many as bullying two indigent activists and as opposing free speech. A transnational network was set up to support Steel and Morris, tied together by the website www.mcspotlight.org, resulting in far more attention to the original leaflet than would have occurred without the case. Although McDonald's won in court on some of the claims, it lost credibility: the defamation suit backfired (Donson 2000).

It is often commented that after this so-called McLibel case, large corporations have been much more reluctant to sue for defamation. To learn more about defamation change in the wake of McLibel, I plan to examine struggles over law reform in English-speaking countries, in particular pressures to restrict the right of corporations (and governments) to sue. More importantly, I will look at patterns of suing in Australia, Britain and the US to see whether the McLibel case has indeed changed litigation patterns. The aim is not so much to determine the extent of change as to pinpoint tactics used by proponents and opponents of revised practice. This can be things as simple as awareness by activists of how to turn defamation suits against the suers, and awareness by corporate executives of public relations costs of suits seen as heavy-handed.

To obtain suitable information, I will consult relevant literature and contact legal experts, activists and corporate executives. I will collaborate in this case study with Sue Curry Jansen, professor of communication at Muhlenberg College, an expert on censorship, with whom I have co-authored two articles about making censorship backfire (Jansen and Martin, 2003, 2004).

The Rwandan genocide

The 1994 genocide in Rwanda is widely seen as a failure by the international community (Melvern 2004). If so, what lessons have been learned from this failure? Has the genocide made international actors — NGOs, governments, the UN — better prepared to prevent

future genocides? Going by the long history of international failure to deal with genocide (Kuper 1981), the answer to this question may well be "no."

My task in this case study is to look at tactics used by proponents and opponents of reform in the international system so that it can better prevent and intervene against genocide. I will examine written accounts — there are many studies of the Rwandan events — and contact genocide researchers and members of NGOs. Government officials are likely to be less accessible, but there will be some willing to reveal techniques used to oppose or promote reform.

Sensory deprivation techniques

Cutting off input to the senses through hooding, restraint and white noise is a powerful method of torture, though on the surface it seems far less harmful than beatings or electroshock. Pioneered by British troops in Northern Ireland in the 1970s (McGuffin, 1974), defenders of human rights revealed the effects of sensory deprivation and mobilised public opinion against it. Yet it has continued to be used, most prominently by the US government first in Guantánamo Bay (Rose 2004) and subsequently in Iraq (Danner 2004).

Opponents of sensory deprivation have promoted their case using scientific research, publicity, lobbying and new laws; proponents have often operated in secrecy or used arguments about protecting the national interest. My aim in this case study is to elucidate the techniques used to support or oppose changes in policies and practices in using sensory deprivation. This will involve studying the literature on sensory deprivation and contacting experienced campaigners, for example in Amnesty International. In this case study I will collaborate with Dr Steve Wright, the world's leading expert on repression technology (e.g. Wright 1998). We have written two articles on making repression technology backfire (Martin and Wright 2003, in preparation).

Alternative cancer therapies

Non-mainstream methods of treating cancer have been marginalised in Australia, the United States and other countries, being denied financial support, attacked by cancer experts and subject to legal restrictions. In some cases, alternative practitioners have been arrested. Despite these efforts, many patients seek out alternative therapies. Movements have developed to support alternatives, leading to limited acceptance of some alternative therapies by orthodox medicine, for example as complementary forms of treatment.

In collaboration with Professor David Hess of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, a leading authority on the politics of alternative cancer therapies (e.g., Hess 1999; Wooddell and Hess 1998), I will examine the tactics of institutionalising cancer treatment alternatives. We have co-authored a paper (Hess and Martin submitted for publication) dealing with backfire and social movements as well as collaborated on other articles.

Bullying at work

Since the 1990s, the issue of bullying at work — also called mobbing (Westhues 2004) — has received a vast increase in attention, with a host of new books (Martin 2000) and much media attention. This has led to calls for legal protection against bullying as well as increased awareness and the creation of support groups. Although there has been no single trigger event, the rapid rise of the issue to the public agenda in Australia makes it easier to analyse tactics used to bring about changes in policies and, more importantly, behaviour. I will consult bullying researchers and bullying support groups, in particular the Black Sheep in Brisbane, at whose conference in October 2004 I gave a talk on making bullying backfire.

Work plan

My plan is to spend the equivalent of six months on each of the six case studies, proceeding on two or three at a time in parallel in order to maximise insights from comparisons. For each study, the following steps will be involved:

- collection of material (for which research assistance is needed);

- categorisation of tactics used by both sides in the reform struggle;
- construction of a study-specific framework of institutionalisation tactics;
- queries to key participants and scholars concerning tactics used and the overall analysis;
- construction and revision of the general theoretical model;
- writing up an account of the struggle in the light of the analysis;
- circulation of the account to key participants to obtain more feedback.
- revision of the account and, as appropriate, publication.

Queries to participants and scholars will usually be by phone and email but may be face-to-face if convenient. In 2005 I expect to have study leave and to be able to visit Los Angeles for interviews about police reform. RAs will undertake some interviewing as training. Ethics approval will be obtained for all techniques used.

In the analysis of case studies, additional bodies of theory will be used as appropriate. For example, social movement theory is relevant to some of the case studies. Cohen's (2001) analysis of how governments deny atrocities is very relevant to the Rwandan and sensory deprivation cases.

E5 National benefit

Outcomes from the project will include (1) detailed case studies of reform struggles in a range of domains, and (2) development of a theory of tactics that can be applied to numerous struggles. Publication of and publicity about these findings will create wider awareness by change agents on how best to plan and promote change, especially in cases where there is popular pressure.

Developing people's understanding of the tactics of institutionalising change strengthens the ability of a society to beneficially transform itself. Given that the framework used in the project grows out of a grounded theory of nonviolent social action, the project has the potential to promote processes of change that are socially responsible — in the sense of building on widely shared cultural values — and to discourage methods that are damaging to all concerned.

If just a single practice or policy can be improved by more effective efforts for change — such as reducing police killings or bullying at work — the national benefits are potentially huge. In Australia, this would be relevant to struggles over freedom of information, environmental issues and police corruption.

These sorts of benefits will be available worldwide. The insights developed will both draw on cases in other countries (Britain, US) and be applicable in many others. If Australians take a lead in modelling principled and effective action to institutionalise change, there will be additional national benefits.

E6. Communication of results

As the project proceeds, I will write one or more scholarly papers on each of the six case studies, targeting journals in criminology, law, human rights, politics, organisational studies and technology studies. I expect most of these papers will be co-authored with international collaborators or research assistants. As well, I will write some more popular treatments, some for a general audience (such as about defamation or sensory deprivation) and some for magazines and newsletters oriented to change agents, such as Amnesty International. As in the past, I plan to give talks at conferences and to groups interested in social change. This both communicates results and gives me valuable feedback for

improving the theory. Also, I can incorporate my findings in talks and interviews on other topics, such as whistleblowing, where I am offered many opportunities to speak.

I will write a book covering the general framework of tactics for change and dealing with many of the case studies.

Each of my previous three ARC grants resulted in a book plus several refereed articles, so this is a realistic plan.

E7 Description of personnel

As **chief investigator**, I will:

- formulate, refine and periodically reassess the project's framework;
- develop refined research plans for specific case studies;
- oversee collection of information;
- formulate and test new theory on tactics and strategy for change;
- formulate and lead publishing initiatives.

I will work with several **research assistants**, chosen for their skills and knowledge in fields relevant to specific case studies such as police matters for the King beating, history/politics for the Rwandan genocide, and organisational studies for bullying at work. Based on experience with my current project which also cuts across a wide range of fields, I expect this approach to be highly effective because it provides cross-fertilisation that is highly productive for developing theory. Within the basic structure of the project, the RAs will be expected, with guidance and assistance from me, to:

- search for documentation about the chosen case studies;
- contact individuals and groups to obtain information about the case studies;
- compile material on case studies;
- participate in some interviews;
- contribute to publications, if able.

Whenever possible, I work with RAs as collaborators: they study the theoretical framework and participate in selecting case material and in writing papers. This involves me in a certain amount of training of developing researchers. The advantage is that the RAs become much more engaged — often quite enthusiastic — about the project and as a consequence do very good work.

David Hess, professor of science and technology studies at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in New York, and an expert on alternative cancer therapies, will collaborate on the case study on that topic. **Sue Curry Jansen**, professor of communication at Muhlenberg College, Pennsylvania, and an expert on censorship, will collaborate on the McLibel case study. **Dr Steve Wright** of Leeds Metropolitan University, who has unequalled expertise on the technology of repression, will collaborate on the sensory deprivation case study. I have co-authored papers with each of these scholars, and each one has expressed enthusiasm about continuing our collaboration.

Although much of the project can be carried out using the net, supplemented by telephone contact, I have found that personal visits are extremely valuable for international collaborations. I prefer visits by my collaborators to Wollongong because, away from their usual commitments, they are available for more concentrated work on the project. In addition, it is then possible for them to meet with RAs and students working on the project, something that I have found, from such visits so far, to be incredibly productive.

Andrew Herd, a research student beginning in 2005, will be studying refugees and backfire under my supervision.

E8 References

- Cohen, Stanley (2001) *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering* (Cambridge: Polity).
- Danner, Mark (2004) *Torture and Truth: America, Abu Ghraib, and the War on Terror* (New York: New York Review Books).
- Donson, Fiona (2000) *Legal Intimidation: A SLAPP in the Face of Democracy* (Free Association Books, London).
- Edelman, Murray (1971) *Politics as Symbolic Action: Mass Arousal and Quiescence* (Chicago: Markham).
- Goodwin, Jeff, James M. Jasper and Francesca Polletta (eds) (2001). *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Harding, Ann (1985). Unemployment policy: a case study in agenda management. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 44, No. 3, pp. 224-246.
- Hess, David J. (1999). *Evaluating Alternative Cancer Therapies* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press).
- Hess, David J. and Brian Martin (2005) Backfire and the theory of transformative events. Submitted to *Mobilization*.
- Jansen, Sue Curry and Brian Martin (2003) Making censorship backfire. *Counterpoise*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 5-15.
- Jansen, Sue Curry and Brian Martin (2004) Exposing and opposing censorship: backfire dynamics in freedom-of-speech struggles. *Pacific Journalism Review*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 29-45.
- Jordan, Tim (2002) *Activism! Direct Action, Hactivism and the Future of Society* (London: Reaktion Books).
- Jowett, Garth S. and Victoria O'Donnell (1999) *Propaganda and Persuasion* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage)
- Kuper, Leo (1981) *Genocide* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).
- Martin, Brian (2000) Review of seven books on bullying at work. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 401-408.
- Martin, Brian (2005, in press) The beating of Rodney King: the dynamics of backfire. *Critical Criminology*.
- Martin, Brian and Steve Wright (2003) Countershock: mobilizing resistance to electroshock weapons. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival*, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp. 205-222.
- Martin, Brian and Steve Wright (2005) Looming struggles over technology for border control. Submitted to *Essex Human Rights Review*.
- McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly (2001) *Dynamics of Contention* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- McGuffin, John (1974) *The Guineapigs* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).
- Melvyn, Linda (2004) *Conspiracy to Murder: The Rwanda Genocide and the International Community* (London: Verso).
- Michie, David (1998) *The Invisible Persuaders* (London: Bantam).
- Moyer, Bill with JoAnn McAllister, Mary Lou Finley and Steven Soifer (2001) *Doing Democracy: The MAP Model for Organizing Social Movements* (Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers).
- Rose, David (2004). *Guantánamo: The War on Human Rights* (New York: New Press).
- Sharp, Gene (1973) *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (Boston: Porter Sargent).
- Shaw, Randy (1996) *The Activist's Handbook* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Starr, Amory (2000) *Naming the Enemy: Anti-corporate Movements Confront Globalization* (London: Zed Books).
- Stoecker, Randy (1996) Sociology and social action: introduction, *Sociological Imagination*, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 3-17.
- Westhues, Kenneth (ed.) (2004) *Workplace Mobbing in Academe* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press).
- Wooddell, Margaret J. and David J. Hess (1998) *Women Confront Cancer: Making Medical History by Choosing Alternative Therapies* (New York: New York University Press).
- Wright, Steve (1998) *An Appraisal of Technologies for Political Control* (Luxembourg: European Parliament).

Acknowledgements I thank Chris Barker, Susan Engel, Sue Jansen, Julie Matarczyk, Peter Robinson, Marian Sawyer, Adrian Vickers and Steve Wright for valuable comments on drafts of this application.