

The Strategic Dimensions of Civil Resistance

Peter Ackerman and Berel Rodal

PROOF

Before, during and after the great wars of the last century, a series of other conflicts took place, not between nations but within them, conflicts waged by organised civilian populations that centred on self-determination and freedom from oppression. These conflicts have been overshadowed by intercontinental and guerrilla war, genocide and terror, but the lessons of successful collective application of nonviolent sanctions may be as pertinent as those of epic naval battles in the Pacific, or fighting in the jungles of Indochina or the streets of Baghdad.¹

Civilians have used disruptive actions as sanctions, to challenge and delegitimize rulers, mobilise publics, constrain authoritarians' power and undermine their sources of support and shift their loyalties. Petitions, marches, walkouts and demonstrations have been used to rouse public support and mobilisation. Forms of non-cooperation such as strikes, boycotts, resignations and civil disobedience have served to frustrate the operations of governments. Direct intervention such as blockades, factory occupations and sit-ins have thwarted rulers' ability to subjugate their people. The sequenced, sustained application of these nonviolent operations has engendered historical results: tyrants have capitulated, governments collapsed, occupying armies retreated and political systems that denied human rights been delegitimated and dismantled.

The streams of thought that frame the possibility of civilian-based nonviolent action are rich and venerable. In his sixteenth-century treatise,

Peter Ackerman is Chair and **Berel Rodal** is Vice Chair of the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict in Washington DC.

The Politics of Obedience: The Discourse of Voluntary Servitude, Etienne de la Boétie formulated the notion of consent as the ultimate source of political power.² He wrote about the origins of dictatorship, developed the analysis of political power in which the technique of nonviolent struggle is rooted and described the means by which people could prevent political enslavement and liberate themselves. In the dramatic year of 1848, which saw a remarkable series of popular uprisings in Europe, Abraham Lincoln proclaimed the right of humans to demand that they be governed with their consent, their right to rise up and shake off oppression, and the importance of their having the power to do so.³

Strategic nonviolent action was invented, re-invented and refined in a score of different conflicts throughout the twentieth century:

- The modern record of civil resistance to an unacceptable status quo may be said to begin in Russia in 1904, when an Orthodox priest, Georgii Gapon, persuaded 150,000 workers to walk the icy streets of St Petersburg in the century's first public challenge to autocratic power. He ignited mass action that led to the country's first popularly elected national parliament.
- Miners and railway workers in the Ruhr in 1923 confronted invading French and Belgian soldiers sent to extract German resources as First World War reparations. Their non-cooperation forced the British and Americans to press for the troops' withdrawal.
- In 1930–31 Mohandas Gandhi led mass civil disobedience against the British in India. He convinced his followers to stop paying salt taxes and buying cloth and liquor monopolised by the British, intensifying a sustained and ultimately successful drive to independence.
- Campaigns of nonviolent action were successful even under Nazi occupation during the Second World War, at least in some places. Danish citizens refused to aid the Nazi war effort during the occupation and brought their cities to a standstill, forcing the Germans to end curfews and blockades.
- Salvadorean students, doctors and merchants, determined to end the brutality imposed on their country by a military dicta-

tor, organised a civic strike in 1944. Without employing guns, they detached the general from his closest supporters, including members of the military, and forced him into exile.

- Less than ten years after the British left India, a Baptist preacher from Georgia, the Reverend Dr Martin Luther King, Jr, following Gandhi's teachings, led his fellow African Americans on a 15-year campaign of marches and boycotts which led to the end of the system of racial segregation in the American South.
- Twelve years after Dr King was assassinated, Polish dissidents defied Communist rule by initiating novel, adaptive forms of resistance. Beginning with a momentous strike in the Gdansk shipyards, workers won the right to organise a free trade union, giving rise to Solidarity and eventually the end of Communist rule.
- In Argentina, the Madres de la Plaza de Mayo, mothers outraged by the government's inaction and silence about the disappearance of their sons and daughters, mounted a 25-year-long campaign of marches and vigils in the central plaza of Buenos Aires. They did not stop until the legitimacy of the country's military junta was undermined, leading to its downfall after the debacle of the Falklands War, and the revoking of immunity from prosecution of the responsible military leaders.
- Half a world away, after Ferdinand Marcos stole an election in the Philippines in 1986, Corazon Aquino, the widow of the assassinated popular opposition leader Benigno Aquino, Jr, led hundreds of thousands into the streets. In conjunction with opposition to the regime by reform-minded military officers, Marcos found himself unable to retain power by force, and fled the country.
- Chilean General Augusto Pinochet was forced from office by a surging and disciplined civilian nonviolent popular movement, after a repressive 17-year-long rule. His attempt to remain in office by ignoring the results of a plebiscite he did not expect to lose was frustrated by the withdrawal of the support of his mili-

- tary commanders, unwilling to undertake the massive repression that would be involved and to run the personal and institutional risks entailed by such a course.
- While Solidarity continued its struggle under martial law, boycott organisers, trade unions and religious leaders in South Africa joined to wage a sustained nonviolent campaign against apartheid. In conjunction with international sanctions, they eventually forced the freeing of Nelson Mandela, enabling the successful negotiation of an end to white domination and the prospect of a full democratic future.
 - Days after the Berlin Wall fell, thousands of Czech students sat down at the edge of Wenceslas Square in Prague chanting ‘we have no weapons ... The world is watching’. In weeks the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia dissolved, along with others like it in East Germany, Hungary and Bulgaria as a result of similar civic pressure.
 - In 1999–2000, the student resistance movement Otpor (‘Resistance’) in Serbia and a unified political opposition led to the defeat of Slobodan Milosevic at the polls, and then frustrated his effort to steal the election. With his security forces standing down in the face of disciplined nonviolent mobilisation, and with a general strike on the horizon, the ‘butcher of the Balkans’ was compelled to relinquish power.

Eight years into the twenty-first century, the record now includes Georgia’s Rose Revolution, Lebanon’s Cedar Revolution and the Orange Revolution in Ukraine. Although significant political and governance problems remained after these civic campaigns, they achieved important results and removed barriers (electoral fraud or foreign occupation) important for further progress towards democratic rule and accountable government. The uprising of Burmese monks in 2007 is easy to dismiss as a failure, but it is likely to have sown the seeds of future change, generating discontent in the military and division in the junta, and tension within Burmese families, many of which contain both a soldier and a monk.

Even though these events occurred in different parts of the world and in different decades, they are essentially the same story. It is the story of what is possible for people to do when their interests and those of their oppressors cannot be reconciled, when the normal political processes in functioning democracies are not available, and when armed resistance is an unpromising option. In each of these conflicts, ordinary citizens joined civic campaigns to seek decisive change, in favour of rights, justice or democracy. Strikes, boycotts, mass protests, civil disobedience and other tactics were used to challenge the legitimacy of the existing system and to drive up the cost of its maintenance.

The dynamics of civil resistance

The repressive violence available to a regime is but one element in a sustained contest between the ruler and the ruled, when those who are ruled do not consent to be so ruled. The strategist and Nobel Laureate Thomas Schelling observed a little over 50 years ago that:

The tyrant and his subjects are in somewhat symmetrical positions. They can deny him most of what he wants – they can, that is, if they have the disciplined organization to refuse collaboration. And he can deny them just about everything they want – he can deny it by using the force at his command. They can deny him the satisfaction of ruling a disciplined country, he can deny them the satisfaction of ruling themselves. They can confront him with chaos, starvation, idleness and social breakdown, but he confronts them with the same thing and, indeed, most of what they deny him they deny themselves. It is a bargaining situation in which either side, if adequately disciplined and organized, can deny most of what the other wants; and it remains to see who wins.⁴

Gene Sharp, an important theorist of nonviolent action, echoed de la Boétie in asserting that ‘no ruler can retain power indefinitely without the consent or acquiescence of the people’.⁵ His principal interest, however, was in developing and applying nonviolent power for actual theatres of operations. In his seminal three-volume treatise, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (1973), he

catalogued 198 nonviolent tactics available to those engaged in civil resistance. Political power, he stressed, is not fixed, stable or concentrated. He analysed power as fragile, or brittle, and liable to shift according to the continuation or withdrawal of people's active cooperation in preserving a status quo.⁶

Strategic thinking is the critical first step

Study of the various cases of nonviolent campaigns for freedom and rights makes it clear that success is not a matter of inspired improvisation in response to particular happenings. It proceeds, rather, from a strategic concept about how to fight oppression. Strategic thinking is the critical first step in 'seeing who wins'. Solidarity's Adam Michnik understood this to be a central component in that movement's success, even after the imposition of martial law when matters seemed hopeless. Michnik declared that:

Above all, we must create a strategy of hope for the people, and show them that their efforts and risks have a future. The underground will not succeed in building a widespread national opposition without such a strategy – without faith in the purpose of action. Otherwise, resistance will amount to nothing more than oral testimony or an angry reaction. And the movement will cease to be one that is aware of its political goals, that is armed with patience and consistency, and that is capable of winning.⁷

What Solidarity proved in Poland, despite the presence of 250,000 Soviet troops on Polish soil and a million more nearby, and what the anti-apartheid civilian-based movement proved in South Africa, is mirrored in virtually all other successful nonviolent resistance movements. Specifically, there are few if any structural conditions that in themselves determine whether nonviolent mobilisation to challenge an oppressive regime can lead to a victorious outcome. Structural and geopolitical factors (including, for example, regime characteristics, or the degree and nature of the state's integration in the global economy) may shape the map of opportunity and strategic and tactical decision-making for resistance planners, but they do not of themselves determine the prospects for successful nonviolent campaigns.

The record suggests that while success is never certain, superior strategic skills on the part of the leadership of nonviolent movements can change objectively unfavourable conditions and yield results that outside observers, experts included, might deem at the outset to be impossible. Repressive states are very often more vulnerable than they seem. There are many cases today of civil protest or reform movements that have not yet succeeded, from Belarus to Burma to Iran to Zimbabwe. Yet rulers in these countries are no more brutal or cunning than others who were forced to step aside in the past.

Just as military leaders learn from historic battles, the example and experience of other nonviolent resistance movements can inspire successful strategies in new conflict situations. The students who helped spark the unexpected downfall of Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic, who was thought at the time to be invincible, were particularly open to and adept at learning from others with experience in nonviolent conflict. The Serbian students applied concepts and principles learned from Sharp and other strategists and scholars to improve and refine their resistance campaign. While the NATO bombing campaign is often credited with Milosevic's removal, it was not until a full year after the bombing ended that Milosevic was forced to relinquish office, by the pressure of civic nonviolent action, and without a shot fired. Georgians learned from the Serbian example and prepared the Rose Revolution. Georgia's success helped encourage many of the participants in Ukraine's Orange Revolution, which yielded images and lessons that emboldened the young Lebanese in their 'Intifada for Independence', also called the Cedar Revolution.

Learning from history

History, recent history in particular, teaches that three elements are essential to successful civil resistance and to winning freedom and rights by means of civilian-based nonviolent campaigns. First, a movement must unite behind leadership that represents the breadth of the nation, not just certain parties and classes. That leadership must also agree on a set of achievable goals. Solidarity campaigned for a free trade union, creating the political space needed to grow a mass movement and change the country. Campaigning

for the end of the communist system at the outset would have met with much less success.

Second, successful civil resistance is the fruit of systematic planning, able to attract and mobilise the participation of people of diverse backgrounds by engaging the manifold elements of civil society: old and young, male and female, rich and poor. Strength and legitimacy come with numbers and representativeness. Accommodation of diverse views, necessary to accomplish this, helps shape the political culture of the society following the transition. Careful analysis is critical. Regime vulnerabilities – political, social, communal, economic, military, international – must be understood, probed and exploited. Just as the adversary uses repression and co-optation to divide and fragment his opposition, nonviolent planners aim to separate the authoritarian adversary from the pillars of support on which his capacity to rule rests. Again, in contrast to the ‘toppling’ approach of violent insurrectionists, nonviolent action aims to crumble or dissolve the regime’s basis of oppression, by building a broadly based movement that can apply pressure to induce shifts in the loyalties of key sectors and actors.

Repression must be expected, and planned for, to minimise and adapt to its negative consequences. Ultimately, a considered, sustained sequencing of strikes, boycotts, protests, and a variety of other nonviolent sanctions challenge the authoritarian ruler’s legitimacy, calling into question his capacity to govern or the occupier’s capacity to control a civilian population. This in turn emboldens and encourages the defection of those whose support is needed by the existing power-holders. A nonviolent movement must plan continuously and marshal resources to achieve tactical capacity that goes beyond protest. An effective civilian resistance should be capable of executing a portfolio of tactics, intelligently sequenced and integral to a comprehensive strategy, to apply continuous pressure on the adversary.

Third, the movement must adhere to nonviolent discipline, because violence brings with it serious costs. With the eruption of violence on the part of the resistance, citizen participation evaporates. Violence, moreover, makes far less likely the defection from the regime of constituencies it depends on, including business owners and the nation’s armed defenders whose loyalty to the regime should not be assumed. Such groups can

be influenced by effective civic action but are unlikely to defect if they are being shot at.

Civil resistance is not about melting hearts but about developing power, and about the artful adaptation of strategy to the complex linkages with other forms and dimensions of power. The dynamic of civil resistance turns much of the traditional understanding of power on its head. It is generated by the action of ordinary people, rather than governments, or elites. Its force is provided by what people inside a country conceive and do, rather than what outside actors determine and decide; and it proceeds by delegitimizing, incapacitating and disintegrating an oppressive system, rather than by decapitating the ruler. While nonviolent resistance works by distributing force, violent insurrection in contrast works by concentrating it. Power sought by violent means is typically an affair conducted by a small group or vanguard. Should the armed revolutionaries or insurrectionists prevail and win rule, despite the risks and low probability of success, decisive power is aggregated to themselves. The people are bystanders.

This dynamic is corroborated in recent studies of transitions. Freedom House analysed the 67 transitions to democracy recorded in its rankings between 1970 and 2005 for any meaningful correlations between opposition behaviour before a change in government and the level of freedom afterward. In 50 of the 67 transitions, nonviolent civic force was pivotal; when less violence was used by the opposition more freedom followed; and the broader the popular participation in the resistance to oppression the greater the freedom after the change.⁸ In short, how one chooses to fight determines what one wins. Sustainable democratic outcomes resulted from those transitions featuring civilian-based nonviolent action, whereas those involving oppositional violence, and, equally interesting, elite deal-making, showed much weaker correlations with democratic outcomes.

Other studies comparing the relative effectiveness of forms of struggle are in various stages of preparation. One forthcoming study compares the

*Civil resistance
is not about
melting hearts
but about
developing
power*

outcomes of 285 nonviolent and violent resistance campaigns in the twentieth century and finds that nonviolent campaigns have twice the success rate as violent ones.⁹

The issue of effectiveness may be germane to the problem of terrorism and the use of extreme violence by radical groups, to the extent that its perpetrators strive to achieve political goals. The cost of using violence to prosecute conflict is higher than those attracted to it appreciate or acknowledge. Disseminating knowledge of the greater benefits available from the alternative of civil resistance could help divert would-be followers of a cause from recourse to methods of extreme violence.

The growing study and practice of civil resistance raises complex issues, including whether there are particular conditions which favour or make less propitious successful civil resistance; the relevance of cultural factors; the role of associated circumstances (for example unsuccessful wars, as in Argentina or the Balkans); the combined dynamic of nonviolent and violent opposition in certain circumstances; the nature and role of vulnerability to repression; and the scope for influence by outside actors. A major and groundbreaking international scholarly project has been undertaken by Oxford University, beginning with a seminal conference held in Oxford in March 2007, treating these issues both thematically and in the context of case studies of civil resistance over the past 60 years.¹⁰ The first volume (featuring 20 case studies) of a projected two-volume set is to be published by Oxford University Press in 2008.¹¹ These, together with further planned analytic work and conferences, will contribute to our understanding of how conflicts featuring civil resistance may shape the emerging strategic landscape.

Backlash

Russian, Chinese, Zimbabwean, Burmese and other authoritarian leaders and spokesmen have shown alarm at the trajectory of civil resistance movements. Shi Zongyuan, China's press regulator, when asked why China had halted plans to allow foreign papers to print locally, answered candidly: 'When I think of color revolutions, I feel afraid'.¹² Authoritarian rulers have indicated through such statements that they recognise the potency of civilian-based nonviolent mobilisation, and are determined – individually

and collectively – to constrain its development in their countries. Civilian-based nonviolent action is presented as a sinister, externally fostered technique to bring about ‘regime change’. This characterisation is part of the identification of civil society as a strategic battleground, and the provision of external assistance to civil society and human-rights capacity-building as illegitimate interference.

In a 5 January 2005 statement known as the ‘Carpathian Declaration’, the leaders of the Rose and Orange Revolutions, Presidents Mikhail Saakashvili of Georgia and Victor Yushchenko of Ukraine, declared that

We strongly reject the idea that peaceful democratic revolution can be triggered by artificial techniques or external interference. Quite the contrary, the Revolutions in Georgia and Ukraine happened despite such political techniques or outside interference.¹³

PROOF

To borrow a phrase, one may say that a spectre haunts the world’s oppressive rulers – the spectre of civilian-based nonviolent power, a force that can only increase in importance as globalisation extends its reach. In a world in which knowledge circulates with previously unimagined speed, in which people are able to learn from each other, and in which the individual consumer is fed an unending diet of technological innovation, the potential for the ‘bottom-up’ assertion of rights can only grow stronger.

Modern communications, audio-visual technology in particular, enormously facilitates the access people almost everywhere have to the experience of others, to lessons of past successes and failures, and to the potential inherent in civilian-based movements to achieve dramatic and enduring results. Their imaginations have been ignited in ways impossible to achieve with the written word.¹⁴ Documentaries distributed by the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict, notably *A Force More Powerful, Bringing Down a Dictator* and *Orange Revolution*, have been seen in over 70 countries and translated

*Only indigenous
actors
can assess
demands,
opportunities
and dangers*

into ten languages, and have led to a growing demand for basic knowledge and organisational know-how relating to strategic nonviolent action.¹⁵ The best guidance to offer those seeking knowledge and training should remain generic, and eschew operational or other forms of specific advice on particular conflict situations. Only indigenous actors can assess the demands, opportunities and dangers of their struggle and design strategies most appropriate to their context. What such actors can learn from outside experts and veterans are the generic variables that are visible in civilian-based campaigns everywhere.

Those threatened by such campaigns are prone to define a 'regime change' desired and driven by outside parties as the object and prize. In fact, the object is transformation in the way people themselves can determine how they are governed. In the not too distant future all the heroes of recent 'colour revolutions' will be due to leave office. The question is whether those leaders will be replaced in constitutionally mandated free and competitive elections determined by citizens, and if not, what the citizens will do to redress the attempt to usurp their democracy. Will they submit passively, resort to violence, or seek inspiration from their own and the world's heritage of nonviolent civic action? And when they ask for assistance in the form of generic know-how to build a nonviolent capacity to challenge oppressive rule, who should be there to help?

PROOF

A right to help

There is now at least paper recognition of a collective 'responsibility to protect' people threatened by genocide, ethnic cleansing and other crimes against humanity. It might also be time to think about recognition of a 'right to help',¹⁶ defining and establishing a norm or right to respond to the needs and requests for help of people denied universally accepted rights. Such help would include the provision of information, or of legal or financial resources. It would be important that such a right to help not be conflated with or be construable as a blanket right of outsiders to interfere in others' domestic politics, serve as an extension of another country's foreign policy, or subordinate other legitimate internal voices and actors.

Unlike the United Nations-blessed ‘responsibility to protect’, which extends to the use of armed force by outside states, a right of people facing oppression to receive help would be strictly confined to activities and forms that are nonviolent.

There is need for a serious examination of the nature of modern norms, of rules of the road for contemporary international, or rather transnational, relations, which today extend well beyond what states do to and with each other. The matter is not so much about exporting or promoting democracy, but about what means are appropriate, useful and legitimate for various actors in support of indigenous civil actors when they seek information, advice and help to pursue their own interests and to secure their rights.

A problem for both statecraft and analysis is that it is natural to think in terms of what it is ‘we’ might do to or for a particular ‘them’, focusing on the traditional tools available to states. Greater attention needs to be paid to the potential of indigenous forces in societies to reshape their own landscape, even if outside actors are incapable of controlling the incidence, pace or trajectory of civil resistance.

Care in language and thought is critical. In a speech forcefully setting out the view that there exists a moral imperative to intervene, sometimes militarily, to help spread democracy, UK Foreign Secretary David Miliband spoke of the need to support ‘civilian surges’.¹⁷ The term, despite Miliband’s caveats, brings to mind the military surge in Iraq and thus many will conflate support for civil resistance with a discredited ‘democracy policy’. Important as appropriate and sustained support for indigenous civil resistance can be, speaking of ‘civilian surges’ in this way and without careful exposition also carries the mistaken implication that indigenous civil resistance is something that outsiders can start or calibrate. Civil resistance, when effective, rarely takes the form of ‘surges’. Even when a culminating series of events features mass protests, strikes and other powerful civic actions, it is only after the patient mobilisation of a unified front, the careful planning of tactics, and the execution of a strategy based on nonviolent discipline and the weakening of loyalties within an authoritarian state.

A growing body of international human-rights law holds that human rights in sovereign countries are legitimate matters for concern and comment on the part of outsiders. This body of law includes the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, and the International Convention on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (sometimes referred to collectively as the International Bill of Rights), as well as fundamental human-rights treaties organised around specific subjects, and a variety of other agreements, in particular the Helsinki Accords, which specifically authorise transnational human-rights advocacy. Individuals and institutions who care about democracy and freedom, peace and security need now to work together to develop a set of modern norms for how citizens and civil societies may freely work together across national boundaries. Universal access to knowledge and resources necessary to protect rights, especially when denied or threatened by oppressive rule, is central to the concept and reality of human rights itself.

PROOF

Notes

- 1 We use 'nonviolent' rather than 'non-violent' to distinguish the newer meaning of 'nonviolent action' at the heart of civil resistance, chosen because it is an effective means of developing and applying political force, rather than as an ethical preference for action that is not violent. Gandhi fought against the use of the term 'passive resistance' (which he regretted coining), because he felt it did not convey the reality of political force which could be applied through nonviolent resistance.
- 2 Etienne de la Boétie, *The Politics of Obedience: The Discourse of Voluntary Servitude* (New York, Free Life Editions, 1975).
- 3 Abraham Lincoln, *Speeches and Writings, 1832–1858* (New York, The Library of America, 1989).
- 4 Thomas C. Schelling, 'Some Questions on Civilian Defense', in Adam Roberts, ed., *Civilian Resistance as a National Defence: Non-violent Action against Aggression* (Harrisburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 1967), pp. 351–2, cited in Peter Ackerman and Christopher Kruegler, *Strategic Nonviolent Conflict* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1994), p. 9. Robert J. Aumann shared the 2005 Nobel Prize for Economics with Tom Schelling. Aumann's particular area of study, the dynamics and application to conflict of repeated games, appears to be of particular relevance to the phenomenon of civil resistance. Work is planned to explore the insights to be gained from specific study of repeated games to help our understanding of the dynamics of civil resistance, and how better to model and exercise it.

- 5 Gene Sharp, *Social Power and Political Freedom* (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1980), p. 23.
- 6 Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*, 3 vols (Manchester, NH: Extending Horizons Books, 1973). Civilian-based defence was a particular development of the concept of civil resistance. The Cold War stimulated thinking amongst a number of scholars about civilian-based defence (CBD) as an alternative form of national defence based on the idea of prepared non-violent non-cooperation and defiance by a trained population.
- 7 Adam Michnik, *Letters from Prison and Other Essays* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1987).
- 8 Peter Ackerman and Adrian Karatnycky, eds, *How Freedom is Won: From Civic Resistance to Durable Democracy* (Washington DC: Freedom House, 2005).
- 9 Maria Stephan and Erica Chenoweth, 'Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Political Conflict', *International Security*, vol. 33, no. 1, Summer 2008 (forthcoming). Stephan and Chenoweth, who developed an original dataset of all known major violent and non-violent campaigns conducted by non-state actors from 1900 to 2006, have found that the higher effectiveness of non-violent campaigns holds true across regime type and the level of repression faced by the campaigners/resisters.
- 10 Civil Resistance and Power Politics, led by Adam Roberts and Timothy Garton Ash.
- 11 Adam Roberts and Timothy Garton Ash (eds), *Civil Resistance and Power Politics: The Experience of Non-violent Action from Gandhi to the Present* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming 2009).
- 12 Quoted in Mure Dickie and Richard McGregor, 'Beijing Concerned about "Colour Revolution"', *Financial Times*, 18 November 2005, <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/739cf006-57c5-11da-8866-00000e25118c.html>.
- 13 Mikhail Saakashvili and Viktor Yushchenko, 'The Carpathian Declaration', *Le Figaro*, 11 January 2005.
- 14 On 26 October 2007 the *New York Times* reported an interview with Ashin Kovida, a Buddhist monk said to be a leader of Burmese protests who escaped to Thailand by dyeing his hair blond and donning a crucifix. Kovida said 'he was inspired by the popular uprisings in Yugoslavia against the government of Slobodan Milosevic, videos of which were circulated by dissident groups in Myanmar'.
- 15 See <http://www.nonviolent-conflict.org/>. The centre's mission is to better understand the experience and dynamics of civilian-based non-violent power, and to disseminate this knowledge widely.
- 16 'Right to Help' is the working title of a project directed by Edward Mortimer and Berel Rodal to develop and disseminate rules of the road and standards for cross-border assistance able to command widespread, even if not universal, assent. See also Peter Ackerman and Michael J. Glennon, 'The Right Side of the Law', *American Interest*, vol. 3, no. 1, September–October 2007, pp. 41–6.
- 17 David Miliband, speech on 'The Democratic Imperative', Aung San Suu Kyi Lecture, St Hugh's College, Oxford University, 12 February 2008.

PROOF