Errata
Why Civil Resistance Works
Updated July 17, 2019 by Erica Chenoweth

On p., 247, Chapter 2, footnote 25 erroneously states that the interaction term and its two components (reported in the online appendix table WA.2) are jointly significant at p=.09. The actual figure is p=.07. This was an author's reporting error.

On p. 259, Chapter 8, footnote 17 erroneously states that the POLITY IV scale is ranked "from 1 (totalitarian regime) to 10 (fully democratic) based on the country's commitment to civil liberties, constraints on executive power, and political competition." The POLITY IV scale is actually a 21-point scale from -10 (totalitarian/absolute monarchy) to 10 (full democracy).

On p. 214, in Table 8.1, Model 2, the marginal effects for nonviolent resistance should read "+45%," and the marginal effects for the constant should read "15%." This was an author's reporting error.

Figure 2.1, the x-axis should read "logged participants per 1,000 population," not "logged participants per capita."

Figure 2.2, the x-axis should read "logged participants per 1,000 population," not "participants per capita, logged."

In Chapter 5, on. p. 137, footnote 38 is repeated twice (it appears on the first line of p. 137 as well as at the end of the second paragraph on the same page). This means that from p. 137 to p. 146, the second reference to fn 38 actually refers to fn 39 in the notes section (p. 254), and so on through the end of the chapter. Thus beginning with the second paragraph on p. 137, footnotes 38 through 55 in the text actually refer to notes 39 through 56 on pp. 254-255. Thanks to Jeremy Pressman for pointing out this error.

On p. 82, the sentence "And nonviolent campaigns have historically had an advantage over nonviolent campaigns in this regard" should read "And nonviolent campaigns have historically had an advantage over violent campaigns in this regard."

There are four known data coding errors in the NAVCO 1.1 data set. The first is the FSLN campaign in Nicaragua (referenced on p. 237), which is erroneously coded as a failure. It should be coded as a success. The second is the Contras campaign in Nicaragua, which is erroneously coded as a failure (referenced on p. 241). It should be coded as a partial success. Third, the Danish revolt against the Nazis in 1944 should be coded as having a violent flank (violsim=1). Fourth, there should be two simultaneous movements associated with the Indian Independence Movement. From 1919-1945, the movement should be coded as primarily nonviolent with a violent flank (violsim=1); it is accurately coded as a partial success. From 1942-1945, there should be a new movement listed—the Indian National Army—which should be coded a primarily violent campaign with defections and with external assistance (statesup=1) in the context of an

international war (extfor=1); it should be coded as a partial success according to our criteria. However, none of these corrections substantially change the results reported in the book *Why Civil Resistance Works*, and all relevant changes are reflected in subsequent versions of the dataset.

There was an additional coding error in the online appendix. The entry "Dutch revolt against Nazi occupation, 1944" should have read "Danish revolt against Nazi occupation, 1944." That entry and its description and source material have been revised accordingly.