From Pots and Pans to Guns and Bombs:

Women and Direct Action

Mary Elizabeth Pinkoski

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

School of Canadian Studies
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
©January, 2003

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-79681-7

Canada

**The undersigned recommend to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies and Research acceptance of the thesis**

**'From Pots and Pans to Guns and Bombs:
Women and Direct Action'**

submitted by Mary Pinkoski, B.A.

**in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts**

.....
Thesis Co-Supervisor

.....
Thesis Co-Supervisor

.....
**Director
School of Canadian Studies**

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

January, 2003

Abstract

This thesis explores the relationship between women, violent protest, and violent protest groups. Two specific bodies of social movement literature are evaluated: the literature on women and protest/social movements, and that on violent protest. The inadequate theoretical attention that has been afforded women who engage in militant activity is thus exposed. This lacuna is addressed with an empirical examination of the Canadian protest group Direct Action and women's experiences in the group, including its violent actions. In combining the literature review and the case study, this thesis argues that women's participation in violent protest is influenced by the internal and external operations and choices of the protest group in which they operate. In turn, the presence of violent women protesters also shapes the practices of the groups themselves. The thesis concludes, therefore, that both literatures must systematically explore the relationship between women, violent protest, and violent protest groups.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Definitions and Parameters of the Study	5
Chapter Outline	7
Chapter One – Where Do Militant Women Fit In? Reviewing and Critiquing Their Omission in Social Movement Literature	11
Introduction	11
Social Movement Literature on Women	12
Literature on Women and Protest	13
Literature on Militant Women	25
Social Movement Literature on Militant Protest	29
Tarrow’s Cycles of Protest	30
Violence versus Non-violence: The Link between the Two	35
The Effects of Militant Protest	39
Conclusion	42
Chapter Two – A Case Study of Direct Action	45
Introduction	45
A History of Direct Action	46
Cheekeye-Dunsmuir Action	50
Litton Systems Action	52
Direct Action After Litton and The Wimmin’s Fire Brigade	56
The Trial	59
Women and Direct Action	61
Direct Action’s Internal Operations and Relationships	62
External Actions	66
Hansen’s perspective on the differences between Direct Action and The Wimmin’s Fire Brigade	68
Society’s Perceptions of Militant Women (as speculated on by Hannah and Hansen)	70
Conclusion	74
Chapter Three – Analyzing the Information	77
Introduction	77
Women’s Roles in Militant Groups	78
The Unique Experiences of Women in Direct Action	81
The Impact of Women on Direct Action’s External Actions	86

Militant Protest and Its Reception in the Case of Direct Action	87
External Actions of Direct Action and the Wimmin's Fire Brigade	93
Women as Peaceful Protesters versus Women in Direct Action.....	98
Conclusion.....	101
Conclusion	103
Hansen, Belmas, and Direct Action	104
Omissions in the Literature and Areas for Further Study.....	106
Bibliography	112
Appendix A	124
Appendix B	125
Appendix C	132
Appendix D	133

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Description	Page
A	Cheekeye-Dunsmuir Bombing Communiqué	124
B	Litton Bombing Communiqué	125
C	Wimmin's Fire Brigade Communiqué	132
D	Ann Hansen's Statement to the Court before Sentencing	133

Introduction

During the 1960s and 1970s, North Americans were exposed to underground, violent¹ groups such as the Black Panther Party, the Weather Underground Movement, and the Symbionese Liberation Army. As news of these groups filled the media, readers witnessed assassination attempts, kidnappings, bombings, and other illegal actions. Particularly noteworthy was the fact that these stories featured profiles of the groups' members, including Elaine Brown, Angela Davies, Kathleen Cleaver, Bernardine Dohrn, Kathy Boudin, and Patty Hearst - women who chose to engage in the groups' subversive tactics.²

This emerging image of the "woman warrior" was not isolated to North America, nor was the symbol of the "woman warrior" specifically a 1960s and 1970s phenomenon. In Europe, groups such as the German Red Army Faction or the Baader-Meinhof group (active from 1968-1972) presented similar images of women to the public. In Latin America, women had long been part of independence-seeking guerrilla movements (e.g., the Sandinista and Zapatista movements). Recently, women have been integrated into movements where they act as suicide bombers, both in the Middle East and elsewhere. In Sri Lanka, for example, women have been used as suicide bombers in the Tamil Eelam Liberation Organization (Briggs and Stoller 2002). Another recent example is the

¹ The term "violent" defines groups that use "combative," "subversive," illegal tactics in their protest repertoire, including firebombing, bombing, or the use of weapons. The term "violent actors" describes those who participate in or utilize these tactics. The next section contains an in-depth definition of "violent".

² Elaine Brown, Kathleen Cleaver and Angela Brown were all women in the Black Panther Party. Brown and Cleaver held leadership positions in the Black Panther Party. Bernardine Dohrn and Kathy Boudin participated in militant actions of the Weather Underground Movement. Patty Hearst was first kidnapped by, and later participated in, the Symbionese Liberation Army.

Chechen-separatist rebel group, who executed the October 2002 Moscow theatre hostage-taking. This guerrilla group, called a “suicide squad” or a “smertniki,” employed ten women suicide bombers in their hostage-taking plot (www.cnn.com). Current movements such as the Black Bloc and the Animal Liberation Front also have had a number of active women participants.

Canada has not had as long a history of violent protest as other countries; however, that is not to say that these types of protest groups are non-existent here. Surveys of these groups/activities in Canada (Kellett 1991; Mitchell 1985) show that there have been several isolated incidents of violent activities protest, although long-term protest groups engaged in armed struggle have been relatively sparse. The two main groups that are usually addressed in this literature are the Front de Libération du Québec and Direct Action. As with non-Canadian groups, women have played various roles in subversive Canadian protest groups. While the Front de Libération du Québec (FLQ), arguably Canada’s most famous contemporary underground group, presented a public image of male leadership (with leaders such as Pierre Vallières and Charles Gagnon), there were women (for example, Louise Cossette-Trudel and Carole de Vault) involved.

During the 1980s, the group Direct Action, also known as the Squamish Five, exposed Canadians more fully to the idea of women as actors in violent protest. Of the group’s five members, two were women, Ann Hansen and Julie Belmas. Moreover, Hansen played a principal role in Direct Action. In the 1990s, women also participated, sometimes violently, in Canadian protest actions during the Oka standoff in Kanesatake,

the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty (OCAP) protests, and the Convergence des Luttes Anti-Capitalistes (CLAC) actions.

As these examples confirm, women have and do participate in violent protest groups, including engagement in the group's subversive acts. However, it can also be said that there is a notable gap between what has actually occurred and society's perception of the role of women within the realm of protest. While there are clear examples of women engaging in armed struggle, these activities are still perceived largely as a male activity. Women, in contrast, are generally considered to be peaceful protesters. This contradiction raises questions about the relationship between violent action and women, especially as it occurs within violent protest groups. One point of entry into an examination of violent protest groups and women is to explore how these groups operate when they include females.

This thesis argues that women's participation in violent protest is influenced by the internal and external operations and choices of the protest group in which they operate. In turn, the presence of women who engage in armed struggle also has an effect on the practices of the groups themselves. In tackling this topic, this thesis is an important first step in creating a meaningful space for women in the analysis of violent protest.

Noting the omission of this topic in the social movement literature demonstrates that it does not adequately theorize both historical and contemporary violent protest situations and the women who participate in them. To address this gap, this thesis offers a starting point, based on a literature review and case study, for thinking through the relationship between women, violent protest, and groups that engage in these tactics.

To address the silences in the literature, this thesis examines one element of the relationship between violent protest and women. It focuses on how violent protest groups affect the participation of their female participants, with the analytical emphasis on the *organizations* in which this protest occurs as opposed to the *individual* women. Specifically, this thesis attempts to answer the following research question: how do the internal and external operations and choices of violent protest groups affect women who employ violent tactics. It will be argued that the size, structure, and ideology of the protest group, as well as the group's composition (in terms of males and females) influences women who engage in the group's armed protest. To answer this question, the thesis explores the existing theoretical material surrounding these subversive protest groups and women's participation in them. To demonstrate the effect that engaging in armed struggle, as enabled by the structure and organization of the protest group, has on violent women protesters, the thesis presents an empirical case study of the Canadian group, Direct Action.

The social movement literature addressing women and violent protest tends to focus solely on the individual woman, whereas this thesis focuses on reflecting the experiences of the individual woman in relation to the organizations in which she participates. While the theoretical literature often deals with the idea of violent protest as a moral or philosophical issue, it is not the aim of this thesis to examine the morality of the tactics used, nor to make an argument regarding their effectiveness as a protest method. The thesis will point to gaps in the theoretical literature; it does not attempt to rewrite this literature. Instead, this thesis seeks to contribute to the academic literature on

violent women protesters and their groups by providing a new perspective on the groups and how these groups affect a woman's participation in violent protest.

First, it is demonstrated that there are gaps in the existing theoretical literature surrounding violent protest groups, arguing that the social movement literature on violent protest does not account for women, and that the social movement literature on women and protest does not account for violent protest. It is important to recognize these omissions because a body of literature regarding violent protest or women cannot be complete until it accounts simultaneously for women and violence. Second, the thesis provides an empirical examination of Direct Action and how its two female members, Ann Hansen and Julie Belmas, were affected by its structure and organization. How these women affected the practices of Direct Action will also be included as a secondary concern. The empirical examination of Direct Action offers an original exploration into the topic of Canadian violent protest groups and a starting point for further analysis of their female participants. Finally, the thesis calls for theoretical attention to women, violent protest, and violent protest groups.

Definitions and Parameters of the Study

This thesis discusses violence and its relationship to actors and protest actions. Violence, as defined by the *Oxford Contemporary Dictionary of Current English*, is the "unlawful use of force" (1026). Violent protest, as defined in this thesis, refers to protest tactics that are forceful, subversive, illegal, and meant to inflict damage to persons or property. At the most extreme, the methods used include bombings, firebombings,

kidnappings and assassinations. Violent actors, in terms of this thesis, are persons who choose to engage in an armed struggle and utilize these violent tactics. This form of protest differs from more common conceptions of protest, in which there is an emphasis on peaceful actions. These actions, often deemed non-violent, may include “demonstrations, sit-ins, occupations, strikes, boycotts” (Lahey <http://csf.colorado.edu>).

“Violent” is used by the social movement literature to discuss protest involving armed struggle. For example, William Gamson’s *Strategy of Social Protest* (1990), one of the pioneering works in this area, labels this type of subversive protest as “violent protest.” Contemporary works (Tarrow 1994; della Porta 1995; Diani and della Porta 1999; Barkan and Snowden 2001) reflect Gamson’s definition and refer to this protest as violent. In choosing to follow this trend in the literature, I use the term violent to describe Direct Action’s protest tactics. In this way, the group’s subversive protests are situated within the academic literature.

However, it should be noted that “violent” is a contested term. Ann Hansen rejects the notion that Direct Action’s protests were violent: “I prefer the term sabotage because that implies a strategic action, with references to economic issues, and not simply a violent reaction or lashing out in frustration” (Steven www.rabble.ca). It is important to note, therefore, that Direct Action did not refer to their actions in this manner, but rather as militant actions. For instance, in the Litton bombing communiqué³ they label their protest as “militant direct actions” (Hansen 485).

The definition of violent, as used by this thesis, narrows the scope of groups that

³ See Appendix B.

can be studied. Within armed struggle, there is a continuum of tactics that can be employed (Lakey <http://csf.colorado.edu>). This would include actions ranging from minor acts of property damage, such as graffiti or the breaking of a window, to actions intent on large-scale property damage such as bombings or firebombings, to any action that involves directly harming people such as assassinations or kidnappings. This thesis does not examine groups that have engaged in minor property damage (such as Convergence des Luttes Anti-Capitalistes or the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty), nor does it examine those that have engaged in assassinations or kidnappings (such as the Front de Liberation du Quebec). However, because Direct Action used bombing and firebombings, this thesis will restrict its definition of violent to include only those tactics.

One final consideration in examining protest groups is the importance of ideology. Groups that choose to use violent tactics fall under a wide-range of ideologies, including both left- and right-wing tenets. This thesis limits itself to examining Direct Action, a group striving to enact progressive, social change through violent tactics.⁴

Chapter Outline

The first chapter of this thesis examines the theoretical literature that focuses on the autobiographical and anecdotal literature on women who have engaged in violent protest, the literature on women as peaceful or passive protesters, scholarly writing on violent protest, and the social movement literature on women protesters. The

⁴ Kellett et. al. (1990) in their report written for the federal government refer to Direct Action as a left-wing, single-issue group (67-68). This separated them from subversive groups acting on the basis of nationalist or separatist ideologies, religious ideologies, Emigré ideologies, and right-wing ideologies (Kellett et. al. 54-69).

autobiographical, anecdotal literature, while providing a contextual analysis of women and their experiences in subversive protest groups, does not provide a systematic theoretical analysis of these women and their experiences. On the other hand, the literature that has analyzed women as peaceful or passive protesters provides a theoretical basis on which to examine women protesters. It also contributes to the notion that violent protest is a male activity and effectively eliminates women participating in this type of protest from its analysis.

This thesis also draws on the social movement literature on violent protest to offer a theoretical lens for examining groups using these tactics. In particular, this literature is critiqued for its omission of women. The thesis also explores the social movement literature on women and protest in order to provide a theoretical perspective on the role of women in protest. However, this literature does not account for women who use violent protest in its analysis.

Chapter Two is a case study of Direct Action. First, the group's history is reviewed, from its inception to the arrests of its members, with a focus on their protest actions. Second, the thesis advances an empirical study that uses interviews with two of its members, Ann Hansen and Gerry Hannah, to examine four areas: the internal operations of the group and how the women in the group were influenced by those operations; the internal relations of the group and how the women in the group experienced those relationships; external actions and how the women in the group worked within those actions; and Hansen's and Hannah's perspectives on the perceptions that society has of women who engage in violent protest.

To garner empirical evidence for the case study, a number of sources were used. Essentially, no scholarly work has been done on Direct Action, but a number of non-scholarly sources furnished relevant commentary about the group. This chapter relies on these non-academic sources to enhance the empirical case study. Direct Action is examined using newspaper articles, television transcripts, and Internet sources. The majority of the empirical information derives from *Direct Action: Memoirs of an Urban Guerrilla* by group member Ann Hansen (2001), and the interviews with Hansen and Hannah.

The third chapter, an analysis of the influence of the internal and external operations and choices of violent protest groups on women's participation in violent protest, synthesizes the theoretical and empirical components of the thesis. This chapter examines how women are affected by both the structure and organization of violent protest groups, and how having women engage in armed struggle shapes the practices of the groups themselves. It looks at the following three areas: gender roles within Direct Action, the impact that being able to participate in the group's external actions had on the women; and the external perceptions of the women of Direct Action as women who used violent protest tactics.

The conclusion demonstrates that the thesis's literature review and the empirical case study emphasize the need for further theorizing of women, violent protest, and violent protest groups. In addition to briefly reviewing the material covered in the thesis, the conclusion proposes a number of areas for further study that could take advantage of the preliminary evidence offered by this thesis. This thesis concludes that women's

participation in violent protest is influenced by the organization and structure of their protest group, and proposes that the links between women, violent protest, and violent protest groups be developed by in more systematic manner by the social movement literature.

In sum, the thesis explores the relationship between violent women protesters and their engagement in violent tactics, emphasizing the importance of the operations and choices made by protest groups. It probes the question of how women's participation in armed struggle is influenced by the organization and structure of these groups and in so doing, exposes the gaps within the existing theoretical literature that does not adequately explain the connections between women, violent protest, and violent protest groups, especially within a Canadian context. In presenting the case study of Direct Action, the thesis argues that there is a relationship between women and their engagement in violent protest and the structure of the protest group. This thesis concludes that, while the effects that women have on violent protest groups is tentative, the influence of factors such as group size, structure, and ideology on women's participation in violent protest is much clearer. It is hoped that future studies will address some of the research questions that arise out of this study.

Chapter One – Where Do Militant Women Fit In? Reviewing and Critiquing Their Omission in Social Movement Literature

Introduction

Women as protesters and violent protest organizations have been the subjects of social movement literature in many ways. As it is the primary goal of this thesis to explore the influence of the organization and structure of violent protest groups on women's participation in the group's actions, this chapter investigates two specific trajectories of this literature. First, the social movement literature is analyzed in relation to women and their involvement in protest and social movement organizations. In looking at a number of representative works in this area, this section critiques the social movement literature on women for its failure to adequately theorize violent women protesters.

An additional approach for considering how protest groups influence women's participation in subversive protest is through examining the social movement literature on violent protest. It is determined that the literature on violent protest could broaden its scope by considering women in its theoretical framework, as it does not currently do this.

Therefore, while the phenomena of the violent woman actor and the violent protest group are realities, this chapter argues that the literature has not accounted for the two in a holistic manner – one that takes these women and their groups into account within a single analysis. Rather, as this chapter demonstrates, the literatures have treated the two as separate entities, thus suggesting that the literature is offering an incomplete analysis.

Social Movement Literature on Women

Social movement scholars have long recognized the importance of gender within social movements through their examinations of the unique experiences of women and men within such movements. Earlier studies (Lawson and Barton 1980) established a precedent in examining the interactions of women and men in social movements, all the while calling for an emphasis on theorizing gender. However, while such studies provided an impetus to theorize women and social movements, more contemporary scholars (West and Blumberg 1990; Cable 1992; McAdam 1992; Einwohner 1999; and Einwohner et al. 2000) still emphasize the need to entrench a theoretical analysis of gender in social movement analysis. While women have been the focus of many social movement studies, this analysis has been critiqued as incomplete and has occurred only within selective studies of particular social movements (Blee 1998; and Kuumba 2001). For example, theoretical attention has focused mainly on the experiences of women within social movements that employ peaceful tactics. Furthermore, studies of women within social movements that employ violent tactics have tended to emphasize the non-violent roles of women within these groups. To obtain an analysis of women who use violent tactics, scholars have, for the most part, had to rely on autobiographical and anecdotal accounts of the women involved.

Most of these researchers focus on women who are involved in peaceful protest; fail to extensively account for women involved in violent protest. The literature that does account for these women tends to focus on the experience of women within their particular social movement organization. These analyses, however, do not extend beyond

the effects of violent protest on women; they do not consider the influence of the external and internal operations and choices of women's participation. Furthermore, they do not provide an indication of how women's participation in violent protest shapes the protest group. An extension of this sort could broaden the theoretical base from which the literature works to examine women's roles in protest.

Literature on Women and Protest

Academics have gradually argued the importance of a gendered analysis to social movement theories. Many of those studying social movements have recognized, through their empirical work, that the involvement of women in social movements creates unique factors for which they attempt to account. M. Bahati Kuumba (2001) notes this uniqueness, saying:

[N]ot only do women and men experience the social realities that lead to the emergence of social movements differently, they often have differential experiences and play distinctive roles with social movements (2).

However, neither the literature that argues for including a theoretical analysis of how women function in social movements, nor the literature that provides empirical examinations of women involved in protest, address the violent woman protester. Nor does the literature consider the structure and organization of the violent protest group as influential factors in determining women's participation in violent protest. Therefore, this literature is incomplete and is unable to respond specifically to the primary question posed by this thesis: how do the internal and external operations and choices of violent protest groups influence women's participation in violent acts? The secondary question of

how the presence of women engaged in armed struggle shapes the practices of these groups is also ignored.

Guida West and Rhoda Lois Blumberg (1990) argue that a gendered analysis of protest situations is necessary: “the absence of gender analysis (except, of course, in research on the women’s movement) stands out starkly in almost all academic works on social protest” (7). Their analysis of women and protest follows a limited number of earlier empirical studies on the role of women in social movements. For example, Ronald Lawson and Stephen E. Barton’s (1980) study of sex roles in the New York tenants’ movement accepts the role of women in protest and analyzes their situation in a particular social movement organization. Their study is one of the first to note that women can and do play integral roles (often leadership roles) in social movements. However, the study also presents the tension surrounding the (expected) roles of women and men in social movements.

Beginning with early studies such as Lawson and Barton’s, a literature focusing on the effects of gender in relation to various aspects of social movement participation has developed. Sherry Cable (1992) examines gender in relation to recruitment and participation in a particular environmental movement. She notes that “if gender figures importantly in recruitment and participation, the effects of participation on members are also likely to be mediated by gender” (Cable 37). Isolating specific aspects of social movements, such as Cable did in her focus on recruitment, allows academics to examine women in specific contexts. Others attempt to focus more holistically on the entire experience of women in particular social movements.

Doug McAdam's (1992) work explores how gender functioned in the Freedom Summer Campaign. He studied the recruitment of participants (both male and female), their selection or rejection from the project, their participation in the campaign, and their activism following the end of the project. McAdam's is one of the first works to examine the entire activist experience as it is influenced by gender, concluding that men and women experienced many aspects of the Freedom Summer Campaign differently.

Advances have been made toward incorporating gender into the analysis of social movements, but the literature remains incomplete. The sociological journal, *Gender and Society* (1999), devoted two issues to the topic of gender and social movements. These issues draw attention to the fact that work on gender and social movements is still evolving. Rachel Einwohner's (1999) work in *Gender and Society* examines protesters' definitions of identity, in terms of gender and class, in two animal rights campaigns. She also considers how those outside of these two specific campaigns saw and defined the identity of the protesters in relation to gender and class.

Einwohner's work reveals that the volume of literature on gender and social movements is increasing, but it also highlights the need for the literature to include an analysis of the context in which the social movements act and how that affects social movements. In Einwohner's case, this means how outsiders' perceptions relate to the protesters' identity. She writes:

[...] the identity that shapes social movement dynamics is not simply protesters' sense of who they are; it is also who their targets understand them to be. And the identities that activists construct for themselves are not necessarily the same identities that their targets attribute to them (Einwohner 73).

Einwohner's argument is crucial in recognizing how gender is conceptualized in the social movement literature on women. Her work acknowledges that the existing body of work does not account for all aspects of participation in these movements, and stresses that gender must be incorporated into the social movement literature. She notes that gender, along with class and race, is a key element of an activist's identity and motivation and thus significantly influences their actions within social movements (Einwohner 74). Therefore, social movements cannot be completely understood without the inclusion of the gender as an element of the participant's identity.

Verta Taylor's (1999) work also appears in *Gender and Society*. Taylor's article theorizes gender and social movements as illustrated in the postpartum depression self-help movement. Taylor attempts to create a theoretical standpoint on gender as it intersects with social movements and criticizes the existing sociological literature for its lack of attention to gender. While this critique is the impetus, not the crux, of Taylor's article, it does address some of the fundamental problems in the literature in terms of its negotiation of gender. Taylor says "the field of social movements, especially compared with other areas of study, has been remarkably untouched by gender scholarship produced in the social sciences over the past decade"(8). However, one of the key points of Taylor's critique is that while the sociological literature has presented "a new knowledge on gender processes in social movements," this knowledge has not "been brought together in a systematic theory of gender and social movements"(9). Taylor's complaint reflects the literature previously surveyed in this chapter that has focused on examining particular aspects of social movements and how these aspects are gendered, but does not

create a comprehensive gender analysis of the differences between men and women's experiences in social movements. Taylor argues that this comprehensive examination has the potential to influence how social movements contribute to the construction of gender both within society and in these movements. She writes:

A synthesis of the theoretical literatures on gender and social movements has the potential to advance our understanding of gender change processes by making explicit the role of social movements in the social construction and recognition of gender [...] (Taylor 10).

Taylor, like others, has argued for an increasingly comprehensive examination of gender in relation to social movements.

Rachel Einwohner, Jocelyn A. Hollander, and Toska Olsen (2000) extend Taylor's critique of the literature. They note that, despite the growth in the study of social movements, "scholars have paid relatively little attention to how gender affects social movement structures and processes and how social movements, in turn, affect gender" (Einwohner, et.al. 679). However, their critique does not stop there. These authors note that most research on gender and social movements analyzes "movements that focus on gender-related issues, especially women's movements" or "on women's protests" (Einwohner, et. al. 680). In their analysis, Einwohner, et. al. focus on gender within social movements that are not specifically developed around feminist concerns.

In attempts to address some of the critiques of the literature mentioned above, one of the most extensive analyses of gender and social movements is that of M. Bahati

Kuumba (2001).¹ Using empirical evidence from the American Civil Rights Movement and the South African National Liberation Movement, Kuumba's work extends the theoretical arguments established in many of the above-mentioned works, and provides an in-depth argument on the interactions between gender and social movements. She writes:

Gendered analyses of social movements have generated critiques and viewpoints that continue to transform our understanding of the dynamics of social insurgence and transformation. As masculinist notions of social activism have been dismantled, strategies of social resistance and struggle that had previously been ignored have become more visible. Analyses that appreciate the gendered nature of political opportunities have added whole new layers to our thinking of the conditions that spark movement participation. Theoretical frameworks that rethink the simplistic dichotomies between leaders and followers have allowed for more textured analysis of movement processes and the variable roles that women, in particular, have played within them (Kuumba 138-139).

Kuumba's analysis defines the importance of studying gender and social movements. She then looks at how gender works in various "stages" of social movements: movement mobilization, movement strategies and techniques, and movement outcomes. Kuumba works from the premise that men and women experience life differently, thus influencing their experiences, both inside and outside of social movements (2). Kuumba argues that notions of gender are influential with regard to the formation and the operation of social movements. She notes, "[n]ot only are social movement strategies far from gender neutral, they sometimes utilize gender strategically

¹ My analysis of Kuumba's work is meant to highlight some of her major points even at the risk of (unintentionally) not fully conveying the entirety of Kuumba's argument. For example, Kuumba addresses what she refers to as "established social movement theory" (collective behaviour theory, resource mobilization theory, political process theory, and new social movement theory), and how these have become more "gender-conscious" (47). I have not addressed this, as I am not using these theories in the thesis.

to achieve both internal and external objectives” (Kuumba 114). Gender is then manifested in a multifaceted manner by social movements:

The significance of gender as a factor in social movement strategies is evident in interrelated ways. First, distinctions between women and men in their social roles, both personal and public, impact the available strategies that they adopt when they are the dominant participants in a movement structure. Secondly, the dominant strategic approach that characterizes a movement during a particular period is often differentially accessible to women and men. This differential access could have either structural or ideological roots. Finally, some acts of resistance have been made virtually invisible due to the male-based notion of appropriate, legitimate, and/or valued forms of collective action (Kuumba 98-99).

The framing of gender reinforced by a social movement influences how gender functions within a social movement. This is to say that a social movement can choose to either replicate socially-constructed notions of gender or construct their own.

Kuumba’s comments indicate that “[s]ocial movements have the potential to reproduce as well as transform gender inequalities, structures, and belief systems” (Kuumba 2). Her argument is that social movements have a certain amount of influence on existing gender structures, both within themselves and in society. This position is also articulated in Suzanne Staggenborg’s (1998) work. Staggenborg notes that “[i]ntentionally or not, social movements may alter men’s and women’s roles, expand the consciousness of movement participants and the public at large, introduce new organization strategies and means of expression [...], and create new cultural practices and discourses on new topics” (Staggenborg 8).

Kuumba states that social movements are “outside of the legitimate power structure” and, by extension, they are in a position to either reinforce society’s notions of gender or attempt to shift these notions (6). Staggenborg concurs and notes that “[b]y

raising consciousness and introducing new ways of talking about gender, social movements help to provide the vision, as well as the organization and tactics, needed to bring about cultural and policy changes” (Staggenborg 10). Since the literature on women in protest, including Kuumba’s, only cursorily examines or entirely omits violent women protesters, it would seem that, for the most part, social movements may largely reinforce society’s notions of gender. In support of this, Kuumba writes, “[w]hile social movements pose challenges to established social structures and usually stand outside, and often diametrically opposed to, the legitimate political processes, they also reflect aspects of these social structures” (97).

Therefore, when Kuumba devotes her time to discussing women’s roles in protest, she spends most of it focussing on the roles that reflect society’s notions of gender. She provides the example of women’s use of silence as a protest technique, something that has been identified as “an important strategy in women’s political culture” (Kuumba 113). She contrasts silence with tactics involving “aggression and noise,” and notes that aggression and noise “can be considered a masculine strategy” (Kuumba 113). In making this distinction, Kuumba notes that protest tactics that involve aggression and noise are given the most attention, and those using silence are often ignored (113). This echoes the concerns of the literature in this section and implies that women’s protest is often not seen as prominent because it is not aggressive and noisy.

On the whole, this literature tends to focus on women who participate peacefully in protest, and hence presents the concept that social movements, with their choice of protest, reinforce society’s notions of gender. Kuumba notes that, because of their

position in society, social movements also have the ability to challenge society's notion of gender roles. This is where Kuumba makes brief mention of women in revolutionary movements, noting that these women challenge gender roles. She writes:

At the same time, though, these normative gender roles are often undermined and transformed during social movements. Women and men often engage in resistance strategies in ways that challenge and counter their positioning in society. For instance, women have been active fighters in armed struggle and guerrilla warfare, movement strategies that are more associated with men and masculinity. The strategic actions taken by movements are, at times, compatible with normative gender roles, while at other times call for participation that counters the positioning of women and men in the society (Kuumba 97).

Kuumba, using the work of Lobao, gives the example of women in the Sandinista National Liberation Front (18).² However, the mention of subversive protest roles for women is brief and is countered by Kuumba's comments that men, as opposed to women, are usually violent protesters.

Kuumba writes, again drawing on Lobao, that "with notable exceptions, these [guerrilla] movements are often characterized by men on the 'front lines' as 'freedom fighters' and women in the background in positions of support" (Kuumba 17). Kuumba acknowledges the entrenched gender stereotypes associated with protest. She speaks about women using domestic instruments such as pots and pans in their protest³, as these are the instruments with which they are familiar, but fails to address women who use bombs and guns to protest:

Pots and pans are utensils that are, in many cases, accessible because of, and symbolic of, the domestic labor. Likewise, armed warfare can be viewed as an

² Lobao's (1990) work discusses women in guerrilla movements.

³ Kuumba takes this idea from *A Feminist Dictionary* (1985), which defines pots and pans as "[i]nstruments of protest." The dictionary notes that "[t]he banging of pots and pans has been used by women of all classes as part of their protest movement" (Kramarae and Treichler 350).

extension of the male role into which men in various societies have been socialized. As a result, armed resistance and military action is usually a male-led social movement strategy (Kuumba 95-96).

Kuumba's work is important not only because she highlights how society's notions of gender influence social movement's notions of gender, she also notes social movements can alter these notions. This highlights the unique and sometimes powerful position of social movements in society, and how that position affects a social movement's negotiation of gender. She writes:

Since gender is not fixed or static, it is also transformed through the strategic choices made by social movements and by individuals within these movements. [...] These transformations in gendered identities may remain after the life of the movement depending on the structure of the society that follows. Alternately, women's participation in strategies that are outside of the typical definition of their societal role, such as guerrilla warfare, can open new spaces and transform gender expectations in the post-movement society (Kuumba 115).

While her work lacks a comprehensive analysis of women who engage in violent protest and their relationship to social movements, it presents a theoretical treatment of the relationship between gender and social movements that can be used as the basis for further work.

The scholars surveyed above have drawn attention to the importance of theorizing women in the social movement literature, arguing that a gendered theory of social movements is necessary because women and men have unique experiences within social movements. However, the empirical case studies on which the majority of these academics tend to rely are examinations of women in peaceful protest roles as opposed to violent roles. Even the explicit critique of gender and social movement research done by Einwohner et al. (2000) fails to acknowledge the literature's lack of accounting for

violent women protesters. West and Blumberg's (1990) empirical survey of women in protest devotes only one chapter to women in revolutionary movements in Latin America (Lobao's chapter), while the other examples all draw on women and peaceful protest. Kuumba's comprehensive summary of gender and social movements only mentions women engaged in armed struggle as part of a cursory examination. Therefore, the theories that have been developed thus far are incomplete and concerned overwhelmingly with the stereotypical (expected) roles of women in protest.

West and Blumberg address the misconception that "women aren't violent protesters" and that for women to engage in these types of tactics would be "against their nature." In their explanation of the types of women's protest, they use the theme of maternalism to argue that women's participation in protest is peaceful, saying:

Maternalism is a basic theme that emerges repeatedly in explanations of the participation of women in all kinds of social protest. In fighting to survive at the grass-roots level, women have justified their political action as a struggle to feed, house, clothe their children. In joining revolutionary or radical struggles, some groups of women have also used the maternalism theme as a way of rationalizing the expansion of their nurturing roles into the public sphere (West and Blumberg 22).

It could be argued that if maternalism were used to explain women's roles in protest, women would be perceived as peaceful or passive protesters and notions of women as violent could be dismissed.

West and Blumberg are not the only theorists to address the stereotype that women are peaceful or passive protesters. Luisella de Cataldo Neuburger and Tiziana Valentini (1996) conducted a psychology-based study of Italian women terrorists. While their study contributes to a different body of the literature than that being examined in this

thesis, their comments on the perception that society has of women who use subversive tactics in protest supports West and Blumberg's ideas. De Cataldo Neuburger and Valentini note:

[W]omen who engage in illegal activities considered traditionally the domain of men supposedly do so because they are, in essence, masculine. Women involved in politically deviant activities, the modern female terrorist in particular, have been portrayed as unisexed, unattractive and 'unnatural' (33).

Because of their supposed rejection of maternal attributes, violent women protesters are explained in terms of male gender roles. West and Blumberg suggest that these "maternal instincts" are especially manifested in the tactics of women engaged in protest around humanistic concerns (22). West and Blumberg write:

Women are popularly believed to be "peacemakers" and the "moral guardians" of the family and the world. Relatively speaking, few would be surprised to find women protesters in these arenas, for their actions have been and are simply viewed as an extension of their primary and traditional "caretaking" role (18).

They reason that a woman's maternal traits provide justification for her entrance into the political sphere.

In drawing attention to the idea of maternal traits (and inferring that these are inherently female), West and Blumberg's introduction provokes questions as to what differentiates women and men within the protest arena, especially in their means of (and reasons for) participation. Their reliance on maternal traits as the reason for women's participation in protest ignores women who do not identify or present these traits as justification for their protest activities. In doing this, West and Blumberg run the risk of isolating particular forms of protest and specific women who engage in those forms that do not reflect "peacemaking" or "nurturing" characteristics, namely women in violent

protest. Cockburn (2001) notes that “[i]dentification as mothers can enlist generous feelings of care and love that powerfully contradict violence. But it skirts dangerously close to patriarchal definitions of women’s role [...]” (24). As with the other works discussed in this section, West and Blumberg make advances in the study of women and protest but do not account for women engaging in violent protest. Nor do they consider the influence of the protest group on women’s participation in armed struggle. Hence, giving consideration to violent women protesters could enhance their work, like the other works in this section.

The literature surveyed creates an awareness of women in social movements and a theoretical framework for examining women and protest. However, it fails to develop a complete picture of women’s involvement in protest because of its omission of women who use violent tactics. This is not to say that there is no literature that explains these women. These works sit outside of the realm of the theoretical and, unlike the literature surrounding women and peaceful protest, it has, for the most part, been limited to personal and anecdotal accounts of women involved in violent groups.

Literature on Militant Women

The literature on women and social movements surveyed in the first section of this chapter largely fails to address violent women protesters or the influence of the structure and organization on women’s participation in these tactics. Caroline O. N. Moser and Fiona C. Clark (2001) write that permeating this literature is the “notion that relate[s] women to peace (passivity) and men to war (masculinity),” thus contributing to

the omission of women who act violently in protest (Moser and Clark 3). Because the theoretical literature on women and social movements is unfolding without adequately accounting for violent protest, it remains incomplete. Kathleen M. Blee (1998) also notes the omission of militant women in the introduction to her survey of women in radical protest. Blee's definition of "radical" differs from the definition of "violent."⁴ Still, Blee notes that the "studies of protest and militant activism have focused largely on men" (2):

In political groupings outside the mainstream, men are depicted as the most militant actors and leaders. Despite evidence that women have been involved in a wide range of very radical political activities, from revolutionary parties to racial hate groups, such women have been the subject of relatively little scholarly attention (Blee 2).

Blee's work recognizes, as others have, that women are not conceived as radical political actors in the social movement literature, despite their documented existence.

Perhaps one reason is that the literature has not known where to situate violent women protesters. Work such as West and Blumberg's indicates that these women do not fall into the stereotypical categories that usually define women and protest. De Cataldo Neuburger and Valentini (1996) speak to this, saying:

Some view women's entry into the underworld of violence, a world culturally alien to them, as proof of their attainment of equality with the other sex, as proof of the demolition of old barriers erected by the male world to defend its prerogatives; others condemn it in the name of preconceived notions that lack any tenable grounding (1).

This absence of violent women protesters has been especially apparent in the North

⁴ Blee's definition of radical is not restricted to violent, illegal, or subversive activities, and the notion of radical women that she uses is not limited to women who engage in armed struggle. She writes that "[r]adicals are those who seek social, political, or economic changes [...]. An inclusive definition of radicalism recognizes that radical actions are not necessarily violent [...]" (Blee 3). Hansen's ideas of strategic action and the rejection of the label violent (as cited in the Introduction) seemingly reflects these ideas.

American literature. By comparison, Latin American (including Mexico), Middle Eastern, and European studies are more developed in their attempts to include these women in analyses of violent protest groups (Kampwirth 2001; Grosso 2002; Briggs and Stoller 2002; Lobao 1990; and de Cataldo Neuburger and Valentini 1996). Nevertheless, even these examinations, especially the Latin American studies, often devote primary attention to the support roles that women play (such as clothing and feeding revolutionaries and raising children), while only giving secondary attention to violent women participants. For example, Ana Cristina Ibáñez (2001), in her study of women involved in El Salvador guerrilla movements, notes that women adopted the primary role of “carers” (121). Therefore, this literature has room to expand. It does not move beyond an analysis of the violent woman participant, ignoring the effects of the structure and organization of her protest group on her participation in subversive protest. As well, it could include a discussion of how the presence of women involved in violent protest shapes the protest group in which they act.

North American works on violent women protesters focus almost exclusively on American groups, and rely mainly on autobiographical, biographical, and/or anecdotal accounts of these women. Most of these accounts centre on women in the Black Panther Party (Brown 1992; Davies 1974; Shakur 1987) with a secondary focus on women in the Weather Underground Organization (Stern 1975; Castellucci 1986; Frankfort 1983). There are other works that give accounts of women involved in other violent actions (Blee 1998; Hearst 1982). These works provide a particular perspective (from that of a violent woman actor) that is unique to the research. This perspective serves as a fruitful

starting point for analyzing the influence of the dynamics of particular protest groups on female members.

In particular, this literature is useful in demonstrating how women experienced the gender divisions in their groups. For example, Elaine Brown (1992) and Angela Davies (1974), in their autobiographies, speak about how they operated at the leadership level of the Black Panther Party. Both women write about their struggle to be leaders in a group dominated by men, citing the patriarchal nature of the group (Davies 181; Brown 357). Their reflections have been noted by scholars studying the Black Panther Party (Matthews 1998; Le Blanc-Ernest 1998).

(Auto)biographical and anecdotal works often lack a theoretical analysis of women, violent protest, and violent protest groups. However, there have been a limited number of studies devoted to the position of women in North American violent protest groups and, once again, most of these have focussed on the Black Panther Party and the Weather Underground Organization (Le Blanc-Ernest, née Brown 1993 and 1998; Matthews 1998; Jacobs 1997). Such studies concentrate on the roles women have held in their groups. In contrast to the (auto)biographical and anecdotal works, these works provide objective insights into women's positions in violent protest organizations. However, because these works, especially within the North American context, have been so sparse and because the experience of each woman within each organization has been unique, no systematic theory has been developed to explain violent women actors in their protest groups. Moreover, they do not examine how the organization has influenced the participation of these women in armed struggle.

Nevertheless, this literature is important because it supplies an empirical base on which to develop a critical theoretical perspective. Unlike the majority of the literature that theorizes about women and social movements, these works recognize that women do engage in violent protest and attempt to account for the role of these women in the protest groups. In terms of its relevance to this thesis, these literatures together still do not adequately address the relationship the structure of the organization and the participation of women in violent protest.

Social Movement Literature on Militant Protest

Another avenue for exploring gender and violent protest is through the literature focusing on violent protest. Because this thesis focuses primarily on how women's participation in violent protest is influenced by the internal and external operations and choices of their protest group, the social movement literature on violent protest is beneficial for considering women's participation from the perspective of the group. However, this body of work, like the social movement literature on women, does not attempt to address the women who engage in armed struggle. Since women are not considered in this literature, on violent protest, it is inadequate for answering the research question.

This section surveys the literature on violent protest. Specifically, three areas are discussed in this section: Sidney Tarrow's cycles of protest; the relationship between violence and non-violence; and the effects of violent protest. The objective of the section is to highlight the lack of a gendered analysis in the literature, and to show how such an

analysis could work to enhance the literature. It is important that this literature consider gender because it has been shown (Einwohner 1999; Taylor 1999; West and Blumberg 1990; Kuumba 2001) to have a bearing on the operations of social movements, the motivations of participants, and the execution of protests.

Tarrow's Cycles of Protest

Sidney's Tarrow's (1994) theory of cycles of protest is a good starting point for a discussion on violent tactics and groups.⁵ It provides a framework for viewing protest activity, delineating what occurs within protest. In breaking down protest into specific stages, Tarrow theorizes the actions of protest participants. His cycles of protest focus on the effects of protest and their influence on protest groups, allowing him to theorize how protest influences collective action at each particular stage. Tarrow notes that within each phase of the protest cycles, different political opportunities are created. He states that "the key concept is the opening, diffusion, and closure of political opportunities" (Tarrow 155). Thus, Tarrow's cycles provide a theoretical framework as to where and how violent tactics fit into the entire protest cycle.

Tarrow identifies the six stages of protest as the "opening up of political opportunities;" "heightened conflict;" the formation of new or transformed repertoires and frames; the production of new symbols within the protest cycle; tactics used in protest; and the creation of new centres of power through protest (154-57). At the peak of

⁵ It should be noted that the cycles of protest are just one element of Tarrow's work *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*. However at the risk of providing only a limited portion of Tarrow's ideas, this section comments exclusively on the cycles of protest argument.

the protest cycle, there is an opportunity for both the old and new groups involved to shift their tactics – perhaps radicalizing the groups (Tarrow 157). However, these “new” or “radical” tactics may also be the downfall of movements. He observes:

The common spiral of radicalization observed in many protest cycles is the outcome of such competition for support. A key element in the decline of movements are disputes over tactics, as some militants insist on radicalizing their strategy while others try to consolidate their organizations and deliver concrete benefits to supporters (157).

Tarrow (1995) provides a clear concept of what is required for violent protest to be accepted, and why such tactics are rarely accepted as part of the protest repertoires:

Few people dare to break the crust of convention. When they do so during moments of madness, they create the opportunities and provide models for others. Moments of madness – seldom widely shared, usually rapidly suppressed, and soon condemned even by their participants – appear as sharp peaks on the long curve of history. New forms of contention flare up briefly within them and disappear, and their rate of absorption into the ongoing repertoire is slow and partial (110).

Therefore, while the protest arena seems to provide a unique opportunity for trying new tactics and negotiating the effectiveness and the desirability of those tactics, violent tactics have little chance of being accepted, at least initially.

However while useful in explaining the role of violent protest, gender is not brought into Tarrow’s analysis. For example, when speaking of the “heightened conflict” that occurs with protest, he notes that the impetus to participate in conflict is not isolated to particular groups of people (Tarrow gives the examples of miners and students as groups that are usually involved in protest); it spreads to include people not normally associated with these tactics (Tarrow 155-56). This notion explains the influx and attraction of diverse groups participating in protest. However, Tarrow does not examine

this diversity. For instance, he does not account for women in the protest arena and what compelled them to enter that arena. It is important to account for the entrance of women into the protest arena, because women may influence the protest cycle in unforeseen ways. As shown in the first section of this chapter, gender is part of the protester's identity and influences how protest groups function; thus, perhaps gender affects protest cycles (Einwohner 1999; Kuumba 2001).

Beckwith (2002) argues that movements organize their tactics around gendered notions that are acceptable to participants. For example, non-violent tactics may be presented as an appealing method of participation for both men and women in order to prevent the use of violent tactics in the protest. She writes that “[e]ach of these general sets of collective actions – violent and nonviolent – are constructed in the course of a movement campaign [...] in gendered terms, which offers women and men different opportunities for political engagement” (Beckwith 79). Therefore, in attaching notions of gender to the type of protest chosen, it could be argued that gender identities do influence the protest cycle, thus calling for an inclusion of a gendered analysis into Tarrow's argument.

Fox Piven and Cloward's (1977) work on protest recognizes, like Tarrow's, that protest is a forum where violent tactics are introduced. They argue that institutions are crucial in determining whether or not various forms of protest are seen as viable. They focus on the fact that institutional patterns “shape mass movements by shaping the collectivity out of which protest can arise” (Fox Piven and Cloward 21). Specifically, they note that “institutional life aggregates people or disperses them, molds group identities,

and draws people into the settings within which collective action can erupt” (Fox Piven and Cloward 21). Fox Piven and Cloward insist that it is the institution and its roles that “determine the strategic opportunities for defiance” (21). They note that this is true because “it is typically by rebelling against the rules and authorities associated with their everyday activities that people protest” (Fox Piven and Cloward 21).

Fox Piven and Cloward do not integrate gender into their analysis. Therefore, while their argument extends Tarrow’s argument, it too is limited by its exclusion of gender. Gender is relevant to their argument as it relates to institutions;⁶ thus, their analysis would be enhanced by an examination of the methods institutions uses to structure and influence definitions of acceptable forms of protest for women, and how this relates to violent women protesters and the tactics they choose. Furthermore, social movements can either align themselves with societal notions of gender or refute these (Kuumba 97). Societal notions of gender can be reflected in its (society’s) institutions. Therefore, Fox Piven and Cloward’s conclusion works in tandem with Kuumba’s theories of social movements. Combining these insights shows that institutions influence the notions of gender adopted by social movements, and affect how social movements choose their protest tactics.

Mario Diani and Donatella della Porta (1999) also use Tarrow’s cycles of protest and relate it specifically to violent protest. At length, Diani and della Porta note:

In fact, the forms of violence used tend to vary according to the stage of the cycle. At the outset of protest violent action is usually limited in its presence, small in scope and unplanned. Typically, violence in these phases is an unforeseen result of direct action such as sit-ins or occupations. As protest develops, violent forms of action initially spread more slowly than non-violent ones. They frequently take

⁶ Staggenborg notes that “[g]ender is, after all, deeply embedded in all sorts of social institutions” (31).

the form of clashes between demonstrators and police or counter-demonstrations. Starting out as occasional, such episodes, nonetheless, tend to be repeated and take on a ritual quality. During these processes small groups begin to specialize in increasingly extreme tactics, build up an armoury for such action and occasionally go underground. The very presence of these groups accelerates the moderate exodus from the movement, contributing to a demobilization which only the most violent groups escape (at least temporarily). The final stages of the cycle thus see both a process of institutionalization and a growing number of violent actions (Diani and della Porta 190).

Diani and della Porta argue that the form of violent protest depends on the stage of protest. Their position is comparable to Tarrow's, but it extends Tarrow's position to include violent protest. An even further extension of both theirs and Tarrow's argument to include gender would make Diani and della Porta's theory even more complete. Because they have related violent protest to Tarrow's protest cycles, Diani and della Porta are in a position to examine how the relationship between gender and violent protest works at each stage of the cycle.

Their findings on the relationship between violence and protest, could be used to uncover the connections between gender, violence, and protest, and examine whether men and women experience the cycles of protest, including the cycles of violent protest, in the same manner. Furthermore, their work could be used as a basis for exploring if the relationship between gender and violent protest varies at different stages of the protest cycle, and its effect on participants. Their work could also be used as a basis to show that gender, as part of a protester's identity (Einwohner 1999), influences how the stages of violent protest are acted out.

Violence versus Non-violence: The Links between the Two

William Gamson, Charles Tilly, and Steven E. Barkan and Lynne L. Snowden all propose theories that link violent and non-violent actions, and attempt to prove that there are connections between the motivations of protesters utilizing either form of protest. None of these theorists, however, includes a gendered analysis in their arguments. Without this perspective, it becomes very difficult to develop an analysis of the relationship between women and violent protest. Furthermore, while these theorists speak of violent protest and the groups and individuals that act, they do not account for the structural and organizational effects of the protest group in defining women's participation in violent protest.

The theorists discussed in the first section of this chapter (Einwohner 1999; Kuumba 2001; Taylor 1999; Einwohner et.al. 2000) argue that women need to be included in an analysis of the social movement literature. One reason is that gendered identities are brought into protest and influence how participants respond in protest groups and protest situations (Einwohner 1999; Kuumba 2001). It could be argued that this also holds true for violent protest groups and violent protest situations. Therefore, theories address the relationship between violent and non-violent protest must also take gender into account for determining if these theories are universally applicable or are dependent upon the identity of the protester.

William Gamson's (1990) work is cited frequently as a reference point for contemporary examinations of protest (Jenkins and Klandermans 1995; Burstein, Einwohner, and Hollander 1995; della Porta 1995). Gamson looks at a number of

“American voluntary groups that, between 1800 and 1945, have challenged some aspect of the status quo. It explores the strategies they used and the organizational characteristics that influenced the success of their challenges” (Gamson ix). His analysis is crucial for studying protest because of its empirical examination of various elements of protest, including violence.

Gamson notes that the questionable nature of violence as a protest tactic interferes with its effectiveness. He maintains that violence should be viewed as:

an instrumental act, aimed at furthering the purposes of the group that uses it when they have some reason to think it will help their cause. [...] The users of violence sense that they will be exonerated because they will be seen as more the midwives than the initiators of punishment (Gamson 81).

Gamson does not extend his comments to an examination of the perpetrators of violence. He acknowledges the negative connotations of violence, but does not consider how these connotations are affected (or changed) by gender.

Charles Tilly (1978), in his work on violent protest, expands on the relationship between violence and non-violence, but again does not address gender. Tilly states that there is a fundamental link between these two tactics. His claim about collective violence, and one that he reiterates repeatedly, is that it is a product of non-violence. He says:

First, most collective violence – in the sense of interactions which produce direct damage to persons and objects – grows out of actions which are not intrinsically violent, and which are basically similar to a much larger number of collective actions occurring without violence in the same periods and settings (Tilly 177).

This link between the two tactics is crucial, as it is a point that is usually missed. Often violence and non-violence are presented as diametrically opposed, whereas Tilly has brought them together. The point is also unique because it does not push violence to the

margins of protest or theorize about it as an extreme action. An examination of the connotations that have been socially constructed around gender would provide an important extension to Tilly's argument. A discussion of women and the expectations about the appropriate method of protest for them would fit into Tilly's analysis of the violent/non-violent dichotomy, and perhaps provide a valuable link between gender and various methods of protest.

Finally, Steven E. Barkan and Lynne L. Snowden (2001), in their study on collective violence, maintain Gamson's position that violent protest is a legitimate form of protest, and then work to extend Tilly's theory of the links between non-violent and violent actions by emphasizing the relationship between violent and non-violent participants. They argue that participants in violent actions "differ very little from those involved in conventional political activities trying to achieve clearly felt political objectives" (Barkan and Snowden 17). While Tilly notes that there is little difference between the origins of violent and non-violent actions, Barkan and Snowden suggest that there is also little difference between participants in violent and non-violent actions. This is an essential point because it erodes the argument that participants in violent actions are irrational and should be marginalized. However, Barkan and Snowden also fail to address the sex of participants in collective violence. As with Tilly's work, an analysis of gender in Barkan and Snowden's work could make important links between methods of protest and gender. Their study's emphasis on the connection between violent and non-violent tactics could potentially, if it included gender, make important connections between women who participate in violent protest and women who participate in peaceful protest.

Further study may successfully link these two groups rather than present them as diametrical opposites.

Examining theories that recognize violent tactics as a legitimate subject of study, locates these tactics in relation to (not in opposition to) peaceful tactics and contributes to a theoretical framework for empirically studying violent protest groups. First, these theories validate empirical studies of groups that employ violent tactics, rather than dismissing these groups as irrational or radical and unworthy of further study. Second, in linking violent tactics to non-violent tactics, these theories provide a justifiable intellectual foundation for examining a violent group's tactics. That being said, these theoretical standpoints are incomplete because of their failure include gender in their analysis.

Caroline Moser (2001) argues that "[g]ender cuts across all levels of causality and shapes both women's and men's involvement in, and experience of, violence"(40). This supports the argument that gender influences the connections between violence and non-violence. Furthermore, as has already been shown, gender is part of a protester's identity and influences one's participation in protest (Einwohner 1999; Taylor 1999; Einwohner et. al. 2000; Kuumba 2001).

Therefore, theories that examine the relationship between violence and non-violence, and make a connection between the motivations of protesters who use both forms of tactics, need to account for gender. If gender influences how a protester frames one's protest actions, it may also influence the connections between non-violence and violence. Indeed, these connections, rather than being universal for all participants, may

depend on aspects of the protester's identity, such as gender. Essentially, if gender influences a protester's identity, then it should also influence one's reasoning for engaging in protest. If gender, as a part of the protester's identity, is one determinant in shaping their participation in protest, then it may also influence their choice of protest tactic. These conclusions lead us to consider whether this relationship changes if men or women are performing violent acts. Therefore, examining the relationship between violent and non-violent tactics provides an excellent space for exploring gender and the stereotypical notions of these acts inherent in gender constructions. An analysis of women would allow the theory to develop the relationship between gender and violent protest, specifically, how one correlates to the other.

The Effects of Militant Protest

To understand the effects of violent protest in the protest arena, it is first necessary to look at how it is viewed by theorists. Barkan and Snowden refute the original ideas of collective behaviour theory and note that while violent protesters are rational, they are still often considered irrational. They say:

Terrorism and other forms of collective violence are often described as "senseless," and their participants are often depicted as irrational. When they are described this way, their actions lose whatever little credibility they might have had with the general public (Barkan and Snowden 6-7).

Barkan and Snowden recognize that those involved in collective violence have a rational thought process that supports their choice of engaging in these tactics however, others do not always recognize this (Barkan and Snowden 8). They state that "[s]ometimes the

beliefs of collective violence groups prompt them to commit actions that are difficult for us to fathom, but that doesn't necessarily mean that these actions stem from irrational individuals" (Barkan and Snowden 8).

William Gamson, in accepting violence as a legitimate form of protest, argues that whether it is valid or not, its reception is often limited by a society's notion of violence.

Gamson writes:

Violence is relatively unambiguous morally. At most, it is regarded as a necessary evil which may be justified in preventing or overcoming some even greater evil. And for many, the situations in which it is justified are scant to nonexistent. The issue depends on one's image of the society in which violence takes place. In a closed and oppressive political system that offers no nonviolent means for accomplishing change, the morality of violence is not as clear. But when it is believed that effective nonviolent alternatives exist, almost everybody would consider these morally preferable (Gamson 73).

What Gamson does not address is the idea that society's reaction to violence may depend on the sex of the protester(s). This is an important factor when looking at the case study in Chapter Two. This also relates to the argument that violent protest is generally deemed to be a masculine activity (West and Blumberg 1990; de Cataldo Neuburger and Valentia 1996).

As noted earlier, Fox Piven and Cloward argue that institutions frame protest tactics. If the institution condemns these tactics, they may not be replicated. However, these same authors also note (as does Gamson) that society's ideas of acceptable protest influence those tactics deemed acceptable. Fox Piven and Cloward differ from Gamson because they recognize that other protestors can carry societal notions of (un)acceptable protest into the protest arena. In other words, the view that other protesters have of acceptable tactics may also influence how violent tactics are received.

Fox Piven and Cloward make the argument that a protest's form depends on the socialization (in terms of protest forms) of the protesters, and is also influenced by a group's outlook on appropriate tactics. Therefore, the protest cannot take a form that is unfamiliar to or deemed unacceptable by protesters; they will not support it. Fox Piven and Cloward say:

Once protest erupts, the specific forms it takes are largely determined by features of social structure. Organizers and leaders who contrive strategies that ignore the social location of the people they seek to mobilize can only fail (Fox Piven and Cloward 36).

Protest leaders must be acutely aware of the demands of the protestors and the type of protest espoused by protesters (Fox Piven and Cloward 36). In shaping the forms of protest, the leaders should follow the ideals laid out by the protesters (Fox Piven and Cloward 36). Therefore, choosing appropriate forms of protest ensures that the protest will continue to challenge and not be diminished by disheartened protesters who cannot relate to the tactics they are encouraged to use.

This theory must include an analysis of women, particularly violent women protesters and their organizations. Fox Piven and Cloward note the tensions that arise in the protest arena, and examine how social conditions shape protesters' expectations. In particular, tensions can arise when these expectations are not met. Therefore, extending Fox Piven and Cloward's theory to include violent women protesters and their groups would allow for an examination of how group expectations and notions of acceptable protest influence women's participation in violent protest.

Recognizing that society has a negative view of violence helps to contextualize a rejection of violent protest groups. However, these notions of the effects of protest on both society and protesters need to be enhanced by an analysis of gender. The possibility that the participation of men and women in particular forms of protest may produce different reactions from society, as well as from other protesters, needs further exploration. This is especially true since it has already been determined that gender is a part of a protester's identity and influences how they negotiate their participation in the social movement group (Einwohner 1999; Kuumba 2001). These developments would contribute to a more fully developed theoretical framework with which to analyze women, violent protest, and violent protest groups.

Conclusion

While history shows that violent women protesters exist and that they engage in socially constructed roles within violent protest organizations, the social movement literature has not dealt adequately with these women and their involvement in their groups. There are only cursory examinations (if not a complete omission) of violent women protesters. Therefore, there is a pressing need to develop a theoretical approach that is inclusive rather than exclusive.

Academics have noted the importance of including a gendered analysis in the study of social movements, and this has been accomplished through empirical examinations of women participating in social movements. However, this literature fails to account for the situation of women participating in violent protest organizations,

meaning those who engage equally in violent acts and are not just involved in “support roles” for the group. This absence of violent women actors is incompatible with the literature’s insistence that the experiences of women within the protest arena must be examined. Therefore, this body of work could be enhanced by providing a theoretical foundation for answering the research question of this thesis. This would help determine how a violent protest group’s structure and organization influence women’s participation in violent protest, and show how women engaging in these actions shapes a group’s practices.

The same omission of gender occurs in the social movement literature on violent protest occurs. However, unlike the social movement literature on women and protest, this literature does not make the claim that it will attempt to incorporate gender into its argument. Nevertheless, it is clear from the literature review that it should including gender in its analysis. Excluding gender means that these works, like the literature on women and protest, do not provide an adequate theoretical framework for answering the research question.

The two different bodies of theory (women in protest and social movements, and violent protest) deal with their respective topics in isolation. However, in theorizing social movements in this manner, neither addresses violent women participants in violent protest group. However, combining insights from both literatures can help develop a theoretical framework for explaining women, violent protest, and violent protest groups.

As this chapter has demonstrated, there are plenty of spaces within each body of literature to include the theories of the other. For example, the literature on women and

social movements argues that gender shapes the identity of participants in social movements (Einwohner 1999; Taylor 1999; Einwohner et. al. 2000; Kuumba 2001). It affects, among other things, the participants' strategies of participation, their choice of tactics, and their relationship to their social movement group. Whereas the literature on violent protest makes a number of assertions, it does not consider whether these assertions change or are influenced by gender.

The following chapters glean insights from both bodies of literature in order to frame the case study presented in this thesis. Chapter Two explores two specific women who engaged in the violent protest of their underground group by presenting an empirical study of the Canadian group Direct Action. It demonstrates that women's participation in violent protest is influenced by the internal and external and choices and operations of their protest group and that the presence of violent women protesters shapes a group's practices. The chapter focuses on the relationships between women and Direct Action. The examination offers evidence that there is a relationship between women, violent protest, and violent protest groups – a relationship that requires theoretical attention.

Chapter Two – A Case Study of Direct Action

Introduction

This chapter presents a case study of the Canadian protest group, Direct Action. It attempts to demonstrate that Ann Hansen and Julie Belmas's participation in Direct Action's violent protest was influenced by Direct Action's internal and external operations and choices. In turn, this case study also indicates that having Hansen and Belmas engage in armed struggle shaped the principles of Direct Action. It, therefore, reinforces the need for a theoretical framework to explain these phenomena.

This case study is original and relevant because of the lack of information on violent Canadian protest groups, partially stemming from the low number of these groups in the country's history.¹ Examining Direct Action's structure in relation women's roles in its protest actions is also pivotal, as it provides an empirical contribution to a social movement literature that lacks theoretical analyses of the relationship between women, violent protest, and violent protest groups.

The first section of this chapter describes the history of Direct Action, while the second section examines the role of women in Direct Action. Specifically, the latter section focuses on the internal operations and relations of the group and their influence on the participation of female members, the external actions undertaken by the group, and the perceptions of two group members regarding the role of violent women protesters in

¹ Kellett's (1991) report on terrorism in Canada lists a number of militant acts, as well as some militant Canadian groups. While these groups are outside the realm of the militant group as defined by this thesis, the two main groups that have been explored in the limited literature on Canadian militant groups are the FLQ (Morf 1970; Gellner 1974; de Vault 1982; Fournier 1984) and the Mohawk Warriors within the context of the Oka Crisis (Tugwell and Thompson 1991; Hornuna 1991; York and Pindera 1999; Ciaccia 2000).

society.

This chapter demonstrates that women are active participants in violent protest and that their participation is affected by the structure and organization of their groups. This empirical evidence is used, in Chapter Three, to demonstrate that the social movement literature does not account for existing evidence. Therefore, the information presented in this chapter provides the impetus for further studies, as will be discussed in the conclusion.

A History of Direct Action

Direct Action is one of the only violent protest groups in Canada to engage in a campaign of left-wing urban guerrilla tactics. The group was formed from a loose organization of anarchists in Vancouver during the late 1970s and early 1980s, and quickly escalated into a tightly knit underground cell (Hansen interview, 06/12/2002). In the end, the group included five members: Ann Hansen (29), Julie Belmas (20), Brent Taylor (26), Gerry Hannah (26), and Doug Stewart (26). Ann Hansen's (2001) memoirs are the most comprehensive summary of the group's activities. Hansen recounts the group's origins through to their arrests on January 20, 1983 and their sentencing to prison. She describes the emergence and origins of Direct Action² as follows:

During the late 1970s and early 1980s there was in Canada a large anarchist community that was particularly active in prison abolition, feminist, Native, environmental, and Third World solidarity movements. While still working within these movements, some anarchists began to adopt direct action tactics that went

² There is very little documented on the group members prior to their involvement in Direct Action. Hansen notes that she spent time in Europe doing a research project for her degree at the University of Waterloo, where she studied protest groups such as the Red Army Faction (23). Hansen also notes that Taylor had a long history of activism in Canada. He was arrested for "pieing" Joe Clark in 1977, and later joined a militia regiment to get weapons training (Hansen 41).

beyond the legal boundaries defined by the state. They took up direct action not because they couldn't control their rage, but as part of a long-term strategy to build a revolutionary movement that would be beyond the control of corporations and the state. An even smaller group within this movement decided to start a guerrilla campaign – going underground to avoid possible arrest and imprisonment. I was part of a guerrilla group that we called Direct Action (Hansen xi).

In the early 1980s in Vancouver, British Columbia, Direct Action began a campaign of direct actions against various corporate targets, adopting the urban guerrilla tactics of other underground groups such as bombing and firebombing. Gerry Hannah argues that Direct Action was relevant to the general public:

I mean the whole purpose of Direct Action existing, the group, was [...] to try and show Canadians that they didn't have to sit by and allow these outrageous injustices to occur and feel helpless and not really do anything about it except for maybe go for a march and everybody goes, "o.k. that's all over with" and the news media cover it for maybe 30 seconds if you're lucky and then that's the end of it and then they go ahead and do whatever they want to do, anyway. We were trying to demonstrate to Canadians that [...] this didn't have to be, that people could organize on grassroots levels and actually take actions themselves. Direct action. Instead of trying to go through some lobby, some MP or some MLA or whoever, that they could actually take the action themselves and say enough is enough and actually organize together and go do it and not necessarily on a high level it could be on a low level too (Hannah 07/20/2002).

Hansen argues that Direct Action has a unique place in Canadian protest history because of their violent tactics. She notes that because of its organizational philosophy the group was probably "the only one of its kind in North America" (Hansen interview, 06/12/2002), referring to the fact that they were the only group that was formed with an anarchist political philosophy. This set them apart from other North American guerrilla

groups such as the Weather Underground and the Black Panther Party, which had more of what Hansen calls “Marxist or communist ideals” (Hansen interview, 06/12/2002).³

In fact, Direct Action could have followed number of models. Jim Campbell’s history of Direct Action notes that these influences were mainly European. He writes:

The political context for Direct Action was international. In the mid to late 1970s and into the 1980s the Red Army Fraction in Germany and the Red Brigades in Italy were only the largest various guerrilla groupings in Europe [sic]. Insurrection in Europe seemed possible in spite of the massive level of repression directed against these militants who assassinated and kidnapped politicians and corporate executives (Campbell 1).

Campbell also notes that a number of American groups influenced Direct Action, including the Black Liberation Army (formed from the Black Panthers), the United Freedom Front, the Armed Resistance Movement, the Symbionese Liberation Army, the New World Liberation Front (Campbell 1-2).

Before they isolated themselves into a closed, underground cell, Direct Action was part of a politically active community in Vancouver. Comprised of like-minded activists, mainly anarchists, this community was involved in a number of “low-level” violent protest actions, including spray painting and postering (Hansen 06/12/2002).

Hansen writes about the philosophies of community⁴, saying:

We didn’t share the basic values and principles upon which the majority of people based their lives. We were opposed to the consumerism and materialism

³ Hansen does not compare her group to other Canadian protest groups. Therefore, her analysis fails to recognize the similarities that existed in organizational structure between Direct Action and other Canadian groups. For example, the FLQ also had anarchist elements in their organizational structure (Kellett 1991).

⁴ Direct Action’s dedication to this community was reflected in the support they received after their arrests. The Free the Five Defense Group, an outside community of activists dedicated to garnering prison support for Direct Action, described the members of Direct Action in a very positive light. Its newsletter noted all five members had a long history of working in progressive social change movements (*Newsletter of the Free the Five Defense Group* (1) 2).

underlying this society. We didn't aspire to buy homes, wear nice clothes, and work for companies that we generally viewed as destructive and that left very few enterprises where any of us could have worked and been satisfied. [...] We ardently believed that we were helping people and the environment by spending our days trying to change it radically (48-49).

However, their involvement in this community would change drastically once Direct Action was formed. Once the eventual group members made the choice to engage in violent protest actions, they were separated from the political community in which they were involved. In her interview, Hansen notes, "Over a period of time we realized that most people did not want to be involved in an urban guerrilla group," (Hansen 06/12/2002). Therefore, the group consolidated its founding membership and focused on serious violent protest actions - actions that would require various illegal activities. Hansen notes, "We realized that if we were to carry out any of our vague plans, we would have to acquire handguns, false identification, and money in order to live an underground lifestyle" (139). All the group's actions were bombings; however, doing these actions required them to go underground and limit their contact to one or two acquaintances, obtain false identification, purchase (and subsequently steal firearms), steal dynamite and numerous vehicles, and perform a robbery to obtain money. While illegal, the group felt that these activities were necessary and politically justifiable. Hansen noted in an interview after her arrest that "when you are living underground trying to avoid the police, you can't have jobs or be on UIC [Unemployment Insurance] or welfare because that tags you to the police" (Fournier 12). Court statements made in court by both Stewart and Taylor reflected this sentiment. Stewart noted (*italics his*):

The true function of the law is not to defend the weak & ensure the furtherance of justice, but to defend the interests of the strong & ensure the continuance of their degradations. And that is why, in attempting to stop Cheekeye-Dunsmuir, I did

not consider the law to be a legitimate moral constraint. I act in defense of the earth (Free the Five Newsletter (9) 3).

Taylor said (italics his):

I have learned a lot about the real character of the system we live under & why it is the way it is ... I was involved in illegal political work because there is a real need for direct action now against the most critical threats confronting people & the environment (Free the Five Newsletter (9) 3).

Direct Action's choice to engage in violent protest separated them from their larger community. With the ensuing isolation, the group formed its own structure that reflected the member's wishes.

"In on the Action," a CBC-TV *Fifth Estate* documentary (26 March 2002) on Direct Action, traces the members' desires to be urban guerrillas. The documentary notes:

They would go underground and what they would do would be very controversial. They'd call themselves Direct Action and they'd concentrate on radical, militant political protests: bombs, guns, sabotage. They had plans to take the left in a whole new direction, whether the left wanted it or not. They saw it as full-time work. They didn't have time for jobs, so they rationalized all kinds of theft. They shoplifted food, clothes, hardware, and late at night they'd steal cars. It was on-the-job training (Fifth Estate 4-5).

Employing the illegal activities of urban guerrillas, Direct Action adopted an underground lifestyle and embarked on a protest campaign against British Columbia Hydro, Litton Industries, and Red Hot Video.

Cheekeye-Dunsmuir Action

The name Direct Action was first used in conjunction with the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir action, a bombing by Hansen and Stewart of the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir

transmission line, a project of British Columbia Hydroelectric, on May 31, 1982. The group (at the time composed of Hansen, Stewart, and Taylor) was opposed to the destruction of the environment that the transmission line would cause. They not only plotted to bomb one of its substations before the line was functional; they were successful in causing substantial damage.⁵

Direct Action's communiqué following the bombing, introduced the general public and the RCMP, to the group.⁶ The British Columbia environmentalist community, though opposed to the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir project, was reluctant to accept a group that used such subversive protest techniques. Shortly after the bombing, Martin Rossander, chairman of the Powell River Anti-Pollution Association, said that "environmentalists are not dynamiters [...]. I know that this is not the way to go. We have proved in the past that the non-violent approach does work" (*Vancouver Sun* June 2, 1982 A2). British Columbia environmentalist Ivan Bulich had a similar reaction to the bombing:

I would think that blowing up...putting a bomb is an act that terrorizes, that I wouldn't want to be treated that way. I mean, and I wouldn't treat anyone else in that manner. So from that point of view, yeah, it's unacceptable (Fifth Estate 7).

Nevertheless, the bombing did raise the public's awareness of the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir project, and generated a debate among members of the environmental movement about appropriate methods of resistance.

⁵ The CBC *Fifth Estate* documentary on Direct Action described the bombing as follows: "On the 31st of May 1982, Ann Hansen and Doug Stewart dynamited a remote substation called Cheekeye-Dunsmuir into a smouldering ruin with a blast so powerful, people thought it was an earthquake" (Fifth Estate 7).

⁶ The communiqué is included as Appendix A.

Litton Systems Action

The group's lifestyle changed dramatically after the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir bombing. Hansen writes:

After the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir bombing our group kept an extremely low profile in Vancouver. We were aware that we were living dangerously by staying there, but we weren't ready to take the plunge into the underground [...]. Instead we applied as many safeguards as we could, using false identification to rent apartments, avoiding public functions where we might run into acquaintances, and limiting our social contacts to one friend each, plus Gerry, Julie and Doug's mother (213).

In the post-Cheekeye-Dunsmuir period, Direct Action expanded to include two new members: Gerry Hannah and Julie Belmas. The group made plans to bomb the Litton Systems plant in Toronto, Ontario. Litton Systems was a Canadian company that, at the time of the bombing, was about to receive an American contract to build guidance systems for the cruise missile (Dutton A1). The group justified its actions as part of the anti-nuclear movement's opposition to Litton's industry.

Although Direct Action was based in Vancouver and had thus far performed all their actions in British Columbia, Hansen justified their shift to Toronto, arguing that "we did not want Direct Action to be considered a provincial group but rather one with international politics, acting across Canada" (226). Therefore, three members of Direct Action (Hansen, Taylor, and Belmas) left for Toronto in mid-September of 1982 to complete the Litton action. On the night of Thursday, October 14, 1982, Direct Action bombed the Litton Plant.⁷ The bombing, undoubtedly the group's largest action, was

⁷ See Appendix B for the communiqué. In terms of the actual action, Hansen was responsible for driving the dynamite-filled van up to the Litton building and turning on the timing device, Taylor drove the get-away car, and Belmas made the call to the security tower to warn the guards of the bomb and request an evacuation of the building.

reported nationally and internationally. For example, *International Terrorism in the 1980s, A Chronology of Events*, lists the bombing, saying:

October 15, 1982 – CANADA – Direct Action bombed the Litton Systems of Canada plant in Toronto that produces the guidance system for cruise missiles. The three hundred to five hundred pounds of dynamite was cached in an orange-colored box marked Danger, Explosives besides a blue van parked in front of the plant. The bomb went off at 11:31 P.M., 13 minutes after a woman's telephone tip. Four factory workers and three policemen, who were approaching the bomb were injured. The bomb caused \$5 million damages. The plant had received three or four bomb threats previously and was the focus of antinuclear demonstrations (Mickolus et. al. 328).

National news reports in the days following the bombing were filled with details of the event, as well as speculation about those responsible and commentary from the anti-nuclear community. Though large in itself (the bombing caused \$5 million damage), the bombing created more controversy because of the inadvertent injuries (ten people were injured) that resulted from various mistakes both on the part of Direct Action, the police, and Litton security (Hansen 267-268).⁸ Hansen explains:

We didn't know what had happened exactly. We figured people were dead, [...] I think all of us were [...] pretty much [...] in a state of, [...] you know, we thought maybe we should just kill ourselves [...] because this is not the sort of thing that we felt like we could stand up for [...] like [...] could justify in any way, [...] because politically, we didn't feel that the people working in the plant were even remotely responsible for the Cruise guidance system being made, and that wasn't our objective (Fifth Estate 9)

It was not just the members of Direct Action who were repulsed by the injuries. A

⁸ The mishap in the bombing was caused by several problems. First, the security guards did not understand Belmas's warning call. Second an unarmed stick of dynamite was placed on top of Direct Action's van with a warning for police to clear the building immediately, however the police did not read this warning because they did not realize that the dynamite was unarmed. These two incidents led to delays in getting the Litton plant cleared of workers. Finally, the bomb went off 12 minutes too soon. Direct Action claimed that their timing device was impeccable and functioned properly. It was later speculated that the radios used by the police may have triggered the device to detonate the bomb early (Hansen 267 –68).

general distaste seemed to arise from members of protest communities who were involved either directly or indirectly with the bombing. Not surprisingly, those injured in the bombing expressed strong opposition to the action. Litton security guard Terry Chikowski responded to the group's initial surprise at the injuries in the following manner:

What does she [Hansen] expect to have happen when she uses over 500 pounds of dynamite in an act of terrorism at a building where they know people are working, right by a major highway? I don't care if it's 11:30 at night, there's going to be cars out on that road. Five hundred pounds of dynamite. [...] I'm okay with the Squamish Five [a name dubbed to Direct Action after their arrest near Squamish, B.C.] today, I mean, I don't have any vendetta, if you will, against them. I'm not pleased with them, I never will be. I think it was a totally unnecessary, brainless thing they did, quite a stupid thing (Fifth Estate 10 and 17).

Worker Barry Blunden echoed this sentiment, saying "I think they're a bunch of idiots and I am glad they got severe penalties" (*Vancouver Sun* June 9, 1984 A11). However, there were other reactions to the bombings, as well. For example, Litton employee James Tayles stated that he "harbors no bitterness toward those convicted of the bombing" and that "[t]hey did something they believed in. [...] I thought what they did was foolish, but they are paying the price" (*Vancouver Sun* June 9, 1984 A11).

This mixed reaction was also expressed by members of the anti-nuclear movement. The bombing led members of this community, especially those who has protested peacefully at Litton, to take a negative view of the action (Hansen 279).

Originally, the peace movement felt that the bombing was "planted by far-right extremists in a bid to discredit anti-nuclear groups" (Scotton M1). The Rev. John Morgan, president of the Canadian Peace Congress at the time, noted that "The Canadian Peace Congress

condemns the bombing of Litton as a provocative attack, the aim of which is the discrediting of national campaigns to stop the production and testing in Canada of the first-strike cruise missile”(Hanlon A3). Ted Schmidt, of Project Ploughshares and Teachers for Social Justice, shared Morgan’s sentiments: “My analysis is that it’s coming from the far right”(Hanlon A3). However, when Direct Action’s communiqué made clear to the public that a left-wing group executed the bombing, the anti-nuclear community’s opinions did not change. Rev. W. G. Zwicker, acting as a spokesperson for anti-nuclear protesters, noted that “the demonstrations were always peaceful and he had never heard any intimation of violence” (Harper A3).

Hansen said, “we [Direct Action] wanted to go beyond where the popular movement stopped” (Hansen speech 03/20/2002). In this way, it may be argued that Direct Action wanted its actions, including the Litton bombing, to complement the anti-nuclear movement and perhaps make a statement in a manner that was (is) considered very controversial and often seen as unacceptable. With their mistakes and the injuries at the Litton plant, however, the Direct Action bombing failed to be embraced as an extension of the anti-nuclear movement. In fact, Direct Action’s attempts to support the anti-nuclear movement were rejected because of the group’s violent tactics, leaving the group alienated from the larger movement.

Participants in the anti-nuclear movement saw the bombing in difference ways. The *Fifth Estate* documentary includes the reaction of Pam Cross, a member of the Alliance for Non-Violent Action, to the bombing. Asked if she was empowered by the bombing, Cross stated:

I'm not going to say I was empowered by the bombing because the bombing caused harm to people, caused pain - and I don't just mean physical pain - and caused some genuine grief for people. What I will say is that the actions of Direct Action empowered me to think and challenge myself and moved myself farther into the field of political action (Fifth Estate 11).

As to whether the bombing actually enhanced the movement's activities, Len Desroches of the Cruise Missile Conversion Project remarked:

I think that we were definitely successful, very successful in putting Litton on the map. [He is speaking in reference to the effectiveness of peaceful protest tactics.] In my opinion, we were just beginning to do our work. I believe that it takes five years to begin, ten years to have some effect, maybe 20 years to really, really have a change happening.[...] I don't believe that violence changes anything. I don't believe it has a place anywhere. The work and discipline to really effect radical transformation takes all of one's energy as a state, as a group, as an individual. You don't have time. You can't...it's a luxury to go around having extra energy to use violence (Fifth Estate 8 and 11).

Nevertheless, the injuries, as well as the negative reaction to the bombing, did not stop Direct Action from beginning to plan subsequent actions.

Direct Action After Litton and The Wimmin's Fire Brigade

After the Litton bombing, all members of Direct Action returned to Vancouver and remained, for the most part, underground. They began to plan further potential actions, including the robbery of a Brink's security guard, to obtain money to support themselves for a relatively long period of time. This is when Direct Action came under police surveillance.⁹

⁹ Hansen notes in her book that the police were aware of Direct Action since the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir action were eventually linked to dynamite stolen from BC Highways, when Direct Action's dynamite storage magazine was discovered. It is presumed that a journalist who recognized the similarity in the writing of styles of the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir and Litton communiqués, and a pamphlet called "Resistance" that reprinted communiqués of guerrilla groups around the world, notified police of the connection (Hansen, 285).

Some of the members of Direct Action also helped plan the firebombing of the Red Hot Video chain through the Wimmin's Fire Brigade.¹⁰ Although this was not specifically a Direct Action initiative, it did involve their members and reflected the group's feminist consciousness. Reflecting this consciousness, Hansen notes that the men in Direct Action originally planned to do their own firebombing, through the Wimmin's Fire Brigade, to show that "men were also opposed to pornography" (Hansen 329). Hansen and Belmas participated in two of the three different, isolated cells of women responsible for this firebombing. Also, Stewart delivered the communiqué for the Wimmin's Fire Brigade. Hansen writes:

Even though we [Direct Action] had few contacts with the community, the women whom we did speak with were universally outraged at the government's inactivity. One evening in mid-November I had met with eight other women, including Julie, to devise a strategy of action. We decided to call ourselves the Wimmin's Fire Brigade. I don't remember how we ended up making a decision to firebomb some Red Hot Video outlets, but by the time the meeting was over we had divided into three groups of three women each. The groups were each going to plan and separately execute firebombings of Red Hot Video outlets in North Vancouver, Port Coquitlam, and Surrey. The three groups of women would remain autonomous except with a communiqué and co-ordinate the exact timing of the actions.

Direct Action itself had not come up with the plan for the firebombings, but our original group had no trouble justifying its involvement with the Wimmin's Fire Brigade. The action harmonized perfectly with our politics (329).

On November 21, 1982, the three video stores were firebombed.¹¹ The only casualty was

¹⁰ The Red Hot Video chain started in Vancouver in 1982, specializing in renting pornography (Hansen, 328). Women's groups, like the North Shore Women's Centre "had lobbied the B.C. attorney general's office to charge Red Hot Video under the hate propaganda section of the Criminal Code to stop the distribution of its catalogue" (Hansen, 329). However, they had had no success, and it was at this point that both Hansen and Belmas joined with a group of women to create the Wimmin's Fire Brigade and plan the firebombing of three stores (Hansen, 329).

¹¹ See Appendix C for the communiqué.

Hansen, who was badly burnt in the action.

The reaction of women's groups, which were involved in the struggle to close Red Hot Video stores, to the Wimmin's Fire Brigade and its firebombing, was very favourable, and thus quite different from the reaction to Direct Action after the Litton bombing.¹² In this instance, the firebombing accomplished what Direct Action aimed to do: complement and extend the actions of the popular movement. Instead of being rejected by the larger movements, the Wimmin's Fire Brigade was embraced by the anti-pornography and women's movements. Hansen cites the B.C. Federation of Women's press release given after the firebombing:

While we did not participate in the firebombings of November 22nd in the Lower Mainland, we are in agreement with the frustration and anger of the women who did. We noted and appreciated their efforts to see that no one got hurt (347).

This sentiment is echoed by the former spokesperson for the British Columbia Federation of Women, Lee Lakeman:

Technically, we didn't condone it. We did work pretty hard not to condemn it, either, and not to condemn the people involved in it for two reasons: one, because we all had this secret glee, and there was no need to be hypocritical about that, we were happy that it had cost the owners some money and time, and frustrated that the government hadn't responded (Fifth Estate 14).

This was the type of public support that Direct Action sought from in their actions, but never received.

After the firebombing, Direct Action began looking at possibilities for their next action, including another Cheekeye-Dunsmuir bombing, bombing the Cold Lake Air Force Base in Alberta, or bombing the ice breaker Terry Fox. However, they focused

¹² See Denise McConney (1985) for an examination of the Wimmin's Fire Brigade's portrayal in the media.

largely on preparing for robbing a Brink's security guard. Part of this preparation forced the group travelled to the forested, mountainous area outside of Squamish, British Columbia for target practice. On January 20, 1983, when the members of Direct Action were on one of these trips to Squamish, they were stopped and arrested in a police roadblock, thus ending their existence as a group.

The Trial

The five members of Direct Action were charged with various criminal offences (Hansen 466). The first part of their trials was consumed by arguments that the group could not be sentenced fairly in British Columbia because of media reports surrounding their arrests and the image that these reports had created among the public. A report in the *Vancouver Sun* during the trial stated that, "[s]ome television coverage of the arrest made them appear to be 'freaks' and would influence public attitudes toward their trial, B.C. Supreme Court Justice S. Martin Toy was told Tuesday"(September 14, 1983 A2).

The group soon deemed that their original idea of turning the trial into a "political forum to expose the issues of environmental destruction, nuclear technology, and pornography" was impossible (Hansen 466). For the trial to have been a political forum, Direct Action would have to overcome strong public sentiment against them, most of which, Hansen insists, was created by media reports on the group. Hansen writes:

We anticipated that this trial would effectively criminalize our actions, because it was unlikely that either a jury or the public would understand any of the charges – stealing cars, weapons, and conspiracy to commit a robbery – as being political in nature. We understood that once the media coverage of this first trial [the Brink's trial] tainted the public's attitude, it would be almost impossible for any jury in British Columbia to fathom the political motivations behind the other charges (466).

Nevertheless, there were citizens in Vancouver and Toronto who followed the trial and supported Direct Action. (Taylor went to Toronto for the Litton trial, while Hansen and Belmas pled guilty to Litton, eliminating the need for them to go to Toronto.) The campaign in Vancouver was called “Free the Five.” This support includes similar “Free the Five” groups in New York City, San Francisco, London, Edmonton, Calgary, Winnipeg, Ottawa, Montreal, Seattle, Santa Cruz, Philadelphia, and Detroit (*Free the Five Newsletter Issue* (5) 4). These groups worked to raise public awareness about Direct Action and sought financial support to pay for Direct Action’s legal fees.

There was also opposition to the group among people who were not involved with Direct Action but were politically active in the same movements, especially in the environmental movement. This was likely due to the mixed feelings about the bombings or the disruption that the arrests caused in lives of others. The *Free the Five Newsletter* describes this opposition, noting, “[i]t has been quite painful to those of us supporting these 5 activists, to witness the condemnation & lack of unity that have come prevalently from several environmental organizations” (*Free the Five Newsletter*(3) 1). This criticism is representative of the uneasy relationship that Direct Action had with the larger movements.

In the end, Julie Belmas was sentenced to 20 years in prison, Gerry Hannah to ten years, Doug Stewart to ten years, Brent Taylor to 22 years, and Ann Hansen to life imprisonment (Hansen 467-68). In interviews with Hannah and Hansen, it was highlighted that Hansen and Belmas received unduly harsh sentences. It has been speculated that this occurred in Hansen’s case because she showed no remorse in her

statement to the court,¹³ and also because she threw a tomato at the judge during sentencing. Justice S. Martin Toy, who presided over the trial, told Hansen before sentencing her, “You were a menace, a real threat to our Canadian way of life” (Odam A1). Judge Toy went on to say that “her closing speech to him had shown that she had not changed her mind and he did not know for how long society would have to be protected against her” (Odam A1).

By January 1990 all of Direct Action was out of prison and on full parole (Hansen 468). However, the members of the group experienced repercussions because of their involvement in Direct Action. This is evidenced by their unwillingness or reluctance to discuss their history of involvement with Direct Action. The *Fifth Estate* documentary notes that each member had “had personal setbacks,” and that “[o]nly Hansen would agree to interviews and only now is she willing to talk about the past” (16).

Women and Direct Action

This section explores the relationship between the structure and organization of Direct Action and Hansen and Belmas’s participation in violent protest, thus showing that women’s engagement in violent protest is influenced by the internal and external operations and choices of the protest group. It also explores, in a secondary nature, how the presence of violent women protesters shaped the practices of the group itself.

The discussion proceeds by describing how Hansen and Belmas were influenced by the internal operations and relations of the group; assessing the external actions of the

¹³ See Appendix D for Hansen’s statement.

group and how Hansen and Belmas participated in these actions; reviewing Hansen's involvement in Wimmin's Fire Brigade and Direct Action; and, finally, presenting Hansen and Hannah's hypotheses regarding society's perception of violent women protesters. This empirical examination is important because it demonstrates that there is a link between women, violent protest, and violent protest groups and illustrates the need for this relationship to be addressed in the social movement literature in a more systematic fashion. Therefore, this section provides a starting point for an extension of the literature surveyed in Chapter One.¹⁴

Direct Action's Internal Operations and Relationships

The women in Direct Action were in a unique position, compared to women in other violent protest groups. Due to the small size of the group, and the continual efforts of both the males and females to be non-sexist, and reflect a feminist consciousness, the women in Direct Action were afforded a unique, enabling and empowering position from which to pursue their violent protest actions.

Each member of the group, depending on their interests prior to joining, assumed specific tasks (Hansen 06/12/2002). These tasks were not designated along traditional gender lines. For example, the women were not forced to assume domestic duties. Hansen

¹⁴ Interviews with Ann Hansen and Gerry Hannah are the primary sources. These interviews are supplemented by information from Hansen's book and from newspaper articles. This examination of the group may reflect the aspirations of Direct Action, as Hansen and Hannah are representative members, but it is also extremely limited by the non-participation of the other three members. Any conclusions reached are regarded as tentative. Nevertheless, in view of the dearth of material available, both on Direct Action and on women in violent protest groups, it can be assumed that these tentative conclusions provide a necessary starting point for further study.

believes that because of the small group size, “[w]e did not need a highly organized group” and that, consequently, each member “took on a different function” (Hansen 06/12/2002). Hannah provides further insight into the group’s organizational structure, noting that:

We operated on the basis of consensus [...]. We made decisions on the basis of trying to come to a consensus. And we wouldn’t push anything on anybody that they didn’t feel comfortable with. And people weren’t pressured to do things that they felt they absolutely did not want to do. But, [...] and we considered ourselves anarchists so we attempted to construct ourselves according to an anarchist structure, so where everybody’s opinions are heard, there is no boss, there was no leader involved. We would have meetings and we would [...] hash stuff out at the meetings as equals. And I think that there was a conscious effort made to, [...] we knew the historical implications of, [...] being female, being male and what that meant in terms of power structures in general society. So we actually, if anything, consciously tried to avoid having the men kind of dominating the meetings and controlling the situation and the women just [...] being [...] told what to do or being kind of pressured to follow. I think that, [...] I mean as far as organizational structure, we basically allowed each other to choose what we thought we could do best and as far as, as far as strategy went everybody had an equal voice in planning [...] what was going to happen. So, yeah it was very, very non-traditional (Hannah 07/20/2002).

Hansen describes the members of the group’s involvement as follows: Stewart, because of his background in physics, “took on the role of studying explosives”; Taylor acquired information for Direct Action and “set out how to get the false identification”; Hansen specialized in mechanics and was involved in stealing cars, picking locks, breaking and entering, and thefts; Belmas had an artistic background and helped with disguises (Hansen notes that she was “instrumental on that level”); and Hannah contributed to the group with his passion for military knowledge and planes (Hansen 06/12/2002). Hannah, however, felt that he was more crucial because of his outdoor skills. He says:

I saw my role when I first got involved with the group, as a support person. As opposed to kind of a [...] key planner and strategizer, [...] person who figures out strategy. I was prepared to use my abilities of, getting around in the outdoors and my knowledge of that sort of thing. [...] I was prepared to use that more [...]. Actually, I even said at one point that I wasn't really interested in urban action, [...] I was interested in rural actions [...] because that was where I felt that I was actually[...] more suited because of my experience in that [...]. As time went on, of course, I became actually [...] as much a person involved in planning as anybody in the group. But my initial intention was never to be, not to go underground, I never intended to go underground when I first got involved with them and I intended to just basically be kind of like a person that they would call on when they needed extra help with some kind of activity that involved being out of the city (Hannah 07/20/2002).

Each member of the group, then, contributed to specific areas because of their expertise.

Whether or not they all shared identical visions of what these were, these contributions obviously allowed the group to function effectively. These tasks and were not defined or assigned along stereotypically gendered lines.

For example, domestic tasks like cleaning and cooking were shared by members of the group (Hansen 06/12/2002). Hansen notes that she did more of the formal cooking, while Stewart and Taylor did more of the cleaning (Hansen 06/12/2002). She says, “[w]e had a very unconventional lifestyle because we were a group of people conscientiously trying to be feminist. [...] We weren’t gender specific with everyday activities”(Hansen 06/12/2002). Hannah corroborates this and notes that the group was very conscious of stereotypical gender roles. He says:

Again we were aware of the [...] stereotypical dynamics between men and women and we were attempting to avoid those.[...] That doesn’t mean that we were 100 per cent successful in doing so; we probably weren’t. [...] Because it is hard to, socialized habits are hard to discard, you know (Hannah 07/20/2002).

This internal perspective of the absence of hierarchy, however, was not reflected in the opinions and views of people outside Direct Action. For example, Justice S. Martin Toy noted in his sentencing that Hansen was one of the group's "ideological leaders," citing Taylor as the other (Still A1 and A2). Hansen admitted that "the cops saw me as being a leader, even though I would say Brent, Doug, and I were easily on par. Pretty much equal out of experience and age" (Hansen 06/12/2002).

Hansen concedes that the group had strong male personas, citing Taylor in particular. She says that sometimes she could tell Taylor was "thinking for me, especially in terms of technology" (Hansen 06/12/2002). Despite Hansen's allusions to a subtle sexism, she is quick to note, as recognized earlier by Hannah, that the males of the group were not intentional in their actions, but rather worked within the framework of a feminist consciousness. She speculates that it was an inadvertent sexism, most likely a by-product of growing up in North American society at that time. Hansen says:

The men in the group were very aware of feminism. They made a conscious effort to not be sexist. But, they are all products of the system and more interested in classical male things (Hansen 06/12/2002).

By "classical male things," Hansen meant "guns, F18s" (Hansen 06/12/2002). In her book, she makes some generalizations based on personal experience:

Even without statistical proof, I would guess a disproportionate number of men have a penchant for weapons. Doug and Brent were no exception, even though they had been raised in liberal homes where hunting was frowned upon and gun control was supported. They didn't like to see themselves as macho, but the long hours they spent reading magazines like *Guns and Ammo* and cleaning their weapons led me to believe they found something irresistible about the power of a gun (Hansen 144).

However, Hannah did not see, in terms of weapons, the same gender imbalances as Hansen. In fact, Hannah saw the members' interests in weapons as gender neutral, in that all members of the group were interested in the weapons. He notes:

We basically, [...] I mean [...] it wasn't like the guys were in charge of cleaning the guns [...] and that sort of thing at all [...]. Everybody did that, everybody cleaned guns, everybody knew about guns, everybody wanted to learn more about guns and did know (Hannah 07/20/2002).

This points to a difference in the perceptions of the group members. While it is difficult to determine if these incongruencies are a result of gender, they do, however, highlight a difference in experience.

External Actions

Maintaining a non-sexist and/or feminist agenda in their activities extended through into the completion of Direct Action's violent protest actions, specifically the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir and Litton bombings. Hansen remembers that even in the actions, the group did not differentiate their tasks along gender lines. She notes that both she and Belmas "were not frail women with stereotypical interests," and this may have contributed to their successful avoidance of stereotypical roles, especially within the group's protest actions (Hansen 06/12/2002). The women were not assigned specific tasks based on their gender; nor did they choose a specific part in the action (or a weapon) because of their physical stature. Hansen says, "[w]e never chose weapons or actions based on physical strength" (Hansen 06/12/2002). Hannah, somewhat comically, also upholds this statement, saying, "Actually, you know, Ann and Julie had the biggest

handguns of anybody in the group [...]. Ann had the biggest handgun of anybody in the group, it actually hurt to shoot the thing. It hurt your wrist” (Hannah 07/20/2002).

On a different level, Hansen insists that the only factor involved in designating tasks were the age and experience of the group’s members. Here Hansen is referring to Belmas’s involvement in the Litton bombing. Belmas, because she was the youngest of the group and it was her first action with Direct Action, was “kept as uninvolved as possible” (Hansen 06/12/2002). Hansen mentions that decisions in the group were made for practicality, but then goes on to say that within the group, the “power dynamics were based more on experience and age” (Hansen 06/12/2002).

In terms of practicality, Hannah saw another instance in which the group was divided along gender lines. In terms of low-level actions such as shoplifting, as well as casing out specific actions, gender stereotypes became a factor in warding off suspicion.

Hannah says:

I would say that things were divided in terms of gender really only in terms of activity [...]. Support activity as opposed to say domestic activity [...]. I would say that things were only divided in that sometimes [...] we would figure that we were going to case something or have to steal something and we would want say two women because they potentially might look less suspicious or something like that, depending on circumstances. Or we might use a male and female to look like a husband and wife [...]. Try and make it look like they were some kind of [...] couple, again to try and lower suspicion. So [...] gender would come into play in those terms sometimes. But I mean that was just straight [...] practical reasons basically (Hannah 07/20/2002).

There was one area where the group’s practice was divided along gender lines. The men wrote the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir and Litton communiqués. While the women had the opportunity to contribute to the statements, the men actually wrote them, a fact that Hannah did not recognize (Hansen 06/12/2002; Hannah 07/20/2002). Hannah, in fact,

spoke of how the communiqués (the actual written documents, as opposed to the task of writing them) attempted to address gender imbalances in society, thus reflecting the feminist consciousness of all the group's members (Hannah 07/20/2002). For example, in the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir communiqué, it was written that “ecological destruction is directly related to the human oppressions of sexism, racism, hierarchy and imperialism” (Hansen 475). However, because Direct Action was an underground group and the communiqués were the only means of contact with the general public, the men, in writing the communiqués, were effectively acting therefore as the spokespersons for the group vis-à-vis the public.

Hansen's perspective on the differences between Direct Action and The Wimmin's Fire Brigade

As noted, Hansen was involved in the women-only Wimmin's Fire Brigade, as well as in Direct Action, and was in a unique position to observe the differences between groups consisting solely of women and those that include both men and women. Hansen states:

I may be making an assumption, but it seemed that working with these women there was no machismo involved. They were a very down-to-earth group of women (Hansen 06/12/2002).

Hansen goes on to say, “[n]obody was getting off on the image of being militant” (Hansen interview, 06/12/2002). By comparison, she notes, “[i]n Direct Action all of us, including Julie and I, got this feeling of being machismo,” a feeling that she likened to “a buzz by accomplishing a power trip” (Hansen 06/12/2002). Hansen also speaks more

generally about receiving an “ego-buzz” from participating in the violent protest actions. She recalls that in violent protest there is a danger: once egos are involved, then more weaponry and power become involved, even power through the use of force, and “you have to fight against letting your ego be affected by that power” (Hansen 06/12/2002).

In talking about the differences between the two groups, Hansen realizes that she may be making an assumption about the different responses of the groups to violent protest. However, she feels that these differences are still relevant:

I assume because it was women involved, but I don’t recall any kind of bravado or machismo. Nobody was bragging. Nobody got an ego-buzz out of it (Hansen 06/12/2002).

The differences in the responses to the actions by members of the two groups led Hansen to speculate on whether things would have been done differently if only women had been involved in Direct Action, or if women had had complete control in Direct Action – as they did in the Wimmin’s Fire Brigade. Hansen stated that she felt Direct Action acquired too many weapons and that too much dynamite was used in the Litton bombing (a sentiment that Belmas repeated after her conviction¹⁵). Hansen reflects: “perhaps if the group was all women we might have used less dynamite and accumulated fewer weapons” (Hansen 06/12/2002), although she speculates that “I couldn’t say that it was because of men in the group that we did robberies, or had too many weapons” (Hansen 06/12/2002). The contradictory nature of Hansen’s response to this issue centres on the fact that both Hansen and Belmas experienced the same machismo attitude toward violent actions as the men. Furthermore, both Hansen and Hannah noted that the

¹⁵ In the *Vancouver Sun*, Belmas is quoted as saying “the 500-pound bomb at Litton was far too large” (Sarti A10).

objectives for the women and men of the group were the same (Hansen 06/12/2002; Hannah 07/20/2002). This demonstrates, then, that within each of the two groups, the members' responses to violent protest were similar.

The differences that Hansen experienced in the two groups, therefore, do not seem to focus around a difference in the responses of males and females to the violent protest act. In fact, if this were the case, it would be plausible to say that Hansen would have had to note an alienation of her experiences from that of the men in Direct Action. However, she recalls that they all felt the same machismo (Hansen 06/12/2002). Therefore, other factors, such as the group's composition (male and female or solely female) must have contributed to Hansen's different experience in the groups.

Society's Perceptions of Militant Women

As stated above, Ann Hansen and Gerry Hannah reported that they participated in the same actions and were not assigned any stereotypically gender-based tasks during their time in Direct Action. That said, Hansen and Hannah highlight a number of experiences for women who participate in violent protest actions that were different from those of men involved in the same activity.

Women involved in violent protest work in contradiction to society's stereotypical representation of women, or, at the very least, of feminine qualities. Hansen says, "[w]omen are more demoralized for these [violent actions] things":

There are images of men as folk heroes, gun toting, defending individual rights and freedoms through the use of force. There are no images of women that I can think of like that. [...] The distinction between what society sees as sane men and militant women, even on a low level, is so much more extreme. You see men throw tear gas and think they are brave street kids and if you see a women do that

you think that she is some kind of dyke - that there is something wrong with her (Hansen 06/12/2002).

It is these stereotypes and this societal rejection that Hansen notes she has had to battle all her life, as a woman involved in violent direct action. She believes that society sees these actions as more typically done by males, and that this is part of the problem. According to Hansen, women who are violent protesters are “combating a stereotype in a big way” (Hansen 06/12/2002). She says:

You can’t compromise to do the right thing. The best way to combat it is by doing it. If you compromise then they think that they are right or you give up your ideals to appease a consensus in society. [...] I am not the gentle, peaceful, earth mother type. [...] I never thought about it [working to combat a stereotype]. It didn’t affect me or influence my judgement. I identified with women in the RAF [Red Army Faction] (Hansen 06/12/2002).

Hansen shares that she never questioned her decision to be engaged in this form of protest, nor did she ever feel discouraged from participating because she is a woman. She says, “It is a personal thing with me. Because [...] personally, I have never felt that being a woman should define what I do politically. It is a political decision, not a gender decision” (Hansen 06/12/2002). Hannah supports this idea when he comments:

Women are supposed to be nurturing and caregivers, and attentive and all that sort of thing. So women like Sister Theresa and that, [...] now there’s a hero because that is what women are supposed to do. That’s the way they’re supposed to rise up against adversity. Is to basically be these incredibly kind, [...] helpful caregivers, they are not supposed to be pissed off and punch somebody in the head because they got it coming [...]. So they are not treated too well when they do that. They’re uppity women [...], I think that’s still largely the game out there (Hannah 07/20/2002).

In reflecting on contemporary violent protest actions, Hansen suggests that younger women are creating a more acceptable niche in which to accomplish these actions because “younger women feel more free from the stereotype” (Hansen

06/12/2002). With respect to the growing number of women participating in violent protest, Hansen feels this reflects a growing feminism. She says: “it reflects that women are making the political decision to do militant action. It is a positive sign. Women are seeing themselves as taking an offensive and possibly the most positive action” (Hansen 06/12/2002).

Nevertheless, in looking at the new positive possibilities for women involved in violent direct actions, Hansen is still unsure about whether society as a whole will accept both violent protest and women involved in it. She understands that “there is no acceptance for militant actions, period, and society is less tolerant for women than men because they’re so far from the stereotype. [...] I don’t think that society will ever accept militancy except if it [society] develops a more revolutionary consciousness” (Hansen 06/12/2002). Hannah expressed this sentiment in almost identical terms: “No, I don’t see acceptance in society for militant actions, period. So I don’t see it for women. Yeah, I see it even less for women of course. But, I don’t see any acceptance of militant action whatsoever” (Hannah 07/20/2002).

This lack of acceptance has influenced the manner in which violent women protesters are treated. One example of this from Hansen’s experience is the harsher sentencing given to these women as compared to the sentences received by men who are involved in the same acts: “Legally, women always get, if the state will see them as criminals and not deviants, more time than the men involved [...] because women engage so far from the stereotypes, it is easy to see them as deviants” (Hansen 06/12/2002). Hansen, the only member of the group to receive a life sentence for her actions,

speculates that this may have been due in part to the fact that she threw the tomato at the judge. Also, she says, “there was more evidence against me [...] and I chose to do a speech instead of showing remorse” (Hansen 06/12/2002). Hansen also acknowledges that her harsh sentence may have been given because she was a woman engaged in violent protest actions. Hannah agrees completely:

I feel that [...] both Julie and Ann got disproportionately long sentences because they were women. I had that feeling at the time. [...] It’s so long ago, I’m not sure I can tell you all the different reasons why I felt that way, but I do remember to this day that it was just the clearest feeling in [...] the world [...]. The state was really pissed at the fact that these two women were so uppity as to [...] take on [...] male roles and be planners and strategizers and [...] be willing to go to the same lengths as basically what is [...] seen as a [...] guy’s kind of, war is a guy’s game, right? And yet Julie and Ann had decided to become warriors and to go to war and I think that really pissed off the state. [...] Ann got life where in fact they knew clearly that she was no more responsible for anything than the rest of us, [...]. And, and Julie who was incredibly young at the time, obviously [...] easily influenced and [...] perhaps outrageously idealistic for her, kind of partly because of her age, they [...] were completely happy to destroy her life too with an incredibly, with twenty years [...]. Twenty years with no former [...] criminal record whatsoever [...]. Convicted of being [...] involved in a bombing and involved in the planning of a robbery that never happened [...] twenty years is a long, long time (Hannah 07/20/2002).

Hansen’s idea of society seeing women involved in armed struggle as deviant is also reflected in how both Hansen and Belmas were treated in prison. An article in *Kinesis* magazine notes:

Although the prison is careful not to interfere with such rights as free access to their lawyers, and their visits, Ann and Julie feel they are treated differently because they are viewed as “terrorists.” They cannot work like some of the other inmates, because they are seen as a security risk; their requests for school enrolment have been ignored; when transported to court they must exit from the vans with loaded guns focused on them; their [the underlining is not mine] visitors are escorted from the gates (others are not). [...] Ann has been forbidden to room with other women [this was in response to a fear that she would indoctrinate other prisoners] (MacDonald 10).

All of these observations support Hansen and Hannah's perception that society treats (and views) violent women protesters differently than violent male protesters.

Conclusion

Direct Action's violent tactics afforded them a unique relationship both externally with other social movements, and internally within their own group. Externally, they were placed both on the periphery of, and as an integral element, of various social movements. After the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir and Litton bombings, the environmental movement and the anti-nuclear movement rejected Direct Action and marginalized them from other social movements. In the case of the Red Hot Video store firebombing, the Wimmin's Fire Brigade was accepted as representing the frustration that women in the anti-pornography movement were experiencing. While the more mainstream groups within the anti-pornography movement (i.e., the B.C. Federation of Women) were careful not to praise the firebombing as a valid method of protest, they were also careful not to denounce the action because of the attention that it had brought to their cause. Thus, the Wimmin's Fire Brigade remained positioned within the anti-pornography movement.

These findings are important because they suggest two implications for further study. First, these conclusions highlight the relationship of violent tactics to non-violent tactics. Arguably, a group must utilize the tactics of the majority of the larger movement in order to be accepted within the movement. This raises interesting questions as to how far the boundaries of acceptable tactics can be pushed in order to include violent protest. The Wimmin's Fire Brigade extended the tactics of the anti-pornography and women's

movement to include subversive tactics and it was accepted. The question, then, arises as to whether or not it is the movement that determines what is acceptable. Taking this question into account, an area for further study would be to explore whether particular movements are more accepting of violent tactics than others. A study of this nature, though beyond the scope of this thesis, could provide interesting conclusions as to the relationship between social movements and violent protest.

The internal dynamics of Direct Action are also noteworthy. In examining the role of women within Direct Action, both Hansen and Hannah noted the absence of overt sexism and the feminist consciousness of the group's members. Hansen noted that she experienced no barriers to her participation in the militant actions because she is a woman, and Hannah's comments support this conclusion. Another preliminary conclusion relates to Hansen's assessment of the differences between Direct Action and the Wimmin's Fire Brigade. She noted that in Direct Action, the members, including the women, adopted attitudes of bravado and machismo after they had performed their violent protest. She recalls that the Wimmin's Fire Brigade did not generate these same attitudes. These differences may have been the result of the differences in each group's composition, or a result of the degree of violence engaged in by each group. In reflecting on the differences experienced by women who engage in violent protest as compared to the experiences of men who employ the same tactics, Hannah and Hansen note that society treats these women in a markedly different way than it treats men. This, they hypothesize, is because the stereotype of violent protest is masculine.

These internal dynamics advance the argument of this thesis that women's participation in violent protest is influenced by the internal operations and external perceptions and choices of the group in which they operate. They also suggest that the presence of violent women protesters shapes the practices of the group. The implications for these empirical findings are that the theoretical literature needs to recognize and develop the connections that the empirical evidence is making between women, violent protest, and violent protest groups. If further study of women within violent protest groups is to be done, the questions raised in this chapter could be pursued in order to help develop an adequate systematic theory of women, violent protest, and violent protest groups.

The next chapter builds upon some of the implications raised in this chapter. The analytical chapter brings together the information from this chapter and the previous chapter. In assessing the theoretical literature in light of the empirical evidence, the analytical chapter furthers the argument that there are connections between women, violent protest, and violent protest groups, and that the literature needs to expand to account for these connections.

Chapter Three – Analyzing the Information

Introduction

To situate the argument that women's participation in violent protest is influenced by the operations and choices of violent protest groups, this thesis reviewed the social movement literature on women and protest as well as the literature on violent protest. As argued, neither area of literature adequately deals with violent women protesters. This thesis then presented a case study of the Canadian protest group Direct Action, in which women played crucial roles in the group's violent protest, and were influenced by the structure and operations and choices of the group. The case study demonstrates the evidence on violent women protesters that is available to bring into the social movement literature's analysis of women and protest, and its analysis of violent protest.

This chapter will connect Chapter One and Chapter Two by analyzing the effects of the protest group on women's participation in violent protest in relation to the social movement literature. Specifically, the effects that the women in Direct Action experienced are examined in light of the existing literature. This analysis includes three elements of women and violent protest: women's roles within Direct Action, the impact that participating in Direct Action's external actions had on the women, and external perceptions of violent women protesters. In this chapter, the connections between women, violent protest, and violent protest groups begin to be theorized, and the need for the literature to expand to account for these connections is made evident.

Women's Roles in Militant Groups

The experience of each individual woman in violent protest groups may in part depend on the internal structure of the group to which they belong. Organizational structure and group size would act as determinants in this regard. Clearly, the smaller the group, the larger the number of roles women play, simply due to the lack of members to complete all the tasks.

Kuumba, in her analysis of gender and social movements, speaks of social movements' position in society. She notes that social movements, because of their location on the periphery of society, can either replicate or challenge traditional notions of gender (Kuumba 6). Underground, guerrilla groups exist on the periphery and often work to eschew societal structures. They attempt to develop their own idea of a model society at a micro-level within their groups. These groups can, because of their location, challenge traditional notions of gender roles. However, Kuumba notes that more often than not, the traditional notions of gender are upheld, and women's involvement in protest remains hidden (97). This appears to have been the case for the majority of women involved in the Black Panthers and the Zapatistas. Although the mandates for these groups included a feminist perspective, women were primarily relegated to the domestic sphere. This observation does not diminish the effects that women had in these groups, but it does limit the options available to them in terms of participating in violent protest. Direct Action also worked from a feminist perspective; however, the small size and anarchist philosophy of the group allowed Hansen and Belmas to experience violent protest in quite a different manner.

Paula Grosso (2002) examined the role of women in the Zapatista Movement. She observed a tension experienced by Zapatista women: an opportunity to engage in violent protest, but also to subscribe to traditional roles and act as nurturers to their community. She notes: “this is the dual role of Zapatista women: equal partners in the Zapatista military while acting as nurturers of the movement by preparing food for marches, mending and distributing clothing, and housing Zapatista soldiers” (Grosso, 6).

Angela Brown (Le Blanc - Ernest), interviewed by Karl Knapper (1996), has also called into question the role of women in a violent direct action group in her work on women in the Black Panther Party. She alludes to the tension in the role that women play (or are expected to play) in these direct action groups. In a situation similar to the Zapatistas, Brown (Le Blanc – Ernest) demonstrates that while Black Panther women were crucial in running and maintaining many of the community programs, they also had the opportunity to participate in violent protest. Yet, perhaps due to this dichotomy, she maintains that not all women felt they needed to be involved in these violent actions. Many women felt they could still be effective members of the group by participating in the other activities of the Party, such as the community programs. Brown (Le Blanc – Ernest) notes:

Some black women believed that the black woman should stand behind her man and support him. ... Others believed that you should be side-by-side, fighting for the same things, getting treated equally and getting accorded the same respect as the men, and I would say that was one critical moment where black women really began to realize that they were activists confronted with the same pressures, in addition to having miscarriages and all of the physical issues that are involved with being a woman (cited in Knapper 50).

In offering women leadership roles in running and coordinating community programs, the Black Panther Party provided a space for women to operate outside of the realm of the violent guerrilla. However, as observed by Brown (Le Blanc – Ernest), there were also women who chose to be violent and attempted to negotiate that identity in conjunction with the “more acceptable” role of working in the community programs and out of the protest arena.

The women of the Zapatistas and the Black Panther Party experienced a tension between the desire to be in a violent protest movement and the desire to negotiate their roles within that violence. For the most part, these women were not included in the violent aspects of the movement.¹ Furthermore, their roles often reflected traditional gender stereotypes of homemaker, caretaker, and maternal figure. Yet when women did decide to take up violent protest roles, both authors note that they had to negotiate these roles within the framework of the non-violent roles that they were already assuming and attempt to balance both identities. The majority of the violent protesters in these groups were men, and the majority of the women worked outside of that realm of protest. Women in these groups appeared to be influential in maintaining the groups’ internal operations and functioning. These experiences, while specific to the group, present an overall picture of the role of women in violent protest groups. In contrast, the women in Direct Action challenged these experiences and were able to participate directly in violent protest.

¹ This conclusion is informed by autobiographical literature, especially that from the Black Panther Party (Brown 1992; Shakur 1987).

The Unique Experience of Women in Direct Action

In terms of the effects that the internal structure of violent protest groups has on women in protest groups, the situation was quite different in Direct Action than in the Black Panthers or the Zapatistas. First, by engaging in armed struggle, Hansen and Belmas were able, in part, to shape the practices of Direct Action. Having women who participated in violent actions allowed the women in Direct Action to abandon stereotypical protest roles, rather than relying upon them in order for the group to function. This expansion of protest roles was undoubtedly encouraged by the group's willingness to accept a feminist ideology. In their interviews, both Ann Hansen and Gerry Hannah insist that women in Direct Action were never forced into stereotypical gender roles. The women of Direct Action were responsible for weapons, shared equally in household chores with the men, and participated equally in the violent protest. Specifically, Hansen stated that she never felt disadvantaged during an action. She was never given a specific task nor did she choose a specific weapon because she was a woman. Furthermore, the tasks each member assumed during an action (according to the published information) were not gender-specific. Each member of the group participated in and ensured the functioning of the group by developing knowledge in their individual area of expertise. In this way, then, the women in Direct experienced a significant flexibility in their roles within the group.

Hansen and Belmas may have been afforded these opportunities in part because of the size and structure of Direct Action. The group's internal structure allowed the women to shed gender roles. It could be argued that the size of a violent protest group is an

influential factor in determining whether women are able to engage in violent protest and thus challenge traditional protest roles. The smaller the group, almost by default because of the lack of members, the more women are able to present a challenge to stereotypes and adopt non-traditional gender roles. Having only five members, Direct Action needed the women to participate in violent protest actions - essentially because there was no one else to perform these acts.

Also, the manner in which a group chooses to structure itself influences the roles in violent protest that women can adopt. As there were no leaders to dictate members' roles in the non-hierarchical, anarchist structure chosen by Direct Action, the women in the group had more opportunities to participate in different areas. Once again, the encouragement to participate equally in the group may also be due in part to the group's feminist ideology. Members contributed to the group based upon their knowledge about, and expertise in, specific tasks. Both Hansen and Hannah said that the group was non-hierarchical, and an anarchist society – something that Hansen felt set them apart from their contemporaries. They believed that decisions were made by consensus. Hannah noted that he and Belmas may have deferred to Hansen and Taylor because of their knowledge in particular areas, but no decision was forced upon any group member and consensus was always sought. This framework appears to be a supportive structure for the movement of women into non-traditional gender roles and allowing them to participate in violent protest. In this type of structure, women appear to have the opportunity to move outside of traditional gender roles, to challenge these roles, and to perform violent protest

actions. Therefore, a non-hierarchical structure may allow for an expansion of women's roles and let them negotiate an identity outside of traditional (or expected) protest roles.

As mentioned, Kuumba sees social movements as often existing on the periphery of society. As an underground, urban guerrilla group, Direct Action was no exception. In fact, the group existed on the periphery of society both in terms of its protest tactics and its gender roles. Direct Action re-negotiated gender roles and expanded women's protest actions by allowing women to engage in violent protest. The women's involvement in Direct Action did not go unnoticed or happen "behind the scenes," something that Kuumba suggests tends to occur in women's protest (113). In fact, after the group was arrested, Hansen was deemed one of the leaders and was portrayed as an archetypal violent woman protester. Her roles within the group were definitely acknowledged and given voice. Therefore, Direct Action took advantage of their position on the periphery to challenge male and female protest roles set out by other violent protest groups and by society. Because these challenges were in opposition to the norm, Direct Action remained on the periphery and did not integrate into the wider society or into other social movements.

Kuumba theorizes that men and women experience life differently and looks at how these differences influence social movements. She argues that since men and women have varying experiences within the broader framework of society, their social movement experience is also different (Kuumba 2). Her position derives from the perspective that gender roles in society create different experiences for men and women, even in social movements and even in social movements that reject stereotypical gender roles. The

interviews with Ann Hansen and Gerry Hannah indicate that in Direct Action men and women had distinct experiences. Hansen acknowledges in her interview that it was impossible for Direct Action, despite its feminist ideology, to be entirely gender-neutral; when sexism occurred, it was more hidden. Both Hansen and Hannah argued that this was probably inherent because they had been exposed to societal gender roles before they participated in Direct Action. Some of society's notions of gender roles were most likely carried (perhaps subconsciously) into the group. This is further exemplified in Hansen and Hannah's contrasting responses to the use of weapons in the group.

Weapons are a key element of violent protest groups; their use defines the tactics employed by the group and separates them from other protest groups. The use of weapons could be considered a traditionally (or stereotypically) male activity. The fact that in Direct Action women seemed to have been supported and encouraged to use weapons demonstrates that the group challenged the roles available for women in violent protest, and draws the possible conclusion that this may have been inspired by their feminist ideology. It is a potential indicator that having a small group where it was required for (and acceptable for) women to use weapons, shapes the practices of the group itself to include women engaged in armed protest.

However, Hansen and Hannah noted different perceptions of how the members of Direct Action reacted to the group's weapons. Hansen recalls that the men were more interested in weapons than the women, while Hannah argued that everyone in the group expressed the same desire in weapons. Perhaps Hansen, in noting what she felt was men's penchant for weapons, is herself replicating the expected stereotypes of gender that she

eschewed in Direct Action. Hannah, in not noticing this distinction, was perhaps also replicating these socially driven stereotypes. These would have been stereotypes that were carried into the group from their socialization in mainstream society, something that Fox Piven and Cloward note can happen in protest groups (36). Or more contentiously, Hannah's statement could actually be seen as representative of the feminist model that Direct Action attempted to follow. Nevertheless, the difference in Hansen and Hannah's responses demonstrates that the place of men and women in social movements are informed by notions of gender (whether or not these notions are being challenged) and are arguably different. It is also important to understand that, in terms of violent protest groups, these differences can revolve around issues of violent protest and the tools used in this form of protest.

Using Kuumba's theory of the position of social movements in society and the existing literature on violent women protesters, it can be hypothesized that the members of Direct Action took advantage of their position in society and worked to challenge stereotypical protest roles for women. This was exemplified in the prominent positions taken by women within the group.

The ability of women in violent protest groups to transcend traditional protest roles depends on the opportunities that the group provides for women, through its organization and structure and through its mandates. Therefore, studies of the internal aspects of violent protest groups are crucial in determining how various situations influence the woman protesters. The case study of Direct Action illustrates that the organization of violent protest groups may be a factor in influencing how women engage

in violent protest for the group. This case study is enhanced by comparisons with other violent protest groups, such as the Zapatistas and the Black Panthers, and the effects that women felt because of the structure of their groups. However, it would seem that these effects are often individually based because of the differences in the internal structures of each group. Therefore, while further study in this area would enhance an understanding of the experiences of violent women protesters, the theoretical advances would have to remain case-based. This may not be a disadvantage, because individual cases will facilitate an exploration that allows for conclusions to be drawn based on comparison. Essentially, in comparing the situations of women who participate in like-minded groups, conclusions can be drawn as to the group structure or organization that is most appropriate in allowing women to take full advantage of their role within the group.

The Impact of Women on Direct Action's External Actions

The external actions of the violent protest group may also affect their woman participants. In order to analyze how Direct Action's protests were received, it is first necessary to examine the reception of violent protest within social movements and in society. Furthermore, how violent protest acts are received could influence how the perpetrators of the acts are also received, thus demonstrating the effects of militant actions on women.

This examination is informed by the theoretical literature on violent protest as discussed in Chapter One. This literature, in connection with the experience of the women in Direct Action, offers a vehicle through which to consider how women are

affected by these actions. This section also focuses on Hansen's perceptions of the differences between Direct Action and the Wimmin's Fire Brigade. This will allow for possible conclusions to be drawn as to whether violent protest actions are received differently in groups comprised solely of women, and groups comprised of both men and women.

Militant Protest and Its Reception in the Case of Direct Action

The reception of violent protest influence whether social movements and society, as a whole, accept violent protesters. Both Hansen and Hannah agreed that until society accepts violent protest, violent women protesters will not be accepted (Hansen 06/12/2002; Hannah 07/20/2002). Hence, it is important to understand the attitudes of a society toward this type of protest in order to understand how the perpetrators are perceived. For example, in realizing that violent protest is rejected by society, it is easier to understand the rejection of protesters, especially women protesters, who employ this type of tactic. Therefore, this section examines the reception that Direct Action received from other social movements and society, in light of the theoretical analyses on the connections between violent and non-violent protest.

William Gamson argues that how a society views violent protest depends on how that society views violence. Therefore, if a society does not accept violence in general, it more than likely also will not accept violent protest. However, he states that even if a society has a negative opinion of violent protest, it is still a valid tactic and does not necessarily hinder a group's "success" (Gamson 81). Charles Tilly believes that violence

and non-violence derive from the same roots, and, in fact, the rhetoric surrounding violence is what prevents it from being accepted (177). These theorists point to the fact that although violent protest is a very real option in protest, and although violent protest derives from the same roots as non-violent protest, it is, nonetheless, viewed negatively by society and other protesters.

The Direct Action case study shows that violent protest is often viewed negatively. Because of Direct Action's violent tactics, mainstream participants in other social movements relegated them to the fringes, whether or not their tactics were supported or rejected by individual members. Ann Hansen speaks of the mixed reaction to their protest tactics. For example, Hansen admits that, "[t]he Litton bombing had certainly not been well received by the disarmament groups. They had not only denounced the bombing but also even speculated that it may have been attempt to discredit the movement" (278-279). This distaste for Direct Action's tactics continues to this day, as shown by the comments of those interviewed on the recent CBC-TV *Fifth Estate* documentary – people who were involved in non-violent campaigns around the same issues.² While Direct Action wanted to participate in the contention surrounding various well thought-out targets, they were isolated from popular movements because of their tactics. These tactics could be seen as more of a hindrance than an aid because of the negative connotations that society had (has) about violent protest. della Porta (1995) notes that the rejection of an underground group's tactics by broader social movements, is not unusual. She writes that "[i]n every case, however, clandestinity considerably reduced an

² See the previous chapter for specific comments by Len Desroches of the Cruise Missile Conversion Project.

organization's strategic flexibility and rendered it less and less capable of perceiving the external situation, and thus of reaching even a tiny group of potential sympathizers" (della Porta 114). One area where violent tactics were received more positively, however, was in the case of the Wimmin's Fire Brigade. While the women's movement, as confirmed by Lee Lakeman on the *Fifth Estate* program, was essentially pleased with the result of the firebombings by the Wimmin's Fire Brigade, they were very careful not to condone the tactics that were used (Fifth Estate 14).

Steven Barkan and Lynne Snowden extend Tilly's connection between violence and non-violence indicating that if there is little difference between non-violent and violent actions, there is also little difference between violent and non-violent participants (17). The situation of Direct Action and the theories involving violent protest here seem to complement each other. It is obvious that the grievances of both Direct Action and the other peaceful protest groups involved in the same protests were based on similar principles. For example, both Direct Action and other the groups involved were concerned about the possible environmental damage that the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir power project would cause. All concerned groups were worried about what they felt was the impending danger of nuclear destruction related to Litton. In the case of Red Hot Video, both Direct Action and those involved in the anti-pornography movement were protesting pornography (on a literal level) and the subjugation of women (on a more philosophical level). Direct Action's communiqués, distributed after each of the actions, show that their reasoning was similar to the more non-violent factions of the same broader social movements. Demonstrating the similarity of the different groups' ideas about why protest

should occur develops links between Direct Action and other actors in the larger social movements, whether or not these links are accepted by all.

As discussed, theoretically there could be little difference between the reasoning of violent and non-violent protesters. However, this does not alter the stigma that surrounds violent protest and the fact that society continues to view violent and non-violent protest as diametrical opposites. The reluctance of broader movements to accept the actions of Direct Action and amalgamate the group into the larger social movements displays a reluctance of these movements, and society as a whole, to accept violent tactics as valid protest options. In applying violent tactics to the protest cycle, Diani and della Porta argue that once these tactics are introduced, the groups using them are relegated to the fringes of the larger (seemingly non-violent) protest movement (190). Therefore, it would follow that the other social movements did not accept Direct Action, despite their similarities in motivation, because of Direct Action's violent tactics, and the overall rejection of this form of protest. Relating this back to Hansen and Hannah's comments that the acceptance of violent women protesters depends on society's willingness to first accept violent protest, the rejection of Direct Action proposes a possible explanation for the rejection that all the group's members received, including the women. This, then, potentially demonstrates how the external operations and choices of Direct Action may have influenced (in terms of their rejection) the women's experience because they chose to engage in violent protest.

Condemning Direct Action and their tactics may have been something that other, less violent protesters had brought with them to the movement, and something that was

developed from their preconceived ideas of acceptable methods of protest (Fox Piven and Cloward 21). Society's perceptions of violence may be involved in the conditioning of those who participate in the arena of protest, thus influencing their choice of tactics. However, one question arises from this: when do violent tactics become accepted as a valid method of protest? Furthermore, if it is agreed that societal notions must change for violent tactics to become accepted as a valid form of protest, as some theories have claimed, how does this occur?

Societal norms of what is acceptable seem to influence the debate about the appropriateness of tactics. It could be argued that as long as people in the protest arena deem violent protests to be inappropriate, its tactics would have little or no chance of gaining acceptance. The activities of Direct Action may have contributed to the broader movement, especially in the case of the women's movement, but their tactics still had little chance of being accepted because of the existing notions about violent protest tactics. There seems to be a gap between the theory and what actually exists in reality. Violent protests may work in conjunction with non-violent protest in that they are deemed to have the same motivational roots. However in reality, society does not seem to recognize this connection and generally condemns violent protest. Society's rejection of protest may be demonstrated through the institutional boundaries that it creates for acceptable protest.

Piven and Cloward focus on the idea that the institutional framework, or the institutions under which protest is occurring, shapes and influences the tactics of the protesters (21). The actions of protesters can challenge the institutional boundaries and

extend or limit them, but the institutional framework can deny or allow the challenge. As other theorists have also observed, the attitudes of protesters, as well as of society, toward various tactics may influence whether protest tactics are accepted. This argument could be extended to include the idea that the attitudes of protesters, and their notions of gender roles in protest, might influence the acceptance of women performing violent protest. Once again, as Hansen and Hannah both argue, society will not make space for the violent women protester until violent protest tactics are first accepted (Hansen 06/12/2002; Hannah 07/20/2002).

The empirical evidence collected from studying the experiences of Direct Action shows the influence that institutions can have on violent protest groups. Since these protest actions are often illegal and not condoned by society, they are relegated to the fringes of protest movements and rejected within the institutional framework that defines protest boundaries. Once again, then, until violent actions are accepted as valid tactics and groups that employ these tactics are considered legitimate social movement partners, the institutional framework that delineates protest boundaries would seem not to have room for - or is become affected by - violent protests. As is evident from the treatment of Direct Action, especially in the Litton bombing, violent actions can be dismissed as “radical” and the violent group’s members dismissed as “irrational.”

As documented, the environmental and anti-nuclear movements outright rejected Direct Action and their tactics. However, the women’s movement (and anti-pornography movement) did not present the same opposition to the Wimmin’s Fire Brigade. This raises the question as to whether some movements are more receptive of, or have more

tolerance for, violent tactics and violent protest factions. An examination of the responses of movements to violent protest is beyond the realm of this thesis; however, it is nonetheless an important area of further study. The questions that arise from the differences in reception to the militant actions are: do some movements provide more space to allow violent actions to happen? If so, what is unique about these movements that allows this to take place?

External Actions of Direct Action and Women in Direct Action

It was proposed earlier that the size and structure of a violent group may be influential in affecting women's participation in violent protest, so too may the group's composition (male and female or solely female) come to bear on the violent women protester's experience. This argument becomes clear through an examination of the differences between Direct Action and the Wimmin's Fire Brigade. Hansen's comparison of her involvement in Direct Action and the Wimmin's Fire Brigade allows for the creation of a hypothesis about the relationship between women and their responses to violent protest. More specifically, Hansen stated that the members of Direct Action carried with them a certain bravado or machismo with respect to their violent actions, and that this was absent among the participants in the Wimmin's Fire Brigade. In connection with attitudes of bravado, Hansen speculated that if the participants of Direct Action had all been women, perhaps they would have used less dynamite in the Litton bombing and accumulated fewer weapons. Hansen realized that she may have made an assumption about the different responses of the groups to their actions, and that she could not have

determined if having men in Direct Action was the reason that the group engaged in robberies or built a substantial arsenal of weapons. However, what Hansen did recognize is that a difference existed between the reactions of the members of the two groups to violent protest actions. Because the groups were composed differently, Hansen's observations lead to conclusions about the effects that violent protest actions have on women who engage in these tactics, and how those are articulated within the protest group. These differences centre on the adoption of attitudes of bravado or machismo.

One possible reason for this difference is that men and women respond differently to violent acts. Moser (2001) argues that "[w]omen and men as social actors experience violence and conflict differently" (30). The association of violent protest acts with masculinity has not been noted explicitly within the theories discussed in this thesis, however Enloe (1988) and Cockburn (2001) both look at the idea that militarism in societies has been framed in terms of perceptions of masculinity. Furthermore, Costain (2000) in her study of non-violence and women's movements, argues that women have expressed a different reaction to violence than men. She writes "women, as a group, consistently and from the start of modern polling, have been far more likely to express negative emotions about violence than men – both when that violence is abstract and when it is a present reality" (Costain 175). However, there is a problem with this theory when it is applied to the situation of Direct Action. Hansen noted that she did not experience any alienation from the males in the group, which is something that probably would have occurred if men and women responded differently to violent actions.

Another possible explanation, then, is that the degree and scale of the violent act influences participants. One of the distinct contrasts between Direct Action and the Wimmin's Fire Brigade was the degree and scale of the violent protest engaged in by the two groups. Direct Action embarked on a more serious, dangerous, and long-term committed strategy of action than the Wimmin's Fire Brigade. Direct Action required their members to obtain false identification and live an underground lifestyle. In other words, the members of Direct Action had to fully immerse themselves in an identity of subversive action. By comparison, participants of the Wimmin's Fire Brigade were able to continue their lives after the action without drastic change. Highlighting the differences in militancy between the two groups, Hansen recalls that the actions of the Wimmin's Fire Brigade were "low-tech" and "completely anonymous" (Hansen 12/06/2002). Hansen, in her book, also shares a conversation with Belmas in which Belmas says, "I'd rather do smaller actions like the Wimmin's Fire Brigade stuff. [...] They're not so heavy and I like working with more people" (Hansen 334). Belmas's comment suggests that there was a different feeling among the women, between the acts of Direct Action and the Wimmin's Fire Brigade. This shows that the women treated the Wimmin's Fire Brigade differently, in its anonymity³ and low level of violence. Possibly, the higher the level of violent protest in which a group engages, the greater the likelihood that the group's members will adopt more typically male gender roles.⁴ This may explain Hansen's

³ The group was structured as three autonomous cells, each consisting of three women. Neither cell was aware of who was involved in other cells (Hansen 329).

⁴ The assumption embedded in this is that the machismo demonstrated by Direct Action group members is a male gender role. Hansen implies this in her interview, and I am replicating this assumption here in order to make a tentative conclusion on Hansen's observations.

observation that the women in Direct Action responded with a certain machismo not experienced by the women in the Wimmin's Fire Brigade. This idea relates to the way society looks at women engaging in violent protest in comparison to men involved in the same actions. If it is agreed that society associates violent protest with stereotypical male gender roles, then women might adopt this machismo or bravado in order to negotiate a space for themselves within society's perception of these acts. This could have occurred in Direct Action, but not within the Wimmin's Fire Brigade. Therefore, the theory that the degree and scale of violent acts influences participants differently, still does not fully account for the differences in attitude between Direct Action and the Wimmin's Fire Brigade.

The pressure to adopt stereotypically male gender roles does not exist only outside of violent protest groups, but also has the potential to exist within these groups. This would provide another possible explanation for the differences experienced by Hansen. The perception that males engage in violent protest actions may be implicitly carried into some groups. Fox Piven and Cloward argue that protesters can carry societal notions of protest into the protest arena (Fox Piven and Cloward 36). Therefore, in a group of men and women, the women who engage in violent protest may be expected to adopt the attitudes of bravado or machismo in order to be accepted or validated by males in the group. It could be hypothesized that groups containing only women do not have this same issue of validation, and therefore have no reason to equate violent protest with a male role, the same stereotypes may not be carried into these groups.⁵ This could explain, in

⁵ Hansen, aside from raising the differences in the groups, did not specifically pinpoint these expectations as occurring within Direct Action.

part, Hansen's different experiences in Direct Action and the Wimmin's Fire Brigade. Because the Wimmin's Fire Brigade did not have a male presence, it may have offered a space for violent acts to be performed without the adoption of masculine gender traits. However, because Direct Action had both male and female members, this same gender-neutral space for performing violent actions was absent.

The women in the Wimmin's Fire Brigade may have been offered a place where they could participate in violent protest and not adopt stereotypical attitudes toward this form of protest. Therefore, the effects of engaging in violent protest on women could be dependent on the individual situation of each protest group: who comprises it, the expectations that the members have of violent protesters, and the degree of violence in which the group is involved.

This section evaluated the theories surrounding violent protest in relation to Direct Action. While these theories help explain the reception of Direct Action by society as a result of their tactics, what they do not explain is the relationship between the effects of violent protest on women who chose to employ it, and how these effects are related to the group in which it is used. This demonstrates that the literature needs to expand to enable further conclusions to be drawn from the case study.

There are a number of directions that the research could take in its expansion. Hansen's experiences in the Wimmin's Fire Brigade, as contrasted with her experiences in Direct Action, suggest that when participating in a higher degree of violent actions, women adopt more masculine attributes (e.g., bravado and machismo). This could be because other protesters, or even society, do not outwardly support women as violent

protesters, thus implicitly forcing them to adopt stereotypically masculine gender traits in order to make their protest more acceptable. In order to determine if this true, further study is required. The parameters of this exploration could be defined by the following questions: does a higher level of militancy cause members of a group, male or female, to adopt more stereotypically male-associated attitudes and roles? Furthermore, do group members adopt this stereotypically masculine mentality in order to fit into society's notion that violent actions belong within a male sphere? If this were proven true, do these actions, because of the responses they elicit, actually limit the role of women who are participating in them, forcing them to adopt more stereotypically male roles?

Women as Peaceful Protesters versus Women in Direct Action

This final section explores the expected roles for women in protest, namely, that women are expected to be peaceful protesters. This section also illustrates how the theories explaining the role of women in protest are inadequate in accounting for violent women protesters such as the ones in Direct Action. The analysis is informed by the experiences of the women in Direct Action, Hansen and Hannah's speculations on the reception that society gives to women actors in violent protest, as well as West and Blumberg's analysis of protest and Tarrow's cycles of protest.

In their preliminary study of women and social protest, Guida West and Rhonda Lois Blumberg state that one of the major justifications for women to participate in protest is due to stereotypical gender roles that position women as nurturers and as caregivers (13). West and Blumberg argue that this maternal role defines women's protest

acts; however, using traditional stereotypes to analyze women's participation in protest limits the discussion (22). If a woman's role in protest is defined by stereotypes of nurturance and caregiving, how then is space made for women who do not follow these stereotypes? Is it possible for women to see themselves as combatants or instigators? For example, the women of Direct Action saw themselves as participants in an armed struggle against various targets. Women employing violent protest tactics do not seem to justify their motivations for protesting through traditional gender stereotypes. If so, West and Blumberg's theory, in relying on these traditional gender stereotypes, ignores the motivations of women participating in violent protest actions. This theory is reflected in Hansen and Hannah's speculations on the reception of these women in society. Both Hansen and Hannah note that females participating in violent protest do not fit into society's perception of women, let alone society's perception of women as protesters. West and Blumberg argue that women who participate in protest must fight against the stereotypical concept that the protest arena belongs to men (30). Hansen, in particular, stated that violent women protesters are perceived to be performing in a male-oriented arena.

In sum, West and Blumberg's theories do not explain the participation of women in violent protest adequately. They describe women as engaging in tactics such as sexual manipulation, theatrics and the use of pots and pans (Kuumba 2001; Kramarae and Treichler 1985) to enact social change (West and Blumberg 26). They omit women who use violent tactics such as bombings as part of their repertoire of protest tactics. In leaving the tactics of such women out of their analysis, West and Blumberg could be

furthering the idea of protest as male-dominated sphere. Hansen and Hannah agree that it will be a long time (if ever) before for such women are accepted in society, and at least not until violent protest actions are embraced as legitimate.

Tarrow's cycles of protest concept provides some insight into the tension between West and Blumberg's definition of what is occurring and what actually occurred in Direct Action. Tarrow explains that within the cycle "[f]ew people dare to break the crust of convention" and when they do it seldom lasts (Tarrow 110). Applying Tarrow's cycles of protest, women who choose to participate in violent protest are rare and their tactics (like all violent tactics) do not last in the protest arena. As the theories discussed in Chapter One allude to, women as peaceful protesters are the convention, and violent women break this convention. Therefore, when theorizing women's participation in protest, it would make sense that the conventional forms of protest would receive theoretical attention. This could, perhaps, explain West and Blumberg's insistence that women are motivated to protest by maternal attributes.

The problem with West and Blumberg's theory and with that of Tarrow's is that while it explains the norm; it does not adequately explain what is happening in reality. In Tarrow's theory, violent women protesters are missing, perhaps because their actions exist outside of the cycles of protest. In West and Blumberg's work, these same women are not addressed because they do not follow the conventional form of protest for women. Tarrow notes that convention is broken in protest, and my empirical example provides the evidence that women do break the convention; West and Blumberg's theories, however, because of their reliance on convention, do not account for the available empirical

evidence. The problem, then, is that violent protest does not seem to be adequately explained using theories that refuse to include the exception to the rule, such as women engaged in violent protest. This is reflected in Hansen and Hannah's comments that violent women protesters stand in contrast to what is expected of women participants in protest, and that they will not be accepted until they are included into protest repertoires rather than being seen as marginal or on the edges of convention.

Conclusion

This chapter meshes the theoretical and empirical information presented in this thesis and analyzes how they inform each other. The chapter draws tentative conclusions, and argues that the participation of women in violent actions affects, and is influenced by, the internal and external operations and choices of the violent protest organizations.

The first section of the chapter demonstrated that in contrast to other violent protest groups, the women of Direct Action were able to occupy positions outside of stereotypical gender roles. This, it was speculated, could have been a result of Direct Action's small group size and non-hierarchical structure. In the second section of the chapter, it was proposed that participation in violent actions may, in fact, produce different responses in its actors, and this may be the result of the composition of the protest group. The differences that Hansen experienced between Direct Action and the Wimmin's Fire Brigade allowed for consideration of whether the degree of violence changes the attitude that women adopt. The more violent the action, the more bravado or machismo women adopt. This occurs because society expects men to carry out violent

protest acts, and therefore by adopting more stereotypically masculine attitudes, women who protest in this manner attempt to gain acceptance from society. The third section of the chapter explored how violent women protesters are working in opposition to society's expectations of the acceptable roles of women in protest and, therefore, women may feel a tension between their chosen role in protest and what is expected of them in terms of social norms.

This thesis argues that the theoretical literature needs to expand to include an examination of women and their relationship to violent protest, as well as the connection that this relationship has to the protest group. The empirical evidence of Direct Action complements a number of the theoretical conclusions made by the literature; however, there is much evidence that is yet unaccounted for by the theoretical literature. For example, the reception of movements to violent protest groups, or the different attitudes adopted in relation to violent protest actions could be considered. It is in these areas that the literature requires further development. It is such an expansion that will generate new theoretical explanations as to what is occurring empirically, thus allowing for a better understanding of the connection between women, violent protest, and violent protest groups.

Conclusion

Ann Hansen and Julie Belmas's involvement in Direct Action confirms that Canadian women do participate in violent protest, and that the internal and external operations and choices of protest groups influence this participation. However, the social movement literature does not address such women and, therefore, is of limited usefulness in explaining the relationship between women, violent protest, and violent protest groups.

This thesis argued that two branches of the social movement literature - the literature on women and protest and on violent protest - are incomplete, as they do not account for violent women protesters. While the literature omits these women from its theoretical analysis, the case study of Direct Action empirically demonstrates that the organization and structure of violent protest groups influences women's participation in their protest. It further demonstrates that the presence of violent women protesters can also shape the practices of the protest groups in which they act. In explaining the relationship of the violent protest group to women engaged in armed struggle, three areas of Direct Action were explored: Hansen and Belmas's specific roles in Direct Action; the impact of Direct Action's external actions on Hansen and Belmas; and the external perceptions of women who act violently in protest. The analysis questioned the existing theoretical literature and revealed that it does not explain the effects of violent protest on women who engage therein, nor does it explain how these effects are linked to the protest group. The majority of the literature (the violent protest literature in particular) either does not account for women or accounts for women but does not go as far as to take violent women protesters into consideration (as is the case with the women and protest

literature). Furthermore, the small body of literature that does account for violent women protesters is largely anecdotal and focuses on the biographies of individual women, rather than the organization, whereas this thesis attempts to account for both. This particular literature provides a means of comparison for the women in Direct Action, but it does not contribute to a systematic analysis of the relationship between women, violent protest, and violent protest groups. Hence, using such literature to understand Ann Hansen and Julie Belmas's role in Direct Action was of limited value.

Hansen, Belmas, and Direct Action

In comparison to the experiences of women in other violent protest groups, Hansen and Belmas were placed in a unique position in Direct Action. The two women were able to participate fully in the group's protest actions, and were not expected to perform tasks specific to gender stereotypes. This differs from other violent protest groups, such as the Zapatistas or the Black Panthers, in which women were first expected to perform non-violent tasks, and participate in violent actions only as a secondary concern (Grosso 2002; Le Blanc 1993 and 1998). Hansen and Belmas might have experienced this flexibility in their role in Direct Action because the group's structure non-hierarchical, anarchist structure, as well as its feminist ideology.

As to the effects of the internal operations of violent protest groups on women, the literature hinders any extensive theorizing about the empirical evidence. Kuumba's work recognizes that men and women experience social movements differently. This would explain some of the differences (e.g., use of weapons) reported by men and women in

Direct Action. However, the literature does not go beyond recognition of these differences, and therefore impedes further analysis of the influence of the group's internal operational structure on women's participation in violent protest.

The social movement literature on violent protest was inadequate in accounting for the effects that the violent protest group's external actions have on women and how these are reflective of the group's external choices (namely, the targets chosen and the tactics used). The literature on violent protest helps explain the situation of Direct Action in society (or rather their isolation from it) and how their actions were viewed both by society at large and those in other social movements. However, it lacks a gendered analysis, and, therefore, cannot fully explain the effects of the external actions of a group on violent women protesters. This is, then, one area where the literature needs to expand if it is to theorize completely the interaction between violent protest groups and their violent women participants.

Regarding Direct Action's external actions and Hansen and Belmas's involvement in them, especially in comparison to their participation in the Wimmin's Fire Brigade, the evidence demonstrates that the women were affected differently than the men in particular group settings. For example, Hansen cited the bravado of the members in Direct Action, which did not occur in the Wimmin's Fire Brigade. This empirical finding indicates that there may be a relationship between the group's composition, male and female or solely female, and the responses that group members adopt in relation to the violent protest actions.

Society's perceptions of violent women actors may mirror its perception of violent protest; there seems to be strong rejection of both. The literature on violent protest suggests that these acts are rejected because of the connotations surrounding violence and violent acts within mainstream society. The literature on women who engage in violent protest provides a similar analysis. In fact, the literature replicates society's reaction and either omits these women or presents them in opposition to a stereotypical, more accepted image of a woman protester - a woman who uses peaceful tactics.

In her interview, Ann Hansen notes that as a woman involved in violent protest, she worked against society's stereotypes of what this entails. This stereotype as demonstrated in the literature on women and protest and social movements, presents women as engaging in peaceful protest tactics. For example, West and Blumberg's exploration of women and protest suggests that women become involved in protest because of their maternal characteristics, and then notes that women primarily engage in peaceful tactics. Violent women protesters, including the women of Direct Action, do not fit the characteristics presented in the literature. Therefore, the literature remains inadequate in attempting to explain more broadly society's perceptions of these women.

Omissions in the Literature and Areas for Further Study

The case study of Direct Action highlights several indicators of the relationship between women, violent protest, and violent protest groups. The empirical evidence demonstrates that there is a connection between women's participation in violent protest and the protest group in which this occurs, and leads to the tentative conclusion that the

internal and external operations and choices of violent protest groups influence women's engagement in the group's protest. However, because of the lack of sufficient theoretical literature on these women and their groups, the conclusions of this thesis are preliminary and point to the need for further theorizing of women, violent protest, and violent protest groups.

Chapter One demonstrated that the two areas of social movement literature (women and protest and social movements, and violent protest) are incomplete in their analysis. The literature on women and protest and social movements bases its theoretical framework on the experiences of women as peaceful protesters and fails to account for women involved in violent actions. This literature is important because it emphasizes that gender is part of a protester's identity and influences their experiences with protest and protest groups. However, the literature's claim that it is inclusive and accounts for the experiences of women in protest can be questioned because it has yet to bring violent women protesters into its analysis. Moreover, the literature would benefit from an expansion to encompass an analysis of the effects of engaging in violent protest on women, and the relationship of these effects to the protest group, that goes beyond the currently available autobiographical or anecdotal literature.

The literature on violent protest focuses on a number of issues involving violent protest actions. Tarrow's cycles of protest frames a discussion of protest stages, while Diani and della Porta's extension of Tarrow's theory demonstrates how violent protest fits into the analysis. Gamson, Tilly, Fox Piven and Cloward, and Barkan and Snowden are all crucial in delineating the relationship of violent tactics to non-violent tactics, and

constructing a theoretical analysis of the reception of violent protest. However, what is missing from this literature is an awareness of gender. In fact, none of these theorists even make an attempt to address gender in their arguments. This is critical because the literature on women and social movements has shown gender to be an important factor in mediating a participant's involvement in protest. Therefore, it can be hypothesized that including violent women protesters in their analysis would enhance the theories on violent protest. This is not only because gender has been seen to be a determining factor in the choice of protest tactics, but also to determine if these theories are dependent upon gender.

The case study on Direct Action highlights where the literature needs further development. At the moment, empirical evidence relating to violent women protesters within violent protest groups is increasingly available, but the literature is not yet developed enough to make the empirical evidence theoretically relevant. The two major bodies of social movement literature discussed in this thesis need to develop together, rather than in isolation of each other. With such an amalgamation, the literature can then address empirical evidence, and will be able to theorize the influence that the organization and structure of the violent protest group has on women's participation in its protest actions, as well as how the presence of violent women protesters shapes the practices of the group itself. This is essential because as it currently stands the literature's foundations are being challenged by empirical evidence, such as Direct Action's. Furthermore, the omissions in the literature are failing to account for and reflect the reality that violent women actors do exist and are affected by their protest groups.

Therefore, a new framework in which to examine the relationship between women, violent protest, and violent protest groups is needed. Despite the limited space of this empirical study, this thesis proposes several hypotheses. They provide a starting point for further study, both in the theoretical and empirical realm. As a beginning, the literature could recognize violent women protesters as legitimate and viable political actors worth further study, rather than dismissing them as passive participants in violent groups, or ignoring them because they do not fit the stereotype of women involved in protest.

The theoretical literature could be developed through studies that involve a larger empirical sample. For example, a comparative study of groups comprised solely of men, of men and women where women follow stereotypical gender patterns, of men and women where women reject stereotypical gender patterns, and solely of women would expand the existing empirical data on women in violent groups. It is not certain that a comparative study could fully theorize the effects that violent women protesters experience as a result of the operations and choices of the protest group; however, one area where a study of this nature could advance the literature is in the examination of the internal organization of violent groups. Case-based studies of individual groups would allow for a comparison of the differences that women experience as a result of a group's internal structures and practices. From these findings, it may be possible to propose conclusions as to the manner in which a group's organization affords violent women actors various possibilities as to the roles that they can assume.

The situation of Direct Action and the Wimmin's Fire Brigade raises questions about the relationship between social movements and their willingness to accept or provide a space for violent tactics. The fact that individual social movements have different reactions to violent protest provides an additional area for further study. For example, certain movements may be more willing to encourage violent tactics in their protest repertoire than others. One research avenue to explore is whether there are particular aspects of certain movements that make them more (or less) receptive to violent tactics, and what these aspects are.

A larger study in a Canadian context would further develop the empirical literature on Canadian women involved in violent protest, an area that basically has not been addressed at all. This thesis chose to deal with one violent Canadian protest group, but other Canadian groups, such as the FLQ, also deserve further attention and the results of such a study could be compared to that of Direct Action.

The importance of studies that include women and violent protest in their analysis is gradually receiving recognition both inside and outside of academia. Outside of the academic realm, the continued participation of violent women protesters in contemporary protest groups is drawing attention to the roles that women are playing in the protest arena. Women are choosing to engage in violent protest activities and should be recognized as being valid protesters. Inside academia, it is becoming increasingly obvious that the existing literature is not equipped to answer questions concerning the roles of women in protest. It becomes obvious, then, that the social movement literature is incomplete until women and violent protest are examined. Therefore, studies such as this

thesis that attempt to deal simultaneously with women, violent protest, and violent protest groups are crucial to expanding the literature and to explaining the influence the internal and external operations and choices of violent protest groups on women's participation in violent protest acts.

Bibliography

"2nd Litton Bomber Gets Life Term, Hurls Tomato at Judge." *Toronto Star* 8 June 1984: A1+.

"5 Charged in Bomb Attack." *Vancouver Sun* 21 Jan. 1983: A1+.

" 'A Boom and Pieces of Debris Were Flying By'." *Toronto Star* 15 Oct. 1982: A3.

Baird – Olsen, Karren. "Reflections of an AIM activist: Has It All Been Worth It?" *No Middle Ground: Women and Radical Protest*. Ed. Kathleen M. Blee. New York: New York University Press, 1998. 133-151.

Barkan, Steven E. and Lynne L. Snowden. *Collective Violence*. Needham Heights, Ma: Allyn and Bacon, 2001.

Beckwith, Karen. "Lancashire Women Against Pit Closures: Women's Standing in a Men's Movement." *Signs* 21.4 (1996): 1034-1069.

Beckwith, Karen. "Women, Gender, and Nonviolence in Political Movements." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 35.1 (2002): 75 –81.

"Beliefs Will Outlast Prison, Hansen Says." *Vancouver Sun* 8 June 1984: A14.

Bellet, Gerry. "Mounties Begin Probe of Sabotage at Hydro Station." *Vancouver Sun* 1 June 1982: A3.

Bewley, Les. "More and Greater Evils Ensur." Editorial. *Vancouver Sun*. 15 June 1984: A5.

Blee, Kathleen M. "Introduction." *No Middle Ground: Women and Radical Protest*. Ed. Kathleen M. Blee. New York: New York University Press, 1998. 7-15.

Briggs, Jimmie and Debbie Stoller. "Guerilla Girls." *Bust* Spring 2002: 38-41.

Brown, Elaine. *A Taste of Power: A Black Woman's Story*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1992.

Brunet, Robin. "Razor's Edge: Two Leftists are Accused of Cross-Country Eco-terrorism." *Alberta Report* 13 April 1998: 35.

Burstein, Paul, Rachel L. Einwohner, and Jocelyn A. Hollander. "The Success of Political Movements: A Bargaining Perspective." Eds. J. Craig Jenkins and Bert Klandermans. *The Politics of Social Protest: Comparative Perspectives on States*

- and *Social Movements*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995. 275-295.
- Cable, Sherry. "Women's Social Movement Involvement: The Role of Structural Availability in Recruitment and Participation Processes." *Sociological Quarterly* 33.1 (1992): 35-50.
- Campbell, Jim. *The Vancouver Five: Armed Struggle in Canada*. Montreal, Quebec: Solidarity, 2001.
- Castellucci, John. *The Big Dance: The untold story of Kathy Boudin and the terrorist family that committed the Brink's robbery murders*. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1986.
- Ciaccia, John. *The Oka Crisis: A Mirror of the Soul*. Dorval, Quebec: Maren Publications, 2000.
- Cloward, Richard A. and Frances Fox Piven. "Hidden Protest: The Channeling of Female Innovation and Resistance." *Signs* 4.4 (1979): 651-69.
- Cockburn, Cynthia. "The Gendered Dynamics of Armed Conflict and Political Violence." *Victims, Perpetrators or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence*. Eds. Caroline O.N. Moser and Fiona C. Clark. London: Zed Books, 2001. 13 – 29.
- Costain, Anne N. "Women's Movements and Nonviolence." *PS: Political Science and Politics* June (2000): 175-80.
- Costello, Cynthia and Amy Dru Stanley. "Report from Seneca (1985)." *No Middle Ground: Women and Radical Protest*. Ed. Kathleen M. Blee. New York: New York University Press, 1998. 199-211.
- Davies, Angela. *Angela Davies: An Autobiography*. New York: Random House, 1974.
- de Cataldo Neuburger, Luisella and Tiziana Valentini. *Women and Terrorism*. Trans. Leo Michael Hughes. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- De Grass, Jan. "Trial By Media #2." *Kinesis* July/August 1984: 6+.
- della Porta, Donatella and Mario Diani. *Social Movements: An Introduction*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1999.
- della Porta, Donatella. *Social Movements, Political Violence, and the State*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

- DeMont, John. "Wakeup Call: A P.E.I. Bomb Baffles Police." *Maclean's* 1 May 1995: 26+.
- DeNardo, James. *Power in Numbers: The Political Strategy of Protest and Rebellion*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University, 1985.
- Dutton, Don. "U.S. Secret Agents Join Hunt for Litton Bombers." *Toronto Star* 16 Oct. 1982: A1+.
- Einwohner, Rachel L., Jocelyn A. Hollander, and Toska Olson. "Engendering Social Movements: Cultural Images and Movement Dynamics." *Gender and Society* 14.5 (2000): 679-99.
- Einwohner, Rachel L. "Gender, Class, and Social Movement Outcomes: Identity and Effectiveness in Two Animal Rights Campaigns." *Gender and Society* 13.1 (1999): 56-76.
- Enloe, Cynthia H. "Beyond 'Rambo': Women and the Varieties of Militarized Masculinity." *Women and the Military System*. Ed. Eva Isaksson. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988. 71 – 93.
- Enloe, Cynthia. *Does Khaki Become You? The Militarization of Women's Lives*. London: Pandora Press, 1988.
- Ferry, Jon. "Island Faces Power Rationing." *Province* (Vancouver) 3 June 1982: A1.
- Fournier, Louis. *FLQ: The Anatomy of an Underground Movement*. Trans. Edward Baxter. Toronto: NC Press, 1984.
- Fournier, Suzanne. "'I'm Still An Idealist'." *Province* (Vancouver) 24 June 1984: A12.
- Fox Piven, Frances and Richard Cloward. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1977.
- Frankfort, Ellen. *Kathy Boudin and the Dance of Death*. New York: Stein and Day, 1983.
- Free the Five Newsletter: Issue 4*. Vancouver: Free the Vancouver Five Defense Group, 3 June 1983.
- Free the Five Newsletter: Issue 5*. Vancouver: Free the Vancouver Five Defense Group, 15 July 1983.
- Free the Five Newsletter: Issue 6*. Vancouver: Free the Vancouver Five Defense Group, 1983.

Free the Five Newsletter: Issue 7. Vancouver: Free the Vancouver Five Defense Group, 16 November 1983.

Free the Five Newsletter: Issue 8. Vancouver: Free the Vancouver Five Defense Group, 27 May 1984.

Free the Five Newsletter: Issue 9. Vancouver: Free the Vancouver Five Defense Group, 5 July 1984.

Free the Five Newsletter: Issue 10. Vancouver: Free the Vancouver Five Defense Group, 1 March 1985.

Gamson, William. *The Strategy of Social Protest*. 2nd Ed. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishers, 1990.

Gellner, John. *Bayonets in the Streets: Urban Guerrilla At Home and Abroad*. Don Mills, Ontario: Collier-MacMillan Canada, 1974.

Glavin, Terry. "Belmas Transferred As A 'Security Risk'." *Vancouver Sun* 26 June 1984: A3.

Goldman, Pam E. "'I Am Kathy Power': Expressions of Radicalism in a Counterculture Community." *No Middle Ground: Women and Radical Protest*. Ed. Kathleen M. Blee. New York: New York University Press, 1998. 19-34.

Gonzalez, Victoria and Karen Kampwirth. "Introduction." Ed. Victoria Gonzalez and Karen Kampwirth. *Radical Women in Latin America: Left and Right*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001. 1-28.

Goodleaf, Donna K. *Entering the War Zone: A Mohawk Perspective on Resisting Invasions*. Penticton, British Columbia, Theytus Books Ltd, 1994.

Goodspeed, Peter. "Group's Message Lends Weight to Bombing Claim, Police Say." *Toronto Star* 22 Oct. 1982: A6.

Goodspeed, Peter. "We Bombed Litton, Unknown Group Says." *Toronto Star* 21 Oct. 1982: A1+.

Grosso, Paula. "The Many Faces of the Zapatista Women." *Briarpatch* March 2002: 3-6.

Hanlon, Michael. "Blast 'Horrifices' Peace Leaders." *Toronto Star* 16 Oct. 1982: A3.

Hannah, Gerry. Telephone Interview. 7 July 2002.

- Hansen, Ann. *Direct Action: Memoirs of an Urban Guerrilla*. Toronto, Ontario: Between the Lines, 2001.
- Hansen, Ann. Interview with Peter Steven. 2001.
<http://www.rabble.ca/everyones_a_critic.shtml?x2821>.
- Hansen, Ann. Personal Interview. 12 June 2002.
- Harper, Tim. "7 Injured Damages in 'Millions'." *Toronto Star* 15 Oct. 1982: A1+.
- Harper, Tim. "Squamish Five Gradually Return to Streets." *Toronto Star* 24 Jan. 1985: B4.
- Hearst, Patricia Campbell. *Every Secret Thing*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1982.
- Helwig, Maggie. "The Trouble With Direct Action." Rabble News. 8 November 2001.
<http://www.rabble.ca/everyones_a_critic/>.
- Hornuna, Rick. *One Nation Under the Gun*. Toronto: Stoddart, 1991.
- Howard, Ross. "Blast Not Canada' 1st Terrorist Act." *Toronto Star* 16 Oct. 1982: C21.
- "Hydro Boosts Security After Blasts." *Province* (Vancouver) 1 June 1982: A12.
- Ibáñez, Ana Cristina. "El Salvador: War and Untold Stories. Women Guerrillas." *Victims, Perpetrators or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence*. Eds. Caroline O.N. Moser and Fiona C. Clark. London: Zed Books, 2001. 117 – 30.
- "In On the Action." *The Fifth Estate*. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. CBC-TV, Toronto. 6 March 2002. Transcript.
- Jacobs, Ron. *The Way the Wind Blew: A History of the Weather Underground*. New York: Verso, 1997.
- Jenkins, J. Craig and Bert Klandermans. "The Politics of Social Protest." Eds. J. Craig Jenkins and Bert Klandermans. *The Politics of Social Protest: Comparative Perspectives on States and Social Movements*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995. 3-13.
- Jennings, Regina. "Why I Joined the Party: An Africana Womanist Reflection." *The Black Panther Party [Reconsidered]*. Ed. Charles E. Jones. Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998. 257-66.

- Kampwirth, Karen. "Women in the Armed Struggles in Nicaragua: Saninistas and Contras Compared." Ed. Victoria Gonzalez and Karen Kampwirth. *Radical Women in Latin America: Left and Right*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001. 79-109.
- Kellet, Anthony, Bruce Beanlands, James Deacon, Heather Jeffrey, and Chantal Lapalme. *Terrorism in Canada: 1960-1989*. Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada, Ministry Secretariat, 1991.
- Khosla, Punam and Patty Gibson. "Interview with Ann." *Kinesis* July/August 1984: 6-8.
- Knapper, Karl. "Women and the Black Panther Party: introduction." *Socialist Review* 26 (1996): 25-32.
- Knapper, Karl. "Women and the Black Panther Party: an interview with Angela Brown." *Socialist Review* 26 (1996): 33-67
- Kramarae, Cheris and Paula A. Treichler. *A Feminist Dictionary*. Boston: Pandora Press, 1985.
- Kuumba, M. Bahati. *Gender and Social Movements*. Walnut Creek, California: AltaMira Press, 2001.
- Lakey, George. "Challenging Ward Churchill's 'Pacifism As Pathology'." <http://csf.colorado.edu/forums/pfus/200211/msg00322.html>
- Lawson, Ronald and Stephen E. Barton. "Sex Roles in Social Movements: A Case Study of the Tenant Movement in New York City." *Signs* 6.2 (1980): 230-47.
- "Lawyer Claims TV Made Clients Look Like Freaks." *Vancouver Sun* 14 Sept. 1983: A2.
- Le Blanc – Ernest, Angela D. " 'The Most Qualified Person to Handle the Job': Black Panther Party Women, 1966 – 1982." *The Black Panther Party [Reconsidered]*. Ed. Charles E. Jones. Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998. 305-33.
- (née Brown). "Black Panther Party." Ed. Darlene Clark Hine. *Black Women in America: An Historic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 1. Brooklyn, New York: Carlson Publishing, 1993. 135-136.
- "Linear Notes from Pissed Off...With Good Reason!" http://homepages.nyu.edu/~cch223/noamerica/info/subhumans_liner.html.
- "Litton Bomb Was Too Big Terrorist Tells Paper." *Toronto Star* 25 June 1984: A2.

- "Litton Bomber Gets Life." *Halifax Chronicle Herald* 8 June 1984: 1+.
- Lobao, Linda. "Women in Revolutionary Movements: Changing Patterns of the Latin American Guerrilla Struggle." Ed. Guida West and Rhoda Lois Blumberg. *Women and Social Protest*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990. 180-204.
- Luciak, Ilja A. "Gender Equality, Democratization, and the Revolutionary Left in Central America." Ed. Victoria Gonzalez and Karen Kampwirth. *Radical Women in Latin America: Left and Right*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001. 189-210.
- MacDonald, Claudia. "Julie Belmas and Ann Hansen Await Trial." *Kinesis* 1983: 10+.
- Macionis, John J and Linda M. Gerber. *Sociology*. 4th Canadian Ed. Toronto: Prentice Hall, 2002.
- Margolis, Jane. "'It's Our Party – Love It or Leave It'." *No Middle Ground: Women and Radical Protest*. Ed. Kathleen M. Blee. New York: New York University Press, 1998. 212-24.
- Mackie, John. "For Love and Anger." *Vancouver Sun* 29 July 1995: D7.
- MacKinnon, J.B. "Usual Suspects: Mass Direct Action has the Power to Transform the Face of Democracy." *This Magazine* July/August 2000: 26-9.
- Matthews, Tracye. "'No One Ever Asks, What a Man's Place in the Revolution Is': Gender and the Politics of The Black Panther Party 1966-1971." *The Black Panther Party [Reconsidered]*. Ed. Charles E. Jones. Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998. 267-304.
- McAdam, Doug. "Gender as a Mediator of the Activist Experience: The Case of Freedom Summer." *American Journal of Sociology* 97.5 (1992): 1211-40.
- McConney, Denise S. *Untuned Ears; Political Violence in the Canadian Press: the case of the Wimmin's Fire Brigade*. M.A. thesis. Carleton University, 1985.
- Mickolus, Edward F., Todd Sandler and Jean M. Murdoch. *International Terrorism in the 1980s: A Chronology of Events, Vol. 1, 1980-1983*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1989.
- Mitchell, Thomas H. *Politically-Motivated Terrorism in North America: The Threat and the Response*. Ph.D. thesis. Carleton University, 1985.

- Monsebraaten, Laurie. "Litton Bomber 'Well Brought Up,' Mother Says." *Toronto Star* 9 June 1984: A1+.
- Morf, Gustav. *Terror in Quebec; case studies of the FLQ*. Toronto: Clarke and Irwin, 1970.
- Morgan, Keith. "Fire Bombings Expected, Video Stores Reveal." *Province* (Vancouver) 23 Nov. 1982: A1.
- Morgan, Keith. "Roundup Nets Anarchist Cell." *Province* (Vancouver) 21 Jan. 1983: A1.
- Morgan, Robin. *The Demon Lover: On the Sexuality of Terrorism*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1989.
- "More about Direct Action." <<http://vuc.interzone.ro/action.html>>.
- Moser, Caroline O.N. "The Gendered Continuum of Violence and Conflict: An Operational Framework." *Victims, Perpetrators or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence*. Eds. Caroline O.N. Moser and Fiona C. Clark. London: Zed Books, 2001. 30-51.
- Moser, Caroline O.N. and Fiona C. Clark. "Introduction." *Victims, Perpetrators or Actors? Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence*. Eds. Caroline O.N. Moser and Fiona C. Clark. London: Zed Books, 2001. 3 -12.
- Mulgrew, Ian. "The Defiant Squamish Five: Down to Earth With A Thud." *Globe and Mail* 19 June 1984: 7.
- Nagle, Patrick. "Defense Pins Hopes on Poll." *Vancouver Sun* 10 Sept. 1983: A13.
- Nagle, Patrick. "Publicity on Arrest of Squamish Five Justified by Public Interest, Court Told." *Vancouver Sun* 20 Sept. 1983: A14.
- Nagle, Patrick. "Squamish 5 Defense Says Deal Made Opposing Direct Indictment of Clients." *Vancouver Sun* 8 Sept. 1983: B3.
- Nagle, Patrick. "Trial Fairness a Vital Concern." *Vancouver Sun* 9 June 1984: A12.
- Neuhouser, Kevin. "'Worse than Men': Gender Mobilization in an Urban Brazilian Squatter Settlement, 1971 - 91." *Gender and Society* 9.1 (1995): 38-59.
- Newsletter of the Free the Five Defense Group: Issue 1*. Vancouver: Free the Vancouver Five Defense Group, 1983.

Newsletter of the Free the Five Defense Group: Issue 2. Vancouver: Free the Vancouver Five Defense Group, 1983.

Newsletter of the Free the Five Defense Group: Issue 3. Vancouver: Free the Vancouver Five Defense Group, 22 April 1983.

Odam, Jes. "Judge Jails Hansen for Life." *Vancouver Sun* 7 June 1984: A1.

Odam, Jes. "Police Listened and Waited as Squamish 5 Laid Plans." *Vancouver Sun* 27 June 1984: B2.

Odam, Jes. "Police Reveal Squamish 5 Hit List." *Vancouver Sun* 27 June 1984: B1.

Odam, Jes. "RCMP 'Eyes' Stalked Gang for 2 Months." *Vancouver Sun* 9 June 1984: A12.

Ottawa Citizen 25 July 1995: A5.

Palmer, Vaughn. "Call it Constructive Destruction." Editorial. *Vancouver Sun* 17 July 1984: A4.

"Papers Given Up." *Vancouver Sun* 21 June 1984: A10.

Pron, Nicholas. "4 Metro Policemen Had Narrow Escape." *Toronto Star* 15 Oct. 1982: A1.

Pynn, Larry. "Judge Lifts Publication Ban." *Vancouver Sun* 22 Oct. 1983: A14.

Randall, Margaret. *Gathering Rage: The Failure of 20th Century Revolutions to Develop a Feminist Agenda*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1992.

Rose, Margaret. "From the Fields to the Picket Line: Huelga Women and the Boycott, 1965 – 1975." *No Middle Ground: Women and Radical Protest*. Ed. Kathleen M. Blee. New York: New York University Press, 1998. 225-50.

Roy, Beth. "Goody Two-Shoes and the Hell-Raisers: Women's Activism, Women's Reputations in Little Rock." *No Middle Ground: Women and Radical Protest*. Ed. Kathleen M. Blee. New York: New York University Press, 1998. 96-132.

Sarti, Robert. "'The 20-year Sentence Has Made Me Stronger'." *Vancouver Sun* 9 June 1984: A1+.

Scotton, Lindsay. "The Litton Bombers." *Toronto Star* 1 June 1985: M1+.

- Scotton, Lindsay. "Snaring the Squamish Five." *Toronto Star* 8 June 1985: M1+.
- "Security in Court Tightened." *Vancouver Sun* 8 June 1984: A1.
- Serres, Christopher. "Real Threat is the Left." *Western Report* 15 May 1995: 10.
- "Seven Freed From Moscow Theater." *CNN* 25 Oct. 2002
 <<http://www.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/europe/10/24/moscow.siege/index.html>>.
- Shaidle, Kathy. "Blast from the Past (the Squamish Five): the World of Radical Peaceniks is like Peanuts – There Are No Grown-ups Anywhere." *Report Newsmagazine* [National Edition] 4 March 2002: 42.
- Shakur, Assata. *Assata: an autobiography*. Westport, Conn.: L. Hill, 1987.
- The Squamish Five*. Dir. Paul Donovan. Prod. Bernard Zuckerman. Writers Ken Gass and Terence McKenna. CBC, 1989.
- Staggenborg, Suzanne. *Gender, Family, and Social Movements*. California: The Forge Press, 1998.
- Stern, Susan. *With the Weathermen: The Personal Journal of a Revolutionary Woman*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc, 1975.
- Still, Larry. "Complex Trial Makes Judge Shudder." *Vancouver Sun* 5 Jan. 1984: A1+.
- Still, Larry and Jes Odam. "Blind Curve Ended Trail." *Vancouver Sun* 9 June 1984: A10.
- Still, Larry. "Shadowy RCMP Official Caught Public Light." *Vancouver Sun* 9 June 1984: A12.
- Still, Larry. "Taps, Bugs Helped Get Convictions." *Vancouver Sun* 9 June 1984: A12.
- "Sun Receives 'Blast' Letter." *Vancouver Sun* 2 June 1982: A1+.
- Sutherland, Scott. "Convicted Terrorist Sets Up Fund for Victims." *Montreal Gazette* 9 Jan. 1993: G8.
- Sutton, Robert and Peter Goodspeed. "Bombing called 'Madness'." *Toronto Star* 16 Oct. 1982: A3.
- Sutton, Robert. "Police Puzzled if Bomb Blast Done by Pros." *Toronto Star* 17 Oct. 1982: A1+.

- Tarrow, Sidney. "Cycles of Collective Action: Between Moments of Madness and the Repertoire of Contention." Ed. Mark Traugott. *Repertoires and Cycles of Collective Action*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995. 110.
- Tarrow, Sidney. *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action, and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Taylor, Verta. "Gender and Social Movements: Gender Processes in Women's Self-Help Movements." *Gender and Society* 13.1 (1999): 8-33.
- Taylor, Verta and Nancy Whittier. "Guest Editors' Introduction: Special Issue on Gender and Social Movements: Part 2." *Gender and Society* 13.1 (1999): 5-7.
- Thompson, Della. *The Oxford Dictionary of Current English: New Revised Edition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- "Three Videotape Chain Stores Attacked By 'Wimmin's' Group." *Vancouver Sun* 22 Nov. 1982: A1.
- Tilly, Charles. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1978.
- Toronto Star* 28 June 1992: C3.
- "Trial Delay Sidestepped." *Vancouver Sun* 8 Sept. 1983: A2.
- Tugwell, Maurice and John Thompson. *The Legacy of Oka*. Toronto: Mackenzie Institute, 1991.
- Useless*. Prod. Glen Sanford. Perf. Gerry Hannah. 2001.
- "The Victims." *Vancouver Sun* 9 June 1984: A11.
- West, Guida and Rhoda Lois Blumberg. "Restructuring Social Protest from a Feminist Perspective." Eds. Guida West and Rhoda Lois Blumberg. *Women and Social Protest*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990. 3-35.
- Wrigley, Julia. "From Housewives to Activists: Women and the Division of Political Labor in the Boston Antibusing Movement." *No Middle Ground: Women and Radical Protest*. Ed. Kathleen M. Blee. New York: New York University Press, 1998. 251 - 88.
- York, Geoffery and Loreen Pindera. *People of the Pines: The Warriors and the Legacy of Oka*. Toronto: McArthur and Company, 1999.

PAGINATION ERROR.

ERREUR DE PAGINATION.

TEXT COMPLETE.

LE TEXTE EST COMPLET.

Appendix A¹

Communiqué Regarding the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir Bombing

This is the communiqué from the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir bombing, taken from *Black Flag*.

Direct Action – May 31, 1982

On May 31, we bombed four 500 kV transformers at the Dunsmuir substation on Vancouver Island. This substation is part of the \$1 billion Cheekeye-Dunsmuir transmission line project being built by British Columbia Hydroelectric. This project, if completed, will provide electricity for a wave of industrial development planned for Vancouver Island.

It was in rejection of both the ecological destruction and the human oppression inherent in the industrial societies of the corporate machine in the West and the communist machine in the East. In the last two hundred years industrial civilization has been raping and mutilating the earth and exterminating other species at an ever increasing rate.

Already in this province, half the forest has been logged and many rivers dammed. The valleys are littered with highways and power lines, the estuaries are paved and polluted, the water is poisoned, mills and smelters belch noxious fumes, and nuclear power and acid rain are soon to come.

While being in complete opposition to further ecological destruction, we also oppose the human oppression resulting from the economic and political systems throughout the world that are based on profit and power. In fact, ecological destruction is directly related to the human oppressions of sexism, racism, hierarchy and imperialism. The desire for power, the insensitivity to the suffering of others and the need to feel superior are the sinister bonds that underlie all these oppressive human relations. Canada's historical role has always been that of supplier of cheap resources to the industrialized world. As this role becomes more critical internationally, the development of energy and resource meg-project projects in Canada has become a government priority. As well as serving a strategic function within the international capitalist economy, the Canadian capitalists see these mega-projects as a means of overcoming the ongoing economic crisis nationally.

We must make this an insecure and uninhabitable place for capitalists and their projects. This is the best contribution we can make towards protecting the earth and struggling for a liberated society.

¹ This is taken verbatim from Ann Hansen's *Direct Action: Memoirs of an Urban Guerrilla*, p.475-76.

Appendix B¹

The Litton Bombing Communiqué

The following is a direct transcript of the original printed Litton communiqué – including the title. It includes spelling and grammatical errors.

Statement Regarding the October 14 Litton Bombing

We claim the responsibility for the bombing of a Litton Systems of Canada Ltd. Industrial plant in Toronto, Ontario where the guidance systems for the Cruise Missile nuclear weapons is being produced.

We sincerely regret that any injuries occurred as a result of this action. We never intended any harm to come to anyone – especially the workers at Litton – but instead, we took great care in preparing what we seriously assumed were adequate precautions to insure the safety of all people in the area. Unfortunately, this did not turn out to be the case.

We do not regret, however, our decision to attempt to sabotage the production of the Cruise Missile's guidance "brain". We only claim in all honesty that this action was never meant to be an act of terrorism. We were not trying to threaten or kill the workers or executives of Litton systems. We were attempting to destroy part of an industrial facility that produces machinery for mass murder. We wanted to blow up as much of that technology of death as possible.

Accidents happen; no systems or people are infallible. For us, however, this fact of life in no way excuses us for the mistakes that we made which contributed to causing injury in this action. We only pose these simple questions to put this tragedy into proper perspective. How many thousands will suffer from cancer-related diseases because of breakdowns at nuclear power plants? How many thousands are maimed and killed every year in industrial accidents? And isn't it a fact that millions of people starve to death annually because so much money and human effort is put into systems of war rather than developing the means to feed the people of the world?

Although we still firmly believe that it is right to attack the technologies of death, we identify our mistakes in this action as the following:

1. The bomb exploded 12 minutes before it was supposed to, assuming that it did detonate at 11:31 p.m. as stated in the media. The bomb was set to go off at 11:43 p.m. If it had exploded at this time, we feel that it was reasonable to have assumed that the Litton plant and the surrounding area would have been safely secured. It is a mystery to us why it exploded early, as we had checked and double-checked the accuracy of the timing system many times.
2. The warning call was not repeated. The van was left on the lawn in front of the Litton building at 11:17 p.m. We telephoned a warning to Litton Security just one minute after the van was parked. This was to ensure a quick reaction by authorities, even though we felt certain that the van would have been seen as it was being driven across the lawn and parked. The van was parked 100 meters directly in front of an exposed glass-walled

¹ This is taken verbatim from Ann Hansen's *Direct Action: Memoirs of an Urban Guerrilla*, p. 477-86.

security guard's booth. In fact, the driver of the van could see 3 guards in the booth at all times during the approach and, as a result, knew that the van had not been noticed. Unfortunately, the Litton guard did not completely understand the instructions of the telephone warning. When he asked that the instructions be repeated, he was only told to go out front and look at the van. We see now that the telephone warning should have been carefully repeated. However, if the warning had been understood, and even the police have said it was "meticulous", then the authorities would have had approximately 25 minutes to clear the plant, the area, and surrounding roads – if the bomb had detonated on time. This was certainly a reasonable length of time to have left the authorities to evacuate the plant and secure the area. Even though the bomb went off early, it seems obvious that even 13 minutes was enough time for the plant to have been safely emptied had the instructions been understood.

3. We made errors in judgement about the "orange box" which was left in front of the van. This box was meant to be a back-up warning system to the telephone warning – again to help authorities understand the situation and ensure prompt and knowledgeable action on their part. The box was painted florescent orange so it could be easily seen and taped to all four sides of it was a sheet of paper with information and instructions. On the top of the box was taped a stick of unarmed dynamite. We felt certain that the Litton guards, either by seeing the van being parked or by being alerted to it by the telephone warning, would quickly come upon the box – thus having written information in their possession to guide them. Unfortunately, we wrote "Danger Explosives" on top of the sheets of instructions. As well, it was not a good idea to leave an unarmed stick of dynamite visible on top of the box. Although these two things were done to prove that this was a real bombing, they actually frightened the Litton guard and police away from the box so that the instructions were never read. Because we left evidence of real explosives, and because the instructions contained the information that there were 550 pounds of explosives inside the van, we assumed that the authorities would have undertaken a massive emergency response and evacuation. This is what we were hoping would happen to make sure that no one was hurt. It was specifically stated in the telephone warning that the box contained important instructions and that the dynamite attached to it was harmless in both the written instructions and the telephone warning, we stated that the van would explode in approximately 15-25 minutes. We said this to insure that everyone, including bomb squad members, would clear away from the van well before it exploded.

4. We were mistaken in believing that the Litton guards and police would be on top of things. The image of cops and guards as "super heroes" caused us to believe that they would have security and safety matters underway very quickly. This obviously did not turn out to be what happened. The Litton guards did not observe the van being parked even though it occurred essentially right before their eyes. A Litton guard did not understand the phone warning even though it was given clearly. It seems that the Litton guards did little or nothing to evacuate the workers until after the police arrived. As the workers have said, they were only told to leave the building seconds before the explosion. The police took a very long time to arrive after they were alerted – approximately 10 minutes – and even then they only sent one car at first to investigate. Finally, neither the

police, but especially Litton security, even took a close look at the orange box. We did not expect this kind of slow and indecisive response from authorities.

We are very disturbed and saddened that injuries occurred as a result of this action. We have gone over what went wrong time and time again. Most significantly, the bomb exploded 12 minutes too early. But nevertheless, we feel we must strongly criticize the Litton security guards for the way in which they “handled” this incident. We know that there were at least 3 guards in the security booth where the van was parked and when the phone warning occurred. We feel it is undeniable that all injury to the workers could have been avoided if the guards had promptly evacuated the Litton plant, as they obviously should have. Although we had no knowledge of the previous false bomb threats (in fact, we oppose authorities to be sceptical of the authenticity of real bomb attacks), we put effort into making sure that the authorities would quickly understand that this threat was real. It is not as if we said that a pipe-bomb was hidden somewhere within the entire Litton complex, so evacuate everything. We informed Litton security of where the van and box were. They were both completely visible to the guards simply by looking straight out through their booth’s window, and the fact that they were there at all obviously indicated that something was definitely amiss. We would like to know why a Litton guard went running into the plant to evacuate the workers only seconds before the explosion – instead of at least 10 minutes earlier? And we would like to know why the two other Litton guards were standing around on the front lawn, instead of informing workers in the other plants? As well, it is irresponsible of Litton to have never informed the workers of past bomb threats, and to not have a loudspeaker system combined with evacuation plans so that workers could be moved to safety in the event of any danger, be it a bombing or otherwise.

The position where the van was parked was chosen for two reasons. One, so that it could be easily and quickly seen from the guard’s booth. It would have been much less conspicuous, and therefore far less risky for the driver of the van, if it had been parked in front of the other two Litton buildings, as neither of these are within direct view of the guard’s booth. Secondly, the van was parked in a corner of the building in order that the two walls of this corner would prevent debris from being case in a southerly or south-westerly direction where the two nearby hotels are located. This position was the only such corner at the front of the three Litton buildings. Again it was at the risk of being apprehended on the spot that we chose to park the van in a location which provided the least risk to public safety.

We have written the above not to redeem ourselves, as we did commit inexcusable errors, but simply as an explanation of our motives and intentions for those people who may feel threatened that there are crazed terrorists on the loose against the Canadian people. Again, we repeat, that we took great care in preparing what we seriously assumed were adequate precautions to insure the safety of all people in the area. Understand and remember, the terrorists are those who have set the world on the brink of nuclear war, not those who fighting this insanity and inhuman madness!

Finally, we wish to state that in no way was this bombing the work of the Cruise

Missile Conversion Project, or any other public peace movement organization in Toronto.

Direct Action
October 17, 1982

Direct Action

We claim responsibility for the bombing of a Litton Systems of Canada Ltd. industrial plant in Toronto, Ontario where the guidance system for the Cruise Missile nuclear weapons are being built.

There is every reason imaginable to tear down the systems and makers of nuclear war: for the survival of all life on Earth, for people's hopes and visions, for the possibilities of a liveable future. We dedicate this action to the spirit of the people, which if awakened, will overcome the threats to our survival.

Nuclear war is beyond question the ultimate expression of the negative characteristics of Western Civilization. Its roots lie deep within centuries of patriarchy, racism, imperialism, class domination and all other forms of violence and oppression that have scarred human history. As well, nuclear war expresses, in the most horrendous way, the general trend of modern technological civilization towards extinction – either by war or ecological destruction. It points out, with terrorizing finality, that unless people can stop the men that dominate societies around the world – the men who use science and technology for war and power and profit – then the intricate natural world as we know it will cease to exist.

The insanity of nuclear war, and the continuing development of the weapons for nuclear war, stands as a horror for all to see. In the industrialized world more resources, scientists and engineers are engaged in creating the armies and weapons systems for nuclear war than for any other single pursuit. Three to ten new bombs are added daily to the arsenals of global annihilation and over \$300 billion is spent every year increasing and upgrading an overkill stockpile of more than 55,000 nuclear weapons. In the U.S., Reagan has asked for a 31% increase in the Pentagon's present \$1.7 trillion five-year budget and has also announced a new \$1.5 trillion arms program. Who can doubt that the dictators and militarists in the Kremlin are far behind?

The terrorism of this relentless nuclear arms buildup, the nightmare of witnessing the Earth being transformed into a giant doomsday bomb, and the realization that things are out-of-control because those in power are greedy and violent madmen has shocked billions with fear and concern. Yet in the industrialized world, many of the same people who profess their abhorrence at the idea of nuclear conflict are nevertheless unthinkingly, and often willingly, participating in the actual processes which are bringing about global nuclear genocide. People of the Western and Eastern empires must wake up to the reality that it is the same governments and militaries that they support, the same ideology and rationalizations that they believe in, the same materialistic, technological and consumeristic lifestyles that they adhere to, and the same corporations or industries that they work for that are directly responsible for the ongoing nuclear insanity that they claim to reject.

We believe that people must actively fight the nuclear war systems in whatever forms they exist and wherever they exist. Although, in total, the nuclear militarization of the world is a vast and seemingly unfathomable and omnipotent networks, it can be understood and effectively resisted when we recognize that it is designed, built and operated in thousands of separate facilities and industries spread throughout the world. By analysing the interests and institutions in our own regions that are contributing to the nuclear buildup we find the smaller component pieces of the nuclear network that are realistic targets for direct confrontation and sabotage. Our opposition to the insanity of nuclear war must be transformed into militant resistance and direct action on a local and regional basis. It is not enough to only theoretically oppose the idea of nuclear war. We must take responsibility for what is going on around us!

In Canada we must specifically fight against the production and testing of the Cruise Missile. But more generally, and strategically, we must recognize that the Canadian State is committed to, and actively involved in, the nuclear war preparations of the U.S. and the rest of the capitalist Western Alliance. As one of the seven Western Summit nations and through its military alliances, the Canadian State is directly participating in the desperate and deadly drive by the Western Alliance (primarily spurred on by the U.S. ruling class) to re-assert capitalism's hegemony globally through the attainment of total nuclear superiority and first-strike capability. The new nuclear weapons systems, such as the Cruise and Pershing II Missiles, the Trident Submarines and the Neutron Bomb, are designed for offensive first-strike use, and are seen by the military strategies and leaders of the Western Alliance as a force to contain or defeat any threats to the security of capitalist interests or strategically important regions around the world – be it from the Soviet Union or liberation struggles in the Third World attempting to establish independent economies.

Canadian economic, foreign and military policy is not committed to peace or global justice, rather it is completely emersed within the genocidal nuclear strategy of the Western Alliance to wage nuclear war, if necessary, to maintain the multinational corporate economy throughout the world. Through membership in the NATO and NORAD nuclear military alliances, the Canadian State is fulfilling an active supporting role in maintaining and developing the nuclear fighting capacity of the Western military forces. Primarily, Canadian support systems for nuclear war involve communications devices which supply targetting information to U.S. nuclear weapons systems or detection of incoming attacks; as well as the deployment of nuclear missiles at Canadian Forces bases at Bagotville, Quebec, at Comox, B.C. and at Chatham, New Brunswick. The ongoing complicity of the Canadian State with nuclear warfare strategies was re-affirmed recently by renewed commitments to both NATO and NORAD, and by the government's support for NATO's nuclear modernization program.

Hand in hand with the government's military involvement in the nuclear operations of NATO and NORAD, Canadian capitalists are making profits from producing components for U.S. nuclear weapons systems. Current government policy places no restrictions on Canadian industrial involvement in the building of U.S. nuclear weapons. Litton is building the Cruise Missile's electronic guidance system, Hawker-Siddeley Canada Ltd. of Toronto is building launchers for the Lance Missles designed to

carry the Neutron Bomb, Vickers of Montrail is building the hull cylinder torpedo tubes for the Polaris, Poseidon and Trident nuclear submarines, Heeds International of Port Moody, B.C. built the cranes to load nuclear warheads into the Trident subs, and a Canadian plant is working on a component for the MX nuclear missile system.

Industries in Canada that produce nuclear weapons components are fully integrated with the military and nuclear policies of the U.S. through the U.S./Canada Defense Production Sharing Arrangements. These arrangements cover the production side of the NORAD agreements for a continental defense policy and set out the division of labour between Canada and the U.S. for weapons production. The federal government directly assists and subsidizes Canadian armament manufacturers through a myriad of programs designed to help these death merchants win U.S. Defense Department contracts available under the Production Sharing Arrangements. Through the Defense Industry Productivity Program, the federal government has given Litton \$26.4 million to subsidize production of the guidance system for the Cruise Missile. In addition, the government has given Litton a five year \$22.5 million interest free loan for the same program.

Giving financial aid for the manufacture of components for the Cruise Missile and the agreements to test the Cruise Missile in northern Alberta and Saskatchewan attests to the complete hypocrisy of Trudeau and the other government officials who proclaim that Canadian policy strives for suffocation of the nuclear arms race. In the grim light of reality, the "peace" pronouncements of Trudeau amount to nothing but enticing lies and illusions designed to con us into believing that the Canadian State is an ally in the struggle for disarmament, and therefore, a workable vehicle in which to direct our energies.

We've got to realize the implications of the government's decisions and actual policy. We must come to see the Canadian State as an active enemy to be fought, and not as misguided humanists open to our enlightenment. Far from listening to the growing protest from the Canadian public to withdraw its involvement in nuclear war, the government has done just the opposite. It has boosted military spending, re-affirmed commitments to NATO and NORAD, publicly defended the U.S./NATO nuclear strategy, given to let the Pentagon warmongers use Canadian territory for the testing of the Cruise Missile, as well as other newly developed U.S. weapons systems. Counting on these officials to solve our problems is ridiculous. Any belief in the "democracy" of the system to save us is simply a belief in the democracy of lambs being led to the slaughter. We must stop our futile attempts at trying to transform the consciousness of the capitalist slime who make up the Canadian State and begin transforming ourselves and the strategies by which we operate. We will not survive if, in the final analysis, the success of our undertakings is determined by whether the nuclear enemy can be persuaded to change its sickened mind.

While we have no illusions that direct action, such as this one, can by themselves bring about the end of Canada's role as a resource based economic and military functionary of Western Imperialism, we do believe that militant direct actions are valid and necessary. Militant direct actions can have a constructive function as both a springboard to the kind of consciousness and organization that must be developed if we are to overcome the nuclear masters, and as an effective tool of resistance now. Whether

they will or not depends on the integrity of the existing movement to develop the commitment and courage to carry the struggle beyond legality and the personal security and privilege of comfortable lifestyles still aspired to, and attainable, by middle-class dissidents in North America.

We believe that it is critical that the already radical sectors of the movement for liberation and nuclear sanity recognize that direct action and militant resistance can have positive effects now, can weaken the enemy now, and that this possibility to sabotage the enemy's undertakings complements the movement's strategic long-term efforts to transform the consciousness of the people. We believe that, if undertaken seriously and well-supported throughout the existing movement, widely practiced militant resistance and sabotage will become effective in slowing down the clock of death and inspire the people to respond to the threats to our survival with urgency, vitality and clarity.

The global situation of nuclear holocaust and extreme ecological disaster is rapidly becoming reality. The new Western Alliance weapons systems for first-strike nuclear war are to be in place by 1983-86. This destabilizing, ever-encroaching reality should compel us all to move beyond protest and work hard to develop a movement with the collective means and ability to actually do something directly to stop the realization of the enemy's life-threatening madness. In the absence of widespread popular refusal to participate any longer in the war projects of the ruling class, we believe that militant direct actions must be used as an attempt to keep uncompleted, or at least slow-down, the programs and technologies which are bringing about our own destruction. For us, this is where the impetus to act lies.

Historically, those in power have always used warfare and repression in order to maintain their control over other people's lives. And today this situation is no different. For the corporate owners and political rulers nuclear weapons are the ultimate tool in the repressive apparatus – the key to maintaining their power. Thus they will never voluntarily disarm or stand aside and watch their power be peacefully taken away. Instead, they will use whatever weapons are necessary to battle those who are threatening their rule. We are certain that only through revolt – not referendums or protest alone – can we stop the powercrazed from launching their W.W. III. It is with an eye towards the generalized development of an actively militant resistance movement that we have undertaken this action.

Appendix C¹
Wimmin's Fire Brigade Communiqué
November 22, 1982

We, the Wimmin's Fire Brigade, claim responsibility for the fire-bombing of three red Hot Video outlets in the Lower Mainland of B.C. on November 22, 1982. This action is another step towards the destruction of a business that promotes and profits from violence against wimmin and children.

Red Hot Video sells tapes that show wimmin and children being tortured, raped and humiliated. We are not the property of men to be used and abused.

Red Hot Video is part of a multi-billion dollar pornography industry that teaches me to equate sexuality with violence. Although these tapes violate the Criminal Code of Canada and the B.C. guidelines on pornography, all lawful attempts to shut down Red Hot Video have failed because the justice system was created, and is controlled, by rich men to protect their profits and property.

As a result, we are left no viable alternative but to change the situation ourselves through illegal means. This is an act of self-defense against hate propaganda!

¹ This is taken verbatim from Ann Hansen's *Direct Action: Memoirs of an Urban Guerrilla*, p. 487.

Appendix D¹
Ann Hansen's Statement to the Court before Sentencing

When I look back on the past year and a half, I realize that I have learned a lesson. Not the kind of lesson that some people would hope I had learned, but rather through direct life experience I have re-learned what I only once understood theoretically – that the courts have nothing to do with justice and prison is where they punish the victims of this society. For many years now I have understood that the justice system was actually a system of injustice when seen in the broader social context. I was aware that parliament is where men make laws to protect big business, wealthy individuals and the status quo. Police were employed to enforce laws, courts were created to prosecute those who broke the law, and prisons were built to punish the guilty.

My faith in the justice system began to erode as I grew up and saw the big businesses ripping off people by selling poorly produced products at high prices, resource companies gouging and raping the earth, governments producing nuclear arsenals capable of destroying life on earth many times over, pornographic magazines that normalized and glamourized rape, incest and sexual assault, and Indians being herded into reservations to die. All these crimes against humanity and the earth are legal. They are protected and sanctioned by Parliament, the courts, the law and the police. This was all very wrong. In Oakalla, where I have spent the last sixteen months, I have found that 70 percent of the prison population are Indian womyn, even though Indian people make up only 1 percent of the total outside population. The disproportionate number of Indian people in prison is reflected in prison populations across the country and reflects the racism of our society. Everyone I have met in prison is poor. No one owns cars, homes, land or anything. They are there because they were forced to commit crimes to survive in a society that has no place for them. They have never owned forest companies that rape whole mountains of their forests, or handled nuclear murder weapons or stolen oil from Arab lands to be sold at scalper's prices in North America.

In the beginning when I was first arrested, I was intimidated and surrounded by the courts and prison. This fear provided the basis for the belief that if I played the legal game, I would get acquitted or perhaps less time. This fear obscured my vision and fooled me into thinking that I could get a break from the justice system. But this past eight months in court has sharpened my perceptions and strengthened my political convictions to see that the legal game is rigged and political prisoners are dealt a marked deck.

From the beginning in January 1983, the police illegally orchestrated press conferences and furnished the mass media with evidence, photos and information that became the basis for nation-wide news stories convicting us as terrorists. We were portrayed as dangerous, psychotic criminals without politics.

Then our charges were separated into four separate indictments, of which the first was the Brink's conspiracy, so that we would be criminalized. This would make it harder for people to understand us as political people for our future trials.

¹ This is taken verbatim from Ann Hansen's *Direct Action: Memoirs of an Urban Guerrilla*, p. 489 – 93.

During the voir dire, it became obvious through police testimony that the different police departments had committed illegal acts during their investigation. The Security Service in all probability watched the WFB (Wimmin's Fire Brigade) do the firebombings since Julie and I had been under intensive twenty-four-hour surveillance by the SS for days prior to and during the day of the firebombing.

CLEU (Co-ordinated Law Enforcement Unit) had committed illegal break-ins to plant the bugs in our house and in Doug's apartment among other illegal activities. But despite this, the judge permitted the wire-tap evidence. This taught me that there is one law for the people and none for the police.

But the event during the court proceedings that has had the most politicizing effect on me was Julie's sentencing. The judge ignored the fact that she had plea bargained and slapped her with the maximum prison sentence suggested by the Crown—twenty years. During the sentencing, the judge said that this case is criminal not political, yet the twenty-year sentence contradicts this view and instead reflects the real political nature of these proceedings. The twenty-year sentence was justified by the judge as a necessary social deterrent, which indicated that the court is so threatened by the potential of social upheaval that it takes a twenty-year sentence to deter others. That is political. It seems that the severity of the prison sentence is in direct proportion to the perceived level of discontent in society.

I understand why I have participated in the legal system up to now, but, in retrospect, in order to be honest to my political principles, I should have refused to collaborate in this legal sham and instead simply stated my political reasons for doing what I did.

Since I didn't then, I have the opportunity to do so now. Over the last couple of days we have heard witnesses who are activists around the different issues. They have spoken at great length about their efforts and the efforts of other groups to prevent the testing of the Cruise and the construction of the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir line and to stop Red Hot Video. I think it has become fairly obvious through their testimony that in each case they had exhausted all the legitimate channels of social protest in order to stop these projects and businesses. It was because there was no legal way to stop these crimes against humanity and the earth that I felt I had to use illegal actions to do so.

I didn't just feel that I should; I felt I had a duty and responsibility to do everything in my power to stop these crimes. At this dangerous point in human history, we have a moral responsibility to stop the arms race, violent pornography and the destruction of the earth. This moral responsibility far overrides any obligation to adhere to man-made laws.

I would prefer to live in peace but, when I looked around me, I couldn't find it anywhere. Everywhere I looked, the land was being destroyed, the Indians were victims of genocide, Third World peoples were oppressed and massacred, people lived in industrial wastelands and womyn were being raped and children molested. I could never live in peace, only quiet – the kind you find in cemeteries.

Even though I knew that a few militant direct actions would not make the revolution or stop these projects, I believe that it was necessary to begin the development of an underground resistance movement that was capable of sabotage and expropriations

and could work free from police surveillance. The development of an effective resistance movement is not an overnight affair – it takes decades of evolution. It has to start somewhere in small numbers, and whether or not it grows, becomes an effective and successful, will depend upon whether we make it happen.

I believe these direct actions of sabotage complement the legal radical movement and serve a purpose that it can't fulfil. Not that the legal movement is ineffective: although its efforts often fail to stop a project, its work will increase people's consciousness. The important thing is that the above-ground and underground support one another because our strength lies in unity and diversity.

Although I did do these three political actions, they were the result of the culmination of a legal struggle around the respective issues. In fact, the point of an underground resistance movement is to develop a strategic political analysis and actions that are based on an understanding of the economies and politics of the corporate state. Instead of reacting to every issue that pops up, we carried out actions that were based upon an analysis. This way, if an effective resistance movement does develop, we can be subjects who determine history instead of reacting to every singularity obvious symptom of the system's disease.

The politics of Direct Action saw the interconnectedness of militarism, sexism, environmental destruction and imperialism. We saw that all these problems are rooted in the value system and was of thinking called capitalism and patriarchy. These values are passed on from one generation to the next through the institutions of this society – the multinational corporations, schools, mass media, church, and commercial culture.

The main value of this society can be boiled down simply into one word – money. All life on this earth is reduced to its profit value by the capitalist economic system. Women, animals, Third World people, and the environment are reduced to a product and thus are objectified. Workers are valued for their productivity, women as sex objects, animals for food or furs, the environment for its potential as a natural resource base. If some living being is of no economic value in relation to the capitalist system then it is valueless. Consequently, traditional Indian people become victims of genocide and huge areas of the earth are designated as "Natural Sacrifice Areas." So the Litton action, the Cheekeye-Dunsmuir action and WFB action, at least for me, were not issue-oriented actions but were our resistance politics transformed into action.

Contrary to the Crown's and police's theories, Direct Action and the WFB were two different groups. Of the five of us charged with the Red Hot Video fire-bombings, only Julie and I did the firebombings. There were no men involved with doing the firebombings. There were no men involved with doing the firebombings. Doug, Brent and Gerry just happened to either live with Julie and me or visit us. The WFB was not an ongoing underground group, it was simply a group of womyn who came together for the purpose of firebombing Red Hot Video because we felt there was no other way for us to stop the proliferation of violent pornography.

Direct Action carried out the Litton and Cheekeye-Dunsmuir actions. I do sincerely regret that people were injured in the Litton bombing. All precautions were taken to prevent these injuries and an explanation as to why it happened was released almost immediately after the bombing. But I must also add that I criticized the Litton

actions itself because it was wrong for Direct Action to place a bomb near a building that people were working in, regardless of the number of precautions taken to ensure that nobody got hurt. In carrying out actions, revolutionaries should never rely on the police or security guard to clear out buildings and save people's lives.

There is no excuse for these mistakes, and I will always live with the pain that I am responsible for, but these mistakes should never overshadow the incredible amount of pain and suffering that Litton contributes to every day and the potential for planetary extinction that the Cruise missile embodies. Every day millions of people are slowly starving to death because so much money and human effort is diverted into the international war industry instead of being used to feed the people of the world. In Canada, essential social services are cut so that the government can pour more money into the war industry and megaprojects. For example, the federal government has given Litton \$26.4 million in subsidies to build the guidance system of the Cruise.

The use of 1984 double-think has become an important part of today's psychological warfare against people developing radical consciousness. We experience it every day, even in this courtroom. I am called a terrorist – one who tries to impose their will through force and intimidation – by the court and press. But I am not a terrorist. I am a person who feels a moral obligation to do all that is humanly possible to prevent the destruction of the earth. Businesses such as Litton, B.C. Hydro and Red Hot Video are the real terrorists. They are guilty of crimes against humanity and the earth, yet they are free to carry on their illegal activities while those who resist and those who are their victims remain in prison. How do we, who have no armies, weapons, power or money, stop these criminals before they destroy the earth?

I believe if there is any hope for the future, it lies in our struggle.