



At James Madison University

Nonviolent Power and the End of Domination

Jack DuVall

President and founding Director
International Center on Nonviolent Conflict
Washington, D.C.

Gandhi Center Working Paper Number 1

January 14, 2008

Gandhi Center Working Papers Series ISSN 1941-2541 (print)
Gandhi Center Working Papers Series ISSN 1941-255X (online)

Copies of Gandhi Center Working Papers are available for download
from <http://www.jmu.edu/gandhicenter/workingpapers.shtml>
or by mailing a request to:

Mahatma Gandhi Center for Global Nonviolence
James Madison University
MSC 2604, Cardinal House
500 Cardinal Drive
Harrisonburg, Virginia 22807, USA

Suggested citation:

DuVall, Jack. 2008. "Nonviolent Power and the End of Domination."
Gandhi Center Working Papers Series, Number 1. Mahatma Gandhi
Center for Global Nonviolence, James Madison University,
Harrisonburg.

Copyright:

The contents of this paper are solely the property of the authors,
and cannot be reproduced without the permission of the authors.

Nonviolent Power and the End of Domination *

Jack DuVall

President and founding Director
International Center on Nonviolent Conflict
Washington, D.C.
<jduvall@nonviolent-conflict.org>

The Green Stick

When he was a boy, Leo Tolstoy was told by his brother Nikolai that he had buried on their family's property at Yasnaya Polyana a little green stick, on which he had written a great secret which, when revealed, would end all wars and suffering and the death they bring. Leo believed him, and after a long life dedicated to peace, Tolstoy was buried on that very site.

Four years later, the first great war of the last century was started by the empires and aristocracies of Europe and was fought by young men, with bayonets, artillery, and gas. Almost 10 million of them died in the same number of years that American troops have been in Iraq. World War I planted the seeds of another great war, which left us with a Cold War. During that war, the U.S. government armed Islamic militants fighting Soviet invaders in Afghanistan in the 1980s; one of the fighters was Osama bin Laden.

In January 2007, President Bush announced that the war in Iraq required 20,000 more American troops and two more years, claiming it was part of a "decisive ideological struggle" to defeat terrorists and bring democracy to the Middle East.¹ Having opened the door to chaos in Iraq, Americans cannot abandon responsibility to restore order, if the way that's done does not compound the suffering. Yet it cannot be assumed that the cost of military action, however high, is justified because it is part of a struggle beyond Iraq. The justice of a cause cannot be measured only by the goals of its proponents—it must also be judged by the impact on those whose lives and rights are at stake. Wars are just if they defend life, not if they take it for the political purposes of those who start the wars.

It was not wrong five years ago to diagnose Iraq as a disaster for its people. The reason was a criminal dictatorship, which had killed over one quarter million Iraqis through war and repression. Saddam Hussein's contempt for life

and people's rights, while inordinate, was not exceptional. In the half-century following World War II, the number of war-related deaths in developing countries averaged 400,000 per year.² These included innocents and combatants in coups and insurrections against dictatorial regimes, as well as wars launched by such regimes and invasions by external powers.

Today more than twenty nations are stricken by violent insurgencies and separatism, and by terrorist campaigns.³ At the core of each of these armed conflicts is a political struggle, in most cases between an undemocratic regime and an ethnic or ideological opposition. Power is concentrated in a ruling group that disdains the people's voice and is challenged by an insurgent group whose skill is sufficient to keep it going but cannot match the violence of the state.

In all these countries, every avenue of systematic human progress, in rights and health and the environment and education, is obstructed by cycles of violence—while the cost of that violence to the livelihood and longevity of the people is paid, again and again, by the people. Self-absorbed or autocratic rulers and the killers who beset them are not just foes of each other, they are assailants of the people's future.

The Tyrannical Principle

Last year I met a young woman who is helping to save her people's future. Her name is Jennifer Latheef, and she is a citizen of the Maldives Islands. Until two years ago, political opposition there was prevented, but then a dissident was killed in custody and international pressure forced the government to open up more space for dissent. Jennifer became an opposition leader, took up nonviolent protest—and was labeled a terrorist. She was under house arrest when I talked with her in Male, the capital-city that occupies a one square mile island in the blue clear water of the Indian Ocean.

The Maldives were a subject of the PBS series, "Odyssey" in 2004. On its web site is an audio report that documents the threat to Maldivians who rely on the trade in reef fish. It quotes an ocean conservationist: "The problem is poverty, hunger," he said. "The problem is too many hungry mouths."⁴ No, that is not the fundamental cause of misery in the Maldives.

For twenty-eight years, this long curving spine of islands has been saddled with the same corrupt dictator. His family and friends own the land beneath luxury tourist resorts, and he looks the other way as the drug trade pushes young males into addiction and radical Islamists push a life of submission on young Muslim women. The poverty in the Maldives is a symptom of a deeper problem: domination by rulers not chosen by the people and therefore not ruling on their behalf.

The Yale University political scientist James Scott, in his landmark work on domination and resistance among Malaysian villagers, found that elite power-holders “institutionalized means of extracting labor, goods and services from a subject population,” infusing the domination with personal terror while propagating a “false consciousness” that it was good for those exploited. In these relationships, he saw parallels as far back as Anglo-Saxon commoners subordinated by Norman conquerors and as recently as Tutsis lording it over Hutus in Rwanda.⁵

One group dominating another may not be uncommon in history, but that cannot excuse those who tolerate it. Political oppression is another variation of traditional domination. For far too long, the international community has ignored the persistence of authoritarian rule, with all the dissimulation that gives it the veneer of legitimacy. Scott says that a “dominant ideology achieves compliance by convincing subordinate groups that the social order in which they live is natural and inevitable.”⁶

If you believe that oppression and the violence it triggers are natural or inevitable, then you are accepting lies that legitimize its power, and it subordinates you just as surely as those whom it victimizes. The philosopher Hannah Arendt said that “much of the present glorification of violence is caused by severe frustration of the faculty of action in the modern world.”⁷ To break that frustration, the truth about how to obtain power must be grasped. Václav Havel, the Czech dissident and later president, said that living without rights was living a lie—the lie that life is normal—and that escaping the lie by confronting repression could open the way to a “social movement” or “civil unrest.” He called this “living in the truth,” saying it would open up “explosive, incalculable political power.”⁸

Activists in the Maldives, and in dozens of campaigns for basic rights elsewhere—in Burma, Egypt, Belarus, or Zimbabwe—are practicing Havel’s civil unrest and opening up a new form of power. Because such struggles may eventually undermine all forms of political domination, they represent collectively a vast, inchoate global movement that could determine whether the prime material torments of our age—violence, poverty, disease and the desecration of nature—can be dissolved.

No one has defined this elemental contest better than Abraham Lincoln did:

It is the eternal struggle between...two principles that have stood face to face from the beginning of time....The one is the common right of humanity and the other is the divine right of kings. It the same principle in whatever shape it develops itself. It is the same spirit that says, “You work and toil and earn bread, and I’ll eat it.” No matter in what shape it comes, whether from the

mouth of a king who seeks to bestride the people of his own race and live by the fruit of their labor, or from one race of men as an apology for enslaving another race, it is the same tyrannical principle.⁹

Lincoln knew who should wage this conflict. As a congressman, he had challenged President James Polk's war with Mexico, yet he recognized the right of Texans to throw off Mexican rule. He said then that "any people anywhere, being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off the existing government, and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable, a most sacred right, a right which we hope and believe is to liberate the world."¹⁰

The "Right to Take Possession"

One year after Lincoln defined "the right to rise up," Henry David Thoreau published his famous essay on *Civil Disobedience*, which suggested a new way to challenge government "when its tyranny or its inefficiency are great and unendurable." He explained that even a minority, refusing to comply with unjust laws, "is irresistible, when it clogs by its whole weight" the laws' enforcement.¹¹

Eighty years later, Mohandas K. Gandhi told the head of the American Civil Liberties Union that Thoreau's essay was the heart of his political philosophy. Believing his own use of civil resistance in South Africa had been the first "scientific confirmation" of Thoreau's ideas, Gandhi spent more than twenty years rallying millions to resist the British Raj in India.¹² The basic proposition he put to them was this: "The British are ruling this country for their own benefit, so why should we help them?" Implicit in this is the idea that the people themselves, by past inaction, had enabled colonial power—suggesting that the people had leverage and opportunity to weaken it.

Gandhi's campaigns were the first stories of mass nonviolent action to be reported worldwide by broadcast media. Ever since, the rate with which people have applied this new force has accelerated. The Danes obstructed German occupiers in World War II by strikes and work slow-downs. African-Americans defied segregation through boycotts, sit-ins and marches, driving up the cost of enforcing it. Polish workers refused to leave their shipyards until they had won the right to a free trade union, from which the ruling party never fully recovered.

In Chile, General Augusto Pinochet, after five years of popular defiance in the streets, tried to steal a plebiscite he had lost, but his fellow generals thwarted him. Czechs, East Germans, and others living under Soviet client regimes choked the streets of their capitals to force change. To oppose apartheid, Black South

Africans boycotted white businesses, welcomed foreign sanctions, and went on strike—until a new constitution was negotiated.

Last year, former Yugoslav leader Slobodan Milosevic died. *The New York Times* called him “a ruler of exceptional ruthlessness” who created “a violence not seen in Europe since 1945.”¹³ In 2000, a movement to dislodge Milosevic was spurred by a youth group, Otpor, to defend election results. A million Serbs converged on Belgrade, the military refused to crack down, and Milosevic had to yield power.

In 2004, Ukrainians exercised the “right to rise up.” Before an election to replace a corrupt president, the opposition candidate was poisoned. When vote fraud on the scale of 2.8 million ballots was revealed, a million people went to the heart of Kyiv and would not leave before a new vote was called. Protesters used slogans like, “A Ukrainian soldier is a patriot, not a killer.”¹⁴ When orders came to clear the streets, the army and secret service did not respond. The voting was repeated, the challenger won, and the Orange Revolution succeeded.

When Lebanese besieged Martyrs’ Square in Beirut to demand the end of Syrian occupation in 2005, many said they were inspired by the Orange Revolution. Suddenly autocrats all over the Middle East realized that they were not exempt from people power. Today there is vigorous nonviolent action underway against autocratic regimes or military occupiers in Egypt, Iran, Palestine and the Western Sahara.

Not all nonviolent campaigns succeed. Perhaps the most spectacular failure was in China in 1989. Charismatic student leaders rallied a half-million Chinese in a weeks-long occupation of Tiananmen Square, demanding free speech and other rights. But they could not agree about tactics, they did not recognize that the government might accept some of their demands—so they lost a chance to bargain for the movement’s survival—and they did not prepare for repression. It might have helped to recall the words of Sun Tzu, an ancient Chinese sage: “Tactics without strategy is the noise before defeat.”¹⁵

Compare that lost opportunity to the strategy of Polish workers in 1980, when shipyard strikes galvanized the nation and stunned the communist regime. Militant workers had wanted to march on local party headquarters, but Lech Walesa realized that would prompt quick repression, so they occupied the shipyards. The militants wanted to demand full democratic rights, but Walesa knew that could trigger Soviet intervention. Instead the workers bargained for a free trade union and won. After that, ten million Poles joined Solidarity, and nine years later Walesa became president of Poland. Opportunity for power emerges from a strategy to achieve it.

When people are mobilized to break the chain of domination—by exposing the pretense of normalcy that lawless rulers try to fabricate, by ending the

economic gain of those who make decisions, and by dividing the loyalty of those who follow orders—then the moment that Gandhi envisioned arrives: “The people, when they become conscious of their power, will have every right to take possession of what belongs to them.”¹⁶

Miracles and Deniers

It is not Western policymakers, international organizations, radical jihadists, or guerrillas with mustaches who do these revolutions. They are the work of people who are oppressed, who have had enough, and who learn how to resist. But freedom is not only seized through resistance. The very act of resistance, of starting a new chain of events, is itself freedom. “The miracle of freedom,” says Arendt, “is inherent in the fact that every human being, simply by being born...is a new beginning.”¹⁷

Yet “every new beginning,” she explained, “is by nature a miracle when seen and experienced from the standpoint of the processes it necessarily interrupts.”¹⁸ Neither dictators nor diplomats, and certainly not the news media, seem able to fathom how movements can take power without violence. They think it must be caused by something else: the mistakes of the old regime, certain unique conditions, or external powers.

The opinion that ordinary people cannot mount a meaningful struggle, and that some other force must do it for them, reduces citizens to mere pawns. Contained in this are two beliefs, which would reinforce apathy and inhibit action: first, the belief that we are all prisoners of nebulous forces and power-holders, that we are tossed around like seaweed on the tides of history; and second, the belief that things change only by material intervention, especially new techniques or money, rather than by changing the minds of individuals through gaining approval of new ideas.

If you believe that sinister forces like military superpowers or big corporations or secret medieval societies control your destiny, and that they cannot be overcome except by deadly weapons wielded by cunning revolutionaries, then you are not going to be impressed by historical evidence of how people have defied almost every kind of subjugation and won their rights without violence. In fact, you may be tempted to explain that liberation any other way.

If you are the one who is doing the subjugating, by shrinking the space for civil society, imprisoning dissenters, and torturing bloggers or women who wear clothes you do not like, then you will probably claim that civil resistance was dreamed up by anyone other than your own people—because you will be

anxious to discredit its appearance. Those who deny that the people have power of their own are those who are threatened by people learning how to use it.

If you believe that power is lodged in social structures and faceless institutions rather than in the consent of people whose cooperation they require, you may readily believe that the only means of removing oppressors is to destroy those institutions by killing those who defend them. Yet unless you love to kill for its own sake, sanctioning violence requires you to believe that the ends justify the means. But then the values of those for whom you fight are necessarily subordinated to your views about both means and ends—and that is just another expression of the “tyrannical principle.”

This is also the sign of a deeper belief, that certain views are right in an absolute sense and demand obedience. Yet no one who joins a nonviolent movement is expected to swallow whole the beliefs of the few who lead the movement, because people power rests on participation by the many. Without adherents who are persuaded by the merit of the ideas and the strategies proposed for a movement, it has no life. They cannot be coerced to embrace those ideas, because it is unreasoning coercion that is the heart of whatever oppression they strive to resist—and they would not knowingly substitute one tyranny of mind for another.

Nonviolent power is developed by people whose freedom of thought and passion for their rights are the reasons for a revolution. Only indigenous leaders and organizers have the necessary knowledge of the people’s grievances, to kindle their action. Only those who must either suffer more oppression or seize the chance for freer life will take the risks that resistance requires. Those who are liberated are the ones who liberate.

Learning Liberation

This model of liberation has no John Locke or Thomas Jefferson, no Karl Marx or Vladimir Lenin, as doctrinal sources. Even Gandhi learned from others, from the struggle for Irish home rule and from the Russian Revolution of 1905. From Gandhi, African-Americans learned the need for nonviolent discipline. Filipinos taught Chileans who resisted Pinochet, and Mongolians knew about the Velvet Revolution in Prague before they rose up to demand democracy. And in the writings of Gene Sharp, the great theorist of nonviolent strategy, Serbian activists saw a way to dislodge a president later tried for war crimes.

These ideas have been amplified and applied in more than fifty countries over the past century. So it is not sufficient any longer to teach nonviolence as a theory derived from any one of its historical contributors and expect that that will end domination. Civil resistance as it is applied today is not a form of moral

exhibitionism that shames power-holders into granting rights. It is a catalyst for incubating independent power, through self-organizing, mass mobilizing, and incapacitating repression. The people do not petition for power, they produce it.

For seven generations, from Walden Pond to Wenceslas Square, from lunch counters in Nashville to the streets of Beirut, the knowledge of how workers, mothers, students, clerics, and nurses can create nonviolent power has gradually accumulated. As the twenty-first century begins, a new generation of scholars and activists are distilling best practices in civil resistance and disseminating those lessons through films, workshops, and the internet. The manifestation of people power cannot be stopped, because the demand for rights and the flow of knowledge it opens cannot be staunched.

While oppressed peoples are gradually learning how to undertake nonviolent struggle, the broader global public is still largely unaware of its impact. The news media are so transfixed by the actions of governments, they neglect the evidence of what self-organized citizens have done to remake their nations, and they are so spellbound by the spectacle of violence, they discount the possibilities of nonviolent resistance, especially when it is not driven by mass protests.

In the past, media disinterest reinforced the credibility of apologists for violent revolution who derided nonviolent struggle as too weak. But now that evidence of its impact can no longer be dismissed, they invent conspiracy theories to explain it away, saying that people power is a capitalist plot, probably cooked up by the CIA—in other words, it is too strong. In fact, they have never liked it, because it undermines the case for violent revolt—as if there have been instances in recent decades when violent insurrection has produced governments that brought justice and were based on the freely expressed consent of the people. But no such thing has happened.

While not opposing nonviolent struggle, most policymakers and pundits, in the fetal position of conventional wisdom, still believe that civil resistance can be checkmated with more repression—though that would limit struggles for freedom to armed revolt, military intervention, or diplomacy. They also appear to abhor conflict more than oppression. *Deadly* conflicts should certainly be prevented or resolved. But nonviolent power emerges from *political* conflicts, waged to remove oppression.

“To Appeal to Public Reason”

Many who are attached on principle to nonviolence contend that civil disobedience is mainly about behavior. Personal conversion or voluntary change by abusive people is the marvel they seek. This philosophy should be respected insofar as it can work. But freeing nations from tyranny, and radically shrinking

the appeal of violent groups who threaten genocidal terror, are urgent matters. “Any response that places man in the center of our current worries,” Arendt argued, “and suggests he must be changed before any relief is to be found is profoundly unpolitical. For at the center of politics lies concern for the world.”¹⁹

To turn that concern into action, Lincoln said we must begin with “reason—cold, calculating, unimpassioned reason.”²⁰ He knew that the content of a great cause had to be adopted by the people’s mind. “I do not seek applause,” he said, “nor to amuse the people, I want to convince them.”²¹ This passion for persuading people reflected his belief in their power as well as their primacy. “With public sentiment, nothing can fail,” Lincoln said, “without it, nothing can succeed.”²² This anticipated Tolstoy by thirty years, who said that “public opinion” could lead to “the abolition of the prevailing order.”²³

Ultimately the proposition to rise up and resist is a challenge to every citizen. It fuses the individual’s fate with the nation’s fate, and the movement’s fate to what each person decides to do. So it is an existential question. “Who *are* you?” is what civil resisters ask the rest of us. Will you sit at home while others save our future? What do *you* think is right, and what does your sense of right tell you must be done? Arendt noted that it was Socrates who “discovered conscience.” He wanted “to make the city more truthful” by convincing citizens to bring out “the inherent truth” every one of them possessed. This was the beginning of political life, and it was based on what the Greeks called *logos*, the power of speech in search of meaning.²⁴

Corazon Aquino, the leader of people power in the Philippines, said that Nelson Mandela achieved his goals in South Africa not by violent force “but with reason.”²⁵ When this is the predicate of revolution, when truth and logic are its parents, justice is more likely to be its child. To be a citizen, said the philosopher John Rawls, you have “a duty of civility to appeal to public reason.”²⁶ This is what Lincoln did, and this is what Gandhi did. In the process, they made Americans and Indians into democrats—even as they rallied the people to furnish the force that yielded victory.

Elihu Burritt, a social activist appointed by Lincoln as U.S. consul in Birmingham, England, studied two British movements, against slavery and against tariffs that raised bread prices for the poor. He saw that apart from correcting these abuses, the struggles changed the British. They “threw down in the people’s mind the whole ideal fabric of brute-force movements for righting political, social, or economical wrongs. It proved the irresistible power...of an enlightened public sentiment, brought to bear against an evil in the continuous, concentrated efforts of a well-organized association....”²⁷

Claiming the right to rise up against oppression, civil reason speaking to the people’s mind, mobilizing people to fracture the power of dominating rulers—in

short, unarmed liberation: When all this work is done worldwide, not only tyrannies, but the tyrannical principle will recede—and with it, the real source of violence and war.

“To End Violence, Struggle for Justice”

When they take you from your house, beat you with all their might...break open your front door with a crowbar and wreck your furniture right in front of your family, when in the middle of the night they drive you to the police station in handcuffs and order you to sign statements, then...your basic sense of human dignity will make you say NO. Because even if these people were doing it all in the name of the best and noblest cause, they would be destroying that cause with their misdeeds.

So the Polish dissident Adam Michnik wrote from prison, before his country was liberated.²⁸

His reaction to violence was outrage, and in Poland, imposing martial law and driving Solidarity underground were seen in retrospect as the self-destruction of the regime’s authority. But there are other possible responses to violence, including gratification if you want revenge, or accepting violence as the means to an end that you think cannot be reached in other ways.

Virtually every statement by Osama bin Laden or Ayman al-Zawahiri has contained a passage in which violence is re-justified. Bin Laden once said, “Oppression...cannot be demolished except in a hail of bullets.”²⁹ But in 50 of 67 transitions from authoritarianism between 1970 and 2005, civil resistance and not violence was the pivotal force.³⁰ So the claim of violence as necessary is a lie, and lies have to be constantly repeated to be believed. Alexander Solzhenitsyn said that anyone advocating violence as his method “is inevitably forced to take the lie as his principle.”³¹

In the struggle between transnational terrorists and the states they have attacked, a stream of Islamist males has succumbed to these fallacies and carried out lethal missions. That has triggered the belief in the West that terrorism can be checked by hunting down terrorists. But if the only strategy against terrorism is to kill perpetrators, military action becomes an endless requirement—and it may or may not reduce the supply of terrorists. The American presence in Iraq apparently led to a surge in the supply—and may have done little to reduce the demand for what terrorists tell Muslims they want to do, which is liberate them from regimes supported by the West.

The decisive power reliably produced by nonviolent movements is directly relevant to the demand for liberation in Muslim lands. It has a better record of

freeing people than violence, in part because it enlists the full breadth of a society—women, workers, merchants and minorities—to propel the cause, rather than only alienated young men. It does not depend on theatrical tactics and news coverage to sustain interest and momentum, and instead of goading its most courageous fighters into suicide, it reinvests their experience in more ingenious ways to expedite the struggle.

Above all, people power does not have to glorify death. Bin Laden once said, “Death is truth.”³² When I read that, it reminded me of how a Serbian civic leader explained why the old regime in his country had lost the people’s trust. “Their language smelled like death,” he said.³³ He knew what Bin Laden doesn’t: Death is not popular. In a poll taken last year in the two most populous Muslim societies, Indonesia and Pakistan, seven out of ten people said that killing civilians is never justified.³⁴

The pretense that they are fighting for the oppressed lends terrorists the costume of dignity. So if we constantly reiterate that the United States, the superpower, is at war with them, their self-proclaimed image as noble warriors seems confirmed. We should not reinforce that myth; we should undermine it. And we should certainly not imagine that we are engaged in a war with a particular kind of religion. That gives apparent credence to the Islamist claim that the Christian West is engaged in another crusade.

The British, repeatedly hit by terrorists—first the IRA and now al Qaeda—are avoiding this. The new British prime minister Gordon Brown has reportedly instructed his government to stop using the phrase “war on terror,” and his new security minister said this summer: “The term ‘war’ can be divisive, playing right into terrorists’ hands. Terrorists are criminals and murderers. What is important is tackling violent extremism. This is something that will take time.”³⁵

But something with more edge than time is on our side: the appeal of reason in a world where violent coercion is not popular. In September 2007, Diah Rashwan of the Al Ahram Center for Strategic and International Studies in Cairo said that Muslims have come to realize that al Qaeda and similar groups are “incredibly rough and rigidly ideological.... Their methods weren’t about winning people over...but imposing upon them. No people in the world like that.”³⁶

In early 2007 I spoke at a seminar in Egypt for activists, students, and workers anxious to find better ways to achieve real democracy. I have also talked with young Palestinians, Pakistanis, and Iranians all eager to rid their countries of dominating elites or whatever blocks their rights. If a nonviolent movement succeeds in pushing decisive change in any of these countries, claims made anywhere in the Middle East about the imperative of violence will begin to ring hollow.

The pretext and the lure of hyperviolence will wane only if those whose grievances have given it altitude find another way to fly to freedom. The appeal of civil resistance lies in its proven effectiveness, as well as its availability to everyone who has been persecuted and will not be silent any longer.

“It never does any good to oppose an ideology derived from prejudice with some current antithetical worldview,” Arendt explained. “The only thing that helps is to attempt to replace prejudices with judgments.”³⁷ And that restores reason, and that permits a clear view of costs and benefits from different courses of action. Gandhi mobilized ordinary Indians to claim ownership of their nation by giving them reason to take the risks of resisting domination.

The choice of how to fight for freedom can also be made without vilifying those who make a different choice. I understand the risks assumed by anyone who wears a uniform, because I once wore one myself. Violence kills people on both sides of a fire line who have the right to live, but in the reactions of many of its mortal antagonists as well as in the minds of those who plot to bomb, it also submerges reason.

In our book, *A Force More Powerful*, there is a photograph of a lone protester on a street corner in South Africa in 1986, holding a sign: “To end violence, struggle for justice.” Today this struggle is in the hands of people everywhere. To accelerate that cause, we cannot magnify the violence that is the hallmark of its adversaries. Those who would bring freedom cannot bring war and expect to be embraced, for now the world hates war, and all the cemeteries it creates, far more than any dictator. If we heighten violence, we cannot end it. No one should be upset that the world rejects war as a way to do good. That is one belief we should never resurrect.

America should be the republic that Lincoln intended, favoring revolution through the virtue and extension of the ideas that are the reason we have power—government by the people, equality under the law, the natural rights of every person. Lincoln said that the struggle of his time, to save the reach of those ideas, was “for a vast future also.”³⁸ To free that future from the reach of violence, the writ of those ideas must be extended—by showing people how to free themselves, through their vision and exertion summoned by those same ideas, which now belong to everyone. There is no copyright on human rights; there is no sole provider of democracy. To free every mind from every kind of domination, the world will learn that power springs from what the people think and what the people do.

The secret on Tolstoy’s little green stick will not be buried much longer.

-
- * Paper presented in the Tolstoy Lecture Series in Global Nonviolence, Mahatma Gandhi Center for Global Nonviolence, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, Virginia, October 2, 2007.
- ¹ President's Address to the Nation, "The New Way Forward in Iraq," January 10, 2007, (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2007/01/20070110-7.html>).
 - ² "The Possibilities for Prevention," Figure 5: War and War-Related Deaths, "The State of the World's Children, 1996," UNICEF (<http://www.unicef.org/sowc96/13prevnt.htm>).
 - ³ Ploughshares Fund, *Armed Conflicts Report*, 2007, <http://www.ploughshares.ca/images/articles/ACR07/MapRevACR07.pdf>.
 - ⁴ Carl Safina, cited in "The Trade in Live Reef Fish for Food—Part 2," PBS, *The Voyage of the Odyssey*, February 27, 2004.
 - ⁵ James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 18, 72.
 - ⁶ Scott, 21.
 - ⁷ Hannah Arendt, *On Violence* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace, 1970), 83.
 - ⁸ Vaclav Havel, *The Power of the Powerless* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, 1985).
 - ⁹ Harry V. Jaffa, *A New Birth of Freedom: Abraham Lincoln and the Coming of the Civil War* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000), 315.
 - ¹⁰ Jaffa, 347.
 - ¹¹ Henry David Thoreau, *Walden and Civil Disobedience* (New York: Penguin Classics, 1983).
 - ¹² Homer A. Jack, ed., *The Gandhi Reader* (New York: Grove Press, 1956).
 - ¹³ "Slobodan Milosevic, 64, Former Yugoslav Leader Accused of War Crimes, Dies," *The New York Times*, March 11, 2006.
 - ¹⁴ Anika Locke Binnendijk, interviews conducted for "Power and Persuasion: Nonviolent Strategies to Influence State Security Forces in Serbia and Ukraine," with Ivan Marovic; *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 39, 3 (September 2006).
 - ¹⁵ Sun Tzu, Wikiquote: http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Sun_Tzu
 - ¹⁶ Dennis Dalton, *Mahatma Gandhi: Nonviolent Power in Action* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).
 - ¹⁷ Hannah Arendt, *The Promise of Politics* (New York: Schocken Books, 2005), 113.
 - ¹⁸ Arendt, *The Promise of Politics*, 59, 111–12.
 - ¹⁹ Arendt, *The Promise of Politics*, 105–6.
 - ²⁰ Allen Guelzo, *Abraham Lincoln: Redeemer President* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 91.
 - ²¹ John Channing Briggs, *Lincoln's Speeches Reconsidered* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), 6.
 - ²² David Zarefsky, "'Public Sentiment is Everything': Lincoln's View of Political Persuasion," *Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Association*, 2004.
 - ²³ Leo Tolstoy, *The Kingdom of God is Within You*, <http://kingdomnow.org/w-inyou11.html>.
 - ²⁴ Arendt, *The Promise of Politics*, 15.
 - ²⁵ Corazon Aquino, "Speech Upon Receipt of the Fulbright Prize," U.S. State Department, Washington, D.C., October 11, 1996.
 - ²⁶ John Rawls, *Political Liberalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 2265.
 - ²⁷ Elihu Burritt, *Lectures and Speeches* (1869), from Google Books (<http://books.google.com/>)
 - ²⁸ Adam Michnik, *Letters from Prison* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987).
 - ²⁹ Anne McElvoy, "Forget the Gunboats—It's Time for Good Old-fashioned Diplomacy," *The Independent*, London, January 13, 1999.
 - ³⁰ Adrian Karatnycky, "How Freedom Is Won: From Civic Resistance to Durable Democracy," A Research Study by Freedom House, 2005.
 - ³¹ Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Nobel Peace Prize Speech, 1970.

- ³² Osama bin Laden, "Declaration of War against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Places," *Al Quds Al Arabi*, 1996.
(http://www.pbs.org/newshour/terrorism/international/fatwa_1996.html).
- ³³ Srdja Popovic, *Bringing Down a Dictator*, documentary film, 2002, produced by Steve York.
- ³⁴ "Large and Growing Numbers of Muslims Reject Terrorism, Bin Laden," report on polls taken by Pew Global Attitudes Project and Terror Free Tomorrow, WorldPublicOpinion.org, June 30, 2006
(http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/international_security_bt/221.php?nid=&id=&pnt=221).
- ³⁵ "You Ask The Questions: Lord West of Spithead, Security Minister and former First Sea Lord," *The Independent*, August 6, 2007.
- ³⁶ Dan Murphy, "Al Qaeda Slips Further From Political Goals," *Christian Science Monitor*, September 11, 2007.
- ³⁷ Arendt, *The Promise of Politics*, p. 152.
- ³⁸ James M. McPherson, "For a Vast Future Also: Lincoln and the Millenium," Jefferson Lecture, National Endowment for the Humanities, 2000.