

**AUSTRALIAN RESEARCH COUNCIL
DISCOVERY PROJECTS
APPLICATION FORM FOR FUNDING COMMENCING IN 2008**



PROJECT ID: DP0879639

Total number of sheets contained in this Proposal	30
---	----

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

PART A—ADMINISTRATIVE SUMMARY

A1 ORGANISATION TO ADMINISTER FUNDING

(Please note this question must be completed first)

Name

A2 PROPOSAL TITLE

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

A3 PARTICIPANT SUMMARY

A3.1 Participant Details - Current Organisations

Enter details of the lead Chief Investigator or Fellow at Person number 1.

Chief Investigators (CI), Partner Investigators (PI) and ARC Fellows - APD, ARF/QEII or APF.

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

A3.2 Participant Summary - Organisations Applicable To This Proposal

(This table is 'read only' and provides a Summary of Organisational Affiliations for Participants. This table will populate once B8.2 is completed for each participant.)

Person Number	Family Name	Initials	Current Organisation	Relevant Organisation for this Proposal	Role
1	Martin	B	University of Wollongong	University of Wollongong	CI

A4 REQUESTED SUPPORT

A4.1 Component(s) sought

Tick each relevant box.

Number sought

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

A4.2 Years for which support is being sought

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

A5 SUMMARY DESCRIPTIONS

A5.1 Summary of Proposal

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

The research will provide a general model of tactics used in complex conflicts, namely conflicts involving many different players, deception and concurrent stages of development. Four diverse case studies will be used to help develop and test the model: the 1994 Rwanda genocide; the sexual harassment case involving Anita Hill and Clarence Thomas; the collapse of Enron; and the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. The model of tactics will pioneer a new area for social science research and offer insight into how to intervene to oppose injustice.

A5.2 Summary of National/Community Benefit (for Public Release)

In no more than 100 words (approx 750 characters) of plain language, summarise the national/community benefits that are expected to arise from the research.

The project will provide an empirically grounded, practical way of assessing tactics in complex conflicts, ranging from sexual harassment to genocide. By showing what works, the findings will provide guidance to all concerned participants - from individuals and NGOs to governments and international bodies - about the best ways to intervene.
Part of the national benefit will come about by empowering those at the grassroots, such as feminists, environmentalists, anti-corruption and human rights NGOs, by helping them make wiser choices in their campaigns. Another part will come from informing officials, such as politicians, diplomats and corporate executives, how to be more effective when intervening against injustice.

A6 CLASSIFICATIONS AND OTHER STATISTICAL INFORMATION

A6.1 National Research Priorities

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

A6.2 Keywords

injustice
social action
strategy

tactics
conflict
deception

A6.3 Research classifications (listed from highest to lowest %, to the nearest multiple of 10%)

Research Fields, Courses and Disciplines (RFCD)	%
379999	100

Socio-Economic Objective (SEO)	%
750699	50
759999	50

A6.4 If the proposed research involves international collaboration, please specify country/ies.

A7 ADDITIONAL DETAILS

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

A7.2 Has a successful eligibility exemption/ruling been granted by the ARC regarding whether the Proposal falls within the area of Medical and Dental Research? (Note - DO NOT include eligibility exemptions/rulings related to ARC Fellowships here - see Section B9.9 of this form.)

Yes No **X**

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

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

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

A8 RESEARCH STUDENTS

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

Number of Research Student Places (FTE) -

PhD	
Masters	
Honours	

A9 CERTIFICATION

The Administering Organisation must obtain the required agreement and hand-written signatures of all parties necessary to allow the proposed research to proceed.

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

I certify that—

- I have obtained the written agreement of all parties identified in this Proposal to submit this Proposal.
- Proper enquiries have been made and I am satisfied that the Participants listed in Part A3 meet the requirements specified in *Discovery Projects Funding Rules for funding commencing in 2008*.
- The Head of Department has approved this Proposal.
- This organisation will contribute the resources specified in this Proposal if the proposal is successful.
- This organisation supports this Proposal and if successful will provide basic facilities and the items listed in the budget for the project.
- I have obtained the written agreement of the other organisation(s), if any, involved in this Proposal to contribute the resources outlined in this Proposal.
- I have obtained the written agreement from the relevant employer(s) for the participation, to the extent indicated in this Proposal, of the participants listed in Part A3.
- I am prepared to have the project carried out in my organisation under the circumstances set out in this Proposal and in accordance with the *Discovery Projects Funding Rules for funding commencing in 2008*.
- The amount of time that the researcher(s) will be devoting to the project is appropriate to existing workloads.
- The project can be accommodated within the general facilities in this organisation, and 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 been obtained.
- I will notify the ARC if there are changes to the participant(s) listed in Part A3 after the submission of this Proposal.
- 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.
- I will notify the ARC of any conflicts of interest relating to parties involved in or associated with this proposal which arise after the submission of this Proposal.
- I consent, on behalf of all the parties, to the ARC copying, modifying and otherwise dealing with information contained in this Proposal for any of the purposes specified in subsection 11.4.2 of the *Discovery Projects Funding Rules for funding commencing in 2008*.
- I consent, on behalf of all the parties, to this Proposal being referred to third parties, who will remain anonymous, for assessment purposes.
- For each Fellowship candidate on this Proposal who currently holds an ARC fellowship and who is seeking a subsequent fellowship, I have obtained the agreement from the Administering Organisation for the current fellowship, as well as the fellowship candidate, that the current fellowship will be relinquished if the fellowship candidate is successful.
- To the best of my knowledge, the Privacy Notice appearing at the top of this application form has been drawn to the attention of all the participant(s) whose personal details have been provided at Part B.
- To the best of my knowledge all details provided in this application form and in any supporting documentation are true and complete and no information specifically relating to personnel track or publication records is false or misleading.

- I understand that it is an offence under the *Criminal Code Act 1995* to provide false or misleading information.
- I understand and agree that all statutory requirements must be met before the proposed research can commence.

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

**Name and Position (please
print)**

Date

--

--

PART B—PERSONNEL

B1 PERSON NUMBER

1

B2 CURRENT DETAILS

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

Family name	Martin	Role	CI
First name	Brian	Second name	
Title	A/Prof		
Current Department/school/other	Social Sciences, Media and Communication		
Current Organisation	University of Wollongong		

B3 POSTAL ADDRESS

Department/school/other	Social Sciences, Media and Communication						
Organisation	University of Wollongong						
Postal address line 1	Building 19 (Arts) Level 1						
Postal address line 2	Northfields Avenue						
Locality	Wollongong	State	NSW	Postcode	2522	Country	Australia

B4 MEMBERSHIPS/ASSOCIATIONS

B4.1 Are you a current member of the ARC or its advisory committees? YesNoX

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

If Yes, please name the ARC member(s)

B4.3 Will you be associated with a Commonwealth Government-funded Research Centre as at 1 January 2008? YesNo X

B5 HAVE YOU EVER BEEN AWARDED A FELLOWSHIP FROM THE ARC?

Please indicate if you have received any of the following Fellowships from the ARC: APD, APDI, APDC, ARF/QEII, APF, RC-ATSI, IRF or SRF.

Yes No X

If yes, please provide details below:

Fellowship type	Funding commencement year	Finish year
-----------------	---------------------------	-------------

B6 AFFILIATIONS

If you are nominated as a Chief Investigator, will you be receiving Earnings in 2008 from an organisation which is outside the higher education sector and which is funded predominantly from State/Territory or Commonwealth Government sources and such funding is provided mainly for research activities?

Yes No X

B7 QUALIFICATIONS**B7.1 PhD qualification awarded**

Discipline/Field	Physics		
Organisation	The University of Sydney		
Country	Australia		
Month and Year awarded	05/1976	(or) Date Thesis Submitted/ Proposed Submission Date	

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

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

B8 ACADEMIC, RESEARCH, PROFESSIONAL AND INDUSTRIAL EXPERIENCE**B8.1 Current and previous appointment(s)/position(s) - during the past 10 years**

Position held	Organisation	Department	Duration and Status
A/Prof	University of Wollongong	Social Sciences, Media and Communication	1997, Continuing

B8.2 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.

Role Organisation

Type of Affiliation

CI	University of Wollongong	Employee
----	--------------------------	----------

B9 ADDITIONAL FELLOWSHIP DETAILS (not applicable)

B10 RESEARCH RECORD RELATIVE TO OPPORTUNITIES

B10.1 Most significant contributions to research field

I have made a series of pioneering contributions to the study of nonviolent action, opening up several new fields of study. These include the critique of Gene Sharp's theory of power (*Journal of Peace Research*, 1989), the grassroots orientation to nonviolent defence (*Social Defence, Social Change*, 1993), the analysis of nonviolent action in and against bureaucracy (*Challenging Bureaucratic Elites*, 1997), the analysis of the role of science and technology in nonviolent struggle (for example, *Technology for Nonviolent Struggle*, 2001), formulation of nonviolent strategy against capitalism (*Nonviolence Versus Capitalism*, 2001), and the analysis of communication in nonviolent struggle (for example, *Nonviolence Speaks*, 2003).

My works are widely recognised as combining intellectual rigour with clear expression and rational, focused argument relevant to social change. *Nonviolence Versus Capitalism*, for example, was reviewed in *Peace News* as being "essential for all those connected in any way to the current movements for social change"; *Freedom's* reviewer recommended the book "strongly to everyone genuinely interested in the search for a better world."

My studies of whistleblowing and dissent are also recognised internationally, especially studies of suppression of dissent in scientific controversies and of strategies for dissidents, in papers and books from the 1980s onwards.

My total publication output includes 12 books, 3 edited books, 37 chapters in books, 133 major articles in refereed journals, 59 major articles in nonrefereed journals, 92 lesser articles (some in refereed journals), and many dozens of book reviews and newspaper articles.

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

B10.2 Refereed publications, 2002-

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

Books

- * Brian Martin. *Justice Ignited: The Dynamics of Backfire* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006).
- * Brian Martin and Wendy Varney. *Nonviolence Speaks: Communicating Against Repression* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2003).

Book chapters

- * 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* (MIT Press, 2007, in press). [accepted 2006]
- * 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, in press). [accepted November 2006]
- * 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).
- * Brian Martin. Strategies for alternative science. In: Scott Frickel and Kelly Moore (eds.), *The New Political Sociology of Science: Institutions, Networks, and Power* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), pp. 272-298.
- Brian Martin. Agricultural antibiotics: features of a controversy. In: Daniel Lee Kleinman, Abby J. Kinchy and Jo Handelsman (eds.), *Controversies in Science and Technology: From Maize to Menopause* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005), pp. 37-51.
- * Brian Martin. The Richardson dismissal as an academic boomerang. In: Kenneth Westhues (ed.), *Workplace Mobbing in Academe* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004), pp. 317-330.
- * Brian Martin. Defending without the military. In: Geoff Harris (ed.), *Achieving Security in Sub-Saharan Africa: Cost Effective Alternatives to the Military* (Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, 2004), pp. 43-55.
- * Brian Martin. Australia: Whistleblowers Australia. In: Richard Calland and Guy Dehn (eds.), *Whistleblowing around the World: Law, Culture & Practice* (Cape Town/London: Open Democracy Advice Centre and Public Concern at Work, 2004), pp. 194-198.

Articles in refereed journals

* Truda Gray and Brian Martin. My Lai: the struggle over outrage. *Peace & Change*, in press [accepted 10 August 2006].

* Kylie Smith and Brian Martin. Tactics of labor struggles. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, in press [accepted 3 April 2006]

* Truda Gray and Brian Martin. Defamation and the art of backfire. *Deakin Law Review*, in press [accepted 20 June 2006].

Brian Martin. Nuclear power and antiterrorism: obscuring the policy contradictions. *Prometheus*, 2007, in press [accepted December 2006].

Brian Martin. Social testing. *Social Alternatives*, in press [accepted 2 January 2007].

* Brian Martin. SRV & NVA: valorizing social roles through nonviolent action. *SRV Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 2, December 2006, pp. 25-33.

* 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.

* 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/issues/issue11_9/valk/index.html

* David Hess and Brian Martin. Backfire, repression, and the theory of transformative events. *Mobilization*, Vol. 11, No. 1, June 2006, pp. 249-267.

* 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.

* Brian Martin. Instead of repression. *Social Alternatives*, Vol. 25, No. 1, First Quarter 2006, pp. 62-66.

* 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.

Noriko Dethlefs and Brian Martin. Japanese technology policy for aged care. *Science and Public Policy*, Vol. 33, No. 1, February 2006, pp. 47-57.

* Brian Martin. How nonviolence works. *Borderlands E-journal*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 2005 [published May 2006].

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* Brian Martin. Illusions of whistleblower protection. *UTS Law Review*, No. 5, 2003, pp. 119-130.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B10.3 Ten career-best publications

Brian Martin. *Justice Ignited: The Dynamics of Backfire* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), 232 pages.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

My publications, in full text on my website, received over a million hits in 2006 according to University of Wollongong statistics, many times more than all the hits on the University's Research Online, which contains over 1000 articles. Several of my articles received over 10,000 hits, a huge number compared to typical articles on Research Online. Documents on suppression of dissent, also on my site, also received over a million hits in 2006. My website leads to unsolicited correspondence from hundreds of new people each year, many seeking advice, especially on whistleblowing and defamation.

I have extensive practical knowledge about complex conflicts via participation in groups and through discussions with individuals. I was national president of Whistleblowers Australia for four years (1996-1999) and since then been international director, and have given personal advice to many hundreds of whistleblowers and dissidents.

For 20 years, I have participated in Schweik Action Wollongong in carrying out community research projects on nonviolent alternatives to aggression, such as a 2003 project on "Defending Muslims in Wollongong." In the past two years I have gathered resources and helped organise workshops on resisting repression. This, and involvement in other organisations, has given me extensive practical experience with complex conflict, both in movements and internally within organisations.

Journalists, including many from outside Australia, seek me out dozens of times every year for interviews or background information, especially on whistleblowing.

I have examined a dozen PhD theses and am on the editorial boards of *Social Alternatives* and *Public Understanding of Science*, among other journals. In 2006 I was an external referee for 15 journal articles, mostly for international journals such as *Ecological Economics*; *Evidence and Policy*; *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change*; and *Science, Technology, and Human Values*.

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

Not applicable.

PART C—PROJECT COST

Costs should be quoted exclusive of the GST.
--

C1 BUDGET DETAILS

C1.1 Year

1

	COSTING			
Column 1	2	3	4	5
Source of funds	ARC	University	Other	Total
DIRECT COSTS				
Personnel (Salaries + On-costs)				
CI 1 (Martin) @ 0.3 FTE + on-costs	0	43932	0	43932
Casual RAs: Rate 5 (1560 hours * \$38.80) + on-costs	60528	0	0	60528
Total Personnel (a)	60528	43932	0	104460
Teaching Relief				
Total Teaching Relief (b)	0	0	0	0
Equipment				
Total Equipment (c)	0	0	0	0
Maintenance				
Purchase of documents	0	750	0	750
Total Maintenance (d)	0	750	0	750
Travel				
Total Travel (e)	0	0	0	0
Other				
Total Other (f)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (g)	60528	44682	0	105210
INDIRECT COSTS				
CIs, PIs and any researcher Level A or above x multiplier				
CI 1 (Martin) @ 0.3 FTE + on-costs x 0.92		40417	0	40417
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (h)		40417	0	40417
TOTAL COSTS (i)	60528	85099	0	145627

C1 BUDGET DETAILS

C1.2 Year

2

Column 1	COSTING			
	2	3	4	5
Source of funds	ARC	University	Other	Total
DIRECT COSTS				
Personnel (Salaries + On-costs)				
CI 1 (Martin) @ 0.3 FTE + oncosts	0	47070	0	47070
Casual RAs: Rate 5 (1560 hours * \$38.80) + on-costs	60528	0	0	60528
Total Personnel (a)	60528	47070	0	107598
Teaching Relief				
Total Teaching Relief (b)	0	0	0	0
Equipment				
Total Equipment (c)	0	0	0	0
Maintenance				
Purchase of documents	0	750	0	750
Total Maintenance (d)	0	750	0	750
Travel				
Total Travel (e)	0	0	0	0
Other				
Total Other (f)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (g)	60528	47820	0	108348
INDIRECT COSTS				
CIs, PIs and any researcher Level A or above x multiplier				
CI 1 (Martin) @ 0.3 FTE + on-costs x 0.92		43304	0	43304
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (h)		43304	0	43304
TOTAL COSTS (i)	60528	91124	0	151652

C1 BUDGET DETAILS

C1.3 Year

3

Column 1	COSTING			
	2	3	4	5
Source of funds	ARC	University	Other	Total
DIRECT COSTS				
Personnel (Salaries + On-costs)				
CI 1 (Martin) @ 0.3 FTE + on-costs	0	49659	0	49659
Casual RAs: Rate 5 (1560 hours * \$38.80) + on-costs	60528	0	0	60528
Total Personnel (a)	60528	49659	0	110187
Teaching Relief				
CI (Martin) 6 months	32972	0	0	32972
Total Teaching Relief (b)	32972	0	0	32972
Equipment				
Total Equipment (c)	0	0	0	0
Maintenance				
Purchase of documents	0	750	0	750
Total Maintenance (d)	0	750	0	750
Travel				
Total Travel (e)	0	0	0	0
Other				
Total Other (f)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (g)	93500	50409	0	143909
INDIRECT COSTS				
CIs, PIs and any researcher Level A or above x multiplier				
CI 1 (Martin) @ 0.3 FTE + on-costs x 0.92		45686	0	45686
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (h)		45686	0	45686
TOTAL COSTS (i)	93500	96095	0	189595

C2 JUSTIFICATION OF FUNDING REQUESTED FROM THE ARC

Personnel

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

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

Teaching relief

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

C3 DETAILS OF NON-ARC CONTRIBUTIONS

The primary contribution from the University of Wollongong is the CI's salary. The University will also cover purchases of books, videos and other documents for the project.

PART D—RESEARCH SUPPORT

D1 RESEARCH SUPPORT OF ALL PARTICIPANTS

For each participant listed in Section A3, provide details of research funding for the years specified in the table below. That is, list all projects/proposals/fellowships awarded and any requests submitted involving that participant for funding.

- The current Proposal is listed first and will be auto populated into the table. List other Proposals and/or projects (including Fellowships) in descending date order.
- ARC-funded projects/fellowships for which reports (including Progress and Final Reports) required in the *Conditions of Grant/Funding Contract/Funding Agreement* have been submitted should be indicated by a double asterisk (**) after the Description.
- Asterisk (*) refers to any items that are in the same area of research as this Proposal.
- Support types (**Sup type**) are 'R' for requested support, 'C' for current support, 'P' for past support.
- The ARC Project ID applies only to Proposals, current and past projects (including fellowships), funded by the ARC.

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

Description (All named investigators on any Proposal or grant/project/fellowship on which a participant is involved, project title, source of support, scheme)	(*)	Sup type	ARC Project ID (if applicable)	2006 (\$'000)	2007 (\$'000)	2008 (\$'000)	2009 (\$'000)	2010 (\$'000)
Tactics in complex conflicts	*	R	DP0879639			60	60	93
Martin, Tactics of social transformation, University of Wollongong, Near Miss	*	P		15				

PART E — PROJECT DESCRIPTION

E1 Tactics in complex conflicts

E2 Aims and background

The research will provide a general model of tactics used in complex conflicts, namely conflicts involving many different players, deception and concurrent stages of development. Four diverse case studies will be used to help develop and test the model: the 1994 Rwanda genocide; the sexual harassment case involving Anita Hill and Clarence Thomas; the collapse of Enron; and the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. The model of tactics will pioneer a new area for social science research and offer insight into how to intervene to oppose injustice.

Tactics are crucially important in social struggles. For example, an employee, seeing evidence of corruption, can choose to ignore it, consult others, tell the boss or go to the media — or indeed participate in the corruption — among other things. Governments, aware of genocide in another country, can choose to ignore it, propose resolutions in the UN, send humanitarian aid or make statements to the media, among other options.

For a human rights group, tactics might include collecting information, writing reports, lobbying, making public statements, sending observers, and supporting nonviolent intervention. For an individual, it might include doing nothing, making a donation to a charity, writing letters to governments, or becoming an activist in a human rights group. Tactics can be thought of as options.

Yet social scientists have given relatively little attention to tactics, instead looking at other (important) topics such as social structures, causes of social problems, and policies. Most studies of tactics, such as in the military and commercial arenas, assume decisions are made by commanders or managers. But for those with less power and authority, there is little in the social sciences to offer guidance.

The aim of this project is to develop a general framework for classifying and analysing tactics used in complex struggles, namely ones involving multiple actors, deception and concurrent stages of development.

The project involves identifying, categorising and classifying tactics on multiple sides and putting them into a nonlinear picture of change dynamics. It will focus on struggles involving serious injustices. This will be an original theoretical contribution to the social sciences, opening up the under-researched area of tactics to systematic investigation.

E3 Significance and innovation

This project involves developing a new theoretical framework designed for practical interventions.

E3.1 Theoretical significance

Despite the importance of tactics in political, social and personal life, there is remarkably little theoretical attention to this topic. Tactics are endlessly debated, to be sure, but seldom theorised.

For example, the large body of writing on sexual harassment includes much valuable information on the frequency and patterns of harassment as well as laws and policies. By comparison, there is very little practical material for directly dealing with harassers; Langelan (1993), which draws on feminist self-defence theory, is an important contribution. In this area, like many others, social scientists have given relatively little attention to tactics at the immediate point of injustice.

Hirschman (1970) formulated a simple categorisation of options for dissatisfied employees and customers: exit or voice, namely leaving/switching or speaking out. This framework is widely cited, suggesting the importance of a useful classification of tactics.

One promising approach to tactics is “agenda management,” a way of understanding the ways that governments deal with political issues that might cause them difficulty (Harding 1985). Agenda management studies have identified — but not classified — a range of tactics used by governments to defuse, redirect or squash challenges.

I have developed a framework — the backfire model — for understanding tactics in a specific type of situation: an attack seen to be unjust, such as a massacre of protesters. In such cases, I have found it is predictable that the perpetrator will use one or more of five methods that inhibit outrage: cover up the attack; devalue the target; reinterpret the events; use official channels to give an appearance of justice; and intimidate and bribe people involved. These five types of methods, or tactics, are found in a wide range of struggles, including over censorship, unfair dismissals, police beatings, and the technology of repression (see B10.2 for references). The backfire framework incorporates agenda management theory as a special case, giving it fine texture: the government tactics cited in the agenda management literature can be easily fitted into the five methods of inhibiting outrage.

The backfire model is designed for a specific type of confrontation, between a perpetrator and a target, in what might be called straightforward conflict. The current project involves developing a framework for classifying tactics for a more general situation, namely complex conflict, defined as containing two or more of these features:

- multiple actors, rather than two main actors;
- deception as a key element;
- many different stages, rather than centred around an attack.

Associated with the new framework will be a set of explanations for why particular tactics are used in particular circumstances. The new framework for tactics will theorise a vital new area for social science research, laying the basis for a general theory of tactics in struggles over injustice.

E3.2 Practical significance

This project will provide useful conceptual tools for understanding complex struggles. Opponents of injustice will be better able to predict moves by other players and choose tactics to counter them or anticipate them. Currently, social movement theory “remains distressingly weak in providing practical information for activists compared to its emphasis on developing complex, and perhaps irrelevant, theoretical models” (Stoecker 1996: 7). The theory developed through this project will be designed to maximise practical insight: its categories will be general, while its specific application will require the localised understandings of participants.

The practical significance of the framework developed will go well beyond social movements: it will be relevant to areas where individuals encounter personal injustice, such as bullying at work, especially cases where there are multiple perpetrators, unclear lines of authority and shifting alliances. Many people have contacted me for advice about defamation, either due to being defamed or being threatened by defamation actions, and I regularly refer them to my work on making defamation threats and actions backfire. In a similar way, the framework developed in this project will offer guidance to individuals in complex conflicts.

E4 Approach and methodology

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

On the theoretical side, I will draw most heavily on the two particular grounded theories (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). One is Gene Sharp's "dynamics of nonviolent action" (1973: 447-814; see also Sharp 2005). It consists of a series of stages in an ideal-typical nonviolence campaign, including laying the groundwork, challenge bringing repression, maintaining nonviolent discipline, political jiu-jitsu, and redistribution of power.

The other valuable theoretical framework is Bill Moyer's Movement Action Plan, a series of eight stages in a social movement campaign (Moyer et al. 2001). The stages include normal times, ripening conditions, take off and success, among others, each with characteristic features and implications for actors.

Sharp and Moyer are each entirely aware that struggles are complex, but their models are built around several assumptions:

- there are two main players, typically the movement and the government;
- the players understand what is happening;
- the struggle develops sequentially, following a series of stages.

Dropping these assumptions leads to complex struggle. And by dropping these assumptions, a more fundamental set of tactics can be discerned.

I will draw on additional bodies of theory as appropriate. For example, social movement theory is relevant to some aspects of the case studies: Schock's (2005) study of nonviolent action and social movement theory is a key theoretical resource. Cohen's (2001) analysis of how governments deny atrocities is very relevant. I will extract relevant insights from game theory, which I've analysed in the past (Martin 1978).

E4.1 Generalisation

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

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

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

The literature on lying and deception does not seem to have a standard classification of methods of deception, so I will develop one with reference to conflict situations. One of the implications of relaxing the assumption of transparency is that players need to incorporate multiple testing and feedback mechanisms rather than assuming the situation is what it appears to be.

A third key assumption in Sharp's and Moyer's models is sequential development, namely that campaigns proceed through a series of stages. Although each author is at pains to point out that campaigns in practice are multi-staged — namely with concurrent elements from various stages — and recursive, in practice their models are built on straightforward sequences. Relaxing this assumption means treating struggles as sets of modular elements, certainly in historical context, but without the same assumption of development. Furthermore, these modular elements can interact.

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

E4.2 Reformulation

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

In my development of the backfire model, I looked at Sharp's political jiu-jitsu and asked: what do attackers do to prevent their attacks becoming counterproductive? This led to a classification of tactics on both sides.

Similarly, in reformulating a theory of struggle with multiple players, I will ask what new options arise, for each of two contending parties, when a third party is introduced. For example, the third party might be a potential ally, a target for attack or a source of legitimation or resources. I will also ask how the third party sees the conflict, and what tactics it might be likely to use. The aim will be to find tactics that are robust in the presence of a new player.

In reformulating a theory of struggle in the presence of deception, I will begin by examining a wide variety of methods of deception through words and actions, such as disinformation, censorship, lying, assumptions built into language, agents provocateurs and black operations. I will do the same for ways of deciding whether deception is occurring, and for responses to deception. I will then seek to categorise tactics for using and responding to deception, to reduce the laundry list of methods to relatively few general approaches. The aim is to find general categories into which specific techniques fit naturally. For example, deception might operate primarily through denial of information, through promoting incorrect beliefs, or through setting misleading agendas.

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

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

E4.3 Testing/refinement

I plan to test and refine the generalised model of tactics by applying it to four distinct case studies: Rwanda; Anita Hill – Clarence Thomas; Enron; and the Cuban missile crisis. I have chosen these case studies for several reasons. First, they involve multiple players, deception and/or lack of an obvious sequence, the three key factors to address for a generalised theory of tactics.

Second, each of these case studies is highly documented, with material from several different points of view. Detailed documentation is vital for uncovering and evaluating tactics.

Finally, the four case studies collectively cover a wide spectrum of domains, participants and scales, from the collective phenomenon of genocide to the interpersonal issue of sexual harassment. Looking at and comparing tactics from such diverse domains will enable development of a general, robust framework that is not tied to the characteristics of a particular scenario.

Rwanda From April to June 1994, hundreds of thousands of Tutsis and moderate Hutus were killed in Rwanda, with a figure of 800,000 deaths commonly cited, the most rapid genocide of the century. During this time, the UN Security Council dithered, eventually pulling out most of its

troops. The genocide was only ended by the victory of the Tutsi-dominated Rwandan Patriotic Front.

The events are very complex, involving many massacres prior to 1994 — some that could be characterised as genocide — a refugee crisis following the RPF victory, and devastating wars in following years, with millions killed.

Key players: Rwandan government; Rwandan killers (genocidaires) and resisters; Rwandan Patriotic Front; UN (including UN Security Council, UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations, UN Secretary-General); governments (especially French, US and Belgian governments); media

Deception: secret genocide preparations; suspicious atrocities; arms sales to Rwanda; killing of Rwandan President Habyarimana; radio broadcast of killing instructions using verbal codes; killers as refugees; the game of blaming others for the genocide

Stages: earlier genocide and killings; civil war; 1994 genocide; refugee crisis; genocide tribunal; central African wars

There is a large and ever-growing literature on Rwanda (e.g., Barnett 2002; Dallaire 2004; Eltringham 2005; Melvern 2004; Moghalu 2005), including astonishing interviews with killers (Hatzfeld 2005), plus over a dozen films. I expect to be able to approach a number of active researchers for advice and feedback on my model.

The large literature on genocide contains much information on tactics used to promote and oppose genocide, but no standard framework for understanding the choice of tactics. The backfire framework provides a good way to understand the methods used by perpetrators. In looking more generally at tactics in genocidal situations, I aim to give insight for human rights activists, supplementing Cohen (2001).

Anita Hill – Clarence Thomas In 1991, President George Bush Sr nominated Clarence Thomas, a black man with conservative views, to the Supreme Court. This was widely seen as a way to split the liberal opposition. In the course of the public debate and nomination hearings in the Senate, Anita Hill, a law professor (also black), revealed she had been sexually harassed when working for Thomas when he was head of the Equal Opportunity Commission.

Key players: Hill; Thomas; President/administration; feminist movement; black population; Congress (liberals, conservatives, pro- and anti-Thomas); media.

Deception: Thomas's denial of harassment; Hill's initial anonymity; Thomas, as a black man, served to disguise — for some audiences — the promotion of conservative views.

Stages: Hill's time working for Thomas; nomination; allegations made; allegations exposed; public debate; aftermath.

For data, there are numerous accounts from different perspectives, including a book by Hill (1997), a biography of Thomas (A P Thomas 2001), Senate hearings (Miller 1994) and books by journalists and political commentators (e.g., Phelps and Winternitz 1993).

With Greg Scott, I wrote an analysis of the Hill-Thomas case using the backfire framework, focusing on the sexual harassment dimension (Scott and Martin 2006). We chose this case after carefully assessing the methodological difficulties of studying more private instances of sexual harassment. I have a long background opposing sexual harassment, having served on university sexual harassment committees for 15 years. QUT academic Paula McDonald, who has extensive files on sexual harassment cases, and I are planning a study of sexual harassment and backfire.

Enron It is well known that Enron, one of the largest companies in the US, went bankrupt in 2001 and was exposed for corrupt practices.

It is extremely difficult for social scientists to obtain permission to undertake fieldwork inside companies and to directly observe organisational struggles: Robert Jackall spent a year obtaining permission for his insightful study of corporate managers, and was forced to display the

very traits he later found among them (Jackall, 1988). The next best option is to choose a case in which inner workings are openly displayed due to catastrophic events. Enron is ideal for this purpose.

Key players: Enron CEO Jeff Skilling and chairman Ken Lay; whistleblowers; the Enron workforce; Enron accountants Arthur Andersen; US government; media

Deception: corporate secrecy; corporate fraud, such as off-the-books transactions; massive destruction of documents just before bankruptcy; lying and self-deception by senior executives.

Stages: corporate expansion; Enron culture; corrupt operations (e.g. California power crisis); exposure; collapse; indictments and trials; regulatory impacts.

There are many books and articles about Enron (e.g. Brewer, 2004; Eichenwald, 2005; Fox, 2003; McLean and Elkind, 2003), from different perspectives, providing ample data to assess tactics. I bring to this case my long background in studying whistleblowing (e.g., Martin 1999).

Cuban missile crisis In October 1962, the United States and Soviet governments came close to a nuclear war, precipitated by President Kennedy's demand for removal of Soviet nuclear missiles installed in Cuba. The crisis involved high-level decision-making and diplomacy in the context of the Cold War and previous conflict over Cuba. The potential injustice involved, global nuclear war, would have been perpetrated against the world's population.

Key players: US and Soviet governments; key politicians (especially John F Kennedy and Nikita Khrushchev); military leaders; mass media; peace movements

Deception: Soviet missiles in Cuba; military and diplomatic bluffs during the stand-off; capabilities of nuclear arsenals; reasons for removal of US missiles in Turkey

Stages: Cold War context; nuclear arms race; Cuban revolution; Bay of Pigs invasion; missile crisis; aftermath

I will draw on the many studies of the crisis (e.g., Fursenko and Naftali 1997; Nathan 2001), including documentation of decision-making dynamics within the US administration (May and Zelikow 1997). As well, there are various contrasting perspectives, for example Bertrand Russell's observations based on personal correspondence with Kennedy and Khrushchev at the height of the crisis. Tactics can be placed in the context of Cold War politics.

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

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

papers specifically on the new framework. As well, I will write more popular treatments, some for a general audience and some for magazines and newsletters oriented to change agents, such as Amnesty International. As in the past, I plan to give talks at conferences and to groups interested in social change, such as War Resisters' International. This has two positive outcomes: one, it communicates results; two, it gives me valuable feedback for improving the theory. Also, I can incorporate my findings in talks and interviews on other topics, such as whistleblowing, where I am offered many opportunities to speak. As I have done with the backfire model, I plan to produce an annotated powerpoint show, presenting the theory and illustrating its applications, that can be used by others for training purposes.

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

Much diffusion of ideas occurs via individuals and groups on the lookout for ways to deal with problems facing them. I have seen this process at work for years: people seek ideas for responding to a defamation threat, bullying at work, or reprisals for whistleblowing, and contact me for advice after finding relevant material on my website, which contains full text of my articles and several of my books. In the past several years I have been able to refer many of these enquirers to my writings on backfire as especially relevant. The same will hold for complex-conflict tactics.

E7 Role of personnel

As **chief investigator**, I will:

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

I will work with **research assistants**, chosen for their skills and knowledge in fields relevant to the case studies. Based on experience with the backfire project, which cuts across a wide range of fields, I expect this approach to be highly effective because it provides cross-fertilisation that is highly productive for developing theory. Within the basic structure of the project, the RAs will be expected, with guidance and assistance from me, to:

- search for documentation about the case studies;
- contact individuals and groups to obtain information about the case studies;
- compile material on case studies;
- catalogue tactics;
- contribute to publications, if able.

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

E8 References

Barnett, Michael (2002) *Eyewitness to Genocide: The United Nations and Rwanda* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

Brewer, Lynn with Matthew Scott Hansen (2004) *Confessions of an Enron Executive: A Whistleblower's Story* (Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse).

- Cohen, Stanley (2001) *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Dallaire, Roméo with Brent Beardsley (2004) *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda* (New York: Carroll & Graf).
- Eichenwald, Kurt (2005) *Conspiracy of Fools: A True Story* (New York: Broadway Books).
- Eltringham, Nigel (2004) *Accounting for Horror: Post-genocide Debates in Rwanda* (London: Pluto).
- Fox, Loren (2003) *Enron: The Rise and Fall* (New York: Wiley).
- Fursenko, Aleksandr and Timothy Naftali (1997) *“One Hell of a Gamble”: Khrushchev, Castro, and Kennedy, 1958-1964* (New York: Norton).
- Galtung, Johan (1989) “Principles of nonviolent action: the great chain of nonviolence hypothesis,” in *Nonviolence and Israel/Palestine* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Institute for Peace), 13-33.
- Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm L. Strauss (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research* (Chicago: Aldine-Atherton).
- Harding, Ann (1985) “Unemployment policy: a case study in agenda management,” *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 44 (September): 224-246.
- Hatzfeld, Jean (2005) *Machete Season: The Killers in Rwanda Speak* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux).
- Hirschman, Albert O. (1970) *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Hill, Anita (1997) *Speaking Truth to Power* (New York: Doubleday).
- Jackall, Robert (1988) *Moral Mazes: The World of Corporate Managers* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Langelan, Martha J. (1993) *Back Off! How to Confront and Stop Sexual Harassment and Harassers* (New York: Simon & Schuster).
- Martin, Brian (1978) “The selective usefulness of game theory,” *Social Studies of Science* 8: 85-110.
- Martin, Brian (1999) *The Whistleblower’s Handbook: How to Be an Effective Resister* (Charlbury, UK: Jon Carpenter).
- Martin, Brian (2003-2004) “Telling lies for a better world?” *Social Anarchism* 35: 27-39.
- Martin, Brian and Wendy Varney (2003) *Nonviolence Speaks: Communicating against Repression* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press).
- May, Ernest R. and Philip D. Zelikow (eds.) (1997) *The Kennedy Tapes: Inside the White House during the Cuban Missile Crisis* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press).
- McLean, Bethany and Peter Elkind (2003) *The Smartest Guys in the Room: The Amazing Rise and Scandalous Fall of Enron* (New York: Portfolio).
- Melvorn, Linda (2004) *Conspiracy to Murder: The Rwandan Genocide* (London: Verso).
- Miller, Anita (ed.) (1994) *The Complete Transcripts of the Clarence Thomas – Anita Hill Hearings. October 11, 12, 13, 1991* (Chicago: Academy Chicago Publishers).
- Moghalu, Kingsley Chiedu (2005) *Rwanda’s Genocide: The Politics of Global Justice* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Moyer, Bill with JoAnn McAllister, Mary Lou Finley and Steven Soifer (2001) *Doing Democracy: The MAP Model for Organizing Social Movements* (Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers).
- Nathan, James A. (2001) *Anatomy of the Cuban Missile Crisis* (Westport, CT: Greenwood).
- Nyberg, David (1993) *The Varnished Truth: Truth Telling and Deceiving in Ordinary Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Phelps, Timothy M. and Helen Winternitz (1993) *Capitol Games: The Inside Story of Clarence Thomas, Anita Hill, and a Supreme Court Nomination* (New York: HarperPerennial).
- Robinson, W. Peter (1996) *Deceit, Delusion and Detection* (London: Sage).
- Schock, Kurt (2005) *Unarmed Insurrections: People Power Movements in Nondemocracies* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press).

- Scott, Greg and Brian Martin (2006) "Tactics against sexual harassment: the role of backfire," *Journal of International Women's Studies* 7 (May): 111-125.
- Sharp, Gene (1973) *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (Boston: Porter Sargent).
- Sharp, Gene (2005) *Waging Nonviolent Struggle* (Boston: Porter Sargent).
- Solomon, Norman (2005) *War Made Easy* (New York: John Wiley).
- Stoecker, Randy (1996) "Sociology and social action: introduction," *Sociological Imagination* 33: 3-17.
- Thomas, A. P. (2001) *Clarence Thomas: A Biography* (San Francisco: Encounter Books).