D-P

Project ID: DP0346386

Total number of sheets contained in this application	27

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 200I and for post award reporting. The information collected may be passed to assessors for the purposes of obtaining a peer review assessment of the application. It may also be passed to the National Health and Medical Research Council, the National Occupational Health and Safety Commission, the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources, the Department of the Environment and Heritage, the Department of Education, Science and Training, the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and the Department of Veterans' Affairs for the purpose of checking eligibility. In other instances, information on this form can be disclosed without your consent where authorised or required by law.

PART A—ADMINISTRATIVE SUMMARY

A1 ORGANISATION TO ADMINISTER GRANT

University of Wollongong

A2 PARTICIPANT SUMMARY

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

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

A3 SUPPORT BEING APPLIED FOR

A3.1 Type

Number sought

X	Research Grant (personnel and project costs other than Fellowship salaries)	
	Australian Postdoctoral Fellowship (APD)	0
	Australian Research Fellowship/Queen Elizabeth II Fellowship (ARF/QEII)	0
	Australian Professorial Fellowship (APF)	0

A3.2 Years that support is being sought from the ARC

2003 ☒   2004 ☒   2005 ☒   2006 ☐   2007 ☐

A3.3 Priority Area

None selected

A4 PROJECT TITLE

Theory and action for opposing political repression

A5   PROJECT SUMMARY

Political repression, such as surveillance, arrests, torture and killings, sometimes rebounds against the represser in a process called "political jiu-jitsu." The aim of this project is to investigate and reformulate the concept of political jiu-jitsu in order to understand its core components and extend its applicability. To test the theory, twelve case studies will be drawn from the areas of the technology of repression, covert operations, cyberactivism and organisational struggles.

A6   CLASSIFICATIONS AND OTHER STATISTICAL INFORMATION

A6.1   Keywords

nonviolent action	peace research
political repression	social action
repression technology	

A6.2   Research classifications

Research Fields, Courses and Disciplines (RFCD)	%	Socio-Economic Objective (SEO)	%
369999	100	**750699**	50
		750799	50

A6.3   Countries of international collaboration.

UK		

A7   ADDITIONAL DETAILS

A7.1   Has a similar application been to any other agency?   Yes ☐   No ☒

If Yes, which agency?

A7.2   Any associations with a Commonwealth Government-funded Centre?   Yes ☐   No ☒

If Yes, the details below indicate how this project is different from the core activities of the Centre.

A8   RESEARCH STUDENTS

The ARC is interested in reporting the number of Research Students that could be supported from this project if it is funded. Following are the number of student places (full-time equivalent) that will be filled as a result of this project.

Number of Postgraduate Research Student Places (FTE) - Phd	0
Masters	0
Honours	0

A9   CERTIFICATION

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

A9.1   Certification by the Deputy/Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) or their delegate or equivalent in the administering organisation

I certify that—

- I am prepared to have the project carried out in my institution under the circumstances set out by the applicant(s).

- To the best of my knowledge all details on this application form are true and complete and that no information specifically relating to applicant track or publication records is false or misleading.

- The amount of time that the investigator/s will be devoting to the project is appropriate to existing workloads.

- The Head of Department has approved this application.

- Approval of the Partner Investigator's participation to the extent indicated has been received from his/her employer.

- This institution supports this application and if successful will provide basic infrastructure and the items listed in the budget for the project.

- All funds for this project will only be spent for the purpose for which they were provided.

- The project can be accommodated within the general facilities in this institution, and sufficient working and office space is available for any proposed additional staff.

- The project will not be permitted to proceed until appropriate ethical clearance has been obtained.

- I have obtained the agreement of other institutions involved to submit this application and to provide the agreed support.

- I will notify the ARC if there is a substantial change to named personnel after the submission of this application.

- I have obtained the agreement of all participants to submit this application.

- I consent, on behalf of the participants, to this application being referred for peer review to persons who will remain anonymous.

- To the best of my knowledge, the Privacy Notice appearing at the top of Part B of this Application Form has been drawn to the attention of all the participants whose personal details have been provided at Part B.

- 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**

A9.2 Certification by private researcher

If you are applying as a private researcher and there is no institutional infrastructure required you should sign below.

I certify that:
   I am prepared to carry out the project.
   To the best of my knowledge all details on this application form are true and complete.

Signature of private researcher (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	Dr		
Department/school/other	Science and Technology Studies		
Organisation	University of Wollongong		

B3   POSTAL ADDRESS

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

B4   MEMBERSHIPS

B4.1   ARC or ARC advisory committee member?   **Yes** ☐   No ☒

B4.2   An associate of a member of the ARC or its advisory committees?   **Yes** ☐   No ☒

If Yes, name the ARC member(s)

B5   CURRENT HOLDER OF AN ARC FELLOWSHIP?   **Yes** ☐   No ☒

B6   AFFILIATIONS

Is there any current salary being drawn from a non-higher education sector organisation that is primarily funded for research from Commonwealth or State Government sources?   Yes ☐   No ☒

If Yes, following is the nature of the employment, association, and/or financial interest (including % of salary).

B7 QUALIFICATIONS

B7.1 PhD qualification awarded

Discipline/Field	Physics
Institution	The University of Sydney
Country	Australia
Year awarded	1976	(or) Date Thesis Submitted	

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

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

B8 ACADEMIC, RESEARCH, PROFESSIONAL AND INDUSTRIAL EXPERIENCE

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

Position held	Institution/Organisation	Department	Year appointed and status
Associate Prof	University of Wollongong	Science, Technology and Society	1997, current
Senior Lecturer	University of Wollongong	Science and Technology Studies	1991, previous

B9   ADDITIONAL FELLOWSHIP DETAILS (not applicable)

B10 RESEARCH RECORD RELATIVE TO OPPORTUNITIES

B10.1 Most significant contributions to research field

In the field of nonviolent action research, one of my major contributions has been critical analysis of the standard conceptual framework, in particular my critique of Gene Sharp's theory of power and articulation of the grassroots orientation to nonviolent defence. Another and perhaps more significant contribution has been pioneering several new fields of application for nonviolence theory. This has included the role of science and technology in nonviolent struggle, the role of communication in nonviolent struggle (both the subject of previous ARC projects), nonviolent strategy against capitalism and nonviolent action in and against bureaucracy. This has involved probing and meshing theoretical frameworks from previously disparate fields, for example communication theory and nonviolence theory, to develop vehicles able to provide analytic insight and guidance for future research and action.

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

In the field of free speech, I have promoted the concept of suppression of dissent as a conceptual tool to analyse the exercise of power against dissidents including whistleblowers and paradigm breakers. Again, I have paid special attention to strategies for action.

Overall, my most important contribution has been developing conceptual tools that are linked to grassroots strategies to challenge various forms of domination.

B10.2 Refereed publications, 1997-

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

Books

* Brian Martin and Wendy Varney, *Nonviolence Speaks: Communicating Against Repression* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2002, in press).

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

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

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

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

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

Book chapters

* Brian Martin. Technology, violence, and peace. In: Lester R. Kurtz (editor-in-chief), *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict, Volume 3* (New York: Academic Press, 1999), pp. 447-459.

* Brian Martin. Against intellectual property. In: Peter Drahos (ed.), *Intellectual Property* (International Library of Essays in Law and Legal Theory, Second Series) (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), pp. 517-532.

Articles in refereed journals

Brian Martin. The politics of a scientific meeting: the origin-of-AIDS debate at the Royal Society. *Politics and the Life Sciences,* 2002, in press.

* E. J. Woodhouse, David Hess, Steve Breyman and Brian Martin. Science studies and activism: possibilities and problems for reconstructivist agendas. *Social Studies of Science,* 2002, in press.

Lyn Carson and Brian Martin. Random selection and technological decision making. *Science and Public Policy,* in press.

Brian Martin. Investigating the origin of AIDS: some ethical dimensions. *Journal of Medical Ethics,* in press.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Brian Martin. Suppressing research data: methods, context, accountability, and responses. *Accountability in Research,* Vol. 6, 1999, pp. 333-372.

* Brian Martin. Social defence strategy: the role of technology. *Journal of Peace Research,* Vol. 36, No. 5, 1999, pp. 535-552.

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

* Brian Martin. Whistleblowing and nonviolence. *Peace & Change,* Vol. 24, No. 1, January 1999, pp. 15-28.

* Brian Martin. Strategies for dissenting scientists. *Journal of Scientific Exploration,* Vol. 12, No. 4, 1998, pp. 605-616. Reprinted several times, including in Swedish.

Brian Martin. Technology in different worlds. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society,* Vol. 18, No. 5, October 1998, pp. 333-339. Reprinted in an edited volume in Korean, 1999.

Brian Martin. Advice for the dissident scholar. *Thought & Action,* Vol. 14, No. 1, Spring 1998, pp. 119-130.

Brian Martin. Political refutation of a scientific theory: the case of polio vaccines and the origin of AIDS. *Health Care Analysis,* Vol. 6, 1998, pp. 175-179.

* Brian Martin. Science, technology and nonviolent action: the case for a utopian dimension in the social analysis of science and technology. *Social Studies of Science,* Vol. 27, 1997, pp. 439-463.

B10.3 Ten career-best publications

Brian Martin and Wendy Varney, *Nonviolence Speaks: Communicating Against Repression* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2002, in press).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

International recognition of my work is indicated by translation of my publications into a dozen languages and by speaking tours arranged for me in Italy (1991), Netherlands (1993) and Japan (1998), with talks and workshops for both researchers and activists.

In addition to the refereed publications listed above, in the past five years I have also authored significant nonrefereed works, including the book *Suppression Stories* (Wollongong: Fund for Intellectual Dissent, 1997) and major articles (typically 5000+ words) in the journals *Civilian-Based Defense, Philosophy and Social Action* and *Gandhi Marg.* I edited an internally published volume, *Technology and Public Participation* (Science and Technology Studies, University of Wollongong, 1999, 271 pages), a project that forged links between participants in our research programme.

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

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 are quoted exclusive of the GST.

C1   BUDGET DETAILS

C1.1 YEAR | 2003 |

Column 1	COSTING			
	2	3	4	5
Source of funds	**ARC**	**University**	**Other**	**Total**
DIRECT COSTS				
Personnel (Salaries + On-costs)				
RA (Level 6/7) @ 1.0 FTE + on-costs	54950	2032	0	56982
CI (Martin) @ 0.3FTE + 30.66% on-costs	0	32457	0	32457
Total Personnel (a)	54950	34489	0	89439
Teaching Relief				
Total Teaching Relief (b)	0	0	0	0
Equipment				
Mac PowerBook G4	4496	0	0	4496
Total Equipment (c)	4496	0	0	4496
Maintenance				
Software	250	0	0	250
Computer consumables	250	0	0	250
Total Maintenance (d)	500	0	0	500
Travel				
UK-Australia-UK (Steve Wright)	2500	0	0	2500
Total Travel (e)	2500	0	0	2500
Other				
Total Other (f)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (g)	62446	34489	0	96935
INDIRECT COSTS				
CIs, PIs and any researcher Level A or above x multiplier	■			
CI & RA x 0.92	■	59320	0	59320
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (h)	■	59320	0	59320
TOTAL COSTS (i)	62446	93809	0	156255

C1   BUDGET DETAILS

C1.2 YEAR   2004

Column 1	2	3	4	5
		COSTING		
Source of funds	ARC	University	Other	Total
DIRECT COSTS				
Personnel (Salaries + On-costs)				
RA (Level 6/7) @ 1.0 FTE + on-costs	57982	2144	0	60126
CI (Martin) @ 0.3FTE + 30.66% on-costs	0	32457	0	32457
Total Personnel (a)	57982	34601	0	92583
Teaching Relief				
Total Teaching Relief (b)	0	0	0	0
Equipment				
Total Equipment (c)	0	0	0	0
Maintenance				
Software	250	0	0	250
Computer consumables	250	0	0	250
Total Maintenance (d)	500	0	0	500
Travel				
Total Travel (e)	0	0	0	0
Other				
Total Other (f)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (g)	58482	34601	0	93083
INDIRECT COSTS				
CIs, PIs and any researcher Level A or above x multiplier				
CI & RA x 0.92		85176	0	85176
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (h)		85176	0	85176
TOTAL COSTS (i)	58482	119777	0	178259

C1   BUDGET DETAILS

C1.3 YEAR **2005**

Column 1	COSTING			
	2	3	4	5
Source of funds	**ARC**	**University**	**Other**	**Total**
DIRECT COSTS				
Personnel (Salaries + On-costs)				
RA (Level 6/7) @ 0.5 FTE + on-costs	30556	1130	0	31686
CI (Martin) @ 0.3FTE + 30.66% on-costs	0	32457	0	32457
Total Personnel (a)	30556	33587	0	64143
Teaching Relief				
CI (Martin) @ 0.5	14833	0	0	14833
Total Teaching Relief (b)	14833	0	0	14833
Equipment				
Total Equipment (c)	0	0	0	0
Maintenance				
Software	250	0	0	250
Computer consumables	250	0	0	250
Total Maintenance (d)	500	0	0	500
Travel				
Total Travel (e)	0	0	0	0
Other				
Total Other (f)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (g)	45889	33587	0	79476
INDIRECT COSTS				
CIs, PIs and any researcher Level A or above x multiplier	■			
CI & RA x 0.92	■	59102	0	59102
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (h)	■	59102	0	59102
TOTAL COSTS (i)	45889	92689	0	138578

C2   JUSTIFICATION OF FUNDING REQUESTED FROM THE ARC

Personnel For the first 2.5 years of the project, the equivalent of a full-time research assistant is necessary for collecting material about the 12 case studies. One or more RAs will be appointed, chosen so that their expertise is relevant to each of the four areas researched (technologies of repression; covert operations; cyberactivism; organisational struggles).

Teaching relief Writing up of the case studies is best done as the project proceeds. However, writing up the definitive account of the theory of apt action, a book-length treatment, will require extra time, hence the need for teaching relief for the CI for six months in the third year.

Equipment Intensive use of the net is fundamental to the cyberactivism case studies, so a high-speed computer is essential. Machines provided by the University of Wollongong are adequate for many but not all purposes of the project. In particular, computer mobility is required for portions of the project, due to the sensitivity of some of the issues addressed. Technically sophisticated recipients of messages can determine the Internet provider address of a fixed computer (for example at a university). Hence, for some of the studies that involve anonymity, it will be necessary to send messages from independent accounts based at different IP addresses, including from other cities. A laptop is ideal for this purpose.

Maintenance Most of the software necessary for the project can be obtained free, but in a few cases proprietary products (including updates) will be advantageous, for example firewalls to protect against attacks. A small amount is set aside for this purpose.

Travel Much of the project can be carried out using the net, supplemented by telephone contact. A trip from the UK to Australia by Dr Steve Wright is included for intensive consultations on repression technology, since there are some sensitive matters for which other forms of communication are too risky.

C3   DETAILS OF NON-ARC CONTRIBUTIONS

The primary contributions from the University of Wollongong are the CI's salary and basic infrastructure, especially computing facilities, databases and library, plus an office for research assistants. A large amount of relevant software is either provided by the university or is available as freeware.

D1   RESEARCH SUPPORT OF ALL PARTICIPANTS

Provide details for all Participants listed in Section A2—

•   The current proposal must be listed first.

•   Asterisk (*) any support related to this project.

•   ARC-funded projects for which reports (including Progress and Final Reports) required in the Conditions of Grant have been submitted should be indicated by a double asterisk after the Description.

•   Support types **(Sup type)** are 'C' for current support, 'R' for requested support, 'P' for past support.

•   The Project ID applies only to past and current ARC/DETYA grants.

Description (All named investigators on any grant held by a participant, project title, source of support, scheme)	**(*)**	**Sup type**	**Project ID**	**2001** ($'000)	**2002** ($'000)	**2003** ($'000)	**2004** ($'000)
B Martin, Theory and action for opposing political repression, ARC, Discovery	*	R	DP0346 386			62	58
B Martin, Communication technology for nonviolent struggle, ARC Large **	*	P	A79905 285	58			

D2 REPORT ON ARC LARGE GRANT, "Technology for nonviolent struggle," 1999-2001:

The aim of the project was to examine nonviolent struggle, as an organised alternative to military methods, and specifically to see how it can be aided by appropriate communication technology. Following a survey of possible case studies, three were chosen: (1) popular action causing the forced resignation of President Suharto of Indonesia in 1998; (2) popular resistance to the 1991 Soviet coup; (3) international activism leading to the stopping of the Multilateral Agreement on Investment in 1998. We studied these struggles in depth through documents and obtaining feedback on written accounts.

In the course of investigating these cases, the project was broadened in two significant ways. First, the ambit of the study was expanded from communication technology to communication generally, including factors such as systems of meaning and bureaucratic control over government-collected information. Second, as well as looking at the three instances of relatively successful nonviolent struggle, we looked at comparison instances of low profile and less successful nonviolent struggle (or even the absence of struggle), namely (1) the 1965-1966 massacres in Indonesia and the 1975 invasion and occupation of East Timor; (2) Stalinist repression in the Soviet Union; (3) structural adjustment programmes, especially before the 1990s.

Examining instances of lower-profile nonviolent resistance was an original contribution to the field. Our findings reaffirmed the crucial role of 'political jiu-jitsu,' the process by which repression can stimulate greater support for the resistance. Building on a range of nonviolence perspectives and communication theories, we developed a communication model for nonviolent struggle and spelled out how it can be used by nonviolent activists. Thus the project was fruitful in terms of both theoretical and practical innovation. Our study was the first major investigation of communication and nonviolence and should set the agenda for further research in the field.

We have published major refereed papers on each of the case studies, some lesser papers along the way, and most importantly completed a book to be published in Hampton Press' Communication Series. The external referees were most enthusiastic. In addition, we have since extended the theory in a major paper submitted to *Journal of Peace Research.*

The most significant aspect of the project was how much it broadened in scope as it has proceeded, something that seemed inevitable since so little had been done previously linking nonviolence and communication. There were no substantial difficulties.

Refereed publications directly resulting from the project
Brian Martin and Wendy Varney, *Nonviolence Speaks: Communicating Against Repression* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2002, in press).
Brian Martin, Wendy Varney and Adrian Vickers. Political jiu-jitsu against Indonesian repression: studying lower-profile nonviolent resistance. *Pacifica Review,* Vol. 13, No. 2, June 2001, pp. 143-156.
Brian Martin. Nonviolent futures. *Futures,* Vol. 33, 2001, pp. 625-635.
Wendy Varney and Brian Martin. Lessons from the 1991 Soviet coup. *Peace Research,* Vol. 32, No. 1, February 2000, pp. 52-68.
Wendy Varney and Brian Martin. Net resistance, Net benefits: opposing MAI. *Social Alternatives,* Vol. 19, No. 1, January 2000, pp. 47-51.

Other publications related to the project
Brian Martin, *Nonviolence versus Capitalism* (London: War Resisters' International, 2001).
Brian Martin, *Technology for Nonviolent Struggle* (London: War Resisters' International, 2001).
Brian Martin and Wendy Varney. Nonviolent action and people with disabilities. *Civilian-Based Defense,* Vol. 15, No. 3, 2000, pp. 4-16.
Brian Martin and Wendy Varney. Convivial media. *M/C Reviews,* 12 April 2000.
    <http://www.uq.edu.au/mc/reviews/features/politics/convivial.html>
Book reviews in *Pacifica Review* and *Social Alternatives.*

Theory and action for opposing political repression

E2 Project description and background

> Political repression, such as surveillance, arrests, torture and killings, sometimes rebounds against the represser in a process called "political jiu-jitsu." The aim of this project is to investigate and reformulate the concept of political jiu-jitsu in order to understand its core components and extend its applicability. To test the theory, twelve case studies will be drawn from the areas of the technology of repression, covert operations, cyberactivism and organisational struggles.

Social activists have long struggled against repression, aggression and oppression. As well as protests aimed at influencing government leaders and policy makers, activists have often used forms of direct action such as sit-ins, strikes and boycotts. For example, peace activists have used marches (including across continents), rallies, blockades (e.g., of arms shipments), sabotage (e.g. damaging missiles) and interposition (e.g., the Gulf Peace Team during the Gulf war) to oppose wars and arms production and trade.

If activists want to know more about the problems they confront, they can consult many excellent analyses of war, racism, capitalism, patriarchy and others. However, research into what makes campaigns and actions effective is surprisingly limited.

Tens of billions of dollars of dollars are spent each year in military research and development, including in fields such as psychology and education, of which one component is R&D in so-called "non-lethal weapons" such as rubber bullets, acoustic weapons and incapacitating sprays, often used for crowd control. Yet, in contrast, virtually nothing is spent in researching ways for activists to survive, confront, oppose or otherwise deal with such weapons.

From time to time over many years, I have interviewed social activists, asking specifically about what theoretical work they find useful in their efforts. Many can think of nothing at all: they do not read scholarly or even popular works on social problems. Others are influenced by generic critiques, such as feminist writings. However, these works do not offer specific advice for activists. It appears that day-to-day decisions in most campaigns are made on the basis of practical experience. A few studies aim to provide insight at this level (Alinsky, 1971; Coover et al., 1981; Herngren, 1993; Shaw, 1999), but usually the link to social theory is tenuous.

Again, a comparison with military R&D is enlightening. Weapons research leads to innovations that are implemented with corresponding changes in organisational structures, training, planning and decision making. Similarly, military-sponsored studies into organisational dynamics and individual psychology are used to introduce changes in training and management. This is not to suggest that military innovation or performance is optimal, as military failures are notorious (Dixon, 1976). The point is that military R&D links theoretical and practical domains far more effectively than occurs for opponents of repression.

For nonviolent activists, the most widely known scholar is Gene Sharp, whose classic book *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (1973) catalogues and classifies nearly 200 methods of nonviolent action and presents a theory of the dynamics of nonviolent action. Although Sharp has largely been ignored in the scholarly literature, his ideas are immensely influential among nonviolent activists, for example being regularly presented in nonviolent action

training. His works have been translated into dozens of languages and widely circulated among dissidents in repressive regimes.

Sharp bases his analysis on a consent theory of power which is empowering for activists but has serious theoretical flaws (Martin, 1989; McGuinness, 1993). This project, though, draws on a different component of Sharp's work: his concept of "political jiu-jitsu," modified from the earlier concept of "moral jiu-jitsu" (Gregg, 1966). The basic idea is that nonviolent action puts opponents, with a capacity for violence, in a bind: if they do nothing, the activists make gains; if they respond with violence, this often generates sympathy for the activists from third parties. A classic case is the salt satyagraha led by Gandhi in India in 1930. To oppose British rule, Gandhi led a march to the sea, where he and many others made salt in defiance of the British laws. Police violence against the activists was reported by US journalist Webb Miller, generating sympathy for the Indians in Britain and elsewhere, helping to undermine British authority (Weber, 1993). Another example is the Sharpeville massacre in 1960 which galvanised opposition to the South African regime. Using the opponent's force to build a movement's strength is analogous to what occurs in jiu-jitsu when the opponent's weight and thrust are used to unbalance them.

If activists use violence, the power of political jiu-jitsu is undermined, since many observers then perceive the conflict as between two violent parties, even though there may be a vast difference in the levels of violence used. Over many years, PLO terrorism did little to advance the cause of the Palestinians. Then there was the 1987-1993 intifada, an unarmed resistance to Israeli rule, which attracted enormous international support. However, the throwing of stones by Palestinian youths partially undermined the effectiveness of the intifada, which arguably would have been even more effective with a complete adherence to nonviolence (Dajani, 1994; Rigby, 1991).

Political jiu-jitsu is widely understood intuitively by activists and their opponents. It explains why, for example, police sometimes use infiltrators to provoke violence and thereby discredit demonstrators, and why nonviolent activists spend so much time training to resist any temptation to become violent.

The case of demonstrators versus police provides an excellent example of developments in tactics by both sides. Police can use various tactics to undercut the operation of political jiu-jitsu.

(1) Police deny being violent and use various forms of media management. This is not new. For example, in the salt satyagraha, the British claimed that Indians carted off to hospital were faking their injuries. All governments deny that they use or sanction torture, though dozens do.

(2) Police may use violence "off stage", for example beating protesters when no cameras are around.

(3) Police may use "non-lethal" weapons, such as pepper spray, which can be damaging or frightening but do not seem so bad to observers.

(4) Police can try to provoke violence by protesters and fail to act against those who do use violence.

(5) Police can use agents provocateurs, as was alleged concerning the Genoa anti-globalisation protests.

What countertactics can be used by protesters? Here are some possibilities:

(1) To counter police denials and media management, protesters can develop links with credible media observers and use alternative media.

(2) To counter off-stage violence, protesters can become more sophisticated in methods of recording police violence.

(3) To counter non-lethal weapons, protesters can educate the public about the impacts of repression technology (as was done concerning the technique of sensory deprivation used in Northern Ireland).

(4) Nonviolent activists can repudiate protester violence.

(5) Agents provocateurs can be exposed.

In developing this list of police tactics and protester countertactics, I have relied on my own analysis of the core processes of political jiu-jitsu, since neither Sharp nor others have analysed this. (My analysis was very well received at a talk I gave in the session on protester ethics at the Rethinking Humanitarianism conference in Brisbane, September 2001).

My preliminary assessment is that political ju-jitsu operates when:
(a) there is a widely recognised boundary, such as violence-nonviolence;
(b) one side crosses it and the other doesn't;
(c) the difference is perceived by relevant audiences.
This seems simple enough, although there are crucial cultural assessments to be made in deciding what is a recognised boundary. The beauty of this formulation is that it can be generalised beyond the violence-nonviolence boundary.

Consider, for example, nuclear weapons. The antinuclear weapons movement draws much of its strength from the widely accepted boundary between nuclear and nonnuclear weapons, seen as a qualitative divide if not indeed a difference between extinction and survival, even though fuel-air explosives are now nearly as powerful as mininukes. The movement, arguably, would be dramatically weakened if nuclear weapons were perceived as just another sort of weapon in the arsenal.

So far this argument about the core of political jiu-jitsu is based on plausibility grounds. It has never been systematically assessed. That is the purpose of this project.

This description of the project could have been written in terms of evolution of concepts about nonviolent action, but this would have been misleading. Gandhi was the undisputed pioneer in developing nonviolence as a strategy of social change, but his writings are theoretically unfocussed and idealistic. Gene Sharp, as mentioned, put nonviolence theory on a pragmatic basis. Even so, the concept of political jiu-jitsu has remained pretty much in its raw state, without serious testing or elaboration, aside from extensions in which I have taken a lead (Martin and Varney, 2002; Martin, Varney and Vickers, 2001). Nearly all the fruitful work on nonviolent action has involved an interplay between theory and action. This project is no different, but it emphasises development and testing of theory.

E3 Significance and innovation

The **theoretical significance** of this project lies in explicating, elaborating, testing and reformulating the concept of political jiu-jitsu beyond its home in nonviolence theory.

First, political jiu-jitsu will be probed conceptually in its traditional formulation. As well as appealing to a shared cultural boundary, nonviolent action can be effective because of popular participation (which is potentially much greater for nonviolent action than armed struggle) and incorporation of ends within means (which is automatic in the case of nonviolent action that aims at a more nonviolent society). These and other aspects of nonviolent action will be laid out so that the core of political jiu-jitsu is clarified.

Second, the concept of political jiu-jitsu will be elaborated by modifying key assumptions. In particular, if the core is the violence-nonviolence boundary, this can be modified to various other boundaries such as nuclear-nonnuclear. Other assumptions within nonviolence theory are that action involves physical bodies protesting in public spaces and confronted by physical violence. These can be modified to look at internet activism, where there is no physical presence nor physical violence.

Third, political jiu-jitsu will be tested by examination of a series of case studies from different domains of action, as described later.

Fourth, the concept will be reformulated in the light of insights from the case studies.

The result of this theoretical process will be generalised theory of action, which can be called "apt action," with insights about the modifications or qualifications appropriate to different action domains. This will be of significance to the development of social science theory, giving greater understanding of the forces that lead to change, in contrast to the more usual emphasis on understanding how change is managed.

The **practical significance** of the project is that movements seeking nonviolent social change will have a conceptual tool that can be used to make actions and campaigns more effective, as in the case study of demonstrations described above. As noted before, nonviolence theory is widely used by activists, but more as a general framework of principles than as a specific assessment tool. This project aims to provide "practical theory" for comparing campaigns and assessing specific actions. Ironically, to be more practical, theoretical generalisation is the first step in order to unearth core components that are central to the effectiveness of social action.

It can be argued that insight into social action can be used to develop better methods of opposing as well as supporting citizen action. While it is true that researchers cannot control the uses of their findings, the choice of research topic and the conceptual framework used have a big influence on who can obtain greatest benefit from findings. Just as traditional nonviolence research has been far more useful to nonviolent activists than their opponents, so research into apt action is likely to be far more useful to activists than to their opponents.

The special value of the research to powerful groups such as governments and corporations will be to provide insight into how to deter and oppose "unprincipled" activism, namely activism that violates the boundaries of apt action, for example, those who cause yell abuse at police at protests. This will also be of value to principled activists.

E4 Approach

To develop and test a generalisation of political jiu-jitsu, it is valuable to study a variety of arenas where a form of political jiu-jitsu operates, including several that do not conform to the usual self-imposed restrictions of nonviolence research. Twelve case studies will be chosen, three from each of the following four areas.

• Challenges to technologies of repression, such as crowd control weapons and torture technology.
• Opposition to covert operations, such as government support for proxy armies.
• Cyberactivism, such as denial of service attacks against websites of repressive regimes.
• Organisational struggles, such as dissident movements inside military forces.

To select case studies, an extensive list of possibilities will be drawn up and then the choice made on the basis of information that can be obtained, the skills and background of the CI and RA, and relevance to testing of the theory.

In each of the twelve case studies, information will be collected from a variety of sources, including participants, to paint a picture of the repressive system (including resources, allies, internal dynamics and weaknesses). This is the most straightforward task, given the many excellent analyses available at a general level which can be applied to the cases chosen. Describing opposition movements and initiatives will be more challenging since there is less literature, though studies on social movements are helpful. Heavy reliance will be put on information from participants, especially those who formulate and reflect on strategy.

With a description of the case study, actions taken and outcomes will be examined in light of the appropriate conceptual framework derived from political jiu-jitsu. If the results do not conform to the framework, then conceptual revisions will be considered.

The baseline for comparison is nonviolent action in public places against obvious violence for which there is a wealth of evidence (Sharp, 1973). Each of four types of case studies offers a significant variation on this standard model and hence each type provides a way to test generalised political jiu-jitsu. Some specifics are worth noting.

Challenges to technologies of repression

As described in E2, use of some weapons undercuts political jiu-jitsu by hiding their effects. Furthermore, torture is usually carried out in secret, another deviation from the standard model for nonviolent action. Technologies of repression thus provide a fruitful test of a theory of apt action.

The following case studies are planned:

• Two cases where a key element of struggle involves persuading audiences about the existence and significance of repressive violence. For example, falanga (beating on the soles of the feet) was a torture innovation designed to inflict pain without leaving physical traces, thereby weakening political backlash. Turkish physician Veli Lök developed a way of detecting falanga by using bone scintigraphy, using scientific knowledge to persuade others of the existence of the torture. Similar knowledge struggles have been carried out over the effects of pepper spray and sensory deprivation.

• Activist intervention at the site of production and sale of repression technologies, such as when protests are held at sales fairs.

For this component of the project, I plan to draw on the wisdom of Dr Steve Wright of the Omega Institute in Manchester, the world's leading researcher on repression technologies, with whom I have exchanged ideas for over a decade. Dr Wright has an unrivalled knowledge of research and action in the area which will prove invaluable for obtaining and analysing the case studies (e.g., Wright, 1998, 2001).

Opposition to covert operations

As described earlier, when police use agents provocateurs, they undercut political jiu-jitsu by making it appear that activists are violent too. Similarly, the use of death squads and proxy armies offers "deniability" to governments, making it harder to mobilise in opposition (Campbell and Brenner, 2000). For example, in Indonesia in 1998, antigovernment activists were kidnapped and tortured, some never being seen again. It was very difficult for opponents of the Suharto regime to mobilise against these kidnappings and secret torture, whereas later in the year the police killings of students at a university during a public protest triggered a huge outpouring of sympathy and support, turning the tide against the regime. In recent decades there has been an increase in the use of covert operations, which can be interpreted as a way of avoiding opposition in an age of greater global communication and citizen awareness. (The increased use of public relations strategies can be interpreted as another response.)

The following case studies are planned:

• Peace Brigades International, which offers unarmed accompaniment of at-risk dissidents as a means preventing attack. One location will be studied. I have been in touch with PBI for many years.

• Tactics used at mass protests to expose agents provocateurs. There are only a few openly documented cases of this, so activist contacts and networks (for example, War Resisters' International) will be used to find a suitable case study.

• Opposition to proxy wars (such as in Afghanistan in the 1980s or Central America in the 1980s). For this case study, I will draw on the expertise of Edward S. Herman, a leading researcher on state terrorism (Chomsky and Herman, 1979), with whom I have been in contact for many years (Herman, 1996). I will also seek the advice of Nicky Hager, an expert on intelligence agencies and spying: see Hager (1996).

Cyberactivism

Struggles in cyberspace deviate from canonical nonviolent struggles in two key respects: there is no physical violence and bodies are not physically present. Therefore, political jiu-jitsu, after generalisation to become apt action, must be refocused to cover entirely symbolic engagements.

The following case studies are planned:

• The Zapatistas, who have used the net to expand their struggle in rural Mexico to global dimensions (Cleaver, 1995; Ronfeldt et al., 1998).

• Dissidents from China and other repressive regimes who have used email and the web to question government actions. (I have been contacted by several such dissidents.)

• "Hactivists" who have launched denial-of-service and "defacement" attacks against government and corporate websites (Wray, 1998).

I plan to draw on the expertise of Danny Yee and others in Electronic Frontiers Australia in my analysis of cyberactivist struggles.

Organisational struggles

Traditional nonviolence analysis deals primarily with conflict engagements in public arenas, with little attention to struggles between members within organisations, where the consent theory of power is more problematical. A previous community research project (Martin et al., 1997) opened up this area, though without the theoretical focus planned here. Weinstein's (1979) analysis of bureaucracies as similar to authoritarian political systems provides a launching point for applying political jiu-jitsu to organisational struggles.

The following types of case studies are planned.

• An opposition struggle within an armed force. There are many possibilities to consider, such as opposition within the Israeli army to military actions in Palestine. There are also many historical examples. The choice of case study will depend on what access to key participants seems possible. I will seek advice from Max Watts (see Cortright and Watts, 1991).

• An opposition to dominant policy elites. An example would be dissent within the Australian foreign affairs apparatus to policy on Indonesia, 1965-1998, especially re East Timor since 1975. There is also good historical material on policy dissent during the Vietnam War (e.g. Halberstam, 1972).

• Dissent within the scientific community over government direction of R&D. A well known example is resistance to "star wars"; there are many other examples I would draw from my studies of dissent in science.

The plan is to spend two to three months on each of the 12 case studies, writing them up as the project proceeds, with some time at the end to complete a book. For each study, the following steps will be involved:
• collection of material (for which research assistance is essential);
• assessment of the dynamics of the struggle using a suitably reformulated model of apt action;
• specific queries to key participants concerning the analysis, to see whether it has captured core dynamic;
• revision, if necessary, 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 considered feedback.
• revision of the account and, as appropriate, publication.

In the analysis of case studies, additional bodies of theory will be drawn on as appropriate. Social movement theory, with its many branches, is one obvious candidate. Cohen's (2001) recent analysis of how perpetrators and bystanders deny atrocities is very relevant.

E5 National benefit

Outcomes from the project will include (1) detailed case studies of struggles in a range of domains, and (2) an extension of nonviolence theory to wider domains, especially to capture the dynamics of action. Publication of and publicity about these findings will create wider awareness by activists on how best to plan and run campaigns.

Nonviolence theory assumes that popular action is necessary to oppose repression and oppression and that nonviolence is more empowering, less damaging and potentially more effective than violence. Developing people's understanding of and capacity to use nonviolent action thus strengthens the ability of a society to beneficially protect and transform itself. The most effective action is that which appeals to widely shared cultural values. Thus, the project has the potential to promote "responsible" activism and to discourage methods that are damaging to all concerned.

If even a single damaging practice or policy can be reoriented by improved activism — such as civil libertarians thwarting government repression — the national benefits are potentially huge. In Australia, this would be relevant to struggles over refugees and racism, environmental issues, police corruption and foreign policy.

These sorts of benefits will be available worldwide. Just as civil disobedience is usually a more responsible and effective way to promote lasting and beneficial social change than riots, sabotage or terrorism (however justified these might be in some circumstances), likewise what is here called "apt action" will usually be a superior approach to social change. If Australians can take a lead in modelling principled and effective social action, there will be additional national benefits.

E6 Communication of results

As the project proceeds, accounts of 12 diverse struggles will be written. This should provide the basis for at least half a dozen scholarly papers — including ones targeted at journals covering peace studies, human rights, politics, internet studies, organisational studies and technology studies. As well, additional articles will be sent to magazines for activists, such as *Peace News,* which in turn should generate new information.

A book from the project as a whole will cover both the theory of apt action and the full range of case studies. Since each of my previous two ARC grants has resulted in a book plus multiple refereed articles, this is a realistic plan.

E7 Description of personnel

The **chief investigator** will:
- formulate, refine and periodically reassess the project's framework;
- develop detailed research plans, including methods of collecting information and choice of case studies;
- oversee collection of information;
- formulate and test new theory on the dynamics of activism;
- formulate and lead publishing strategies.

Several **research assistants** will be employed as appropriate to the different types of case studies. Within the basic structure of the project, the RAs will be expected, with guidance and assistance from the chief investigator, to:
- search for documentation about the chosen case studies;
- contact individuals and groups to obtain information about the case studies;
- compile material on case studies;
- participate in some interviews;
- contribute to publications, if able.

I am supervising two new **research students** this year whose topics are most relevant to the project. Keith McLeod (PhD) will be researching terrorism, which has links with the technology of repression and covert operations. Andy Nicholson (MA research with possible conversion to PhD), who has a background in engineering, will be designing computer systems for democratic communications, which has strong connections with cyberactivism.

Dr Steve Wright of the Omega Institute in Britain, who has unequalled expertise on the technology of repression, is eager to collaborate on that component of the project. Several individuals in cyberliberties groups, including Electronic Frontiers Australia, have assisted in previous work and will be invited to be involved in the cyberactivism component of this project.

E8 References

Alinsky, Saul D. (1971) *Rules for Radicals: A Practical Primer for Realistic Radicals* (New York: Random House).

Campbell, Bruce B. and Arthur D. Brenner (eds.) (2000) *Death Squads in Global Perspective: Murder with Deniability* (New York: St. Martin's Press).

Chomsky, Noam and Edward S. Herman (1979) *The Political Economy of Human Rights* (Boston: South End Press).

Cleaver, Harry (1995) "The Zapatistas and the electronic fabric of struggle," http://www.eco.utexas.edu/faculty/Cleaver/zaps.html, November.

Cohen, Stanley (2001) *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering* (Cambridge: Polity).

Coover, Virginia, Ellen Deacon, Charles Esser and Christopher Moore (1981) *Resource Manual for a Living Revolution* (Philadelphia: New Society Publishers).

Cortright, David and Max Watts (1991) *Left Face: Soldier Unions and Resistance Movements in Modern Armies* (Westport, CT: Greenwood).

Dajani, Souad R. (1994) *Eyes Without Country: Searching for a Palestinian Strategy of Liberation* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).

Dixon, Norman (1976) *On the Psychology of Military Incompetence* (London: Jonathan Cape).

Gregg, Richard B. (1966) *The Power of Nonviolence* (New York: Schocken Books).

Hager, Nicky (1996) *Secret Power: New Zealand's Role in the International Spy Network* (Nelson, NZ: Craig Potton).

Halberstam, David (1972) *The Best and the Brightest* (New York: Random House).

Herman, Edward S. (1996) "Terrorism: the struggle against closure," in Brian Martin (ed.), *Confronting the Experts* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press), pp. 77-97.

Herngren, Per (1993) *Path of Resistance: The Practice of Civil Disobedience* (Philadelphia: New Society Publishers).

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

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

Martin, Brian and Wendy Varney (2002, in press) *Nonviolence Speaks: Communicating Against Repression* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press).

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

McGuinness, Kate (1993) "Gene Sharp's theory of power: a feminist critique of consent," *Journal of Peace Research,* Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 101-115.

Ronfeldt, David et al. (1998) *The Zapatista "Social Netwar" in Mexico* (Santa Monica, CA: Rand).

Rigby, Andrew (1991) *Living the Intifada* (London: Zed Books).

Sharp, Gene (1973) *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (Boston: Porter Sargent).

Shaw, Randy (1999) *Reclaiming America: Nike, Clean Air, and the New National Activism* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Weber, Thomas (1993) "'The marchers simply walked forward until struck down': nonviolent suffering and conversion," *Peace & Change*, 18(3), pp 267-289.

Weinstein, Deena (1979) *Bureaucratic Opposition* (New York: Pergamon).

Wray, Stefan (1998) "Electronic civil disobedience and the World Wide Web of hacktivism: a mapping of extraparliamentarian direct action net politics," http://www.nyu.edu/projects/wray/wwwhack.html.

Wright, Steve (1998) *An Appraisal of Technologies for Political Control* (Luxembourg: European Parliament).

Wright, Steve (2001) "The role of sub-lethal weapons in human rights abuse," *Medicine, Conflict and Survival,* Vol. 17, pp. 221-233.