

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 8

8

The Methods of Nonviolent Intervention

INTRODUCTION

One final class of the methods of nonviolent action remains, that of nonviolent intervention. The forty-one methods in this class differ from those in the classes of protest and persuasion and of noncooperation in that in some way they *intervene* in the situation. Such methods of intervention operate both negatively and positively: they may disrupt, and even destroy, established behavior patterns, policies, relationships, or institutions which are seen as objectionable; or they may establish new behavior patterns, policies, relationships, or institutions which are preferred. Some of these methods contribute primarily to the first of these results, some to the second.

Compared with the methods of the classes of protest and persuasion and of noncooperation, the methods of nonviolent intervention pose a more direct and immediate challenge. *If successful*, the victory is likely to come quicker by the use of methods of this class than with the use of methods of the previous classes, because the disruptive effects of the intervention are

harder to tolerate or withstand for a considerable period of time. For example, intervention by a sit-in at a lunch counter disrupts more immediately and completely than would, say, picketing or a consumers' boycott, though the objective of each of these actions be to end racial discrimination. However, though the challenge of methods of intervention is clearer and more direct, the result is not necessarily more rapid success; precisely because of the character of intervention, speedier and more severe repression may be a first result—which, of course, does not necessarily mean defeat.

In most cases, use of the methods of this class may induce change through the mechanisms of accommodation or of nonviolent coercion, i.e., without the opponent's being convinced that he *ought* to change his policy on the matter in question. However, certain of these methods (especially those classed as psychological intervention) and also the repression which frequently occurs against others (especially those of physical intervention) may contribute to the opponent's conversion, or at least to his becoming less certain of the rightness of his previous views. These mechanisms of conversion, accommodation and nonviolent coercion are discussed in detail in the final Part of this book.

To a greater degree than in the classes discussed earlier, methods of nonviolent intervention are associated with initiative by the nonviolent actionists. The methods of intervention may be used both defensively—to thwart an opponent's attack by maintaining independent initiative, behavior patterns, institutions, or the like—and offensively—to carry the struggle for the actionists' objectives into the opponent's own camp, even without any immediate provocation. These methods, therefore, are not simply defensive responses to the opponent's initiative.

The range of methods within this class is wide. In this chapter they have been classified according to the dominant manner of expression of the intervention itself: psychological, physical, social, economic, or political. This is quite often different from the influences the method may have. For example, an act of social intervention may have strong psychological influence. An act of psychological intervention may have a political impact. An act of physical intervention may have social repercussions, and so on. All the methods of nonviolent action are likely to have some type of psychological influence; as considered here, psychological intervention includes methods in which the psychological element is the dominant form of expression.

Obviously these five subclasses are somewhat arbitrary. Alternative classifications of particular methods are possible, especially in a given conflict situation. Furthermore, not every use of these methods will actually produce intervention. A given act may be too limited, weak, or restricted

in time, numbers, or focus to constitute significant intervention, and may instead become primarily an act of nonviolent protest and persuasion. Of the five subclasses of intervention we turn first to psychological intervention.

PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERVENTION

The four methods of psychological intervention described here differ significantly from each other in attitudes toward the person or group to which they are directed, in the intended process of change, and in the actual types of behavior. They have in common only the characteristic that the intervention is predominantly or exclusively on a psychological level.

158. Self-exposure to the elements

Exposure of one's own body to discomfort or suffering from the elements, such as the heat of the sun, is one form which psychological intervention has taken. This method is one of the several forms in which self-retribution may be expressed. Self-retribution involves putting psychological, moral, or emotional pressure on others to induce them to change their attitudes or to take certain action, by voluntarily taking discomfort, humiliation, penalties, or suffering upon oneself. Other ways in which self-retribution is expressed within nonviolent action include protest disrobing, destruction of one's own property (as used by some Doukhobors) both already discussed, and the fast, which follows.

An example of self-exposure to the elements comes from the mid-nineteenth century China and concerns the action of a judge, Lu Chia-shu, who dealt with a "legal fight" between brothers. Ch'ien Yung recorded:

There were two brothers who fought against one another without stopping (i.e. reconciliation). Mr. Lu told them: "If brothers are not harmonious, this represents a great change in the human relations. I am the father and mother of the people here. So this must be my fault, that I did not teach you well." Then he knelt down in the blazing sun. The fighting (parties) were touched and cried. From then on, they were good to one another.¹

Professor Wolfram Eberhard, who provided this example, comments:

The judge Lu, in this case, could have severely beaten both claimants for their violation of the Confucian rules of brotherly love. This would have been the normal action of the judges at the time. No judge would have looked into the case in order to find out who is right and who is wrong. Lu's actions (to take the guilt upon himself) shamed the brothers, corrected their behavior, and did not involve the expected violence.²

A related but much milder type of action was used, probably in the 1880s, by temporary farm laborers in the province of Kherson of Imperial Russia, in order to protest the poor diets provided by the landowners. Trotsky records seeing this as a child on his father's farm:

The laborers would leave the fields and collect in the courtyard. They would lie face downward in the shade of the barns, brandishing their bare, cracked, straw-pricked feet in the air, and wait to see what would happen. Then my father would give them some clabber, or watermelons, or half a sack of dried fish and they would go back to work again, often singing.³

In the summer of 1972 some English and American prisoners protested by staying for long periods, and with danger to themselves, on the slanting roofs of prison buildings, or even on top of the prison water-tower (as at the Federal Correctional Institution at Danbury, Connecticut).

159. The fast

The fast is often used as a method of psychological intervention. Abstinence from certain or all foods may be undertaken for a number of reasons, including health, religion, penance, self-purification, and desire to achieve social and political objectives. The latter reason is most relevant here, although fasts undertaken for reasons of religion, penance and self-purification may under certain circumstances also constitute intervention. In addition, fasts may serve simply as a form of moral protest. Three types of the fast will be distinguished in this context: the *fast of moral pressure*, the *hunger strike*, and the *satyagrahic fast* as applied on some occasions by Gandhi.

The *fast of moral pressure* has characteristics which fall between the other two types. It is also much more likely not to fulfill completely the requirements of nonviolent intervention, and to become instead a form of nonviolent protest and persuasion (although for simplicity this form of the fast is not listed under both classes). Fasts of moral pressure are usually conscious attempts to exert moral influence on others to achieve an objective, though they lack the openly coercive intent of the hunger strike, and the full "conversion" intent of the satyagrahic fast. Many people have argued that the fast is incomprehensible in the West; however, there are a multitude of Western examples, and in cases where fasts have been initiated where they have been unfamiliar, the response has often been unexpectedly favorable. For example, in 1960 and 1961 exponents of nuclear disarmament and pacifists in England had argued that fasts should not be used in the disarmament campaign since they would be incomprehensible to Englishmen. However, when this method was introduced in 1962 in sup-

port of the unilateral nuclear disarmament movement and simultaneously to raise money for famine relief, the number of fasts grew rapidly during that year and 1963, and they were received with considerable public understanding and sympathy.⁴

Examples of fasts of moral pressure are varied. St. Patrick once fasted against King Trián of Ulster to compel him to have compassion on his slaves. On another occasion he fasted three days and three nights against the Pelagian heresy in a city to compel the inhabitants to become orthodox.⁵

Fasting was on several occasions also practiced by American colonists. For example, on May 24, 1774, the Virginia House of Burgesses resolved to observe June 1 (the day the Boston Port Act was to go into effect) as a day of "Fasting, Humiliation, and Prayer." The objective was to implore divine interposition to avert the "destruction to our Civil rights, and the Evils of Civil War . . . and that the Minds of his Majesty and his Parliament, may be inspired from above with Wisdom, Moderation, and Justice, to remove from the loyal People of America all cause of danger, from a continued pursuit of Measures, pregnant with their ruin." Two days later, after the Governor had summoned the members of the House to meet with him immediately in the Council chamber, he declared that the resolve was conceived "in such Terms as reflect highly upon his Majesty and the Parliament of Great Britain," and thereupon he dissolved the House,⁶ thus preventing its continuing to meet and preventing it from taking other "hostile" actions.

There is an interesting story behind this case which introduced fasting into the American colonists' struggles. Earlier, in response to the action of some Bostonians in dumping tea belonging to the East India Company into Boston harbor, the British government had decided to close the port of Boston on June 1, 1774, and published the Boston Port Act to that end. This news reached Virginia while the House of Burgesses was in session. Thomas Jefferson later wrote that the lead in the House was no longer being left to the older members. A small group of younger members which included Patrick Henry, Richard Henry Lee, Jefferson himself, and four or five others, met to consider what to do. They were determined to take a bold, unequivocal stand in support of Massachusetts. As Jefferson described it, they gathered to

consult on the proper measures in the council chamber, for the benefit of [i.e. to have the use of] the library in that room. We were under conviction of the necessity of arousing our people from the lethargy into which they had fallen as to passing events; and thought that the appointment of a day of general fasting and prayer would be most likely

to call up & alarm their attention. No example of such a solemnity had existed since the days of our distresses in the war [against the French] of [17]55, since which a new generation had grown up. With the help therefore of Rushmore, whom we rummaged over for the revolutionary precedents & forms of the Puritans of that day, preserved by him, we cooked up a resolution, somewhat modernizing their phrases, for appointing the 1st day of June, on which the Port bill was to commence, for a day of fasting, humiliation & prayer, to implore heaven to avert from us the evils of civil war, to inspire us with firmness in support of our rights, and to turn the hearts of the King & parliament to moderation & justice.⁷

Edmund Randolph credits Jefferson and Charles Lee with originating the "fast to electrify the people from the pulpit."⁸ The young men who drafted the resolution "were famed more for skill with the violin and grace in dancing than for piety and prayer."⁹ In order, therefore, to avoid ridicule and defeat if they offered so grave a resolution, the next morning they persuaded Robert Carter Nicholas, the pious, elderly chairman of the committee of religion, to move the resolution. Mr. Nicholas did so the same day, and it was passed without opposition.¹⁰ One opponent denounced the fast as "a Schem calculated to *inflame* and excite an *enthusiastic zeal* in the Minds of the People under a Cloak of Religion . . ." ¹¹ After dissolution, the members of the House met elsewhere and agreed to call for a meeting of an American Congress of Deputies for all the colonies; and then they returned to their own districts to arouse the clergymen and people to patriotic feelings. When the first of June came, B.O. Flower writes:

the great fast day led to the crystallizing of the revolutionary sentiment of the colony, just as the leaders had predicted it would. Never before, and rarely since, have the clergy been so brave and outspoken. "The cause of liberty is the cause of God!" exclaimed one minister; and this was the sentiment echoed from ocean to mountain.¹²

Later Jefferson himself wrote: "The people met generally, with anxiety & alarm in their countenances, and the effect of the day thro' the whole colony was like a shock of electricity, arousing every man & placing him erect & solidly on his centre."¹³

In the summer of 1774, "a day of fasting and prayer, on account of the dark aspect of our publick affairs" was proclaimed in Rhode Island.¹⁴ The next spring, on February 16, 1775, the Massachusetts Bay Provincial Congress (the unconstitutional legislature of members of the previous House

of Representatives), meeting in Cambridge, set aside a day for fasting and prayer, with a request included for prayers for King George III, pointedly indicating the conflict was not with the King but with the King's government. Boston observed the day with "marked solemnity." However, while a religious service was in progress that day, the King's Own corps played their drums and fifes within ten yards of the church.¹⁵

There are many more examples of the fast of moral pressure. For example, in April 1962 a number of Frenchmen fasted for peace in Algeria,¹⁶ and a French pacifist, Louis Lecoin, fasted in June of that year to obtain legal recognition of French conscientious objectors.¹⁷

Danilo Dolci has used both the individual and mass fast in his efforts to relieve poverty in Sicily. When a child died of malnutrition in December 1952, Dolci resolved to fast to draw attention to the misery and unemployment in Trappeto, and to refuse food until a certain amount of money had been received for the relief of the starving. On January 30, 1956, he led about one thousand unemployed fishermen in a twenty-four hour mass fast on the beach to call attention to their plight; the demonstration was broken up by the police.¹⁸ On January 16, 1966, Dolci completed a seven-day fast against the Mafia; and he called for casting off the fear which imposed the *omertà* (the law of silence) and prevented the gathering of evidence on Mafia crimes. Dolci fasted in a traditional Sicilian one-room family habitation in Castellammare del Golfo in Western Sicily—the district whose parliamentary representative was Signor Mattarella, the former Minister for Foreign Trade who had been accused of connections with the Mafia. The fast was reported to have brought about a "revolution" in people's willingness to criticize authority and an increased willingness to defy the Mafia.¹⁹

Buddhists also used fasting in nonviolent struggles in South Vietnam during the 1960s. Sometimes individuals have fasted alone, sometimes a group, and sometimes thousands of people have taken part in the fast. On occasion only elders of the Buddhist church took part. Trich Nhat Hanh reports that the Venerable Thich Tri Quang fasted for one hundred days at the Duy Tan Clinic in 1966. Hanh continues: "The purpose of fasting is for prayer, for purifying one's heart and consolidating one's will, or for arousing the awareness and compassion latent within the people."²⁰

The *hunger strike*, the second type of fast considered here, may be defined as a refusal to eat with the aim of forcing the opponent to grant certain demands but without any serious effort to convert him or to achieve a "change of heart." On this point it differs sharply from the satyagrahic fast, as applied by Gandhi, which is discussed next. The hunger strike may be undertaken for a set period of time, for an indefinite period,

or unto death if the demand is not granted. Prisoners who feel they have no other powerful method of protest at their disposal often use the fast. The examples are many and varied.

According to the legal code of ancient Ireland it was the duty of an injured person, when all else had failed, to inflict punishment directly on the wrongdoer. In some cases before a settlement involving reimbursement by seizure of property (such as cattle or other effects),

. . . the plaintiff *fasted* on the defendant; . . . and this process, called *troscaid*, "fasting," was always necessary before distress [removal of goods in compensation] when the defendant was of chieftain grade and the plaintiff of an inferior grade. . . The plaintiff, having served due notice, went to the house of the defendant, and, sitting before the door, remained without food. It may be inferred that the debtor generally yielded before the fast was ended, i.e., either paid the debt or gave a pledge that he would settle the case. If the creditor continued to fast after an offer of payment, he forfeited all the debt due to him

From some passages it would appear that the debtor was bound to remain fasting as long as the creditor or complainant fasted . . . it was considered disgraceful for a defendant not to submit to it: "He that does not give a pledge to fasting is an evader of all: he who disregards all things shall not be paid by God or man." (British Laws, I, 113).²¹

That is, he would be subjected to a complete social boycott.

This is closely related to the Indian practice of *dhurna* or sitting *dhurna*, described by Shridharani as follows:

Every so often in the Middle Ages a moneylender, failing to receive his money back in due time, would sit in front of the house of the debtor, refusing to budge from his place or to take any food until the client paid in full. Since the interesting situation always gathered a crowd of idle curious, the debtor would make a supreme effort to pay rather than suffer a long drawn-out siege with its attendant embarrassment. The *Bhat* (bard of the royal court) used a similar method when he wanted his king to "be a man" and fight. When his ruler, out of cowardice or other considerations, refused to meet an invading or offending king in combat, the *Bhat* would sit in the palace gate [way] and start a hunger strike. In most cases, this compelled the king to fight.²²

There were also a considerable number of Russian hunger strikes, as

illustrated by the following examples. Political prisoners in the Peter-Paul Fortress in St. Petersburg went on a long hunger strike during the summer of 1875; following a number of deaths of hunger strikers, the Head of the Third Section (the branch of the police which had a vast network of informers and agents) was assassinated in revenge.²³ In another case, while imprisoned in the dungeon of the Peter-Paul Fortress the notorious revolutionary Sergei Nechaev at about the end of 1877, after four years in solitary confinement, went on a hunger strike to obtain books not in the prison library.²⁴ In July 1878, reports Peter Kropotkin, six prisoners at Kharkov prison "resolved to starve themselves to death" in an act of opposition against extreme jail conditions. After they had resisted efforts to feed them by injection, officials promised walking exercise for prisoners and the removal of the sick from irons. These promises were not kept, and "only later on, when several had died, and two went mad . . . the prisoners obtained the privilege of sawing some wood in the yard, in company with two Tartars, who understood not a word of Russian."²⁵ Kropotkin also reports that the right of prisoners in the Peter-Paul Fortress to have visits from relatives every fortnight in 1879 and 1880 was won "by the famous famine strike, during which a number of prisoners in the Trubetskoi bastion refused to take any food for five or six days . . ." and resisted all efforts to feed them by injections.²⁶

While confined in Kherson in 1898 the youthful Trotsky persuaded his fellow political prisoners to go on a hunger strike to protest a police proposal that juvenile prisoners be released if their parents promised to give them a thrashing and keep them from political activities; according to Trotsky, this was "an insult to the honor of the juvenile revolutionary."²⁷ Early in 1922, when two thousand arrested Mensheviks were threatened with administrative mass exile to distant provinces, some of them went on hunger strike, and approximately twelve were eventually allowed to leave the country.²⁸

However, the results were very different when similar action was attempted in the autumn of 1936. According to an eyewitness, Boris Podolak, whose testimony was given in 1951, a large, well-organized group of Trotskyist prisoners at Vorkuta, with participation of other political groups, participated in a hunger strike of four hundred prisoners. They remained lying on their bunks and also refused to work. They addressed their declaration to the internal police of the N.K.V.D., denounced the current political system as fascist, and stated demands. Although many of the other prisoners were sympathetic, the number of hunger strikers did not grow, but rather became smaller. After one-and-a-half or two months, most of them could no longer resist forced feeding. Only about forty held out until they died. In the autumn of 1937, the report continues, a special com-

mission arrived from Moscow, and the former strike leaders together with many other prisoners were arrested. After being kept in a barracks, they were moved twenty miles away to an abandoned brickworks "which became a kind of death-isolator." By the end of February 1938 about seven hundred prisoners were being kept there. The first mass executions began the night of May 8-9 and continued.²⁹

Hunger strikes have also occurred in the modern Irish nationalist movement. For example, in late September 1917 two Irish nationalists imprisoned for one year at hard labor at Mountjoy Gaol went on hunger strike. They were Thomas Ashe, an Irish Volunteer, and Austin Stack, a Kerry Volunteer, both charged with "attempting to cause disaffection among the civil population." In prison they organized a hunger strike in support of the demand that they be either treated as political prisoners or released. The jail officials, however, force-fed the hunger strikers: after a week of this Ashe collapsed, and within five hours of being hospitalized, died.³⁰ (A brief account of his funeral is offered in Chapter Three under the method demonstrative funeral.)

The British also applied other measures to deal with hunger strikers including the so-called cat-and-mouse act. This had been used to deal with women suffragists who frequently went on hunger strikes in England.³¹ Weakening prisoners on hunger strikes were released, but when they regained their strength they were rearrested. Edgar Holt reports that "it was an effective measure . . . and there were no more deaths from hunger strikes until 1920."

On Easter Monday, April 5, 1920, some one hundred Sinn Fein prisoners in Mountjoy Gaol began a mass hunger strike, this time demanding either that they be treated as prisoners of war or released. The official British attitude to this challenge was expressed in the House of Commons by Bonar Law, the leader of the House and Lord Privy Seal: "It would be perfectly futile if men are to be released because they choose to refuse food." In Ireland, however, support grew, for members of the Irish Labour Party called for a general strike for April 13 for support of the Mountjoy prisoners, and the Roman Catholic hierarchy publicly declared it to be "their solemn duty to call the attention of everyone to the appalling tragedy that seems imminent in Mountjoy Prison." After ten days, the government released the prisoners unconditionally.³² One who did not fare so well that same year was the Lord Mayor of Cork, Terence McSweeney, who died after a fast of seventy-four days.³³

In October 1944 several American conscientious objectors, imprisoned in the federal prison at Lewisburg, who objected to punishment imposed on them for their participation in a work strike against the parole system, organized a "rotation" hunger strike. In this, five men would refuse to

eat for a definite but unannounced period, after which five others would take their place as hunger strikers.³⁴

In May 1958 nearly thirteen thousand prostitutes in India threatened a mass hunger strike when brothels were closed under an Act prohibiting the letting of houses for prostitution.³⁵ In a similar case to "sitting *dhurna*" discussed earlier, in August 1959 a factory stoker in New Delhi undertook a fast unto death outside his employer's villa to protest low pay and poor working conditions.³⁶

The final type of fast discussed here is the *satyagrahic fast*, predominantly practiced by Gandhi who distinguished his fasts for social objectives from the hunger strike, which he regarded as coercive. Although accused of failing to recognize coercive elements in his own fasts, Gandhi insisted that their objective was to convert. According to him, the *satyagrahi* may fast to "sting" the conscience of the wrongdoer (who may be an individual, a group of people, or even millions) through voluntary suffering only if he has exhausted all other nonviolent means. The *satyagrahic fast* may be for a set period of time, or unto death if the demand is not granted.

Gandhi sought to establish strict limits on this use of the fast; for example, it should not be applied against just anyone, regardless of the issue. Normally, one would not fast against one's opponent, especially if the opponent were a stranger or not one's friend. Gandhi thought that the wrongdoer and the fasting *satyagrahi* must have been close and have shared mutual affection for this self-imposed form of suffering to be justified and to have the intended conversion effect. Under special circumstances, however, the fast could be applied to others, primarily if the opponent's repression and restrictions closed other avenues of approach. *Satyagrahis* who as prisoners were subjected to inhuman treatment might, for example, fast for the removal of such treatment—though they might not, in Gandhi's view, fast for their release. In either case, the "mistake" of the individual or group against whom the fast is undertaken must have been gross and have moved the *satyagrahi* to the very depth of his being.

Gandhi believed that considerable spiritual preparation and service were necessary before one was justified in undertaking a *satyagrahic fast*, and that a fast unto death was to be used only when every other form of *satyagraha* had failed. Examples of Gandhi's use of the *satyagrahic fast* include his fast during the Ahmedabad labor strike in February-March 1918, undertaken to arouse striking workers who had weakened in their resolve to keep their pledges to him to continue the strike until their demands had been granted.³⁷ His final fast at Delhi in January 1948, for Hindu-Muslim unity in the midst of the riots, is a clearer example of the characteristics he avowed for this instrument.³⁸ In this Gandhi sought to

restore by his fast an awareness of the worth of the lives of all Indians and to arouse feelings of brotherhood between Hindu and Muslim.

160. Reverse trial

Another form of psychological intervention is the reverse trial. Sometimes the combination of circumstances and the behavior during the trial of those prosecuted for political, religious, or other reasons significantly reverses the roles of prosecution and defender in the trial. The defendants become the prosecutors, and the trial is turned into a demonstration against the government and is used by the prosecuted to publicize their beliefs, program and indictment of the established order. This is what we call a reverse trial.

This reversal of roles has taken place in a wide variety of political cases. In Russia, in each of the "great trials of 1877" of revolutionaries the accused were able to conduct themselves in such a way as to arouse public sympathy and support. The first of these, the trial of the demonstrators of the Square of Our Lady of Kazan in St. Petersburg, brought great sympathy for those on trial. In the second trial, of "the fifty" in March in Moscow, observers compared the accused with early Christian martyrs. And in the 1877-78 St Petersburg "trial of the hundred and ninety-three" members of the movement "to go to the people" with the revolutionary message, the events of the trial made an important public impact despite strict censorship. Part of this impact resulted from the speech of Ippolit Nikitch Myshkin, one of the accused, on the ideas and program of socialism. Myshkin, in another speech, also denounced the tribunal itself as "a useless comedy" and "more shameful than a brothel . . ." The revolutionary S.M. Kravchinsky later wrote: "After his words the tribunal was annihilated."³⁹

In a very different style, when he was on trial, Gandhi behaved in such a way that even when he pleaded guilty to the charge he gave the impression that he had only been guilty of doing the right thing; this occurred, for example, in 1922, during his trial for writing three seditious articles in his journal, *Young India*. Asking the judge either to resign his post or, if he believed in the system, to give him (Gandhi) the severest penalty possible, Gandhi declared it to be "an honor to be disaffected towards a government which in its totality has done more harm to India than any previous system."⁴⁰

Similarly, Germans prosecuted by the occupation powers during the *Ruhrkampf* used their trials as a means of pointing out the injustice of the French and Belgian seizure of the Ruhr.⁴¹ After the abortive *Putsch* in 1923, Adolph Hitler made the most of his trial, which for the first

time gave him an audience outside the frontiers of Bavaria; according to his biographer, Allan Bullock, "in his final speech he established a complete mastery over the court."⁴² In the famous *Reichstag* fire trial in Nazi Germany in 1933, one of the accused, the Bulgarian Communist Georgi Dimitroff, served as his own lawyer, cleverly cross-examined Göring himself, taunted him into a rage, and succeeded in obtaining acquittal for himself and three others.⁴³

Further examples of reverse trial continue to occur when political and moral issues are involved in the case and when the prosecuted persons are able to regain the initiative against their prosecutors. This method illustrates the potential of simple psychological intervention even when no other types of leverage are at the disposal of the accused.

161. Nonviolent harassment

This method consists of psychological harassment by a combination of actions which concentrate private and public pressures on one or more individuals engaged in activities which are detested. The actions which may be used to produce nonviolent harassment include stronger and more persistent use of "haunting" (constantly remaining physically near the person) and "taunting" (name-calling and accusations)—both of which have been discussed in mild forms as methods of nonviolent protest and persuasion. Nonviolent harassment has also utilized means of public communication such as posters and newspaper advertisements; the use of other such means would fall within this method. The objective of the combination of pressures is to induce the person to halt the behavior or action which is found objectionable; these are not the types of pressures likely to alter the opinion or beliefs of the person against which they are directed. This method has been termed nonviolent harassment by Carleton Mabee in *Black Freedom*, his study of nonviolent opposition to slavery in the United States.⁴⁴ The proposal to use this method was worked out in detail by Charles K. Whipple, who had been treasurer of the Nonresistance Society and was a contributor to William Lloyd Garrison's paper, *Liberator*. This method was to be used against slave hunters in Northern states hired to capture and return escaped slaves to their Southern owners. Whipple's proposal drew upon general recommendations by Garrison, Wendell Phillips and the Rhode Island Antislavery Society. The Boston Vigilance Committee debated and partially adopted the proposal, which was published in the *Liberator* and other antislavery papers in 1850-51. The recommendation was this:

As soon as the kidnappers arrived in any town, large handbills should be posted in all the public places, containing their names, with a description of their persons and the business on which they come.

An attempt should be made to induce the landlord of any hotel or boarding-house to which they may go, to refuse them entertainment, on the ground of their being persons infamous by profession, like pick-pockets, gamblers, or horse-stealers.

If this proves unsuccessful, some of the committee of attendance should take lodging in the same house with the kidnappers, and take, if possible, sleeping rooms and seats at table directly opposite to them.

The doors of the house should be watched carefully, day and night, and whenever they go out, two resolute, unarmed men should follow each of them wherever he goes, pointing him out from time to time with the word *SLAVE-HUNTER*. They should follow him into every shop, office, or place of public dwelling, wait outside, watching all the avenues, and ready to renew the attendance when he comes out. If he takes a coach, they should follow in another; if he drives out of town, they should follow; if he takes a seat in a railroad car, they should go with him, and make him known as a slave-hunter to the passengers in the car, and to the people of the town where he stops. He should not have one moment's relief from the feeling that his object is understood, that he cannot act in secret, that he is surrounded by men who loathe his person and detest his purpose, and who have means at hand to prevent the possibility of success.⁴⁵

Mabee reports that on the basis of this and similar proposals nonviolent attempts were made throughout the 1850s to protect fugitive slaves in the North.⁴⁶ For example, this method was used in Philadelphia when a Miss Wilson from Maryland arrived to locate her runaway slave. J. Miller McKim, an exponent of nonviolent methods who was in charge of the office of the Pennsylvania Antislavery Society, on hearing of her efforts to hire a local slave catcher, arranged for an abolitionist to pose as one. He was hired and obtained the name of the slave. McKim notified the fugitive, who went into hiding, and then prepared posters about three feet square, headed "*BEWARE OF SLAVE-CATCHERS*," which were posted about the city. Miss Wilson was named, as well as the slave, whom people were urged to hide, in accordance with a scriptural injunction. When she learned of the posters, Miss Wilson abandoned the hunt and returned to her home in Maryland.⁴⁷

Similarly in Boston, when Charles Hobson from Virginia came to hunt his escaped slave, Henry Langhorn, abolitionists took an advertisement in the newspaper, mimicking the advertisement which Hobson had published seeking his slave; the abolitionists' advertisement described Hobson and stated that he was staying at the Tremont Hotel. They also posted about one hundred placards warning that Hobson was in town to catch a slave.

Unnerved, Hobson hurriedly departed for Virginia without Henry Langhorn.⁴⁸

These cases of nonviolent harassment of slave catchers were not, however, widely imitated, and this method was not applied on a sufficiently large scale to test its potential in that situation.

PHYSICAL INTERVENTION

A second subclass of methods of nonviolent intervention consists of those predominantly characterized by the interference created by people's physical bodies, especially as they enter, or refuse to leave, some place where they are not wanted or from which they have been prohibited.

162. Sit-in

In a sit-in the interventionists occupy certain facilities by sitting on available chairs, stools and occasionally on the floor for a limited or unlimited period, either in a single act or in a series of acts, with the objective of disrupting the normal pattern of activities. The purpose may be to establish a new pattern, such as opening particular facilities to previously excluded persons, or to make a protest which may not be directly connected with the facilities occupied. This method has often been used in the civil rights movement in the United States.

In conception the method is not at all new, however. Mabee reports that as early as 1838 the Antislavery Convention of American Women adopted a comprehensive policy supporting sit-ins and ride-ins, but that there had been no systematic follow-up campaign.⁴⁹ Then, during the August 1841 meeting of the Massachusetts Antislavery Society, a "Garrisonian nonviolent actionist," Stephen S. Foster, impatient with regular political methods, moved a resolution which described the basis of sit-ins, ride-ins and related methods: "We recommend to [white] abolitionists as the most consistent and effectual method of abolishing the 'Negro-pew,' to take their seats in it, wherever it may be found, whether in a gentile synagogue [church], a railroad car, a steamboat, or a stage coach."⁵⁰ The exponents of nonviolent means within that Society split on the resolution, William Lloyd Garrison himself opposing it, although he personally participated in ride-ins, and the resolution was defeated. Nevertheless, the principle was applied in a series of ride-ins, as will be described under that method.⁵¹

An early, modified application of the sit-in occurred in Chicago in late 1869 or early 1870. Negro protests had failed to abolish the segregationist

Black Code and segregated education, Negro children being forced to attend the so-called Black School. The Negro parents and children then applied a form of the sit-in; since segregation was then the law, this method also involved civil disobedience. The parents simply sent the children to the school nearest their homes. Although the teachers did not assign the children to classes or give them lessons to do, "The children . . . attended daily, taking their seats in an orderly fashion throughout the controversy that ensued." The school board attempted to compromise by admitting only children with one-eighth Negro ancestry to the regular schools, but the Chicago Negroes invaded the offices of the board and of the Mayor, and the Black School was abolished.⁵²

In 1938 Chippewa Indians from a reservation in the Cass Lake region of Minnesota, through their chiefs, had protested against the decision made by Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier to move the Bureau of Indian Affairs headquarters from the reservation to Duluth; the chiefs argued that this was a violation of the new United States policy of granting Indian self-government. Agency Superintendent Lewis Balsam, however, proceeded with the moving plans. Then several hundred Chippewa braves, painted and wearing traditional costumes, marched to the headquarters and danced around the building to the beat of drums. A group of Chippewa women followed, entering the office, and Balsam fled. The young braves then moved in, sitting on desks and filing cabinets, while a picket line formed outside. Commissioner Collier still insisted on moving the office to the city, but his superior, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, ordered a tribal referendum on the issue, agreeing to accept its results.⁵³

In 1960 American Indians of Cherokee ancestry, called Croatans, resorted to a sit-in after six years of unsuccessful efforts to gain admission to Dunn High School, in Dunn, Hartnett County, North Carolina. At the beginning of the 1960-61 school year nine Indian students had attempted to register for school at Dunn but had been refused, being told to attend instead the all-Indian high school, which meant a seventy-mile round-trip each day from Dunn. On August 31 seven Indian youths, accompanied by two adults, began a three day sit-in at Dunn High School. On the third day seven youths and five adults were arrested for trespassing. Promised an Indian school in Dunn by the autumn of 1961, they called off their action. However, in response to protests from across the United States, the local Mayor, G.F. Blalock, insisted that the problem was not the town's fault, and that the local citizens overwhelmingly favored admission of Indian students. In June 1961 the Hartnett County School Board announced that twenty Indians would be allowed to enroll in the Dunn High School during the next school year.⁵⁴

The sit-in has been widely used in the United States to break down racial discrimination in restaurants and lunch counters. In this method the actionists progressively occupy a large number or all of the available seats and refuse to leave until the Afro-American members of the group are served, the restaurant closes, the group arrested, or a certain predetermined period of time elapses.

The Congress of Racial Equality used this method in Northern and border states during the 1940s and 1950s.⁵⁵ It first became widely practiced on a large scale in the South in early 1960, with sit-ins in Woolworth's in Greensboro, North Carolina, conducted by students of North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College. Shortly thereafter, high school and college students all over the South began to stage similar sit-ins at lunch counters, and a movement of major proportions developed.⁵⁶ The Southern Regional Council reported that within seven months at least 70,000 Negroes and whites had actively participated and 3,600 had been arrested.⁵⁷ A U.S. Supreme Court decision on December 11, 1961, outlawed the use of disorderly conduct statutes as grounds for arresting Negroes sitting in to obtain equal service.⁵⁸

The basic principle may also be applied in other situations—for example, to protest segregated housing or to express various political grievances. For example, 801 demonstrators supporting the Free Speech Movement at the University of California at Berkeley were arrested on December 3, 1964, following a sit-in to support their demand for freedom of political action.⁵⁹ A student sit-in, called by the Student Council, was held in the administration building of City College in New York City in November 1966 to demand specific measures for increased student participation in administrative decisions for the college.⁶⁰ In June 1963 an all-night sit-in was held at the headquarters of the Boston School Committee in protest against the refusal of most of its members to admit the existence of *de facto* segregation in the school system.⁶¹

In 1964 delegates from the Freedom Democratic Party of Mississippi, which was predominantly Negro, claimed the seats of the regular Democratic Party delegation at the Democratic Party's National Convention, stating that only the Freedom Democratic Party was pledged to support the Democratic Party's national ticket. When their full claim was not granted, the Freedom delegates, aided by sympathetic delegates from other states, entered the convention hall during the evening sessions of August 25 and 26, and the F.D.P. representatives simply sat in the seats for the Mississippi delegation. After a brief attempt to remove them by force, the convention authorities left them alone, and the "regular" white Mississippi delegation had to sit elsewhere.⁶²

In addition to student sit-ins in universities in recent years, there have also been sit-ins in mayors' and governors' offices, but these, and suggestions for sit-ins on Capitol Hill and in congressional offices, have been widely condemned and regarded as "the disruption of the governing process itself."⁶³

A very different case occurred in Moscow in 1964. Forty-five Moroccan students began a sit-in and twenty-four hour fast at the Moroccan Embassy there on March 19 to protest the death sentences and severe imprisonments of alleged antigovernment plotters in Morocco. At Moroccan request, Soviet authorities expelled them from the Embassy.⁶⁴

163. Stand-in

The stand-in occurs when direct actionists remain standing in an orderly quiet manner at a ticket office, admission entrance, appointment desk, doorway, or the like, as they seek to purchase a ticket, admission, an interview, or whatever when these have been refused to them. This method has been used particularly by civil rights actionists in the United States seeking to obtain equality of service for all potential customers. It has been applied especially in seeking admission to motion picture theaters and swimming pools. When admittance, purchase of a ticket, or the like is refused to the Negro, for example, all the direct actionists, including the person refused admission, wait patiently in line for admittance, refusing to leave until all are granted equal service, a specified period of time has elapsed, the group is arrested, or the facilities are closed. This method may be repeated until the policy is changed to allow all to use the facilities.

The stand-in was used, for example, in 1947 to end discrimination at the swimming pool in the Palisades Amusement Park, New Jersey. On Sundays the interracial Congress of Racial Equality (C.O.R.E.) groups "would remain peacefully lined up in front of the pool's ticket booth after being refused admission." Despite repeated beatings by park guards and police, and arrests, the C.O.R.E. stand-in was continued on Sundays throughout the summer.⁶⁵ It has been claimed that the enactment of the New Jersey civil rights bill in 1949 was partly due to the news reports and editorials published in newspapers in northern New Jersey as a result of the beatings and arrests during the summer of 1947.⁶⁶

A different form of the stand-in was urged in 1837 for use in churches where Negroes were admitted but were assigned to segregated seating. In 1837 the periodical *Colored American* told its readers that if they were not allowed to sit where the whites did, they should "stand in the aisles and rather worship God upon your feet than become a party to your own

degradation. You must shame your oppressors, and wear out prejudice by this holy policy."⁶⁷

164. Ride-in

The ride-in, popularly known in the United States as the freedom ride, is a type of sit-in adapted to public transportation. It was widely used during the 1960s in the United States against racial segregation on buses, although its earlier use was more diverse. In this method Negroes and whites persist in sitting in sections of buses or other vehicles opposite to those assigned to them. Sometimes such actions have violated company regulations or local and state laws. More recently, since federal rulings have outlawed such segregation, ride-ins were taken to bring local practice into conformity with the law.

In 1841 when the ride-in campaign against frequent, but not universal racial segregation in transportation began in New England, the small minority of Negroes in those states (one percent in Massachusetts and about three percent in Rhode Island, for example) were highly discriminated against. On stagecoaches, Negroes, even in bad weather, might be refused rides completely, or be required to ride on top in the open. On steamboats they might be refused cabins or only be permitted to travel on deck with cattle. The new railroads enforced segregation of free blacks, while allowing slaves to ride with their Southern masters when visiting from the South.⁶⁸ The campaign against this discrimination and segregation was led by Garrisonian nonviolent abolitionists, Mabee reports, including Garrison himself, John A. Collins, active in the Nonresistance Society, and Frederick Douglass, former slave who became the famous advocate of abolition of slavery.⁶⁹

In June and July 1841, while visiting Massachusetts, the young David Ruggles, a half-blind New York Negro who was very active in the struggle for rights of his people, set a personal example for the ride-ins. He insisted on buying a ticket for first-class accommodation on the steamer for Nantucket, and refused to move from a white car on the New Bedford Railroad. In both cases, he was physically attacked; his nonviolence did not prohibit his taking court action, however. Ruggles based his insistence on equal service on this belief: "While I advocate the principles of equal liberty, it is my duty to practice what I preach, and claim my rights at all times."⁷⁰ Following a protest meeting by New Bedford Negroes, chaired by the young Frederick Douglass, Garrison, Douglass and about forty black and white abolitionists boarded a steamer, also for Nantucket. The whole ship was segregated. When the captain refused to sail until the Negroes occupied the upper deck, some of the party left the ship; those

remaining, obtained the captain's agreement that the whole group should ride on the upper deck. "As the steamer moved toward Nantucket the abolitionists cheerfully held a meeting . . . to protest the steamship company's already crumbling segregation policy," Mabee reports.⁷¹

A series of ride-ins on New England railroads took place in 1841. Sometimes whites rode in the Negro car, sometimes unaccompanied Negroes rode in white cars, and sometimes integrated groups or two or three rode in the white cars. Physical assault was commonplace. One of the participants, James N. Buffum, a Quaker, reported his view that the ride-in actions and the reactions of the railroad officials brought new converts to the cause; in Lynn, for example, and "even in Salem, where it has seemed as if nothing short of Almighty judgments could wake them from their guilty slumbers," people were aroused and talking of the "shameful" treatment of the "ride-inners."⁷² A boycott of the segregated Massachusetts railroads was organized, people being urged to use unsegregated rail or stage service instead. Mabee writes that "it is doubtful that without the drama of the ride-ins, often heightened by the violence of the conductors, a boycott of significant proportions would have developed."⁷³ This boycott was strongly supported every week for a year, beginning in April 1842, by Garrison's *Liberator* and by the *American Antislavery Almanac*.⁷⁴ The combination of these nonviolent pressures, plus the strong possibility of legislation against such segregation, induced both the New Bedford Railroad and the Eastern Railroad quietly to end segregation.⁷⁵ Referring to the ride-ins by Negroes who had entered "the cars intended only for white passengers and allowed ourselves to be beaten and dragged out," Frederick Douglass said in 1849 that this had produced desegregation of the railroads "because the railroad companies became ashamed of their proscription."⁷⁶

A few years later ride-ins were also used on horse-drawn cars in New York City and in Philadelphia. In 1854 and 1855 there were several instances of Negroes insisting on riding on the basis of equality in the horse-cars, including members of the congregation of the highly respected Dr. Pennington, the Heidelberg-educated Negro moderator of the Presbyterian Church. Similar action occurred in Philadelphia in 1858 when the well-known Negro poet and Garrisonian Frances Watkins insisted on riding like any other passenger. Similar action occurred during the Civil War when a Negro businessman and his wife insisted on riding inside the car, not on the platform. In that case, in final exasperation the conductor opened all the windows, unhitched the horses, and abandoned the car.⁷⁷

After the Civil War another ride-in was held in Louisville, Kentucky, in 1871, by newly freed Negro slaves who sought the end of segregation

on the streetcars of the city. It began in January when Robert Fox paid his fare and insisted on sitting in the white section, refusing to move when ordered and finally being thrown off the car. He won a Federal District Court ruling in his favor, which was, however, ignored by the local streetcar company, which continued segregated seating; instead of throwing Negroes bodily out of the cars for refusing to sit where ordered, they simply halted the cars until the Negroes moved. After consultation with local Federal officials and white attorneys, local Negro leaders launched a full-scale ride-in. In May a young Negro boy sitting in the white section was evicted and beaten by a hostile white crowd, then arrested and fined in the city court, with the judge warning against further ride-ins. But the ride-in campaign continued as Negroes in streetcar after streetcar took "white" seats. The drivers then left the cars completely, and occasionally Negroes drove the cars themselves. White violence erupted, and a race riot threatened. Moderate Kentucky newspapers and many community leaders deplored the fighting, and the Republican gubernatorial candidate, John Marshall Harlan—a former slave owner—denounced the segregation policy. National attention grew. There were rumors that President Grant might send in Federal troops. Federal marshals and an attorney for the Federal government backed the Negroes. The streetcar company capitulated, and all city transit companies in Louisville abandoned segregation permanently.⁷⁸

After the 1946 Supreme Court ruling against segregation in interstate travel, George Houser and Bayard Rustin in 1947 organized the first extended freedom ride, the group riding interstate buses throughout the upper South, insisting without violence on their newly awarded constitutional right to be seated without segregation.⁷⁹

The big wave of freedom rides was launched, however, in 1961 under the sponsorship of the Congress of Racial Equality, then a nonviolent group led by James Farmer. On May 4 the interracial group left Washington D.C., originally intending to reach New Orleans. The group was subjected to a long series of arrests, harassments, and white mob violence, though it also gained increased support and wider sponsorship. The freedom ride, however, halted on May 28 in Jackson, Mississippi, where a jail-in campaign developed. At least a dozen of these ride-ins were held during the period, involving over a thousand persons representing four major organizations. Beginning on November 1 all interstate buses were required by federal regulation to display a sign: "Seating aboard this vehicle without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin, by order of the Interstate Commerce Commission." The following year this was also printed on all interstate bus tickets, and terminals for such buses had to post similar signs.⁸⁰

165. Wade-in

The wade-in is a method designed to counter racial discrimination in the use of beaches which are physically accessible to the public (i.e., not surrounded by fences, etc.) and for which tickets are not required. The opponents of racial discrimination simply enter the area and make normal use of the beach and water without regard to restrictive customs or legal prohibition. An interracial group of seventy-five from the Youth Work Committee of the Chicago National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, for example, conducted a wade-in at Rainbow Beach on Lake Michigan, in the South Shore of Chicago, from July 16 to the end of the summer 1961.⁸¹ The principle of such entry and use of facilities may be applicable to other restricted areas which are not fenced in, and is related to, but not identical with, nonviolent invasion, which is described below.

166. Mill-in⁸²

In the mill-in the actionists gather in some place of symbolic significance or one which is related to the grievance, such as the offices of the opponent. They then remain there for a certain period, usually determined in advance. But instead of conducting a sit-in or a sit-down, they remain mobile. People may thus move within the building (or other place), and individuals may come and go during the mill-in. This method has been described as capable of achieving the goals of direct confrontation and intervention while being less likely to provoke serious repression than, say, a nonviolent occupation. The presence of a large number of "mill-inners" is likely to impede the normal operations of people who may be working in the building, but deliberate obstruction of their activities is not a part of this method.

The mill-in was used, for example, by the Afro-American Society of Tufts University and its supporters, who sought more minority employment in the construction of a dormitory on the campus at Medford, Massachusetts, in November 1969. After a large police contingent occupied the building site itself, the Afro-American Society held a mill-in at the university administration building, Ballou Hall, on Friday November 7 and again on Monday, November 10. *Criterion*, a Tufts alumni journal, describing the Friday action, reported:

Approximately 400 students—50 blacks, 350 whites—and a few faculty members—gathered in front of Ballou Hall at 9:00 A.M. for a "mill-in." They divided into four equal groups, each assigned to approach one of four university administrators The peaceful "mill-in" was al-

lowed by University officials; there were no policemen inside or outside Ballou Hall Students peacefully occupied administrative offices, querying officials on issues surrounding the situation. A meeting convened around 9:30 A.M. in the Coolidge room of Ballou and was packed with about 300 students. They listened to President Hollowell air the University's position for about one half hour.⁸³

Students evacuated the room and building thirty minutes before normal closing time. It is reported that normal administrative work in the building was "either slowed or halted completely" during the mill-in.⁸⁴

167. Pray-in

In the pray-in persons enter, or attempt to enter, a church from which they have been by custom or policy barred, in order to participate equally in the religious services. In cases where admission has been allowed but seating has been segregated, participants in the pray-in sit in the pews reserved for others.

In early 1848 Frederick Douglass urged all Negroes to abandon the separate black churches and instead to attend white ones, in "a massive pray-in," as Mabee calls it. Douglass declared that Negroes "should go in and take seats without regard to their complexion, and allow themselves to be dragged out by the ministers, elders, and deacons. Such a course would very soon settle the question, and in the right way."⁸⁵

This massive action did not occur, but there were a number of individual cases of pray-ins reported from Philadelphia, New York state and parts of New England. The reactions were not always friendly. For example, in Randolph, Massachusetts, sometime before 1835, a Negro family purchased a pew in a white Baptist church; when they discovered one Sunday morning that the pew had been removed, they sat in its place on the floor. The next Sunday, they discovered that even the floorboards had been removed. When visiting the Marlborough Presbyterian church in New York State in 1837, the white abolitionist Lewis Tappan joined with the Negroes, who were served communion last; the minister was startled and later resolved to serve all at the same time.

In 1838 a white minister in Newark, New Jersey, was driven out of his pulpit after he had walked a black woman servant to church and seated her with his wife. The only abolitionist congressman from New York in 1840, Seth Gates, invited a visiting Negro abolitionist to sit with him in his church pew in Genesee County, New York; the local newspaper denounced Gates as an "amalgamator," but he was nonetheless reelected to Congress. A young white Quaker was in 1840 reprimanded for sitting

with the blacks in the separate pews assigned to them; the youth was told he was "sitting in judgment" of the Friends who had assigned the pews. The Grimké sisters, Angelina and Sarah, new converts to Quakerism, insisted on sitting with the black women in the Philadelphia Meeting house they attended. Also scolded by the Quakers, the sisters replied: "While you put this badge of degradation on our sisters, we feel it is our duty to share it with them." A predominantly white Baptist church in Newport, Rhode Island, in 1858 refused to renew the lease on the pew of a white lady who had invited a black girl who was a member of the church to sit with her; the white woman brought a camp stool to church and sat in the aisle beside her former pew.⁸⁶

During the civil rights actions of the 1960s, when Negroes sought admission to all-white churches in the South, they frequently knelt at the church entrance; this became known as a kneel-in. For example, one Sunday in February 1961, in Rock Hill, South Carolina, the city's first kneel-ins took place, at the same time that many students were being jailed for participation in sit-ins at lunch counters. The Negroes were admitted to three of the white churches but barred at two others.⁸⁷ In Birmingham, Alabama, in 1963 it was announced that part of the current campaign on Easter Sunday, April 14, would include mass attempts to worship at white churches. As had already been done on various occasions, the pattern was that when refused entrance to the churches, the Negroes would kneel on the church steps and pray.⁸⁸

168. Nonviolent raids

In nonviolent raids, volunteers march to certain designated key points of symbolic or strategic importance and demand possession. This method usually involves civil disobedience and the risk of severe repression by police and troops. During the 1930-31 campaign in India, for example, quite a few of the seized Congress offices were reoccupied, and unorganized attempts to occupy government buildings occurred.⁸⁹ An even clearer example from that campaign was the effort to "seize" the Dharasana salt depot. Almost every day for a period of weeks volunteers marched in an orderly procession toward the depot and asked possession. Intending to take the salt stored there as an advanced method of defiance of the Salt Act (which was a major point of attack during that campaign), the volunteers met with severe repression.⁹⁰

As the volunteers do not use violent methods of seizing or holding such places, their raids are not conducted with the main intent of actually gaining possession. Rather, nonviolent raids are intended more as a challenge to authority, a symbolic defiance of the established regime, and as

a means of bringing into use some of the psychological mechanisms associated with self-suffering. In an extremely advanced stage of a nonviolent revolt, however, large masses of people might conceivably surround such "seized" points and effectively obstruct efforts by officials to recapture them, if helped by restrictions on the means of repression or assistance from the troops or police.

A variation on this method—seeking possession of merchandise rather than of a place—was practiced in Boston, Massachusetts Bay Colony, on January 18, 1770, in an attempt to deal with eight merchants who were violating the nonimportation agreement. The offending merchants had refused to reverse their behavior and to surrender the imported products to the committee of inspection. Arthur Schlesinger reports that:

The whole body of more than a thousand persons then proceeded, in impressive and orderly array, to the houses or stores of each of these men; and, through William Molineux as spokesman, demanded that the goods, which had once been placed in the store, should be immediately deposited with the committee of inspection. Only Cary made the concession demanded.⁹¹

169. Nonviolent air raids⁹²

Airplanes, balloons, or other air transport may be used to enter the air space of an opponent, without use or threat of any violence or destruction, to bring leaflets, or perhaps food and other gifts, to the population. (Air missions bringing supplies to break blockades are classed separately.) At times such a raid and dropping of leaflets may have an important psychological impact. An example of this occurred in the closing phase of the Kapp *Putsch*. On Tuesday, March 16, an airplane of the German government, which had fled to Stuttgart, appeared over Berlin, held by the putschists, to drop a leaflet, "THE COLLAPSE OF THE MILITARY DICTATORSHIP." Lieutenant-Colonel Goodspeed reports that "even in the fashionable sections of the city, the Berliners eagerly seized the printed sheets and, when they read them, cheered so loudly that officers of the Allied Commission of Control came hurrying to their hotel windows to see what was going on."⁹³

Nonviolent air raids have often been small actions in overwhelmingly violent struggles—highly unfavorable conditions in which to produce results. For example, in late July 1965 United States planes dropped toys and clothes over villages near Hanoi in order to impress the civilian population of the good will of the United States.⁹⁴ And in South Vietnam U.S. planes some weeks later hovered above National Liberation Front positions,

playing tape recordings of typical family noises and sounds. This was followed by a pitiful entreaty intoned by a Vietnamese woman: "Come home." U.S. officials believed this produced many deserters and called it a "humane form of terrorism."⁹⁵

170. Nonviolent invasion

In nonviolent invasion a group of nonviolent volunteers deliberately and openly enter a forbidden area in order to demonstrate their refusal to recognize the right of the controlling regime or agency to exercise sovereignty or control over that area or to use it for a particular purpose. This method entails civil disobedience and the risk of severe repression. The mass nonviolent invasion of Goa in 1955 to defy the right of Portugal to exercise sovereignty over that part of India is perhaps a classic example of nonviolent invasion.⁹⁶ Other examples include attempts by pacifists to enter rocket sites near Omaha, Nebraska, in 1959,⁹⁷ and attempts to "reclaim" military land in Harrington, England, for peaceful purposes.⁹⁸ The attempt, in January 1960, to halt the French atomic test at Reggan, North Africa, by entering the forbidden area was intended to create nonviolent interjection, but as the volunteers did not come close to the actual test site this case was limited to a nonviolent invasion of French-controlled territory.⁹⁹ American opponents of nuclear weapons sought to halt Pacific nuclear tests by sailing into the prohibited area in 1958 and 1962.¹⁰⁰

171. Nonviolent interjection

The method of nonviolent interjection involves placing one's body between a person and the objective of his work or activity, or sometimes between a soldier or a policeman and his opponent, or on other occasions in the path of a vehicle. This action is distinguished from the next method, nonviolent obstruction, in that the interjection does not constitute a sufficiently large or extensive physical obstruction that it cannot be overcome, removed, or surmounted. For example, with nonviolent interjection, persons or vehicles could simply proceed over the bodies, while with nonviolent obstruction they cannot do so.¹⁰¹ The aim of nonviolent interjection is to persuade or otherwise induce the persons being impeded (soldiers, drivers, etc.) that they should desist from the activity which the actionists regard as immoral or illegitimate, or at least that the activity should not be continued at the price of imposing human suffering on the people who have intervened to bring it to a halt.

Since the possible results of this method are not achieved by imposing an insurmountable physical obstruction, the numbers of actionists are not decisive. A single person or a small group of people may, for example, lie or sit in front of a tank or train carrying war supplies in an effort to induce the driver to refuse to move the vehicle instead of inflicting injury or death on those lying or sitting in front of it. In fact, it has been argued that fewness of numbers increases the psychological or moral impact of the interjection. Bradford Lyttle distinguishes between individual nonviolent interjection (which he sees as running the greatest risk of injury or death because the individual may not be seen or may be thought to be bluffing) and group interjection (in which the risk of suffering or death for each individual taking part is less). Lyttle therefore suggests that individual nonviolent interjection may be more powerful. The examples of nonviolent interjection which are offered here are grouped into three types: intervention in social and employment activities, in actions of police and soldiers, and in halting vehicles.

In a rather atypical case, antiapartheid demonstrators sat down on the tennis court at Madserud Arena, Oslo, on May 13, 1964, to oppose the Davis Cup tennis match between Norway and the all-white South African team.¹⁰² It is more common for this method to be used, however, as interjection between the actionists and the work or other activities of some group. For example, during the 1922 campaign in India, some students sat in the gateways of Calcutta University to block the passage of their fellow students. Urging them to refuse to attend classes, the demonstrators took the risk of being stepped on by those who persisted in entering the university. Similar means were used during the Indian nationalist struggles by women to halt the sale of liquor and by noncooperators to "persuade" government workers still loyal to the British *Raj* to resign their jobs. It is reported that Indian women used this method to induce their husbands working for the British to refuse to cooperate with the regime.¹⁰³ In 1957 striking hosiery workers in Reading, Pennsylvania, lay down on the sidewalks at factory gates, forcing the nonstrikers to choose whether they would walk over them in order to enter the factory or stay away from their jobs.¹⁰⁴

Civil rights demonstrators in the United States have used nonviolent interjection as a strong means of influencing employers to hire more Negroes. In May 1963 Philadelphia chapters of the Congress of Racial Equality and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People blocked the entry of white workmen at sites of allegedly discriminatory employment—calling this a "job blockade." (In this case there was some

violence between the demonstrators and white construction workers.) Similar means were later successfully used in San Francisco to reach agreement from local hotels and car dealers to hire hundreds of Negroes; some demonstrators drew long jail sentences, illustrating that interventionist methods are often met with strong counteraction. The entrance to a New York City plumbers' union headquarters was also blocked, winning an agreement to admit Negro apprentices.¹⁰⁵

Nonviolent interjection has also been used by white segregationists to block integration in the South; for example, in Greenwood, Mississippi, in the summer of 1964, a Negro couple and their son had been attempting to be served at a local cafe. Undaunted by a lawyer blocking the door one day, they returned the following day carrying a copy of the Civil Rights Act. This time, however, the proprietor herself stood in the door, effectively blocking it, and screaming at them to get out. Later, the couple told civil rights workers that next time they would go somewhere else.¹⁰⁶

Nonviolent interjectionists have also attempted to interfere with the activities of police or soldiers, especially where they have attempted to arrest persons, or sometimes to prevent fighting. It has also been used to assist the escape of an apprehended Negro who was thought to be an escaped slave. One such example occurred in Boston in 1851, during the period of the Federal Fugitive Slave Law. Shadrach, a waiter in a Boston coffeehouse, had been arrested, Mabee reports, charged as an escaped Virginia slave, and brought to court. A group of from twenty to forty Negroes entered the courtroom and, laughing and jostling, moved about the room, hiding Shadrach among them long enough to rush him out of the room, thus enabling him to start the journey to Canada. Daniel Webster, then Secretary of State, called the rescue treason, and Senator Henry Clay thought the law should be made more severe. The American and Foreign Antislavery Society pointed out, however, that no weapons had been used and no one was injured, while Garrison pronounced this action by "unarmed friends of equal liberty" to be "an uninjurious deliverance of the oppressed out of the hands of the oppressor."¹⁰⁷

When, in late winter or early spring of 1943, it became known in Bulgaria that the first deportations of Jews were being planned, "revolutionary elements in Sofia" issued an appeal for people to intervene to protect the Jews:

Take your stand before your neighboring Jewish homes and do not let them be led away by force! Hide the children and do not give them to the executioners! Crowd the Jewish quarters and manifest your solidarity with the oppressed Jews!¹⁰⁸

In the course of rivalries threatening newly independent Algeria with civil war, there were at the end of August and the beginning of September 1962 many instances in which unarmed local inhabitants barred the road between Oran and Constantine with their bodies and challenged the troops to use arms against them if they insisted on advancing toward rival troops.¹⁰⁹ In the Boghari area, south of Algiers, local inhabitants placed themselves between the pro-Ben Bella forces and opposition troops and demonstrated against any resumption in fighting. "Many of them lay down on the road."¹¹⁰

In June 1965 opposition Buddhists in Vietnam interjected themselves to prevent troops which were repressing Buddhist resistance from entering a pagoda by sitting in front of the gate of the National Buddhist Institute, Vien Hoa Doa.¹¹¹

Nonviolent interjection has also been used in efforts to stop vehicles, such as automobiles, trucks and trains carrying goods the actionists did not wish to be delivered, construction machinery, and even tanks. On February 11, 1963, students sat on the road outside the Royal College at Nairobi, Kenya, to draw attention to the dangerous road-crossing conditions for undergraduates.¹¹² Women with baby carriages (prams), some with babies and older children, have often blocked highways and streets in the United States and England in efforts to have traffic lights or other safety devices installed to protect children and others from the traffic. At times this method may be used in a different issue, however, and in association with another method. In connection with the Glasgow school boycott of 1963 described in Chapter Four, against a dangerous unfenced canal, fifty mothers with prams and children blocked the canal bridge to traffic.¹¹³

In Palermo, Sicily, in 1963, an unemployed bricklayer linked hands with four of his seven children to form a human barrier across a busy street, protesting his being unemployed and "striking" to get a job.¹¹⁴

In Bombay, during the 1930-31 campaign a young man, Babu Ganu, attempted to stop a truck carrying boycotted cloth by lying in front of it and was killed when it ran over him.¹¹⁵ There are several examples of this method in efforts to stop one type of construction or another. For example, in August 1958 at a missile base near Cheyenne, Wyoming, four persons attempted to stop trucks carrying supplies from entering the base; one was seriously injured.¹¹⁶ Another example took place in England in December 1958 at a rocket site near a town called Swaffham. Direct actionists on two different occasions lay across the road and surrounded equipment in such a way as to force the workmen to choose between halt-

ing their work or injuring the demonstrators.¹¹⁷ There were no serious injuries, the work was temporarily disrupted, and newspaper publicity was often sympathetic.

In 1958, in an effort to block work on a plan of the New York State Power Authority to flood 1,300 acres of Tuscaroras Indian nation land for a storage reservoir while legal action was being taken to stop the seizure of the land, members of this tribe on three separate occasions interjected their persons. Signs such as "WARNING. NO TRESPASSING. INDIAN RESERVE" and "MUST YOU TAKE EVERYTHING WE OWN?" were carried by bands of Tuscaroras in April 1958 as they blocked the entrance of surveyors and trucks by standing or lying down in front of them. State and county police arrested three of the demonstration leaders for unlawful assembly and disorderly conduct. Two of the men were tackled by police and dragged to the police wagon. Some scuffling between the police and Indian women and children occurred, although the interjection itself was nonviolent. In May surveyors again entered the reservation; Tuscaroras stood in front of their instruments to disrupt the survey work. Later, when bulldozers were sent in to clear land, the clearance crew consisting of Tuscaroras men stayed away from the job, and the work was stalled again. In the meantime their attorney, Mr. Grossman, was pursuing the legal battle. Edmund Wilson, in his *Apologies to the Iroquois*, reports that "the practical obstruction by one group of the Indians and the defense of them in their difficulties by Grossman gave pause to the Power Authority and influenced public opinion." In 1959 the Indians won their case when the Federal Power Commission refused to permit the New York Power Authority to build on Indian reservation land.¹¹⁸

While demonstrators in Cleveland, Ohio, on April 7, 1964, sought to disrupt construction of a new school in a Negro area—which was seen as an attempt to stop Negroes from attending predominantly white schools and to tighten segregation—the Rev. Bruce William Klunder, twenty-seven, a Presbyterian minister, threw himself on the ground behind a bulldozer which was moving in reverse to avoid three other demonstrators lying in front of it. The driver, not seeing Rev. Klunder, drove over him, and he was crushed to death. Rioting followed.¹¹⁹

In one small town in Slovakia during the Nazi occupation all the young men lay down on the railroad tracks to prevent a train from taking away the Jews.¹²⁰

In 1953, when the Russians used tanks in Jena, East Germany, to disperse a crowd of 25,000 persons which were seeking the release of eight demonstrators who had been arrested during the uprising in June, "the

crowd refused to budge. Women sat down in rows and forced the drivers to stop," Stefan Brant reports. By this means, and by maneuvering streetcars to block the tanks, the crowd held up the Russians for half an hour, at which time they temporarily withdrew. Eventually, the Russians dispersed the demonstrators by shooting over the heads of the crowd.¹²¹

172. Nonviolent obstruction

Nonviolent obstruction is similar to nonviolent interjection, except that the human bodies are used not only for psychological intervention but as a physical obstruction.¹²² Such physical blocking occurs when the obstruction is undertaken by very large numbers or when the obstructors are so placed that the work, vehicle, police, troops, or the like cannot proceed even though they injure or kill the demonstrators. As in the previous method, the risk of arrest, injury, or death is involved. Such obstruction is unlikely to last very long unless: 1) the numbers are exceedingly large, are maintained over a long period, and are beyond the control of the personnel, equipment, and weaponry which the opponent is able and willing to apply; 2) the opponent is unwilling simply to kill all the obstructors by whatever means may be available; 3) the workers or the enforcement officials, police, or troops are, or become, sympathetic to the demonstrators; or 4) the demonstration of public opposition to the grievance, or to repression of the actionists, is strong enough to induce the opponent to abandon the objectionable activity or halt it for a time.

Various proposals for nonviolent obstruction to protect fugitive slaves in the United States were made between 1850 and 1852. The Rhode Island Antislavery Society, for example, decided that when it was impossible to hide slaves for whom warrants had been issued or to help them escape, "they shall be surrounded by a sufficiently numerous and influential Peace Committee to protect them from assault and capture." Wendell Phillips proposed that in a case where a fugitive was held in a courthouse, "hundreds of thousands" of people should nonviolently surround the building to prevent his return to the South by requiring officials "to walk over our heads." The periodical *National Antislavery Standard* argued that a phalanx of peaceful men, willing to give their lives, could protect an escaped slave even from military forces; it called for men who were ". . . unarmed but determined that no slave shall be taken . . . except over their bodies." This would, it continued, be a "revolution," ". . . the noblest the world ever saw, and it would, we cannot doubt, be effectual. We can hardly believe that armed citizen-soldiers would ride over and cut

down their fellow-citizens standing and braving death with calm but desperate resolution lest a man should be taken among them and made a slave."¹²³

It is not always easy to find the border-line between nonviolent interjection and nonviolent obstruction, as some of these cases may suggest. In Hungary, in early December 1956, seven hundred unarmed men and women blocked factory gates when police and two truckloads of Hungarian Army officers came to arrest three members of the workers' council at the *Danubia* textile factory. The arresting officers eventually left without the three men.¹²⁴ Another case of obstruction took place in Sunakawa, Japan, in 1956, when ten thousand people occupied a site intended for a United States air base; after several days of obstruction, plans for building the air base was abandoned.¹²⁵ In Brooklyn, New York, on July 22, 1963, about 1,250 persons took part in an effort to block public construction until more Negroes and Puerto Ricans were hired. More than two hundred obstructors were arrested, including at least ten ministers and church officials. Peter Kihss, of *The New York Times*, reports "In wave after wave for nearly eight hours Negro and white sympathizers darted in front of incoming construction vehicles to sit down or lie down in the roadway. They were picked up and taken away in patrol wagons—a dozen at a time."¹²⁶

In the autumn of 1963, when white segregationist Mississippians feared that governor Ross Barnett might be arrested by federal marshals for contempt of a court order desegregating the University of Mississippi, Waskow reports, thousands of them sat down around the governor's mansion "to interpose their bodies—perhaps intending a 'not-quite-violent' resistance—between him and the forces of law and order."¹²⁷

173. Nonviolent occupation

Nonviolent occupation may be used after a nonviolent invasion or a nonviolent land seizure, or by people who have been ordered to leave their land or building. Thus nonviolent occupation may involve technical trespass and the violation of other laws. Nonviolent occupation was successfully practiced by Bishop Ambrose during Easter week, 385 A.D., when he defied orders of the imperial government of the Roman Empire to surrender one of the larger churches in Milan to the Arian Christians. Although the church was surrounded by troops, Ambrose risked imprisonment and death, and continued to hold masses for five days. Finally the government ordered the troops withdrawn and the fines remitted, and, wrote Ambrose, "as

soon as they heard, the troops rushed into the Church to receive the kiss of peace."¹²⁸

During the 1928 Bardoli campaign in India, those peasants whose land was attached because of their refusal to pay taxes either refused to leave the land at all or returned to it. They cultivated it and planted crops, and insisted that whatever the current legal status might be, morally the land remained theirs and that they had a right to use it for constructive purposes.¹²⁹

In August 1957 about two hundred Mohawk Indians, part of the Iroquois Confederacy, settled on the banks of the Schohari Creek, near Fort Hunter, New York; they said that they had been blasted from their homes by the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and that the land they now occupied had belonged to the Mohawks under a treaty made in the 1700s. The Indians built a longhouse—the place of worship of the Handsome Lake religion—and half a dozen cabins. The Mohawks asserted they would recognize no local eviction proceedings, nor would they deal with local or state officials; as they were a nation they would deal only with the Federal government.¹³⁰

The most dramatic nonviolent occupation by American Indians has been that of Alcatraz Island. On November 9, 1969, a few American Indians swam through the waters of San Francisco Bay and landed on the old island prison of Alcatraz, abandoned seven years before by the government. Eleven days later a hundred more joined them, and claimed the site by right of some old treaties that awarded all deserted areas within a tribe's original territory to the original inhabitants. The Indians wanted to make the area into an educational culture center for the American Indian and proved their determination by continued occupation of the island. Power and water were cut off by the authorities, but the inhabitants managed with two malfunctioning generators and the little drinking water that could be carried over in jugs. They were supported from the mainland by both Indians and non-Indians alike, who donated food, clothing and medical supplies. A small school was established, and many families took up permanent residence on "the Rock." It became a central focus of the new Indian movement and a source of pride as a successful intervention to protest the U.S. government's inadequacies in Indian affairs. Alcatraz was held by the Indians until the last fifteen were removed by Federal marshals on June 14, 1971.¹³¹

With Russian military units outside Czechoslovak government buildings in August 1968, government officials and legislators remained in their buildings and continued to act in their legitimate capacities. For example, in the afternoon of August 24, *Politika* reported:

The Government Presidium building is blockaded, tank guns are aiming at the building from all sides, guns stand in firing positions in the little park at Klarov. The Government Presidium is blockaded, but the Government is functioning. Twenty-two ministers meet, hold discussions, make decisions, report to the parliament on their activity, maintain contact with the new Party leadership.¹³²

Politika also reported that the extraordinary twenty-sixth session of the National Assembly had already lasted four days:

The National Assembly building is surrounded by foreign troops, but the deputies are not leaving; they have imposed on themselves a house arrest. Acting on the summons by the Presidium, almost two hundred deputies from all over the Republic have reported in . . . an almost two-thirds majority. . . . On the first night, the deputies slept on the floor of their offices; for the following nights, they were able to get blankets and, more important, field cots for the women. Machine gun salvos rattle under the windows of the National Assembly building at night. Supplies in the dining room are satisfactory. . . .

Neither the gun barrels aimed at the National Assembly windows nor the threat of arrest will force the deputies to capitulate. The permanent session is to continue until some solution to the aggression is found.¹³³

SOCIAL INTERVENTION

Methods which take the form of direct intrusion in social behavior patterns, social occasions and social institutions are grouped as the third subclass of nonviolent intervention. In addition to these seven methods, certain others—such as a sit-in—produce social intervention, even though their dominant form is some other one, such as physical intervention, and hence they are grouped here in another subclass.

174. Establishing new social patterns

While social disobedience, a method of social noncooperation, consists of the refusal to obey various social customs, rules, regulations, practices, and behavior patterns, another method of social intervention consists of new ways of behavior which may positively contribute to the establishment of new social patterns. These may be unplanned actions by individuals or a

series of individuals or groups. Or they may be actions planned as organized opposition. A wide variety of social patterns may be involved. It is, however, easily illustrated with behavior which replaces social patterns of inequality, hatred, or avoidance with new relationships of equality and respect. In the 1830s American abolitionists, sometimes naturally and without deliberation, sometimes as a conscious act, associated with Negroes, who even in Northern cities were normally socially boycotted. Mabee reports that on the proposal of Sarah Grimké, a Quaker, the Antislavery Convention of American Women in 1838 adopted a resolution which stated: "It is . . . the duty of abolitionists to identify themselves with these oppressed Americans, by sitting with them in places of worship, by appearing with them in our streets, by giving them our countenance in steamboats and stages, by visiting with them at their homes and encouraging them to visit us, receiving them as we do our white fellow citizens."¹³⁴ Some abolitionists did not approve of such practices, however, either because of a fear that they would provoke violence against abolitionists or against Negroes, or because of an opinion that the issues of slavery and racial prejudice should be kept separate. Among abolitionists the issue of public association with persons of another color was so sharp that there was fear in 1836 that the American Antislavery Society would split on it.¹³⁵

Various abolitionists in Boston, Philadelphia, New York City and elsewhere engaged in "walk-alongs" (as Mabee calls them), in which they simply walked in the streets with persons of the other color, and often the other sex, sometimes arm in arm. This often upset people; the mayor of Philadelphia in 1839 urged Lucretia Mott not to do this because it offended the white rabble at a time when an anti-Negro riot was expected. However, she persisted in walking publicly with people regardless of color. After a meeting the Boston physician Dr. Henry Bowditch invited Frederick Douglass to walk home down Washington Street with him to dinner; Dr. Bowditch was afraid he would encounter his friends but Douglass later said that it was the first time a white had treated him as a man. In 1849 Douglass wrote in his periodical, *North Star*, that the way for abolitionists to remove prejudice was "to act as though it didn't exist, and to associate with their fellow creatures irrespective of all complexional differences. We have marked out this path for ourselves, and we mean to pursue it at all hazards."¹³⁶

Mixed dining during the 1840 annual meeting in New York of the American Antislavery Society met with trouble from a mob, but by 1847 and 1858 similar events were not disturbed.¹³⁷ Private individuals "interdined," i.e., ate together in violation of taboos against social equality

between their groups. To cope with prejudiced Quakers during a Friends Yearly Meeting, the Quaker Isaac Hooper invited his Negro Quaker guests, Mr. and Mrs. David Mapes, to join him for dinner and told the other guests that if they objected to joining them, they could eat later when the first group had finished. None did.¹³⁸ Various abolitionists entertained traveling abolitionists of a different color in their homes. However, in Pendleton, Indiana, a Quaker doctor who had been host to Frederick Douglass during his 1843 lecture tour was driven out of town by a mob.¹³⁹ Social equality within abolition societies was not fully accepted; about 1835 the Unitarian preacher William Ellery Channing, for example, advised against permitting Negroes to become members of such groups. That advice did not prevail, and Negroes held major offices in the national antislavery societies; but as late as the 1840s and 1850s Negroes sensed that they were not fully accepted.¹⁴⁰

Interracial marriages occurred among abolitionists. Those marriages clearly set a different social pattern and violated the strong taboo against them. Such marriages were sometimes illegal, as they were in Massachusetts until repeal of the law in 1843. Both men and women married across the racial barrier, sometimes then having to face diverse pressures and sanctions. These included having to move elsewhere, social ostracism, physical assault, and loss of job. Nevertheless, since more male than female fugitive slaves reached Canada, the young men "frequently" married whites; in one year during the Civil War the city of Boston reported that sixteen percent of the Negroes who married that year were marrying whites.¹⁴¹

Another variation on this method has been the individual insistence on receiving equal treatment in public facilities, such as restaurants. For example, in 1837 Charles R. Ray and Philip Bell, the general agent and the proprietor of the *Colored American*, traveling up the Hudson on a steamer from New York City refused to have their tea in the kitchen, insisting on service in the dining cabin, even if they had to wait until the whites had had been served. Ray and Bell insisted: ". . . we do not like to be the agents of our own degradation." Similarly, until threatened with physical removal, Frederick Douglass, also on a Hudson River steamer, insisted on taking dinner like the other passengers. In Cleveland in 1857, Susan B. Anthony, the woman suffrage leader, and other delegates to an abolitionist convention refused to enter the dining room until a black abolitionist, William Wells Brown, was permitted to join them; the hotel backed down and provided equal service for the remainder of their stay.¹⁴²

A number of these actions are almost identical with activities which have been undertaken in modern India for the eradication of untouchabil-

ity and achieving communal unity. "Interdining" by people of various castes, untouchables and members of other religions has frequently occurred. Beginning in the 1930s Gora (born a Brahman), the prominent atheist Gandhian social revolutionary, organized intercaste and interreligious dining on a mass scale in India. Everyone brought his own provisions, and the cooking and dining were done without regard to caste or religious taboos, although intercaste dining was prohibited by orthodox Hindus. Special efforts were sometimes needed to overcome the hesitancy of lower-caste Hindus to eat with groups lower than themselves. Inter-marriage has also been practiced and even encouraged as a means of ending untouchability. For example, Gora's children have been encouraged on that basis to marry outside the caste barriers, including with untouchables, and have done so.¹⁴³

175. Overloading of facilities

Overloading facilities involves the deliberate increase of demands for services far beyond their capacity, so that the operation of the institution (government department, business, social service, and so on) is slowed down or paralyzed. Such overloading may be initiated by customers, the public, or employees of the institution. The objectives may vary and may include improved services, wage increases and political ends.

In 1965 at the Los Angeles County Hospital in California, for example, interns protesting pay policies initiated an overloading of facilities by admitting far more patients to the hospital than existing facilities could accommodate—even persons not needing hospitalization were admitted. This was called a heal-in. The interns' aim was to obtain a better bargaining position with the hospital administration. The hospital was filled with patients within four days, and the action cost the city around \$250,000 in increased costs.¹⁴⁴

A similar case occurred in Massachusetts at the Boston City Hospital in 1967, where it was called an "around-the-clock heal-in." This action was begun by 450 residents and interns at Boston City Hospital on Tuesday, May 16, 1967. The purpose of the heal-in was to dramatize salary demands by doctors at Boston teaching hospitals; at that time the take-home salary of an intern was only sixty dollars per week. The doctors felt that it would be in violation of their oaths to go on strike, so they chose instead to practice "ultra-conservative medicine" in order to overcrowd the hospital. Dr. Philip Caper, President of the House Officers' Association, said: "Everyone gets the best of care," which was ensured by having all the interns and residents work twenty-four hours a day. "Every patient

who might benefit from hospitalization will be admitted, and no one will be discharged until he is completely well."

The heal-in was patterned after the similar action at the Los Angeles County Hospital eighteen months previously. The Boston City Hospital doctors began their heal-in as an unannounced experiment on Saturday, with 874 patients in the hospital. On Sunday there were 890, on Monday 924, and on Tuesday at 7 A.M. (after the main action was begun) there were 982. An unidentified doctor stated: "With 1,200 or more patients in the hospital the laundry will not be able to keep up, the kitchens will have trouble getting the food out, the X-ray and laboratory departments will be swamped, and people will begin to listen to our demands . . ." By Wednesday morning there were over 1,000 patients, and 1,075 on Thursday. The heal-in was supported by private doctors and house officers at the other major Boston hospitals. Action was taken only at Boston City Hospital because house officers there had full responsibility for medical procedure, unlike the private hospitals.

Countermeasures by the administration began Tuesday afternoon with an announcement that there were no more beds for male patients, which was disproved that evening by the admission of two more patients. They next tried to influence the chiefs of services to override the admittances, which these doctors refused to do on the grounds that these patients were indeed getting the best of care. The administration's final effort was to deny their competence to make salary changes. On the evening of Thursday, May 18, they relented and promised to make salary adjustments. The doctors ended the heal-in voluntarily that night. Observers felt that it was a "safe, effective way of backing up demands for higher wages."¹⁴⁵

A student version of the method was applied in Japan in 1954. It was the practice in some private universities to admit more students than there were facilities, on the assumption that not all students would attend classes at the same time. The students organized a campaign of "united attendance" as a means of pressure against the university.¹⁴⁶

176. Stall-in

The stall-in is a method that consists simply of conducting legitimate business as slowly as possible. This differs from stalling and obstruction, described in the previous chapter on political noncooperation, which is action by government employees to delay or prevent the implementation of some policy. The stall-in is undertaken by customers and clients for purposes which are likely to be social, but which may also include economic and political objectives. This method was applied in June 1964 by

the Congress of Racial Equality against the Bank of America in San Diego, California, with C.O.R.E. customers taking thirty minutes to transact business normally done in about three. C.O.R.E. was seeking an end to discrimination in the bank's employment practices.¹⁴⁷ In conjunction with the 1938 Harlem Negroes' "black-out boycott" movement (see consumers' boycott above), bill payers by the hundreds went to the electric utilities offices, each paying in nickels and pennies.¹⁴⁸

177. Speak-in¹⁴⁹

A special form of nonviolent intervention occurs when actionists interrupt a meeting, church service, or other gathering for the purpose of expressing viewpoints on issues which may or may not be related directly to the occasion. Since the intervention is primarily interference with the social form of the meeting, this method can best be classed as one of social intervention, although it includes psychological and physical aspects also.

This form of action was often used by George Fox and other early Quakers. For example, in his *Journal* George Fox records how one Sunday (First-day) in 1649 he attended the Church of St. Mary in Nottingham, England, (a "steeplehouse," he called it, rather than a church) and was "moved" to speak during the regular service:

Now as I . . . looked upon the town the greatest steeplehouse struck at my life . . . , a great . . . idolatrous temple. And the Lord said unto me, "Thou must go cry against yonder great idol, and against the worshippers therein." . . . And when I came there, all the people looked like fallow land, and the priest, like a great lump of earth, stood in his pulpit above. He took for his text these words of Peter, "We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed. . ." And he told the people that the Scriptures were the touchstone and judge by which they were to try all doctrines, religions, and opinions. . . Now the Lord's power was so mighty upon me . . . that I . . . was made to cry out and say, "Oh, no, it is not the Scriptures," . . . But I told them it was . . . the Holy Spirit, by which the holy men of God gave forth the Scriptures, whereby opinions, religions, and judgements were to be tried. . . Now as I spoke thus amongst them, the officers came and took me away and put me into prison, a pitiful stinking place . . .¹⁵⁰

In 1651 at Cranswick, in Yorkshire, one Sunday afternoon, a friend took Fox to meet the local priest, with whom he would talk after the service, which they attended. Fox records what happened:

And he took a text, which was, "Ho, everyone that thirsteth, let him come freely, without money and without price." And so I was moved of the Lord God to say unto him, "Come down, thou deceiver and hireling, for dost thou bid people come freely . . . and yet thou takest three hundred pounds off them for preaching the Scriptures to them. Mayest thou not blush for shame? . . . And so the priest, like a man amazed, packed away; . . . And so after the priest had left his flock, I had as much time as I could desire to speak to the people, and I directed them to the grace of God that would teach them and bring them salvation. . . .¹⁵¹

Fox did not always interrupt the regular services but sometimes waited until they had been completed, and then spoke to the priest and the people, as, for example, he did in Doncaster in 1652:

. . . and after the priest had done I spoke to him and the people what the Lord God commanded me, and they were in a great rage and hurried me out and threw me down the stairs, and haled me before the mayor and magistrates . . . and they threatened my life if I ever came there again . . .¹⁵²

During the antislavery campaign in the United States, actionists at times interrupted church services in order to denounce the lack of effective opposition to slaveholding, and also the refusal of many churches to accommodate antislavery meetings. Thus Mabee reports:

One Sunday morning in 1841, a determined young Garrisonian, Stephen S. Foster, entered a Congregational Church in Concord, New Hampshire. In a lull in the service he rose and denounced the church for upholding slavery. The pastor asked Foster to stop speaking, but he continued until some of the congregation took him by the arms and led him out. In the afternoon Foster returned to another service and again spoke without permission. This time some of the congregation threw him down the stairs, and he was arrested for disturbing public worship.¹⁵³

In using this method abolitionists were cautious to attempt a hearing through more agreeable means if possible:

. . . Foster and his team never interrupted a worship service unless they had already tried and failed to win a hearing by permission, including attempts to secure the use of the church building to hold their own meetings.¹⁵⁴

178. Guerrilla theater¹⁵⁵

Guerrilla theater, another method of social intervention, means a disruptive skit, dramatic presentation, or similar act. It came to be used in the United States in the late 1960s. The disruption may be of speeches, lectures, or normal proceedings of some group or institution. (The term guerrilla theater is also used for a spontaneous style of stage theater, usually with a political theme.)

Two examples are provided by Jerry Rubin, one of the more dramatic self-styled revolutionaries who emerged in the late 1960s. In late 1967 a conference of college newspaper editors in Washington, D.C., was debating whether or not to take a stand on the Vietnamese conflict:

Someone made a motion to table all resolutions and take no stand. The motion passed. Suddenly the lights went out and across the wall flashed scenes of World War II fighting, burning Vietnamese villages, crying Vietnamese women and napalmed children, image after image. The room echoed with hysterical screams, "*Stop it! Stop it!*"

A voice boomed over a bullhorn: "Attention. This is Sergeant Haggerty of the Washington Police. These films were smuggled illegally into the country from North Vietnam. We have confiscated them and arrested the people who are responsible. Now clear this room! Anyone still here in two minutes will be arrested!"

The editors fell over themselves rushing for the door. . . They believed they were going to be arrested for seeing a . . . film. They believe they live in a Nazi country. They accept it.¹⁵⁶

Earlier, in August of that year, Rubin and some others had used a similar device to denounce the American preoccupation with money. Rubin and his friends did this at the New York Stock Exchange:

The stock market comes to a complete standstill at our entrance to the top of the balcony. The thousands of brokers stop playing Monopoly and applaud us. What a crazy sight for them—longhaired hippies staring down at them.

We throw dollar bills over the ledge. Floating currency fills the air. Like wild animals, the stockbrokers climb over each other to grab the money.

"*This is what it's all about, real live money. Real dollar bills! People are starving in Biafra!*" we shout. . .

While throwing the money we spot the cops coming. The cops grab us and throw us off the ledge and into the elevators. The stockbrokers below loudly boo the pigs.¹⁵⁷

179. Alternative social institutions

One of the forms which nonviolent intervention may take is the building of new institutions. When their creation and growth produces a challenge the previous institutions, the new ones constitute nonviolent intervention. These new institutions intervene in various ways, such as by becoming competitive rivals of the opponent's institutions, by replacing them partly or completely, by providing institutional implementation of the actionists' principles or program, or by increasing the effectiveness of other methods of nonviolent action being used in the struggle. In any of these cases the opponent's institutions will no longer have the field to themselves, and the actionists will have intervened by offering substitute institutions. Alternative economic and political institutions are discussed later in this chapter. The focus here is on social institutions, which of course include educational ones.

It may be useful, however, to note briefly some of the reasons why new institutions may be launched. For example, in a long-term nonviolent struggle a necessary counterpart to noncooperation with certain established institutions may be the building up of alternative institutions, social, economic and political. This is often necessary in order to make noncooperation with institutions controlled by the opponent effective and in order to develop or maintain an alternative social order. Sometimes also this is done in order to prevent "contamination" by the institutions which are opposed, or to fulfill needs neglected by established bodies.

In the nineteenth century, during their resistance to Austrian rule, the Hungarians developed both social and economic institutions to combat the "Austrianization" of Hungary. These included the National Academy of Sciences, the National Museum, and the National Theater, while economic bodies included the Agricultural Union, the National Protective Union, and the Company of Commerce.¹⁵⁸ In 1905 in Ireland, Arthur Griffith developed a comparable Sinn Fein policy of building alternative educational, economic, political and diplomatic institutions for Ireland, built on the Hungarian pattern and designed to restore self-reliance and independence to the country.¹⁵⁹ Gandhi, too, developed the theory of alternative institutions as a crucial part of his constructive program.¹⁶⁰

Sometimes, however, a resistance movement may select only a few institutions for parallel development. In the nineteenth century the American abolitionists and Negro churchmen, for example, protesting against segregation within the churches, withdrew from them and sometimes es-

tablished new churches. This is how the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church was established in 1821.¹⁶¹

In addition to privately teaching slaves and free Negroes to read and write, abolitionists and others before the Civil War sometimes established new schools, usually for Negroes but occasionally for an integrated enrollment. In many states both such private instruction and schools were forbidden by law. In breaking up a school for slaves, a grand jury in Lexington, Kentucky, argued that the school would enlighten ". . . the minds of those whose happiness obviously depends on their ignorance."¹⁶² A Negro woman in Savannah, Georgia, taught a black school illegally for over thirty years; in other cases the teacher went to private homes, as in Petersburg, Virginia, where a mulatto secretly went from house to house at night to teach Negroes. In the late 1850s the abolitionist Rev. John G. Fee tried to create integrated schools in Kentucky; after his school building was burned by armed proslavery whites, Fee defiantly returned despite threats. He refused to carry weapons even for self-protection, and although frequently mobbed, he continued to create integrated schools. Catholics, Quakers and Negro church bodies supported several schools for free Negroes in Baltimore and Washington. Mobs broke up furniture and burned these schoolhouses, driving some teachers out of the capital city. After Quakers helped Myrtilla Miner to establish a normal school for Negroes in Washington in the early 1850s, boys on the street tormented the students, and a mob invaded the schoolroom. Miss Miner, however, "laughed them to shame; and when they threatened to burn her [school]house, she told them they could not stop her in that way, as another house, better than the old, would immediately rise from its ashes." A fire was set in 1860, but the building was nevertheless saved.¹⁶³

Schools seem to be one of the most common social institutions for parallel development, for the remaining two examples refer also to them, in very different circumstances. During the German occupation of their country Polish citizens set up an educational system independent of Nazi control. In 1942 in the Warsaw district alone more than 85,000 children were receiving education in small secret sessions in private homes. Over 1,700 had by that date been graduated from high school, receiving innocently worded cards which were after the war to be exchanged for official diplomas.¹⁶⁴

Alternative private school systems have been created in the U.S. South by pro-segregationist whites in efforts to counter Federal court decisions ordering integration in public schools. In Virginia, in the autumn of 1958,

for example, state aid to pay tuition for children in private schools was attempted. A Federal court ruling banning publicly paid teachers from operating private segregated schools (along with citizen support for the public schools and other factors) prevented these private schools from replacing integrated public ones.¹⁶⁵

180. Alternative communication system¹⁶⁶

Under political systems which have extensive control or monopoly over systems and media of communication, the creation by opposition groups of substitute systems of communication may constitute nonviolent intervention when they disrupt the regime's control or monopoly over the communication of information and ideas. This may involve newspapers, radio and even television. Systems for communication between individuals (as substitutes for the controlled postal or telephone system) may also be involved. Newspapers themselves, or radio broadcasts, as described in Chapter Three, are classed as methods of protest and persuasion; but when these are developed as alternative systems of communication on a sufficient scale to challenge the controlled ones, the intervention of these new systems disrupts the opponents control of these media. These new communication systems then become powerful tools of the nonviolent actionists; and, the opponent's control of communication of ideas and information having been broken, these systems in turn may enable the actionists in the future to resist and intervene in still other ways.

The underground newspaper systems cited in Chapter Three in certain Nazi-occupied countries were on a sufficient scale to constitute an alternative news communication system. This was clearly the case in the Netherlands. The very day after the German invasion the first hand-written underground bulletin appeared, and soon there were more handwritten or typewritten sheets or bulletins, called "snow-ball letters" (which readers were expected to copy and to pass on to friends). Major periodicals developed and grew to have very large circulations, especially considering the repressive conditions under which they were edited, published and distributed. *Vrij Nederland* with its local editions reached a circulation in September 1944 of one hundred thousand printed copies. *Het Parool* began as the first printed underground paper with six thousand copies, reaching a circulation of sixty thousand in 1944, and its daily news bulletins nearly reached a circulation of one hundred thousand. *Je Maintiendrai* grew from a small mimeographed sheet to a weekly which had a circulation of forty thousand in 1945. *Trouw* had a basic circulation of sixty thousand, but there were also about sixty local and regional editions; by

January 1945 the total circulation of all its editions and news bulletins was about two million. In 1944 *De Waarheid*, a weekly printed in Amsterdam and Rotterdam, may have reached one hundred thousand copies. *Ons Volk* reached a circulation of 120,000. In addition to these, various other clandestine periodicals and papers were published and circulated, and after confiscation of radios in May 1943 they grew rapidly; 150 separate such titles appeared in 1943, and between September 1944 and January 1945, 350 news bulletins appeared, "reaching a cumulative circulation of millions of copies."¹⁶⁷ With so extensive an alternative system of communication of political ideas, discussion of resistance tactics, and news, the illegal papers clearly rivaled the official ones and prevented the occupation forces from establishing a monopoly for the Nazi-controlled press and censored news reports.

Another type of alternative communication system is more specialized, involving the delivery of information and special messages to particular persons or groups, when the regular media for such communication, like the postal service, telephones and so on, are subject to interception or tapping.

The system of alternative radio broadcasting and television which operated in Czechoslovakia for a full two weeks, described briefly in Chapter Three, is the most advanced development thus far of such an alternative broadcast system operating within an occupied country. It operated longer under those conditions than had been believed possible, but as yet there has been relatively little attention to the technical, organizational and other requirements which might enable such a rival broadcasting system to continue to operate periodically over months or years to assist a resistance movement.

ECONOMIC INTERVENTION

Nonviolent intervention may also take economic forms.¹⁶⁸ The effect of some of the twelve methods in this subclass is, however, primarily psychological, while in other methods it is largely economic, often with political ramifications. Four of these methods are characterized by combined physical and economic characteristics: the reverse strike, the stay-in strike, nonviolent land seizures, and defiance of blockades. Four of these methods are simply disruptive of an opponent's economy, especially that of another country, and these usually involve government action, although they could in special circumstances be carried out by private groups; they are politically motivated counterfeiting, preclusive purchasing, seizure of assets

in another country, and dumping of products on the international market to injure or destroy the economy of another country. These methods are far from forms derived from love of one's opponent and indeed have sometimes been used just prior to or during military conflicts by the belligerents themselves. These methods however do fulfill the technical characteristics of this class of methods within the technique of nonviolent action. The last grouping within economic intervention is primarily nongovernmental, and involves the creation, shifting, or increase of alternative purchasing, marketing, transportation and production capacity.

181. Reverse strike

While economic in form, the reverse strike is largely psychological in impact. As far as is now known, the reverse strike is a relatively new form of nonviolent action, originating among agricultural workers in Italy around 1950, prior to the well-known use of the reverse strike in Sicily by the Italian exponent of nonviolent social change, Danilo Dolci. In using this method, the agricultural workers worked harder and longer than they were either required or paid to do. They did this to support their demand for pay increases and to place the employer in a difficult position to deny their requests.

The reverse strike has also been used to dramatize the need for jobs for unemployed men. In 1956 unemployed Sicilians led by Danilo Dolci used this method when they voluntarily repaired a public road in order to call attention to the severe unemployment in the area, the government's failure to deal adequately with it, and the constitutional guarantee of the right to work. On this occasion, Dolci and others were arrested.¹⁶⁹

James Farmer reports that more recently (no date given) in Chicago a Congress of Racial Equality (C.O.R.E.) group organized unemployed Negro youths to work on a slum clean-up campaign and then left a bill at City Hall (which was never paid) enumerating the costs of the effort. They were, as Farmer puts it, "as it were doing public works before they were authorized."¹⁷⁰

The first Sunday of the Russian occupation of Czechoslovakia, August 25, a majority of workers of the C.K.D., one of the country's largest machinery factories, including office workers, reported for an extra shift of work they called "Dubček's Sunday," to support the Dubček government by building the economy, instead of striking, which would have hurt the country itself, not the Russians. At the compressor plant, however, the instructions for the "Dubček shift" came too late and only about forty percent reported for work.¹⁷¹

Although the reverse strike *appears* innocuous and of little threat to the established order, it has at times in Italy been regarded by officials as sufficiently dangerous to merit the arrest, imprisonment and even shooting of reverse strikers by police.¹⁷² Why this is so is difficult to answer unless defiant initiatives and intervention by workers is seen as more perilous than the halting of work by ordinary strikes.

182. Stay-in strike

In the stay-in strike—the term is used by both Peterson and Knowles¹⁷³—the workers halt work but remain at the place of work, such as the factory, and refuse to leave until their demands are granted. This has been more frequently called a sit-down strike, but the term stay-in strike is recommended here as a more accurate (for the workers do not literally remain sitting down), and in order to avoid confusion with the sit-down described in Chapter Seven. When used by miners, this has been called a stay-down strike, since they remain down in the mines for its duration.

The stay-in strike has a number of advantages for the strikers: it leaves them in control of the means of production; it reduces the chances of strikebreakers being used to keep production going; and unless the stay-in strikers are attacked by police or troops, the chances of violence and sabotage in the strike are lessened.¹⁷⁴

Joseph G. Rayback, in his *A History of American Labor*, reports that "women in the needle trades had engaged in at least one sit-down strike in the nineteenth century" and says that the method had been used in Poland and France, but that these cases were not remembered by the American trade unionists in the mid-1930s.¹⁷⁵ Although it is by no means clear, there is some evidence that the development of this method in the United States was influenced by the Gandhian struggles in India.¹⁷⁶

Stay-in strikes were widely used in Europe and the United States during the 1930s. Rubber workers in Akron, Ohio, in 1936 conducted the first major American sit-down strike,¹⁷⁷ and the same year Cleveland auto workers conducted another.¹⁷⁸ In October 1936 the stay-in strike was used against the speedup at the General Motors plant in Anderson, Indiana,¹⁷⁹ and on November 13, the same year, it was used against the firing of union men at General Motors' Chevrolet plant in Flint, Michigan.¹⁸⁰

It was, however, the strike by the United Automobile Workers against General Motors at Flint which made the stay-in, or sit-down, strike famous, Rayback reports. "The strike was something new because workers instead of walking out of the plant just sat at their workbenches . . . The

sit-down proved highly effective." The action was denounced by General Motors as an unlawful invasion of property rights and ejection of the workers was demanded. The company cut off heat in the plants, but the workers remained. Two waves of attack by Flint city police were repulsed violently by the strikers, first with coffee mugs, soft drink bottles, iron bolts and hinges, and then, against tear gas bombs, by fire hoses. Governor Frank Murphy refused to use the state militia to expel the strikers. The workers defied a court order for evacuation, saying that they were seeking to make General Motors "obey the law and engage in collective bargaining"; in defiance of the Wagner Act, the company had refused to discuss either union recognition or collective bargaining. On February 4, President Franklin D. Roosevelt requested that negotiations be resumed, and a week later an agreement was reached whereby the company recognized the union, dropped the injunction, and agreed not to discriminate against union members.

In April 1937 a short stay-in strike forced the Chrysler Corporation to come to terms, Rayback also reports. The strike innovation spread widely, so that between September 1936 and June 1937 almost five hundred thousand workers took part in stay-in strikes in rubber, textile, glass and many other industries. This type of action produced a strong reaction, however, from employers, newspapers, sections of the public, the United States Senate, and finally the American Federation of Labor (A.F.L.). The Congress of Industrial Organizations (C.I.O.) had primarily used it against companies which ignored or defied orders of the National Labor Relations Board; in the summer of 1937 the C.I.O. decided that the stay-in strike "was both unnecessary and impolitic," writes Rayback, and it was quietly abandoned. In 1939 the United States Supreme Court virtually outlawed this type of strike as trespass on private property.¹⁸¹

Whereas the stay-in strike in America was used only to press for particular demands concerning wages, working conditions and union recognition, the use of the method in Italy before Mussolini's rise to power was revolutionary—the workers hoped to take over the factories and run them themselves.¹⁸² These cases were sometimes combined with violence.

There are a number of examples of the stay-down strike by miners. In 1934 the miners of Pecs, Hungary, conducted a combined stay-down and hunger strike in the mines.¹⁸³ The stay-down strike has also been used by coal miners in Poland and Wales,¹⁸⁴ including two cases of eight miners in September 1959 at the Great Mountain Colliery, Tumble, near Llanelly, South Wales,¹⁸⁵ and thirty-seven men at Groesfaen Colliery, Glamorgan, Wales in March 1960.¹⁸⁶

In Bitterfeld during the East German Rising in June 1953, the stay-in strike was used as a method of nonviolent struggle which would be effective while keeping people off the streets and avoiding mass confrontations with Russian and East German police and troops. The head of the local strike committee later declared: "We appealed to the workers over the city radio to return to their firms but not to resume work."¹⁸⁷ Evaluating the general use of this method in that revolt, Rainer Hildebrandt writes: ". . . [in] some factories . . . the sit-down strike lasted several days, sustained no casualties and even got some workmates released who had been arrested for striking."¹⁸⁸

183. Nonviolent land seizure

Another method of economic intervention occurs when people nonviolently expropriate and utilize land which by statute has belonged to someone else, with the intent of producing a *de facto* change of ownership and control. They hope that it will be recognized as a *de jure* change of ownership as well. Usually such land seizures are carried out by landless peasants against large landowners, frequently the same ones on whose land the peasants have previously worked. On other occasions, the seized land may be owned by the government, or may recently have been confiscated as punishment for popular antigovernment resistance, such as tax refusal.

The conditions under which nonviolent land seizures occur differ widely, sometimes even being undertaken with the approval of the government in power or with the encouragement of powerful groups in the society. It seems that the social and political situation is always complicated. They have occurred in diverse parts of the world, only a few examples of which are cited here.

The accounts of land seizures which are readily available are, as is the cases with many other methods, written with a focus which makes it difficult to determine whether the particular seizure was completely nonviolent, largely so, or mixed with significant violence; further research on such illustrative cases as are listed here might therefore require some modification in their descriptions.

As a few examples, we may cite peasant land seizures which occurred in Central and Southern Italy and in Sicily in 1919 and 1920. Christopher Seton-Watson reports that peasant land seizures began in August 1919 in the Roman Campagna.

Columns would set out at dawn from the villages, with banners and martial music, march to the selected estate, mark out the uncultivated

land in strips or plots, and at once begin to dig or plough, to establish ownership. Often the land selected for seizure had been the object of bitter disputes for decades and was regarded by the peasants as rightfully theirs.¹⁸⁹ In September the government authorized the prefects to requisition uncultivated land; it was to be distributed to needy claimants if they organized themselves into cooperatives. In the spring of 1920 Catholic peasant leagues, frequently encouraged by parish priests, organized larger land seizures in Sicily. The government then said that only peasants capable of efficient farming would have their claims recognized. The total amount of land which permanently changed hands by land seizures was small.¹⁹⁰

A large number of cases of land seizure have occurred in South America, especially in Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, Venezuela and Brazil. In Colombia peasant leagues in 1929 used land seizures and apparently defensive violence in Cundinamarca, Tolima and Valle and maintained on the former Viotá estates, in a mountainous area of over five hundred square kilometers, an independent communist republic for over twenty years. In 1933 the peasants took advantage of a Colombian law which made the landlord financially obligated to his tenants for improvements they made on his land. With and without permission, tenants planted coffee trees, making repossession by the landlord impossible without payment to the tenants. In the area of Cundinamarca these peasant actions were successful, and they kept the land. Somewhat later the Colombian Congress passed the Law 200, known as the López land reform.¹⁹¹ The *Caja Agraria*, agricultural credit bank, legalized the seizure of various *haciendas* by buying them from the original owners and selling them on long-term credit back to the peasants who had occupied them; this would not have happened except for the peasants' action.¹⁹²

About 1961 between five and six hundred peasant families invaded and seized the large abandoned *haciendas* of the area of Cunday. In this and two other areas the government's Land Reform Institute then divided the estates among a large number of peasant families.¹⁹³

Miguel Urrutia reports that around 1967 land seizures were still being organized by peasant unions and that the Roman Catholic-oriented *Federación Agraria Nacional* (affiliated with the *Unión de Trabajadores de Colombia*) had organized land seizures which had given *de facto* property rights to thousands of peasants. Such seizures have often been approved by Church advisors and led by priests. Nonviolent seizures were in some cases made legal by sales on credit by the landowner to the peasants, while in other instances the government's Land Reform Institute declares

the invaded land a "land reform" area. In other cases, says Urrutia, "the peasants keep their land through force."¹⁹⁴

Major land seizures have also occurred in Bolivia, often with government encouragement. In 1945 at a national congress of *campesinos* the Indians were urged by officials of the revolutionary nationalist government to strengthen their organizations as a step toward future actions to expropriate the *latifundios*—the large estates. However, later under a conservative government when Indians invaded the *haciendas* of the plateau they were cruelly repressed, Eduardo Arze-Loureiro reports.¹⁹⁵

In 1952, after the elected Nationalistic Revolutionary Movement gained government power, the N.R.M. and government together set about urging the Indians to occupy the land. With help, agricultural unions were established, and land was distributed into family plots and collective fields.

With surprising rapidity the land was taken and distributed, without violence, even before the promulgation of the Agrarian Reform Decree. The process took place almost simultaneously throughout the vast zone which is inhabited by 80 percent of the national population, and this with all its amplitude and with a stability that precluded the necessity for subsequent revisions.¹⁹⁶

The feudal divisions of land use, between family plots and the landowners, were kept, but ownership was transferred to the family groups and the community respectively. "It has been a peaceful process," writes Arze-Loureiro, "although one of transcendent importance, because it has eliminated one rural social class, that of the *latifundistas*, and has converted the serf into the owner of his parcel and a member of an institution with common possessions and interests."¹⁹⁷ The large landowners retreated to the cities, where they turned to gaining control of the State apparatus by means of the *coup d'etat*.

Huntington reports that peasant land seizures in the Cuzco area of Peru and the growing strength of peasant organizations contributed to the passage of the 1960 land reform law in that country;¹⁹⁸ it is also reported that President Belaunde Terry had "encouraged landless Indians to seize untilled latifundios so as to force through Congress his land reform bill."¹⁹⁹ In 1962-63 in Peru a syndicate movement grew in the departments of Junin and Pasco in the Central Sierra. Doreen Warriner reports that these groups organized "numerous seizures or invasions of *haciendas* which had taken land from the Indians. ('Invasion' means that the Indians drive their cattle onto the disputed land, build huts and live there.)"²⁰⁰

After President Rómulo Betancourt of Venezuela returned to power in 1959, his government immediately began to distribute public lands and to approve of land seizures which had been organized by the syndicates. The 1960 Agrarian Reform Law, writes Warriner, "did not really initiate the reform: it regularized the preceding take-overs of land by the syndicates, and provided a mechanism by which syndicates could, in future, petition the National Agrarian Institute for the expropriation of estates."²⁰¹ She also reports that "Venezuela is the only country where a trade union movement has carried out a land reform . . ."²⁰²

In 1963-64 land invasions occurred in Brazil, especially of abandoned and uninhabited estates where opposition was unlikely. The Paraíba Valley was the scene of many of the land seizures. Police threw the invaders out most of the time but not always, as Warriner reports: "In one case where the invaders were backed by the railway workers' syndicate which threatened a railway strike if the invaders were expelled, the state government purchased the estate and handed it over to the invaders."²⁰³ The Brazilian government agency *Superintendencia da Política de Reforma Agraria* did expropriate some properties where land seizures had been attempted or had been successful.²⁰⁴ The government of President Goulart was ousted by a *coup d'état* in April 1964. Landowners' fear of a general upheaval is reported as one factor in its overthrow. Leaders of the syndicate movement were then imprisoned.²⁰⁵

184. Defiance of blockades²⁰⁶

In the course of international conflict, nations may attempt to exert political pressure by blockading opponents, to exclude certain "strategic goods" of a military nature or to cut off food and other necessary supplies, or both. Defying the blockade without the threat or use of military action, in order to bring food and related necessities to the cut-off population, then constitutes a method of economic intervention which third parties may use to support the besieged country. Such defiance may be made by both private and governmental bodies. Where governmental action is involved, there is always the possibility that even when there is no intent to threaten or use military support, the opponent may perceive this to be a possibility if he interferes with the defiance of the blockade. Also, as in the case of embargoes, there may be an implicit possibility of violent action by the government to support a method which is by itself non-violent. These background conditions may have been present in the best-known example of blockade defiance, the Berlin Airlift of 1948-49. In it British and United States planes airlifted into Berlin food, fuel and other

necessary supplies after the Soviet Union had imposed a blockade, which began on June 24, 1948, and continued until May 12, 1949. There does not, however, appear to have been an explicit threat of Western military action by the British or Americans, nor apparently were the supply planes armed. This case thus meets the criteria for classification as nonviolent action as well as do embargoes. Further study of this type of phenomenon is needed.

In addition to the Allied airlift, Germans themselves brought supplies to Berlin for several months. W. Phillips Davidson writes in his book *The Berlin Blockade* that owing to the currency reform it was profitable for West German farmers to increase production and to try to keep Berlin as a market.

Enterprising truckers managed to evade Soviet controls and spirit produce from West Germany [across East Germany] to West Berlin, where it would command slightly higher prices. During the summer there were some days when fresh vegetables smuggled in from the west zones were available at such reasonable prices that the Magistrat [the executive branch of the Berlin city government] was hard pressed to dispose of those marketed through the usual channels.

In addition, throughout the summer West Berliners were able to obtain a limited quantity of food and other supplies from the Soviet zone. Trucks drove out daily into the surrounding country-side and came back with vegetables. Individuals returned by boat, train, subway, or bicycle with wood, coal briquettes, potatoes, and sundries.²⁰⁷

In the autumn of 1948 Soviet officials moved to seal these holes in the blockade.

The vast bulk of supplies, however, were brought in by air; these included not only vast quantities of food, but even coal, machinery and electrical generating equipment. The record was set on April 16, 1949, when 12,490 tons were airlifted in twenty-four hours. Tonnage airlifted for the month of April alone was 235,000.²⁰⁸

185. Politically motivated counterfeiting

Politically motivated counterfeiting involves the deliberate distribution in one country of counterfeit money and other documents of economic importance by a hostile country. "It might be done either to disrupt the economy by monetary means," writes Professor Thomas C. Schelling, "or to create such a prevalence of counterfeit as to cause loss of confidence in the currency."²⁰⁹ Murray Teich Bloom reports that "counterfeiting

an enemy's coinage or currency has been a tactic of most wars since 1470 when the wily Duke Galeazzo Sforza of Milan used it against Venice."²¹⁰

President Franklin D. Roosevelt is reported to have asked the British to consider counterfeiting German currency, but they refused, though they did make good facsimiles of Nazi ration stamps, which were air-dropped in 1940. Counterfeit postage stamps for Germany and occupied France were also made, and used by secret agents and for mailing propaganda within these countries. It is also reported by Bloom (and denied by the former director of the Office for Strategic Services) that the United States made and distributed counterfeit Japanese currency.²¹¹

After 1943 the Germans circulated counterfeit British notes of various denominations. The very best quality notes were used in neutral countries and by German spies in enemy countries, the second best for paying off collaborators and Quislings in occupied countries, and notes of the third quality were to be dropped over England by plane to disrupt the British banking system. Others were unusable. The counterfeit money was distributed widely in North Africa after the Allied invasion, and in Portugal and Spain, among other places. The Bank of England suspected the scheme in April 1943. In 1944 alone the Nazis produced usable British currency worth about \$277,500,000. Only a very few U.S. one hundred dollar bills were produced early in 1945.²¹²

186. Preclusive purchasing

Preclusive purchasing is a intervention which involves "buying strategic commodities in world markets for the purpose of making them unavailable to the enemy."²¹³ During World War II, for example, the United States bought various minerals in Spain, Portugal and Turkey in order to ensure that they did not become available to the Axis powers.²¹⁴

187. Seizure of assets

Another method of economic intervention involves the impounding or confiscating of assets, including "blocking the use of bank accounts, or of securities in brokerage accounts; preventing the payment of interest or dividends to enemy countries; abrogating patent or royalty rights and so forth."²¹⁵

All Japanese assets in the United States were ordered frozen on July 25, 1941, and Britain and the Netherlands took similar action. Japan had signed a treaty with Axis powers in September 1940, and a treaty of neutrality with the Soviet Union in April 1941; after the German attack in June on Russia, Japan had made demands on the Vichy French govern-

ment for still more bases in Indochina. Embargoes on shipment of various war materials to Japan had already been declared; petroleum supplies were particularly short. "In these circumstances," writes Thomas A. Bailey, "the Big Freeze was a blow hardly less jarring to the Japanese than their later assault on Pearl Harbor was to the Americans."²¹⁶ During World War II the freezing of assets of enemy countries was a standard practice.²¹⁷

Following the nationalization of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. by the government of Iran under Mossadegh in 1951, one of Britain's actions was to freeze all Iranian deposits in British banks, thus bringing all of Iran's foreign trade to a standstill.²¹⁸

188. Dumping

This is, writes Professor Schelling, the "deliberate sale [at below standard prices] of a commodity on world markets to depress price and reduce the earnings of another country."²¹⁹ It is, he writes, "most uncommon," partly because it is very expensive. The threat to dump agricultural products may be a very serious threat against countries whose economies are highly dependent on export of such products. When the Russians in the early 1950s sought to sell oil abroad, they were wrongly thought to be aiming at disrupting the oil market, and some also thought that the 1953-54 Russian gold sales were intended to cause confusion in foreign financial circles.²²⁰

Such examples involve government action which is likely to make possible faster and more complete results. However, there has been at least one abortive and somewhat ambitious attempt by private groups to undermine an economic system by dumping on the international market. This complex plan to end slavery in the United States by dumping cotton on the international market was developed, St. Clair Drake reports, by physician Martin R. Delaney and minister Henry Highland Garnet, founders of the African Civilization Society. Under a mandate by the Emigration Convention of 1854, Delaney went to Africa and signed an agreement with the rulers of Yoruba (now part of Nigeria) to allocate land for settlement by Negro freedmen from the United States. The plan was that these ex-slaves would teach Africans how to grow cotton. It would then be dumped on the world market at such a low price as to destroy the economic basis of the Southern plantation system. The result would be freedom for the slaves, cheaper cloth, and skills and prosperity for the Africans. The plans, and British financial support, ended with the outbreak of the Civil War.²²¹

189. Selective patronage

As mentioned in the discussion of consumers' boycotts in Chapter Five, nonviolent campaigners in the United States have sometimes urged patronage of named firms, instead of boycott of others, in order to bypass anti-boycott laws in some states. Selective patronage campaigns have, however, been used more widely, and with other motives, than those cases suggest. This method has been used in order to reward financially businesses which have pursued an approved policy, especially at times when such a policy was regarded by some as an economic risk.

Garrison and a group of abolitionists in 1834 deliberately chose to patronize a steamboat on the Delaware River which was not segregated, as some were; the route was slower and less direct, but they preferred to encourage the integration policy, and told the captain that because of it he had gained twenty-seven dollars worth of business. *The Liberator* reported their view that if the refusal to use segregated transportation, and the choice of integrated transportation, were "extensively imitated by anti-slavery men . . . every barrier of caste will soon be overthrown."²²²

When the people of one country are engaged in a struggle to attain independence from another country which has been ruling them, the economic means of action used often include campaigns to purchase the products grown or made in the dependent country. This is often the counterpart of an economic boycott, but in important ways differs from it. The object with a program of selective patronage of a country's own products is not simply to hurt the opponent country economically (which would be compatible with buying the boycotted products from other countries instead), but to build up the dependent country economically. This is sometimes seen as a necessary step toward full independence.

This was an important component of American colonial struggles before 1775. As resistance was organized in 1765 against the Stamp Act, for example, a campaign was launched to promote and develop alternative American products.²²³ Although the policy did not originate with him, this movement was given impetus by a pamphlet by Daniel Dulany, who wrote: "By a vigorous Application to Manufactures, the Consequence of Oppression in the Colonies to the Inhabitants of Great Britain would strike Home and immediately . . ." ²²⁴ Various societies were organized to promote the manufacture and use of American products in preference to English ones, and descriptions of the domestic products were publicized in the newspapers. These American-made items included scythes, spades, shovels, wallpaper, liquors, cordials, cloth and clothing. The colonial production campaign included the promotion of American linen, made of na-

tive-grown-and-spun flax. Factory production of linen grew in Philadelphia and New York, while in Rhode Island women turned to spinning flax in their homes. A variety of American substitutes for tea—sage, sassafras and balm—were promoted as more healthful, and the eating of lamb was abandoned in order not to interfere with the production of American wool.²²⁵

During the Gandhian struggles against the British rule of India, an important component of the Indian means of action was the movement to increase Indian production and use of her own products. This was called *swadeshi*, and it had a philosophical as well as economic and political ramifications. Gandhi often preferred *swadeshi* to an economic boycott movement which he sometimes, especially earlier in his career, regarded as vindictive. *Swadeshi*, however, positively built up India's economy and independence, and reduced economic dependence on all foreign countries.²²⁶

Trade unions in the United States have often urged the purchase of products bearing the union label, as a means of supporting higher wages and improved working conditions. Myers and Laidler defined the union label as "a device which organized labor has developed to encourage the purchase of goods made under union conditions."²²⁷ Looking something like trademarks, insignia, coats of arms, and the like, the union label is attached directly to the product where possible, or displayed where the item is sold, or shown on the packaging. Its presence shows that the article has been "produced by union labor under conditions required of union shops."²²⁸ Trade unionists have been especially urged to purchase products bearing the union label, and conventions in the 1930s in the United States used to have a "union-label roll call" in which delegates using particular union-made items were asked to stand as the list of products was called. The union label began in 1875 among cigar factory workers in California and was originally used to identify cigars made by white workers.²²⁹ One of the departments created in the merged A.F.L.-C.I.O. was a Union Label Department, in Washington, D.C., which provides lists of union-label products.²³⁰ After the grape growers of California began signing union contracts with the United Farm Workers in 1970, the union label on boxes of grapes sold throughout the country became very important in determining which grapes should be purchased by supporters of the grape workers and which should still be boycotted.

190. Alternative markets²³¹

Illegal or "black" markets, especially in wartime or during occupations, are usually associated with exploitative prices and selfish objectives.

In some cases, however, alternative illegal channels of buying and selling food and various other supplies may be created as a form of economic intervention. Apart from helping to meet needs of the populace and keeping goods out of the enemy's hands, there may be a wider political significance in such action. Against a totalitarian regime's attempts to control all economic life, thwarting that control by the maintenance of independent channels of distribution may become an important resistance objective.

This method has been used at least once in a struggle during an occupation, the German occupation of Norway. A.K. Jameson reports:

The high moral tone of the whole movement is clearly shown in the way the black market was run. Producers of foodstuffs were supposed to hand over all their produce to government distributing agencies, but in fact they succeeded in keeping back quite a lot. In contrast to what happened elsewhere, however, this store was sold secretly at prices very little higher than those officially fixed and much of it was bought up by employers for the benefit of employees and by individuals for the maintenance of those hiding from the authorities. Practically no private profit was made from these transactions and hence the market had not the same demoralizing effects as it had in other occupied countries, and it ceased the moment the occupation was over.²³²

It is difficult without detailed research to judge whether this report may be too sweeping, although in any case it illustrates the potential of this method. In a wider discussion of production during this period, not limited to foodstuffs, Professor Erling Petersen points out that while many products were saved for the Norwegian economy by withholding them from the regular market, "in many cases" the main consideration was to get the high prices of the black market, with the "moral excuse" of keeping the products out of German hands.²³³

191. Alternative transportation system

Side by side with the boycott of a public transportation system, a parallel substitute system has occasionally been improvised. This occurred in the Montgomery, Alabama, bus boycott, already described in detail, almost immediately after its beginning. "In the early stages of the protest the problem of transportation demanded most of our attention," Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., later wrote. For the first few days Negro taxi companies followed an agreement to carry passengers for the ten cent bus fare, but a law which set a minimum taxi fare of forty-five cents required

that other arrangements be made. Drawing on experience during an earlier bus boycott in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, the Montgomery group quickly decided to set up a volunteer private car pool. The new transportation system established forty-eight dispatch and forty-two pick-up stations by December 13. Dr. King reports: "In a few days this system was working astonishingly well" and even impressed the white segregationists. During the next year fifteen new station wagons were purchased for the transport system.

The parallel transportation system was clearly seen by the Montgomery city officials and the bus company as a serious problem in itself. Four times the insurance on the vehicles was canceled and under the administration of Mayor Gayle the city's legal department took court action to ban the motor pool. But the United States Supreme Court decision that Alabama's state and local bus segregation laws were unconstitutional came before the local court's temporary injunction against the motor pool.²³⁴

192. Alternative economic institutions²³⁵

Although not all economic institutions created or used by nonviolent actionists constitute economic intervention, they do so when the economic institution is itself used in a conflict situation as a method of wielding power or influence. These new institutions may be concerned with production, ownership, or distribution of economic goods. The objectives may not only be economic but also be social and political.

For example, when consumers' or producers' cooperatives are engaged in conflict with capitalist or State industries, or when the cooperatives are being deliberately developed and expanded to replace the existing economic system, or part of it, they constitute economic intervention. For example, after the turn of the century the Swedish cooperative society *Kooperativa Förbundet*, having failed to lower the price of margarine by boycotting the products of the margarine cartel factories, purchased a small margarine factory, and later built a larger one, in order to enter the market itself at lower prices. The result was a sixty percent cut in the price of margarine, which saved Swedish consumers about two million dollars annually.²³⁶ During the 1920s and 1930s K.F. bought or built plants for making other products, including light bulbs, tires, fertilizers, pottery and building materials. Usually when they captured fifteen to twenty-five percent of the market monopoly prices were broken.²³⁷

In Italy after 1890 the "Charity and Christian Economy" branch of

the Roman Catholic activist organization *Opera dei Congressi* attempted to build up "a network of cooperatives, peasant unions, friendly societies, insurance and rural credit institutions." With continued expansion, these had the potential of becoming "the framework, prefabricated and tested by experience, of a new Catholic state, rising from the ruins of liberalism."²³⁸ By 1912 this branch had 360,000 members.

The Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association, organized in 1967 by veterans of the Selma civil rights march, arranged for marketing of produce through cooperative channels. This, writes Michael Miles in the *New Republic*, "disrupted the system of exploitation of the black farmer, which depends on the identification of each farmer's cotton at the warehouse so that it can immediately be appropriated by his creditors . . ." ²³⁹ Other Southern black organizations attempting economic intervention include the Poor People's Corp., (Jackson, Mississippi), the Federation of Southern Cooperatives, and Crawfordville (Florida) Enterprises. ²⁴⁰ Such organizations have often encountered strong opposition but nevertheless increased the economic well-being and self-determination of their members.

POLITICAL INTERVENTION

This last subclass of methods of nonviolent intervention includes seven which are clearly political in form. The first five of these are acts by citizens, individually or in small or large groups, who attempt to intervene by disrupting the administrative or enforcement agencies of the government. The sixth method, work-on without collaboration, is undertaken by the government employees and officials, while the last one, dual sovereignty and parallel government, involves the shift of loyalties by citizens to a new rival government. All of these, in differing degrees and ways, intervene to disturb the working of the opponent's government and even to challenge its existence.

193. Overloading of administrative systems²⁴¹

Administrative systems of governments may be overloaded by excessive compliance in providing them with diverse types of information which may be directly or indirectly related to their responsibilities, or in making an excessive number of enquiries of them, or by providing them with excessive numbers of suggestions, protests or statements. The resulting overloading of the administrative system may make the continuance of opera-

tions difficult or may slow its capacity to deal with its normal activities. This type of action is particularly likely to happen where the law or regulations which the administrative unit is implementing require frequent revision of data concerning personnel or other matters, or when complex systems of rules and regulations to be followed are subject to frequent change.

This method—called the comply-in—was applied in the United States in the spring of 1970 by the antiwar movement, as people were urged to comply with all the usually neglected provisions of the law concerning personal information. The *New York Times* quoted Mrs. Trudi Young, spokesman for the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, to this effect: "The [Selective Service] law also requires registrants to inform the draft boards within ten days of any change in address or status. This means changes in religion, mental attitude and everything else." Although almost entirely ignored by the Selective Service System itself, the law applies its regulations to all males born after August 30, 1922, not just to those up to twenty-five years of age. Mrs. Young continued:

We want everyone to take this law so seriously that they inform their board of every single change, even if they're over age or have already completed their service. This means wives, mothers, and friends as well. They should submit documents attesting to any change in the status of a registrant. The Selective Service just cannot stand up, administratively, to absolute obedience to the draft law.

The paper quoted a Selective Service spokesman as saying that if thousands of overage men followed the law to the letter, "Lord help us."²⁴² This type of action is closely related to the "working-to-rule" strike described in Chapter Six.

In Massachusetts in June 1970, following the invasion of Cambodia by United States forces and the resultant protests, Colonel Paul Feeney of the Selective Service System in the state in an interview described the flood of mail which had poured into their offices:

Some of the mail says "I've changed my status, I've moved from the first floor to the third floor." Or we'll get a letter saying, "I'm going to Europe." A few days later we'll get another letter saying, "I've changed my mind. I am not going to Europe."

One official estimated that perhaps a thousand man-hours had been lost by handling the excess mail. Officials ordered seven hundred thousand postcards which could quickly, yet legally, be used to respond to the increased quantity of mail.²⁴³

194. Disclosing identities of secret agents²⁴⁴

Where secret police and undercover political agents are employed, one means of dealing with them when they are discovered has been to publish their names, perhaps with other details, photographs and the like; this has the effect of making it extraordinarily difficult for those particular persons to continue their activities as secret agents. This may be applied to political agents which have infiltrated, or have attempted to infiltrate, resistance organizations, and may constitute an alternative to murdering them, a frequent practice by resistance movements in Nazi-occupied countries during World War II.

The publication of names and descriptions of slaveowners seeking their runaway slaves, described earlier in this chapter under nonviolent harassment, is very close to this method. In other cases the various other described forms of personal harassment were not used but placards were posted describing paid slave hunters; these instances are clearly within this method. Such a case occurred in Boston in 1850 when two slave hunters arrived to seize William and Ellen Craft; with the identities and objective of the hunters openly revealed, their effectiveness was reduced, and this helped to induce the slave hunters to leave town.²⁴⁵

In 1969 the *Los Angeles Free Press*, which opposed imprisonment for the use of nonaddictive drugs, published the names of over fifty state narcotics agents with their addresses and telephone numbers. The newspaper saw this as a political act, although officials took a different view. The California Attorney General then obtained an injunction against publication of more "confidential" documents of the state Justice Department, and the exposed agents as a group filed a suit for \$25,000,000 against the newspaper, while the Attorney General filed another damage suit for the state.²⁴⁶

195. Seeking imprisonment

Imprisonment in civil disobedience is normally a secondary consequence of the peaceful breaking of a law or regulation, which act is seen to be of much greater importance than the imprisonment. However, on occasion imprisonment may be sought by the nonviolent actionists as a *primary* objective, especially when this is done in very large numbers. Actionists may deliberately disobey a particular regulation in order to be imprisoned, and may ask to be arrested even though police select others for arrest or even though the persons were not present on the original occasion. At times the objective is to fill the jails; that is called a jail-in.

Requests to be arrested usually occur as an expression of solidarity with

associates already under arrest, but the intent may also be to demonstrate a lack of fear of arrest, to obtain the release of those already arrested, to clog the courts or fill the prisons, or to obtain wider publicity and increased resistance. During the Norwegian teachers' noncooperation struggle in 1942, the day after Quisling had personally stormed and raged at the teachers in the Stabekk school and ordered their arrest, teachers who had that day been absent went to the prison and demanded to be arrested also.²⁴⁷

In January 1959 women supporters of Dr. Banda and the Nyasaland African Congress rejected police orders to disperse as they marched toward the Zomba Government House to hear the results of talks between Dr. Banda and the Governor. An initial advance was followed by a clash and beatings of the women, and finally another advance;

. . . in the end, the police arrested a few of them. The remainder protested. They began to protest physically and insisted that if some are arrested, then all must be arrested. . . So the police arrested them—36 in all.²⁴⁸

In France in 1959 a group under the auspices of *Action Civique Non-violent* went to the Thol detainee camp, where North Africans were held without trial or hearing, and requested that they, too, be placed in the camp as witnesses against the flagrant miscarriage of justice.²⁴⁹

In 1961, in connection with a wave of freedom rides against racial segregation on buses, C.O.R.E. members, together with many volunteers, began to fill Mississippi jails—the jail-in being "aimed at making segregationist practices so expensive and inconvenient as to become unfeasible." The flood of prisoners cost the city of Jackson, Mississippi, alone over a million dollars in increased enforcement and imprisonment bills.²⁵⁰ James Peck, a veteran of many nonviolent civil rights struggles, reports that the term jail-in was coined by newspapermen in February 1961 to refer to the increasing number of antisegregation Southern nonviolent student actionists who "to emphasize the injustice of being arrested for protesting racial discrimination, chose to remain in jail rather than pay fines or go out on bail."²⁵¹

On March 25, 1960, four days after the shootings at Sharpeville, Philip Kgosana, a young Pan-Africanist leader led a march of 1,500 Africans from Langa location to the police station in nearby Capetown and demanded their arrest for refusing to carry the required passes. The police chief, however, turned them away, and they went home in an orderly manner.²⁵²

At the time of the arrest and trial of six members of the Committee

of 100 in Britain in 1962, several other members of the Committee offered themselves for arrest as being equally guilty.²⁵³

In February 1964 Southern Rhodesian African women protested the lack of government action in providing roads, bridges and schools in the Tanda reserve by refusing to dip their cattle as required. Of the 172 women arrested, 150 refused to pay the imposed fine, choosing instead to serve the prison sentence. Another group of 158 was remanded for later sentencing. Three hundred more women also marched to the Meyo Court demanding to be placed under arrest. They were reinforced by still another angry group of 300 women, who arrived later with the same demand.²⁵⁴

196. Civil disobedience of "neutral" laws

Although civil disobedience is usually the disobedience of laws which are regarded as inherently immoral or otherwise illegitimate, at times non-violent actionists may disobey or ignore laws and regulations which are regarded as morally "neutral." This is most likely to occur in the advanced stages of a nonviolent revolutionary movement (as in India under the British), or in cases where the nature of modern government, or of the issue itself, makes it difficult to noncooperate with or to disobey a law directly related to the grievance. An example of this was the issue of nuclear weapons in Britain in 1962.

In all modern States there are laws which exist simply to help the government exercise its authority, regulate the citizenry, and carry out its functions, but which neither prohibit people from committing some "inhuman" or "immoral" act, nor are themselves regarded as unjust or oppressive. These "neutral" laws are often of a regulatory character. While disobedience of laws which prohibit infliction of harm on other people does not fall within civil disobedience of any type, these "neutral" laws are violated in this extreme type of civil disobedience. The point then is not that the disobeyed law is itself wrong, but that the actionists have either rebelled against the government, or have found no other strong way to express their grievance.

Gandhi regarded this type of civil disobedience as justified at times, but as "a most dangerous weapon." It should be postponed, he maintained, when the opponent is in difficulties; at such times the *satyagrahi* ought not to harass him but rather seek to convert him. However, when the government is regarded as having become so unjust as to have forfeited all obligation to obedience, and the intention has become to destroy the government by noncooperation and disobedience, this type of civil disobedience may be justified. Gandhi believed that then the breach of

such laws would not harm the people, but would merely make it more difficult for the government to carry out its administration, and that, when undertaken on a mass scale, such a breach would contribute to the government's dissolution.²⁵⁵ This stage has thus far rarely been reached in actual campaigns, but during the 1930-31 Indian campaign it was closely approximated on several occasions.²⁵⁶

197. Work-on without collaboration

This method involves determined persistence by civil servants, government officials, and ordinary citizens in carrying out the legally established policies, programs and duties in indifference to, or defiance of, contrary measures from a usurping regime, which has seized the State apparatus in either a *coup d'etat* or a foreign invasion. This method thus differs from a selective refusal of assistance by government aides, a method of political noncooperation, which is a refusal to carry out particular instructions or orders, though the two methods may be related. The emphasis here is on the deliberate continuation of legitimate duties and tasks.

The clearest theoretical presentations of this method have been made by Dr. Theodor Ebert in discussion of the strategic problems of civilian defense—i.e., the prepared use of nonviolent action for purposes of national defense. Ebert writes: "Everyone should remain at his job and do his duty under the law and in the tradition of his country until physically removed by the occupation power." This would involve, Ebert writes:

... a strict refusal at all levels to recognize the usurper's legality and to obey his orders. The constitution and the laws of the land should be defended as legitimate, and the occupiers regarded as unauthorized private persons whose orders must be ignored. Every member of parliament, minister, civil servant and ordinary citizen would become, in the event of occupation, a soldier on guard at his place of work. *In general, the emphasis should be more on a determined continuation of the existing social and political system, than on resignations and strikes* [italics added].

This method would thus involve "the deliberate continuation of ordinary social roles according to one's legal status . . ." ²⁵⁷

Dismissals by the new authorities are to be ignored and people are to attend to their work until physically restrained from so doing. When a leader is removed, his legitimate representative should take his place; and where no such person is available, the subordinates and

assistants are to act on their own responsibility, the usurper's appointees being ignored.²⁵⁸

Ebert argues that this method would cause the usurper "more technical and psychological difficulties than a strike or voluntary resignations," reduce opportunities for collaboration, force the opponent to leave legitimate holders of positions alone or face the difficult task of replacing an entire administration (especially difficult on the local level), reduce the risk of social and industrial chaos which is run in a prolonged general strike, and, finally, by the continuing struggle illustrate the objective of the conflict: "to ensure a society's right to order its affairs free from outside coercion."²⁵⁹

One interpretation of official policy which is very close to the work-on but not identical with it was issued in May 1943 in the occupied Netherlands. This was written by Bosch Ridder van Rosenthal, former Commissioner of the Queen for the province of Utrecht and a leading resistance leader. Rosenthal wrote a "Commentary," which was published in the underground press on the "Directives of 1937," issued by the Colijn government; Warmbrunn describes these as "a set of somewhat vague secret instructions for the conduct of civil servants in the event of a military occupation." He summarized them as instructing civil servants to continue their work if their service to the Netherlands population was greater than to the enemy; otherwise they should resign. The "Directive of 1937" assumed, however, that the occupier would respect the rules of the Hague Convention, and were so vague that decisions were left to each individual.²⁶⁰ Also these directives were kept so secret that Prime Minister Gerbrandy (with the exile government in London) apparently did not learn of them until 1943!²⁶¹

However, in addition to urging officials to refuse to carry out actions which conflicted with the interests of the population, Rosenthal's "Commentary" urged them not to resign but "to wait for possible dismissal for their failure to implement 'illegal' German orders." "The assumption was that the German authorities might not dismiss all officials practicing such passive resistance." The "Commentary" also emphasized that the legal government of the Netherlands was the one in exile in London, and it was to it that loyalty was due. Specific impermissible types of assistance by civil servants to the Germans were also enumerated.²⁶²

On a minor scale many of the Norwegian teachers in the case described in Chapter Two conducted a work-on without collaboration; those who were not arrested when they returned to their schools repudiated membership in the fascist teachers' organization, explained to their classes

their higher responsibilities, and continued to teach without regard to new fascist "obligations."²⁶³

198. Dual sovereignty and parallel government

This method involves the creation of a new government, or continued loyalty to an existing rival government to that of the opponent. If the parallel government receives overwhelming support from the populace, it may replace the opponent's established government. This extreme development of alternative political institutions has only rarely been deliberately initiated and developed; more commonly it has been an unanticipated product of a massive resistance or revolutionary struggle. Although the examples here refer to this type of situation, comparable cases of parallel government may also occur when the population of an occupied country continues to obey the legal government deposed by the invader and to deny the legitimacy of the invader's regime and hence disobey it.

When a nonviolent revolutionary movement seeking the abolition, not reform, of a regime, and possessing extensive popular support, reaches an advanced stage, it threatens the stability of the old regime by depriving it of the obedience and cooperation of the populace. At this point, the shifting of loyalty to a new authority and the creation, or acceptance, of some type of a parallel government is a necessary next step if the movement is to prove successful. This is both a logical consequence of the cooperation which has developed among the resisters themselves, and a step taken to maximize the impact of noncooperation and defiance against the old regime. A new sovereignty thus begins to replace the established one and a new political structure evolves to claim the support and allegiance of the populace. Although this tendency may be present without conscious intent, the resisters often deliberately attempt to establish a parallel structure to advance their policies.²⁶⁴ A parallel government with widespread popular support can take over the governmental functions and eventually squeeze the tottering regime out of existence.²⁶⁵

This general phenomenon has occurred in a variety of situations and is by no means a product of twentieth century revolutions. Important elements of a parallel government emerged in 1575-77, for example, during the Netherlands' struggle against the Spanish king.²⁶⁶ The characteristics of parallel government often occur during struggles of national liberation (especially at the time of a declaration of independence), and in domestic revolutions against a dictatorship or social system. As Crane Brinton has pointed out: "This is at once an institution and a process; or better, a process that works through a very similar set of institutions."

When another and conflicting chain of institutions provides another and conflicting set of decisions, then you have a dual sovereignty. Within the same society, two sets of institutions, leaders, and laws demand obedience, not in one single respect, but in the whole interwoven series of actions which make up life for the average man.

. . . the legal government finds opposed to it, once the first steps in actual revolution have been taken, not merely hostile individuals and parties—this any government finds—but a rival government, better organized, better staffed, better obeyed. . . . At a given revolutionary crisis they step naturally and easily into the place of the defeated government.²⁶⁷

The outcome of a contest between rival governments in ultimate terms is usually determined by their relative ability to procure the necessary support and obedience from the populace. This contest for obedience occurred, for example, when both the Japanese and the “Border Government” were trying to rule in North China in the late 1930s:

In this extraordinary situation there is a sense in which the rival governments were concerned . . . more with the problem of creating new bases for political authority, new concepts of political obligation, new relations between government and people, than with the mere exercise of authority.²⁶⁸

Parallel government may develop in revolutions in which violence plays an important role, as well as in conflicts in which violence is noticeably absent. Although the new government may continue to use violence after its victory, the emergence of dual sovereignty and parallel government is *not* intrinsically associated with violence and in fact depends almost entirely on the voluntary withdrawal of authority, support and obedience from the old regime and their award to a new body. Dual sovereignty and parallel government may thus be classified as a method of nonviolent action and occur in revolutionary struggles in which violence is largely or entirely absent.

Professor Brinton notes that the general phenomenon occurred in England in the conflict between Charles and the Long Parliament (albeit in the context of a civil war) during the 1640s. He mentions also the struggle of the American colonists, both before and after 1776, and the rival groupings of the French Revolution.²⁶⁹

Various organs of parallel government were of extreme importance in the American colonists' struggle. The Continental Association—the program of organized nonviolent resistance adopted by the First Continental Congress in the autumn of 1774, which its authors described as “a non-

importation, non-consumption, and non-exportation agreement”²⁷⁰ illustrated this development well, while parallel government found also organizational expression in a variety of alternative quasi-governmental bodies. Gipson writes:

Although the First Continental Congress was dissolved on October 26, 1774, the measures it had adopted were held by the patriots to be nothing less than the supreme law of the land, taking precedence over any measure or pronouncement of the individual colonial assemblies, not to mention the laws of Parliament relating to America. Therefore, it was not surprising that the Association adopted by the Congress was entered into and enforced with a high degree of unanimity.²⁷¹

The extremity of the collapse of British colonial power at least in certain colonies *before* the War of Independence is testified to by two British governors. Governor Dunmore of Virginia wrote to Lord Dartmouth on December 24, 1774, that the Continental Association was being enforced “with the greatest rigour” and that “the Laws of Congress” (i.e., the First Continental Congress) were given by Virginians “marks of reverence which they never bestowed on their legal Government, or the Laws proceeding from it.” Dunmore added:

I have discovered no instance where the interposition of Government, in the feeble state to which it is reduced, could serve any other purpose than to suffer the disgrace of a disappointment, and thereby afford matter of great exultation to its enemies and increase their influence over the minds of the people.²⁷²

On September 23, 1775, Governor Wright of Georgia wrote in similar but more extreme terms, complaining also of intimidation and threats of destruction of property: “Government totally Annihilated, and Assumed by Congresses, Councils and Committees, and the greatest Acts of Tyranny, Oppression, Gross Insults &c &c &c committed, and not the least means of Protection, Support, or even Personal Safety . . .” Wright added on October 14: “The poison has Infected the whole Province, and neither Law, Government, or Regular Authority have any Weight or are at all attended to.”²⁷³ In some cases existing legal organs of local or provincial government *under* the British system were turned into parts of a system of parallel government *against* the British system, and in other cases new bodies helped serve this role, representative ones (such as certain provincial assemblies and the Continental Congresses) or self-selected ones (for example, the Sons of Liberty).²⁷⁴

Usually parallel government has been but one of many methods and types of action which emerge in the course of a very large struggle. There is at least one instance, however, in which during a significant period of a struggle this method became the predominant method of action relied upon by those opposed to the established order. This was in Rhode Island in 1841-42, during what became known as "Dorr's Rebellion," or, far less accurately, as "Dorr's War."²⁷⁵

In 1841 Rhode Island's government was still operating under the Charter granted by King Charles II in 1663. Under that Charter, representation in the legislature took no account of the shifts of population and the growth of certain cities; even more seriously, built-in property qualifications for voting disenfranchised three of every five adult white males (to say nothing of anyone else). From 1796 on, repeated attempts had been made to obtain a new constitution, or reapportionment in the legislature, or an extension of the suffrage, if not to all adult white citizens, at least to a few more. All these efforts had been defeated, obstructed or ignored by the legislature or the property-owning voters (called "freemen"). In January 1841 the General Assembly passed over the call to expand the suffrage and responded favorably to an appeal for a constitutional convention—but the delegates to it were apportioned exactly like the existing General Assembly, and existing restrictions on who could vote applied also to election of the delegates. Thus two of the main grievances were built into the convention, and power was clearly intended to be kept in the same hands.

In April, May and July mass meetings of suffragists were held in Providence and Newport. At the Providence meeting on July 5 a resolution was passed demanding a constitutional convention and expressing determination to put into effect a new constitution. On July 20 it was announced that on August 28 delegates to such a convention would be elected by all adult male citizens resident in the state; the constitutional convention would meet at Providence on October 4. Over 7,500 of over 25,000 potential voters—which included resident adult male citizens whether or not franchised under the constitution—participated in the election of delegates. The new constitution—called the "People's Constitution"—was completed by the Convention in mid-November; it extended voting to all adult resident white male citizens, reapportioned representation in the General Assembly, increased the separation between the legislative and judicial branches, and made certain other changes. In December 1841, in a referendum in which all resident adult white male citizens could take part, the new constitution was ratified by a vote of nearly 14,000 to 52 (with more than 10,000 potential voters not participating).

But this was not the whole story, for another convention which had been called by the legislature in January—the "Freemen's Convention"—had also met in November; finally in mid-February 1842 it completed its new draft constitution. This also extended the suffrage to adult white male resident citizens but only reapportioned seats in the House of Representatives. A few weeks before, however, on January 12, the People's Convention had reassembled and declared its "People's Constitution" to be in force. Under attack by extremists on both sides, the "Freemen's Constitution," with the same enlarged electorate as had voted in the other referendum, was narrowly defeated by less than 700 votes of a total of about 16,700. The state Supreme Court unofficially denounced the "People's Constitution" as illegal, and in March a repressive "Algerine Law" was passed. This law imposed severe penalties, including the charge of treason, for people who participated in any elections not in accordance with previous statutes; even persons voting in elections held under the "People's Constitution" were to be punished.

Claiming popular sovereignty in a republic, the suffragists argued that their constitution was legal. Governor Samuel King of Rhode Island appealed to President Tyler, who replied on April 11 that he could not anticipate a revolutionary movement but that should an actual insurrection take place, Federal aid would be forthcoming; he also denied his right to judge on the merits of the conflict in the state, but added that he would continue to recognize the established government until advised that another had legally and peaceably been adopted by both the authorities and the people of the state.²⁷⁶

On April 18 elections were held for state offices under the "People's Constitution," including for members of both houses of the new legislature; all candidates were elected unanimously, but the leader of the movement, Harvard graduate Thomas Wilson Dorr, received only a little over 6,300 votes for governor, which did not help establish his authority. President Tyler's letter, the repressive Algerine Law, and perhaps other factors had caused many persons who were undecided to shift over to the "law and order" party. Many suffragists also weakened in their determination to go through with the new substitute constitution and government, and several of the earlier nominees of the suffragists for that election had even withdrawn.

On April 20, two days after the "People's Election," the regular election according to the regular Charter took place, and Governor King defeated his challenger, General Carpenter, who was originally to have been the candidate on the "People's ticket" by a margin of a little more than two to one. About seven thousand property-owning "freemen" had voted.

Despite the severity of the challenge by the new constitution and the elected substitute government, the established government was cautious in repressing the rival group for, as A.M. Mowry points out, they would have been acting against 180 of the state's most prominent citizens, backed by at least a large minority of the citizens of Rhode Island, over six thousand of whom had also laid themselves open to prosecution by voting in the "People's Election."²⁷⁷ The Charter government was not certain that the state militia would come to its aid.²⁷⁸ The situation was clearly regarded by both sides as grave, and there were signs both sides were preparing for military action.

On May 3, 1842, after Thomas Dorr and elected members of the new General Assembly paraded through the streets of Providence with a militia escort, they were inaugurated, and the Assembly received an inaugural address from Governor Dorr. The new officials, however, did not even attempt to gain access to and control of the State House, or to install a new judiciary. In his history Mowry says that it would have been "a peaceful, as well as an easy, task" to take possession of the State House, but instead of doing so the new legislature met in an empty foundry building, and after two days of action adjourned for two months. They had requested Governor Dorr to make known to the President, Houses of Congress, and governors of the states those changes which had taken place: they proclaimed the new government as duly organized, called for obedience, and repealed the Algerine Law and various other acts. Dorr later wrote that the failure to replace the old government by occupying the State House was "fatal." Mowry writes that "the old charter government had lost its force, and could accomplish little; the new charter government had yet to organize; and the charter officials were at Newport."²⁷⁹

However, on May 4, at Newport, the government elected under the old Charter met and organized, and passed a resolution against the new constitution and government under Governor Dorr; they particularly called attention to "the strong military force" supporting Dorr (the fairly small militia escort at the inauguration, which body had pledged obedience to Dorr as the state commander-in-chief). On this basis, the Charter legislature declared that an "insurrection" existed in Rhode Island and called for Federal intervention.²⁸⁰

Governor King sent a delegation to see President Tyler. Governor Dorr also sent various documents to President Tyler. Tyler, however, did not wish to intervene at the moment. On May 7, Dorr, wanted for arrest by the rival government, secretly left for Washington, D.C., to plead the case of the People's government in person, leaving his government in Rhode Island without effective leadership. During the brief stay of

Dorr and his colleagues in Washington, they scored no tangible successes with either executive or congressional officials.

In Rhode Island, within a week of the adjournment of the General Assembly under the People's Constitution, the new rival government was in a state of collapse. Arrests and resignations depleted its ranks.

There seems to have been no consideration given, either at an earlier or at this critical stage, to a campaign of noncooperation with the Charter government and persistent obedience to the People's government. Nor apparently was there any consideration of the possible negative effects that even the appearance of military action might have on many Rhode Islanders, or on Federal intervention (as President Tyler had already indicated). Instead, on his return from Washington, Governor Dorr sought support from the Democrats of Tammany Hall, and while in New York he explored the possibilities of military assistance from other states. He received offers from two commanders of regiments of New York state militia, and wrote the governors of Connecticut and Maine for military aid in case of Federal intervention.²⁸¹

Arriving in Providence on May 16, Governor Dorr was welcomed by a crowd of about 1,200 persons, a quarter of whom were armed. The outcome of the contest was still unsettled, and even the loyalty of the militia was undetermined. There were no attempts to arrest Dorr on the sixteenth or seventeenth. Dorr then clearly shifted to military action, even if it was slightly comic. In a swift move, two field pieces were seized without a fight, but his men forgot to take the balls and shot for the cannons. The Charter government called the militia of Providence to readiness and summoned other outside companies to report to the city. Dorr determined to seize first the arsenal, then several other buildings and armories; otherwise, he thought, the whole campaign was lost.

About midnight on the seventeenth, with about 230 men and two cannons, Dorr's forces set out for the city arsenal in the midst of great confusion and a heavy fog, with many people flooding the streets, bells ringing, and uncertainty as to who was friend and who foe. When the arsenal commander refused to surrender, Dorr ordered the cannons fired, but either someone had tampered with them or the damp from the fog was as effective, and they only flashed twice but did not fire. Had they worked, and had troops in the well-armed stone arsenal returned fire, the attackers would quite probably have been annihilated. As the night went on, Dorr's volunteers melted away until by daylight not more than fifty remained. At about eight o'clock Dorr was given a letter stating that all the officers of his government who lived in Providence had resigned. Dorr

was advised to flee and this he did, though later he reportedly regretted having done so. Members of the People's legislature repudiated the military actions. After a brief rally of his forces in Gloucester late in June, Dorr escaped to New Hampshire.

While the tide of reaction was still strong, a new constitutional convention for Rhode Island was assembled that November. The Charter General Assembly authorized increased representation for Providence and Smithfield, and permitted all native-born adult male citizens to vote for delegates. The new constitution, with limited reapportionment, and a somewhat expanded but complicated system of suffrage rights, was adopted in November and went into effect in May 1843. Dorr's supporters boycotted the referendum, while many diehard supporters of the Charter opposed the constitution as too liberal. About 7,000 men, of a voters' list of over 25,000, voted in the referendum. Dorr returned to Providence to surrender in October 1843 and was sentenced to life imprisonment. After one year the new governor signed a bill releasing him, and in 1851 the General Assembly restored his civil and political rights. Despite the state Supreme Court's protest, the General Assembly in 1854 reversed his conviction for treason.

From the perspective of nonviolent action, this case illustrates the deliberate development of a parallel government by popular assembly and referendum and also its initial operation, although the events do not show how the later struggle might have been conducted nonviolently. The introduction of military action to defend the new constitution and government, and Dorr's appeals for Federal support, seem to have been remarkably ineffective. The events even suggest that the threat and use of military action were counterproductive. They may have caused those people who were wavering in loyalty to support the Charter government, and may also have caused even existing supporters of the People's government to withdraw, leaving it still weaker.

Some other very clear examples of parallel government occur in the Russian 1905 Revolution and in the 1917 Russian Revolution prior to the Bolshevik seizure of power from both the Provisional Government and the independent *soviets*.²⁸² The most famous such organ of the 1905 Revolution was the Council of Workingmen's Deputies of St. Petersburg, "at once general strike Committee, communal administration, organizer of nationwide revolt, temporary parliament of labor in particular and the Russian people in general, rival governmental power."²⁸³

For the St. Petersburg Soviet had astonishingly maintained itself as in some sort a rival authority to the government. It was to the soviet

that the working population turned for advice or aid in the chaotic conditions in the capital; it was the soviet which gave instructions in the workers' quarters. Its executive committee negotiated directly with Prime Minister Witte on problems of transport and food supplies. The government's orders to the postal and telegraph workers could be issued only through the soviet. Even the city *duma* was obliged to carry out the instructions of the soviet, most conspicuously in allocating funds for the relief of the strikers' families.

For the time being at least the government could not but acquiesce. But so paralyzing a form of dual power in the capital could not continue indefinitely.²⁸⁴

On trial for his role in the revolution, Trotsky told the court that the Council of Workingmen's Deputies "was neither more nor less than the self-governing organ of the revolutionary masses, *an organ of state power* . . ."²⁸⁵

This was by no means the only expression of parallel government during that revolution, however, as the Bureau of *Zemstvo* Congresses also exercised considerable authority at one time.²⁸⁶ Entire districts established their own administrations independent of the central government,²⁸⁷ especially certain nationalities as happened in Georgia, where the parallel government was maintained into 1906,²⁸⁸ and the Mongol government which was elected and obeyed for some months toward the end of 1905.²⁸⁹ Prior to these events, Marxist thought had given relatively little attention to this method as a means of carrying out a revolution, despite an early comment by Marx²⁹⁰ and some significant discussion by the Menshevik Axelrod just prior to the 1905 revolution.²⁹¹

Strong tendencies to develop alternative sovereignty and parallel government have emerged, unanticipated and unplanned, during large-scale nonviolent struggles, such as Western general strikes and Indian independence movements. Hiller, for example, noted the development of control organizations among strikers and wrote:

Control organizations, whether representing attempts to assert authority and enforce it by physical coercion or to "maintain order" while practicing economic non-participation, constitute usurpation of governmental functions. For example, the enrolling of an independent police force responsible to an upstart authority is a revolutionary act, and, if community-wide and permanent, constitutes an actual revolution. It signifies a new integration of society around the competing center of dominance in the social body.²⁹²

Crook points out that during the 1919 general strike in Winnipeg, Canada, a citizens' committee of one thousand ran the fire, water and police services, which is evidence that it had some of the qualities of a parallel government.²⁹³ Hiller cites further examples of this kind of development during the general strikes in Seattle and the Italian general strike of 1904.²⁹⁴

Although the British General Strike of 1926 was not intended or pursued as a revolutionary strike for overthrowing the government, W.H. Crook concludes that:

There can be just as little question that the *orders* of the General Council, as interpreted by the various strike committees throughout the nation and as put into practice by them, did logically constitute an attempt to set up a rival authority to that of the local and national governing bodies. This is particularly evident in the matter of *permits*. The General Council had apparently intended that the workers themselves should carry on, if not actually organize, the distribution of food and absolute essentials of life The Government, through Mr. Churchill, had tendered an emphatic refusal to enter "into partnership with a rival Government."²⁹⁵

The nascent forms of a parallel government were nearly or actually reached on several occasions in local situations during the Indian struggles, especially the 1930-31 campaign. In late April 1930, after the refusal of two platoons of the Garhwali Regiment to support the police against the nonviolent volunteers, troops were removed from Peshawar city completely. The Congress Committee then assumed virtual control of the city, including issuing instructions and patrolling the streets at night, for nine days. A contemporary British report also described the success of the local Muslim nonviolence organization, the Khudai Khidmatgar, in collecting land revenue owed to the government.²⁹⁶ The authority of the old *panchayats* was restored in many places to replace the British judicial system. A program of "national education" was intended to replace the British schools.²⁹⁷ In some cities volunteer corps were organized to direct traffic and to act as policemen. The Bombay Congress Committee worked out its own system of taxation for those citizens who would cooperate, and in a few instances even fined financial interests when they diverged from Congress policies.

Speaking of Bombay during the early period of the 1930 struggle, an eyewitness, H.N. Brailsford, wrote:

Bombay, one soon perceived, had two governments. To the British Government, with all its apparatus of legality and power, there still were loyal the European population, the Indian sepoys who wore its uniform, and the elder generation of the Moslem minority. The rest of Bombay had transferred its allegiance to one of His Majesty's too numerous prisoners. In Mahatma Gandhi's name Congress ruled this city. Its lightest nod was obeyed. It could fill the streets, when it pleased, and as often as it pleased, with tens of thousands of men and women, who shouted its watchwords. It could with a word close the shutters of every shop in the bazaar. When it proclaimed a *hartal* (a day of mourning), which it did all but every week, by way of protest against some act of the other government, silence descended upon the streets, and even the factories closed their doors. Only with its printed permit on a scrap of coloured paper, dare a driver urge his bullocks and his bales past its uniformed sentries, who kept watch, day and night, in every lane and alley of the business quarter. They had their guardrooms. Their inspectors entered every warehouse and shop, and watched every cotton-press. They would even confiscate forbidden goods, which a merchant had tried to smuggle past their patrols.²⁹⁸

At such points the program of building alternative institutions may culminate in a major challenge to the existence of the old institutions. In Gandhi's view this did not necessarily mean violence, for he repeatedly emphasized that any parallel government ought not rely on the usual governmental coercive powers but upon strictly nonviolent methods and popular support of the populace.²⁹⁹

In the relative absence of theoretical foundations and studies of the strategic role of parallel government in nonviolent struggle, these various developments may be highly significant. Parallel government in the context of nonviolent struggle may point to a type of institutional change which differs sharply from the *coup d'etat* on the one hand and the abortive collapse of the resistance movement on the other.

CONCLUSION

Any future revision of the listing in these past six chapters is certain to lead to considerable expansion. This listing itself has increased by one quarter since the 1968 version, and that had more than doubled in length since the author's first version, prepared in 1960;³⁰⁰ the latter was itself

vastly longer than any previous integrated list.³⁰¹ Future research should also produce further examples of the listed methods, which would make the illustrations more representative historically, geographically and politically.

These methods have all occurred spontaneously, or have been consciously invented, to meet the needs of an immediate conflict situation. They have then spread by imitation, perhaps being modified in the process to suit new circumstances. To my knowledge, however, no one has tried to compile as many *new*, previously unused, methods as possible which conceivably could be applied in future conflicts. This task is a logical next step in the conscious development of the technique of nonviolent action which has now begun. It may be particularly important in the possible extension of its applicability to new political situations and conditions.

These six chapters, which have examined minutely many specific methods at the disposal of the practitioner of nonviolent action, present a one-sided and somewhat static view of the conflict situation in which (at least) one side is using this technique. These many methods can be viewed as limited implementations of the theory of power presented in Chapter One—that all governments and hierarchical systems depend on the obedience, assistance and cooperation of the people which they rule and that these people have the capacity of limiting or withholding their contributions and obedience to the system. According to that theory, if the withholding is undertaken by enough people for a long enough period of time, then the regime will have to come to terms or it will be collapsed.

But of course only very rarely, if ever, do governments and other hierarchical systems face the extreme alternatives of complete support or none. Most frequently they receive partial support. Even when, in the end, the regime is destroyed by disobedience, noncooperation and defiance, this may follow only after a severe struggle in which the regime was supported sufficiently and long enough to inflict brutal repression against the nonviolent actionists. The simple enumeration of specific methods of this technique and exploration of their characteristics and application give less than one side of this picture. This is so because even that does not explore the psychological forces which may operate in these conflict situations nor does it take into consideration the extreme and often quick shifts in power relations which occur between the contesting groups.

Except for an introductory discussion in Chapter Two, what has been missing thus far in our examination of the basic nature and characteristics of the technique of nonviolent action has been an exploration of how it operates in struggle against a violent opponent and the several ways in which changes are finally produced. That is, we have not yet examined

the technique's dynamics in struggle, its mechanisms of change, the specific factors which determine whether a given campaign will be a success or a failure or something in between. It is to these vital aspects of our subject which we now turn: how does nonviolent action work in struggle?

NOTES

1. Ch'ien Yung, *Li-yüan ts'ung hua*, chapt. 1, p. 11a-11b. I am grateful to Professor Wolfram Eberhard for both the example and the translation from the original Chinese text.
2. Personal letter, 19 November 1966.
3. Leon Trotsky, *My Life* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, Universal Library, 1960), p. 25.
4. *Peace News*, 4 and 25 May, 24 August, 26 October and 14 December 1962, and 4 January, 29 March and 20 December 1963. For a Canadian example, see *ibid.*, 15 June 1962.
5. Whitley Stokes, ed., *Tripartite Life of St. Patrick* (London: H.M. Stationary Office, by Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1887), CLXXVII, pp. 219, 417 and 419.
6. Gipson, *The British Empire Before the American Revolution*, vol. XII, *The Triumphant Empire, Britain Sails into the Storm, 1770-1776*, pp. 240-241.
7. Paul Leicester Ford, ed., *The Works of Thomas Jefferson*, vol. II, pp. 9-10.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 10, n. 1.
9. B. O. Flower, "Jefferson's Service to Civilization During Founding of the Republic," in Andrew A. Lipscomb, editor-in-chief, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association of the United States, 1903), vol. VII, p. vii.
10. Ford, ed., *The Works of Thomas Jefferson*, vol. II, pp. 10-11.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 11, n. 1.
12. Flower, "Jefferson's Service to Civilization During the Founding of the Republic," p. viii.
13. Ford, ed., *The Works of Thomas Jefferson*, vol. II, p. 12.
14. Gipson, *The British Empire . . .*, vol. XII, p. 233.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 316-317 and Trevelyan, *The American Revolution* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), p. 277.
16. *Peace News*, 20 April 1962.
17. *Ibid.*, 8 and 15 June 1962.
18. Giovanni Pioli, *Peace News*, 16 March 1956 and Mary Taylor, ed., *Community Development in Western Sicily* (duplicated; *Partinico: Centro studi e iniziative*

- per la piena occupazione*, 1963), pp. 5-6.
19. Helen Mayer, *Peace News*, 4 February 1966.
 20. Hanh, "Love in Action," p. 12.
 21. Patrick Joyce, *A Social History of Ancient Ireland* (London: Longmans, Green, 1903) vol. I, pp. 204-205.
 22. Shridharani, *War Without Violence* (U.S. ed.: pp. 19-20; Br. ed.: p. 85.)
 23. Seton-Watson, *The Decline of Imperial Russia*, pp. 68-69.
 24. Prawdin, *The Unmentionable Nechaev*, p. 102.
 25. P. Kropotkin (sic), In *Russian and French Prisons* (London: Ward and Downey, 1887), p. 76.
 26. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
 27. Isaac Deutscher, *The Prophet Armed: Trotsky: 1879-1921* (New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1963), pp. 40-41.
 28. Schapiro, *The Origin of the Communist Autocracy*, p. 205. See also I.N. Steinberg, In *the Workshop of the Revolution* (New York: Rhinehart & Co., 1953), pp. 167-172. (Cited by Miller, *Nonviolence*, pp. 174-175.)
 29. Paul Barton, "The Strike Mechanism in Soviet Concentration Camps," in *Monthly Information Bulletin*, International Commission Against Concentration Camp Practices, no. 4, (Aug.-Nov., 1955) pp. 25-26.
 30. Holt, *Protest in Arms*, p. 145. I am grateful to William Hamilton for this and certain other examples.
 31. Bernard, *Social Control in its Sociological Aspects*, pp. 396-397; and S.K. Ratcliffe, "Hunger Strike," *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (New York: Macmillan, 1935), vol. VII, pp. 532-533.
 32. *Ibid.*, pp. 206-07.
 33. Ratcliffe, "Hunger Strike," p. 533.
 34. Mulford Sibley and Asa Wardlaw, "Conscientious Objectors in Prison," p. 304, in Lynd, ed., *Nonviolence in America*.
 35. *The Times*, 2 May 1958.
 36. *Observer*, 9 August 1959.
 37. Louis Fischer, *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi*, (New York: Harpers, 1950), pp. 154-157 and Erik Erikson, *Gandhi's Truth: On the Origins of Militant Nonviolence* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1969), pp. 255-392.
 38. Sharp, *Gandhi Wields the Weapon of Moral Power*, pp. 227-289.
 39. Venturi, *Roots of Revolution*, pp. 585-590.
 40. Louis Fischer, *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi* (New York: Harpers, 1950), p. 203.
 41. Sternstein, "The *Ruhrkampf* of 1923," p. 114.
 42. Bullock, *Hitler*, p. 117.
 43. Delarue, *The Gestapo*, pp. 38-39.
 44. Mabee, *Black Freedom*, p. 301.
 45. *Ibid.*, p. 302.
 46. *Ibid.*
 47. *Ibid.*, pp. 303-304.
 48. *Ibid.*, p. 204. See also p. 311.
 49. *Ibid.*, p. 115.
 50. *Ibid.*

51. *Ibid.*, pp. 115-116.
52. From the account of a "Colored Old Settler," quoted by St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton, *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1945), p. 44.
53. DeMarco, "The Use of Non-violent Direct Action Tactics and Strategy by American Indians," MS. p. 6; her source is John R. Covert, "Indians Win Sit-Down Strike," *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 19 April 1938.
54. DeMarco, *ibid.*, pp. 14-15. Her sources are the *Philadelphia Bulletin*, 7 September 1960 and the *New York Times*, 1 September 1961, p. 18.
55. See George Houser, *Erasing the Color Line* (Rev. ed., pamphlet; New York: Congress of Racial Equality, 1948); Farmer, *Freedom-When?*, pp. 61-62; and Peck, *Freedom Ride*, pp. 45-50, for descriptions of the 1942 Chicago restaurant sit-in—probably the first of its kind.
56. Patrick O'Donovan, *Observer*, 20 March 1960; and Jim Peck, *Peace News*, 4 March 1960. Merrill Proudfoot's *Diary of a Sit-in* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1962) contains a detailed account—from a religious perspective—of the campaign for the integration of lunch counters in Knoxville, Tennessee in July 1960. See also C. Eric Lincoln, "The Sit-in Comes to Atlanta," in Westin, ed., *Freedom Now*, pp. 259-265. On other cases see Peck, *Freedom Ride*, pp. 73-79 and 82-88.
57. Claude Sitton, "A Chronology of the New Civil-Rights Protest, 1960-1963," in Westin, ed., *Freedom Now*, p. 81.
58. Peck, *Freedom Ride*, p. 89.
59. *Peace News*, 11 December 1964.
60. *New York Times*, 10 and 12 November 1966.
61. Hentoff, *The New Equality*, p. 204.
62. Waskow, *From Race Riot to Sit-in*, pp. 267-275.
63. *Ibid.*, pp. 243-244.
64. *Peace News*, 3 April 1964.
65. James Peck, *Freedom Ride*, pp. 23-29. For another case see p. 44.
66. *Ibid.*, pp. 34-35.
67. Mabee, *Black Freedom*, pp. 127-38.
68. *Ibid.*, pp. 112-13.
69. *Ibid.*, p. 112.
70. *Ibid.*, p. 114.
71. *Ibid.*, p. 115.
72. *Ibid.*, p. 121.
73. *Ibid.*, p. 122.
74. *Ibid.*, pp. 123-24.
75. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
76. *Ibid.*, p. 126.
77. *Ibid.*, pp. 202-203.
78. Westin, "Ride-in's and Sit-in's of the 1870's," in Westin, ed., *Freedom Now*, pp. 69-70.
79. For an account, see Peck, *Freedom Ride*, pp. 14-27.
80. Lomax, *The Negro Revolt*, pp. 145-156, Miller, *Nonviolence*, pp. 313-316, and Peck, *Freedom Ride*.

81. *New York Times*, 9, 16, 23 and 24 July 1961
82. This section is based on a draft by Michael Schuller.
83. *Criterion*, November 1969, p. 4.
84. *Ibid.*, p. 1.
85. Mabee, *Black Freedom*, p. 128.
86. *Ibid.*, pp. 128-130.
87. Peck, *Freedom Ride*, p. 98.
88. Anthony Lewis and *The New York Times*, *Portrait of a Decade: The Second American Revolution* (New York: Random House, 1964) p. 177.
89. Sharp, *Gandhi Wields . . .*, p. 177 and Shridharani, *War Without Violence*, U.S. ed., pp. 41-42; Br. ed., p. 57.
90. Sharp, *Gandhi Wields . . .*, pp. 132-151.
91. Schlesinger, *The Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution*, p. 176.
92. This section, and the Vietnamese examples, have been suggested by Michael Schuller.
93. Goodspeed, *The Conspirators*, p. 134.
94. *Newsweek*, 2 Aug. 1965, p. 10.
95. *Ibid.*, 4 October 1965, p. 40.
96. *The Times*, 19 and 20 May and 16 June 1955.
97. *Peace News*, 22 May, 10, 17, 24 and 31 July 1959.
98. *Ibid.*, 27 November and 4 December 1959, and 2 and 15 January, and 18 March 1960.
99. *Ibid.*, 2, 9 and 23 October, 13 and 27 November, 18 and 25 December 1959, 1 and 22 January and 10 June 1960.
100. *Peace News*, 20 June 1958, and 13 and 20 July 1962.
101. This definition is based upon a terminological refinement by Bradford Lyttle, *Essays on Nonviolent Action* (mimeo; Chicago, The Author, 1959), pp. 31-32.
102. *Peace News*, 22 May 1964.
103. Shridharani, *War Without Violence*, U.S. ed. p. 21; Br. ed., p. 41.
104. Myers and Laidler, *What Do You Know About Labor?*, p. 76.
105. Waskow, *From Race Riot to Sit-in*, p. 242.
106. Belfrage, *Freedom Summer*, p. 184.
107. Mabee, *Black Freedom*, p. 307.
108. Matei Yulzari, "The Bulgarian Jews in the Resistance Movement," in Suhl, ed., *They Fought Back*, p. 277.
109. *Guardian*, 1 September 1962.
110. *Ibid.*, 3 September 1962.
111. *Peace News*, 2 July 1965.
112. *Peace News*, 1 March 1963.
113. Isobel Lindsay, *Peace News*, 29 November 1963.
114. *Peace News*, 12 April 1963.
115. Sharp, *Gandhi Wields . . .*, pp. 166-167.
116. Lyttle, *Essays on Non-violent Action*, p. 34, and *Peace News*, 22 and 29 August 1958.
117. *The Times*, 8 December 1958, *Manchester Guardian*, 8 December 1958,

- Observer*, 21 December 1958, *The Times*, 22 December 1958 and *Manchester Guardian*, 22 December 1958.
118. This account is based on student paper by Margaret DeMarco, "The Use of Non-violent Direct Action Tactics and Strategy by American Indians," MS. pp. 15-17. Her sources are Edmund Wilson, *Apologies to the Iroquois* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1960), the quotation being from p. 143, and the *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 7 May 1958.
119. Benjamin Muse, *The American Negro Revolution: From Nonviolence to Black Power 1963-1967* (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1968), pp. 111-12.
120. Friedman, "Jewish Resistance to Nazism," in *European Resistance Movements*, p. 204.
121. Brant, *The East German Rising*, pp. 111-112.
122. Lyttle, *Essays on Non-violent Action*, p. 32.
123. Mabee, *Black Freedom*, pp. 300-301.
124. *Daily Mirror* (London), 7 December 1956.
125. *Peace News*, 26 October 1956 and 1 March 1957.
126. Peter Kihss, "Blockades in New York," in Westin, ed., *Freedom Now*, pp. 275-276.
127. Waskow, *From Race Riot to Sit-in*, p. 279.
128. John Morris, "Early Christian Civil Disobedience," in *Peace News*, 5 January 1962. This article contains a translation of Ambrose's letter to his sister describing the events.
129. Bondurant, *Conquest of Violence*, p. 57 and Desai, *The Story of Bardoli*, pp. 172 and 186.
130. *New York Times*, 17 August 1957, p. 17. This account is based on Margaret DeMarco's unpublished paper, "The Use of Non-violent Direct Action Tactics and Strategy by American Indians," MS. pp. 7-8.
131. This account has been prepared by Katherine Preston. For some coverage of the occupation at Alcatraz consult Akwesasne Notes, a resume of Indian affairs available from Mohawk Nation, via Roosevelttown, New York, 13683, and also *The Warpath*, published by the United Native Americans, Inc., P. O. Box 26149, San Francisco, California, 94126. Details of final removal are from *New York Times*, 14 June 1971.
132. Littell, ed., *The Czech Black Book*, p. 142.
133. *Ibid.*, pp. 147-48. See also pp. 164, 198, 204, 208, 223, 224 and 249.
134. Mabee, *Black Freedom*, pp. 91-92.
135. *Ibid.*, p. 93.
136. *Ibid.*, pp. 93-94.
137. *Ibid.*, p. 104.
138. *Ibid.*, p. 105.
139. *Ibid.*, p. 104.
140. *Ibid.*, p. 106.
141. *Ibid.*, pp. 107-09.
142. *Ibid.*, pp. 95-97.
143. G. S. Rao, *Gora—An Atheist* (Vijayawada, India: Atheistic Centre, 1970), pp. 4, 13-14, and 16; and personal conversations with Lavanam, one of the sons, in

- 1968, and Gora himself in 1970.
144. James Q. Wilson, "The Negro in Politics," in *Daedalus*, vol. 94, no. 4 (Fall, 1965), p. 973, n. 29. No other details are given.
 145. This account has been drafted by Ronald McCarthy on the basis of reports in the *Boston Globe*, 16-19 May 1967. The quotations are respectively from the following issues: 16 May (morn. edition), 16 May (eve. ed.), 16 May (morn. ed.), *ibid.*, 18 May (eve. ed.), and 16 May (eve. ed.).
 146. Shimbori, "Zengakuren", in *Sociology of Education*, vol. 37, no. 3 (Spring 1964), p. 247.
 147. Michael Parkhouse, *Peace News*, 10 July 1964.
 148. Botemps, *100 Years of Negro Freedom*, p. 254.
 149. This section is based on a draft prepared by Michael Schuller.
 150. John L. Nickalls, ed., *The Journal of George Fox* (Cambridge: [Cambridge] University Press, 1952), pp. 39-40.
 151. *Ibid.*, p. 76.
 152. *Ibid.*, p. 98.
 153. Mabee, *Black Freedom*, p. 205.
 154. *Ibid.*, p. 208.
 155. This section is based on a draft by Michael Schuller.
 156. Jerry Rubin, *Do It!* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970), pp. 133-135.
 157. *Ibid.*, pp. 117-118.
 158. Griffith, *The Resurrection of Hungary*, pp. xx, xxvi-xxvii, 7 and 170.
 159. *Ibid.*, pp. 139-163.
 160. Gandhi, *The Constructive Programme*.
 161. Mabee, *Black Freedom*, pp. 127 and 133-135.
 162. *Ibid.*, p. 140.
 163. *Ibid.*, pp. 139-142. See also p. 149.
 164. Karski, *The Story of a Secret State*, pp. 304-305 and 308.
 165. Muse, *Virginia's Massive Resistance*, pp. 8, 15, 76-79, 111-118, and 148-159.
 166. This section has been suggested by Michael Schuller.
 167. Warmbrunn, *The Dutch Under the German Occupation 1940-1945*, pp. 221-258. The quotation is from p. 244.
 168. My earlier drafts of discussions of nonviolent intervention did not include economic intervention as a distinct class within it. A student and friend at Harvard, Robert Reitherman, argued that this was unfortunate, and produced an independent study paper, "Nonviolent Economic 'Intervention'", 15 pp., in March 1970, which was convincing.
 169. Pioli, *Peace News*, 16 March 1956.
 170. Farmer, *Freedom—When?* p. 105. No date is given for this example.
 171. Littell, ed., *The Czech Black Book*, pp. 162 and 191. CKD, as it is now known under State ownership, was originally founded as a private firm *českomolavská Kolben-Daněk*.
 172. *Peace News*, 20 April 1956.
 173. Peterson, *American Labor Unions*, p. 30, and Knowles, *Strikes*, pp. 10-11.
 174. For further discussion of the sit-down strike, see Light, *The Conquest of Violence*, pp. 144 and 167; Edward Levinson, "Sit-down Strike," in E. Wight

- Bakke and Charles Kerr, *Unions, Management and the Public* (New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1948), pp. 410-412; Coleman, *Men and Coal*, p. 164; Howe and Widick, *The U.A.W. and Walter Reuther*, pp. 47-65; Herbert Harris, *American Labor* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938); Peterson, *American Labor Unions*, pp. 222-225 and 268.
175. Joseph G. Rayback, *A History of American Labor*, p. 353.
176. Peterson, *American Labor Unions*, p. 223.
177. Peterson, *American Labor Unions*, p. 217 and *Newsweek*, vol. VII, no. 13 (28 March 1936), pp. 13-14.
178. Rayback, *A History of American Labor*, p. 353.
179. Levinson, "Sit-Down Strike," p. 410.
180. *Ibid.*
181. Rayback, *A History of American Labor*, p. 355 and Solomon Barkin, "Labor Unions and Workers' Rights in Jobs," p. 127, in Arthur Kornhauser, Robert Dubin and Arthur M. Ross, eds., *Industrial Conflict* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954) and references cited in n. 92.
182. Harris, *American Labor*, p. 294.
183. Light, *The Conquest of Violence*, p. 144.
184. Peterson, *American Labor Unions*, p. 223.
185. *Observer*, 6 September 1959.
186. *Ibid.*, 13 March 1960.
187. Quoted by Theodor Ebert, "Nonviolent Resistance Against Communist Regimes?" in Roberts, ed., *Civilian Resistance as a National Defence*, p. 193; Br. ed.: *The Strategy of Civilian Defence*, p. 193.
188. Rainer Hildebrandt, *Was lehrte der 17 Juni*, p. 7 (Berlin: the author, 1954), quoted by Ebert, *op. cit.*, p. 193.
189. Christopher Seton-Watson, *Italy From Liberalism to Fascism 1870-1925* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967, and London: Methuen, 1967), p. 521.
190. *Ibid.*, p. 522.
191. Miguel Urrutia, *The Development of the Colombian Labor Movement* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1969), pp. 130-131. On the Viotá case, Urrutia cites José Gutiérrez, *LaRevelodia Colombiana* (Bogotá: Tercer Mundo, 1962), pp. 83-96. From Urrutia's account it is difficult to determine the extent of violence in this case as his conception of violence (p. 128) includes the general strike and the "sit-in strike."
192. Samuel Huntington writes that Colombia's agrarian reform law of the 1930s was "primarily designed to legitimize peasant land seizures which had already occurred." Samuel P. Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1968), p. 393. See also p. 358.
193. Urrutia, *The Development of the Colombian Labor Movement*, p. 135.
194. *Ibid.*, p. 133.
195. Eduardo Arze-Loureiro, "The Process of Agrarian Reform in Bolivia," in T. Lynn Smith, ed., *Agrarian Reform in Latin America* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965), p. 133.
196. *Ibid.*, p. 136.
197. *Ibid.*
198. Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies*, p. 393.

199. John Gerassi, *Great Fear in Latin America* (New York: Collier, 1965), p. 139. I am grateful to Bob Reitherman for this reference.
200. Doreen Warriner, *Land Reform in Principle and Practice* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 259. I am grateful to Jeffrey B. Peters for these references, and for encouraging the expansion of the discussion of nonviolent land seizures.
201. *Ibid.*, p. 353.
202. *Ibid.*, p. 351.
203. *Ibid.*, p. 289.
204. *Ibid.*, p. 290.
205. *Ibid.*, pp. 290-291.
206. This method has been suggested by Michael Schulter.
207. W. Phillips Davidson, *The Berlin Blockade* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1958), p. 196.
208. *Ibid.*, p. 261.
209. Thomas C. Schelling, *International Economics*, p. 488.
210. Murray Teigh Bloom, "The World's Greatest Counterfeiters," *Harpers Magazine*, vol. 240, no. 1436 (July 1957), p. 47.
211. *Ibid.*
212. *Ibid.*, pp. 50-52.
213. Schelling, *International Economics*, p. 488.
214. *Ibid.*, p. 489.
215. *Ibid.*, p. 488.
216. Bailey, *A Diplomatic History of the American People*, p. 734.
217. Schelling, *International Economics*, pp. 488-489.
218. Nirumand, *Iran*, p. 55.
219. Schelling, *International Economics*, p. 488.
220. *Ibid.*, p. 489.
221. St. Clair Drake, "Negro Americans and the Africa Interest," in John P. Davis, *The American Negro Reference Book* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), p. 675, n. 23. I am grateful to Robert Reitherman for this reference.
222. Mabee, *Black Freedom*, p. 99.
223. Morgan and Morgan, *The Stamp Act Crisis*, pp. 49-50; and Gipson, *The British Empire Before the American Revolution*, vol. X, *The Triumphant Empire: Thunder-Clouds Gather in the West, 1763-1766*, p. 361.
224. Gipson, *op. cit.*, p. 363.
225. Schlesinger, *The Colonial Merchants . . .*, p. 77.
226. See M. K. Gandhi, *Economics of Khadi* (Ahmedabad, India: Navajivan, 1941), esp. pp. 3-20, 26-29, 108-109, and 369-372; and Bondurant, *Conquest of Violence*, pp. 106-107, 126-127, and 180.
227. Myers and Laidler, *What Do You Know About Labor?*, p. 186.
228. Dale Yoder, *Labor Economics and Labor Problems*. (New York and London: McGraw-Hill Co., 1939), p. 509.
229. *Ibid.*, pp. 309-310.
230. Myers and Laidler, *What Do You Know About Labor?*, pp. 32 and 187n.
231. This section is based on a draft by Michael Schulter.
232. A.K. Jameson, *A New Way In Norway* (pamphlet; London: *Peace News*, 1946 or 1947 [?]; also quoted in Mulford Q. Sibley ed., *The Quiet Battle* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), pp. 168-169.
233. Professor Erling Petersen, "*Økonomiske Forhold*," in Steen, gen. ed., *Norges Krig*, vol. III, pp. 524-26.
234. King, *Stride Towards Freedom*, pp. 69-74 and 151-154.
235. This section draws heavily on Bob Reitherman's unpublished student independent study paper "Nonviolent Economic 'Intervention'," Harvard University, March 1970.
236. Wilfred Fleischer, *Sweden: The Welfare State* (New York: John Day, 1956), p. 76.
237. *Ibid.*
238. Seton-Watson, *Italy: From Liberalism to Fascism*, pp. 228-29 and 302.
239. Michael Miles, "Black Cooperatives," *New Republic*, vol. 159, no. 2 (21 September 1968), p. 22.
240. Art Goldberg, "Negro Self-Help," *New Republic*, vol. 156, no. 239 (10 June 1967), pp. 21-23.
241. This section is based on suggestions by Robin Remington and Michael Schulter.
242. *New York Times*, 3 March 1970, I am grateful to Robin Remington for this reference.
243. Interview with Colonel Paul Feeney, *Record American* (Boston), 27 June 1970.
244. This section is based on a proposal by Michael Schulter.
245. Mabee, *Black Freedom*, pp. 302-303.
246. *New York Times*, 13 August 1969, p. 39.
247. Sharp, *Tyranny Could Not Quell Them*.
248. Letter from H.B. Chipembere to M.W.K. Chiume, Appendix I, p. 145, *Report of the Nyasaland Commission of Inquiry*. See also p. 53.
249. *Peace News*, 6 May 1960.
250. Farmer, *Freedom—When?*, pp. 70-72.
251. Peck, *Freedom Ride*, p. 94.
252. Miller, *Nonviolence*, p. 280.
253. *Peace News*, 16 February 1962.
254. *Ibid.*, 6 March 1964.
255. Gandhi, *Non-violent Resistance*, p. 265; Ind. ed., *Satyagraha*, p. 265.
256. Sharp, *Gandhi Wields . . .*, pp. 152, 182, and 187-189.
257. Theodor Ebert, "Organization in Civilian Defence," in Roberts, ed., *Civilian Resistance as a National Defence*, p. 258; *The Strategy of Civilian Defence*, p. 258.
258. *Ibid.*, p. 262
259. *Ibid.*, pp. 260-261.
260. Warmbrunn, *The Dutch . . .*, p. 121.
261. *Ibid.*, p. 298. n. 4.
262. *Ibid.*, pp. 121-122.
263. Sharp, *Tyranny Could Not Quell Them*.
264. Bernard, *Social Control . . .*, pp. 126 and 186.
265. Shridharani, *War Without Violence*, U.S. ed., p. 42; Br. ed., p. 58.

266. Geyl, *The Revolt of the Netherlands 1555-1609*, pp. 138-139, 147-148, and 154.
267. Crane Brinton, *The Anatomy of Revolution*, pp. 139-141.
268. Taylor, *The Struggle for North China*, p. 199.
269. Brinton, *The Anatomy of Revolution*, pp. 142-143.
270. The full text is published in Schlesinger, *The Colonial Merchants . . .*, pp. 607-613.
271. Gipson, *The British Empire . . .*, vol. XII, p. 313.
272. Schlesinger, *The Colonial Merchants . . .*, p. 519.
273. *Ibid.*, pp. 551-552.
274. See *ibid.*, p. 136, 148-149, 428, 435-436, 452, 483-484, 494, 505, 509, 519, 522-523, 528-529, 549, 551, 563, and 580-581; Trevelyan, *The American Revolution*, pp. 270-271; Gipson, *The Coming of the American Revolution*, pp. 103, 180-181, 203, 222-223, and 228-230; Gipson, *The British Empire Before the American Revolution*, vol. XI, *The Triumphant Empire, The Rumbling of the Coming Storm 1766-1770*, p. 513; and *ibid.*, vol. XII, pp. 157, 160, 216-217, 222, 313, 315-316, 324 and 349.
275. I am grateful to Dennis Brady for calling my attention to this case. This account is based primarily on Irving Berdine Richman, *Rhode Island: A Study in Separatism* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1905), pp. 285-307, and Arthur May Mowry, *The Dorr War or The Constitutional Struggle in Rhode Island* (Providence, R.I.: Preston & Rounds, 1901), pp. 98-198 and 286-306, and also on Peter J. Coleman, *The Transformation of Rhode Island 1790-1860* (Providence, R.I.: American History Research Center, Brown University Press, 1963), pp. 255-294. See also, e.g., Dan King, *The Life and Times of Thomas Wilson Dorr with Outlines of the Political History of Rhode Island* (Boston: the Author, 1859) and "A Rhode Islander," *Might and Right* (Providence: A.H. Stillwell, 1844). A larger literature is available.
276. Mowry, *The Dorr War*, p. 143.
277. *Ibid.*, p. 139.
278. *Ibid.*, p. 140.
279. *Ibid.*, p. 155.
280. *Ibid.*, p. 157.
281. *Ibid.*, p. 172.
282. See Charques, *The Twilight of Imperial Russia*, p. 243, Deutcher, *Stalin*, pp. 130, 134, 160-161, and 193, and Schapiro, *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, pp. 154, 159, 162 and 166.
283. Wolfe, *Three Who Made A Revolution*, p. 319.
284. Charques, *The Twilight . . .*, p. 134. See also Seton-Watson, *The Decline of Imperial Russia*, p. 227, and Harcave, *First Blood*, pp. 187-189, 195, 212-214 and 236.
285. Wolfe, *Three Who Made a Revolution*, p. 333.
286. Keep, *The Rise of Social Democracy in Russia*, p. 162.
287. Schapiro, *The Communist Party . . .*, p. 66.
288. Seton-Watson, *The Decline . . .*, p. 240, and Keep, *The Rise . . .*, p. 160.
289. Seton-Watson, *The Decline . . .*, p. 241.
290. Wolfe, *Three Who Made a Revolution*, p. 493.
291. Schapiro, *The Communist Party . . .*, p. 67, and Keep, *The Rise . . .*, p. 214.

292. Hiller, *The Strike*, p. 246.
293. Crook, "General Strike," p. 610.
294. Hiller, *The Strike*, pp. 244-249.
295. Crook, *The General Strike*, p. 402. See also Symons, *The General Strike*, pp. 89, 93, 118, 124-125, 138, 144, and 158-159.
296. Bondurant, *Conquest of Violence*, p. 137.
297. Sharp, *Gandhi Wields . . .*, p. 152.
298. H.N. Brailsford, *Rebel India* (New York: New Republic, Inc., 1931; and London: Leonard Stein [with Victor Gollancz], 1931) U.S. ed., pp. 4-5; Br. ed., p. 13.
299. See Pyarelal (Nayar), "Gandhiji Discusses Another 1942 Issue: Non-violent Technique and Parallel Government," reprinted from *Harijan*, in *The Independent* (Bombay), 25 March 1946.
300. Sharp, "The Methods of Nonviolent Resistance and Direct Action," duplicated, 68 pp.; Oslo: Institute for Social Research, 1960). That paper contained sixty-three methods.
301. Indeed, some additional methods have already been suggested which have not been included here for one reason or another. These are: circulation of hostile rumours and jokes, the "rally" (which might possibly be classified separately from "assemblies of protest or support" and "protest meetings"), hoarding (under certain political and economic conditions), a noisy claque pro or con some cause involved in a meeting, packing a meeting with sympathizers, clogging the channels of justice (which here might be a part of "seeking imprisonment"), over-use of certain technical or mechanical (as distinct from social) facilities (as clogging a telephone switchboard with masses of calls), inviting martyrdom (if one separates the extreme forms— as daring soldiers or police to shoot one—from the general phenomenon which may occur with various methods), aesthetic display (art, music, poetry, drama) not itself containing protest but performed *in the name* of protest, subtle protest through artistic performance (as a few lines in a play). These have been suggested by John L. Sorenson while at the Defense Research Corporation; he also called my attention to several others which are included in the present classification.