towards Vietnam. McNamara portrays his own role as that of a moderator between the military and President Johnson. The fear that a communist takeover in South Vietnam would threaten vital US interests in South East Asia – as well as the Democratic Party on the US mainland – was widespread in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. However, there was an astonishing gap between policy objectives and the means available. Unsuccessful, amateurish, ineffective – thus the former Defense Secretary describes the US policy-making process. McNamara contrasts the Vietnam policy of the USA with the fine-tuned policy toward the Soviet Union during the same period, asserting that one reason for the lack of political finesse toward Vietnam was the lack of knowledge and understanding of the region. Yet lack of knowledge was only part of the problem: McNamara warned the President of the consequences of supporting the regime in South Vietnam, and the political impotence of the military campaign against the North, yet Johnson chose to remain on the course toward escalation. Loyal to Johnson, McNamara chose to stay on. By 1968, however, battle fatigue over Vietnam and over LBJ had worn him out and he left for the position of President in the World Bank. 'I do not know to this day whether I quit or was fired. Maybe it was both.' McNamara takes his share of this responsibility and he deserves credit for finally having come forth with his account of the events.

OB

Martin, Brian, 1993. *Social Defence – Social Change*. London: Freedom. 158 pp.

Unlike Brian Martin's earlier work on social defense, this book is directed to an audience already interested in the topic. Brian Martin is critical of those (notably Gene Sharp, Adam Roberts, and Theodor Ebert) who advocate social defense as a means to protect the state and existing social structures, and argues for an alternative grassroots strategy. Seeking a 'top-down' implementation of social defense from policy-makers is both futile and less realistic. Despite research and government-sponsored reports and several successful campaigns and political regime changes waged by means of nonviolent action, no government has ever implemented large-scale social defense. The author argues that social defense should be extended beyond conventional foreign policy between states, and be used offensively to confront authoritarian regimes and abuses within other countries. Lessons from the military coups on the Fiji Islands are reviewed, including the potential of possible approaches such as short-wave radio. Brian Martin rejects the idea that social defense can be employed as a universal method that can be used to promote any objective regardless of content. He claims that social defense by its nature approaches values such as consensus, equality, and democracy, which are, in turn, hard to reconcile with centralized rule and hierarchy. The question of whether nonviolent action is intrinsically positive is addressed. The case of the Finnish constitutionalists' struggle against Czarist Russia is often used as an example of nonviolent liberation struggle, whereas it is generally ignored that also their opponent followed a largely nonviolent imperial policy. Much of the oppression and many of the structures of inequality found in the world today are also 'nonviolent' in the literal sense of the word. Martin's book encourages reflection on social defense and nonviolence, and it is simultaneously a guide for action. It deserves to be read by all those interested in social defense and nonviolence.

KSG

Miall, Hugh, ed., 1994. *Minority Rights in Europe*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press. 120 pp.

From the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Hugh Miall continues to present very interesting papers related to Europe and its main political problems. This time he has coordinated the editing of several articles concerning minority rights. James Mayall discusses the clash between sovereignty and self-determination in the new international system after the Cold War. Patrick Thornberry examines the present legal status of minority rights, suggesting a framework for further legislation. In four chapters on minority rights in practice, Tom Hadden analyses Northern Ireland, arguing against communal separation; Anthony Alcock presents the case of the German-speaking minority in South Tyrol as a successful example of minority protection achieved through more than 40 years of dialogue; Zoran Pajic argues that group identities in the former Yugoslavia have marginalized people of mixed backgrounds and those who refuse to accept an ethnic classification, pointing out that the only remedy to the current conflict is to give more importance to individual rights; Hugh Poulton makes a similar point about the situation in Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Kosovo and Macedonia. In the final two chapters, Klaus Schumann reviews the work of the Council of Europe, and Richard Dalton presents the CSCE and its work in relation to minorities throughout Europe. The various cases studied as well as the different points of view in relation to minority rights make this a recommended book for all those inter-

1983, 38.
[14] Peirats, op. cit., 163.
[15] See Gómez Casas, op. cit., 188.
[16] Juan García Oliver, *El Eco de los Pasos*, Ruedo Ibérico, Paris, 1974, 177.
[17] Richards, op. cit., 35 n14.
[18] See Juan Gómez Casas, op. cit., 194 and 200.
[19] García Oliver, op. cit., 250. It seems unclear as to when García Oliver became a member of the FAI. Gómez Casas, op. cit., writes that in 1931 García Oliver's anarchist group 'Los Solidarios' was not yet affiliated to the FAI, yet in 1936, when the CNT and FAI joined the Republican government, García Oliver is presented as a FAI militant. See pp 124 and 199 respectively.
[20] See here The Friends of Durruti Group, *Towards a Fresh Revolution*, Cienfuegos Press, Sanday, 1978.
[21] Bookchin, op. cit., 21.
[22] 'Conferencia AIT sobre sexualidad', *CNT* 144, December 1992, 2.
[23] *Direct Action*, Industrial Supplement, (no date, April 1993?).
[24] *Solidaridad Obrera*, special four page A4 edition, no date (April 1993?), Barcelona.
[25] Bookchin, op. cit., 16.
[26] Bookchin, op. cit., 17.
[27] Bookchin, op. cit., 15.

Anarchist Studies, 2(1), Spring 1994

New Social Movements and Nonviolent Direct Action

Political Protest and Cultural Revolution: Nonviolent Direct Action in the 1970s and 1980s
Barbara Epstein,
Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993
ISBN 0-520-08433-0 (PB) £12.95; 340pp.

Social Defence – Social Change
Brian Martin
London: Freedom Press, 1993
ISBN 0-900384-69-7 PB £4.95; 157pp.

Barbara Epstein has written a wonderful account of some of the most significant North American nonviolent action campaigns of the 1970s and 1980s. In the process she captures much of the spirit that informed the actions. From a position she depicts as 'critical engagement', she highlights the 'utopian' features of the movements – the emphasis on a prefigurative politics which involved efforts to construct alternative communities in the process of resistance; the commitment to egalitarianism, non-hierarchy and participatory democracy; the emphasis on nonviolence and the continuity between means and ends; the commitment to a project of cultural revolution that went far beyond halting the construction of nuclear power stations – and proceeds to ask important questions about whether movements that hold such visions can sustain themselves over time and be effective in helping to change society.

She commences her insider's analysis by focusing on the Clamshell Alliance, which had a vital influence on a generation of nonviolent activists in the USA and elsewhere. It was formed in 1976 to oppose the construction of a nuclear energy plant on the New Hampshire coast near the town of Seabrook, and took its name from the clams that were threatened by the construction of the power station. Influenced by the ideas of Murray Bookchin, but drawing also on a tradition of radical nonviolence and permeated throughout by a deep commitment to feminism, the protesters organized themselves into autonomous affinity groups, each group delegating one of their number to a central decision-making/ coordinating body that operated on the basis of consensus. By means of such a radically decentralized mode of organization – a microcosm of how a nonexploitative society might be ordered – the Alliance succeeded in carrying out a number of large-scale nonviolent occupations, culminating in a massive occupation in Spring 1977.

Within a year of the 1977 occupation, Clamshell was breaking apart. It was torn by three issues: (i) Where was the fine line between violence and nonviolence, and upon what side of this line did fence-cutting fall? (ii) What to do when consensus cannot be reached about such issues? (iii) When consensus cannot be

reached, is there then a need for a clear division of power and a legitimate role for leadership?

Barbara Epstein traces the style of political organizing and action from the Clamshell Alliance across the United States to northern California, devoting the remainder of her historical analysis to an examination of the careers of the Abalone Alliance and the Livermore Action Group, with some attention also paid to the emergence of anti-interventionist groups such as Witnesses For Peace and the sanctuary movement, formed to counter US intervention in Central America.

The Abalone Alliance was modelled on Clamshell (even to the choice of name) and involved an effort to prevent the construction of a nuclear plant near San Luis Obispo. Like Clamshell, the Abalone held a series of progressively larger occupations – with the largest in 1981 resulting in 1900 arrests. As with Clamshell, there were divisions and conflicts within and between the network of groups that constituted the Alliance, but the demise of the movement came after a specialist's report identified safety faults in the design of the plant and construction was halted – only for a couple of years as it turned out. Out of the Alliance, however, there emerged another network – the Livermore Action Group – which mobilized a mass effort between 1981 and 1984 to close down the nuclear weapons producing Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory of the University of California.

I want to emphasize how sympathetic and informed is Barbara Epstein's analysis of these movements. Her writing reveals her own moral stance on the issues they took up, and her familiarity with all the stresses and strains of holding together a disparate movement is evidence of her active involvement in the campaigns themselves.

It is when she moves beyond her role as participant observer/ historian of NVDA campaigns that she starts to weaken. According to her, each of these three movements failed because they had no strategy beyond mass direct action. She returns to this theme repeatedly during the course of the book, and the reader naturally thinks that this gap in strategic thinking is going to be bridged. No way – we get a mishmash of Gramsci, George Lakey, postmodernism in its Laclau and Mouffe guise, Habermas, and Stuart Hall (the architect of New Times, not the radio personality).

Underpinning the author's observations about lack of strategy there is a clear assumption that cultural revolution is on the agenda in late capitalist society, and it is the responsibility of social movements to make it happen. I don't think social change happens in such a purposive manner.

At the core of the approach to social change pursued by nonviolent direct activists in the 1970s and 1980s there was the belief that through acting upon one's principles, through bearing moral witness, they/we could sway public opinion to such an extent that eventually governments would be coerced into action. It would appear, however, that efforts to convert large sections of the

public to the anti-nuclear point of view by means of site occupations and peace camps had very limited success. Persuasion would seem to be effective only with people who have no strong views on a subject. The impact of the European peace movements in the 1980s and movements such as the Freeze Campaign in the USA lay in their ability to mobilize the concerns and sympathies that already existed within the public at large – people were all ready, waiting to be mobilized. One comes back to the old adage about people being swayed by a movement only when they have the ears with which to hear its message. Movements don't make revolutions, people do.

Furthermore, with regard to influencing the state, there is some evidence to show that it is the disruptive power or potential of a movement that has the greatest impact on government, not its organizational strength. It is the unpredictability of the righteously indignant that scares the upholders of the status quo, not the measured tones of a besuited leader standing atop an impressive organizational structure.

Implicit in much of Barbara Epstein's analysis is the verdict that 'We had great fun, it was a transformative experience for those of us who took part – but we did not achieve much.' One should not underestimate the longer term significance of such times.

Nonviolent activists of the 1970s and 1980s, like war resisters before them, have had to deal with the 'What if' questions. If we got rid of nuclear weapons, how would we defend ourselves? In the 1980s a considerable amount of research went into 'alternative defence'. At one end of the spectrum was the advocacy of various forms of 'defensive deterence' and 'non-provocative defence' as a means of defending territory against any potential aggressor. A more radical position urged nonviolent defence under various labels: civilian-based defence, civilian defence, and social defence.

Prior to the Second World War pacifists in Britain expressed the naive conviction that 'an invading army being greeted with kindliness and hospitality, and a calm refusal to be anyone's slaves, would be wholly unable to continue shooting down their hosts in cold blood' (Wilfred Wellock, quoted in A Rigby, *A Life in Peace*, Bridport: Prism Press, 1988, p 71). In the post-war period a more strategic exploration of the potential of nonviolent means of defence was undertaken – inspired in part by the example of the Gandhian independence struggle in India and the instances of nonviolent resistance within occupied Europe during the war.

Gene Sharp, in particular, was to the fore in this work. For over 30 years he has persuasively and unceasingly argued his case that nonviolence represents a more effective and ultimately less costly functional alternative to violence as a means of defence, based on the fundamental insight that no regime can survive without the cooperation, willing or forced, of key sectors of the civilian population. He has sought to separate the advocacy of nonviolent defence (or civilian based defence as he calls it) from the moralism and religiosity of radical

pacifists. His target has been the military and state élites, arguing that civilian-based defence can be introduced gradually from the top-down, without involving radical social change.

In recent years Sharp's position has come under sustained criticism from a generation of peace activists and researchers whose formative political experiences were in the nonviolent direct action movements of the 1970s and 1980s. Amongst the most prominent of this new wave has been Brian Martin, an American now living in Australia. In 1984 Freedom Press published his *Uprooting War*, and now they have published a collection of his articles under the title *Social Defence – Social Change*.

The term 'social defence' is significant. It implies the defence by the general population of what they value in their culture and way of life, rather than the defence of the state's territorial boundaries. The training of people in methods of nonviolent struggle against outside aggressors is seen as a continuation of community-based nonviolent struggle against all forms of exploitation and domination within their own societies. In this new publication Brian Martin develops the theme that any move towards a nonviolent defence posture must emerge out of grassroots initiatives to challenge oppressive structures and relationships encountered in everyday life. The military establishment and the culture of militarism (hierarchy, centralization of power, patriarchy, glorification of the state etc.) permeates all aspects of society. Therefore, any attempt to transcend reliance on the military for defence purposes must start with, and grow out of, nonviolent attempts to transform ourselves and our relationships as part of the wider project of creating a more egalitarian and truly democratic society – one which would be worth defending.

In effect, what Brian is exploring through his own lens of 'practical utopianism' are the age-old questions that have bothered anarchists: What would a society without state-like structures look like? How might life be organized within a radically decentralized participatory political order? In the process he takes that necessary creative leap to imagine a world without armies, and then starts exploring practical questions. How might a nonviolent police force function? How would a political system based on 'demarchy' (the random selection of leaders within functional groupings) operate? What new agenda for scientific research and technological development would emerge in the new anarchistic order? What are the implications for environmental policy of a demilitarized society? How can third parties intervene nonviolently (social attack) to combat repression in other countries?

To go along with these explorations requires the reader to make the same creative leap as the author. It would appear that the publishers have some difficulty with this. In an introductory note they confess that whilst many anarchists will agree with his approach, 'many more would agree with all his conclusions if they were clear in their minds as to how Brian Martin imagines that the military forces will be 'abolished' in the first place'.

I understand their problem. I cannot speak for Brian Martin but I know how I would answer. It involves the notion about the pessimism of the intellect needing to be countered by the optimism of the will. If we were to surrender to a cold intellectual analysis of the trends and tendencies of our barbaric world we would lose all hope. And with the loss of hope we would lose any chance of creating the nonviolent world of our dreams. We need to counter the negativism of the intellect by an optimism of the will. We must will ourselves into believing that change is possible. Only then will we be able to generate the commitment necessary to realise our visions. And if we do will ourselves into believing that change (such as turning swords into ploughshares) is possible, whatever doubts the intellect might throw up, we have a responsibility to start exploring – in the most intellectually rigorous manner possible – the kinds of structures and relationships whereby our utopia might be made real. This, I believe, is the project upon which Brian Martin is engaged – and long may he continue to do so.

Andrew Rigby
University of Bradford

Anarchism and Terrorism

Life of an Anarchist: The Alexander Berkman Reader
Gene Fellner (editor)
New York: Four Walls Eight Windows, 1992
ISBN 1-941423-78-6 £10.95; 355pp.

Violence, Terrorism and Justice
R.G. Frey and Christopher W. Morris (editors)
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991
ISBN 0-521-40125-9 (HB) £37.50, 0-521-40950-0 (PB) £13.95; 319pp.

Alexander Berkman is a relatively unsung anarchist hero. Most European readers of anarchism probably know him merely as the life-long associate and one time lover of Emma Goldman, would-be assassin of Henry Clay Frick, and early critic of Soviet Russia. For them, and even American readers, perhaps more familiar with Berkman's writings, Gene Fellner's collection will make absorbing reading.

The *Reader* is composed of the *Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist, The Bolshevik Myth, The Kronstadt Rebellion, The Russian Tragedy, The ABC of Anarchism;* articles from *The Blast;* documents from the No-Conscription League; and a selection of correspondence – mostly between Berkman and Emma Goldman. Of these, only *The Russian Tragedy* and *The ABC of Anarchism* are printed in full, but the excerpted texts are accompanied by summaries of the

CIVILIAN-BASED DEFENSE AND NONVIOLENT STRUGGLE

by William B. Vogele

Social Defence, Social Change, by Brian Martin. London: Freedom Press, 1993.

Unarmed against Hitler: Civilian Resistance in Europe, 1939-1943, by Jacques Semelin, translated by Suzan Husserl-Kapit. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1993.

Activists and scholars are only beginning to come to grips with the vast social transformations and the seemingly sudden surge of violence that accompanied the end of the cold war and the collapse of the Soviet Union. The fact that the events ending communist rule in Europe and the Soviet Union were rooted in, and often manifested by, nonviolent struggle holds great promise for powerful means of social change without resort to violence. Yet, optimism must be tempered by the simultaneous emergence of vicious conflicts—sometimes even where nonviolent struggle previously prevailed—which have been resistant to easy resolution by the participants or outside parties. Scholars and activists are both challenged, therefore, to sort out the dynamics, potentials, and limits to nonviolent means of struggle for justice and peace.

Social, or civilian-based, defense has been offered as one of the main proposals for institutionalizing nonviolent struggle. Defense based on civilian resistance has been proposed as a means to resist aggression, whether imposed by actors from outside or arising from internal usurpers. As such, it is promoted as the functional equivalent of military defense. Civilian-based defense is rooted in the general observation that social groups may find themselves in

PEACE & CHANGE, Vol. 19 No. 4, October 1994 436-441

conflict with others, in which societal institutions are threatened or the integrity of territorial claims challenged. Events of recent decades have given greater credibility to the argument that a society can be organized and mobilized effectively in its own defense without resort to arms and violence. Unarmed Czechs frustrated invading Soviet-led forces for several months in 1968, and Lithuanians stood against Soviet special forces in early 1990. The relevance and potential of unarmed resistance has thus come to be explored seriously by proponents of nonoffensive defense strategies as well as national military leaders grappling with the dilemma of defense in the nuclear age.

Increased attention also has highlighted the need to address systematically several key propositions, including the need for a detailed empirical study of how people have used nonviolent methods to resist aggression and oppressive regimes; the evaluation of the effectiveness of these struggles; the analysis of the social structures that supported nonviolent struggles, as well as those that emerged from the experience; and conclusions about the interaction between violent and nonviolent methods of action. Each of these issues contributes to advancing our knowledge of the underlying challenge of civilian-based defense proposals—what is required systematically to implement, perhaps even institutionalize, "people power" on a broad scale so that alternatives to violence become more enduring? In application, a defense by civil resistance would not prevent attacking forces from entering the country, except perhaps by planned demolition of strategic rail lines, highways, and bridges. Instead, defense would begin after the invasion. Occupying forces would be prevented from achieving their principal objectives by concerted nonviolent resistance, noncooperation, and efforts to weaken the coercive effectiveness of the military forces.

A nonmilitary civilian defense organizes the population around occupational or social affinities, such as neighborhoods, churches, labor unions, factory groups, or public employment. Defenders would be able to focus their noncooperation or nonviolent interventions on narrow but critical aspects of the occupier's objectives. They might refuse to teach the occupier's educational program (as in Norway in the 1940s), close a city with a general strike, sabotage

factories to prevent production, or fraternize with and encourage mutiny among invading troops. In addition, there can be disruption by mass demonstrations and the proliferation of alternative news sources, publications, or broadcasts. Nonoccupation institutions can emerge to maintain social unity and resistance, as occurred with the underground educational system in Poland in the second half of World War II. The power basis for civilian defense, as implied above, is not the use or threats of physical force, but rather the social powers inherent in human community.

Civilian resistance makes two key assumptions. First, people are linked in community by bonds of social relationships and norms, and by networks of organizations and institutions. Second, all relationships of authority are continuously renegotiated between those who claim to rule and those who must acquiesce. Thus institutions of power and the individuals who claim to rule are dependent on the consent of the governed; and alternative loci of power always potentially exist and can be activated. Brian Martin and Jacques Semelin each explore crucial issues related to civilian-based defense, although from very distinct perspectives. Semelin carefully analyzes the social bases and characteristics of unarmed resistance to Nazi occupations in Europe during World War II. From this comparative viewpoint, he suggests both the potential and the limits for civilian resistance in a national defense strategy. Martin is explicitly forward looking. He argues that social defense is inherently revolutionary and therefore should be adapted to a broad conception of social change. Each author challenges us to consider the problematic nature of "people power" and the relationship of nonviolent struggle to existing social institutions. Semelin's work offers fresh insights into the dynamics of collaboration, resistance, and defense under the extreme circumstances of Nazi occupation. If this work were simply an account of the forms of nonviolent struggle against Nazism, it would be a significant contribution. Although several of the stories are well known—the resistance of Norwegian teachers, for example—rarely is this history systematically and comparatively presented. Thus Semelin argues that unarmed resistance was more widespread than commonly acknowledged. In addition, he makes this argument within a broader

analytical framework. He seeks to demystify resistance in general by exploring the widely varying choices made by individuals, groups, and nations. Collaboration or resistance, cooperation or noncooperation, were hardly black-and-white choices.

Two social features were crucial in promoting civilian resistance in Europe as well as contributing to resistance successes—social cohesion and existing norms and institutions of democratic governance. Semelin notes that, in those countries with a high degree of social cohesion, civilian resistance was more effective. Denmark and Norway, for example, contrast sharply with Poland. In the former, groups and sectors of society possessed a sense of material and ideological identity that linked them together. In Poland, civilian resistance was hampered by social divisions and conflicts, which the occupiers often exploited. When the society already values itself and all its component parts, even symbolic acts of defiance take great meaning. "Civilian resistance is above all an affirmation of legitimacy, which the language of symbols expresses perfectly and which the force of arms is powerless to destroy" (p. 162).

Semelin ends his book by connecting the experience of unarmed resistance to regimes of brutal occupation to the arguments for nonmilitary defense. He correctly notes that those same features in the European experience will be critical variables in any defense plan. It is conceivable, as civilian defense advocates imply, that the training and education required for a national defense would promote social cohesion and perhaps strengthen democratic institutions. Semelin's work suggests the necessary prior existence of such social features, but not a theoretical basis for connecting resistance training to democratic values. He ends rather cautiously, arguing that civilian strategies "can . . . be an option in various circumstances, either accompanying and strengthening a military operation or taking its place" (p. 183). It is with this implicit acceptance that nonviolent struggle can be integrated into traditional military planning and strategic thinking that Brian Martin takes sharpest exception. Martin profoundly disagrees with what he characterizes as an "elite" approach to developing a social defense capacity. He defines "social defense" as "nonviolent community resistance to aggression as an alternative to military de-

fense" (p. 4). Martin notes that "community" is the most useful social group needing defense, rather than the "nation." Communities may or may not be the same as the nation in which they reside, and the threats to their security may well come from the violence of the state apparatus acting in the name of the nation. Although his definition narrows the scope of the argument to alternatives to military methods of defense, Martin is quite clear about the radical implications of social defense.

Nonviolent struggle is fundamentally rooted in the capacity of a community to mobilize against violence and aggression. Because the military institutions of states serve multiple functions of coercive social control, even in those polities in which the military is ostensibly most directly under popular control, pursuing reform through elite channels is likely to stifle popular initiative and power. Social defense, Martin argues, is revolutionary in the broadest sense, even to the extent that it should be turned to an offensive strategy. One does not have to accept this argument to recognize that Martin identifies a central dilemma in promoting civilian-defense strategies through elite channels. The willingness of any state to provide its citizens with the tools of revolutionary power should be treated as problematic. In countries that have experienced people power revolutions, such as the Philippines, Czechoslovakia, and Lithuania, defense policies and the role of the military have been transformed only where the military establishment was already weak. Filipino military forces continued their intense counterinsurgency warfare after 1985 and regularly threatened to initiate coups. Military strategy in postcommunist Czechoslovakia was reoriented to a more general international role, in conformance with European security institutions. Only in Lithuania, where virtually no military establishment existed prior to independence, has civilian resistance been seriously considered as an integral part of security planning.

Martin's argument also broadly connects the concept of social defense to other movements and social concerns, especially feminism and environmental issues. By casting the notion of social defense as a method of radical grass-roots empowerment, Martin links the notions of community, security, and social justice. Thinking about defense in this way forces us to ask appropriate questions about who is being defended, whose rights are being defended, and what are the geographical and social boundaries of community. In making these arguments, Martin uses history illustratively and selectively. Thus the vital details of how communities struggle against oppression and injustice, and the extent to which they are empowered by their efforts, are largely left out. His purpose is to challenge and stimulate the community that already takes nonviolent struggle seriously. The shift from theory to practice, however, requires much more attention to the empirical aspects of these questions. Taken together then, both of these books advance the resources by which scholars and activists can understand both the limits and potential for nonviolent struggle in the "new world order."

perspective, a recent report of the US Army Chemical Materiel Destruction Agency has suggested that there are chemical warfare (CW) remains at 215 sites in 33 states, and that clean-up will cost $17.7 billion over the next 40 years!). Actual inspection costs for the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) are in the $75-100 million range per annum.

As noted in the final chapters, arms control is a very difficult technical matter, and the diplomats must receive the best scientific advice if their political objectives are to be achieved. This is difficult enough for delegations from developed nations, but it is almost impossible for many others, if only because of the costs of augmenting national delegations at multilateral negotiations. Books such as the present one by Dr Crone will help bridge the gap between the scientists, the general public and their representatives. We just have to make sure that such books end up in the hands of those who need them.

In summary, this is a readable book that achieves what it sets out to do. Those who read it will understand the scientific background to the banning of chemical weapons and should then insist that their representatives read it too.

[Professor Ron Sutherland, University of Saskatchewan]

A New World Order: Grassroots movements for global change by Paul Ekins, (London & New York: Routledge, 1992), pp. x + 248, rrp A$29.95. Distributed in Australia by The Law Book Company Ltd.

Hopes and Fears: The Human Future edited by Hanna Newcombe, Canadian Papers in Peace Studies 1992 No.2, (Toronto: Science for Peace/Samuel Stevens, 1992), pp. viii + 195.

These two books offer alternative perspectives and creative suggestions for the pursuit of international peace and security which go beyond the confines of state-centric thinking. While Ekins focuses on individual and local initiatives, Newcombe's collection of papers is supportive of a world federalism model for the future. Both unfortunately suffer from being researched and edited during the 'twilight zone' at the end of the Cold War when strategic thinking had not quite extricated itself from the dominant East-West bipolar system. Nevertheless, many of the issues raised and solutions proposed offer valuable food for thought and action.

Ekins outlines four threats to human existence which he describes as the 'global problematique': the military machine, the holocaust of poverty, the environmental crisis, and the denial of human rights. He gives thoughtful and original critiques of each of the three UN commissions established to deal with these issues: the Palme, Brandt and Brundtland Reports. Ekins argues that the reports are all seriously flawed and are inadequate to deal with the global problematique primarily because they fail to take full account of the role of 'people's organisations' and the unequal interdependence of North/South and other power relations. Most of the book is taken up with describing numerous inspiring case studies of individuals and organisations whose activities in promoting peace, human rights, people-centred development and environmental regeneration provide a framework within which the global problematique can be successfully addressed. In the final chapter he draws together this broad, eclectic framework by identifying the three central forces of 'the modern project' - scientism, developmentalism and statism - which the 'people's alternative' must challenge in order to create a 'future that works through a new world order'.

The papers in Newcombe's volume offer a mixed bag of contributions to the international security debate, and are broadly grouped into five subject areas: future scenarios for Europe; war prevention; global decision-making; values and cooperation; and ecological issues. Some suffer more than others from being dated, many having been previously published and originally written up to five years ago. The most useful and interesting contributions include Bjorn Moller on development of a common security system for Europe; Dietrich Fischer on components of an active peace policy; Walter Dorn on the international legal implications of the UN being involved in the verification of arms control treaties; and Hanna Newcombe on the notion of subsidiarity and on the roots of co-operation.

[Wendy Lambourne]

Social Defence, Social Change, by Brian Martin, (London: Freedom Press, 1993) £4.95

Social Defence, Social Change is part of the continuously increasing field of literature that deals with nonviolent alternatives to traditional mechanisms of defence. In the opening chapter, Brian Martin provides a useful although somewhat too condensed overview of the main arguments and the historical evidence presented by the protagonists of social defence (also called civilian-based defence).

Martin then introduces his own radical agenda for social defence, which he defines as 'nonviolent community resistance to aggression as an alternative to military defence'. Employing methods such as strikes, social non-cooperation and boycotts, social defence aims at opposing both internal political repression and external military aggression. Martin builds upon the arguments presented by the main contributors to the field (such as Gene Sharp, Adam Roberts, Johan Galtung, and Theodor Ebert), yet diverges from them in a number of crucial areas.

He criticises alternative defence mechanisms that are initiated by elites and implemented on a state or national level. Being controlled by a few key personalities, such vast defence apparatuses are susceptible to becoming corrupted or can easily be taken over by an aggressor. Instead, Martin advocates a community-based, self-reliant social defence system that is initiated by grass-roots organisations (schools, churches, offices, suburbs and the like) and operates according to non-hierarchical, consensus-oriented decision-making.

Martin also opposes the introduction of civilian-based defence as part of a conventional military defence system, because an unofficial yet crucial function of the latter is to sustain the existing exploitative societal order. He thus introduces social defence only as one aspect of a larger societal transformation process that aims at undoing existing systems of domination.

In its normative dimension, *Social Defence, Social Change* is a highly utopian book. It is hard to imagine that the author's suggestion to abolish the army, the police, prisons, the capitalist economic system and the state will acquire practical significance in the decades to come. Martin brushes also too easily over a number of difficult issues, such as nonviolence and the Gulf War or the various conflicts in former Yugoslavia.

Despite its radical, utopian and sometimes unpractical content, Martin's provocative book is important for both activists and academics because it seriously challenges a number of reifying principles that presently contribute to a great deal of conflict and oppression.

[Roland Bleiker, PhD student, Department of International Relations, ANU]

Power and Protest: Movements for Change in Australian Society by Verity Burgmann (St. Leonards: Allen & Unwin, 1993), pp. 302, A$24.95 (pb)

This study of five social protest movements in twentieth century Australia - Aboriginal civil and land rights; women; lesbians and gays; and the peace and green movements - arose out of Burgmann's work as a teacher in the Politicial Science Department

7(1)

Civilian-Based Defense for the Grassroots

A Review of Brian Martin's *Social Defence, Social Change*[1]

by

David T. Ritchie [2]

An important offshoot of the growing nonviolence movement is the debate concerning Civilian-Based Defense (CBD). Advocates of CBD argue that the military structures which currently exist within nation-states, and presumably other social groups as well (tribes and bioregions for example), can and should be replaced by training civilians to use nonviolent action techniques in conflict situations such as coups, invasions and occupations.[3] The chief proponents of this post-military system of national and transnational defense are readily recognizable to even the casual observer of the dialogue on nonviolence, and over the past twenty years or so the work of these individuals has gradually determined the conceptual parameters of the debate.

This evolution, spurred primarily by Gene Sharp and his colleagues at the Albert Einstein Institute and the Civilian-Based Defense Association, has taken a decidedly uni-focal course, concentrating almost exclusively on replacing military structures through existing social and political institutions.[4] This viewpoint, in fact, is so dominant that one would have been extremely hard pressed to find any serious alternatives until very recently. This is a severe shortcoming, especially from the perspective of social change proponents and activists, and one which Brian Martin seeks to rectify with his new book *Social Defence, Social Change*.

Martin squarely addresses the fact that the advocates of this "Sharpian" discourse totally ignore entire segments of the

nonviolence movement in order to make their proposals more palatable to the political mainstream. Not only does Martin properly point out that Sharp and his followers are quite obvious in their attempts to distance themselves from activists and others who push for substantive social change,[5] but he persuasively argues that true implementation of nonviolent CBD (which he prefers to call social defense) will require fundamental changes to the military-industrial apparatus.

This in turn would require a shake-up of the political status quo, because the present power structure is intimately tied to the economic power of the arms producing conglomerates and the institutions (public and private) which support them.[6] In this way, then, the present ruling "elites" would be less willing to implement social defense because it would effectively bring about an end to the political framework which supports them.[7] In short, any substantive structural modifications to the social, economic and political mechanisms at work in a given society are sure to substantially impact upon other such mechanisms. That most CBD advocates never so much as address this phenomena - let alone resolve it - is quite troubling to Martin. For his part, Martin goes a long way in showing (rightfully, I believe) that the impact of replacing the military-industrial complex would have a consuming and adverse effect on the ruling elites.[8]

Beyond this, Martin criticizes the notion that social defense is best left to a small band of researchers, policy analysts and strategists.[9] This leads, we are told, to a continuation of the present top-down hierarchies which most social change activists maintain to be the core component to oppression and dogmatic entrenchment. This kind of criticism has been leveled at proponents of "elite" CBD in the past, but with little apparent reception.[10] Martin even envisions a scenario whereby a corps of elite professionals who are supposed to implement a social defense system use that system against popular movements for social change.[11] It is interesting to note that Sharp does not address this possibility in any of his principal writings on CBD.

Martin indicates that the only true way to alleviate the internal systemic pressure caused by implementing social defense is to sidestep existing social institutions altogether, and to turn to the very people and movements that Sharp and his colleagues appear to disdain the most; activists in the peace, feminist, environmental and social change movements. The work that groups in these fields can - and in many instances do - undertake (collectively referred to by Martin as grassroots initiatives) allow for the mass implementation of nonviolent action techniques from the bottom up. This inversion would have a decentralizing effect, thus concentrating social defense strategy (and power) on a community-based level. This is an implementation agenda that several alternative movements will be attracted to,[12] and one which sets him far apart from Sharp.

After a short primer on social defense theory, and the chapters containing the themes outlined above, Martin sets out to justify his contentions by using illustrations of the impact that grassroots social defense might have on the feminist and environmental movements. He takes this intellectual project even further, by addressing issues such as the effect of his vision on science, technology and telecommunications.

Herein lies the downside of this generally very important book. While Martin uncovers a glaring and obvious deficiency in "traditional" CBD discourse, he attempts to cover far too many specifics in his alternative theory - at least in a book that contains less than 150 pages. He might have been better off to elaborate further on his very perceptive criticisms of Sharp's work, followed by a more general, yet in-depth, discussion of why grassroots implementation is a more appropriate strategy. The kind of detailed implications which he outlines (such as the effect on police and prisons) could probably have waited until some of the more foundational constructs have been parsed out a little more thoroughly. For example, the final three chapters (which deal with, respectively, substantive political and economic change and shifts in power relationships) could have been expanded to give a fuller discussion on how grassroots social defense would intersect with and affect status quo institutions, as well as theories concerning "elite" CBD.

This having been said, I would reiterate that Martin's book is an extremely important addition to scholarship on social defense. He gingerly touches on many (most) of the integral points concerning social defense, and - as has been said - uncovers a most egregious shortcoming in traditional CBD theory. Individuals

interested in the field should still refer to Gene Sharp's works to gather the background on the evolution of the ideas that Sharp and his colleagues have pioneered, but I would venture to say that no full examination of CBD would be complete without a reading of Martin's intriguing book. *Social Defense, Social Change* pushes the conceptual envelope concerning where social defense can, might and should be used, and adds an important dimension to the debate that has been virtually nonexistent up to now.

End Notes

[1] Brian Martin, *Social Defence, Social Change* (London: Freedom Press, 1993).

[2] David Ritchie is Managing Editor of the *International Journal of Nonviolence*. He is currently studying law at the Howard University School of Law in Washington, D.C.

[3] See Gene Sharp, *Civilian-Based Defense: A Post-Military Weapons System* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990).

[4] See, e.g., Gene Sharp, "Promoting Civilian-Based Defense: Lessons from the History of Development of the Policy," in *Civilian-based Defense: News and Opinion* 7:6 (August 1992): 11.

[5] Martin, op. cit., 34.

[6] Since the United States now exports more arms than any other country in the world, this discussion is structured around the current military-political symbiosis in the U.S. For more on this, see Gerald Segal, *The World Affairs Companion* (New York: Touchstone Books, 1991), 141.

[7] This would be similar to the situation that Mikhail Gorbachev found himself in after he initiated structural reforms in the former Soviet Union.

[8] Martin, op. cit., 34-37.

[9] Ibid., 28-31.

[10] See, e.g., Steven Huxley, "Nonviolence Misconceived? A Critique of

Civilian-Based Defense," in *Civilian-based Defense: News and Opinion* 7:6 (August 1992): 3.

[11] Martin, op. cit., 30.

[12] See, for example, Greens/Green Party USA Program, 4th National Congress, 1991.

On the 18th of October, Thailand lost one of its greatest artists. Professor Fua Hariphitak, a veteran guardian of Thailand's classic artistic traditions and winner of the 1983 Magsaysay Award for Public Service, passed away due to complications following the debilitating stroke he suffered more than three years ago. He was 84 years old.

Born in 1910, near the muddy banks of the Chao Phraya River, Fua quickly became obsessed with capturing the beauty in the lush orchards surrounding his home in Thonburi. After completing his degree at the Royal Fine Arts Department in Bangkok, Fua continued his studies in India and Italy before beginning his life's work, restoring the long-neglected murals adorning the walls of some of Thailand's most revered temples.

For the 1982 Rattanakosin Bicentennial celebration in Bangkok, Fua undertook his crowning labor, the restoration of the Ho Phra Trai Pidok library at Wat Rakhang in Thonburi. Named supervisor of the project in 1968, he recruited and directed many of the country's finest craftsmen and painters. Panels and doors were carefully carved true to the originals first done more than 200 years ago. Several of the murals were fully restored by him personally, others redone and the entire library renovated. The final result was the complete restoration of one of Southeast Asia's architectural masterpieces.

In an era of acclerating conformity, Fua set aside a lucrative career as an accomplished painter and chose instead to patiently struggle to preserve Thailand's artistic heritage and cultural uniqueness. Through his writing and own tireless personal example, Fua has given his fellow Thais a priceless gift, helping them realize that their country's 30,000 temples house many of their greatest national treasures.

REVIEWS & NEW BOOKS

Social Defense, Social Change
by Brian Martin,
Freedom Press London 1993

Looking for a provacative read to inspire a revolution? Here's the book for you. Brian Martin sets the tone in the first paragraphs of this exciting little book.

"The idea of social defence-namely of abolishing military forces and relying in their stead on nonviolent struggles by the general population – is extremely radical. Yet a large amount of the writing on this subject is set within the most conservative of assumptions about society. It is assumed that it is somehow possible to introduce social defence and yet leave much of society the same: the same economic system, the same political structures, the same scientific and health systems, and so on.

To me this is implausible. The military is one of the keys to protecting existing systems of power. Remove the military and the scope for change would be greatly increased....training people in methods of nonviolent struggle against outside aggressors would also give them the skills to challenge employers, politicians, sexual exploiters and many others."

In the next 140 pages the author examines the implications of a society in which the citizens have systematic training in the tools of defending through social power what the people themselves determine is important. This may result in social strikes against polluters or mass actions in response to gender based crimes, areas frequently untouched in the main stream of "citizen based defense" literature.

The first several chapters review the development of the concept social defense. In these chapters the author leaves none of the basic assumptions unexamined, or unquestioned. Following a chapter which looks at possible applications of the concept in a case study of the 1987 Coup in

Fiji, there is an excellent 2-page synopsis of what people can do to move this concept forward *now*, entitled: "Social Offense: taking the struggle to the aggressor."

Without providing prescription answers, the following chapters point the reader in the direction of considering how this model can address deeper manifestations of violence in our cultures. There is a chapter each devoted to how social defense can address violence against women; replacement of police and jails; deal with environmental insensitivity, unrestrained science and technology, political corruption and exploitative economic systems.

One of the last chapters may incite you to organize your friends to begin a project of your own. In it the author describes his participation in a people's research group which set out to study and document how they could prepare to use the system of mass communication to mobilize and inform the populace in case of a political crisis while protecting the system, or making it inoperable by an aggressor.

Undeterred by controversial topics, the author finishes with a postscript entitled "Power tends to corrupt, even social defense." Be forewarned, you'll be challenged by this book, especially in your complacency.

Yeshua Moser

When Loyalty Demands Dissent
by Santi Pracha Dhamma Inst.
350 pages, Bt. 500

Thailand has seen dramatic changes in the more than two years since social critic Sulak Sivaraksa gave his controversial speech on 'Democracy and the Coup D'Etat' at Thammasat University.

The social critic, and the charge of *lese Majeste* originally filed by General Suchinda, are the subject of the Santi Pracha Dhamma Institute's new book, *When Loyality Demands Dissent*.

It brings together a wide collection of articles on Sulak written in newspapers and magazines in Thailand and abroad, testimonitals from supporters around the globe, and documents relating to the charges, as well as a selection of his own writings. It holds the position that the charges were politically motivated and that the NPKC bore the brunt of the Thammasat attack.

Newspaper clippings follow the progress of the case from September 1991 up until the present. Longer articles culled from international jounrals provide more insights into Sulak's energetic and high-profile background in the promotion of socially engaged Buddhism, peace studies, and ecumenism.

Ironically enough, in one extract from *Literature and Politics and Siam in the American Era* (1985) by Cornell academics Benedict Anderson and Ruchira Mendiones, Sulak is described as "an idiosyncratic conservative-monarchist."

The book places itself, and Sulak, in the center of the current "crossroads of ideas" about Thailand (or Siam, as Sulak refers to the country) and its future--choca-bloc westernization, consumerism and the threat to moral and cultural values are recurrent themes.

Sandy Barron

Choose Love
by Joe Gorin
Parallex Press
198 pp., $12

With warmth, humor, and passion, Joe Gorin describes his days accompanying men and women threatened by death squads, documenting human rights violations in remote areas of Nicaragua's war zone, working with *campesino's* and labor activists in the Guatemalan popular movement, and just sharing the times with those like Rigoberta Menchu, who courageously maintain hope in the face of brutal oppression and war. Combining historical analysis and personal anecdote while drawing on his Jewish cultural roots and his Buddhist meditation practice, Gorin brings us an intimate view of and important insights into the tragic consequences of U.S. policy and, equally important, of *la lucha*, the remarkable struggle of ordinary people for social justice and human dignity.

David Dellinger writes in the forward:

"The shorter this is the better, since that will mean you get to Joe's book sooner. And what an exciting experience that is.

"I don't mean just learning new things about Guatemala and Nicaragua, things that the media neglects or the obscene hypocrisy of U.S. claims to be supporting human rights and democracy there, eye-opening and crucial as that is. I don't even mean the way the resilient heroisim of some of the people Joe works with and writes about comes alive, inspiring as that is.

"Those contributions would be enough to make this little book 'must reading' for anyone who wants to know both Central America and our own U.S. culture and society better. But valuable as they are, what excites me most is the way Joe accomplishes them without lapsing into dogmatism, guilt-tripping, or other forms of self-righteous fanaticism. The things that rightfully turn off the people who must be reached if things are to be changed. Grim as much of the subject matter is, none of it crowds out Joe's sense of humor.

"Being told this without reading the book, one might be tempted to interpret it in the classic manner, that Joe has to laugh when he writes because if he doesn't he will cry. But cry he does, and cry I did when I read

Social Defense, Social Change

by Brian Martin, Freedom Press, London, 1993

Looking for a provocative read to inspire a revolution? Here's the book for you. Brian Martin sets the tone in the first paragraphs of this exciting little book.

"The idea of social defence - namely of abolishing military forces and relying in their stead on nonviolent struggles by the general population - is extremely radical. Yet a large amount of the writing on this subject is set within the most conservative of assumptions about society. It is assumed that it is somehow possible to introduce social defence and yet leave much of society the same: the same economic system, the same political structures, the same scientific and health systems, and so on.

To me this is implausible. The military is one of the keys to protecting existing systems of power. Remove the military and the scope for change would be greatly increased... training people in methods of nonviolent struggle against outside aggressors would also give them the skills to challenge employers, politicians, sexual exploiters and many others."

In the next 140 pages the author examines the implications of a society in which the citizens have systematic training in the tools of defending through social power what the people themselves determine is important. This may result in social strikes against polluters or mass actions in response to gender based crimes. Areas frequently untouched in the main stream of civilian-based defence literature.

The first several chapters review the development of the concept social defense. In these chapters the author leaves none of the basic assumptions unexamined, or unquestioned. Following a chapter which looks at possible application of the concept in a case study of the 1987 coup in Fiji, is an excellent two page synopsis of what people can do to move this concept forward **now**, entitled *Social Offense: taking the struggle to the aggressor.*

Without providing prescription answers, the following chapters point the reader in the direction of considering how this model can address deeper manifestations of violence in our cultures. There is a chapter each devoted to how social defense can address violence against women; replacement of police and jails; deal with environmental insensitivity; unrestrained science and technology, political corruption and exploitative economic systems.

One of the last chapters may incite you to organize your friends to begin a project of your own. In it the author describes his participation in a people's research group which set out to study and document how they could prepare to use the system of mass communication to mobilize and inform the populace in case of a political crisis while protecting the system, or making it inoperable by, an aggressor.

Undeterred by controversial topics, the author finishes with a postscript entitled *"Power tends to corrupt, even social defense"*. Be forewarned, you'll be challenged by this book, especially in your complacency.

Yeshua Moser,
Nonviolence International SE Asia,
Bangkok Thailand
NvT

Housmans Peace Diary and World Peace Directory

Housmans announces the publication of the 41st edition of the Housmans Peace Diary and World Peace Directory, printed- naturally - on recycled paper.

This 41st edition of the Diary features, as usual, the unique World Peace Directory listing 2000 national and international peace, human rights and environmental organisations in more than 130 countries. It remains the most comprehensive and authoritative listing of national and international peace organisations available anywhere in the world.

The Diary is in pocket format, with a week to an opening. It notes significant peace dates and anniversaries, and gives weekly quotations. It includes a feature on the International Fellowship of Reconciliation (IFOR), which celebrates its 75th anniversary in 1994.

The Directory, re-compiled every year with the help of contributors around the world, is rightly described as "indispensable" and "a masterpiece".

Over half of the entries are different from last year's edition - for reasons ranging from the breaking apart of countries, via this year's complete re-structuring of Germany's post district numbering system, to the routine births, deaths and movements of organisations.

The Diary is now on sale world-wide, priced at Aus$12.95 in Australia, US$9.95 in North America, and £5.50 or equivalent in the UK and elsewhere. ISSN: 0957-0136, ISBN: 0 85283 226 5.

"The World Peace Directory assures me instant access to important progressive organisations across the globe." Anh Phan, youth peace activist, USA.

"The Housmans Peace Diary is an inspiration, and an invaluable tool for all who work for peace." Kenneth Lee, former Secretary, Quaker Peace & International Relations Committee, Britain.

Peter Jones, PO Box 451, North Hobart, TAS 7002, Ph (002) 78 2380, has copies for sale. NvT

Social Defence, Social Change
by Brian Martin
Freedom Press, 157 pages, £4.95

Social Defence, Social Change

My criteria for any book whether fiction or non-fiction is that it has to be readable and comes quickly to the point with no obscure or lengthy repetitive statement and waffle. Brian's book certainly meets my criteria.

Brian has written a well-researched and interesting book on the subject of social defence, or non-violent struggle to achieve social change. He takes you through the whole subject in a logical step-by-step process that flows easily from a definition of social defence through to its practical application and the problems that are likely to occur. I assume he has used this approach as a result of his training as mathematician.

Brian defines social defence as being a pro-active resistance to repressive governments and military control. He feels that social defence should be about community resistance and not national resistance, which he quite rightly assumes to be of a militaristic nature, however he does acknowledge that some resistance can involved a whole nation. He suggests an advantage of local community resistance can be to produce a more participatory and egalitarian society.

In chapter two he lists a number of methods that can be employed in social defence. For this he refers to Gene Sharp's extensive list of 198 different types of action – fortunately Brian only highlights some of them, those range from symbolic actions, like formal statements to establishing parallel institutions to those run by governments, and sabotage of documents. Whether any of these would actually achieve change is difficult to say, but I'm sure a combination of different methods would achieve some change.

Brian then goes on to discuss the origins of social defence, which he sees flowing from the work of such notables as Henry Thoreau, Leo Tolstoy and Bertrand Russell to name a few. He specifically mentions the activities of Gandhi in the 1950s, and a British writer and former Naval Officer called Stephen King Hall in 1958, but says that social defence remained a theory for several decades until the '80s when the theories became practise as a result of the resurgence of the peace movement.

Brian illustrates this part with historical examples where social defence was employed to undermine repressive governments. Brian rightly says that historical examples have limited use. He describes them as being like tools in a box – they can be useful for hammering points, but can also be used to knock down any edifice built with them. I don't intend to cover these in detail, but one example, that of Iran, perhaps illustrates Brian's awareness of their limited use. Iran still has a repressive regime despite overthrowing the Shah. However, any new regime is likely to prevent any further chances of a revolution or similar occurring again, they are going to be more aware of people's power to undermine their position and I would agree with Brian that any regime or organisation works with the consent of those within it and if that consent is not there the organisation will topple and those in control would be unable to do anything about it.

Brian suggests that social defence should be a grassroots initiative rather than an elite reform. Grassroots activity, he feels, broadens the sphere of change and can involve a wide range of people who do not have vested interests to promote their own ideologies. However, grassroots initiatives will take a long time to evolve and as such are not fully developed. At present, however, Brian sees social defence as being a tool for organising and promoting local change. He recognises that there will be opposition, but he suggests that we should use decentralised and non-hierarchical forms of organisation. He goes on to discuss this in detail and demonstrates some of the tools people can use. He also highlights a form of organisation called 'demarchy', an idea devised by Burhiem. What this boils down to is a form of organisation based in local communities using functional groups to co-ordinate and run services such as education, transport and health. These groups use random selection on a voluntary basis, for a limited term. The advantages of this mean that there would be no specific favours or vested interests in getting people into the groups, as compared to the current centrally controlled system. Those involved in the groups are not remote individuals but have strong connections with their community, they would be free to voice their opinions on other issues. Brian goes on to suggest that selection can be based on statistically representative groups from the area, i.e. half from men in the area and half from women. This would eliminate the need for elections, and therefore competition, using an unrepresentative quota system.

Brian's final chapter considers the old adage that power tends to corrupt. He recognises that social defence would not be immune from influences of those in power. This is the one question he does not answer, but leaves us the readers to find the answers.

All I have done is provide a brief summary of the book to give a general flavour of its tenor and content. As I said at the beginning, I found the book well written and interesting. Social defence as a concept is entirely worthy of adoption and Brian is sensitive enough to recognise that there are faults with it, but like Brian I feel it's the way forward to achieve change and the opportunity to develop a more egalitarian and participatory society. I am left with one question: would the Irish conflict be around now if the IRA has adopted such an approach to overthrow the English occupation of Northern Ireland? I would like to think they would.

Military action achieved nothing but destruction and hate. This is linked with an increasingly centralised system whereby people have less control over their own lives. Social defence is a means to achieve this, but like other concepts is subject to flaws – but then we are only human.

Chris Platts

Bill Fishman at 70

Outsiders and Outcasts: essays in honour of William J. Fishman
edited by Geoffrey Alderman and Colin Holmes
Duckworth, 224 pages, £35 (hardback only)

Bill Fishman, Visiting Professor and Honorary Fellow at Queen Mary's College, London University, author of *East End Jewish Radicals* and *East End 1888*, and a good friend of all at Freedom Press, celebrated his 70th birthday this year and has been presented with this beautifully produced *festschrift*, of which signed copies are available on request.

After the customary biographical tribute, the essays include 'Power, Authority and Status in British Jewry', 'Jew and Non-Jew in the East End of London', 'The German Poor and Working Classes in Victorian and Edwardian London', 'The Chinese Connection', 'Henry Mayhew and Charles Booth – Men of their Times?', 'Penniless and Without Food: unemployment in London between the wars', 'The British Union of Fascists in Hackney and Stoke Newington 1922-1940', 'Another East End – a Remembrance' and 'The City and Industry: the nature of British capitalism 1750-1914'.

Not only is Bill Fishman an historian, and a very fine one, he is also a *socialist*. The authors of these essays have paid him a worthy tribute in the depth of their research and their evident commitment to human equality.

CC

I Swear by Almighty God

Tired and Emotional
by Peter Paterson
Chatto, £20

Fighting All the Way
by Barbara Castle
Macmillan, £20

The Supernatural Murders
edited by Jonathan Goodman
Piatkus, £13.99

One of life's small pleasures is to see, read or hear that someone one actively dislikes or hates, or a friend, has, like the poor man's slice of buttered bread, fallen face down in a puddle of shit. Of a friend there is the additional pleasure of hastening to help even though one knows that for that kindly action they will be forever in your debt and because of that their friendship towards you will always be that little bit less. No one claiming any understanding of politics or the human comedy wishes to see our beloved Prime Minister John Major thrown out of office for to raise a voice or a finger against that poor pathetic creature whose only crime was to be given the Golden Key to the Little Boy's Room in Number Ten is to stand accused of being a cad before the overcrowded Bar of History. When Heath, Lawson, Howe, Thatcher and Lamont were grabbed by the short and curlies and given the bum's rush out and through the iron gates of Downing Street, good men and women gripped each other's hands crying in sincere third act Wednesday matinée style that the worst is past for before us now shines a new dawn.

The offence of the Famous Five was that they were the creatures of a dreary anti-social ideology with the authority to order it to be put into operation, which they did and millions knew fear and millions believed, wrongly, that with the passing of each one of these sad sacks the grass would grow greener in our green and pleasant land.

My Lord George Brown, piss artist extraordinaire, was one of those unpleasant creatures who pass through life without one single redeeming feature, detested by everyone and feared for the power they accumulate and the use and abuse of it. A creature of right-wing politics, he was eased into the higher ranks of the Labour Party by the union barons to protect the right-wing union interest and act as their mouthpiece when the occasion did or did not demand it. One fearful step from becoming Prime Minister, this drunken slob staggered through Britain's foreign policies to the amusement and disgust of those who worked for him. But, as Peter Paterson's biography spells out, he was the creature of the right-wing and press private sources and political cigars and claret cliques protected and covered for him.

When Maxwell of *The Mirror* slipped on the deck and went to an end of sale date, dunking everybody, but everybody my dear, who knew what a criminal rat the old man was pissed into print to expose poor ol' Marxie, but only after

"I've dedicated the whole of my life to the effing working class and the bastards sold me down the river."

he was being marinated on the sea-bed. So too with George Brown. It is a good book, easy on the eye with every page a fresh revelation of a worthless creature who waxed fat on the idealism or the sufferings of his fellow men, women and children. But as one who has ridden every horse in the press and political circus, we are surely justified in asking Michael Foot, who had a foot in every swing-door from right-wing Fleet Street to the left and liberal Aldermaston, why it is that he and others like him have waited until Brown has joined the Great Brewery on high before telling us what a shit the man was. I can do no more than quote what Foot has written of George Brown "that he betrayed every cause he served and everyone who trusted him – his trade union, his party, his church and, most pitifully of all ... his family and the longest sufferer, Sophie [Brown]". Libel? With so much that was true and unprinted public knowledge? Let us have no illusions about drear people like Brown for they exist in any association that feels they have to place their trust in others. Too many stay silent, but when they believe it is safe to speak then they should at least have the courage to remain silent for it then becomes no more than good old shit-house gossip. My last memory of good ol' George was of a huge Hyde Park May Day demonstration when ol' George staggered into the park party pissed and attempted to clamber onto the platform to give out the golden phrases and of that pathetic drunk surrounded by a guard of police dragging him to safety as the party of love and good fellowship tried to, physically, tear him to bits. There are those of an academic turn of phrase and the cynical turn of the side of the lip who will reject Paterson's book as no more than tabloid reading, and the loss is theirs, and let them turn to Barbara Castle's autobiography *Fighting All the Way*. It is a good title for anyone who has fought their way through the 626 pages, and it is a worthy book and, dare I say it, worthy of a pleasant party hack for Barbara has struggled all the way for feet under the Captain's table.

It is a book that has to be written for the academic historians need it, if only to steady the copying machine. But nay, I jest, for she is a good and worthy woman who will be remembered for the breathalyser, ferment in peace George, and the failed attempt to get the rank and file workers to accept legal chains should they decide to stop towing the barge or lifting the bale. So many organisers of our lives clamber onto the platform declaiming their radical demands on our behalf before becoming the sensible slightly to the right of

(continued on page 6)