Editor's Note: The past year of the Arab Spring, as well as recent experience in Iraq and Afghanistan, have shown the power of civil resistance. This resistance has been used as a relatively stand-alone tactic powerful enough to topple long-standing dictators, and we have also seen it come in conjunction with violent insurgencies. Dr. Chenoweth offers a nuanced understanding of this topic and its importance.

Is civil resistance a form of warfare (a method of using a set of tactics “as a substitute for traditional military means to achieve an operational objective”)?

I do see civil resistance as an active form of conflict, albeit often a far less destructive and more constructive form than violent warfare. I see the deliberate application of nonviolent methods, like strikes, boycotts, protests, and other tactics, as a viable substitute for armed insurgency in many cases, but without the long-term damage that armed insurgencies often do to social relationships, infrastructure, and economic and political development. This means that a number of principles from traditional insurgency apply to civil resistance campaigns. For instance, few generals (or guerrillas) win wars by using the same technique on the battlefield day after day. Flexibility, unpredictability, and efficiency are essential in battle. They are essential in civil resistance as well.

Gene Sharp argued that planning a strategy in a nonviolent resistance campaign is of crucial importance. What does strategy/strategic competence mean in the context of civil resistance?

As with any struggle, strategic competence is the ability to articulate realistic, viable objectives, link tactics to those objectives, and develop contingency plans for when things go wrong. A strategically adept campaign will have a strategy not only for confronting the opponent with disruptive force, but also for
enforcing discipline and unity within the campaign itself. A successful civil resistance campaign will have a plan for overcoming adverse conditions—and a plan B for when plan A goes wrong. I believe it was Winston Churchill who said that “Those who plan do better than those who do not plan, even though they rarely stick to their plan.”

**What is the role of networks in mobilizing a civil resistance? How important is to leverage and harness the power of widely spread societal networks?**

Most civil resistance campaigns that succeed enjoy broad-based support from a variety of different societal groups. They typically engender support from women, the elderly and the young, people from a variety of classes, parties, regions, and religious backgrounds. Insofar as widely spread networks help movements to draw in diverse participation, they are useful. However, formalized networks or civil society organizations may not be necessary to achieve high levels of diverse participation. Sometimes the opponent is so widely hated in society (like the Shah in Iran, for instance) that diverse and broad-based mobilization occurred without formalized societal networks existing in the country.

**In the pop-centric COIN language is said that the best weapons don’t fire bullets. Which are the “best weapons” to be used in a civil resistance? What are the core “ammunitions”??**

The best weapons in civil resistance campaigns are those that exert the maximum pressure on the opponent with the minimum amount of risk and damage to the civil resistance campaign. These will vary from conflict to conflict. Sometimes mass protests are extremely disruptive and less risky than other types of actions, like nonviolent occupations. Other times protests may expose participants to extreme repression, where general strikes, slow-downs in the workplace, or economic boycotts would be just as disruptive but less risky. Activists have to decide for themselves what kind of opponent they face, and where they have the capacity to truly exert real pressure without submitting themselves to needless repression. But regardless of the tactics they choose, these tactics will likely remain ineffective without active support from the civilian population. In that regard, I suppose people are the most important assets.

**You have focused your research on a few clear cut nonviolent resistance campaigns: the Iranian Revolution, The First Intifada, the Philippine People Power movement and the Burmese uprising. Which are the key ingredients for a civil resistance to achieve success? What kind of domestic mechanisms should be leveraged/triggered in order to achieve success?**

Successful campaigns have a few things in common. First, they tend to attract massive support from diverse sectors of society. This means that their mobilization strategy typically focuses on a particular social or political issue that has widespread resonance in the society. Second, they tend to mix their methods—they combine methods of concentration (like protests, demonstrations, occupations, rallies, etc.) with methods of dispersion (like stay-at-homes, go-slows, strikes, boycotts). This allows them to keep the pressure on while giving activists a bit of relief from exposure to regime repression. Third, although it is never a good idea to deliberately provoke violence from the regime, most regimes use violence against major nonviolent campaigns anyway. Successful campaigns find ways to publicize regime abuses to challenge the regime’s moral legitimacy, which can lead to the campaign’s attracting even more participants as more people reject the regime’s claim to legitimate rule. Fourth, many nonviolent campaigns are able to produce loyalty shifts within the regime’s “pillars of support”—the security forces, economic elites, civilian bureaucrats, media elites, and other regime functionaries. This is not because these erstwhile regime supporters begin to sympathize or support the unarmed rebellion. Rather, regime elites begin to perceive further resistance to change too costly—politically, economically, or socially. This is a major reason why numbers matter: they produce the sense that change is inevitable, and that regime elites must surrender, reform, or get out of the way.
Can you explain in more detail the process through which a campaign of nonviolent resistance is able to leverage its pressure and influence on the regime’s “pillars of support”?

Gene Sharp has theorized that every regime is dependent on the cooperation, obedience, and help of different pillars of support—such as economic elites, civilian bureaucrats, state media, security forces, and educational elites—to remain in power. Historically, nonviolent campaigns have been able to chip away at these pillars by imposing significant costs on them. For instance, oil worker strikes deprived the Shah of Iran the revenue necessary to convince Iranian economic elites and security forces to continue to support him. Activists associated with the Nashville lunch counter sit-ins in the U.S. civil rights movement learned how to make segregation costly for white business owners. By refusing to leave segregated lunch counters at downtown Nashville diners, white townspeople stopped eating at the diners, making local business lose revenue that they earned during lunchtimes. Those business-owners then put pressure on Nashville's mayor to desegregate, not necessarily because they agreed with desegregation, but rather to save their own businesses. So leverage doesn't really depend on "conversion" as much as it depends on imposing costs. Importantly, the ability to impose and sustain these high costs often depends on broad-based participation. The more people participate, the higher capacity to impose costs on the pillars and pull them away from the regime.

Counterinsurgencies and insurgencies tend to be seen as “cognitive battles”, “battles for the minds of the people” with the objective being the four inches between the ears of the people. To what extent is the civil resistance about influencing and winning the argument for the minds of core audiences and constituencies of a target-regime?

I disagree with those who think that nonviolent resistance wins because it has “moral superiority.” But a campaign clearly has to win a cognitive battle, which is essentially a struggle to motivate people who share common grievances and common goals to overcome the fear, apathy, or indifference that leads them to accept the status quo. This is a difficult thing to do in many societies, and it’s the core challenge for any civil resistance campaign. Although I do think that civil resistance is essentially a battle over legitimacy, nonviolent resistance doesn’t win because it is legitimate per se. It wins because regimes cannot bear the costs imposed on them once a massive portion of the population refuses to be afraid, refuses to accept intolerable circumstances, and begins to collectively say “no.”

“If you can identify the sources of a government’s power - legitimacy, popular support, institutional support- then you know on what that dictatorship depends for its existence. All you have to do is to shrink that support, that legitimacy and the regime will be weakened and if you can take that sources of power away the regime will fall” said Gene Sharp. Having in mind the nonviolent resistance campaigns covered in your book which was the center of gravity of the target-regime? Where or what was the Achilles’ heel?

Each society has its own centers of gravity. However, one clear pattern is that nonviolent campaigns are superior in producing defections within the security forces compared with armed insurgencies. This pattern does vary across countries, though, and approaching security forces to encourage defections is very risky business.

How imperative is for a campaign of nonviolent resistance to search and identify the “centers of gravity” of the target - regime?

It is imperative for a campaign to identify the target regime's centers of gravity. This is one reason why campaigns cannot be imported or exported. The centers of gravity vary across countries, and only the population knows what the centers of gravity are, what the pillars' vulnerabilities are, and how to mobilize support and participation from the general population.
How does a civil resistance win the allegiance and the support of the regime main sources of power/centers of gravity in order to shift their loyalty away?

With regard to security forces, the tactics that nonviolent campaigns use—strikes, protests, etc.—spread out regime repression and make it extremely costly to continue indefinitely. When the workers aren’t going to work, people aren’t paying their taxes, and the economy has ground to a halt because of general strikes and sanctions from the international community, security forces often sense that they aren’t going to get their paychecks next month. This can be enough to make officers begin to call in sick to work, or to disobey orders altogether. Many economic elites and civilian bureaucrats are equally vulnerable to these same dilemmas. But because they don’t face violence from the unarmed insurrection, the risks costs of supporting the movement aren’t as high as if the movement was armed.
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INTRODUCTION TO
TRAINING MANUAL FOR NONVIOLENT DEFENSE
AGAINST THE COUP D'ÉTAT

Over the last century, in diverse parts of the world, nonviolent action has proven to be a remarkably effective means for people to struggle for democracy, rights, justice, freedom, self-determination, good governance, and accountability from governments and corporations. Those who study nonviolent action have long known—based on theoretical models, historical case studies, and more recent quantitative studies—the advantages that nonviolent action used by civilians (also referred to as “civil resistance”) has over violence. The ability of a civil resistance movement to withdraw societal support from an oppressor, and to induce defections from the oppressor’s own supporters, is documented historical fact. As I remember the scholar Gene Sharp telling me, “If the people do not obey, then the ruler cannot rule.” It is in this way that nonviolent movements wield power and struggle victoriously against even the most repressive of opponents, who ultimately have no power if their commands are no longer obeyed.

The use of nonviolent action to win rights, freedom, and democracy has received the bulk of researchers’ attention in this field in recent decades, while the use of nonviolent action to deter and defend against coups d’état has received relatively less focus. Therefore, Richard K. Taylor has done a service for all who have been or will be affected by coups by laying out, in clear language, a framework for civil society to think about how it can engage in nonviolent anticoup resistance. I see this manual as a starting point in the effort to develop further an understanding of the potential that nonviolent action has to deter and collapse coups d’état—and in so doing, to prevent one of the most common ways that authoritarian governments are established and perpetuated.

This manual is designed to be used for a two-day training workshop, which, if at all possible, should be given before any suspected coup takes place. As Taylor notes, once a coup is underway, it is extremely important for anti-coup opposition to become active as quickly as
possible. The success or failure of coups can sometimes hinge on delays of hours, or even minutes (as in the case of Russian President Boris Yeltsin’s narrow escape from arrest during the 1991 coup in Moscow), during the first few days when the coup plotters are struggling to consolidate their grip on power. Hence, once a coup has taken place, there is little time available at that point to hold training workshops on defense against coups.

Therefore, Taylor’s work is best used by people who want to make advance preparations before any possible coups d’état, especially in societies in which there is a general history of coups, or where conditions (such as political instability and splits between the military and civilian leadership) make a coup more likely. Pro-democracy activists and civil society groups will want to familiarize themselves with the ideas in this book, as may government personnel who would like to make sure that their government is less vulnerable to the threat of coups. In addition, any long-term civil resistance movement that is struggling for democracy will want to review this manual, because there is always a risk when a movement is making progress against a dictatorship that a coup will take place, potentially setting back the movement’s gains.

If you find this manual useful, one additional resource bears mention. In 2003, Gene Sharp and Bruce Jenkins of the Albert Einstein Institution published a monograph titled *The Anti-Coup*, which has a similar strategic perspective to Taylor’s *Training Manual*, but is organized more as a reference for scholars, members of civil society and NGOs, and people in governments. Sharp’s and Jenkins’ book also includes two sets of specific preparations that governments and civil society organizations can take to prevent coups d’état.

In addition, in the event that a coup takes place and is able to consolidate its rule and establish a dictatorship, an appendix has been added at the end of the *Training Manual* listing additional resources that may be useful to people as they prepare for a longer-term struggle against the dictatorship.

It is my hope that this manual will provide valuable information and hope to those facing coups and struggling for a more peaceful, just, and free world.

Hardy Merriman

March 2, 2010
Two exciting new quantitative studies have been released in the last several years.

A 2008 study by Maria J. Stephan and Erica Chenoweth evaluated 323 violent and nonviolent resistance campaigns from 1900 to 2006 and found that “major nonviolent campaigns have achieved success 53 percent of the time, compared with 26 percent for violent resistance campaigns.” They account for this by pointing out that nonviolent movements tend to have more domestic and international legitimacy than violent movements and therefore tend to get more participation by the domestic population and support by international actors than violent movements. They also found that government repression against nonviolent movements is far more likely to backfire against the government than government repression against violent movements.

A 2005 study by Adrian Karatnycky and Peter Ackerman examined 67 transitions from authoritarianism between 1972 and 2005. They found that transitions driven by nonviolent resistance resulted in greater increases in freedom than transitions driven by violence. In 64% (32 out of 50) of the cases in which nonviolent civic resistance was a key factor, the transitions from authoritarianism led to political systems that had high levels of respect for political rights and civil liberties. In contrast, in the cases in which opposition groups used violence, only 20% (4 out of 20) led to governments with high levels of respect for political rights and civil liberties.


Available for download at: http://aeinstein.org/organizations/org/TAC.pdf
INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE MANUAL IN THE CONTEXT OF WORLDWIDE COUP D'ETATS

The purpose of this manual is to help trainers run well-designed workshops to prepare citizens in effective nonviolent methods of defending their governments and their institutions against coup d’états.

The phrase "coup d’état" is from the French, "blow against the state.” It refers to the sudden, forcible overthrow of a government by a group plotting against it. Governments have been shaken or forcibly brought down since time immemorial. Our era is no exception.

In the famous "beer-hall putsch" of 1923, Adolf Hitler attempted to depose the republican government of Bavaria. Within a decade, the world was embroiled in a cataclysmic war between totalitarianism and allies espousing freedom and democracy.

Seventy years later, on November 17, 1993, General Sani Abacha and his military confederates ousted the civilian government of Ernest Shonekan in Nigeria. The next day, the general announced that he was installing himself as ruler, dissolving virtually every democratic institution in Nigeria, forbidding any political gatherings, banning political parties, replacing civilian officials with military commanders and running the country as a police state. With one stroke, he effectively dismantled a decade of Nigerian progress toward a system of elected government.

In the seven decades between Hitler and Abacha, plotters have organized successful coups in over half of the world's sovereign states. In a few cases, democratic forces have used coups to put an end to repressive regimes. In many others, however, nascent democracies have been snuffed out and replaced by military dictatorships or other undemocratic cabals. Some examples of countries experiencing post-World War II coups are:

- Algeria Ethiopia Panama
- Argentina Greece
- Paraguay Azerbaijan
- Guatemala Poland Burma
- Haiti South Korea Bolivia
- Honduras Sudan Chile
- Indonesia Soviet Union
- Ceylon Cuba Iraq
- Czechoslovakia Lebanon
- Thailand Dahomey Liberia
- Turkey Egypt Nicaragua
- Uganda El Salvador
- Nigeria Venezuela
- Ecuador Pakistan Vietnam
- Laos Syria Tanzania

Here in the mid-1990’s, the movement towards democracy seems to be gaining strength. However, shaky new democracies around the world are threatened by anti-democratic forces. Supporters of these fledgling democracies want to know how to defend governments “of the people, by the people, and for the people” against the forces that would sweep them aside.

The good news is that powerful nonviolent means of resisting coups are available. In significant instances, supporters of democracy have used nonviolent methods effectively to resist
attempted take-overs by usurpers. This manual attempts to learn from this important experience and pass it on to others.

ADVANTAGES OF NONVIOLENT STRUGGLE IN BUILDING DEMOCRACY

In using nonviolent action, one is able to build and defend democracy within institutions. It is a way to fight for democracy with democratic means. The means are inherent in the ends. This gives nonviolent ways of resisting coups a strong advantage over military methods. In the latter approach, centralized, top-down decision-making by the military hierarchy trains people in authoritarian mentalities rather than participatory democracy. Military means can undercut democratic ends. Nonviolent struggle also contributes to a democratic spirit by its refusal to kill opponents and its commitment to building community. This basic attitude mirrors democracy’s profound respect for human dignity. It contrasts sharply with the military approaches that necessarily depend on killing or threatening to kill enemies. After the battle for control of government is over, the two sides, which normally are part of the same nation or state, have to find a way to live together. If they have been trying to physically destroy one another, the hatred set loose can undercut the task of building a common civil society. If, on the other hand, one side has been stressing goodwill, non-retaliation, and the goal of what Dr. Martin Luther King called “the beloved community,” then that community of mutual respect becomes more attainable.

THE NEED FOR KNOWLEDGE AND TRAINING

Often nonviolent defense against coups has been spontaneous and not rooted in careful study and preparation. The success of such ad hoc defense gives hope that a more careful and systematic approach can provide even stronger resistance against the coups. As people learn the methods of effective nonviolent struggle, they will make it increasingly difficult for plotters to smash their hard-won democratic gains. If citizens worldwide grow in their knowledge of nonviolent means of defense and become competent in its methods through training, the time may come when coups against democratic governments will be a thing of the past. This manual is one attempt to spread this knowledge and promote this training. It is a working document, not the final word. Please give the author and/or Nonviolence International feedback on how you think it can be improved. We plan to publish revised editions over time.

Author

Dick Taylor
HOW THE MANUAL IS ORGANIZED

The rationale behind the manual is that participants must first understand what a coup is and how it operates. Only then can they organize to defeat it. Therefore, the manual begins by describing the nature of the coup d’état (Session II), then deals with how to organize nonviolent resistance to defeat it.

NOTE TO TRAINERS WHO USE THIS MANUAL

The manual has a logical flow, with the information in the early chapters laying the basis for the latter. However, there is nothing sacrosanct about the manual's organization or its contents. It is written as a general guide, knowing that you may need to modify it. Please feel free to use those parts that are most appropriate to your local reality and to put aside what does not seem helpful. Since you may not be familiar with all the training methods or exercises used in the manual, I strongly suggest that you read it carefully from beginning to end before trying to use it in a real-life training session. You also will find it helpful, I think, to tryout some of the exercises on a smaller group before using them in a larger training context. If the training is done by a training team (which I strongly recommend) rather than by an individual trainer, then that team, along with a few sympathizers, would be a good group to use for a “test run” of the exercises and training methods. Good luck, and let us know your experience in using the manual.
SESSION I
THE PURPOSE AND IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING

PURPOSE OF THIS SESSION: (1) To introduce trainers and participants to one another; (2) To get participants to understand the purpose and importance of training.

MATERIALS NEEDED: (1) Flip-chart stand; (2) Magic markers; (3) Pad of newsprint.

ESTIMATED TIME FOR THE SESSION: 1 hour, including the Question and Answer period. The session may go longer if the group is large and/or if trainers use a long process to introduce participants.

INTRODUCTIONS (Time: Variable, depending on group’s size)

1. Introduction of Trainers
   a. Trainers introduce themselves, giving their names and highlighting any experience they may have had in nonviolence training and action.
   b. Point out that participants in the training have important practical experience that will be extremely valuable for the training. “We trainers will expect to draw upon your experience and insights.”
   c. Therefore, this is a two-way learning experience, rather than a series of lectures by “experts.”

2. Introduction of Participants
   a. Trainers organize a “creative introductions exercise” to help workshop participants get to know one another.
   b. This could be a simple exercise, like having participants give their names, what they do, and why they are interested in the training. Or trainers can design a more complex exercise, using small groups, dyads, etc.

AGENDA AND LOGISTICS REVIEW (10 minutes)

1. Trainers explain briefly what the training will entail. (A summary of the workshop agenda could be written on the newsprint or could be handed to each participant on a paper.)

2. This is also a time for announcements about logistics for the workshop, e.g., locations of meeting rooms, meals, sleeping arrangements, etc.

THE IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING (Talk by a Trainer – 20 minutes)

Trainer discusses the value of training. Some of the following points might be made:
1. Although unprepared actions have sometimes accomplished great feats, it rarely makes sense to rush into action without preparation. People have scaled mountains without readying themselves, but success is more likely when one has a plan and the necessary equipment.

2. Training helps us to anticipate crises or problem situations we may encounter in the actual struggle. It helps us think carefully about the best response, away from the heat of the battle. It is a place to test strategies and tactics, to weed out those that will not work and to emphasize those that will.

3. Training confronts people’s fear and anger. People worry that they may not be able to stay nonviolent in the face of opponents’ hostility. They worry that they will lose their courage and run away. Or that they will respond to antagonists with anger or counter-violence. Practicing nonviolent responses to hostility in training exercises gives people confidence that they can remain nonviolent even in the face of belligerent opposition in a real conflict situation. “We made it clear,” said Martin Luther King, “that we would not send anyone out to demonstrate who had not convinced themselves and us that they could accept and endure violence without retaliating.”

4. Training gives time to think through the many roles that need to be played and the functions that need to be fulfilled to make a nonviolent campaign well-organized.

5. Training develops solidarity among participants and confidence in companions, the organization, and its leadership.

6. Training reminds us of the long history of nonviolent struggle, in all its many forms, from which we can draw inspiration and strength.

7. Preparation gives time to develop an organizational structure and leadership based on democratic decision-making, whereas leadership in unplanned actions tends to go to the most charismatic person or to those seeking power.

8. Nonviolence training has been an essential part of many of history’s most powerful nonviolent movements. It is said that Gandhi trained 100,000 Indians in his campaign against British colonialism. Such training was crucial in the black power civil rights movement in the U.S. It had a prominent place in the movement against the war in Vietnam. More recently, it played a vital role in the “People Power” movement, which overthrew the Marcos dictatorship in the Philippines.

**QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD (15 minutes)**

Trainers solicit questions from the participants by asking questions such as –

“Do people have any questions about what we’ve said so far?”

“Do people have anything they would like to add from their own experience of training?”
Session II

UNDERSTANDING THE COUP D'ÉTAT

PURPOSE OF THIS SESSION: (1) To gain understanding of the dynamics of a coup. (We have to know what we are facing in order to know how to combat it.); (2) To explore the weaknesses of a coup and how it can be defeated; (3) To begin to think about how even the best organized coup can be resisted effectively through nonviolent struggle.

MATERIALS NEEDED: (1) Flip-chart stand; (2) Magic markers; (3) Pad of newsprint; (4) Newsprint page with list of "COUNTRIES WHERE COUPS HAVE TAKEN PLACE SINCE WORLD WAR II" (see page 8).

ESTIMATED TIME: 1 hour, 45 minutes, including break; 3 hours (optional if small group exercise on pages 16-17 is added.)

INTRODUCTION TO SESSION II (Talk by trainer/discussion – 20 minutes)

1. The purpose of our workshop is to prepare you to use effective nonviolent methods to resist and prevent coups.

2. What we will do in Session II:
   
a. In order to prevent a coup, we first have to understand what a coup is.

   b. In this session, therefore, we will do 4 things:
   
   1) Define the word “coup d’état.”

   2) Discuss the threat that coups represent.

   3) Describe how a coup happens.

3. What is the definition of a “coup d’état”?

   WRITE ON NEWSPRINT the words “STROKE OF STATE.” Then explain that the phrase “coup d'état” comes from the French and means “stroke of state” or “blow against the state.” It refers to the sudden, forcible overthrow of a government by a group plotting against it.

   DISCUSSION: Any questions? Is this definition clear?

4. What kind of threat do coups represent? How dangerous are they? How often are they successful?

   a. When Adolf Hitler wanted to come to power in Germany, he first founded the Nazi Party in 1920. Three years later, he tried to overthrow the republican government of Bavaria by means of a coup d’état.
b. In the 80 plus years since Hitler tried his coup, plotters have organized successful coups in over half of the world’s sovereign states. In a few cases, democratic forces have used coups to put an end to repressive regimes. In many others, however, nascent democracies have been snuffed out and replaced by military dictatorships or other nondemocratic cabals. Some examples of countries experiencing post-World War II coups are REFER TO NEWSPRINT PAGE WITH THE COUNTRIES LISTED BELOW:

COUNTRIES WHERE COUPS HAVE TAKEN PLACE SINCE WORLD WAR II:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algeria</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>Honduras</th>
<th>Sudan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Laos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. We should take this as a warning:

a. Coups are a major threat to democracy. Very often they are used by a country’s military or by an authoritarian group to pull down a democratic government.

b. Many coups have been successful. Citizens have not been able to defeat them.

c. Often citizens feel powerless to do anything in the face of a coup.

1) They are silent or submit passively because they do not know what else to do.

2) Their sense of powerlessness is aggravated by the fact that they have not prepared themselves to fight coups though advanced planning or training.

d. Therefore, it is a real challenge for us to understand how coups work and citizens can prepare themselves to defeat them.

IT IS HARD TO ORGANIZE AN EFFECTIVE COUP (Trainer talk – 10 minutes)
1. It is sobering to think that governments in over half the world’s sovereign states have been overthrown by coups since World War II.

2. On the other hand, it should be noted that it is hard to organize a coup. It is hard to overthrow a government. Many attempts at a coup are unsuccessful. There are many more failed coups in history than successful ones.

3. It is especially hard to carry out a successful coup when the following three conditions exist:

WRITE ON NEWSPRINT: The 3 conditions listed below: (a) “The existing government is well established”; (b) “The populace generally supports the government”; (c) “Other nations are ready to become involved.” Then talk about the points under each condition.

   a. The existing government is well established if it:

      1) Is democratically elected or has some other basis for legitimacy.

      2) Shows it cares for the people and is responsive to their needs and concerns.

      3) Has many regional centers of power, rather than having all power concentrated in one place.

      4) Is supported as legitimate by a range of political forces in the society, such as political parties and regional, ethnic, and religious groupings.

      5) Has strong support in the armed forces, the police, and the security agencies.

   b. The populace generally supports the government if it:

      1) Feels the existing government and its leaders are legitimate.

      2) Is not passive. Political participation and interest by the populace is relatively high.

      3) Has some experience with democratic participation and values freedom and democratic means of change.

      4) Is well-educated; has many sources of information.

      5) Has a history and experience of saying "No" to illegitimate power.

      6) Feels that its physical needs are being met.

   c. Other nations are ready to become involved if they:
1) Believe the government in question is legitimate and has the support of its people.

2) Are willing to bring pressure against attempts to change it by extra-parliamentary means.

4. When these above conditions exist:
   a. The existing government will cling strongly to power.
   b. The population will rise up spontaneously to resist the coup.
   c. Other nations will use diplomatic or other means (e.g., embargoes) to bring pressure against the coup planners.

5. If you add to the 3 favorable conditions a populace that has some EXPERIENCE in combating coups, is TRAINED in resisting coups, and has a well-thought-out PLAN for resisting any attempt at a coup, then you have made it extremely hard for even the best-laid plot to succeed.

6. Our task together is to add these elements of TRAINING and advance PLANNING. With these, you will have not only the capability to defeat a coup, but to DETER schemers from trying a coup, knowing the opposition they will face.

7. Now we will look at how coups happen.

HOW DO COUPS HAPPEN? (Trainer’s talk – 20 minutes)

1. We have mentioned that the dictionary definition of “coup d’état” comes from French, “blow against the state.” It is defined as “the sudden, forcible overthrow of a government.”
   a. Purpose of the coup: To replace the current ruling group with your own and to seize governmental power.
   b. Interesting point: Often accomplished by a relatively SMALL group of conspirators and with little or no violence. For example:
      1) SOUTH KOREA 1961: General Park Chung Hee seized power with 3,500 troops out of an army of 600,000.
      2) GHANA 1966: a mere 500 troops out of an army of 10,000 overthrew the single-party government of President Kwame Nkrumah with hardly a shot fired.
c. Rather than a slow building of force, with many battles and a final clash (as in revolution), the coup usually is QUICK and requires careful timing. Examples:

1) Nigeria: In just one day November 17, 1993, military strongman General Sani Abacha ousted the civilian government of Ernest Shonekan in Nigeria. The next day, the general announced that he was installing himself as ruler and would dissolve virtually every democratic institution in Nigeria. With one quick stroke, he dismantled a decade of Nigerian progress toward a system of elected government.

2) ARGENTINA: The Anti-Peron coup of 1955 was foiled because of a 10-minute delay in the appearance of warplanes, fog preventing the seaborne landings, and the last minute failure of political arrangements.

3) USSR: In August 1991, plotters quickly arrested Russian leader Mikahil Gorbachev. However, they missed arresting Boris Yeltsin by 40 minutes. This allowed him to get from his house to his office, from which he called for and helped lead the resistance, which thwarted the attempted coup.

2. Mechanics of the coup - how does a coup take place?

a. Five key elements:

1) Plotters form a small inner group, which supports the coup. This small core group plans and carries out the coup in complete secrecy.

2) Plotters build a reliable force beyond the inner group who can be positioned to implement the coup. They persuade key people to join the coup without tipping off those who might oppose it.

3) Before, during, and after the coup, the conspirators neutralize those forces that oppose the coup.

4) Once the coup is initiated, he intriguers use maximum speed in the transition so that opposition does not have time to build before they have consolidated their power.

5) Once power is taken, the conspirators work to convince the populace that the take-over was necessary and the new order is legitimate.

b. Armed forces often are relied upon. Why?

1) Army, police and/or security forces give the plotters means of coercion to overwhelm or neutralize their opposition.

2) Perceived advantages of using armed forces:
a) Units are located throughout the society.

b) Quick mobilization of large numbers possible.

c) They follow orders from the top down.

d) Are feared when they use or threaten force.

e) Are well-organized to carry out the many operations of the coup that have to be done almost simultaneously.

3) Plotters' strategy in approaching the armed forces

a) Turn a few elements of the armed forces into ACTIVE PARTICIPANTS in the coup. Identify and recruit key individuals, usually officers who command units that can intervene directly and effectively at the time and place of the coup.

b) NEUTRALIZE the other elements. Rather than have to fight them, assure their neutrality so as to prevent their intervention during the limited time span of the coup.

c. The process of neutralizing potential opponents

1) Neutralizing the armed forces

a) Assess which elements will "ride out" the coup. No need to contact them. (Many will take a "wait and see" attitude, worrying about endangering their careers under their future employers if the coup is successful.)

b) Assess which elements are "on the fence." Persuade them to not intervene against the coup, if they will not join it.

c) Assess which elements are likely to oppose the coup actively. Be prepared to make lightening arrests of their leaders. Troops are less likely to move if commanders are under arrest. Prepare to disrupt their communications and close airports, railways, and city entry points to their forces.

2) Neutralizing the social/political sectors.

a) Prior to coup:

(1) Convince key leaders of important sectors (e.g., trade unions, political parties) to support the coup and encourage their members not to oppose it.
b) Upon initiation of coup:

1) Monopolize the means of communication. Communicate a credible message justifying the coup and call on the populace to support it. (For example, the Soviet putschists of August 1991 occupied the radio and TV stations and the newspapers and used them to broadcast their version of the coup. They also ordered all fax and copying machines and all video equipment to be turned over to them.)

2) Have leading figures (union leaders, respected intellectuals, political figures, etc.) come out publicly in support of coup and ask their members to support it. Isolate, arrest, or assassinate leaders who might oppose the coup.

3) Announce appointment of interim government with members chosen for widest possible public appeal (as well as loyalty to the coup).

3) Other key steps once the coup is initiated:

a) Use pre-arranged teams designed to move quickly to specific targets.

(1) Teams accompanied by the coup member associated with that target, e.g., the prospective new police chief goes with the team taking over the police station; the chief spokesman for the coup goes with the team hitting the TV station.

(2) Alert each team individually, with only as much advance warning as required to perform its particular task.

(3) Have one or more teams present a public show of force to demonstrate that the plotters are in control. (For example: the Soviet conspirers of August 1991 not only had military units and police occupy key facilities, but also ordered elite tank units into the streets.)

b) Arrest and assassinate key leaders of pre-coup government, especially those most dangerous in terms of likely opposition to the coup and ability to rally forces against it. (For example, the Soviet coup planners of August 1991 put Gorbachev under house arrest and tried to arrest Yeltsin.)

c) Impose a strict curfew to prevent street demonstrations or other signs of public opposition.

d) Seize, sabotage, or neutralize facilities. Have the military, police and/or security forces occupy key positions such as:
(1) Means of mass communication (radio, TV, print media)
   (a) Need to achieve monopoly and means of communication.
   (b) May mean seizing one particularly authoritative voice and sabotaging or "temporarily" closing the others.
   (c) Impose strict censorship.

(2) Telecommunications (telephone, telex, telegraph, independent networks, etc.)
   (a) Paralyze existing government communications system so they cannot speak to allies and rally forces.
   (b) Keep popular opposition forces from communicating with one another.

(3) Transportation: city entry/exit road links, airports, railroads
   (a) Station forces at all city entry/exit road links and at railroad facilities.
   (b) Close airports and cancel all flights.
   (c) Control prevents unexpected arrival of loyalist or unaffiliated forces.

(4) Government center and public buildings (parliament, leaders' residences, ministry of defense, military HQ, etc.)
   Purpose:
   a) Enables arrest of key leaders.
   b) Provides protection for coup leaders and their allies.
   c) Tanks in center give evidence of coup's power.
   d) When coup controls buildings that symbolize the center of government, many people will assume its leaders now have political power.

d. Timing of the coup

1) Take advantage of favorable circumstances, e.g.
a) The temporary absence of political leaders from the capital. The Soviet conspirators of August 1991 timed their coup for when Gorbachev was on vacation outside the capital.

b) Riots or civil disturbances expressing dissatisfaction with the current government (e.g., food riots, marches of the unemployed.)

2) Move with maximum speed once the coup is initiated so that opposition does not have time to build.

BREAK (30 minutes)

DISCUSSION (10 minutes)

Trainer asks if there are any questions or comments from the previous session. Is everyone clear about the dynamics of coups, how coups take place?

OPTIONAL SMALL GROUP EXERCISE: BASED ON WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS’ KNOWLEDGE OR EXPERIENCE OF COUPS (1 hour, 15 minutes)

The following exercise may be used if participants have some direct knowledge or experience of coups. For example, there may have been one or more well-known attempts at a coup against the government of their own country or that of a country nearby.

1. Trainer explains the exercise
   
a. The purpose of the exercise is to draw on your own knowledge or actual experience of coups in order to deepen our understanding of how coups happen.

b. The focus of our exercise will be on the (attempted) coup which took place in (country) on (month/year).

c. We will divide into 4 small groups, each with a question to discuss about the coup.

d. After discussion in the small groups, we will come back together to hear reports from each group and have a general discussion.

2. Trainer divides the participants into 4 small groups.

3. Trainer’s instructions to the small groups.

   a. Each group will have a question to answer about the coup.

   b. Each group will have ½ hour to discuss the question.

   c. Each group should name a recorder to write down the discussion and report back to the full session.
4. Questions for the small groups. (Trainer can write these questions on the newsprint)

   a. Group #1: What were the goals and objectives of the coup planners? What were they trying to accomplish? Why did they say they wanted to overthrow the existing government? What was their political program, if any?

   b. Group #2: What methods did the conspirators use to try to carry out the coup? What strategies and tactics did they use in pursuit of their goals and objectives?

   c. Group #3: What were the strengths and weaknesses of the coup? Did it succeed? If so, why? Did it fail? Why?

   d. Group #4: How did citizens respond to the coup? Did they resist it? If so, how? If not, why not?

5. Small group discussion (30 minutes)

6. Session of the full group (30 minutes)

   a. Each of the 4 small groups reports back to the full session.

   b. Trainers write a summary of each report on newsprint.

   c. Trainers lead a general discussion of the reports. Some questions they might ask to stimulate discussion are:

       1) Are the reports clear? Do you have any questions for the recorders about their reports?

       2) How do these reports increase our understanding of how coups happen?

WEAKNESS OF THE COUP (Trainer’s talk: 5 minutes)

1. As the above discussion of the coup makes clear:

   a. The coup’s leaders need two things for success:

       1) Legitimacy: The population’s acceptance of their moral and political rights or authority to rule.

       2) Cooperation: The active assistance or passive cooperation from many elements of society to carry out their purpose.

   b. A small group of military officers or other schemers cannot bring off the coup by themselves. They need active or passive cooperation from many sectors of society. For example, they need:
1) Units of the armed forces to support them, follow orders to make arrests, jail protesters, and, if necessary, to shoot into crowds, and carry out assassinations. They also need the other units to remain passive and not intervene to try to stop the coup.

2) Journalists and broadcasters to follow censorship; not disseminate unauthorized news, not be critical of coup or its leaders. Media technicians keep everything running normally.

3) Members of the telecommunications and transportation systems to follow their orders or at least not oppose them.

4) Key leaders of important sectors to support them or at least to be neutral.

5) The population to obey the coup leaders’ curfews, not to demonstrate against them, not to go on strike or commit other acts of civil disobedience.

c. If this cooperation and submission is not forthcoming, then coup backers cannot achieve their objectives.

d. The conspirators live in fear of defiance and repudiation:

   1) That someone will rally the population into mass resistance to the coup.

   2) That key sectors (e.g., the media, telecommunications) will not cooperate and will in fact use control of their technical means against the coup.

2. This defiance is exactly what happened in Russia in August 1991 and in other parts of the world where the population has successfully resisted coups.

   a. In these instances, people simply refused to cooperate with the new order and instead defied it.

   b. Power, therefore, does not lie in the conspirators’ guns and tanks. Power lies in the refusal of the people to submit.

   c. Defiance and refusal to submit to injustice or to cooperate with oppressive rule is the essence of nonviolence, as we will see in our next session.

OPEN DISCUSSION (10 minutes)

1. Trainers ask the group: Do you have any reactions to what has been said so far? Can you see how power lays not so much in guns as in people’s refusal to submit to the guns?

2. Back and forth discussion between trainers and participants.
Session III

DEFEATING COUPS THROUGH NONVIOLENT STRUGGLE

PURPOSE OF THIS SESSION: (1) To understand what nonviolent struggle is; (2) To explore the advantages of using nonviolent struggle to combat a coup d’état; (3) To understand the “weapons” of nonviolent struggle that people can use to combat coups.

MATERIALS NEEDED: (1) Flip-chart stand; (2) Magic markers; (3) Pad of newsprint; (4) Enough copies of “198 Methods of Nonviolent Action” to hand out to all participants.

INTRODUCTION (Trainer’s talk- 5 minutes)

1. Plotters of coups want to make two things happen:
   a. Bring off the coup QUICKLY so the opposition does not have time to mobilize.
   b. NEUTRALIZE OPPOSITION so that no one blocks their way to establishing effective control over the state apparatus and society.

2. To defeat a coup, resisters must make two contrary things happen:
   a. Move QUICKLY to oppose the coup so that it cannot become consolidated. • Inspire WIDESPREAD OPPOSITION rather than letting opposition be NEUTRALIZED.

3. In simplest terms, the resisters need to find quick, effective ways to say “NO!” to the coup. The essence of opposition can be expressed in one word: “NO!”

4. How can resisters say “NO!” most effectively?
   a. One way is through armed struggle, violence.
      i. If this were a workshop on VIOLENT opposition to coups, we would be studying MILITARY MEANS of resistance.
      ii. We would be discussing what weapons would be needed to counter the weapons of the plotters, where to store them, and how to set up a military command structure. How to organize for violent battle.
   b. But we believe NONVIOLENT STRUGGLE is a more effective and more morally consistent way to resist and defeat coups.
      i. We assume you agree, since you invite us to lead a workshop on NONVIOLENT means.
ii. Therefore, we will be talking about how to utilize NONVIOLENT WEAPONRY and how to organize for NONVIOLENT BATTLE.

WHAT IS NONVIOLENT STRUGGLE? (Trainer’s talk and group exercise - 40 minutes)

1. GROUP EXERCISE

   a. Trainer asks groups: “What comes to your mind when you hear the word “nonviolence”?

   b. Other trainer writes replies on newsprint. Some possible comments from participants may be: “Not being violent” “Passivity” “Pacifism” “Non-resistance”

2. What is nonviolent struggle? (Trainer’s talk)

   a. Many misconceptions about nonviolence. Many people think it implies:

      i. Passivity

      ii. Simple lack of violence

      iii. Weakness

      iv. Cowardice

   b. We see nonviolent struggle differently. Here are two possible definitions of nonviolent struggle: (Trainer writes the following definitions on the newsprint):

      i. Philosophical or Religious: A MEANS OF STRUGGLING FOR HUMAN LIBERATION WHICH, WITH GOD’S HELP, RESISTS AND REFUSES TO COOPERATE WITH EVIL OR WRONG OR INJUSTICE, WHILE STRIVING TO SHOW GOODWILL TOWARDS ALL OPPONENTS, AND BEING WILLING TO ACCEPT SUFFERING RATHER THAN INFlicting SUFFERING OR VIOLENCE ON OTHERS

      ii. Pragmatic or Sociological: A MEANS OF WAGING CONFLICT TO ACHIEVE AN OBJECTIVE BY DOING UNEXPECTED ACTIONS OR REFUSING TO DO EXPECTED ACTIONS IN RESISTANCE TO ILLEGITIMATE AUTHORITY WITHOUT THREATENING OR INFlicting DIRECT PHYSICAL HARM ON HUMAN BEINGS

   c. Note the elements of the definitions.

      i. It is a means of STRUGGLE, as is armed struggle.
ii. It is not PASSIVE - it resists.

iii. UNLIKE violent struggle, however, it shows goodwill toward opponents and does not respond to their violence with counter-violence.

d. Religiously or sociologically based?

i. For many great practitioners, such as Mohandas Gandhi and Martin Luther King, their nonviolence came out of a deep RELIGIOUS FAITH.

ii. For other great practitioners, it was simply the MOST EFFECTIVE way to struggle and had nothing to do with religion.

iii. If you are a person of faith you may find great strength by seeing nonviolence in relation to your faith. For example, Jesus, who taught, “Love your enemies” is perhaps the greatest practitioner of nonviolent struggle.

iv. If you are not a person of faith, you may find great strength in seeing nonviolent struggle as part of a long history of people who used this method as the most effective means of fighting for their liberation or the liberation of others.

3. GROUP EXERCISE

a. Trainer tells group to reflect on discussion about coups so far. What are some examples of nonviolent methods that citizens have used to resist coups?

b. Other trainer writes answers on newsprint under the following categories (taken from the first definition of nonviolence above):

i. "RESISTS AND REFUSES TO Cooperate" or "RESISTS"

ii. "While STRIVING TO SHOW Goodwill" or "Goodwill"

iii. "BEING WILLING TO ACCEPT Suffering" or "Suffering"

c. When the group has listed all the examples it can think of, the trainer:

i. Compliments the group for its examples.

ii. Notes that, as we have alluded to earlier, Russian citizens organized effective nonviolent resistance against the attempted coup of August 1991. The trainer writes examples from this resistance on the newsprint:
iii. Instructions: On the newsprint write only the underlined phrases below, but read and explain the idea of each sentence.

TRAINER’S EXAMPLES FROM SOVIET RESISTANCE:

1) "RESISTS AND REFUSES TO COOPERATE"

a) Citizens carried signs ridiculing the coup's leaders.

b) People distributed leaflets calling for civil disobedience.

c) TV personnel refused censorship orders. They allowed Mayor Sobchak in Leningrad to get on TV and call for a national political strike and an all-city protest meeting in Palace Square.

d) An enormous protest meeting was held in Leningrad's Palace Square.

e) Some newspapers published with blank spaces, protesting censorship.

f) When the coup leaders tried to impose a curfew on Aug. 20, ordinary citizens violated it by appearing on the streets and drivers of public transportation kept their vehicles running.

g) When the coup leaders issued an order prohibiting strikes, workers in various parts of the country held protest work stoppages.

h) When the coup leaders sent tanks and armored personnel carriers in the direction of Yeltsin's "White House" office, citizens massed on the streets in front of them. They threw up barricades and linked arms, standing in front of the tanks in spite of the danger of being shot and though soaked with rain.

i) Boris Yeltsin stood on a tank and called for a general strike.

2) "WHILE STRIVING TO SHOW GOODWILL"

a) People approached tanks, knocked on them, and tried to talk to the soldiers. Yeltsin climbed up on the tanks and shook the soldiers' hands.

b) Women gave soldiers cakes, food, kisses, and cigarettes and asked them not to kill their mothers, brothers, and sisters.

c) One person brought a lot of roses and distributed them to soldiers with a hug saying, “Don't shoot, be kind to people.”

d) People encouraged one another: "Don't hurt the soldiers; they are our sons and brothers; we are trying to win them over, not hurt them.”
e) An orator in front of the White House told the crowd: “Our only weapon is kindness, words, and smiles.”

3) “BEING WILLING TO ACCEPT SUFFERING”

   a) Leaders like Yeltsin and various pacifist, democratic, and religious groups called on people to refuse violence.

   b) People climbed on the barricades and faced tanks even though they believed an attack was coming and that they might well be killed.

   c) Women linked arms and created a “sisters and mothers chain” in front of the tanks with placard saying: “Soldiers, don’t shoot at your mothers.”

   d) Three people were killed in confrontation with tanks.

4) Trainer notes that the above discussion helps us begin to understand the nature of nonviolent struggle and how it can be used effectively to counter coup d’etats. After the break, we will ask the question: “Why choose nonviolent resistance?”

BREAK (30 minutes)

WHY CHOOSE NONVIOLENT RESISTANCE? (Trainer’s talk and group exercise-25 minutes)

1. GROUP EXERCISE

   a. Trainer asks group to call out: “Everything you can think of IN FAVOR of using nonviolent methods to resist a coup, and everything you can think of AGAINST using nonviolent methods to resist a coup.”

   b. Other trainer divides newsprint with a line down the middle and writes the answers under the words: “IN FAVOR OF” “AGAINST”

2. Advantages of nonviolent methods (Trainer talk)

   a. Trainer affirms the points the group has made.

   b. Trainer will add his/her own ideas on the ADVANTAGES of nonviolent means of struggle, including answering any “against” comments that have been made. Trainers undoubtedly will have their own best arguments for the advantages of nonviolent methods. The following way of organizing the arguments is simply to give trainers a possible way to present the advantages of a nonviolent approach.

   c. Advantages
i. Advantages of resistance and non-cooperation

1. Nature of power

a. Power to govern rests to a significant degree on the cooperation - willing or coerced - by the governed.

b. The film, “The Sorrow and the Pity,” shows how most of the French population cooperated with the German occupation after the Nazis defeated the French army. Marshall Petain's collaborationist government kept the bureaucracy running smoothly. French police helped the Gestapo track down and arrest French resisters. Some French actors even went to Germany to make films.

c. People wishing to wield governmental power must be able to direct the behavior of other people, draw on large resources (human and material), apply sanctions, and direct a bureaucracy to administer their policies. They depend upon the cooperation and obedience of many groups and institutions, special personnel, and the general population they wish to rule.

d. To the extent this obedience and cooperation is withdrawn, the rulers', or aspirant rulers', power is diminished. Total non-cooperation leads to total disintegration of rulers' power.

2. In nonviolent resistance willing collaboration is withdrawn. In a thousand different ways throughout the whole society, people defy the coup, refuse its legitimacy, dramatize their disapproval, and maintain allegiance to their pre-coup way of life.

3. Even if the plotters punish people with arrest, torture, or death, they remain firm.

4. They will NEVER obey the plotters.

5. The plotters NEED millions of people who make the society work. They cannot run the society by themselves. Through nonviolent resistance, the resisters REFUSE this necessary acquiescence, and make it impossible for the plotters to gain
legitimacy or to consolidate their rule. f) Support for this view of the relationship between power and obedience was found after the failed Soviet coup of August 1991. Two months after the attempted coup, First Deputy Chairman Anatoly Oleinikov released an internal KGB investigation which stated: “[The coup planners] counted on the factor of obedience...but the people who were supposed to implement it refused.” (As reported in Associated Press, 10/26/91)

ii. Advantages of rejecting violence and showing goodwill

1. Coup is relying upon soldiers and soldiers know how to deal with violence.

2. Nonviolent struggle is different:
   a. Seeks to disarm the opponent, not by overwhelming him with superior firepower, but by making him unwilling and unable to use his.
   
   b. There are hundreds of historic instances where well-armed soldiers or police have refused to fire on nonviolent crowds. (During 1917 Russian Revolution, the Volynsky Regiment was one of several which, at first, fired at unarmed demonstrators, then mutinied and refused to fire.)
   
   c. It is much easier for soldiers to kill if they believe others hate them and want to kill them. It is much harder to kill unarmed people who are showing you goodwill, as did the Russian mothers at the tanks in August 1991.
   
   d. "Moral jujitsu" - A soldier is thrown off balance when he does not meet the violence he has been trained to expect, does not feel threatened, and does not see comrades falling around him. He may find it hard to justify violence when it does not seem brave or manly to kill defenseless people. He may develop respect, even sympathy, for people who are willing to suffer for their beliefs, and may begin to doubt the propaganda he has been fed by the plotters.
e. Nonviolent resistance may give resisters the power to undermine soldiers' morale, make them mutiny, or at least not follow orders.

f. This happened in Russia, August 1991:
   i. At the Moscow Military Institute of the Ministry of Defense, 101 students barricaded themselves in their barracks, refusing to participate in the coup.
   ii. Six tanks ordered to seize the White House defected, hanging Russian flags on their antennas and turning their gun turrets 180 degrees away from the White House.
   iii. Troops flown in from Odessa to put down street resistance sat down and refused to proceed to the city upon being told in Moscow airport of their mission.
   iv. When ordered to attack the crowd in Moscow, the KGB unit that attacked the TV tower in Vilnius and killed 13 civilians, refused, saying: "We were formed as an anti-terrorist unit. In Vilnius we killed innocent people. We won't do it again."

iii. Advantage of Mass Involvement

1. If resisters choose VIOLENCE to fight the coup, their numbers are LIMITED by the number of people willing and able to use guns, Molotov cocktails, etc.

2. In NONVIOLENT resistance, nearly EVERYONE can have a role. The whole population can practice non-cooperation and say "No!"

3. Nonviolent methods can be used by old and young, men and women, city and rural dwellers, educated and uneducated, the strong and the weak, factory workers, farmers, bureaucrats.

4. Thus the possible number of resisters is vastly increased.

iv. Advantages of building democracy
1. Military means of struggle typically require centralized, top-down decision-making by military leaders and unquestioning obedience by followers. This structure trains people in authoritarian mentalities rather than in participatory democracy.

2. By contrast, nonviolent struggle is based on large-scale, voluntary, democratic participation of the populace. Although it requires leadership, it allows and encourages a much wider participation in decision-making by participants than does the military. Those using it find that it can build democracy among the people while fighting to defend democracy in the people's institutions. It is a way to fight for democracy with democratic means. The means are inherent in the ends. This gives nonviolent ways of resisting coups a strong advantage over military methods.

3. Nonviolent struggle also contributes to a democratic spirit by its attitude of goodwill toward opponents, its refusal to kill them, and its commitment to building community. This basic attitude mirrors democracy's profound respect for human dignity. It contrasts sharply with military approaches that necessarily depend on killing or threatening to kill enemies. After the battle for control of government is over, the two sides, which normally are part of the same nation or state, have to find a way to live together. If they have been trying to physically destroy one another, the hatred set loose can undercut the task of building a common civil society. If, on the other hand, one side has been stressing goodwill, non-retaliation, and the goal of what Dr. Martin Luther King called “the beloved community,” then that community of mutual respect becomes more attainable.

DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS (10 MINUTES)

Trainers take any questions or comments on the above presentations. Is everything clear so far? Does anyone have anything to add, especially from his or her own experiences?

THE “WEAPONS” OF NONVIOLENT STRUGGLE (Trainer’ talk and handout - 10 minutes)

1. Trainer’s talk
a. We have been talking about the power of nonviolent methods to undercut the power of those plotting the coup. We have mentioned various methods of nonviolent action that people have used.

b. If workshop was on military means of resisting coups, we would talk about an array of weapons available to resisters. Many people do not realize that non-violent struggle also has an array of weapons.

2. Handout Trainers hand out the paper, “198 Methods of Nonviolent Action” (click here). Then:

   a. Review for the group the main categories of “Nonviolent Protest and Persuasion,” “Social Non-Cooperation,” etc. Comment on some of the specific methods that have come up in the above discussion.

   b. Tell the group to keep this sheet. We will be discussing it in future sessions.
SESSION IV

HISTORICAL EXAMPLES OF SUCCESSFUL NONVIOLENT RESISTANCE TO COUPS

PURPOSE OF THIS SESSION: (1) to examine in detail two historical examples of how nonviolent struggle was used to defeat coups; (2) to underline the point that nonviolence provides effective methods for thwarting coups; (3) to give concrete illustrations of nonviolent methods that workshop participants could use to frustrate coups.

MATERIALS NEEDED: (1) Flip-chart stand; (2) Pad of newsprint; (3) Magic markers

ESTIMATED TIME: 40 minutes unless “Other Historical Examples” Section is added at the end

INTRODUCTION (Trainer’s talk - 5 minutes)

1. Helpful to learn from history. Gives confidence that, if others have triumphed over attempted coups, we can too.

2. Have often mentioned the Russian resistance to the attempted coup of August 1991 because it was recent and so well-documented.

3. Useful to look at a couple if other examples where nonviolent methods defeated coups. What more can we learn?

4. Will look at 2 historical examples, the 1961 attempted coup against French President Charles deGaulle, and the 1920 attempted coup against the Weimer Republic in Germany.
   a. Both illustrate that legitimate government can be saved by the action of ordinary people acting nonviolently.
   b. Both were spontaneous responses to an attempted coup.
      i. No planning or training prior to the coup.
      ii. You, therefore, have the great advantage of being able to prepare yourselves ahead of time.

THE KAPP PUTSCH, GERMANY, 1920 (Trainer’s talk - 10 minutes)

1. Political situation in Germany
   a. 1919- National assembly establishes a democratic government known as “The Weimer Republic.”
b. Government faces severe economic and political problems due in part to Germany’s defeat in World War 1. Severe unemployment, government having to pay high reparations.

2. Coup attempt in 1920

   a. Organized by Dr. Wolfgang Kapp, an extreme Right-wing nationalist, and Lt. Gen Walter von Luttwitz.

   b. Coup backed by Gen. Erich Ludendorff, who in World War I, had been chief of staff of Field Marshall Paul von Hindenburg. (Von Hindenberg was regarded as Germany’s greatest war hero because of his victories on the Eastern front.)

   c. Most of the German Army remained neutral, neither backing nor opposing the coup. • 5,000 ex-soldiers and civilians, organized into “Freikorps” units, occupied Berlin on March 12.

   d. Legal government under President Friedrich Ebert fled Berlin, eventually setting up in Stuttgart.

   e. Kapp declared himself Chancellor of the Reich and made von Luttwitz commander of the armed forces.

3. Resistance to the coup

   a. The deposed Ebert government

      i. Declared it was still the legal government and that all citizens have a duty to obey it.

      ii. Directed the states to refuse all cooperation with the coup.

      iii. Social Democratic Party issued proclamation, under the names of President Ebert and other party leader called for a general strike. Appeal read in part:

             “The strongest resistance is required. No enterprise must work as long as the military dictatorship of the Ludendorfs reigns. Stop working! Strike! Strangle the reactionary clique...The whole economy must be paralyzed. No hands must move. No proletarian must help the military dictatorship. The total general strike must be carried through.”

   b. Sparked widespread nonviolent resistance to the coup.

      i. Workers in Berlin spread strikes against the coup.
ii. Insurgents seized two Berlin newspapers supporting the Ebert government, but the printers struck.

iii. Leading civil servants refused to run the ministries under the insurgents and the government administration as a whole refused cooperation.

iv. Qualified people refused to accept posts in the new regime.

v. People in all sectors refused cooperation.


4. The plotters' response:
   a. Repression - Some strikers shot to death.
   b. However, found to their dismay that they could issue orders and decrees, but these were not being acted upon.
   c. Story told that Kapp at one point found himself wandering up and down the corridors of power, looking in vain for a secretary to type up his proclamations.

5. Developments
   a. March 15: Ebert government refuses to compromise with the usurpers.
   c. “Friekorps” units resume obedience to the democratic government and march out of Berlin.

6. Weimar government still had grave problems.
   a. In 1933, all traces of democratic government were removed with the appointment of Adolf Hitler as Chancellor.
   b. However, in 1920 the Weimar government showed that it could withstand the frontal attack of a coup through the nonviolent non-cooperation of its leaders and important sectors of the German people.

THE GENERALS’ COUP, FRANCE, 1961 (Trainer’s talk- 10 minutes)

1. Political Situation
a. France had invaded Algeria in 1830 and declared it a colony in 1848.

b. War for independence broke out in 1954. Generals loyal to the legal government and capture DeGaulle ministers who were visiting Algeria.

c. Seven years of bitter fighting -10,000 French soldiers 100,000 Algerians killed.

d. Early in April, 1961 President Charles de Gaulle announced he was abandoning the attempt to keep Algeria French.

e. This outraged large sections of the French officer corps, who were still rankling under defeats suffered in Indochina. They didn’t want to face another defeat in Algeria. They saw De Gaulle’s policy as an intolerable sellout and determined to replace him.

2. Coup attempt


b. Rebels arrest three French Generals loyal to the legal government and capture De Gaulle ministers who were visiting Algeria.

c. April 23: Four colonels who had organized the coup receive public backing by prominent French Generals, including head of air force. Most armed forces take a “wait-and-see” attitude.

d. Rebels seize control of newspapers and radio in Algeria.

e. Coup in Algeria at this point successful. Next step: move to replace the De Gaulle government in France.

3. Problem for de Gaulle government

a. A half-million French troops in Algeria - few operational units left in France and loyalty of some of them in doubt. Even forces loyal to De Gaulle were doing nothing to actively oppose the rebels.

b. Powerful parachute units gave the rebels a tough, battle-hardened force for intervention. The bulk of the armed forces were either with them or neutral.

c. Fear that a parallel coup would be attempted in Paris or that the Air Force would transport rebel troops to invade France and oust de Gaulle.

4. Resistance to the coup
a. April 23: French political parties and trade unions hold mass meetings, calling for one hour symbolic strike to demonstrate opposition to coup. De Gaulle broadcasts appeal to the nation:

"In the name of France, I order that all means - I repeat all means - be employed to bar the way everywhere to these men until they are brought down. I forbid every Frenchman, and in the first place every soldier, to carry out any of their orders."

b. Prime Minister Debre, fearing an airborne attack, closes the Paris airports, and appeals by radio to the people:

“The authors of the Algiers coup...have planes ready to drop or land parachutists on various [French] airfields as a preliminary to a seizure of power...As soon as the sirens sound, go [to the airports] by foot or by car, to convince the mistaken soldiers of their huge error.”

c. Broadcasts were picked up in Algeria via transistor radio. Troops began to question their orders. Pilots pretended mechanical failures or flew their planes out of Algeria, making them unavailable for the invasion.

d. April 24: 10 million French workers take part in a symbolic general strike, showing massive support for the legitimate government. People prepare to place vehicles on runways to block planes. Financial and shipping blockade on Algeria.

e. Civil servants in Algeria hide documents or go into hiding in order not collaborate with the rebels.

f. Police in Algeria declare support for De Gaulle government. Army units start to declare their support.

g. Night of April 25-26, rebels withdraw from Algiers, a leading coup General surrenders and other go into hiding.

5. Results

a. Coup defeated with only three people killed and several wounded.

b. Leaders of coup arrested or exiled. First Foreign Legion Parachute Legion disbanded.

c. De Gaulle remained President, heading his legal government.

d. Algeria became independent in 1962.
LESSONS FROM THE HISTORICAL CASES (Group discussion, trainer comments - 15 minutes)

1. GROUP DISCUSSION
   a. Trainer asks group what lessons they draw from these cases.
   b. Trainer writes group’s comments on newsprint.

2. If the group doesn’t bring up the following lessons, they should be mentioned by the trainer:
   a. Relation between civilians and military forces.
      i. Non-cooperation by civilians can defeat well armed dedicated tough military forces.
      ii. Military units often will take a “wait-and-see” attitude. Their decision to support the coup or not can be decisively influenced by the coup or not can be decisively influenced by how the civilian population reacts.
   b. Leaders of legitimate government have a key role:
      i. Insist that people continue to recognize their legitimacy and authority
      ii. Call for massive resistance- rally the people.
   c. However, nonviolent resistance can be done by ordinary civilians acting apart from government leaders.
   d. Civil servants and bureaucrats can undercut the rebels’ power by refusing to follow orders, delaying, etc.
   e. Role of strikes in the economic sector:
      i. Usually do not DIRECTLY undercut the rebels’ power, since the rebels are initially seeking POLITICAL, rather than economic, objectives.
      ii. However, strikes have great value symbolically to send a message of mass resistance. (The French strike, though symbolic and brief, involved 10 million people. Sent string message to the rebels.)

OTHER HISTORICAL EXAMPLES

Trainers might want to add other cases to illustrate the power of nonviolent resistance - “People Power” in the Philippines, Norway’s resistance to the Nazis, the Baltic States’ campaigns against the Soviets in the early 1990’s, etc. These need not necessarily be from an historical case of
resistance to a coup. However, if a non-coup example is used, the trainer should make it clear that this is to show how a specific nonviolent strategy or tactic can effectively counter or defeat a specific method likely to be used in a coup.
SESSION V
DEVELOPING STRATEGIES TO DEFEAT COUPS

PURPOSE OF THIS SESSION; (1) To learn about the role of strategy in planning nonviolent defense against coups; (2) To give participants some practical experience in planning anti-coup strategy.

MATERIALS NEEDED: (1) Flip-chart stand; (2) Pad of newsprint; (3) markers

ESTIMATED TIME: 1 HOUR, 50 MINUTES

THE MEANING OF “STRATEGY” (Trainer’s talk - 3 minutes)

1. Effective resistance to coups involves not only using specific tactics, like factory workers going on strike, but also following a broad strategy.

2. This session, therefore, focuses on strategy. What we will do:
   a. We will define the meaning of strategy.
   b. We will pose some questions about strategy for you to consider. Then we will outline some important principles we think you should have in mind in developing your strategy for defeating coups.
   c. Finally, we will have you do a group exercise in which you will develop your own strategic action plan for defeating a coup by means of nonviolent struggle.

3. Listen carefully to the presentation because you will be asked later to develop your own strategy.

4. What does the word “strategy” mean?
   a. Refers to a general plan of action that specifies how best to achieve one’s objectives.
   b. Example: Playing a game of soccer
      i. Coach thinks through a strategy before the championship game.
      ii. His objective: To score more points than the other team and win the game.
      iii. His strategy: An action plan to achieve that objective. The plan will involve, for example:
         1. His assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the other team.
2. His assumption about what strategies the other team is likely to use.

3. His thinking about when and how to use his players.

4. Which plays he will use.

5. What to do if there are injuries to key players.

iv. If the coach knows that his team tends to get tired and fade toward the end of the game, his overall strategy might be to score early and build as many points as possible so the other team will not be able to catch up with his team.

c. The same kind of planning happens in warfare, political campaigns, coup plotting - any area of life where people are seeking the most effective means to mobilize resources to reach objectives.

d. In your case, "strategy" tries to answer the question, “What is the best plan to achieve the objective of resisting and defeating a coup in my country?"

5. A warning - expect the unexpected. The unexpected happens. You cannot cover everything in your plan. Therefore:

   a. See the plan as a tool, but do not be bound by it.

   b. Use your creativity and ingenuity.

   c. If you are religious, know that God is with you when you fight for justice and freedom. Let God guide you.

IMPORTANT QUESTIONS ABOUT STRATEGY (Trainer’s talk - 2 minutes)

1. Questions about the coup plotters:

   a. What strategies are plotters of a coup in your country likely to use? What will be their objectives and how will they try to realize them? What will be their targets?

   b. What will be the strengths and weaknesses of those who plan a coup? What resources might they be able to bring to the struggle? What is likely to be the size of their effort, the prestige of their supporters, their access to technical means like military units, communications, etc.? What weaknesses might resisters exploit?

2. Questions about nonviolent resisters:
a. Who are our most likely allies? What are the “circles of support” - from our inner core of the most active and dedicated resisters out to general supporters? What can be expected from each circle?

b. What are the strengths and weaknesses of resisters and potential resisters? How can we maximize our strengths and minimize our weaknesses? How can we undercut the strengths of the plotters and maximize their weaknesses?

c. What methods can we use that will be the most effective in defeating a coup?

IMPORTANT PRINCIPLES TO HAVE IN MIND IN DEVELOPING STRATEGY TO DEFEAT A COUP (Trainer’s talk - 10 minutes)

1. Quick response is crucial.
   a. Strategy must enable resistance to begin immediately after the coup is initiated.
   b. The longer the resistance delays, the more opportunity the plotters have to consolidate their control over the state apparatus and society.
   c. Coups generally are weakest in their first hours and days. A broad and deep resistance has the greatest likelihood of defeating the coup at this early stage. An early defeat of the coup means the resistance will not have to deal with a long-term struggle against a regime that has become entrenched.

2. Repression is likely to occur.
   a. Coup plotters may try to crush all resistance ruthlessly through mass arrests, shooting, and torture. They may try to “chop the head off” the opposition by killing the head of state, key political leaders, and members of the resistance.
   b. The strategic plan should expect repression and prepare resisters to face it with courage and with the determination not to give in, no matter what.

3. Resistance should be developed in every sector of society.
   a. Mass public meeting and street actions can be important tactics, but they should not be the sole strategy.
   b. Strategy should identify the key sectors of the society- political, economic, social, religious etc., and develop a resistance plan for each.

4. Resistance usually should defend social institutions, not buildings.

b. However, strategy should focus on defending social institutions rather than buildings because:

i. Extreme weather conditions (especially cold or prolonged rain) can make it difficult or impossible to keep a human barricade in place for long.

ii. Determined, ruthless military units can crash through civilian defenders and their barricades. If strategy hinges on defending a building, then its loss is a defeat for the resisters. Supporters can become unjustifiably demoralized. They can believe that occupation of the building has put the rebels in control.

iii. Social institutions can be defended directly, apart from the buildings that house them. For example:

   1. Seizure of a school building is of no use to someone trying to control education if the teachers, students and administrators have set up shop elsewhere, e.g. in homes.

   2. Seizure of a parliament building has only symbolic value if the members of the legitimate government have moved elsewhere and are continuing to function. (You will recall from session IV that Ebert did this in Germany when Kapp took Berlin.)

   3. Control of a radio station does no good if all the personnel have sabotaged the equipment and "called in sick," while actually setting up clandestine broadcasting facilities elsewhere.

iv. Therefore, strategy should plan how specific social institutions can be defended, apart from their physical structures. It should ask:

   1. What are key institutions or social sectors which can be organized for resistance?

   2. What particular form of non-cooperation is most appropriate for each particular sector?

v. Each sector and social institution should have a plan appropriate to that sector.

5. Flexibility is very important.
a. Strategy should be able to shift in order to take account of new and unexpected circumstances, e.g., the plotters change their strategy, unexpected weaknesses are exposed among the defenders, etc.

b. Strategy should draw upon a range of nonviolent methods that can be used in different situations.

6. The general population should be able to defend against the coup apart from instructions by a leadership group.

   a. Leaders play a vitally important role, but people at every level of society and without detailed instructions can practice nonviolent resistance.

   b. Such capability is important because:

      i. Leaders may be arrested, killed, or unable to communicate. (Part of the success of the 1967 coup in Greece was that the plotters rounded up all suspected leaders and arrested thousands of potential resisters.)

      ii. People in their own setting (newspaper, TV station, court, police station, etc.) can build their resistance on their intimate knowledge of their institutions.

      iii. Freeing people from complete dependence on leaders allows more creativity, initiative and potentially much larger numbers of resisters.

   c. Strategy, therefore, should prepare people ahead of time for the role they can play in defending their society and its institutions, even if leaders have been arrested, deported or killed.

7. Long-term defense may become necessary.

   a. If the resistance is not able to defeat the coup quickly, it is still possible to organize resistance as a long term strategy. Failure of a quick defeat of the coup does not doom the society to being ruled long-term by the usurpers.

   b. The rebels will have established control of certain key facilities and will have established a modicum of legitimacy and acceptance.

   c. The struggle will then change from simple anti-coup defense to a longer-term conflict with an established dictatorship.

   d. A long history of successful nonviolent combat against dictatorship may be drawn upon for ideas and inspiration.
e. Resistance may have to change from massive non-cooperation to defense of “key points” that the plotters wish to control. Examples:

i. Norwegian teacher’s struggle against Quisling’s attempt to take over Norwegian education.

ii. Poland’s 10-year nonviolent struggle against its communist government.

iii. A few illustrative possibilities:

1. Police find themselves “unable to locate” leaders they have been ordered to arrest and they warn people of impending arrests or repressive action.

2. Teachers refuse to introduce plotters propaganda into the schools.

3. Clergy continue to preach about the duty to struggle for freedom.

WRITING A STRATEGIC PLAN (Group exercise - 1 hour, 35 minutes)

1. Trainer to group

   a. We have discussed important questions about strategy and outlined important principles.

   b. Now, we would like to give you a chance to apply these ideas by writing your own strategic action plan.

   c. The plans will be very rough, because we have limited time. But this is an exercise to get you thinking. Later, you can refine the plans.

2. Trainer instructions to group:

   a. Divide line into small groups of 8 or fewer. Name a recorder for each group.

   b. Each group has paper and pencils.

   c. Will be given 45 minutes to write your strategic plan.

   d. Your plan can be written in any form you like, but it should cover the following points (which trainer writes on newsprint):

      1. Assumptions about Plotters: Their Strategies? Their Objectives?; Strengths/ Weaknesses?

      2. Assumptions about Resisters: Our Allies?; Our Strengths/ Weaknesses
3. What strategy should the nonviolent resistance use?: Most effective methods?; Institutions/sectors?; Form of Noncooperation for each sector?; Repression?; Leadership

e. Trainer explains the points on the newsprint - these are the points each group should include in its Strategic Action Plan:

i. What are your assumptions about the plotters of a coup that might occur in the future in your country?
   1. What strategies are they likely to use?
   2. What will be their objectives, their targets, and how will they try to realize them?
   3. What will be the strengths and weaknesses of those who plan a coup?

ii. What do you assume about the nonviolent resisters?
   1. Who are the resisters most likely allies?
   2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the resistance?

iii. Given these assumptions, what strategy should the resistance use?
   1. What methods will be the most effective in defeating a coup?
   2. What key institutions or social sectors can be organized for resistance?
   3. What particular form of non-cooperation is most appropriate for each particular sector?
   4. How can resisters be prepared to respond to repression?
   5. What leadership should the resistance have?

3. 45 minutes in small group sessions.

4. Full group re-convenes for:
a. Reports - 15 minutes.

b. General discussion - 30 minutes. The trainer should:

   i. Write the main points from each group's strategic plan on pieces of newsprint.

   ii. Add any of the trainer's own ideas for strategy.
SESSION VI
DEVELOPING TACTICS TO DEFEAT COUPS

PURPOSE OF THIS SESSION: (1) To explore specific tactics that can be used in nonviolent defense against coups; (2) To give participants some practical experience in planning anti-coup tactics.

MATERIALS NEEDED: (1) Flip-chart stand; (2) Pad of Newsprint; (3) Magic markers.

ESTIMATED TIME: 2 hours, including 20 minute break.

THE MEANING OF “TACTICS” (Trainer’s talk – 2 minutes)

1) If STRATEGY is a general plan of action for realizing one’s objectives, TACTICS are the individual methods or specific forms of action used to implement the strategy.

   a) A STRATEGY might say, “This is the plan of nonviolent non-cooperation for each significant social group.”

   b) A TACTIC might say, “In the mass media sector, newspaper editors will refuse to follow censorship rules ordered by the coup.”

2) Tactics are vitally important.

   a) The struggle against a coup cannot be won just with strategy, a grand plan.

   b) Specific tactics must be developed that are appropriate for every person and every institution involved in the resistance.

   c) Analogy to military conflict:

      i) In a military engagement, “strategy” is the generals’ overall battle plan; “tactics” are the weapons and maneuvers used by the fighting troops.

      ii) In nonviolent struggle, “strategy” is the action plan developed by leaders; “tactics” are the specific nonviolent methods used to resist the coup.

   d) We have already looked at a long list of 198 nonviolent methods or tactics. In this session, we will talk about how to apply them in the resistance against the coup.

THE GOAL OF STRATEGY AND TACTICS (Trainer’s talk – 3 minutes)
3) The OVERALL GOAL that our strategy and tactics are trying to achieve is the following:

   a) To get as many parts of the society to say “NO!” to the plotters and to say “YES!” to our constitutional government and to a free, democratic way of life.

   b) We want to make each institution of our society into resistance organizations against the coup.

   c) We want people to maintain the control and self-direction of their own society, rather than giving over that control to the conspirators.

4) How can we achieve this? What tactics can we use to achieve this goal?

5) Think of this society as made up of many different units or sectors – political, economic, social, etc. The society has the military, police, judges, journalists, bureaucrats, technicians, shopkeepers, workers, farmers, taxi drivers, religious groups, intellectuals, artists, sports figures, and so on. Effective nonviolent resistance should try to have an action plan appropriate for each sector.

6) In this session, we will first consider what we want to say to ALL these sectors TOGETHER – what they can do IN COMMON to resist a coup. Second, we will consider what we want to say to EACH sector – how each sector can organize ITSELF effectively to make it own unique contribution to the resistance.

WHAT DO WE WANT TO SAY TO ALL THE SECTORS TOGETHER? WHAT IS THE MESSAGE WE WANT TO GET OUT TO EVERYONE? (Trainer’s talk – 5 minutes)

Each sector or institution must have it own unique action plan and tactics appropriate to its unique place in society. But every sector should be taking some common, general stands together, enabling each to work as one. These common stands or positions are:

* “Repudiate the coup and its leaders as illegitimate and meriting only rejection as a new government.”

* “Refuse to give legitimacy to the conspirators in any way.”

* “Look upon all decrees and orders from the rebels as illegal. Disobey them. Continue to act in accord with the pre-coup constitution, laws, and policies of the legal government.”

* “Do not cooperate in any way with the rebels.”

* “Make the place where you live and work a center of resistance and non-cooperation. If removed, continue normal operation from other locations.”
* “Participate in rallies, demonstrations, strikes, and other protests to show massive repudiation of the coup.”

* “Do not supply the rebels with information, supplies, equipment, communications, transportation, or anything else that will aid them. Hide these resources if necessary.

* “Keep all resistance strictly nonviolent. Refuse to be provoked into violence.”

* “While continuing resistance, show good will toward the functionaries serving the coup. Talk to them. Urge them to see their mistake. Explain that the defenders respect their lives and will not be violent toward them. Urge them to follow the constitutional government, to disobey the orders of mutinous officers, and to defect peacefully to the defenders’ side.”

WHAT DO WE WANT TO SAY TO EACH SECTOR BY ITSELF? (trainer’s talk – 15 minutes)

1) Now we will look at the different sectors or social institutions that make up this society. What SPECIFIC resistance and non-cooperation can EACH group engage in, given its role and position in society?

2) We trainers will suggest just a few possible actions for a number of key sectors, then ask YOU to make plans for these sectors. Hopefully, you will be able to add more out of your experience.

NOTE TO TRAINERS: The suggested actions below are only a few examples. Feel free to add others from your own experience.

SECTOR OR INSTITUTION

MASS MEDIA (journalists, broadcasters, technicians, printers...)

1. Use your newspapers, magazines, radio, and TV stations to put out a call to resistance as soon as a coup begins. Continue issuing the call - and reporting on resistance actions - as long as possible. Keep up the morale of the resistance.

2. Do everything possible not to cooperate with the coup and its directives. Do not publish its propaganda or its lies. Tell the truth. Be a source of accurate information.

3. Do not follow the coup's censorship rules. If forced, publish newspapers with blank spaces in protest, as Russian papers did in August 1991.
4. Try creative non-collaboration. For example, if forced to broadcast from your radio station at the point of a gun, do so with "broken" transmitter that will not carry the message. Make parts disappear.

5. Try to report and publicize all instances of resistance to the coup and the calls to resistance from defenders of the existing government.

6. If shut down, forced out of buildings, etc., continue “underground” media August 1991, employees of 11 banned Soviet newspapers united to publish a “general newspaper” using photocopiers, laser printers and mimeograph machines. These were pasted on walls at metros, bus stops and street corners. Example: During the 5-year Nazi occupation of Denmark during World War II, the resistance published 538 illegal newspapers with a combined circulation of over ten million readers.)

7. In preparation for underground operation, be ready to set up stocks of newsprint, equipment, broadcast facilities, etc. in secret locations.

GOVERNMENT (leaders, civil servants, bureaucracy, judges...)

1. In preparation, have resistance plans at every level of government - from national to local.

2. Put out a call to resistance as soon as the coup starts. Remind people that the most important thing is to say “No!” to the coup, while not using violence against its functionaries. Instead try to convince them of their mistake.

3. Stay in official buildings if possible (e.g. with help of human barricades), but if arrest seems imminent, be prepared to move elsewhere and continue operations.

4. Do not cooperate with orders or decrees of the coup. Judges should not participate in any trials organized by the coup; civil servants should not follow orders (or should do so ineffectively). Follow the legitimate government.

TRANSPORTATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS

1. Do not cooperate in any way with the coup.

2. Defy curfews by operating your vehicles as long as possible.

3. Do not transmit coup messages.

4. Do not use railroads, buses, planes, etc. to transport the coup’s troops or equipment. (Example: After the February 1917 “bourgeois” revolution in Russia, General Kornilov attempted a coup. It was foiled by the refusal of the Union of Railroad Employees to work the railways carrying his troops to Petrograd.)

TRADE UNIONS AND THE ECONOMIC SECTOR
1. Do not cooperate in any way with the coup. Do not join new unions set up by the coup or attend its meeting.

2. Be prepared to strike (short symbolic strike or general strike) to protest the coup. Do not follow coup bans on strikes.

3. If the coup tries to operate economic facilities, refuse their orders. If forced, “call in sick,” or operate inefficiently.

**SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES**

1. Do not cooperate in any way with the coup.

2. Speak out against the coup, encourage students and teachers to join demonstrations, protests.

3. Use departments of universities to aid the resistance, e.g. art dept. to make banners. Medical school to aid people injured in the resistance.

4. Refuse to teach the coup’s propaganda or to use their materials.

**FARMERS AND FOOD TRANSPORTERS**

1. Do not cooperate with orders from the coup.

2. Supply food to the resistance and not to the forces of the coup.

**CHURCHES, SYNAGOGUES, MOSQUES**

1. Priests and ministers encourage resistance among their people and speak out against the coup in sermons and rallies.

2. Join demonstrations, rallies, and parades and encourage followers to turn out for protests.

3. Allow church facilities to be used for anti-coup rallies, meetings, clandestine radio station, sheltering opposition figures, etc.

4. Encourage nonviolence and goodwill toward opponents, based on “love your enemies” spirit.

**COORDINATION OF ANTI-COUP EFFORTS**

**SOME IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS**

1. Set up close cooperation with each sector and especially with legitimate government leadership.
2. Prepare effective means of communications, both “high tech” and “low tech,” so you can keep in touch with various parts of resistance and continue to get out your message even if the coup blocks normal means. These might include:

   a. Storage of material to publish underground newspapers, leaflets, etc.

   b. Photocopies, printers, computers.

   c. Cell phones, fax machines, short-wave radios (in case inner-city telephone lines are cut).

   d. A computer communications network.

   e. “Low tech” means of communication, like having messages carried by taxi, bus drivers, and couriers on foot or bike.

3. Be prepared to “go underground” in case the coup attempts to arrest or assassinate resistance leaders.

BREAK: 20 MINUTES

SMALL GROUP EXERCISE: PLANNING FOR EACH SECTOR (Trainer and small group exercise - 1 hour, 15 minutes)

1. Trainer to group

   a. Having given some of our ideas for what kinds of nonviolent non-cooperation can take place in each sector, we want to give you a chance to express your ideas.

   b. We are going to divide you into small groups according to sectors and then ask you to discuss four questions.

   c. Please name a recorder in each small group to write down the most important points of your discussion and to be prepared to report back to the full meeting.

2. Trainer - divide participants into small groups by sector.

   a. Trainer writes the following sectors on newsprint:

      • MASS MEDIA
      • GOVERNMENT
      • TRANSPORTATION
      • TELECOMMUNICATIONS
• TRADE UNIONS
• ECONOMIC SECTOR
• SCHOOLS & UNIVERSITIES
• FARMERS AND FOOD TRANS.
• VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS CHURCHES, SYNAGOGUES AND MOSQUES
• MILITARY, POLICE, PRISONS
• POLITICAL PARTIES/MOVEMENTS
• INTELLECTUAL AND ARTISTIC
• SPORTS
• INTERNATIONAL POPULACE AS A WHOLE

b. Add any other sectors to the list that the participants feel are important.

c. If the number of participants is too small to split up into all the above small groups, some of the above sectors can be combined into the same group, e.g. "Military, Police, Prisons and Veterans' Organizations."

d. If possible, place members in each small group who are familiar with that sector, e.g., reporters in the "Mass Media" group, factory workers in the “Trade Unions" group," teachers in “Schools and Universities,” etc.

3. Questions for each small group. (Trainer writes the four questions on the newsprint.)

   a. What methods are coup plotters likely to use to try to control or neutralize your sector?

   b. How can your sector prepare itself to say "No!" to the coup plotters' attempt to control or neutralize it?

   c. What resources for resistance does your sector already have that can be strengthened or built upon?

   d. What forms of nonviolent non-cooperation and what nonviolent tactics can best be utilized by this sector to resist the coup attempt?

4. Small groups meet for 45 minutes.

5. Full group re-convenes.

   a. Recorders give reports from each sector.
b. Trainer writes the main points from each sector report on newsprint.

c. Trainer leads general discussion.

SESSION VII

NONVIOLENCE TRAINING EXERCISES FOR SECTORS

PURPOSE OF THIS SESSION: To introduce participants to two practical nonviolence training exercises that they can use to prepare themselves for the kinds of hard choices and confrontations they may face in struggling against an attempted coup.

MATERIALS NEEDED: (1) Flip-chart stand; (2) Pad of newsprint; (3) magic markers
TIME: Approximately 3 hours

NOTE TO TRAINERS: If you don’t have any experience in leading the two exercises described below, please practice them with a few friends before doing them in a large group. The exercises work best when led by someone who is thoroughly familiar with them.

INTRODUCTION (Trainers talk - 2 minutes)

1. Up until this point, we have mainly been thinking and planning about the most appropriate strategy and tactics to use in resisting and defeating coups.

2. In this session, we will do some exercises to give you a more realist feel for the kinds of situations you may actually confront as you try to carry out your strategies and tactics in the struggle against an attempted coup.

3. The value of these exercises is that, by putting ourselves imaginatively into a problem or conflict situation, we learn something that we do not learn by just discussing it. These exercises can:
   a. Help us think through what each person must do to carry out a particular nonviolent tactic.
   b. Help us analyze and test tactics to see if they are realistic.
   c. Give us the confidence to remain calm and nonviolent and show goodwill, even in the face of hostility.
   d. Develop solidarity and mutual confidence.
   e. Help us anticipate crises or problem situations we may confront and think through solutions ahead of time.

4. We are going to use one sector, the mass media, as an example. Each of you needs to imagine, for the rest of the Session, that you are a journalist or broadcaster or technician in a mass media office confronted with a coup.

“QUICK DECISION-MAKING” EXERCISE (Trainer's talk and group exercise -1 hour)

1. Trainer to group - Description of "Quick Decision-Making"
   a. Explain purpose of Quick Decision-Making exercise:
      i. Often in a conflict situation we have to make a decision quickly under pressure, but we need to consult with others and decide together.
ii. This exercise helps us to "get a feel" for that situation and to see how we function under time pressure.

iii. Often the exercise also gives us new insight into how to solve particular problems. Or it raises new questions that we need to consider.

b. Explain how Quick Decision-Making works:
   i. You will be divided into small groups of 3 to 10 people, all in the same room.
   ii. The trainer will give you a problem to resolve.
   iii. You have two minutes to decide in your group how to resolve the problem.
   iv. Then each small group will report back to the full group.

c. Give instructions for setting up the exercise
   i. Have the participants divide into small groups of anywhere from 3 to 10 people.
   ii. Stand where everyone can hear you.
   iii. State one of the problems below. Ask the groups, “What would you do?“ or “How would you respond to this problem?”
   iv. Remind the groups that they have just 2 minutes to come up with a solution.
   v. Then ask each group to report on their discussion.

PROBLEMS TO POSE FOR THIS EXERCISE

1. Problems trainer will pose to groups (substitute with issues appropriate to the situation)
   a. You are a group of editors at a major national newspaper. An attempted coup has begun. Your Managing Editor has just received a phone call from one of the coup leaders that you must publish a statement from the coup leaders that will be delivered to you within the hour. Failure to publish will be severely dealt with. What will you do?

   b. You are the same group of editors. An armed group from the coup invades your office and announces that their representative is taking over the duties of Editor in Chief. Hereafter the coup leadership will determine what will be published. What will you do?
c. You are the employees of a city T.V. station. You have been broadcasting anti-coup information. You find that the coup has shut down electrical power to your section of the city, putting your station off the air.

BREAK: 10 minutes

MAINTAINING NONVIOLENCE (Trainer’s talk - 5 minutes)

1. Back in Session III, we discussed the advantages of nonviolent struggle. We also gave a definition of nonviolence. We said that nonviolent struggle combines a stance of resistance to injustice with an attitude of goodwill toward all opponents and willingness to suffer rather than to inflict suffering on others.

2. But how can we maintain this attitude of goodwill in the face of hostile opposition and death threats?

3. In this next set of exercises, we will put ourselves imaginatively into several conflictual situations. The challenge for the proponents of nonviolent resistance is to keep an attitude of calmness and goodwill toward their opponents even though they are being challenged forcefully.

4. Here are some thoughts on how to express this nonviolent attitude of goodwill.
   a. Remember these principles of nonviolence:
      i. Every human being has a sacred human dignity, no matter how brutally they may be acting at the moment. From a spiritual point of view, they are “made in God’s image.” Treating them with respect may encourage them to remember their own dignity and act more in accord with it.

      ii. To show goodwill toward an opponent, to "love one's enemy," does not mean to have affectionate FEELINGS toward them. It is impossible to feel affectionate emotions toward someone who is threatening to hurt or kill you. "Goodwill" means to WILL the good. It is a conscious decision to act toward the other person in a calm and respectful manner, even though your EMOTIONS may be ones of anger or fear.

   b. Express nonviolent goodwill in your "BODY LANGUAGE"
      i. Try to keep calm and respectful EYE CONTACT with the other person.

      ii. Keep your HANDS open, at your sides, or in another non-threatening position. Do not cross your arms defensively across your chest or make fists.
iii. Respect the other person's SPACE. Getting too close or being right on top of the person can convey hostility and a prelude to attack. Being too far away can convey fear or an unwillingness to engage the other person.

iv. Use GESTURES and POSTURE that show that you are trying to be courteous, quiet, calm and peaceful.

c. Express nonviolent goodwill in what you SAY--your WORDS
   i. If possible, INTRODUCE YOURSELF and ask the name of the other person. Offer to shake hands, if it seems appropriate. This can defuse tension and make things more personal and more human.
   ii. LISTEN to the other person. It's not necessary to respond immediately. Show respect by trying to find out why they are doing what they are doing.
   iii. If you cannot think of what to say right away, it is fine just to listen sympathetically or to ask questions: "Can you tell me more?"
   iv. ASK QUESTIONS that challenge the other while showing respect. For example: “I agree with you 100% that it is good to be patriotic, but how do you feel about democracy? Is this attempted coup not undermining democratic institutions?”

5. Think about how YOU will express nonviolent goodwill by word and action as we turn to our next exercise, "Hassle Lines."

“HASSLE LINES” EXERCISE (Trainer’s talk and group exercise- 1 hour)

1. Trainer to group- Description of “Hassle Line” exercise.
   a. Explain the purpose of Hassle Lines:
      i. When we are involved in nonviolent struggle against an opponent, we are often in a situation where there is a lot going on around us, but we need to focus on the individual in front of us who is challenging us or asking us questions.
      ii. Hassle lines simulate that situation and helps us to see how to respond creatively and nonviolently even in the midst of distractions and hostility.
   b. Explain how the Hassle Lines exercise works:
      i. Everyone will divide into two parallel lines, with each person facing a “partner” directly across from them.
ii. Each person in one line will be in a one-on-one “hassle“ with his or her partner in the other line.

iii. The trainer will give one “role” to one line, and another “role” to the other line. The trainer will give each line 30 seconds to “get into” their role-to think how to play the role.

iv. When the trainer gives the signal, each person will play the assigned role with the “partner” directly across from them.

v. The trainer will call “Stop” after a few minutes and then lead an evaluation.

c. Give instructions for setting up the exercise.

i. Ask everyone to stand up and move any furniture out of the way. Then, form 2 parallel lines, with each person facing a “partner” directly across from them.

ii. Call one line “Line A” and the other “Line B.”

iii. Ask each person to reach across the line to make sure that everyone has a partner. LINE A LINE B LINE A LINE B TRAINER:

iv. Explain again what will happen: “I am going to give one role to Line A and a different role to Line B. Then I will give everyone 30 seconds to get into his or her roles. When I say 'Start!' you should play your assigned role with your partner. When I say 'Stop!' everyone should stop playing their role and raise their hands as a signal for quiet.”

v. Say: “It is natural to be a little nervous and to relieve tension by laughing. But try to play your role as seriously and realistically as possible. Think about what you are going to say and how you are going to express your feelings through your tone of voice and gestures. If your role calls for anger, for example, use an angry tone of voice and make angry gestures. The more real-to-life the role-play, the more we can learn from it.”

2. Run the exercise.

a. Give clear instructions to each line as to the role they are to play. (See "situations to Pose for the Hassle Lines" at the end of this session.)

b. Give participants 30 seconds to get into their roles.

c. Give the "Start!" signal.
d. Observe what happens:
   
   i. Let the participants play their roles for about 2 or 3 minutes. Do not cut it short, but do not let it drag out too long either. Let people have several good exchanges back and forth.
   
   ii. Walk along the outside of the lines and observe carefully what the players are doing and saying. Make mental notes especially of those participants whose words and actions show strong feeling or a creative nonviolent approach.
   
   e. Stop the action. Say “Stop!” and remind people to raise their hands as a signal for quiet. (You may need to walk between the lines to get people to stop playing their roles. Sometime people get so involved that they do not want to stop.)
   
   f. Evaluate what happened:
   
   i. The purpose of the evaluation is to help people learn from what has happened and what makes for effective nonviolent communication in the midst of distractions and hostility.
   
   ii. Questions the trainer might ask to help participants evaluate and learn from what happened:

   1. To everyone: “What was it like to play your roles? How did it feel to play this role?”
   
   2. To the nonviolent resister: “How did it feel to have your partner approach you with such anger? Was it difficult to maintain an attitude of nonviolent goodwill in the face of such hostility? What did you try to do or say to show calmness and respect for the other person? What seemed to work? What felt difficult?”
   
   3. To the attacker: “Did your partner express nonviolence in words or body language in a way that made a positive impression on you? Did they do or say anything that made you less hostile? Was there anything they could have done to get through to you?”
   
   4. Almost inevitably, this kind of exchange will draw out of the participants many ideas for effective nonviolent behavior. The “nonviolent resister” may not have realized they were being effective until they hear the “attacker” say, “My partner looked very calm, kept eye contact with me, and asked me good questions
in a friendly manner. I could feel myself softening, even though I
did not show it.”

g. Ask generally: “What did you learn from this experience?”

SITUATIONS TO POSE FOR THE “HASSLE LINES” EXERCISE

1. Everyone in LINE A and B is an employee of a prominent daily newspaper. The paper
has just received word that a coup has begun. Those in Line A have been trained in
nonviolent methods for resisting coups. They want to make immediate preparations to
oppose the coup. Those in Line B would like to resist, but haven't thought about how
resistance could be carried out. They are very skeptical that anything effective can be
done. They need to be convinced that resistance is possible. The purpose of Line A is to
convince Line B that resistance is needed and to begin thinking about what needs to be
done. The purpose of Line B is to raise every possible objection to the ideas of Line A,
because Line B does not see what can be done to oppose the coup effectively.

2. Everyone in Lines A and B are employees of a major radio station. An attempted coup
has begun. The manager has just called all the employees together. He says that he has
just received an order over the phone from a representative of the coup saying that the
station must not broadcast anything against the coup. If it does so, it will be occupied by
armed force and resisting employees will be severely punished. The manager wants the
employee's opinion on what the station should do. The people in Line A are frightened by
the coup's threats and are afraid to resist. Those in Line B are determined to resist the
coup. The purpose of Line A is to convince Line B that resistance is dangerous and futile
and that it is better to go along with the demands of the coup. Their fear can make Line A
people angry and defensive. The purpose of Line B is to convince Line A that resistance
is necessary and possible; it can be successful.

3. The people in Line A are editors at a TV station. Those in Line B are representatives of
the coup, backed up by an armed military unit, who have invaded the station. They are
angrily demanding that the TV station put on the air a spokesman for the coup to make a
statement justifying the coup. The purpose of Line B is to have their demand carried out
immediately. The purpose of Line A is to resist this demand through nonviolent non-
cooperation.

4. The scene is a prominent magazine. The people in Line A are an armed group from the
coup who have invaded the magazine office and announced that they are taking it over
and will hereafter decide what will and will not be published. Their purpose is to take
over the magazine. Those in Line A are the managing editors at the magazine. Their
purpose is to resist this take-over nonviolently.
SESSION VII
NONVIOLENCE TRAINING EXERCISES FOR STREET ACTIONS

PURPOSE OF THIS SESSION: (1) To provide further ideas on how to keep a nonviolent spirit throughout the resistance; (2) To give participants further experience with “Quick Decision-Making” and “Hassle Lines” exercises in preparation for street actions.

MATERIALS NEEDED: (1) Flipchart stand; (2) Pad of newsprint; (3) Magic markers; (4) Copies of the “Nonviolent Discipline” for the group (see page 71)

ESTIMATED TIME: Two and a half to three hours, depending on number of exercises used and amount of discussion about each.

INTRODUCTION: ADVANTAGES OF NONVIOLENCE (Trainer’s talk- 2 minutes)

1. In Session VII, we used two nonviolence training exercises, “Quick Decision-making” and “Hassle Lines,” to help you think creatively and act nonviolently in the difficult or hostile situations you may confront during coup.

2. In Session VIII, we will use these same exercises, applying them to “street actions” that might be used in the struggle against a coup.

3. Before we begin these exercises, let’s say a few words about nonviolence.

4. Back in Session III, we discussed some of the advantages of using nonviolent struggle to resist coups. We noted that:

   a. Nonviolence can throw troops off balance. They are not meeting the violence they have been trained to deal with. They do not feel threatened and do not see comrades being killed around them. They may find it hard to justify using violence against people who are not harming them and who are willing to suffer for their convictions.

   b. Outreach to troops with an attitude of active goodwill can cause troops to question what they are doing and to doubt the coup plotters’ propaganda.

   c. We gave examples of how this approach can cause troops to mutiny, defect, refuse to follow orders, or follow orders half-heartedly.

   d. If we can cause such dissention among the coup’s armed supporters, the we will hve reduced the power of the coup drastically.

5. At the same time, it must be recognized that it is hard to be nonviolent in the face of violence. Violence inspires fear. How can we overcome or deal with this fear?

OVERCOMING FEAR #1 (Trainer’s talk- 2 minutes)
1. Those plotting the coup:
   a. Want to eliminate all resistance and consolidate their power.
   b. Will use violence to inspire fear in those who might oppose them. May use arrests, imprisonment, beating, shootings, torture, assassinations, and so on.

2. If potential resisters give in out of fear, then the coup is likely to win.

4. The violent measures in themselves, however, are not decisive unless they inspire submissiveness. They will not work unless they make people cooperate with the new regime.

5. If people refuse to cooperate in spite of the repression and in spite of fear, then the plot cannot win.

OVERCOMING FEAR #2 (Trainer and group discussion- 5 to 10 minutes)

1. Trainer to group
   a. All of us have been in situations at some time in our lives when we need to do something, but were afraid to do it.
   b. What have you done in your own life to try to overcome fear in such situations? Or try to do what is right in spite of your fear?

2. Trainer writes group’s reactions on newsprint.

3. Trainer adds other thoughts, if group has not mentioned them:
   a. The definition of “courage” is not to act without fear” but rather “to go ahead in spite of one’s fear.” We do not need to be free of fear to act courageously or with determination.
   b. Remember the stakes, what we are fighting for.
   c. Support one another. Be willing to admit that you are afraid and to ask for support from others.
   d. If religious, pray. “I sought the Lord, and he heard me, and delivered me from all my fears.” (Psalm 34:5)

NOTE TO TRAINERS

At this point, you might recount some historical examples that illustrate how, if the resisters refuse to be intimidated into submission or passivity, then the repression may fail. For example: (1) The early Christian church, which overcame the Roman Empire in spite of being thrown to lions, etc.; (2) polish Solidarity’s ten year resistance to communism in the 1980’s; (3) the

OTHERS WAYS TO REINFORCE NONVIOLENT ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR IN RESISTANCE: NONVIOLENT DISCIPLINE (Trainer’s talk- 10 minutes)

1. Fear may make people reticent to resist; anger may tempt resisters to respond with their own violence.

2. What are some other ways that we can encourage the resistance to stay nonviolent in spite of the inevitable emotions of fear and anger that resisters will feel?

3. A written “nonviolent discipline”
   a. Used in nonviolent movement throughout history.
   b. Suggest you give it to participants before an action starts. Could be printed ahead of time to hand out in social institutions and at all points of resistance.
   c. The resistance might organize ceremonies in which people could read the discipline and pledge to follow it.
   d. The text that follows is for illustration only. You can write your own wording appropriate to your situation.

   NONVIOLENT DISCIPLINE

   We pledge to resist the coup with all out strength and to refuse to cooperate with it.

   We will endeavor to show goodwill to all opponents and refrain from any violence against them.

   We will not bring or use any weapons except our hearts and minds. We will use no violence. We will refuse to return assaults of the opponent.

   Whenever possible, we will protect opponents from attack.

   Our attitudes conveyed through words, symbols and actions will be one of the friendliness and respect toward all people we meet, including police and armed forces.

   We will follow the directions of our designated leaders. In the event of serious disagreement, we agree to remove ourselves from the action.

4. Have the group read over the discipline. Any questions? Any suggestions for re-wording?

OTHER WAYS TO REINFORCE NONVIOLENT ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR IN RESISTANCE: “MARSHALLS” (Trainer’s talk- 1 minute)
1. Trainer explains that specifically-trained “marshalls” are often used to help keep a nonviolent spirit during actions. They usually have an identifying symbol, such as an armband.

2. If, for example, the action is a march, the “marshalls” would be spaced all along the march. If violence occurs during the march, they step in and use nonviolent means to resolve the conflict.

3. We will illustrate the role of marshalls in some of the exercises that follow.

BREAK (Stand up and stretch - 5 minutes)

IMPORTANCE OF NONVIOLENT STREET ACTIONS (Trainer’s talk - 2 minutes)

1. Nonviolent anti-coup campaigns have often involved actions in which masses of people have taken to the streets for marches, rallies, human barricades, etc.

   a. The thousands of people who stood between the tanks and Boris Yeltsin’s “White House” in August 1991 played a vital role in foiling the attempted coup.

   b. Such actions are a vivid way of demonstrating that the population does not support the coup.

   c. They are particularly effective in combination with the nonviolent non-cooperation in society’s sectors and institutions that we described in Sessions V and VI.

2. In this session, we will again use “Quick Decision-making exercises” and “Hassle Lines” to give a realistic feel for the dynamics of street actions that might be taken to resist an attempted coup.

NOTE TO TRAINERS

The set up for those two exercises is the same as for those in Session VII. For “Quick Decision-making,” use the same instructions that we used in Session VII, page 59-60. For “Hassle Lines,” use same instructions as in Session VII, Page 63-65.

You goal as trainer is to help the group find creative nonviolent solutions to the problems that the exercises pose. For example, in QDM exercise (2a. below “Rain”), you could point out the need to have supplies of plastic sheeting to use for quick rain cover and the need to make sign and banners from waterproof material. QDM (2b) points out the need to have a medical team to support any large march.

QUICK DECISION MAKING EXERCISE (Trainer and group - 1 hour)

1. Trainer instructions to group (see page 59-60 for details)

2. Problems to pose in this exercise
a. You are a group of “marshalls” who have been specially trained to keep order and a nonviolent spirit in a large street rally that has been called to show defiance of an attempted coup. Ten thousand people have gathered in a public square. It is a cold day. Leaders of the resistance have begun to address the crowd. Just at this moment, it begins to pour down a drenching rain. What will you do?

b. You are the same group of “marshalls” and are positioned along the lines of a large protest march through the center of the city. It is a hot day. Suddenly, at the front of the line, one of the marchers faints from the heat. At the same time, at the back of the line, a marcher and a passerby get in an argument and they start a scuffle. What will you do?

c. You are a group of leaders of the nonviolent resistance. You understand that a tank unit supporting the coup is entering the city and plans to position itself in front of the main government building where the legitimate government is located. How will you respond?

d. You are part of a human barricade and are trying to talk to soldiers ordered to hold an important public building. A nervous soldier fired into the crowd and injuries one of the demonstrators. What will you do?

e. You are part of a human barricade. A tank commander defects with his tank and crew. He offers to turn his tank around and fire at the tanks supporting the coup. What will you do?

HASSLE LINES (Trainer and group- 1 hour)

1. Trainer instructions to group (see page 63-65 for details)

2. Situations to pose for the Hassle Lines.

   a. Line A is a group forming a human barricade to prevent tanks from approaching a building where the legitimate government is at work. Line B is a new person who comes to the group, carrying a large knapsack. He explains that it is filled with Molotov cocktails. He feels that violence is the only courageous way to resist. He plans to start throwing these fire bombs at the tanks if they do not leave in five minutes.

   b. Line B is a human barricade group standing between a government building and troops supporting the coup. Line A is a person who comes up to the barricade and begins telling people that he knows where they can get lots of guns and ammunition to defend themselves.

   c. Line A marshalls with the same human barricade group. Line B is an army commander supporting the coup. He comes up to the marshalls and says that they must order the barricade to disperse. If the crowd does not disperse, he will be forced to have his troops advance through the crowd and disperse it himself.

CLOSING DISCUSSION (Trainer and group- 30 minutes)
Have everyone sit together and ask, “What did we learn from these exercises?” Write down any new points on the newsprint.
SESSION IX

USING A STRATEGY GAME TO PLAN RESISTANCE TO A COUP

PURPOSE OF THIS SESSION: To use a realistic game that will enable participants to try out and evaluate their strategies and tactics for resisting an attempted coup.

MATERIALS NEEDED: (1) Flipchart stand; (2) Pad of newsprint; (3) Magicmakers; (4) Pencils and paper for all participants.

ESTIMATED TIME: Three hours minimum. To get the full impact and benefit of a strategy game, it should be played over the course of a whole day.

INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE OF A STRATEGY GAME (trainer’s talk)

1. The “Quick Decision-Making” and “Hassle Line” exercises we have done in the last two sessions focus on a particular, isolated program or situation that may be encountered in nonviolent resistance to a coup.

2. A “Strategy Game” is a much broader exercise that allows participants to get a sense of a while anti-coup campaign over time. It helps participants:
   a. To see how a large-scale campaign may develop from beginning to end.
   b. To gain information about the consequences of using a particular strategy or set of strategies – what works and what doesn’t.
   c. To explore the most realistic and effective strategies and tactics over the course of a campaign in light of how opponents may respond to them.

HOW THE STRATEGY GAME WORKS (Trainer’s talk)

1. Explain that, in a Strategy Game, the participants play all the relevant roles that would be played in an actual conflict situation.

2. Here, participants will be divided between “attackers” (the coup plotters), “Defenders” (those resisting the coup), “Onlookers” (those not immediately involved in the conflict but who may be influenced to support or resist the coup), and other relevant parties.

3. During the game, the attackers, defenders, onlookers, and others will make “moves” and will have a chance to respond to “moves” made by other players. Each group must pick a leader who will help their team choose a “move” and then announce it to the other teams. The first move must be made within 20 minutes of the start of the game, with subsequent
moves every 10 minutes. The attackers begin, but thereafter each group makes its moves simultaneously. If a group has no move to announce, it may say “Pass.”

4. A group of 3 “judges” has the following responsibilities and authority:

   a. To decide whether a proposed move is realistic or not. Anyone participating in the game can question the realism of a move. If a dispute occurs, the judges will decide by majority vote if the proposed move will be allowed or not. Their ruling is final during the game.

   b. To see that groups only make moves of which they are capable. For example, the attackers cannot say that they defenders mass rally turned into a riot which justified mass arrest by the attackers’ troops. It can say that it’s people infiltrated the rally with agents provocateurs to try to provoke a riot.

   c. The judges also write down each move as it occurs.

   d. They also make sure that each group makes its “move” within the allotted time span. If they do not, the group loses its turn. (Judges can adjust the time for deliberation if things are moving too quickly or too slowly.)

5. Trainers will call for break when they are needed.

6. At the end of the game, the trainers will lead a debriefing and discussion of what was learned.

7. Note: the game’s structure will make communications and decision-making hurried, fragmented and pressured. This will be frustrating, but it also will add to the reality of the game. Decision-making during an attempted coup will be under similar pressure.

8. Are there any question? Is everything clear?

   INSTRUCTIONS FOR SETTING UP THE GAME (TRAINER’S TALK)

   1. Write the following 6 groups on a piece of newsprint:

      a. Attackers
      b. Defenders
      c. Onlookers
      d. Judges
      e. Existing government
      f. Foreign governments
2. Explain the composition of each group and its goals and strategies as follows:

   a. Attackers - This group is made up of the leaders of the coup plot and any groups in the society who might support a coup, e.g., units of the army, navy, air force, police, secret police, dissident politicians, etc. The attackers’ goal is to take governmental power through a successful coup. They can use their supporters in any realistic fashion to try to achieve their goal.

   b. Defenders - This group is made up of the leaders of the resistance and organized groups throughout various sectors of society that will join in the resistance. These might include resistance teams in the mass media, transportation system, trade unions, schools and universities, agriculture, religion, military and police, political parties, and groups of intellectuals, artists and sports figure. The defenders strategy involves using every relevant and realistic method of nonviolent struggle.

   c. Onlookers - This group is made up of members of the general populace who have not initially committed themselves either to support the coup or fight it. The onlookers’ group includes members of the military and police who have not initially taken sides, and any relevant social sectors. Their goal is to decide whether they should support the coup, join the resistance or try to be neutral.

   d. Judges - As described above, they have the authority to decide if a proposed move is realistic or not. Anyone participating in the game can question the realism of a move. If a dispute occurs, the judges will decide by majority vote if the proposed move will be allowed or not. The judges also keep a running, written record of all moves and they make sure that each group makes its move within 10 minutes of the last group’s move. If they fail to do, the judges can require that they skip their turn.

   e. Existing government - This is the legitimate government which the coup is trying to overthrow. It is composed of its leaders and all the various national, regional and local units that make it up. Its goal is to remain in power and not have the coup succeed. Its strategy involves any realistic methods that a government might employ under such circumstances.

   f. Foreign governments - this group includes any foreign governments that might have reason to become involved in the struggle over the coup. They are reticent to “intervene in the internal affairs of a sovereign state,” but circumstances may make them feel that they must take a stand. Their goal is to protect their own national interest. If they decide to intervene, their
methods might involve, e.g., making statements in support of the existing government (or the coup), withdrawing ambassadors, using diplomacy, economic boycotts, etc.

3. Divide participants into the groups. Allow participants to choose the group they want to be in.
   a. Group size: the “judges” group should have three members, the other groups 3 to 6 members. (If there are more than 33 participants in the workshop, the other should be “observers” who will follow the action, take notes, and share their observations during the discussion at the end.

4. Remember to ask each group to name a leader/spokesperson who will announce the group’s moves.

5. When the groups are set up, have named a leader, and are ready to go, announce “Start.” The groups now have 20 minutes before announcing their first strategy.

6. At the end of 20 minutes, ask the attackers to announce their first move. (They might say, “We have arrested the Head of State and are sending sympathetic army units to arrest other top government leaders and occupy their offices. We are also sending messages to all the mass media that they must publish our statement explaining why we had to take his drastic but necessary action to end corruption and malfeasance at the highest levels of government.”)

7. After the attackers make their first move, any other players can ask clarifying questions of the attackers and can make any challenges as to the realism of the move. If there are challenges, the judges decide if the move will be permitted.

8. The defenders and other then have 10 minutes before they must announce their first moves. (The judges do not make moves; they decide if the other groups’ moves can be permitted.) After a full round of moves has been announced, each group has 10 minutes to plan its next move. In subsequent rounds of moves, it is good to rotate groups’ reports first.

9. Once the players have gotten into the game, the judges can adjust the time for moves to provide longer or shorter periods for deliberation. Judges should be sensitive to the players’ needs and the overall time allotted.

10. Negotiations: at any time during the game, groups can request permission from the judges to negotiate with another group. The negotiations can happen without stopping the game or the time-keeping.
11. Role-playing: with the permission of the judges, the moves can be stopped temporarily to permit participants to role play a particular situation. Judges should stop the same for the moment, allow groups time to prepare for and run the role-play, evaluate, and then return to the strategy game at the point where it is stopped.

12. The moves and counter-moves continue until one side has won, the allotted time has run out, the outcome seems determined, the participants are too tired, or the trainers decide that enough issues have been unearthed to have a good discussion. If it is not clear at the end of the game who won, the judges each give their opinion and vote to decide.

13. If the game ends quickly (e.g., the coup wins with a couple of brilliant strokes!), the game can be re-played to try out different, more effective strategies.

14. When the game is completed, the trainers should call a break to let people get out of their roles. Players also may want to assure people with whom they have had heavy conflicts during the game that the feelings are not carried over. Then trainers lead a discussion. Some good questions might be:

   a. At what point did your group feel a lot of tension or frustration? What did you do about it? How well did the members of your group work together?

   b. What did you learn? What strategies seemed the most/ least effective? Why? What could you have done differently? Were some strategies outstanding? Why?

   c. Was it hard to find nonviolent strategies/ tactics? What insights did you gain about the power nonviolent struggle to defeat an attempted coup?
Session X

PLANNING NEXT STEPS

PURPOSE OF THIS SESSION: To wrap up the training session and plan what more must be done to organize people for effective nonviolent defense against coups.

MATERIALS NEEDED: (1) Flip-chart stand; (2) Pad of newsprint; (3) Magic markers.

ESTIMATES TIME: 1 to 3 hours, depending on how much specific future planning needs to be done.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED? (Trainer and group)

1. Trainer to group: “What have been the highlights of this training? What are the most important things you have learned?”

2. Trainer writes summary of these on the newsprint.

WHAT DO WE NEED TO DO NEXT?

1. Trainer to group
   a. We have gone through an enormous amount of material exercises, discussion and planning. We will leave with you all the newsprint pages with your ideas.
   b. However, one workshop is not sufficient to organize effective resistance to an attempted coup.
   c. What next steps need to be taken to organize such resistance?

2. Group exercise
   a. Trainer makes list of all the “next steps” that the participants mention.
   b. If they do not mention the following, the trainer should be sure to list them:
      i. What further training do we need? How can we offer training to others who were not able to be with us at this time?
      ii. How will we organize among the various key sectors of society so that each will have a core group committed to preparing that sector for effective nonviolent resistance?
      iii. How will we coordinate our efforts from here on?
iv. Who will take responsibility for specific tasks that need to be done, such as writing a Nonviolent Discipline?

v. (If the group is non-governmental) What support do we need from our government to make this effort successful? How can we obtain this support?

vi. What organizational structure do we need among ourselves to keep the planning moving forward? Steering Committee? Task Forces? Memberships? Leadership?

ORGANIZING FOR SPECIFIC NEXT STEPS (Trainer and group)

1. What do we need to do next?

2. Is there a core group from this training session that will take responsibility for next steps? Who should be on it? When and where should they meet?

PARTICIPANTS SHOULD NOT LEAVE THE WORKSHOP WITHOUT A DEFINITE PLAN FOR NEXT STEPS OR WITHOUT SPECIFIC PEOPLE HAVING TAKEN RESPONSIBILITY TO INITIATE THE NEXT STEPS.

1 Two exciting new quantitative studies have been released in the last several years.

A 2008 study by Maria J. Stephan and Erica Chenoweth evaluated 323 violent and nonviolent resistance campaigns from 1900 to 2006 and found that “major nonviolent campaigns have achieved success 53 percent of the time, compared with 26 percent for violent resistance campaigns.” They account for this by pointing out that nonviolent movements tend to have more domestic and international legitimacy than violent movements and therefore tend to get more participation by the domestic population and support by international actors than violent movements. They also found that government repression against nonviolent movements is far more likely to backfire against the government than government repression against violent movements.

A 2005 study by Adrian Karatnycky and Peter Ackerman examined 67 transitions from authoritarianism between 1972 and 2005. They found that transitions driven by nonviolent resistance resulted in greater increases in freedom than transitions driven by violence. In 64% (32 out of 50) of the cases in which nonviolent civic resistance was a key factor, the transitions from authoritarianism led to political systems that had high levels of respect for political rights and civil liberties. In contrast, in the cases in which opposition groups used violence, only 20% (4 out of 20) led to governments with high levels of respect for political rights and civil liberties.


Nonviolent resistance
From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
See also: Nonviolent revolution

Nonviolent resistance (NVR or nonviolent action) is the practice of achieving goals through symbolic protests, civil disobedience, economic or political noncooperation, satyagraha, or other methods, without using violence. It is largely but wrongly taken as synonymous with civil resistance. Each of these terms ("nonviolent resistance" and "civil resistance") has its distinct merits and also quite different connotations and commitments, which are briefly explored in the entry on civil resistance.

The modern form of non-violent resistance was popularised and proven to be effective by the Indian leader Mohandas Gandhi in his efforts to gain independence from the British.

Major nonviolent resistance advocates include Mahatma Gandhi, Henry David Thoreau, Gene Sharp, Maori (indigenous New Zealand) leaders Te Whiti o Rongomai Samoan High Talking Chief Lauaki Namulauulu Mamoe Tohu Kakahi, Leo Tolstoy, Alice Paul, Martin Luther King, Jr, James Bevel, Václav Havel, Andrei Sakharov, and Lech Wałęsa. There are hundreds of books and papers on the subject — see Further reading below.

From 1966 to 1999, nonviolent civic resistance played a critical role in 50 of 67 transitions from authoritarianism.[1] Recently, nonviolent resistance has led to the Rose Revolution in Georgia and the Orange Revolution in Ukraine. Current nonviolent resistance includes the Jeans Revolution in Belarus, the "Jasmine" Revolution in Tunisia, and the fight of the Cuban dissidents. Many movements which promote philosophies of nonviolence or pacifism have pragmatically adopted the methods of nonviolent action as an effective way to achieve social or political goals. They employ nonviolent resistance tactics such as: information warfare, picketing, marches, vigils, leafletting, samizdat, magnitizdat, satyagraha, protest art, protest music and poetry, community education and consciousness raising, lobbying, tax resistance, civil disobedience, boycotts or sanctions, legal/diplomatic wrestling, underground railroads, principled refusal of awards/honours, and general strikes. Nonviolent action differs from pacifism by potentially being proactive and interventionist.

![The Salt March on March 12, 1930](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nonviolent_resistance)

![A demonstrator offers a flower to military police at an National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam sponsored protest in Arlington, Virginia, on October 21, 1967](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nonviolent_resistance)

![A "No NATO" protester in Chicago, 2012](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nonviolent_resistance)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Main Article</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Refs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC 470–391</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Mohism</td>
<td>The Mohist philosophical school disapproved of war. However, since they lived in a time of warring polities, they cultivated the science of fortification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>around AD</td>
<td>Judea</td>
<td>Pontius Pilate</td>
<td>Jews demonstrated in Caesarea to try to convince Pontius Pilate not to set up Roman standards, with images of the Roman emperor and the eagle of Jupiter, in Jerusalem (both images were considered idolatrous by religious Jews). Pilate surrounded the Jewish protesters with soldiers and threatened them with death, to which they replied that they were willing to die rather than see the laws of the Torah violated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>Chatham Islands,</td>
<td>Moriori</td>
<td>The Moriori were a branch of the New Zealand Māori that colonized the Chatham Islands and eventually became hunter-gatherers. Their lack of resources and small population made conventional war unsustainable, so it became customary to resolve disputes nonviolently or ritually. Due to this tradition of nonviolence, the entire population of 2000 people was enslaved, killed or cannibalized when 900 Māori invaded the island in 1835.</td>
<td>[2][3][4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500–1835</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756–1920</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Women's Suffrage in the</td>
<td>A political movement that spanned over a century, where women protested in order to receive the right to suffrage in the United States.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Peterloo massacre</td>
<td>Famine and chronic unemployment, coupled with the lack of suffrage in northern England, led to a peaceful demonstration of 60,000–80,000 persons, including women and children. The demonstration was organized and rehearsed, with a &quot;prohibition of all weapons of offence or defence&quot; and exhortations to come &quot;armed with no other weapon but that of a self-approving conscience&quot;. Cavalry charged into the crowd, with sabres drawn, and in the ensuing confusion, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834–38</td>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>End of Slavery in Trinidad</td>
<td>The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, then the colonial power in Trinidad, first announced in 1833 the impending total liberation of slaves by 1840. In 1834 at an address by the Governor at Government House about the new laws, an unarmed group of mainly elderly people of African descent began chanting: &quot;Pas de six ans. Point de six ans&quot; (&quot;No six years. Not at all six years&quot;), drowning out the voice of the Governor. Peaceful protests continued until the passing of a resolution to abolish apprenticeship and the achievement of de facto freedom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Cherokee removal</td>
<td>The Cherokee refused to recognize the fraudulent Treaty of New Echota and therefore did not sell their livestock or goods, and did not pack anything to travel to the west before the soldiers came and forcibly removed them. That ended tragically in the Cherokee trail of tears.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849–1867</td>
<td>Habsburg Monarchy</td>
<td>Passive Resistance (Hungary)</td>
<td>In the failed Hungarian Revolution of 1848, the Hungarians tried to regain independence, and were defeated by the Austrian Empire only with the aid of the Russian Empire. After 1848, the empire instituted several constitutional reforms, trying to resolve the problem, but without success. The resistance was instrumental in keeping up hope and spirit in a Hungary fully incorporated into Austria and characterized by reprisals against political dissidents, thousands of treason trials, military governance, centralization, absolutism, censorship and direct control of Vienna.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860–1894, 1915–1918</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Tainui-Waikato</td>
<td>Māori King Tāwhiao forbade Waikato Māori using violence in the face of British colonisation, saying in 1881 &quot;The killing of men must stop; the destruction of land must stop. I shall bury my patu in the earth and it shall not rise again ... Waikato, lie down. Do not allow blood to flow from this time on.&quot; This was inspirational to Waikato Māori who refused to fight in World War I. In response, the government brought in conscription for the Tainui-Waikato people (other Māori iwi were exempt), but they continued to resist, the majority of conscripts choosing to suffer harsh military punishments rather than join the army. For the duration of the war, no Tainui soldiers were sent overseas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879–1880</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Parihaka</td>
<td>The Māori village of Parihaka became the center of passive resistance campaigns against Europeans occupying confiscated land in the area. More than 400 followers of the prophet Te Whiti o Rongomai were arrested and jailed, most without trial. Sentences as long as 16 months were handed out for the acts of ploughing land and erecting fences on their property. More than 2000 inhabitants remained seated when 1600 armed soldiers raided and destroyed the village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903–1906</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Protest against the Education Act of 1902</td>
<td>This civil disobedience movement was launched against the Education Act of 1902 to defend the rights and influence of Nonconformist denominations in British school boards. Nonconformists...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
believed this law to be calculated to support denominational (mainly Anglican and Catholic) religious teaching in the schools. John Clifford, a baptist minister, led the movement, which consisted in refusing to pay the taxes established by the 1902 Education Act. By 1906, over 170 men had been imprisoned for this refusal, and yet no change to the law was made.\[10\] The movement had a large share in the defeat of the Unionist government in January 1906 but failed to achieve its ultimate aim of getting a nondenominational act passed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1908–62</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>Mau movement</td>
<td>Nonviolent movement for Samoan independence from colonial rule in the early 20th century. [12][13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919. 2.8, 3.1</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>March 1st Movement</td>
<td>This movement became the inspiration of the later Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi’s Satyagraha—resistance and many other non-violent movement in Asia. [14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919–22</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Egyptian Revolution of 1919</td>
<td>A countrywide revolution against the British occupation of Egypt. It was carried out by Egyptians from different walks of life in the wake of the British-ordered exile of revolutionary leader Saad Zaghlul and other members of the Wafd Party in 1919. The event led to Egyptian independence in 1922 and the implementation of a new constitution in 1923.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919–21</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Irish Non-cooperation movement</td>
<td>During the Irish War for Independence, Irish nationalists used many non-violent means to resist British rule. Amongst these was abstention from the British parliament, tax boycotts, and the creation of alternative local government, Dáil Courts, and police. [15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919–present</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>First Intifada Second Intifada Palestinian Protests in West Bank</td>
<td>Palestinian groups have worked with Israelis and foreign citizens to organize civilian monitors of Israeli military activity in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Peace camps and strategic [16][17][18][19][20][21]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
non-violent resistance to Israeli construction of Jewish settlements and of the West Bank Barrier have also been consistently adopted as tactics by Palestinians. Citizens of the Palestinian village of Beit Sahour also engaged in a tax strike during the First Intifada.

In 2010, A "White Intifada" took hold in the West Bank, including East Jerusalem. Weekly protests by Peaceful Palestinian activities accompanied by B'Tselem (the Israeli Information Center for Human Rights in the Occupied Territories) in addition to Israel academics and students against settlers and security forces. The EU through its foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton has criticised Israel for convicting an organiser of the peaceful movement and said that she was deeply concerned about the arrest of Abdullah Abu Rahmeh. There have been two fatalities among protesters and an American peace activist suffered brain damage after being hit by a tear gas canister.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920–22</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Non-cooperation movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>The Occupation of the Ruhr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930–34</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Civil disobedience movement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A series of nationwide people's movements of nonviolent resistance and civil disobedience, led by Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi (Mahatma Gandhi) and the Indian National Congress. In addition to bringing about independence, Gandhi's nonviolence also helped improve the status of the Untouchables in Indian society.

With the aim of occupying the centre of German coal, iron, and steel production in the Ruhr valley; France invaded Germany for neglecting some of its reparation payments after World War I. The occupation of the Ruhr was initially greeted by a campaign of passive resistance.

Nonviolent resistance marked by rejecting British imposed taxes, boycotting British manufactured
products and mass strikes, led by Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi (Mahatma Gandhi) and the Indian National Congress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Movement/Refuge</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1933–45</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>German Resistance</td>
<td>Throughout World War II, there were a series of small and usually isolated groups that used nonviolent techniques against the Nazis. These groups include the White Rose and the Confessional Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940–43</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Danish resistance movement</td>
<td>During World War II, after the invasion of the Wehrmacht, the Danish government adopted a policy of official co-operation (and unofficial obstruction) which they called &quot;negotiation under protest.&quot; Embraced by many Danes, the unofficial resistance included slow production, emphatic celebration of Danish culture and history, and bureaucratic quagmires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940–44</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Le Chambon-sur-Lignon Jewish refuge</td>
<td>During World War II, with the leadership of two pacifist local ministers André Trocmé and Edouard Theis, the citizens of the village of Le Chambon-sur-Lignon (and of the neighbouring areas) risked their lives to hide Jews who were being rounded up by the Nazis and the collaborationist Vichy regime and sent to the death camps. This was done in open defiance of the Vichy government's orders. It is estimated that the people of the area of Le Chambon-sur-Lignon saved between 3,000-5,000 Jews from certain death. A small garden and plaque on the grounds of the Yad Vashem memorial to the Holocaust in Israel was dedicated to the people of Le Chambon-sur-Lignon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940–45</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Norwegian resistance movement</td>
<td>During World War II, Norwegian civil disobedience included preventing the Nazification of Norway's educational system, distributing of illegal newspapers, and maintaining social distance (an &quot;ice front&quot;) from the German soldiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Event/Action</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Quit India Movement</td>
<td>The Quit India Movement (<em>Bharat Chhodo Andolan</em> or the August Movement) was a civil disobedience movement launched in India in August 1942 in response to Mohandas Gandhi’s call for immediate independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945–71</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Defiance Campaign</td>
<td>The ANC and allied anti-apartheid groups initially carried out non-violent resistance against pro-racial segregation and apartheid governments in South Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946–1958</td>
<td>Territory of</td>
<td>Hawaii Democratic Revolution of 1954</td>
<td>Following World War II, general strikes were initiated by the large working poor against racial and economic inequality under Hawaii’s plantation economy. Movement members took over most of the government in 1954 and the State of Hawaii was established in 1959.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955–68</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>African-American Civil Rights Movement</td>
<td>Tactics of nonviolent resistance, such as bus boycotts, freedom rides, sit-ins, marches, and mass demonstrations, were used during the African American Civil Rights Movement. This movement succeeded in bringing about legislative change, making separate seats, drinking fountains, and schools for African Americans illegal, and obtaining full Voting Rights and open housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957–present</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Committee for Non-Violent Action</td>
<td>Among the most dedicated to nonviolent resistance against the US arsenal of nuclear weapons has been the Plowshares Movement, consisting largely of Catholic priests, such as Dan Berrigan, and nuns. Since the first Plowshares action in King of Prussia, Pennsylvania during the autumn of 1980, more than 70 of these actions have taken place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959–present</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Cuban opposition since 1959</td>
<td>There have been many nonviolent activists in opposition to Cuba's authoritarian regime. Among these are Pedro Luis Boitel (1931–1972), Guillermo Fariñas Hernández (&quot;El Coco&quot;), and Jorge Luis García Pérez (known as Antúnez), all of whom have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965–1972</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Draft resistance</td>
<td>During the Vietnam War, many young Americans chose to resist the military draft by refusing to cooperate with the Selective Service System. Techniques of resistance included misrepresenting one's physical or mental condition to the draft board, disrupting draft board processes, going &quot;underground&quot;, going to jail, leaving the country, and publicly promoting such activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 11, 1967</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Los Angeles Black Cat Protest(1), Homosexual Bar and Site of Civil Resistance to Heightened Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) Raids against Homosexual Establishments throughout the City, especially in the Homosexual Quarter known as Sunset Junction(2) District/East Hollywood An Historic Cultural Monument, City of Los Angeles, recognized as a site of Peaceful Civil Resistance in the struggle for Homosexual Civil Rights in the United States. The standoff is significant in that it occurred a year prior to the 1968 Stonewall Riots in New York. The Stonewall Bar in the Greenwich Village section of Manhattan was listed to the National Register of Historic Places in 2001.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1968       | Worldwide | Protests of 1968         | The protests that raged throughout 1968 were for the most part student-led. Worldwide, campuses became the
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[36] 1968 Worldwide
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>Prague Spring</td>
<td>During the 1968 Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia, the Czechoslovak citizens responded to the attack on their sovereignty with passive resistance. Russian troops were frustrated as street signs were painted over, their water supplies mysteriously shut off, and buildings decorated with flowers, flags, and slogans like, &quot;An elephant cannot swallow a hedgehog.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970–81</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Larzac</td>
<td>In response to an expansion of a military base, local farmers including José Bové and other supporters including Lanza del Vasto took part in nonviolent resistance. The military expansion was canceled after ten years of resistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Iranian Revolution</td>
<td>The Iranian Revolution of 1979 or 1979 Revolution (often known as the Islamic Revolution), refers to events involving the overthrow of Iran's monarchy under Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980–1981 as movement</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Solidarity Solidarnosc Walczaca Orange Alternative etc.</td>
<td>Solidarity, a broad anti-communist social movement ranging from people associated with the Roman Catholic Church workers and intellectuals to members of the anti-communist Left (minority), advocated non-violence in its members' activities. Additionally, the Orange Alternative offered a wider group of citizens an alternative way of opposition against the authoritarian regime by means of a peaceful protest that used absurd and nonsensical elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>People Power Revolution</td>
<td>A series of nonviolent and prayerful mass street demonstrations that toppled Ferdinand Marcos and placed Corazon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987–90</td>
<td>The Baltic States</td>
<td>Singing Revolution</td>
<td>A cycle of mass demonstrations featuring spontaneous singing in The Baltic States. The movement eventually collected 4,000,000 people who sang national songs and hymns, which were strictly forbidden during the years of the Soviet occupation of the Baltic States, as local rock musicians played. In later years, people acted as human shields to protect radio and TV stations from the Soviet tanks, eventually regaining Lithuania's, Latvia's, and Estonia's independence without any bloodshed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Tiananmen Square protests</td>
<td>Nonviolence in 1989 Tiananmen protests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>Velvet Revolution</td>
<td>The Monday demonstrations in East Germany in 1989 and 1990 (German: Montagsdemonstrationen) were a series of peaceful political protests against the authoritarian government of the German Democratic Republic (GDR) of East Germany that took place every Monday evening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989–90</td>
<td>East Germany</td>
<td>Monday demonstrations</td>
<td>The Monday demonstrations in East Germany in 1989 and 1990 (German: Montagsdemonstrationen) were a series of peaceful political protests against the authoritarian government of the German Democratic Republic (GDR) of East Germany that took place every Monday evening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990–91</td>
<td>Azerbaijan SSR</td>
<td>Black January</td>
<td>A crackdown of Azeri protest demonstrations by the Red Army in Baku, Azerbaijan SSR. The demonstrators protested against ethnic violence, demanded the ousting of communist officials and called for independence from the Soviet Union.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Otpor!</td>
<td>Otpor! (English: Resistance!) was a civic youth movement that existed as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Movement/Movement Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-2003</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Such from 1998 until 2003 in Serbia (then a federal unit within FR Yugoslavia), employing nonviolent struggle against the regime of Slobodan Milošević as their course of action. In the course of two-year nonviolent struggle against Milosevic, Otpor spread across Serbia and attracted more than 70,000 supporters. They were credited for their role in the successful overthrow of Slobodan Milošević on 5 October 2000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Women of Liberia Mass Action for Peace - This peace movement, started by women praying and singing in a fish market, brought an end to the Second Liberian Civil War in 2003.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Israel's unilateral disengagement plan of 2004 - Protesters opposing Israel's unilateral disengagement plan of 2004 nonviolently resisted impending evacuations of Jewish settlements in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. Protesters blocked several traffic intersections, resulting in massive gridlock and delays throughout Israel. While Israeli police had received advance notice of the action, opening traffic intersections proved extremely difficult. Eventually, over 400 demonstrators were arrested, including many juveniles. Further large demonstrations planned to commence when Israeli authorities, preparing for disengagement, cut off access to the Gaza Strip. During the confrontation, mass civil disobedience failed to emerge in Israel proper. However, some settlers and their supporters resisted evacuation non-violently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Orange Revolution - A series of protests and political events that took place in Ukraine in the immediate aftermath of the run-off vote of the 2004 Ukrainian presidential election which was marred by massive corruption, voter intimidation and direct electoral fraud. Nationwide, the democratic revolution was highlighted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by a series of acts of civil disobedience, sit-ins, and general strikes organized by the opposition movement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Cedar Revolution</td>
<td>A chain of demonstrations in Lebanon (especially in the capital Beirut) triggered by the assassination of the former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafik Hariri on February 14, 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006, 2009</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Remember about the Gas — Do not buy Russian goods!</td>
<td>A campaign to boycott Russian goods as a reaction to political pressure of Russian Federation to Ukraine in the gas conflicts of 2005-2006 and 2008-2009 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>Tunisian Revolution</td>
<td>A chain of demonstrations against unemployment and government corruption in Tunisia began in December 2010. Protests were triggered by the self-immolation of vegetable seller Mohamed Bouazizi and resulted in the overthrow of 24-year-ruling president Zine el-Abidine Ben Ali on January 14, 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Egyptian Revolution</td>
<td>A chain of protests, sit-ins, and strikes by millions of Egyptians starting January 25, 2011 eventually led to the resignation of President Hosni Mubarak on February 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Libyan Protests</td>
<td>Protests against the regime of Colonel Muammar al-Gaddafi began on January 13, 2011. In late January, Jamal al-Hajji, a writer, political commentator and accountant, &quot;called on the Internet for demonstrations to be held in support of greater freedoms in Libya&quot; inspired by the Tunisian and Egyptian revolutions. He was arrested on 1 February by plain-clothes police officers, and charged on 3 February with injuring someone with his car. Amnesty International stated that because al-Hajji had previously been imprisoned for his non-violent political opinions, the real reason for the present arrest appeared to be his call for demonstrations. In early February, Gaddafi, on behalf of the Jamahiriya,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
met with political activists, journalists and media figures and warned them that they would be held responsible if they disturbed the peace or created chaos in Libya.[43] The plans to protest were inspired by the Tunisian and Egyptian revolution.[43]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Syrian Uprising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protests against the regime of President Bashar al-Assad began on March 15, 2011. Security forces responded with a harsh crackdown, arresting thousands of dissidents and killing hundreds of protesters. Peaceful protests were largely crushed by the army or subsided as rebels and Islamist fighters took up arms against the government, leading to a full-blown rebellion against the Assad regime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–present</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>Bahraini uprising (2011–present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inspired by the regional Arab Spring, protests started in Bahrain on 14 February. The government responded harshly, killing four protesters camping in Pearl Roundabout. Later, protesters were allowed to reoccupy the roundabout where they staged large marches amounting to 150,000 participants. On 14 March, Saudi-led GCC forces were requested by the government and entered the country, which the opposition called an &quot;occupation&quot;. The following day, a state of emergency was declared and protests paused after a brutal crackdown was launched against protesters, including doctors and bloggers. Nearly 3,000 people have been arrested, and at least five people died due to torture while in police custody. Protests resumed after lifting emergency law on 1 June, and several large rallies were staged by the opposition parties, including a march on 9 March 2012 attended by over 100,000. Smaller-scale protests and clashes outside of the capital have continued to occur almost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
daily. More than 80 people had died since the start of the uprising.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011–present</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2011–2013 Spanish protests</td>
<td>Peaceful protests against reconstruction of Gezi Park at Istanbul's landmark Taksim Square, turned into protests against Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan. Over one million people nonviolently resisted police brutality. Started in Istanbul, protests spread in 10 days to over 82 cities of Turkey. Significant violence from the police side was manifested by use of tear gas and rubber bullets. Many people were arrested, including haphazard arrests of people simply standing at the square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Occupy Wall Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–present</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Yo Soy 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–present</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2013 protests in Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–present</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Do not buy Russian goods!</td>
<td>A campaign to boycott Russian goods as a reaction to a series of Russian trade embargos against Ukraine and military invasion of Russia in Ukraine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014–present</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Umbrella Revolution</td>
<td>Student class boycotts and public demonstrations followed by spontaneous outbreak of civil disobedience and street occupation lasting 79 days.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Civil resistance

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Civil resistance is political action that relies on the use of nonviolent resistance by civil groups to challenge a particular power, force, policy or regime.\(^1\) Civil resistance operates through appeals to the adversary, pressure and coercion: it can involve systematic attempts to undermine the adversary's sources of power. Forms of action have included demonstrations, vigils and petitions; strikes, go-slows, boycotts and emigration movements; and sit-ins, occupations, and the creation of parallel institutions of government. Civil resistance movements' motivations for avoiding violence are generally related to context, including a society's values and its experience of war and violence, rather than to any absolute ethical principle. Cases of civil resistance can be found throughout history and in many modern struggles, against both tyrannical rulers and democratically elected governments.\(^2\) The phenomenon of civil resistance is often associated with the advancement of democracy.\(^3\)
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**Historical examples**

Civil resistance is a long-standing and widespread phenomenon in human history. Adam Roberts and Timothy Garton Ash in their book Civil Resistance and Power Politics: The Experience of Non-violent Action from Gandhi to the Present include accounts of many significant historical examples they label civil resistance.\(^4\) These case-studies, both successful and unsuccessful, include:

- Mohandas K. Gandhi's role in the Indian independence movement in 1917-47
- the US civil rights struggle in the 1960s, led by Martin Luther King Jr.
- aspects of the civil rights movement in Northern Ireland in 1967-72
- the Revolution of the Carnations in Portugal in 1974-5, supporting the military coup of 25 April 1974
- the Iranian Revolution in 1977–79, before Khomeini’s advent to power in February 1979
- the People Power Revolution in the Philippines in the 1980s that ousted President Marcos
- the campaigns against apartheid in South Africa, especially before 1961, and during the period of 1983-94.
- the mass mobilization against authoritarian rule in Pinochet's Chile, 1983–88
- the Tiananmen Square protests of 1989 in China
- the various movements contributing to the revolutions of 1989 in central and eastern Europe, and to the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991
- the campaign against Serbian domination in Kosovo, 1990–98, that was followed by war
- the revolutions in Serbia in 2000, Georgia in 2003, and Ukraine in 2004, all of which involved successful resistance against an incumbent government that had refused to acknowledge its defeat in an election and had sought to falsify the election results
- the demonstrations, mainly led by students and monks, in Burma in 2007.

Numerous other campaigns, both successful and unsuccessful, could be included in a longer listing. In 1967 Gene Sharp produced a list of 84 cases.[5] He has followed this with further surveys.[6] In 2013 Maciej Bartkowski authored a long list of cases in the past 200 years, arranged alphabetically by country. [7]

**Effectiveness of civil resistance**

It is not easy to devise a method of proving the relative success of different methods of struggle. Often there are problems in identifying a given campaign as successful or otherwise: the answer may depend on the time-frame used, and on necessarily subjective judgments about what constitutes success. In 2008 Maria J. Stephan and Erica Chenoweth produced the most thorough and detailed analysis of the rate of success of civil resistance campaigns, as compared to violent resistance campaigns. After looking at over 300 cases of both types of campaign, from 1900 to 2006, they concluded that "nonviolent resistance methods are likely to be more successful than violent methods in achieving strategic objectives." Their article noted particularly that "resistance campaigns that compel loyalty shifts among security forces and civilian bureaucrats are likely to succeed."[8] The evidence of several of the 2011 uprisings, on the other hand, appears to provide contrasting pathways by which this logic may fail to materialise, with splits in the armed forces contributing towards civil war in Libya and Syria, and a shift in armed forces loyalty in Egypt failing to contribute towards enduring democratic reform.[9]

**Reasons for choosing to use civil resistance**

Some leaders of civil resistance struggles have urged the use of non-violent methods for primarily ethical reasons, while others have emphasized practical considerations. Some have indicated that both of these types of factor have to be taken into account – and that they necessarily overlap.

In his chapter on "Pilgrimage to Nonviolence" Martin Luther King gave a notably multi-faceted account of the
various considerations, experiences and influences that constituted his "intellectual odyssey to nonviolence". By 1954 this had led to the intellectual conviction that "nonviolent resistance was one of the most potent weapons available to oppressed people in their quest for social justice."

In one of her BBC Reith Lectures, first broadcast in July 2011, Aung San Suu Kyi, the Burmese pro-democracy campaigner, stated: "Gandhi’s teachings on non-violent civil resistance and the way in which he had put his theories into practice have become part of the working manual of those who would change authoritarian administrations through peaceful means. I was attracted to the way of non-violence, but not on moral grounds, as some believe. Only on practical political grounds."

Relationship to other forms of power

The experience of civil resistance suggests that it can at least partially replace other forms of power. Some have seen civil resistance as offering, potentially, a complete alternative to power politics. The core vision is of non-violent methods replacing armed force in many or all of its forms.

Several writers, while sharing the vision of civil resistance as progressively overcoming the use of force, have warned against a narrowly instrumental view of non-violent action. For example, Joan V. Bondurant, a specialist on the Gandhian philosophy of conflict, indicated concern about "the symbolic violence of those who engage in conflict with techniques which they, at least, perceive to be nonviolent." She saw Gandhian satyagraha as a form of "creative conflict" and as "contrasted both to violence and to methods not violent or just short of violence".

It is generally difficult in practice to separate out entirely the use of civil resistance and power-political considerations of various kinds. One frequently-encountered aspect of this problem is that regimes facing opposition taking the form of civil resistance often launch verbal attacks on the opposition in terms designed to suggest that civil resistance is simply a front for more sinister forces. It has sometimes been attacked as being planned and directed from abroad, and as intimately connected to terrorism, imperialism, communism etc. A classic case was the Soviet accusation that the 1968 Prague Spring, and the civil resistance after the Soviet-led invasion of August 1968, were the result of Western machinations. Such accusations of sinister power-political involvement are often presented without convincing evidence.

There can be some more plausible connections between civil resistance and other forms of power. Although civil resistance can sometimes be a substitute for other forms of power, it can also operate in conjunction with them. Such conjunction is never problem-free. Michael Randle has identified a core difficulty regarding strategies that seek to combine the use of violent and non-violent methods in the same campaign: "The obvious problem about employing a mixed strategy in the course of an actual struggle is that the dynamics of military and civil resistance are at some levels diametrically opposed to each other."

However, the connections between civil resistance and other forms of power are not limited to the idea of a "mixed strategy". They can assume many forms. Eight ways in which civil resistance can in practice relate to other forms of power are identified here, with examples in each case:

1. Civil resistance is often a response to changes in constellations of power. Leaders of civil resistance campaigns have often been acutely aware of power-political developments, both domestic and
In some countries there has been a growth of civil opposition after, and perhaps in part because of, an occupying or colonial state’s internal political turmoil or setbacks in war: for example, this was a key factor in the Finnish struggle of 1898-1905 against Russian control. In other countries the problems faced by their own armed forces, whether against conventional armies or guerrillas, played some part in the development of civil resistance: for example, in the People Power Revolution in the Philippines in 1983-86.

2. Civil resistance campaigns frequently lead to a situation of partial stalemate, in which negotiation between civil resisters and those in positions of governmental power is perceived as essential. Hence, "round table talks" were critically important in the Indian independence struggle up to 1947, in Solidarity’s campaign in Poland up to 1989, and in Ukraine in 2004.

3. The relation between civil resistance and the military coup d'état can be especially multi-faceted. In some cases a civil resistance campaign has been an effective response to a military coup. In other cases a campaign could succeed in its final objective—e.g. the removal of a hated regime—only when there was the reality or the threat of a military coup to bring about the desired change. Thus, the 1963 Buddhist crisis in South Vietnam a long civil resistance campaign against the government resulted in change only when the South Vietnamese army coup of 1–2 November 1963 toppled President Ngo Dinh Diem. In Egypt in June-July 2013, a civil resistance movement in effect called for a military coup: peaceful demonstrators and a petition supported by millions of signatures demanded the replacement of the elected Muslim Brotherhood government, and provided a degree of revolutionary legitimacy for the army take-over of 3 July 2013. At least one non-violent campaign, the Revolution of the Carnations in Portugal in 1974-5, was in support of a military coup that had already occurred: this campaign helped to steer Portugal in a democratic direction.

4. Some non-violent campaigns can be seen as reluctant or unwitting harbingers of violence. For example, if they are perceived as failures, or are repressed with extreme violence, they may be followed by the emergence of groups using armed force and/or by military intervention from outside the territory concerned. This was the case, for example, in Northern Ireland in 1967-72, and in Kosovo in the 1990s. The possibility of such developments can be an inducement to a government to bargain with a non-violent movement before things get out of hand. However, in several countries in the Middle East and North Africa in 2011 and after, campaigns by civil resistance movements were followed by violent internal conflict and civil war, often with the involvement of external forces: Syria is the most tragic case.

5. There have also been some cases of certain uses of force by civil resistance movements, whether against their adversaries, or to maintain internal discipline. For example, on 2 February 2011, in the generally peaceful Egyptian struggle against President Mubarak, some groups among the crowds in Tahrir Square in Cairo did use certain forms of force for a defensive purpose when they were attacked by pro-regime thugs, some of whom were riding on horses and camels. In the subsequent days the crowds in Tahrir Square reverted to using non-violent methods.

6. Some civil resistance movements have sought, or welcomed, a measure of armed protection for their activities. Thus in the US civil rights movement of the 1960s, the Freedom Ride of May 1961, having been opposed violently, received armed protection for part of its hazardous journey, and the Selma to Montgomery March of March 1965 only succeeded in reaching Montgomery, Alabama, at the third attempt, when it was protected by troops and federal agents.

7. Some campaigns of civil resistance may depend up the existence of militarily defended space. A life-saving example of an effective civil resistance enabling threatened people to reach a defended space occurred with the Rescue of the Danish Jews in 1943 when thousands of Jews were spirited out of German-occupied Denmark and across a narrow stretch of sea (the Sound) to Sweden.
8. When leaders of even the most determinedly non-violent movements have come to power in their countries, they have generally accepted the continued existence of armed forces and other more or less conventional security arrangements. For example, in 1991 Václav Havel who had been a leading figure in civil resistance in communist Czechoslovakia from the founding of Charter 77 to the Velvet Revolution of 1989, in his new capacity as President of the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic paid tribute to the NATO alliance.[31] On 12 March 1999 the Czech Republic, along with Poland and Hungary, became a member of NATO.

Proposals for defence by civil resistance

The promise of civil resistance as a means of opposing oppressive rule has led to many proposals that countries might rely, in whole or in part, on civil resistance as a means of defence against external attack (for example, invasion) and internal usurpation (for example, coup d'état). Preparations for such resistance are sometimes seen as potentially helping to deter such threats in the first place. Various terms have been used to describe either the policy of relying on such non-military action by a society or social group, or the general phenomenon of sustained country-wide campaigns against outside attack or dictatorial rule. These terms - all near-synonyms - include "defence by civil resistance", "non-violent defence", "civilian defence", "civilian-based defence", and "social defence". For further information and references to some relevant literature, see social defence.

The term "civil resistance": merits and concerns

The term is not new. Gandhi used it in many of his writings.[32] In 1935 he wrote: "... I found that even civil disobedience failed to convey the full meaning of the struggle. I therefore adopted the phrase civil resistance."[33] It is a near-synonym for nonviolent resistance, civil disobedience, people power and satyagraha. While each of these terms has its uses and connotations, "civil resistance" is one appropriate term to use in cases where the resistance has a civic quality, relating to a society as a whole; where the action involved is not necessarily disobedience, but instead involves supporting the norms of a society against usurpers; where the decision not to use violent methods is not based on a general philosophy of nonviolence, but on a wide range of prudential, ethical and legal considerations; and where the technical and communications infrastructure of modern civil societies provides a means of organizing resistance.[34] Because of such considerations, the term has been used in this century in many analyses in academic journals.[35]

What exactly are the advantages of the term "civil resistance", as distinct from its near-synonyms "non-violent action" and "non-violent resistance"? All these terms have merits, and refer to largely the same phenomena. Indeed, there is a long history, in many languages, of using a wide variety of terms to describe these phenomena. The term "civil resistance" has been used increasingly for two main reasons:
1. It emphasises the positive (civic goals; widespread civil society involvement; and civil as distinct from uncivil conduct) rather than the negative (avoidance of the use of violence).
2. It conveys, more effectively perhaps than such terms as "nonviolent resistance", that a movement’s avoidance of violence in pursuit of a particular cause is not necessarily tied to a general belief in "nonviolence" in all circumstances, nor to a philosophy of "Gandhism", but rather arises from the particular values and circumstances of the society concerned.

There have been concerns that the term “civil resistance” might on occasion be misused, or at least stretched in a highly controversial way, to encompass acts of violence. Thus, arising from experience within the anti-globalization movement, one participant-observer has seen “new forms of civil resistance” as being associated with a problematic departure from a previously more widely shared commitment to maintaining non-violent discipline.[36] Because of these concerns, those who have used the term "civil resistance" have tended to emphasise its non-violent character, and to use it in addition to – and not in substitution of – such terms as "non-violent resistance".
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Satyagraha
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For the opera, see Satyagraha (opera). For the 2013 Hindi film, see Satyagraha (film).

Satyagraha (/ˌsætɪəˈɡrɑːha/; Sanskrit: सत्याग्रह satyāgraha), loosely translated as "insistence on truth" (satya "truth"; agraha "insistence" or "holding firmly to") or holding onto truth[^1] or truth force, is a particular philosophy and practice within the broader overall category generally known as nonviolent resistance or civil resistance. The term satyagraha was coined and developed by Mahatma Gandhi.[^2] He deployed satyagraha in the Indian independence movement and also during his earlier struggles in South Africa for Indian rights. Satyagraha theory influenced Nelson Mandela's struggle in South Africa under apartheid, Martin Luther King, Jr.'s and James Bevel's campaigns during the Civil Rights Movement in the United States, and many other social justice and similar movements.[^3][^4] Someone who practices satyagraha is a satyagrahi.
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### Origin and meaning of name

The term originated in a competition in the news-sheet Indian Opinion in South Africa in 1906.[^2] It was an adaptation by Gandhi of one of the entries in that competition. "Satyagraha" is a Tatpuruṣa compound of the Sanskrit words satya (meaning "truth") and Agraha ("polite insistence", or "holding firmly to"). Satya is derived from the word “sat”, which means “being”. Nothing is or exists in reality except Truth. In the context of satyagraha, Truth therefore includes a) Truth in speech, as opposed to falsehood, b) what is real, as opposed to nonexistent (asat) and c) good as opposed to evil, or bad. This was critical to Gandhi’s understanding of and faith in nonviolence:”"The world rests upon the bedrock of satya or truth. Asatya, meaning untruth, also means nonexistent, and satya or truth also means that which is. If untruth does not so much as exist, its victory is out of the question. And truth being that which is, can never be destroyed. This is the doctrine of satyagraha in a nutshell."[^5] For Gandhi, satyagraha went far beyond mere "passive resistance" and became strength in practising non-violent methods.[^6] In his words:
Truth (satya) implies love, and firmness (agraha) engenders and therefore serves as a synonym for force. I thus began to call the Indian movement Satyagraha, that is to say, the Force which is born of Truth and Love or non-violence, and gave up the use of the phrase “passive resistance”, in connection with it, so much so that even in English writing we often avoided it and used instead the word “satyagraha” itself or some other equivalent English phrase.[7]

In September 1935, a letter to P.K. Rao, Servants of India Society, Gandhi disputed the proposition that his idea of Civil Disobedience was adapted from the writings of Thoreau.

The statement that I had derived my idea of civil disobedience from the writings of Thoreau is wrong. The resistance to authority in South Africa was well advanced before I got the essay of Thoreau on civil disobedience. But the movement was then known as passive resistance. As it was incomplete, I had coined the word satyagraha for the Gujarati readers. When I saw the title of Thoreau’s great essay, I began the use of his phrase to explain our struggle to the English readers. But I found that even civil disobedience failed to convey the full meaning of the struggle. I therefore adopted the phrase civil resistance. Non-violence was always an integral part of our struggle. “[8]

Gandhi described it as follows:

I have also called it love-force or soul-force. In the application of satyagraha, I discovered in the earliest stages that pursuit of truth did not admit of violence being inflicted on one’s opponent but that he must be weaned from error by patience and compassion. For what appears to be truth to the one may appear to be error to the other. And patience means self-suffering. So the doctrine came to mean vindication of truth, not by infliction of suffering on the opponent, but on oneself.[9]

**Contrast to "passive resistance"

Gandhi distinguished between satyagraha and passive resistance in the following letter:

I have drawn the distinction between passive resistance as understood and practised in the West and satyagraha before I had evolved the doctrine of the latter to its full logical and spiritual extent. I often used “passive resistance” and “satyagraha” as synonymous terms: but as the doctrine of satyagraha developed, the expression “passive resistance” ceases even to be synonymous, as passive resistance has admitted of violence as in the case of the suffragettes and has been universally acknowledged to be a weapon of the weak. Moreover, passive resistance does not necessarily involve complete adherence to truth under every circumstance. Therefore it is different from satyagraha in three essentials: Satyagraha is a weapon of the strong; it admits of no violence under any circumstance whatsoever; and it ever insists upon truth. I think I have now made the distinction perfectly clear.”[10]
Ahimsa and satyagraha

It is important to note the intrinsic connection between ahimsa and satyagraha. Satyagraha is sometimes used to refer to the whole principle of nonviolence, where it is essentially the same as ahimsa, and sometimes used in a “marked” meaning to refer specifically to direct action that is largely obstructive, for example in the form of civil disobedience.

Gandhi says:

It is perhaps clear from the foregoing, that without ahimsa it is not possible to seek and find Truth. Ahimsa and Truth are so intertwined that it is practically impossible to disentangle and separate them. They are like the two sides of a coin, or rather of a smooth unstamped metallic disk. Nevertheless, ahimsa is the means; Truth is the end. Means to be means must always be within our reach, and so ahimsa is our supreme duty.[11]

Defining success

Assessing the extent to which Gandhi’s ideas of satyagraha were or were not successful in the Indian independence struggle is a complex task. Judith Brown has suggested that "this is a political strategy and technique which, for its outcomes, depends of historical specificities."[12] The view taken by Gandhi differs from the idea that the goal in any conflict is necessarily to defeat the opponent or frustrate the opponent’s objectives, or to meet one’s own objectives despite the efforts of the opponent to obstruct these. In satyagraha, by contrast, “The Satyagrahi’s object is to convert, not to coerce, the wrong-doer.”[13] The opponent must be converted, at least as far as to stop obstructing the just end, for this cooperation to take place. There are cases, to be sure, when an opponent, e.g. a dictator, has to be unseated and one cannot wait to convert him. The satyagrahi would count this a partial success. For more on the meaning of “success” in nonviolence see “work vs. “work”.

Means and ends

The theory of satyagraha sees means and ends as inseparable. The means used to obtain an end are wrapped up in and attached to that end. Therefore, it is contradictory to try to use unjust means to obtain justice or to try to use violence to obtain peace. As Gandhi wrote: “They say, 'means are, after all, means'. I would say, 'means are, after all, everything'. As the means so the end...”[14]

Gandhi used an example to explain this:

If I want to deprive you of your watch, I shall certainly have to fight for it; if I want to buy your watch, I shall have to pay for it; and if I want a gift, I shall have to plead for it; and, according to the means I employ, the watch is stolen property, my own property, or a donation.[15]

Gandhi rejected the idea that injustice should, or even could, be fought against “by any means necessary” – if you use violent, coercive, unjust means, whatever ends you produce will necessarily embed that injustice. To those who preached violence and called nonviolent actionists cowards, he replied: “I do believe that, where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence....I would rather have India
resort to arms in order to defend her honour than that she should, in a cowardly manner, become or remain a helpless witness to her own dishonour....But I believe that nonviolence is infinitely superior to violence, forgiveness is more manly than punishment.”[16]

**Satyagraha versus Duragraha**

The essence of Satyagraha is that it seeks to eliminate antagonisms without harming the antagonists themselves, as opposed to violent resistance, which is meant to cause harm to the antagonist. A Satyagrahi therefore does not seek to end or destroy the relationship with the antagonist, but instead seeks to transform or “purify” it to a higher level. A euphemism sometimes used for Satyagraha is that it is a “silent force” or a “soul force” (a term also used by Martin Luther King Jr. during his famous “I Have a Dream” speech). It arms the individual with moral power rather than physical power. Satyagraha is also termed a “universal force,” as it essentially “makes no distinction between kinsmen and strangers, young and old, man and woman, friend and foe.”[17]

Gandhi contrasted satyagraha (holding on to truth) with “duragraha” (holding on by force), as in protest meant more to harass than enlighten opponents. He wrote: “There must be no impatience, no barbarity, no insolence, no undue pressure. If we want to cultivate a true spirit of democracy, we cannot afford to be intolerant. Intolerance betrays want of faith in one's cause.”[18]

Civil disobedience and non-cooperation as practised under Satyagraha are based on the “law of suffering”,[19] a doctrine that the endurance of suffering is a means to an end. This end usually implies a moral upliftment or progress of an individual or society. Therefore, non-cooperation in Satyagraha is in fact a means to secure the cooperation of the opponent consistently with truth and justice.

**Satyagraha in large-scale conflict**

*Main articles: Bardoli Satyagraha, Champaran and Kheda Satyagraha, Dharasana Satyagraha, Flag Satyagraha, Guruvayur Satyagraha, Non-cooperation movement, Quit India Movement, Salt Satyagraha and Vaikom Satyagraha*

When using satyagraha in a large-scale political conflict involving civil disobedience, Gandhi believed that the satyagrahis must undergo training to ensure discipline. He wrote that it is “only when people have proved their active loyalty by obeying the many laws of the State that they acquire the right of Civil Disobedience.”[20]

He therefore made part of the discipline that satyagrahis:

1. appreciate the other laws of the State and obey them voluntarily
2. tolerate these laws, even when they are inconvenient
3. be willing to undergo suffering, loss of property, and to endure the suffering that might be inflicted on family and friends[20]

This obedience has to be not merely grudging, but extraordinary:

...an honest, respectable man will not suddenly take to stealing whether there is a law against stealing or not, but this very man will not feel any remorse for failure to observe the rule about carrying headlights on bicycles after dark.... But he would observe any obligatory rule of this kind, if only to escape the inconvenience of facing a prosecution for a breach of the rule. Such compliance is not, however, the willing and spontaneous obedience that is required of a
Principles for Satyagraha

Gandhi envisioned satyagraha as not only a tactic to be used in acute political struggle, but as a universal solvent for injustice and harm. He felt that it was equally applicable to large-scale political struggle and to one-on-one interpersonal conflicts and that it should be taught to everyone.\[22\]

He founded the Sabarmati Ashram to teach satyagraha. He asked satyagrahis to follow the following principles (Yamas described in Yoga Sutra):\[23\]

1. Nonviolence (ahimsa)
2. Truth – this includes honesty, but goes beyond it to mean living fully in accord with and in devotion to that which is true
3. Not stealing
4. Chastity (brahmacharya) – this includes sexual chastity, but also the subordination of other sensual desires to the primary devotion to truth
5. Non-possession (not the same as poverty)
6. Body-labor or bread-labor
7. Control of the palate
8. Fearlessness
9. Equal respect for all religions
10. Economic strategy such as boycott of exported goods (swadeshi)

On another occasion, he listed seven rules as “essential for every Satyagrahi in India”:

1. must have a living faith in God
2. must believe in truth and non-violence and have faith in the inherent goodness of human nature which he expects to evoke by suffering in the satyagraha effort
3. must be leading a chaste life, and be willing to die or lose all his possessions
4. must be a habitual khadi wearer and spinner
5. must abstain from alcohol and other intoxicants
6. must willingly carry out all the rules of discipline that are issued
7. must obey the jail rules unless they are specially devised to hurt his self-respect

Rules for satyagraha campaigns

Gandhi proposed a series of rules for satyagrahis to follow in a resistance campaign:\[17\]

1. harbour no anger
2. suffer the anger of the opponent
3. never retaliate to assaults or punishment; but do not submit, out of fear of punishment or assault, to an order given in anger
4. voluntarily submit to arrest or confiscation of your own property
5. if you are a trustee of property, defend that property (non-violently) from confiscation with your life
6. do not curse or swear
7. do not insult the opponent  
8. neither salute nor insult the flag of your opponent or your opponent’s leaders  
9. if anyone attempts to insult or assault your opponent, defend your opponent (non-violently) with your life  
10. as a prisoner, behave courteously and obey prison regulations (except any that are contrary to self-respect)  
11. as a prisoner, do not ask for special favourable treatment  
12. as a prisoner, do not fast in an attempt to gain conveniences whose deprivation does not involve any injury to your self-respect  
13. joyfully obey the orders of the leaders of the civil disobedience action  
14. do not pick and choose amongst the orders you obey; if you find the action as a whole improper or immoral, sever your connection with the action entirely  
15. do not make your participation conditional on your comrades taking care of your dependents while you are engaging in the campaign or are in prison; do not expect them to provide such support  
16. do not become a cause of communal quarrels  
17. do not take sides in such quarrels, but assist only that party which is demonstrably in the right; in the case of inter-religious conflict, give your life to protect (non-violently) those in danger on either side  
18. avoid occasions that may give rise to communal quarrels  
19. do not take part in processions that would wound the religious sensibilities of any community

**Satyagraha and the Civil Rights Movement in the United States**

Satyagraha theory also influenced many other movements of nonviolence and civil resistance. For example, Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote in his autobiography about Gandhi's influence on his developing ideas regarding the Civil Rights Movement in the United States:

> Like most people, I had heard of Gandhi, but I had never studied him seriously. As I read I became deeply fascinated by his campaigns of nonviolent resistance. I was particularly moved by his Salt March to the Sea and his numerous fasts. The whole concept of Satyagraha (Satya is truth which equals love, and agraha is force; Satyagraha, therefore, means truth force or love force) was profoundly significant to me. As I delved deeper into the philosophy of Gandhi, my skepticism concerning the power of love gradually diminished, and I came to see for the first time its potency in the area of social reform. ... It was in this Gandhian emphasis on love and nonviolence that I discovered the method for social reform that I had been seeking. [24]

**Satyagraha and the Jewish Holocaust**

In view of the Nazi persecution of the Jews in Germany, Gandhi offered satyagraha as a method of combating oppression and genocide, stating:

> If I were a Jew and were born in Germany and earned my livelihood there, I would claim Germany as my home even as the tallest Gentile German might, and challenge him to shoot me or cast me in the dungeon; I would refuse to be expelled or to submit to discriminating treatment. And for doing this I should not wait for the fellow Jews to join me in civil resistance, but would have confidence that in the end the rest were bound to follow my example. If one Jew or all the Jews were to accept the prescription here offered, he or they cannot be worse off than now. And suffering voluntarily...
When Gandhi was criticized for these statements, he responded in another article entitled “Some Questions Answered”:

Friends have sent me two newspaper cuttings criticizing my appeal to the Jews. The two critics suggest that in presenting non-violence to the Jews as a remedy against the wrong done to them, I have suggested nothing new... What I have pleaded for is renunciation of violence of the heart and consequent active exercise of the force generated by the great renunciation.“[26]

In a similar vein, anticipating a possible attack on India by Japan during World War II, Gandhi recommended satyagraha as a means of national defense (what is now sometimes called "Civilian Based Defense (CBD) or "social defence"):

...there should be unadulterated non-violent non-cooperation, and if the whole of India responded and unanimously offered it, I should show that, without shedding a single drop of blood, Japanese arms – or any combination of arms – can be sterilized. That involves the determination of India not to give quarter on any point whatsoever and to be ready to risk loss of several million lives. But I would consider that cost very cheap and victory won at that cost glorious. That India may not be ready to pay that price may be true. I hope it is not true, but some such price must be paid by any country that wants to retain its independence. After all, the sacrifice made by the Russians and the Chinese is enormous, and they are ready to risk all. The same could be said of the other countries also, whether aggressors or defenders. The cost is enormous. Therefore, in the non-violent technique I am asking India to risk no more than other countries are risking and which India would have to risk even if she offered armed resistance.[27]

See also
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- Salt Satyagraha
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- Gandhi as a Political Strategist
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"Disobedience" redirects here. For the 2003 film, see Disobedience (film). For the act of disobeying an authority figure, see insubordination.

For other uses, see Civil disobedience (disambiguation).

Civil disobedience is the active, professed refusal to obey certain laws, demands, and commands of a government, or of an occupying international power. Civil disobedience is a symbolic or ritualistic violation of the law, rather than a rejection of the system as a whole. Civil disobedience is sometimes, though not always,[1][2] defined as being nonviolent resistance.
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Overview

One of its earliest massive implementations was brought about by Egyptians against the British occupation in the 1919 Revolution.[3] Civil disobedience is one of the many ways people have rebelled against what they deem to be unfair laws. It has been used in many nonviolent resistance movements in India (Gandhi's campaigns for independence from the British Empire), in Czechoslovakia's Velvet Revolution and in East Germany to oust their communist governments,[4] in South Africa in the fight against apartheid, in the American Civil Rights Movement, in the Singing Revolution to bring independence to the Baltic countries from the Soviet Union, recently with the 2003 Rose Revolution in Georgia and the 2004 Orange Revolution[5] in Ukraine, among other various movements worldwide.

One of the oldest depictions of civil disobedience is in Sophocles' play Antigone, in which Antigone, one of the
daughters of former King of Thebes, Oedipus, defies Creon, the current King of Thebes, who is trying to stop her from giving her brother Polynices a proper burial. She gives a stirring speech in which she tells him that she must obey her conscience rather than human law. She is not at all afraid of the death he threatens her with (and eventually carries out), but she is afraid of how her conscience will smite her if she does not do this.[6]

Following the Peterloo massacre of 1819, poet Percy Shelley wrote the political poem *The Mask of Anarchy* later that year, that begins with the images of what he thought to be the unjust forms of authority of his time—and then imagines the stirrings of a new form of social action. It is perhaps the first modern statement of the principle of nonviolent protest.[7] A version was taken up by the author Henry David Thoreau in his essay *Civil Disobedience*, and later by Gandhi in his doctrine of *Satyagraha*.[7] Gandhi's Satyagraha was partially influenced and inspired by Shelley's nonviolence in protest and political action.[8] In particular, it is known that Gandhi would often quote Shelley's *Masque of Anarchy* to vast audiences during the campaign for a free India.

Thoreau's 1848 essay *Civil Disobedience*, originally titled "Resistance to Civil Government", has had a wide influence on many later practitioners of civil disobedience. The driving idea behind the essay is that citizens are morally responsible for their support of aggressors, even when such support is required by law. In the essay, Thoreau explained his reasons for having refused to pay taxes as an act of protest against slavery and against the Mexican-American War. He writes,

> If I devote myself to other pursuits and contemplations, I must first see, at least, that I do not pursue them sitting upon another man’s shoulders. I must get off him first, that he may pursue his contemplations too. See what gross inconsistency is tolerated. I have heard some of my townsmen say, “I should like to have them order me out to help put down an insurrection of the slaves, or to march to Mexico; — see if I would go;” and yet these very men have each, directly by their allegiance, and so indirectly, at least, by their money, furnished a substitute.

By the 1850s, a range of minority groups in the United States—blacks, Jews, Seventh Day Baptists, Catholics, anti-prohibitionists, racial egalitarians, and others—employed civil disobedience to combat a range of legal measures and public practices that to them promoted ethnic, religious, and racial discrimination. Public and typically peaceful resistance to public power would remain an integral tactic in modern American minority-rights politics.[10]

### Etymology

Thoreau's 1849 essay "Resistance to Civil Government" was eventually renamed "Essay on Civil Disobedience." After his landmark lectures were published in 1866, the term began to appear in numerous sermons and lectures relating to slavery and the war in Mexico.[11][12][13][14] Thus, by the time Thoreau's lectures were first published under the title "Civil Disobedience," in 1866, four years after his death, the term had achieved fairly widespread usage.

It has been argued that the term "civil disobedience" has always suffered from ambiguity and in modern times, become utterly debased. Marshall Cohen notes, "It has been used to describe everything from bringing a test-case in the federal courts to taking aim at a federal official. Indeed, for Vice President Agnew it has become a code-word describing the activities of muggers, arsonists, draft evaders, campaign hecklers, campus militants, anti-war demonstrators, juvenile delinquents and political assassins."[15]
LeGrande writes that "the formulation of a single all-encompassing definition of the term is extremely difficult, if not impossible. In reviewing the voluminous literature on the subject, the student of civil disobedience rapidly finds himself surrounded by a maze of semantical problems and grammatical niceties. Like Alice in Wonderland, he often finds that specific terminology has no more (or no less) meaning than the individual orator intends it to have." He encourages a distinction between lawful protest demonstration, nonviolent civil disobedience, and violent civil disobedience.\[16\]

In a letter to P.K.Rao, dated September 10, 1935, Gandhi disputes that his idea of civil disobedience was derived from the writings of Thoreau:\[17\]

The statement that I had derived my idea of Civil Disobedience from the writings of Thoreau is wrong. The resistance to authority in South Africa was well advanced before I got the essay ... When I saw the title of Thoreau's great essay, I began to use his phrase to explain our struggle to the English readers. But I found that even "Civil Disobedience" failed to convey the full meaning of the struggle. I therefore adopted the phrase "Civil Resistance."

**Definition, theories, and justifications**

Civil disobedience is usually defined as pertaining to a citizen's relation to the state and its laws, as distinguished from a constitutional impasse in which two public agencies, especially two equally sovereign branches of government, conflict. For instance, if the head of government of a country were to refuse to enforce a decision of that country's highest court, it would not be civil disobedience, since the head of government would be acting in her or his capacity as public official rather than private citizen.\[18\]

However, this definition is disputed by Thoreau's political philosophy pitching the conscience vs. the collective. The individual is the final judge of right and wrong. More than this, since only individuals act, only individuals can act unjustly. When the government knocks on the door, it is an individual in the form of a postman or tax collector whose hand hits the wood. Before Thoreau’s imprisonment, when a confused taxman had wondered aloud about how to handle his refusal to pay, Thoreau had advised, “Resign.” If a man chose to be an agent of injustice, then Thoreau insisted on confronting him with the fact that he was making a choice. But if government is “the voice of the people,” as it is often called, shouldn’t that voice be heeded? Thoreau admits that government may express the will of the majority but it may also express nothing more than the will of elite politicians. Even a good form of government is “liable to be abused and perverted before the people can act through it.” Moreover, even if a government did express the voice of the people, this fact would not compel the obedience of individuals who disagree with what is being said. The majority may be powerful but it is not necessarily right. What, then, is the proper relationship between the individual and the government?\[19\]

Some justifications for civil disobedience come from the natural law tradition, which holds that laws lacking moral legitimacy are not legally binding. This is in contrast to legal positivism, which holds that laws properly enacted are binding. Although legal positivism is the dominant political theory in the modern world, events in
the 19th and 20th centuries raised public awareness of the horrific consequences that can arise from compliance with jurisdictionally adequate but morally evil laws like the Nazi enactments requiring reporting Jews and dissidents or the antebellum Fugitive Slave Act.[20] Lawbreaking came to be regarded as a potentially useful and perhaps morally obligatory check against such abuses.

According to John Rawls, the decision about whether civil disobedience is justified and appropriate should be guided by three principles. First, it should be limited to "instances of substantial and clear injustice, and preferably to those which obstruct the path to removing other injustices". Second, before engaging in civil disobedience an individual should ascertain that "normal appeals to the political majority have already been made in good faith and ... they have failed". I.e., "[s]ince civil disobedience is a last resort, we should be sure that it is necessary." Thirdly, "[i]n certain circumstances the natural duty of justice may require a certain restraint" to avoid too many groups with equally sound cases from simultaneously engaging in civil disobedience and thereby diminishing the effectiveness of their disobedience. In addition to these conditions, every person electing to engage in civil disobedience must consider whether it is "wise or prudent" in certain circumstances.[21]

Some theories of civil disobedience hold that civil disobedience is only justified against governmental entities. Brownlee argues that disobedience in opposition to the decisions of non-governmental agencies such as trade unions, banks, and private universities can be justified if it reflects "a larger challenge to the legal system that permits those decisions to be taken". The same principle, she argues, applies to breaches of law in protest against international organizations and foreign governments.[22]

It is usually recognized that lawbreaking, if it is not done publicly, at least must be publicly announced in order to constitute civil disobedience. But Stephen Eilmann argues that if it is necessary to disobey rules that conflict with morality, we might ask why disobedience should take the form of public civil disobedience rather than simply covert lawbreaking. If a lawyer wishes to help a client overcome legal obstacles to securing her or his natural rights, he might, for instance, find that assisting in fabricating evidence or committing perjury is more effective than open disobedience. This assumes that common morality does not have a prohibition on deceit in such situations.[23] The Fully Informed Jury Association's publication "A Primer for Prospective Jurors" notes, "Think of the dilemma faced by German citizens when Hitler's secret police demanded to know if they were hiding a Jew in their house."[24] By this definition, civil disobedience could be traced back to the Book of Exodus, where Shiphrah and Puah refused a direct order of Pharaoh but misrepresented how they did it. (Exodus 1: 15-19)[25]

Another proposed condition for civil disobedience is that the lawbreaker offer an explanation of his defiance based on moral or religious conviction that the law was wrong, stupid, or unfair. It is on this basis that citizens have been relieved from their military duty on grounds of ethical standards that had a functional role in guiding the conscientious objector's behavior throughout his everyday activities, when these beliefs were held extremely deeply, and when the objector demonstrated his strength of convictions by accepting punishment.[26] Is is also proposed that civil disobedience, at least when engaged in by attorneys, exclude activities motivated primarily by material self-interest, in order to emphasize the features of self-sacrifice and concern for the public interest.[27]

**Variants**

In seeking an active form of civil disobedience, one may choose to deliberately break certain laws, such as by forming a peaceful blockade or occupying a facility illegally, though sometimes violence has been known to occur. Often there is an expectation to be attacked or even beaten by the authorities. Protesters often undergo
training in advance on how to react to arrest or to attack.

Ronald Dworkin held that there are three types of civil disobedience:

- "Integrity-based" civil disobedience occurs when a citizen disobeys a law she or he feels is immoral, as in the case of northerners disobeying the fugitive slave laws by refusing to turn over escaped slaves to authorities.
- "Justice-based" civil disobedience occurs when a citizen disobeys laws in order to lay claim to some right denied to her or him, as when blacks illegally protested during the Civil Rights Movement.
- "Policy-based" civil disobedience occurs when a person breaks the law in order to change a policy (s)he believes is dangerously wrong.[28]

**Violent and nonviolent**

There have been debates as to whether civil disobedience must necessarily be non-violent. Black's Law Dictionary includes nonviolence in its definition of civil disobedience. Christian Bay's encyclopedia article states that civil disobedience requires "carefully chosen and legitimate means," but holds that they do not have to be nonviolent.[29] It has been argued that, while both civil disobedience and civil rebellion are justified by appeal to constitutional defects, rebellion is much more destructive; therefore, the defects justifying rebellion must be much more serious than those justifying disobedience, and if one cannot justify civil rebellion, then one cannot justify a civil disobedients' use of force and violence and refusal to submit to arrest. Civil disobedients' refraining from violence is also said to help preserve society's tolerance of civil disobedience.[30] Matthew Hall argues, "Because all law breaking involves some harm, justified civil disobedience dictates that only minimal injury may occur and that it must bear a relationship to the unjust law or policy. For example, racial discrimination in the school system would not justifiably justify a protest rendering a fire station ineffective."

Philosopher H.J. McCloskey argues that "if violent, intimidatory, coercive disobedience is more effective, it is, other things being equal, more justified than less effective, nonviolent disobedience."[32] In his best-selling *Disobedience and Democracy: Nine Fallacies on Law and Order*,[33] Howard Zinn takes a similar position; Zinn states that while the goals of civil disobedience are generally nonviolent,

> in the inevitable tension accompanying the transition from a violent world to a nonviolent one, the choice of means will almost never be pure, and will involve such complexities that the simple distinction between violence and nonviolence does not suffice as a guide...the very acts with which we seek to do good cannot escape the imperfections of the world we are trying to change.[34]

Zinn rejects any "easy and righteous dismissal of violence," noting that Henry Thoreau, the popularizer of the term civil disobedience, approved of the armed insurrection of John Brown. He also notes that some major civil disobedience campaigns which have been classified as nonviolent, such as the Birmingham campaign, have actually included elements of violence.[35][36]

**Revolutionary and non-revolutionary**

Non-revolutionary civil disobedience is a simple disobedience of laws on the grounds that they are judged "wrong" by an individual conscience, or as part of an effort to render certain laws ineffective, to cause their repeal, or to exert pressure to get one's political wishes on some other issue. Revolutionary civil disobedience is more of an active attempt to overthrow a government (or to change cultural traditions, social customs, religious beliefs, etc...revolution doesn't have to be political, i.e. "cultural revolution", it simply implies sweeping and
widespread change to a section of the social fabric).\[37\] Gandhi’s acts have been described as revolutionary civil disobedience.\[18\] It has been claimed that the Hungarians under Ferenc Deák directed revolutionary civil disobedience against the Austrian government.\[38\] Thoreau also wrote of civil disobedience accomplishing “peaceable revolution.”\[39\] Howard Zinn, Harvey Wheeler, and others have identified the right espoused in The Declaration of Independence to “alter or abolish” an unjust government to be a principle of civil disobedience. \[40\][41]

**Collective and solitary**

The earliest recorded incidents of collective civil disobedience took place during the Roman Empire. Unarmed Jews gathered in the streets to prevent the installation of pagan images in the Temple in Jerusalem. In modern times, some activists who commit civil disobedience as a group collectively refuse to sign bail until certain demands are met, such as favorable bail conditions, or the release of all the activists. This is a form of jail solidarity.\[42\] There have also been many instances of solitary civil disobedience, such as that committed by Thoreau, but these sometimes go unnoticed. Thoreau, at the time of his arrest, was not yet a well-known author, and his arrest was not covered in any newspapers in the days, weeks and months after it happened. The tax collector who arrested him rose to higher political office, and Thoreau's essay was not published until after the end of the Mexican War.\[43\]

**Techniques**

*Main article: Examples of civil disobedience*

**Choice of specific act**

Civil disobedients have chosen a variety of different illegal acts. Bedau writes, "There is a whole class of acts, undertaken in the name of civil disobedience, which, even if they were widely practiced, would in themselves constitute hardly more than a nuisance (e.g. trespassing at a nuclear-missile installation)...Such acts are often just a harassment and, at least to the bystander, somewhat inane...The remoteness of the connection between the disobedient act and the objectionable law lays such acts open to the charge of ineffectiveness and absurdity."

Bedau also notes, though, that the very harmlessness of such entirely symbolic illegal protests toward public policy goals may serve a propaganda purpose.\[38\] Some civil disobedients, such as the proprietors of illegal medical cannabis dispensaries and Voice in the Wilderness, which brought medicine to Iraq without the permission of the U.S. Government, directly achieve a desired social goal (such as the provision of medication to the sick) while openly breaking the law. Julia Butterfly Hill lived in Luna, a 180-foot (55 m)-tall, 600-year-old California Redwood tree for 738 days, successfully preventing it from being cut down.

In cases where the criminalized behavior is pure speech, civil disobedience can consist simply of engaging in the forbidden speech. An example would be WBAI's broadcasting the track "Filthy Words" from a George Carlin comedy album, which eventually led to the 1978 Supreme Court case of FCC v. Pacifica Foundation. Threatening government officials is another classic way of expressing defiance toward the government and unwillingness to stand for its policies. For example, Joseph Haas was arrested for allegedly sending an email to the Lebanon, New Hampshire city councilors stating, "Wise up or die."\[44\]

More generally, protesters of particular victimless crimes often see fit to openly commit that crime. Laws against public nudity, for instance, have been protested by going naked in public, and laws against cannabis consumption have been protested by openly possessing it and using it at cannabis rallies.\[45\]
Some forms of civil disobedience, such as illegal boycotts, refusals to pay taxes, draft dodging, distributed denial-of-service attacks, and sit-ins, make it more difficult for a system to function. In this way, they might be considered coercive. Brownlee notes that "although civil disobedients are constrained in their use of coercion by their conscientious aim to engage in moral dialogue, nevertheless they may find it necessary to employ limited coercion in order to get their issue onto the table."[22] The Plowshares organization temporarily closed GCSB Waihopai by padlocking the gates and using sickles to deflate one of the large domes covering two satellite dishes.

Electronic civil disobedience can include web site defacements, redirects, denial-of-service attacks, information theft and data leaks, illegal web site parodies, virtual sit-ins, and virtual sabotage. It is distinct from other kinds of hacktivism in that the perpetrator openly reveals his identity. Virtual actions rarely succeed in completely shutting down their targets, but they often generate significant media attention.[46]

Dilemma actions are designed to create a "response dilemma" for public authorities "by forcing them to either concede some public space to protesters or make themselves look absurd or heavy-handed by acting against the protest."[47]

**Cooperation with authorities**

Some disciplines of civil disobedience hold that the protestor must submit to arrest and cooperate with the authorities. Others advocate falling limp or resisting arrest, especially when it will hinder the police from effectively responding to a mass protest.

Many of the same decisions and principles that apply in other criminal investigations and arrests arise also in civil disobedience cases. For example, the suspect may need to decide whether or not to grant a consent search of his property, and whether or not to talk to police officers. It is generally agreed within the legal community,[48] and is often believed within the activist community, that a suspect's talking to criminal investigators can serve no useful purpose, and may be harmful. However, some civil disobedients have nonetheless found it hard to resist responding to investigators' questions, sometimes due to a lack of understanding of the legal ramifications, or due to a fear of seeming rude.[49] Also, some civil disobedients seek to use the arrest as an opportunity to make an impression on the officers. Thoreau wrote, "My civil neighbor, the tax-gatherer, is the very man I have to deal with--for it is, after all, with men and not with parchment that I quarrel--and he has voluntarily chosen to be an agent of the government. How shall he ever know well that he is and does as an officer of the government, or as a man, until he is obliged to consider whether he will treat me, his neighbor, for whom he has respect, as a neighbor and well-disposed man, or as a maniac and disturber of the peace, and see if he can get over this obstruction to his neighborliness without a ruder and more impetuous thought or speech corresponding with his action."[39]

Some civil disobedients feel it is incumbent upon them to accept punishment because of their belief in the validity of the social contract, which is held to bind all to obey the laws that a government meeting certain standards of legitimacy has established, or else suffer the penalties set out in the law. Other civil disobedients who favor the existence of government still don't believe in the legitimacy of their particular government, or don't believe in the legitimacy of a particular law it has enacted. And still other civil disobedients, being anarchists, do not believe in the legitimacy of any government, and therefore see no need to accept punishment.
for a violation of criminal law that does not infringe the rights of others. Activists who do not believe that accepting punishment is morally required may still believe it is wise to do so, for publicity value or for the credibility it buys them. Accepting punishment can serve the purpose of communicating the gravity of the protested injustice, and a requirement that activists accept punishment for civil disobedience can act as a deterrent against spurious or trivial disobedience that would erode social order.[31]

Choice of plea

An important decision for civil disobedients is whether or not to plead guilty. There is much debate on this point, as some believe that it is a civil disobedient's duty to submit to the punishment prescribed by law, while others believe that defending oneself in court will increase the possibility of changing the unjust law.[50] It has also been argued that either choice is compatible with the spirit of civil disobedience. ACT-UP's Civil Disobedience Training handbook states that a civil disobedient who pleads guilty is essentially stating, "Yes, I committed the act of which you accuse me. I don't deny it; in fact, I am proud of it. I feel I did the right thing by violating this particular law; I am guilty as charged," but that pleading not guilty sends a message of, "Guilt implies wrong-doing. I feel I have done no wrong. I may have violated some specific laws, but I am guilty of doing no wrong. I therefore plead not guilty." A plea of no contest is sometimes regarded as a compromise between the two.[51] One defendant accused of illegally protesting nuclear power, when asked to enter his plea, stated, "I plead for the beauty that surrounds us,"[52] this is known as a "creative plea," and will usually be interpreted as a plea of not guilty.[53]

When the Committee for Non-Violent Action sponsored a protest in August 1957, at the Camp Mercury nuclear test site near Las Vegas, Nevada, 13 of the protesters attempted to enter the test site knowing that they faced arrest. At a pre-arranged announced time, one at a time they stepped across the "line" and were immediately arrested. They were put on a bus and taken to the Nye County seat of Tonopah, Nevada, and arraigned for trial before the local Justice of the Peace, that afternoon. A well known civil rights attorney, Francis Heisler, had volunteered to defend the arrested persons, advising them to plead "nolo contendere", as an alternative to pleading either guilty or not-guilty. The arrested persons were found "guilty," nevertheless, and given suspended sentences, conditional on their not reentering the test site grounds.

Howard Zinn writes, "There may be many times when protesters choose to go to jail, as a way of continuing their protest, as a way of reminding their countrymen of injustice. But that is different than the notion that they must go to jail as part of a rule connected with civil disobedience. The key point is that the spirit of protest should be maintained all the way, whether it is done by remaining in jail, or by evading it. To accept jail penitently as an accession to 'the rules' is to switch suddenly to a spirit of subservience, to demean the seriousness of the protest...In particular, the neo-conservative insistence on a guilty plea should be eliminated."[54]

Sometimes the prosecution proposes a plea bargain to civil disobedients, as in the case of the Camden 28, in which the defendants were offered an opportunity to plead guilty to one misdemeanor count and receive no jail time.[55] In some mass arrest situations, the activists decide to use solidarity tactics to secure the same plea bargain for everyone.[53] But some activists have opted to enter a blind plea, pleading guilty without any plea agreement in place. Mohandas Gandhi pleaded guilty and told the court, "I am here to . . . submit cheerfully to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in law is a deliberate crime and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen."[56]

Choice of allocution
Some civil disobedience defendants choose to make a defiant speech, or a speech explaining their actions, in allocution. In *U.S. v. Burgos-Andujar*, a defendant who was involved in a movement to stop military exercises by trespassing on U.S. Navy property argued to the court in allocution that "the ones who are violating the greater law are the members of the Navy". As a result, the judge increased her sentence from 40 to 60 days. This action was upheld because, according to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, her statement suggested a lack of remorse, an attempt to avoid responsibility for her actions, and even a likelihood of repeating her illegal actions.[57] Some of the other allocution speeches given by the protesters complained about mistreatment from government officials.[58]

Tim DeChristopher gave an allocution statement to the court describing the U.S. as "a place where the rule of law was created through acts of civil disobedience" and arguing, "Since those bedrock acts of civil disobedience by our founding fathers, the rule of law in this country has continued to grow closer to our shared higher moral code through the civil disobedience that drew attention to legalized injustice."[59]

**Legal implications of civil disobedience**

Steven Barkan writes that if defendants plead not guilty, "they must decide whether their primary goal will be to win an acquittal and avoid imprisonment or a fine, or to use the proceedings as a forum to inform the jury and the public of the political circumstances surrounding the case and their reasons for breaking the law via civil disobedience." A technical defense may enhance the chances for acquittal but make for more boring proceedings and reduced press coverage. During the Vietnam War era, the Chicago Eight used a political defense, while Benjamin Spock used a technical defense.[60] In countries such as the United States whose laws guarantee the right to a jury trial but do not excuse lawbreaking for political purposes, some civil disobedients seek jury nullification. Over the years, this has been made more difficult by court decisions such as *Sparf v. United States*, which held that the judge need not inform jurors of their nullification prerogative, and *United States v. Dougherty*, which held that the judge need not allow defendants to openly seek jury nullification.

Governments have generally not recognized the legitimacy of civil disobedience or viewed political objectives as an excuse for breaking the law. Specifically, the law usually distinguishes between criminal motive and criminal intent; the offender's motives or purposes may be admirable and praiseworthy, but his intent may still be criminal.[61] Hence the saying that "if there is any possible justification of civil disobedience it must come from outside the legal system."[62]

One theory is that, while disobedience may be helpful, any great amount of it would undermine the law by encouraging general disobedience which is neither conscientious nor of social benefit. Therefore, conscientious lawbreakers must be punished.[63] Michael Bayles argues that if a person violates a law in order to create a test case as to the constitutionality of a law, and then wins his case, then that act did not constitute civil disobedience.[64] It has also been argued that breaking the law for self-gratification, as in the case of a homosexual or cannabis user who does not direct his act at securing the repeal of amendment of the law, is not civil disobedience.[65] Likewise, a protestor who attempts to escape punishment by committing the crime covertly and avoiding attribution, or by denying having committed the crime, or by fleeing the jurisdiction, is generally viewed as not being a civil disobedient.

Courts have distinguished between two types of civil disobedience: "Indirect civil disobedience involves violating a law which is not, itself, the object of protest, whereas direct civil disobedience involves protesting the existence of a particular law by breaking that law."[66] During the Vietnam War, courts typically refused to excuse the perpetrators of illegal protests from punishment on the basis of their challenging the legality of the Vietnam War; the courts ruled it was a political question.[67] The necessity defense has sometimes been used as
a shadow defense by civil disobedients to deny guilt without denouncing their politically motivated acts, and to present their political beliefs in the courtroom.\[68\] However, court cases such as \textit{U.S. v. Schoon} have greatly curtailed the availability of the political necessity defense.\[69\] Likewise, when Carter Wentworth was charged for his role in the Clamshell Alliance's 1977 illegal occupation of the Seabrook Station Nuclear Power Plant, the judge instructed the jury to disregard his competing harms defense, and he was found guilty.\[70\] Fully Informed Jury Association activists have sometimes handed out educational leaflets inside courthouses despite admonitions not to; according to FIJA, many of them have escaped prosecution because "prosecutors have reasoned (correctly) that if they arrest fully informed jury leafleters, the leaflets will have to be given to the leafletter's own jury as evidence,"\[71\]

Along with giving the offender his "just deserts", achieving crime control via incapacitation and deterrence is a major goal of criminal punishment.\[72\][73] Brownlee argues, "Bringing in deterrence at the level of justification detracts from the law’s engagement in a moral dialogue with the offender as a rational person because it focuses attention on the threat of punishment and not the moral reasons to follow this law."\[22\] Leonard Hubert Hoffmann writes, "In deciding whether or not to impose punishment, the most important consideration would be whether it would do more harm than good. This means that the objector has no right not to be punished. It is a matter for the state (including the judges) to decide on utilitarian grounds whether to do so or not."\[74\] The necessity defense and jury nullification are two ways by which the illegality of an act of civil disobedience can be "cured" through legal channels.\[75\]

Matthew Hall proposes that the law allow courts to render a verdict of "guilty but civilly disobedient" if conditions of conscientiousness, openness, and respect are met that distinguish the offense from other kinds of crime. He notes that such a verdict might usefully have different implications with regard to collateral consequences of criminal conviction, such as those involving professional discipline within quasi-publicly-licensed groups, government contracting and hiring, security clearance and background check procedures, and private employment decisions. Hall argues that "civil disobedience serves as a firebreak between legal protest and rebellion, while simultaneously providing a safety valve through which the profoundly disaffected can vent dissent without resorting to more extreme means. Civil disobedience broadly benefits society by liberating views divergent from the status quo — in much the same manner as free speech itself — and maximizing the prospect that a democratic society will correct its mistakes, or at least reexamine intensely divisive decisions in a manner that assures dissidents that they have been heard. Accordingly, in order for civil disobedience to succeed, it must retain a sufficiently distinct moral status such that society as a whole respects its place in the political order."\[31\]

### See also

#### Ideas
- Civil resistance
- Satyagraha
- Conscientious objection
- Direct action
- Diversity of tactics
- Draft resistance
- Examples of civil disobedience
- Hunt sabotage
- Insubordination
- Nonconformism
- Nonviolence
- Nonviolent resistance
- Sousveillance, passive campaign against surveillance
- Tax resistance
- Tree sitting

#### Groups

- [Wikiquote](https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Civil_disobedience) has quotations related to: \textit{Civil disobedience}
- [Wikimedia Commons](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Civil_disobedience) has media related to \textit{Civil disobedience}.
- Abalone Alliance and Clamshell Alliance, anti-nuclear power groups
- Committee of 100 (United Kingdom)
- Defiance Campaign, anti-apartheid campaign in South Africa.
- Gay Liberation Front
- Gay Activists' Alliance
- Greenpeace
- Righteous Among the Nations
  - Le Chambon-sur-Lignon, French bread town
- Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, 1960s civil rights organization
- Students for a Democratic Society (20th century)
- Students for a Democratic Society (21st century)
- Women's Social and Political Union, suffragette organization
- The White Rose
- Trident Ploughshares, anti-nuclear weapons group

People

- Mohandas Gandhi
  - Satyagraha
- Daniel Berrigan Jesuit priest and nonviolent activist
- Étienne de La Boétie French writer and philosopher
- Shiphrah and Puah, a pair of women from the Bible
- Philip Berrigan former Josephite priest and nonviolent activist

- James Bevel, strategist of the Birmingham campaign and other projects of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC)
- Dorothy Day co-founder of Catholic Worker Movement
- Stokely Carmichael, field organizer (1961-1968) and Chair (1966-1967) for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC)
- James Forman, Executive secretary (1961-1967) of SNCC
- Václav Havel
- Anna Hazare, 2011 Civil Disobedience in India for Jan Lokpal Bill (Citizen's ombudsman Bill)
- Dr Martin Luther King, Jr
  - Letter from Birmingham Jail
- Dalai Lama
- Emmeline Pankhurst, women's suffrage leader
- Rosa Parks, "mother of the civil rights movement"
- Gloria Richardson, SNCC leader
- Henry David Thoreau
- Lech Wałęsa

By country

- Mass incidents in China
- Indian independence movement

Documents

- Civil Disobedience, an essay written by Henry David Thoreau
- May 68, Philosophy is in the Street!, a book written by Vincent Cespedes
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