

**AUSTRALIAN RESEARCH COUNCIL
Discovery - Projects
Proposal for Funding Commencing in 2012**

DP

PROJECT ID: DP120102473

First Investigator: Prof Brian Martin

Admin Org: University of Wollongong

Total number of sheets contained in this Proposal: 38

Information on this form and its attachments 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 Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research, the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, 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.

CERTIFICATION

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

I certify that—

- I have obtained the agreement, attested to by written evidence of all the relevant persons and organisations necessary to allow the Project to proceed. This written evidence has been retained and will be provided to the ARC if requested.
- I have read, understood and complied with the *Discovery Projects Funding Rules for funding commencing in 2012* and, if the Proposal is successful, I agree to abide by the terms and conditions of the *Discovery Projects Funding Agreement for funding commencing in 2012*.
- Proper enquires have been made and I am satisfied that the Participants and the Organisations listed in this Proposal meet the requirements specified in the *Discovery Projects Funding Rules for funding commencing in 2012*. I will notify the ARC if there are changes to any named Participant or organisation after the submission of this Proposal.
- This organisation supports this Proposal and if successful will provide basic facilities and the items listed in the budget for the Project.
- To the best of my knowledge, all Conflicts of Interest relating to parties involved in or associated with this Proposal have been disclosed to the ARC, and I will notify the ARC of any changes which arise after the submission of this Proposal.
- This Proposal does not have a significant focus on near-term clinical medical (including dental) outcomes as defined by the ARC.
- This Proposal does not duplicate Commonwealth-funded research including that in a Commonwealth-funded Research Centre.
- I consent, on behalf of all the parties, to this Proposal being referred to third parties, who will remain anonymous, for assessment purposes.
- I consent on behalf of all the parties, to the ARC copying, modifying and otherwise dealing with information contained in the Proposal.
- To the best of my knowledge, the Privacy Notice appearing at the top of this Proposal form has been drawn to the attention of all the Participants whose personal details have been provided at the Personnel section.
- To the best of my knowledge all details provided in this Proposal form and in any supporting documentation are true and complete in accordance with Section 14.5 of the *Discovery Projects Funding Rules for funding commencing in 2012*.
- If this Proposal is successful, I am prepared to have the Project carried out at this organisation as set out in this Proposal and in accordance with the *Discovery Projects Funding Rules for funding commencing in 2012*.
- The Project can be accommodated within the general facilities in this organisation, and if applicable, within the facilities of other relevant organisations specified in this Proposal, 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 are provided.
- The Project will not be permitted to proceed until appropriate ethical clearance(s) has/have been obtained.
- I understand and agree that all statutory requirements must be met before the Project can commence.

PART A - Administrative Summary (DP120102473)

A1. If this proposal is successful, which organisation will it be administered by?

Administering Organisation Name

University of Wollongong

A2. Proposal Title

(Provide a short descriptive title of no more than 150 characters (20 words). Avoid the use of acronyms, quotation marks and upper case characters.)

Nonviolent action and the violence connection

A3. Person Participant Summary

	Person number	Family name	First name	Current organisation
1	1	Martin	Brian	University of Wollongong

	Relevant organisation for this proposal	Role
1	University of Wollongong	Chief Investigator

A4. Summary of Proposal

(In no more than 750 characters (approx 100 words) of plain language, summarise aims, significance and expected outcomes.)

In some challenges to repressive rule, nonviolent methods are accompanied by violence, for example in Palestine, West Papua and Egypt. By examining these and other struggles, a framework for assessing the relative effectiveness of nonviolent and violent methods in mobilising popular support for change will be developed and tested.

A5. Summary of Project for Public Release

(In no more than 350 characters (approx 50 words), please provide a two-sentence descriptor of the purpose and expected outcome of the project which is suitable for media or other publicity material. Do not duplicate or simply truncate the 'Summary of Proposal'.)

Rallies, strikes, boycotts, sit-ins and other nonviolent methods can be effective in challenging repressive governments. Sometimes violence is also used. By studying struggles involving both nonviolent and violent methods, the tactics most likely to be effective can be determined.

PART B - Classification and other statistical information (DP120102473)

B1. National Research Priorities

	National Research Priority Area	National Research Priority Goal
1		
2		

B2. Field of Research (FOR)

	Field of Research (FOR)	Field of Research (FOR) Percent
1	Political Science not elsewhere classified	100

B3. Socio-Economic Objective (SEO-08)

	Socio Economic Objective (SEO)	Socio Economic Objective (SEO) Percent
1	Law, Politics and Community Services not elsewhere classified	100

B4. Keywords

	Keywords
1	nonviolent action
2	violence
3	social action
4	conflict

B5. If the proposed research involves international collaboration, please specify the country/ies involved.

	International Collaboration Country Name
1	
2	

C1. Please upload a Project Description as detailed in the Instructions to Applicants in no more than 10 A4 pages and in the required format.

Attached PDF

Nonviolent action and the violence connection

AIMS AND BACKGROUND

Aim To evaluate the ways that violent and nonviolent methods mobilise opposition to repressive regimes.

The toppling of dictators in Tunisia and Egypt this year shows yet again that popular nonviolent action can be effective against repressive regimes. However, these and other instances of nonviolent action by civilians have involved some violence by regime opponents. Does using violence help or hinder popular movements, and how? Addressing this question is the aim of this project.

The project is interdisciplinary. It deals with the politics of popular struggle and overlaps with social movement studies. It deals with strategy for people's movements, a topic seldom addressed in strategic studies.

Although violent and nonviolent paths have been debated at least since the 1920s, when Marxists challenged Gandhi's nonviolent campaigns in India, surprisingly there has been little in the way of systematic comparison — until recently. Karatnycky and Ackerman (2005) found that nonviolent struggles were more likely to be effective in fostering democratic transitions. Stefan and Chenoweth (2008) used a different data set to arrive at a similar conclusion. In several places in the world today, for example Palestine and West Papua, some campaigners use violence while others promote nonviolent action. Both violence and nonviolence were used in a number of earlier struggles, such as resistance to the Indonesian occupation of East Timor and opposition to apartheid in South Africa.

In recent decades, nonviolent action by civilians — sometimes called “people power” — has been crucial in challenging repressive governments. Examples include the 1986 overthrow of the Philippines dictatorship, the collapse of Eastern European communist regimes in 1989, the 2000 toppling of president Milosevic in Serbia, subsequent so-called coloured revolutions in Georgia, Lebanon, and the Ukraine, and this year's people power uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt. (On the role of nonviolence theory and practice in Tunisia and Egypt, see for example Kirkpatrick and Sanger 2011.)

There are dozens more examples from Africa, South America and Asia (Ackerman and DuVall 2000; Crow et al. 1990; McManus and Schlabach 1991; Schock 2005; Zunes et al. 1999; for more sources see McCarthy and Sharp 1997). Note that nonviolent action refers to protesters being nonviolent: violence can be and often is used against peaceful protesters.

Nonviolent action is a marginalised topic in the social sciences. This is anomalous, considering the great expansion in the use of nonviolent action in numerous countries and its role in so many democratic transitions.

Supporters of armed struggle say violence is necessary to challenge and overthrow the power of the state, though they usually put this in the context of an overall political struggle. They point to successes such as the 1949 Chinese revolution and 1959 overthrow of the Cuban Batista dictatorship. Supporters of nonviolent action, on the

other hand, say techniques such as rallies, strikes, boycotts and sit-ins are a better way of opposing repression because they have a greater capacity for mobilising support, minimising suffering and creating a more democratic new government.

Neither armed struggle nor nonviolent insurrection is guaranteed to succeed. Armed struggle has often failed, for example the Malayan communist guerrillas in the 1950s and the Italian Red Brigades in the 1970s. Nonviolent challenges can also be crushed, most famously in Beijing in 1989. Some nonviolent struggles overthrow dictators but do not usher in a freer society, as with the 1978–79 Iranian revolution.

My role in the issue

Much of my research takes the form of engaged scholarship. I seek to provide tools to activists and dissidents for improving their understanding and strategies. At the same time I pursue the deepest possible understandings, even when activists do not welcome the resulting insights. For example, I have long cautioned whistleblowers against their usual approach of seeking relief using official channels. I took an unpopular position within the peace movement in recommending preparation for the political aftermath of nuclear war.

Directly relevant to this project, I have written some of the most detailed rebuttals to arguments against nonviolence (Martin 1997, 2008). Therefore I am far from a neutral observer in the debate between violence and nonviolence. Nevertheless, over the past decade, my work on tactics against injustice has provided a new perspective. As well as studying cases of violence used against peaceful protesters, such as the 1960 Sharpeville massacre in South Africa and the 1991 Dili massacre in East Timor, I have applied my model to cases in which violence has been used on both sides. Examples include US bombing during the Vietnam War (Gray and Martin 2008) and the 2003 invasion of Iraq (Martin 2007). These studies show that in struggles involving violence, some tactics are more effective than others in winning support, and some are counterproductive, such as Palestinian suicide bombings in Israel and the Israeli attack on the Free Gaza flotilla.

Although I look at the issues from a nonviolence point of view, I am open to the possibility that, in certain situations, violent methods may be helpful or not matter. This relates to the issue of nonviolent discipline, which involves not using violence and developing the capacity to not respond to provocation. Sharp (1973) includes maintaining nonviolent discipline as a stage in his dynamics of nonviolent action. Remaining nonviolent maximises the likelihood that violence against protesters will backfire against the authorities.

However, in many actual struggles, such as this year's instances of people power in the Middle East, there was relatively little preparation for mass action and little training in how to maintain nonviolent discipline. The question arises: does spontaneous use of violence help or hurt a movement? Some proponents of armed struggle might also recommend against spontaneous violence.

Nonviolence theory

Nonviolence is commonly divided into two traditions, principled and pragmatic (Stiehm 1968). The principled tradition, associated with Gandhi, advocates nonviolence (Gandhi's more general term is *satyagraha*) on moral grounds, namely

that it is immoral to use violence against others. The Gandhian approach is often accompanied by an emphasis on moral witness and attempts to persuade opponents.

The pragmatic tradition advocates nonviolent action because it is more effective than violence. The key figure in this tradition is scholar Gene Sharp whose 1973 book *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* presents a theory of power, 198 methods of nonviolent action — picketing, mock awards, vigils, renunciation of honours, social boycott, stay-at-home, refusal to sell property, peasant strikes, judicial noncooperation, mutiny, sit-ins and seizure of assets, to pick a few examples — and a set of stages in campaigns that Sharp calls the dynamics of nonviolent action.

The theory behind most nonviolent activism is not greatly different from that given by Gandhi and Sharp. Gandhi remains the key influence in much principled nonviolence, such as “ploughshares” actions in which protesters damage weapons systems and then give themselves up to police. Such activists are often religiously motivated and see their actions as bearing moral witness.

Actions in the pragmatic tradition, the most common sort in western countries, often proceed without any explicit attention to theory. Protesters may be unaware of ideas in the area and just do what seems effective, perhaps having read about or witnessed other actions. For example, when workers walk off the job or sabotage equipment, rarely are they familiar with theory about these sorts of actions.

Increasingly, though, activists use a wide variety of tools for analysis, group dynamics, preparation, communication and other facets of actions and campaigns. Ideas about nonviolent action are part of the activist toolkit and most commonly they are drawn from Sharp, including the consent theory of power and examples of nonviolent action. Successful campaigns are widely used as exemplars.

Compared to nonviolence theory, writing and theory about the effectiveness of armed struggle is limited. There is no treatment dealing with violence remotely comparable with Sharp’s *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*. The most comprehensive treatment of violence, Vollman’s (2007) *Rising Up and Rising Down*, focuses on justifications for and consequences of violence, and includes a detailed moral calculus. He neither addresses pragmatic nonviolence nor systematically compares nonviolence and violence. In short, he deals with rationales rather than effectiveness.

The main reason for the neglect of a pragmatic assessment of violence by proponents of armed struggle seems to be that they simply assume its necessity and effectiveness and therefore see no need to analyse it closely. A similar assumption is made by governments, where no justification is considered necessary for the existence of military forces. It is therefore left to advocates of nonviolent alternatives to make their case.

The consensus among nonviolence researchers is that the mixing of violent and nonviolent methods in campaigns is counterproductive, usually reducing the effectiveness of the nonviolent components (Sharp 1973). In practice, every democratic transition, including those conceptualised as nonviolent such as the Indian independence movement, has included both violence and nonviolence. Given the under-theorisation of the violence-nonviolence intersection, addressing this boundary is vital for the advancement of nonviolence theory and practice.

RESEARCH PROJECT

I will start with a preliminary framework for assessing tactics, and then use case studies to probe and revise the framework. The preliminary framework is built around a single goal for activists: mobilisation, which basically means maintaining and increasing popular support. Even a tactic that appears to fail in the short term, for example when protesters are arrested or fighters are killed, can be successful if it generates greater support. I find it useful to break down the concept of mobilisation into five principal components.

1 *Awareness* An action can lead to more people becoming aware of an issue or of the existence of opposition. Awareness is foundational to the success of a social movement. Actions to increase awareness are especially important in the early stages of a movement's campaign.

2 *Credibility* An action can lead to people seeing a movement as powerful, respectable or principled, among various positive attributes. Governments commonly try to discredit movements as dangerous and disreputable, for example labelling protesters as "rabble" or fighters as "terrorists." This indicates the importance of credibility as a component of mobilisation.

3 *Understanding* An action can lead more people to understand the issues, for example the injustices involved in current social arrangements. Understanding encompasses history, issues, arguments, social dynamics and a host of other dimensions. Some actions have straightforward educational elements, for example rallies in which leaflets are distributed. Others foster understanding via self-education, for example when media reports lead people to search for information on the web. Yet other actions promote a different sort of learning by provoking responses from authorities that reveal behaviour discrepant with their rhetoric.

4 *Allies* An action can lead to greater support for a movement through other groups making public stands, joining the campaign, providing money and resources, becoming formal partners or lending their support in other ways. This is a traditional aspect of mobilisation.

5 *Participation* An action can lead activists or others to become more active in support of the cause. For example, participating in a sit-in can be a moving experience and cause participants to be eager to do more. Another avenue is through setting an example: news about a campaign can lead supporters to increase their efforts or stimulate previously uncommitted individuals to become involved. Participation is the end-point of mobilisation.

The five components of mobilisation depend sensitively on how the opponent acts, including how the opponent responds to tactics taken by a movement. For example, if a government censors the media, this makes it more difficult to foster awareness. If a government beats or kills protesters, this can discourage action but sometimes trigger greater action due to public outrage, depending on people's awareness and the credibility of the protesters.

I have developed this preliminary framework over the past 12 months, drawing on knowledge of case studies and experience with my model of tactics against injustice (Martin 2007). The core concept of mobilisation has affinities with the

strategic aim of nonviolent defence systems, which different authors have said is either the unity (Boserup and Mack 1974), morale (Keyes 1981) or power and will (Burrowes 1996) of the defending population. I believe mobilisation has more potential as a central concept, given its connection with work on social movements.

This preliminary framework will be revised and refined, or perhaps even substantially revamped, after detailed scrutiny in relation to case studies such as the following.

- In the East Timorese struggle against the Indonesian invasion and occupation from 1975, initially armed struggle was the primary mode of resistance. In the late 1980s, the East Timorese strategy changed to a combination of nonviolent resistance in urban areas accompanied by defensive-only military resistance in the countryside (Fukuda 2000).

- In the South African resistance to apartheid, armed struggle was used by the African National Congress from the 1970s but in the 1980s and early 1990s there was a greater use of nonviolent methods (Zunes 1999).

- During the Vietnam War, the primary mode of resistance to the South Vietnamese government was armed struggle, mainly in the countryside. However, the Buddhist opposition used nonviolent methods at the same time, mainly in urban areas.

- Resistance to the Nazi occupation of Europe included both violence by partisans and nonviolent methods such as public protests, bureaucratic obstruction of orders and sabotage in factories (Semelin 1993).

- In the first Palestinian intifada (uprising) (1987–1993), the primary Palestinian actions were nonviolent, including strikes, boycotts and rallies, but there was some violence including throwing of stones. In the second intifada (2000–present), suicide bombings have been prominent, while a wide range of nonviolent actions continue to be used, though with little international publicity (Kaufman-Lacusta 2010).

Methodology

In analysing the case studies, I will seek sources that provide detailed information for assessing the impact of actions taken by movement activists. In a few instances, activists have reflected on their own experiences, providing invaluable insight. For example, Janet Cherry, an anti-apartheid activist, has written about the impact of violent and nonviolent strategies (Cherry 2008). I have been in touch with her about this work and will continue to be as the project proceeds, because such insider reflections are of exceptional value in assessing the link between movement actions and mobilisation.

However, few such in-depth assessments exist, so I will seek to obtain documents providing equivalent information: personal chronicles, news reports, movement publications, opinion polls, government pronouncements and data from interviews. There are some excellent secondary sources based on extensive interviewing, for example Collin's (2007) account of pro-democracy movements in Serbia, Georgia, Ukraine and elsewhere. These provide guidance to incidents worth exploring for more detail.

I will rely on several different research assistants to help in obtaining documents. Specialist knowledge about individual countries will be an advantage. Some translations may be useful.

The test of the framework developed for this project is whether it helps make sense of evidence that is otherwise apparently unconnected or unnoticed. It can be considered an extension and elaboration of the concept of political jiu-jitsu (Sharp 1973), in which violent attacks on peaceful protesters can rebound against the attackers. In my previous ARC study (DP0346386), I developed a model of the likely tactics used by powerful perpetrators to minimise outrage: this model makes sense of a diverse range of tactics that might otherwise seem unconnected (Martin 2007). Tactics and strategy are largely neglected in social science (Jasper 2006); my model enables recognition and, sometimes, prediction of tactics used by players, across a diverse range of issues. The framework I will develop and test is similarly ambitious in providing a way to grasp tactics and predict their effects when both violent and nonviolent methods are used.

National benefit

Nonviolent action has already benefited Australia through helping end the Suharto government without massive loss of life (Forrester and May 1998). An improvement in the understanding of and capacity for nonviolent action has enormous potential for improving the prospects for democratic transitions within Indonesia (Aceh and West Papua) and in countries such as Burma, China and North Korea, all of which affect Australia's security and economic environment.

Nonviolent action is increasingly used by a wide range of movements at national, sub-national and transnational levels. As an alternative to armed struggle, it has numerous advantages, including greater participation, lower casualties, and a smaller likelihood of a repressive successor regime.

RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT

Over the past decade, I have created a personal research environment to support my nonviolence-related work. It contains several elements.

- *University of Wollongong (UOW)* A number of my immediate colleagues are sympathetic to my nonviolence work and provide inspiration, support and critique from various disciplinary perspectives. I am an associate member of the Institute for Social Transformation Research (ISTR), which provides support for my work. ISTR focuses on human rights and social change, topics central to my project. Also at UOW is the Centre for Asia Pacific Social Transformation Studies (CAPSTRANS), with expertise relevant to regional engagement.

- *An international network* As one of the world's senior nonviolence researchers, I am in touch with a considerable number of other leading figures, for example April Carter (UK), Howard Clark (Spain) and Kurt Schock (US), authors of key works in the field. I have visited nonviolence researchers during trips to Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, Britain and Germany.

With funding from the Arts Faculty, in July 2010 I organised a workshop in Wollongong for a small group of nonviolence researchers who were visiting Australia for the biennial conference of the International Peace Research Association, held in

Sydney. One outcome of the workshop was the establishment of the Nonviolent Action Research Network. The online page is coordinated by Cynthia Boaz (US) and Véronique Dudouet (Germany); Jørgen Johansen (Norway) and I are advisers. This new network is still being developed, but promises to enable greater sharing of ideas that will be especially helpful to new nonviolence researchers.

- *A national network* In Australia, I maintain regular contact other Australian nonviolence researchers, notably Ralph Summy (retired but still attached to the University of Queensland) and Tom Weber (La Trobe).

Majken Sørensen (Denmark) is one of the most promising young nonviolence researchers I have met. She has published several articles and written a book. This year she will be starting a PhD with me at UOW. Jørgen Johansen, author of several books and numerous articles on nonviolence, will be spending months in Wollongong also. (Jørgen and I have co-authored one article, translated into several languages, and are engaged in ongoing collaboration.)

I am the external and de-facto primary PhD supervisor for Jason MacLeod (University of Queensland), another productive and knowledgeable nonviolence researcher. His topic is the struggle in West Papua, one that has involved both violent and nonviolent action. We have built a strong relationship that will continue after he submits his thesis this year. I will collaborate with Jason drawing on his insights for the West Papua case study.

- I have adopted a *high-output writing programme*, based on the work of Robert Boice and Tara Gray, that enables me to be productive and yet highly efficient throughout the year, irrespective of teaching and other commitments (Martin 2009). Most of my PhD students have been using the programme since 2008. I also run the programme for academics and other research students in the Arts Faculty at UOW, with weekly meetings at which we comment on each other's writing. Additionally, I run a remote programme for a group of nonviolence researchers outside Australia. I am a mentor or supervisor in all these programmes; they also provide me with highly valuable feedback on my own writing and research plans.

In summary, I work in a congenial faculty context that has enabled me to establish a supportive environment for my research at minimal expense, using electronic communication for international networking, occasional visits, and formal collaboration with a few individuals. The writing programme, which enables high productivity, works best with a regular work routine, and I am quite happy to develop this sort of semi-virtual research environment using email, web pages and Skype.

Communication of results

I plan to publish papers in top peace research journals such as *Journal of Peace Research*, as well as journals in diverse fields, raising key theoretical ideas with relevant audiences. A further outcome of the project will be a full-length book study, which will synthesise the different threads in the research, while also contributing to contemporary social action theory.

To maximise availability of the research, I will place all articles on my website and supplement these with an activist-oriented summary, in the style of my widely used “Backfire basics.” In addition, I will write short accounts for magazines oriented to activists, such as *The Nonviolent Activist* and *Peace News*.

I will give talks to both academic and activist audiences in Australia and internationally, and will use these opportunities to both present the work and obtain feedback for improvement. Based on these experiences, I will develop a slide show, with an accompanying script and sources of information, for use by others, making it available on my website, similarly to my backfire slide show. In addition, I will set up an interactive website with annotatable texts to stimulate contributions from a wide range of scholars and activists.

I will work intensively with the RAs to develop their writing and other communication skills. They will be participants in the high-output writing programmes that I run. The RAs will be expected to produce significant outputs and I will work with them to target all appropriate modes including academic papers, popular accounts, wikis, talks and workshops.

Because communication is central to nonviolent action (Martin and Varney 2003a, b), I aim to model good communication practice concerning research into nonviolent action. This means trying different approaches, including interactive methods, and learning from experience.

ROLE OF PERSONNEL

The RAs will systematically analyse writings about struggles and campaigns identified by me, identifying instances of nonviolent action and violence and classifying them according to components of mobilisation. My role as CI will be to conceptualise the theoretical dimensions of the project, participate in collecting information, analysing documents and cataloguing tactics, formulate and test theories, and lead efforts in publication and other communication of results.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, Peter and Jack DuVall (2000) *A Force More Powerful: A Century of Nonviolent Conflict* (New York: St. Martin's Press).
- Boserup, Anders and Andrew Mack (1974) *War without weapons: Non-violence in national defence*. London: Frances Pinter.
- Burrowes, Robert J. (1996) *The strategy of nonviolent defense: A Gandhian approach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Cherry, Janet (2008) "The intersection of violent and nonviolent strategies and tactics: case study of South Africa," report to the International Center for Nonviolent Conflict, Washington, DC, November.
- Collin, Matthew (2007) *The Time of the Rebels: Youth Resistance Movements and 21st Century Revolutions* (London: Serpent's Tail).
- Crow, Ralph E., Philip Grant, and Saad E. Ibrahim, eds. (1990) *Arab Nonviolent Political Struggle in the Middle East* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner).
- Forrester, Geoff and R. J. May, eds. (1998) *The Fall of Soeharto* (Bathurst: Crawford House).
- Fukuda, Chisako M. (2000) "Peace through nonviolent action: the East Timorese resistance movement's strategy for engagement," *Pacifica Review*, 12: 16–31.
- Gray, Truda and Brian Martin (2008) "The American war in Indochina: injustice and outrage," *Revista de Paz y Conflictos*, No. 1 (online).
- Jasper, James M. (2006) *Getting Your Way: Strategic Dilemmas in the Real World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Karatnycky, Adrian and Peter Ackerman (2005) *How Freedom is Won: From Civic Resistance to Durable Democracy* (New York: Freedom House).
- Kaufman-Lacusta, Maxine (2010) *Refusing to Be Enemies: Palestinian and Israeli Nonviolent Resistance to the Israeli Occupation* (Reading, UK: Ithaca Press).
- Keyes, Gene (1981) "Strategic non-violent defense: the construct of an option," *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 4: 125–151.
- Kirkpatrick, David D. and David E. Sanger (2011) "Dual uprisings show potent new threats to Arab states," *New York Times*, 13 February.
- Martin, Brian (1997) "Critique of violent rationales," *Pacifica Review*, 9 (1): 83–91.
- Martin, Brian (2007) *Justice Ignited: The Dynamics of Backfire* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield).
- Martin, Brian (2008) "How nonviolence is misrepresented," *Gandhi Marg*, 30 (2, July-September): 235–257.
- Martin, Brian (2009) "Research productivity: some paths less travelled," *Australian Universities' Review*, 51(1), 14–20.
- Martin, Brian and Wendy Varney (2003a) *Nonviolence Speaks: Communicating against Repression* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press).
- Martin, Brian and Wendy Varney (2003b) "Nonviolence and communication," *Journal of Peace Research*, 14 (2): 213–232.
- McCarthy, Ronald M. and Gene Sharp (1997) *Nonviolent Action: A Research Guide* (New York: Garland).
- McManus, Philip and Gerald Schlabach, eds. (1991), *Relentless Persistence: Nonviolent Action in Latin America* (Philadelphia: New Society Press).

- Schock, Kurt (2005) *Unarmed Insurrections: People Power Movements in Nondemocracies* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).
- Semelin, Jacques (1993) *Unarmed Against Hitler: Civilian Resistance in Europe 1939–1943* (Westport, CT: Praeger).
- Sharp, Gene (1973) *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (Boston: Porter Sargent).
- Sharp, Gene (2005) *Waging Nonviolent Struggle* (Boston: Porter Sargent).
- Stephan, Maria J. and Erica Chenoweth (2008) “Why civil resistance works: the strategic logic of nonviolent political conflict,” *International Security*, 33(1): 7–44.
- Stiehm, Judith (1968) “Nonviolence is two,” *Sociological Inquiry* 38 (Winter): 23–30.
- Vollman, William T. (2003) *Rising Up and Rising Down*, 7 volumes (San Francisco: McSweeney’s Books).
- Zunes, Stephen (1999) “The role of non-violent action in the downfall of apartheid,” *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 37 (1): 137–169.
- Zunes, Stephen, Lester R. Kurtz, and Sarah Beth Asher, eds. (1999) *Nonviolent Social Movements: A Geographical Perspective* (Oxford: Blackwell).

D1. What is the proposed budget for your project?

(Please provide details of the budget proposed for your project.)

Proposal Funding Summary

Total requested budget: \$127017

Year 1

Description	ARC	AdminOrg
Direct Cost	40689	59331
Personnel	40689	59331
Casual research assistance (level 5) @ 0.5FTE (900 hours) + 17.61% on-costs	40689	0
CI Martin @ 0.3FTE + on-costs	0	59331

Year 2

Description	ARC	AdminOrg
Direct Cost	42318	61704
Personnel	42318	61704
Casual research assistance (level 5) @ 0.5FTE (900 hours) + 17.61% on-costs	42318	0
CI Martin @ 0.3FTE + on-costs	0	61704

Year 3

Description	ARC	AdminOrg
Direct Cost	44010	64172
Personnel	44010	64172
Casual research assistance (level 5) @ 0.5FTE (900 hours) + 17.61% on-costs	44010	0
CI Martin @ 0.3FTE + on-costs	0	64172

PART E - Budget Justifications (DP120102473)

E1. Justification of funding requested from the ARC (excluding justification of Discovery Outstanding Researcher Award requests)

(In no more than three A4 pages fully justify in terms of need and cost, each budget item requested from the ARC (use the same headings as in the ARC Request Budget Column). NOTE: Justification for Discovery Outstanding Researcher Award requests should be made in Part F – Personnel.)

E1 JUSTIFICATION OF FUNDING REQUESTED FROM THE ARC

Personnel

The RAs working on the project will primarily collect documents about the case studies — contemporary accounts, news reports, newsletters, secondary sources and anything else available — and search these for evidence of the use of nonviolent or violent methods and their impact on the five components of mobilisation. Under my guidance, they will also explore case studies additional to the ones indicated in this application, to determine whether they are suitable for more detailed analysis.

With previous ARC projects, I as sole CI have employed either a single RA/fellow or several different RAs. I have found that employing a range of RAs is more productive for the sort of research I do. There are numerous talented PhD students at the University of Wollongong who can undertake this work. RA level 5 is appropriate for the type of work they will do.

I aim to work with RAs as collaborators. In my most recent ARC project, I individually co-authored papers with five different RAs (25, 29, 30, 31, 34, 38, 40, 41). This helps develop research capacity in the field.

E2. Details of non-ARC contributions

(In no more than one A4 page provide an explanation of how non-ARC contributions will support the proposed project (use the same headings as in the non-ARC contributions Budget Column).)

Attached PDF

E2 DETAILS OF NON-ARC CONTRIBUTIONS

The main contribution from the University of Wollongong is the CI's salary @ 0.3 FTE totalling \$185,207 over three years.

F1. Personal details

(The personal details will be filled out for you automatically. To update any of your personal details in this form, please update your profile accordingly and your details will update automatically in this form.)

Title

Professor

Family Name

Martin

First Name

Brian

Person identifier

G1317975

Role

Chief Investigator

F2. Postal address

(The postal address will be filled out for you automatically. To update your postal address, please update your profile accordingly and your postal address will update automatically in this form.)

Postal Address Line 1

University of Wollongong, Building 19 (Arts) Level 1

Postal Address Line 2

Northfields Avenue

Locality

Wollongong

State

NSW

Postcode

2522

Country

Australia

F3. Are you a current member of the ARC or its selection or other advisory committees?

(This relates only to College of Experts members or Selection Advisory Committee members for National Competitive Grants Program funding schemes.)

Current Member of Advisory Committee

No

F4. Please name any of your relatives or close social/professional associates that are members of the ARC or its selection or other advisory committees.

Associates and Relatives Members of Advisory Committee	
1	
2	
3	
4	

F5. Please name any Commonwealth-funded Research Centre that you will be associated with as at 1 January 2012.

	Full Legal Name of Centre	Start Date	Cessation Date	Centre Role
1				
2				

Centre Role if Other	
1	
2	

F6. Do you as a participant relate to any of the following special interest items?

	Special Interest Name	Special Interest
1		
2		
3		

F7. Awarded ARC Fellowships

Have you ever been awarded a fellowship from the ARC?

Previous Fellowship

No

Please indicate if you have been awarded any Fellowships from the ARC.

(If yes, please list their short-hand names (e.g. ARF, APD, IRF, etc.) here.)

Fellowship type

Not applicable for this candidate

Funding commencement year

Not applicable for this candidate

Finish year

Not applicable for this candidate

F8. PhD Qualification**F8.1. Do you hold a PhD or expect to be awarded a PhD qualification in the near future?****PhD Yes/No**

Yes

F8.2. If you hold a PhD or expect to be awarded a PhD qualification in the near future, please enter the date your PhD has been awarded or the date your thesis will be submitted, respectively.**Date of Award**

00/07/1976

F9. Qualifications

	Degree/Award	Year	Discipline/Field	Organisation Name
1	PhD	1976	Physics	The University of Sydney

	Country
1	Australia

F10. Current and previous appointment(s)/position(s) – during the past 10 years

	Position	Organisation Name	Department	Year Appointed
1	Associate professor	University of Wollongong	Science, Technology and Society	1996
2	Professor of Social Sciences	University of Wollongong	Arts Faculty	2007

	Continuity	Employment Kind	Current
1	Permanent	Full Time	No
2	Permanent	Full Time	Yes

F11. Organisational affiliations for eligibility purposes for this Proposal

(Name of the organisation you will be associated with for the purposes of satisfying the eligibility requirements for your nominated role in undertaking the proposed research (i.e. for a CI this will usually be the Eligible Organisation at which they will be employed or hold an adjunct appointment as at 1 January 2012 and beyond; for PIs it will generally be their main employer as at 1 January 2012).)

Organisation Name

University of Wollongong

Type of Affiliation

Employee

F12. Are you requesting an International Collaboration Award?

(Note: If you are an Australian-based PI, you must choose 'No'. Also, if you are a PI working in an Australian Eligible Organisation overseas campus you must choose 'No'.)

International Collaboration Award

No

F13. Discovery Outstanding Researcher Award**F13.1. Are you requesting a Discovery Outstanding Researcher Award (DORA)?**

(This question is not applicable to PIs.)

Discovery Outstanding Researcher Award

No

F13.2. If yes, please indicate the requested salary level.

Not applicable for this candidate

F13.3. Justification

(In no more than two A4 pages please justify how this Discovery Outstanding Researcher Award would benefit, enhance and expedite the overall Project.)

Justification

PDF attachment not submitted

F14. Research Record Relative to Opportunities**F14.1. Details on your career and opportunities for research over the last 5 years.**

(Write a maximum of 3750 characters (approx 500 words). Provide and explain: (i) The number of years it has been since you graduated with your highest educational qualification; (ii) The research opportunities that you have had in the context of your employment situation, the research component of your employment conditions, and any unemployment or part-time employment you may have had; (iii) Whether you are a research-only, teaching and research, teaching only, teaching and administration, research and administration, or administration-only academic, as well as giving any additional information (e.g. Part-time status) needed to understand your situation. Give an indication of what percentage of time you have spent over the last five years in those roles; (iv) Any career interruptions you have had for childbirth, carer's responsibility, misadventure, or debilitating illness; (v) The research mentoring and research facilities available to you; and (vi) Any other aspects of your career or opportunities for research that are relevant to assessment and that have not been detailed elsewhere in this Proposal (e.g. any circumstances that may have affected the time you have had to conduct and publish research).)

(i) I received my PhD 35 years ago, in 1976.

(ii) After that, I worked for a decade as a research assistant in applied mathematics before officially becoming a social scientist in 1986. Since then I have been employed as a full-time teaching-and-research academic, with a full-time teaching load, aside from two semesters as head of school on a half teaching load.

(iii) Over the past five years, I have spent 40% of my time on research, 40% on teaching (undergraduate teaching and postgraduate supervision) and 20% on administration.

(iv) My career has had no interruptions.

(v) As a senior academic, I do not receive formal mentoring, though I continue to learn much from my colleagues, old and new. For decades I have been a mentor to junior colleagues, and in recent years I have mentored numerous postgrads and colleagues through the writing programmes that I run. For example, over the past year I have been principal supervisor for nine PhD students, co-supervisor for four PhD students, mentor for five nonviolence researchers (through an online writing programme) and mentor to five academics and 20 postgrads (in addition to the ones I supervise) through the UoW Arts Faculty writing programmes.

The research facilities at UoW are excellent for supporting my work.

(vi) No other considerations are relevant.

F14.2. Recent significant publications (since 2006)

(Please attach a PDF with a list of your recent significant publications (40 pages maximum). (1) Provide your research publications published in the last five years split into the five categories of (a) scholarly books, (b) scholarly book chapters, (c) refereed journal articles, (d) refereed conference papers only when the paper was published in full in the proceedings and, (e) other (e.g. major exhibitions, compositions or performances). You must number your publications continuously. Asterisk the publications relevant to this Proposal. (2) Provide a list of your ARC grants awarded in the last 10 years on which you have been a Chief Investigator. Give the ARC grant number, Chief Investigator names in the order that they appear on the grant, the amount funded, the years for which the grant was awarded, and the title of the grant. Please refer to the Instructions to Applicants for format requirements. With respect to your numbered publications in the last 5 years given in part 1 of question F14.2, next to each ARC grant, provide the numbers of the publications from part 1 of question F14.2 that arose from, or were in part supported by, your ARC grants.)

Scholarly book

1. * Brian Martin. *Justice Ignited: The Dynamics of Backfire* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007).

Scholarly book chapters

2. Brian Martin. Defending dissent. In Sue Curry Jansen, Jeff Pooley and Lora Taub (eds.), *Media and Social Justice* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, in press). [accepted June 2010]

3. Brian Martin. Leaders in scientific and technological controversies. In William Sims Bainbridge (ed.), *Leadership in Science and Technology: A Reference Handbook* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, in press). [accepted May 2010]

4. * Brian Martin. From means to ends and back again. In Jørgen Johansen and John Y. Jones (eds.), *Experiments with Peace: Celebrating Peace on Johan Galtung's 80th Birthday* (Cape Town, South Africa: Pambazuka Press, 2010), pp. 214–219.

5. * Brian Martin. Corruption, outrage and whistleblowing. In Ronald J. Burke and Cary L. Cooper (eds.), *Research Companion to Corruption in Organizations* (Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2009), pp. 206-216.

6. * Brian Martin. Making accompaniment effective. In Howard Clark (ed.), *People Power: Unarmed Resistance and Global Solidarity* (London: Pluto Press, 2009), pp. 93-97.

7. Brian Martin. Varieties of dissent. In: Stephen P. Banks (ed.), *Dissent and the Failure of Leadership* (Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2008), pp. 22–36.

8. David Hess, Steve Breyman, Nancy Campbell and Brian Martin. Science, technology, and social movements. In: Ed Hackett, Olga Amsterdamska, Michael Lynch and Judy Wajcman (eds.), *Handbook of Science and Technology Studies* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008), pp. 473–498.

9. Brian Martin. Whistleblowing: risks and skills. In: Brian Rappert and Caitriona McLeish (eds.), *A Web of Prevention: The Life Sciences, Biological Weapons and the Governance of Research* (London: Earthscan, 2007), pp. 35–49.

10. * Brian Martin. Paths to social change: conventional politics, violence and nonviolence. In: Ralph Summy (ed.), *Nonviolent Alternatives for Social Change*, in *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS)*, developed under the auspices of the UNESCO (Oxford: Eolss Publishers, <http://www.eolss.net>, 2006).

11. * 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.

Refereed journal articles

12. Brian Martin. On being a happy academic. *Australian Universities' Review*, 2011, in press [accepted January 2011].
13. Brian Martin, Chris Moore and Colin Salter. Sharing music files: tactics of a challenge to the industry. *First Monday: Peer-Reviewed Journal on the Internet*, Vol. 15, No. 12, 6 December, <http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/viewArticle/2986/2680>.
14. * Paula McDonald, Tina Graham and Brian Martin. Outrage management in cases of sexual harassment as revealed in judicial decisions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, Vol. 34, 2010, pp. 165–180.
15. Sandrine Thérèse and Brian Martin. Shame, scientist! Degradation rituals in science. *Prometheus*, Vol. 28, No. 2, June 2010, pp. 97–110.
16. * Brian Martin. How to attack a scientific theory and get away with it (usually): the attempt to destroy an origin-of-AIDS hypothesis. *Science as Culture*, Vol. 19, No. 2, June 2010, pp. 215–239.
17. Brian Martin. Techniques to pass on: technology and euthanasia. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, Vol. 30, No. 1, February 2010, pp. 54–59.
18. * Brian Martin. Managing outrage over genocide: case study Rwanda. *Global Change, Peace & Security*, Vol. 21, No. 3, 2009, pp. 275–290.
19. Patrick Hodder and Brian Martin. Climate crisis? The politics of emergency framing. *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 44, No. 36, 5 September 2009, pp. 53–60.
20. Chris Barker and Brian Martin. Dilemmas in teaching happiness. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, Vol. 6, Issue 2, 2009, <http://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol6/iss2/2/>.
21. Brian Martin. Academic patronage. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, Vol. 5, No. 1, June 2009, pp. 3–19.
22. Brian Martin. Nonviolent strategy against capitalism. *Social Alternatives*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 2009, pp. 42-46. [adapted from *Nonviolence Versus Capitalism*]
23. Brian Martin. Research productivity: some paths less travelled. *Australian Universities' Review*, Vol. 51, No. 1, February 2009, pp. 14-20.
24. Brian Martin. Plagiarism struggles. *Plagiary: Cross-Disciplinary Studies in Plagiarism, Fabrication, and Falsification*, Vol. 3, 2008, <http://www.plagiary.org/editorials.htm>

25. * Samantha Reis and Brian Martin. Psychological dynamics of outrage against injustice. *Peace Research: The Canadian Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 1, 2008, pp. 5-23.
26. * Chris Barker, Brian Martin and Mary Zournazi. Emotional self-management for activists. *Reflective Practice*, Vol. 9, No. 4, November 2008, pp. 423–435.
27. * Brian Martin. The Henson affair: conflicting injustices. *Australian Review of Public Affairs*, July 2008, <http://www.australianreview.net/digest/2008/07/martin.html>.
28. Truda Gray and Brian Martin. Comparing wars. *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies* (<http://www.jmss.org/>), Vol. 10, No. 3, Spring 2008.
29. * Truda Gray and Brian Martin. My Lai: the struggle over outrage. *Peace & Change*, Vol. 33, No. 1, January 2008, pp. 90–113.
30. * Truda Gray and Brian Martin. The American war in Indochina: injustice and outrage. *Revista de Paz y Conflictos*, No. 1, 2008, http://cicode-gcubo.ugr.es/revpaz/articulos/The_american_war_in_Indochina_injustice_and_outrage.
31. * Kylie Smith and Brian Martin. Tactics of labor struggles. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 3, September 2007, pp. 193–206.
32. * Brian Martin. Slow injustice. *Social Alternatives*, Vol. 26, No. 4, Fourth Quarter 2007, pp. 5–9.
33. Brian Martin. The globalization of scientific controversy. *Globalization*, Special issue, 2007, <http://globalization.icaap.org/content/special/Martin.html>
34. * T. Gray and B. Martin. Backfires: white, black and grey. *Journal of Information Warfare*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 2007, pp. 7–16.
35. Brian Martin. Opposing nuclear power: past and present. *Social Alternatives*, Vol. 26, No. 2, Second Quarter 2007, pp. 43–47.
36. Brian Martin. Nuclear power and antiterrorism: obscuring the policy contradictions. *Prometheus*, Vol. 25, No. 1, March 2007, pp. 19–29.
37. Brian Martin. Social testing. *Social Alternatives*, Vol. 25, No. 4, Fourth Quarter 2006, pp. 39–42.
38. * Truda Gray and Brian Martin. Defamation and the art of backfire. *Deakin Law Review*, Vol. 11, No. 2, 2006, pp. 115–136.
39. * Brian Martin. SRV & NVA: valorizing social roles through nonviolent action. *SRV Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 2, December 2006, pp. 25–33.

40. * Susan Engel and Brian Martin. Union Carbide and James Hardie: lessons in politics and power. *Global Society*, Vol. 20, No. 4, October 2006, pp. 475–490.
41. * Greg Scott and Brian Martin. Tactics against sexual harassment: the role of backfire. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 4, May 2006, pp. 111–125.
42. * Brian Martin and Steve Wright. Looming struggles over technology for border control. *Journal of Organisational Transformation and Social Change*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2006, pp. 95–107.
43. * Giliam de Valk and Brian Martin. Publicly shared intelligence. *First Monday: Peer-reviewed Journal on the Internet*, Vol. 11, No. 9, September 2006, <http://www.firstmonday.org/>.
44. * Brian Martin. Instead of repression. *Social Alternatives*, Vol. 25, No. 1, First Quarter 2006, pp. 62–66.
45. * David Hess and Brian Martin. Backfire, repression, and the theory of transformative events. *Mobilization*, Vol. 11, No. 1, June 2006, pp. 249–267.
46. Noriko Dethlefs and Brian Martin. Japanese technology policy for aged care. *Science and Public Policy*, Vol. 33, No. 1, February 2006, pp. 47–57.

Articles in refereed conference proceedings

47. Brian Martin. Obstacles to academic integrity. Proceedings of the 3rd Asia-Pacific Conference on Educational Integrity: Creating a Culture of Integrity, University of South Australia, Adelaide, 6–7 December 2007, pp. 21–26.
48. * Brian Martin. Opposing surveillance. *From Dataveillance to Überveillance and the Realpolitik of the Transparent Society* (The Second Workshop on the Social Implications of National Security, Wollongong, 29 October 2007), edited by Katina Michael and M. G. Michael (Wollongong: University of Wollongong, 2007), pp. 71–82.

Other articles of significance

49. Brian Martin. The value of techniques. *Social Alternatives*, 2011, in press. (guest editor's introduction to themed section on techniques) [accepted December 2010]
50. Brian Martin. When you're criticised. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 2011, in press.
51. Brian Martin. Debating vaccination: understanding the attack on the Australian Vaccination Network. *Living Wisdom*, No. 8, 2011, pp. 14–40.

52. Brian Martin. Theory for activists. *Social Anarchism*, No. 44, 2010, pp. 22–41.
53. * Brian Martin. Dilemmas in promoting nonviolence. *Gandhi Marg*, Vol. 31, No. 3, October-December 2009, pp. 429–453.
54. Brian Martin. Statist language. *Etc.* — *A Review of General Semantics*, Vol. 66, No. 4, October 2009, pp. 377–381.
55. Brian Martin. Expertise and equality. *Social Anarchism*, No. 42, 2008–2009, pp. 10–20.
56. * Brian Martin. How nonviolence is misrepresented. *Gandhi Marg*, Vol. 30, No. 2, July-September 2008, pp. 235–257.
57. * Jørgen Johansen and Brian Martin. Sending the protest message. *Gandhi Marg*, Vol. 29, No. 4, January-March 2008, pp. 503–519.
58. * Brian Martin. Enabling scientific dissent. *New Doctor*, No. 88, December 2008, pp. 2–5.
59. Brian Martin. Comment: citation shortcomings: peccadilloes or plagiarism? *Interfaces*, Vol. 38, No. 2, March-April 2008, pp. 136–137.
60. Brian Martin. Writing a helpful referee's report. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, Vol. 39, No. 3, April 2008, pp. 301–306.
61. Brian Martin. Surviving referees' reports. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, Vol. 39, No. 3, April 2008, pp. 307–311.
62. Brian Martin. Contested testimony in scientific disputes: the case of the origins of AIDS. *The Skeptic*, Vol. 13, No. 3, 2007, pp. 52–58.
63. Brian Martin. Anarchist theory: what should be done? *Anarchist Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 2007, pp. 106–108.
64. * Brian Martin. Energising dissent. *D!ssent*, No. 24, Spring 2007, pp. 62–64.
65. * Brian Martin. Safeguarding your group. *Chain Reaction*, No. 101, December 2007, pp. 31–33.
66. * Brian Martin. Schweik in Wollongong. *FriedensForum: Zeitschrift der Friedensbewegung*, No. 3, June/July 2006, pp. 39–40 (translated into German by Hanna Poddig).
67. * Brian Martin. Globalising nonviolence: overcoming the obstacles. Published as: Globalisierung der gewaltfreiheit: überwindung der hindernisse. Gewaltfreiheit ist das ziel — und der weg. *Forum Pazifismus: Zeitschrift für Theorie und Praxis der Gewaltfreiheit*, No. 10, II/2006, pp. 8–12 (translated into German by Kai-Uwe Dosch).

68. 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.

Encyclopaedia entries

69. * Brian Martin. Anti-coup; Information technology and peace activism; Power in nonviolence theory. In: Nigel Young (ed.), *Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

70. * Brian Martin. Activism, social and political. In: Gary L. Anderson and Kathryn G. Herr (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Activism and Social Justice* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2007), pp. 19–27.

2) ARC Grants, 2002-2011

Project ID	CI name	Amount funded	Number of years	Project title	Publications
DP0346386	B Martin	\$90,000	3	Theory and action for opposing political repression	1, 4, 5, 6, 13, 14, 16, 18, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 34, 38, 40, 41, 42, 45, 48, 51, 57, 58

F14.3. Ten career-best publications

(Please attach a PDF with a list of your ten career-best publications (10 pages maximum). Provide the full reference for each of your ten best publications. Next to each provide information on any ARC grant scheme on which you were a Chief Investigator from which they originated, as described in F14.2. Add a statement of a maximum of 30 words explaining and justifying the impact or significance of each publication. Asterisk the publications relevant to this Proposal.)

- * 1. Brian Martin. *Justice Ignited: The Dynamics of Backfire* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007), 232 pages.

DP0346386, Martin, \$90,000, 2003–2005, Theory and action for opposing political repression

An original framework, growing out of nonviolence research, is presented for understanding tactics of outrage management. Case studies include massacres, whistleblowers, torture technology, the Iraq war and terrorism.

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

A79905285, Martin, \$150,000, 1999–2001, Communication technology for nonviolent struggle

This is the first systematic examination of the intersection between nonviolence theory and communication theory, with applications to three major case studies.

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

This is the major study of nonviolent alternatives to capitalism and how to move towards them using nonviolent methods.

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

A79231921, Martin, \$96,000, 1993–1995, Science and technology for nonviolent struggle

This is the major study analysing the role of technology in nonviolent resistance to aggression and oppression.

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

This book describes how choosing decision-makers randomly has been and could be used in political systems.

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

This book presents an approach to information based on power and its corruptions, using case studies of the mass media, intellectual property, surveillance, defamation and other topics.

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

This book argues that introducing nonviolent defence systems has to be part of process of social change. It covers diverse topics including feminism, policing, telecommunications and alternative economics.

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

This book is an analysis of the fluoridation controversy as a set of struggles involving knowledge and power, including attacks on dissidents.

* 9. Brian Martin. *Uprooting War* (London: Freedom Press, 1984), 300 pages. Revised edition published in Italian, 1990.

This book presents an analysis of the roots of war — including the state, bureaucracy and other social structures — and grassroots challenges to them.

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

This book analyses bias in two scientific research papers and uses these case studies to explore biases in the wider social structure of science.

F14.4. Further evidence in relation to research impact and contributions to the field over the last 10 years.

(Write a maximum of 7500 characters (approx 1000 words). In this section, provide: (1) Research outputs other than publications. Other research outputs might include patents and policy advice, competitive grants and other research support, relevant consultancies, and other professional activities or other outputs; and (2) Evidence for the quality of your research outputs including those in F14.2 to F14.4. Assess the impact of your research for all of your outputs relative to opportunity and in the context of discipline expectations. Include a wide range of research evaluations of impact (e.g. citations, evaluations of the publication's quality; the journal, the book publishing house, the conference etc; and any other measures of impact; honours and awards/prizes, esteem measures, and any other evaluations of your outputs).)

Many of my books and articles have been translated into foreign languages, with individual articles translated into one to four languages and 19 languages involved in total, including Bengali, Chinese, Croatian, Danish, Dutch, Finnish, French, German, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Norwegian, Persian, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, Spanish and Swedish.

According to university web statistics, my publications have an exceptional impact via the web, receiving over a million hits per year.

I have examined 14 PhD theses in a variety of fields including philosophy, sociology, Asian studies and communication, and have been an external examiner for many masters and honours theses.

In the past five years I have been an external referee for over 60 articles in a range of journals including Social Problems, American Journal of Sociology, American Political Science Review, Perspectives in Politics, Public Understanding of Science, Review of International Political Economy and Science, Technology, and Human Values.

I was the national president of Whistleblowers Australia for four years (1996-1999) and am currently vice-president. I have given personal advice to hundreds of whistleblowers and dissidents, who typically approach me because of my reputation or after reading some of my publications online. Journalists, including many from outside Australia, contact me regularly for interviews and background information about whistleblowing, dissent and other topics.

Over 20 years ago I founded Schweik Action Wollongong, a small nonviolence group. I have been a leader in numerous Schweik community research projects, for example on crisis communication and on Muslims responding to attacks. Our project reports are widely known overseas, with several translated into other languages.

Every week or two, I receive an unsolicited email from a stranger complimenting me on my work. Some examples:

* "Thanks very much for such an interesting website, it's a fantastic source of info and much appreciated ..." - from a potential whistleblower in an environmental area

* "I've been a big fan of your writing for the last few years. It's helped my understanding of nonviolence greatly" - from a US activist and editor

* "I just read your paper on patronage in the academy. It's excellent - thank you." - from a learning-and-teaching advisor

* "I first want to thank you for your webpage and research on suppression of dissent; we can't have too much of this kind of information." - from an Austrian academic

* "Thanks for your inspiring work" - from a former UK academic

For publishing, I seek outlets that effectively make my ideas available to relevant audiences. This includes scholars and, importantly, activists, whistleblowers and people in need of assistance. Social impact is my primary goal, so journals with high status or high impact factors are not always the best options. In several instances when writing for high-status journals (Social Problems, Mobilization), the process of responding to several rounds of referee demands turned an originally cogent paper into a less digestible complexity. On the

other hand, some of my papers with the highest scholarly impact entered the literature without formal refereeing. My two papers with the most number of citations in the Social Sciences Citation Index were published in a highly respected journal (Science, Technology, & Human Values, one of the top two journals in science and technology studies) — but were selected by the editor without going through the usual process of external refereeing. Another paper, “Against intellectual property,” published in a non-refereed journal, Philosophy and Social Action, was later reprinted in a collection of the most significant papers in the field (Peter Drahos (ed.), Intellectual Property, 1999) and translated into several languages.

I think it is most important for my articles to be high quality in themselves, so I send them to several peers for comment before submission. In 3/4 of cases, I receive more helpful comments from pre-publication peer comment than via journal referees.

Because I work on interdisciplinary topics, such as nonviolent action and suppression of dissent, it is often very difficult to publish in disciplinary journals, because referees are seldom familiar with the perspective or are hostile to it. The best work on nonviolent action — my own and that of many others — is not found in disciplinary journals, but mainly in books and specialist journals like Journal of Peace Research.

Finally, I am sceptical of the emphasis on publishing in highly ranked journals, having read some of the research in scientometrics (a branch of science and technology studies). Publishing in such journals does not guarantee that one’s own article is important, any more than living in a prestigious suburb says anything about one’s own house. The address doesn’t guarantee income or personal qualities, and likewise the address of one’s article doesn’t guarantee citations or significance.

F14.5. A statement on your most significant contributions to this research field of this Proposal.

(Write a maximum of 3750 characters (approx 500 words).)

I have made a series of major innovations in the study of nonviolent action, most of which take nonviolence theory into new arenas. Collectively these constitute one of the greatest contributions to the field in recent decades.

- Development of the backfire model for analysis of tactics in struggles against injustice, an extension of nonviolence theory to domains beyond nonviolence (in the 2007 book Justice Ignited and dozens of articles)
- Melding communication theory and nonviolence theory (in the 2003 book Nonviolence Speaks, with Wendy Varney)
- Analysis of nonviolent action as a tool and goal for struggles to move beyond capitalism (in the 2001 book Nonviolence versus Capitalism)
- Analysis of the role of technology in nonviolent action (in the 2001 book Technology for Nonviolent Struggle and earlier articles)
- A critique of the consent theory of power by Gene Sharp, the most significant figure in nonviolence theory since Gandhi (in a 1989 article in Journal of Peace Research)
- The most prominent articulation of the view that the road to nonviolent defence systems is through grassroots action, not by convincing governments (in the 1993 book Social Defence, Social Change and earlier articles)

I have also made major contributions to the study of dissent and whistleblowing, scientific controversies and information issues. These feed into my studies of nonviolent action. For example, my article “Whistleblowing and nonviolence” (Peace & Change, 1999) is frequently cited.

My publication output includes twelve books (ten single-authored, eight since 1997), three edited books, 40 chapters in books, 150 articles in refereed journals, 100 major articles in nonrefereed journals and over 200 other publications (lesser articles, book reviews, newspaper articles).

PART G - Research Support (DP120102473)

G1. Research Support for all participants

(For each participant on this Proposal, provide details of research funding (ARC and other agencies in Australia and overseas) for the years 2010 to 2014 inclusive. That is, list all projects/proposals/fellowships awarded or requests submitted involving that Participant for funding. Please refer to the Instructions to Applicants for submission requirements.)

G1 Research support for all participants

Description	Same research area?	Support status	Proposal ID	2010 \$'000	2011 \$'000	2012 \$'000	2013 \$'000	2014 \$'000
B Martin, Nonviolent action and the violence connection, ARC, DP2012	Yes	R	DP120102473			41	42	44

PART H - Statements on Progress (DP120102473)

H1. For each participant on this Proposal, please attach a statement detailing progress for each project/fellowship involving that participant who has been awarded funding for 2010 under the ARC Discovery Projects, Linkage Projects or Fellowship scheme.

	Project ID	First named investigator	Scheme	Statement
1				
2				
3				

PART I - Additional Details (DP120102473)

I1. Other agencies

Have you submitted or do you intend to submit a similar Proposal to any other agency?

Other Agency Submission

No

If Yes, please select one of the following:

Other Agency Name

Not applicable for this candidate

If Other is selected above, please enter the full name of the agency:

Not applicable for this candidate

I2. Does this Proposal relate to any of the following special interest items?

	Special Interest Name	Special Interest
1		
2		
3		