

and Russia, and under some conditions even to the countries of Western Europe.

To reliably protect the population, a large system is being created which can successfully be used for civilian-based defense.

We inherited from the Soviet Union a large civil defense system. Now we are working to adapt it to the changing needs of our country. The system includes:

- Means for warning and informing the population and administrative staff about arising dangers
- Specific means of protection
- Air raid shelters and radiation protection locations.

At the same time, we are working intensively to create our own system. This includes:

- Maintenance of material and technical provisions (collection, allocation, and storage of vitally important items, such as food, fuel, and medicine)
- Rendering medical aid to the population
- Inspecting and indicating the danger zones
- Planning appropriate actions in extreme situations
- Preliminary training of administrative leaders and the population about how to behave in extreme situations
- Forecasting the behavior of various sections of the population.

All these systems can successfully serve to advance the purposes of civilian-based defense. For example, in case radio and television are not functioning, warning systems of civil security can help to inform the population of an emergency, to rally them to some action, or, on the contrary, to instruct them how to behave. Decentralization, which we have introduced, makes this system very mobile and important. In creating plans for civil defense in extreme situations, it is possible to anticipate certain sequences of civilian-based defense actions.

Considering the problem creatively and rationally, every component of civil security can be successfully used as a separate system for the purposes of civilian-based defense.

This is all relevant to the main problem of preparing the population, officials, and administration staff for civilian-based defense in the civil security system. We have created a full training program so that the general population and these officials will be able to act properly in extreme

situations.

In the largest Lithuanian cities—Vilnius, Kaunas, Siauliai, Utena Panevezys, Marijampole, and Alytus—teaching centers for civil security are either already established or are being established. In these, educational activities for officers and the population have already started or will soon do so. The educational activities will vary according to the nature of work and occupation, raw materials used in production, and geographical location.

This helps to explain why Government decision N151, issued March 9, 1992 included, in addition to other tasks for the Department of Civil Security, the responsibility “to teach citizens to apply civilian-based defense in case of the occupation of a foreign army.”

Personnel to be Taught and Duration of the Studies

The Lithuanian government policy statement “about teaching civil security” designated the personnel to be taught and the duration of the studies for the near future. A special course and a course credit test is compulsory for heads of ministries, municipalities, state departments, enterprises, and offices as well as for leaders of lower echelons (such as dispatch managers and teachers). In all there are twenty categories of studies. The course of studies is also defined in the government policy statement as 35 hours every four years. Within the 35 hours of the civil security course, two to four hours are allocated for the problems of civilian-based defense, according to the category of the students. Eight thousand people are to take this course every year.

Content of Civilian-Based Defense Studies

The civilian-based defense studies could be divided into three levels. On the first level, the students could be acquainted with the basic concept of civilian-based defense, basic terms, and the general experience of Lithuania and foreign countries in this field. At the same time, we shall try to make listeners think about possible future applications of civilian-based defense and to encourage them to take an active part in this process.

On the second level, it would be expedient to introduce possible ways to adapt the system of civil security to civilian-based defense. In this case, students will be better acquainted with the forms, methods, strategy, and tactics of defense.

On the third level, we should try to encourage students to take up civilian-based defense while preparing plans for civil security in case of aggression. Students will be supplied with literature and recommendations which help to increase knowledge of this field.

Problems of Teaching Civilian-Based Defense

First, a very short time is devoted to civilian-based defense problems in the course. This is why it is necessary to improve as soon as possible the self-training methods of social information and to find additional time to study the available literature.

Second, it is obvious that civilian-based defense is one component in the total defense system. It is a part of a complex. Therefore, this kind of defense should be based on empirical evidence. However, we are short of information, including literature, data, methods of investigation, and the like.

Third, we lack qualified staff. It would therefore be very useful to cooperate with other countries in exchanging teaching staff, methods of investigation, and so on.

Conclusion

Civil security and civilian-based defense are very closely connected. The infrastructure of the civil security system and its educational centers can be successfully used for preparing the population for civilian-based defense. ■

IMPRESSIONS OF THE DUTCH SOCIAL DEFENCE NETWORK

Brian Martin

Brian Martin teaches in the Department of Science and Technology Studies, University of Wollongong, Australia. He is involved with Schweik Action Wollongong, a group promoting social defense, and has written widely on grass roots strategies against war, among other topics.

Brian Martin's defines social defense as “nonviolent community resistance to aggression as an alternative to military

defense. It is based on widespread protest, persuasion, noncooperation and intervention in order to oppose military aggression or political repression. It uses methods such as boycotts, acts of disobedience, strikes, demonstrations and setting up alternative institutions" (Social Defense, Social Change, London: Freedom Press, 1993, p. 4).

I first heard about the Dutch social defence network in 1984 when I received a letter from Lineke Schakenbos, international contact for the network. In Australia at the time there was only limited awareness of social defence: just one group (Canberra Peacemakers) and a few other individuals took an active interest. The Dutch operation was much grander, with a network of ten groups on different topic areas.

Nearly a decade later, in April and May 1993, I took a trip to the Netherlands to find out more about Dutch activities to promote social defence. I was able to speak with several of the leading figures in the Dutch network and to gain a better understanding of the history and organisation of activity there. This is a report of my impressions of the network. It can be no more than impressions since I have not carried out an in-depth study. Nor could I, not knowing the Dutch language. While spoken language is not a barrier-most Dutch people speak English excellently-many important books and other documents have not been translated into English.

Before proceeding further, it is important to distinguish between social defence and nonviolent action. Social defence means organised nonviolent action-rallies, strikes, boycotts, noncooperation, alternative institutions, fraternisation, etc.-as a method of resisting military invasions or coups. Social defence would be either a full replacement for the army or a supplement to it. Nonviolent action, by contrast, is a more general category: it can refer to action against police, corporations, racism, male violence, etc., as well as against military threats. In practice, different people in the Dutch network have different ways of defining social defence. Some prefer a broader conception, bringing it closer to nonviolent action generally, whereas some see it exclusively as an alternative or supplement to military defence.

In the Netherlands, as in Australia, it is possible to distinguish the following:

- The peace movement, which is not

necessarily committed to nonviolence

- The nonviolence movement, interested in promoting awareness of and use of nonviolent action, and specifically in running workshops on nonviolent action
- The social defence movement.

Support in the Netherlands for the peace movement is impressive. Although activity is far less now than in the mid 1980s, membership in groups remains high. Churches play an important role in the peace movement as they do elsewhere in Dutch society. Pax Christi has some 16,000 members, mostly Catholics. It includes many articulate people but is organised hierarchically, and at the top there is some resistance to nonviolence because it is seen to have a low political impact. Then there is the Inter-Church Peace Council (IKV), which covers nine churches (Pax Christi officially represents the Roman Catholic Church), has 2000 paying members and 15,000 on its mailing list. Also important is Women for Peace (Vrouwen voor Vrede or VVV). It produces a newsletter of forty pages six times per year, which goes to 3000 members. This is not to mention other groups.

The nonviolent action training network seems similar in activity to Australia, with perhaps five to ten active trainers in the country. This, at least, is my impression, which would have to be verified by closer study in both the Netherlands and Australia! There is a national network of nonviolence organisations.

A national network is much easier to organise in the Netherlands than in Australia, simply because of size of the country. With a population nearly as large as Australia's, the Netherlands has an area only half that of Tasmania. Furthermore, the rail network is dense and efficient compared to Australian cities. That means that a group on a particular topic can be formed with members from all around the country, with as much ease as bringing people together from across Sydney or across Melbourne.

The social defence network was set up with a series of theme groups: women, research, the military, civil servants, churches, trade unions and others.

The women's group, with 5 or 6 active members, is the most active. It has had most success in promoting the idea of social defence and nonviolence among members of Women for Peace. For example, this year 80 women attended a one-day workshop on violence in daily life.

The research group has 4 to 5 active members. As its name implies, the group pursues research into social defence. It meets every two months or so, typically to discuss an article written by one of the members. A few of the articles by members have been published.

The military group has 3 to 4 active members. Its aim is to promote the idea of social defence in the Dutch military.

The civil servants group aimed to encourage civil servants to be prepared to resist a hostile power that has taken over the government. (The memory of the Nazi occupation from 1940-45 remains fresh.) The main outcome of the group was some papers on the issue. The group has not been active for the past couple of years. The groups dealing with churches, trade unions and other topics never really got off the ground.

Social Defence Research

Before commenting further on the network, it is worthwhile mentioning research on social defence in the Netherlands, which has a fascinating history. A key figure is Johan Niezing, Professor of Peace Research at the Free University of Brussels for the past 20 years. He has long been committed to social defence, not for idealistic reasons but because it seems to him to be the most pragmatic alternative to the horrors of military methods. Although Niezing works in Belgium, he is Dutch by origin and his book on social defence is in Dutch.

In the late 1970s, a small radical party was part of a coalition government in the Netherlands. (Dutch governments are always coalitions, partly due to the voting system with proportional representation.) A member of this party was made science minister, and Niezing was his chief scientific adviser. As a result, the acceptance of proposals to fund ten social defence research projects was set as a condition for continuing the coalition. A committee, chaired by Niezing, was set up to oversee the ten projects. But then there was a change of government. Funding was dramatically reduced so that there was enough for just one project. (One way that this cutback was justified was on the basis of a critique of the Niezing committee proposals by social scientist Koen Koch.)

The one project was a study coordinated by Alex Schmid of Leiden University. Schmid's book, resulting from the study, argued that an invasion by a determined military power (specifically, the Soviet

Union) could not be stopped by nonviolent means. (In retrospect, now that the Soviet threat to western Europe has collapsed in the wake of the largely nonviolent 1989 revolutions in Eastern Europe, this analysis seems quite shortsighted.) Thus ended a promising possibility for sustained research on social defence.

(Schmid went on to set up the Interdisciplinary Research Project on Root Causes of Gross Human Rights Violations, with the Dutch acronym PIOOM, at the University of Leiden. This is a vitally important social science enterprise, whose core funding remains precarious.)

Although the Niezing committee was disbanded in 1987, it took until 1993 before its original proposals, having been updated and augmented by Giliam de Valk, were published in English. Niezing himself played a key role in ensuring that this publication took place.

The civil servants group also had trouble in raising money. They had done some interviews in Rotterdam and prepared for training civil servants for social defence. Rotterdam officials then organised a meeting to inform civil servants about training, but gave it so little publicity that hardly anyone attended. The lack of attendance was then used by the officials as an excuse to avoid providing any further support for the project.

The Background to the Network

How exactly did the network get started? There appear to be several roots. In the 1970s at the Technical University of Twente, there was a group, mainly composed of students, working on social defence. There were two subgroups. One focussed on research, doing summaries of articles. The other decided to learn how to do social defence in a practical fashion, so they did interviews with civil servants in the city of Hengelo. After the members of this group dispersed (most received degrees in 1980 and left to work elsewhere), the group was reconstituted as a national one, involving some people who had been involved for a long time. Indeed, there has been interest in social defence in the Netherlands since the 1920s. Some of those people were still active after World War II, and this has contributed to the current strength of the Dutch network.

Another group, the Centre for Nonviolent Response, had been active since the 1970s. They organised a meeting on social defence in the early 1980s and had more

people than they could cope with. Afterwards there was a meeting in September 1983 with the other group (which had interviewed civil servants), along with other interested people (especially from Women for Peace) and the network was formally established in 1984. It really just formalised connections between groups that were already active.

Another important organisation is Stichting Voorlichting Actieve Geweldloosheid (SVAG), or in other words the Foundation for Information on Active Nonviolence. Headed by Evert Huisman, it has been active for nearly 30 years and has a mailing list of 2,500 people. Among other things, it has published a large amount of material on nonviolence, both original works and Dutch translations from other languages, and has provided an invaluable service in circulating ideas about social defence.

Comments

The Dutch social defence network has some dedicated activists, and Dutch social defence researchers have produced a considerable body of literature. But there is also a pessimistic side. With the collapse of the Soviet threat, interest in peace issues is in decline in the Netherlands (as in most western countries), and this includes social defence.

On the research side, things do not look bright. Peace studies programmes are being closed down in several universities. Johan Niezing retires this year and there is no one of comparable prominence in the social defence field to take his place. Social defence researchers such as Giliam de Valk and Joep Creyghton are currently unemployed. It is difficult to obtain funds for social defence research, so it is tempting to move into other fields, as Alex Schmid did. One of the few established researchers still interested in social defence is Professor Hylke Tromp of the University of Groningen.

The network groups are not tied so much to funding, but they do require commitment from their members. The groups on research and civil servants seem mainly to have remained at the level of discussion, producing some valuable writings but not otherwise taking the message to wider constituencies. It might also be mentioned that these groups have always been almost entirely male. By contrast, the women's group remains the most active and has continued to bring social

defence to new people.

A highlight of my visit was a workshop on social defence at the Centre for Nonviolent Change in Amersfoort, organised by Abel Hertzberger and Lineke Schakenbos, at which I was a featured speaker. I described some of the projects that we had done in Canberra and Wollongong, such as producing a slide show and interviewing telecommunications experts. Those attending seemed to appreciate the practical nature of our projects. In addition, they were surprised to hear that the groups carrying out these projects were so small. It was nice to find that our efforts in Australia could provide some insight and stimulation to Dutch social defence activists, since for many years the activities of the Dutch network and, indeed, the very existence of the network have provided encouragement to us in Australia.

Promoting social defence can be a lonely task. The resources devoted to military methods remain vast, and most people still believe that military forces are needed. Furthermore, there is no guaranteed path to social defence. That's why every small project is important. We need to try out different approaches, see what works in each situation, and communicate our experiences openly and honestly. I thank all those who talked to me about social defence in the Netherlands, including Joep Creyghton, Piet Dijkstra, Anton Heering, Evert Huisman, Johan Niezing, Herman Stegehuis, and especially Giliam de Valk and Lineke Schakenbos.

Recent Dutch Books on Social Defence

- J. P. Feddema, A. H. Heering and E. A. Huisman, *Verdediging met een menselijk gezicht: grondslagen en praktijk van sociale verdediging* (Amersfoort: De Horstink, 1982).
- Evert A. Huisman, *Van geweld bevrijd: overleven door democratisering en ontwapening* (Zwolle: Stichting Voorlichting Actieve Geweldloosheid, 1987). An abridgement and translation of 7 chapters has been published as *Freed from violence: a nonviolent defence* (Zwolle: SVAG, 1989).
- A. A. Klumper, *Sociale verdediging en Nederlands '40-'45* (Tilburg: H. Gianotten B.V., 1983).
- Johan Niezing, *Sociale verdediging als logisch alternatief: van utopie naar optie* (Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1987).
- Alex P. Schmid, in collaboration with Ellen Berends and Luuk Zonneveld, *Social*

defence and Soviet military power: an inquiry into the relevance of an alternative defence concept (Leiden: Center for the Study of Social Conflict, State University of Leiden, 1985).

• Hylke Tromp, editor, *Sociale verdediging: theorieën over niet-militaire verdediging als alternatief voor geweldpolitiek en nukleaire afschrikking* (Groningen: Xeno, 1979).

• Giliam de Valk, *Strategie en sociale verdediging: een exploratieve literatuurstudie naar de fundamenteën van de strategie van sociale verdediging* (Zwolle: Stichting Voorlichting Actieve Geweldloosheid, 1988 [Masters thesis, University of Leiden]).

• Giliam de Valk in cooperation with Johan Niezing, *Research on civilian-based defence* (Amsterdam: SISWO, 1993).

Contacts

• Lineke Schakenbos, Normapad 4, 3816 EZ Amersfoort, The Netherlands. Phone: +31-33-755838. Fax: Gooi & Stricht Publishing House, Baarn, attn: Wil Rikmanspoel, +31-2154-20658.

• Giliam de Valk, Van Ostadestraat 45H, 1072 SN Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Phone: +31-20-6756197 ■

GLOBAL PEACE SERVICE: NEW VISION OR REINVENTING THE WHEEL? INTERNATIONAL CONSULTATION ON THE GLOBAL PEACE SERVICE 1993

Klaus Heidegger

Dr. Klaus Heidegger was responsible for the educational program of Pax Christi Vienna and taught Roman Catholic religion in Vienna. He works for an antimilitaristic Austrian magazine (ZAM). This year he is

in Somerville, Massachusetts. He volunteers for the Civilian-based Defense Association and is the father of a sixteen-month old girl.

Three and a half years ago, at an international Conference on Social Defense in England, I met Margareta Ingelstam. She spoke enthusiastically about the idea of a Global Peace Service (GPS). Mrs. Ingelstam and a handful of other people have devoted themselves to this idea, met periodically, and organized the consultation in New York City from November 18 to 20, 1993, which I attended. This gathering provided a good chance to analyze the concepts of GPS and to think about their possible development.

There are several obvious connections between GPS and civilian-based defense. The relevance of GPS to civilian-based defense has already been outlined by Phillips Moulton in the December 1992 issue of *Civilian-based Defense*. Over the past few years, Mrs. Ingelstam worked with the Albert Einstein Institution on issues concerning the Baltic states, where there has been official interest in civilian-based defense. Mary Link, a board member of the Civilian-based Defense Association, and Philip Bogdonoff, consulting editor of this magazine, attended the Consultation on GPS in New York. So the words of Philip Moulton are taken seriously: "Although GPS is still in its nascent stage, advocates of civilian-based defense should be aware of it as an idea whose time appears to have come. In the years ahead, the two movements may find areas of mutual support in bringing nonviolent methods to bear on violent situations." True, but what does GPS look like? What lies behind the words?

THE INVITATION

We can find information about GPS in the invitation brochure. The three-day consultation was called "Seeds of Peace, Harvest for Life." The name gives some of the spiritual background of the steering group.

In the brochure, thirty-four peace groups are listed that endorsed the consultation and the principle of a GPS. Almost all are American organizations with a clear commitment to nonviolence. They reflect the diversity of peace efforts in the United States. Among the international endorsers are Pax Christi International, Peace Brigades International, the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, UN Volunteers, and the UN

Committee for the University for Peace.

The list of the organizations that gave financial support for the consultation is another key for understanding GPS. Almost all of the sponsors are Christian organizations, especially from the Protestant side. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America gave the most financial help. GPS is promoted in Christian institutions, at least in the principal offices and committees. Nevertheless, GPS is not a Christian or religious institution.

Important programmatic declarations were announced beforehand in the brochure. It gives the following short description of GPS: "Global Peace Service is a movement towards international groups of women and men committed and trained in large numbers for nonviolent service in struggles for justice and human rights, in situations of severe social tensions, civil strife and war, and in places of environmental conflicts." This description is general. It doesn't say anything about organizational questions, such as What is or can be the organizational framework for a GPS and Who will decide how to use a GPS? The inviting group stresses that components of GPS have long existed, but that it should differ from other voluntary services. It should be an internationally recognized alternative to military service. GPS aims to receive recognition and support from governments as soon as possible.

In the invitation brochure, eleven fields of activities for GPS members are listed:

promote human rights and protect the environment; aid the cause of children's rights; teach methods and strategies of active nonviolence; stand by those threatened with kidnapping, torture and murder; assist in the resettlement of refugees; monitor democratic processes including elections; mediate in conflict situations; serve in situations where a country's independence is threatened; be part of a country's civilian-based defense; serve where there are large-scale catastrophes; document and report on situations in which they serve.

This list makes clear again that the