

Chapter Thirty-eight

CONDUCTING THE STRUGGLE

The role of a strategic plan

The diverse cases of nonviolent struggle described in earlier chapters of this book started in various ways. Almost without exception, they did so without a strategic plan for the impending major conflict. The closest to a strategic plan was the case of India in 1930-1931, although elements of planning were also present in Serbia in 2000.

The approach that is presented in this book is a more deliberate one. It envisages careful analysis and strategic development before the struggle begins. The deliberate initiation of the struggle with advance planning will likely increase the chances of the struggle being successful. Advance planning may also reduce, but not eliminate, the possibility of extreme casualties.

Once the struggle has begun, it will not remain static. Power relationships will change, sometimes rapidly. Although the non-violent struggle group should always try to maintain initiative in the conflict, momentum may be periodically gained or lost. Unanticipated problems and setbacks may, and probably will, occur.

Strategic planners and leaders of the nonviolent struggle group should try to anticipate changes in the conflict situation and be prepared to take them into account over the course of the struggle. Such changes may result in a need to alter tactical plans for the implementation of the existing campaign strategies. Changes in the conflict situation will also be important in the continued development of the strategic plans for imminent future campaigns within the grand strategy. On rare occasions, the strategies for existing campaigns may need to be altered if it is determined conclusively that setbacks in the struggle are due to poor strategic planning rather than inadequate implementation.

In this chapter, we will offer some thoughts that may help to guide the resisters in these matters as the struggle develops.

Preparing the population for struggle

The effectiveness of nonviolent struggle can be significantly increased if certain activities are undertaken before the conflict begins. These can include improving the social context for the coming action, spreading the understanding of nonviolent struggle among potential participants, strengthening independent groups and institutions, and increasing the resisters' capacity to apply the technique skillfully.

An important initial step in preparing the general population for later struggle is the spreading of the simple concept of noncooperation, and some basic understanding of the technique of nonviolent struggle. It will be important to determine how deep and widespread the knowledge of nonviolent struggle is among the population of potential resisters. For some sections of the population, fuller explanations of nonviolent struggle may be required. For example, this may include additional emphasis on the role of noncooperation and the recognition that violence has no role in this struggle and must be excluded. Various means of communication may be used for these purposes, including radio, audio- and videocassettes, leaflets, booklets, books, cartoons, and stories.

It will be important also to assess what skills will be needed during future individual campaigns, and whether these skills are already present among expected resisters. If not, then preparations to develop these skills will be a necessary task.

It will also be important to spread the idea of phased campaigns with limited objectives, conducted both to gain those objectives and to strengthen the subordinated population and society, while weakening the controls of the oppressive regime. The population needs to become accustomed to the need for making repeated and continued efforts and not to expect instant success.

In well-prepared campaigns, clear instructions will be issued to the general population and to particular groups that are asked to carry out specific acts of resistance and defiance in disciplined ways. Guidelines for specific types of resistance behavior can also be determined in advance of a crisis (such as a coup d'état), with instructions for contingencies. These instructions may include the resistance roles of various groups in the population and various institutions in the society.

Experience also establishes that, even under the most extreme totalitarian systems, it has been impossible for the dictators to sever completely all communication among resisters and the general population. Illegal news sheets, pamphlets, and even books were published and circulated under Nazi occupations and Communist rule.

Facing problems: barriers or challenges?

It must be expected that problems will be encountered during the course of the conflict. How the resisters regard these problems and respond to them is very important. Both the resisters and their leaders need to regard identified problems as challenges, not insurmountable barriers. Unless this attitude is present, it will be impossible to move beyond such difficulties.

It is therefore very important to learn how to examine serious problems and how to develop effective ways to solve them. In that way, the problems can be overcome, bypassed, or removed, and the struggle can proceed toward achieving its objectives. It is wise to try to anticipate such problems throughout the course of the struggle and to seek solutions for them before they occur.

Maintaining momentum and initiative

It is very important that the resistance movement maintain the initiative and strong momentum during the conflict in order that the application of the adopted strategies can proceed with vigor and effectiveness. Failure to do so seriously weakens the movement. For example, a brave, disciplined, and imaginative demonstration may occur on a given day that attracts significant interest, attention, and support. However, if during the following weeks and months no new acts of resistance are carried out, the public focus will be on the period of silence and passivity, not on the earlier demonstration. Its impact will be largely lost. On the other hand, maintaining the initiative and the progressive advancement of the resistance movement by new acts of protest or resistance according to the planned strategy will strengthen the struggle and contribute to the movement's success.

The nonviolent struggle movement needs to conduct primarily offensive actions, taking and maintaining the initiative as much as possible. If the movement retains its capacity to resist but does not take the initiative, there is a serious danger that the movement will become primarily reactive. The choice of what to do and how to do it would then be determined by the opponents' initiatives, thereby giving them great advantages. Defensive operations should be limited to those taken to block advances by the opponents while offensive operations are being prepared. Keeping the planned strategy in mind, leaders and strategists will need to consider what their options are for taking the initiative in the next steps of the conflict.

Even in the case of a basically defensive struggle, such as one opposing a foreign occupation or a coup d'état, the defenders need to take the initiative to turn the struggle into one in which they are the driving force. The defenders will need to plan what offensive actions they can take to protect their institutional bases, principles, and ability to act to force the collapse or withdrawal of the attackers.

A wise grand strategy, as well as particular strategies for individual campaigns, should include plans for developing a progressively more powerful and successful movement.

A long-term struggle operating under a grand strategy may include several campaigns for limited objectives. Effectiveness of the

long-term struggle is likely to be increased, and momentum is maintained, if both the campaign goals and the population groups required to bear the brunt of the responsibility for waging the struggle are varied between the successive campaigns.

In some long-term struggles, campaign strategies might focus on economic issues at one time, on freedom of expression issues at another, and on religious issues at still another. Quite different methods of action might be used in each of these campaigns. Each campaign may also call for differing degrees of both involvement and risk for different sectors of the resistance. For example, teachers may bear the brunt of the responsibility and the repression for a while. For other periods, the clergy, rail workers, journalists, judges, or students may hold prime responsibility for carrying out certain actions to gain specific objectives. Later, the group primarily responsible for resistance during one period may be given rest time, as the specific issue shifts or a different occupational or geographical group is required to assume a more active role in a new campaign.

If such a plan for developing an increasingly strong resistance movement has been made, then it is important to monitor the course of the struggle to determine whether or not the movement has indeed been growing more powerful. If the movement has become primarily reactive or has been acting largely defensively, a change to more aggressive action is needed. Decisions must be taken and implemented to make the struggle increase its drive, initiative, and force toward greater capacity to achieve its objective(s).

Monitoring the course of the conflict

During the course of the conflict, many important changes are likely to occur among both the opponents and the resisters, in their relationships to each other, and in their relationships to third parties. Very importantly, the degree and type of support that each of the contending parties receives from its own “pillars of support” may increase or decrease. The result is likely to be shifts in the overall conflict situation that was earlier assessed during the preparation of the strategic estimate, as we discussed in Chapter Thirty-six. The original situation will not remain static. Various factors will intervene as the resisters attempt to

apply a chosen strategic or tactical plan and as the opponents react. Therefore, it is important to know how the support for each side has changed, how it is currently changing, and whether and how well plans for the nonviolent struggle are actually being applied.

Larger indicators of the impact of the struggle should be monitored. These will include developments among the resisting groups, the general population, the opponents, and third parties. A variety of important questions needs to be asked. What are the favorable developments? What are the unfavorable ones? How are the views, morale, and reliability of the opponents' troops, officials, and population being affected by the conflict? How has the tenacity of the resisters been affected thus far in the conflict, and are their numbers growing or shrinking? What has happened during the conflict to the opponents' ability to control the conflict situation and the resisting population?

It is important to identify the reasons why the changes in power relationships have occurred, on both sides. What are the trends? What factors have contributed to these changes? Are the events providing evidence that the original strategic plan was sound, or that it needs to be revised? Were the opponents' countermeasures anticipated, and therefore responses prepared, or are new actions by the resisters now required? What does this say about the possible benefits of initiating changes in the tactics and the methods to be employed, or even in evaluating the selected strategy during a future review? Additional information may also be gathered about other relevant and changing factors in the conflict situation, including the use of propaganda, intelligence agents and informers, movements of key opponent personnel, and other factors.

One of the most important tasks in the evaluation of the ongoing struggle is to assess how effectively the specific tactics and methods of resistance are being applied. This is especially the case when methods have been selected that require participation of large numbers of resisters. Examples of these methods include economic boycotts, labor strikes, various forms of political non-cooperation, and even some symbolic actions such as protest marches or the public display of certain colors or symbols. If such methods are being applied by large numbers of people, that fact alone communicates a great deal, and can have a major impact on

the conflict. On the other hand, if a call for the use of methods that require many participants receives a very small response, a weakness in the resistance is exposed that may have very negative consequences for the future of the struggle.

The strategists and leaders will need ways to monitor the strengths and weaknesses of their ongoing campaign in order to assess what, if any, new steps may be needed to increase its effectiveness and its chances of success. That assessment may make it possible to take steps (1) to prevent, correct, or compensate for certain negative developments, or (2) to take new initiatives to increase the power of their struggle, strengthen the struggle group, weaken the opponents, and gain increased third party support.

Shifts in tactics and methods

A wise strategy that has been prepared to guide the main course of the conflict by the nonviolent struggle group should not be regarded as easily disposable in favor of another. However, the plans that implement the adopted strategy can be subject to change when opportunities arise to accelerate momentum, or when unanticipated serious opposition is encountered.

As the situation changes and the conflict proceeds, opportunities may arise for the resisters to take steps that were earlier envisaged but not scheduled for that particular time. If, after assessment, the proposed new actions are deemed to be wise, the movement needs to be prepared to take advantage of the unexpected opportunities. However, these steps must be compatible with the adopted grand strategy and the strategy of the current campaign.

The movement must also be careful not to be distracted into focussing on side issues and undertaking activities that are not central to the basic strategy of the struggle.

Within a given campaign, shifts may at times be made in which population groups are relied upon to conduct particular applications of protest, noncooperation, or intervention. Other changes may also be made in the choice of specific methods to be applied in the short term. Such changes in methods, or groups of methods, can be used to shift responsibilities and dangers from one group of resisters to another that is perhaps less exhausted or more disciplined. Shifts in methods may also be made to change

the kind of pressures applied to the opponents or to compensate for weaknesses in the nonviolent struggle group. Variation in tactics and methods may also add variety and interest—and often newsworthiness—to the campaign.

Retrenchment or acceleration?

If the course of the struggle has revealed that the necessary strength and ability of the resisters to persist in the face of punishments and suffering do not exist, that fact must be recognized. Ways must be sought to correct the weaknesses while continuing the struggle.

On the other hand, if significant weaknesses in the opponents are exposed, or if the nonviolent resisters are stronger than expected, it may be wise to accelerate the resistance and the implementation of the planned strategy.

The implementation of strategy and tactics requires sensitivity to the developing conflict situation. If a given tactical action succeeds, then what? If a given tactical action fails, what then? If there is partial success for that limited action, what follows? The capacity to respond to unforeseen, or unforeseeable, events must be acutely developed. It is especially important to conserve the morale of the nonviolent resisters and potential supporters and to continue their resistance actions. If a tactical action is not succeeding, plans must be altered. Under some conditions, a temporary retreat might be called in order to prepare for a stronger future effort.

Several additional important questions may need to be asked. When is it wise to continue current actions to increase the power of the resistance, or instead to modify those actions? When is it wise to initiate new activities and toward what specific limited objectives should the new action be aimed? When is it wise, despite a tactical setback, to attempt to strengthen the resisters and to persist with the chosen strategy? How does one determine whether it is wise to reassess and revise strategies already adopted?

Making gains despite setbacks

Not all struggles will proceed smoothly. Resistance leaders and strategists need to be prepared to offer guidance in situations in which the opponents have gained important ground and have won some or all of their objectives despite the resistance.

Setbacks are not permanent defeats. Without anticipation of such contingencies, and without preparations by the resisters to deal with them, setbacks and defeats in specific campaigns within an overall grand strategy may result in demoralization, confusion, and a collapse of the resistance campaign. On the other hand, with proper anticipation and preparations, the resisters may be able to handle setbacks and reverse them before they turn into debacles.

Lessons should be learned from setbacks. These may include ways to improve the development of strategies, increase the solidarity of the resisters, maintain discipline, improve their skill in applying resistance actions, and increase their capacity to continue resistance despite repression and other problems.

It is important to determine, on the basis of the examination of developments in the movement and careful analysis of events, whether the causes of a setback have been in the choice of the objectives and the strategy. If this was not the case, and the objective was wisely chosen and the strategy to achieve it was well developed and planned, then the objective and the strategy should not be lightly abandoned or replaced.

Difficulties on the tactical level are not necessarily grounds for abandoning the strategy. Changes may, instead, be appropriate on the tactical level. The general population and the resisting group may have been weak and thus needed strengthening. The implementation of the strategy and the tactics may have been poorly conducted. There may have been organizational and leadership problems. The resisters may have lacked effective means to counter the opponents' strengths and moves. In all cases, the precise nature of weaknesses in the resistance needs to be identified, and corrections need to be made on the proper levels.

In those cases where the objectives of individual campaigns have been achieved, those gains need to be recognized and the resisters given credit for their achievements. This recognition and

credit will help the resisters to follow up their successes with further gains in the next stages of the conflict.

Bringing the conflict to an end

No technique of struggle, violent or nonviolent, can be guaranteed to succeed in all circumstances, irrespective of the conditions, the strengths and skills of the resisters, and the nature and actions of the opponents. Full consideration certainly needs to be given to the external conditions of the conflict and to the nature and capacities of the opponents. However, other important factors in determining the outcome of the struggle that are often neglected are the skill, preparation, bravery, strategies, and persistence shown by the resisters. If these qualities are weak or absent, then it is most likely that the struggle will fail. But if such capacities are present and can be fortified, the resisters stand a chance of winning against even ruthless opponents.

There are three basic ways in which a conflict may end: defeat, mixed results, or success. Conflicts involving the use of nonviolent struggle are no exception.

Defeat

The nature of defeat may range from simple failure to achieve the declared objectives of the struggle to full collapse of the resistance movement. This is similar to defeat in military warfare, except that this evaluation of nonviolent struggle is measured by an additional standard that is not usually applied to wars, namely, whether the vowed objectives have in fact been gained.

Defeat may occur because of insufficient strength, or weakness in organization, perseverance, or strategy. As we said earlier, there is no substitute for genuine strength in nonviolent struggle.

The consequences of defeat will vary. At times, there may be physical suffering, loss of life, mental anguish, economic losses, worsened conditions, or new legal restrictions. If there is demoralization and loss of confidence in nonviolent struggle, the chances of using this technique again may be small.

If defeat of a nonviolent struggle appears nearly certain, or at least very likely, the nonviolent leaders and strategists will need to make very careful calculations as to how to handle the situation.

Even if the struggle group is unable to achieve its objectives at the time, it does not have to abandon them or otherwise surrender legitimacy to the opponents. Deliberate steps should be taken to ensure the possibility of resuming the struggle after major regrouping, internal strengthening, and new strategic analysis and preparations.

A movement that has proved to be too weak to stand up to the opponents and has simply disintegrated will have very little capacity at that time to salvage anything from the debacle.

However, if the defeat has not been extreme, and yet the resisters and the broader population are incapable at the time of regrouping after losses, then a temporary halt to the action should be called. An effort can be made to salvage as much as possible from the crisis. It is important to know how to withdraw in an orderly fashion to a tenable position. What that position may be will vary widely with the particular situation and the strengths of the contending groups.

If a given struggle has been defeated, it is important to analyze what factors contributed to the failure. When those are identified, it will be necessary to examine them to see why they occurred, whether they can be corrected in the future, and, if so, how. That analysis must be done carefully and without simplistic explanations, such as "the opponents were too brutal."

An attempt will need to be made to turn the difficult situation into a period of regrouping and new preparations. If some spirit of resistance survives among the resisters and the population, it will be important to maintain at least some small symbolic means of protest and to continue some limited organizational work. This is what Norwegian philosopher Arne Næss has called "micro-resistance."¹ As conditions improve, surviving resistance leaders and strategists will need to conduct preparations for future non-violent resistance, encourage people to take small, low-risk actions, and later even to initiate limited local protest and resistance activities for small objectives.

¹ Arne Næss defined micro-resistance as "resistance by individuals and tiny, temporary groups carried out in such a way that exposure and annihilation of larger organizations do not affect it, at least not directly." See Adam Roberts, ed., *Civilian Resistance as a National Defense*, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Stackpole Books, 1967 and *The Strategy of Civilian Defence* (London: Faber & Faber, 1967), pp. 252 and 270n. Several examples are offered.

Not all defeats are total and permanent. Even if the resisters appear to be defeated, the opponents' power, despite their victory, may actually have been significantly weakened. In military warfare, this is known as a "Pyrrhic victory." Even at times when objectives have not been achieved, the resisters may grow in organizational strength and skill in resisting. Such gains can be the basis for later increased strength and effectiveness. A fundamental reassessment of the situation is likely to be required, however, including a new strategic estimate.

Mixed results

In practice, of course, the end results of conflicts are often neither a complete success nor a complete defeat, but a mixture of both. In such cases, the nonviolent struggle group will need to reassess the situation and determine what needs to be done to achieve the full objectives of the campaign as originally intended.

Limited gains must be accurately reported and understood. They are not the same as defeats, but neither are they full successes. Nevertheless, in a situation of limited gains for the nonviolent struggle group, it is possible that the opponents also may have experienced comparable setbacks. They may lose self-assurance and become weakened and less able to deny the resisters' objectives in the future.

If the gains from the struggle have been less than desired by the resisters but no fundamental questions have arisen challenging the validity of the chosen strategy, then it is important to continue applying that same strategy, perhaps in a new way. However, if serious problems have been discovered in the earlier resistance, problems that can be identified as factors impeding other gains in the future, the previous strategic plan may need to be reconsidered.

Not all major changes can be achieved in a single struggle, and negotiated conclusions may be wise in some campaigns. Sometimes, the very fact of negotiating for gains—not losses—is a victory, for it reflects an improved power relationship. At times, a truce or interim settlement may be produced without formal negotiations and agreements.

The nonviolent resisters may compromise on secondary, non-essential matters, but ought not compromise on essentials or give

up fundamental principles or demands. The resisters need to know the difference and ought not claim secondary issues as fundamental principles or major objectives. The full achievement of fundamental principles or demands may be postponed, but they must not be renounced.

The period following a truce or interim settlement will be difficult. It could be used by the resisters to regroup, strengthen positions, or consolidate gains. One should not continue along the same line that led to the truce. The new strategy and tactics are very important. The first actions after losing a battle should be brief, but one should never allow the opponents to dictate the resisters' future actions. The nonviolent struggle group should not allow itself to become completely passive and to return to submission. Periods of retreat and even defeat must be turned into opportunities for the recovery of strength and preparations for more favorable action. When limited successes have been won by producing basic changes in attitudes, power positions, and relationships, these successes are likely to be genuine and lasting, not easily taken away.

Strategists and leaders will need to assess how their struggle can be strengthened to enable them to proceed from a campaign or a struggle that concluded with mixed results, toward a new campaign capable of attaining their full objectives. How can they recover from losses, regroup, strengthen their people, and prepare to resume a new phase of the struggle? Do they need to focus on a more vulnerable specific objective? Or do they need to expand their objectives to capitalize on their newly identified strengths and opportunities? The strategy and tactics during such a period of regrouping and regaining strength will be of particular importance.

Success

Success in a limited campaign, or in a major nonviolent struggle operating on the basis of a grand strategy, needs to be precisely understood. Success in nonviolent struggles is defined as the achievement of the substantive objectives of the struggle group. Have the resisters' goals been gained? This is all that is necessary for victory to be declared, even if the opponents have not explicitly acknowledged the changed situation.

As we just discussed, some nonviolent struggles may produce results that are mixtures of success and failure. But a struggle cannot be called fully successful if only the morale of the resisters has improved, if only the general population has become better organized and skilled in resistance, or if the opponent group has merely been weakened. Those situations are indeed gains, but they are something less than full successes.

When there have been significant advances and victory is in sight, one has to be careful. This is a crucial and dangerous period. The nonviolent struggle group may become overconfident and careless. At this point, the opponents can make a supreme effort to avoid capitulating. The nonviolent struggle group's final effort is the most important and most difficult. Campaigns may be successfully concluded in different ways. These include negotiations, the opponents granting the demands, and the collapse of the opponents' regime.

On some occasions, a negotiated agreement between the contending sides may include the goals gained by the nonviolent struggle group. Sometimes, the goals may be formalized by a decision imposed by an institution, such as a court, that has not been a party to the conflict, as occurred at the conclusion of the Montgomery, Alabama, bus boycott in 1956. Examination is then needed of the degree to which that decision was directly or indirectly influenced by the nonviolent resistance. In extreme cases, such as a nonviolent uprising to end an extreme dictatorship, success may be produced by the disintegration of the oppressive system. This disintegration may result from the shrinking or the severance of the regime's sources of power due to widespread and focused noncooperation by the regime's previous pillars of support.

Often, opponents will firmly deny that the gaining of the resisters' objectives was in any way influenced by their resistance. Opponents who have been defeated will sometimes do the best they can to save face. It may also be the case that strong opponents rarely want opposition groups and the general population to become aware that their power potential could, by wise strategy and action, be turned into effective power. Some other explanation of the change may be offered. Perhaps, it may be claimed by the opponents that their views or policies had been misunderstood, the grievances had been the result of poor administration

or wrong doing by underlings, or the change had been planned all along. It may even be claimed that the change had in fact been delayed by the actions of the nonviolent struggle group.

The ways success is implemented will vary with the chosen objectives, the scale of the conflict, and the nature of the opponent group. In a large conflict against a powerful dictatorship willing to apply ruthless repression, the dictatorship could be undermined by the withdrawal of authority and submission by the general population, massive shut-downs of the society, general strikes, mass stay-at-homes, defiant marches, loss of control of the economy, the transportation system, and communications, slowdowns and defiance by the civil service and the police, disguised disobedience or outright mutiny by soldiers, or other activities. As a consequence of such defiance and noncooperation, executed wisely and with mass participation in resistance over time, even dictators would become powerless. The democratic forces would, without violence, triumph.

Of course, this is not the typical situation in which nonviolent struggle is practiced. Most cases are far less difficult than facing an extreme dictatorship. Against a powerful dictatorship, the resistance most likely would require several campaigns and considerable time to succeed. However, in some situations in which conditions are favorable and much groundwork has been laid, the collapse of a dictatorship may occur extremely rapidly, as occurred in Czechoslovakia and East Germany in 1989.

Handling the transition skillfully

Nonviolent strategists and leaders should early on provide resisters with insights to help them to face and solve problems they may encounter when the movement is on the verge of success or has accomplished its objective. Such problems may include attempts by the opponents to disrupt the movement, to promote claims that the success credited to the resisters was really gained by some other group, or they may even attempt to seize the State in a coup d'état.

In the past, several nonviolent struggles that were mostly or completely successful in achieving an objective were met with hostile intervention and disruption that damaged the achieved results or produced a new oppressive regime. For example, the suc-

cessful anti-tsarist Russian Revolution of February/March 1917 was followed within a few months by the Bolshevik seizure of the State in October/November. Another example is the predominantly nonviolent Iranian revolution of 1979, which was followed by the establishment of the clerical dictatorship. Such events can be made less likely if they are anticipated and plans are prepared in advance to prevent and to counter these dangers.

If the struggle is a major one that aims to disintegrate an established dictatorship and that aim is gained, a period of political uncertainty is likely to follow. The resisters should calculate in advance how the transition from the dictatorship to the new interim government is to be handled at the end of the struggle in order to establish a viable and improved political system. The path should be blocked to any persons or group that would like to become the new dictators, while they of course deny that intention.

It is very important for nonviolent struggle strategists and leaders to assess the situation accurately. They will also need to consolidate the victory and decide how best to prevent and defeat possible hostile attacks. These may include international attacks, such as military aggression or activities of foreign intelligence services and their collaborators. Particular attention needs to be paid to preparing plans to defeat coups d'état,² and any other efforts to establish a new dictatorship. Attention will also need to be given to planning how to face the dangers of the transition between dictatorship and the new regime, and to the importance of building a free society with capacity to withstand possible new threats.

Short-term issues that merit attention during the transitional period include how to consolidate and strengthen newly established democratic and popular rule, how to induce the military and the police to shift loyalties and to accept the new system, and how to resist attempted seizures of the State.

It is wise to recognize that the social and political situation following the collapse of a dictatorship will not be the ideal society desired by all persons and groups. Major additional objectives

² See Gene Sharp and Bruce Jenkins, *The Anti-Coup*, Boston, Massachusetts: Albert Einstein Institution, 2003, and Gene Sharp, *Civilian-Based Defense*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990.

will remain to be achieved in the future. These include creating and enriching the forms of democratic control, political freedom, popular participation, and social and economic justice. At this point, these will be at best imperfectly achieved and at worst will still be serious problems requiring major attention. The reality will be, however, that a grave form of oppression in the form of the old political order will have been effectively removed as the result of the wise and courageous nonviolent struggle by the population. This success opens the way for additional effective steps in improving and enriching human society.

Expanding future potential

In a world of many acute conflicts, widespread oppression, and great violence, the technique of nonviolent struggle has considerable potential to be applied with greater success than ever before in a wide range of situations. Strategic analysis, planning, and action can significantly increase the effectiveness of its future use.

The insights into the importance and the wise development of strategic nonviolent struggle here are not the final word. Nor are they the only studies of strategy in nonviolent struggles that strategic planners and leaders should examine. A very important additional analysis has been offered by Dr. Peter Ackerman and Dr. Christopher Kruegler in their book *Strategic Nonviolent Conflict: The Dynamics of People Power in the Twentieth Century*.³ They offer detailed analyses of 12 general principles of strategic nonviolent conflict.

Another very important study is Robert Helvey, *On Strategic Nonviolent Conflict*.⁴ It offers both a review of basic insights into this technique of struggle and more advanced analyses of several elements of the application of this technique. These include the strategic estimate, psychological operations, strategic analysis, fear, leadership, contaminants, and consultations.

It is now urgent that major attention and resources be devoted to the task of refining nonviolent struggle, expanding the skilled

³ Peter Ackerman and Christopher Kruegler, *Strategic Nonviolent Conflict: The Dynamics of People Power in the Twentieth Century* (Westport, Connecticut and London: Praeger, 1994), Chapter Two, pp. 21-53.

⁴ Robert Helvey, *On Strategic Nonviolent Conflict: Thinking About the Fundamentals*, Boston: Albert Einstein Institution, 2004.

strategic uses of this technique in place of violence, and exploring the types of conflict situations in which it can be applied in place of both passivity and violence.