

34 Nonviolent revolutionary movements

Jørgen Johansen

The history of nonviolence goes back hundreds if not thousands of years. Several philosophical, political and religious traditions have strong elements of nonviolence in their theories and practice.¹ Library shelves are filled with books on the wars in our history, yet it is close to impossible to find books on the history of peace. Historians seem to regard peace as something that can be found between wars, but barely a topic in itself. In the modern media we all 'know' that a story is not worth covering if it doesn't involve violence. Most journalists and academics lack interest in and understanding of nonviolence. The result is meagre coverage and a focus on nonviolence.

Nonviolent revolution

My focus is on some of those movements that have confronted governments and parliaments and demanded changes in leadership. These movements have gotten different labels depending on who they are and who is using the terminology, from 'terrorists' to 'democratic movements'. Between those extremes we find terms like 'paramilitaries', 'rebels', 'freedom fighters', 'guerrillas' and 'opposition'. Often the same movement receives many of these labels at the same time from different quarters. This labelling is part of the political rhetoric included in the conflicts.

I focus on movements that do not use violent means in their struggle and that have been successful in toppling the leadership of a country.

I am not evaluating the consequences of changing the leadership in a country. Cases are included only because the former regime resigned; I do not judge what replaced them. To include short- and long-term consequences will be an important follow-up of the present research.

I exclude all movements that follow constitutional procedures. Cases where movements have used ordinary channels such as elections, referendums or other conventional political tools within the system of law are consequently excluded. I also exclude all forms of coups d'état by elitist groups, which is the most common type of non-constitutional regime change. Most coups d'état are even carried out with few or no casualties.²

Nonviolence

There is little agreement on the definition of the concept 'nonviolent revolution'. Both 'revolution' and 'nonviolence' are controversial terms, separately, and, of course, when they are used together. Dave Dellinger wrote in his 1965 essay, 'The Future of Nonviolence', that 'the theory and practice of active nonviolence are roughly at the stage of development today as those of electricity in the early days of Marconi and Edison' (Dellinger, 1971, p. 368).³

In the framework I am using here, 'nonviolence' is used as a political tool. It is not primarily a philosophy or lifestyle but a number of activities used by individuals and groups in order to influence a conflict. This form of nonviolence could be seen in Poland from 1980 to 1989, when the trade union Solidarity challenged the role of the Communist Party and its leadership. Solidarity's strategy did not include the use of violence against other human beings. They decided for strategic reasons to use nonviolence. If they took up arms, they knew the state was stronger and could easily justify the use of massive force against armed rebellions.

There is a widespread view that in most conflicts there are only two or three actors. Typical examples are the conflicts in Kashmir, Colombia and the Middle East. Seen from a distance or through the lens of the mainstream media, it is indeed difficult to recognize more than a few actors. Kashmir is presented as a conflict between India and Pakistan. The war in Colombia is described as the government against Marxist drug-financed guerrillas. In Palestine, the mainstream media often explain the situation as a conflict between Israel and Palestine. But anyone who spends time in these areas will easily identify many more actors.⁴ By 'actor' I mean an individual or a group that influences the conflict and that has its own distinct agenda.⁵ In most micro-, and all meso-, macro- and mega-scale conflicts, the majority of actors and activities/means are not violent. Even in the midst of the most violent conflict, one will always find nonviolent actors and nonviolent activities. It is not exceptional to find that the numbers of actors is more than 20 in such conflicts, and most do not use violence. The tendency to limit the number of actors when describing a conflict creates a number of difficulties for those who want to understand or act in the conflict. All important actors need to be recognized in order to understand the process in the conflicts.

Most political actors never use violent means, and those who do also have a number of non-violent means in their toolbox.⁶ Should a few actors using violent means on some occasions be enough to label the whole movement violent? Or does it depend on who is using the violent means? I argue that those actors with wide popular support who are opposing the present situation should be the ones to determine whether the conflict is violent or not. Even in these blood-spattered conflicts, most successful acts by non-state actors should be labelled nonviolent.⁷

The situations where the opposition has access to arms but has promised not to use them are more complicated. That was the situation in Serbia when Milosevic was forced to step down in October 2000.

Revolution

The main difference between a political revolution and a social one is that the victorious forces in the first achieve their political goals by taking over state power, while in the second, the winners take power as a means to either achieve or secure broader socio-economic goals. Peralta argues that for a socio-political change to be labelled revolutionary it must be comprehensive, thorough and deep within the society. It is not enough to have an insurgency that ends after minimal changes have been achieved, like a government that resigns or a change of a law. A social revolution is dependent on a political revolution, but a political revolution does not require a social revolution (Peralta, 1990).⁸

Here, revolution means a non-constitutional process of changing the political leadership of a country; this is a typical political revolution that does not necessarily include significant social change. The process is relatively quick, and it is not part of a constitutional process. The changes at the top of the political pyramid may influence the rest of society; the possible changes may be intentional or not. And they may come as an immediate result of the new leadership or as a delayed consequence.

Complexity

Revolutionary conflicts are, like most societal conflicts, extremely complex.⁹ The number of factors influencing their outcome is very high. Some factors and actors are external, while others are internal. Some factors are necessary, while others are not that important to the outcome. Probably none of them are sufficient by themselves for a change to occur. Grix discusses different factors and their importance (Grix, 2000),¹⁰ and his analysis of East Germany has a general relevance for similar cases. He discusses the collapse of the GDR (the former German Democratic Republic), and categorizes changes in five broad, interlinked groups, to which he gives the following labels:

- Foreign policy-based approach/external factors
- Economic/systemic approach
- Elite intransigence approach
- Revolution or no revolution?
- Legitimacy deficit/opposition

Each of these approaches produces a distinct set of questions. To get a fuller picture of the revolutionary process and to understand the entire process and its results, each of these approaches is important. Together these approaches may produce a more comprehensive picture of the complete process of political change.

The use of nonviolence is certainly one aspect that plays an important role. In some cases, that may have been the only factor that was required for a regime change to take place. If that is the case, then one must examine the reasons that masses of people were willing to mobilize. In other words, there is a need to explain why large groups of people take to the streets with common demands and goals. Here the answers will be almost as complex as the revolutions themselves.

The waves of nonviolence

The types of revolutions described and discussed here have grown in numbers in the last 30 years.¹¹

In the last 30 years we have seen six waves of such revolutions.

- 1 Poland, Bolivia, Uruguay and the Philippines
- 2 Czechoslovakia, DDR, Hungary, Bulgaria, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Russia
- 3 Francophone Sub-Saharan Africa: Benin, Burkina Faso, Guinea, Senegal, Mali, Malawi, Madagascar
- 4 Serbia, Georgia, Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon
- 5 Iceland, Latvia, Hungary, . . .
- 6 Tunisia, Egypt, . . .

This list is not complete but gives an indication of how frequent such revolutions are. In the first wave the Catholic Church played an important role. In the next, the former East European block collapsed. The third started in Benin, as former French colonies celebrated the 300th anniversary of 1789. Then followed what was labelled the 'Coloured Revolutions'. Wave number five was a direct result of ordinary peoples' reactions to the financial crisis and the speculative collapsing economy. The last wave started in Tunis and is still going on as this text is being written.

Some of the cases were in the headlines for days when the escalation of the conflict reached its peak, but most of them were hardly mentioned, and none were described in such a way that the reader, listener or viewer of newspapers, radios, websites or TV news could get more than a superficial understanding of what was going on. In some of these cases, good research was done. Most of the cases, however, still have not been examined and studied systematically and methodically enough to get a good understanding of what happened. English-language publications on the nonviolent revolution in Benin 1990 and the other earlier French colonies to follow are typically few in number.

The following are a few illustrative cases and a more complete list can be found in 'Waves of Nonviolence and the New Revolutionary Movements'.¹²

Poland 1980–1989

After two centuries of armed uprising, Polish workers tried to fight the regime in 1980 with unarmed means (Garton Ash, 1991; Karpinski, 1982; Lukowski and Zawadzki, 2006).¹³

After the turmoil in 1956 in Poland and Hungary, the workers movement was just waiting for an opportunity to resurface. Jacek Kuron's 1964 'Open Letter to the Members of the Polish United Workers Party' challenged the system and influenced underground discussions (Weber and Brust, 1989, pp. 57–90).¹⁴ In both December 1970 and June 1976, revolutionary attempts were made, but without the necessary momentum. The Committee in Defence of Workers (KOR) was one important result of the discussion. (Blumsztajn et al., 1986, pp. 73–91).¹⁵ What Jane Leftwich Curry calls 'Poland's permanent revolution' changed its strategy in 1980 and went public with strikes (Curry and Fajfer, 1996).¹⁶ After many discussions, a network of groups and organizations became better structured. The Catholic Church and the Polish pope, John Paul II, played crucial roles in inspiring individuals in the years ahead. The visit by the Pope to Poland in June 1979 mobilized some of the largest gatherings ever in Poland. None doubted the Pope's critical view of communism.

Solidarity was also famous for its use of symbols in its struggle. Not only the flag and the Catholic cross but also a number of monuments and historic dates were used to express Solidarity's views in times of censorship.¹⁷ On July 1, 1980, localized strikes broke out all over Poland due to a government decree that raised meat prices by almost 100 percent.¹⁸ In August 1980, the Gdansk Strike Committee (MKS) formed and 21 demands were presented. By early September, agreements were signed in three cities, giving workers the right to form trade unions and to strike.¹⁹

On September 21, Sunday Mass was on national radio for the first time since World War II. The autumn strikes and court cases were augmented with dialogue between Solidarity and the Communist regime. A nationwide one-hour warning strike was held on October 3. The Supreme Court officially registered Solidarity on November 10. On December 5, Warsaw Pact members met for a summit in Moscow; four days later, the Soviets initiated military exercises all around Poland, and many feared that an invasion like the one in Hungary in 1956 or Prague in 1968 was approaching. A week later, leading cultural, religious, governmental and Solidarity figures attended a dedication of a memorial in Gdansk commemorating workers martyred in the 1970 strike. By early February 1981, General Jaruzelski was named prime minister, and he asked for a three-month 'ceasefire'. Industrial and general strikes occurred throughout 1981 in several parts of the country. Starting in the shipyards in Gdansk, the strikes spread to many sectors and cities. The scope of the protests and the lack of violence created a situation in which the government was forced to start negotiations with the newly formed free trade unions. By the end of autumn, close to 10 million people of a total population of 35 million had joined the protests.

The unions created a multitude of diverse forums for free expression of opinions. An Independent Student Union was also recognized by the government, and farmers began to form independent organizations; 1981 continued with strikes and recognition of more organizations. The peak came on December 13, when PM Jaruzelski declared a state of war, and a number of Solidarity leaders and activists were arrested. In the spring of 1982, Solidarity started to organize underground and formed a Temporary Coordinating Commission (TKK). In the following 12 months, a number of demonstrations took place, but without large numbers of participants. In October a new law dissolved independent self-governing trade unions, and by January 1983, martial law was suspended. The visit by the Pope in June 1983 resulted in the lifting of martial law, and in October Lech Walesa was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. The struggle continued, and Solidarity asked people to boycott the 1984 local government elections. In 1985, a major shift started in the Soviet Union, with the election of Gorbachev as the General Secretary of the Communist Party. In 1989, Solidarity got 35 percent of the seats in Sejm²⁰ and 99 out of 100 seats in the new upper house, the Senate. After almost a decade of nonviolent action, Walesa was elected president on December 9, 1999.

The GDR 1989

After the important changes in Poland, many opposition movements in other East European countries were energized and inspired in their struggles. East Germany was one of the first of these countries to see the opportunity for change.²¹

There has been excellent research done on the nonviolent fall of the German Democratic Republic.²² Many nonviolent activists were involved in what happened in the autumn of 1989 in East Germany, not all of them in public. Open files have made these events seem a little more transparent today, and the decisions to set up investigations and publicize material from these days have been important.²³ When the first people managed to get permission to leave East Germany by train via Czechoslovakia in 1989, the communist leadership thought that it would get rid of the ‘troublemakers’. More and more people took the opportunity to leave. At the same time, protests grew in several cities around the country. In Leipzig, protests and other actions in 1989 were led by the Protestant church (Bartee, 2000; Bohse and Neues Forum Leipzig, 1990; Burgess, 1997).²⁴

It would be a misinterpretation of what happened to focus only on civil resistance and non-violence. These are important and necessary elements, but they are not sufficient to explain what happened, although the means used had an important impact on the process as well as on the outcome of the revolutions in Eastern and Central Europe. To what degree and in what way the means influenced how the revolutions took place and their outcomes is still to be investigated.

Estonia 1991

By 1988, the bloodless ‘Singing Revolution’ was about to make history: a series of singing mass demonstrations eventually led to one that saw 300,000 Estonians (more than one-fifth of the population) in Tallinn singing national songs played by rock musicians. And on August 23, 1989, about two million people from Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania stood on the Vilnius–Tallinn road holding hands. The unprecedented living chain measured nearly 600 kilometres.²⁵

This period was the peak of a movement that gained more room for manoeuvre during *glasnost*²⁶ and *perestroika*²⁷ in the Soviet Union under the liberalization led by Gorbachev. The

Estonian Communist Party (ECP) lost members as well as credibility, and several networks and organizations filled the vacuum that it left. The Estonian Popular Front was one major part of the new civil society. Created in 1988, it was joined by the dissident Estonian National Independence Party and the Green Party. By 1988, the Estonian Supreme Soviet was transformed into a regional law-making body, and soon afterward Estonia achieved economic independence from the Soviet Union and recognition of Estonian as the official language.

A grassroots Estonian Citizens' Committees Movement was launched in 1989, with the objective of registering all pre-war citizens of the Republic of Estonia and their descendants in order to convene a Congress. The ECCM emphasized what it deemed the illegal nature of the Soviet system and the fact that hundreds of thousands of inhabitants of Estonia had not ceased to be citizens of the Estonian Republic, which still legally existed and was recognized by the majority of Western nations. Despite the hostility of the mainstream official press and intimidation by Soviet Estonian authorities, dozens of local citizens' committees were elected by popular initiative nationwide. These quickly organized into a coordinated body, and by the beginning of 1990, more than 900,000 persons had registered themselves as citizens of the Republic of Estonia.

Two free elections and two alternative legislatures developed in Estonia in 1990. On February 24, 1990, the 464-member Congress of Estonia (including 35 delegates of refugee communities abroad) was elected by the registered citizens of the republic. The Congress of Estonia convened for the first time in Tallinn on March 11–12, 1990, passing 14 declarations and resolutions.²⁸ This was a democratically elected but informal body without its base in the constitution or any other law. The Congress represented a broad array of civic groups, and functioned as an alternative to the formal structure.

Despite having 50,000 Soviet troops and a large percentage of Russian-speaking Soviet-era immigrants, Estonia managed to gain its independence without the violent incidents that occurred in its sister republics Latvia and Lithuania.

Sweden put a lot of energy into diplomatic efforts to support an independent Estonia and to gain international support for it. When Estonia declared its formal independence on August 20, 1991, a number of Western countries recognized it quickly, and the U.S. and the Soviet Union, which was disintegrating, followed in early September.

Russia 1991

The collapse of the Soviet Union left Russia as the main political power in the region. Inside Russia, the struggle over power escalated in August 1991. A group calling itself the Emergency Committee arrested President Gorbachev on August 19 while he was on vacation. The arrest was covered up by reports that Gorbachev was ill. The coup plotters were against *perestroika* and *glasnost*, but most of all opposed the process to give the republics independence. A treaty to make them independent in a federation with a common president, foreign policy and military was to be signed on August 20. The plotters included the vice president, the defence minister and the head of the KGB. They banned all forms of public demonstrations, protests and strikes. Orders were given for military units to enter Moscow and protect vital buildings. The men behind the coup expected popular support for their actions, but the majority of the population in the capital turned against them. Many realized that the news about Gorbachev being sick was a ploy. Large crowds came to the 'White House' to protest the coup. More people met at other central places in Moscow. Boris Yeltsin became famous when he climbed on a military vehicle and urged people to use civil disobedience against the coup makers. That event was shown on TV and resulted in many more citizens joining the protesters.

Other cities also held large-scale demonstrations, which included the intelligentsia, middle classes and workers. In Leningrad more than 100,000 protested in Palace Square.

Serbia 2000

The first successful nonviolent revolution in this century took place in the former Yugoslavia. NATO tried to remove Slobodan Milosevic with three months of intensive bombing in 1999, but they were more successful in destroying the opposition than in removing Milosevic. When external troops are bombing a country, the population has a tendency to forget internal disagreements and stand together against the enemy. Serbs stood hand-in-hand on the bridges in Novia Sad and Belgrade to prevent the external aggressor from destroying their cities.

The student movement Otpor,²⁹ created in October 1998 to oppose a new university law, soon became the main organization opposing the government. The first leader of a state to be removed by a peaceful revolution in the new century was Milosevic. Otpor focused on three demands: Free and fair elections in Serbia, a free university and guarantees for independent media (Sharp, 2005, p. 317). The students had some early discussions on strategies and means, but decided early on to use nonviolence. This was not due to philosophical or moral arguments, but basically because armed struggle would be much easier for Milosevic to handle than nonviolent actions.³⁰ The main demand was a call for early elections. The students expected to win and remove Milosevic and his people from power.

Otpor, the Center for Civic Initiatives, and other opposition movements got a lot of financial support from foreign sources. The National Democratic Institute and the International Republican Institute, two U.S.-based institutions, were among those who gave at least 40 million dollars prior to the elections in 2000, which was used to run the opposition groups' campaigns.

Georgia 2003

In 2003, Georgia's 'Rose Revolution' dethroned Eduard Shevardnadze. Here the student movement 'Kmara'³¹ was the main organizer of demonstrations and protests. Kmara began organizing civilian groups of mainly students as election observers, and was vocal about the need for fair elections prior to the November 2003 elections. Its work garnered much attention from Shevardnadze, who complained that the Russian government and George Soros' Open Society Institute (OSI) had been funding an opposition movement meant to remove Shevardnadze from power. Links to the Russian government have never been proven, although the OSI is well known to have funded training for Kmara. The Belgrade-based Center for Nonviolent Resistance was also key in training Kmara, and several other Western organizations were involved in supporting the group. After international observers condemned Shevardnadze's conduct of the November 2003 parliamentary elections, Kmara led the protests that led to his downfall. Kmara also received training and inspiration from Otpor, which had led the overthrow of Slobodan Milosevic in Serbia in 2000. Kmara also used Gene Sharp's handbook *From Dictatorship to Democracy* as a basis for its campaigns.³²

People encircled the parliament for weeks before the old regime gave up in 2005.

Conclusion

The nonviolent revolutions on five continents in the last 30 years demonstrate that the trend of nonviolent resistance to oppression has grown to a global force more powerful than many

people could have imagined. Countries in all parts of the world, with many different cultural, religious and political backgrounds, have recently changed leadership through massive, organized and nonviolent revolutions. These occurred outside the framework of constitutional rules, and were often a surprise to most of the involved parties.

These cases of nonviolent political revolutions are all based on an understanding of political power as being dependent on cooperation from below. It is like an old Greek temple whose roof support is based on pillars and columns. When Mohandas Gandhi developed his strategy against the British Empire he understood that the colonial power was completely dependent on Indians supporting the ‘occupiers’. By means of non-cooperation he wanted all Indians to remove the support and hence the control over India to collapse. By weakening and removing the supporting pillars he reduced and challenged the political power. Refusal to pay salt tax, strikes, massive civil disobedience, and bureaucrats refusing to do their jobs were all parts of this strategy of removing the support the British rulers were dependent on.

Later, Gene Sharp and other scholars studied the case of Gandhi and the Indian liberation struggle and they developed the strategy further. In the books *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*,³³ *Gandhi as a Political Strategist*,³⁴ *Social Power and Political Freedom*³⁵ and *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*³⁶ Sharp has, step by step, developed an advanced understanding of political power and a nonviolent strategy to utilize such power. His latest contributions are *From Dictatorship to Democracy*³⁷ and *Self Liberation*,³⁸ which are frequently used as manuals for oppositional groups all around the world.

In each case the situation and context are different and hence it is not possible to just copy what was successfully done in other situations. The basic strategy can be similar, but the implementation and the techniques need to be adopted according to the local context. What Solidarity did successfully in Poland in the eighties would probably not function in Egypt in 2011. At the same time we can recognize similarities like strikes, religious ceremonies, the use of media to spread the message, and phases of negotiations with the opponent.

Most media report such events as surprising news, and most politicians around the world seem to be taken by surprise as well. The only people who may be less astonished when old regimes are toppled are those actors who have done the preparation and training for such events. There are a number of actors who have taken on the responsibility for strategizing, planning and financing some of these movements. Preparation is probably the most important ingredient in these processes. They cannot happen completely spontaneously. Even if much of the planning and training includes relatively small circles of people and gets little or no attention outside the inner circle, the case studies carried out later show the role of preparations in almost every case.

Governments, politicians, dictators and militaries worldwide are faced with a new phenomenon – massive, popularly supported nonviolent oppositional movements for progressive political change. Will they be able to control these movements? If so, what sort of control will they achieve and by what means? Will new movements learn from recent history? Serious studies of the cases we have witnessed so far are only the first steps for such developments to take place. It is clear, however, that despite neoliberal control and attempts at maintaining empire, new revolutionary movements – ones strategically centred around nonviolent methods – are a crucial part of the contemporary political landscape.

Since the use of cellphones and text messages in nonviolent revolution in the Philippines in 2001, the role of electronic media has been discussed and developed in most revolutionary movements. The relatively easy and cheap ways to communicate, inform others, mobilize people, document what is going on, and counter false rumours have been facilitated by Facebook, Twitter and other social media. At the same time these means of communication also

add to the vulnerability of the movement. The web can easily be monitored, cellphone users can be identified and state authorities can both manipulate and shut down these systems.

It is not possible to give a general answer as to why some movements are successful and others are still struggling. Like all other political means, nonviolence has no guarantee for success. Some victories are won within months; others take decades. The liberation of India took at least 50 years. For Solidarity in Poland it was nine years from the first strike to free elections. The fall of the Berlin wall was a matter of months, and in Tunisia, Ben Ali was forced out of power in a few weeks.

In countries like Belarus, Burma, China and Zimbabwe the democratic opposition has tried for years to remove the authoritarian leaders. If or when the opposition will be in a position to succeed in these countries is not possible to predict. But recent history tells us that most recent victories come with nonviolent means.

Notes

- 1 See Voegelé, William B., 'Nonviolence, Theory and Practice of' in Nagler (ed) *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*, Vol 3, pp. 168–173, Oxford, 2010; Johansen, J., 'Nonviolence, More than Absence of Violence' in Webel & Galtung, eds., *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*, London: Routledge, 2007.
- 2 For data up to 1995 see Frank R. Pfetsch and Christoph Rohloff, *National and International Conflicts, 1945–1995: New empirical and theoretical approaches*, Routledge advances in international relations and politics, London, New York: Routledge, 2000.
- 3 Dellinger, Dave. *Revolutionary Nonviolence: Essays*, Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1971.
- 4 When I was teaching an MA course in Jerusalem with students from Palestine, Israel and Europe some years ago, I gave the students the task of identifying actors in the Middle East. They never came back after a 40-minute session of group work with fewer than 40 actors.
- 5 More on the number of actors is discussed in the later section called 'Complexity'.
- 6 The number of political actors in the world will depend on definition. But even with a limited definition like 'political parties, parliaments, and organizations' they far outnumber armies and military units.
- 7 Stephan, M.J. and E. Chenoweth. 'Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict', *International Security* 33, 2008, 7–44.
- 8 Peralta, A. ' . . . med andra medel. Från Clausewitz till Guevara – krig revolution och politik i en marxistisk idétradition', Göteborg: Daidalos, 1990, 35–36.
- 9 Few authors have dealt with the complexity of conflicts. Sandole, in his book *Capturing the Complexity of Conflict*, London: Pinter, 1999, developed a multilevel theory for analysing violent ethnic conflicts in postwar situations. Parts of his model are also useful for the types of conflicts we deal with in this article.
- 10 Grix, J. *The Role of the Masses in the Collapse of the GDR*, Hampshire: Macmillan Press, 2000.
- 11 Johansen, Jørgen. 'Gewaltfrei erfolgreicher als bewaffneter Kampf', *Wissenschaft und Frieden* 22, no. 2, 2004.
- 12 ———. 'Waves of Nonviolence and the New Revolutionary Movements', in Matt Meyer and Elavie D. Ouédraogo, eds., *Seeds of New Hope, Pan-African Peace Studies for the Twenty-First Century*. Asmara: African World Press, 2009.
- 13 Garton Ash, Timothy. *The Polish Revolution: Solidarity*, rev. and updated ed., London: Granta Books, 1991; Karpinski, Jakub. *Countdown: The Polish Uprising of 1956, 1968, 1970, 1976, 1980*. New York: Karz-Cohl, 1982; Lukowski, Jerzy and W.H. Zawadzki. *A Concise History of Poland*. Second ed., Cambridge Concise Histories, Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- 14 Weber, Wolfgang and Bill Brust. *Solidarity in Poland, 1980–1981 and the Perspective of Political Revolution*. Detroit: Labor Publications, 1989.
- 15 Blumsztajn, Seweryn et al., *Från röda scouterna till Solidarnosc*, Stockholm: Ordfront, 1986.
- 16 Curry, Jane Leftwich and Luba Fajfer. *Poland's Permanent Revolution: People vs. élites, 1956 to the present*. Washington, D.C.: American University Press, 1996.
- 17 J. Kubik, in his 1994 book *The Power of Symbols against the Symbols of Power*, gives the reader an excellent and sophisticated cultural understanding of these nonviolent means.

- 18 One major reason for this price rise was the demand from Russia to send large quantities of meat to Moscow before the Olympics Games started. They wanted to prove false rumours from the West that there was a lack of meat in Russia.
- 19 It was explicitly written that they had to acknowledge the directive role of the Communist Party.
- 20 That was the maximum agreed to in the Round Table discussions.
- 21 Opposition was not as well known there as in other countries, but as Fricke, Steinbach and Tüchel (Fricke, 1984), Raschka (Raschke, Kuhr, et al., 2001), Torpey (1995), Herrmann (Herrmann and Petzold, 2002) and Neubert (1997) have shown, there was a long tradition of opposition, although it was less organized than in countries like Czechoslovakia and Hungary.
- 22 Opp, Karl-Dieter, Peter Voss and Christiane Gern, *Origins of a Spontaneous Revolution: East Germany*. 1989. Economics, cognition, and society. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.
- 23 The Enquete-Kommission has published internal discussions from many about how they reacted to the large-scale peaceful demonstrations (Enquete-Kommission, 'Aufarbeitung von Geschichte und Folgen der SED-Diktatur in Deutschland', 1999). The collection of internal documents from Germany from 1989–1990, edited by Küsters and Hofmann (1998), is also important in order to understand how the leaders in the U.S. and the Soviet Union reacted when the Berlin wall was removed. Maier (1997) has also written an excellent study on the crises of communism and the end of East Germany. For a good chronology of the background and events in East Germany, see Philipsen (1993) and Childs (2001).
- 24 Barteo, Wayne C. *A time to speak out: The Leipzig citizen protests and the fall of East Germany*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000; Bohse, Reinhard and Neues Forum Leipzig. *Jetzt oder nie – Demokratie: Leipziger Herbst '89*. First ed. München: Bertelsmann, 1990; Burgess, John P. *The East German Church and the End of Communism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- 25 The many oppositional meetings at the end of the 1980s are described in detail by Ignats in his 1989 book *Estland: Den Sjungande Revolutionen*, as well as the movie: *The Singing Revolution*
- 26 *Glasnost* means 'openness'.
- 27 *Perestroika* means 'reform'.
- 28 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Estonia. Accessed 2010-12-06.
- 29 *Otpor* means 'Resistance'.
- 30 Parts of the discussions in Otpor can be found at <http://www.otpor.net>. Accessed 2010-12-06.
- 31 *Kmara* means 'Enough'.
- 32 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GeneSharp>
- 33 Sharp, Gene. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*. Boston: P. Sargent Publishers, 1973.
- 34 —, *Gandhi as a Political Strategist: With essays on ethics and politics*. Boston: Extending Horizons Books, Boston: P. Sargent Publishers, 1979.
- 35 —, *Social Power and Political Freedom*. Boston: P. Sargent Publishers, 1980.
- 36 —, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*, 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential. Boston: Extending Horizon Books, 2005.
- 37 Sharp, Gene and Albert Einstein Institution (Cambridge, MA), *From Dictatorship to Democracy: A conceptual framework for liberation*, 3rd U.S. ed. East Boston, MA: Albert Einstein Institution, 2008.
- 37 Available to download from <http://www.aeinstein.org/>

Bibliography

- Barteo, Wayne C. *A Time to Speak Out : The Leipzig Citizen Protests and the Fall of East Germany*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000.
- Blumstajn, Seweryn, Patrick Michel, Georges Mink and Anders Bodegård. *Från Röda Scouterna Till Solidarosc*. Stockholm: Ordfront, 1986.
- Bohse, Reinhard and Neues Forum Leipzig. *Jetzt Oder Nie – Demokratie: Leipziger Herbst '89*. First ed. München: Bertelsmann, 1990.
- Burgess, John P. *The East German Church and the End of Communism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Childs, David. *The Fall of the GDR: Germany's Road to Unity*. Themes in Modern German History Series. Harlow, England; New York: Longman, 2001.
- Curry, Jane Leftwich and Luba Fajfer. *Poland's Permanent Revolution: People vs. Elites, 1956 to the Present*. Washinton, D.C.: American University Press, 1996.

- Dellinger, Dave. *Revolutionary Nonviolence: Essays*, 787. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1971.
- Fricke, Karl Wilhelm. *Opposition Und Widerstand in Der DDR: Ein Politischer Report*. Köln: Verlag Wissenschaft und Politik, 1984.
- Garton Ash, Timothy. *The Polish Revolution: Solidarity*. Rev. and updated ed. London: Granta Books, 1991.
- Germany. Enquete-Kommission 'Aufarbeitung von Geschichte und Folgen der SED-Diktatur in Deutschland', and Germany. Bundestag. Materialien Der Enquete-Kommission 'Überwindung Der Folgen Der Sed-Diktatur Im Prozess Der Deutschen Einheit' (13. Wahlperiode Des Deutschen Bundestages). First ed. Baden-Baden, Frankfurt am Main: Nomos; Suhrkamp, 1999.
- Grix, J. *The Role of the Masses in the Collapse of the GDR*. Hampshire: Macmillan Press, 2000.
- Herrmann, Ulrich, and Joachim Petzold. *Protestierende Jugend: Jugendopposition Und Politischer Protest in Der Deutschen Nachkriegsgeschichte*, Materialien Zur Historischen Jugendforschung. Weinheim: Juventa, 2002.
- Hofmann, Daniel, Hanns Jürgen Küsters, and Förbundsrepubliken Västtyskland. Bundesministerium für innerdeutsche Beziehungen. *Dokumente Zur Deutschlandpolitik*. Frankfurt am Main: Metzner, 1998.
- Ignas, Ülo. *Estland: Den Sjungande Revolutionen*. First ed. Göteborg: MH Publishing, 1989.
- Johansen, Jørgen. 'Gewaltfrei Erfolgreicher Als Bewaffneter Kampf'. *Wissenschaft und Frieden* 22, no. 2 (2004), 12–15.
- . 'Waves of Nonviolence and the New Revolutionary Movements' in Matt Meyer and Elavie D. Ouédraogo, eds., *Seeds of New Hope, Pan-African Peace Studies for the Twenty-First Century*. Asmara: African World Press, 2009, 69–124.
- . 'Nonviolence, More than Absence of Violence' in Webel & Galtung, eds., *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*, London: Routledge, 2007.
- Karpinski, Jakub. *Countdown: the Polish Upheavals of 1956, 1968, 1970, 1976, 1980*. New York: Karz-Cohl, 1982.
- Kubik, Jan. *The Power of Symbols Against the Symbols of Power: The Rise of Solidarity and the Fall of State Socialism in Poland*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994.
- Lukowski, Jerzy and W. H. Zawadzki. *A Concise History of Poland*. Second ed. Cambridge Concise Histories. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Maier, Charles S. *Dissolution: The Crisis of Communism and the End of East Germany*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Neubert, Ehrhart. *Geschichte Der Opposition in Der DDR 1949–1989*. 2. Durchgesehene und erw. sowie korrigierte Aufl. ed. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 1997.
- Opp, Karl-Dieter, Peter Voss and Christiane Gern. *Origins of a Spontaneous Revolution: East Germany, 1989, Economics, Cognition, and Society*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.
- Peralta, A. '... med andra medel. Från Clausewitz till Guevara – krig revolution och politik i en marxistisk idétradition', Göteborg: Daidalos, 1990.
- Pfetsch, Frank R., and Christoph Rohloff. *National and International Conflicts, 1945–1995: New empirical and theoretical approaches*, Routledge advances in international relations and politics, London, New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Philipsen, Dirk. *We Were the People: Voices from East Germany's Revolutionary Autumn of 1989*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.
- Raschka, Johannes, Eberhard Kuhrt, Hannsjörg F. Buck, Gunter Holzweissig and Germany. Bundesministerium des Innern. *Zwischen Überwachung Und Repression: Politische Verfolgung in Der DDR 1971 Bis 1989, Am Ende Des Realen Sozialismus*. Bd. 5. Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 2001.
- Sharp, Gene. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*. Boston: P. Sargent Publishers, 1973.
- . *Gandhi as a Political Strategist: With Essays on Ethics and Politics*. Extending Horizons Books. Boston: P. Sargent Publishers, 1979.
- . *Social Power and Political Freedom*. Boston: P. Sargent Publishers, 1980.
- . *Waging Nonviolent Struggle, 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential*. Boston: Extending Horizons Books, 2005.

- . *From Dictatorship to Democracy: A Conceptual Framework for Liberation*. 3rd U.S. ed. East Boston, MA: Albert Einstein Institution, 2008.
- Stephan, M.J. and E. Chenoweth. 'Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict'. *International Security* 33 (2008), 7–44.
- Torpey, John C. *Intellectuals, Socialism, and Dissent: The East German Opposition and Its Legacy, Contradictions of Modernity*. Vol. 4. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.
- Vogele, William B. 'Nonviolence, Theory and Practice of' in Nagler, ed. *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*. Vol. 3. Oxford, 2010, 168–173.
- Weber, Wolfgang and Bill Brust. *Solidarity in Poland, 1980–1981 and the Perspective of Political Revolution*. Detroit: Labor Publications, 1989.

PART 5: NONVIOLENT ACTION AND POLITICAL CHANGE

Suggestions for further reading

- Gandhi, Mohandas Karamchand (1960). *All Men Are Brothers*. First Indian edition. Ahmedabad: Navajivan Pub. House.
- King, Martin Luther and James Melvin Washington. *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.* (1991) First HarperCollins publication. ed. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Martin, Brian and Wendy Varney (2003). *Nonviolence Speaks: Communicating against Repression*, The Hampton Press Communication Series. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Schock, Kurt (2005). *Unarmed Insurrections: People Power Movements in Nondemocracies, Social Movements, Protest, and Contention*, Volume 22. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sharp, Gene, (1973). *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*. Boston: P. Sargent Publisher.
- Sharp, Gene and Joshua Paulson (2005). *Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential*. Boston: Extending Horizons Books.
- Stephan, M.J. and E. Chenoweth (2008). 'Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict', *International Security* 33, 7–44.
- Stephan, Maria J. (2009). *Civilian Jihad: Nonviolent Struggle, Democratization, and Governance in the Middle East*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Websites with online resources

- International Center on Nonviolent Conflict: <http://www.nonviolent-conflict.org/>
 Bibliography for texts on Civil Resistance: <http://www.civilresistance.info/>
 The Albert Einstein Institute: <http://www.aeinstein.org/>

Questions for reflection and discussion

- 1 Reflect on the role religions have had in justifying the means (violent and nonviolent) of engaging in social and political conflicts.
- 2 How are nonviolent movements able to successfully confront armed police and militaries?
- 3 Why do you think the history of nonviolent movements has fared so poorly in history books and academic studies of conflicts?
- 4 What do you think is the impact of having charismatic leaders, like Gandhi in India and Lech Walesa in Poland, in nonviolent movements, compared with the apparent lack of such figures in Egypt in 2011 or in Serbia in 2000?
- 5 How do you regard the role of domestic and international media in large-scale nonviolent conflicts?