Proposals must comply with the requirements of the *Discovery Projects Funding Rules for funding commencing in 2009*, and any content, font and page limit requirements specified in this form and the Instructions to Applicants document.

PROJECT ID: DP0985562

Total number of sheets contained in this Proposal	

Information on this form and its attachments is collected in order to make recommendations to the Minister on the allocation of financial assistance under the Australian Research Council Act 200I 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 Water Resources, 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	University of Wollongong

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.)

Tactics of deception

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

X	Research Costs (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

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 750 characters (approx 100 words) of plain language, summarise aims, significance and expected outcomes.

Deception is pervasive in many realms of life, yet there is no standard way of understanding it. Rather than focus on morality or motivations, the project will classify methods of deception, methods of detection and types of responses in cases in which perceived injustice is involved, such as genocide, corporate corruption and sexual harassment. The resulting framework will be a contribution to a theory of tactics against injustice and offer practical guidance to opponents of injustice.

A5.2   Summary of National/Community Benefit (for Public Release)
In no more than 750 characters (approx 100 words) of plain language, summarise the national/community benefits that are expected to arise from the research.

People encounter deception in interpersonal relations, workplaces and international affairs, yet there is no standard framework for dealing with it. The research will catalogue likely deceptive techniques in cases of perceived injustice, from genocide to sexual harassment, highlighting key types of methods. The resulting framework will be useful for citizens, activists and policy-makers when encountering situations in which deception may be involved.

A6   CLASSIFICATIONS AND OTHER STATISTICAL INFORMATION

A6.1   National Research Priorities

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

A6.2   Keywords

deception	tactics
strategy	lying
injustice	social action

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

Research Fields, Courses and Disciplines (RFCD)	%		Socio-Economic Objective (SEO)	%
379999	100		759999	100

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 <u>successful</u> 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 Part 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 750 words (approx 100 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 2009*.
- 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 2009*.
- 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 14.4.2 of the *Discovery Projects Funding Rules for funding commencing in 2009*.
- 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	Prof			
Current Department/school/other	Arts Faculty			
Current Organisation	University of Wollongong			

B3   POSTAL ADDRESS

Department/school/other	Arts Faculty					
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 selection or other advisory committees?

Yes   No X

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

Yes   No X

If Yes, please name the ARC member(s)

B4.3   Will you be associated with a Commonwealth-funded Research Centre as at 1 January 2009?

Yes   No 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, APDC, APDI, APF, ARF, FF, IRF, QEII, RC-ATSI, 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 2009 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

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	Year appointed and Status
Professor	University of Wollongong	School of Social Sciences, Media and Communication	2007, Continuing
Associate Professor	University of Wollongong	Science, Technology and Society	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. (i.e. for a CI this will usually be the Eligible Organisation at which they will be employed or hold an adjunct appointment as at 1 January 2009 and beyond; for Fellowship candidates it will be the Host Organisation; and for PIs it will generally be their main employer as at 1 January 2009).

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

My research includes path-breaking contributions in nonviolent action, dissent, democracy, communication, plagiarism and scientific controversies, among other topics. By working in diverse fields, I have been able to develop wide-ranging interdisciplinary insights. For example:

   • My 2007 book *Justice Ignited* introduces concepts that unify understanding across several social science fields.

   • My recent papers on the backfire model have been published in journals in the fields of organisational studies, criminology, journalism, politics, sociology, international relations, higher education, peace research and women's studies.

   • My 2003 book with Wendy Varney, *Nonviolence Speaks,* links communication studies with peace studies.

   My publication output includes 12 books (10 single-authored, 8 since 1997), 3 edited books, 38 chapters in books, 138 articles in refereed journals, 94 major articles in nonrefereed journals and over 200 other publications (lesser articles, book reviews, newspaper articles).

   According to the ISI Web of Knowledge for current and recent Arts academics at the University of Wollongong, my journal articles have received nearly 200 citations across a range of articles (an h-index of 8), comparable to ISI-listed citations to articles by all other academics in my faculty combined.

   According to the Worldcat database — which contains listings from only selected libraries — two of my books are found at more than 150 foreign libraries and two at more than 300.

   Many of my articles have been published in high-impact journals (ranks taken from *Journal Citation Reports*), across a range of fields: five in *Social Studies of Science* (rank 2 in history and philosophy of science), four in *Journal of Peace Research* (rank 7 in political science), three in *Science, Technology & Human Values* (rank 2 in social issues), and two in *Social Science and Medicine* (rank 2 in social sciences, biomedicine).

B10.2 Refereed publications, 2003-

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, 2007).

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

Book chapters

* Brian Martin. Making accompaniment effective. In: Howard Clark (ed.), *Unarmed Resistance and Global Solidarity* (London: Pluto, 2009, in press) [accepted 11 February 2009].

* Brian Martin. Varieties of dissent. In: Stephen P. Banks (ed.), *Leadership and Dissent* (UK: Edward Elgar, 2008, in press). [accepted June 2007]

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

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

* 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. The American war in Indochina: injustice and outrage. *Revista Electrónica de Paz y Conflictos,* 2008, in press [accepted 15 October 2007].

* Kylie Smith and Brian Martin. Tactics of labor struggles. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal,* 2008, in press [accepted 3 April 2006].

Truda Gray and Brian Martin. Comparing wars. *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies,* 2008, in press [accepted 12 February 2008].

Brian Martin. Writing a helpful referee's report. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing,* April 2008, in press [accepted 27 September 2007].

Brian Martin. Surviving referees' reports. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing,* April 2008, in press [accepted 27 September 2007].

* Truda Gray and Brian Martin. My Lai: the struggle over outrage. *Peace & Change,* Vol. 33, No. 1, January 2008, pp. 90-113.

Brian Martin. Slow injustice. *Social Alternatives,* 2007, in press [accepted 26 October 2007].

Brian Martin. The globalization of scientific controversy. *Globalization,* Special issue, 2007, http://globalization.icaap.org/content/special/Martin.html

* T. Gray and B. Martin. Backfires: white, black and grey. *Journal of Information Warfare,* Vol. 6, No. 1, 2007, pp. 7-16.

Brian Martin. Opposing nuclear power: past and present. *Social Alternatives,* Vol. 26, No. 2, Second Quarter 2007, pp. 43-47.

Brian Martin. Nuclear power and antiterrorism: obscuring the policy contradictions. *Prometheus,* Vol. 25, No. 1, March 2007, pp. 19-29.

Brian Martin. Social testing. *Social Alternatives,* Vol. 25, No. 4, Fourth Quarter 2006, pp. 39-42.

* Truda Gray and Brian Martin. Defamation and the art of backfire. *Deakin Law Review,* Vol. 11, No. 2, 2006, pp. 115-136.

* 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.

* 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 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.

* 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

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

* Brian Martin. How nonviolence works. *Borderlands E-journal,* Vol. 4, No. 3, 2005.

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

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. 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Articles in refereed conference proceedings

Brian Martin. Obstacles to academic integrity. Proceedings of the 3rd Asia-Pacific Conference on Educational Integrity: Creating a Culture of Integrity, University of South Australia, Adelaide, 6-7 December 2007, pp. 21-26.

Brian Martin. Opposing surveillance. *From Dataveillance to Überveillance and the Realpolitik of the Transparent Society* (The Second Workshop on the Social Implications of National Security, Wollongong, 29 October 2007), edited by Katina Michael and M. G. Michael (Wollongong: University of Wollongong, 2007), pp. 71-82.

Other articles of significance

* Jørgen Johansen and Brian Martin. Sending the protest message. *Gandhi Marg,* 2008, in press [accepted 1 February 2008].

Brian Martin. Citation shortcomings: peccadilloes or plagiarism? *Interfaces,* 2008, in press. [accepted June 2007]

* Brian Martin. Contested testimony in scientific disputes: the case of the origins of AIDS. *The Skeptic,* Vol. 13, No. 3, 2007, pp. 52-58.

Brian Martin. Anarchist theory: what should be done? *Anarchist Studies,* Vol. 15, No. 2, 2007, pp. 106-108.

* Brian Martin. Energising dissent. *D!ssent,* No. 24, Spring 2007, pp. 62-64.

Brian Martin. Safeguarding your group. *Chain Reaction,* No. 101, December 2007, pp. 31-33.

Brian Martin. Schweik in Wollongong. *FriedensForum: Zeitschrift der Friedensbewegung,* No. 3, June/July 2006, pp. 39-40 (translated into German by Hanna Poddig).

* Brian Martin. Globalising nonviolence: overcoming the obstacles. Published as: Globalisierung der gewaltfreiheit: überwindung der hindernisse. Gewaltfreiheit ist das ziel — und der weg. *Forum Pazifismus: Zeitschrift für Theorie und Praxis der Gewaltfreiheit,* No. 10, II/2006, pp. 8-12 (translated into German by Kai-Uwe Dosch).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Encyclopaedia entries

Brian Martin. Anti-coup; Power and nonviolence theory; Internet and protest. In: Nigel Young (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Peace* (New York: Oxford University Press, in press) [accepted 2007 and 2008].

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

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

B10.3 Ten career-best publications

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

The international recognition and impact of my work are shown by the translation of a wide range of my books and articles into foreign languages, with individual articles translated into one to four languages and 19 languages involved in total: Bengali, Chinese, Croatian, Danish, Dutch, Finnish, French, German, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Norwegian, Persian, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, Spanish and Swedish.

My publications have an exceptional impact via the web, receiving over a million hits in each of the years 2006 and 2007. In comparison, all publications by all authors on the University of Wollongong's Research Online had a total of about 100,000 hits in 2006.

I have examined 13 PhD theses in a variety of fields including philosophy, sociology, Asian studies and communication, and been external examiner for many masters and honours theses.

In the past two years I have been an external referee for 30 journal articles for many different journals including *American Journal of Sociology, American Political Science Review, Perspectives in Politics, Public Understanding of Science, Review of International Political Economy* and *Science, Technology, & Human Values.*

I was national president of Whistleblowers Australia for four years (1996-1999) and am currently vice-president, and have given personal advice to many hundreds of whistleblowers and dissidents. Journalists, including many from outside Australia, contact me about two dozen times per year for interviews or background 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 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	55037	0	55037
Casual RAs, Rate 5, 1344 hours x $40.76 (includes 18.11% on-costs)	54781	0	0	54781
Total Personnel (a)	54781	55037	0	109818
Teaching Relief				
Total Teaching Relief (b)	0	0	0	0
Equipment				
Total Equipment (c)	0	0	0	0
Maintenance				
Total Maintenance (d)	0	0	0	0
Travel				
Total Travel (e)	0	0	0	0
Other				
Total Other (f)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (g)	54781	55037	0	109818
INDIRECT COSTS				
CIs, PIs and any researcher Level A or above x multiplier	███			
CI 1 (Martin) @ 0.3 FTE + on-costs x 0.92	███	50634	0	50634
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (h)	███	50634	0	50634
TOTAL COSTS (i)	54781	105671	0	160452

C1   BUDGET DETAILS

C1.2 Year   [2]

Column 1	COSTING			
Source of funds	**2** **ARC**	**3** **University**	**4** **Other**	**5** **Total**
DIRECT COSTS				
Personnel (Salaries + On-costs)				
CI 1 (Martin) @ 0.3 FTE + on-costs	0	58064	0	58064
Casual RAs, Rate 5, 1344 hours x $42.82 (includes 18.11% on-costs)	57550	0	0	57550
Total Personnel (a)	57550	58064	0	115614
Teaching Relief				
Total Teaching Relief (b)	0	0	0	0
Equipment				
Total Equipment (c)	0	0	0	0
Maintenance				
Total Maintenance (d)	0	0	0	0
Travel				
Total Travel (e)	0	0	0	0
Other				
Total Other (f)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (g)	57550	58064	0	115614
INDIRECT COSTS				
CIs, PIs and any researcher Level A or above x multiplier	██████			
CI 1 (Martin) @ 0.3 FTE + on-costs x 0.92	██████	53949	0	53949
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (h)	██████	53949	0	53949
TOTAL COSTS (i)	57550	112013	0	169563

18

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	61257	0	61257
Casual RAs, Rate 5, 1344 hours x $44.99 (includes 18.11% on-costs)	60467	0	0	60467
Total Personnel (a)	60467	61257	0	121724
Teaching Relief				
Total Teaching Relief (b)	0	0	0	0
Equipment				
Total Equipment (c)	0	0	0	0
Maintenance				
Total Maintenance (d)	0	0	0	0
Travel				
Total Travel (e)	0	0	0	0
Other				
Total Other (f)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (g)	60467	61257	0	121724
INDIRECT COSTS				
CIs, PIs and any researcher Level A or above x multiplier	■			
CI 1 (Martin) @ 0.3 FTE + on-costs x 0.92		56356	0	56356
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS (h)		56356	0	56356
TOTAL COSTS (i)	60467	117613	0	178080

C2   JUSTIFICATION OF FUNDING REQUESTED FROM THE ARC

Personnel

The investigation covers a wide range of areas: genocide, corporate fraud and sexual harassment, then broadening out to abuses associated with states, capitalism and patriarchy. It also covers contemporary Australian case studies. For each main area, I plan to use a research assistant with relevant skills and 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.

I plan to deal with exemplary case studies (E4.2) myself, having already read extensively on Rwanda and begun reading on Enron. RAs are vital for the survey of other case studies (E4.3) and the current case studies (E4.5).

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 a need for at least four days per week of research assistance.

C3   DETAILS OF NON-ARC CONTRIBUTIONS

The primary contribution from the University of Wollongong is the CI's salary @ 0.3 FTE plus on-costs.

PART D—RESEARCH SUPPORT

D1 RESEARCH SUPPORT OF ALL PARTICIPANTS

For each participant listed in Part 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)**	**2007** ($'000)	**2008** ($'000)	**2009** ($'000)	**2010** ($'000)	**2011** ($'000)
Tactics of deception	*	R	DP0985562			55	58	60

D2   STATEMENTS ON PROGRESS OF ARC-FUNDED PROJECTS

n/a

D2.1   List of the projects that you are providing statements for

n/a

D2.2   Provide the statements

n/a

E1 Tactics of deception

E2 Aims and background

The aim of the project is to develop a general framework for classifying tactics of deception used in cases of injustice. Three main sorts of injustice will be considered: those perpetrated by governments, such as genocide, those perpetrated by corporations, such as corrupt dealings, and those perpetrated by individuals, such as sexual harassment. The framework will be used to throw light on key theoretical perspectives on deception.

The research will contribute to theory in the understudied areas of deception and tactics, and will provide practical guidance to opponents of injustice in a wide range of areas.

The initial, exemplary case studies to be examined are the Rwandan genocide, Enron, and the Anita Hill – Clarence Thomas sexual harassment case. These recent cases can provide insight into deceptions used in current genocides and mass killings, corporate frauds and cases of sexual harassment and violence. The framework developed in the project, based on these and other cases, will be tested on emerging Australian case studies, the successors of children overboard and the Wheat Board scandal. The project thus involves an interplay between theory and many current and recent case studies.

Considering the pervasiveness and significance of deception in many realms of life — some good surveys are Barnes (1994), Ford (1996), Lewis and Saarni (1993) and Robinson (1996) — there is surprisingly little scholarly analysis of the structure of deceptive practices. At the level of government, for example, there are numerous case studies of government censorship, false allegations, public relations, spin-doctoring and the like (Solomon 2005), but no standard framework for understanding the techniques deployed.

David Shulman, in his recent book on deception in workplaces, says "Most assessments of deception by business ethicists, psychologists, philosophers, and religious traditions focus on deception as an individual character flaw rather than as an aspect of people's social environments." (2007: 3). He goes on to point out a range of limitations of conventional approaches to deception.

Shulman's goal is to study routine lies at work and how deception is a means of administering work. My goal is rather different, though there is some overlap: to study standard sorts of deception when significant unfairness is involved, in diverse circumstances.

Deception is pervasive in everyday life. Many lies are conventional, such as responding "fine" to a greeting of "How are you?" when actually you're feeling lousy. Deceptions are routine in workplaces, including being polite to a person who is disliked, hiding non-work activities, and not reporting problems to the boss. In personal life, deception is often intertwined with self-deception, such as when someone asks "Do you think I'm looking good tonight?" and a partner answers "Definitely."

There is a long tradition of writing that says lying is bad and should be avoided whenever possible (Bok 1978). There is also a revisionist perspective that says lying is often better than telling the truth (Nyberg 1993; Wolk and Henley 1970), especially in interpersonal relations. Both these literatures are concerned with whether a person should lie at all, and the particular circumstances in which it can be justified. There is a psychological literature on why people

lie (Ford 1996). There is also a literature on how to detect lies, for example from facial expressions (Dimitrius and Mozzarella 1998; Ekman 2001).

My focus is on *tactics* of deception and counter-deception, which is a quite different approach, avoiding debates about the morality and motivations of lying. I also plan to focus on situations in which a serious injustice or abuse is perceived to be involved. This eliminates from consideration benign and conventional deceptions.

The word "deception" may imply the existence of an underlying truth that can be determined. Likewise, the word "lying" implies conscious intent. To sidestep issues of truth and relativism, the analysis in this project will be of *perceived* deception. Namely, someone — typically the target or observers, and sometimes the perpetrator — believes that deception is involved. Questions of reality and intent will be backstaged by the focus on tactics.

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.

A crucially important contribution to the study of tactics is James Jasper's book *Getting Your Way: Strategic Dilemmas in the Real World* (2006). It is an attempt to put strategy on the social science agenda. He comments that "My research on social movements showed me just how little social scientists have to say about strategy" (p. xii) and says "It is time to describe the indescribable … agency" (p. xiii). Jasper uses the term "strategy" in a way not too different from my use of "tactics." I reserve "strategy" for plans for reaching a goal. Tactics are action elements in a strategy. Jasper's goal in *Getting Your Way* is to highlight the complexity of strategic (or tactical) decisions: what to do depends a lot on the circumstances, so it hard to make general rules about how to proceed.

My project is complementary to Jasper's: it is precisely my intent to develop some general rules, or rather expectations based on patterns, for particular types of strategic encounters, namely ones where there is a significant perceived injustice and deception is involved.

The project thus addresses two understudied yet vital areas, deception and tactics, combining them with the aim of producing a framework for tactics of deception.

E3 Significance and innovation

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

E3.1 Theoretical significance
Tactics are endlessly debated 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.

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, 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 struggles over censorship, unfair dismissals, police beatings, and the technology of repression (see B10.2 for references).

The current project builds on this prior work by giving a more fine-grained examination of the role of deception and by developing a detailed classification of methods for detecting and responding to deception. Because techniques of deception are chosen in order to succeed against likely unmasking responses, this is an analysis of what Erving Goffman (1970) calls strategic interaction between individuals, but also applied to situations beyond interpersonal interactions.

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 of deception will theorise a vital new area for social science research, contributing to a general theory of tactics in struggles against injustice.

E3.2 Practical significance
This project will provide useful conceptual tools for understanding struggles involving deception. Opponents of injustice will be better able to predict moves by other players and choose tactics to counter or anticipate them.

Most people believe they can tell when others are lying, but research shows that only a very few individuals — such as US Secret Service agents — can detect lying much better than chance. Similarly, most people believe that others are influenced by advertising (often deceptive) but they themselves are not. In this context, a framework that highlights types of deceptions, methods of detecting them and ways to respond to them will be very helpful.

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). Similarly, Jasper (2006: xiii) says scholars know "almost nothing … about how activists (and others) make strategic decisions, much less how they might make good ones." The framework 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 project will take account of research on social movements, especially studies oriented to activists (e.g., Moyer et al. 2001), but its practical significance will go well beyond social movements. The framework developed will also be relevant to areas where individuals encounter personal injustice, such as bullying at work. This will be similar to the way my project on backfire has led to practical advice for individual targets of defamation actions that has been much appreciated by many correspondents.

E4 Approach and methodology

The development and testing of the new framework will have 6 components.
1. Development of a provisional framework
2. Close scrutiny of exemplary case studies
3. Survey of other case studies
4. Revision and elaboration of the framework
5. Testing on current case studies
6. Comparison with other theories

E4.1 Development of a provisional framework
The literature on lying and deception does not have a standard classification of methods of deception, and in any case the classifications presented by some authors (e.g., Ekman 2001; Nyberg 1993) are not specific to the conflict situations I am examining. So I will develop a provisional framework based on my previous work, along the following lines.

It is possible to classify deceptions according to the medium used (words, actions, frame), the method (hiding, misleading, framing), the motive (inadvertent, sincere, intentional, benign versus malicious), the actor (self, others, frame) and persuasiveness (ordinary, authoritative, perverse/counterproductive). My provisional assessment is that the most useful way of classifying deceptions is by method, with three key types being hiding, misleading and framing. Hiding is what Ekman (2001) calls concealment, misleading is what Ekman calls falsification, and framing — including agenda setting and arena transfer — is related to what Bailey (1991) calls basic lies.

Even more important, because it is far less analysed, is classifying ways of detecting deception. Methods include (1) assessing the speaker, for example analysing the speaker's track record and motives, (2) uncovering and assessing evidence, for example bringing out suppressed information, checking facts, and clarifying concepts to deal with assumptions built into language (Poole 2005), and (3) assessing the history and context.

Finally, there are responses to actual and potential deception, including (1) insuring, such as obtaining financial, reputational or other commitments against deceit, (2) validating, for example undertaking more assessment and obtaining additional sources of information, (3) protecting, for example disengaging or choosing win-win methods to avoid negative consequences, and (4) exposing, for example presenting credible evidence or putting people together to bring out suppressed information and perspectives.

In summary, the provisional framework will cover types of deceptions, methods of detection and possible responses.

E4.2 Close scrutiny of exemplary case studies

The amount of case material involving deception is enormous. Hence I have chosen to begin by examining three general areas:
- genocide
- major corporate fraud
- sexual harassment

These are injustices associated with the state, capitalism and patriarchy, respectively. Initially I will examine one case study in each. The most useful case studies are prominent ones with a considerable literature. I have chosen:
- Rwanda 1994
- Enron
- Anita Hill – Clarence Thomas

Each of these involves numerous deceptions.

Rwanda From April to June 1994, hundreds of thousands of Tutsis and moderate Hutus were killed. Deceptions included 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. There is a large literature on the genocide (e.g., African Rights 1995; Barnett 2002; Dallaire 2004; Des Forges 1999; Hatzfeld 2005; Melvern 2004) but no standard framework for understanding the choice of tactics (Martin 2008).

Enron, one of the largest companies in the US, went bankrupt in 2001 and was exposed for corrupt practices. Deceptions included corporate secrecy; corporate fraud; massive destruction of documents just before bankruptcy; lying and self-deception by senior executives. There are many books and articles about Enron (e.g. Brewer, 2004; Eichenwald, 2005; McLean and Elkind, 2003).

Hill-Thomas In 1991, President George Bush Sr nominated Clarence Thomas, a black man with conservative views, to the Supreme Court. 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. Deceptions included Thomas's denial of harassment; Hill's initial anonymity; and Thomas, as a black man, serving to disguise — for some audiences — the promotion of conservative views. 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). Greg Scott and I wrote an analysis of the Hill-Thomas case using the backfire framework, focusing on the sexual harassment dimension (Scott and Martin 2006).

Based on preliminary reading on these case studies, there is plenty of information about deception but far less on how deceptions are detected and on strategically assessing responses to deception. Therefore, a key aim in addressing these rich case studies is to probe for information on detection and responses.

E4.3 Survey of other case studies

After looking in some depth at the particular case studies of Rwanda, Enron and Hill-Thomas, the RAs and I will survey literature on other cases of genocide, corporate corruption and sexual harassment. I have chosen these areas because of prior familiarity.

   • Genocide: for many years I have been reading about genocide (e.g. Fein 1979; Kuper 1981) because of my research into nonviolent responses to human rights abuses.

   • Corporate corruption: my studies of dissent and my involvement with Whistleblowers Australia (e.g. Martin 1999) have given me insight into corporate deception.

   • Sexual harassment: I was a member of university sexual harassment committees for 15 years.

   After addressing these areas, the survey will be broadened to include other abuses associated with states (e.g. torture and aggressive wars), capitalism (e.g. exploitation of workers, environmental impacts) and patriarchy (e.g. discrimination, rape). Because of the abundance of material, this is likely to involve choosing particular areas because of availability of information and the possibility of collaboration. In particular, I anticipate approaching previous and current collaborators on particular topics:

   • David Hess, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, New York (health, social movements)
   • Sue Curry Jansen, Muhlenberg College, Pennsylvania (censorship),
   • Jørgen Johansen, Norway (nonviolent action)
   • Paula McDonald, QUT (sexual harassment)
   • Steve Wright, Leeds Metropolitan University (torture technology).

E4.4 Revision and elaboration of the framework

In tandem with the survey of case studies, I will revise the framework. This will involve:

   • populating the provisional framework with examples from the case studies: I proceed by searching sources for examples of tactics and putting these under provisional categories, so that each tactic type is illustrated by an expanding number of cases, each with references back to one or more sources;

   • adding new categories to the framework to incorporate examples not fitting into existing categories: when a category becomes too diverse, I introduce a new category or divide it into two or more sub-categories;

   • reassessing categories in the light of case studies: I may rearrange or combine categories, or reconceptualise them to capture a diversity of examples.

One risk is the proliferation of categories as the case studies bring to light a host of deceptive techniques. Therefore, a key task will be to refine the general categories.

   It is possible that the three general areas — genocide, corporate corruption and sexual harassment — will lead in different directions, with specificities making it difficult to see commonalities. However, it has been my experience with the analysis of tactics against injustice (Martin 2007) that remarkably consistent patterns emerge.

E4.5 Testing on current case studies

To test the usefulness of the framework developed, I will pick three Australian contemporary case studies to see what insights can be gained. In recent years, likely options would have included the children overboard affair, the Australian Wheat Board bribery scandal, and Judge Marcus Einfeld's trial for allegedly lying to avoid paying speeding fines. There will be no shortage of emerging cases for examination. The value of addressing current cases is being able to interview participants and knowledgeable observers and to ask them about particular details related to the model.

E4.6 Comparison with other theories

In writing a book and articles on tactics of deception, I will compare the tactics approach to other standard approaches to deception. In particular, I will look at the relation of the tactics approach to:

    • deontological approaches, which focus on the morality of lying;

    • pragmatic approaches, which do not see lying as intrinsically bad and examine circumstances when it may be advisable;

    • psychology of persuasion (e.g., Cialdini 1984; Pratkanis and Aronson 1992; Rushkoff 2000);

    • Gandhian approaches, which prioritise the search for truth, often treated as unproblematical.

    As well, there are other theoretical approaches to deception. An aim of the project is to develop a greater understanding of these approaches by illuminating them with insights from a tactical perspective.

E4.7 Work plan

I plan to work on case studies in an overlapping sequence in order to maximise insights from comparisons. Cases in the general area of states, capitalism and patriarchy will follow on from the foci of genocides, corporate fraud and sexual harassment.

Case study	2009		2010		2011	
Rwanda	XXXXXX					
genocides	XXXXXXXXXXXX					
Enron		XXXXXX				
corporate fraud		XXXXXXXXXXX				
Thomas-Hill			XXXXXX			
sex harassment			XXXXXXXXXXXX			
Australian cases				XXXXXXXXXXXX		
Synthesis	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx					

For each case study — from Rwanda to current cases — some or all the following steps will be involved:

    • collection of material, including print, video and interview;

    • categorisation of actors and deception-related tactics used by each of them;

    • construction of a case-study-specific framework of tactics;

    • queries to key participants and scholars concerning tactics used and the overall analysis;

    • construction, application and revision of the framework;

    • writing an account of the struggle in the light of the analysis;

    • circulation of the account to key participants to obtain more feedback.

    • revision of the account and, as appropriate, publication.

Queries to participants and scholars will usually be by phone and email but may be face-to-face if convenient.

E5 National benefit

The project will provide an empirically grounded, practical way of understanding and responding to tactics of deception. This is relevant to a wide range of social problems, ranging from the workplace to international relations. By showing, through detailed case studies, which methods of detection and which responses work and which don't, the findings will give guidance to all concerned participants — from individuals and NGOs to governments and international bodies — about how to proceed.

Part of the national benefit from this work 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, about how to be more effective when intervening against injustice.

E6 Communication of results

As the project proceeds, I will write one or more scholarly papers on each of the three exemplary case studies (E4.2) and/or the general areas of genocide, corporate corruption and sexual harassment (E4.3), targeting journals in politics, organisational studies, social movements and genocide studies, plus 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 framework and illustrating its applications, that can be used by others for training purposes.

I will write a book on tactics of deception, spelling out the new framework, showing how it applies to case studies and relating the tactics approach to other theories.

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. 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 tactics of deception.

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;
   • participate in collecting information, analysing documents and cataloguing tactics;
   • formulate and test new theory;
   • formulate and lead publishing initiatives.

I will work with several **research assistants,** chosen for their skills and knowledge in fields relevant to the case studies. Based on experience with 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 case studies;
- contact individuals and groups to obtain information about case studies;
- compile material on case studies;
- catalogue tactics;
- contribute to publications, if able.

What this means in practice is that I will take the lead in theoretical and methodological facets of the research and be directly involved in data collection and analysis, with the RAs under my direction working primarily on case studies and cataloguing tactics. 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 higher-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

African Rights (1995) *Rwanda: Death, Despair and Defiance.* London: African Rights.

Bailey, F. G. (1991) *The Prevalence of Deceit.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Barnes, J. A. (1994) *A Pack of Lies: Towards a Sociology of Lying.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Bok, Sissela (1978) *Lying: Moral Choice in Public and Private Life.* New York: Random House.

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

Cialdini, Robert B. (1984) *Influence: How and Why People Agree to Things.* New York: Morrow.

Dallaire, Roméo with Brent Beardsley (2004) *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda.* New York: Carroll & Graf.

Des Forges, Alison (1999) *"Leave None to Tell the Story": Genocide in Rwanda.* New York: Human Rights Watch.

Dimitrius, Jo-Ellan and Mark Mozzarella (1998) *Reading People: How to Understand People and Predict their Behavior — Anytime, Anyplace.* New York: Ballantine.

Eichenwald, Kurt (2005) *Conspiracy of Fools: A True Story.* New York: Broadway Books.

Ekman, Paul (2001) *Telling Lies: Clue to Deceit in the Marketplace, Politics, and Marriage.* New York: Norton.

Fein, Helen (1979) *Accounting for Genocide: National Responses and Jewish Victimization during the Holocaust.* New York: Free Press.

Ford, Charles V. (1996) *Lies! Lies!! Lies!!! The Psychology of Deceit.* Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.

Goffman, Erving (1970) *Strategic Interaction.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Hatzfeld, Jean (2005) *Machete Season: The Killers in Rwanda Speak*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Hill, Anita (1997) *Speaking Truth to Power*. New York: Doubleday.

Hirschman, Albert O. (1970) *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Jasper, James M. (2006) *Getting Your Way: Strategic Dilemmas in the Real World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kuper, Leo (1981) *Genocide*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Langelan, Martha J. (1993) *Back Off! How to Confront and Stop Sexual Harassment and Harassers*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Lewis, Michael and Carloyn Saarni, eds. (1993) *Lying and Deception in Everyday Life*. New York: Guilford Press.

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

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

Martin, Brian (2008) "Genocide tactics," submitted to *Genocide Studies and Prevention.*

McLean, Bethany and Peter Elkind (2003) *The Smartest Guys in the Room: The Amazing Rise and Scandalous Fall of Enron*. New York: Portfolio.

Melvern, Linda (2004) *Conspiracy to Murder: The Rwandan Genocide*. London: Verso.

Miller, A., ed. (1994) *The Complete Transcripts of the Clarence Thomas – Anita Hill Hearings. October 11, 12, 13, 1991*. Chicago: Academy Chicago Publishers.

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).

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.

Poole, Steven (2006) *Unspeak*. London: Little, Brown.

Pratkanis, Anthony R. and Elliot Aronson (1992) *Age of Propaganda: The Everyday Use and Abuse of Persuasion*. New York: Freeman.

Robinson, W. Peter (1996) *Deceit, Delusion and Detection*. London: Sage.

Rushkoff, Douglas (2000) *Coercion: The Persuasion Professionals and Why We Listen to What They Say*. London: Little, Brown.

Scott, Greg and Brian Martin (2006) "Tactics against sexual harassment: the role of backfire," *Journal of International Women's Studies* 7 (May): 111-125.

Shulman, David (2007) *From Hire to Liar: The Role of Deception in the Workplace*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Solomon, Norman (2005) *War Made Easy*. New York: John Wiley.

Stoecker, Randy (1996) "Sociology and social action: introduction," *Sociological Imagination* 33: 3-17.

Thomas, A. P. (2001) *Clarence Thomas: A Biography*. San Francisco: Encounter Books.

Wolk, Robert L. and Arthur Henley (1970) *The Right to Lie: A Psychological Guide to the Uses of Deceit in Everyday Life*. New York: Peter H. Wyden.