

The Logics of Gene Sharp's Nonviolent Action and Moon-Young Lee's Nonviolence

Hun Myoung Park
(Internation University of Japan, Japan)

Abstract

This paper examines how Moon-Young Lee's conception of nonviolence differs from Gene Sharp's theory of nonviolent action. Sharp's nonviolent action excludes only physical violence, while Lee's nonviolence does not allow verbal, emotional, or psychological violence either. The former is not verbal but behavioral, whereas the latter involves expressing oneself only in words. The weak must say the strong the right things, which even an evil ruler dares not rebuff, minimally and without provoking him/her. Lee's nonviolence is grounded in general standards and procedures, including common sense and agreement, but Sharp's nonviolent action is not necessarily. Sharp's nonviolent action is designed to change the sources of power and subjects' consents and, thus, control the ruler's power abuse. Lee's transcendence framework of nonviolence, personal ethic, social ethic, and self-sacrifice aims to avoid an all-out confrontation between rulers' tyranny and subjects' rampage and, thus, pursue rationality and eventually peace. An illegitimate regime devoid of self-correction will collapse in on itself in the end as a result of self-enlargement and power hypertrophy. The weak ought not to ask too much but, instead, to keep telling the truth to the ruler, while enduring violence and waiting patiently to the end. Lee's nonviolence together with minimalism makes his transcendence framework distinct from other theories of nonviolent action.

Key words :

nonviolence, nonviolent action, transcendence ethics, transcendence framework, minimalism, self-enlargement, power hypertrophy, self-disintegration

Introduction

Gene Sharp (1928–2018), a former professor of political science at the University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth, examined the natures and methods of nonviolent political actions in his seminal work, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (1973). He argues that a ruler's political power depends upon the obedience and cooperation of the ruled and that, accordingly, his/her power will collapse if the ruled withdraw their consent by means of active nonviolent struggles. His theory shows how nonviolent actions work through three methods (i.e., protest and persuasion, noncooperation, and intervention) and mechanisms of change (i.e., conversion, accommodation, and nonviolent coercion). His research has been known to influence many social activists and anti-government movements across the globe.

Moon-Young Lee (1927–2014), an emeritus professor of public administration at Korea University, Seoul, elaborated his analytic framework of transcendence ethics mainly in *Public Administration* (1980); *Autobiographical Public Administration* (1991); *The Analects of Confucius, the Works of Mencius, and Public Administration* (1996); *Man, Religion, and State* (2001); and *Cooperative Governance* (2006). His works are based on his experience of pro-democracy struggles during the 1970s and 1980s in the Republic of Korea. As a dissident intellectual, he convinced himself that the distinct feature of the Korean anti-government movement lies in nonviolent resistance (Lee, 1984, p. 147; Lee, 1986, pp. 318–319). Nonviolence is a component of transcendence ethics and a prior condition of other ethics (i.e., personal ethic, social ethic, and self-sacrifice). Lee uniquely used the concept of nonviolence in conjunction with minimalism, which is associated with not doing what ought not to be done (Lee, 1991, p. 51; Lee, 1996, pp. 404, 420).

The term nonviolence is equally used by these two leading scholars in the West and East, but its meanings in their works are different from each other. How does Lee's nonviolence differ from Sharp's nonviolent action? How do the conceptual differences affect the logics of their theories of nonviolent struggles? How does nonviolence differentiate the Korean pro-democracy movement from nonviolent resistance in other countries? This review essay examines their theories of nonviolence and tries to broaden the understanding of the logics of nonviolent struggles. First, I will explore the conceptual differences in these two theories of nonviolent struggle in the next section.

Sharp's Nonviolent Action and Lee's Nonviolence

In general, nonviolence, as the antonym of violence, means not using violence. Sharp (1973) literally defines nonviolence as "doing-or refusing to do-certain things without using physical violence" (p. 64). Lee (1980, p. 365; Lee, 2001, p. 149) also mentions that nonviolence is to refrain from punching and to, instead, express oneself in words. Inevitably, a violent reaction cannot be the right alternative to a use of violence (Lee, 1986, p. 290). A nonviolent action is not inaction (e.g., passivity, submissiveness, and cowardice) but an active combat technique, such as protests, noncooperation, and interventions (Schock, 2003, p. 705; Sharp, 1973, pp. 64–67, 70). It is not subservient but is assertive to enhance human dignity in the sense that the weak voluntarily give up doing what ought not to be done and flatly speak their minds to the strong rather than become paralyzed with the fear of violence (Lee, 1991, pp. 18–19, 118). Nonviolence does not mean that the weak ought to remain silent without doing anything when they are unilaterally beaten by the strong (Lee, 1986, p. 294; Lee, 1991, p. 118). The concept of nonviolent action appears to be clear for Sharp but not for Lee, who goes beyond common sense and convention.

Table 1. Sharp's nonviolent action and Lee's nonviolence

Sharp's (1973) Nonviolent Action	Lee's Nonviolence
To not use physical violence	To not use any violence, including physical, verbal, emotional, gestural, and/or psychological violence
Not verbal, but behavioral	To express oneself only in words
	To say the right (factual and rational) things
	To tell the truth to the ruler minimally
Extraconstitutional; to not rely upon established institutional procedures	To be grounded in natural laws, formal laws, common sense, agreements, rules and procedures
	Prior condition of other transcendence ethics (personal ethic, social ethic, and self-sacrifice)

Note. Adapted from Lee (1980, 1986, 1991, 1996, 2001, 2008) and Sharp (1973).

First, Sharp's nonviolent action means not using physical violence, while Lee's nonviolence excludes not only physical but also verbal, emotional,

gestural, and psychological violence (Table 1). Nonviolence should be thorough and complete, excluding any nonphysical violence (Lee, 2001, pp. 149, 246). If someone contradicts the truth and common sense, for instance, he/she is wielding virtual violence in the form of words (Lee, 1986, p. 242). However, Lee's nonviolence does not exclude civil revolutions and independence movements such as the April Revolution (4.19) and the Gwangju Democratization Uprising (5.18) in Korea (p. 297). The weak should not resort to any violence even when they are induced by the strong (Lee, 1986, pp. 289, 291). Once the weak adhere to and persevere with nonviolence, they are able to protect themselves from the ruler's violence and then grow (Lee, 1991, pp. 18–19).¹⁾

Second, Lee's nonviolence involves expressing oneself verbally and suggesting an alternative to solve a pending problem (Lee, 1986, p. 290). The weak should only respond with words, whether spoken or written, even when they suffer from the strong's violence (Lee, 1986, p. 290; Lee, 1991, p. 118). Hence, the antonym of violence is words to express oneself (Lee, 1986, p. 290; Lee, 1996, p. 404; Lee, 2001, p. 246). By contrast, Sharp's (1973) nonviolent action is not verbal but behavioral in nature (p. 65). His nonviolent action includes protests, strikes, tax payment refusals, noncooperation, and civil disobedience, but it excludes verbal and psychological persuasion (e.g., conciliation and verbal appeal) and peaceful institutional procedures (e.g., compromise and negotiation) even if they are not violent at all (pp. 65–67). A nonviolent action is not the use of words but "a sanction and a technique of [active] struggle involving the use of social, economic and political power, and the matching of forces in conflict" (p. 70).²⁾ Therefore, a labor union strike is a nonviolent action for Sharp, but a verbal appeal for a wage increase is not.

Third, the words used should be substantively reasonable, legally correct, factually true, and logically consistent so that ordinary citizens eagerly take them for granted and even a despotic ruler dares not refuse them (Lee, 2008, pp. 66, 497). In order to make others understand oneself, one must express oneself in reasonable words (Lee, 1991, p. 118). Not all words are nonviolent and acceptable. If someone flatters or sides with tyranny without any factual and rational basis, for example, his/her remark is close to actual violence (Lee, 1986, p. 242). Absurd or deceptive words rarely convince

counterparts and instead will invite retaliation from them. The antonym of words is not silence but violence in this regard (Lee, 2001, p. 189).

Fourth, the weak should tell right things (truth) to the strong minimally. A vital minimum action is to boldly throw oneself into the spirit of the times, knowing the impending danger of being damaged by the strong once the right time comes (Lee, 1991, p. 25). The weak ought to express themselves succinctly using "plain speaking," without unnecessary phrases and gushes of emotion (Park, 2015, p. 290); they should only say what ought to be said (Lee, 1991, p. 18). An imperative minimum action under a terrifying political situation should be prudent in the sense that it (1) adheres to complete nonviolence, (2) relies upon agreements among activist colleagues, and (3) tries to band them together with ordinary citizens (Lee, 1991, pp. 25–26, 330). The weak ought not to ask too much but must concentrate on the most fundamental agenda of the times (pp. 26, 330). This minimum action is not aimed at obtaining personal political gain after the success of an anti-government movement (p. 26).³⁾ A real pro-democracy movement involves making a minimal request (e.g., human rights) that even an evil regime dares not rebuff and then eagerly paying an expensive price for telling the truth (Lee, 2008, pp. 491, 615).

The minimum here is a set of basic requisites, such as love, food, labor rights, and a peaceful community, that everyone must have and wants in daily life (Lee, 1986, p. 95). For example, a sip of warm water is a minimum for a prisoner shivering with cold, but a cup of hot coffee is not. Telling the right thing or the truth (e.g., about labor rights) in spoken or written words to a despotic ruler is a minimal action. Nonviolence involves insisting on the inalienable minimum to which everyone is entitled. The antonym of truth is not falsity but violence in this regard (Lee, 2001, p. 187). Lee sought the minimal conditions for rational public administration in a series of his major pieces (1991, 1996, 2001, 2006) following his dissertation in 1970. This minimalism features prominently in his concept of nonviolence and his transcendence framework.

Finally, Lee's nonviolence is founded on objective principles and standards, such as natural laws, formal laws, rules and procedures, common sense, and agreements that people take for granted (Park, 2015).⁴⁾ Lee (1991) argues, for instance,

1) Sharp (1973) remarks, however, "In nonviolent action there is no assumption that the opponent will refrain from using violence against nonviolent activists" (p. 71).

2) Sharp's (1973) nonviolent action is a means of combat and is in contrast to common nonviolent action that relies on rational persuasion (p. 67).

3) "In general, a pro-democracy movement is not to pursue personal interests but to re-establish the principles that were broken by the strong" (Lee, 1991, p. 330).

4) Fisher, Ury, and Patton (2011) suggest four principled negotiation (as opposed to positional bargaining) strategies, one of which is to insist on using objective criteria including fair standards (e.g., market price, precedents, and scientific judgement) and fair procedures (pp. 82–95).

that common sense is expressed by words in the form of rules and procedures (p. 351). If someone, including the ruler and the ruled, violates general principles and standards of legitimacy, his/her action is considered to be violent no matter whether it involves physical violence or not.⁵⁾ Since there might be a discrepancy between one criterion and the other, some nonviolent actions might go against laws and procedures. If a ruler makes an evil law that does not permit basic human needs (e.g., food and human rights), for instance, citizens may disobey the law because even the ruler himself/herself does not want to be deprived of the same minimum by that law. However, Sharp's (1973) nonviolent action is extraconstitutional and does not rely upon institutional procedures (p. 67). It does not require "shared standards and principles, a high degree of community of interest, or a high degree of psychological closeness between the contending groups" (p. 71). In short, Lee's nonviolence examines whether an action violates legitimacy criteria, whereas Sharp's nonviolent action asks whether it involves physical violence or not.

Popular Sovereignty and Power Abuse

Both Sharp and Lee presuppose popular sovereignty in the sense that political power originates from the people of a country. The rulers are servants of the people and are supposed to represent the source of their power. A basic problem arises when the ruler misuses political power and fails to meet people's demands and preferences. The question here is how to control the power abuse of a regime in a peaceful manner. Lee (1980) asserts that the only reason for the lack of rationality in public administration is the invasion of others' legal rights and power abuse (p. 6). Sharp's (1973) nonviolent action is an answer to the "problem of uncontrolled power" or the abuse of political power (pp. 32–33). However, subjects rarely realize, probably due to their innocent ignorance or deliberate deception by the ruler, that they are the source of the ruler's power and that they can control his/her power through their organized joint actions (p. 44).

Goals of Nonviolent Struggles

Despite the similar recognition of the problem, both scholars set different goals to be achieved

5) Lee (2001) remarks that a despotic regime grasps weapons and violence, but frail citizens ought to express themselves only in words and resist such a regime on the basis of justice (p. 88).

by means of nonviolent struggles. Sharp's (1973) nonviolent action, as a set of methods and techniques for active combat (nonviolent struggle), seeks a victory over the ruler by controlling the sources of his/her political power (pp. 10, 67, 70). He contends, "Nonviolent action is a technique used to control, combat and destroy the opponent's power by nonviolent means of wielding power" (p. 4). The victory is followed by changes in the violent regime in the form of conversion, accommodation, or nonviolent coercion (p. 69). It should be noted that nonviolence alone does not necessarily produce a victory (p. 70). Sharp appears to imagine a zero-sum power game in which a winner's gain is exactly balanced by the loss of the loser.

Lee's nonviolence does not aim at simply winning a victory over a violent ruler (Table 2).⁶⁾ Lee (1980) wants to avoid an all-out collision between the naked power of the strong and the irresponsible rampage of the weak by empowering autonomous social groups, such as universities, labor unions, and opposition parties (p. vii).⁷⁾ Such an unrestrained confrontation between the ruler and the ruled will lead to an anarchy, of which only two extreme politicians (i.e., the left and the right) will take full advantage, leaving most people worse off (p. vii). Citizens ought not to demand (expect) too much from the ruler just as the ruler ought not to leave his/her people behind uncared for; both the strong and the weak ought not to cross their lines and should abstain from radical and intolerable behaviors.⁸⁾ The avoidance of a violent confrontation will bring about rational policy in government and peace in the civilian sector (Lee, 1981: vii).

Civilian groups' reasonable pressure is more likely than government's self-criticism and self-correction to stimulate government reform (Lee, 1980, p. vii). A rational relationship between citizens and government is possible when independent and autonomous social groups demand righteousness without going on a rampage and government builds at least a marginally rationalized governance structure to accommodate the minimal request without abusing its power (pp. vii–viii). Citizens' rampage and a ruler's power abuse are to violence as their righteous demand and rational governance are to nonviolence. The nonviolence is, at it were,

6) Once a man has been deprived of his minimum, he is able to appreciate the true face of deprived human beings: his dignity cannot possibly let him confront with only hatred those people who stripped him of basic human rights; and his humanity expects that the same minimum should be given to them (Lee, 1986, p. 96).

7) By contrast, Sharp (1973) emphasizes that nonviolent action has been predominantly practiced by ordinary people and not necessarily by pacifists or holy persons (p. 71).

8) Mencius (1970) states, "For them, when they cannot enjoy themselves, to condemn their superiors is wrong, but when the superiors of the people do not make enjoyment a thing common to the people and themselves, they also do wrong" (pp. 157–158).

the antithesis of violence (thesis) and, through a dialectical process, leads to rationality (synthesis) (Lee, 1991, pp. 30, 117–118). In short, Lee's nonviolence is a minimal condition for starting rationality in government and is ultimately aimed at bringing about peace in society (p. vii).⁹⁾ Lee's nonviolence is close to principled nonviolence in this respect, while Sharp's nonviolent action is pragmatic or strategic nonviolence (Clements, 2015, p. 4).

Based on the differences in concept and the goal of the two nonviolent approaches, the next two sections explore respectively the logics of Sharp's nonviolent action and Lee's nonviolence of the transcendence framework.

Table 2. Logics of Sharp's nonviolent action and Lee's nonviolence

	Sharp's (1973) Nonviolent Action	Lee's Nonviolence
Problem	Power abuse Uncontrolled power	Power abuse Self-enlargement and hypertrophy
Goal	To win a victory over the ruler (zero-sum)	To avoid a people's rampage and ruler's tyranny and to pursue rationality and peace (co-existence)
Players	Rulers and subjects (the general population, agents, and foreign countries and people)	Rulers, social groups, and ordinary citizens
Power source	Subjects' consent (obedience and cooperation)	Legitimacy
Target	Availability of power sources	Lack of political legitimacy
Methods	Protests and persuasion Noncooperation (boycotts and strikes) Intervention	Social groups' reasonable pressures To express oneself only in words To say the right things minimally
Effects	Withdrawal of subjects' consent To control rulers' power abuse (conversion, accommodation, and nonviolent coercion)	Self-disintegration and self-destruction To stop rulers' violence (power abuse) To protect the weak and let them grow
Caution	To maintain nonviolent disciplines (noncooperation and disobedience)	To keep telling the truth minimally To avoid a rampage of the weak

Note. Adapted from Lee (1980, 1986, 1991, 1996, 2001, 2008) and Sharp (1973).

9) By contrast, Sharp (1973) remarks, "Nonviolent action is thus not synonymous with 'pacifism.' Nor is it identical with religious or philosophical systems emphasizing nonviolence as a matter of moral principle" (p. 68).

Logics of Sharp's Nonviolent Action

For Sharp (1973), a society consists of a ruling group and subject people. The subjects here include the general population, the ruler's agents (administrators) and followers, and foreign governments and people (p. 37). A ruler needs the obedience of and cooperation from a part of society (followers) to rule the whole (p. 24). That is, a ruler's power is derived from the consent of the subjects and his/her power is proportional to their willingness to accept or cooperate with him/her, to obey his/her commands, and to carry out his/her wishes (p. 16).¹⁰⁾ The exercise of power depends on the consent of the ruled, who hold the natural right to withdraw that consent (p. 4). Sharp (1973) asserts, "All government is based upon consent" (p. 28) and "Obedience is at the heart of political power" (p. 16).

A ruler's power is not durable, self-perpetuating, and self-reinforcing but fragile and subject to change (Sharp, 1973, p. 8–9). It is dependent upon the availability of political power sources, such as authority, human resources, skills and knowledge, intangible factors, material resources, and sanctions, which depends upon the degree of obedience and cooperation of the subjects (pp. 8, 12, 18, 28). The ruler's power capacity, subjects' cooperation and obedience, and sources of political power are mutually determined in this continual interdependent process (pp. 16, 37).¹¹⁾

As subjects' obedience (consent) may be strengthened or weakened, depending on the interaction between the ruler and the subjects, the degree of a ruler's power will vary (Sharp, 1973, p. 30).¹²⁾ Sharp states, "To the degree that the law and the ruler's general policies agree with the needs of a society and the general sense of what is desirable and tolerable, obedience will be widespread" (p. 25). If a ruler misuses his/her political power and implements unfavorable policies for a society, the subjects will decrease their level of cooperation or withdraw their consent to obey; then, the availability of the ruler's power sources will diminish; and finally, the ruler's power capacity will be reduced. When the general population and agents withdraw their obedience and cooperation, the ruler will

10) "Authority nevertheless rests on the acceptance or consent of individuals [subjects]" (Barnard, 1968, p. 164).

11) "The power relationship exists only when completed by the subordinates' obedience to the ruler's commands and compliance with his wishes. ... The wielding of political power is not, therefore, a one-way process in which the ruler issues commands which are inevitably carried out" (Sharp, 1973, p. 17).

12) The extent to which a ruler's power is controlled is determined by "1) the relative desire of the populace to control his power; 2) the relative strength of the subjects' independent organizations and institutions; and 3) the subjects' relative ability to withhold their consent and assistance" (Sharp, 1973, p. 29).

encounter extreme difficulties in sustaining his/her authoritarian regime (p. 32)¹³⁾

The target of Sharp's nonviolent action is the sources of political power. It is not likely that nonviolent activists, without being engaged in warfare, can control a ruler's power capacity directly. Sharp's (1973) nonviolent action involves controlling rulers' political power indirectly by undermining the availability of his/her power sources (pp. 8–10).

Sharp (1973) illustrates specific nonviolent action methods that are classified into three categories. Nonviolent protests and persuasion, such as letters of opposition, picketing, marches, parades, and demonstrative funerals, are symbolic actions to persuade the opponent (the ruler) and express disapproval and dissent. It is noted that verbal and psychological persuasion are not valid nonviolent actions for Sharp (p. 70). Noncooperation is to withdraw political, economic, and social cooperation and make it difficult for a ruler to enforce his/her laws and orders. This method includes boycotts, strikes, and civil disobedience. Finally, nonviolent interventions involve psychological, physical, social, economic, or political intervention, such as nonviolent obstruction, nonviolent invasion, nonviolent land seizure, and sit-ins.

Nonviolent actions are expected to control rulers' power abuse by altering subjects' obedience and cooperation. Successful nonviolent actions will produce three mechanisms of change (Sharp, 1973, p. 69). The first mechanism is conversion, in which the ruler positively accepts nonviolent activists' viewpoints. During accommodation, the ruler grants activists' demands without changing his/her viewpoint. Nonviolent coercion is a mechanism in which the ruler is unable to struggle against activists because the sources of his/her power and the means of his/her control are undermined by nonviolent actions.

Unorganized subjects should realize their potential for controlling the ruler's power by their corporate resistance and defiance (i.e., noncooperation and disobedience) and the withdrawal of their consent (Sharp, 1973, pp. 47–48). They also need to understand the methods and logics of nonviolent action, the dynamics of political change, and the principles of nonviolent strategies and tactics (p. 48). The noncooperation and disobedience must be widespread and persistent enough to control the ruler's power effectively (p. 32). The critical question is how to carry out and maintain the collective nonviolent discipline skillfully in the face of the ruler's repression (pp. 32, 47, 70).

13) "Noncooperation and defiance by subjects, at least under certain conditions, can create serious problems for rulers, thwart their intentions and policies, and even destroy their government" (Sharp, 1973, p. 44).

Logics of Lee's Nonviolence

Lee's transcendence framework consists of nonviolence, personal ethic, social ethic, and self-sacrifice in this order. It originates from the Four Gospels of rebirth, holiness, healing, and the second coming (Lee, 1991, pp. 32–33; Lee, 2001, p. 254) and is enriched with his experience of the pro-democracy movement. His theory of nonviolence postulates the following premises (Park, 2015).

First, all bad things come from a government that lacks political legitimacy and misuses its power, while all good things are created by citizens (Lee, 1991, p. 42; Lee, 2008, pp. 268, 589). A government, by its nature, does not have the ability to behave nicely by itself and to correct itself when it does something wrong (Lee, 1991, p. 29; Lee, 2008, p. 65). It is implied that a bad government, if not controlled properly, will get worse and worse and then reach power hypertrophy (Park, 2015, p. 293). Not all citizens, but only those who endure hardship and adhere to nonviolence in desperate situations, can put forward meaningful alternatives to violence and eventually make peace (Lee, 1980, p. 365; Lee, 1986, p. 290).

Second, a government learns from citizens' good practices, while citizens learn bad practices from an illegitimate government (Lee, 1991, p. 29). Citizens have to stick to nonviolence when the ruler wields brutal violence, and even when citizens are induced to use violence, they should not fall for this deception (Lee, 1986, p. 289). Due to the lack of self-correction in government, citizens (social groups) should continuously demand that such a ruler rectifies his/her power abuse (Lee, 2008, p. 65).

Third, a tyrannical ruler collapses by himself/herself (Lee, 1986, p. 289; Lee, 2008, pp. 346–347). A violent government is not strong but indeed weak in nature because it always suffers from its illegitimacy (Lee, 1986, p. 297).¹⁴⁾ Such a government tends to launch policies for show

14) Lee's (2001) strong government is established through legitimate procedures (e.g., election) and, as usual, represents people properly. It employs basic principles of organization, such as the rule of law, the division of labor, and hierarchical structure. In a strong government, for example, civil servants are given legitimate authorities that come from superiors' delegation, subordinates' consent, or the duties themselves (p. 385). These official, democratic, and practical authorities enable public officials to utilize their expertise without being subordinate to their superiors; work to enhance social welfare and equity rather than pursue personal gain by bribing superior officials; reject irrelevant requests of a superior or organization; and permit civil participation (p. 112). A strong government is neither an autocratic government that misuses its political power and suppresses people nor a weak government such that its bureaucrats and subjects sway arbitrarily at their pleasure; it is not a violent government but a nonviolent government that does not use naked power (pp. 112, 385).

to disguise the dearth of its legitimacy and thus loses support from its subjects. Individual members of the ruling group usually have insatiable appetites for power and wealth and, accordingly, engross themselves in their own gains. They desperately compete with or even attack each other to get more and more rather than to serve the people. If the ruler faces difficulties in enforcing laws and controlling omnivorous subjects, then he/she will use more violence (power abuse) and make new arbitrary laws to suppress the dissidents (Lee, 1984, pp. 144–145). But, such harsh laws rarely work, and even the ruler denies them in the end (Lee, 1986, p. 289). This phenomenon is a signal of the worst situation in which people neither believe in the legitimacy of the regime nor abides by its laws and rules (Lee, 1986, p. 289; Lee, 2008, p. 347). Lee wants to describe this process as a ruler's self-enlargement and power hypertrophy (Lee, 1991, p. 119; Lee, 1996, p. 405). In this anomic circumstance, the ruling group rapidly disintegrates by itself and the violent regime collapses in on itself (Lee, 1986, p. 297).

Finally, citizens' rational resistance or nonviolent struggle is enough to transform the ruler because an illegitimate government based on violence will bring destruction upon itself (Lee, 1986, p. 297; Lee, 1991, p. 30). The ruled must express themselves in words that even a bad ruler dares not refuse (Lee, 2008, pp. 66, 491, 615). The words should be reasonable, factual, and logical without any unnecessary or emotional expressions. This mature and complete strategy will surely compel the strong to stop committing wrongdoings (Lee, 2008, p. 59). Citizens' rampage or an incomplete and half-baked nonviolent struggle will give the members of the ruling group, who are in the middle of self-disintegration and self-destruction, an excuse to unite themselves and retaliate against the ruled (Lee, 1986, p. 297). Therefore, it is important that the weak endure the hardship and wait tenaciously to the last minute, saying the right things minimally (Lee, 1986, p. 298; Lee, 2001, p. 204; Lee, 2008, p. 202). Endurance is the pinnacle of nonviolence and all virtues needed for people who are suffering from tyrannical power; accordingly, endurance is synonymous with nonviolence (Lee, 1980, p. 384; Lee, 1986, p. 336). Abstinence is not lethargy but the power to wait, grow, and overwhelm violence (Lee, 1991, p. 19).

Lee (1980) mentions that Jangseung, Korean village guardians or totem poles, are the symbol of Korean nonviolence culture. Jangseung are

traditionally placed in a pair at the entrance to villages or on roadsides to frighten demons off. The left pole is carved into a figure of a male general, called "the Great General All Under the Heaven," while "the Female General of the Underground" is etched on the left pole. Jangseung's nonviolent characteristics include (1) they play a role of boundary markers, making possible clear and fair land governance; (2) Jangseung look peaceful because they consist of a man and a woman, rather than two men or two women; (3) the female general indicates enhanced women's rights; (4) both generals are not carrying any weapons, such as a bow and arrow, a spear, or a sword; (5) both general officers are not wearing armor but are dressed in traditional wedding attire, which is used on the most pleasant day of one's life; (6) Jangseung always stand in the open air (as opposed to a shrine or temple), come rain or shine, implying that they are free from any side effects of an institutionalized religion; (7) Jangseung symbolize patience and endurance. They are usually made of wood (as opposed to steel) that decays and perishes easily in rain and snow, implying frail human beings whose bodies die away readily and whose patience is spiritually transformed into a virtue;¹⁵ and (8) those who bow and pray to Jangseung are not a violent ruler but ordinary citizens on skid row (pp. 383–384).

Conclusion

Sharp (1973) examined the nature of nonviolent struggles and developed a theory of nonviolent action as a political technique and as a means of combat to win a victory over an opponent. Sharp's nonviolent action consists of a set of protests and persuasion, noncooperation, and intervention methods. Lee developed the framework of transcendence ethics on the basis of his experience as a conservative pro-democracy fighter during the 1970s and 1980s. His nonviolence is the antecedent of personal ethic, social ethic, and self-sacrifice in his transcendence framework and is used interchangeably as a virtue, qualification, ability, or method, depending upon the context. His conception of nonviolence features him as a minimalist who stubbornly adheres to the inalienable minimum.

Sharp's nonviolent action and Lee's nonviolence,

15) Lee might imagine that political power can easily go wrong and should be refreshed periodically as is the case for Jangseung, which are rebuilt in a community ritual or ceremony mainly on the first full moon of the lunar calendar.

despite their terminological similarity, are quite different from each other (Table 1). Sharp's nonviolent action excludes only physical violence, while Lee's nonviolence leaves out verbal, emotional, gestural, and psychological violence as well. The former is not verbal but behavioral, whereas the latter involves expressing oneself in words, whether spoken or written. The words used should be rational and logical enough to be considered right. The weak must tell the truth to a ruler minimally without provoking him/her. Lee's nonviolence should be grounded in laws, rules, procedures, common sense, and agreements, while Sharp's nonviolent action does not necessarily rely upon established standards, principles, and institutional procedures.

These conceptual differences distinguish the logics of Lee's nonviolence and Sharp's theory of nonviolent action. Sharp seeks effective ways to win a victory over a ruler who misuses his/her political power, while Lee wants to devise a foolproof way to avoid a harsh confrontation between a ruler's tyranny and subjects' rampage and thus return rationality and peace (Table 2). A nonviolent struggle is their answer. Sharp's theory of nonviolent action is pragmatic nonviolence, whereas Lee's nonviolence is closer to principled nonviolence.

Sharp's methods of nonviolent action are supposed to undermine the sources of uncontrolled power, induce the withdrawal of subjects' consent, and eventually control the ruler's power. The key issue is how to maintain nonviolent discipline and beware of any physical violence. Lee presupposes that a government does not have the ability to correct its errors and a tyrannical regime will collapse in on itself as a consequence of self-enlargement and power hypertrophy. Therefore, the weak ought not to ask too much and keep minimally telling the right things to the despot, which not even he/she can rebuff. They should adhere to complete nonviolence while enduring the cruel violence of the strong and waiting patiently to the end.

Sharp's nonviolent action and its methods are more practical and specific than Lee's nonviolence, which is more philosophical and normative than Sharp's concept. The former is more of a field manual for activists whereas the latter is closer to a doctrine for their leaders. The concept and logic of Lee's nonviolence together with minimalism make them distinct from those of other scholars and activists in the world. The uniqueness of Lee's conception comes from his Confucian philosophy, lifelong religious life in Christianity, and dramatic experience as a dissident intellectual and pro-democracy fighter in Korea.

References

- Barnard, C. I. (1968). *The functions of executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Clements, K. P. (2015). Principled nonviolence: An imperative, not an optional extra. *Asian Journal of Peacebuilding*, 3(1), 1–17. doi: 10.18588/201505.000033.
- Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in* (3rd ed.). New York: Penguin.
- Lee, M. Y. (1980). *한국행정론* [Korean public administration]. Seoul, Korea: Ilchokak.
- Lee, M. Y. (1984). 韓國國民의苦難と希望 [The hardship and hope of Korean citizens]. <世界>, February, 1984, 143–148.
- Lee, M. Y. (1986). *겁많은 자의 용기* [Cowardly man's courage], 2nd ed. Seoul, Korea: Joongwon Culture.
- Lee, M. Y. (1991). *자전적 행정학* [Autobiographical public administration]. Seoul, Korea: Silcheon Munhak.
- Lee, M. Y. (1996). *논어맹자와 행정학* [The analects of Confucius, the works of Mencius, and public administration]. Seoul, Korea: Nanam Publishing House.
- Lee, M. Y. (2001). *인간 종교 국가: 미국행정, 청교도 정신, 그리고 마르틴 루터의 95개조* [Man, religion, and state: American public administration, Puritanism, and Martin Luther's 95 Theses]. Seoul, Korea: Nanam Publishing House.
- Lee, M. Y. (2006). *협력형 통치: 원효 울곡 함석헌 김구를 중심으로* [Cooperative governance: Won Hyo, Yulgok, Ham Seok-Heon, and Kim Gu]. Kyunggi, Korea: Open Books.
- Lee, M. Y. (2008). *겁많은 자의 용기: 지켜야 할 최소에 관한 이야기* [Cowardly man's courage: A tail about the minimum to which ordinary men must adhere]. Seoul, Korea: Samin.
- Mencius. (1970). *The works of Mencius* (J. Legge, Trans.). New York: Dover Publications.
- Park, H. M. (2015). Moon-Young Lee's transcendence ethics for democratic public administration: Meanings and rationales of Lee's nonviolence. *World Environment and Island Studies*, 5(4), 283–296.
- Schock, K. (2003). Nonviolent action and its misconceptions: Insights for social scientists. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 36(4), 705–712. doi: 10.1017/S1049096503003482.
- Sharp, G. (1973). *The politics of nonviolent action*. Boston, MA: Porter Sargent Publishers.

Receiving Date : January 15, 2020

Reviewing Date : January 22, 2020

Reporting Date of Article Appearance: February 29, 2020