A Bold Initiative in Lithuanian Defense

By Christopher Kruegler

Among the under-reported but significant news stories of the past few months is an astonishing development in Lithuania. According to a press release from the Lithuanian Information Center in New York, the Government declared on February 28 that nonviolent direct action by civilians was to be the country’s primary line of defense in the event of “active occupation” by forces of the Soviet Union.

Not since the Franco-Belgian occupation of Germany’s Ruhr region in 1923 has a government taken this stance, but the current policy is vastly more sophisticated at the outset than was the Weimar Republic’s. Coming after the recent heady experiences of “people power” in East-Central Europe and elsewhere, the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania has spelled out the rudiments of a full-scale civilian-based defense operation.

Founded on the recognition that Lithuanians have no realistic military option, but that their collective behavior is not irrelevant to the success or failure of Soviet domination, the policy specifies what to do, and when, to defend society from further encroachments. In the event that the elected Supreme Council is “forcibly constrained from acting as the highest governing body of the state,” organized resistance is to begin, led by a “provisional defense leadership.”

All actions, laws, orders, and decisions of the occupying force are to be considered illegal and confronted with disobedience and noncooperation. All government
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1991–92 Einstein Fellowships Awarded

The Einstein Institution Board of Directors, at its February meeting, awarded Einstein fellowships for 1991–92 to five scholars conducting promising research on nonviolent forms of struggle. The five were chosen as Einstein Institution Fellows from among twenty-nine applicants, based on their research proposals and recommendations.

Glenn T. Eskew is a doctoral student of history at the University of Georgia. His project is entitled “But for Birmingham: The Local and National Movements in the Civil Rights Struggle.” Eskew will analyze the effectiveness of nonviolent sanctions in transforming race relations through a study of Birmingham, Alabama from 1940 to 1990. He will examine five phases in the movement which culminated in a high level of black incorporation within the political structure. These phases were (1) the limited use of boycotts by an accommodationist black elite, (2) the localized challenge to segregation under the Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth, (3) the intervention of the national movement and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, (4) the shift from collective action to electoral politics, and (5) the threatened renewal of sanctions in the country club desegregation conflict of 1990. In addition to giving an historical perspective on transitions within the local movement, Eskew intends to explore the tension between the divergent goals, strategies, and tactical commitments of the local and national movements.

Kathleen E. Smith is a Ph.D. candidate in political science at the University of California at Berkeley. Her dissertation is entitled “Coming to Terms with Previous State Repression: Civic Activism and Regime Response in the USSR.” Smith
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Christopher Kruegler Appointed Einstein Institution President

After an extensive search, on February 25 the AEI Board of Directors chose Christopher Kruegler to succeed Gene Sharp as president of the Albert Einstein Institution. Freed from major administrative responsibilities, Dr. Sharp will continue his research, writing, and consulting as senior scholar-in-residence.

Dr. Kruegler will be the Institution’s sole administrator. The Institution will no longer have an executive director. Stephen Crawford, former executive director of the Einstein Institution, resigned last year for personal reasons and has become executive director of the Center for International Security Studies at Maryland.

Dr. Kruegler has worked at the Program on Nonviolent Sanctions in Harvard University’s Center for International Affairs since the program was founded in 1983. He has been the program’s director for the past two years and will remain so until a new program director is appointed. Prior to his tenure at the Program on Nonviolent Sanctions, Dr. Kruegler directed the Peace Studies Program at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

He has served on the Boards of the Einstein Institution since 1985 and the Civilian-Based Defense Association from 1982 to 1987. He holds a B.A. and an M.A. in peace studies from Manhattan College and Antioch International and a Ph.D. in social science from Syracuse University. His dissertation explored the intellectual history of civilian-based defense, with special reference to the work of Sir Basil Liddell Hart. Dr. Kruegler is currently working with AEI board member Peter Ackerman on Strategic Nonviolent Conflict, a comparative study of six cases of mass nonviolent struggle, leading to the construction of a comprehensive strategic model.

“The Einstein Institution should be the leading authority when it comes to interpreting events in the arena of nonviolent conflict for the public,” Dr. Kruegler said upon accepting the position. “The work that Gene Sharp and others have pioneered, to identify and assess the potential of nonviolent methods in conflict, will only increase in significance as the century draws to a close. The ability, not only to understand, but also to change, the course of events around us will depend in no small part on the quality and breadth of this work.”

Elizabeth Defeis Joins AEI Board of Directors

Elizabeth F. Defeis has accepted an invitation to serve on the Board of Directors of the Albert Einstein Institution. She is the former Dean of Seton Hall University School of Law and is currently teaching International Law and Human Rights at Seton Hall. Professor Defeis recently concluded a term as Visiting Scholar at Columbia University’s Center for the Study of Human Rights. She served as the first chair of the Urban Development Corporation of New Jersey and is an NGO delegate to the United Nations Coalition Against Traffic in Women. Professor Defeis is a member of the New Jersey Supreme Court Task Force on Gender Bias in the Courts. Her most recent publication is “International Covenants: An Alternative to ERA?”.

AEI Conference Report Published in Dutch

The spring/summer 1990 issue of Nonviolent Sanctions, which featured highlights from the Einstein Institution’s February Conference on Nonviolent Sanctions, has been translated into Dutch and published as a special issue of Geweldloos Aktief (“Nonviolent Action”) with the title “Geweldloze Strijd in de Wereld van Nu!” (“Nonviolent Struggle in Today’s World!”). This special issue of the Dutch publication is dedicated to Gene Sharp. For more information, write: Redaktie Geweldloos Aktief, Wim Robben, Postbus 288, 5280 AG Boxtel, The Netherlands.
Those Who Said “No!” to the Holocaust

by David Kitterman

The following op-ed article appeared in slightly different form in The Boston Globe on April 7, 1991. It is based on research conducted by David Kitterman, a 1989–90 Einstein Institution Fellow.

This is Holocaust Remembrance Week. It is a time to remember the millions who were killed by the Nazis in World War II. It is also a time to remember those courageous individuals who saved lives by refusing to participate in Hitler’s genocide.

Well-known are the stories of those who hid Jews or helped them escape from the Nazis. Virtually unknown, however, are the cases of resistance by Germans inside the Nazi extermination apparatus.

Historical research has revealed at least 100 documented cases of German soldiers, policemen, or members of the SS refusing orders to kill Jews, other unarmed civilians, or POWs. Not one of these Germans was killed for refusing orders and few suffered serious consequences.

These facts contradict the conventional wisdom held during the war by German combatants that any order given by a superior officer had to be obeyed or drastic consequences would follow. Many students of Nazi history have held the same view.

One dramatic case involved Dr. Albert Battel, a lawyer and first lieutenant in the army. His troops were stationed in Przemysl, Poland, where Jewish ghetto laborers were working for the army. On July 26, 1942, Battel used his troops to seal off a bridge, preventing the SS from taking the Jews to the Belzec extermination camp. He and his unit then forced entrance to the ghetto, which had been surrounded by police and SS troops, and relocated 80-100 laborers and their families to army headquarters.

The next day Battel was forced to allow the SS into the Jewish ghetto, with tragic results. The Jews were sent on death trains to Belzec, all but the few hundred Battel had managed to save. His actions constituted direct armed resistance to SS orders. SS leader Himmler threatened to arrest him. However, he received only a reprimand and was subsequently promoted before being sent to a front-line unit. Battel survived the war and was honored in Israel for his efforts to save the Jews.

What other tactics did Germans employ in refusing orders to kill? Unlike Battel, virtually all others used nonviolent methods. The majority simply stated their refusal to carry out such orders. Others protested to their superiors, which was especially effective when police or army units not under the direct control of the SS were asked to assist. A few cited damage to their emotional, psychological, or physical health. Others refused on grounds of conscience, religion, or moral scruples. Still others asked for transfers or feigned madness.

One army officer in Poland told Jewish captives to escape when his colleague, the security officer in charge of their roundup, was absent. The guards assumed it was approved and allowed the Jews to leave.

Some threw away or “lost” their weapons. One shot wildly, deliberately missing an old man in a ditch. Others overlooked women and children hiding from search details. In one case, two men raised their loaded rifles in self-defense against their drunken officer. He had drawn his pistol to kill them when they wouldn’t shoot twenty women and children encountered on a road.

What were the consequences of these acts? Each of the refusers I interviewed had felt certain they would be shot or placed in a concentration camp for refusing to obey orders. But surprisingly, in 58% of the cases, those who refused suffered no negative consequences.

In only eight percent were there serious consequences. Two men were court-martialed and sent to concentration camps. Others were forced to participate in some minor way, such as driving officers to the execution site or digging the execution pit.

Lesser consequences happened in about one third of the cases. Some were transferred back to Germany (hardly a punishment) or to another unit. Such transfers sometimes resulted in demotions with lower salary, but several of those transferred were later promoted. Verbal or written reprimands, transfer to a combat unit, demotion in rank, and slower promotions were most common.

The Holocaust was an unparalleled tragedy. But in the midst of the horror heroes emerged, those who said “No!”, those who overcame fear, indoctrination, and peer pressure to refuse participation in crimes against humanity. Their stories show that it was possible to refuse participation in Holocaust killings. Contrary to popular belief, there was not an effective automatic system of “terror-justice” operating against those who refused. Indeed, the coercive powers of the wartime Nazi system proved to be impotent or ineffective in nearly every documented case of refusal to murder unarmed people.

If only more Germans had said “No!”, perhaps the Holocaust might have been prevented.

David Kitterman is an associate professor of history at Northern Arizona University.
Einstein Institution Delegation Discusses Civilian-Based Defense with Lithuanian Officials

by Bruce Jenkins

In declaring nonviolent struggle to be its primary means of resistance in the event of a Soviet occupation, Lithuania is one of the first states to actively pursue a policy of civilian-based defense. Government officials, social scientists, and political activists are now examining the field of nonviolent action to gain insights for their country’s struggle.

As part of their exploration of the nature and potential of nonviolent struggle, the Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs recently invited representatives of the Albert Einstein Institution to Vilnius, Lithuania’s capital. From April 24 to May 1, Gene Sharp, Peter Ackerman, and Bruce Jenkins discussed the Institution’s research on nonviolent action and civilian-based defense with several audiences: President Vytautas Landsbergis; the Director-General of the Department of National Defense, Mr. Audrius Butkevicius; representatives of the Lithuanian militia; members of the parliamentary Committee on National Defense and Internal Security; social scientists at the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences; Russian Orthodox Archbishop Khrisostom; and activists of the Lithuanian reform movement Sajudis.

The Einstein Institution representatives were invited to Vilnius not to advise officials on their struggle for independence, but rather to discuss the nature and the strategic dimensions of nonviolent conflict. In examining how best to organize their society’s resources for civilian-based defense, Lithuanians are raising important questions and issues for consideration by scholars of nonviolent sanctions.

One such issue concerns the conceptualization of nonviolent action as a technique of active struggle, requiring strategic analysis and coordination. From street rallies to the creation of Lithuanian postage stamps, from political boycotts to human barricades, Lithuanians have employed numerous methods of nonviolent action. Yet these actions have generally been isolated or spontaneous events, lacking in coordination.

To each audience, Dr. Sharp outlined the technique approach to nonviolent action, its methods, dynamics, and requirements for effectiveness, repeatedly emphasizing that this was a form of conflict, not inaction or peaceful behavior. To be effective, Dr. Sharp said, nonviolent action required strategic planning.

An issue of central importance to the field of nonviolent sanctions was repeatedly raised in Vilnius: can violent and nonviolent forms of resistance be combined? Although nonviolent resistance has been deemed Lithuania’s primary mode of defense, in mid-1990 the Lithuanian government began organizing an armed national militia. Partly as a means to assert national sovereignty and partly as a way to provide an officially sanctioned structure for the thousands of Lithuanian men who refused to serve in the Red Army (9,500 in 1990), the “Volunteers” have been assigned the task of defending official buildings and institutions, vowing to give their lives if need be.

At a meeting in the barricaded parliament building, the question was raised whether, in the event of an attack, one could combine nonviolent civilian resistance with limited military or paramilitary resistance by security forces. Dr. Sharp urged caution in considering this question. Even limited violent resistance, he said, could disrupt the dynamics of nonviolent struggle, such as the process of political jiu-jitsu. Also, Dr. Sharp continued, military or paramilitary resistance could undermine attempts to weaken the morale of the opponents’ forces through specific methods of nonviolent action. “Troops under fire, with friends dying next to them, are not likely to question their own actions,” Dr. Sharp said. In addition, military or paramilitary resistance could also vastly increase civilian casualties as well as reduce the likelihood of third-party support.

Another problem-area raised during our discussions in Vilnius and Kaunas was how best to combat organized terrorist activity directed against nonviolent resisters. The Soviets, we were told, had
supplied arms to certain groups in Lithuania opposed to independence. This problem, under different conditions, has been confronted both in South Africa (where the African National Congress has considered forming armed defense units to guard against vigilante violence) and in the Israeli-occupied territories (where Palestinians have been faced with Jewish settler attacks). In Lithuania, the question arose whether normal police functions—with the clearance to use lethal force—could be separated from general nonviolent resistance activity. The problem of protecting nonviolent resisters against armed attacks by groups not under the direct formal control of the opponent requires urgent consideration by scholars in the field of nonviolent sanctions.

Another issue of grave concern to Lithuanian defense planners is the threat of a renewed economic blockade. Lithuania imports ninety-seven percent of the fuel it consumes—all from the Soviet Union. Lithuania has few independent sources of foreign currency and is thus unable to purchase its fuel oil on the world market. Furthermore, foreign oil tankers hoping to deliver oil to the Lithuanian port at Klaipeda would most likely be stopped by the Soviet navy in the event of a blockade. After the 1990 blockade, Lithuania increased oil exploration in its own territory and set up direct barter exchanges with oil-rich Soviet republics. However, these steps are not likely to provide adequate alternatives for energy in the event of a renewed blockade.

Lithuanian officials are exploring ways to establish more sources of hard currency and Lithuanian researchers are examining how economic blockades have been circumvented in the past. Lithuanian officials, academics, and political activists are also concerned with the link between prevailing economic conditions and the population’s willingness to mobilize in the event of an attack. Problems in the supply of consumer goods, large price increases, and slow progress in the area of privatization have caused much social dissonance in Lithuania. One academic told us that the credibility of the Sąjūdis movement (which comprises an overwhelming majority in the parliament) had hit an all time low due to deteriorating economic conditions and political infighting. He postulated that the population would not respond with much enthusiasm to protect an increasingly unpopular government in the event of a crisis.

The questions and problem-areas presented to the representatives of the Einstein Institution indicate the seriousness with which Lithuanian officials, academics, and activists are examining civilian-based defense. Lithuanian researchers will be intensively exploring the literature on nonviolent resistance in the coming months. Translations of works on nonviolent action are in progress, including Gene Sharp’s Civilian-Based Defense.

Lithuania could well be the first country to implement a prepared policy of nonviolent resistance for defense. Though there is much pressure in the Lithuanian government and Department of National Defense to employ military and paramilitary forces for specific objectives (such as for a last show of defiance in protecting the parliament building), President Landsbergis, Director-General Butkevicius, and the Supreme Council have all declared their intent to pursue a policy of civilian-based defense; they are now confronted with translating this intent into practice.

Lithuanians have suffered greatly since declaring independence. The three-month economic blockade in 1990 shut off almost all of Lithuania’s fuel supplies and caused the production of consumer goods to fall by half. Goods and materials have been seized. Buildings have been occupied. And on January 13, 1991, Soviet troops opened fire on unarmed civilians surrounding the Vilnius television transmission tower. Fourteen people died. Despite such Soviet pressure, intimidation, and force, Lithuanians remain defiant in their pursuit of independence. On February 9, 1991, Lithuanians, in a plebiscite, were asked the following question: “Are you in favor of the Lithuanian Republic being an independent, democratic state?” More than ninety percent of eligible voters answered “yes.” Lithuania then, in turn, boycotted Soviet President Gorbachev’s referendum on a renewed Soviet federation. Lithuanian flags and symbols are displayed throughout the country. Employees of Vilnius radio and television stations are conducting a rotating hunger strike directly in front of their bullet-scarred office building, now occupied by Soviet troops.

Lithuania has also taken its struggle into the Soviet heartland, where it has established contacts and signed treaties with other independence-minded governments in other Soviet republics. In April of this year, Lithuanian workers shipped food directly to striking workers in Minsk. With the preparation of a civilian-based defense policy, Lithuanians are examining how to make their country “politically indigestible.” In the event of a Soviet attack, concentrated and coordinated forms of mass civilian resistance will be brought to bear on the attackers. Furthermore, international and internal Soviet pressures will be mobilized. In such a scenario, Lithuania may prove too much of a burden for the Soviets to maintain control over.

---

**Lithuania could well be the first country to implement a prepared policy of nonviolent resistance for defense.**
Nonviolent Sanctions in the News

Increasingly, nonviolent sanctions are in the news. They are being used in struggles around the world. Here are just a few of the stories that have appeared in recent months in The Boston Globe (BG), The Christian Science Monitor (CSM), and The New York Times (NYT).

UNITED STATES, Feb. 22 — Students took part in teach-ins, rallies and marches yesterday, which was declared an international day of student mobilization against the Persian Gulf War. (BG)

BUCHAREST, Feb. 22 — A two-week-old railway strike ended yesterday after the Romanian government and union leaders negotiated a settlement. The government has said the strike brought the economy to the verge of collapse, disrupted trade with the Soviet Union and food distribution and starved industry of raw materials. (BG)

JOHANNESBURG, Mar. 6 — A hunger strike by detained white rightist leaders in South Africa is threatening to reignite extreme right-wing and neofascist fervor, which has been waning in recent months, analysts say.

Afrikaners throughout the country have been urged to fast today in support of 55-year-old Piet Rudolph and eight others who have vowed to fast until they die. Rudolph has not eaten since Feb. 4. (BG)

PRAGUE, Mar. 12 — Tens of thousands of Slovak separatists shouting “Enough of Prague!” staged one of their biggest demonstrations for independence from the Czechoslovak federation yesterday in Slovakia’s capital, Bratislava. (BG)

LOS ANGELES, Mar. 25 — Four members of an environmental group chained themselves to an oil tanker in Los Angeles Harbor for several hours last weekend in a protest marking the second anniversary of the massive Exxon-Valdez oil spill. (CSM)

ABIDJAN, Ivory Coast, Mar. 26 — Thousands of workers in Mali went on strike yesterday and rallied to demand the resignation of President Moussa Traore.

For the first time in four days, troops did not fire on protesters against the government. (BG)

NAIROBI, Kenya, Mar. 27 — For the dwindling number of African leaders resisting a groundswell for democracy, the message coming out of West Africa this month is: Watch out!

Two African leaders were toppled this week under pressure from pro-democracy movements in their nations. And two other leaders were made to promise democratic reforms after protests against their one-party rule. (CSM)

MOSCOW, Mar. 28 — More than 100,000 Muscovites defied a strong show of military force and Mikhail S. Gorbachev’s ban on public meetings to rally today behind his rival Boris N. Yeltsin.

Chanting “Yeltsin! Yeltsin!” and “Gorbachev, go away!” within sight of the extraordinary cordon of military vehicles, water cannon and troops in riot gear, the throng demonstrated the embattled Soviet President’s impotence to suppress the growing shift of allegiance to Mr. Yeltsin, the President of the Russian republic. (NYT)

NOVOKUZNETSK, U.S.S.R., Apr. 9 — From a small room on the second floor of a nondescript building in this bleak Siberian city, a group of coal miners have transformed an underground strike into a mass movement that threatens to topple the Soviet system.

The room is the headquarters of the Novokuznetsk Workers’ and Strike committees — forces that have idled 88 of the 101 coal-related mines and industries since early March in the key Kuzbass coal field, the nation’s largest.

Unlike their counterparts in the Donbas coal region of the Ukraine, the Kuzbass miners have no economic demands. They are waging a purely political strike, demanding that Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev resign. (CSM)

MOSCOW, Apr. 10 — Tens of thousands of workers rallied in Minsk today, as Georgian leaders called for widespread strikes and Siberian miners intensified their demands, all on the day after President Mikhail S. Gorbachev proposed a yearlong moratorium on strike and protests. (NYT)

SANTO DOMINGO, Dominican Republic, Apr. 11 — Thousands of professionals began a 48-hour strike yesterday, the latest in a series of protests and work stoppages for higher wages in the Dominican Republic. (BG)

SAFWAN, Iraq, Apr. 12 — More than 100 Iraqis held a peaceful demonstration at the main refugee camp here today, appealing to American forces to stay in southern Iraq. (NYT)

BUCHAREST, Apr. 13 — More than 60,000 Romanians demanding new elections demonstrated in cities across the nation yesterday, two weeks after the government more than doubled food prices. (BG)

NEW YORK, Apr. 15 — With guerrilla-like zeal and finesse, students at at least eight campuses of the City University of New York have been barricading buildings, papering over windows to conceal their movements, communicating over walkie-talkies — all in an effort to head off tuition increases and budget cuts. (NYT)

BERLIN, Apr. 18 — Thousands of eastern Germans answered the call of the nation’s largest labor union and rallied yesterday to demand that more be done to save jobs and stop the economy of the region from collapsing. (BG)

BELGRADE, Apr. 18 — The communist government of Serbia caved in to demands by 700,000 striking workers Tuesday in an attempt to stop Yugoslavia’s biggest labor protest since World War II. (CSM)

TIRANA, Albania, Apr. 18 — Opposition lawmakers ended a boycott of Parliament yesterday and marked their first day in the multiparty assembly by staging a silent protest, followed by
denunciations of the Communist majority. (BG)

YOUNGDE, Cameroon, Apr. 20 — A general strike called to force President Paul Biya to introduce democratic reforms virtually shut down Cameroon’s economic capital, Douala, for the second straight day yesterday, and troops were redeployed at the country’s main university. (BG)

SUMTER, S.C., Apr. 22 — Three Greenpeace protesters were arrested today after locking themselves to a train holding contaminated soil from Michigan, the authorities said.

Three other protesters were also charged after climbing aboard the train to hoist a banner. (NYT)

MINSK, U.S.S.R., Apr. 24 — Workers across the Soviet republic of Belorussia went on strike yesterday to demand that its parliament meet to secure greater political and economic autonomy from the Kremlin.

The strike and a rally by 15,000 demonstrators in Minsk, the capital of Belorussia, were organized labor’s latest challenge to President Mikhail S. Gorbachev. The strike was the second in two weeks. (BG)

BURLINGTON, Vt., Apr. 24 — Hundreds of University of Vermont students and faculty members rallied yesterday in support of minority students who took over the president’s office Monday to protest what they call a lack of cultural diversity on campus.

Students remained barricaded in the office last night, vowing to stay until the university meets their demands for more minority faculty members, students and programs. The takeover forced the president, George Davis, to move his office to another building. (BG)

SEOUL, South Korea, Apr. 30 — The country was hit today with another day of widespread though generally nonviolent student demonstrations after a student set herself on fire to protest the beating to death by riot police officers of another student on Friday.

News reports said that as many as 20,000 students at dozens of campuses across South Korea held peaceful demonstrations for a second day, among the most widespread demonstrations against the Government of President Roh Tae Woo in three years. (BG)

WASHINGTON, May 2 — Disabled activists, including more than 100 in wheelchairs, blocked entrances to the headquarters of the Health and Human Services Department yesterday to protest policies that they said favor nursing homes over home care. Some of the protesters discarded their wheelchairs and crutches and tried to get past a police line securing the building. (BG)

A Bold Initiative in Lithuanian Defense

(Continued from p. 1)

institutions and officials are legally required to withhold collaboration. Citizens are reminded by the declaration that they have a right to defend themselves and their property, but are enjoined to rely on nonviolent methods as “the primary means of struggle for independence.”

Ironically, the end of the cold war and the “new world order” ensure that the Lithuanians, unlike the Kuwaitis, will not have a coalition of united nations to back them if it comes to a bigger fight with the Soviet Union. They will be lucky to get a few symbolic sanctions wielded on their behalf. Under the circumstances, their option for a self-reliant civilian-based defense is both practical and shrewd.

The question remains, of course, whether it can succeed. The outcome will depend on many factors, but prominent among them will be how an embattled Gorbachev (or his successor?) counts the likely costs of a protracted conflict with a disciplined and nonviolent population, using methods that are not so easily repressed if one cares about one’s image abroad. That calculation will in turn depend on how credible the Lithuanian policy in fact is.

Anyone who has been watching the Baltics carefully for the past two years will not underestimate the seriousness of this initiative. It is nothing more or less than “people power” with the force, resources, and planning capabilities of a committed government behind it. □

The Albert Einstein Institution

MONOGRAPH SERIES

Monograph No. 1
Insurrectionary Civic Strikes in Latin America: 1931–1961
by Patricia Parkman

“From 1931 to 1961 eleven Latin American presidents left office in the wake of civic strikes,” writes Parkman. “In addition, at least four . . . faced unsuccessful attempts to force them out by the same means.” Dr. Parkman compares and contrasts these fifteen cases and includes a chronological summary of each case as well as extensive notes. (55 pp.) Price: $3.00 ea.

Monograph No. 2
Civilian-Based Defense in a New Era
by Johan Jørgen Holst

In the wake of the peaceful revolutions of Eastern Europe in 1989, Johan Holst outlines the key criteria and parameters of a future security order in Europe and explores the potential of nonviolent civilian-based defense as a complement to traditional military forms of defense. Mr. Holst is Director of the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs in Oslo and is a former Defense Minister of Norway. (22 pp.) Price: $2.00 ea.

Monograph No. 3
The Role of Power in Nonviolent Struggle
by Gene Sharp

“Nonviolent action . . . is capable of wielding great power even against ruthless rulers and military regimes,” writes Sharp, “because it attacks the most vulnerable characteristic of all hierarchical institutions and governments: dependence on the governed.” Abstracted from Sharp’s classic three-volume work, The Politics of Nonviolent Action, this monograph summarizes the core concepts behind the technique of nonviolent struggle. (19 pp.) Price: $2.00 ea.

Available from:
The Albert Einstein Institution
1430 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138

Please add $1.00 ea. for postage and handling.
will explore two major questions: (1) How do individuals come to terms with the experience and history of state-sponsored violence? (2) How and when does this individual process of coping with a violent totalitarian past translate into civic activism, and how do state institutions respond to this activism? Her investigation of the motivations behind civic activism as a response to repression and the capacity of such movements to influence democratization through nonviolent action will concentrate on the anti-Stalinist organization “Memorial.”

Nathalie J. Frensley is a doctoral student of government at the University of Texas at Austin. She is doing dissertation research on “Elite Demobilization and Conversion of Mass Constituencies: The Role of Persuasion in Northern Irish Conflict Settlements.” Frensley proposes to test the theoretical proposition that inter-party conflict settlements must be defended to constituents by elites in each party in order to demobilize and convert their constituents to the settlement. She will do this by comparing the failure of the 1973 Sunningdale Agreement with the survival, if not success, of the 1985 Anglo-Irish Agreement. Both were preceded by nonviolent movements: the Northern Irish Civil Rights Association campaign of 1968-69 and the later Peace People Movement.

Eva-Lotta E. Hedman is a Ph.D. student in government at Cornell University. She is studying “The Philippines Revolution of 1986.” Hedman intends to focus on the interaction of the Marcos regime and various opposition groups over a five-year period, including business elites, organized religion, reform elements in the military, and the U.S. government. Dissecting the coming of the People Power revolt in this way will contribute to identifying conditions under which popular nonviolent action may emerge and topple highly personalistic authoritarian regimes. Her project will also examine the mechanisms that distinguish nonviolent action from other forms of insurrection, the role of popular mobilization in transitions from authoritarian rule, and the importance of international influences on popular rebellions and the breakdown of non-democratic states.

Paul Routledge will be doing post-doctoral research at Syracuse University. His project is entitled “The Cultural Expressions of Resistance: The Use of Nonviolent Sanctions by Contemporary Indian Social Movements.” Routledge will compare the strategies, settings, and cultural aspects of two ongoing movements employing nonviolent sanctions in India: the Chipko movement against ecological destruction and the Baliapal movement to defend community lands against seizure for a missile base.

The Einstein Institution Fellows Program supports research, writing, and systematic analysis and thought on nonviolent sanctions. Its primary goal is the advancement of knowledge about the strategic uses of nonviolent sanctions in relation to problems of political violence. The Fellows Program offers support to scholars conducting research on the history, characteristics, and potential application of nonviolent sanctions. It also supports practitioners in the preparation of accounts, documentation, and analysis of their experiences in the use of nonviolent struggle.

The deadline for proposals is January 1.

For more information, write to: Dr. Ronald McCarthy, Research Coordinator.