

NONVIOLENCE

Today

This magazine
is printed on
recycled paper

- **Action**
- **Secrecy Debate**

- **Theory**
- **Review**

No. 61

January/February 1999 (Vita/Domus)

Print Post PP408233/00020. ISSN 1031-6434.

About the Cover

The cover artwork and other original drawings are by Zdzislaw Genek.



Printing by UniPrint, Griffith University.

Contents

Action

- 3 Taking Bail, Remaining Vigilant *Ciaran O'Reilly*
 5 International Group Arrested Attempting Inspection of Israel's Dimona Nuclear Weapons Plant *Felice Cohen-Joppa*



Secrecy Debate

- 7 Covert or Open?
 7 A Snowball's Chance...
 9 A Critique of genetiX snowball
 11 Accountable to Whom? *Rowan Tilly*
anonymous Bob



Theory

- 12 Surviving in the Organisation *Brian Martin*



Review

- 14 Resistance of the Heart: Intermarriage and the Rosenstrasse Protest in Nazi Germany *Elin Ross*

Letter

- 15 Letter from Japan *Philip White*

Thanks to our Supporting Subscribers

Brian Martin	Wollongong, NSW
Jan De Voogd	Sydney, NSW
Janet Mayer	Foxground, NSW
Greg Heys	Shortland, NSW
Louise Finegan	Laurieton, NSW
Shorona de Mbessakwini	Byron Bay, NSW
Kevin Thomasson	Herberton, QLD
Terry Pinnell	Brisbane, QLD
Michael Oldmeadow	Rosanna, VIC
Daniel Boase-Jelinek	Perth, WA
Howard Wheatley	Perth, WA

Maniacal Subscribers

Greg Bird	Sydney, NSW.
Francoise Matter & Hugh Paterson	Sydney, NSW
Denis Klein	Sydney, NSW
David Keenan	Brisbane, QLD.
Jo Vallentine	Perth, WA.
Neville Watson	Perth, WA.
Yumiko Kanebako	Yokohama, Japan.
Gynevra Cerridwin	???
Pat Finegan	???

If you know Gynevra or Pat, please tell them we don't have their current address.

Supported...

<i>India</i>	
Vigil	Devi Prasad
Sarvodaya Friendship Centre	
Babu Mathew	Gandhi Marg
Narayan Desai	
<i>USA</i>	<i>Thailand</i>
Mubarak Awad	Nv International
<i>Sri Lanka</i>	
Nonviolent Direct Action Group	

Adopted...

Uni of Papua New Guinea, PNG
The Commonweal Collection, England
Geoff Harris
IFOR, Netherlands
Louise Finnegan
Alba Kor, Hungary
Thomas Weber
Izmir War Resisters' Association, Turkey
Alexandra Perry
Coalition for Peace & Reconciliation, Cambodia
Society for Peace & Development, Bangladesh
Pan-African Reconciliation Council, Nigeria
Sulak Sivaraksa, Thailand
ECT Resource Centre, South Africa
Swati & Michael, India
K Arunachalam, India
V Ramachandran, India
The Dalai Lama, India
Anyone can write to NvT requesting adoption

Editorial Collective

We hope *Nonviolence Today* will promote nonviolence in a broad sense. It is strictly nonprofit and all editors donate their time and use of personal resources. The editors for this issue were Jan, Janelle and David. We hope you will continue to support our efforts to promote the understanding and practice of nonviolence.

Taking Bail, Remaining Vigilant

In the early hours of Sunday morning, August 9, 1998 (the 53rd anniversary of the bombing of Nagasaki), Ciaran O'Reilly and Treena Lenthall carried out the nonviolent disarmament of uranium mining equipment on Energy Resources Australia's Jabiluka lease in the Northern Territory of Australia.

On Monday December 14, the pair were convicted and sentenced. The magistrate sentenced the pair to the two week mandatory sentence for Criminal Damage. The magistrate ruled that they had already served this time and so were not required to return to gaol. They were also ordered to jointly pay court costs of \$1,415 and restitution of \$5,258, and given one month to pay. They stated that they had no intention of paying and face a further sixty-six days imprisonment in default of payment.

After five and seven weeks as remand prisoners, Treena and I took bail. The population of the women's jail had passed maximum capacity and the lists of transfers to Alice Springs (1,200 kms away) were on the wall. Darwin being a small (60,000) isolated (2,000 miles to the nearest city, Brisbane) town with little familiarity with Ploughshares, the movement bureaucrats having denounced us and with our oversight of putting any other support in place to organise jail & court solidarity, coming out pretrial to organise was the only option.

The jail experience is a totalitarian one, when you're in you're very very in and when you're out you're very very out! Sitting here this morning surrounded by tropical gardens with lots of options it feels like I was never in. I know after a few daze of returning to the old cell block it will feel like I was never out. The human psyche has an amazing capacity for denial as a means of coping with trauma. This probably goes a ways to explaining why there isn't a strong vibrant social movement of ex-prisoners

demanding justice in our prison system. It probably goes a long ways to explaining a lot of things! How does one remain vigilant, awake, while there is so much geared to our sedation and distraction?? This is one of the big questions for radical discipleship in the First World context.

I was released on the eve of the national elections in which the conservative government was returned and the Labor leader Beazley seemed pretty happy about not winning. I assumed the ALP would have sold out the anti-nuke movement as they did in '83 - but we didn't get to find out this time. Since the election the single issue, anti-Jabiluka campaign has been downsized by its leadership which has requested that Jabiluka Action Groups (JAG) no longer identify themselves as "anti-uranium" but as solely support groups for the "human rights of the traditional owners (Mirrar)." Taking the anti-nuclear dimension out of the campaign sounds like setting the scene for a sell-out or committing political suicide. Why would sympathetic people in the cities prioritise the human rights of the Mirrar (twenty-seven people) when they have indigenous human rights struggles a lot closer to their homes or more serious violations (detentions, torture, killings by Indonesian troops) just a little north of here in East Timor and West Papua. All

this remains a mystery to me; as I'm sure we remain a mystery to them!

We moved into a Darwin house of East Timor solidarity activists. I've been sleeping on a verandah under a mosquito net with a fan going, surrounded by palm, bamboo and tropical vegetation. The place crawls with life - geckos on the ceiling, frog in the toilet bowl, snake in the laundry, frilly lizards in the backyard. The house shares a fence with 140-strong Aboriginal housing estate containing many and varied language and clan groups.

The vibe of Darwin is very indigenous, very Asian with a chunk of hardcore white siege mentality reaction to these realities. Growing up on the east coast I was under the geo-delusion we were located somewhere mid-Atlantic with the U.S. & U.K. as our terms of reference. In Darwin, one definitely has the feeling that Australia is a lot older than 200 years and is located in an Asian neighbourhood.

In some ways the indigenous community is the most integrated in Australia. In other ways the indigenous poverty is more extreme than any state capital, folks suffering from a fast forward cultural displacement compacted by predictable alcoholism and homelessness. The long

grass folks live and die in Third World conditions in the precincts of suburban Darwin. The Fish Camp mob squat on some land in the landing flight path of the local airport, the visual contrast as one of these international flights comes in is striking. We were privileged to attend their flag-raising ceremony as they replaced an old land rights flag with a new one. The ceremony, the dance, the singing, the weeping were so intense complemented by a thunderstorm. It was a scene full of pathos, spirituality, dignity, struggle and from which I am still reeling.

The scale of Darwin lends itself to familiarity - you become quite familiar to people in the streets and they to you. It is truly amazing how many former fellow prisoners and prison officers we run into downtown. Yesterday, we ran into a senior officer who told us that due to our activism while on remand that fans and televisions have been installed in all the men's remand cells and the transfers of Top End women prisoners to Alice Springs has been halted. So a couple of small victories!!

Three times a week we have been maintaining a vigil outside the Department of Mines & Energy in downtown Darwin with a litany of observations and demands... "Nuclear Weapons Kill," "Nuclear Waste Kills," "Depleted Uranium Kills," "Close Ranger," "Stop Jabiluka" and "Stop Uranium Shipments." To vigil is to remain awake while society slumbers to surrounding peril. We are joined by Vaughn (who has worked at uranium mines), and Stuart Highway (a local anarchist whose pseudonym leads straight out of town!). Our interactions with passers-by are many and varied. Former fellow prisoners, blockaders wanting to know more about our action, a former "Mother Teresa brother" who used to volunteer at the Catholic Worker Kitchen in LA, a guy who went to school with my brother, supportive church folks, our arresting officer from mid-July trespass at Jabiluka, an old man with throat cancer who cannot speak takes time to give us the finger!

We host a "Film Festival Celebrating Nonviolent Resistance" in downtown Darwin one evening. Over 200 folks at-

tend to see Robin Taubenfield's fine one hour video on the Jabiluka Blockade "Minds & Energy" the latest "Undercurrents" from the U.K.; Neil Goodwin's documentary video on the "Seeds of Hope Ploughshares" Trial in Liverpool (Eng.) following the \$3m disarmament of a British Aerospace Hawk Fighter being sold to Indonesia; and Zippy's recent fifteen minute video explaining our Jabiluka Ploughshares action. It was a great night.

Last year on the anniversary of the Dill Massacre I was with a group of East Timorese and English folks vigilling through a freezing night outside British Aerospace military aircraft factory in northern England. This year I was at the closest point to East Timor in the humidity of Darwin outside the huge Indonesian consulate. The genocide in East Timor is so close. It is the same distance to this point of the Australian mainland as the Martin Bryant's rampage at Port Arthur, Tasmania was to Melbourne. Statistically the genocide in East Timor is equal to those thirty-five killings on a daily basis over the twenty-year period of Indonesian occupation. The Australian government's response to the Bryant atrocity was to outlaw semi-automatics and buy back a huge amount of privately held weapons at great political cost to itself (eg. the growth of "One Nation"). The government's response to the same atrocity on a daily basis for twenty years at a similar distance to the mainland was to train to the Indonesian military perpetrators in killing efficiency. That is the difference between high crime and low crime, state sanctioned murder and those who mimic without a license.

Thirty East Timorese and solidarity activists gathered outside the Indonesian Consulate in Darwin to mark the seventh anniversary of the Dili Massacre. We built a shrine to the dead with candles, a flood of plants and flowers, with the centrepiece of a traditional East Timorese sword resting on a shroud with the names of the dead woven into it. A huge East Timorese flag was carried as well as signs demanding the release of political prisoners.

The liturgy was lead by Darwin-based East Timorese elder Veronica Miam who

grieved, admonished the consulate and prayed in her traditional language. Jose Gusmao (Xanana's cousin), whose two sons, brothers and father had been killed by the Indonesian military led the protest. He spoke passionately about the sufferings of his people. We also reflected on Western complicity in, and nonviolent resistance to, the genocide in East Timor. We remembered the courage of Max Stahl, Russell & Saskia in smuggling out the footage of the massacre and alerting the world. Footage of our demonstration was carried around Australia and South East Asia on "Australian Television International."

In the evening over eighty members of the East Timorese community gathered at a Darwin Catholic church for a mass remembering the dead. Over 10,000 East Timorese crowded into the Santa Cruz cemetery in Dili to remember the massacre with prayer and reenactment. This followed a memorial mass celebrated by Bishop Belo at the Cathedral. Footage of both these events was carried nationally on Australian television. This was the first year since the massacre that the residents of Dill have been able to mourn the massacre victims publicly on the anniversary.

Meanwhile in London my Maubere, Scouse and Anglo brothers & sisters were taking the message to the Indonesian Embassy. This week before court we will head back to Jabiluka, the scene of the crime, check out the beauty of Kakadu and prepare for the next step on this witness. Many thanks for keeping us company.

Ciaron O'Reilly

- Ciaron and Treena would like to thank all who supported them during their time in prison.
- If you would like to receive a booklet about the Jabiluka Ploughshares action and trial, send a request to c/- O'Reilly's, 38 Elbury St, Mitchelton, Brisbane Qld 4053, Phone (07) 3355 0384
- You can order the Jabiluka Ploughshares video be sending a \$10 cheque to Grant Focas, PO Box 693, Lismore NSW 2480.
- Look at the Jabiluka Ploughshares website: <http://www.freespeech.org/ploughshares>

NVT

International Group Arrested Attempting Inspection of Israel's Dimona Nuclear Weapons Plant

More than seventy anti-nuclear activists, ranging in age from children to elders, came together near Israel's Dimona nuclear facility on Tuesday afternoon, September 22, the beginning of the Jewish New Year. The international demonstrators held signs and banners at the remote desert site calling for nuclear disarmament and for the immediate release of imprisoned nuclear whistle blower Mordechai Vanunu.

The demonstration, organised by the Israeli Committee for Mordechai Vanunu and for a Middle-East Free of Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Weapons, brought together Israeli activists and representatives of the international campaign to free Mordechai Vanunu from the U.K., U.S., Norway, and Australia. By the side of the road where they gathered, they could see the large dome of the nuclear reactor.

Demonstrators called for the immediate closure of the reactor; that it be opened to international supervision and inspection; and for an immediate halt to the production of weapons of mass destruction in Israel. Several speakers addressed the gathering, including Nuri al-Ugbi, representing the Bedouin population in the Negev area. Al-Ugbi called the Dimona reactor "a monster threatening all life in the region."

After the demonstration, when other participants had left, a small International Citizen's Weapons Inspection Team began to walk along the road towards the Dimona reactor, where they planned to carry out a citizen's inspection for weapons of mass destruction. They carried two large banners with them which read, "Warning - Nuclear Weapons Made Here" and "U.N. Arms Inspector Butler - Dimona Nuclear Weapons Plant, This Way."

Soon spotted and pursued by police officers, they attempted to continue peacefully on their way while police insisted that they could not demonstrate without a permit. Wearing badges which read in English and Hebrew "International Weapons Inspector," the team explained their mission to the police and read their statement out loud. They asserted that under international law, they had a responsibility and obligation to carry out their inspection, despite not having an Israeli permit to do so.

After awhile, when stopped from proceeding further, most of the citizen weapons inspectors sat down and linked arms. They continued to explain to the police their purpose for being there: Dimona's connection to Israel's nuclear arsenal, revealed to the world twelve years earlier by Dimona technician-turned-whistle blower Mordechai Vanunu. The police tried to convince the inspectors to leave, but they steadfastly refused. Seven men and three women were then taken in

police vans to the station in the nearby town of Dimona. Arrested were Sam Day, Hal Carlstadt, Barry Roth, Eurydice Hirsey, Felice Cohen-Joppa, Art Laffin, Scott Schaeffer-Duffy, John Landgraf (all from the USA), David Folden (UK) and Ruth Haviv (Israel). People supporting the inspection team soon joined them in the police station. During the four hours they were detained, the ten were warned of various consequences: they would be charged with demonstrating without a permit and spend the night in jail until a judge could be found the next day; they would be immediately deported, not necessarily to their country of origin, except for the Israeli, who would go to jail; they would not be allowed back in the country for a time period ranging from one year to forever; they would be sent to court at night without a lawyer. During questioning, the group consistently refused to sign papers, including an agreement to not return to Dimona for fifteen days. Finally, they were told by police that if they

each gave a verbal agreement to not return for fifteen days to the site, they would be free to go. When they refused this also, the group was released anyway. Authorities evidently decided to keep the event as low key as possible.

The Dimona demonstration and citizen's weapons inspection action occurred during a week-long international vigil calling for the release of Mordechai Vanunu and a Middle East free of weapons of mass destruction. Vigilers held signs and banners and handed out leaflets at Ashkelon Prison, where Vanunu has been held since 1986, at the Ministry of Defence, in front of President Weisman's residence, at Prime Minister Netanyahu's office, where petitions were delivered, and at the embassy of India, calling for India and Pakistan to halt their nuclear arms race. International delegates joined with Israeli activists in several public meetings where nuclear weapons and nonviolent direct action were discussed. A visit was also made to Bedouin villages near Dimona. Bedouin lands were confiscated in the 1950s to build the nuclear reactor.

At the end of the week, the new commander of Ashkelon Prison, Avraham Lazarian, refused to let Vanunu's adoptive parents, Americans Mary and Nick Eoloff, have a second brief visit before they returned to the U.S. Lazarian, when assuming command two months ago, ordered that Vanunu's cell door be closed except for two one-hour periods each day, when he can take walks in the common yard. In early September, Vanunu's mail was withheld for two weeks after a verbal argument.

On October 13 is Mordechai Vanunu's 44th birthday. Please send cards and letters to him at Ashkelon Prison, Ashkelon, Israel.

Felice Cohen-Joppa

For more information, contact the U.S Campaign to Free Mordechai Vanunu, 2206 Fox Ave., Madison, WI 53711, fax/phone (608)257-4764, email: nukeresister@igc.org website: www.nonviolence.org/vanunu

NVT

Statement of International Citizens Weapons Inspection Team, Dimona, Israel. September 22, 1998

We have come to Dimona today as a citizen's inspection team in response to the dictates of conscience and international law.

We have come to verify the presence of nuclear weapons and their components, first reported twelve years ago by the nuclear technician Mordechai Vanunu and confirmed by scientists, journalists and others familiar with Israel's unacknowledged nuclear weapons programme.

If the production of the materials for such weapons at Dimona can be verified, this would clearly fall within the purview of the United Nations Security Council Resolution which calls for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction not only in Iraq but throughout the Middle East.

In assisting in the upholding of international law we are also heeding our obligations under the Nuremberg Principles which place on every citizen the duty to prevent crimes against humanity.

Here, as in similar factories elsewhere in the world, the making of a nuclear weapon is a crime against humanity. It is the building of a global gas oven. Auschwitz showed what humans are capable of. Hiroshima showed how that capability threatened the survival of humanity. Nuclear weapons join Auschwitz with Hiroshima.

Today, we heed the prophet Isaiah, who called on us to beat swords into ploughshares. We honour the wisdom of Albert Einstein and Bertrand Russell, who warned us of the suicidal consequences of a nuclear-armed world. We follow the example of the women of Greenham Common, who took nonviolent collective action in the cause of peace.

We are Jews, Christians and people of no religion. We are citizens of Israel, the United States and Britain acting together as citizens of the world. All of us have acted against nuclear weapons or for peace in our own countries and elsewhere.

We have chosen Dimona because we are in Israel to honour the sacrifice of Mordechai Vanunu and to continue his work of nuclear disarmament.

We are acting now because this is the time chosen by citizens in many countries to conduct inspections of nuclear weapons facilities.

We act in a spirit of mutual respect for all the people of this region, knowing that they would be the first to suffer the disastrous consequences of an explosion or other accident at this aging, uninspected reactor, as occurred at Chernobyl.

And so, at the beginning of a new year, wishing peace, justice and security to all people, we call upon you, our brothers and sisters guarding the Dimona reactor, to assist us in this inspection. And in doing so, we ask you to set an example to Israel and all other countries to help to create a nuclear-free world.

Thank you,
Sam Day, Hal Carlstad, Art Laffin, Ruth Haviv, Scott Schaeffer-Duffy, Eurydice Hirsey, Felice Cohen-Joppa, John Landgraf, Barry Roth, David Folden.

NVT

Covert or Open?

The radical peace/anti-nuclear movement and the radical environmental movement have both adopted nonviolent direct action as a central part of their strategy. But the two movements have very different understandings of the nature of NvDA.

Many in the peace movement, influenced by Gandhi (and more recently the Plowshares movement), have seen openness and accountability as an essential part of nonviolence. Some have felt that the symbolism of individuals taking responsibility for (and suffering for) their actions, is a powerful part of the dynamic of nonviolent action. Others - particularly feminists - have been less convinced of the revolutionary nature of voluntary suffering.

Environmental activists from Earth First! and related groups tend to see nonviolence as more of a tactic than an ideological principle, and have favoured covert actions, arguing that these are more likely to avoid the damaging effects of individual activists becoming martyrs. Instead of symbolic actions, they have often aimed to cause the maximum amount of economic damage, seeing this as the most effective form of protest. A culture of anonymity has traditionally extended to writing as well. Last year, Peace News printed a series of articles contributing to the debate (July and October 1997).

A group of British environmental protesters recently announced the genetiX snowball campaign, inspired by a 1980s

campaign of symbolic direct action against nuclear weapons, explicitly calling for open and accountable actions.

At the recent British Earth First! summer gathering; two anonymous leaflets - *Accountable to whom?* and *Fuck the disobedient, let's get civil* - were circulated. Both were heavily critical of gXs, as well as of tendencies within the movement towards more open forms of action. Here we reprint edited versions of both leaflets, along with a reply by a member of gXs. As always, we encourage readers to contribute further to the debate.

From *Peace News* November 1998

NVT

A Snowball's Chance...

genetiX snowball (gXs) is experimenting with methods which are relatively new to the ecological movement. We are being very cautious and reflective since we do not know whether they are really appropriate; but given the track record of these methods in the peace movement, we thought it is well worth a try.

If we are to progress our ecological movement with a keen radical edge we will need to be adventurous and creative in trying out different methods, strategies and tactics - and we will need to foster a culture in which we encourage and support each other in our efforts. Our critics say that gXs is detrimental to the radical ecological movement - a gXs is condemned before it has even had the chance to try out its newly fledged wings, who will dare to try out new ways to fly in the future?

Civil responsibility

We are not playing with words by calling our campaign "civil responsibility" - we really mean it. When we take direct action, we take a big slice of power - which should be balanced with an equal weight of responsibility. We do not accept that we are being "disobedient", although we pay tribute to some successful historic civil disobedience campaigns. Our cam-

aign is an attempt to move on from civil disobedience and claim our actions as responsible whilst challenging mindless obedience - which is subtly different to being disobedient.

Our demands

Our demands are "reasonable" because we are trying to be responsible with our slice of power. Who are we to demand a total ban on all genetic engineering forever? A small group of people with opinions. For one thing, we cannot be sure that all genetic engineering is bad. If a ban is to win acceptance and support people will need information, debate, time for thought, etc. Yet time is what we cannot afford when we see the ecosystem and our food increasingly contaminated by genetic pollution. Since most people

would recognise the need for further debate and new data to be considered, they would also recognize the need for a five year moratorium. If we win this, we will have won the time to refer to a truly independent assessment and public opinion. During this time, we will be in a good position to call for a ban against GM foods and other misuses of genetic engineering.

genetiX snowball's tactics

Our methods include nonviolence, openness, accountability and accepting the consequences of actions in the belief that this will achieve long-term radical change. These methods are consistent with our vision of a society which is founded on democracy, social justice and peace.

We acknowledge that we tread a very fine line in terms of getting the crops out of the ground in the best possible way and we are treading carefully. Radical change, unfortunately, lies exactly on that very fine line. There is a tension between pushing the boundaries of openness as far as we can and still managing to pull up the GM crops. We encourage people to be flexible and adaptable, to stay in touch with what has been possible so far, but to make their own decision (within the criteria of our ground-rules) about how open to be in advance of the action.

When we explain our removal of GM crops to the company, we also confront them with the consequences of their actions. We also explain our actions to anyone else who wants to know about it since they could be affected by the GM crops and we want them to understand our campaign; this includes the police if they are present. We explain the danger that the police may pass on addresses to the company, who may serve an injunction; it is up to each snowballer to decide what to do about this.

One difference in views between gXs and our critics seems to centre around what constitutes "effective". We can probably agree that getting GM crops literally out of the ground is a good degree of effectiveness; but the constancy of that effectiveness surely depends on keeping the crops out of the ground; and that depends on how much the issue is raised in the public eye and generates some good public debate. If we manage to involve many people in literally getting the crops out of the ground then we will have achieved both kinds of effectiveness in a participatory and democratic way. "A very high turnover" of people taking action is essential since we cannot achieve our aims alone. We need people to help us and we want to create a culture of mutual aid. We will all need to participate if change is to be either radical or long lasting.

We ask people to accept the consequences of their actions because, paradoxically, our power lies in our preparedness to be vulnerable in the face of danger. It is true that people may be put off because of the risks; but still we I maintain that there can be no revolution without people taking risks. "Where there's fear, there's

power" - we become immensely powerful when we are prepared to move through our fears in reaching for our visions.

Big v Cool

We intend to warmly invite people who have not taken direct action before, and hope that our attention to careful preparation and the support of working in an affinity group will give them a positive first experience of direct action, encouraging them to continue. Being prepared for arrest is very different to passively submitting to arrest. Choosing to walk together into a risky situation prepared, grounded, ready for the consequences, can be a rich and uplifting experience, which is very different to being caught and "minced in the judicial grinder".

But again, we tread a fine line. If the state comes down too heavily, stopping us from taking action or mashing us, then we have good reason to adapt our methods accordingly. They will have forced us to be less open through their own repressive measures and have only themselves to blame for it. Until then - and let's hope that day doesn't come - we can continue to pressure them to be more open and accountable by our own example.

Legitimising action

We seek to legitimise ourselves in terms of the views of other people and their active involvement; we want people to support us by doing what we are doing. If we are wrong (and it is always possible for a small group of people to be wrong) then at least we are willing to own up to our mistakes. We invite their support rather than lobby for it; if our actions are good then people I will join in without any pressure from us.

I agree with Anonymous Bob (see page 11) that arguing a case in court legitimises the legal system and certainly some successful civil disobedience campaigns (eg. The Welsh Language Society) have chosen not to participate. However, there are some advantages to participating in the legal arena: it is arguably an easier route to take if you are new to nonviolent action since it may keep you out of prison; it is also an effective way of letting the public know about our actions. Although we provide information for navigating the legal system, going to court is not in our ground-rules.

Whilst we do not agree with legitimising the state, neither do we want to demonise the companies involved with GE, Seeing the companies as The Enemy only underlines their power and feeds the myth that the enemy is something entirely external and separate from ourselves. It also suggests that companies such as Monsanto, Novartis, Zeneca - all transnational giants - can be easily identified and pinned down. Corporate networks are extremely complex and opaque so that tracking their accountability is extremely difficult. We aim to expose and challenge the bad practices of the companies but we will also need to reach the real people with beating hearts, as opposed to faceless corporations, who are implicated either actively or passively by allowing it to happen.

Dead-end single-issue reformism?

Although gXs is very focussed, it is not a single issue campaign; we outline the links with issues that are integral, such as corporate power, food security, patents and biopiracy, ethics - difficult not to really since GE itself is not single issue. Neither is gXs moderate or reformist - on the contrary we aim to be radical and revolutionary. It is radical in the sense that it gets to the roots, literally and metaphorically, both to the immediate problem at hand - of GM crops - and to the wider issue of challenging corporate control and mindless obedience. It is revolutionary in the sense that if we are to achieve our vision of society (social justice, peace and democracy), then everything will have to change (such as farming, science, economics, etc.), and everyone will need to be involved (we are serious when we invite farmers and companies to dig up the crops themselves). We will all need to take the necessary risks (being prepared to risk consequences of prison, humiliation of failure, etc.). We are trying to live out the totality of our vision literally as we act, which means having the courage to be open, accountable and to take risks. Our revolution will need to be within us as individuals whilst we are challenging outside structures. We want our revolutionary ends and means to unfold together here and now, rather than in some dim and distant future happening.

The argument that involvement of new people will not go any wider into the ecological direct action movement or

that gXs is appealing only to the liberal middle classes does not carry much weight in the light of the condition of the ecological movement. The fact is that our movement is small and young; it lacks diversity and although women are present so are patriarchal values; we have much to learn from other radical movements both historically and geographically. On the other hand, it is true that the Ploughshares tradition (which has inspired gXs) has largely failed to counter "the spectacle of the few committed activists being cheered on by their totally passive supporters". gXs attempts to counter this tendency, attempting (somewhat unsuccessfully) to lower the risk in the interests of encouraging greater involvement and support from a diversity of people.

The dangers of gXs

Our critics suggest that gXs is separate from the ecological movement. gXs's organisers have variously been involved with the grassroots ecological movement going back to the '80s, Twyford Down and rainforest actions in the early 90s, up to recent actions at Manchester Airport.

There is a very clear distinction between taking power (direct action) and giving power away (lobbying). We do fly a little close to the wind when we suggest that people write letters, but only alongside - not instead of - nonviolent direct action. Also, our aims in this respect are to open up dialogue, which isn't exactly giving power away, more like sharing it out by opening up the debate. Co-option of our campaign by the state is a possible hazard to be wary of but certainly so far the indications show that it is highly unlikely. Monsanto's injunctions after the first action are hardly a strategy for co-option!

One of our concerns before launching gXs was that we would get the same kind of "eco-terrorist" publicity as covert actions. Surprisingly this has not been the case: the press has mistakenly described most actions as open and reports have otherwise improved, becoming more accurate and representative. Far from dividing us, thankfully this seems quite helpful in creating a united movement. Possibly we have created excessively tight boundaries around our campaign, this being a reflection of our caution in

taking our first tentative steps along that fine line of radical change. Paradoxically, it seems that our tight boundaries have made our methods more accessible to other activists who, disagreeing with certain aspects of our campaign, are now experimenting with various degrees of openness and different shades of accountability in other actions. If this is the case, it is a very good spin-off which hopefully will contribute richly to the debate about methods and where we should draw our boundaries. gXs is one possible way forward for the ecological movement; hopefully others will build on any progress we make.

Rowan Tilly

genetiX snowball
c/o One World Centre, 6 Mount Street,
Manchester M2 5NS, Britain
Ph: +44 161 834 0295; fax 834 8187
email:genetixsnowball@orangenet.co.uk

The genetiX snowball *Handbook for Action* is available from the above address, price £3.50.

From *Peace News* November 1998

NVT

A Critique of genetiX snowball

We hope to show how genetiX snowball (gXs) is not only flawed both philosophically and tactically in itself, but is actually detrimental to the radical ecological movement as a whole. We argue that gXs should not get the support of activists and we will propose a way in which a truly radical and effective campaign should proceed.

genetiX snowball's tactics

gXs hopes to achieve its aims by "nonviolently, accountably and safely pull[ing] up a small number of genetically modified crops and convinc[ing] others to do the same". We have problems with this:

- By letting the police and land-owners know in advance where and when it will strike, gXs enables them to prevent that strike from actually having a direct effect in destroying a field. Hence the fact that on one action eleven activists only managed to remove ten plants.
- By insisting on participants disclosing their identities gXs makes it easier for the authorities to arrest/injunct/sue/impris-

on those involved. (Not to mention the issue of future state surveillance and repression of individuals.) This means that there must be a very high turnover of activists in order for gXs to continue. This is highly unlikely in the event of newcomers soon getting nicked, since most people do not wish to become "pig fodder" or incur large debts.

- By insisting that those involved remove no more than "a small number of plants" each, gXs makes it less likely that any one action will succeed in destroying a test site. genetiX snowball's tactics ap-

pear to be highly limiting, self-defeating even. Why does it insist on criteria which prevent it becoming effective? We believe it has to do with the problem of legitimising action.

Legitimising action

This problem is a very real and relevant one. It is our view that resistance does not need to legitimise itself according to the terms of the system and its ideology. It is legitimate precisely because it resists these things. gXs, in contrast to this, does not contextualise itself within capitalism

or the resistance to it. It is therefore forced to justify itself by emphasising its ultra nonviolence and accountability and the moderation and reasonableness of its demands. A case of "fuck the disobedient let's get civil". gXs is not resistance but souped-up civil disobedience, spectacular lobbying and therefore shoots itself in the foot.

Single-issue reformism

This lack of radical analysis leads to further problems with gXs. Insistence on ultra-"reasonable[ness]" prevents it from wanting anything more than to effect change within the system. Emphasising the single-issue nature of a campaign in this way is to imply support for, or at least tolerance of, all the other attendant social and ecological abuses of the system. This is the essential problem with aiming for any single-issue reform, especially one so hideously moderate: if you achieve it you have nowhere to go. You cannot jump from issue to issue without losing your legitimacy. Reforms should be welcomed as small-scale improvements achieved as a by-product of radical agitation, not as end goals in themselves. To aim for single issue reform is to walk into a dead-end.

Big v Cool (and the possibility of being both)

One issue which is often raised in defence of gXs is that of its potential to appeal to sections of society to which wider ecological resistance does not generally appeal, and therefore to introduce them to it. Again we will state the reasons why this is not the case, and why, even if it were, it would not justify gXs's extreme moderation.

- As already mentioned, the insistence on accountability is likely to prevent people getting involved since most people do not want to risk retribution, let alone to court it.

- Even if gXs does attract a lot of people, it will not attract them to the wider direct action resistance because it is not a part of that resistance. It has been argued that gXs acts as a stepping stone into Earth First!-style direct action. On the contrary, it may well prevent people from becoming further radicalised.

- The British public is firmly opposed to genetic engineering (77 percent against, according to recent polls). There is therefore no need to be very moderate in order

to court public opinion. On the contrary, there is great opportunity to push the radical agenda and to be at the cutting edge of struggle for real change without alienating public opinion.

- Even if it is currently impossible to be radical without alienating public opinion, then we should prioritise radicalism over mass appeal. After all, what do we want that mass appeal for? If you value size over content then join the Labour Party.

The dangers of gXs

It is our view that gXs is not simply a flawed campaign in itself, it is actively damaging to the wider ecological resistance movement. It is not actually a part of that resistance and yet it takes on the appearance of being so, both in terms of its close association with groups like Earth First! (EF) and by using direct action imagery such as the pulling up of plants. In this way it blurs the lines between lobbying and direct action, a blurring which comes dangerously near in its effect to recuperation¹. Far from being a stepping stone which can be used to help people into direct action, it is, to mix our metaphors, and repeat ourselves, a false summit.

By legitimising itself through its "reasonable" tactics and demands, gXs renders illegitimate, by its own criteria, those campaigns which do not reach this level of "reasonable[ness]". In this way, it shows itself to be part of the process of co-option of the radical ecological movement. The term co-option refers to the process by which the bulk of a radical challenge is bought off, with increased support, in return for abandoning its more radical activity. The other side of the process is called marginalisation and applies to those elements which cannot be co-opted. The challenge is thus negated. gXs is part of the co-option of ecological resistance and by accepting this role it reinforces and increases our marginalisation.

A proposal for fighting genetic engineering

When taking on a campaign there are three main issues to be addressed: Firstly, that the campaign has maximum potential for public involvement. Secondly, that those who are involved can have maximum effect. Thirdly, that the campaign can be linked to other issues and

the struggle widened and advanced.

Taking this into account we propose action on three levels:

1. Stepping up the covert site trashings. These are a good way in which a small number of people can achieve maximum effect.
2. Land squats on test sites. These are perhaps the best means of outreach on the issue and can also serve as a base for covert and accountable actions in the surrounding area.
3. Public actions on test sites and at the laboratories and offices where the research for and administration of genetic engineering is done. This has the potential to involve large numbers of people in directly effective action.

Such action could include marches on and rallies at test sites (which might, we feel, result in site trashings), as well as occupations of offices and laboratories. Actions such as these have the potential to involve large number of people and to simultaneously allow those people to have a real effect through their involvement. Action like this would not rely on moderate tactics and demands. It could be backed up with propaganda stressing the need to stop all genetic engineering and tying genetic engineering into the wider issue of corporate control of our lives, which would provide scope for broadening the struggle. It would also be highly inclusive in that all participants would be free to choose whether to actually destroy plants or other property, how many plants to remove and whether or not to be responsible to the state for their action. Action like this is nothing if not reasonable in response to the corporate assault on our lives that is genetic engineering.

This was produced a group of activists in Leeds, England.

For full text: Agit-Wank, c/o Leeds EF!, 16 Sholebroke Ave, Chapeltown. Leeds, LS7 3HB, England.

Note: 1. "Recuperation" used in this context is a Situationist term. It refers to the process by which the imagery of rebellion is taken by the system and sold back to us so that it is no longer a threat and may even be beneficial to them. The appearance of the *Eco Warrior* in soap operas in the wake of the Swampy phenomenon is an example of this.

From *Peace News* November 1998

NVT

Accountable to Whom?

Recently, accountable actions have been suggested by some as the way forward for the radical ecological movement. So, what exactly does this mean? The basic idea is that we should do our illegal actions (criminal damage for example) in a totally open way, providing our names and addresses to the authorities, submitting to arrest and justifying our acts in court. Many people will remember the accountable disarming of a Hawk jet destined for Indonesia and the subsequent acquittal of the women responsible, while the Trident Ploughshares 2000 and genetiX snowball campaigns are probably the best known current examples of this approach.

I remember reading an interview with one of the women involved in the Hawk action where she talked about her time in prison on remand. She said that the other prisoners had a lot of respect for her stand, for risking so much for what she believed in, but what they couldn't understand was why she didn't trash the planes then get away while she had the chance! I'd argue that that is the reaction of most people to accountable actions, especially most working class people. Vast numbers of individuals have experienced the police and the legal system as brutal and corrupt institutions, and many families are devastated by imprisonment. To suggest to them that anyone should voluntarily put themselves into the judicial grinder, especially as a means of changing the system it is there to protect, seems frankly insane - hardly the best way to help our movement grow.

Privileged positions

From a more privileged position, accountably may seem more appealing - after all, if your experience of the police has been mostly as your protector, you might see accountable actions as a way for concerned citizens to force reform in a basically sound system that has gone astray. The idea of giving yourself to the police, of arguing your position in court legitimises their power and the system that power protects. It respects their "right" to judge you and your actions. This is fine if you basically agree with that system, but I think we have learned better from our struggles. We have sure-

ly seen enough loaded public inquiries, enough police and bailiff violence, enough beautiful places trashed and enough of our friends sent to prison to see the state as our enemy. While I appreciate that many of those most committed to accountable actions have questioned deeply the military-industrial state we live under, accountable actions seem to aim for support from the liberal middle class i.e. some of those who benefit from the way things are run at the moment. This obviously leads to the bigger question of what kind of a movement we're trying to build, and whose support we're looking for.

What kind of a movement?

The radical ecological direct action movement is aiming to create deep and long-lasting changes in our society. This change must involve overcoming the forces currently destroying the future and making the present a misery - i.e. industrial capitalism and its protectors. It's pretty obvious that the people running this system aren't going to do away with it just because we ask them to. The task of creating such a change, and challenging those who currently benefit from the way in which society is run, is an enormous project which requires the active involvement of millions of people - people taking back control of their lives and their communities through direct action, and creating an ecologically sane society. Telling people to voluntarily give themselves in to those we fight against will prevent us ever reaching such a point. Equally bad is the way accountable actions help to split our movement, dividing us into "nice" open people, and "nasty" covert people. It is a favourite tactic of the cops to divide and rule like this. We sure as hell shouldn't be helping them to achieve this.

The problem of elitism

Many of our activities demand a level of commitment that excludes a lot of people already (which is a problem we need to sort out), but accountable actions seem to make this worse. Most Ploughshares actions previous to the Hawk action have resulted in very long prison sentences, while the current mass genetiX snowball participants are facing heavy financial

penalties through injunctions. Like the injunctions served on various anti-roads activists previously, the only people prepared to break them will be the young unemployed with less to lose - it's crazy to expect that people with jobs, houses or a family to support: will risk so much on an action which openly invites punishment. (A large group of Devon people from diverse backgrounds intended to do an accountable genetics action but decided against it for exactly this reason.) This all seems likely to reproduce the spectacle of the few committed activists being cheered on by their totally passive supporters. Similarly, the assumption that training is needed before such actions and the symbolic nature of many accountable actions (e.g. only pulling up a couple of plants rather than destroying the whole crop) shows a pretty strange idea of direct action.

Odd though it might seem, this approach shares many ideas with terrorism - the ultra-militant/committed elite who do actions that seem far beyond the capabilities of their supporters and the use of acts of destruction, not as an end in themselves, but as a means of influencing the state or public opinion. One person I spoke to, closely involved with the Hawk Ploughshares campaign, said many of the groups and people seemed ultimately to have been disempowered by the women's action, feeling they could only support the heroes who did it. Direct action is making our individual and collective desires into reality, regardless of the laws that try to control us. It's taking, occupying, destroying or building - it can't be asking or demanding.

anonymous Bob

From *Peace News* November 1998

NVT

Surviving in the Organisation

Think of nonviolent action and the usual picture is of something happening in public, whether it leafletting, rallies, sit-ins or perching in trees. Just as "politics" is normally thought of as happening in public rather than private, so is nonviolent action. To counter this perception, feminists and others have argued that "the personal is political," meaning that patterns of personal behaviour need scrutiny and change as well as formal political structures.

One domain often left out the picture is the organisation, especially corporations and government bodies. There is one notable form of nonviolent action involving members of organisations: the strike. However, many of the usual forms of nonviolent action, from speaking out to organising alternative decision-making systems, can also be used in organisations. Yet this arena has been relatively neglected by nonviolent activists, many of whom are more familiar with protesting against organisations, such as governments and corporations, from the outside than operating on the inside.

Schweik Action Wollongong did a study of how to go about transforming bureaucratic organisations from the grassroots. We looked at case studies such as the Movement for the Ordination of Women and the Dutch soldiers' movement. We made an analogy between bureaucracies and authoritarian states, and looked at some examples of nonviolent challenges to states - the toppling of the El Salvador military government in 1944 and the collapse of the East German communist government in 1989 - in order to suggest ideas for challenging bureaucratic systems of power. Our conclusions were as follows.

- It is extremely difficult to change bureaucracies.
- A collective challenge is needed to bring about change.
- Challengers need to have a vision of an alternative, such as a self-managing workplace.
- Struggles to change bureaucracies usually take a long time.
- Bureaucracies are vulnerable to loss of

legitimacy.

(Challenging Bureaucratic Elites, published by Schweik Action Wollongong in 1997, is available free at <http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/dissent/documents/>, from PO Box U129, Wollongong NSW 2500, Australia, or by ringing me at 02-4221 3763.)

Schweik's study focused on major collective challenges to bureaucratic elites. One of our conclusions was that the lone organisational dissident who speaks out has virtually no chance of bringing about change. Whistleblowers typically are attacked in several ways, including ostracism, harassment, punitive transfer, demotion, referral to psychiatrists, dismissal and blacklisting. They have little chance of personal survival, much less changing the organisation.

Yet it is only occasionally that a large-scale challenge can be mounted inside organisations. Usually, those who are willing to act are surrounded by co-workers who are afraid to buck the system. A nonviolent activist in a traditional authoritarian organisation who mounts a campaign at the first instance of injustice is unlikely to last long enough to make a difference.

There is certainly plenty of exploitation and injustice in organisations that is wor-

thy of attention. Activists well know the problems in their own groups, which have their share of poor dynamics such as cliques, snubs and emotional blackmail. Nonviolent activists usually have high expectations of their own groups, and what is found upsetting in them would be the merest blip in a typical authoritarian organisation. A boss who is a bully may subject victims to petty harassment (slighting comments, loss of files, inconvenient postings), undermine their performance, spread rumours about them, make threats and invoke formal procedures such as reprimands and demotions. Individuals may be singled out for whatever reason, such as their sex, ethnicity, personal style or good performance, or just because they are a convenient target. Some workplaces are so toxic that virtually everyone suffers in ongoing battles involving put-downs, tantrums, set-ups and physical assaults. In many such toxic workplaces, one person - the scapegoat - becomes a convenient target for everyone's abuse.

What should you do if you or one of your co-workers comes under attack? Doing nothing is not much help, since the abuse usually continues or worsens. Formal complaints often lead nowhere and trigger further abuse. Traditional techniques used by nonviolent activists, including analysis of power systems, role plays and

gradual building of support, are very helpful. But they may be of limited help to a worker who is highly traumatised and barely able to do a day's work, much less join in a campaign for change.

Books on management and organisations don't give much guidance. There are stacks of books on dynamic leadership, empowering the workplace and creating positive change. Unfortunately, these sorts of optimistic writings give little recognition of the really terrible dynamics of many workplaces. Furthermore, they are invariably oriented to managers, especially top managers. They assume a sincere will to bring about beneficial change. There is virtually nothing directed to middle and lower-level workers who would like to change things but have no support from, or are actively sabotaged by, their superiors and co-workers.

Given this situation, it is exciting to find a new book that provides some real hope for workplace victims: Judith Wyatt and Chauncey Hare, *Work Abuse: How to Recognize and Survive It* (Rochester, Vermont: Schenkman Books, 1997). This is a comprehensive guide to surviving harassment, scapegoating, humiliation and undermining. It is by far the most helpful manual that I've come across.

The authors have years of experience in counselling work abuse victims. They are blunt in stating that most workplaces are abusive and that there's no easy way to change them. Therefore, they argue, the individual who is a target of abuse needs to develop personal skills to understand the situation, change their emotional response and rehearse new behaviours.

Their underlying premise is that in order to survive, change the situation or leave successfully, one has to change oneself. Although this will not be welcomed by those who seek to confront and expose management, the approach nevertheless has useful insights for organisational activists, especially in understanding what may be happening to others and learning how to support them.

The authors rely on the concept of shame as the driving force behind organisation-

al dynamics. People are shamed (humiliated) in various ways, for example by being exposed or criticised for doing an inadequate job, by having suggestions ignored or laughed at and by being revealed as too emotional or caring.

To develop a method of coping with the dynamics of shame in organisations, the authors examine the psychology of both individuals and groups. They develop the ideas of "cims" (childhood individual maintenance strategies) that shape individual psychology and of "norms" (native organisational maintenance strategies) that shape group dynamics. Both cims and norms are unconscious, and their interaction affects how individuals cope.

Wyatt and Hare's basic strategy for workers is to learn how to analyse people and the organisation (cims and norms) and to develop the capacity to not be affected by shaming, but instead to psychologically distance oneself. In other words, rather than being caught up in toxic behaviours at work, they believe it is possible to emotionally separate oneself, maintaining integrity internally and helping to survive and promote beneficial change. They are quite clear about how difficult it is to get others to change, especially managers, who have a stake in their power and who are threatened by those who demonstrate competence (not to mention those who mount a direct challenge).

They elaborate two major methods for survival: "empowered awareness" and "strategic utilisation." Empowered awareness is basically becoming conscious of what is happening, including all the abuse, rather than denying it. It is a process of developing the skills for building one's own inner psychological world. It involves observing one's own feelings, evaluating other people's character styles and observing the organisation's norms and power structure. It includes generating meaning and purpose in one's own life, coping with shaming by others, avoiding self-shaming and avoiding futile power struggles.

Strategic utilisation involves setting goals, planning and preparation, evaluating alternatives and taking action. One

important part of this is working out one's own self-interests and also the self-interests of others, and then aligning one's self-interests with those of others, especially superiors, in order to achieve one's own goals while not threatening others.

The authors give some lengthy examples, showing how shaming, abuse and their recommended strategies operate. Their analysis is based largely on experience with US workplaces, but most of it would apply readily in Australia.

Work Abuse is a long book. It is not something to read in a day or even a week. It does not provide a quick fix to urgent problems. Rather, it is best studied slowly and thoughtfully. The process of changing one's own habitual ways of responding to abuse is not easy. The authors recommend finding either a therapist or a friend to help, especially in recovering from a crisis. But most important is being willing to undertake the process of change and putting in the effort to do so.

The authors believe that the culture of shaming is so pervasive and taboo that it is extremely difficult to bring together a group of co-workers who can be open, honest and mutually supportive about processes of shaming. If a worker is fortunate enough to be involved in an affinity group involving people who are not co-workers, this might well provide the emotional space to recover from a crisis and develop the strength to continue on the job.

To a considerable extent, the reader must take what the authors say on trust. There is no detailed justification for the analysis (such as their assumption that shame is the key driving force in abuse), nor any statistics on the effectiveness of their methods compared to other techniques. Their case rests primarily on how well their explanation fits with readers' own experiences and understandings. In other words, you need to ask, does what they say ring true? To me, having talked to many dissidents and whistleblowers over the years, it does!

The authors' focus is on surviving personally and developing strategies to move

ahead. In most cases, making a formal complaint or a public statement about problems leads only to grief for the person who speaks out and no change in the organisation; the authors argue against any such self-destructive path. They say that justice cannot be expected from top management. In fact, they say, "Justice is a myth, a story; expecting it to happen within a negative-norm workplace is always self-destructive."

Nonviolent activists will want to do more than this. They are, after all, passionately concerned about justice. However, the passion needs to be tempered by a realistic assessment of what it takes to bring about beneficial change. Some activists may not worry about losing their job, and be in a good situation to stir things up in

an organisation. Others, though, may have family or other commitments, and want to survive on the job to continue the struggle another day, or to stay employed to provide resources for non-work activism. The techniques explained in *Work Abuse* thus are worth exploring for a number of reasons.

Wyatt and Hare do not connect their analysis to ideas about nonviolent action. It would be an intriguing project to make the connections. For example, how well does their perspective on shame apply to situations encountered by nonviolent activists? How does their vision of a personal psychology able to survive abusive situations relate to emotional frameworks recommended for or adopted by nonviolent activists? Is their pessimism

about organisational activism in abusive work environments justified, or can techniques of nonviolent campaigning be readily applied in organisations? Is survival in an abusive workplace even a worthy goal from the perspective of a nonviolent activist?

Wyatt and Hare are completely sympathetic to the goal of transforming workplaces into collaborative, egalitarian, supportive environments. The question is how. Their primary concern is individual survival. Nonviolent activists usually focus on social change. Meshing these two orientations productively seems a worthy task.

Brian Martin
NVT

Resistance of the Heart: Intermarriage and the Rosenstrasse Protest in Nazi Germany

**Nathan Stoltzfus;
W.W. Norton & Company,
New York, 1996.**

In *Resistance of the Heart*, Nathan Stoltzfus details the final roundup of the Jews in Berlin in 1943. To the great surprise of the SS and the Third Reich hierarchy; one small group of Jews and their supporters proved to be one of the most successful challenges to the Nazi reign of terror during World War II. On February 27, 1943, intermarried Jews (Jews married to non-Jews), along with several other categories of Jews, were arrested and detained for final processing before being sent to concentration camps where they would face almost certain death.

Intermarried Jews were detained at the Jewish Community's public and youth welfare administrative centre at Rosenstrasse. As word of the roundup spread, the unexpected occurred - the spouses of the detained men (most of the intermarried individuals detained at Rosenstrasse were men) gathered outside the building and demanded the release of their husbands. Despite threats from the armed

guards to fire into the angry crowd, the women continued their loud, vocal protest day and night for a week challenging the supremacy of the SS on a new front - the domestic front.

The historical backdrop for the protest was the ever increasing military losses suffered by the Nazis. In early 1943, the Third Reich war machine was beginning to struggle with tremendous losses on the Eastern front. The detention, resulting protest, and deportation of intermarried Jews had the potential to gravely injure

public morale on the home front.

Intermarried couples faced job discrimination, reduced food rations, and a regime, which not only banned further intermarriages in 1935, but also encouraged divorce among intermarried couples.

The official condemnation, however, was often relatively minor compared to the treatment couples received at the hands of their neighbours' and families. Many non-Jewish families chose to disassoci-

ate themselves from their sisters, daughters, or cousins when they married a Jew. Often, non-Jewish spouses were verbally and physically harassed more in public than their Jewish spouses. Despite these challenges and frustrations, by the end of 1944, there were 12,987 officially registered intermarried Jews in Germany and almost all of them survived to the end of the war.

Protest in Nazi Germany was not the norm. Anti-Jewish regulation was either actively embraced or at least condoned by popular assent. The question that Stoltzfus asks and attempts to answer is why these women protested and why did the Nazis relent? The further question is, can the Rosenstrasse Protest be labelled as classic resistance as we understand it to mean in nonviolence theory?

The first questions are relatively simple for Stoltzfus to address. By their refusing to divorce their spouses and suffering the daily indignities of being married to Jews, non-Jewish spouses had a history of non-compliance with the Nazis. Stoltzfus historically documents the often harsh regulations imposed by the Nazis and the creative ways in which intermarried couples got around them. Intermarried spouses were also very aware that those who were arrested and processed, seldom came back from where they were sent. Once their spouses were arrested, they realised

that they had only a very short time in which to do anything. What may have begun as an attempt to deliver necessities such as toothbrushes and warm clothing, quickly became a way of turning events to their advantage. In his interviews with some of the participants Stoltzfus notes most agreed that the Rosenstrasse Protest was not an organised protest, with leaders or a clear political agenda, but rather an event which allowed them to find a unified voice within the safety of a group.

Both the Nazis and the women of Rosenstrasse protested to create change. The Nazis used mass demonstrations to control behaviour, while the women used demonstrations to influence decisions which had been made by Hitler and his government. But, the irony of this is that the women were using the very skills which had been taught to them by the National Socialists. The non-compliance of intermarried Jews and, in the end the Rosenstrasse Protest proved to be troubling reminders to the Nazis of the limits of power over human heart and mind. The question, as practitioners of nonviolence remains: Do we classify as true resistance those acts, which are in the personal self-interest of the individual resister?

Stoltzfus notes that even though the consequences of the actions of the women of

Rosenstrasse exceeded the limits of self-interest. Their motivations were individual and local (affecting for the most part, the spheres of the nuclear families) and very few engaged in any further types of resistance during or after the war. However, by the very nature of Nazi Germany's secretive, tightly controlled dictatorship, any type of mass demonstration exacerbated dissent and affected the regime's "daily portrayal of reality". Stoltzfus further notes that no group of Germans hindered the Nazis more significantly than intermarried Germans.

Their protest at Rosenstrasse drew a line in the sand of genocide and the Reich backed down. This was no small achievement for a group of no more than seventy women on any given day of protest.

The work is a well-researched historical document which raises almost as many questions as it answers. Resistance is not easily defined and does not fall into predetermined set of parameters. If nothing else, Stoltzfus leads the theorist and practitioners to gently question the notion of resistance against the backdrop of historical events that most idealists believe truly tests their skills and faiths.

Elin Ross

From *Frontline* vol 7 no 1 Summer 1998

NvT

Letter from Japan

Australian anti-militarism web site

By way of a follow up to the article in *NvT* #58, the Australian anti-militarism web site is still operating at the same address: <http://www.metropolis.net.au/foe/antimilweb/>.

I have been able to keep the site fairly up-to-date from Japan, but I would still really appreciate more information on Australian peace groups and their web sites, campaigns and actions. That is the area that I can't manage on my own, especially while I am living in Japan. Please send information to amweb@hotmail.com.

The information on the Australian military is obviously always going to be incomplete, but it is quite extensive, nev-

ertheless. It has the effect of attracting readers from within the military and I feel that the communication I have with them serves a similar purpose to the peace oriented newsletter Anthony Kelly was producing for military personnel.

Tax Resistance

I have always had mixed feelings about the tax resistance issue. It has never been an issue that I have had to think too much about, because whenever I have been earning enough money to pay tax, I have been a PAYE taxpayer. As an activist much of my energy has gone into lobbying the government to spend our taxes differently, which in some ways is approaching the problem from the other end to the tax resisters.

After reading all the articles about tax resistance in *NvT* #58, I found myself being persuaded of the value of tax resistance, not because you are withholding money from the military, but rather because of the great potential for spending the money on worthy causes which otherwise might not get any money at all.

Nonviolent resistance, for example, would never get, and possibly should never get, government funding, but if tax resistance were more widely practiced, nonviolent campaigns could begin to attract the resources they need to become more effective.

Philip White

NvT

in back of it all

What is NONVIOLENCE TODAY?

Nonviolence Today is published every two months to help increase the understanding and use of nonviolence. We publish reports and evaluations of trainings and actions, with a view to improving the quality of both. It's the peoples' magazine and first hand participant reports are especially welcome. *Nonviolence Today* also serves an educational role in promoting a theoretical understanding of nonviolence as a political philosophy. There is much diversity of opinion of what that is, but the common ground of agreement is probably that political power

comes from cooperation. If we don't like the behaviour of power holders, then we withdraw our cooperation in sufficient numbers and they will be disabled. Nonviolent action is a technique which has existed throughout history and occurs in all cultures and has been used by an enormous range of social groups. Nonviolence can be applied to activities as widely different as personal growth and national defence. Violence is not necessary for social change and is, in fact, counterproductive to greater freedom, justice and harmony.

Subscription Information

Although *Nonviolence Today* is on sale in some alternative bookshops around Australia, subscriptions are a better form of support. Supporting and Maniacal subscriptions make it possible for us to send the magazine to organizations and people who couldn't otherwise receive it, e.g. organisations in the Third World. Unless requested not to, the names and towns of supporting and maniacal subscribers will be published for the time period which applies. The subscription card should have annoyed you

by falling out of the magazine by now. You can pay by telephone with Bankcard, Mastercard or Visa. Phone Dave on (07) 3366 2660 (10am to 9pm 7days). If you like the magazine and want it to continue, please:

Subscribe to Nonviolence Today today!

Nonviolence Today is also published electronically (without graphics) on the World Wide Web at <http://uq.net.au/~zzdkeena/NvT/>

Subscription Options

- | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|
| • Australia | (six issues for \$25) | • Supporting | (six issues for \$50+) |
| • Overseas Airmail | (six issues for \$35) | • Maniacal | (lifetime for \$400+) |

NONVIOLENCE TODAY PO Box 5292, West End QLD 4101, Australia. Phone (07) 3366 2660
Email: NvT <d.keenan@uq.net.au>

Free Trial Offer

If you know someone you think might be interested in *Nonviolence Today* (including yourself if you are not a subscriber), send us their(your) name and address. We will send a free copy and invite them(you) to subscribe. Tick the appropriate option on the subscription card (In this case you don't even need to use an envelope) or phone.

Adoptions

This is a gift subscription idea which encourages *Nonviolence Today* supporters to pay for a subscription to be sent to a library of their choice. This has the potential to introduce a much larger number of people to the idea and practice of nonviolence, not to mention the possibility of finding new subscribers. A subscription card is enclosed for your convenience. If you are a librarian and would like to seek adoption, let us know and we will place your library on a list and make adoption available as soon as possible. The names of the adopted library and the person or persons who adopted it will be published in the magazine unless we are specifically asked not to.

Notes for Contributors

Nonviolence Today exists to promote
(1) nonviolence as a political theory and
(2) the study and practice of nonviolent action as a method of social change.

Theoretical proposals and analyses of actions and campaigns that advance these goals are most welcome. We may edit articles to maintain a focus on nonviolence.

We prefer contributions to be sent by electronic mail (see address above) or on a floppy disk, which we will return. Failing that, preferably typed (for scanning), or clear, legible handwriting (if in doubt, please type it). Please inform us of the authorship of any items you send and tell us if they're not for publication.

Photographs are extremely desirable, preferably: (1) clearly captioned on the back; (2) dramatic.

Copy deadlines are at the end of January, March, May, July, September, November.