

**AUSTRALIAN RESEARCH COUNCIL  
DISCOVERY PROJECTS  
APPLICATION FORM FOR FUNDING COMMENCING IN 2007**

DP

**PROJECT ID: DP0770917**

Total number of sheets contained in this application	29
------------------------------------------------------	----

*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 third parties for assessment purposes. 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 contained in this Proposal can be disclosed without your consent where authorised or required by law.*

**PART A—ADMINISTRATIVE SUMMARY**

**A1 ORGANISATION TO ADMINISTER FUNDING**

University of Wollongong
--------------------------

**A2 PROPOSAL TITLE**

Nonviolent action and complex warfare
---------------------------------------

**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.

Number sought

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Research Costs (personnel and project costs other than Fellowship salaries)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Australian Postdoctoral Fellowship (APD)	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	Australian Research Fellowship/Queen Elizabeth II Fellowship (ARF/QEII)	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	Australian Professorial Fellowship (APF)	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 Proposal

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

The aim of this project is to reframe and elaborate nonviolence theory to encompass contemporary, complex forms of civil conflict. Nonviolent action has had many successes against dictators and in promoting social change. However, nonviolent action theory requires reformulation to deal with complex warfare in which there are multiple actors, unclear lines of responsibility and violence used for terror and domination. Principles for nonviolent strategy and tactics to deal with complex conflicts will be developed in tandem with a close examination of conflicts in East Timor, ex-Yugoslavia and Palestine.

### 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).

For those seeking social change, nonviolent action offers a powerful alternative to terrorism. By making nonviolence more effective, the attractions of terrorism will be reduced and Australia will be made safer. The project thus fits within the priority area of Safeguarding Australia.

Nonviolent action is also a way of challenging terrorists, making their threats and attacks counterproductive far more than the usual approach of government repression. By better understanding and improving nonviolent tactics, civil society can oppose terrorists more powerfully and confidently.

## A6 CLASSIFICATIONS AND OTHER STATISTICAL INFORMATION

### A6.1 National Research Priorities

National Research Priority	Priority Goal(s)
Safeguarding Australia	Protecting Australia from terrorism and crime

### A6.2 Keywords

nonviolent action	peace research
social action	new war
tactics	strategy

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

Research Fields, Courses and Disciplines (RFCD)	%
369999	100

Socio-Economic Objective (SEO)	%
750699	50
750799	50

**A6.4 Country/ies of international collaboration**

Norway	Spain	UK
Germany	USA	

**A7 ADDITIONAL DETAILS**

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

**A7.2** Have you been granted an eligibility ruling regarding whether the Proposal falls within the area of clinical medical and/or dental research and training?

Yes No **X**

**A7.3** Administering Organisation have arrangements to manage intellectual property and facilitate commercialisation of research? Does the Yes **X** No

If Yes, in no more than 750 characters (approx 100 words) of plain language, summarise these arrangements.

The University of Wollongong has in place Intellectual Property and Commercial Research policies, approved by its governing body. It has also established a framework to maximise the benefits arising from University research in accordance with the National Principles of Intellectual Property Management for Publicly Funded Research. Further, UOW, through its partnership with UniQuest (technology transfer company of the University of Queensland) and through its Research and Innovation Division actively and successfully identifies, protects and commercialises UOW technology and expertise.

**A8 RESEARCH STUDENTS**

The ARC is interested in reporting the number of Research Students that would be involved in this Proposal 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 Proposal 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 Proposal.
- The Head of Department has approved this Proposal.
- This organisation supports this Proposal 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 Proposal 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 participant(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 Proposal.
- I consent, on behalf of the participants, to this Proposal being referred to third parties for assessment purposes who will remain anonymous.
- For any Fellowship candidate on this Proposal who is seeking a second ARF/QEII or APF Fellowship, I have agreement from the Administering Organisation for the project on which the current Fellowship is held, as well as the Fellowship candidate, that the current Fellowship will be relinquished if this Fellowship candidate is successful.
- 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 in this Proposal are true and complete and that no information specifically relating to personnel 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**

---

## 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	Social Sciences, Media and Communication		
Organisation	University of Wollongong		

### B3 POSTAL ADDRESS

Department/school/other	Social Sciences, Media and Communication				
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?** YesNoX

**B4.2 Are any of your relatives or close social/professional associates members of the ARC or its advisory committees?** YesNoX

If Yes, name of the ARC member(s)

**B4.3 a) Are you associated with a Commonwealth Government-funded Research Centre?** Yes NoX

b) Are you seeking a Fellowship, which would be hosted within a Centre? Yes No X

**B5 HAVE YOU BEEN AWARDED A CURRENT OR PREVIOUS ARC FELLOWSHIP** Yes No X

Project ID	Funding commencement year	Finish year	Fellowship type
------------	---------------------------	-------------	-----------------

**B6 AFFILIATIONS**

If you are nominated 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	05/1976	(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**

**B8.1 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	SSMAC	1997, Continuing

**B8.2 Do you or will you be employed by, or hold an adjunct or equivalent appointment with, an Eligible Organisation as at 1 January 2007?** Yes X No

If Yes, the organisation at which it is, or will it be, held:

University of Wollongong

**B9 ADDITIONAL FELLOWSHIP DETAILS (not applicable)**

## **B10 RESEARCH RECORD RELATIVE TO OPPORTUNITIES**

### **B10.1 Most significant contributions to research field**

I am recognised internationally for my pioneering studies of nonviolent action, especially my work in linking theory and action. I have opened up several new areas of research inquiry, including critique of Gene Sharp's theory of power, the analysis of nonviolent action in and against bureaucracy, the analysis of the role of science and technology in nonviolent struggle, formulation of nonviolent strategy against capitalism, and the analysis of the role of communication in nonviolent struggle.

My total publication output includes 12 books, 120 major articles in refereed journals (47 of them since 1997), 33 chapters in books, 57 major articles in nonrefereed journals, 86 lesser articles (some in refereed journals), and many dozens of book reviews and newspaper articles.

International recognition of my work is indicated by translation of my publications into many languages (Bengali, Chinese, Croatian, Danish, Dutch, Finnish, French, German, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Norwegian, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, Spanish, Swedish).

Speaking tours have been arranged for me in Italy (1991), Netherlands (1993) and Japan (1998), with talks and workshops for both researchers and activists, primarily in the nonviolence field. At several international conferences I have addressed scholars and activists from many countries: in 1990 I gave the closing address at the conference on "Nonviolent struggle and social defence" in Bradford, England; in 2002 I gave the keynote addresses on both days of a symposium on nonviolence research held at the University of Tromsø, Norway; and in June 2005 I was a featured speaker at a conference on peace in north-east Asia held in South Korea.

## **B10.2 Refereed publications, 2001-**

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

### **Books**

- \* Brian Martin. *Justice Ignited: The Dynamics of Backfire* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, in press). [contract signed; full manuscript delivered July 2005]
- \* 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, 2006), pp. 272-298.
- Brian Martin. Agricultural antibiotics: features of a controversy. In: Daniel Lee Kleinman, Abby J. Kinchy and Jo Handelsman (eds.), *Controversies in Science and Technology: From Maize to Menopause* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005), pp. 37-51.
- \* 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. Beyond the repression paradigm. *Social Alternatives*, in press [accepted 24 January 2006].
- \* Susan Engel and Brian Martin. Union Carbide and James Hardie: lessons in politics and power. *Global Society*, in press [accepted 14 January 2006].



\* Brian Martin. How nonviolence works. *Borderlands E-journal*, 2006, in press [accepted 11 January 2006].

\* David Hess and Brian Martin. Backfire, repression, and the theory of transformative events. *Mobilization*, in press [accepted 15 December 2005].

Noriko Dethlefs and Brian Martin. Japanese technology policy for aged care. *Science and Public Policy*, February 2006, in press [accepted 21 December 2004].

\* Brian Martin. The beating of Rodney King: the dynamics of backfire. *Critical Criminology*, Vol. 13, No. 3, 2005, pp. 307-326.

\* Brian Martin and Iain Murray. The Parkin backfire. *Social Alternatives*, Vol. 24, No. 3, Third Quarter 2005, pp. 46-49, 70.

\* Brian Martin. Bucking the system: Andrew Wilkie and the difficult task of the whistleblower. *Overland*, No. 180, Spring 2005, pp. 45-48.

\* Brian Martin and Truda Gray. How to make defamation threats and actions backfire. *Australian Journalism Review*, Vol. 27, No. 1, July 2005, pp. 157-166.

\* Brian Martin. Boomerangs of academic freedom. *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor*, Vol. 6, No. 2, June 2005, <http://www.cust.educ.ubc.ca/workplace/issue6p2/steele.html>.

\* Brian Martin. Researching nonviolent action: past themes and future possibilities. *Peace & Change*, Vol. 30, No. 2, April 2005, pp. 247-270.

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/](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.

\* 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, 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 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](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. 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. 119-130.

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

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.

### **Other articles of significance**

Brian Martin. Caught in the defamation net. *GP Solo (American Bar Association General Practice, Solo & Small Firm Division)*, Vol. 23, No. 1, January/February 2006, pp. 48-51.

Brian Martin and Lyn Carson. Getting over post-election blues. *Australian Review of Public Affairs*, 14 February 2005. [http://www.econ.usyd.edu.au/drawingboard/digest/0502/martin\\_carson.html](http://www.econ.usyd.edu.au/drawingboard/digest/0502/martin_carson.html)

Brian Martin. On the whistleblowers' protection. *Philosophy and Social Action*, Vol. 30, No. 1, January-March 2004, pp. 19-34.

\* 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. Terrorism: ethics, effectiveness and enemies. *Social Alternatives*, Vol. 23, No. 2, Second Quarter 2004, pp. 36-37.

\* Brian Martin. Telling lies for a better world? *Social Anarchism*, No. 35, 2003-2004, pp. 27-39.

Brian Martin. Citizen advocacy and paid advocacy: a comparison. *Interaction*, Vol. 17, Issue 1, 2003, pp. 15-20.

\* 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. Overcoming barriers to information. *The Drawing Board: An Australian Review of Public Affairs*, Digest, 12 April 2002, <http://www.econ.usyd.edu.au/drawingboard/digest/0204/martin.html>.

\* Ross Colquhoun and Brian Martin. Constructing social action. *Philosophy and Social Action*, Vol. 27, No. 4, October-December 2001, pp. 7-23.

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

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

\* Schweik Action Wollongong (Sharon Callaghan, Chris Fox, Brian Martin and Yasmin Rittau). Feminists look at civilian-based defense. *Civilian-Based Defense*, Vol. 16, No. 1, Spring 2001, pp. 3-12.

### **Encyclopaedia entries**

Brian Martin. Grassroots science. In: Sal Restivo (ed.), *Science, Technology, and Society: An Encyclopedia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 75-81.

Brian Martin. Environment and public health. In: Derek Jones (ed.), *Censorship: A World Encyclopedia, Volume 2* (London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2001), pp. 740-743.

Brian Martin. Science: contemporary censorship. In: Derek Jones (ed.), *Censorship: A World Encyclopedia, Volume 4* (London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2001), pp. 2167-2170.

### **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. Revised edition published in Italian, 1990.

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**

I have extensive practical experience in social action groups, especially Canberra Peacemakers and, since 1986, Schweik Action Wollongong, which carries out community research projects on nonviolent alternatives to aggression, such as a 2003 project on “Defending Muslims in Wollongong.” This year I am gathering resources and helping organise workshops on resisting repression.

I have extensive experience with whistleblowing, which relates to nonviolent action in several ways. In particular, tactics used to crush whistleblowers are also used to attack peaceful protesters. I was national president of Whistleblowers Australia for four years (1996-1999) and am currently international director. I have given personal advice to many hundreds of whistleblowers and dissidents, experience that contributes to my understanding of the dynamics of conflict.

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

Each year I am a referee for about five articles, including for top journals in peace research. I have examined a dozen PhD theses and am on the editorial boards of *Social Alternatives* and *Public Understanding of Science*, among others.

#### **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
<b>DIRECT COSTS</b>				
<b>Personnel (Salaries + On-costs)</b>				
Casual research assistants totalling 4 days/week @ rate 5 + 18.11% on-costs (1560 hours @ \$33.22)	51823	0	0	51823
CI (Martin) @ 0.3 FTE + 30.36% on-costs	0	41475	0	41475
<b>Total Personnel (a)</b>	51823	41475	0	93298
<b>Teaching Relief</b>				
<b>Total Teaching Relief (b)</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Equipment</b>				
<b>Total Equipment (c)</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Maintenance</b>				
Purchase of documents	750	0	0	750
<b>Total Maintenance (d)</b>	750	0	0	750
<b>Travel</b>				
<b>Total Travel (e)</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Other</b>				
International telephone calls	750	0	0	750
<b>Total Other (f)</b>	750	0	0	750
<b>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (g)</b>	53323	41475	0	94798
<b>INDIRECT COSTS</b>				
<b>CIs, PIs and any researcher Level A or above x multiplier</b>				
CI (Martin) @ 0.3 FTE + 30.36% on-costs x 0.92		38179	0	38179
<b>TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (h)</b>		38179	0	38179
<b>TOTAL COSTS (i)</b>	53323	79654	0	132977

**C1 BUDGET DETAILS**
**C1.2 Year**
**2**

<b>COSTING</b>				
<b>Column 1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Source of funds</b>	<b>ARC</b>	<b>University</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>DIRECT COSTS</b>				
<b>Personnel (Salaries + On-costs)</b>				
Casual research assistants totalling 4 days/week @ rate 5 + 18.11% on-costs (1560 hours @ \$33.22)	51823	0	0	51823
CI (Martin) @ 0.3 FTE + 30.36% on-costs	0	43756	0	43756
<b>Total Personnel (a)</b>	51823	43756	0	95579
<b>Teaching Relief</b>				
<b>Total Teaching Relief (b)</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Equipment</b>				
Equipment (c)	0	0	0	0
<b>Maintenance</b>				
Purchase of documents	750	0	0	750
<b>Total Maintenance (d)</b>	750	0	0	750
<b>Travel</b>				
Australia-Europe-Australia, \$2919	2919	0	0	2919
Per diem, 14 days at \$165	2310	0	0	2310
<b>Total Travel (e)</b>	5229	0	0	5229
<b>Other</b>				
International telephone calls	750	0	0	750
<b>Total Other (f)</b>	750	0	0	750
<b>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (g)</b>	58552	43756	0	102308
<b>INDIRECT COSTS</b>				
<b>CIs, PIs and any researcher Level A or above x multiplier</b>				
CI (Martin) @ 0.3 FTE + 30.36% on-costs x 0.92		39895	0	39895
<b>TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (h)</b>		39895	0	39895
<b>TOTAL COSTS (i)</b>	58552	83651	0	142203

**C1 BUDGET DETAILS**
**C1.3 Year**
**3**

<b>COSTING</b>				
<b>Column 1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Source of funds</b>	<b>ARC</b>	<b>University</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>DIRECT COSTS</b>				
<b>Personnel (Salaries + On-costs)</b>				
Casual research assistants totalling 4 days/week @ rate 5 + 18.11% on-costs (1560 hours @ \$33.22)	51823	0	0	51823
CI (Martin) @ 0.3 FTE + 30.36% on-costs	0	46163	0	46163
<b>Total Personnel (a)</b>	51823	46163	0	97986
<b>Teaching Relief</b>				
CI (Martin) - six months	32294	0	0	32294
<b>Total Teaching Relief (b)</b>	32294	0	0	32294
<b>Equipment</b>				
<b>Total Equipment (c)</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Maintenance</b>				
Purchase of documents	750	0	0	750
<b>Total Maintenance (d)</b>	750	0	0	750
<b>Travel</b>				
<b>Total Travel (e)</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Other</b>				
International telephone calls	750	0	0	750
<b>Total Other (f)</b>	750	0	0	750
<b>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (g)</b>	85617	46163	0	131780
<b>INDIRECT COSTS</b>				
<b>CIs, PIs and any researcher Level A or above x multiplier</b>				
CI (Martin) @ 0.3 FTE + 30.36% on-costs x 0.92		41277	0	41277
<b>TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (h)</b>		41277	0	41277
<b>TOTAL COSTS (i)</b>	85617	87440	0	173057



## **C2 JUSTIFICATION OF FUNDING REQUESTED FROM THE ARC**

### **Personnel**

For each of the four case studies, I plan to use a different research assistant, with relevant skills and area expertise, for extended investigation. The RAs will collect books, articles, videos, newsletters, blogs and other sources, analyse them to select examples of tactics, find potential contacts, and participate in discussions and workshops to formulate, test and refine the theoretical framework.

Because RAs working with me are usually involved through to the final stages of completing and submitting papers, funding is necessary through all three years of the project. Based on previous experience, I estimate that each case study will require research assistance equivalent to one day per week over the three years, giving a total of four days per week for the four case studies.

### **Teaching relief**

I need six months teaching relief to complete all the work for the project. The extra time is vital for me to assess all the information collected from the case studies in relation to the new theory and to write the articles on the four case studies as well as a book covering both the theory and its application. This is based on the experience with my just-completed project in which an extra six months of leave — in addition to study leave — was essential for finishing the work. It is my experience that developing grounded theory requires considerable time to become intimately familiar with case material so that theoretical constructs can be fully tested and refined and confidently applied.

### **Travel**

I plan one trip to Europe, in 2008, to meet with international members of my reference group, who are based in Spain, Norway and Germany (see E7), and their networks to present work-in-progress papers and obtain in-depth feedback on my new theory.

### **Maintenance/other**

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

## **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 and will be auto populated into the table. List other Proposals and/or projects in descending date order.
- 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 Proposal.
- Support types (**Sup type**) are 'C' for current support, 'R' for requested support, 'P' for past support.
- The ARC Project ID applies only to Proposals, current and past projects funded by the ARC.

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

<b>Description</b> (All named investigators on any Proposal or grant on which a participant is involved, project title, source of support, scheme)	<b>(*)</b>	<b>Sup type</b>	<b>ARC Project ID</b> (if applicable)	<b>2005</b> (\$'000)	<b>2006</b> (\$'000)	<b>2007</b> (\$'000)	<b>2008</b> (\$'000)	<b>2009</b> (\$'000)
Nonviolent action and complex warfare	*	R	DP0770917			53	58	85
Martin, Tactics of social transformation, University of Wollongong, Near Miss	*	C			15			
Martin, Theory and action for opposing political repression, ARC, Discovery **	*	P	DP0346386	30				

**D2.1**

Project ID	First named investigator	Scheme
DP0346386	Martin, B	DP

**D2.2 REPORT ON ARC DISCOVERY GRANT DP0346386, “Theory and action for opposing political repression,” 2003-2005**

The aim of the project was 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. In doing this, I developed what I call the backfire model, a generalised theory of tactics used in struggles over injustices. This model is simple, non-trivial and has turned out to be widely applicable.

The basic framework is that powerful groups perpetrating an injustice regularly use five methods that inhibit outrage: cover up the action; devalue the target; reinterpret the events; use official channels to give an appearance of justice; intimidate and bribe people involved. Those opposing injustice need to counter each of these methods.

Scholars — especially my collaborators — and activists have found the backfire model productive. Most excitingly, activists used the model in exposing and opposing the deportation of US peace activist Scott Parkin, as reported in Martin and Murray (2005).

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

- Electroshock weapons. I collaborate 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 (submitted for publication) during his visit to Wollongong in 2005.

- Censorship. I collaborate 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. Two papers appeared in 2005 on dismissals of academics: Ted Steele from the University of Wollongong and Herbert Richardson from the University of Toronto.

- Iraq. My backfire analysis of the conquest of Iraq was published in 2004. Truda Gray (research assistant) and I have submitted a paper on Abu Ghraib and backfire.

- Defamation. Truda Gray and I wrote two papers on how defamation threats and suits can backfire. One has been published (Martin and Gray 2005); the other is submitted.

- Vietnam war. Truda Gray and I have submitted two papers, one on the Vietnam war generally and the other on the My Lai massacre.

- Rodney King. My backfire analysis of the 1991 beating of Rodney King by Los Angeles police was published in *Critical Criminology* in 2005.

- Whistleblowing. I published two articles (2004, 2005).

- Social movements. I collaborated 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 paper will be published in *Mobilization*.

- Others. Susan Engel’s (RA) and my paper about corporate disasters and backfire is to appear in *Global Society*. My paper on backfire and the 1930 salt march in India will appear in *Borderlands E-journal*. Kylie Smith (RA) and I have submitted a paper on labour struggles and backfire. Greg Scott (RA) and I analysed the sexual harassment case involving Anita Hill and Clarence Thomas as a backfire process. Our paper is submitted.

- Backfire book. I completed a book on backfire dynamics titled *Justice Ignited: The Dynamics of Backfire*. It covers the historical cases of the 1930 salt march led by Gandhi, the 1960 Sharpeville massacre in South Africa and the 1991 Dili massacre, various other cases, and a comprehensive account of the backfire model. My publishing contract is with Rowman & Littlefield, and I have delivered the full manuscript.

## PART E — PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### E1 Nonviolent action and complex warfare

#### E2 Aims and background

**The aim of this project is to reframe and elaborate nonviolence theory to encompass contemporary, complex forms of civil conflict.** Nonviolent action has had many successes against dictators and in promoting social change. However, nonviolent action theory requires reformulation to deal with complex warfare in which there are multiple actors, unclear lines of responsibility and violence used for terror and domination. Principles for nonviolent strategy and tactics to deal with complex conflicts will be developed in tandem with a close examination of conflicts in East Timor, ex-Yugoslavia and Palestine.

Some analysts argue that conventional war, in which one state's military forces battle another's, is on the decline. There are still numerous wars occurring worldwide in any given year, but in many of these, unlike conventional warfare, there is no monopoly on violence: multiple actors participate in violent activities; lines of responsibility are unclear, with mercenaries and militias supplementing or competing with government forces, and violence is used for intimidating civilians as much as attacking the "enemy." This conflict configuration has been called "new war" (Duffield 2001; Jung 2003; Kaldor 1999). The archetypal case is ex-Yugoslavia in the 1990s, with conventional forces, militias, ethnic cleansing, confused battle lines and third party interventions.

Whether there is a genuine trend towards new forms of war is a matter of debate (Newman 2004). Furthermore, the "war on terror" has reintroduced a for-and-against polarity to many conflicts. In any case, much contemporary conflict does not conform to the conventional model. **The key point here is that nonviolence theory — the focus of this application — has not adequately addressed these more complex forms of conflict.**

Nonviolent *action* includes methods such as petitions, rallies, strikes, boycotts, fasts, sit-ins and alternative institutions, used to challenge oppression and repression. When a movement uses nonviolent action against a dictatorship, the struggle may seem to be a contest between two players, the movement and the regime. This two-player model is analogous to conventional warfare and seems to fit many of the prominent successes of nonviolent action including toppling dictators in the Philippines (1986), Eastern Europe (1989), Indonesia (1998) and Serbia (2000) as well as dozens of repressive regimes in Africa and Latin America (Ackerman and DuVall 2000; Schock 2005; Zunes et al. 1999).

Nonviolent activists have also taken many initiatives in complex conflicts such as ex-Yugoslavia. International relations theorists have addressed a multitude of issues relating to complex warfare, and beyond (Ramsbotham et al. 2005). Nonviolence *theory*, though, has not kept up with either on-the-ground developments or IR theory.

The most influential nonviolence theorist is Gene Sharp (1973, 2005), whose theoretical framework is based on a ruler-subject dichotomy and thus is most suited for analysing struggles against repressive rulers, but less so for dealing with dispersed systems of power, such as patriarchy, capitalism and bureaucracy (Martin 1989; McGuinness 1993). This points to a relative weakness in nonviolence theory for addressing complex struggles — a weakness to be redressed in this project.

## E3 Significance and innovation

This project involves a major reformulation of nonviolence theory, is of immense practical significance, and is built on a theoretical innovation. These three facets are treated in the following subsections.

### E3.1 Theoretical significance

This project will reformulate nonviolence theory, enabling its application to complex struggles that involve multiple actors, deceptive practices and multiple concurrent stages of development. The reformulation includes identifying, categorising and classifying tactics on multiple sides and putting them into a nonlinear picture of change dynamics.

Gandhi was the pioneering figure in twentieth century nonviolence, developing nonviolent action as a mode of struggle through personal practice in South Africa and India. Gandhi was a prolific writer but not a systematic theorist, so it was left to others to conceptualise his method (Bondurant 1958/1988; Gregg 1934/1966). Arguably, Gandhi's understanding of the success of his own methods was flawed, in that he thought nonviolent action worked through conversion of opponents, whereas in practice it worked by mobilising support, including allies and third parties (Weber 1993).

The next major step in theorising nonviolence was by Gene Sharp (1973, 2005), who conceived of nonviolent action as a pragmatic tool rather than a matter of principle. In formulating his "dynamics of nonviolent action," a set of stages through which nonviolence campaigns typically pass.

The development of nonviolence strategy has been most marked in formulating defence against foreign aggression, a mode of civil resistance called social defence, nonviolent defence or civilian-based defence (Boserup and Mack 1974; Burrowes 1996; Sharp with Jenkins 1990). Strategic principles, drawn from prominent theories of war, have been adapted for a nonviolent struggle, for example in identifying the centre of gravity of the offence and defence. Most of this work has assumed that the problem is defending a state, in the familiar scenario in which an enemy's military forces threaten or occupy a country.

The considerable body of writing about social defence pays relatively little attention to complex conflicts, precisely because of the assumption that the task is national defence, with a single well-defined opponent. More generally, Sharp's model, the template for most writing in the western pragmatic school of nonviolence theory, implicitly assumes a form of strategic planning that fits national defence or a social movement campaign but is not so well suited for complex conflicts in which opponents are sometimes disguised (through proxy armies and disinformation) and coalitions are shifting.

***This project will fill two gaps in nonviolence theorising.*** First, it will reformulate Sharp's dynamics of nonviolent action by generalising it beyond a campaign sequence, towards a more flexible collection of intervention points. Second, it will flesh out tactics within these intervention points. This will constitute a major reformulation and extension of nonviolence theory.

The new theory will be relevant to a wide range of struggles, such as within bureaucracies and between competing political agendas, well beyond the violence-versus-nonviolence scenarios normally addressed in nonviolence theory. As such, a new name may be appropriate, as this will be a generalised theory of struggle.

### **E3.2 Practical significance**

This project will provide useful conceptual tools for understanding complex struggles. Activists will be better able to predict moves by other players and choose tactics to counter them or anticipate 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 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 framework developed will also be relevant to areas where individuals encounter personal injustice, such as bullying or sexual harassment, especially cases where there are multiple perpetrators, unclear lines of authority and shifting alliances. This will be similar to the way my current project on backfire has led to practical advice for individual targets of defamation actions — a topic well outside nonviolence theory — that has been much appreciated by many correspondents.

In principle, the theory developed in the project could be used by any party to a conflict, including perpetrators of abuse or violence. In practice, though, it is far more likely to be taken up by those opposing domination, because it will be structured to be of more value to them. This is similar to the way that traditional nonviolence theory has been used overwhelmingly by nonviolent activists and hardly ever by their opponents.

### **E3.3 Foundation for innovation**

The new theory will build on and complement my backfire model — developed in my just-completed ARC project — which is itself a generalisation of one aspect of nonviolence theory, namely the concept of political jiu-jitsu, when a violent attack on nonviolent protesters is counterproductive for the attackers. The backfire model provides a framework for understanding tactics, something largely neglected in social theory. The model has proved useful for analysing a wide range of struggles, including over censorship, unfair dismissals, police beatings, and technology of repression (see B10.2 for references). The new theory will also address tactics, this time in complex conflicts.

My previous research has laid the basis for this theoretical work. For many years I have developed the grassroots orientation to social defence, taking it beyond a national focus (Martin 1984, 1993). My examination of the role of technology and, in particular, communication in nonviolent struggle (Martin 2001; Martin and Varney 2003) has been premised on capacity-building at the community level, without an assumption of national coordination. With this background, I am ideally placed to develop nonviolence theory for the context of complex warfare.

To do this, I will draw on a grounded theory approach (Glaser and Strauss 1967), with a methodological innovation. The usual approach in grounded theory is to immerse oneself in the empirical material and develop concepts from scratch to make sense of it. My approach will be to start with the best available grounded theories of nonviolent action and build a new model from them, using the processes of generalisation, reformulation and testing, as described in the next section, E4.

## E4 Approach

**The development and testing of this new theory will have three components: generalisation of existing theory, reformulation, and case study analysis to test and refine the theory.** These components will operate in tandem but it is convenient to describe them separately. This approach is built on the one I successfully used in developing the backfire model.

On the theoretical side, I will draw most heavily on the two best grounded theories of nonviolence campaigns. One is Sharp's "dynamics of nonviolent action" described at length in *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (1973: 447-814). It consists of a series of stages in an ideal-typical nonviolence campaign, including laying the groundwork, challenge brings repression, maintaining nonviolent discipline, political jiu-jitsu, and redistribution of power. Although Sharp does not describe his theory as grounded, it is clearly so, given his presentation of numerous historical examples for each stage.

The other valuable theoretical framework is Bill Moyer's Movement Action Plan, a series of eight stages in a social movement campaign, explicitly presented as grounded theory (Moyer et al. 2000). The stages include normal times, ripening conditions, take off and success, among others, each with characteristic features and implications for actors.

I will draw on additional bodies of theory as appropriate. For example, social movement theory is relevant to some aspects of the case studies: Schock's (2005) study of nonviolent action and social movement theory is a key theoretical resource. Cohen's (2001) analysis of how governments deny atrocities is very relevant. I will also draw on techniques to stimulate creative thinking (e.g., de Bono 1996).

### E4.1 Generalisation

The process of generalisation will involve relaxing specific assumptions in Sharp's and Moyer's models. The first is the assumption of two players who are opponents. In Sharp's picture this is the ruler-subject dichotomy and in Moyer's it is the social movement versus powerholders. In practice Sharp and Moyer well understand that there are multiple actors. They are both aware of classic campaigns such as the US civil rights struggle, in which key players included segregationists, civil rights activists, the federal government and the media, among others. But their *models* are built on a two-player picture. I will explore models that accommodate multiple players.

Johan Galtung, widely acknowledged as the world's leading peace researcher, introduced the fruitful idea of the "great chain of nonviolence," a set of intermediaries between ruler and subject through which psychological identification can occur (Galtung 1989). I plan to extend these ideas by treating additional actors as players, not just intermediaries.

Another key assumption in Sharp's and Moyer's models is that the struggle is transparent, namely that unambiguous information is available about what is happening. Both authors are fully aware that governments can and do lie. Moyer in particular stresses that activists can misjudge how successful their efforts have been. But their models do not systematically incorporate the role of disinformation, spin-doctoring, deception and self-deception (Solomon 2005). I have been studying these processes in relation to social movements and communication (Martin and Varney 2003) and have given special attention to the revisionist literature on lying (Nyberg 1993; Robinson 1996; see Martin 2003-4). One of the implications of relaxing the assumption of transparency is that activist strategies need to incorporate multiple feedback mechanisms rather than assuming the situation is what it appears to be.

A third key assumption in Sharp's and Moyer's models is sequential development, namely that campaigns proceed through a series of stages. Although each author is at pains to point out that campaigns in practice are multi-staged — namely with concurrent elements from various stages — and recursive, in practice their models are built on straightforward

sequences. Relaxing this assumption means treating struggles as sets of modular elements, certainly in historical context, but without the same assumption of development. Furthermore, these modular elements can interact.

In summary, the process of generalisation will involve relaxing three assumptions in Sharp's and Moyer's models — two players, transparent struggle, and sequential development — and hence dealing with a more complex picture of multiple players, potential deception and modularity.

#### ***E4.2 Reformulation***

Next, I will reformulate the theory, in other words develop a new theory drawing on elements of the old. This process will involve grasping key processes in the struggle, analysing what makes them happen (or not happen), and recasting these into categories of tactics and strategy.

In my development of the backfire model, I looked at political jiu-jitsu and asked: what do attackers do to prevent their attacks becoming counterproductive? This led to a classification of tactics on both sides. Similarly, in reformulating a theory of struggle with multiple players, I will ask not just what new opportunities arise, for each of two contending parties, when a third party is introduced — but how does the third party see the conflict, and what tactics might it be likely to use?

I am familiar with game theory, though sceptical of its value in understanding the struggles of interest here because of its analytic categories of choices and payoffs (Martin 1978). Nevertheless, I will keep an open mind to this and other ways of analysing conflict.

In reformulating a theory of struggle in the presence of deception, I will ask simple questions such as, what difference would it make if a player is lying? What possible self-deceptions can occur, to any of the players? Such questioning can point the way to possible actions and counter-actions to deal with potentially deceptive ploys and with self-deception.

Finally, I will examine tactics at a series of exemplary points, without the assumption of stages. Just as I developed a series of tactics by analysing political jiu-jitsu, without treating it as a stage in a campaign, I will do the same with other points such as laying the groundwork and redistribution of power.

The point of this process is not to throw out the idea of stages, but rather to set it aside temporarily while reformulating theory. The revised theory can then be inserted into sequential models whenever they are relevant.

#### ***E4.3 Testing/refinement***

I plan to test and refine the generalised model of nonviolent action by applying it to several case studies: East Timor 1998-2000; ex-Yugoslavia in the 1990s; Palestine from 1987; and an emerging conflict. The case studies are chosen because they involve multiple players, deception and/or lack of an obvious sequence, the three key factors to address for reformulating nonviolence theory. Each of them has several of the characteristics of complex conflict, such as state failure, ethnic conflict, civilian casualties, forced displacement and breakdown of public authority.

**East Timor** The East Timorese struggle for independence was first primarily an armed struggle in the countryside; later, emphasis was placed on peaceful protest in urban areas, an approach that turned out to be much more successful (Fukuda 2000). Through much of the period of Indonesian occupation, the struggle could be reasonably approximated as a ruler-subject confrontation, but in the period surrounding the 1999 referendum, multiple actors were more apparent: key roles were played by militias, the Australian and US governments, the UN and the media, as well as civil society in several countries. Deception was central to the struggle, especially the lie that militias were independent of the Indonesian military.



The East Timor case study provides a bounded, well-studied basis for testing the theoretical model. As well as drawing on news reports and critical accounts (e.g. Fernandes 2004; Nevins 2005), I will use the accounts of other observers (e.g. Minion 2004), films and interviews, for example with whistleblowers such as intelligence officer Lance Collins, with whom I have been in contact.

**Ex-Yugoslavia** The wars in ex-Yugoslavia are a rich test-bed for my theory; indeed, these wars were a prime stimulus for attention to “new war” (Kaldor 1999). The existence of multiple players is well known, including armies of Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia, UN troops and NATO bombing in 1999. Less well known are the decade-long nonviolent struggle carried out in Kosovo (Clark 2000) and nonviolent intervention projects initiated from elsewhere in Europe (Howard et al. 2001). The events certainly do not fit a linear series of social movement stages.

To collect relevant information for testing purposes, I will use scholarly, journalistic and movement sources plus consult with individuals with first-hand experience and expertise, especially about nonviolence initiatives, such as Howard Clark (Spain) and Christine Schweitzer (Germany) of War Resisters’ International and Jan Øberg of the Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research (Lund, Sweden), on whose advisory research panel I serve.

**Palestine** since 1987. Within Palestine there are several groups competing for leadership, significant international involvement, and competing violent and nonviolent agendas. Prior to 1987, the PLO used terrorism, largely unsuccessfully. The first intifada, 1987-1993, was largely based on unarmed resistance, with significant impacts on the dynamics of Palestinian society (Dajani 1994; Rigby 1991). In the second intifada, from 2000, violent and nonviolent tactics are used side by side, though mass media coverage almost entirely ignores the significant nonviolent actions carried out by Israelis, Palestinians and international participants, sometimes jointly.

For data, I will select diverse sources from the vast amount of material available, including books, articles, films, newsletters, blogs and Indymedia, as well as consulting with nonviolent activists and scholars.

**Emerging conflict** In addition to these three case studies, I will include an emerging complex conflict. Given that there are a couple dozen wars proceeding at any given time — some concluding, new ones arising and some old ones flaring up — this should not prove difficult. My aim will be to consult with nonviolence practitioners intending to intervene in such a conflict. Should no such conflict emerge that fits the purposes of the project, the fallback case study is Colombia, a current complex conflict. A key member of my reference group (see below), Jørgen Johansen, has contacts in Colombia, including with NGOs promoting nonviolence and armed movements that are considering nonviolent options.

**Benefits of the case studies** First, they offer a way to test and refine the theoretical model, especially by suggesting tactics used by players (including methods of deception), and revealing the mixing of stages found in conventional campaigns. In developing the backfire model, I found it immensely stimulating to examine a range of case studies, with each one revealing both common patterns and case-specific features. Similarly, the case studies in this project will enable fine-tuning of the theory.

Second, the case studies will be illuminating in themselves given the new theoretical lens through which they will be analysed. Finally, the case study treatments will serve as exemplary applications of the theory, namely showing what it means to deploy the theory. This will be in the tradition of Sharp’s and Moyer’s grounded theories, each of which is inspired by and richly illustrated by case material.

#### **E4.5 Work plan**

My plan is to work on the four case studies in parallel in order to maximise insights from comparisons. For each case study, the following steps will be involved:

- collection of material, including print, video and interview;
- categorisation of actors and tactics used by each of them, including deceptions;
- construction of a case-study-specific framework of tactics;
- queries to key participants and scholars concerning tactics used and the overall analysis;
- construction, application and revision of the 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.

#### **E5 National benefit**

For those seeking social change, nonviolent action offers a powerful *alternative* to terrorism (Martin 2002). **By making nonviolence more effective, the attractions of terrorism will be reduced and Australia will be safer. The project thus fits within the priority area of Safeguarding Australia: Protecting Australia from Terrorism and Crime.**

Nonviolent action is also a way of *challenging* terrorists, making their threats and attacks counterproductive far more than the usual approach of government repression (Martin in press). By better understanding and improving nonviolent tactics, civil society can oppose terrorists more powerfully and confidently.

Internationally, more armed movements are considering nonviolence as an alternative approach, as occurred during the East Timor and South Africa liberation struggles and currently in West Papua and Colombia, among other places. Understanding how to be even more effective in using nonviolent action therefore can foster this turn to nonviolence, reducing dangers to Australians internationally.

If just a single war or massacre can be moderated or a single potential war or massacre averted, the benefits are potentially huge. In Australia, there is immediate relevance to counter-terrorism, attacks on Australians in other countries and involvement of Australian troops in foreign wars. As well, Australian activists are engaged in opposing wars and atrocities in a number of countries, for example through Peace Brigades International. Insights into being more effective are tremendously important.

Publication of and publicity about the findings will create wider awareness of how best to intervene against or deter aggression in complex conflicts. Gene Sharp's work on nonviolent action has been widely translated and frequently deployed in struggles against repressive regimes. The aim in this project is to develop a theory that has similar usefulness in more complex struggles.

## E6 Communication of results

As the project proceeds, I will write one or more scholarly papers on each of the four case studies, targeting journals in human rights, politics, and peace research, plus papers specifically on the new theory. As well, I will write more popular treatments, some for a general audience 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, such as War Resisters' International. This has two positive outcomes: one, it communicates results; two, it 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 plan to produce an annotated powerpoint show presenting the theory and illustrating its applications, that can be used by others for training purposes.

I will write a book on nonviolence and complex conflict, spelling out the new theory and showing how it applies to the four case studies and other types of conflict.

## E7 Role of personnel

As **chief investigator**, I will:

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

I will work with several **research assistants**, chosen for their skills and knowledge in fields relevant to the case studies. Based on experience with my current project which 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 case studies;
- contact individuals and groups to obtain information about the case studies;
- compile material on case studies;
- catalogue tactics;
- 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 training developing researchers. The advantage is that the RAs become much more engaged — often quite enthusiastic — about the project and as a consequence do very strong work.

Because the project breaks so much new ground theoretically, I plan to set up a reference group of key scholars and practitioners to offer guidance and feedback. I will seek advice at regular intervals via email and phone and make one trip, in 2008, to present work-in-progress papers to European members of the group, along with others in their own networks.

The following key individuals have agreed to be part of this reference group:

- Howard Clark, Spain, activist and author of a key book on Kosovo (Clark 2000).
- Jørgen Johansen, Norway, activist, scholar and author of five books.
- Christine Schweitzer, Germany, programme director of Nonviolent Peaceforce, an international nongovernment organisation, and member of a peace research institute.
- Ralph Summy, Adjunct Professor, Australian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Queensland, Australia's senior nonviolence researcher.
- Tom Weber, La Trobe University, one of the world's leading Gandhian scholars.

As well, I will remain in close contact with my current collaborators on backfire, who can provide essential feedback about the theory from outside a nonviolence framework.

- David Hess, professor of science and technology studies at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in New York.
- Sue Curry Jansen, professor of communication at Muhlenberg College, Pennsylvania, and an expert on censorship.
- Dr Steve Wright of Leeds Metropolitan University, who has unequalled expertise on the technology of repression.

## E8 References

- Ackerman, Peter and Jack DuVall (2000) *A Force More Powerful: A Century of Nonviolent Conflict* (New York: St. Martin's Press).
- Bondurant, Joan V. (1958/1988) *Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Boserup, Anders and Andrew Mack, *War Without Weapons: Non-violence in National Defence* (London: Frances Pinter).
- Burrowes, Robert J. (1996) *The Strategy of Nonviolence Defense: A Gandhian Approach* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press).
- Clark, Howard (2000) *Civil Resistance in Kosovo* (London: Pluto).
- Cohen, Stanley (2001) *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Dajani, Souad R. (1994) *Eyes Without Country: Searching for a Palestinian Strategy of Liberation* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).
- de Bono, Edward (1996) *Serious Creativity* (London: HarperCollinsBusiness).
- Duffield, Mark (2001) *Global Governance and the New Wars: The Merging of Development and Security* (London: Zed).
- Fernandes, Clinton (2004) *Reluctant Saviour: Australia, Indonesia and the Independence of East Timor* (Melbourne: Scribe).
- Fukuda, Chisako M. (2000) "Peace through nonviolent action: the East Timorese resistance movement's strategy for engagement," *Pacifica Review* 12: 16-31.
- Galtung, Johan (1989) "Principles of nonviolent action: the great chain of nonviolence hypothesis," in *Nonviolence and Israel/Palestine* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Institute for Peace), 13-33.
- Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm L. Strauss (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research* (Chicago : Aldine-Atherton).
- Gregg, Richard B. (1934/1966) *The Power of Nonviolence* (New York: Schocken).
- Howard, Donna et al. (2001) *Nonviolent Peaceforce Feasibility Study* (St. Paul, MN: Nonviolent Peaceforce).
- Jung, Dietrich, ed. (2003) *Ethnic Conflicts and New Wars: A Political Economy of Intra-State War* (London: Routledge).

- Kaldor, Mary (1999) *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Martin, Brian (1978) "The selective usefulness of game theory," *Social Studies of Science* 8: 85-110.
- Martin, Brian (1984) *Uprooting War* (London: Freedom Press).
- Martin, Brian (1989) "Gene Sharp's theory of power," *Journal of Peace Research* 26: 213-222.
- Martin, Brian (1993) *Social Defence, Social Change* (London: Freedom Press).
- Martin, Brian (2001) *Technology for Nonviolent Struggle* (London: War Resisters' International).
- Martin, Brian (2002) "Nonviolence versus terrorism," *Social Alternatives* 21(2): 6-9.
- Martin, Brian (2003-2004) "Telling lies for a better world?" *Social Anarchism* 35: 27-39.
- Martin, Brian (in press) "Beyond the repression paradigm," *Social Alternatives*.
- Martin, Brian and Wendy Varney (2003) *Nonviolence Speaks: Communicating against Repression* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press).
- McGuinness, Kate (1993) "Gene Sharp's theory of power: a feminist critique of consent," *Journal of Peace Research* 30: 101-115.
- Minion, Lynne (2004) *Hello Missus: A Girl's Own Guide to Foreign Affairs* (Sydney: HarperCollins).
- 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).
- Nevins, Joseph (2005) *A Not-So-Distant Horror: Mass Violence in East Timor* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).
- Newman, Edward (2004) "The 'new wars' debate: a historical perspective is needed," *Security Dialogue* 35(2): 173-189.
- Nyberg, David (1993) *The Varnished Truth: Truth Telling and Deceiving in Ordinary Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Ramsbotham, Oliver, Tom Woodhouse and Hugh Miall (2005) *Contemporary Conflict Resolution: The Prevention, Management and Transformation of Deadly Conflicts*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Rigby, Andrew (1991) *Living the Intifada* (London: Zed Books).
- Robinson, W. Peter (1996) *Deceit, Delusion and Detection* (London: Sage).
- Schock, Kurt (2005) *Unarmed Insurrections: People Power Movements in Nondemocracies* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press).
- Sharp, Gene (1973) *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (Boston: Porter Sargent).
- Sharp, Gene (2005) *Waging Nonviolent Struggle* (Boston: Porter Sargent).
- Sharp, Gene with Bruce Jenkins (1990) *Civilian-Based Defense: A Post-Military Weapons System* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Solomon, Norman (2005) *War Made Easy* (New York: John Wiley).
- Stoecker, Randy (1996) Sociology and social action: introduction, *Sociological Imagination* 33: 3-17.
- Weber, Thomas (1993) "'The marchers simply walked forward until struck down': nonviolent suffering and conversion'," *Peace & Change* 18: 267-289.
- Zunes, Stephen, Lester R. Kurtz, and Sarah Beth Asher (eds.) (1999) *Nonviolent Social Movements: A Geographical Perspective* (Oxford: Blackwell).