

Sharp, Gene. 1973. The Politics of Nonviolent Action, Part Two: The Methods of Nonviolent Action: Political Jiu-Jitsu at Work. Boston: Porter Sargent Publishers.

Chapter 4

The Methods of Social Noncooperation

Chapter Four
The Methods of Social Noncooperation

INTRODUCTION

Overwhelmingly, the methods of nonviolent action involve noncooperation with the opponent. That is, the actionists deliberately withdraw the usual forms and degree of their cooperation with the person, activity, institution, or regime with which they have become engaged in conflict. People may, for example, totally ignore members of the opposition group, looking through them as though they did not exist. They may refuse to buy certain products, or they may stop work. They may disobey laws they regard as immoral, sit down in the streets, or refuse to pay taxes. The actionists conduct their struggle by reducing or ceasing their usual cooperation, or by withholding new forms of assistance, or both; this produces a slowing or halting of normal operations. In other words, noncooperation involves the deliberate discontinuance, withholding, or defiance of certain existing relationships—social, economic or political.

The action may be spontaneous or planned in advance, and it may be legal or illegal.

The methods of noncooperation are divided below into three main classes: 1) methods of *social noncooperation* (which include social boycotts); 2) methods of *economic noncooperation* (which are subdivided into economic boycotts and strikes); and 3) methods of *political noncooperation* (which might also be called the methods of the political boycott).

This chapter deals with the first of these classes, the methods of social noncooperation. These involve a refusal to carry on normal social relations, either particular or general, with persons or groups regarded as having perpetrated some wrong or injustice, or to comply with certain behavior patterns or social practices. In addition to the methods of social noncooperation listed here, others are likely to emerge from reflection, research and invention. The fifteen specific methods included here in this, at present the smallest, class of nonviolent action methods, are grouped in three subclasses: ostracism of persons, noncooperation with social events, customs and institutions, and withdrawal from the social system as a means of expressing opposition.

OSTRACISM OF PERSONS

55. Social boycott

The most common method in this class, the social boycott, is characterized by a refusal to continue usual social relations with a person or group of persons. Such refusal is also called ostracism. This term derives from the ancient Athenian practice in which citizens voted to send into exile (for ten years, and in a later period only five years) those persons who had become too powerful or popular. The citizens voted by writing the person's name on tiles or on potsherds, called *ostrakon*; to banish by this practice was called *ostrakizein*.

In modern England the social boycott is called being "sent to Coventry" and has been used especially by trade unionists against workers who have refused to take part in strikes and other such activities. The social boycott has also been frequently associated with religious groups. The extent to which this ostracism is carried, and the spirit in which it is practiced, vary considerably. For example, at times it has been accompanied by hatred and vindictiveness; occasionally the boycotters may avow love of the rejected persons who, they hope, will alter their behavior to one acceptable to the boycotting group. The effectiveness of the

social boycott seems to depend in large part on how vital or important the social relations in question are to the persons or groups being ostracized. In the context of a political struggle, the social boycott is usually a temporary practice, rarely lasting more than some months or occasionally years. However, in certain social or religious systems, a particular group such as the untouchables in India may be subjected to social boycott for centuries. This should remind us that social boycott—like other methods of nonviolent action—may be used for ignoble causes. For example, in early 1904 a brief social boycott took place against Jews in Limerick, Ireland; it was denounced by the Irish nationalist, Michael Davitt.¹

Among the various uses to which social boycotts have been put, three stand out as especially significant within the context of resistance movements. This method has been used: 1) to induce large sections of a population to join in resistance activities; 2) to induce particular persons and groups to refrain from, or cease, some special collaboration with or service to the opponent group; and 3) to apply pressure on—and also often to communicate intense rejection or hatred to—the opponent's representatives or especially his police or troops. Let us now explore some examples of each of the uses.

Among the cases where social boycotts have been applied to induce resistance from reluctant sections of one's own population, the American colonies, Finland and India provide good examples. American colonials used social boycotts widely in their struggles with the Mother Country, both to encourage participation in noncooperation campaigns and to punish those who were judged too pro-British. These boycotts took many forms and were frequently combined with economic boycotts. The term social boycott did not come into use until over a century after these events; instead, the term frequently used at this time was "discountenancing," which indicated showing disfavor, putting to shame, showing disapprobation, and withdrawing one's good will and moral support.

During the Stamp Act campaign, for example, "The maids of Providence and Bristol [Rhode Island] displayed the extent of their resolution by bravely agreeing to admit the addresses of no man who favored the Stamp Act."² Later, social boycotts—discountenancing—were used to unify colonial nonviolent resistance against the Townshend Acts.

The town meeting in Providence on December 2, 1769, determined to enforce its strong nonimportation, nonconsumption and austerity plan with a discountenancing—"in the most effectual but decent and lawful Manner"—of anyone who refused to sign or obey the new regulations

for the campaign.³ And the previous March Philadelphians had pledged not only to buy no goods imported in violation of the agreement, but also to discountenance "by all lawful and prudent measures" anyone who violated it.⁴ Publication of names of violators during this period was also a common form of expressing disapproval and of communicating the names of persons to be socially boycotted. In Boston in July 1769, for example, it was resolved to print the names of violators of the economic boycott agreement.⁵

Social boycotts were again used during 1774-75 to gain compliance with the program of economic and political noncooperation known as the Continental Association, adopted in October 1774 by the First Continental Congress. For example, the Maryland convention in December 1774, in seeking means to enforce the nonimportation, nonconsumption and nonexportation policy of the Continental Association, resolved that lawyers should not prosecute suits for persons who violated this policy and should not seek to recover debts for stores where such violators served as managers.⁶ Similar action in support of the Continental Association campaign was also reported from Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts Bay, New Hampshire and Maryland.⁷ In Massachusetts Bay, persons who had in violation of the colonists' policy of political noncooperation accepted Crown appointments as members of the Council were branded as "infamous Betrayers of their Country" whose names should be published "as Rebels against the States," in order that they might be "handed down to Posterity with the Infamy they deserve . . ."⁸

Following Tsar Nicholas II's autocratic abolition of the Finnish constitution by the February Manifesto of 1901, the Finns split into two groups: the "Compliants," who approved of submission to the change, and the "Constitutionalists," who favored uncompromising rejection of the new system and refusal to obey laws or decrees issued under it. During the disobedience campaign which followed, the underground leadership group, known as *Kagal*, called for social boycott of the "Compliants":

According to the "Citizen's Catechism" published by the *Kagal*, those who advocated compliance should be treated in daily life like carriers of the plague or violent criminals. Contacts between relatives and friends were broken off if they happened to take opposite sides in the conflict; they did their shopping in different stores and deposited their savings in different banks; and, in one town, a new secondary school was founded because families belonging to opposite political camps did not want their children to attend the same institution.⁹

The social boycott was also used by Indian nationalists against Indians who refused to join the noncooperation movement during the non-violent struggles for independence. In this case the avowed aim was not to penalize the dissenter but to remind him constantly of his antisocial attitude and behavior, which put him beyond the pale of social intercourse. No physical harm was done to him or his relatives; in fact, the *satyagrahis* usually saw to it that all his primary needs, such as food, shelter, clothing, and water, were filled. The boycotted person had a standing invitation to see his error, correct it, and "rejoin" the community. (Gandhi strongly reproved the occasionally overzealous enforcers of the social boycott during the 1930-31 campaign, especially when the boycotted persons were denied food.)

After Gandhi's imprisonment early in that struggle, V.J. Patel, a prominent Indian nationalist, urged the social boycott of all government employees for the duration of Gandhi's imprisonment. On June 27, 1930, the All-India Working Committee of the Congress called upon the people ". . . to organize and enforce a strict social boycott of all Government officials and others known to have participated directly in the atrocities committed upon the people to stifle the national movement."¹⁰ In Gandhi's view the social boycott could be permissible or not, depending upon the spirit and manner in which it was carried out. Boycotted persons, for example, should be supplied with food, water and medical care, and the boycotters should not feel hatred or vindictiveness against those boycotted; instead, the attitude should be sorrow, concern and hope that they would rejoin the community by stopping their help to the British government. When Gandhi returned from the Round Table Conference in 1931, the All-India Working Committee modified its earlier instructions by reminding the people that: "Social boycott with the intention of inflicting injury on Government officers, police or anti-nationalists should not be undertaken and is wholly inconsistent with the spirit of nonviolence."¹¹

Now we turn to the second use of social boycotts in resistance movements. Individual members of one's own group who have served the opponent in particular ways seen to be traitorous (as political police or puppet officials) or who have clearly defied instructions for a specific noncooperation campaign (as strikebreakers) have often been subjected to social boycott. For example, early twentieth-century American trade unionists often refused to work with nonunionists and practiced social boycott against strikebreakers ("scabs") by avoiding their boarding-houses and restaurants. The local unions circulated lists of strikebreakers to others of the same trade in different cities, thus preventing their admittance to membership.¹²

There are also Irish, Polish, and Czech examples. In the struggle against British rule of Ireland, the social boycott was directed against members of the Royal Irish Constabulary and their families in 1919. Unlike the British police, the R.I.C. carried guns, and many of the members were quartered in barracks throughout Ireland. Charles L. Mowat reports: "A policy of ostracism, including the refusal to sell food to members, demoralized the force far more than a few murders or the threat of more; the men were mostly Irish and resigned in large numbers, and no new recruits came forward." This was described by Mowat as "the most successful weapon in 1919 . . ." ¹³ The social boycott was similarly used in Poland during the Nazi occupation. There, the underground government's Directorate of Civilian Resistance, which was charged with keeping Poland clear of traitors and collaborators during the German occupation, used the sentence of "infamy" as an alternative to a death sentence:

A Pole was sentenced to "infamy" who did not follow the prescribed "stiff attitude toward the occupant" and was unable to justify his conduct when asked to do so by us. It meant social ostracism, and was also the basis for criminal proceedings to be held after the war. ¹⁴

As an example, one might cite the sentence of "infamy" which was imposed on a Polish actress who kept a theater open in violation of the underground's specific orders. Her name was published in all the underground papers. ¹⁵

In late August 1968, after the Russian invasion, social boycott and the public "naming" of Czech collaborators or potential collaborators were important means in helping to prevent the early establishment of a pro-Russian puppet government. The Czech Union of Journalists urged in a printed leaflet, probably on August 24: "Help each other and stand together. Ostracize the traitors, ostracize their families. Do not help them." ¹⁶ Posters in Prague streets named persons believed to be collaborators; as a result, one of these persons, Karel Mestek, sent a letter to the National Assembly dissociating himself from the occupiers. ¹⁷

Officials, police and troops of a foreign regime are often subjected to social boycott—the third use we are exploring. This is sometimes applied to members of visiting delegations or commissions. For example, in Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland noncooperation with the 1960 visiting Monckton Commission from London was frequently extended beyond political noncooperation to refusal to have any social relationship with its members. ¹⁸ Then there is the case of the policemen who were sta-

tioned in the town of Kilmallock, Ireland, during a rent strike in June 1881. The British had not provided them with means of travel and the villagers would have nothing to do with them, with the following results:

These men had much difficulty in providing themselves even with food, being "boycotted." The licensed publicans refused them the use of any public conveyance, which rendered the men almost powerless to act on an emergency outside the town. ¹⁹

During the 1923 *Ruhrkampf*, members of the French and Belgian occupation forces in the Ruhr were boycotted socially by Germans; when the soldiers entered a tavern for a drink, the German guests would promptly leave. ²⁰ Similar treatment was also accorded German troops in Denmark during the Nazi occupation. Throughout the four years of occupation, some soldiers were never spoken to by civilians in Denmark; the Danes would walk away without replying when spoken to by Germans, and shoppers would either remain silent or leave when Germans entered a store. ²¹ In Norway the social boycott was sometimes carried to such an extreme that Norwegians would look right through German soldiers as though they did not even exist and would never speak. Refusal to sit beside German soldiers on streetcars was widespread, and it was finally made an offense to stand when there was an empty seat. ²² In addition, social boycott was also at times used against Norwegians who either collaborated with the opponent or refused to join resistance activities. ²³

In 1959 Breton peasants in France used various types of social boycott. Under syndicalist leadership, the artichoke growers attempted to raise prices of that vegetable by reducing the supply of artichoke buds to growers elsewhere. The Artichoke Committee proposed forms of the social boycott as means of enforcing this ban, Suzanne Berger reports. In a circular to district leaders, the Artichoke Committee recommended that a peasant who violated the ban should first be visited by a few of his neighbors. If he persisted in selling the buds for growing artichoke plants, the entire neighborhood was to visit him. That failing, he should be removed as a member of all agricultural organizations, ostracized, refused all neighborly help, and publicly shamed. (Provision was also made for final resort to certain minor acts of damage to property, such as deflating tires or putting sugar in gasoline, if the social boycott provisions failed.) ²⁴

After a short period during which the Czechs and Slovaks engaged in extensive arguments with Russian soldiers in Prague in late August 1968, a period of deliberate ostracism of Soviet soldiers followed. This

was urged on Czechs and Slovaks by the resistance radio and leaflets. By August 23 (troops invaded the night of August 20) it was already reported that "nobody talks to the Soviet soldiers any more. The people are passing by and pay no attention to them. But you can see everywhere written in large letters in the Russian alphabet: 'Go HOME!' 'DON'T SHOOT AT US!'"²⁵

56. Selective social boycott

Instead of a social boycott being total or near-total, it may be restricted to one or more particular types of relationship. These particular relationships may have been chosen as a result of a tactical decision, or they may simply happen to be the main points of contact between the particular resisters and the opponent. Thus, shopkeepers or traders may be willing to speak to occupation troops but refuse to sell them anything. This type of social noncooperation differs from a "traders' boycott," which is an economic boycott, because here it is not a refusal to sell the *item* in question, but to sell it to the *particular person*. Hence the act is not economic but social noncooperation. During the *Ruhrkampf*, for example, shopkeepers refused to serve French and Belgian soldiers.²⁶ And in 1956 during the British and French occupation of Port Said at the time of the Suez invasion, Egyptian street peddlers observed a complete boycott of British and French forces, and Egyptian merchants in the European quarter of the city closed down their shops.²⁷

A selective social boycott may, of course, take quite different forms having nothing to do with trading. Following the shooting of peaceful demonstrators in St. Petersburg on "Bloody Sunday," January 9, 1905, for example, the Merchants Club barred its doors to Guards officers because of their participation in the firings.²⁸ In January 1917 a sharp exchange took place at the Winter Palace between the President of the *Duma*, M.V. Rodzyanko, and the Minister of the Interior, A.D. Protopopov (who was regarded as Enemy Number One of the "progressive forces"). Later, while waiting for the Tsar, Protopopov approached Rodzyanko, obviously intending to shake hands. An eyewitness reported the following scene:

In one of these groups I saw the heavy figure of Rodzyanko. Protopopov approached him, and wishing him a happy New Year, proffered his hand. The impolite Rodzyanko, without even turning, pronounced in a resounding voice: "Go away! Do not touch me."

. . . . The incident at once became known all over the palace, and by that evening was the talk of all Petrograd.

George Katkov describes this refusal to shake hands as "a calculated discourtesy with political significance."²⁹

On March 7, 1917, five days after the abdication of Tsar Nicholas II, a special commission from the *Duma* arrived at Mogilev, where Nicholas then was, with the news that the Provisional Government had decided to put him under arrest. The delegation and the ex-Tsar, accompanied by ten soldiers, then traveled by train from Mogilev to the palace at Tsarskoe Selo. There Nicholas invited the *Duma* Commissars to dinner. The invitation was refused.³⁰

57. Lysistratic nonaction

The prescription for stopping war contained in Aristophanes' play *Lysistrata*—that wives should refuse sexual relations with their bellicose husbands—is so special a form of selective social boycott that it merits individual classification. This method has been applied on at least two known occasions. Stan Steiner reports that at the beginning of the seventeenth century the women of the Iroquois Indian nation conducted the "first feminist rebellion in the U.S.":

The year was 1600, or thereabouts, when these tribal feminists decided that they had had enough of unregulated warfare by their men. Lysistratas among the Indian women proclaimed a boycott on love-making and childbearing. Until the men conceded to them the power to decide upon war and peace, there would be no more warriors. Since the Iroquois men believed that women alone knew the secret of birth, the feminist rebellion was instantly successful.³¹

In late December 1963 the African women in the Mpopoma township in Bulawayo, Southern Rhodesia, sought the wider agreement of wives to deny their husbands all marital rights until an outbreak of bombings and explosions had ceased.³²

58. Excommunication³³

One of the forms of social and religious sanctions which churches may apply is excommunication, that is, excluding an individual or group from membership and the associated privileges and participation. This form of social noncooperation is initiated by the leadership of the church, rather than individual members. While such action may at times be

prompted by purely personal factors (i.e., excommunication of an individual for conduct considered morally objectionable), in other instances these forms of social noncooperation have been used in political and social struggles.

Excommunication and interdict (discussed below) were both politically crucial sanctions in Europe during the medieval period, when the Church had a great share in temporal power and final political as well as religious allegiance belonged to the Pope. Thus excommunication of a secular ruler might lead to a popular withdrawal of authority and revolution.

During the late eleventh century there was a struggle between Pope Gregory VII and Emperor Henry IV of the Holy Roman Empire (an area now centering upon present-day Germany and Austria). After Henry had associated with excommunicates (a form of social disobedience), he drove an invested archbishop from Milan; in 1076, at a council at Worms, he referred to the Pope as a false monk. At this point:

Gregory answered by excommunicating and deposing Henry himself—and the news made all men tremble. Henry's rebellious subjects in Saxony made it so clear that they would throw off the yoke of an excommunicate prince, that Henry was driven to circumvent them by submitting. Making a hasty winter journey into Lombardy, and finding Gregory at Canossa, one of the Alpine strongholds of the countess Matilda of Tuscany, he waited three days in the snow of the courtyard as a penitent, imploring release from excommunication. He had appealed from the statesman in Gregory to the priest, and on the fourth day, against the interests of the statesman, Gregory absolved him.³⁴

Nevertheless, certain of the Saxon rebels elected a rival emperor in 1077. After a civil war in which neither side accepted the intervention of the Pope, Gregory again excommunicated Henry in 1080, and Henry reacted by designating a rival pope and establishing him in Rome. The struggle was never finally decided.³⁵

Excommunication was also used in the United States as a weapon of antislavery forces during the struggle over abolition in the mid-nineteenth century. Often slaveholders were either excommunicated or prevented from joining churches on account of their practice.³⁶

59. Interdict

The interdict is the suspension of religious services and other religious activities in a given district or country for a specific period, by the decision of the leadership of the church.

An interdict, although it may be partially punitive in nature, usually has as its primary goal the coercion of a government or population to rectify specific grievances, which may be either strictly religious or (more often) partially political. The pressure is imposed by depriving the district of religious services, sacraments, or canonical burial, or a combination of these. A canon of Pope Innocent II described the interdict as *cessatio a divinatorum celebratione*.³⁷ Edward B. Krehbiel, an authority on the interdict, has written that

... the purpose of the interdict is to secure compliance with demands made by the church on some offender against the welfare of society, church, or priesthood, or against the laws of faith and morals. It is compulsion by a form of passive resistance. It is not an aggressive act and not a punishment; it is a defensive act by which the church withdraws from public service until society "plays fair."³⁸

Thus Innocent III placed under interdict London and the land under the barons who opposed King John after he repudiated the Magna Charta; the Lombard cities were disciplined for reforming their league with the intention of resisting Frederick II; and as early as 1031 the Council of Limoges threatened interdiction for the robber barons who fought in violation of the Peace of God.³⁹

NONCOOPERATION WITH SOCIAL EVENTS, CUSTOMS AND INSTITUTIONS

60. Suspension of social and sports activities

Social noncooperation may take the form of cancellation of, or refusal to arrange, social and sports activities. This type of social noncooperation may be intended either as a protest by renunciation (hence related to the methods of nonviolent protest and persuasion), or as an attempt to counter efforts (usually by the government) to initiate new controls over the society (hence related to political noncooperation). This method is classed here because it is social in form, although it may be political in intent or result.

During the 1940-45 occupation Norwegians continually refused in one way or another to cooperate in sports activities, both with the Germans and with the Norwegian fascist party, the *Nasjonal Samling*.⁴⁰ As early as the summer of 1940 German officers sought to have German-Norwegian football matches. Only a few were played before they

were halted, in accordance with a policy adopted in 1939 by both national Norwegian sports organizations prohibiting matches with foreign teams, in support of strict Norwegian neutrality. The prohibition provided a good basis for declining German overtures.

Germans then tried to join Norwegian sports clubs, and officers especially sought out tennis clubs. Everywhere the Norwegians succeeded in declining such an influx of unwanted members. Where German pressure was most persistent, it was settled that the Germans might requisition or rent the tennis courts one or two days a week, but club members stayed away on those days, thwarting Nazi attempts to build friendships with their "Germanic brothers in the North."

Various Norwegian fascist and German attempts were made in September 1940 to establish controls over sports organizations. On October 1 the new Minister of Labor Services and Sports, Axel Stang, ordered the prohibition against international sports contests lifted. Sports organizations' officials, however, insisted on continued freedom and self-determination of sports organizations, without party agitation or interference. On November 4 the annual meetings of sports organizations were banned by the Department for Labor Services and Sports. The steering committee of Norway's Sports Association sent a circular letter to their branches concerning the fascist efforts to establish party control over the sports organizations, and announced that the committee felt unable to continue its activities. No instructions or recommendations for action were given to members. On November 22, Stang announced State control of Norway's Sports Association, with prohibition of dissolution of the constituent organizations; there would be no more elected officials and "Leaders" would be named for each sports organization. A protest letter was drafted by sports officials and sent to Stang; this was later distributed in circulars and illegal papers throughout the country. These officials withdrew, stating that all responsibility now lay with the State Minister.

The members of sports clubs throughout the country now took the initiative—action occurred almost immediately. Plans for wrestling matches between Norway and Denmark had already begun. When the *Nasjonal Samling* (N.S.) official arrived in Tønsberg, where the matches were to be held, he was told that the sixty-four scheduled Norwegian wrestlers had all stayed away. "And thereby the sports front was really created," wrote Olaf Helset, who had been the Chairman of Norway's Sports Association before N.S. control. "Now it was clear that the active sports youths would have nothing to do with the 'New Order.' Now it was necessary to hold the front."⁴¹ With few exceptions, all the activities

of the fascist-controlled sports organizations were boycotted, including participation in and attendance at official sports events and contests. The sports strike was not simply conducted on the basis of orders from above, but arose from the rank-and-file members in the sports clubs throughout the country. Illegal and unofficial sports contests in track, skiing, football and tennis were held, however, with high attendance, while official matches attracted almost no spectators.

Helset, later a Major General in the Norwegian Army, described the sports strike as: ". . . the unconditional *no* to every demand for participation in sports contests in which Germans were present, and to the edict to be part of the sports movement for the 'New Order' . . ." Furthermore, he added, "its moral significance for the whole resistance movement lay both in that it was the first organized rally against the German administrative attack and in that it continued under all pressures as long as the war lasted."⁴² Thomas Wyller, a Norwegian political scientist analyzing the occupation resistance, points out that the action of the sportsmen "became an example which showed the way when other organizations later were confronted with the choice between existing in a new form or laying down their activities." The sports strike conveyed throughout the whole country the eye-opening message that the Norwegian people were still involved in struggle.⁴³

One of the most prominent historians of this period, Magne Skodvin, writes:

The sports strike extended over the whole country and gathered the greater part of the youth. When the sports people disappeared from the sports grounds—and from the newspaper columns, when they stopped appearing officially completely, then one had either to be very stupid, or very much like a hermit, not to notice it. The Germans and N.S. suffered a serious defeat when the sportsmen refused to play, and no tolerably awake Norwegian could be blind to the pattern which was thereby given.⁴⁴

The sports strike was not officially broken until June 3, 1945, when parades of thousands of sportsmen and crowds of people all over Norway celebrated the end of the struggle and the initiation of new uninhibited sports activities. (Parts of this example are also associated with political noncooperation.)

This method took a somewhat different form in Portugal where in the spring of 1962 students in Coimbra suspended their social and sports activities as a protest against the government; this was intended as a

protest by renunciation rather than as an attempt to counter governmental efforts to initiate new controls.⁴⁵

61. Boycott of social affairs

A spirit of resistance may also be expressed by a corporate refusal to attend certain social affairs, such as receptions, banquets, parties, concerts and the like. During the Nazi occupation, for example, the Danes refused to attend concerts of German military music.⁴⁶ In late 1940 and early 1941 a wave of "cinema strikes" occurred in Norway in which patrons boycotted the cinemas. These began in Stavanger, where the local cinema board was dismissed for refusing to allow members of Quisling's elite organization (the *Hird*) to enter free. Cinema-going was then suspended elsewhere, culminating in the Oslo cinema strike in February.⁴⁷ (This example is also related to the economic boycott.) In Poland during the same period the underground forbade Poles to patronize cinemas and theaters which had been started by the Germans. In 1942 the underground determined that Polish theaters as well as German-operated theaters should be boycotted, and that no Pole should operate such a theater. Jan Karski reports that the predominant reason was that "no Pole could be allowed to forget, even for two hours, what was happening in his country, or to amuse himself. It was forbidden to interrupt the fight and insurrection in permanence against the invader."⁴⁸

62. Student strike

Students and pupils of all types of schools, from elementary schools to universities, may as a means of protest or resistance temporarily refuse to attend classes. Or they may refuse to cooperate in a related way—by boycotting only some, not all, lectures, for example;⁴⁹ or students may attend classes but refuse to pay attention, as was done at the University of Madrid in 1965 as part of the campaign for an independent student union.⁵⁰ Possible variations are legion. It is more usual, however, for all classes to be boycotted. (Student strikes are also called school boycotts or class boycotts.)

The student strike has long been widely used in China, Latin America, and to a lesser degree Africa;⁵¹ in 1970 following the United States' invasion of Cambodia it became a prominent part of university life in the United States. The student strike is not a modern invention, as the Chinese examples show. Student strikes in China have sometimes taken

the form of refusal to take the examinations, sometimes in protest against the lack of impartiality by the examiners. In an edict of 1673, for example, the K'ang-hsi emperor noted that "young scholars in the provinces often went on strike in the local examinations, as a result of their quarrel with local functionaries." The Yung-cheng emperor also noted the same type of action in 1734. This type of student strike was also reported from districts of Kwangtung in 1851, this time in protest against action of the magistrates on taxes and money matters.⁵²

Other examples include the strike in May 1935 of students at the Belleville Township High School, near St. Louis, in the United States, in protest against the firing for political reasons of teachers with seniority;⁵³ the 1960 walkout of half the students at the Jesuit secondary school at Chikuni, Northern Rhodesia, in protest against the expulsion of fourteen boys who, in connection with political agitation, had refused to obey orders;⁵⁴ and the sit-down strike by pupils at the Fort Jameson Secondary and Grades Schools, Northern Rhodesia (now Zambia), in March 1960, for the purpose of asking that "political" visits to the schools, such as by the visiting Monckton Commission, be stopped.⁵⁵

In 1899 there was a student strike in all universities of the Russian Empire, in protest against the flogging of some students by the police in St. Petersburg.⁵⁶ During the 1905 Revolution the student strike which had begun in February was called off in the autumn in order to open the lecture halls to the public for revolutionary talks and discussions in the evenings.⁵⁷ During the Egyptian noncooperation movement of 1919, strikes of schoolboys and students became so frequent that the government had to issue a special order to counter them.⁵⁸ The noncooperation movement which toppled Guatemalan strongman Jorge Ubico in June 1944 began with a strike of students at the National University.⁵⁹ In the Netherlands in the winter of 1940-41 students at Delft and Leiden went on strike in protest against the dismissal of Jewish professors.⁶⁰ Early in 1955 students at the East German University of Greifswald went on strike against a government decree transforming the medical faculty into a military school of medicine directed by the "People's Police."⁶¹

Student strikes may also be directed against certain grievances directly associated with the schools. This was the case in Glasgow in the autumn of 1963 when parents refused to send their children to school because of school arrangements requiring children to cross a dangerous unfenced canal. Instead, the parents organized their own classes.⁶² Similar stu-

dent strikes have been held in the United States to protest *de facto* racial segregation and bad conditions in schools; this happened in New York City on January 3, 1964, when nearly a half million pupils stayed at home⁶³ and on February 3, 1964, when forty-four percent of the city's total school population was absent. In the latter case substitute private "freedom schools" were held for the children.⁶⁴ In neither case were the teachers on strike. In Chicago on October 22, 1963, 224,000, or ninety percent, of the Negro children stayed away as a protest, and on February 25, 1964, also in Chicago, 172,000 Negro pupils were absent.⁶⁵ New York City whites have also applied short-term school boycotts in protest against steps to desegregate neighborhood schools.⁶⁶

Following the United States invasion of Cambodia in May 1970, American colleges and universities, and even some high schools, experienced a wave of student strikes without precedent in United States history. According to the *Newsletter* of the National Strike Information Center at Brandeis University, as of May 10 there were 142 high schools on strike or scheduled to strike, and on May 9, 431 colleges and universities were reported on strike.⁶⁷

63. Social disobedience⁶⁸

This is the disobedience of social customs or the rules, regulations, or practices of a nongovernmental social institution (a religious body, club, economic organization, or the like).⁶⁹ Such social disobedience may take many forms—for example, breaking factory regulations (short of striking) or disobeying ecclesiastical orders or violating standard forms of speech, dress and behavior. In other cases, persons who disapprove of a social boycott against certain people may fraternize with them, thereby practicing social disobedience. Persons in India who reject untouchability have often deliberately fraternized with untouchables, defying both the religious taboo and social customs. Although social disobedience may not challenge the government at all, or do so only indirectly, there may nevertheless be a counteraction from those offended by the disobedience. Such retaliation may or may not involve action by police. Violation by U.S. civil rights workers of social taboos against social equality between Negroes and "whites" has sometimes aroused extreme violent responses from archsegregationists. The murder in Mississippi, during the 1964 campaign for Negro voter registration, of James Chaney, Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner, one Mississippi Negro and two New York "whites," is one example.⁷⁰

64. Withdrawal from social institutions

During conflicts members of various types of social organizations and institutions may, as a means of expressing their views, either resign membership or withhold participation in the body without actually canceling membership. The examples here refer to religious groups, but this method may be applied to other institutions.

In the 1830s, after the failure of attempts to persuade the churches in the United States to take a stronger stand against slavery, many Garrisonian abolitionists took the radical step of withdrawing membership from their traditional denominations: thus in 1840 an abolitionist editor named Rogers withdrew from the Congregational Church of Plymouth, New Hampshire, after having urged it to no avail to denounce all slaveholding congregations and ministers, and fellowship with them. General Agent Wright of the Nonresistance Society (a group actually dedicated to moral nonviolent resistance) excommunicated his church in the same year before it had a chance to excommunicate him; and Congregational deacon Amos Wood, also a member of the Nonresistance Society in Concord, New Hampshire, had withdrawn from his church and was attending "a little meeting of anti-slavery worshippers."⁷¹ (Where members withdraw because a political party or the State has taken control over their organization, this is classed as boycott of government-supported organizations, a method of political noncooperation.)

WITHDRAWAL FROM THE SOCIAL SYSTEM

65. Stay-at-home

The stay-at-home is often applied in close association with forms of the strike or the *hartal*, although it may be practiced entirely after working hours. In this form of noncooperation the population as a whole remains at home for a set period, usually for a political motive. Normally, the stay-at-home will last a short period, such as one or two days. It is usually organized, although it may be spontaneous. In addition to reducing the chances of "incidents," it may serve to demonstrate to the opponent the degree of unity and self-discipline among the population.

This method has been used in South Africa on several occasions. A one-day stay-at-home was held in that country on June 26, 1950, for example, to protest against the Group Areas Bill and the Suppression of

Communism Bill, and also to mourn the dead of the liberation struggle. It was especially effective in Johannesburg, Port Elizabeth and Durban.⁷² Another was held following the shootings in Sharpeville, in March 1960.⁷³ After the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 was crushed and it was announced that former Premier Imre Nagy and others had been executed, people in Budapest conducted a stay-at-home in the evenings, leaving the streets and places of entertainment deserted.⁷⁴

66. Total personal noncooperation

Very rarely, there have been cases in which a prisoner has literally refused to do almost everything except breathe because he believed his arrest to be unjust for moral or political reasons. The best known case is that of Corbett Bishop, an American religious conscientious objector during World War II. Bishop had initially cooperated with the alternative service program provided for conscientious objectors—Civilian Public Service—but over a period of time he concluded that his beliefs required him to discontinue cooperation in *any* form. Refusing to continue C.P.S. work, Bishop was arrested on September 9, 1944; he announced that his spirit was free and that if the arresting officers wanted his body, they would have to take it without any help from him. In the federal prison at Milan, Michigan, he refused to eat, stand up or dress himself. He was force-fed by tube. After eighty-six days he was brought to trial for walking out of C.P.S. camp, but the judge released him without bond until a decision could be made. Bishop refused to return to court and was rearrested in Philadelphia on February 20, 1945. Bishop then went limp and remained limp during his later hearings. He told the U.S. Commissioner: "I am not going to cooperate in any way, shape or form. I was carried in here. If you hold me, you'll have to carry me out. War is wrong, I don't want any part of it." His limp body was carried into the court in Philadelphia on February 26. Shortly afterward, he was returned to Grand Rapids, where he was fined and sentenced to four years in prison. Bishop continued his complete personal noncooperation and finally, after 144 days, he was paroled without signing any papers or making any promises, under the Special Parole Plan of Executive Order 8641. He was, however, expected to work on a cooperative farm in Georgia, and when he refused to do so he was again arrested, on September 1 in Berea, Ohio, this time as a parole violator. Bishop again went limp, resumed his full noncooperation, and was returned to the Milan prison to finish his uncompleted sentence. After continued refusal

by Bishop to do *anything*, and considerable newspaper publicity, the Department of Justice on March 12, 1946, released him on parole, with no conditions and without his signing anything; he returned to his home in Hamilton, Alabama, thus ending 193 days of continuous and total personal noncooperation.⁷⁵

67. "Flight" of workers

This precursor of the strike involved both a cessation of work by the peasants or workers and their leaving their homes and fleeing elsewhere, without demands or conditions being stated for their return. In the Egyptian cases described below the withdrawal seems usually to have been intended to be temporary, though not necessarily short, while in the Russian cases the "flight" seems to have been intended to be permanent, as was usually the case with African slaves in America.

When peasant conditions were intolerable in ancient Egypt the peasants resorted to "flights to the temples to seek the protection of gods or to the swamps and the desert . . ." ⁷⁶ These cases have important features in common with the next method in this class, "sanctuary." This was a "characteristic feature of Egyptian life" and continued at least into the second century A.D.⁷⁷ M. Rostovtzeff writes:

When the demands [of the State] became intolerable and made life a heavy burden for any group of natives, they resorted to passive resistance, to strikes. A strike was a resolve to submit the case to the judgement of the god, and was effected by leaving their usual place of residence and taking refuge in a temple. Here the strikers remained in idle resignation until the wrong was redressed or compulsion was used to make them resume work. In Greek terminology these strikes were called "secessions" . . .⁷⁸

Under the severe conditions prevailing in the Roman Empire during the first and second centuries, ". . . we hear repeatedly of villages refusing to pay taxes or to perform compulsory work and resorting to the ancient Egyptian practice of striking, that is to say, leaving the villages and taking refuge in the swamps of the Delta."⁷⁹ During the reign of Emperor Commodus (176-192 A.D.), "The numbers of those who fled from the villages of Egypt to the swamps of the Delta to escape the burden of levies, compulsory work, and taxes became so large that the fugitives . . . , under the leadership of a priest, could challenge the imperial government."⁸⁰

"Flight" as a type of strike in the Roman Empire was not limited to Egypt, however, for one petition to Emperor Commodus from tenants-peasants on an imperial estate elsewhere in North Africa warned that if their grievances were not righted, "we will flee to some place where we may live as free men."⁸¹

In the 1860s and 1870s Russian workers of peasant origin sometimes rebelled against extremely severe working conditions by collectively leaving their jobs and returning to peasant life. In 1860 and 1861, for example, mine workers and those engaged in constructing roads and new railway lines refused to continue to work under existing conditions:

The most serious cases involved not so much abstention from work as "flight"—desertion, intended to be irrevocable, by those who had some hope or possibility of obtaining a piece of land and so resuming their normal lives as peasants. Movements of this kind occurred, for instance, among the men digging the New Canal at Ladoga and other similar undertakings. In one case, in 1861, at least fifty workers were flogged for leaving their work.⁸²

Venturi reports that "a few concessions" quickly ended most of these protests. This particular method continued to be used for some years. It clearly was not regarded as a means by which individuals changed jobs, but rather as a means for collective resistance. Venturi adds that between 1870 and 1879 in the Russian Empire there were forty-nine cases in which desertion of work was carried out in an "organized way."⁸³ "Flight" was still the means of defence to which the workers sometimes resorted to escape from conditions when they became too oppressive."⁸⁴ Where the withdrawal is permanent, this method is closely related to the method of protest emigration described below, although a change in political jurisdiction may not be involved.

Temporary or permanent flight was also used by African slaves in the United States. Slaves who were hired out by their owners to other masters sometimes ran away from the new masters, either returning to their owner or remaining in hiding until they decided to return to work.⁸⁵ U.B. Phillips also reports this type of resistance by African slaves:

Occasionally, . . . a squad would strike in a body as a protest against severities. An episode of this sort was recounted in a letter of a Georgia overseer to his absent employer: "Sir: I write you . . . to let you know that six of your hands has left the plantation. . . They

displeased me with their work, and I give some of them a few lashes . . . On Wednesday morning they were missing. I think they are lying out until they can see you or your uncle Jack . . ."

The slaves could not negotiate directly at such a time, but while they lay in the woods they might make overtures to the overseer through slaves on a neighboring plantation as to terms upon which they would return to work, or they might await their master's post-haste arrival and appeal to him for a redress of grievances. Humble as their demeanor might be, their power of renewing the pressure by repeating their act could not be ignored.⁸⁶

Frederick Olmsted, a traveler through the slave states in the 1850s, reported cases of flights to "the swamp" by slaves in response to excessive work demands or cruel treatment.

The slave, if he is indisposed to work, and especially if he is not treated well, or does not like the master who has hired him, will sham sickness—even make himself sick or lame—that he need not work. But a more serious loss frequently arises, when the slave, thinking he is worked too hard, or being angered by punishment or unkind treatment, "getting the sulks," takes to "the swamp," and comes back when he has a mind to. Often this will not be till the year is up for which he is engaged, when he will return to his owner, who, glad to find his property safe, and that it has not died in the swamp, or gone to Canada, forgets to punish him, and immediately sends him for another year to a new master.⁸⁷

The importance of "flight" in the slave struggle is also emphasized by Herbert Apteker, who points to its role in producing bargaining:

The method most commonly pursued was for the Negroes to flee to outlying swamps or forests, and to send back word that only if their demands—perhaps for better food or clothes, or fewer beatings, shorter hours, or even a new overseer—were met (or, at least, discussed) would they willingly return. It is interesting to observe that during the Civil War the slaves added a new demand, the payment of money wages, and at times won, thus "lifting themselves by their own bootstraps" from chattels to wage workers.⁸⁸

The latter is potentially of extreme significance as it points to the possibility of self-liberation by nonviolent struggle by the slaves themselves.

African slaves in the United States also undertook "flight" as a

means of full escape from slavery by leaving slave territory. One of the early places to which they went was Spanish Florida. In the 1730s many slaves escaped into the Spanish territory of Florida, where they had been promised—and received—freedom under Spanish law. A royal decree had been issued in 1733 to the effect that all fugitive slaves reaching Florida would be permitted to live there as freemen.⁸⁹

Later, many slaves, often with the help of abolitionist groups, escaped to Northern states and frequently went on to Canada. The escape network, called the Underground Railroad, enabled many to reach freedom. Their legal status in Northern states, however, varied from state to state and changed with legislation and court decisions; these particular “flights” therefore have characteristics of both “flight” and protest emigrations in varying proportions.

68. Sanctuary⁹⁰

Sanctuary is an unusual method whereby an individual or, more often, a group of people important to the opponent withdraws to a place where they cannot be touched without violation of religious, moral, social or legal prohibitions. Such violation would, in turn, put the opponent in a new and difficult situation. Temples, churches and other holy places have frequently been such places of refuge. When ancient Egyptian peasants took “flight” to temples, as described in the preceding method, they were using a combination of flight and sanctuary; when they went to hide in the swamps they were using only the method of “flight.” There are examples within both the Christian and the Islamic traditions.

In medieval Christian Europe even professed murderers and felons, as well as the innocent, could obtain safety within the sanctuary of shrines and sacred places. The present status of sanctuary in Roman Catholic ecclesiastical law is defined in canon 1179 of the still authoritative *Codex juris canonici* promulgated by Pope Benedict XV in 1917, which is based on earlier codes and laws.⁹¹

During 1968 the idea of sanctuary was revived in the United States within the context of resistance to military conscription. First in churches and later in universities, a kind of symbolic sanctuary was offered to young men wanted for arrest on grounds of disobedience to military conscription orders. The Rev. William Sloane Coffin delivered a sermon which discussed the subject at a “Service of Acceptance” at the Arlington Street Unitarian-Universalist Church in Boston, when three hundred young men turned their draft cards over to clergymen. Coffin said:

Now if in the Middle Ages churches could offer sanctuary to the most common of criminals, could they not today do the same for the most conscientious among us? . . . should a church declare itself a “sanctuary for conscience” this should be considered less a means to shield a man, more a means to expose a church, an effort to make a church really a church.

For if the state should decide that the arm of the law was long enough to reach inside a church there would be little church members could do to prevent an arrest. But the members could point out what they had already dramatically demonstrated, that the sanctity of conscience was being violated.⁹²

On May 20, 1968, that Boston church offered sanctuary to Robert Talmanson and William Chase, both wanted for acts of disobedience to military duty. On May 23 they were arrested. Talmanson, going limp, was carried from the pulpit where he was reading from the writings of Lao-tse. A Roman Catholic priest, Father Anthony Mullaney, told arresting officers as they entered that they were about “to violate a moral sanctuary.” He and another priest were among those beaten outside the church and arrested.

Similar cases of sanctuary took place in Providence, Rhode Island, and churches in New York City, Detroit and San Francisco declared themselves open to those seeking sanctuary.⁹³ After sanctuaries were provided in chapels at the Harvard Divinity School and Boston University, a nonreligious sanctuary was conducted in the Student Center of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Other university sanctuaries were held as far apart as the City College of New York and the University of Hawaii. Noting that in the United States there was no legal recognition of the custom of sanctuary, which had once existed both in Europe and in old Hawaii, the University of Hawaii Resistance group stated: “Yet as a symbol of resistance to injustice, sanctuary remains effective today in stirring the conscience of man.”⁹⁴

Probably the most politically significant cases of the use of sanctuary occurred in the Persian Revolution in 1905-06,⁹⁵ in combination with certain other methods including the closing of bazaars. These Persian examples are sufficiently important to merit fairly detailed descriptions. Such sanctuary was powerful because the Shah’s authority was believed to derive from religious sources; hence, when Islamic leaders of Persia went into sanctuary they were in fact withdrawing the religious basis of his right to rule.

There had been various grounds for dissatisfaction with the Shah, Muzaffaru'd-Din: he was disliked for his extravagance, his love of foreign travel, the tariffs imposed by his imported Belgian officials and their arrogance, the exploitation of the country by foreign *concessionaries*, and the tyranny of his main Minister, Grand Vizier Abdu'l Hamid, who was known by his title, 'Aynu'd-Dawla. This powerful nobleman was also believed to be cooperating with the Belgians and Russians against Persian interests.

When the Shah in April 1905 undertook a pilgrimage to Mashhad, he traveled through Russian territory to reach it and was accompanied by a Russian official; there was disapproval in the Persian capital of Tehran. Many merchants therefore retired to Sháh 'Abdu'l-'Azim, a holy shrine near Tehran, and the bazaars were closed for five days.

Later, various new grievances developed. One of those was the government violence at Mashhad under the oppressive rule of *Ásaf'd-Dawla*. This official had ordered his soldiers to fire on a crowd of people who in protest against his exactions had taken refuge within the holy precincts of the Shrine of Imám Rizá. *Mullás* (Islamic teachers) and businessmen also had been beaten (*bastinadoed*).

As a result, in December 1905 a large number of merchants took sanctuary in the Royal Mosque, called Masjid-i-Shah. They were shortly joined by many of the chief *mullás*. The *Imám-Jum'a*, or prayer leader of the congregation, himself a wealthy relative of the Shah, was asked by the Grand Vizier to disperse them. After violent eviction by the followers of the *Imám-Jum'a*, the expelled *mullás* and a few others left the city and took refuge in the holy shrine of Sháh 'Abdu'l-'Azim. There was a difference in kind between a mosque and a holy shrine, a shrine being far more sacred. They were joined at the shrine by many others, *mullás* and students, including Shaykh Fazlu'lláh, who was to become famous as one of the three founders of the Constitutional Movement. The aim of this action, however, was simply the dismissal of the disliked 'Aynu'd-Dawla, the Grand Vizier; for this there was wide support.

The taking of sanctuary was known in Persian as *bast*, and those taking sanctuary were called *bastis*. Three prominent persons including the Crown Prince, Mohamed Ali Mirza, contributed large sums of money for food and other supplies for the *bastis*. The Crown Prince is reported also to have urged the *mullás* of Tabriz to support the *bast*. Despite efforts of 'Aynu'd-Dawla to prevent new volunteers and supplies from reaching the sanctuary, both got through. More *mullás* and theological students, as well as merchants and traders, joined in the *bast*. The Shah's

threats and promises failed to induce them to return to the capital of Tehran, and even a personal trip by the Amír Bahadur Jang, an army commander, accompanied by three hundred horsemen, failed to persuade the *bastis* to return from sanctuary.

The historian Edward G. Browne writes of the events of January 1906:

At length the scandal became so grave and the inconvenience so intolerable that the Sháh sent them a *dast-khatt*, or autograph letter, promising to dismiss 'Aynu'd-Dawla; to convene the 'Adálat-khána, or "House of Justice," which they now demanded, and which was to consist of representatives elected by the clergy, merchants and landed proprietors, and presided over by the Shah himself; to abolish favouritism and to make all Persian subjects equal in the eyes of the law.⁹⁶

After photographic copies of this letter had been distributed throughout the country, the *bastis* returned to Tehran with great pomp, the leaders riding in the royal carriages, and were received by the Shah, who verbally renewed his promises. However, soon there were attempts to interpret away certain of these concessions; the "House of Justice" had never been intended to be a Legislative Assembly, it was said, but only a judicial court. As the weeks went on, there were new grounds for dissatisfaction, including currency problems. Toward the end of April 1906 the *mullás* of Tehran presented a petition to the Shah, asking that the promised reforms be implemented and that he use his executive power in accord with the laws. The petition was published in the official *Gazette*, but it had no results. Things steadily got worse. Spies were everywhere. Cossacks and soldiers filled the streets. A curfew was imposed three hours after sunset. There were more protests against the Grand Vizier, 'Aynu'd-Dawla, and Islamic leaders preached sermons against autocracy and tyranny. A free National Library was set up to educate the people in patriotic ideas, and a secret society was formed.

The Shah suffered a paralytic stroke, and 'Aynu'd-Dawla decided on repression. Annoyed by the denunciations of himself from the pulpit, the Grand Vizier expelled Ágá Sayyid Jamal, who then retired to the theological center of Qum, built around the shrine of an important female saint. Then 'Aynu'd-Dawla also decided to expel Shaykh Muhammad, a very effective preacher (*Wá'iz*), who was very popular among the artisans and humble folk of the bazaars. A crowd of people gathered around the preacher and the soldiers and attempted to prevent his removal. After

Shaykh Muhammad had been imprisoned in a guardhouse, a student who was a descendant of Mohammed rushed at the door trying to free him. The soldiers disobeyed orders and refused to fire, but an officer personally killed the young man. The date was June 21, 1906. The body of the dead Sayyid Husayn was then carried through the streets and bazaars; there were rioting and clashes between people and soldiers who had tried to stop the procession. Fifteen people were killed by shootings into the crowd. The soldiers succeeded in clearing the streets and occupied the whole town. But a large number of *mullás*, *rawza-khwáns* (who recite to the common people narratives about the sufferings of Mohammed's spiritual descendants), students, merchants, tradesmen, artisans and humble people then took sanctuary in the Masjid-i-Jami, the Mosque of Assembly, in the city's center. There they buried the body of the dead student. They were besieged by soldiers for three or four days, after which the Shah granted their request for permission to leave the city and to retire to Qum, ninety miles to the south.

They left for Qum about July 21. Thousands of people joined the clerical leaders in this procession from the capital to Qum; one Persian author said the road between the two places "was like the street of a town." Among Persians this is known as "the Great Exodus" (*Hijrat-i-Kubrá*). One historian of Persia writes: "This action amounted to a withdrawal of religious sanction for the regime and thus challenged its legitimacy."⁹⁷ The Shah's permission for the *bastis* to leave the Masjid-i-Jami to go to Qum had been given on the condition that the *mujtahids* ("supreme religious judges" of the dominant Shia sect of Islam) depart from the mosque alone. On their way to Qum, these *mujtahids* issued a notice threatening to leave Persia completely unless the Shah fulfilled his promises. General Percy Sykes reports: "As their absence would stop all legal transactions, this threat was really a serious one, for it would be equivalent to placing the land under an interdict."⁹⁸

Meanwhile the bazaars and shops had been closed in protest, and 'Aynu'd-Dawla had ordered them to open, under threat of looting. On July 19 a few bankers and merchants were assured by the British *Chargé d'Affaires* that if they took refuge in the British Legation in the capital, they would be allowed to remain symbolically under British protection. A few of them proceeded at once to the Legation garden and encamped there. By July 23 their numbers had increased to 858; three days later there were five thousand, all in the Legation grounds. These merchants demanded, as the price for their return to their homes and normal activities, the dismissal of Grand Vizier 'Aynu'd-Dawla, the

promulgation of a Code of Laws, and the recall from Qum of the ecclesiastical leaders.

The Shah, greatly vexed and perplexed, decided on July 30 so far to yield to the popular demands as to dismiss 'Aynu'd-Dawla, appoint in his place the popular and liberal Mirza Nasru'lláh Khán, *Mushiru'd-Dawla*, and invite the *mullás* to return from Qum to the capital . . .⁹⁹

The people no longer trusted the Shah, however, and demanded a regular constitution, a representative National Assembly, and satisfactory guarantees of the Shah's good faith. By August 1 there were thirteen thousand persons in sanctuary at the British Legation, and the number still grew, reaching at least fourteen thousand (some said sixteen thousand). During the *bast* at the Legation, according to a British eyewitness, there were tents everywhere. People policed themselves "in a most remarkable manner" and gave little trouble; meals were cooked in enormous caldrons; and at night old, old stories were told.¹⁰⁰ For a long time the *bastis* refused direct negotiations with the Government. Finally, through the good offices of the British representative, an acceptable document was drafted. On August 5, his birthday, the Shah, Muzaffaru'd-Din, granted all the demands of the *bastis*, who then left the Legation. The hated Grand Vizier was ordered to proceed to his estate. The document the Shah issued that day has been called "The *Magna Charta* of Persia."¹⁰¹

This same eyewitness to the events reports that the 1905 Russian Revolution had had "a most astounding effect here. Events in Russia have been watched with great attention, and a new spirit would seem to have come over the people. They are tired of their rulers, and, taking examples of Russia, have come to think that it is possible to have another and better form of government."¹⁰² The writer also added, evaluating the whole moment, that after the riots, which followed the killing of the student, Sayyid:

Finding that they were unable to oppose armed resistance to the Government, the people decided to take *bast* in the British Legation, and this proved a very successful method of obtaining their ends. . . . the exiled *mullás* have asked to return, and will be brought back in triumph, and the Courts of Justice are to be established.¹⁰³

In short, writes General Sykes, "without bloodshed or civil war, the Persians had gained on paper everything demanded by their leaders."¹⁰⁴

Shortly after the Shah yielded, the religious leaders from Qum returned to the capital escorted by 'Aşudu'l-Mulk (who later became Regent) and Hájji Nizamud-Dawla. It was a day of great rejoicing over the "National Victory" (*Fath-i-Milli*). On August 19 the new House of Parliament was opened by the ailing Shah, in the presence of high ecclesiastical authorities who were the Shah's guests for three days. A few days earlier, a proclamation had been issued announcing the establishment as well of a National Consultative Assembly.

About September 8, 1906, fresh friction arose when the *mullás* refused to accept the ordinances drafted by the Prime Minister, and the Shah refused to allow the changes they demanded. Again *bastis* took sanctuary in the British Legation, and the bazaars were closed. The Shah gave way to the demands concerning electoral districts, membership in the *Majlis* (parliament), and qualifications for election. On September 17, the Shah accepted the proposed ordinance concerning the constitution of the *Majlis*, setting up a parliament of 156 members elected every two years (directly in the capital and by colleges of electors in the provinces), and providing that the deputies were to be inviolable. "Thus," writes Richard Cottam, "by utilizing the time-honored, almost sacrosanct, institution of *bast* the merchants and clergy were able to force their demands for a constitution upon the government."¹⁰⁵ Many problems still remained, but parliamentary constitutional government was thereby established:

69. Collective disappearance

At times the population of a small area, such as a village, may choose to cut off any social contact with the opponent by disappearing and abandoning their homes and village. As one example, the peasants of Kanara in South India used this method in 1799 and 1800 in opposing British attempts to establish rule over them. The British officer in charge, Sir Thomas Munro, wrote that ". . . whenever I approached a village, the inhabitants went to another, so that I was sometimes several weeks in a district without seeing one of them . . ." ¹⁰⁶

E.C. Barber, a nineteenth century English writer, reported an incident of collective disappearance which took place in central China in 1883:

"In very early times," it was said, the magistrate of a *hsien* in central China was directed by the governor "to institute a census of the population." Being dissatisfied with the returns sent in by his subordinates the magistrate undertook to count the inhabitants himself.

The population "alarmed at the pertinacity of the [official] and apprehensive that he was coming to levy some oppressive tax, fled from the city and hid themselves in the fields." The official was thus frustrated in his efforts, and hanged himself to escape the expected punishment. He left the following note:

"Men	none
Women	none
Children under 14 years of age, of both sexes	none

Total

George Taylor, in describing North China during the Japanese occupation in 1939, also cited similar instances:

So well organized are the villages now that when the Japanese approach, the people evacuate the village completely, bury their food, remove all animals and utensils, and retire into the hills. The Japanese must, therefore, bring with them everything they need.¹⁰⁸

70. Protest emigration (*hijrat*)

Protest emigration, called *hijrat* in India, is a deliberate emigration from the jurisdiction of the State responsible for certain injustices or oppression in the eyes of the resisters with the objective of expressing their disapproval and protest by this complete severance of all forms of social cooperation. Hence, only certain special cases of emigration are included here. It is sometimes intended to be permanent and at other times is intended to be temporary, especially where the opponent needs cooperation of some type from the emigrants. Joan Bondurant calls this method "voluntary exile."¹⁰⁹ Arabic in origin, the term *hijrat* (also spelled *hizrat*) derives from *hejira*, the flight of Mohammed from Mecca to Medina, which he chose instead of submission to the tyranny in Mecca.¹¹⁰

Hijrat (also called in India *deshatyaga*—giving up the country)¹¹¹ was extensively used in India during the various campaigns against specific injustices and for independence during British rule. There it was a spontaneous, though peculiar, offshoot of the various "no-tax" campaigns. In terms of Gandhi's teachings, the bravest course was for the *satyagrahis* cheerfully to suffer the worst repression which might be meted out to them, in the belief that this would have the greatest effect in achieving their goals and in melting the hearts of the opponent. However, if the resisters and population felt oppressed and unable to have

self-respect while living under such circumstances and if they lacked the strength to bear such repression—strength which came either from a deep inner conviction in *ahimsa* (nonviolence) or from the capacity (though not the willingness) to defend themselves violently—then Gandhi felt there was nothing immoral, dishonorable, or cowardly about self-imposed exile. *Hijrat* was a physical withdrawal from the territory controlled by the State, at the sacrifice of all interests which the emigrants had there. It provided a nonviolent way out of an unbearable situation.¹¹² This method has been interpreted as a final effort of noncooperation. Clearly, where large portions of the population are involved, this method becomes a form of political noncooperation and not simply an instance of nonviolent protest.

Hijrat was used by the peasants of Gujarat who migrated to Baroda (where the British had no jurisdiction) during the repression following their refusal to pay taxes during the 1930-31 campaign.¹¹³ Similarly, it was used during the 1928 Bardoli tax-refusal campaign, when peasants from Bardoli district also emigrated temporarily to Baroda.¹¹⁴

Other examples of protest emigrations range from that of the plebians in 494 B.C. to secure reforms from the patricians of the Roman Republic,¹¹⁵ described in Chapter Two, to those of various persecuted religious and political groups from Europe to America,¹¹⁶ and the mass emigrations from Hungary during the 1956 Revolution.¹¹⁷ It is also reported by Clarence Marsh Case that similar methods were considered in China for combatting foreign control of pockets along the Chinese coast in the days when the Western powers had gained territorial enclaves in China; it was proposed to organize the population of these areas to participate in a "wholesale exodus from foreign concessions" as a drastic means of protest.¹¹⁸

Japanese peasants, especially around the middle of the nineteenth century, during the Tokugawa Period, resorted to this type of method to deal with oppressive feudal barons and corrupt officials. The peasants migrated out of the jurisdiction of their opponents and into a neighboring fief or province. These actions were called "desertions," or *chōsan*.¹¹⁹ Hugh Borton writes:

Originally, individuals would secretly desert into a neighbouring village or fief to avoid some specific grievance or hardship, but gradually the habit developed into an organized group of one or more villages leaving en masse. If the villagers crossed into the neighbouring fief or province, they would petition the lord of that fief that they

either be allowed to remain within his domain, or that he intervene on their behalf.¹²⁰

Chōsan was most prevalent in the early part of the Tokugawa Period (1603-1867)¹²¹; the largest such case of the Period occurred in 1853, when some peasants in the north of the Nambu fief at Morioka, angry at the general corruption among the fief officials and their monopoly of all transactions, deserted to Sendai, a neighboring fief, asking to be allowed to live there and finally presenting their complaints to the Sendai officials.¹²² It is reported that *chōsan* were illegal and that the feudal barons would send officials out to bring back the peasants who had fled into another fief, but it is not clear whether the permission of the neighboring baron was required for such recapture. The whole feudal structure depended on the ability of the peasant to produce, and hence officials were reluctant to punish the returned peasants whose rice-producing capacity was much needed.¹²³ One estimate is that *chōsan* constituted 9.2 percent of the peasant uprisings of the Tokugawa Period.¹²⁴

In addition to the large-scale general migration from the German Democratic Republic (East Germany) prior to the building of the Berlin Wall, protest emigration from East Germany also occurred because of specific measures. For example, East German farmers in 1952 expressed their opposition to the introduction of Soviet-like cooperative farms by emigration to the West; between January and April 22, 852 farmers left.¹²⁵

Protest emigrations in large numbers may, as the above Chinese plan suggests, take on the character of political noncooperation. For example, when Frederick William of Prussia threatened them with compulsory military service in 1723, Mennonites living in East Prussia emigrated to Pennsylvania in such large numbers that the project was abandoned. New regulations of 1787 and 1801 which were intended to check the growth of the Mennonites led to a new emigration, this time to Russia, so the government again made concessions.¹²⁶ Action thus intended to enable the believers to maintain their religious principles by a total withdrawal from all relations with the interfering government, nevertheless produced political concessions.

The more usual forms of noncooperation in modern societies, however, are not social but economic, and sometimes political. It is to the two main types of economic noncooperation to which we now turn our attention.

NOTES

1. F. Sheehy-Skiffington, *Michael Davitt: Revolutionary, Agitator and Labor Leader* (London and Leipsic: T. Fisher Unwin, 1908), p. 232.
2. Schlesinger, *The Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution*, p. 77.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 111-112.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 129-130.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 162.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 504-505.
7. See *ibid.*, pp. 292, 301, 316, 319, 324 and 352, and Gipson, *The British Empire Before the American Revolution*, vol. XII, *The Triumphant Empire, Britain Sails into the Storm, 1770-1776*, pp. 162, 170 and 196.
8. Gipson, *The British Empire . . . vol. XII*, p. 162.
9. Jutikkala, *A History of Finland*, pp. 233-234.
10. B. Pattabhi Sitamarayya, *The History of the Indian National Congress, 1885-1935* (Madras: Working Committee of the Congress, 1935), vol. I, p. 684.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 869.
12. Reynolds, *Labor Economics and Labor Relations*, p. 33.
13. Charles Loch Mowat, *Britain Between the Wars, 1918-1940* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1955), p. 64. I am grateful to William Hamilton for this reference.
14. Karski, *The Story of a Secret State*, p. 235.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 260-261.
16. Littell, ed., *The Czech Black Book*, p. 151.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 145.
18. Report of the Advisory Commission on the Review of the Constitution of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Cmnd. 1148 (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1960), pp. 8 and 17.
19. Clifford Lloyd, *Ireland Under the Land League: A Narrative of Personal Experiences* (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons, 1892), p. 78.
20. Sternstein, "The *Ruhrkampf* of 1923," p. 116.
21. Conversation with Hagbard Jonassen, Virum, Denmark, March 1957 and Bennett, "The Resistance Against the German Occupation of Denmark 1940-5," p. 159.
22. Conversation with Haakon and Lotta Holmboe, Asker, Norway, 1957, and various later conversations with others.
23. Wyller, *Nyordning og Motstand*, p. 63.
24. Suzanne Berger, *Peasants Against Politics: Rural Organization in Brittany, 1911-1967* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972), p. 204.
25. Littell, ed., *The Czech Black Book*, p. 111. See also pp. 75 and 114.
26. Sternstein, "The *Ruhrkampf* of 1923," p. 116.
27. *New York Times*, 6 December 1956.
28. Harcave, *First Blood*, p. 101.
29. George Katkov, *Russia 1917: The February Revolution* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), pp. 211, 211 n. 1, and 218.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 351.
31. Stan Steiner, *The New Indians* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 220. My attention was called to this by Margaret DeMarco, "The Use of Non-violent Direct Action Tactics and Strategy by American Indians," unpublished research paper, Upland School of Social Change, Upland, Pa., July 1968).
32. *Guardian* (Manchester and London), 31 December 1963, and *Peace News*, 10 January 1964.
33. This section and the next on interdict are based on a draft by Michael Schullter.
34. Margaret Deanesly, *A History of the Medieval Church, 590-1500* (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1965), pp. 102-103.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 103.
36. Carleton Mabee, *Black Freedom: The Nonviolent Abolitionists from 1830 Through the Civil War* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1970), pp. 217-221.
37. Edward B. Krehbiel, *The Interdict, Its History and Its Operation* (Washington: American Historical Association, 1909), pp. 13 and 9.
38. *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.
39. *Ibid.*, pp. 26-27.
40. This description is largely based upon Major General Olaf Helset, "Idrettsfronten," in Steen, gen. ed., *Norges Krig*, vol. III, pp. 7-34.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
43. Wyller, *Nyordning og Motstand*, p. 11.
44. Magne Skodvin, "Det Store Fremstot," in Steen, gen. ed., *Norges Krig*, vol. II, pp. 640-641.
45. *Peace News*, 18 May 1962.
46. Bennett, "The Resistance Against the German Occupation of Denmark 1940-5," p. 159.
47. Magne Skodvin, "Det Store Fremstot," p. 624.
48. Karski, *The Story of a Secret State*, p. 260.
49. Michael Prawdin, *The Unmentionable Nechaev*, p. 21.
50. *Peace News*, 5 March 1965.
51. Case, *Non-violent Coercion*, p. 333, and L. L. Bernard, *Social Control in its Sociological Aspects* (New York: Macmillan, 1939), pp. 387-388.
52. Hsiao, *Rural China*, pp. 246-247.
53. Bernard, *Social Control in its Sociological Aspects*, p. 388.
54. *The Observer* (London), 20 March 1960.
55. *Ibid.*, 13 March 1960.
56. Seton-Watson, *The Decline of Imperial Russia*, p. 145, and Keep, *The Rise of Social Democracy in Russia*, p. 70.
57. Keep, *The Rise of Social Democracy in Russia*, pp. 217-218.
58. Brockway, *Non-co-operation in Other Lands*, p. 35.
59. *New York Times*, 24 and 27 June 1944.
60. Warmbrunn, *The Dutch Under German Occupation*, p. 105.

61. Brant, *The East German Rising*, p. 181.
62. *Peace News*, 29 November 1963.
63. *Ibid.*, 14 February 1964.
64. *Ibid.*, 21 February 1964.
65. *Ibid.*, 6 March 1964.
66. Waskow, *From Race Riot to Sit-In*, p. 280.
67. National Strike Information Center (Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.), *Newsletter*, no. 8, 12 May 1970, p. 9 and dittoed 6 pp. memo "Colleges on Strike - State by State Breakdown," 9 May 1970.
68. This description is based upon a draft prepared by Michael Schuller.
69. This is a more narrow usage than suggested by Seifert, *Conquest by Suffering*, pp. 17-18.
70. *Newsweek*, 17 August 1964, p. 28.
71. Mabee, *Black Freedom*, pp. 221-243. I am grateful to Michael Schuller for these examples.
72. Luthuli, *Let My People Go*, pp. 108-110. See also pp. 170 and 182.
73. *The Times*, 29 and 30 March 1960.
74. Lajos Lederer, *The Observer*, 22 June 1958.
75. Mulford Q. Sibley and Philip E. Jacob, *Conscription of Conscience: The American State and the Conscientious Objector, 1940-1947* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1952), pp. 401-409.
76. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, vol. I, p. 179. I am grateful to Margaret Jackson Rothwell for these references.
77. *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 677, n. 52.
78. *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 274.
79. *Ibid.*, p. 348.
80. *Ibid.*, p. 374.
81. *Ibid.*, 398.
82. Venturi, *Roots of Revolution*, p. 507.
83. *Ibid.*, p. 509.
84. *Ibid.*, p. 510.
85. Raymond A. and Alice H. Bauer, "Day to Day Resistance to Slavery," *Journal of Negro History*, vol. XXVII, no. 4 (Oct. 1942), pp. 400-401.
86. Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, *American Negro Slavery: A Survey of the Supply, Employment and Control of Negro Labor as Determined by the Plantation Regime* (New York: Peter Smith, 1952 [orig. 1918], pp. 303-304.
87. Frederick Law Olmsted, *A Journey in the Seaboard Slave States, with Remarks on Their Economy* (New York: Dix and Edwards, 1856, and London: Sampson Low, Son & Co., 1856), p. 100. I am grateful to Ron McCarthy for this illustration.
88. Herbert Apteker, *American Negro Slave Revolts* (New York: International Publishers, 1964), p. 142. I am grateful to Marilyn Saunders for this citation.
89. Apteker, *American Negro Slave Revolts*, p. 174.
90. This section is based on a suggestion by James Prior, who has also provided the cited references, and clarified certain matters related to Persian terms and religious customs.

91. George Huntston Williams, "The Ministry and the Draft in Historical Perspective," in Donald Cutler, ed., *The Religious Situation - 1969* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), pp. 464-512.
92. Quoted in J. Dennis Willigan, S. J., "Sanctuary: A Communitarian Form of Counter-Culture," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, vol. XXV, no. 4 (Summer, 1970), p. 532. See esp. his discussion on pp. 531-539. For further discussion and case material, see Cutler, ed., *The Religious Situation - 1969*, pp. 513-537.
93. *Ibid.*, p. 534.
94. *Ibid.*, p. 539.
95. This account is based upon the following sources: Edward G. Browne, *The Persian Revolution of 1905-1909* (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1910), pp. 111-124; Brigadier-General Sir Percy Sykes, *A History of Persia* (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1963), vol. II, pp. 394-405; and Richard W. Cottam, *Nationalism in Iran* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964), pp. 139-141.
96. Browne, *The Persian Revolution of 1905-1909*, p. 114.
97. Cottam, *Nationalism in Iran*, p. 141.
98. Sykes, *A History of Persia*, p. 402.
99. Browne, *The Persian Revolution of 1905-1909*, p. 119.
100. *Ibid.*, p. 120.
101. Sykes, *A History of Persia*, p. 403. The full text of that document is published on pp. 403-404.
102. Browne, *The Persian Revolution of 1905-1909*, p. 120.
103. *Ibid.*, p. 121.
104. Sykes, *A History of Persia*, p. 404.
105. Cottam, *Nationalism in Iran*, p. 141.
106. Quoted by Diwaker, *Satyagraha*, p. 147.
107. E. C. Baber, "China in Some of Its Physical and Social Aspects," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society*, N. S., V, (1883), pp. 44-43. Quoted in Hsiao, *Rural China*, p. 582, n. 143. Hsiao comments that although "this story may not literally be true, . . . the situation which it illustrates is authentic."
108. George R. Taylor, *The Struggle for North China*, p. 171. New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1940.
109. Bondurant, *Conquest of Violence*, p. 41.
110. On the origin of the term *hijrat* see Shridharani, *War Without Violence*, U.S. ed., p. 28; Br. ed., p. 47.
111. Bondurant, *Conquest of Violence*, p. 119.
112. For Gandhi's views on *hijrat*, see for example Gandhi, *Non-violent Resistance* pp. 212 and 289; Ind. ed.: *Satyagraha*, pp. 212 and 289.
113. Sharp, *Gandhi Writes . . .*, pp. 188, 190 and 197-198.
114. Shridharani, *War Without Violence*, U. S. ed., pp. 97-98; Br. ed., p. 101.
115. Cowell, *The Revolutions of Ancient Rome*, pp. 41-43.
116. Allan Nevins and Henry Steele Commager, *America: The Story of a Free People* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1943), pp. 12-13 and 29.
117. George Mikes, *The Hungarian Revolution*, pp. 172-173.

118. Case, *Non-violent Coercion*, pp. 345-346. For another example, see Pieter Geyl, *The Revolt of the Netherlands, 1555-1609* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1958, and London: Ernest Benn, 1962), p. 201.
119. Hugh Borton, *Peasant Uprisings in Japan of the Tokugawa Period* (Second ed.; New York: Paragon Book Reprint Corp, 1968 [First published in *The Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* (Second Ser.), vol. XVI, 1938.]) Preface [p. iii]. I am grateful to Carl Horne for calling my attention to this reference.
120. *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.
121. *Ibid.*, Preface, [p. iii].
122. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
123. *Ibid.*, Preface [pp. iii-iv].
124. *Ibid.*, p. 31, n. 53. For other details, see also pp. 65-66 and 144 ff.
125. Brant, *The East German Rising*, p. 37.
126. Margaret E. Hirst, *The Quakers in Peace and War* (New York: George H. Doranco, 1923, and London: Swarthmore Press, 1923), p. 32.